The things you have heard me say in the presence of many witnesses entrust to reliable people who will also be qualified to teach others. 2 Timothy 2:2
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ABSTRACT: This paper represents an exploration into the difference in the perceived source of calling and the related work outcomes (i.e. living out a call, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction) between Indian and Ugandan leaders. The preliminary test results, except for living out a calling by the source of calling among Indian leaders, are consistent with earlier findings. There are no major differences among the three principal sources of calling on levels of living a calling, job satisfaction, or life satisfaction. The Indian nationality with a higher score on the individualism dimension than the Ugandan nationality exhibits significant differences among the three key sources of calling on levels of living a calling. Among the three hypothesized sources of calling, perfect fit had the highest frequency of endorsement, adding credence to previous findings by Duffy, Allan, Bott, and Dik (2014). The interpretations offered need further empirical exploration and investigation. Future research could test different levels of attentiveness with hypothesized sources of calling.
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The post-Enron-World recession world increasingly yearns for more integrity, ethical behavior, and honesty in the workplace. This craving has put the subject of spirituality, and in particular calling, in the center of many research studies (Berkelaar & Buzzanell, 2015; Duffy, Allan, & Dik, 2011; Gazica & Spector, 2015; Hirschi, 2011; Neubert & Halbesleben, 2015). Various prominent secular scientists and secular scholars postulate that the study of spiritual experience is potentially one of the most important areas of research in the next decade (Miller, 2012, p. 489). Furthermore, Winston (2009), postulates that a Christian leader needs to develop what he calls the four Cs; (a) Calling, (b) Competence, (c) Confidence, and (d) Character in that sequence (p.1). Callings come in various ways. Some are dramatic and extraordinary; a revelation, a strong urge, a divinely sent message (Acts 9; Ex 2-3; Jer 1-1-10), while other instances of calling are characterized by a quiet and gradual shift into a particular vocation. Similar to the call experienced by the Apostle Peter, it is a series of events that lead an individual into a distinct calling (Mt 4:18-24; Jn 21). This phenomenon of receiving a “call” is experienced by people of all ages, faith, agnostics and atheists (Ansberry, 2016, para. 1-2).

However, one of the most debated issues within the calling literature is the investigation on how individuals find a calling (Duffy, Allan, Bott, & Dik, 2014, p. 564) and how that perception influences work outcome. Ansberry (2016) asks a pertinent question: Does the experience of being "called" come from within the brain (i.e. an activity in the brain) or does it originate from a divine source? (para. 5-6). Several scholars have contended that a calling can originate from multiple sources at once (Byrne et al., 2009, p. 424). Some researchers argue that calling is a sense of inner direction and need not be coupled with any religious or spiritual undertones (Neubert & Halbesleben, 2015, p. 860). Though, Novak (1996) posits that stripping “religious” overtones from calling affects its motivational potential (pp. 17-18). The extant literature reveals that there are three prominent views regarding the source of calling: (a) an external source, (b) a destiny, and (c) a perfect fit for one’s interests, values, and skills (Duffy, Allan, et al., p. 564). In a study conducted by Duffy, Allan, et al., a multivariate analysis of variance revealed no significant differences among the three primary source groups on levels of living a calling, job satisfaction, or life satisfaction (p. 562). Conversely, Duffy, Allan, et al. further recommended the findings in that study be further confirmed through replicated investigations with various samples in diverse cultures (p. 570). Additionally, Duffy, Allan, et al. suggest future research examines the frequency of perceiving multiple sources of a calling and compare these participants to those who perceive one source (p. 570). Thus, the primary objective of the study was as to explore the difference in the perceived source of calling and the related work outcomes (i.e. living out a call, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction) between Ugandan and Indian leaders. Consequently, research questions are summarized as follows:

(a) Does one’s perceived source of calling differentiate the way one lives out calling?

(b) Among Indian and Ugandan leaders, does source of calling make a difference in the way the calling is lived out?

