

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

---

2005

## An Analysis Of The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction, Organizational Culture, And Perceived Leadership Characteristics

William Omer Dale Amburgey  
*University of Central Florida*



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Doctoral Dissertation (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact [STARS@ucf.edu](mailto:STARS@ucf.edu).

---

### STARS Citation

Amburgey, William Omer Dale, "An Analysis Of The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction, Organizational Culture, And Perceived Leadership Characteristics" (2005). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019*. 425.

<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/425>

AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION,  
ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE, AND PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP  
CHARACTERISTICS

by

W.O. DALE AMBURGEY

B.A. Transylvania University, 1994  
M.B.A. University of Louisville, 1996

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Education  
in the Department of Educational Research, Technology, and Leadership  
in the College of Education  
at the University of Central Florida  
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term  
2005

Major Professor: Dr. William C. Bozeman

## ABSTRACT

The purposes of this study were to determine if (a) there is a relationship between job satisfaction, organizational culture, and perceived leadership characteristics at a dual-residential private university based on location, gender, level of education, and length of employment and, (b) to measure those relationships if they were present. Understanding how these areas relate may enhance strategic planning and personnel decisions for leaders within organizations. The population of this study was the 1,478 full-time faculty and staff located on the residential campuses of the participating university.

Participants in the study were asked to complete three test instruments: an Employee Demographic Survey, Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), and the Organizational Description Questionnaire (ODQ). The Employee Demographic Survey was designed by the researcher to collect demographic data from the population. The JSS was designed by Spector (1994) as an instrument to assess an employee's attitude toward variables such as pay, promotion, supervision, operating procedures, and communication. Designed by Bass and Avolio (1992), the ODQ measures how a member of the organization perceives the organizational culture in terms of transactional or transformational leadership characteristics.

Findings indicated that the only statistically significant mean score differences between total scores on the JSS and ODQ occurred when length of employment was the independent variable. Statistically significant correlations were also observed between the mean total JSS score, the ODQ transactional leadership score, and the ODQ transformational leadership score. Further, the scores obtained from the ODQ were used

to define the organizational culture typology. A Moderately Four I's, as described by Bass and Avolio (1992), was the dominant culture identification across all levels of independent variables.

To my parents, Roger and Barbara Amburgey, and my fiancé/soon-to-be wife, Kristy, for all of the love, encouragement, aggravation, and empathy you have displayed throughout all of my educational endeavors. I love you all more than you could ever imagine.

To my grandmothers, Blanche P. Smith and Elizabeth M. Amburgey, for the lessons they imparted in me during my adolescence. I am confident that their love has shined down throughout my adult life and I so wish for one more conversation to tell them everything about my life since their passing.

To all of my aunts, uncles, family and friends, whose support was beneficial in completing my doctoral studies and dissertation.

To Dr. Robert Haynes, Wendell Taylor, and Alice Taylor, for the opportunities provided and lessons taught so long ago.

To every average student who has hopes and aspirations to achieve his or her personal pinnacle of success.

To McKinley Jack Russell Amburgey, one of the most intelligent minds of modern times.

Lastly, to all of the citizens of Jeffersonville, Kentucky (population: 1,854). People from small towns can achieve big things.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the guidance and insight of my advisor, Dr. William Bozeman. Thank you for your direction and encouragement throughout my doctoral studies. I express my sincerest appreciation to my dissertation committee: Dr. Walter Bogumil, Dr. David Harrison, Dr. Douglas Magann, and Dr. John Watret. The hours spent reviewing drafts and offering suggestions have made my dissertation a well-crafted document. I thank you for your time and support.

Many thanks go to Pam Williams for all of her assistance with editing and formatting my dissertation. I will always be grateful to her accommodating schedule and incredible turnaround. Also, I would like to thank Dr. Robert Lange for assisting in the statistical calculations contained in Chapter 4. He took the time to assist me while on medical leave and I will always appreciate his willingness to assist.

I would like to thank the members of my cohort, especially LeeAnn Davis, Jim Gallogly, Rick Inge, and Tony Recascino, for all of the laughter, tears, joy, and sarcasm we shared as we traversed the academic path towards a doctorate.

I must acknowledge Dr. Charles Rarick and Dr. Bob Myers for the inspiration they provided me. Dr. Rarick helped shape my future career goals and served as a role model during my undergraduate studies at Transylvania University. Dr. Myers gave me the confidence to believe that I could complete doctoral studies. I cherish their advise, tutelage, and friendship.

I would like to thank Gary Hamme, Michael Novak, and Richard Clarke of Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University for allowing me the flexibility to complete my doctoral studies while retaining full-time employment.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |    |
|--|----|
| LIST OF TABLES .....   | ix |
| CHAPTER 1: THE PROBLEM AND ITS COMPONENTS.....                           | 1  |
| Introduction.....  | 1  |
| Purpose of the Study .....   | 7  |
| Research Questions and Definitions .....                                 | 7  |
| Definition of Terms.....   | 8  |
| Study Design and Methodology .....                                       | 9  |
| Data Collection and Analysis .....                                       | 12 |
| Significance and Limitations of the Study.....                           | 13 |
| Assumptions.....   | 13 |
| Limitations .....  | 14 |
| Significance of the Study .....  | 14 |
| Summary .....  | 15 |
| CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....                                | 17 |
| Introduction.....  | 17 |
| An Overview of Job Satisfaction .....                                    | 17 |
| An Overview of Organizational Culture.....                               | 22 |
| Buckingham and Coffman’s Non-conventional View of the Organization ..... | 25 |
| The Bolman and Deal View of the Organization .....                       | 34 |
| An Overview of Leadership History.....                                   | 38 |
| Transformational Leadership .....  | 41 |
| Transactional Leadership .....   | 43 |
| Research in Leadership, Culture, and Job Satisfaction.....               | 46 |
| Summary .....  | 56 |
| CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY .....   | 59 |
| Introduction.....  | 59 |
| Purpose of the Study .....   | 59 |
| Population .....   | 60 |
| Data Collection .....  | 61 |
| Instrumentation .....  | 63 |
| Data Analysis.....   | 70 |
| Data Analysis for Research Questions.....                                | 71 |
| Summary .....  | 72 |
| CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS OF THE DATA .....                                    | 73 |
| Introduction.....  | 73 |
| Population and Demographic Characteristics.....                          | 73 |
| Research Question #1 .....   | 77 |
| Research Question #2 .....   | 88 |



|   |            |
|---|------------|
| Research Question #3 .....  | 96         |
| Research Question #4 .....  | 102        |
| Summary .....   | 112        |
| <b>CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>                                | <b>116</b> |
| Introduction.....   | 116        |
| Summary of Chapters .....   | 116        |
| Methodology.....  | 118        |
| Summary and Discussion of Statistical Findings .....  | 122        |
| Research Question #1 .....  | 122        |
| Research Question #2 .....  | 125        |
| Research Question #3 .....  | 128        |
| Research Question #4 .....  | 130        |
| Discussion and Implications for Leaders.....  | 132        |
| Recommendations for Further Study .....   | 138        |
| <b>APPENDIX A: SURVEY PACKET COVER LETTER.....</b>  | <b>140</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE.....</b>   | <b>142</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX C: EMPLOYEE DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY .....</b>  | <b>144</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX D: JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY (JSS).....</b>   | <b>146</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX E: SAMPLE ITEMS FROM THE ORGANIZATIONAL DESCRIPTION<br/>QUESTIONNAIRE (ODQ) .....</b> | <b>149</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX F: INSITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD PERMISSION .....</b>                                     | <b>152</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX G: PERMISSION TO USE THE JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY (JSS)<br/>.....</b>                  | <b>155</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX H: PERMISSION TO USE THE ORGANIZATIONAL DESCRIPTION<br/>QUESTIONNAIRE (ODQ).....</b>  | <b>157</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX I: FOLLOW-UP E-MAIL TO THE STUDY POPULATION.....</b>                                  | <b>160</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX J: COMMENTS COLLECTED FROM THE TEST INSTRUMENTS ...</b>                               | <b>162</b> |
| <b>LIST OF REFERENCES.....</b>  | <b>164</b> |

## LIST OF TABLES

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Distribution of Survey Packets .....  | 62 |
| Table 2: Survey Packets Received.....  | 62 |
| Table 3: JSS Internal Consistency Reliability Coefficients .....                                 | 65 |
| Table 4: Score Ranges for the Organizational Description Questionnaire (ODQ).....                | 69 |
| Table 5: Respondents’ Aggregate Demographic Data.....  | 74 |
| Table 6: Respondents’ Years of Service to the Institution .....                                  | 75 |
| Table 7: Respondents’ Level of Education.....  | 75 |
| Table 8: Respondents’ Gender.....  | 76 |
| Table 9: Respondents by Campus.....  | 77 |
| Table 10: Mean Total JSS Score By Level of Education .....                                       | 79 |
| Table 11: Mean ODQ Transactional Scores By Level of Education.....                               | 79 |
| Table 12: Mean ODQ Transformational Scores By Level of Education.....                            | 80 |
| Table 13: Correlation Coefficients for Respondents with a High School<br>Diploma/GED .....       | 81 |
| Table 14: Correlation Coefficients for Respondents with Some College.....                        | 83 |
| Table 15: Correlation Coefficients for Respondents with an Associate’s Degree.....               | 84 |
| Table 16: Correlation Coefficients for Respondents with a Bachelor’s Degree.....                 | 85 |
| Table 17: Correlation Coefficients for Respondents with Some Graduate-Level Course<br>Work ..... | 86 |
| Table 18: Correlation Coefficients for Respondents with a Master’s Degree .....                  | 87 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Table 19: Correlation Coefficients for Respondents with a Professional Degree .....   | 88  |
| Table 20: Mean Total JSS Score By Gender .....  | 89  |
| Table 21: Mean ODQ Transactional and Transformational Scores By Gender .....          | 89  |
| Table 22: Correlation Coefficients for Female Participants .....                      | 92  |
| Table 23: Organizational Culture Identified By Female Participants.....               | 93  |
| Table 24: Correlation Coefficients for Male Participants.....                         | 94  |
| Table 25: Organizational Culture Identified By Male Participants .....                | 95  |
| Table 26: Mean Total JSS Score By Location.....                                       | 96  |
| Table 27: Mean ODQ Transactional and Transformational Scores By Location.....         | 97  |
| Table 28: Correlation Coefficients for Eastern Campus Participants.....               | 99  |
| Table 29: Organizational Culture Identified By Eastern Campus Participants .....      | 100 |
| Table 30: Correlation Coefficients for Western Campus Participants.....               | 101 |
| Table 31: Organizational Culture Identified By Western Campus Participants .....      | 102 |
| Table 32: Mean Total JSS Score By Length of Service .....                             | 103 |
| Table 33: Mean ODQ Transactional Scores By Length of Service.....                     | 103 |
| Table 34: Mean ODQ Transformational Scores By Length of Service.....                  | 104 |
| Table 35: Correlation Coefficients for Participants Employed Less Than 1 Year .....   | 107 |
| Table 36: Correlation Coefficients for Participants Employed 1 Year – 5 Years .....   | 109 |
| Table 37: Correlation Coefficients for Participants Employed 6 Years – 10 Years.....  | 110 |
| Table 38: Correlation Coefficients for Participants Employed 11 Years – 15 Years..... | 111 |
| Table 39: Correlation Coefficients for Participants Employed Greater Than 15 Years .  | 112 |

## CHAPTER 1

### THE PROBLEM AND ITS COMPONENTS

#### Introduction

One of an organization's greatest challenges is ensuring the wellbeing of its employees. An employee's level of job satisfaction is not only important to his or her wellbeing, but also to organizational culture and the goals set both by the leaders within the organizations and by the individuals that follow. The relationship among job satisfaction, organizational culture, and perceived leadership is important to understand because it assists in creating an efficient and motivated workforce and allows for an organization to better achieve overall goals. There are many factors that could influence an employee's perception of satisfaction, culture, and leadership including educational background, lengths of service, and gender.

For leaders to ensure job satisfaction, they must first ascertain individual motivational and employment requisites and understand the employee's performance history and past behavior patterns. Leaders may maximize the potential to influence motivation patterns by noticing and reacting to those of the individual. Furthermore, understanding these motivational patterns is important to gauging the level of future employee performance (Hanson & Miller, Jr., 2002).

One of the most common ways leadership can discover the sources of employee motivation and employee satisfaction is by seeking input from the individual employee. It would be difficult for management to assume an understanding of the complex

composition of motivational patterns in a diverse workforce without establishing dialogue with employees (Hanson & Miller, Jr., 2002). However, there are certain occasions, mostly occurring in larger organizations, in which individuals in management or supervisory roles lack the specific ability to communicate with their employees. These situations require the individual employee to initiate the process and become more proactive in initiating communications. Employees should construct a definitive inventory of their professional competencies and core motivations to present to organizational leadership to catalyze discussions regarding rewards or advancement within the organization.

One of the most beneficial results of understanding factors that affect employee satisfaction from an organizational perspective is the reduction in costs associated with employee turnover. Some organizations experience huge losses associated with employee turnover, with estimates in certain cases of hundreds of thousands of dollars. Organizational leadership creates a feeling of utilization and fulfillment in an individual's job situation. The potential for creating a bond between the employee and the organization is greater when employees feel that an employer is paying attention to their individual motivational needs and using their knowledge, skills, and attributes to help shape a job position. Such employees are more likely to experience higher levels of job satisfaction and should be less likely to leave an organization (Hanson & Miller, Jr., 2002).

Frederick Herzberg offered the theory that employees were best motivated to work when their respective motivations were understood. Simply stated, management

can best provide the means for motivation when it understands what motivates the individual employee. Herzberg developed the motivation-hygiene theory as a means to focus the attention on the work environment, rather than the individual, as the source of positive or negative attitudes toward work.

Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory was sometimes referred to as the two-factor or dual-factor system because it was composed of motivators and hygiene factors. Motivators, also known as content factors, were identified as factors that generally contributed to good feelings attributed to the job. Responsibility, achievement, and the position itself were just a few variables that composed motivators. Herzberg defined the hygiene factors, or context factors, as the variables associated with the physical environment of the organization. Aspects such as organizational policies, salaries, and relations with colleagues composed the hygiene factors (Hansen, Smith, & Hansen, 2002; Herzberg, 1974; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004).

Pollock, Whitbred, and Contractor (2000) incorporated elements of Herzberg's theory into research conducted to describe differences between job satisfaction and motivation. The researchers sampled a population of public works employees at a U.S. military installation. Their study simultaneously compared the job characteristic theory and the social information processing theory.

First, the researchers expanded on the concepts presented in job characteristic theory by examining previous research theorists such as Maslow and Herzberg. Both Herzberg and Maslow theories were viewed as being closely aligned with the job characteristic theory because individuals were thought to have needs that must be met

and that their levels of job satisfaction could be increased by the presence of motivating characteristics. Conversely, the social information processing theory suggested that individuals' needs are influenced by the many social and interpersonal relationships present in the work environment. The social information processing theory was designed as an alternative to the theories associated with the fulfillment of individual needs.

The research indicated that the social environment of the individual had a significant impact on work attitudes. Furthermore, the researchers found that levels of individual job satisfaction were significantly predicted by the characteristics of the position. This finding was consistent with the principles of the job characteristic theory. In addition, the level of individual job satisfaction was significantly related to the levels of satisfaction of others working with the individual. These findings were consistent with the principles of the social information processing theory (Pollock, Whitbred, & Contractor, 2000).

Another factor effecting employee satisfaction is the fact that the number of women employed in organizations has risen drastically over past decades. The increase of women seeking management and supervisory roles will continue to increase as this trend continues. As the number of women increase within organizations, the difference in leadership styles of women and men will do much to shape and possibly shift job perceptions for all employees. Historically, the workforce proved to be an arena that promoted male-versus-male competition. It was a given that the primary competition for career advancement for men would be other men. However, in the work environment of the present, males and females are competing and performing with each other in the same

organizational culture and both are experiencing success (Valentine & Godkin, 2000; Drucker, 1995).

Understanding the impact of gender roles within the organization goes far beyond the proverbial glass ceiling. Understanding the similarities and differences between feminine and masculine stereotypes may allow an organization to improve its ability to make personnel decisions. There are many implications for women who defy traditional feminine stereotypes in the workforce. Females sometimes face harsh criticism in the workforce if they choose to personally adopt a more masculine demeanor in performing their employment responsibilities (Rigg & Sparrow, 1994).

Often, organizations portray the image of being a rational, streamlined, strategic-minded entity. These same characteristics have long been associated with masculinity. Conversely, terms such as nurturing and gentle have been associated with femininity. Society has long been the primary motivator for gender differences. The implications for women are extremely important to understand.

The case of *Hopkins v. PriceWaterhouse* is an excellent example of the role of gender in the workplace. A female senior manager with a nationwide accounting firm was held up for promotion to partner within the firm. Evaluations from all of the partners in the firm, which were mostly male, led to a division in support. The senior manager supporters felt she was ready for the promotion based on her work performance. Those who dissented felt she was too abrasive and came across as too masculine. The female senior manager brought suit against the accounting firm with appeals reaching to the United States Supreme Court. The final ruling was in favor of the senior manager



because the accounting firm could not confirm they would have made the same decision if the discriminatory factor of gender had not been considered (*Hopkins v. PriceWaterhouse*, 1989).

As this case indicates, leadership is an imperative component of any successful organization. In the future, the ability of leaders to create the social framework that allows for the stimulation of employee intellect will enjoy the most organizational success. The key to providing this environment to employees is creating an atmosphere of trust within the organization. Trust is a key element in laying the foundation for the relationship between leadership and employees (Morden, 1997).

It is widely accepted that there is an important relationship between organizational culture and leadership as it relates to establishing organizational success. Leadership can be seen as a catalyst that removes the barriers of operating within traditional patterns and allows for a new mode of thinking that may improve the effectiveness or efficiency of the organization. An organization's culture is all encompassing. Management must identify and adapt to the unique organizational culture and how it affects numerous employee-related constructs (Buch & Rivers, 2001; Lund, 2003).

Measuring the culture of an organization has long proved a difficult task to perform. Typically, the organizational culture has occupied a subconscious level among the many individual employees. Early research into culture was firmly rooted in examining and interpreting stories or symbols within the organization. Later, most

researchers agreed that the types of organizational cultures present were characterized by sharing beliefs in leadership, strategy, and effectiveness (Lund, 2003).

The importance of understanding job satisfaction, organizational culture, and perceived leadership is evident. Understanding how these variables function within an organization provides organizational leaders with the knowledge and direction to attain a wide range of goals. The multitude of employee backgrounds and personal experiences, combined with the perspectives of two genders, provide a diverse workforce to focus on the achievement of goals and initiatives. Gaining an understanding of how different employees function within the organizational framework may provide the competitive advantage needed for organizational success.

### Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study are to determine if (a) there is a relationship between job satisfaction, organizational culture, and perceived leadership characteristics at a dual-residential private university based on location, gender, level of education, and length of employment and, (b) to measure those relationships. Understanding how these areas relate may enhance strategic planning and personnel decisions.

### Research Questions and Definitions

The following research questions guide this study. A better understanding of the relationships among job satisfaction, organizational culture, and perceived leadership may be ascertained from responses to these questions:

1. Is there a relationship between the mean scores on the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) and the Organizational Description Questionnaire (ODQ) based on the level of education?  
H<sub>1</sub>: The mean scores on the JSS and ODQ will not differ significantly across all levels of education.
2. Is there a relationship between the mean scores on the JSS and the ODQ based on gender?  
H<sub>2</sub>: The mean scores on the JSS and ODQ will not differ significantly based on gender.
3. Is there a relationship between the mean scores on the JSS and the ODQ based on geographic location of employment?  
H<sub>3</sub>: The mean scores on the JSS and ODQ will not differ significantly for the eastern and western campus.
4. Is there a relationship between the scores on the JSS and the ODQ based on the number of years of employment?  
H<sub>4</sub>: The mean scores on the JSS and ODQ will not differ significantly based on the number of years of employment.

### Definition of Terms

During the course of this study, the following terms will be used:

Length of Employment: The number of years the participant has been employed by the institution participating in the study.

Level of education: The highest degree of formalized educational study that the participant has completed.

Location: Whether the participant is located on the eastern coastal campus or the western mountain campus.

Residential campus: An educational location where the primary mode of instruction occurs physically at that location.

Organizational Culture: “Used to describe the shared values and beliefs of members about the activities of the organization and interpersonal relationships” (Yukl, 2000).

Perceived Leadership: The type of leadership style that the participant believes is present within the organization; defined in this study as transactional or transformational.

Job Satisfaction: The level of enjoyment an individual feels that they receive from their employment in the institution as it relates to numerous job-related variables.

Transactional leadership: The leader of an organization displays leadership by two distinct behaviors: “contingent reward, which is where work is clarified to define what is needed to obtain rewards, and passive management by exception, in which the leader uses contingent punishments and other coercive actions in response to obvious deviations from acceptable performance standards” (Bass & Avolio, as cited in Yukl, 2000, p.254).

Transformational leadership: The leader of an organization “transforms and motivates followers by making them more aware of the importance of task outcomes, inducing them to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the organization or team, and activating their higher-order needs” (Burns, as cited in Yukl, 2002, p. 253).

### Study Design and Methodology

The primary methodology of the study will consist of analysis of descriptive questionnaire data. Surveys will be administered to employees at a medium-sized private university with two residential campuses located in the eastern and western United States. The selected participants will be administered a test instrument to measure the relationship of organizational culture to perceived leadership. The operationalization and

measurement of this variable is Bass and Avolio's Organizational Description Questionnaire (ODQ). The ODQ measures how the staff member views the organizational culture in relation to transformational or transactional leadership characteristics (Bass & Avolio, 1992).

The ODQ is a 28-item questionnaire that provides results that may assist an organization in understanding the relationship between leadership style and organizational culture. Bass and Avolio created the ODQ to focus on the leadership culture within the organization. The ODQ measures how a member of the organization perceives the organizational culture in terms of transactional or transformational leadership characteristics. The odd-numbered questions on the questionnaire represent the individual's score based on transactional leadership theory. The even-numbered questions represent the individual's score based on transformational leadership theory. The scores for transformational and transactional questions are totaled to determine an overall presence of a particular culture of leadership. The transactional and transformational score on the ODQ allows the participant to be classified into one of nine categories based upon transactional and transformational impressions (Bass & Avolio, 1992; Parry & Proctor-Thomson, 2001; Bradley & Charbonneau, 2004).

The selected participants will also be administered a test instrument to determine their level of job satisfaction. The instrument used to measure this variable is the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) designed by Paul E. Spector. The JSS is an instrument that assesses an employee's attitude toward variables such as pay, promotion, supervision, operating procedures, and communication. The Job Satisfaction Survey was chosen

because it appears appropriate for analysis of the constructs of this study and because it has a total reliability alpha of .91 based on a sample of 2,870. The JSS was originally designed for use in human service organizations; however, it has applications to both public and private organizations (Spector, 1985; Spector, 1994).

The population of the study will be the 1,478 employees of a medium-sized private university with two residential campuses located in the eastern and western United States. A further breakdown of the population reveals 1,097 employees associated with the eastern campus and 381 employees associated with the western campus. Historical survey administration data from the Institutional Research department of the participating institution indicated that a response rate of 30-35% could be expected. Because of this, all employees will be administered the test instruments in order to secure the desired confidence intervals and margin of error.

The educational institution used for the study was founded as flight-training institute in Cincinnati, Ohio. Over the course of its history, the institution has grown from its flight training roots to what is considered to be one of the top ten engineering schools in the United States. There are approximately 4,600 undergraduate students at the eastern campus and 1,700 undergraduate students at the western campus. The university offers a great deal of diversity with students attending from all 50 states and over 100 countries. Students may choose from over thirty undergraduate and graduate degree programs. Approximately 90% of the faculty at both campuses has achieved a doctorate or a terminal degree. The faculty has strong industrial ties, which offer the

student body many employment and research opportunities (Fast facts, n.d., Retrieved July 24, 2004).

### Data Collection and Analysis

Each participant in the study received a survey packet that contained the following items: a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and providing instructions for using the test instruments, the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), the Organizational Description Questionnaire (ODQ), an information survey to assess specific demographic information, and a pre-addressed return envelope. Each test instrument and the demographic survey were coded to ensure that data were secured consistently from the individual participant. Participants in this study were anonymous to all university personnel, including the researcher. The researcher also took precautions to ensure the confidentiality of all participant responses. It was stressed to all participants that their participation was completely voluntary.

