

Walden University

SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Ray Kest

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Lilburn Hoehn, Committee Chairperson,
Applied Management and Decision Sciences Faculty

Dr. James Bowman, Committee Member,
Applied Management and Decision Sciences Faculty

Dr. Dale Swoboda, Committee Member,
Applied Management and Decision Sciences Faculty

Provost

Denise DeZolt, Ph.D.

Walden University
2007

ABSTRACT

Transformational Leadership and its Outcomes in a Local Government

by

Ray T. Kest

M.B.A., University of Toledo, 1978

B.B.A., University of Toledo, 1971

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Applied Management and Decision Sciences

Walden University
February 2007

ABSTRACT

Despite successful results in using transformational leadership to improve performance with wide number of different organizations, there is a lack of academic research in applying these concepts with local government. The purpose of this study was to compare outcomes in transactional and transformational settings to see if the transformational experiences were more positive. Self-administered surveys were mailed to a randomly selected sample of 500 Lee County, Florida County Commission employees. Comparing transactional and transformational leadership styles, the survey measured organizational effectiveness, motivation to support extra effort, and employee satisfaction. The surveys also evaluated if there was a correlation between organizational culture dimensions and leadership styles. Leadership style and outcomes were measured using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire developed by Bass and Avolio. Dimensions of culture were measured with the Organizational Culture Survey. The results revealed that transformational leadership led to higher effectiveness, increased extra effort, and improved employee satisfaction; while transactional leadership had a negative effect on these outcomes. Correlation between the leadership styles of transactional and transformational leadership and organizational culture dimensions could not be established. The study demonstrated that transformational leadership in this governmental unit could increase effectiveness and job satisfaction. The use of transformational leadership techniques holds promise for improving the operational effectiveness of local governments and encouraging positive social change through more effective delivery of critical services to citizens.

Transformational Leadership and its Outcomes in a Local Government

by

Ray T. Kest

M.B.A., University of Toledo, 1978

B.B.A., University of Toledo, 1971

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Applied Management and Decision Sciences

Walden University
February 2007

DEDICATION

This research study is dedicated to my mother, Marian Haggerty Kest, who gave me the confidence to start my journey to receive a doctorate and my wife, Jeane, who encouraged me to complete the program.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have been fortunate to have a mentor with unyielding character, integrity, and accomplishment. Dr. Lilburn Hoehn has given me the guidance, expertise, and instruction that helped me through the dissertation process. I am deeply appreciative of his support. I also am appreciative of the support from the other two members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Dale Swoboda and Dr. James Bowman. A special thanks to my editor, Marilyn Benson of International College, who guided me in the submission of the dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Background of the Problem	5
The Purpose	8
Theoretical Support for the Study.....	8
Assumptions.....	13
Scope and Delimitations	13
Limitations	14
Definition of Terms.....	14
Research Questions.....	15
Significance of Study	15
Summary	17
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	18
Introduction.....	18
Evolution of the Theory and Studies of Leadership	19
Trait Theory	19
Behavioral Style Theories and Studies	21
Leadership Theories of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).....	27
Transactional Leadership Theory	28
Laissez-faire Leadership	29
Transformational Leadership	30
Organizational Culture.....	32
Research Rational and the null Hypothesis	36
Summary	36
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHOD	38
Introduction.....	38
Description of Research Design.....	38
Target Population.....	40
Sampling Procedure	40
Sample.....	41
Instrumentation	42
Data Collection Procedure	47
Data Analysis	47
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS	51

Analysis Procedures.....	52
Hypotheses Tests Utilized.....	52
Research Questions and Hypothesis.....	53
MANOVA Test Results.....	55
ANOVA Test Results.....	60
Transformational Leadership.....	60
Transactional Leadership.....	66
Organizational Culture Dimensions and Transformational and Transactional Leadership.....	69
Comparison of the Means.....	75
Transformational Leadership Means.....	76
Transactional Leadership Means.....	77
Mean Outcomes of Effectiveness, Extra Effort, and Satisfaction.....	77
Organizational Culture Dimension Means.....	77
Summary.....	78
CHAPTER 5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	81
Introduction.....	81
Summary.....	81
Conclusions.....	85
Recommendations.....	88
Social Significance.....	90
Concluding Statement.....	91
REFERENCES.....	93
APPENDIX A: SURVEY.....	98
APPENDIX B: MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE RATER FORM.....	100
APPENDIX C: PERMISSION TO USE – DR. JOYCE OSLAND.....	103
APPENDIX D: PERMISSION TO USE – DR. ROBERT MOST.....	104
APPENDIX E: RAY KEST INTRODUCTION LETTER.....	105
APPENDIX F: CONSENT FORM.....	106
APPENDIX G: LEE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LETTER.....	108
APPENDIX H: CURRICULUM VITAE.....	109

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Organizational Samples Used in Initial Analysis for MLQ 5X.....	44
Table 2. Question Variables as they Relate to Leadership Behavior.....	54
Table 3. Multivariant Data Analysis: Transformational Leadership	57
Table 4. Multivariant Data Analysis: Transactional Leadership	59
Table 5. Transformational Leadership.....	62
Table 6. Transactional Leadership.....	67
Table 7. Organizational Culture.....	71
Table 8. Comparison of the Means for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Questions 1-45 and the Organizational Culture Questionnaire (OCQ) Questions 46-52	75

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Introduction

The conflicts of the 20th century have made the public sensitive to the theme of political leadership. Prior to the 18th century, leadership was defined by sovereignty, and the 19th century had the conflicting themes of democracy and collectivization (Seligman, 1950). The new politics of leadership has seen the advent of the professional politician and the growth of bureaucracy. The field of public administration has been explored from many different points of view and from different focuses. Organizational theory in the private sector has been examined in great detail. In striving to achieve organizational goals, managers from both sectors are measured by the efficiency of the organization. Most scholarly research has focused on the structural distinctiveness of organizations. The classical period of public administration used the works of authors like Frederick Taylor (1911) and Chester Barnard (1938). These early theorists studied leadership from the perspective of how the organization can be more efficient. Wallach (1988) indicated that the study of leadership by political scientists describes conditions and systems that the actions of individuals are secondary. Therefore, political science research is lacking in this area. The democratic system connects the leadership with the citizens at all levels of government. Leadership in the public sector calls for leaders to determine public preferences and to gain support for policy decisions (Svara, 2002).

From 1970 through the end of the century, public offices were challenged by tax revolts and efforts to privatize services. The common belief by the public is that private

business can do things better than a public institution (Cochran, Mayer, Carr, & Cayer, 2003). A new focus was thrust upon public leadership: how to deliver more services with fewer financial resources. On a state and local level, the federal government continues to develop policies and programs without providing the financial support for these activities (Cochran et al., 2003).

Pressure is being exerted on all levels of government to reform managerial practices and to alter the organization to meet these new realities. These challenges are perfect for charismatic, transformational leadership to come forward in the governmental sector. One of the central questions of government leadership is this: Do elected officials lead or do they implement the desires of the voting public? One of the least understood and least examined areas of leadership is in public organizations (Ihrke, 2003).

James MacGregor Burns (1978) studied 25 years of political leadership that spanned several historic periods. He found that some so-called leaders committed horrendous crimes in the name of leadership. Intellectual differences between rulers and leaders have not been shown by research, but leadership style has been differentiated (Burns, 1978). Burns defined political leadership as a method where the followers are induced.

To act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations—the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations—of both leaders and followers, and the genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders see and act on their own and their followers' values and motivations. (Burns, 1978, p. 19)

In his studies of political leadership, Burns (1978) developed the concepts of transactional and transformational leadership, which have been further developed and researched by many authors (Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004; Bass 1981; Bass & Avolio 1990; Keller 1992). The transactional style of leadership tends to motivate followers in a direction that has established goals with known rewards and punishments (Burns, 1978). Transactional leadership generally does not provide intellectual stimulation or individual consideration for the followers. Transformational leadership is built upon the transactional leadership style in that the leader does provide intellectual stimulation and individual consideration (Bass, 1985). This raising of the needs of the followers is consistent with Maslow's hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1948). Transformational leadership occurs at all levels in an organization; it is bottom to top as well as top to bottom. The transactional leadership style does not require relationships between the leader and the followers, but a foundation in transformational leadership style is relationships. Transactional leadership is very useful in government, where maintaining government functions is important on a daily basis. Where substantive change is needed, transformational leadership can provide the moral elevation (Rada, 1999).

Statement of the Problem

The problem to be addressed in this study is despite some successful results in using transformational leadership concepts, there is a lack of research in applying these concepts in local government settings. The outcomes of a transformational leadership approach—employee satisfaction, effectiveness, and extra effort—are not being realized

in a transactional environment. In order to obtain relevant data, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) 5X developed by Bass and Avolio (2004) was used to measure how the factors of transformational change are related to organizational culture in a local government elected office. This study was a comparison of organizational culture perceptions as they relate to transformational and transactional leadership. Specific variables of the MLQ are charisma/inspirational, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, contingent rewards, active management by exception, and passive avoidant. According to Bass and Avolio (2004), the operational definitions of these variables are as follows:

1. Charisma/inspirational – Provides followers with a clear sense of purpose that is energizing; a role model for ethical conduct, which builds identification with the leader and his/her articulated vision.

2. Intellectual stimulation – Gets followers to question the tried and true ways of solving problems; encourages them to question the methods they use to improve upon them.

3. Individualized consideration – Focuses on understanding the needs of each follower and works continuously to get them to develop to their full potential.

4. Contingent reward – Clarifies what is expected from followers and what they will receive if they meet expected levels of performance.

5. Active management by exception – Focuses on monitoring task execution for any problems that might arise and correcting those problems to maintain current performance levels.

6. Passive avoidant – Tends to react only after problems have become serious to take corrective action and may avoid making any decisions at all.

These variables were compared to the outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction. Other variables relating to the office culture were regressed to see the relation and correlation to the style of leadership. The cultural dimensions tested were conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organizational clarity, warmth and support, and leadership.