(c) Is there a difference in job satisfaction based on source of calling?
Among Indian and Ugandan leaders, does the source of calling make a difference in job satisfaction?

Does source of calling make a difference in life satisfaction?

Is there a difference in life satisfaction based on source of calling?

Among Indian and Ugandan leaders, does source of calling make a difference when measuring job satisfaction?

The findings in this study add to the increasing body of literature on “calling,” specifically the relationship between perceived multiple sources of calling and work outcomes such as living out a call, job satisfaction (An attitude a person holds towards one’s specific job as a result of experiences in a job; Neubert & Halbesleben, 2015, p. 862), and life satisfaction (The degree to which an individual feels satisfied with life; Douglass, Duffy, & Autin, 2016, p. 258). Additionally, this paper reports a cross-cultural study that explores further the validity of the construct of calling among leaders. Moreover, it reports findings that may have significant implications on work motivation, career choices, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and employee turnover in Sub-Saharan Africa and Southern-Asian cultures.

LITERATURE REVIEW

There is no consensus on what the term “calling” means, but there are two main approaches to defining calling; “neoclassical” and “modern” (Duffy & Dik, 2013, p. 428). According to Duffy and Dik, the neoclassical approach focuses on the historical roots of the term and emphasizes a sense of destiny (a career - something that one is meant to do- that someone is searching for and hopefully ultimately finds; Duffy, Allan, et al., 2014, p. 564) and prosocial duty (Duffy & Dik, p. 429). In contrast, the modern approach largely focuses on an inner drive towards self-fulfillment or personal happiness (Duffy & Dik, p. 429). Modern definitions are intentionally stripped off any spiritual undertones. For instance, Dobrow and Tosti-Karas (2011) described calling as “a consuming, meaningful, passion people experience toward a domain” (p. 1005). Calling has also been defined as “that place in occupational division of labor in society where one feels destined to fill by virtue of particular gifts, talents, and/or idiosyncratic life opportunities.” (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009, p. 38). However, some scholars argue that severing calling from its religious ties could result in altering the motivational dimension of calling and its legitimacy (Novak, 1996, p. 7). A definition of calling that retains the spiritual aspect of the definition is in keeping with the religious and historical origins of calling in the Christian faith and is inclusive of other theistic religious traditions such as Islam, Judaism, and Hinduism (Neubert & Halbesleben, 2015, p. 861). Elangovan, Pinder, and McLean, (2010) define a calling as “a course of action in pursuit of prosocial intentions embodying the convergence of an individual’s sense of what he or she would like to do, should do, and actually does.” (p. 430). Dik and Duffy (2007) have defined calling as a meaningful career that improves the lives of others. A calling means an approach to work with a mindset that one’s career is an important part of a broader sense of direction and meaning in life, and it is used to enrich the lives of others or promote the greater good in some way (Duffy & Dik, p. 429). In this article, calling is described as a meaningful and purposeful job (or vocation) that one executes to serve others or contribute to the greater good (Duffy, Allan, et al., p. 563).
The renewed interest in callings in organizational leadership is partly due to the belief that calling is central to one’s identity and this has a broad range of work-related outcomes (Elangovan, et al., 2010, p. 428). Numerous studies on calling have revealed that motivation and job satisfaction tends to be higher in individuals with a sense of calling than those who only view their work as merely another job (Duffy, Dik, & Steger, 2011; Hall & Chandler, 2005; Lee, 2014; Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, & Schwartz, 1997). Studies have shown that a sense of calling correlates with lower levels of stress and depression (Hall & Chandler, 2005; Willemse & Deacon, 2015). Serrow (1994) found that teachers who view their work as a calling in life, significantly show greater enthusiasm, commitment, and a willingness to sacrifice for their career than their colleagues who did not feel called to teach (p. 94). Duffy, Allan, et al (2014) have also confirmed that calling is a significant predictor of personal growth and life meaning, and life meaning, the search for life meaning, and vocational self-clarity significantly predict the presence of a calling (Duffy, Douglass, Autin, & Allan, 2014, p. 309). Douglass and Duffy (2015) examined the relation of calling and career adaptability, and they found that calling weakly to moderately correlated with four components of adaptability, namely, concern, control, curiosity, and confidence (p. 58).