Administration of the test instruments took place during early November 2004. Employees at the two residential campuses received the survey packet through intra-university mail. Due to possible delays in delivery resulting from the lack of geographic proximity of the two campuses, the researcher traveled to the western mountain campus to deliver the survey packets for distribution to ensure the most expeditious dispersal possible.

Participants were encouraged to complete the test instruments and return them within a two-week time frame. The cover letter, while encouraging participation, also

instructed participants to return uncompleted surveys if they chose not to participate in the study. Contact information for the researcher was also included in the event that the participants had questions or concerns regarding the survey instruments or their participation in the study.

An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine whether the population means of each questionnaire was significant at an alpha of .05. Means for the total population and each demographic area were compared for significant results. Furthermore, a correlation analysis was conducted to analyze the relationship between the scores on the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) and the Organizational Description Questionnaire (ODQ) for each level of the independent variable.

### Significance and Limitations of the Study

#### Assumptions

The following major assumptions will be made in this study: (1) staff members will provide accurate and reliable information, (2) the information collected through the survey instruments will provide a valid measurement of employee opinions, and (3) participants selected for this study will be representative of staff members at private, multi-campus institutions.



## Limitations

The scope of this study will only include the participating institution and will not try to generalize findings to a larger population. Furthermore, the duration of this study will be affected by resource constraints and is not expected to be considered a longitudinal study. Geographic constraints may also play a role in the administration of the survey instruments due to fact that the residential campuses lie on the eastern coast and western mountains of the United States respectively.

## Significance of the Study

It is anticipated that relationships will be found among job satisfaction, organizational culture, and perceived leadership characteristics based on the demographic variables present. Understanding the strength of these relationships will greatly enhance the ability of university administrators to understand the perceptions of staff on the eastern and western campuses. This may lead to improvements and modifications in the relationships that exist between university staff and supervisors. Personnel and staffing decisions may also benefit from understanding the relationships present within the organization.

Significant relationships between scores on the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) and the Organizational Description Questionnaire (ODQ) relating to the demographic variables may lead University administration to further investigate the relationship between job satisfaction, organizational culture, and perceived leadership. Future

research may be conducted at other dual-residential campus universities or multi-campus university systems to seek similar results.

The significance of this study is rooted in understanding the attitudes and behaviors of staff members at two residential campuses of a medium-sized private university. Comprehending the relationship between job satisfaction and the perception of organizational culture and leadership may lead to improvement of hiring practices and to understanding factors that affect the motivation and satisfaction of current employees.

If supervisors are aware that employees of varying education levels, years of experience, location, and gender are more susceptible to positive or negative views of job satisfaction and leadership, steps may be taken as early as the hiring process to accommodate these attitudes. Comprehending these relationships may lead to an overall increase in the improvement of employer-employee relations.

### Summary

Chapter 1 has provided the framework of this study. Research questions and definitions of terms used during the course of the study were presented. The study design and methodology were introduced and limitations and assumptions were identified. The significance of the study was also defined. Chapter 2 contains an overview of job satisfaction, organizational culture, and leadership. Non-conventional organizational cultures are discussed as well as how to identify the framework of the organization are presented. The methodology of the study is outlined in Chapter 3. Evaluating the research questions guiding the study through statistical analyses comprises Chapter 4.

The final chapter contains discussions concerning the relationships that exist between job satisfaction, organizational culture, and leadership characteristics. Implications concerning the importance of understanding these relationships and suggestions for future research are also discussed.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Introduction

Job satisfaction, organizational culture, and leadership have long been areas of interest among social science, business, and education researchers. Leaders in all facets of business, industry, and education understand the importance of analyzing and evaluating the link between the individual employee's performance and organizational leadership. The largest quantity of past research conducted within these areas has been conducted in the service industry. Although higher education may be considered a service industry, the amount of research conducted within this realm does not match that available within other areas of the service industry. In order to understand the relationship that exists among job satisfaction, organizational culture, and leadership, it is imperative to understand each of those components individually.

#### An Overview of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a topic that often seems to be self-explanatory. If one is satisfied with his or her current employment situation, then he or she must have an acceptable level of the construct termed "job satisfaction." In some instances, this may be true. However, job satisfaction is more complex and involves considerably more analysis than one may imagine.

Job satisfaction is often divided into two separate types by industrial psychologists and researchers. The first type concerns the holistic level of job satisfaction for an individual and is referred to as global job satisfaction. Global job satisfaction is ascertained by querying individuals on the factors and motivational forces that led to their view of job satisfaction. This type of job satisfaction is open to criticism because it is simplistic in nature. It may be said that understanding job satisfaction goes much deeper than asking a few pointed questions to the individual employee. In its defense, global job satisfaction is considered a good initial investigation into the level of job satisfaction (Morgan, McDonagh, & Ryan-Morgan, 1995).

The second type of job satisfaction may be considered the structure to determine global job satisfaction. Facet job satisfaction relates to the level of job satisfaction an individual has with specific components of his or her job position or organization. For example, an account executive that finds great pleasure in having personal contact with clients but despises the paperwork generated from his or her responsibilities is an example of facet job satisfaction. Satisfaction is derived from one facet of his or her work while displeasure may result from another facet. Organizational leaders may notice that different aspects of an employee's work experience will result in differing levels of job satisfaction. Measuring facet job satisfaction is important and is achieved by performing regular evaluations on the intrinsic and extrinsic factors that affect employee satisfaction (Morgan, McDonagh, & Ryan-Morgan, 1995).

Morgan, McDonagh, and Ryan-Morgan (1995) identified several key intrinsic and extrinsic factors that served as emotional catalysts for employees. The intrinsic factors

are related to the employee's position. The nature of work, specialization of tasks, and other factors that compose a job position are some themes that may be viewed as intrinsic factors. Extrinsic factors that may shape job satisfaction are those components that reside outside the actual performance of work responsibilities. Salary, the work environment, and the organizational culture are generally recognized as extrinsic factors that can play an integral role in job satisfaction.

The ability of a leader to understand the sources of employee job satisfaction is critical to the overall health of an organization. There are rippling effects throughout an organization when individuals verbalize their discontent or unhappiness. Organizational culture is destined to suffer from any overt individual criticism because it potentially may lead to a "bandwagon effect" where others may feel more inclined to join in the criticism. Organizations that contain critical masses of dissatisfied employees are likely to form a work culture that does not encourage members to perform tasks to their optimum ability. Employee morale is usually the victim of low levels of job satisfaction. The level of morale is often linked to the amount of job satisfaction experienced by the employee. When opportunities for advancement are not available within an organization, individual employees become prone to mentally and emotionally separate from the organization and its mission (Lok & Crawford, 2004)

Ganzach (2003) suggested that an employee's level of education might also have some influence on job satisfaction. Those who have higher levels of education were more apt to find employment opportunities that were both professionally and emotionally more rewarding. These positions may lead to an indirect increase in the level of job

satisfaction of the individual. Conversely, those individuals with higher levels of education may also find decreasing levels of job satisfaction because of the rewards associated with an employment position. Those with higher levels of education may have higher levels of reward expectation from employment positions. Job satisfaction may decrease when the individual finds that the salary, benefits, or other rewards associated with the position are below his or her expectations.

Job satisfaction is an imperative component to the success of an organization. As the organization strives to continuously improve its overall operations, the level of job satisfaction present within workers is crucial to the achievement of goals and objectives. Organizations that follow continuous improvement philosophies associated with total quality management may be expected to have higher levels of job satisfaction than companies who pursue more traditional operational methods. However, this is not always the case.

The principles associated with continuous improvement philosophies allow for employees to receive a great deal of feedback about their work outcomes or standards. The manner in which the employee receives feedback does not necessarily lead to increased levels of job satisfaction. Satisfaction levels are not going to increase if the employee is only informed of how well they performed. Equally important is to relate how an employee could use established procedures or functions to meet goals and improve his or her performance. Job satisfaction levels are more likely to increase when the employee gets feedback on his or her performance in relation to goals and objectives (McAfee, Quarstein, & Ardalan, 1995).

Job satisfaction can be greatly influenced by the culture present in the organization and the type of leadership to which the employee is exposed. Some consider these two factors as the greatest influences on job satisfaction, more so than any intrinsic factor that may influence the employee. There are some leadership principles that seem vital to increasing the levels of job satisfaction present within an organization (Morris & Bloom, 2002).

Greenleaf (1977) created the philosophy of servant leadership. When servant leadership principles are present within an organization, the levels of employee job satisfaction in that organization may see improvement due to the culture present. Greenleaf described servant leadership in terms of an institution transforming its culture into one that serves all vital components of that organization. The vital components may range from external customers to the employees that comprise the organization.

As each layer of the organizational hierarchy understands the need to serve, feelings of self-worth and self-importance are likely to improve. The employee's level of job satisfaction may grow as he or she receives personal enrichment from practicing servant leadership. This philosophy differs greatly from what most employees encounter with organizations where the focus is placed on production and efficiency, not serving.

A leader may see his or her ability to lead an organization tremendously improve by understanding the components and affects of job satisfaction. Understanding the components of job satisfaction and comprehending that employees are individuals are critical in changing levels of satisfaction. Employees will identify different stimuli when defining their personal levels of employee job satisfaction. The leader who understands



how his or her employees derive job satisfaction will be better poised to have a positive impact on their job satisfaction levels.

### An Overview of Organizational Culture

Organizational culture is a phenomenon that occurs in many different facets. The formal definition of organizational culture as stated by Schein (2004) was as follows: a pattern of shared basic assumptions that was learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptations and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (p. 17). Culture is an area that has not benefited from the breadth of research and discussion of leadership or job satisfaction and motivation. However, organizational culture has a major influence on the perception of leadership and satisfaction for individual employees.

Schein (2004) described culture as the “phenomena that are below the surface, that are powerful in their impact but invisible and to a considerable degree unconscious” (p. 8). Culture plays the role of lifeblood for an organization. The personality that an organization portrays to internal constituents and to external customers can best be viewed through its culture. One may assume that organizational culture is a constantly evolving phenomenon. As members of the organization leave to pursue other interests, the culture of the organization they participated in will shape their future experiences elsewhere. Conversely, as new members join the organization, their past experiences will play a role in shaping the culture of the organization in the future.

Sometimes the size of the organization plays a role in the establishment of its culture. It is easier for a smaller organization to possess a unique culture that permeates the entire entity. For larger organizations, it is more difficult to possess one unique culture. The organizational culture for larger organizations may best be viewed as a conglomerate of smaller subcultures. Not only could there be multiple subcultures, each of these subcultures could range in depth and breadth. The individual learns to function in one or many of the subcultures in order to achieve his or her goals and objectives (Schein, 2004).

Organizational culture can be viewed in three different levels. The first level is visible explicitly in the organization and is called artifacts. Artifacts include the majority of an organization's capital, both human and physical. It contains an overview of the processes and structure of the organization. The artifact level is similar in nature to the symbolic frame of Bolman and Deal in that it also incorporates rituals, myths, and ceremonies (Schein, 2004; Bolman & Deal, 1999).

The second level of culture incorporates the strategic goals, initiatives, and philosophies of the organization. This level is best described as the espoused beliefs and values level. As an organization matures, the strength of the cultural philosophies and goals become more engrained in the culture. Early in the development of organizational culture, these established beliefs may meet with challenges and resistance. If the beliefs are proven to be beneficial, they become part of the organization. As time progresses, the more successful the belief, the more it can be solidified into the cultural foundation of the organization (Schein, 2004).

The final level of culture is the fundamental assumptions of the organization. These assumptions are a product of the effects of successful organizational goals and philosophies. Ideas or operational approaches usually begin with feelings of great opportunity and considerable doubt. As these approaches are continuously utilized and are proven successful, the way they are viewed changes. The approaches become second nature and their performance becomes mundane. A fundamental assumption is achieved when components of the organization reach the point that a philosophy projects such a feeling of security that it no longer serves as a focus of debate (Schein, 2004).

Peterson (2002) described culture in terms of how it relates to schools. His definition included components such as ceremonies, rituals, and the overall persona of the school that is established over time. These elements link together to create the predominant culture of an individual school. Each school culture has the potential to be considered either positive or toxic.

A positive school culture occurs when the school shares a vision and purpose. All levels of school employees are committed to continuous improvement and sacrificing personal achievement for the benefit of the larger purpose. Strong relationships exist within the school and collaboration among employees is encouraged. Conversely, a toxic school culture struggles to find a clear purpose or mission. Relationships are sometimes viewed as adversarial throughout the school. There are instances when students and staff blame each other for the failures that occur. A negative culture may be reversed but the transition is usually very difficult.

It is the responsibility of leaders at all levels of the school to actively work to promote and shape the school culture. Leaders are a crucial component in identifying and understanding the culture that is present within the school. It is important for the leader to understand the history that is imbedded in the school culture. Past events may hamper the ability to attempt a cultural shift. Furthermore, the leader must evaluate aspects of the present culture and determine which of those aspects are positive and which are negative. Positive elements should be promoted and reinforced throughout the school. Negative elements should be evaluated and reviewed for potential change (Peterson, 2002; Peterson & Deal, 1998).

Organizational culture is truly the representation of the collective relationships, ceremonies, and rituals present within the organization. It is evident that all individuals play an integral role in shaping the direction of the organizational culture. The potential for developing a negative culture is always possible and the effort required to reverse a negative culture is tremendous. By understanding the components and composition of the organizational culture, both leaders and followers will be better prepared to create and enjoy the most positive and productive culture possible.

#### Buckingham and Coffman's Non-conventional View of the Organization

Modern theories relating to organizational theory and management principles are forging into new and different realms than theories of the past. Buckingham and Coffman (1999) researched the commonalities of great managers through Gallup Organization studies. One study focused on what employees needed from their

workplace. Over one million employees from diversified backgrounds were asked to share their experiences and to provide insight on what could be considered the most urgent needs of most individuals.

The results of the first Gallup survey yielded a great number of interesting insights. However, the most striking finding of the study was the fact that the employees with the most talent were those in need of the greatest managers. Great managers were described as those who were not afraid to discard the theories and principles that are generally accepted as conventional management wisdom. Great managers do not try to mold individuals through training but try to place individuals in roles that best meet their demonstrated strengths and weaknesses. They also practice selection based on talent rather than specific skills or experiences.

Buckingham and Coffman noted that talented employees might join an organization for a multitude of reasons. Employee benefits and professional freedom are just a few reasons that the most desirable employees would choose an employer. Further, benefits and freedom may not be enough to keep a talented employee with an organization for the long term. Often, the length of time employees will stay with an employer and the level of their productivity can be greatly influenced by the relationship that exists with their immediate supervisors.

Another Gallup study had its genesis in the findings of previous studies. Knowing what influenced talented employees when selecting organizations with which to seek employment and the motivation for their productivity, it was only natural to analyze the same influences from the management perspective. Gallup surveyed individuals in

management roles from a cross section of public and private companies. Those surveyed ranged from being classified as average managers to exceptional. The factors used to consider success included aspects such as profits and customer satisfaction reports. The study lasted almost twenty-five years and over 80,000 managers were interviewed (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999).

The Gallup surveys provided a great deal of insight into the relationship between employer and employee. One of the most beneficial lessons learned from the interviews conducted with managers was that each person has a different source of motivation. Each individual is just that, an individual. The sources of motivation for one person or group are not necessarily the same across the organization. These findings may be aligned with the work of Frederick Herzberg and hygiene-motivation factors that affect employee satisfaction and motivation. One trait of the Gallup-identified great manager was that these differences should not be considered an obstacle or constraint. Instead, great managers viewed these differences as opportunities. Each individual difference presented the opportunity for a manager to develop that person into the best performer he or she could possibly be (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999; Herzberg, 1974).

Buckingham and Coffman identified four keys that allow managers to play the role of catalyst for the organization. These keys represent the tools that managers may use to achieve the greatest potential from all employees. One benefit of understanding the relationship between leadership, culture, and satisfaction is the potential for a manager or supervisor to better fulfill the role of catalyst for the organization, when fulfilling the catalytic role sometimes contradicts conventional business wisdom.

Buckingham and Coffman encourage this approach and provide supporting data from the Gallup studies that suggests unconventional approaches to management philosophy may yield the best results for the employee and organization.

Selecting an employee based on the talent they possess is the first of Buckingham and Coffman's keys. Talent is a difficult concept to define in business terms. It is imperative that organizational leadership has a definition of talent and how the traits associated with talent align with the job position that must be filled. Buckingham and Coffman stated, "every role, performed at excellence, requires certain recurring patterns of thought, feeling, or behavior" (p. 71). These recurring traits are the necessary components of talent within an organization. Talent is unique for every organization and for each individual vocation that can be imagined.

Talent is also an attribute that is inherent within each individual. It is not something that can be taught. Talent is a resource that can be developed through educational development and professional experience. Each individual's reaction to a given situation is based on his or her talent. No two employees will react to a situation in the same manner. Their collective work and life experiences allow them to filter an obstacle or challenge and determine a reaction that is unique based on their outlooks (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999).

It appears that talent is an attribute that cannot be taught, but can be developed or enhanced. Buckingham and Coffman stress the importance of managers understanding talent. Understanding talent means comprehending that talent is immutable. However, there are two other components of employee behavior that a manager may have some

influence with changing or adapting. It is possible for an employee's skills and knowledge to be transformed.

Employee skills may be viewed as the necessary components of a job position. The conglomeration of a set of skills provides the framework for every position within an organization. Employee skills are not similar to talent in that skills can be taught. An organization may provide training for employees in certain job-related skills that may allow for the individual to increase his or her performance or efficiency.

The knowledge that an employee possesses can come in a variety of forms. An employee may gain knowledge in his or her everyday work experience. Dealing with clients, both internal and external to the organization, provides an individual with the knowledge needed to deal with daily activities. The experience that the employee brings from his or her personal life is another form of knowledge. Whether it is an individual's encounters at a prior employer or just the natural occurrence of everyday life, personal experiences are one of the greatest sources of knowledge available to an individual. The organizational culture present within an institution truly represents the collective personal and professional experiences of the individuals that compose the work unit. The better organizational leadership learns to understand how to utilize the group of collective experiences, the better equipped the organization will be to enjoy overall success (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999).

The second key that allows managers to serve as organizational catalysts is defining the right outcomes. Employees truly hold a great deal of power in the organization. More often than not, the amount of employee power is actually greater than



he or she realizes. Employees have the ultimate decision of determining what tasks or requests they will ultimately fulfill and when those requests will be fulfilled. This occurrence results in the manager or supervisor losing the ability to effectively manage. Herein lies the importance of determining the right outcomes for the organization.

The ability to determine the right outcome requires elements of strategic management and organizational behavior. Organizational leadership must be in a position to understand the motivations of members within each unit in order for outcomes to be achieved. Understanding individual motivations allows for the focus to be placed on achieving the outcome rather than the actual means used to achieve the outcome. Therefore, a feeling of responsibility is instilled within employees as they realize that their collective actions are the driving force behind achieving the objectives defined by the organization.

Determining whether or not an outcome is the correct one has long been a question shared by both employee and manager. There are a number of factors to consider in determining if an outcome is accurate. First, the effect on both external constituents and internal clients of the organization should be considered. The second consideration should be whether the outcome is right for the organization as an entity. If the outcomes do not align with a predetermined strategic plan or mission, it may not be in the organization's best interest to try to achieve them. Buckingham and Coffman stated, "a company's mission should remain constant, providing meaning and focus for generations of employees. A company's strategy is simply the most effective way to execute that mission" (p. 135). Defined outcomes should parallel the mission or strategy.

Finally, the outcome must be right for the individual employee. This requires organizational leadership to utilize the knowledge, skills, and talents of the individual employee. When outcomes are aligned with the individual strengths of the employee, it allows both to reap mutual rewards and to enjoy the benefits of a shared vision.

One of the most important attributes of any organization is the ability for management to capitalize upon the strengths of its employees. Utilizing employee strengths can be the impetus of successful outcomes or the genesis of difficult times if the strengths are not utilized correctly. Buckingham and Coffman have identified focusing on strengths as the third key for catalytic managers. Because each employee is different, one of the greatest challenges and sources of opportunity for an organization is to identify those strengths.

Organizational leadership must overcome any obstacles in the identification of individual strengths in order to place the right people in the right positions. Buckingham and Coffman wrote that everyone has a specific task, trait, or characteristic that they perform better than those around them. The employee, in concert with management, must communicate to ensure that a job is the right fit for the individual. An employee who is wasting their talents and skills must be reassigned into a position that better fits their intrinsic traits. This requires management to observe and understand the employee, not just focus on the individual's output. There have been many instances where an employee may have been mistakenly viewed as unproductive and inefficient. Because of his or her lack of performance, management may label the employee as lacking the right

attitude or work ethic for the organization. However, it is more logical to imagine that the employee has simply not been placed in the right position within the organization.

There is often a misconception that occurs when organizational leadership strives to focus on strengths. Many think that focusing on strengths means ignoring areas of deficiency or weakness. Focusing on strengths is important to determine the right person for the right position. However, when the right person is in the correct position and mistakes or deficiencies occur, these inadequacies must be resolved. The first step towards the resolution of employee deficiencies is to understand the root cause of the problem. Most often, employee deficiencies result from either procedural or personal problems. Procedural problems stem from some problem with the policies or procedures required to perform work tasks. Personal problems are the result of experiences or pressures in the personal life of an individual. A manager can help with the resolution of these problems by providing a strong support network or restructuring the job position within reason (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999).

The final key identified by Buckingham and Coffman was finding the right fit within the organization. Every employee has experienced the feeling of having grown out of his or her current employment role. Those in entry-level positions usually begin to feel trapped after they have gained some valuable experience. Those in middle to upper management positions experience the same phenomenon. The challenge for organizational leadership is to determine the fate of employees when they reach that career crossroad.

The possibilities for determining the right fit are numerous. An employee may be promoted to a new position. He or she may be given some type of supervisory responsibility. It may be determined that the individual's best fit is with another organization. Others may be given the latitude to grow within their current positions. It is ultimately the responsibility of the leadership of an organization to determine the path for the individual employee. Unfortunately, there are many occasions where the needs of the organization and the desires of the individual employee are not closely aligned. This scenario provides one of the greatest challenges a manager will face, as he or she must determine how much flexibility can be used in creating a win-win situation for the employee and the organization (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999).

Conventional organizational culture tends to funnel employees into the traditional employee growth pattern. This pattern begins with an entry-level position and continues as the individual is promoted through each level of an organization to the level of his or her potential. Employees have historically been trained to perform the tasks of their current position to the best of their ability in order to earn a promotion to the next level. This does not align with the principle of determining the right fit because it does not encourage the option of growth within the current position.

Buckingham and Coffman described the ability to create heroes within every role. If an individual felt important in his or her current role, it may lead to an increased level of pride and self-importance in his or her role within the organization. Conversely, traditional thinking encourages employees to view each step within the organizational hierarchy as more prestigious than the last. This often leads to the individual being

promoted to a position where his or her talents are not being utilized and his or her personal and professional happiness have been greatly diminished (Buckingham and Coffman, 1999).

### The Bolman and Deal View of the Organization

Bolman and Deal (1997) provided an interesting framework to describe organizational cultures and to assist in the development and utilization of employee potential. The basis of their studies focused on the components of an organization that caused it to succeed or fail. They identified four frames that may be used to classify any organization. An organization may represent only one of the four frames, or it may contain elements of several. Each frame is characterized by several distinguishable factors. Organizational leadership is charged with using elements of the four frames to improve the organizational culture and allow for the creation of an environment that promotes job satisfaction and employee growth.

The structural frame was the first identified by Bolman and Deal. This frame is embedded in the theories of Frederick Winslow Taylor, the father of scientific management, and sociologist Max Weber. Taylor was well known for research that was rooted in specialization of tasks, delegation of responsibility, and the range of power and control that management possessed. Weber focused his research on the monocratic bureaucracy. A monocratic bureaucracy focused on several principles, including how labor was divided, a hierarchy of power, and rules establishing how organizational policies were carried out.

An organization must have a purpose for its existence. In the structural frame, the organization exists to meet established goals and objectives. The structural frame requires the organization to focus on rational thought rather than focusing on individual preferences or pressures external to the organization. The organization is charged to understand the physical environment in which it operates, including the knowledge that the technologies and facilities needed to achieve goals and objectives are present.

The structural frame necessitates the division of labor and identification of areas of specialization in order to achieve optimum efficiency. It also promotes the use of control methods to assure that the different units in the organizational structure are unified towards achieving the established goal. Furthermore, the structural frame provides the means for the organizational structure to be corrected if deficiencies are identified by streamlining processes. The size of the organization will determine the extent of structure needed. For instance, a large multinational corporation will have a larger scope of goals and objectives than a small, regional company. Therefore, one would anticipate the division of labor, organizational hierarchy, and need for streamlining processes would be greater and more complex for the multinational corporation as opposed to the regional company.