Background of the Problem

Burns (1978) described transactional leaders as those who guide the followers in the direction of established goals with roles and task requirements; it is also based on an exchange between the leader and the follower. Leadership in the public sector is sometimes equated to patronage and political favors, which are truly transactional exchanges. Research reveals a number of typologies and definitions of leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1990; Yuki, 1989). In political environments it is thought that real leadership involves managing and making decisions involving the tough issues that affect the public. Situational factors have influenced the public perception of leadership at all levels of government. The daily management decisions are left to the administrators, who enjoy a decreased leadership role. For example, the typical county government is administered by elected commissioners. Many county commissions hire administrators to take care of daily details of administering a county government. The larger decisions of zoning, economic development, and the general political philosophy of the local government are left to the elected officials. The appointed professional administrator in a public office

may have been exposed educationally to different management styles; however, the ultimate responsibility and decision making is with the elected official, who may or may not have had exposure to various management styles and theories.

The definition of transformational leadership has evolved. Burns (1978) stressed that in a transformational setting, the leader and followers have common goals and both rely on their motives in order to achieve the desired goals. They also raise themselves to a higher level in achievement and motivation (Nanus, 1992). The transformational definition goes far beyond the transactional relationship that usually occurs in political offices. The charismatic/transformational leader in the private sector can be very different from the charismatic/transformational leader in the public sector. Depending on the political office, the audience targeted to hear the visionary message is much larger. More second-guessing and criticism can occur in the public sector from a variety of sources such as the opponent, press, and political parties. Some authors contend that the two sectors cannot be easily compared (Golembiewski, 1994).

A literature review that covered a 10 year period on charismatic leadership in the public area produced very few references (Javidan & Waldman, 2003). While there has been little research done in the area of local government leadership, there is research indicating that leaders can expect higher performances from employees when they use a transformational leadership approach (Wofford, Whittington, & Goodwin, 2001). In a study of federal leadership in the public sector it was found that transformational leadership leads to higher performance and employee satisfaction (Parry & Proctor-Thompson, 2003).

Transformational and charismatic leadership have been linked by several authors (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). Generally, transformational leaders are those who are considerate of the individual, who have charisma, project a vision, and inspire intellectual stimulation. A charismatic leader is one who exhibits self-confidence and whose personality can influence the actions of others. Many charismatic leaders also can articulate a vision of the future that improves a current condition.

True charismatic/transformational leaders view their vision as morally correct and have confidence in their abilities. The more self-confidence a leader shows, the more followers discount uncertainties (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon 2000). In many cases, the voting public expects their elected officials to be able to effectively communicate with them. The need to be able to effectively communicate becomes more important as the level of the political office increases. It is important that a candidate take complicated, abstract ideas and issues and put them in a form that followers and the public in general can understand (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Charismatic/transformational leaders expend a great deal of energy in attempting to see their vision realized.

Persistence is needed to overcome the status quo and to convince those affected that change is needed. Charisma of the elected official can advance the employees and the follower's duty of purpose, but it is individual attention by the elected official that will help the follower succeed in achieving the ultimate potential (Yammarino, Spangler, & Bass, 1993).

This study is worthy of attention because it uses an acknowledged measurement, MLQ, as analyzed against a series of culture dimensions. This study goes beyond

traditional leadership studies of private companies, the military, and the federal government in that it explores leadership in the local elected office and the organizational culture dimensions.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to compare the outcomes in a transactional and transformational setting and see if the transformational setting was more positive. The expected outcomes of a transformational leadership approach—employee satisfaction and higher productivity—may not be realized in a transactional environment. Organizational culture dimensions were correlated with leadership style to ascertain if transformational leadership can improve the employee's perception of the dimensions. In order for a local government to achieve a higher level of performance, this study may be of assistance.

Theoretical Support for the Study

There are three theoretical supports for the study: Follower needs and satisfaction, organizational culture, and leadership. What is called the classical period in public administration occurred because the classicists were interested in designing the most efficient form of organization. Many credit the work of Frederick Taylor (1911) as starting the classical management point of view. Taylor's (1911) use of the scientific method started the analysis of how best to do a job and what is the most efficient organization to accomplish the task. One of the major problems with the classical theory was that the reality of how a political system works clashes with changes within the system (Ihrke, 2003).

In a political climate, value decisions are made every day that are contrary to the pure form of efficient management. By protecting administrators in the public sector from their decisions, they are held unaccountable to the public where the elected official is not. The implication is it is sometimes difficult to determine in the public sector where the buck stops or who is ultimately responsible.

The leader in relation to the needs of the followers has been explained by the human relations movement, especially Abraham Maslow (1948), who developed the hierarchy of needs. Maslow's (1948) theory states that there are five human needs: physiological, safety, social, esteem, and self-actualization. Once a lower level need is met, an individual is no longer motivated to achieve it and thus can attempt to satisfy the next higher level on the hierarchy. Maslow's (1948) theory was expanded by Douglas McGregor (1960) into the Theory X and the Theory Y paradigm. The classicists viewed employees as needing strict supervision because they lacked motivation and thus only satisfied the lower of needs (Theory X). McGregor (1960) presented an alternative that followers wanted responsibility and are creative (Theory Y). In Theory Y, leadership called for organizations that allow for the higher needs to be met and thus achieve maximum results (McGregor, 1960).

The early theories of leadership in public administration focused on transactional leadership that had a view of human nature that corresponded to Theory X. Herbert Simon (1960) expanded upon McGregor's (1960) Theory Y in that the needs and desires of worker must be met within the boundaries of the organization. While the corporate world has embraced these new theories of human nature in the work place, public sector

institutions have been slow to embrace the needs of followers. The transactional leadership style, predicated on self-interest, has been the dominant leadership method in political environments (Vasu, Stewart, & Garson, 1998). Very few political offices are operated in a transformational manner (Vasu et al., 1998).

Every organization has an internal environment that can be described as its culture. This environment has assumptions, beliefs, and values used to help the organization function (Schein, 1985). There are many external forces that have an impact on an elected office. The culture of the office helps moderate these external forces and also assists in obtaining its goals (Schultz, 1995). Researchers have identified seven dimensions of organizational culture (Fayol, 1916). Different researchers have called them by different names but they correspond to conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organizational clarity, warmth and support, and leadership (Kolb, Osland, & Rubin, 1995).

The degree to which an employee accepts the culture and influences of an organization will determine the allegiance to the overall organization (Weber, 1958). If the key values of an organization are shared with a passion, then the culture is determined to be strong and has influence over the operations. Employees are indoctrinated into the office culture by socialization, which allows the new employee to learn and adapt to the organizational culture (Judy & D'Amico, 1999).

Burns (1978) stressed that in a transformational setting, the leader and followers have common goals and both rely on their motives in order to achieve the desired goal. In a transformational setting some authors have stated that the leaders and the followers

raise themselves up to a higher level in achievement and motivation (Nanus, 1992). These definitions have evolved beyond the transactional relationship that usually occurs in political offices. Usually in a government office environment, goals and tasks have been established by the leader in order to accomplish the tasks assigned. Many of the assumptions are similar to the authoritative style that was first explored in the University of Iowa studies (Lewin & Lippitt, 1938). With the transactional leadership style people are motivated by rewards and punishments similar to the behavior theories of Skinner (1965). Subordinates will respond to the leader based upon rewards and punishments with a clear chain of command. Rewards may be structured while the discipline is understood by rules. It is the function of the subordinate to do what is instructed by the manager.

Transactional leadership is result driven by control, measurement, administration, and performance (Drucker, 1993). The key directional ideas of transactional leadership are as follows:

Clear boundaries – Having clearly defined boundaries between role and function, technical process, span of control, decision rights, and domains of influence allow transactional leaders to control and manage interactions to drive desired results.

Order – For the transactional leader, everything has its own time, place, and usefulness to the process. By maintaining a highly ordered system of interaction, transactional leaders can drive predictably uniform outcomes systematically over time.

Compliance – This aspect of transactional leadership focuses on the need to comply with mutually defined operational guidelines and methodologies in every aspect of the business system. Deviation from procedure, methodology, and process guidelines are viewed as problems to be resolved and eliminated in order to drive predictable uniform outcomes.

Willfulness – Striving to impose order and control on an otherwise chaotic and uncontrollable environment is a driving force behind transactional leadership.

(Northouse, 2000, p. 132)

While there has been considerable research on the limitations of transactional leadership, it is still a popular approach to management style. On a scale of leadership versus management, the transactional style would very much be on the management end and is thought to be the style of preference in the public sector (Seligman, 1950).

A strength of the transactional leadership approach is that objectives and goals are clearly defined within a structured environment. Rewards and punishments are the driving factor for subordinate compliance. A major weakness in this approach is that change is difficult to implement. Also, relationships are short term and are dictated by the task (Vasu et al., 1998).

From a theoretical view point, studies have shown that transformational leaders generally outperform transactional leaders in employee satisfaction, intellectual stimulation, and performance (Jung, 2001). An organizational culture must be adaptable to create the environment needed to generate transformational leadership (Hatch, 1993).

Assumptions

1. The employees of the government organization are not in fear of providing their opinions asked in the survey. The cover letter explained that their responses are confidential and their individual responses cannot be revealed.

2. The employees will be interested in providing a completed survey to the researcher. Many government employees are interested in improving their operations and service to the public. This instrument will give them the opportunity to reveal their opinions.

3. The importance of the organizational culture may not be apparent to the leadership and the employees. Most employees do not think of the culture of the organization, and this instrument will allow the respondent to give their opinion.