Hunter, Dik, and Banning (2010) carried out a qualitative study that examined how 295 students defined the construct of calling, how it influenced their career and the extent to which the term “calling” applied to areas of life other than work (p. 178). The results showed that students perceived calling as originating from guiding forces, co-occurring with "unique" fit and well-being, having self-sacrificing features, and encompassing multiple life roles (Hunter, Dik, & Banning, p. 178). Hirschi (2011) in an empirical study, identified three types of calling: “negative career self-centered,” “pro-social religious,” and positive varied work orientation” (p. 60). In a similar study involving 312 undergraduate students, Duffy, Allan and Dik (2011) found that the presence of a calling was moderately correlated with academic satisfaction (p. 74).

Experiencing a calling is perhaps the single most important phenomenon that takes place in an individual’s life and has many positive consequences for the individual and organizations (Hagmaier & Abele, 2012, p. 39). Cardador, Dane, and Pratt (2011) in their study confirmed that a calling orientation is positively associated with organizational identification and negatively related to the turnover intention (p. 367). While, Duffy, Dik, and Steger, (2011), using a sample of 370 employees representing diverse occupations confirmed that calling moderately correlated with career commitment, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment and weakly correlated with withdrawal intentions (p. 210). Many questions still linger in the mind of scholars. What exactly is the link (if any) between being engaged in a calling and leader effectiveness? How is the source of a call related to a leader’s effectiveness? Some scholars posit that it is the engagement in the calling, not the outcome that is critical in a leader (Elangovan, Pinder & McLean, 2010, p. 438). In a study carried out by Duffy, Allan, et al. (2014) no significant contrasts were found by sources of calling across work and life outcomes, though people with external summons (an individual perceives a call arising from transcendent summons, such as God, a higher power, a family legacy, or the needs of society) had the highest living calling scores ($M = 28.71$), job satisfaction scores ($M = 25.60$), and life satisfaction scores ($M = 23.53$) when compared to people with destiny callings ($M = 26.80, 24.34,$ and $20.77$, respectively) and people with perfect fit (An individual finds a complete harmonization between his or her skills, values, and interests in an occupation) callings ($M = 27.54, 25.38,$ and $22.67$), respectively. Duffy, Allan, et al. recommended that future research should examine the
prevalence of perceiving multiple sources of a calling (e.g., a higher power and perfect fit) and compare these participants to those who perceive one source (p. 570).

CULTURAL DIMENSIONS AND CALLING

Arguably the most popular theory on national culture is Hofstede's (1984) cultural dimensions' theory. It describes the effects of society's culture on the values of its members, and how these values are linked to behavior (Hofstede, 2011, p. 8). Geert Hofstede (2011) defines culture as “the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another” (p. 3). The national culture value system is quite stable over time and may be carried forward from generation to generation (Soares, Farhangmehr, & Shoham, 2007, p. 282). Additionally, Hofstede (1997) postulates that the core element of any culture is its values which are general tendencies to favor certain states of affairs over other. Hofstede (1997) introduced four dimensions of national culture, and later introduced two more; power distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Masculinity versus Femininity, Individualism versus Collectivism, Short-term and long-term Orientation, and indulgence versus restraint:

**Individualism Versus Collectivism.** A society’s position on this dimension is determined by whether people’s self-image is defined in terms of “I” or “we.” In an individualist society, members are expected to take care of themselves and immediate families, and unrelated individuals are loosely connected. While in a collectivist society individuals are integrated into a strong and cohesive framework where individuals expect members of their society to take care of them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty.

**Power Distance.** A society’s position on this dimension is determined by the degree to which the less powerful in a society accept and expect inequality in power distribution. Individuals in societies that exhibit high power distance accept a hierarchical order without any elaborate justification while societies that exhibit low power distance, individuals strive to equalize power distribution and demand justification for inequalities of power.