The human resource frame, as identified by Bolman and Deal, had its foundations in the research of Douglas McGregor and Chris Argyris. McGregor was well known for his Theory X and Theory Y management beliefs. Theory X managers felt that employees were lazy and did not want to succeed. A manager's belief that employees wanted to fulfill certain intrinsic needs and wanted to succeed defined Theory Y. Argyris felt that

the organization often treated employees like children and purposely defined job positions to be narrow to increase efficiency. This is contrary to the individual being able to self-actualize, a method championed by Argyris (Bolman & Deal, 1997 ; Bass, 1990). The relationship between the individual employee and the organization is the primary basis for the human resource frame. The strength of this relationship allows for both entities to experience needed results. The organization relies upon the individual employee to bring his or her experience, talents, knowledge, and abilities to a specific job position to achieve goals and objectives. The individual needs the organization to be able to attain the basic needs of life. The organization provides a salary and benefits that allow the individual to meet his or her basic human needs. However, conflicts do arise when the needs of the individual and the needs of the organization are not closely aligned.

The human resource frame is difficult to pursue in the current business climate. Organizations are caught in the dilemma of whether to invest in human capital or to create a trim, efficient organization. The human resource frame would be more dominant in the organization looking to increase the potential of its employees. An efficient, lean organization is not guaranteed to be more productive or to achieve objectives. Reducing the workforce may result in irreparable damage as an organization carves away talent, ability, and experience. Understanding that the collective talents of the workforce may provide a huge competitive advantage is the hallmark of the human resource frame.

When discussing politics, one may not think of an organization. However, the workforce is perhaps one of the most political arenas in society. Bolman and Deal

described the political frame by defining organizations as “alive and screaming political arenas that host a complex web of individual and group interests” (p. 163). In this frame, the organization is characterized as having numerous coalitions between individuals and groups in order to achieve unique goals, with each coalition having differing objectives and opinions. Each relationship was created to manipulate or obtain scarce resources within the organization. These differences sometimes lead to friction between coalitions and the exercising of whatever political power the coalition possesses. Power is often the most sought after resource within the political frame. The coalition that wields the most power is the driving force behind negotiation and distribution of the scarce resources being sought.

Although the negotiations that occur in the political frame may seem negative or detrimental, they can also lead to positive changes. Whether it be an individual employee, a middle manager, or upper-level executive, the ability to use the political frame to achieve objectives that are positive for both the individual and organization is possible. Some would even argue that the organization is dependent on an unstable political environment to provide the catalyst for change not only internally, but also within its area of business or industry (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

The final frame that Bolman and Deal described refers to the organization as a theater. The organization contains many different players, numerous myths, and a multitude of symbols that provide a dramatic environment. If the organization experiences a culture that is not to its liking, these components may be revised to create different symbolic values.



The symbolic frame provides an opportunity to question what an organization considers to be traditional. Every organization has orientation and indoctrination programs for new employees. These programs may be viewed as a symbolic rite of initiation that assists the new employee in adapting to not only the professional circles present within the organization, but also the social circles that are present. Organizations are also full of myths that have developed over time that help describe certain positions, processes, or individuals. These myths are important because they help establish an underlying organizational culture that breeds inclusiveness and teamwork.

The symbolic frame is entrenched in spirituality. This spirituality is almost religious in nature and is quite important to achieving organizational goals and objectives. The feelings of negativity that are present within modern organizations can be alleviated with elements from the symbolic frame. The drama displayed by the myths and symbols of an organization allow the individual employees to bond and create a mutual understanding to help deal with the frustrations they may possess with the organization (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

### An Overview of Leadership History

There has been fascination with the study and interpretation of leadership and leadership theory for centuries. Understanding the principles and values of leadership has often been viewed as a means to increase one's depth and breadth of knowledge. Examples of leadership have been passed from generation to generation serving as symbolic reminders to what characteristics compose and define leadership (Bass, 1990).

Societal development was greatly influenced by the myths and legends of great leaders. It was not uncommon for a unique society to develop anecdotes about the strength of its chief or king and how the ability and power he possessed led to the submission of his underlings. Bass (1990) stated “the greater the socioeconomic injustice in the society, the more distorted the realities of leadership- its powers, morality, and effectiveness- in the mythology” (p. 3). One may argue that recorded history is nothing more than a study in leadership over the ages. History is mainly composed of the exploits of great leaders from global societies.

Literature has played an important role in the understanding of leadership. Homer’s *Iliad*, Virgil’s *Aeneid*, and Plato’s *Republic* are early examples of how Greek and Roman principles of leadership were infused into society. Greek philosophy examined finding the ideal leader in the idyllic state. Julius Caesar’s journals of his wars are treatises on his leadership style. A good leader was the most imperative component of a good form of government. The good leader possessed the education and wisdom needed to rule wisely and orderly (Bass, 1990).

Kellerman (1987), as cited in Bass (1990), elaborated on one of the most infamous leadership treatises, Machiavelli’s *The Prince*. Machiavelli described the leader’s ability to accept a leadership role in the context of a new manner of operations. The risks and rewards associated with ascending to a leadership position are just as prevalent today as they were in the day of Machiavelli. The challenges of being a leader and the resistance that may be present from those opposed to the leader’s methods are eternal obstructions that leaders have been facing for centuries.

In *The Prince*, Machiavelli justified the need for the prince to be strong and merciless because of the underlying assumption that all people were self-centered and self-serving. It was the right of the prince to do whatever was necessary to prevent the people from creating chaos by undermining the government. Any justification of the leader's action was irrelevant because the most important outcome was averting chaos. Machiavelli promoted the need for political calculation as a requisite to controlling events within the state, eliminating the potential of the state to become the victim. The needs of the state produced a mentality that any result was justified as long as it served the state. The leader must focus on what should be done for the benefit of the state rather than what ought to be done for the benefit of its people. Decisions were void of any consideration of moral or ethical implications.

Machiavelli also offered a warning for those who were in close proximity of the prince. A leader must not tolerate the presence of strong, intelligent people within his or her close-knit circles. Therefore, one who helped the leader during his or her ascension to power may eventually fall victim to the same power one helped establish (Bass, 1990). Throughout the course of history, one key ingredient to change is conflict. War has been one of the greatest agents for change that history has endured. Change from conflict is seldom welcome and usually meets with great resistance. However, the battlefield has been the genesis of some of the greatest examples of leadership society has witnessed. For example, Napoleon outlined over 100 traits that were requisite for any military leader. Even the barbaric Attila the Hun has been lauded as possessing the innate qualities of a good leader.

Some of history's greatest leaders have been so because of their ability to transform the needs of the masses from the lower level, local concerns to higher-level concerns by relating them to faith or country. Winston Churchill had the ability to motivate and lead the British even as German bombs fell on London. Mahatma Gandhi used faith and non-violent protest to influence thousands. The influence that the Ayatollah Khomeini had upon the Iranian people may be difficult to fathom by western civilization, but his ability to induce people to martyrdom is considered an excellent example of transformational leadership (Bass, 1990; Roberts, 1987).

### Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is a means of practicing leadership that allows a leader to focus on transforming a follower into a leader. The leader has an agenda planned for the follower that will be challenging and morally strengthening to assist him or her in becoming an individual leader. Transformational leadership requires a great deal of trust between the leader and follower because it allows for a great deal of vulnerability on the part of both parties. One common thread of transformational leadership is that the leader takes the time to get to know his or her followers and what it takes to achieve the best results for them.

Burns (1978) defined transformational leadership as a process in which both the leader and follower mutually aspire to raise each other to the highest possible level of morality and motivation. Transformational leaders often use charismatic measures to appeal to the higher ideals and values possessed by their followers. Burns felt that

transformational leadership was more effective than transactional leadership because it appeals more to the individual's spiritual needs rather than individual concerns of the organization. The basic principles of transformational leadership promote a culture of collaboration and may be viewed as a never-ending process. Unlike transactional leadership where individual transactions permeate the organization, transformational leadership helps provide followers with a sense of higher purpose and spiritual belonging.

Avolio (1999) identified four components that composed transformational leadership. These components are important because they allow for the leader to use his or her influence to allow the follower to transform into a leader. Idealized influence is the first component of transformational leadership and requires the leader to be a role model for the follower. The follower tries to emulate the traits and actions that he or she witnesses in the leader. However, in constantly trying to emulate the actions of the leader, the follower does not question the actions to which he or she is witness.

Transformational leaders often try to provide a source of inspiration to those who follow them. Leaders are using inspirational motivation, the second component of transformational leadership, when they try to provide meaning to their followers and try to create an esprit de corps. The sources of this motivation often stem not only from what a leader says, but also what he or she does.

Transformational leaders are charged with trying to stimulate the creativity that is contained within those that follow. By establishing a culture where creativity is encouraged, the component of intellectual stimulation is being promoted. Intellectual stimulation is mutually beneficial. The follower is seeking an environment of creative

freedom from the leader to allow the follower to design new or unconventional methods to achieve tasks. Conversely, the follower influences the leader when established methods or the leader's principles are challenged in a creative manner.

The final component of transformational leadership requires that the leader give attention to the individual needs that are present within the follower. These needs are centered on the ability for growth and accomplishment. It is up to the leader to fulfill the role of mentor in guiding the follower to the best of his or her ability. Also, leaders often delegate tasks to aid in the development of the follower. Individual consideration requires constant personal communication between the leader and follower while promoting a sense of continued improvement for both. In this sense, it is akin to the practice of kaizen, or continuous improvement, associated with the beliefs of Deming and Juran (Avolio, 1999).

Transformational leadership requires the leader to be able to inspire followers by breaking down barriers that may be present within the organization. It will always be a challenge for leaders to ask their followers to forsake some personal interests for the overall health of the organization. However, these challenges may be overcome if the leader possesses inspirational qualities and the follower is open to organizational change.

### Transactional Leadership

Avolio (1999) stated, "transactional leadership occurs when the leader rewards or disciplines the follower, depending on the adequacy of the follower's behavior or performance" (p. 49). Furthermore, transactional leadership is based on the layout of a

series of reinforcements or rewards that may be either positive or negative in their nature. Besides being positive or negative, the reinforcements may also be administered in either a passive or aggressive nature. Transactional leaders try to address the unique interests of those who fall under their influence. It is customary for the transactional leader to exchange rewards or favors for collaboration and compliance to achieve an assignment. Transactional leadership often leads to the creation of an organizational culture that is not highly innovative and quite reluctant to accept risk.

There are several components that are identified with transactional leadership. One of the more effective components in the context of leader transactions is related to contingent rewards. Contingent rewards are motivating factors that a leader uses to secure an agreement with his or her employees. If the goal or task is successfully completed, the individual receives the rewards. The punishment for not successfully completing the task is not receiving the reward.

Management-by-exception is another component of transactional leadership that may prove to be ineffective, especially if used in great amounts. Management-by-exception uses passive or aggressive corrective measures to encourage employees to achieve a goal. Aggressive corrective measures require the leader to dynamically monitor deviations from established standards for the follower's task and to take corrective actions to eliminate those mistakes in the future. The passive nature of corrective measures allows the follower to make mistakes or deviations in a task or assignment and then have the leader take corrective measures after the fact (Avolio, 1999).

Burns (1978) described transactional leaders as those looking to approach their followers with a series of transactions that could best be categorized as quid pro quo. The entire relationship between the leader and follower is defined and thrives on the nature of the transactions between the two entities. Burns used terms such as bureaucrats and politicians to describe transactional leaders.

The transactional leader views the primary purpose of the follower as being subordinate to the leader. The framework is set up so that the follower knows what rewards will result from compliance with the leader's request and what punishments will follow failure to comply with that request. The initial transaction between the transactional leader and a follower most often occurs when salary and benefits are discussed for the position. As part of the agreement to the salary package, the follower unconsciously cedes allegiance and authority to the leader. When tasks are delegated from the leader to the follower, it is understood that the follower retains full responsibility for the successful completion of the task. Whether or not the follower has the necessary resources and training to complete the delegated task is irrelevant to the leader (Burns, 1978).

The initial transaction between the leaders and follower most often occurs when a salary and benefits are discussed for the position. As part of the agreement to the salary package, the follower unconsciously cedes allegiance and authority to the leader.

Transactional leaders seem to promote an adversarial relationship between the leader and follower. There are organizational cultures where a transactional leadership style may be effective. More traditional management philosophies seemed to be rooted



in transactional leadership where the leader was viewed as super ordinate to the follower. One may also view any military operation as having a transactional leadership influence. However, transactional principles may not be as effective in organizations where the followers are either highly educated or have great levels of motivation. It is important for a leader to understand the leadership style to which the employee best responds. This understanding can lead to increased dialogue between the leader and follower while allowing both to enjoy a mutually beneficial relationship. The leader will benefit by enjoying a setting where goals and objectives are more likely to be met. The follower should realize greater levels of satisfaction in both employment position and with the organization as a whole (Burns, 1978).

#### Research in Leadership, Culture, and Job Satisfaction

There has been a vast amount of research conducted in the areas of leadership, culture, and satisfaction. The research has been conducted in different settings in almost all areas of education, business, the military, or industry. The majority of this research has taken place in the service industry in both public and private organizations. Numerous researchers who seek to establish a significant association within these areas have evaluated relationships between demographic variables, employee attitudes, and education levels.

Lok and Crawford (1999) evaluated the relationship between organizational culture, subculture, and commitment. Through their research, they found that organizational subculture had a much stronger relationship to commitment than

organizational culture alone. Furthermore, the researchers found that leadership had a strong relationship to commitment. The level of education, number of years in the particular position, and total number of years of experience did not appear to be related to commitment.

The first Lok and Crawford study sampled nurses from a variety of hospitals in Sydney, Australia. A questionnaire containing four established scales relating to organizational culture, commitment, job satisfaction, and leadership behavior was administered to the nurses. Demographic information such as age, level of education, and job tenure were collected from the participants. The results of the study also indicated that the variables of job satisfaction that related to Maslow's higher order needs had a strong relationship to employee commitment to the organization. Among these needs were degree of control, level of professionalism, and the quantity of interaction (Lok & Crawford, 1999).

Rodsutti and Swierczek (2002) researched the relationships between organizational effectiveness and leadership at firms located in Southeast Asia. Their survey measured international leadership characteristics, organizational culture, multicultural management style, executive motivation, and organizational effectiveness. Rodsutti and Swierczek focused their study on managers from over 1,000 multinational companies that had base operations in Thailand. The study covered over 30 nationalities. Of the respondents, 37% held positions in top management and 45% held division manager positions. Approximately 50% of the respondents had been with their organization longer than five years and almost 25% had been in service longer than ten

years. Leadership characteristics and organizational culture were found to have an influence on management style. The researchers evaluated the influence of organizational culture and management style on areas such as job satisfaction and personal satisfaction.

Multinational organizations that experienced better performance placed an emphasis on an organizational culture that focused on performance-oriented values, continuous improvement, and long-term employee commitment. Additionally, the successful organizations stressed having a leader with specific characteristics and championed creating a nurturing and supportive organizational culture. The culture usually provided an environment where the leaders of the organization attempted to maximize the satisfaction of employees (Rodsutti & Swierczek, 2002).

Lok and Crawford (2004) evaluated the effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and commitment. They studied a random sample of participants completing MBA studies in Hong Kong and Australia. The participants in the study all held middle or senior management positions. The researchers intended to measure the differences that existed between eastern and western cultures and the perception of job satisfaction and commitment. The researchers hoped to establish that differences in variables such as age, level of education, and length of employment between the eastern and western cultures could be attributed to inherent values, such as the influence on Confucian principles on those from the east.

Lok and Crawford found significant differences between the Australian and Hong Kong samples in organizational culture, job satisfaction, and commitment. The

differences between both samples were eliminated after statistically controlling for organizational culture, leadership, and demographic traits. When the samples were combined, supportive organizational cultures and a leadership style focused in consideration yielded positive effects on job satisfaction and commitment. The effect of national culture was moderate on job satisfaction, with a more positive effect on the sample from Hong Kong.

Testa (1999) performed research to examine whether the level of satisfaction with the organizational vision experienced by a stakeholder was related to the overall perceived effort and job satisfaction of that individual. The researcher surveyed a random sample of 740 cruise line managers with a 31-item questionnaire. Of the questionnaires distributed, 95.8% were used in the study. The breakdown of participants was 60.4% male and 32.8% female. The results from the survey indicated “that satisfaction with vision accounted for 33% and 21% of the variance in job satisfaction and service efforts” (p. 154). The results also indicated that the attitude of the stakeholder toward the organizational vision had a significant correlation with job satisfaction and the perception of efforts to provide a high quality of service.

Lund (2003) studied the impact of different types of organizational culture on job satisfaction. The study was conducted using a group of 1,800 marketing professionals who were given a questionnaire relating to several issues, which included organizational culture and job satisfaction. Lund’s research indicated that organizational culture fell within one of four forms: clan, adhocracy, hierarchy, or market. Levels of job satisfaction varied greatly across the four forms. Clan and adhocracy cultures provided

the highest levels of job satisfaction. A clan culture contained traits associated with cohesiveness, facilitating mentor relationships, and the development of human resources. Adhocracy cultures were characterized as being entrepreneurial, innovative, and not averse to risk. These results indicate that organizational leaders may enjoy greater success by better understanding the strengths and weaknesses that lie within the different cultures present within the organization. Furthermore, leaders may want to exercise higher levels of sensitivity when planning strategies to maximize the strengths of cultures and subcultures that may be present.

Wong (2002) focused her dissertation on the role leadership played in affecting the culture of an organization. Transformational leadership qualities were the focus of her research that was set in a private Catholic university. The researcher used a combination of personal interviews, the Organizational Description Questionnaire, and a demographic survey to collect information from the participants. One purpose of the study was to determine if the vision of the university president played a significant role in organizational culture. Other purposes were to determine if faculty and staff would resist organizational change and new leadership, as well as to determine if organizational change would mold a new culture. The results of the study indicated that the president played an integral role in creating a transformational culture and facilitated a change of vision within those rooted in the established culture and created a new vision and niche for the university.

Miles and Mangold (2002) focused their research on the relationship between team leaders and their subordinate team members. The purpose of their study was to

determine if significant relationships existed between the perceptions of the subordinate team member and those of the team leader in regards to overall satisfaction and the factors affecting the performance of the team. A population of business students from a mid-sized university provided the sample for Miles and Mangold's study. The population was enrolled in an undergraduate, senior-level business course or a graduate business course. Students filled out applications for either a team leader or team worker position. The professor selected team leaders. Each team met throughout the semester to complete assignments. The results of the study indicated that open lines of communication tended to be an area that was suitable for continuous improvement. Furthermore, "dissatisfied team members may be able to improve their level of satisfaction by requesting that the team focus on less sensitive issues rather than to address their team leaders' performance directly" (Miles & Mangold, 2002, p. 116).

Connelly and Kelloway (2003) conducted research to examine whether certain organizational factors had a significant relationship to how employees perceived the culture of sharing knowledge. The study consisted of a survey of MBA or MPA students from Canadian universities. The results indicated that an organizational leader's support of an environment in which knowledge was shared and social interaction was encouraged was a significant indicator of a positive organizational knowledge-sharing culture. It is also worth noting that, "gender moderated the effects of a positive social interaction culture on the knowledge sharing culture" (p. 298).

Block, in 2003 noticed that there was not a considerable amount of research examining the link between leadership and organizational culture in academic literature;

although the relationship between leadership and culture does have an influence on performance within the organization. The purpose of Block's study was to investigate the relationship between leadership and culture in the private sector. The organization studied was an industrial equipment sales and service company that consisted of approximately 900 employees throughout 23 "unique" branch offices. A correlation study was conducted to investigate the leadership-culture relationship with data collection by survey. The sample was 782 employees participating in the study, representing a response rate of 91%. There was an even distribution across pay levels ranging from salaried positions to hourly workers.

The study suggested that between 24-36% of the variance within the perception of culture could be attributed to the immediate supervisor's leadership style. The results of Block's study pointed to the theory that transactional leadership styles contribute less to a favorable organizational culture than transformational leadership styles (Brook, 2003).

Burke (1999) conducted an exploratory study that examined the relationships between supervisor feedback, climate, organizational values, employee satisfaction, and the quality of goods and services provided to clients. Approximately 1,000 managers and field staff from a professional services firm were surveyed for the study. Results indicated that clients directly linked the amount of feedback from supervisors to the perception of quality of goods and services. Furthermore, the presence of an organizational culture that encouraged development directly affected values, employee satisfaction, and the perception of quality of goods and services.

The relationship between individual intelligence and education as it relates to job and pay satisfaction was the focus of research conducted by Ganzach (2003). According to the researcher, the level of education an individual possesses could play both positive and negative roles in job satisfaction. Positive effects stem from the fact that highly educated people tend to seek jobs that provide higher rewards allowing for more satisfaction. Conversely, negative effects occur when reward expectations increase with education, though the actual rewards of a given position do not increase, thereby leading to decreased job satisfaction.

Research into the effects of job satisfaction, organizational culture, and leadership relating to staff members in higher education is a topic that needs further development. By understanding how job satisfaction relates to the culture of the organization and perceived leadership, administrators and supervisors may be able to better understand staff mentality and adjust factors that may lead to improved job satisfaction.

Griffith (2003) conducted a study that evaluated whether the behavior of school principals could be illustrated in the themes of transformational leadership. Furthermore, the study assessed the effects of transformational leadership on staff turnover and job satisfaction. Griffith examined elementary schools in a suburban school district of a large metropolitan area. The researcher used a structural equation model to examine the direct effects of transformational leadership on turnover and performance while assessing the indirect effect on job satisfaction. Additionally, Griffith used hierarchical linear modeling to further assess the effect of transformational leadership on job satisfaction. The findings of the study indicated that the transformational leadership qualities of the



principal did not directly associate with the turnover of staff or the achievement of students.

Walumbwa, Wu, and Ojode (2004) studied the relationships that existed between leadership and gender. The researchers gathered information from a sample of 412 students from a midwestern research university. The study was intended to gain an understanding of how students perceived their instructors as leaders as opposed to their classroom performance. The results of the study were that gender may discriminate the perception of certain instructor leadership styles for some students. In addition, some students associated perceived leadership style with instructional outcome. However, gender itself did not appear to discriminate instructional outcomes.

Earlier research relating to gender and leadership identified interesting results. Druskat, as cited in Walumba et al, found in a study conducted in religious orders that females were more likely to be identified with characteristics associated with transformational leadership and tended not to be associated with principles of management-by-exception. Transformational leadership characteristics have tended to be exhibited more by females within the educational realm as well. Transformational leaders in education, especially those within the classroom, often attempt to identify the needs and desires of the students with whom they work. They may try to delve deeper into the motivations and interests of their students. The nature of transformational leadership in this and many other cases seems to be more consistent with gender traits of females.

Transactional leadership characteristics focus on the structure of tasks and the exchanges that may take place between the leader and the follower. A bargaining mentality is inherent within a transactional leadership environment. Males tend to identify more with the bargaining nature of transactional leadership. In education, rewards for success may result in a passing grade or praise from the instructor. Lack of success usually meets with punishment or lack of recognition. This competitive nature tends to be met with greater acceptance by males rather than females (Walumbwa et al, 2004).

Bass (1997) suggested that an organization might be considered an example of transactional groups if rules and documented procedures are commonplace. Employees who seem to be jockeying for position also characterize a transactional organization. Conversely, transformational organizations are characterized by traits of adaptability and an attitude of sharing common goals. The ODQ was designed to allow organizations the opportunity to evaluate culture based on transformational and transactional qualities.

Lawrence (2000) utilized the Organizational Description Questionnaire in a doctoral dissertation that examined the relationship between transactional, transformational, and laissez-faire leadership approaches between senior-level administrators and their subordinates. Lawrence conducted a correlational study with participants from two health care organizations. Data were received from 45 healthcare executives and department heads, along with 113 subordinates. Significant relationships were observed between the various leadership approaches and the outcome criteria. Furthermore, no significant relationship was observed between the perceived

organizational culture of the subordinates and the leadership approaches used by senior leadership.

Bass, Avolio, Jung, and Berson (2003) examined 72 U.S. Army light infantry rifle platoon leaders and sergeants to predict the relationships of transformational and transactional leadership on unit potency, cohesiveness, and performance in combat situations. The research showed that the transformational and transactional contingent reward ratings of the platoon leaders and sergeants were positive indicators of unit performance. This research supported the theory that passive leadership, where leaders wait for problems to arise and then take corrective action, was detrimental to the performance of the unit.