Scope and Delimitations

This study was limited to the employees of the County Commissioners of Lee County, Florida. Each employee selected in the sample received a questionnaire in the mail with an explanation letter and return stamped envelope. It was the target of the researcher to receive 248 completed instruments in order to evaluate the data. A survey using the MLQ by Bass and Avolio (2004) was one of the research tools. Another research tool was a dimension culture questionnaire developed by Kolb, Osland, and Rubin (1995). It is an examination of leadership style of the county government and the effectiveness of the leadership style as perceived by the employees. Job satisfaction, effectiveness, and productivity were examined as to the type of leadership exhibited. The management style was compared with the attitudes of the employees as to the dimensions

of the governmental actual culture. There was no attempt to rate the individual commissioners or the county executive. The educational levels of the employees and the leaders were not evaluated. There was no attempt to compare the results with other governmental units. The sample of the employees did not determine their types of behavior or possible leadership style.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. Only one county in southwest Florida was used in the study, and the success of obtaining data from a larger population is problematic. The sample using Lee County, Florida, was selected because of the convenience of obtaining the data. Regional attitudes, work ethics, and values might differ from region to region. Also, the size of the government unit in this study is a midsized county. There are much larger and much smaller government units that could yield different results. The results may not be the same using a different sample; however, government units are very similar across the United States so it is possible that a different sample would result in the same findings. The response rate for the survey was 20% or 102 returned surveys. This was well below the expected return. The low response rate might be indicative of a biased sample. However, the sample was selected randomly so perhaps it can be assumed that the returns were representative of the target population.

Definition of Terms

Elected official. The five county commissioners who are elected in Lee County.

County executive. The manager of the day-to-day operations who is hired by the county commissioners.

Employees, The employees of the commissioners' office.

Governmental unit. County government as it is used in this study.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

1. What are the differences in job performance, extra effort, and job satisfaction of those who are responsible to a transactional leader and those who are responsible to a transformational leader?

2. What are the differences in the perceived actual culture dimensions between employees who are responsible to a transformational or a transactional leader?

The null hypotheses that were tested to answer the research questions are as follows:

1. There will be no difference in the outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness as they relate to the leadership style of transactional and transformational.

2. There will be no difference in the leadership styles of transformational and transactional as it relates to the organizational culture dimensions of conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organizational clarity, warmth and support, and leadership.

Significance of the Study

Elected officials come from all walks of life. Many elected officials may not have management backgrounds or have had any management experience prior to their election.

Elected officials may have been salesman, farmers, store owners, or attorneys who

managed only themselves in their vocation. Upon assuming office they are the immediate supervisor of sometimes thousands of employees. What management/leadership skills do they possess? Having been elected based on an issue or an ideology, can they manage and do they have a management philosophy? In both the Florida and Ohio county commissioner's guide to the officials' background, educational information is optional. Therefore, any analysis of that information might be incomplete (CCAO, 2006; Counties, 2006).

Many elected official organizations have yearly meetings that are mostly centered on socialization of the members and interactions with interested parties. Very little if any professional development is offered to the membership. Management and leadership seminars are nonexistent in most of these organizations (CCAO, 2006; Counties, 2006).

The culture of these political offices is very much influenced by the elected officials. The actual organizational dimensions of the office culture can be very different from the ideal. The perception of the employees, compared to that of the elected official, can also be very different. Local elected officials can use the results from this research to improve their management techniques. State associations can also use this data to implement management training seminars for their local official members. Past research has not adequately explored local elected officials and their leadership styles as they relate to the office culture and the outcomes of leadership style.

Elected officials may benefit from training in management and leadership techniques. They need to understand the elements that comprise the different leadership styles so that they can adapt and be responsive to their constituents. Of special interest,

this study may show the need to adapt to a transformational style of leadership and could indicate to the elected official that employee satisfaction and effectiveness can make the elected official a better, more responsive officeholder. Also, the study may show organizations that their members can become more effective office holders by presenting effective management/leadership seminars.

The social impact of the study may be twofold. It might be used to inform the electorate and elected officials that a transformational leadership style can lead to greater effectiveness, employee satisfaction, and intellectual stimulation by government employees. The government might be able to provide a higher level of service to the public. The second social impact may be that organizational culture can be improved in a political office. By improving the culture dimensions, higher productivity and service to the public might be obtained.

Summary

Chapter 1 outlined the introduction to the study. Chapter 2 consists of a literature review relating to the hypotheses and research questions outlined in Chapter 1. Noted theorists who developed the subject of leadership and organizational dimensions are discussed in the literature review. The theorists' propositions and conclusions about leadership are detailed in the review. Chapter 3 describes the methodology used in this study. A description of the research design, target population, sampling procedure, the sample itself, the instrument, data collection, and the data analysis are outlined. Chapter 4 discusses the results using various regression tests. Chapter 5 is a summary of the study with conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The focus of this literature review will be on transformational leadership and the critical elements of inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration (Bass & Avolio, 2004). These elements result in the outcomes of extra effort, employee satisfaction, and job effectiveness. This review will also examine organizational culture and how it connects to transformational leadership. In order to understand transformational leadership it is important to briefly examine how leadership theory developed and how transformational leadership adds a new dimension.

Many authors of management and organization text books discuss leadership in the terms of the following theories and studies (Gordon, 2002; Robbins & Coulter, 2005):

1. Traits theory, the behavioral studies of the University of Iowa, Ohio State University, the University of Michigan, and the management grid theory.
2. Contingency theories include the Fiedler model, situational leadership, and path goal leadership.
3. New approaches in evaluating leadership include transactional and transformational leadership.

The brief historical review sets the framework for the new paradigm of transformational leadership and the MLQ used in this study. In all of the theories and studies presented, styles of political leadership can be identified.

Evolution of the Theory and Studies of Leadership

A general historical review of the following theories and studies will be reviewed due to their relationship to the development of transactional and transformational leadership and leadership in local elected offices: trait theory, studies by Kurt Lewin (1938) at the University of Iowa, leadership development at Ohio State University and the University of Michigan, management grid, contingency leadership, situational leadership, and path-goal theory. During the 1980s there was a major paradigm shift in leadership caused by organizations desiring to be more efficient and effective. Bass and Avolio (1990) recognized three primary leadership styles: transactional, laissez-faire, and transformational. The main emphasis here will be on transformational leadership, but transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles will also be included.

Trait Theory

The early leadership theories centered on the traits of an individual. It was thought that certain traits could differentiate those who would become leaders and those who would not. The *great man approach* was one of the initial trait theories whereby it was believed that a person had to be born with leadership traits (Northouse, 2000). Those early studies proved to be inconclusive as to which traits were always present in an individual who was believed to be a leader. Early studies did indicate that leaders varied from nonleaders in traits such as intelligence, initiative, desire to take on responsibility, and other traits (Stogdill, 1948). Drive and its components of achievement, ambition, and energy also separated leaders from nonleaders. The problem with the research into trait theory is that the research was not conclusive into what traits could always be identified

from the leaders as compared to the nonleaders. Having these traits make it more likely that effective leadership can occur, but it is not conclusive. As Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) explained, there are seven traits linked to leadership:

1. Drive. Leaders exhibit high effort. They have a relatively high desire for achievement, they are ambitious, they have a lot of energy, they are tirelessly persistent in their activities, and they show initiative.

2. Desire to lead. Leaders have a strong desire to influence and lead others. They demonstrate the willingness to take responsibility.

3. Honesty and integrity. Leaders build trusting relationships between themselves and followers by being truthful or nondeceitful and by showing high consistency between word and deed.

4. Self-confidence. Followers look to leaders for an absence of self-doubt. Leaders, therefore, need to show self-confidence in order to convince followers of the rightness of their goals and decisions.

5. Intelligence. Leaders need to be intelligent enough to gather, synthesize, and interpret large amounts of information, and they need to be able to create visions, solve problems, and make correct decisions.

6. Job-relevant knowledge. Effective leaders have a high degree of knowledge about the company, industry, and technical matters. In-depth knowledge allows leaders to make well-informed decisions.

7. Extraversion. Leaders are energetic, lively people. They are sociable, assertive, and rarely silent or withdrawn. (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991)

Northouse (2000) identified many strengths and weaknesses of the theory. Strengths include that it is naturally appealing and it provides a guide for which traits to look for in a prospective leader, especially in politics. However, a definitive list of traits that all leaders exhibit has not been found. Furthermore, the research has been inconclusive in that it does not look at situations and outcomes (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Northouse, 2000). Situations and outcomes at times defines political leadership; therefore, the trait theory was rejected as a possible model for this study.

Behavior Style Theories and Studies

Behavioral style and theories emerged as the building blocks for the transformational and transactional style of leadership. In these early studies, the behavior of the leader was examined rather than the personality. In the late 1930s studies on leadership were conducted by Kurt Lewin at the University of Iowa. These studies centered on three leadership styles: autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire (Lewin & Lippitt, 1938). In the autocratic style, decision making was centralized with limited input and work methods rigid. Leaders assign people to clearly defined tasks with a downward flow of communication. Under the democratic style, participation is encouraged by subordinates and authority is delegated. With the democratic style there is an active flow upward and downward. In the laissez-faire style, the leader grants authority to the group. Communication is primarily horizontal. Northouse (2000) identified numerous strengths and weaknesses in this style. The strength of the authoritarian style is that it stresses prompt, orderly, and predictable performance. The strength of the democratic style is that it enhances personal communication through participation. The strength of the laissez-

faire is that it permits individuals to do things without interference of the leader. The primary weakness of the autocratic style is that it stifles individual initiative. The primary weakness of the democratic style is that it is cumbersome and time consuming. In the case of the laissez-faire style, the primary weakness is that it allows for the group to drift from organizational goals (Lewin & Lippitt, 1938). The authoritarian style from the Lewin studies can be associated with a transactional type of leadership and the democratic style can be associated with the transformational type of leadership.

The Ohio State University studies in the 1940s resulted in identifying two behavior types: initiating structure and consideration. Stogdill and Coons (1957) of Ohio State University concentrated on two dimensions: orientation to task and orientation to people. They concluded that managers with an initiating structure and consideration would have employees with high performance, low grievance rates, and low turnover. A manager with high initiating structure but low consideration would have high performance, high grievance rates, and high turnover. A manager with a low initiating structure but high consideration would have low performance, low grievance rates, and low turnover. A manager with high initiating structure and low consideration would have employees with high performance, high grievance rates, and high turnover. A manager with low initiating structure and low consideration would have low performance, high grievance rates, and high turnover. The orientation to task can be associated with the transactional style of leadership and the orientation to people can be associated with the transformational style of leadership.