**Masculinity Versus Femininity.** In a masculinity society achievement, heroism, assertiveness, competition and material reward for success are prized and celebrated. In a femininity society cooperation, modesty, caring for the weak and quality of life is preferred.

**Uncertainty Avoidance.** This dimension expresses the degree to which a society is uncomfortable with uncertainty and ambiguity. Is effort needed to control the future or is the future inevitable? Societies high in uncertainty avoidance maintain rigid codes of belief and behavior, and they are intolerant of unorthodox conduct and unconventional ideas. Societies low in uncertainty avoidance are open to new ideas.

**Long-Term Orientation Versus Short-Term Orientation.** This dimension shows whether a society shows a pragmatic future-oriented perspective or a conventional historic point of view. A long-term orientation perspective fosters perseverance, thrift, and ordering relationships by status. A short-term orientation perspective is more related to the past and present and engenders respect for traditions.
**Indulgence Versus Restraint.** Indulgence refers to societies that allow relatively free gratification of human desires related to the enjoyment of life and having fun, while restraint refers to societies that prefer the suppression and regulation of the gratification of human needs and desires by strict social norms.

Although some scholars (e.g., Dik & Duffy, 2007; Dik, Eldridge, Steger, & Duffy, 2012), have recommended a further empirical investigation to explore the cross-cultural relevance of the construct, thus far relatively little effort has been made. Interestingly, Douglass, Duffy, and Autin (2016) conducted a study that investigated group variations in perceiving a calling and living a calling (The degree to which one senses that he or she is currently living her or his calling; Duffy, Bott, Allan, Torrey, & Dik, 2012) between Americans and Indians (p. 253). The study revealed, among other things, that nationality moderated the living calling–life meaning and living calling–job satisfaction links (Douglass, Duffy, & Autin, p. 253). These results indicate the importance of nationality in the interaction between living a calling and life satisfaction (Douglass, Duffy, & Autin, p. 253). However, from the review of extant literature there is little or no evidence of empirical studies done to explore the moderating effect of culture on the relation between multiple sources of calling (as opposed to one source), and job satisfaction, life satisfaction and living out the call in Africa. It is also noteworthy, the vast majority of studies on calling have been conducted with samples found in America and Europe (Duffy, Allan, Autin, & Douglass, 2014). This admission denotes a significant gap in the calling literature, and several scholars have urged researchers to examine how the concept of a calling applies to individuals in non-Western societies (Hirschi, 2011; Douglass, Duffy, & Autin, 2016). These research studies indicate the need and importance of investigating the role of nationality in the relationship between the source of calling, living a calling, life satisfaction, and job satisfaction.

---

**SOURCE OF CALLING, LIVING A CALL, JOB SATISFACTION, AND LIFE SATISFACTION**

Research studies reveal a critical link between sensing a calling and living out a calling (Duffy & Autin, 2013). Studies have also shown that the degree to which individuals were living their calling was the same regardless the source of calling (Duffy & Dik, 2013, p. 429). Nevertheless, it is worth noting that these sources are not mutually exclusive, and often individuals claim to perceive more than one source of calling (Dik & Duffy, 2012). Studies have also proved that calling is associated with job satisfaction (Dik, et al., 2012). Calling provides an intrinsic source of satisfaction (Dobrow & Tosti-Kharas, 2011). Additionally, research findings consistently depict that calling and life satisfaction are linked (Douglass, Duffy, & Autin, 2016, p. 254). Peterson, Park, Hall, and Seligman (2009) found that the correlation coefficient between calling and job satisfaction was .54, and Greene and Robbins (2015), in their study, confirmed that individuals with a sense of calling, even when exposed to workplace discrimination, still show a high degree of job satisfaction.