The amount of research conducted within the areas of leadership, culture, and satisfaction is vast. Future research will play a vital role in better understanding the strength of the relationship between these variables. Future research on the relationship among these variables in higher education will only increase the ability of education leaders to better serve students, faculty, and staff.

### Summary

Organizations are best described as living organisms. The assembly of the numerous components of each organization plays an important role in understanding the prevailing culture present within, as well as how individual motivations and satisfaction gel to create subcultures. Leadership, culture, and satisfaction are crucial components of any organization and are greatly influenced by the numerous entities that compose the

organization. By understanding how these components function within an organization and realizing how power flows through the organizational structure, leaders may be able to ascertain the best possible means of reaching efficiency of operations while maximizing individual satisfaction and performance.

Leadership, culture, and satisfaction are variables that have numerous definitions. Defining organizational culture requires a basic knowledge of the overall culture along with awareness of any subcultures. The leadership styles contained within an organization may be categorized as predominantly transactional or transformational. Leadership styles are most likely defined differently at each level of the organization. Finally, the level of individual job satisfaction is based entirely upon the unique perspective of the individual employee. Satisfaction levels may be influenced by employee relationships, monetary or professional motivations, or a combination of numerous variables. A better understanding of how these variables interact will allow organizational leaders greater opportunity to achieve goals and objectives.

Historically, most organizational leaders seem to approach any discussion concerning leadership, culture, or job satisfaction with a somewhat rigid, conventional point of view. However, modern theorists have taken to rebuking what has long been considered conventional wisdom for a fresh new approach to management. Whether or not these new approaches are effective is yet to be determined. Yet, the willingness to attempt a new approach brings a fresh viewpoint to examining the leader-follower relationship.

Job satisfaction, culture, and leadership are topics that have been evaluated for centuries and will continue to be debated in the future. Understanding the key components of each topic is important in harnessing the potential they possess. Satisfaction, leadership, and culture are similar in composition and are strongly related to each other. Each factor plays a beneficial role in the way employees view their vocation. Organizational leadership must understand the relationships that exist and capitalize upon those relationships in order to operate in the most efficient manner possible.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to explain the methodology and procedures used to determine if there are relationships among job satisfaction, organizational culture, and perceived leadership characteristics. Another purpose of this chapter is to describe the population of the study and the test instruments used to conduct the various analyses used in this study.

This chapter is divided into six sections. The first section defines the purpose of the study. The population of the study is described in the second section. The third section contains a description of data collection for the study. The fourth section details the instrumentation used in the study, while the fifth section presents the methods of data analysis for the research questions. The final section contains a summary of all of the sections.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine if there is a relationship between job satisfaction, organizational culture, and perceived leadership at a dual-residential private university based on location, gender, level of education, supervisory responsibilities, and length of employment and to measure those relationships. Understanding how these areas relate may enhance strategic planning and personnel decisions. It is important to

understand the concepts associated with job satisfaction for employees so that measures may be taken to increase satisfaction levels if there are deficiencies. In addition, knowledge of job satisfaction, organizational culture, and leadership characteristics may aid the organization in running more efficiently and improving the relationship between leaders and followers.

### Population

The population of this study consisted of full-time employees at a private, multi-campus university with residential campuses in the southeastern and southwestern United States. Many multi-campus universities are arranged so that the respective campuses are within a relatively close proximity. In some cases, the campuses are located within the same city or the same region. The university used in this study is unique in the fact that the two residential campuses are located in the eastern and western regions of the United States and are separated by a distance of approximately 2,000 miles.

The University Director of Human Resources Office at the participating university was contacted to obtain the name, employment position, and location of faculty and staff. The first report indicated a total number of 1,584 university employees. The actual physical location of these employees was at one of the residential campuses or at the affiliate operations offices of the university, located at numerous sites around the United States. For the purposes of this study, only employees that were based on either of the residential campuses were selected to participate. The removal of those employees associated with the affiliate operations resulted in a population of 1,478 university

employees. Of these employees, 379 were located at the university's western region residential campus and 1,099 were located at the university's eastern region residential campus.

The original intent of the study was to select a random sample of the population to survey for the study. However, in discussions with the Director of Institutional Research at the university it was decided to conduct a census of the population instead of using a random sample. Historical rates of return for university-conducted surveys fell between 30-35%. In order to ensure an adequate sample size, the decision to survey the entire population was made.

The Human Resources Department and Institutional Research Department of the participating university were notified of the purpose and intent of the study before the commencement of data collection. This notification was necessary to assure university officials that the study being conducted was not an attempt to replicate any planned or previously conducted university research. It was stressed to these officials that the purpose of this study was to add to the collection of prior research.

### Data Collection

Employees of the university were sent survey packets through intercampus mail in early November, 2004. The survey packets consisted of a cover letter (Appendix A), an informed consent to participate letter (Appendix B), an Employee Demographic Survey (Appendix C), the Job Satisfaction Survey (Appendix D), the Organizational Description Questionnaire (Appendix E), and a return envelope. The packets were



addressed to the individual employee to be delivered to his or her respective department.

The cover letter explained the survey and requested that the survey instruments be returned to the researcher in the envelope provided.

Table 1

Distribution of Survey Packets

|  | Eastern Region<br>Campus | Western Region<br>Campus | Total N |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| Surveys<br>Distributed                           | 1,099                    | 379                      | 1,478   |
| Undeliverable<br>Surveys                         | 41                       | 1                        | 42      |
| Total Number of<br>Useful Surveys<br>Distributed | 1,058                    | 378                      | 1,436   |

Table 2

Survey Packets Received

|   | N   |
|---|-----|
| Survey Packets Returned                         | 495 |
| Non-completed Survey<br>Packets                 | 30  |
| Net Number of Useful<br>Survey Packets Returned | 465 |

The initial mailing of the survey resulted in the return of 42 packets (see Table 1) because the employees to whom they were delivered were no longer affiliated with the university. The total number of survey packets delivered was thereby decreased to 1,436.

Of this total, 490 survey packets were returned (34.1%). However, 30 were not completed, further reducing the usable return rate of survey packets to 32.0%. A follow-up e-mail was sent to both residential campuses in January 30, 2005 to thank those who participated and to target those employees who had yet to respond. The e-mail encouraged those who had not completed or mailed their surveys to do so and offered to replace any missing or misplaced survey packets. The e-mail yielded 5 additional responses. It was the 465 respondents who provided the data used for this study (see Table 2). With the addition of these responses, the return rate for usable surveys was 32.4%

### Instrumentation

The test instruments used for data collection were the Employment Demographic Survey, the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), and the Organizational Description Questionnaire (ODQ). Each of the test instruments was labeled with a tracking number to ensure that individual responses were grouped together.

The Employee Demographic Survey was an instrument created by the researcher to acquire specific demographic information from the population. The test instrument was a four-item survey that identified the respondent's affiliation to a residential campus, length of service to the university, highest level of formalized education, and his or her gender. The respondent was asked to place an "X" by his or her appropriate response. Responses that were unanswered or unable to be determined were labeled as such.

The JSS was developed by Spector (1985) to fulfill the needs for human services to have an instrument to measure employee satisfaction. The theory that job satisfaction was formed by an attitudinal reaction to an employment situation was the basis for the JSS. The design of the JSS is rooted in both public and private service organizations that may be either for-profit or non-profit in nature. The JSS scale was created to be applicable to service organizations for use in rating employee satisfaction, as past scales were not focused on that particular category. Furthermore, the JSS scale provides a total satisfaction score for an individual while also containing subscales that reflect distinct components of job satisfaction. The inclusion of subscales allow for unique components of job satisfaction to be measured individually.

The JSS contains 36 items that may be grouped into 9 different facets. The different facets are defined as pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, and communication. The combined total of these facets determines the individual total satisfaction score. The instrument uses a summated rating scale where the respondent selects from six choices ranging from a score of “1” where the respondent strongly disagrees to a score of “6” where the respondent strongly agrees. Approximately half of the items are worded negatively and must be reverse scored.

The JSS total score is determined by combining the nine sub scores from the different facets. The minimum total score that may be achieved is 36, while the maximum score that may be achieved is 216. Each negatively worded item is reverse

scored before the final summation of scores to allow for continuity in scoring the responses.

Spector (1985) computed the internal consistency reliability for the JSS based on a sample of 2,870. Table 3 contains a listing of all coefficient alphas for the JSS. A coefficient alpha of at least 0.60 was found for all of the nine facets of the JSS. The lowest coefficient alpha for the nine facets was coworkers (0.60) and the highest was supervision (0.82). Only two of the facets fell below a coefficient alpha of 0.70 and the coefficient alpha for the total scale was 0.91.

Table 3

JSS Internal Consistency Reliability Coefficients

| FACET                | Alpha |
|----------------------|-------|
| Pay                  | 0.75  |
| Promotion            | 0.73  |
| Supervision          | 0.82  |
| Fringe Benefits      | 0.73  |
| Contingent Rewards   | 0.76  |
| Operating Procedures | 0.62  |
| Coworkers            | 0.60  |
| Nature of Work       | 0.78  |
| Communication        | 0.71  |
| Total                | 0.91  |

Note: Based on a sample of 2,870 public and private sector participants

The ODQ is a 28-item instrument that was designed to assess organizational culture in terms of transactional or transformational leadership characteristics. The respondents must choose whether they feel different statements about the organization are true or false. Furthermore, the respondent may select “?” if they are unable to determine if the statement pertains to the organization or if they are undecided about the statement.

The ODQ contains both a transformational and transactional leadership scale. Odd-numbered statements are used to calculate the transactional score while even-numbered statements are used to calculate the transformational score. The range of transactional and transformational scores may range from –14 to +14. Each “true” response is scored +1 and each “false” response is score –1. Any “?” response is given a score of 0. A large positive score indicates a large presence of the particular characteristic within the organization. Conversely, a large negative score indicates a minimal presence of the particular characteristic within the organization (Bass & Avolio, 1992; Parry & Proctor-Thompson, 2001).

The transactional and transformational scores produced by the ODQ allow the culture of the organization to be classified. There are nine types of culture that may be assigned to an organization by using the ODQ. These cultures are Predominantly Four I’s, Moderately Four I’s, High-Contrast, Loosely Guided, Coasting, Moderately Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive, Garbage Can, Pedestrian, and Predominantly Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive.

Characteristics of the Four I's of transformational leadership are most evident in a culture that is either Predominantly or Moderately Four I's. Individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence collectively define the four I's. This type of organizational culture often displays constant communication about mission and vision while placing little emphasis on the need for control or formal agreements. The greater the negativity of the transactional score, the purer the transformational traits of the organization. As the transactional score of the organization grows and the culture is viewed more moderately, the importance for control and formal agreements increase.

A High-Contrast organizational culture is one that embraces the Four I's of transformational leadership while displaying high levels of transactional qualities. Maintaining balance between management and leadership activity can be difficult, as this culture possesses the potential for conflict between new and old ways of performing tasks coupled with remaining inside established boundaries. The conflicts that arise are most often are constructive in nature. High-Contrast cultures also require trust between the individual and the organization.

A Loosely Guided organizational culture has employees mostly working independently of each other. However, there are occasions of loosely connected informal leadership. The amount of structure present within the organization is extremely small. Production usually occurs as a result of the informal leadership and little else.

When managerial and leadership activities occur in modest amounts, the organization may possess a Coasting organizational culture. Organizations that are

complacent and are satisfied with maintaining the status quo are examples of a Coasting culture. A Coasting culture may have numerous respondents selecting a “?” to answer questions on the ODQ. Coasting organizations tend to fall in between transformational and transactional characteristics.

The Predominantly to Moderately Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive organizational culture is highly transactional in nature. The transactional characteristics are the ones most associated with the culture of the organization. Transformational characteristics are found to have little presence in this culture. Strict compliance to organizational rules and a well-defined hierarchy are noticeable qualities for this culture. However, as the transformational scores begin to increase, the culture begins to lose some of the internally competitive edge and focus shifts to more long-term objectives and to concern for the individual.

The lack of definition of a clear organizational culture results in a Garbage Can organizational culture. Garbage Can organizations often have employees with little direction who focus mainly on individual plans. The organization is void of direction, leadership, goals, and objectives. It is extremely difficult to achieve order because leadership and management are inconsistent.

A Pedestrian organizational culture is one where risk taking is generally avoided. The commitment of the organization to goals and objectives, along with commitment amongst employees, is very minimal. Structures and procedures within the organization appear in different manifestations based on the transactional characteristics that are present (Bass & Avolio, 1992; Avolio, Waldman, & Yammarino, 1991)

Table 4

Score Ranges for the Organizational Description Questionnaire (ODQ)

| Culture  | Transactional Score Range | Transformational Score Range |
|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Predominantly 4 I's                                  | -14 to +6                 | +7 to +14                    |
| Moderately 4 I's                                     | -14 to +6                 | +7 to +14                    |
| High-Contrast  | +7 to +14                 | +7 to +14                    |
| Loosely Guided                                       | -14 to -7                 | -6 to +6                     |
| Coasting   | -6 to +6                  | -6 to +6                     |
| Moderately Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive    | +7 to +14                 | -14 to +6                    |
| Predominantly Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive | +7 to +14                 | -14 to +6                    |
| Garbage Can  | -14 to -7                 | -14 to -7                    |
| Pedestrian   | -6 to +6                  | -7 to -14                    |

The reliability of the ODQ was based on a sample of 1,354 managers conducted nationwide by Parry and Proctor-Thompson (2001). The reliabilities were determined to be 0.88 for transformational characteristics and 0.74 for transactional characteristics. Descriptive statistics for the transformational characteristics yielded an M= 8.76 and a S.D.= 6.5. The transactional characteristics yielded an M= -1.07 and a S.D.= 6.16.



## Data Analysis

Data collected from the test instruments used for research were labeled and entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) v 13.0 for analysis. Data were entered into SPSS to evaluate descriptive statistics, frequencies and percentages, and to provide analysis to answer the research questions posed. The following demographic variables were used to group the respondents: location, length of service, level of formalized education, and gender.

The 36-question JSS was scored and points were assigned based on the following scale: (1) disagree very much, (2) disagree moderately, (3) disagree slightly, (4) agree slightly, (5) agree moderately, and (6) agree very much. The minimum score one could possibly attain on the JSS was 36 (answering all questions with “disagree very much”) and the maximum score was 216 (answering all questions with “agree very much”). The 36 questions that comprise the JSS were divided into facets with each facet containing four questions. In cases where missing data occurred, the mean of the participant’s total responses was used to prevent the mean total JSS score from being too high or low. This replacement was in accordance with procedures provided by the instrument’s creator. Some of the JSS questions were negatively worded and required the scoring to be reversed so that all responses would be based on positive responses. The total JSS score of the participant was computed by combining the totals of each of the nine facets.

The 28-item ODQ required the participant to choose either true, false, or “?” as a response to the question. The odd-numbered questions on the ODQ defined transactional leadership characteristics. The even-numbered questions on the ODQ defined

transformational leadership characteristics. Taking the number of true responses and subtracting the number of false responses achieved the transactional and transformational characteristic scores. Respondents who selected “?” were given a score of 0 because they were unable to determine either a true or false response.

### Data Analysis for Research Questions

The research questions guiding this study focused on the relationship between the mean total JSS score and the mean transactional and transformational scores obtained from the ODQ as they related to gender, length of employment, level of education, and geographic location. Two statistical analyses were conducted to evaluate the relationship between the mean scores derived from the test instruments and the demographic variables ascertained from the Employee Demographic Survey.

A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the mean total JSS score, the mean ODQ transactional leadership characteristic score, and the mean ODQ transformational leadership characteristic score for each level of the dependent variable present. The ANOVA was conducted at  $\alpha = .05$ . An ANOVA was selected because each independent variable had at least two levels, the population was assumed to be normally distributed, and variances were assumed to be homogenous.

To further evaluate the relationship between the mean scores from both test instruments, a correlation analysis was conducted at each level of the independent variable. The correlation was conducted at  $\alpha = .05$  and the strength and effect size of significant correlations were analyzed.

The final analysis related to the perception of organizational culture as defined by the participants. Descriptive statistics defining the organizational culture present were calculated for each level of the independent variable. The results and trends defining organizational culture, as well as the ANOVA and correlational analyses, will be discussed in Chapter 5.

### Summary

This chapter has described the procedures and methodology that provided the framework for this research. The purpose of this study has been reviewed and the population of the study has been identified. The steps taken to collect the data from the research population have been presented. Furthermore, reliability coefficients for the chosen test instruments have been presented to support their use. The subsequent chapters will evaluate and summarize the data analysis relating to the research questions posed and discuss the potential for future research.

## CHAPTER 4

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

#### Introduction

This study was developed to examine the relationships present among job satisfaction, organizational culture, and leadership. The results of this study are intended to further contribute to the body of research that has been conducted considering these variables. It is also intended to aid employers and employees in understanding and maximizing existing and potential relationships.

This chapter contains a description of the population and demographic characteristics of the study. The analyses and results for each of the research questions guiding the study are presented. The last section contains a summary of all sections contained within the chapter.

#### Population and Demographic Characteristics

The population of this study included the 1,478 employees of the eastern and western region residential campuses of the participating institution. Demographic data were obtained from the 465 participants who returned the survey packets. A summary of the demographic data is displayed in Tables 5-8.

Table 5 represents the aggregate number of usable responses that were returned by the respondents. Of the 465 respondents who defined the survey population, 454 (97.6%) indicated the number of years of service to the university. There were 11

respondents (2.4%) who did not indicate their years of service or whose answers were not able to be determined. There were 450 (96.8%) respondents who indicated a level of education while 15 respondents (3.2%) either did not answer or their answers were unable to be determined. A gender was indicated by 453 (97.4%) of respondents and 12 respondents (2.6%) either did not answer or their answers were unable to be determined. Finally, 453 respondents (97.4%) indicated their campus affiliation, while 12 respondents (2.6%) did not reply or the answer was unable to be determined.

Table 5

Respondents' Aggregate Demographic Data

| Variable           | Number | Percentage | Missing | Percentage | Total |
|--------------------|--------|------------|---------|------------|-------|
| Campus             | 453    | 97.4       | 12      | 2.6        | 465   |
| Length of Service  | 454    | 97.6       | 11      | 2.4        | 465   |
| Level of Education | 450    | 96.8       | 15      | 3.2        | 465   |
| Gender             | 453    | 97.4       | 12      | 2.6        | 465   |

Table 6 shows the number of years that the respondents have been employed by the university. Each respondent had a choice of five categories: less than 1 year, 1 year to 5 years, 6 years to 10 years, 11 years to 15 years, or greater than 15 years. The largest number of respondents (184 or 40.5%) reported employment with the university between 1-5 years. There were only two other levels reported where the number of respondents was greater than 20%: those employed 6 to 10 years (91 or 20%) and those employed greater than 15 years (96 or 21.1%).

Table 6

Respondents' Years of Service to the Institution

| Years of Service           | Total | Percent |
|----------------------------|-------|---------|
| Less than 1 Year           | 50    | 11.0    |
| 1 Year to 5 Years          | 184   | 40.5    |
| 6 Years to 10 Years        | 91    | 20.0    |
| 11 Years to 15 Years       | 33    | 7.3     |
| Greater than 15 Years      | 96    | 21.2    |
| Total of Completed Surveys | 454   | 100.0   |

Table 7

Respondents' Level of Education

| Level of Education              | Total | Percent |
|---------------------------------|-------|---------|
| High School Degree/GED          | 31    | 6.9     |
| Some College                    | 76    | 16.9    |
| Associate's Degree              | 37    | 8.2     |
| Bachelor's Degree               | 69    | 15.3    |
| Some Graduate-level Course Work | 42    | 9.3     |
| Master's Degree                 | 128   | 28.4    |
| Professional Degree             | 67    | 15.0    |
| Total of Completed Surveys      | 450   | 100.0   |

Table 7 shows the distribution and percentage of respondents based on their reported level of education. Respondents had seven categories from which to choose:

high school degree/GED, some college, associate’s degree, bachelor’s degree, some graduate-level course work, master’s degree, or professional degree. The largest number of respondents possessed a master’s degree (128 or 28.4%). Over two-thirds of the respondents who indicated a level of education possessed a bachelor’s degree or higher (n= 306, 68.0%). Just less than one-third of respondents who indicated a level of education possessed an associate’s degree or lower level of education (n=144, 32%).

Table 8 indicates the responses to the gender of the participant. There were 453 respondents who indicated a gender and 12 respondents who either chose not to indicate a gender or for whom the answer was unable to be determined. Female respondents comprised 230 (50.8%) of those respondents who indicated gender. Male respondents comprised 223 (49.2%) of those respondents who indicated gender. Given historical trends of male-dominated faculty and staff at the participating university, the appearance of an almost even distribution of responses is quite interesting.

Table 8

Respondents’ Gender

| Gender                     | Total | Percent |
|----------------------------|-------|---------|
| Female                     | 230   | 50.8    |
| Male                       | 223   | 49.2    |
| Total of Completed Surveys | 453   | 100.0   |

Table 9 represents the difference in the number of responses received from each residential campus. Approximately three-quarters (73.7%) of responses came from the eastern region campus of the participating institution. The remaining responses (26.3%)

were received from the western region campus of the participating institution. A total of 12 responses (2.6% of total responses) either did not indicate a geographic location or it was unable to be determined.

Table 9

Respondents by Campus

| Campus         | Total | Percent |
|----------------|-------|---------|
| Eastern Region | 334   | 73.7    |
| Western Region | 119   | 26.3    |
| Total          | 453   | 100.0   |

Research Question #1

Is there a relationship between the mean scores on the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) and the Organizational Description Questionnaire (ODQ) based on the level of education?

H<sub>1</sub>: The mean scores on the JSS and ODQ will not differ significantly across all levels of education.

The data collected from the 450 respondents who indicated a level of education on the Employee Demographic Survey were used to conduct the analysis for Research Question #1. Respondents could identify with one of the following classifications of the highest level of education attained: (1) high school diploma/GED, (2) some college, (3) associate's degree, (4) bachelor's degree, (5) some graduate-level course work, (6) master's degree, and (7) professional degree. Responses to the JSS and ODQ were scored yielding mean scores for total job satisfaction, transactional leadership



characteristics, and transformational leadership characteristics. Tables 10, 11, and 12 display the mean scores by level of education for both test instruments.

The participants who had a high school diploma/GED ( $n = 31$ ) had the largest mean total JSS score ( $M = 132.7097$ ,  $S.D. = 11.32$ ), while those who possessed a bachelor's degree ( $n = 69$ ) had the lowest mean total JSS score ( $M = 129.8116$ ,  $S.D. = 8.68$ ). Those with a high school diploma/GED ( $M = 132.7097$ ,  $S.D. = 11.32$ ) also possessed the highest mean transactional leadership characteristic score. The lowest mean transactional leadership characteristic score occurred with those completing some graduate-level course work ( $M = 129.8116$ ,  $S.D. = 8.68$ ). Those who had some college courses had the highest mean transformational leadership characteristic score ( $M = 8.14$ ,  $S.D. = 7.14$ ). The respondents with an associate's degree had the lowest mean transformational scores ( $M = 6.41$ ,  $S.D. = 7.93$ ).

A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the respondents' level of education and the total JSS score. The null hypothesis that there is not a significant difference between the mean total JSS scores based on the level of education. The dependent variable was the total JSS score. The independent variable was the level of education and contained 7 levels. The ANOVA was not significant,  $F_{.05}(6, 443) = .236$ ,  $p = .965$ . Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected at the .05 level.