Researchers at the University of Michigan developed a model based on two qualities: employee-oriented and production-oriented (Kahn & Katz, 1960). Managers that were employee-oriented took a personal interest in their employees and emphasized relationships of the group. In contrast, a production-oriented manager emphasized the production or goal that was accomplished. This study of highly productive work groups found that these managers spent quite a bit of time planning work schedules and supervising and gave their employees discretion and leeway in accomplishing the task. The Michigan study found that employee-oriented leaders achieved higher productivity and a higher job satisfaction than production-oriented managers. These studies paralleled the Ohio State studies. As with the Ohio State studies, transactional leadership can be associated with production orientation and transformational leadership can be associated with orientation to employees.

From these early studies, a management grid was developed in two-dimensional format (Blake & Mouton, 1984). The two dimensions were concern for people and concern for production. The grid went into greater detail than the Ohio State studies using these factors. Blake identified five basic elements of the grid:

1. Country club management. This style satisfies relationships and the needs of employees. It establishes a sociable work environment and work cadence. This is on the high bar for the concern of the worker. Concerns for production are secondary to the concerns of the workers.

2. Impoverished management. In this model, management does not concern itself with the concerns of the worker. Minimum effort is used to maintain required production. This low concern translates for both production and people.

3. Task management. Operations efficiency is established to arrange work with a minimum of human interactions. People are machines for production and the goals of production are of the highest importance.

4. Team management. Productivity is accomplished by employees working as team. The team concept establishes trust among stakeholders. The manager wishes to obtain high performance and high employee satisfaction.

5. Middle of the road. In the center of the grid is common ground that produces adequate performance while maintaining morale. The manager tries to accomplish a satisfactory level of performance and employee satisfaction (Blake & Mouton, 1984).

The concern for production can be associated with a transactional approach, while the concern for people can be associated with the transformational approach. This type of analysis has been described as a style approach. The strengths of this approach have been explained by Northouse (2000): First, leadership not only encompasses personal traits but takes into account different behaviors in different situations. Second, much research conducted at Ohio State University and the University of Michigan has concluded that the style approach is very well substantiated and provides an understanding of leadership. Third, leadership is examined from a behavioral perspective using tasks and relationships as the focus. Fourth, leadership is complex and this approach offers a framework for

understanding. Under this framework leaders can critically review their approach and make changes. All of the style approaches can be applied in political leadership.

Recent research has shown that there are some weaknesses in the style approach. As will be discussed, the situational approach calls for using a leadership style to match the situation. On the other hand, the style approach research shows that the high, high approach is best for managers to achieve results and employee satisfaction. Research has shown that no one style is effective in all situations (Northouse, 2000). In a political climate, situations dictate different styles for different situations.

Situational leadership theory (SLT) was developed by Paul Hersey and Ken Blanchard (2001). Readiness is a key concept of this theory whereby the extent of worker willingness and ability is measured (Hersey & Blanchard, 2001). The authors refer to it as a model and not a theory because there is no explanation of why certain actions happen. The success of the leader is measured by the actions of those he or she leads. This measurement seems to have been unnoticed in other leadership theories. Hersey and Blanchard (2001) broke down leadership into four categories. In telling (high task-low relationship) the leader defines roles and tells people what, how, when, and where to do various tasks. In selling (high task-high relationship) the leader provides both directive and supportive behavior. In participating (low task-high relationship) the leader and follower share in decision making: The main role of the leader is facilitating and communicating. In delegating (low task-low relationship) the leader provides little direction or support (Hersey & Blanchard, 2001). The follower readiness is then evaluated from a scale comparing people who are both unable and unwilling to take

responsibility to people who are both able and willing to do what is asked of them. The situational approach is used by many practitioners in the field of leadership to train leaders both in the private and public sector (Northouse, 2001). Some criticism of the theory is that it is lacking in research for its support and that there is little consideration of leader style and employee commitment of the development level of the followers. As with the other leadership theories, hints of transactional and transformational elements are present but the concepts do not get to the desired outputs of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness.

The contingency theory matches a leader's behavior to the current situation. Fiedler (1967) expanded the theory of leadership in that it could be measured by the interaction of the manager and the control over the situation. With Fiedler, there is no right or wrong style; the needs of leadership roles change with different circumstances. Like the grid theory, the basic question Fiedler (1967) considered was if the style was a task-oriented relationship. To ascertain a leadership style, Fiedler (1967) developed the *Least-Preferred Co-worker* (LPC) questionnaire. Strengths of the contingency theory are that it is highly supported by empirical research, situations are compared to style, it provides predictable outcomes, and it allows leadership profiles (Northouse, 2000). Some criticisms are that the LPC scale can be difficult to work with and that it is unwieldy to work with in real situations. As political environments change, so does the leadership style of the political official in many circumstances.

Another contingency theory that puts the responsibility for success into the hands of the manager is the path-goal model, whereby it is the duty of the leader to help those

underneath in the management ladder to attain their goals. The theory assumes that a leader's behavior influences the performance of subordinates. This research by Robert House (1971) identified four basic leadership behaviors: the directive leader, the supportive leader, the participation leader, and the achievement oriented leader. With the directive leader, subordinates know what to expect with specific guidance. The supportive leader shows support and concern for the needs of the followers. The participation leader consults with group members and uses their suggestions before making a decision. The achievement orientated leader sets goals and expects followers to perform at the highest level.

Strengths of the path-goal approach include its attempts to integrate motivation into leadership theory and provide a framework for understanding how behavior affects employee satisfaction and work performance (Northouse, 2000). A drawback is that it is complex and fails to explain the relationship between the behavior of the leader and worker motivation. In political offices, the behavior of the official can have a huge impact on subordinate behavior. The directive and achievement leader is similar to the transactional approach, while the supportive and the participation leader have elements of the transformational leader. All of the historical leadership theories and studies have elements of transactional and transformational leadership.

Leadership Theories of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

The MLQ was used in this study to assess leadership style. Leadership behaviors of the transformational leader include charisma, a vision, inspirational, intellectually stimulating, individual consideration, and influence. The three expected behaviors of the

transactional leader are contingent reward, management by exception active, and management by exception passive. In contingent reward, the effort of the follower is exchanged for a specific reward provided by the leader. In active management by exception, the leader is active in searching for problems in order to correct them. In passive management by exception, a leader sets standards and only intervenes when problems are discovered. Laissez-faire is the most passive of the leadership styles (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Transformational leadership behaviors of charisma, inspiration, consideration, and stimulation lead to performances beyond normal expectations. The transactional behavior of contingent reward and active and passive management by exception generally leads to performance that just meets expectations.

In the case of laissez-faire behavior, there are expectations because the leader is not involved (Bass & Avolio, 1990). In 1997, Bass and Avolio further refined leadership theory by proposing that leaders display elements of transactional, laissez-faire, and transformational depending on the situation (Sosik & Potosky, 2002). The use of the MLQ provided the data needed to assess the outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness.

Transactional Leadership Theory

In most of the theories and studies presented, the university studies, leadership grid, contingency theory, situational theory, and the path goal theory have been typically transactional in nature (Robbins & Coulter, 2005). In these theories, goals and tasks have been established by the leader in order to accomplish the tasks assigned. Many of the assumptions are similar to the authoritative style that was first explored in the University

of Iowa studies. With the transactional leadership style people are motivated by rewards and punishments similar to the behavior theories of Skinner (1965). Subordinates will respond to the leader based upon rewards and punishments with a clear chain of command. Rewards may be structured while the discipline is related to rules. It is the function of the subordinate to do what is instructed by the manager. The first theorist to use the term transactional leadership was Burns (1978) in describing leadership by those in politics. Transactional leadership is result driven by control, measurement, administration, and performance (Drucker, 1993). While there has been quite a bit of research on the limitations of transactional leadership, it is still a popular approach to management style. On a scale of leadership vs. management, the transactional style would very much be on the management end. In research conducted on federal leadership, Parry and Proctor-Thompson (2003) found that the public sector had a higher level of transactional culture and lower levels of transformational culture. As Bass (1985) noted, leaders in the transactional approach choose to intervene only when failures, breakdowns, and deviations occur. This is especially true in a political environment.

Strength of the transactional leadership approach is that objectives and goals are clearly defined within a structured environment. Rewards and punishments are the driving factor for subordinate compliance. A major weakness in this approach is that change is difficult to implement. Relationships are short term and are dictated by the task.

Laissez-Faire Leadership

Laissez-faire is the French phrase for *hands-off* or *it will work out*. As Lewin (1938) described, this approach removes responsibility from the leader to the group

(Lewin & Lippitt, 1938). This method results in delays in decisions, does not correct bad decisions in a timely manner and does not provide feedback in order to make corrections. Delays of action, absences by employees and general indifference to the tasks at hand characterize the laissez-faire style of leadership (Sosik & Potosky, 2002). The only positive outcomes in this method is that perhaps a leader will emerge from the group and that decisions by the group can be made without interference from the leader.

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership became popular with the research of James Burns (1978). Burns (1978) linked the power of a position with the response to the need of the followers. In this style, the vision of the leader must be conveyed to the followers. This vision sometimes requires change in the organization. This style is becoming more important because of the demands of organizations to change in today's world of *globalization*.

It is important that the transformational leader motivate the followers in their vision. Transformational leaders motivate followers to be better in three ways according to Burns (1978). They raise the consciousness about the importance of certain outcomes such as high productivity or efficiency. The leader shows the value of workers concentrating on what benefits their work team can achieve rather than the individual interests. Furthermore, the leader increases the needs of the workers so that they value challenges, responsibility, and growth (Burns, 1978). B.M. Bass (1985) linked transactional and transformational leadership as a continual process. Transformational

leadership is developed from transactional leadership. To this end, the Full Range of Leadership Model was developed (Bass, 1985).