Numerous studies using a wide cross section of samples have demonstrated that feeling called to a particular vocation or career is associated with increased life satisfaction (Duffy & Dik, 2013). These results also have been echoed by qualitative studies (Duffy, Foley, et al., 2012). Several hypotheses are derived from recommendations made in a previous study by Duffy, Allan et al. (2014) our sample was relatively small, was mostly White, and data were collected through an online data collection service. Although all participants were employed and represented a wide range of income levels, it is difficult to extend these results to the broader population, and future studies may
wish to explore similar questions with more representative samples. (Duffy, Allan, Bott, & Dik, 2014, pp. 570-572).

Thus, this research study sought to explore and validate the findings of Duffy, Allan, et al.’s (2014) research in non-western cultures by examining the following hypotheses:

RH1a: There is a difference in living out a calling by the source of calling for Indian leaders.

RH1b: There is a difference in living out a calling by the source of calling for Ugandan leaders.

RH1c: There is no difference in living out a calling by the source of calling between the Indian and Ugandan leaders.

RH2a: There is a difference in job satisfaction by the source of calling for Indian leaders.

RH2b: There is a difference in job satisfaction by the source of calling for Ugandan leaders.

RH2c: There is no difference in job satisfaction by the source of calling between Indian and Ugandan leaders.

RH3a: There is a difference in life satisfaction by the source of calling for Indian leaders.

RH3b: There is a difference in life satisfaction by the source of calling for Ugandan leaders.

RH3c: There is no difference in life satisfaction by the source of calling between Indian and Ugandan leaders.

VARIABLES

The source of calling is one of the theorized independent variable with three groups or levels i.e. External Summons, Destiny, and Perfect Fit (non-metric). The second independent variable is cultural grouping with two levels; Indian and Ugandan. Living a Call (metric), Job Satisfaction (metric), and Life Satisfaction (metric) are the three dependent variables.

METHODOLOGY

The target population was working adults of Ugandan (Sub-Saharan cultural cluster) and Indian (South Asian cultural cluster) descent located in Kampala, Uganda and India. In both countries (i.e. in India and Uganda), due to the limited resources and time permitted to conduct the research study, the purposive sampling technique was used. In Kampala, the research team went from street-to-street, house-to-house, and from one workplace-to-another soliciting a response from potential respondents in the business center of Kampala. In India, because of the inaccessibility of respondents to the researcher who was based in Kampala, Uganda, the data were primarily collected online using the snowball sampling strategy. Ninety-four respondents were of South Asian descent.
or Indian descent (19 were resident in India and 75 were resident in Uganda). Eighty-four were Ugandans all resident in Uganda.

INSTRUMENTS

The Demographic Information Survey collected information about participants’ age, gender, the level of education, cultural grouping, current role in their organization, and whether the organization was in private or public sector.

The Source of Calling instrument developed by Duffy, Allan, et al. (2014, p. 567) was used. It came into being based on the theory that calling comes from three sources: (a) something outside to oneself, (b) something that one is meant to do, and (c) as a perfect fit for one’s skills, interests, and values.

The Calling and Vocation Questionnaire (CVQ) instrument was used to measure living out a call. According to Dik, Eldridge, Steger, and Duffy, (2009), the CVQ is appropriate to use in this study because it provides a multidimensional approach to assessing the construct of calling and it applies to a wide range of people with different career paths, cultural beliefs, and religion (p. 17). According to Dik, et al. (2012), the reliability of this scale was reported as ranging from Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .90 (individuals who perceive they currently experience a sense of calling) to .91 (individuals not currently experiencing a sense of calling but are actively seeking one).

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) assesses employee attitudes towards their jobs and the different aspects of their jobs. According to Spector (1994), it applies to all organizations, both in private and public sector. The internal consistency reliabilities (coefficient alpha), based on a sample of 2,870, range from .60 to .91.

Satisfaction with Life was assessed using the Satisfaction with Life Scale. The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) is one of the most extensively used instrument to measure and assess life satisfaction (Maroufizadeh, Ghaferi, Omani Samani, & Ezabadi, 2016). Studies have shown that the SWLS has strong internal consistency and moderate temporal stability with Cronbach's alpha of 0.87 (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985).