Table 10

Mean Total JSS Score By Level of Education

| Level of Education              | Mean     | Standard Deviation | N   |
|---------------------------------|----------|--------------------|-----|
| High School Diploma/GED         | 132.7097 | 11.32              | 31  |
| Some College                    | 129.8684 | 9.93               | 76  |
| Associates Degree               | 130.6757 | 7.88               | 37  |
| Bachelors Degree                | 129.8116 | 8.68               | 69  |
| Some Graduate-Level Course Work | 130.7857 | 8.54               | 42  |
| Masters Degree                  | 130.3281 | 14.22              | 128 |
| Professional Degree             | 130.4627 | 18.16              | 67  |
| Total                           | 130.4267 | 12.42              | 450 |

Table 11

Mean ODQ Transactional Scores By Level of Education

| Level of Education              | Mean   | Standard Deviation | N   |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------------------|-----|
| High School Diploma/GED         | .4516  | 4.39               | 31  |
| Some College                    | .0526  | 5.32               | 76  |
| Associates Degree               | .5405  | 4.48               | 37  |
| Bachelors Degree                | -.2319 | 5.98               | 69  |
| Some Graduate-Level Course Work | -.3571 | 4.47               | 42  |
| Masters Degree                  | .2188  | 5.23               | 128 |
| Professional Degree             | .0746  | 5.16               | 67  |
| Total                           | .0889  | 5.15               | 450 |

Table 12

Mean ODQ Transformational Scores By Level of Education

| Level of Education              | Mean   | Standard Deviation | N   |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------------------|-----|
| High School Diploma/GED         | 6.7419 | 6.85               | 31  |
| Some College                    | 8.1447 | 7.14               | 76  |
| Associates Degree               | 6.4054 | 7.93               | 37  |
| Bachelors Degree                | 7.8261 | 6.69               | 69  |
| Some Graduate-Level Course Work | 7.9048 | 7.05               | 42  |
| Masters Degree                  | 8.0781 | 7.04               | 128 |
| Professional Degree             | 7.6716 | 6.75               | 67  |
| Total                           | 7.7444 | 7.00               | 450 |

A second ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the respondents' level of education and the total ODQ transactional leadership characteristic score. The null hypothesis was that there would not be a significant difference in the mean transactional score based on the level of education. The independent variable was the level of education and the ODQ transactional leadership score was the dependent variable. The ANOVA was not significant,  $F_{.05}(6,443) = .182$ ,  $p = .982$ . Since the  $p$  value is greater than .05, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

A final ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between level of education and the total ODQ transformational leadership characteristic score. The null hypothesis was that there is no significant difference in the mean transformational score

based on the level of education. The ANOVA was not significant,  $F_{.05}(6,443) = .425$ ,  $p = .862$ . The null hypothesis was not rejected due to the  $p$  value being greater than .05.

Table 13

Correlation Coefficients for Respondents with a High School Diploma/GED

|                  |                     | Total JSS<br>Score | Transactional | Transformational |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Total JSS Score  | Pearson Correlation | 1                  | .454*         | -.137            |
|                  | Significance        |                    | .010          | .461             |
|                  | N                   | 31                 | 31            | 31               |
| Transactional    | Pearson Correlation | .454*              | 1             | -.437.*          |
|                  | Significance        | .010               |               | .014             |
|                  | N                   | 31                 | 31            | 31               |
| Transformational | Pearson Correlation | -.137              | -.437*        | 1                |
|                  | Significance        | .461               | .014          |                  |
|                  | N                   | 31                 | 31            | 31               |

Note: \*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Correlation coefficients were computed for the total JSS score, mean ODQ transactional leadership characteristic score, and the mean ODQ transformational leadership characteristic scores for each level of education. Table 13 displays the correlation coefficients for those participants with a high school diploma/GED. The relationship between total JSS score and the transactional leadership characteristic score was significant,  $r(29) = .454$ ,  $p = .01$ . Spatz (2001) defined a small effect size as  $r = .10$ , a medium effect size as  $r = .30$ , and a large effect size as  $r = .50$ . The effect size of this relationship is just below the threshold of a large effect size identified as  $r = .5$ . The only other significant relationship occurred between the transactional and transformational leadership characteristic score. The relationship produced the following results:  $r(29) =$

.437,  $p = .014$ . The effect size of this relationship is just below the .5 required to be considered a large effect.

The ODQ transactional leadership characteristic score and the ODQ transformational leadership characteristic score were used to identify the organizational culture typology for the participants with a high school diploma or GED ( $n = 31$ ). A Predominantly Four Is culture was identified by 51.6% of the participants ( $n=16$ ). The next largest culture, identified by 22.6% of the participants ( $n = 7$ ), was Coasting. All other labels of organizational culture had three or fewer responses.

Table 14 identifies the correlation coefficients for those participants who indicated “some college” as the level of education. The correlations were all statistically significant within this level of the independent variable. The relationship between total JSS score and the transactional score was  $r(74) = .407$ ,  $p < .001$ . The effect size may be considered somewhere between medium and large because the correlation coefficient falls between .3 and .5. The relationship between total JSS score and the transformational score was  $r(74) = -.368$ ,  $p = .001$ . The negative correlation coefficient yielded a medium effect size.

The relationship between the transactional and transformational leadership characteristic scores was significant at  $r(74) = -.636$ ,  $p < .001$ . The correlation coefficient indicated a negative relationship between transactional and transformational scores. The effect size was well over the .5 used to define a large effect size.

Table 14

## Correlation Coefficients for Respondents with Some College

|                  |                     | Total JSS<br>Score | Transactional | Transformational |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Total JSS Score  | Pearson Correlation | 1                  | .407*         | -.368*           |
|                  | Significance        |                    | .000          | .001             |
|                  | N                   | 76                 | 76            | 76               |
| Transactional    | Pearson Correlation | .407*              | 1             | -.636*           |
|                  | Significance        | .000               |               | .000             |
|                  | N                   | 76                 | 76            | 76               |
| Transformational | Pearson Correlation | -.368*             | -.636*        | 1                |
|                  | Significance        | .001               | .000          |                  |
|                  | N                   | 76                 | 76            | 76               |

Note: \*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The scores from the ODQ were used to identify an organizational culture for those participants who identified their level of education as some college (n = 76). A Predominantly or Moderately Four I's organizational culture was identified by 69.7% (n = 53) of the participants. The only other sizable culture identifications were from those participants who identified the culture as Coasting (n = 10, 13.2%) and Moderately Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive (n = 8, 10.5%).

Table 15 contains the correlation coefficients for those participants who indicated an associate's degree as the highest level of education achieved. The relationship between total JSS score and the ODQ transformational leadership characteristic score was significant at  $r(35) = -.405$ ,  $p = .013$ . The correlation coefficient indicates a negative correlation between the variables with an effect size that may be considered between medium and large.

The relationship between the ODQ transactional and transformational leadership characteristic scores was significant at  $r(35) = -.598$ ,  $p < .001$ . There is a strong negative

correlation between transactional and transformational scores. The effect size is large because  $r > .5$ .

Table 15

Correlation Coefficients for Respondents with an Associate's Degree

|                  |                     | Total JSS Score | Transactional | Transformational |
|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|
| Total JSS Score  | Pearson Correlation | 1               | .271          | -.405*           |
|                  | Significance        |                 | .104          | .013             |
|                  | N                   | 37              | 37            | 37               |
| Transactional    | Pearson Correlation | .271            | 1             | -.598**          |
|                  | Significance        | .104            |               | .000             |
|                  | N                   | 37              | 37            | 37               |
| Transformational | Pearson Correlation | -.405*          | -.598**       | 1                |
|                  | Significance        | .013            | .000          |                  |
|                  | N                   | 37              | 37            | 37               |

Note: \*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

An organizational culture of Moderately Four I's was identified by 54.1% (n = 20) of participants with an associate's degree. A Coasting organizational culture was identified by 21.6% (n = 8) participants. All other categories of culture were identified by 3 or fewer participants.

Table 16 contains the results of a correlational analysis among the total JSS score, the transactional leadership characteristic score, and the transformational leadership characteristic score for those participants with a bachelor's degree. The relationship between the total JSS score and the transactional score was significant at  $r(67) = .341, p = .004$ . The positive correlation between the two variables had a medium effect size. There was a significant negative correlation between the transactional and the

transformational leadership characteristic score at  $r(67) = -.518, p < .001$ . This relationship had a large effect size.

Table 16

Correlation Coefficients for Respondents with a Bachelor's Degree

|                  |                     | Total JSS Score | Transactional | Transformational |
|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|
| Total JSS Score  | Pearson Correlation | 1               | .341*         | -.146            |
|                  | Significance        |                 | .004          | .231             |
|                  | N                   | 69              | 69            | 69               |
| Transactional    | Pearson Correlation | .341*           | 1             | -.518*           |
|                  | Significance        | .004            |               | .000             |
|                  | N                   | 69              | 69            | 69               |
| Transformational | Pearson Correlation | -.146           | -.518*        | 1                |
|                  | Significance        | .231            | .000          |                  |
|                  | N                   | 69              | 69            | 69               |

Note: \*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

A Moderately Four I's organizational culture was the most popular response for those participants with a bachelor's degree with 52.2% (n = 36) of participants identifying this culture. Furthermore, almost two-thirds of participants defined the organizational culture as either Predominantly or Moderately Four I's (n= 45, 65.2%). A Coasting culture was identified by 13.0% (n = 9) of the participants, while 10.1% (n = 7) identified the culture as Moderately Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive. All other categories had 3 or fewer responses.

Table 17 contains the correlation coefficients calculated between the total JSS score, ODQ transactional score, and ODQ transformational score for those participants who identified themselves as having some graduate-level course work. The only significant correlation was that between the transactional score and the transformational



score. A large negative correlation exists between these variables, indicated by  $r(41) = -.739, p < .001$ .

Table 17

Correlation Coefficients for Respondents with Some Graduate-Level Course Work

|                  |                     | Total JSS<br>Score | Transactional | Transformational |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Total JSS Score  | Pearson Correlation | 1                  | .129          | -.279            |
|                  | Significance        |                    | .415          | .074             |
|                  | N                   | 42                 | 42            | 42               |
| Transactional    | Pearson Correlation | .129               | 1             | -.739*           |
|                  | Significance        | .415               |               | .000             |
|                  | N                   | 42                 | 42            | 42               |
| Transformational | Pearson Correlation | -.279              | -.739*        | 1                |
|                  | Significance        | .074               | .000          |                  |
|                  | N                   | 42                 | 42            | 42               |

Note: \*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Of the participants who identified their level of education as some graduate-level course work, an organizational culture of Moderately Four I's was indicated by 66.7% (n = 28) and a Coasting culture by 21.4% (n = 9) of the participants. The other culture typologies had 2 or fewer responses.

The correlation coefficients among the total JSS score, ODQ transactional score, and ODQ transformational score for those participants with a master's degree are contained in Table 18. There were only two significant relationships identified among these variables. There was a medium negative correlation between the total JSS score and the ODQ transformational score. The correlation was significant at  $r(126) = -.255, p = .004$ . A large negative correlation was also identified between the ODQ transactional

and ODQ transformational score. The correlation between the two variables was significant at  $r(126) = -.576, p = .004$ .

Table 18

Correlation Coefficients for Respondents with a Master's Degree

|                  |                     | Total JSS Score | Transactional | Transformational |
|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|
| Total JSS Score  | Pearson Correlation | 1               | .134          | -.255*           |
|                  | Significance        |                 | .132          | .004             |
|                  | N                   | 128             | 128           | 128              |
| Transactional    | Pearson Correlation | .134            | 1             | -.576*           |
|                  | Significance        | .132            |               | .000             |
|                  | N                   | 128             | 128           | 128              |
| Transformational | Pearson Correlation | -.255*          | -.576*        | 1                |
|                  | Significance        | .004            | .000          |                  |
|                  | N                   | 128             | 128           | 128              |

Note: \*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Of those participants with a master's degree, an organizational culture of either Predominantly or Moderately Four I's was indicated by 69.5% (n = 89), with 58.6% (n = 75) of those being Moderately Four I's. A Coasting culture was identified by 13.3% (n = 17) of the participants. The other culture definitions received 8 or fewer responses.

There was only one statistically significant correlation identified among the total JSS score, ODQ transactional, and ODQ transformational score for those participants possessing a professional degree. There was a negative correlation with a large effect size between the ODQ transactional and ODQ transformational scores. The correlation was significant at  $r(65) = -.466, p < .001$ .

Table 19

Correlation Coefficients for Respondents with a Professional Degree

|                  |                     | Total JSS<br>Score | Transactional | Transformational |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Total JSS Score  | Pearson Correlation | 1                  | .048          | -.048            |
|                  | Significance        |                    | .701          | .701             |
|                  | N                   | 67                 | 67            | 67               |
| Transactional    | Pearson Correlation | .048               | 1             | -.466*           |
|                  | Significance        | .701               |               | .000             |
|                  | N                   | 67                 | 67            | 67               |
| Transformational | Pearson Correlation | -.048              | -.466*        | 1                |
|                  | Significance        | .701               | .000          |                  |
|                  | N                   | 67                 | 67            | 67               |

Note: \*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Of the participants who identified a professional degree as the level of education (n = 67), 47.8% (n = 32) defined the organizational culture as Moderately Four I's. A Coasting culture was identified by 23.9% (n = 16) of the participants. The only other sizable definition of culture was from the 14.9% (n = 10) of participants who felt the organizational culture was Predominantly Four I's.

### Research Question #2

Is there a relationship between the mean scores on the JSS and the ODQ based on gender?

H<sub>2</sub>: The mean scores on the JSS and ODQ will not differ significantly based on gender.

The data collected from the 453 respondents who indicated a gender on the Employee Demographic Survey were used to address Research Question #2. The responses to the JSS and ODQ were evaluated and scored. The JSS yielded a total JSS score for the participant. The responses to the ODQ yielded a mean score for both

transactional and transformational leadership characteristics. Tables 20 and 21 display the mean JSS total score and mean ODQ transactional and transformational leadership characteristic for those participants who selected gender.

Table 20

Mean Total JSS Score By Gender

| Gender | Mean Score | Standard Deviation | N   |
|--------|------------|--------------------|-----|
| Female | 130.9130   | 9.87               | 230 |
| Male   | 130.0135   | 14.59              | 223 |
| Total  | 130.4702   | 12.41              | 453 |

Table 21

Mean ODQ Transactional and Transformational Scores By Gender

| Gender |                      | Mean Score | Standard Deviation | N   |
|--------|----------------------|------------|--------------------|-----|
| Female | ODQ Transactional    | .2522      | 5.25               | 230 |
| Male   | ODQ Transactional    | -.0404     | 5.06               | 223 |
| Total  | ODQ Transactional    | .1082      | 5.16               | 453 |
| Female | ODQ Transformational | 7.4174     | 7.14               | 230 |
| Male   | ODQ Transformational | 8.1794     | 6.68               | 223 |
| Total  | ODQ Transformational | 7.7925     | 6.93               | 453 |

The female respondents (n = 230) had a mean total JSS score of 130.9130 (S.D. = 9.87261). The female mean ODQ score for transactional leadership characteristics was .2522 (S.D. = 5.25481). The female mean ODQ score for transformational leadership characteristics was 7.4174 (S.D. = 7.14294).

The mean total JSS score for males ( $n = 223$ ) was 130.0135 (S.D. = 14.59405). The mean total JSS score for males was very similar to that of the female respondents (130.0135 compared to 130.9130). The standard deviation for male participants was considerably larger than that of the female participants (14.59 compared to 9.87).

To evaluate the relationship between gender and the mean total JSS score, a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted. The null hypothesis was that there was no significant difference in the mean total JSS score based on gender. The dependent variable in the analysis was the mean total JSS score. Gender was the independent variable. There were two levels of the independent variable: female and male. The ANOVA was not significant,  $F_{.05}(1, 451) = .594$ ,  $p = .441$ . Therefore, the null hypothesis that there were significant differences in the mean total JSS score based on gender could not be rejected. The 95% confidence interval of the estimated marginal means for female participants had a lower bound of 129.303 and an upper bound of 132.523. For male participants, the lower bound was 128.379 and the upper bound was 131.648.

A second ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between gender and the mean transactional leadership characteristic score from the ODQ. The null hypothesis was that there was no significant difference in the mean transactional score based on the gender of the participant. The dependent variable was the mean ODQ transactional leadership characteristic score. The independent variable was the gender of the participant. The ANOVA was not significant,  $F_{.05}(1, 451) = .364$ ,  $p = .547$ . Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected. The 95% confidence interval of the

estimated marginal means for female participants had a lower bound of -.417 and an upper bound of .921. For male participants, the lower bound was -.720 and the upper bound of .639.

A final ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between gender and the mean transformational leadership characteristic score from the ODQ. The null hypothesis was that there was no significant difference in the mean transformational leadership characteristic score based on the gender of the participant. The dependent variable was the mean ODQ transformational leadership characteristic score. The independent variable was gender. The ANOVA was not significant,  $F_{.05}(1, 451) = 1.37$ ,  $p = .242$ . Therefore, the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference in the mean transformational leadership characteristic score based on gender could not be rejected. The 95% confidence interval of the estimated marginal means for female participants had a lower bound of 6.520 and an upper bound of 8.315. Male participants had a lower bound of 7.268 and an upper bound of 9.091.

Correlation coefficients were computed among the total JSS score, the mean ODQ transactional score, and the mean ODQ transformational score for female participants. The results of the correlational analysis for female participants are contained in Table 22. All correlations were significant at the .01 level.

The relationship between total JSS Score and the transactional leadership characteristic score was statistically significant,  $r(228) = .326$ ,  $p < .001$ . The relationship between the total JSS score and the transformational leadership characteristic score was also significant,  $r(228) = -.278$ ,  $p < .001$ . The relationship between the transactional

leadership characteristic score and transformational leadership characteristic score was significant,  $r(228) = -.561, p < .001$ . The results suggest there is a medium effect size for the positive correlation between the total JSS score and transactional leadership characteristic score. The effect size for the negative correlation between the total JSS score and the transformational leadership characteristic score is slightly lower than the  $r = .3$  required to be considered a medium effect. The negative correlation between the transactional leadership characteristic score and transformational leadership characteristic score was greater than the  $r = .5$  required to be considered a large effect.

Table 22

Correlation Coefficients for Female Participants

|                  |                     | Total JSS Score | Transactional | Transformational |
|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|
| Total JSS Score  | Pearson Correlation | 1               | .326*         | -.278*           |
|                  | Significance        |                 | .000          | .000             |
|                  | N                   | 230             | 230           | 230              |
| Transactional    | Pearson Correlation | .326*           | 1             | -.561*           |
|                  | Significance        | .000            |               | .000             |
|                  | N                   | 230             | 230           | 230              |
| Transformational | Pearson Correlation | -.278*          | -.561*        | 1                |
|                  | Significance        | .000            | .000          |                  |
|                  | N                   | 230             | 230           | 230              |

Note: \*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 23 displays the frequencies of organizational culture identified by female participants. The transactional characteristic score and the transformational characteristic score were utilized to label the organizational structure as one of nine different cultures as perceived by the participant. Over 55% ( $n = 127$ ) of female respondents viewed the organizational culture as Moderately Four I's. The next largest identification of

organizational culture among female participants was Coasting, which accounted for 17% (n = 40) of responses.

Table 23

Organizational Culture Identified By Female Participants

| Culture  | Number     | Percentage   |
|--|------------|--------------|
| Predominantly Four I's                               | 19         | 8.3          |
| Moderately Four I's                                  | 127        | 55.2         |
| High-Contrast  | 4          | 1.7          |
| Loosely Guided                                       | 3          | 1.3          |
| Coasting   | 40         | 17.4         |
| Moderately Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive    | 22         | 9.6          |
| Pedestrian   | 9          | 3.9          |
| Predominantly Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive | 6          | 2.6          |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>230</b> | <b>100.0</b> |

Correlation coefficients were also computed among the total JSS score, the mean ODQ transactional score, and the mean ODQ transformational score for male participants. The results of the correlational analysis for male participants are contained in Table 24. One correlation was statistically significant at the .05 level and one was significant at the .01 level. The relationship between the total JSS score and the transformational leadership characteristic score was significant,  $r(228) = -.163, p = .015$ ,



as was the relationship between the transactional leadership characteristic score and transformational leadership characteristic score,  $r(221) = -.564, p < .001$ . The relationship between the total JSS Score and the transactional leadership characteristic score was not significant,  $r(221) = .114, p = .089$ .

The results suggest that the effect size for the negative correlation between the total JSS score and the transformational leadership characteristic score was slightly larger than the  $r = .1$  used to define a small effect. Furthermore, the negative correlation between transactional leadership characteristic scores and transformational leadership characteristic scores had a large effect size.

Table 24

Correlation Coefficients for Male Participants

|                  |                     | Total JSS<br>Score | Transactional | Transformational |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Total JSS Score  | Pearson Correlation | 1                  | .114          | -.163*           |
|                  | Significance        |                    | .089          | .015             |
|                  | N                   | 223                | 223           | 223              |
| Transactional    | Pearson Correlation | .114               | 1             | -.564**          |
|                  | Significance        | .089               |               | .000             |
|                  | N                   | 223                | 223           | 223              |
| Transformational | Pearson Correlation | -.163*             | -.564**       | 1                |
|                  | Significance        | .015               | .000          |                  |
|                  | N                   | 223                | 223           | 223              |

Note: \*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 25

## Organizational Culture Identified By Male Participants

| Culture  | Number | Percentage |
|--|--------|------------|
| Predominantly Four I's                               | 24     | 10.8       |
| Moderately Four I's                                  | 130    | 58.3       |
| High Contrast  | 6      | 2.7        |
| Coasting   | 37     | 16.6       |
| Moderately Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive    | 13     | 5.8        |
| Pedestrian   | 7      | 3.1        |
| Predominantly Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive | 5      | 2.2        |
| Not Determined                                       | 1      | .4         |
| Total  | 223    | 100.0      |

Table 25 displays the frequencies of organizational culture identified by male participants. The transactional characteristic score and the transformational characteristic score were utilized to label the participant as one of nine different cultures. Almost 70% (n = 154) of male respondents viewed the organizational culture as either Predominantly or Moderately Four I's. Coasting was the next largest organizational culture identified by male participants, which accounted for 16.6% (n = 37) of responses.

### Research Question #3

Is there a relationship between the mean scores on the JSS and the ODQ based on geographic location of employment?

H<sub>3</sub>: The mean scores on the JSS and ODQ will not differ significantly for the eastern and western campus.

The data collected from the 453 respondents who indicated a location of either the eastern or western campus on the Employee Demographic Survey were used to address Research Question #2. The responses to the JSS and ODQ were evaluated and scored. The JSS yielded a total JSS score for the participant. The responses to the ODQ yielded a mean score for both transactional and transformational leadership characteristics. Tables 26 and 27 display the mean JSS total score and mean ODQ transactional and transformational leadership characteristic for those participants who selected a location.

Table 26

Mean Total JSS Score By Location

| Location | Mean Score | Standard Deviation | N   |
|----------|------------|--------------------|-----|
| Eastern  | 130.6617   | 11.62              | 334 |
| Western  | 129.9076   | 14.45              | 119 |
| Total    | 130.4636   | 12.42              | 453 |

Table 27

Mean ODQ Transactional and Transformational Scores By Location

| Location       |                      | Mean Score | Standard Deviation | N   |
|----------------|----------------------|------------|--------------------|-----|
| Eastern Campus | ODQ Transactional    | .2844      | 5.20               | 334 |
| Western Campus | ODQ Transactional    | -.3866     | 5.02               | 119 |
| Total          | ODQ Transactional    | .1082      | 5.16               | 453 |
| Eastern Campus | ODQ Transformational | 7.4192     | 7.18               | 334 |
| Western Campus | ODQ Transformational | 8.6471     | 6.30               | 119 |
| Total          | ODQ Transformational | 7.7417     | 6.98               | 453 |

In order to evaluate the relationship between location and the mean total JSS score, a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted. The null hypothesis was that there was no significant difference in the mean total JSS score based on the location of the participant. The dependent variable in the analysis was the mean total JSS score. The campus location was the independent variable. There were two levels of the independent variable: eastern campus and western campus. The ANOVA was not significant,  $F_{.05}(1,451) = .323$ ,  $p = .570$ . Since the ANOVA was not significant, the null hypothesis that there were significant differences in the mean JSS scores based on the location of the participant could not be rejected.

A second ANOVA was conducted to analyze the relationship between the mean ODQ transactional leadership characteristic score and the location of the participant. The null hypothesis was that there would be no significant difference between the mean ODQ transactional score based on location. The mean ODQ transactional score was the dependent variable. Location, the independent variable, had two levels: eastern campus

and western campus. The ANOVA was not significant,  $F_{.05}(1, 451) = 1.486$ ,  $p = .223$ . With the ANOVA yielding a result that was not statistically significant, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

A third ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the location of the participant and the mean ODQ transformational leadership characteristic score. The null hypothesis was that there would be no significant difference in the mean ODQ transformational score based on location. The mean ODQ transformational score was the dependent variable. The location of the participant was the independent variable. The ANOVA was not significant,  $F_{.05}(1, 451) = 2.729$ ,  $p = .099$ . The null hypothesis that there are no significant differences in the mean ODQ transformational score by location could not be rejected. This ANOVA also violated the homogeneity of variances. A Levene's Test of Equality of Variances was significant. If the ANOVA had been significant, post hoc tests for unequal variances would have been conducted.

Correlation coefficients were computed among the total JSS score, the mean ODQ transactional score, and the mean ODQ transformational score for participants from the eastern campus. The results of the correlational analysis for participants from the eastern campus are contained in Table 28. All correlations were statistically significant at the .01 level.