Transformational leaders give individual consideration along with intellectual stimulation. The transformational factors involve the following: Charisma or being able to influence by one's personality. For this to occur the leader must be respected and be able to articulate the vision. Inspirational motivation; the followers must be inspired by the vision and expectations must be high. Intellectual stimulation; creativity must be encouraged in followers. These leaders want the followers to challenge the beliefs that they have as well as those of the leader and the organization. Individualized consideration; a supportive atmosphere is created by the leader. The leader acts more like a coach and advisor to the group so that expectations can be maximized. Transformational leaders view themselves as change agents who have a vision for the organization. In order to effect change, they do take risks but are not reckless.

Many researchers believe that the transformational style of leadership is superior to the transactional style. Studies have found that transformational leaders are higher performers and are more likely to be promoted than a transactional leader. Furthermore, some studies have found that there is a correlation between transformational leadership and low turnover rates, higher productivity and higher employee satisfaction (Conger et al., 2000; Keller, 1992).

Transformational leadership clearly defines the role of the leader and followers but also includes the followers in the leadership process. This style also acknowledges that leader's provide the primary means for change in an organization. Rewards and

punishments may be used by the transformational leader as the transactional leader does but it goes further in that the growth and needs of the followers are acknowledged by the leader. In today's global economy, many companies look for transformational leaders in order to change an organization and to affect a new vision for the company.

Organizational Culture

While most research began on organizational culture in the late 1970s, there is a forgotten history of the topic that is generally listed as management principles (Parker, 2000). Early organizational culture was very much influenced by the Marxist concept of capital and labor and how they conflict in the workplace. Generally, reviews on culture from United States authors do not mention Marxism in their research of organizational culture. In Europe and other parts of the world, the labor process or categories such as class are very relevant to work on organizational culture (Parker, 2000). The management concepts presented by Taylor, Mayo, and Weber had direct influences on the culture of an organization (Schein, 1992). The environment continually changes, therefore the culture of an organization changes and adapts to the new environmental circumstances that exists at the time (Schein, 1992). The performance of an organization can be correlated with adaptive organizational cultures in this new environment (Kotter & Schiesinger, 1979). One of the first works that discussed organizational change and culture was produced by Adam Smith in his work *The Wealth of Nations* (1776). His theory of the division of labor was that if jobs could be broken down into narrow and repetitive tasks, then more output of the product would result. The tasks given to the employees in local government offices are for the most part repetitive tasks.

The industrial revolution forced companies to have formal organizations in order to produce and distribute the manufactured goods. This development caused managers to consider organizational frameworks. One of the first theories of management was produced in the early 1900s by Fredrick Winslow Taylor (1911). The theory he fashioned was called scientific management (Taylor, 1911). During the early 1900s, several writers defined management and its relations with workers in detailed form. The classical view was presented by Henri Fayol (1916). He developed principles of management that set a structure that could be followed and in many cases are still followed today. The concepts of division of work, authority, discipline, unity, direction, subordination, remuneration, centralization, scalar chain, order, equity, stability, initiative, and esprit de corps are all themes that have been expanded on since his writings (Fayol, 1916). Another influential writer in management and organizational culture theory in the early 1900s was Max Weber (1958). As a sociologist he studied European organizations. Out of his research he developed the concept of *bureaucracy*. Weber's (1958) principles of bureaucracy included the theory that each employee has specific responsibility that is established by competence and expertise. In a bureaucracy each employee reports to a single boss and the management of employees is controlled by rules and regulations (Gordon, 2002). Government in general is equated to bureaucracy in many instances and it is certainly the case with local government (Caiden, 1981).

Some of the earliest work into the area of organizational culture was provided by Burrell and Morgan (1979). They developed the typology of paradigms that had objectivist, subjectivist, regulatory, and radical at opposite ends. It was again divided into

the structural functionalist, the radical structuralism, the radical humanist, and the interpretive (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). Each of these paradigms approaches organizational culture from a different perspective. The early work of several authors brought together the strands of organizational culture of climate, personality, atmosphere, institutionalism, informal organizations, and the various dimensions that they encompass (Deal & Kennedy, 1988; Ouchi, 1981; Peters & Waterman, 1982).

The culture of organizations, whether private or government, exist in three layers which are artifacts, values, and assumptions (Schein, 1992). It is also proposed in the belief that language, symbols, and rituals are the behavior outcomes of the culture (Tierney, 1988). The culture of public management is somewhat different from the corporate world in that there is an ideology of public service (Caiden, 1981).

By examining an office one can get a visible idea of the office culture. The way people evaluate the visual and their behaviors comprise the value layer. Ideals and assumptions are always made on a human level and this is the third level of the organizational culture. Various authors have identified different dimensions of organizational cultures. A set of dimensions proposed by Kolb, Osland, and Rubin (1995) will be used in this study are as follows:

1. Conformity. The feeling that there are many externally imposed constraints in the organization: The degree to which members feel that there are many rules, procedures, policies, and practices to which they have to conform rather than able to do their work as they see fit.

2. Responsibility. Members of the organization are given personal responsibility to achieve their part of the organization's goals: The degree to which the members feel that they can make decisions and solve problems without checking with superiors each step of the way.

3. Standards. The emphasis the organization places on quality performance and outstanding production, including the degree to which members feel the organization is setting challenging goals for itself and communicating these goal commitments to members.

4. Rewards. The degree to which members feel that they are being recognized and rewarded for good work rather than being ignored, criticized, or punished when something goes wrong.

5. Organizational clarity. The feeling among members that things are well organized and that the goals are clearly defined rather than being disorderly, confused, or chaotic.

6. Warmth and support. The feeling that friendliness is a valued norm in the organization and that members trust one another and offer support to one another; the feeling that good relationships prevail in the work environment.

7. Leadership. The willingness of organization members to accept leadership and direction from qualified others. As needs for leadership arise, members feel free to take leadership roles and are rewarded for successful leadership. Leadership is based on expertise. The organization is not dominated, or dependent on, one or two individual.

Research Rationale and the Null Hypothesis

The Literature Review provided the foundation for the research rationale and the testing for the null hypotheses. Inspiration, individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, and idealized influence are components of transformational leadership which is the focus of this study. Contingent reward, management by exception (active and passive), are components of transactional leadership and are often found in effective transformational leaders (Bass, 1985). The Literature Review also contained material on organizational culture and what components are to be used in the research. The null hypotheses that will be tested to answer the research questions are as follows:

1. There will be no difference in the outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction and effectiveness as they relate to the leadership style of transactional and transformational.
2. There will be no difference in the leadership styles of transformational and transactional as they relate to the actual employee organizational culture dimensions of conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organizational clarity, warmth and support, and leadership.

Summary

Since the early 1900s there has been various leadership and organizational culture theories and studies that have been presented. The literature review was a review of historical background as well as new research in these areas. The latest paradigm is transformational leadership. The concept of transformational leadership was first discussed by Burns (1978) and was updated by Bass (1985). Most of the models and studies presented could be used to study the leadership style of local political offices. The

transformational paradigm can be a model for local government leadership and can increase the outcomes of effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness of government employees. The review of the literature demonstrates that there is a limited application of these concepts in the area of local government.

The MLQ developed by Bass and Avolio (2004) was one of the data gathering mechanism and the other was the organizational culture dimensions developed by Kolb et al. (1995). The generalization of the MLQ and the organizational culture dimensions used in this study will expand the empirical data for leadership study in local governments.

CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHOD

Introduction

The design and methodology of the dissertation research will be presented in this chapter. The description of the research design, the target population, sampling procedures, and the sample itself will be presented. Also, the treatment, instrumentation, data collection procedures, and the data analysis will be described in this chapter.

Description of the Research Design

This study examined the relationship between transformational/transactional leadership and perceived and actual organizational culture. The outcomes of employee satisfaction, intellectual stimulation, and extra effort were used to compare the transformational style with the transactional style of leadership (Bass & Avolio, 2004). In this quantitative research, the relationship between the nonmanipulated independent variable of leadership and the dependent variable of organizational culture were examined. The responses to the instrument from the sample provided a numeric description of the results. This method was selected because it can be useful in describing characteristics of a large population. Standardized questionnaires can help strengthen the measurement factors explored in this study. Survey research usually is high in reliability (Babbie, 2004). Reliability is important in this research because it suggests that the same data would be collected each time in repeated studies. Validity for this study is important to ensure that what was measured is what was expected to be measured.

Using a survey for this study was appropriate because surveys are very useful in describing the characteristics of large populations (Babbie, 2004). Using a standardized instrument along with a selected sample, assertions can be made in this case about local elected officials and their organizational culture. Measurement is strengthened by using a standardized instrument because the same questions are asked of all participants in the survey.

In order to find questions relevant to this research, the MLQ (Bass & Avolio, 2004) and the Organizational Culture Questionnaire (Kolb et al., 1995) were selected. The wording of the questions is important to minimize bias. Both instruments minimize bias because of the wording of the questions. It was expected that both questionnaires would have high reliability and validity.

The association of the tested variables is a correlation relationship rather than a causal relationship. Correlation is an empirical relationship between two variables such that changes in one are associated with changes in the other. Correlation alone does not constitute a causal relationship between two variables but is one measure of a causal relationship. In a nomothetic (accounts for much of the difference but not the total), causality of the variables must be correlated, the cause takes place before the effect, and the variables are nonspurious in that there is no third variable that can account for the statistical correlation (Babbie, 2004). The outcomes of the leadership style of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction were compared for transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant behavior leadership styles.

Target Population

The population examined is a distinct group of county employees from one segment of the government. The target population of this study is employees of the county commissioners in Lee County, Florida. There were no artificial settings nor are the variables controlled or manipulated. Other county elected officials that were not part of the sample are as follows: the clerk of the circuit court, county property appraiser, the tax collector, the sheriff, and the supervisor of elections.