RESULTS

First, several preliminary analyses using SPSS were carried out before investigating the study's main research questions. The data analysis revealed there were 175 valid responses and four responses were incomplete. Interestingly, the highest frequency of the source of calling was the combination of all the three postulated sources (i.e. external summons, destiny, and perfect match of interests, and talents with ones’ career/job) were jointly perceived as the source of calling as shown in Table 1.
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Table 1: Frequency Table of Source of Calling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Calling</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Summons</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destiny</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect Match</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All three</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the three</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>179</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, 80.9% (n = 144) of the respondents were between 25-46 years of age. Male respondents were 76% (n = 136) and the female respondents were 24% (n = 43). And 53% identified themselves as Indians (of South Asian descent), and 47% described themselves as Ugandans (of Sub-Saharan descent). Lastly, 65% were working in the Private sector, and 50.9% were either in middle or senior management levels.

Analyses of Variance Tests. The second phase of the investigation involved analyses of variance (ANOVAs) to investigate some of the main research questions. First, a significant difference was found (F (4,80) = 3.526; p = .011) in living out a calling by the source of calling among Indian leaders (Table 2). However, no significant difference was found in living out a calling by the source of calling for Ugandan leaders (F (4,73) = 2.252; p = .072) as indicated in Table 3.

Table 2: Living Out a Call by Source of Calling Among Indian Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Calling</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1432.683</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>358.171</td>
<td>3.526</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>8126.070</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>101.576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9558.753</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Living Out a Call by Source of Calling Among Ugandan Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Calling</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1188.510</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>297.127</td>
<td>2.252</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>9633.285</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>131.963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10821.795</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerning job satisfaction, neither the Indian sample (F (4,80) = 2.260; p = .070) nor the Ugandan sample (F (4,75) = 1.216; p = .311) was found to have any significant difference in job satisfaction by the source of calling (Table 4). Lastly, as indicated in Tables 4-7, there was also no significant difference in life satisfaction by the source of calling in the Indian sample (F (4,78) = 2.236; p = .073) and the Ugandan sample (F (4,74) = .292; p = .883). These results, except for living out a calling by the source of calling among Indian leaders, are consistent with earlier findings. There are no significant differences among the three primary source groups on levels of living a calling, job satisfaction, or life satisfaction (Duffy, et al., 2014).

Table 4: Job Satisfaction (Indian Leaders)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>612.093</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>153.023</td>
<td>2.260</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>5417.602</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67.720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6029.694</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Job Satisfaction (Ugandan Leaders)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>197.469</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49.367</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3044.419</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40.592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3241.888</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Life Satisfaction (Indian Leaders)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>645.633</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>161.408</td>
<td>2.236</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>5631.331</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72.197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6276.964</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Life Satisfaction (Ugandan Leaders)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>69.346</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.337</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>4400.249</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>59.463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4469.595</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**T-tests to Compare Nationalities.** Independent-samples t-tests were conducted to compare the Indian and Ugandan leaders by their perceived source of calling and the related work outcomes (living a call, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction). The results are summarized in Table 8. In regard to living out a calling, there was a significant difference in the scores for Indian leaders (M= 67.78, SD= 10.67) and Ugandan leaders (M= 61.43, SD= 11.85) conditions; t (163) =3.62, p = .000. These results suggest that nationality has an effect on leaders living out a calling by the source of calling. However, when the two groups are compared in job satisfaction since the p-value = .163 > .05, the null hypothesis is accepted. There was lack of evidence to support the view that there is a significant difference in the scores for Indian leaders (M= 63.16, SD= 8.47) and Ugandan leaders (M= 61.54, SD= 6.37) conditions; t (165) =1.400, p = .163. Similarly, when the two nationalities are compared in life satisfaction, since the p-value = .860 > .05, there is ample evidence to support the null hypothesis. Table 5 shows there was not a significant difference in the scores for Indian leaders (M= 65.16, SD= 8.75) and Ugandan leaders (M= 65.38, SD= 7.57) conditions; t (162) = -.177, p = .860.