The relationship between total JSS Score and the transactional leadership characteristic score was significant,  $r(332) = .228$ ,  $p = .000$ . The relationship between the total JSS score and the transformational leadership characteristic score was also significant,  $r(332) = -.224$ ,  $p = .000$ . The relationship between the transactional

leadership characteristic score and transformational leadership characteristic score was significant,  $r(332) = -.580, p = .000$ . The results suggest there is a medium effect size for the positive correlation between the total JSS score and transactional leadership characteristic score. The effect size for the negative correlation between the total JSS score and the transformational leadership characteristic score is slightly lower than the  $r = .3$  required to be considered a medium effect. The negative correlation between the transactional leadership characteristic score and transformational leadership characteristic score was greater than the  $r = .5$  needed to be considered a large effect.

Table 28

Correlation Coefficients for Eastern Campus Participants

|                  |                     | Total JSS<br>Score | Transactional | Transformational<br>Score |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Total JSS Score  | Pearson Correlation | 1                  | .228*         | -.224*                    |
|                  | Significance        |                    | .000          | .000                      |
|                  | N                   | 334                | 334           | 334                       |
| Transactional    | Pearson Correlation | .228*              | 1             | -.580*                    |
|                  | Significance        | .000               |               | .000                      |
|                  | N                   | 334                | 334           | 334                       |
| Transformational | Pearson Correlation | -.224*             | -.580*        | 1                         |
|                  | Significance        | .000               | .000          |                           |
|                  | N                   | 334                | 334           | 334                       |

Note: \*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 29 contains the frequency of the participants' identification of organizational culture using the ODQ transactional and ODQ transformational scores. The largest number of participants (54.5%,  $n = 182$ ) identified the organizational culture as Moderately Four I's. In addition, combining the number of respondents who identified culture as some incarnation of the Four I's accounted for 63.8% ( $n = 213$ ) of

respondents.. The next largest culture identified by those from the eastern campus was Coasting, which was selected by 17.9% (n = 60) of participants. A Moderately Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive culture was identified by 8.7% of participants (n = 29). All other culture typologies were represented by fewer than 3.9% of participants.

Table 29

Organizational Culture Identified By Eastern Campus Participants

| Culture  | Number | Percentage |
|--|--------|------------|
| Predominantly Four I's                               | 31     | 9.3        |
| Moderately Four I's                                  | 182    | 54.5       |
| High Contrast  | 9      | 2.7        |
| Loosely Guided                                       | 1      | 0.3        |
| Coasting   | 60     | 17.9       |
| Moderately Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive    | 29     | 8.7        |
| Pedestrian   | 13     | 3.9        |
| Predominantly Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive | 9      | 2.7        |
| Total  | 334    | 100.0      |

Correlation coefficients were computed among the total JSS score, the mean ODQ transactional score, and the mean ODQ transformational score for participants from the western campus. The results of the correlational analysis for participants from the

western campus are contained in Table 30. Only one correlation was statistically significant at the .01 level.

The relationship between the transactional leadership characteristic score and the transformational leadership characteristic score was significant,  $r(119) = -.491, p = .000$ . The negative correlation between the transactional leadership characteristic score and transformational leadership characteristic score was almost at  $r = .5$  necessary to be considered a large effect.

Table 30

Correlation Coefficients for Western Campus Participants

|                  |                     | Total JSS<br>Score | Transactional | Transformational |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Total JSS Score  | Pearson Correlation | 1                  | .134          | -.171            |
|                  | Significance        |                    | .146          | .062             |
|                  | N                   | 119                | 119           | 119              |
| Transactional    | Pearson Correlation | .134               | 1             | -.491*           |
|                  | Significance        | .146               |               | .000             |
|                  | N                   | 119                | 119           | 119              |
| Transformational | Pearson Correlation | -.171              | -.491*        | 1                |
|                  | Significance        | .062               | .000          |                  |
|                  | N                   | 119                | 119           | 119              |

Note: \*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 31 displays the organizational culture breakdown of the participants from the western campus. The Moderately Four I's culture was identified by 60.5% ( $n = 72$ ) of the participants. When these participants are added to those identifying the culture as Predominantly Four I's (10.1%,  $n = 12$ ), 70.6% ( $n = 84$ ) felt the culture was classified by either of the Four Is culture. A Coasting culture was selected by 4.3% of the participants ( $n = 17$ ). No other culture type had a percentage over 5.0%.



Table 31

Organizational Culture Identified By Western Campus Participants

| Culture  | Number     | Percentage   |
|--|------------|--------------|
| Predominantly Four I's                               | 12         | 10.1         |
| Moderately Four I's                                  | 72         | 60.5         |
| High Contrast  | 3          | 2.5          |
| Loosely Guided                                       | 2          | 1.7          |
| Coasting   | 17         | 4.3          |
| Moderately Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive    | 6          | 5.0          |
| Pedestrian   | 4          | 3.4          |
| Predominantly Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive | 2          | 1.7          |
| Unable to Determine                                  | 1          | .8           |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>119</b> | <b>100.0</b> |

Research Question #4

Is there a relationship between the scores on the JSS and the ODQ based on the number of years of employment?

H<sub>4</sub>: The mean scores on the JSS and ODQ will not differ significantly based on the number of years of employment.

The data collected from the 454 respondents who indicated a length of service to the institution on the Employee Demographic Survey were used to conduct the analysis for Research Question #4. Respondents could identify with one of the following classifications of length of service achieved with the institution: (1) less than 1 year, (2)

1 year – 5 years, (3) 6 years – 10 years, (4) 11 years – 15 years, (5) and greater than 15 years. Responses to the JSS and ODQ were scored yielding mean scores for total job satisfaction, transactional leadership characteristics, and transformational leadership characteristics. Tables 32, 33, and 34 display the mean scores by level of education for both test instruments.

Table 32

Mean Total JSS Score By Length of Service

| Length of Service     | Mean     | Standard Deviation | N   |
|-----------------------|----------|--------------------|-----|
| Less than 1 year      | 126.3200 | 8.51               | 50  |
| 1 year – 5 years      | 128.8424 | 12.92              | 184 |
| 6 years – 10 years    | 132.5055 | 7.38               | 91  |
| 11 years – 15 years   | 130.3939 | 24.91              | 33  |
| Greater than 15 years | 133.8646 | 9.18               | 96  |
| Total                 | 130.4736 | 12.40              | 454 |

The participants who had a length of service of 6 – 10 years (n = 91) had the largest mean total JSS score (M = 132.5055, S.D. = 7.38), while those who were employed less than 1 year (n = 50) had the lowest mean total JSS score (M = 126.32, S.D. = 8.51). The highest mean transactional leadership characteristic score was also held by those employed 6 – 10 years (M= 1.23, S.D. = 4.71). The lowest mean transactional leadership characteristic score occurred with those employed less than 1 year (M = -1.84, S.D. = 4.32). Those employed less than 1 year had the highest mean

transformational leadership characteristic score ( $M = 10.52$ ,  $S.D. = 3.76$ ). The respondents employed 6 years – 10 years had the lowest mean transformational scores ( $M = 6.41$ ,  $S.D. = 7.49$ ).

Table 33

Mean ODQ Transactional Scores By Length of Service

| Length of Service     | Mean    | Standard Deviation | N   |
|-----------------------|---------|--------------------|-----|
| Less than 1 year      | -1.8400 | 4.32               | 50  |
| 1 year – 5 years      | .0326   | 5.08               | 184 |
| 6 years – 10 years    | 1.2308  | 4.71               | 91  |
| 11 years – 15 years   | -.7273  | 6.02               | 33  |
| Greater than 15 years | .5000   | 5.61               | 96  |
| Total                 | .1101   | 5.15               | 454 |

Table 34

Mean ODQ Transformational Scores By Length of Service

| Length of Service     | Mean    | Standard Deviation | N   |
|-----------------------|---------|--------------------|-----|
| Less than 1 year      | 10.5200 | 3.76               | 50  |
| 1 year – 5 years      | 7.6685  | 7.03               | 184 |
| 6 years – 10 years    | 6.4066  | 7.49               | 91  |
| 11 years – 15 years   | 8.0000  | 7.91               | 33  |
| Greater than 15 years | 7.6667  | 7.01               | 96  |
| Total                 | 7.7533  | 6.97               | 454 |

A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the respondents' length of employment and the total JSS score. The null hypothesis was that there is not a significant difference between the mean total JSS scores based on the level of education. The dependent variable was the total JSS score. The independent variable was the length of employment and contained 5 levels. The ANOVA was significant,  $F_{.05}(4,449) = 4.754$ ,  $p = .001$ . The critical F value for  $F_{.05}(4,449) = 2.39$ . The null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the mean total JSS score based on length of service was rejected because the computed F value was greater than the critical value.

Follow up tests were conducted to evaluate the pairwise differences among the means. The variances were assumed to be homogenous based on the Levene's test of equality of variances. A Tukey B post hoc test was conducted due to the unequal sample sizes. The results of this analysis indicated that those employed less than 1 year had total JSS scores significantly lower than the other employment groups. Those employed 6 – 10 years and greater than 15 years had significantly higher total JSS scores.

A second ANOVA was conducted to analyze the relationship between the mean ODQ transactional leadership characteristic score and the length of employment of the participant. The null hypothesis was that there would be no significant difference between the mean ODQ transactional score based on length of employment. The mean ODQ transactional score was the dependent variable. Length of employment, the independent variable, had 5 levels. The ANOVA was significant,  $F_{.05}(4,449) = 3.298$ ,  $p$

= .001. With the ANOVA yielding a result that was statistically significant, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Follow up tests were conducted to evaluate the pairwise differences among the means. The variances were not assumed to be homogenous based on a significant Levene's test of equality of variances. A Dunnett C test was conducted due to the unequal sample sizes and because equal variances were not assumed. The results of this analysis indicated that there were significant differences at the .05 level between the mean scores for those employed less than 1 year and those employed 6 – 10 years.

A third ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the length of employment of the participant and the mean ODQ transformational leadership characteristic score. The null hypothesis was that there would be no significant difference in the mean ODQ transformational score based on length of employment. The mean ODQ transformational score was the dependent variable. The length of employment of the participant was the independent variable. The ANOVA was significant,  $F_{.05}(4,449) = 2.885$ ,  $p = .022$ . The significant results of the ANOVA allow the null hypothesis that there were no significant differences in the mean ODQ transformational score based on length of employment to be rejected.

Follow up tests were conducted to evaluate the pairwise differences among the means. The variances were not assumed to be homogenous based on a significant Levene's test of equality of variances. A Dunnett C test was conducted due to the unequal sample sizes and because equal variances were not assumed. The results of this analysis indicated that there were significant differences at the .05 level between the

mean scores for those employed less than 1 year and those employed 6 – 10 years and those employed greater than 15 years.

Correlation coefficients were computed for the total JSS score, mean ODQ transactional leadership characteristic score, and the mean ODQ transformational leadership characteristic score for each level of the independent variable. Table 35 displays the correlation coefficients for those participants with a length of service less than 1 year. The relationship between total JSS score and the transactional leadership characteristic score was statistically significant,  $r(48) = .386, p = .006$ . The effect size of this relationship can be considered medium. The only other significant relationship occurred between the transactional and transformational leadership characteristic score. The relationship produced the following results:  $r(48) = -.295, p = .038$ . The effect size of this relationship was just below the .3 required to be considered a medium effect.

Table 35

Correlation Coefficients for Participants Employed Less Than 1 Year

|                  |                     | Total JSS<br>Score | Transactional | Transformational |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Total JSS Score  | Pearson Correlation | 1                  | .386**        | -.216            |
|                  | Significance        |                    | .006          | .132             |
|                  | N                   | 50                 | 50            | 50               |
| Transactional    | Pearson Correlation | .386**             | 1             | -.295*           |
|                  | Significance        | .006               |               | .038             |
|                  | N                   | 50                 | 50            | 50               |
| Transformational | Pearson Correlation | -.216              | -.295*        | 1                |
|                  | Significance        | .132               | .038          |                  |
|                  | N                   | 50                 | 50            | 50               |

Note: \*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The scores from the ODQ were used to identify an organizational culture for those participants who identified a length of service of less than 1 year ( n = 50). A Moderately Four I's organizational culture was identified by 72.0% ( n = 36) of the participants. Respondents identifying the culture as either type of the Four I's comprise 82.0% ( n = 41) of participants. The only other sizable culture identification was from those participants who identified the culture as Coasting ( n = 4, 8.0%).

Table 36 displays the correlation coefficients for those participants with a length of service of 1 – 5 years. The relationship between total JSS score and the transactional leadership characteristic score was significant,  $r(182) = .169, p = .022$ . The effect size of this relationship can be considered small. The relationship between total JSS score and the transformational leadership characteristic score was significant,  $r(182) = -.248, p = .001$ . The effect size of this relationship can be considered medium. The only other significant relationship occurred between the transactional and transformational leadership characteristic score. The relationship produced the following results:  $r(182) = -.615, p = .000$ . The effect size of this relationship is just below the .3 required to be considered a medium effect.

The scores from the ODQ were used to identify an organizational culture for those participants who identified a length of service of 1 – 5 years ( n = 184). A Predominantly or Moderately Four I's organizational culture was identified by 68.0% ( n = 125) of the participants. The only other sizable culture identifications were from those participants who identified the culture as Coasting ( n = 31, 16.8%) and Moderately

Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive (n = 10, 5.8%). All other culture types had fewer than 4% of responses.

Table 36

Correlation Coefficients for Participants Employed 1 Year – 5 Years

|                  |                     | Total JSS<br>Score | Transactional | Transformational |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Total JSS Score  | Pearson Correlation | 1                  | .169*         | -.248**          |
|                  | Significance        |                    | .022          | .001             |
|                  | N                   | 184                | 184           | 184              |
| Transactional    | Pearson Correlation | .169*              | 1             | -.615**          |
|                  | Significance        | .022               |               | .000             |
|                  | N                   | 184                | 184           | 184              |
| Transformational | Pearson Correlation | -.248**            | -.615**       | 1                |
|                  | Significance        | .001               | .000          |                  |
|                  | N                   | 184                | 184           | 184              |

Note: \*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 37 displays the correlation coefficients for those participants with a length of service between 6 - 10 years. The relationship between total JSS score and the transactional leadership characteristic score was significant,  $r(89) = .236, p = .024$ . The effect size of this relationship can be considered medium. The only other significant relationship occurred between the transactional and transformational leadership characteristic score. This relationship produced the following results:  $r(89) = -.506, p < .001$ . The effect size of this negative relationship is large.



Table 37

## Correlation Coefficients for Participants Employed 6 Years – 10 Years

|                  |                     | Total JSS<br>Score | Transactional | Transformational |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Total JSS Score  | Pearson Correlation | 1                  | .236*         | -.199            |
|                  | Significance        |                    | .024          | .058             |
|                  | N                   | 91                 | 91            | 91               |
| Transactional    | Pearson Correlation | .236*              | 1             | -.506**          |
|                  | Significance        | .024               |               | .000             |
|                  | N                   | 91                 | 91            | 91               |
| Transformational | Pearson Correlation | -.199              | -.506**       | 1                |
|                  | Significance        | .058               | .000          |                  |
|                  | N                   | 91                 | 91            | 91               |

Note: \*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The scores from the ODQ were used to identify an organizational culture for those participants who identified a length of service of 6 – 10 years (n = 91). A Moderately Four Is organizational culture was identified by 53.8% (n = 49) of the participants. The only other sizable culture identification was from 23.1% (n = 21) of participants who identified the culture as Coasting. A Moderately Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive culture was identified by 11.0% (n = 10). All other cultures had 6 responses or fewer, or fewer than 4% of total responses.

Table 38 displays the correlation coefficients for those participants with a length of service between 11 - 15 years. Only one statistically significant correlation resulted from the analysis. There was a significant negative correlation between the ODQ transactional and ODQ transformational score,  $r(31) = -.642, p = .000$ . The correlation coefficient indicates there is a large effect size for this relationship.

Table 38

## Correlation Coefficients for Participants Employed 11 Years – 15 Years

|                  |                     | Total JSS<br>Score | Transactional | Transformational |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Total JSS Score  | Pearson Correlation | 1                  | .051          | -.196            |
|                  | Significance        |                    | .778          | .275             |
|                  | N                   | 33                 | 33            | 33               |
| Transactional    | Pearson Correlation | .051               | 1             | -.642*           |
|                  | Significance        | .778               |               | .000             |
|                  | N                   | 33                 | 33            | 33               |
| Transformational | Pearson Correlation | -.196              | -.642*        | 1                |
|                  | Significance        | .275               | .000          |                  |
|                  | N                   | 33                 | 33            | 33               |

Note: \*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Less than half of the participants (48.5%,  $n = 16$ ) identified the organizational culture as Moderately Four Is. A culture of Predominantly Four I's was selected by 21.2% ( $n = 7$ ) of participants. A Coasting culture was chosen by 12.1% ( $n = 4$ ). The remaining culture types received 2 or fewer responses.

Table 39 displays the correlation coefficients for participants who indicated a length of service of greater than 15 years. There was a positive correlation between the total JSS score and the ODQ transactional score,  $r(94) = .273$ ,  $p = .007$ . The effect size for this relationship may be considered medium. There was only one other statistically significant correlation found during the analysis. The relationship between the ODQ transactional score and the ODQ transformational score was significant,  $r(94) = -.509$ ,  $p = .000$ . There was a large effect size for this relationship.

Table 39

## Correlation Coefficients for Participants Employed Greater Than 15 Years

|                  |                     | Total JSS<br>Score | Transactional | Transformational |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Total JSS Score  | Pearson Correlation | 1                  | .273*         | -.100            |
|                  | Significance        |                    | .007          | .334             |
|                  | N                   | 96                 | 96            | 96               |
| Transactional    | Pearson Correlation | .273*              | 1             | -.509*           |
|                  | Significance        | .007               |               | .000             |
|                  | N                   | 96                 | 96            | 96               |
| Transformational | Pearson Correlation | -.100              | -.509*        | 1                |
|                  | Significance        | .334               | .000          |                  |
|                  | N                   | 96                 | 96            | 96               |

Note: \*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

A Moderately Four I's culture was dominant among those participants employed greater than 15 years (45.8%, n = 44). The next largest cultural representation was Coasting (17.7%, n = 17). There were equal numbers of participants identifying the culture as Predominantly Four I's or Moderately Bureaucratic or Internally Competitive (12.5%, n = 12). No other culture type had a representation higher than 5.2% of the participants.

### Summary

The data analysis conducted for this study was presented in Chapter 4. Demographic data describing the 465 participants in this study were presented. Descriptive and inferential statistics were utilized to analyze the four research questions guiding this study.

Research Question #1 presented descriptive statistics regarding the mean scores derived from the JSS and the ODQ for the 450 respondents who indicated a level of

education on the Employee Demographic Survey. A series of one-way ANOVAs were conducted to evaluate the relationship among the mean total JSS score, the mean ODQ transactional leadership characteristic score, and the mean ODQ transformational leadership characteristic score. No significance was found in any of the three one-way ANOVAs at  $\alpha = .05$ .

A correlation analysis was conducted to evaluate the strength and effect size of the relationship between the three mean scores and each level of the independent variable. Descriptive statistics were presented representing the frequencies of responses relating to the organizational culture present in the organization.

Research Question #2 was addressed by presenting descriptive statistics of the mean scores obtained from the JSS and the ODQ based on the gender of the participant. One-way ANOVAs were conducted to evaluate the relationship of mean scores from the JSS and ODQ by gender. The ANOVAs did not yield significant results at  $\alpha = .05$ .

Correlation coefficients were calculated to evaluate the strength and effect size for each gender. Significant positive correlations were found between the JSS score and the ODQ transactional score for female participants. There was a slight significant negative correlation between the JSS score and the ODQ transformational scores in female participants. There was a large significant negative correlation between female scores on the ODQ transactional and transformational scores.

The analysis for Research Question #2 was completed by presenting descriptive statistics for each type of organizational culture for each gender. The results for male and

female participants indicated a Moderately Four I's culture as the most identified organizational culture.

Research Question #3 evaluated the relationship between the mean scores from both test instruments as they related to the geographic location of the participant. A one-way ANOVA was conducted for each of the mean scores obtained from the test instruments and the geographic location. The ANOVAs yielded non-significant results for the total JSS score, ODQ transactional score, and ODQ transformational score.

Correlation coefficients were computed between the mean scores and each level of the independent variable. There was a significant positive correlation between the total JSS score and the ODQ transactional score for the eastern campus. Negative correlations between the total JSS score and the ODQ transformational score, as well as negative correlations between the ODQ transactional and transformational scores, were significant. Descriptive statistics indicating the types of cultures identified by participants from each campus identified the prevailing culture at each location as Moderately Four I's.

The final research question evaluated the relationships between length of service to the institution and the computed mean scores from the JSS and ODQ. The ANOVA conducted to analyze the relationship between length of service and the total JSS score was significant at  $\alpha = .05$ . The null hypothesis that there were no significant differences in the mean total JSS score by length of service was rejected.

The ANOVAs evaluating the mean ODQ transactional and mean ODQ transformational scores by length of service were also significant at  $\alpha = .05$ . Both tests

yielded significant results when a Levene's Test of Equality of Variances was conducted. A Dunnet C post hoc test was conducted because the variances were not homogenous and because of the unequal sample size.

Correlation coefficients were calculated to analyze the strength of the relationship between the mean total JSS score, mean ODQ transactional, and mean ODQ transformational score for each of the 5 levels of the independent variable. Furthermore, descriptive statistics relating to how each level of the independent variable identified the organizational culture were also presented.

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Introduction

Chapter 5 contains a summary of the first four chapters along with discussion of the analyses conducted in Chapter 4. The chapter contains an introduction, a summary of the previous chapters, an overview of the methodology of the study, a synopsis and discussion of statistical findings, and a discussion of implications for policy and procedures. Recommendations for future studies are also addressed.

#### Summary of Chapters

Chapter 1 contained the structure of the study planned by the researcher. There was a primary question that provided purpose to, as well as guided, this study: “Is there a relationship between job satisfaction, organizational culture, and perceived leadership characteristics at the participating institution?” Answering this question and measuring the potential relationships that may be present were the primary foci of the study. The chapter also contained the stated purpose of the study, the specific research questions guiding the study, definitions of terms relating to the study and a brief overview of the study design and methodology and data collection and analysis, as well as the significance and limitations of the study.

The review of the literature contained in Chapter 2 presented an overview of the key components of the study. It was imperative to the study to understand the history and

definitions of job satisfaction, organizational culture, and leadership characteristics. Furthermore, it was imperative to evaluate previous research in these areas to identify past trends and to anticipate the ramifications for future study.

The first section provided an overview of job satisfaction. Global job satisfaction and facet job satisfaction were introduced and defined. Sources of employee motivation were presented and the affects of organizational culture on job satisfaction were identified. The relationship between continuous improvement management philosophies and job satisfaction was presented, along with how practicing servant leadership may increase individual levels of job satisfaction by fulfilling the needs of others.

The second section provided an overview of organizational culture. The culture of an organization relies on numerous variables allowing for numerous definitions of culture to evolve over time. Organizational culture consists of four levels that incorporate components of the organization ranging from the overall mission to fundamental assumptions. The importance of the role that subcultures play in shaping the overall organizational culture was identified.

The third and fourth sections related to modern theories in organizational culture. Buckingham and Coffman's non-conventional view of the organization that seems to defy conventional wisdom on how managers select employees to fill positions was presented. Through their research, they tried to identify the reasons behind why an employee chooses to work for an organization and how managers can assess the factors that motivate the employee. Bolman and Deal present a structure for defining an



organization through rational and non-rational frames. These frames include facets of the organization such as hierarchy, human relations, politics, and symbols and rituals.

The fifth section provided a history of leadership thought. Leadership has many definitions depending on the situation. The roots of leadership theory rest in Greek and Roman philosophies, though leadership historically has been shaped by numerous means. However, political and military experiences seem to have had a tremendous impact on the evolution of leadership throughout history. Transactional and transformational leadership were also discussed. Transactional leadership relates to the series of rewards and punishments that are employed to encourage an individual to complete a task. These transactions may be either positive or negative in nature. Conversely, transformational leadership is a positive form of leadership where the leader tries to transform his or her followers into leaders. Leaders often rely on charismatic qualities to influence those who follow.

The final section provided past research in the areas of job satisfaction, organizational culture, and leadership. The research covered a vast spectrum of populations. Manufacturing settings, the service sector, and higher education were just some of the populations that were the subjects of previous research.

### Methodology

The methodology of the study was contained in Chapter 3. The chapter also consisted of an introduction, the purpose of the study, a description of the population, the

method of data collection, instrumentation used, a description of data analysis for the research questions, and a summary.