The population selected is from a typical midsized county government. The advantage of using this population is that small counties are quite different in the delivery of services and the responsibilities from large counties. For example, counties in Ohio vary in population from 15,000 in Vinton County to almost 1,500,000 in Cuyahoga County (CCAO, 2006). Employees who report to the county commissioners total approximately 1,240 and are the population for this research. The choice of this target population may allow for conclusions to be drawn regarding counties with similar demographics and size.

Sampling Procedure

For this study a systematic sampling procedure was used. In this type of sampling procedure every n th unit from a list is selected. With a population of 1,240 and 500 selected for the sample, the sampling interval, which is the standard distance between the elements selected from the population, will be 2.5. The actual selection alternated between the second and third name on the population list. The systematic approach yields virtually the same results as a simple random sample (Babbie, 2004). The sampling frame

was a list of employees and their home addresses that was provided by the director of human relations of the Lee County Commissioners office. The selected employees received the instrument in the mail with a self-addressed return envelope. E-mail addresses were not provided by Lee County; therefore, the instrument was mailed.

Sample

The sample comprises a diverse group of employees who have various job responsibilities, genders, income levels, and ethnic backgrounds. The sample is typical of a midsized county government in the United States. This particular population is made up of 1,240 employees. While these employees may report to different supervisory staff personnel, they ultimately are responsible to the county commissioners of Lee County, Florida.

In deriving statistics to ensure the sample provided the information needed to make an analysis, the sampling error must be known. Sampling error is the degree of error to be expected from the sample design and is made up of the parameter, the sample size, and the standard error (Babbie, 2004). Gays' (1996) formula was used to select the sample size. Gays's (1996) guidelines are as follows:

1. For small populations ($N < 100$), there is little point in sampling. Survey the entire population.
2. If the population size is around 500, 50% of the population should be sampled.
3. If the population is around 1,500, 20% should be sampled.
4. Beyond a certain point (at approximately $N = 5,000$), the population size is almost irrelevant, and a sample size of 400 will be adequate.

With a total population of 1,240, a response of 248 was deemed adequate (.2 times 1,240). Questionnaires were mailed to a sample size of 500 in the hope of getting 248 responses or a return rate of approximately 50%. The instruments returned totaled 102, which was far below the expected return rate, and the low return rate could be a biased sample.

Instrumentation

One of the measurement instruments was the MLQ Form 5-X Rater as developed by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio (2004). MLQ was initially developed to ascertain the differences between transactional and transformational leadership. It was first used as a model by Waldman and Bass in 1986 in a study of industrial managers and military officers (2004). It was replicated in by Seltzer and Bass in 1990 in a study of 300 MBA students. There are 45 questions in this measurement, which uses a 5-point Likert scale. The scale is set up as follows: (4) frequently if not always, (3) fairly often, (2) sometimes, (1) once in a while, (0) not at all. Demographic information was not included due to the length of the entire questionnaire and the resulting information derived from demographic information was not the focus of the research questions. Transactional leadership displays behaviors associated with constructive and corrective transactions. This style of leadership defines expectations and encourages performance to achieve these goals (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The following are the core behaviors associated with the transactional style:

1. Contingent reward (CR): CR leadership clarifies expectations and offers recognition when goals are achieved. The leader makes clear what is expected and what the rewards are for achieving the goals.

2. Management by exception-active (MBEA): The leader focuses attention on mistakes and deviations from standards. Punishments may ensue due to mistakes (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

A more passive and reactive management by exception style can also be exhibited. Those using this style of leadership do not respond to situations and problems. This passive-avoidant leadership can be described as follows:

1. Management by exception-passive (MBEP): In this style the leader does not interfere until the problem becomes serious. This must go seriously wrong before the leader takes action.

2. Laissez-faire (LF): The laissez-faire leader is absent when needed and avoids making decisions (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

From these factors, the outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction with the leadership can be measured.

Coefficient alphas were analyzed in several studies to confirm the internal consistency reliability of the MLQ. A study of business leaders by Hater and Bass (1988) indicated internal consistency reliability, as did a study of navy officers and business managers by Yammarino and Bass (1990) that also found internal consistency reliability. Table 1 indicates the data used for the reliability and validity (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The

MLQ 5 X has been consistently confirmed for both reliability and validity in many studies (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

Table 1

Organizational Samples Used in Initial Analysis for MLQ 5X

Description of the Sample	N of Raters
1. Undergraduate Students (American)	162
2. United states Government Research Agency	66
3. United States Army	202
4. Scottish Gas Firm	99
5. United States Business Firm	549
6. United States Business Firm	320
7. United States Business Firm	457
8. Undergraduate Students (American and Taiwanese)	254
<u>9. United States Nursing School</u>	<u>45</u>
Total	2,154

The reliabilities listed in the nine samples listed above range from .74 to .94 (Bass & Avolio, 2000).

The second instrument used in this research was a questionnaire on organizational culture (Kolb et al., 1995) that attempts to measure the actual and ideal dimension. The dimensions explored are as follows:

1. Conformity. The feeling that there are many externally imposed constraint in the organization: The degree to which members feel that there are many rules,

procedures, policies, and practices to which they have to conform rather than able to do their work as they see fit.

2. Responsibility. Members of the organization are given personal responsibility to achieve their part of the organization's goals: The degree to which the members feel that they can make decisions and solve problems without checking with superiors each step of the way.

3. Standards. The emphasis the organization places on quality performance and outstanding production, including the degree to which members feel the organization is setting challenging goals for itself and communicating these goal commitments to members.

4. Rewards. The degree to which members feel that they are being recognized and rewarded for good work rather than being ignored, criticized, or punished when something goes wrong.

5. Organizational clarity. The feeling among members that things are well organized and that the goals are clearly defined rather than being disorderly, confused, or chaotic.

6. Warmth and support. The feeling that friendliness is a valued norm in the organization and that members trust one another and offer support to one another; the feeling that good relationships prevail in the work environment.

7. Leadership. The willingness of organization members to accept leadership and direction from qualified others. As needs for leadership arise, members feel free to take

leadership roles and are rewarded for successful leadership. Leadership is based on expertise. The organization is not dominated, or dependent on, one or two individuals.

Reliability is important in this research because it suggests that the same data would be collected each time in repeated studies. Validity for this study is important to ensure that what is measured is what was expected to be measured. Regarding validity, the question is as follows: Are we measuring what we think we are measuring? In the case of the Kolb (1995) instrument, the questions have face validity in that on the face of it, the instrument measures the concept of organizational culture dimensions (Bingham & Felbinger, 2002). In the opinion of several experts who are faculty members at Walden University, the instrument does have face validity. The instrument does appear to have external validity in that it is representative of the sample. Threats to external validity were minimized because of the randomness of the selection (Babbie, 2004).

Information as to the reliability of the Kolb instrument is not available. A measurement is reliable if one measures the same set of objects again and again with the same or comparable measuring instrument and the same or similar results occur (Bingham & Felbinger, 2002). In order to establish reliability, the instrument was submitted to a class of nine MBA students and then resubmitted several weeks later. The test-retest was calculated for a statistical correlation. A correlation of 0 indicates an unreliable measure and a 1.00 indicates a perfect reliable measure (Bingham & Felbinger, 2002). Reliability in this test was .9, which indicated that reliability was strong.

Data Collection Procedures

This survey research required the use of two instruments: the 45-question MLQ (Bass & Avolio, 2004) and a 7-question Organizational Culture Questionnaire (Kolb et al., 1995). The questionnaires were mailed upon acceptance of the research proposal. Each questionnaire had a self-addressed stamped return envelope provided. There was a cover letter of explanation indicating the purpose of the study and assuring the respondents that their answers were confidential. Dillman suggested a four-part mailing process: questionnaire, cover letter, token incentive, and return envelope (2000). The only component not used was the token. Those respondents who did not return the questionnaire in 7 days were sent a second letter encouraging a response to the survey. A post card reminder did follow the second letter approximately 1 week later. It was the goal of the research to achieve a response rate of 50% or higher, which is considered a good return rate (Babbie, 2004). Don Dillman (1996) has researched the various ways of administering surveys and has concluded that mail is a superior way to obtain information from a instrument (Dillman, Sangster, Tarnai, & Rockwood, 1996).

To ensure confidentiality, all returned surveys were mailed to the researchers' home address. The mail was opened only by the researcher and the data input was only performed by the researcher. Only the final results of the entire survey will be revealed to the Lee County administrator and the Lee County commissioners.

Data Analysis

This research study consisted of two instruments that were analyzed separately and together. The first questionnaire is the MLQ, which was refined in 2004 (Bass &

Avolio, 2004). The integrated data gathered from the 45 questions were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Multivariate regression analysis using econometric techniques, MANOVA, was used to analyze the correlations and relationships among the variables. Wilks' Lambda and Hotelling's Trace were the two tests used to analyze the multivariate data. These tests included but were not limited to a comparison of the means; a Pearson correlation, a significance test of the variables (*t* test); the *R*-squared statistic, which shows how the independent variables are explained in the model; the adjusted *R*-squared, which indicates the percent of error in the model, the significant *F* change, which indicates if there is no relationship between the variables, and an ANOVA test that shows an *F* statistic, at a .05 confidence level, which again indicates the relationship of the variables. A histogram is presented that indicates the frequency of the dependent variable and the standardized residuals.

There is a series of regressions to test the null hypothesis, which states there will be no difference in the outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness as they relate to the leadership style of transactional and transformational. The outcomes are the dependent variables, which were tested against the independent variables that establish transactional or transformational leadership. Certain questions from the MLQ establish which criterion establishes transactional or transformational leadership characteristics. There are 20 questions from the MLQ that make up the total independent variables of transformational leadership and four questions comprise the individual attributes. The series of regressions is modeled as follows: $Y = \text{constant} + bx_1 + bx_2 + bx_3 \dots + \text{error}$. *Y* is the dependent variable tested (such as extra effort). The constant was calculated; the *X*s

are the independent variables, the Bs were the calculated effects of the independent variables, and the error was the unexplained error of the model.