In summary, the highest frequency of the source of calling was the combination of all the three postulated sources and not any single perceived source of calling. The multivariate analysis of variance showed no significant difference among the three sources of calling on levels of living out a call, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction. However, nationality, specifically cultural dimensions, appear to moderate living out a calling by the source of calling. The results show a significant difference (F (4,80) = 3.526; p = .011) in living out a calling by the source of calling among Indian leaders. These results reveal the need to investigate further the effect of cultural dimensions on the link between the perceived source and living out a calling.

Secondly, in agreement with prior research, there are no significant differences among the three principal sources of calling on levels of living a calling, job satisfaction, or life satisfaction. Hence, the findings in this study re-ignite the discussion on the relevance of the three sources in further research. Is there a need to redefine what is meant by a “source of calling?”

**DISCUSSION**

The primary objective of the study was to explore the difference in the perceived source of calling and the related work outcomes (i.e. living out a call, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction) between Indian and Ugandan leaders. The preliminary test results, except for living out a calling by the source of calling among Indian leaders, are consistent with earlier findings. There are no major differences among the three principal sources of calling on levels of living a calling, job satisfaction, or life satisfaction (Duffy, Allan, Bott, & Dik, 2014). It is also not surprising that the highest frequency of the source of calling was the combination of all the three postulated sources (i.e., external summons, destiny, and perfect match of interests, and talents with ones’ career/job). Duffy and Dik (2013) in their study confirmed that as long as individuals feel they are living out their calling, the source of calling is inconsequential regarding how a calling links to job and life satisfaction. Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Ann, and Tipton (1985) argue that there are three distinct ways workers view their tasks: as jobs, careers or callings (p. 66). The results of this study further prove that there is a significant positive correlation between calling and work-related outcomes. How workers view, their work has tremendous implications for organizational leaders. The task
Table 8: T-tests to Compare Nationalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test*</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVING A CALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>3.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>3.611</td>
<td>158.670</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB SATISFACTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>3.696</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>1.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.407</td>
<td>155.762</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFE SATISFACTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>-.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>159.724</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Levene's Test for Equality of Variances
** 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
before scholars and practitioners is how managers can encourage and assist workers transform a job into a calling? How can managers and human resource personnel redesign jobs and tasks in ways that foster a sense of calling?

Secondly, Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, and Schwartz (1997) argue that the way individuals view work is not just a function of their reflections of the work itself but other factors such as culture have a significant role in their assessment of work. Thus, in this study, a cross-cultural investigation was carried out to explore the construct of calling in India and Uganda. A significant difference was found ($F(4,80) = 3.526; p = .011$) in living out a calling by the source of calling among Indian lead. Studies have shown that on the individualism dimension, the Indian nationality scores 64 (“India - Geert Hofstede,” 2010), while the Ugandan nationality scores 30 (Rarick et al., 2013, p. 4). That means the Indian society is more individualistic than the Ugandan society. Individualism is described as a worldview that prioritizes the personal interests, goals, uniqueness, and personal control while trivializing the social or group interests (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002, p. 5). As stated earlier, calling provides an intrinsic source of satisfaction (Dobrow & Tosti-Kharas, 2011). Additionally, Individualism is associated more often with an exaggerated sense of one's abilities and a greater degree of confidence, enthusiasm and optimism than collectivism (Williams, 2003, p. 371). It is thus possible that the Indian leaders, who are expected to exhibit an inflated sense of one's abilities and a higher degree of optimism than the Ugandan leaders would have major differences among the three principal sources of calling on levels of living a calling. Among the three postulated sources of calling, perfect fit had the highest frequency of endorsement (54), followed by external summons (34), and destiny (22). This finding adds credence to a similar finding by Duffy, Allan, Bott, and Dik (2014) who found that the perfect fit was endorsed most frequently as the source group (p. 570). External summons to a particular career or job are exhilarating, but they are not a common occurrence. When searching for and identifying a call, attentiveness (i.e. a state of readiness, silence, introspection, or vigilance), is critical because a call may vary in intensity and tangibility (Elangovan, Pinder, & McLean, 2010). This quality of attentiveness may not be readily attainable to most leaders. This inability to maintain a high-level attentiveness may result in a low endorsement of external summons as a perceived source of calling. Obviously, the interpretations offered here need further empirical exploration and investigation. Future research could test different levels of attentiveness with hypothesized sources of calling.