The population of this study consisted of full-time employees at a private, multi-campus university with residential campuses in the southeastern and southwestern United States. Many multi-campus universities are arranged so that the respective campuses are within relatively close proximity. In some cases, the campuses are located within the same city or the same region. The university used in this study is unique in the fact that its two residential campuses are located in the eastern and western regions of the United States and are separated by a distance of approximately 2,000 miles.

The University Director of Human Resources Office at the participating university was contacted to obtain the name, employment position, and location of faculty and staff. The first report indicated a total number of 1,584 university employees. The physical location of these employees was identified as based on either of the two residential campuses or the affiliate operations of the university, located at numerous sites around the United States. For the purposes of this study, only employees that were based on either of the two residential campuses were selected to participate. The removal of those employees associated with the affiliate operations resulted in a population of 1,478 university employees. Of these employees, 379 were located at the university's western region residential campus and 1,099 were located at the university's eastern region residential campus.

The test instruments used for data collection were the Employment Demographic Survey, the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), and the Organizational Description

Questionnaire (ODQ). Each of the test instruments was labeled with a tracking number to ensure that individual responses were grouped together. The Employee Demographic Survey was an instrument created by the researcher to acquire specific demographic information from the population. The test instrument was a four-item survey that identified the respondent's affiliation to a residential campus, length of service to the university, highest level of formalized education, and his or her gender. The respondent was asked to place an "X" by his or her appropriate response. Responses that were unanswered or unable to be determined were labeled as such.

The JSS was developed by Spector (1985) to fulfill the needs for human services to have an instrument to measure employee satisfaction. The theory that job satisfaction was formed by an attitudinal reaction to an employment situation was the basis for the JSS. The JSS design is rooted in both public and private service organizations that may be either for-profit or non-profit in nature. The JSS scale was created to be applicable to service organizations for use in rating employee satisfaction, as past scales were not focused on that particular category. Furthermore, the JSS scale provides a total satisfaction score for an individual while also containing subscales that reflect distinct components of job satisfaction. The inclusion of subscales allows for unique components of job satisfaction to be measured individually.

The JSS contains 36 items that may be grouped into nine different facets. The different facets are defined as pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, and communication. The combined total of these facets determines the individual total satisfaction score. The

instrument uses a summated rating scale where the respondent selects from six choices ranging from a score of “1” where the respondent strongly disagrees to a score of “6” where the respondent strongly agrees. Approximately half of the items are worded negatively and must be reverse scored.

The JSS total score is determined by combining the nine sub scores from the different facets. The minimum total score that may be achieved is 36, while the maximum score that may be achieved is 216. Each negatively worded item is reverse scored before the final summation of scores to allow for continuity in scoring the responses.

The ODQ is a 28-item instrument that was designed to assess organizational culture in terms of transactional or transformational leadership characteristics. The respondent must choose whether they feel a statement relating to the organization is true or false. The respondent may also select “?” if he or she are unable to determine if the statement pertains to the organization or is undecided about the statement.

The ODQ contains both a transformational and transactional leadership scale. Odd-numbered statements are used to calculate the transactional score while even-numbered statements are used to calculate the transformational score. The range of transactional and transformational scores may range from -14 to +14. Each “true” response is scored +1 and each “false” response is score -1. Any “?” response is given a score of 0. A large positive score indicates a large presence of the particular characteristic within the organization. Conversely, a large negative score indicates a minimal presence of the particular characteristic within the organization. The

transactional scores and transformational scores are used to identify the organizational culture as one of nine different classifications (Bass & Avolio, 1992; Parry & Proctor-Thompson, 2001).

Employees of the university were sent survey packets through intercampus mail in early November, 2004. The survey packets consisted of a cover letter, an informed consent to participate letter, an Employee Demographic Survey, the Job Satisfaction Survey, the Organizational Description Questionnaire, and a return envelope. The packets were addressed to the individual employee to be delivered to the respective department of each person. The cover letter explained the survey and requested that the survey instruments be returned to the researcher in the envelope provided.

### Summary and Discussion of Statistical Findings

The summary and discussion of the results of data analysis for the research questions guiding this study were as follows:

#### Research Question #1

Is there a relationship between the mean scores on the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) and the Organizational Description Questionnaire (ODQ) based on the level of education?

There were three types of analyses conducted to evaluate Research Question #1. The ANOVAs conducted among the total JSS score, ODQ transactional leadership characteristic score, and ODQ transformational leadership characteristic score in relation to the level of education of the participant were not significant. The null hypothesis for

this research question was that there was no significant difference in the mean scores based on level of education. The non-significant ANOVAs resulted in a decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis.

The highest mean score observed on the JSS resulted from those participants who had a high school degree/GED ( $M = 132.78$ ,  $S.D. = 11.32$ ). The lowest mean JSS score was possessed by those participants who had a bachelor's degree ( $M = 129.87$ ,  $S.D. = 8.68$ ). The mean difference between the highest and lowest JSS score was 2.91. The means across all 7 levels of the education variable were very similar.

The ANOVA analyzing the level of education and the mean ODQ transactional leadership characteristic score was not significant at  $\alpha = .05$ . The null hypothesis that the mean ODQ transactional scores would not be significantly different based on the level of education could not be rejected. Those possessing a high school degree/GED had the highest ODQ transactional score ( $M = .4516$ ,  $S.D. = 4.39$ ). The lowest mean ODQ transactional score belonged to those participants who had some graduate-level course work ( $M = -.3571$ ,  $S.D. = 4.47$ ). The mean difference between the highest and lowest ODQ transactional score was .8087. Considering the range of ODQ transactional leadership scores was  $-14$  to  $+14$ , there was not one particular educational group that demonstrated a significantly different mean score.

The ANOVA analyzing the mean ODQ transformational leadership characteristic score and the level of education did not yield a significant result at  $\alpha = .05$ . The null hypothesis for this analysis was that there would be no significant difference in the mean ODQ transformational scores based on level of education. The null hypothesis was not

rejected based on the non-significant outcome of the ANOVA. The highest mean ODQ transformational score was attained by those who had some college ( $M = 8.1447$ ,  $S.D. = 7.14$ ). The lowest mean ODQ transformational score ( $M = 6.7419$ ,  $S.D. = 6.85$ ) was identified by those who had a high school degree/GED. The difference in the means between the highest and lowest score was 1.4. Like the transactional score, the transformational score range was  $-14$  to  $+14$ . It is important to note that a transformational score of  $+6$  or  $+7$  could affect the definition of culture for the individual participant.

Correlation coefficients were calculated for each level of the independent variable to see if there was a relationship among the JSS score, ODQ transactional score, and ODQ transformational score. A pattern emerged when analyzing the significant correlations based on the participants' education levels. Significant correlations between the JSS score and the ODQ transactional score provided a range of positive correlations. Significant correlations between the JSS score and the ODQ transformational score provided a range of negative correlations. There were consistent larger negative correlations between the ODQ transactional and transformational scores based on level of education.

The majority of participants in each level of education identified the culture as being Moderately Four I's. The only group where less than 50% of respondents identified the culture as Moderately Four Is was that of respondents who held a professional degree. A solid majority across all levels of education identified the culture as being some variation of the Four Is if the percentages of the Moderately and

Predominantly Four I's are combined. Coasting was the second largest organizational culture identified across all levels of education.

The relationship between education and job satisfaction was the subject of research by Ganzach (2003). The researcher found that intelligence could have both positive and negative impacts on job satisfaction based on whether it was intrinsic satisfaction or global satisfaction. A correlational study was utilized to evaluate these relationships. Ganzach's findings suggest that there was a low correlation between education and intrinsic job satisfaction. He also found that the level of education did not possess significant relationships based on global job satisfaction. Conversely, when using intelligence as an independent variable, significantly negative relationships based on global satisfaction were observed.

Similar to the findings of Ganzach, this study did not find statistically significant relationships between level of education and job satisfaction. Unlike Ganzach, this study focused solely on the total JSS score. Future study is recommended to evaluate the relationships that may exist between the 9 facets of the JSS and the level of education of the sample.

#### Research Question #2

Is there a relationship between the mean scores on the JSS and the ODQ based on gender?

Research Question #2 was evaluated by the same means as the previous research question. A combination of ANOVA, correlational analyses, and descriptive statistics measured the relationship among the mean JSS score, mean ODQ transactional



leadership characteristic score, and mean ODQ transformational leadership characteristic score based on the gender of the participant. The null hypothesis for each ANOVA conducted was that there would be no significance difference in the mean scores on both test instruments based on the gender of the participants.

A one-way ANOVA conducted between the mean JSS score and gender was not significant at  $\alpha = .05$ . Lacking a significant outcome, the null hypothesis could not be rejected. Female participants had a slightly larger mean JSS score ( $M = 130.91$ ,  $S.D. = 9.87$ ) than that of the male participants ( $M = 130.01$ ,  $S.D. = 14.59$ ). The difference between the means based on gender was only 0.9. The small difference between the gender means appears to add support to the null hypothesis.

The ANOVA conducted using the mean ODQ transactional leadership characteristic score and gender was not significant. The non-significant test led to failure to reject the null hypothesis. Female participants had the highest ODQ transactional score ( $M = .2522$ ,  $S.D. = 5.25$ ). Male participants scored a negative mean ODQ transactional score ( $M = -.0404$ ,  $S.D. = 5.06$ ).

There was also a non-significant ANOVA between the mean ODQ transformational leadership score and gender. Once again, the null hypothesis could not be rejected. Male participants scored the highest ODQ transformational score ( $M = 8.18$ ,  $S.D. = 6.7$ ). The mean ODQ transformational score for females was slightly lower than the male score ( $M = 7.42$ ,  $S.D. = 7.14$ ). The mean difference between both genders was less than 1. This appears to lend support to the null hypothesis that there were no significant differences based on gender.

The correlation coefficients calculated among the JSS score, the ODQ transactional leadership characteristic score, and the ODQ transformational leadership characteristic score presented both positive and negative correlations based on gender. Both genders had significant negative correlations between the JSS score and the ODQ transformational score. Female participants also had a significant positive correlation between the JSS score and the ODQ transactional score. Both genders had significant negative correlations between the ODQ transactional and transformational scores.

Over 55% of both genders identified the organizational culture as Moderately Four I's. Adding to that percentage those who identified culture as Predominantly Four I's, the total percentage of respondents identifying the culture as a variation of the Four I's was over 63%. The second most identified culture after the Four I's was Coasting, accounting for at least 15% of both genders.

The identification of the Moderately Four I's culture for both genders was consistent with the results of research conducted by Wong (2002). Wong administered the ODQ to a sample consisting of employees at a private, religiously-affiliated university. The results of that research indicated that more than 50% of each gender identified the organizational culture as Moderately Four I's. Wong also used length of service as an independent variable in her research. However, for the mean average length of service for employees was 14 years. This study differs from Wong's research in the fact that it includes a larger sample spread across different ranges in the length of service. However, the identification of organizational culture as either Moderately or Predominantly Four I's was consistent in both studies.

The research showed that both genders identify a greater presence of transformational leadership characteristics and considerably lower levels of transactional leadership characteristics. Walumbwa et al (2004) arrived at a similar finding in their research conducted on college students' perceptions of their instructors leadership potential. The researchers found that both genders reacted more favorably to active leadership attributes, including transformational qualities. Unlike the Walumbwa research, this study did not seek to identify whether leadership attributes were active or passive. However, both genders seem to identify and relate to the inherent characteristics possessed by transformational leaders.

### Research Question #3

Is there a relationship between the mean scores on the JSS and the ODQ based on geographic location of employment?

In order to evaluate Research Question #3, a series of ANOVAs, correlational analyses, and presentation of descriptive statistics were prepared. This question related to the relationships present between the mean scores from the JSS and the ODQ depending on whether the participant was located at the eastern or western campus of the institution. The null hypotheses guiding these questions was that there would be no significant difference between mean scores based on the location of the participant.

The ANOVA conducted to evaluate the relationship between the mean total JSS score and location was not significant at  $\alpha = .05$ . Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. The mean JSS score for participants from the eastern campus was slightly larger ( $M = 130.66$ ,  $S.D. = 11.62$ ) than those participants from the western campus ( $M =$

129.91, S.D. = 14.45). The difference between the means for both locations was approximately 0.75.

The ANOVA evaluating the ODQ transactional score and the location of the participant was not significant at  $\alpha = .05$ . The mean ODQ transactional score was higher at the eastern campus ( $M = .2844$ , S.D. = 5.2). The western campus had a negative ODQ transactional score ( $M = -.3866$ , S.D. = 5.02). The standard deviations indicate that the ODQ transactional scores fall within roughly the same distance of the mean.

The relationship between the ODQ transformational score and the location of the participant was analyzed using a one-way ANOVA. The ANOVA was not significant at  $\alpha = .05$ . However, if the less strict alpha of .10 were used for the analysis, a significant result would have been achieved. The mean ODQ transformational score for the western campus was higher ( $M = 8.65$ , S.D. = 6.3) than that of the eastern campus ( $M = 7.42$ , S.D. = 7.18).

The eastern campus had significant correlations among the three mean scores computed. There was a significant positive correlation between the JSS score and the ODQ transactional score. The relationship between the JSS score and the ODQ transformational score produced a significant negative correlation. There was also a significant negative correlation between the ODQ transactional and transformational scores.

The organizational culture was described as Moderately Four I's by over 54% of the respondents from each campus. Almost two-thirds of respondents from each campus classified the organizational culture as some variation of the Four I's. The Coasting

culture definition continued to be the second most commonly identified typology by participants.

#### Research Question #4

Is there a relationship between the scores on the JSS and the ODQ based on the number of years of employment?

Research Question #4 was evaluated by a series of one-way ANOVAs, correlational analyses, and descriptive statistics. The null hypothesis posed for all of these analyses was that there would not be a significant difference in the mean JSS and ODQ scores based on the number of years of employment.

The first ANOVA resulted in a significant relationship between the total JSS score and length of employment. In this instance, the null hypothesis is rejected. It can be assumed that there is a statistically significant difference in the mean JSS scores depending on the length of employment of the participant. Post hoc tests showed that those participants who were employed less than 1 year had significantly lower total JSS scores than those participants who were employed either 6 – 10 years or greater than 15 years and had significantly higher total JSS scores. The largest mean JSS score was achieved by those participants employed greater than 15 years ( $M = 133.86$ ,  $S.D. = 9.18$ ). Those participants employed less than 1 year had the lowest mean JSS score ( $M = 126.32$ ,  $S.D. = 8.51$ ).

The second ANOVA identified a significant relationship between the length of employment and the ODQ transactional leadership characteristic score. However, a Levene's test of equality of variances was significant, indicating that the variances were

heterogeneous. A Dunnett C post hoc test was conducted because of the heterogeneity of variances and the unequal sample sizes. The post hoc tests identified significant differences between the ODQ transactional score for those participants who were employed less than 1 year and those employed 6 – 10 years. The largest mean ODQ transactional score belonged to those participants employed 6 – 10 years ( $M = 1.23$ ,  $S.D. = 4.7$ ). The lowest mean ODQ transactional score was achieved by those employed less than 1 year ( $M = -1.84$ ,  $S.D. = 4.32$ ).

The final ANOVA produced a significant relationship between the participants' length of employment and the ODQ transformational score. The variances were proven not to be homogenous by a significant Levene's test of equality of variances. A Dunnett C post hoc test was conducted due to the unequal sample sizes and the heterogeneity of variances. The post hoc test identified significant relationships between means for those employed less than 1 year and for those employed 6 – 10 years and those employed greater than 15 years.

The correlational analysis for each level of employment followed the same pattern as analyses in the previous research questions. When significant correlations occurred between the total JSS score and the ODQ transactional score, the relationships were positively correlated. The significant correlations present between the total JSS score and the ODQ transformational score tended to be negatively correlated. The significant correlations between the ODQ transactional and transformational score were negative in nature.

The Moderately Four I's culture remained the most identified definition of organizational culture. The percentage of participants identifying Moderately Four I's decreased as the length of employment increased. The highest percentage of participants who identified the culture as Moderately Four I's were those employed less than 1 year (72%, n = 36). Those employed greater than 15 years identified Moderately Four I's as the culture by the smallest percentage (45.8%, n = 44). Outside of the variations of the Four I's, a Coasting culture was identified as the second most common type of culture.

#### Discussion and Implications for Leaders

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were relationships between job satisfaction, organizational culture, and leadership characteristics. If relationships did occur among the three variables, they would be measured and evaluated.

The results obtained from analyzing the total JSS score provided useful information about the level of job satisfaction of the participants in this study. Significant differences in mean scores were found based only on the length of service of the participant. Managers and supervisors may find tremendous benefit in understanding the levels of job satisfaction present within an organization. Changes in the performance or motivation of individual employees may be addressed by evaluating the demographic variables contained in this study. The mean scores for the total JSS score showed an increase up through the participants who were employed between 6 – 10 years. There was a slight decrease in mean total JSS scores for those employed 11 – 15 years. Finally,

those participants who were employed longer than 15 years had the highest mean total JSS score.

The leaders in the organization may want to assess why job satisfaction levels tend to drop between an employee's tenth and fifteenth year of service. Numerous variables could potentially cause a decrease in job satisfaction. Opportunities for individual advancement may be a source of lower job satisfaction. An employee's level of dissatisfaction may grow if he or she has had limited opportunities for advancement during the first decade of employment. Another source of decreasing job satisfaction may be related to salary and benefits. Employees may have certain expectations of where their salaries and benefits should be at certain times during their careers. It may be that job satisfaction is reduced when those benefits are not achieved by a specific timeframe in employment.

The majority of participants in the study (55.7%, n = 259) identified the organizational culture as Moderately Four Is. An additional 9.2% (n = 43) identified the culture as Predominantly Four Is. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents felt that the organizational culture was some variation of the Four Is. One of the characteristics defining a Predominantly or Moderately Four Is culture are an importance placed upon individual motivation and consideration. Another is that formal agreements are not stressed and there is not a great concern for control. As the transactional leadership score of the participant increases, the culture begins to shift from Predominantly to Moderately Four Is. With the majority of participants identifying with a Moderately Four Is culture, it can be assumed there is a large group who believe that transactional leadership



characteristics are occurring in the organization. However, this growth is not large enough to diminish the affects of the transformational leadership characteristics present.

The correlation analyses indicated that the total job satisfaction score had a positive correlation with the ODQ transactional score and a negative correlation with the ODQ transformational score when significant correlations were found. Understanding the affect this relationship has on how the culture will be defined may be important for leaders within the organization. Increasing levels of job satisfaction will result in increases in ODQ transactional leadership characteristic scores and decreases in ODQ transformational leadership characteristic scores for employees in certain demographic ranges. The differences in the ODQ scores may have an affect on the overall classification of culture.

The relationship between the total JSS score and the ODQ scores has implications for leaders within the organization. The leadership characteristics displayed by a supervisor may have a tremendous affect on how the employee views the organizational culture and interprets his or her level of job satisfaction. Employees who have a greater amount of work experience may relate better to transactional leadership qualities. The transactions that take place between the leader and follower may have been engrained in the individual as the most effective means of achieving goals and objectives. Conversely, those employees who are relatively new to the work force may react better to transformational leadership characteristics, which may in turn increase their level of job satisfaction.

The challenge for leaders in the organization is to ascertain which of their followers best responds to transformational or transactional leadership. The more able a leader is to determine the leadership characteristics to which an employee responds, the greater the influence the leader has on the employee's level of job satisfaction and definition of the organizational culture. Improving the levels of job satisfaction and establishing a culture that is conducive to the employee's expectations will have significant effects on morale and worker longevity.

The participants in the study identified transformational leadership qualities as being more prevalent than transactional leadership qualities. The transactional score for all participants fell almost in the middle of the -14 to +14 range of scores on the ODQ ( $M = .1545$ ,  $S.D. = 5.22$ ). The transformational score ( $M = 7.74$ ,  $S.D. = 6.98$ ) on the ODQ was considerably higher for all participants than the transactional score. The mean transformational score falls very close to some of the culture identification cutoffs. A one-point variation in the mean score could have an affect on the type of culture identified. For example, with a consistent transactional score and the transformational mean score being a 7 or above, the culture may be viewed as High Contrast or Predominantly or Moderately Four I's. A transformational score of 6 or lower would put the organization in the Coasting or Loosely Guided classification. Essentially, any score variation has the potential to frame the culture in a number of ways.

It is important to point out that not all participant responses carried a point value on the ODQ. If the participant did not answer a question or if they selected “?” as a response, no points were awarded for that question. This seems to be more of an issue

with the transactional scores because the mean is very close to 0. In some cases, the participant may not have felt comfortable answering a question or did not feel that the culture could be defined as either transactional or transformational.

The mean scores obtained from the ODQ mirrored findings obtained from research conducted by Lawrence (2000). The researcher used the ODQ and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to evaluate leadership and culture typologies identified by supervisors and subordinates in a healthcare setting. The results of the ODQ indicated that both supervisors and subordinates achieved a mean transformational score of at least 9.9 and a mean transactional score of lower than -.63. These results were based on a sample that represented 45 supervisors and 113 subordinates.

Much like the findings obtained by Lawrence, this study also arrived at a culture that exhibited a considerably larger transformational score and a much smaller transactional score. Unlike the findings of Lawrence, the mean transactional scores obtained from the different levels of the independent variable did not always result in a negative transactional score.

The utilization of transactional and transformational scores defining organizational culture can be related to the research of Block (2003). Her research on the relationship between organizational culture and perceived leadership yielded results suggesting that transactional leadership characteristics contribute to less favorable perceptions of organizational culture. Block used the MLQ to identify transactional and transformational characteristics possessed by 782 participants from a sales and service

organization. Much like Block's results, this study would have seen the presence of a less favorable culture identification if the mean transactional leadership characteristic scores had remained consistent and transformational leadership characteristic scores had been slightly reduced. This occurrence would have resulted in shifting the culture identification from a balanced Moderately Four I's culture to a not as favorable Coasting culture.

Leaders within an organization must take an active approach to comprehend job satisfaction, organizational culture, and leadership characteristics. Established cultural trends are no longer the most effective. The research conducted by Buckingham and Coffman shows that the composition of the organization and the way leaders make employment decisions are changing. Leaders must define what motivates their employees and realize the implications that may result from an unmotivated work force. Knowing the frame of the organization, as defined by Bolman and Deal, is a means of understanding the organizational structure. Understanding this structure is imperative to cohesive leader and follower relations.

Comprehending culture and job satisfaction holds the potential for success or failure for organizational leaders. This study has established perceptions of job satisfaction, organizational culture, and perceived leadership characteristics for the participating institution. Much like the research conducted by Lund (2003), job satisfaction levels do influence how employees view the organizational culture. Lund's research showed that job satisfaction levels were higher in cultures that are rooted in flexibility and spontaneity, characteristics possessed by transformational leadership. This

trend was reflected in the current study by the total JSS score having positive correlations with the ODQ transformational scores and negative correlations with the ODQ transactional score. Understanding the variables that affect culture is imperative in creating an organizational environment that allows employees to achieve personal and professional goals.

### Recommendations for Further Study

This study has provided an overview of the relationships that exist among job satisfaction, organizational culture, and perceived leadership characteristics. The review of literature included overviews of the definition and types of job satisfaction, the components that help shape an organizational culture, and a history and definition of leadership and its numerous components. This study focused on analyzing relationships that occurred among job satisfaction, organizational culture, and leadership characteristics by utilizing two of many different evaluation methods in existence. One suggestion for further study would be to analyze the population using different test instruments and compare results with this study.

The potential to replicate this study at other multi-campus, residential institutions is another recommendation for continued study. In this study, the distance between locations of the two campuses was over two thousand miles. It would be interesting to conduct this analysis at other institutions that do not have as great a distance between the multiple campuses and to compare the results with those derived from this study.

Another potential for future study would be to conduct this study, or a variation of it, in several higher education settings. This study was conducted at a private institution of higher education. The study could be conducted at public two-year and four-year institutions to see if similar relationships or trends can be identified.

This study focused on four demographic variables: location, gender, education, and length of employment. Future modifications may be incorporated to include supervisory responsibilities, age of the participants, or race. These modifications could increase the knowledge base and scope of understanding for the results of this study.

Finally, attitudes in higher education provided the foundation of this study. In the future, conducting similar research across service and manufacturing industries may assist in identifying prevalent trends or relationships. The greater the understanding of job satisfaction, organizational culture, and perceived leadership characteristics, the better poised an organization will be to maximize efficiency and productivity of employees. There could also be a benefit for employees. Increasing employees' understanding of these concepts could help them be better suited for the roles they play within the organization and management taking a more knowledgeable approach to employee relations could only improve their situation.