A comparison of the correlations between the variables of the two instruments was analyzed using the Pearson correlation. The variables correlated were those tested using the MLQ and the organizational culture instrument. By correlating these variables, relationships or nonrelationships between the variables were determined.

The second set of questions indicated the actual organizational culture dimensions. There are seven sets of dimensions as developed by Kolb (1995). The results were compared using a comparison of the means. The findings were presented in a table format with an explanation of the results. The final data analysis is a determination of relationships between transformational leadership and the actual results of the organizational culture dimensions. The data analysis of this segment parallels the tests used for the MLQ. The data are presented in tables and graphs and include an explanation of their significance. The second analysis tested the null hypothesis that there will be no difference in the leadership styles of transformational and transactional as it relates to the organizational culture dimensions of conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organizational clarity, warmth and support, and leadership. The means of each dimensional question were compared to the transformational and transactional style of leadership to determine the differences.

Testing using the multivariate data analysis of Wilks' Lambda and Hotelling's Trace for the null hypothesis that there will be no difference in the outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness as they relate to the leadership style of

transformational and transactional could not be rejected. Also, the second null hypothesis that stated there will be no difference in the leadership styles of transformational and transactional as it relates to the organizational culture dimensions of conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organizational clarity, warmth and support and leadership also could not be rejected using multivariate data analysis. However, using the analysis of variance, ANOVA, and the resulting associated tests, the first null hypothesis can be rejected and that there is a difference in the outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness as it relates to the management styles of transformational and transactional.

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to examine transformational and transactional leadership in a local government setting and compare the results to organizational culture. The expected outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction as the dependent variables were evaluated against the independent variables that determine transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership as measured by the MLQ 5X (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The data showed that transformational leadership had a direct positive relationship on the outcomes of effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction, while transactional leadership had a direct negative relationship to the outcome variables tested. The study was also an evaluation of the results from the MLQ 5X with the means of the survey questions from the organizational culture questionnaire. A direct relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and organizational culture dimensions was not established.

Chapter 4 is separated into two sections. Data analysis procedures, research question, and hypothesis test outcomes along with supporting tables make up the first section. The second section has the survey results, which are reported as descriptive statistics, mean scores, and correlations. The sample was 500, with a response of 102 instruments for a response rate of 20%. While the validity of the MLQ has been documented (Bass & Avolio, 2004), the current study focused on a local government and therefore should be repeated on another local government to ensure validity.

Analysis Procedure

The research questions were analyzed using regression analysis, which provided descriptive statistics, multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), Wilks' Lambda, Hotelling's Trace, the analysis of variance (ANOVA), the F test, t stat or the statistical significance of the variable, the P (two-tail) test and the R -squared statistic. The data to analyze the research questions and hypothesis are presented using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 14 (SPSS). Both survey instruments, the MLQ 5X and the Kolb (1995) questionnaire, provided the data to analyze the research questions and the hypotheses.

Hypotheses Tests Utilized

There are several basic ways of testing the null hypothesis. The simple t test tests the hypothesis that a particular coefficient is zero rather than the estimated regression value. The t test indicates that at a particular confidence level (95%) that the hypothesized value is an acceptable approximation of the true value. This analysis used the 2-t rule of thumb, whereby if the absolute value of the t stat is greater than 2, then the null hypothesis is rejected. The analysis of variance table is an analysis of the variation of the dependent variable by separating it into a regression part and a residual part. ANOVA yields the F test which also tests the hypothesis using all of the coefficient estimates. The F test tests the hypothesis that all of the coefficients are jointly zero. If the F stat is greater in absolute value than the critical F , then the null hypothesis is rejected in that all of the coefficient estimates are zero. The P (two-tail) test, or significance test, tests for the probability of rejecting a true hypothesis. At the 95% confidence level, if the P value

is less than a .05 significance level, the null hypothesis is rejected. The *R*-squared statistic yields a percentage that represents the amount of the dependent variable that is explained by the independent variables chosen (Gujarati, 2003).

Research Questions and Hypothesis

The research questions that are the focal point of this study are as follows:

1. What are the differences in job performance, extra effort, and job satisfaction of those who are responsible to a transactional leader and those who are responsible to a transformational leader?

2. What are the differences in the perceived actual culture dimensions between employees who are responsible to a transformational or a transactional leader?

The null hypotheses that were tested to answer the research questions are as follows:

1. There will be no difference in the outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness as they relate to the leadership style of transactional and transformational.

2. There will be no difference in the leadership styles of transformational and transactional as it relates to the organizational culture dimensions of conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organizational clarity, warmth and support, and leadership.

Different questions in the instruments relate to the dependent outcomes variables and the independent variables. The first 45 questions are from the MLQ, and questions 46 through 52 are from the Kolb (1995) instrument. Those variables that directly relate to a type of leadership style, an outcome, or a culture dimension are listed in Table 2. The

variables listed in Table 2 are those that were tested to either accept or reject the null hypotheses presented.

Table 2

Question Variables as They Relate to Leadership Behavior

<u>Transformational</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Question # variable</u>
	Idealized Influence (Attributed)	10,18,21,25
	Idealized Influence (Behavior)	6,14,23,34
	Inspirational Motivation	9,13,26,36
	Intellectual Stimulation	2,8,30,32
	Individual Consideration	15,19,29,31
<u>Transactional</u>		
	Contingent Reward	1,11,16,35
	Management by Exception (Active)	4,22,24,27
	Management by Exception (Passive)	3,12,17,20
<u>Laissez-faire</u>		5,7,28,33
<u>Outcomes</u>		
	Extra Effort	39,42,44
	Effectiveness	37,40,43,45
	Satisfaction	38,41
<u>Organizational Culture variables</u>		
	Conformity	46
	Responsibility	47
	Standards	48
	Rewards	49
	Organizational Clarity	50
	Warmth and support	51
	Leadership	52

MANOVA Test Results

The MANOVA tests used in this study showed that the null hypothesis could not be rejected. The first null hypotheses that there will be no difference in the outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness as they relate to the leadership style of transactional and transformational could not be rejected. The null hypothesis that stated that there will be no difference in the leadership styles of transformational and transactional as it relates to the organizational culture dimensions of conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organizational clarity, warmth and support, and leadership also could not be rejected using MANOVA testing. Table 3 lists the results of the tests used as they relate to transformational leadership and Table 4 lists the test results as they relate to transactional leadership.

MANOVA was used to analyze the data due to the number of dependent and independent variables. The usefulness of MANOVA is that the variables can be optimally combined. The multiple dependent variables are measured as a single value that maximizes the differences across groups (Hair, 2006). The first test using MANOVA was a test of the F statistic. In interpreting the F statistic the researcher needs to determine if the F value is sufficient to reject the null hypotheses. The critical F value at .05 is approximately 2.45. Therefore, the F value must exceed 2.45 for a conclusion that the means across all groups are not equal. The MANOVA tests using Wilks's Lambda indicated that only a few variables produced a significant F value exceeding the critical F that would warrant a rejection of the null hypothesis for both transformational and transactional leadership. Because so many independent variables were weak, the null

hypothesis could not be rejected using this test. The F statistic assesses the null hypotheses of equal means but it does not address which means are different (Hair, 2006).

The multivariate extension of the t test is Hotelling's t squared test. For both MANOVA testing and ANOVA, the 2- t rule of thumb was used to analyze the data. The 2- t rule of thumb states that if the number of degrees of freedom is 20 or more and if the alpha is set at .05, then the null hypotheses $B^2=0$ can be rejected if the t value computed exceeds 2 in absolute terms (Gujarati, 2003). The Hotelling's t squared tests the statistical significance of the differences on the means of two or more variables between groups. The MANOVA tests Hotelling's Trace indicated that there were very few variables that exceeded 2.0 and therefore were not related to the dependent outcome variables of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction. That being the case in all but a few instances, the MANOVA test could not yield a conclusion that the null hypothesis could be rejected. The data results for the MANOVA tests for transformational leadership are included in Table 3. An asterisk (*) indicates that that the value is significant at the 95% confidence level. Table 3 shows that the results did not allow the null hypotheses to be rejected that stated there is no relationship between the outcomes of effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction and related variables of transformational leadership.

Table 3

Multivariate Data Analysis: Transformational Leadership

<u>Null Hypothesis</u>		<u>Variable</u>	<u>Wilks' Lambda</u>	<u>Hotelling's Trace</u>
Multivariate Dependent <u>Variable</u>	Independent <u>Variable</u>			
Satisfaction	Ideal. Influence (A)	10	1.386	1.39
		18	1.779	1.761
		21	2.926*	2.983*
		25	1.97	1.92
Satisfaction	Intellectual Stim.	2	1.349	1.32
		8	1.357	1.373
		30	2.551*	2.535*
		32	0.837	0.819
Satisfaction	Individual Consider.	15	2.326*	2.599*
		19	11.541*	12.571*
		29	6.406*	8.903*
		31	3.118*	3.3393*
Satisfaction	Inspirational Mot.	9	1.528	1.598
		13	2.427*	2.693*
		26	1.162	1.195
		36	1.308	1.276
Effort	Ideal. Influence (A)	10	1.052	1.076
		18	1.198	1.226
		21	1.495	1.55
		25	1.591	1.627
Effort	Individual Consider.	15	1.359	1.375
		19	1.708	1.714
		29	0.724	0.695
		31	2.407*	2.573*
Effort	Inspirational Mot.	9	2.944*	3.301*
		13	3.528*	3.293*
		26	1.689	1.695
		36	3.371*	3.238*

(table continues)

<u>Null Hypothesis</u>		<u>Variable</u>	<u>Wilks' Lambda</u>	<u>Hotelling's Trace</u>
Multivariate	Independent			
Dependent	Variable			
Variable				
Effort	Intellectual Stim.	2	3.25*	3.458*
		8	2.183*	2.111*
		30	0.865	0.832
		32	1.393	1.365
Effectiveness	Ideal Influence (A)	10	2.656*	3.847*
		18	1.51	1.738
		21	3.813*	4.054*
		25	2.393*	2.497*
Effectiveness	Individual Consider.	15	0.577	0.562
		19	1.351	1.287
		29	0.751	0.702
		31	0.991	0.979
Effectiveness	Inspirational Mot.	9	1.326	1.39
		13	1.823	1.827
		26	1.468	1.419
		36	1.941	1.921
Effectiveness	Intellectual Stim.	2	3.23	3.166
		8	1.031	1.077
		30	1.171	1.175
		32	2.198*	2.129*

The multivariable tests for transactional leadership and the outcomes of effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction are presented in Table 4. The results presented in Table 4 show that null hypothesis can not be rejected that the outcomes were related to the transactional independent variables.