Lastly, in 2017, the unemployment levels in developing countries were projected to increase, with unemployment rates hovering at around 5.5 percent in 2017 and 2018 (International Labor Organization, 2017, p. 2). Unfortunately, this trend is driving the precarious mass exodus of youth from developing countries into developed countries seeking employment. The highly publicized human trafficking and slavery in the popular press are some of the symptoms of this chronic unemployment. However, one of the ways of dealing with this problem is workers in developing countries discovering ways of creating meaning (a sense of calling) in unsatisfying jobs and careers they can secure in their countries. This research study has re-emphasized the importance of workers having a sense of meaning and purpose in their work to remain productive. Many graduates in these countries find available work opportunities frustrating, unfulfilling, offering inadequate remuneration and hope for the future. Frustrated and gripped with a sense of hopelessness and depression they become vulnerable to human traffickers and other forms of gross abuse as they trek deserts and oceans seeking so-called "greener pastures." According to Dik and Duffy (2012), a chronically dissatisfying workplace can be transformed into a place of purpose and meaning by using three crafting strategies:
(a) **Task Crafting.** This strategy focuses on redesigning the tasks to become more appealing while still tending to the core responsibilities assigned to the worker.

(b) **Relational Crafting.** This strategy emphasizes expanding and improving the relationships of the worker in the workplace.

(c) **Cognitive Crafting.** The goal of this strategy is to enrich the understanding of the purpose of the work.

It is therefore recommended that political leaders, managers, and workers in developing countries jointly review and craft the tasks of available work opportunities to stem the exodus of youth to developed countries.

### CONCLUSION

This study contributes to ongoing research on the “sense of calling” in the workplace, particularly the perceived source of calling and their related work outcomes. In this research, except for living out a calling by the source of calling among Indian leaders, results are consistent with earlier findings. Additionally, cultural dimensions are confirmed as possible mediators in the relationship between a calling and workplace outcomes. There is also evidence that there are no major differences among the three principal sources of calling on levels of living a calling, job satisfaction, or life satisfaction. The study also confirmed that as long as individuals feel they are living out their calling, the source of calling is inconsequential regarding how a calling links to job and life satisfaction. The study has also highlighted the importance of scholars and practitioners developing skills to assist workers and leaders transform their jobs and tasks into callings. The question that, more than ever, needs to be answered, “How can managers and human resource personnel redesign jobs and tasks in ways that foster a sense of calling?”

### LIMITATIONS

Some of the limitations of this study included budgetary and time constraints. The study and findings were scheduled to be completed within an inflexible period with limited funds. Thus, the research was limited in scope. For example, although studies have shown there is a connection between religious traditions and workplace outcomes (Lynn, Naughton, & VanderVeen, 2011; Neubert & Halbesleben, 2015), the study did not control for religion (or faith) of the respondent nor their level of commitment to religious practices and traditions. However, the findings do stimulate further inquiry. For example, there is a need to investigate the interactive effects of religious variables on the relationship between the perceived source of calling and the related work outcomes (i.e., living out a call, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction) across different cultures. Hofstede’s six dimensions of culture provide additional opportunities for further inquiry into the relationship between the perceived source of calling and workplace outcomes, especially the indulgence versus restraint dimension. For instance, would societies with high restraint (i.e., where gratification is suppressed and regulated by strict social norms), necessarily exhibit a high sense of calling? Is there a difference in job satisfaction by the source of calling between individuals in high uncertainty avoidance index countries as opposed to those living in countries with low uncertainty avoidance index?
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