APPENDIX A  
SURVEY PACKET COVER LETTER

W.O. Dale Amburgey  
1563 Town Park Drive  
Port Orange, FL 32129

---

November 8, 2004

Dear Colleague,

I am writing to ask for your assistance in a research project being conducted to analyze the relationship between job satisfaction, organizational culture, and leadership. The purpose of this study is to better understand how demographic variables affect individual views of satisfaction, culture, and leadership. This is an independent study conducted as part of my doctoral requirements and is not related to, nor does it replace, any official survey conducted by Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University Institutional Research.

Embry-Riddle employees at the Daytona Beach, FL and Prescott, AZ campuses were selected to participate in this study. You are being asked to complete two questionnaires. One questionnaire relates to individual views on job satisfaction. The second questionnaire relates to individual perceptions of organizational culture and leadership. Furthermore, a survey to collect demographic information of the participant is included. Upon completing the questionnaires and demographic survey, please return the documents in the return envelope provided by **Wednesday, November 24, 2004**.

The results of this study will help understand how different demographic variables influence job satisfaction and the perception of organizational culture. By understanding how these variables affect individual perceptions, those in leadership positions may be able to foster an environment that would increase the efficiency and productivity of the organization. Benefits of understanding these relationships might be a reduction in employee turnover and an increase in morale.

Your answers are completely confidential and will be released only in summary form. Each questionnaire has a tracking number that allows individual responses to be grouped together. The tracking number is not used for personal identification. Participation in this study is voluntary. Your assistance with this study would be greatly appreciated. However, if you choose not to take part, please return the blank questionnaire in the return envelope.

If you have any questions regarding this study, I would be happy to speak with you. Please feel free to contact me by phone at 386/ 226-6129 or by e-mail at [dale.amburgey@erau.edu](mailto:dale.amburgey@erau.edu).

Thank you very much for helping with this important study.

Sincerely,



W.O. Dale Amburgey  
Associate Director, Admissions Information Technology  
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University- Daytona Beach, FL

Doctoral Student  
University of Central Florida



APPENDIX B  
INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE

## INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE

“An Analysis of the Relationship between Job Satisfaction, Organizational Culture, and Perceived Leadership”

W.O. Dale Amburgey, a doctoral student at the University of Central Florida and an employee of Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, is conducting a research project to analyze the relationships that may exist between job satisfaction, organization culture, and perceived leadership. The purpose of this study is to identify whether demographic features shape an individual's perception of their work environment. Furthermore, this study is not related to, nor does it replace, the employee climate survey conducted by Embry-Riddle Institutional Research.

You are being asked to participate in this study by completing two questionnaires and a demographic survey. A return envelope has been provided to collect the completed questionnaires. Please be aware that you are not required to participate in this study. Additionally, you may cease your participation at any time and you may omit any items on the questionnaire if it is your preference not to answer.

There are no risks associated with participating in this study. The contact person listed below may provide additional information if you have any questions about your rights.

Responses to the questionnaires will be analyzed and reported anonymously to ensure confidentiality. The potential benefits of this study include allowing employees and supervisors to gain a better understanding of the relationships between the individual and the organization.

Please indicate your agreement to voluntarily participate in this study by completing and returning the following questionnaires. Please retain this consent cover form for your reference. Thank you for your participation in this study.

Information regarding your rights as a research volunteer may be obtained from:

Barbara Ward  
UCFIRB Office  
University of Central Florida Office of Research  
Orlando Tech Center  
12443 Research Parkway, Suite 302  
Orlando, FL 32826

Phone: 407/ 823-2901

APPENDIX C  
EMPLOYEE DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

## EMPLOYEE DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

**Instructions:** Please mark the appropriate response with an "X"

On which of the following residential campuses are you located?

- Daytona Beach, FL
- Prescott, AZ

Which of the following best indicates the number of years of service to Embry-Riddle?

- Less than 1 year
- 1 year – 5 years
- 6 years – 10 years
- 11 years – 15 years
- Greater than 15 years

What is the highest level of formalized education you have attained?

- High School Degree/GED
- Some College
- Associate's Degree
- Bachelors Degree
- Some Graduate-level course work
- Masters Degree
- Professional Degree (MD, Ph.D., Ed.D., J.D., etc.)

What is your gender?

- Female
- Male

APPENDIX D

JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY (JSS)

| <p align="center"><b>JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY</b></p> <p align="center">Paul E. Spector<br/>Department of Psychology<br/>University of South Florida</p> <p align="center">Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved.</p> |   |                       |                        |                      |                   |                     |                    |
|--|---|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| <p align="center">PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION<br/>THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION<br/>ABOUT IT.</p>   |   | Disagree<br>very much | Disagree<br>moderately | Disagree<br>slightly | Agree<br>slightly | Agree<br>moderately | Agree<br>very much |
| 1  | I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.                                   | 1                     | 2                      | 3                    | 4                 | 5                   | 6                  |
| 2  | There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.                                | 1                     | 2                      | 3                    | 4                 | 5                   | 6                  |
| 3  | My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.                                    | 1                     | 2                      | 3                    | 4                 | 5                   | 6                  |
| 4  | I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.   | 1                     | 2                      | 3                    | 4                 | 5                   | 6                  |
| 5  | When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.             | 1                     | 2                      | 3                    | 4                 | 5                   | 6                  |
| 6  | Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.                         | 1                     | 2                      | 3                    | 4                 | 5                   | 6                  |
| 7  | I like the people I work with.  | 1                     | 2                      | 3                    | 4                 | 5                   | 6                  |
| 8  | I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.   | 1                     | 2                      | 3                    | 4                 | 5                   | 6                  |
| 9  | Communications seem good within this organization.  | 1                     | 2                      | 3                    | 4                 | 5                   | 6                  |
| 10   | Raises are too few and far between.   | 1                     | 2                      | 3                    | 4                 | 5                   | 6                  |
| 11   | Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.                       | 1                     | 2                      | 3                    | 4                 | 5                   | 6                  |
| 12   | My supervisor is unfair to me.  | 1                     | 2                      | 3                    | 4                 | 5                   | 6                  |
| 13   | The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.                    | 1                     | 2                      | 3                    | 4                 | 5                   | 6                  |
| 14   | I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.  | 1                     | 2                      | 3                    | 4                 | 5                   | 6                  |
| 15   | My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.                               | 1                     | 2                      | 3                    | 4                 | 5                   | 6                  |
| 16   | I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with. | 1                     | 2                      | 3                    | 4                 | 5                   | 6                  |
| 17   | I like doing the things I do at work.   | 1                     | 2                      | 3                    | 4                 | 5                   | 6                  |
| 18   | The goals of this organization are not clear to me.                                       | 1                     | 2                      | 3                    | 4                 | 5                   | 6                  |

PLEASE CONTINUE ON THE NEXT PAGE ⇒

**START HERE**

|    | PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT.<br>Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved. | Disagree very much | Disagree moderately | Disagree slightly | Agree slightly | Agree moderately | Agree very much |
|----|--|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 19 | I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.  | 1                  | 2                   | 3                 | 4              | 5                | 6               |
| 20 | People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.  | 1                  | 2                   | 3                 | 4              | 5                | 6               |
| 21 | My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.   | 1                  | 2                   | 3                 | 4              | 5                | 6               |
| 22 | The benefit package we have is equitable.  | 1                  | 2                   | 3                 | 4              | 5                | 6               |
| 23 | There are few rewards for those who work here.   | 1                  | 2                   | 3                 | 4              | 5                | 6               |
| 24 | I have too much to do at work.   | 1                  | 2                   | 3                 | 4              | 5                | 6               |
| 25 | I enjoy my coworkers.  | 1                  | 2                   | 3                 | 4              | 5                | 6               |
| 26 | I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.  | 1                  | 2                   | 3                 | 4              | 5                | 6               |
| 27 | I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.   | 1                  | 2                   | 3                 | 4              | 5                | 6               |
| 28 | I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.   | 1                  | 2                   | 3                 | 4              | 5                | 6               |
| 29 | There are benefits we do not have which we should have.  | 1                  | 2                   | 3                 | 4              | 5                | 6               |
| 30 | I like my supervisor.  | 1                  | 2                   | 3                 | 4              | 5                | 6               |
| 31 | I have too much paperwork.   | 1                  | 2                   | 3                 | 4              | 5                | 6               |
| 32 | I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.   | 1                  | 2                   | 3                 | 4              | 5                | 6               |
| 33 | I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.  | 1                  | 2                   | 3                 | 4              | 5                | 6               |
| 34 | There is too much bickering and fighting at work.  | 1                  | 2                   | 3                 | 4              | 5                | 6               |
| 35 | My job is enjoyable.   | 1                  | 2                   | 3                 | 4              | 5                | 6               |
| 36 | Work assignments are not fully explained.  | 1                  | 2                   | 3                 | 4              | 5                | 6               |

Thank you for your time in completing this survey.

APPENDIX E  
SAMPLE ITEMS FROM THE ORGANIZATIONAL DESCRIPTION  
QUESTIONNAIRE (ODQ)





SR1145

1690 Woodside Road, Suite 202 Redwood City, CA 94061  
650-261-3500 fax 650-261-3505 www.mindgarden.com

Date: MAY 23, 2005

To whom it may concern,

This letter is to grant permission for: DALE AMBURGEY  
to use the following copyright material;

Instrument: Organizational Description Questionnaire

Author: Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio

Copyright: 1992 by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio. All Rights Reserved.  
for her/his thesis research.

In addition, five (5) sample items from the instrument may be reproduced for inclusion in a proposal, thesis or dissertation.

The entire measure may not at any time be included or reproduced in other published material.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Sandra Darrow".

Sandra Darrow  
Director of Customer Service

## ORGANIZATIONAL DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE (ODQ) [FORM A]

Name of your organization Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

INSTRUCTIONS For items 1 through 28, circle "T" for a true statement, "F" for a false statement, or "?" if you are undecided or cannot say about the team, department, or organization you are leading or representing.

## N MY TEAM, DEPARTMENT OR ORGANIZATION...

|   |   |   |    |  |
|---|---|---|----|--|
| T | F | ? | 1. | We negotiate with each other for resources.  |
| T | F | ? | 2. | People go out of their way for the good of the team, department and/or organization. |
| T | F | ? | 3. | Decisions are often based on precedents.   |
| T | F | ? | 4. | There is continuous search for ways to improve operations.                           |
| T | F | ? | 5. | Rules and procedures limit discretionary behavior.                                   |

APPENDIX F

INSITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD PERMISSION



Office of Research

October 14, 2004

W.O. Dale Amburgey  
Associate Director  
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University  
600 S. Clyde Morris Blvd.  
Daytona Beach, FL 32114

Dear Mr. Amburgey:

With reference to your protocol entitled, "An Analysis of the Relationship between Job Satisfaction, Organizational Culture, and Perceived Leadership," I am enclosing for your records the approved, expedited document of the UCFIRB Form you had submitted to our office.

Please be advised that this approval is given for one year. Should there be any addendums or administrative changes to the already approved protocol, they must also be submitted to the Board. Changes should not be initiated until written IRB approval is received. Adverse events should be reported to the IRB as they occur. Further, should there be a need to extend this protocol, a renewal form must be submitted for approval at least one month prior to the anniversary date of the most recent approval and is the responsibility of the investigator (UCF).

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 407-823-2901.

Please accept our best wishes for the success of your endeavors.

Cordially,

*Barbara Ward*

Barbara Ward, CIM  
IRB Coordinator

Copies: IRB office  
Dr. William Bozeman, Educational Research, Technology and Leadership



04-2204

THE UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA  
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB)

*IRB Addendum/Modification Request*

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Please complete the upper portion of this form and attach all revised/new consent forms, altered data collection instruments, and/or any other documents that have been updated. The proposed changes on the revised documents must be clearly indicated by using bold print, highlighting, or any other method of visible indication. The Addendum/Modification must be sent the IRB Office: ATTN: IRB Coordinator, 12443 Research Parkway, Suite 301, Orlando, FL 32826, Email: [IRB@mail.ucf.edu](mailto:IRB@mail.ucf.edu), Phone: 407-823-2901, Fax: 407-823-3299.

- **DATE OF ADDENDUM:** 11/2/2004 to IRB#04-2108
- **PROJECT TITLE:** An Analysis of the Relationship between Job Satisfaction, Organizational Culture, and Perceived Leadership
- **PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** W.O. Dale Amburgey
- **MAILING ADDRESS:** Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, 600 S. Clyde Morris Blvd., Daytona Beach, FL 32114
- **PHONE NUMBER & EMAIL ADDRESS:** 386-226-6129, [dale.amburgey@erau.edu](mailto:dale.amburgey@erau.edu)
- **REASON FOR ADDENDUM/MODIFICATION:** Addition of forms to original proposal
- **DESCRIPTION OF WHAT YOU WANT TO ADD OR MODIFY:**

Utilization of the full Job Satisfaction Survey (only one page of the two were originally submitted). Add an employee demographic survey to ascertain specific demographics of the participants.

**SECTION BELOW - FOR UCF OR IRB USE ONLY**

Approved     Disapproved

Full Board     Chair Expedited  
*Minor change not affecting risk*

*[Handwritten Signature]*  
IRB Chair Signature

*7 Nov 2004*  
Date

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS Provided. *AP*

APPENDIX G

PERMISSION TO USE THE JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY (JSS)

## Dale Amburgey

---

**From:** Paul Spector [spector@chuma.cas.usf.edu]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 18, 2004 8:37 AM  
**To:** Dale Amburgey  
**Subject:** Re: Job Satisfaction Survey

Dear Dale:

You have my permission to use the JSS for your dissertation research. Best of luck with your study.

Best,

Paul E. Spector  
Department of Psychology  
University of South Florida  
Tampa, FL 33620  
(813) 974-0357 Voice  
(813) 974-4617 Fax  
spector@chuma.cas.usf.edu  
website <http://chuma.cas.usf.edu/~spector>

On Wed, 18 Aug 2004, Dale Amburgey wrote:

> Dr. Spector,  
>  
> Greetings from Daytona Beach. I'm currently a doctoral student who is  
> beginning work on a dissertation. I would like to use your Job Satisfaction  
> Survey as part of my research. I am most willing to share my results with  
> you and my research is for educational purposes. Is there anything else  
> that I need to do to secure permission to use your instrument.  
>  
> Looking forward to your response,  
>  
> Best regards,  
>  
> Dale Amburgey  
>  
> \_\_\_\_\_  
>  
> W.O. Dale Amburgey  
> Associate Director  
> Admissions Information Technology  
> Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University  
> 600 S. Clyde Morris Boulevard  
> Daytona Beach, FL 32114  
>  
> 800/ 862-2416 (toll-free)  
> 386/ 226-6129 (office)  
> [www.embryriddle.edu](http://www.embryriddle.edu)  
>  
> \_\_\_\_\_  
>  
>

APPENDIX H  
PERMISSION TO USE THE ORGANIZATIONAL DESCRIPTION  
QUESTIONNAIRE (ODQ)



**Organizational Description  
Questionnaire**

**Bulk Permission Set**

Permission for:  
Dale Amburgey to reproduce up to  
1,400 copies for one year starting from  
date of purchase:  
October 18, 2004

Developed by Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio

Published by **MIND GARDEN**

1690 Woodside Road Suite 202, Redwood City California 94061 (650) 261-3500  
www.mindgarden.com  
info@mindgarden.com

**Copyright © 1992 Bernard Bass and Bruce J. Avolio. All rights reserved.**

It is your legal responsibility to compensate the copyright holder of this work for any reproduction in any medium. If any part of this Work (e.g., scoring, items, etc.) is put on an electronic or other media, you agree to remove this Work from that media at the end of this license. The copyright holder has agreed to grant one person permission to reproduce this work for one year from the date of purchase for non-commercial and personal use only. Non-commercial use means that you will not receive payment for distributing this document and personal use means that you will only reproduce this work for your own research or for clients. This permission is granted to one person only. Each person who administers the test must purchase permission separately. Any organization purchasing permissions must purchase separate permissions for each individual who will be using or administering the test.

## **Organizational Description Questionnaire**

### **Bulk Permission Set**

Permission for:  
Dale Amburgey to reproduce up to 200  
copies for one year starting from date of  
purchase:  
October 26, 2004

Developed by Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio

Published by MIND GARDEN

1690 Woodside Road Suite 202, Redwood City California 94061 (650) 261-3500  
www.mindgarden.com  
info@mindgarden.com

**Copyright © 1992 Bernard Bass and Bruce J. Avolio. All rights reserved.**

It is your legal responsibility to compensate the copyright holder of this work for any reproduction in any medium. If any part of this Work (e.g., scoring, items, etc.) is put on an electronic or other media, you agree to remove this Work from that media at the end of this license. The copyright holder has agreed to grant one person permission to reproduce this work for one year from the date of purchase for non-commercial and personal use only. Non-commercial use means that you will not receive payment for distributing this document and personal use means that you will only reproduce this work for your own research or for clients. This permission is granted to one person only. Each person who administers the test must purchase permission separately. Any organization purchasing permissions must purchase separate permissions for each individual who will be using or administering the test.

APPENDIX I

FOLLOW-UP E-MAIL TO THE STUDY POPULATION

I would like to express my thanks to the approximately 500 faculty and staff from the Prescott and Daytona Beach campuses that completed the questionnaire packet associated with my dissertation research. Thank you for sharing both your positive and negative experiences. Your input is critical to assist in the understanding of the potential relationships that may exist among the fields of job satisfaction, organizational culture, and leadership.

It is not too late to submit your questionnaires. Please forward your completed questionnaire packet to me by campus mail before February 25, 2005. In addition, if you have misplaced the questionnaires and would like replacements, please contact me by phone at 386/ 226-6129 or by e-mail at [dale.amburgey@erau.edu](mailto:dale.amburgey@erau.edu)

Thank you again for your consideration and participation.

Best regards,

W.O. Dale Amburgey

APPENDIX J

COMMENTS COLLECTED FROM THE TEST INSTRUMENTS

1. There is some resistance to changing the old ways of doing things.
2. Major decisions usually require several layers of authorization before action is taken.
3. "We all decide what's most important to do with our limited funds".
4. Regarding a question about avoiding responsibility for actions: "some people do, leaders don't".
5. Regarding a question about getting what you earn, no more or no less: "I do, but can't say that about others".
6. Regarding a question about resistance to change: "Some of the changes are not good".
7. Regarding a question about initiative and ability: "Are you 'new' or 'old', the old don't learn anything".
8. Regarding a question about hesitancy to say what you really think: "Very much true!".
9. "Initiative is encouraged, but not rewarded".
10. Regarding a question about having too much to do at work: "Not always".
11. Regarding a question about new ideas being greeted with enthusiasm" "Used to be".
12. "Individual initiative used to be encouraged".
13. "Seems as too many employees in our department are suddenly seeking job interviews".
14. Regarding a question about hesitancy to say what you really think: "Presently hesitant".
15. "You go Dale!"

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- Avolio, B.J. (1999). *Full leadership development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Avolio, B.J., Waldman, D.A., & Yammarino, F.J. (1991). Leading in the 1990s: the four I's of transformational leadership. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 15(4), 9-16.
- Bass, B.M. (1997, February). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *Journal of American Psychologist*, 52(2), 130-139.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership theory, research, & managerial applications*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1992). *Organizational description questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden
- Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.J., Jung, D.I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 207-218.
- Block, L. (2003). The leadership-culture connection: an exploratory investigation. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24(6), 318-334.
- Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T.E. (1997). *Reframing organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bradley, P. & Charbonneau, D. (2004, Spring). Transformational leadership: something new, something old. *Canadian Military Journal*, 7-14.
- Buch, K. & Rivers, D. (2001, July). TQM: the role of leadership and culture. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(8), 365-371.
- Buckingham, M. & Coffman, C. (1999). *First, break all the rules*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Burke, R.J. (1999). Managerial feedback, organizational values and service quality. *Managing Service Quality*, 9(1), 53-57.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

- Connelly, C.E. & Kelloway, E.K. (2003, February). Predictors of employees' perceptions of knowledge sharing cultures. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24(5), 294-301.
- Drucker, P.F. (1995). *Managing in a time of great change*. New York, NY: Penguin Books USA.
- Fast facts. (n.d.) Retrieved July 24, 2004 from <http://www.erau.edu/er/abouterau/fastfacts.html>
- Ganzach, Y. (2003). Intelligence, education, and facets of job satisfaction. *Work and Occupations*, 30(1), 97-122.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (2002). *Servant Leadership: a journey into the nature of legitimate power & greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- Griffith, J. (2003, October). Relation of principal transformational leadership to school staff job satisfaction, staff turnover, and school performance. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(3), 333-356.
- Hansen, F., Smith, M., & Hansen, R.B. (2002, Sept./Oct.). Rewards and recognition in employee motivation. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 64-72
- Hanson, M. & Miller, Jr., A.F. (2002). The productive use of strengths: a shared responsibility. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 34(1), 95-100).
- Herzberg, F. (1974, Fall). Motivation-hygiene profiles: pinpointing what ails the organization. *Organizational Dynamics*, 3(2), 18-29.
- Hopkins v. PriceWaterhouse*, 490 U.S. 228 (1989).
- Lawrence, E.T. (2000). The relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles of the senior executives/department heads and their immediate subordinates' perceived satisfaction, extra effort, effectiveness, and organizational culture typology in the hospital setting (Doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, 2000), Retrieved from UMI Proquest Digital Dissertations on August 2, 2004.
- Lok, P. & Crawford, J. (1999). The relationship between commitment and organizational culture, subculture, leadership style and job satisfaction in organizational change and development. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 20(7), 365-373.



- Lok, P. & Crawford, J. (2004). The effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment: a cross-national comparison. *Journal of Management Development*, 23(4), 321-338.
- Lund, D.B. (2003, November). Organizational culture and job satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 18(3), 219-236.
- Lunenburg, F.C. & Ornstein, A.C. (2004). *Educational administration: concepts and practices*. (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- McAfee, B., Quarstein, V., & Ardalan, A. (1995). The effect of discretion, outcome feedback, and process feedback on employee job satisfaction. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 95(5), 7-12.
- Morden, T. (1997). Leadership as vision. *Management Decision*, 35(9), 668-676.
- Morgan, R., McDonagh, P., & Ryan-Morgan, T. (1995). Employee job satisfaction: an empirical assessment of marketing managers as an occupationally homogeneous group. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 10(2), 10-17.
- Morris, A. & Bloom, J.R. (2002). Contextual factors affecting job satisfaction and organizational commitment in community mental health centers undergoing system changes in the financing of care. *Mental Health Services Research*, 4(2), 71-83.
- Parry, K.W. & Proctor-Thomson, S. B. (2001). Testing the validity and reliability of the organizational description questionnaire (ODQ). *International Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 4(3), 111-124.
- Peterson, K. (2002). Positive or negative. *Journal of Staff Development*, 23(3), 10-15.
- Peterson, K. & Deal, T. (1998). How leaders influence the culture of schools. *Educational Leadership*, 56(1), 28-30.
- Pollock, T.G., Whitbred, R.C., & Contractor, N. (2000). Social information processing and job characteristics: a simultaneous test of two theories with implications for job satisfaction. *Human Communication Research*, 26(2), 292-330.
- Rigg, C. & Sparrow, J. (1994). Gender, diversity, and working styles. *Women in Management Review*, 9(1), 9-16.
- Roberts, W. (1987). *Leadership secrets of Attila the Hun*. New York, NY: Warner Books.

- Rodsutti, M.C. & Swierczek, F.W. (2002). Leadership and organizational effectiveness in multinational enterprises in southeast Asia. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(5), 250-259.
- Schein, E.H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Spatz, C. (2001). *Basic statistics: tales of distributions* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Spector, P.E. (1994) Job Satisfaction Survey. Retrieved July 24, 2004 from <http://chuma.cas.usf.edu/~spector/scales/jsspag.html>
- Spector, P.E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13(6), 693-713.
- Testa, M.R. (1999). Satisfaction with organizational vision, job satisfaction and service efforts: an empirical investigation. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 20(3), 154-161.
- Valentine, S. & Godkin, L. (2000). Supervisor gender, leadership style, and perceived job design. *Women in Management Review*, 15(3), 117-129.
- Walumbwa, F.O., Wu, C., & Ojode, L.A. (2004). Gender and instructional outcomes. *Journal of Management Development*, 23(2), 124-140.
- Wong, S.H.P. (2002). The role of leadership in the organizational transformation and the impact on organizational culture: A case study of a private Catholic university (Doctoral dissertation, Spalding University, 2002), (UMI No. 3036906) Retrieved from UMI Proquest Digital Dissertations on August 2, 2004.
- Yukl, G.A. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.