Table 4

Multivariate Data Analysis: Transactional Leadership

<u>Null Hypothesis</u>		<u>Variable</u>	<u>Wilks' Lambda</u>	<u>Hotelling's Trace</u>
<u>Multivariable</u>	<u>Independent</u>			
<u>Dependent</u>	<u>Variable</u>			
<u>Variable</u>	<u>Contingent</u>			
Effectiveness	Reward	1	1.195	1.235
		11	1.092	1.189
		16	0.866	0.837
		35	0.575	0.54
Effectiveness	MBE Active	4	2.87	3.125
		22	1.86	1.889
		24	1.328	1.323
		27	1.088	0.992
Effectiveness	MBE Passive	3	1.397	1.359
		12	1.071	1.161
		17	0.985	0.963
		20	1.522	1.478
Extra Effort	Contingent Reward	1	1.156	1.111
		11	1.894	2.045
		16	2.035*	1.943
		35	1.232	1.179
Extra Effort	MBE Active	4	1.596	1.658
		22	0.437	0.413
		24	1.53	1.5
		27	0.37	0.356
Extra Effort	MBE Passive	3	0.824	0.799
		12	2.559*	2.47*
		17	0.919	0.883
		20	2.316*	2.563*
Satisfaction	Contingent Reward	1	0.257	0.251
		11	0.202	0.194
		16	2.361*	2.521*
		35	1.307	1.27

(table continues)

<u>Null Hypothesis</u>		<u>Variable</u>	<u>Wilks' Lambda</u>	<u>Hotelling's Trace</u>
<u>Multivariable Dependent Variable</u>	<u>Independent Variable</u>			
Satisfaction	MBE Active	4	3.415	3.588
		22	1.426	1.372
		24	1.636	1.616
		27	1.04	1.015
Satisfaction	MBE Passive	3	0.945	0.973
		12	2.152*	2.201*
		17	0.975	0.954
		20	1.468	1.425

ANOVA Test Results

Transformational Leadership

Multivariate testing did not show that two null hypotheses relating to the research questions could be rejected. MANOVA did reveal that there were weak variables and that testing each independent variable against each outcome dependent variables could indicate that individual null hypothesis that relate to the main null hypotheses could be rejected. To accomplish this task, testing of the null hypotheses was expanded to determine if irrelevant variables were skewing the results from the MANOVA tests. In determining which variables might not be relevant, the data were analyzed using the Pearson correlation, which can range in size from -1.00 to +1.00. The strength of the relationship of the variables is determined by this test (Gujarati, 2003). A correlation of 0 indicates no relationship, while 1.0 indicates a perfect positive correlation and -1.0 indicates a perfect negative correlation. According to Cohen (1988), a correlation value of .10 to .29 is small, .30 to .49 is medium, and .50 to 1.0 is large. It was determined that only those independent variables that were medium and above as tested against the

dependent variable would be subject to regression analysis. This bottom-up approach allowed for the detection of unnecessary independent variables. The objective of the bottom-up approach is to develop the best model using the F statistic, the t test, the R -squared and the test for significance or the P (two tail) test (Gujarati, 2003). The two main null hypothesis of 1) there will be no difference in the outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness as they relate to the leadership style of transactional and transformational and 2) there will be no difference in the leadership styles of transformational and transactional as it relates to the organizational culture dimensions of conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organizational clarity, warmth and support, and leadership were analyzed using each dependent variable question regressed against each group of independent variable questions. To obtain the results, the main null hypotheses had to be subdivided into a series of sub-null hypothesis in order to draw an accurate conclusion. After the elimination of weak variables, the results of the sub hypotheses' show that the null hypotheses that states there will be no difference in the outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction as they relate to the leadership style of transformational and transactional can be rejected. The results for transformational leadership are listed in Table 5. Under each subtitle of *Null Hypothesis* the dependent variable is the first stated variable and the independent variable is the second stated variable. The sub null hypotheses are stated as follows:

1. There will be no difference in the outcome of satisfaction as it relates to the transformational variables of individual consideration, idealized influence attributes, idealized influence behavior, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation.

2. There will be no difference in the outcome of effectiveness as it relates to the transformational variables of idealized influence attributes, idealized influence behavior, individual consideration, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation.

3. There will be no difference in the outcome of extra effort as it relates to the transformational variables of idealized influence attributes, idealized influence behavior, inspirational motivation, individual consideration, and intellectual stimulation.

Table 5

Transformational Leadership

<u>Null Hypothesis</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>F Value</u>	<u>T Stat</u>	<u>Sig</u>	<u>R-Sq.</u>
Satisfaction and Indiv. Consideration	38	21.503	2.086	0.04	0.305
	19		3.583	0.001	
	31		4.339	0	
	41	24.614	3.591	0.001	0.334
	19		5.639	0	
	31		2.519	0.013	
Satisfaction and Idealized Influence A	38	14.346	2.331	0.022	0.226
	18		3.352	0.001	
	21		2.797	0.006	
	41	23.014	1.214	0.228	0.416
	18		2.556	0.012	
	21		4.743	0	
Satisfaction and Idealized Influence B	25		3.041	0.003	
	38	11.618	4.342	0	0.105
	14		3.409	0.001	
	41	15.448	3.779	0	0.24

(table continues)

<u>Null Hypothesis</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>F Value</u>	<u>T Stat</u>	<u>Sig</u>	<u>R-Sq.</u>
	14		4.291	0	
	23		2.137	0.035	
Satisfaction and Inspirational Mot.	38	16.871	2.096	0.039	0.256
	26		2.896	0.005	
	36		3.072	0.003	
	41	13.427	3.817	0	0.215
	26		2.682	0.009	
	36		2.643	0.01	
Satisfaction and Intellectual Stim.	38	11.517	3.126	0.002	0.19
	30		2.442	0.016	
	32		1.918	0.058	
	41	16.721	2.813	0.006	0.254
	2		3.732	0	
	30		3.491	0.001	
Effectiveness and Idealized Influence A	37	15.893	1.111	0.269	0.33
	10		2.66	0.009	
	18		3.26	0.002	
	21		2.858	0.005	
	40	18.061	2.485	0.015	0.269
	18		3.274	0.001	
	21		3.635	0	
	43	24.469	2.841	0.005	0.333
	21		4.035	0	
	25		4.766	0	
	45	18.291	5.572	0	0.272
	18		3.305	0.001	
	21		3.648	0	
Effectiveness and Idealized Influence B	37	9.711	3.202	0.002	0.165
	14		2.937	0.004	
	23		2.293	0.024	

(table continues)

<u>Null Hypothesis</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>F Value</u>	<u>T Stat</u>	<u>Sig</u>	<u>R-Sq.</u>
	40	7.918	3.562	0.001	0.139
	14		2.901	0.005	
	45	10.752	5.741	0	0.18
	14		3.196	0.002	
	34		2.46	0.018	
Effectiveness and Individual consid.	37	17.55	2.733	0.007	0.264
	19		3.737	0	
	31		3.434	0.001	
	40	19.504	2.725	0.008	0.285
	19		4.305	0	
	31		3.213	0.002	
	43	18.38	6.899	0	0.157
	19		4.287	0	
	45	9.932	6.519	0	0.169
	19		2.772	0.007	
	31		2.625	0.01	
Effectiveness and Inspirational Mot.	37	37.67	1.364	0.176	0.435
	26		2.371	0.02	
	36		6.242	0	
	40	10.04	3.227	0.002	0.17
	26		2.083	0.04	
	36		2.514	0.014	
	43	9.916	6.44	0	0.091
	36		3.149	0.002	
	45	14.384	5.804	0	0.227
	26		2.059	0.042	
	36		3.395	0.001	
Effectiveness and Intellectual Stimu.	40	12.161	3.948	0	0.109
	2		3.487	0.001	
	43	15.314	5.677	0	0.125
	2		3.913	0	
	45	15.514	7.545	0	0.135
	32		3.939	0	

(table continues)

<u>Null Hypothesis</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>F Value</u>	<u>T Stat</u>	<u>Sig</u>	<u>R-Sq.</u>	
Extra Effort and Idealized Influence A	39	9.442	1.824	0.071	0.226	
	21		2.67	0.009		
	25		2.229	0.028		
	42	19.383	0.858	0.393	0.375	
	18		2.329	0.022		
	21		5.031	0		
	44	19.306	0.866	0.387	0.374	
	18		3.086	0.003		
	21		4.244	0		
	Extra Effort and Idealized Influence B	39	10.638	5.053	0	0.097
		14		3.262	0.002	
		42	24.619	4.183	0	0.199
14			4.962	0		
44		24.381	4.265	0	0.198	
14			4.938	0		
Extra Effort and Inspirational Mot.	39	11.215	3.241	0.002	0.186	
	36		3.272	0.001		
	42	14.356	2.802	0.006	0.227	
	36		3.541	0.001		
	44	12.034	3.085	0.003	0.197	
	26		2.42	0.017		
Extra Effort and Individual Consid.	36		2.62	0.01		
	39	25.624	4.515	0	0.206	
	19		5.062	0		
	42	19.521	1.608	0.111	0.376	
	19		3.212	0.002		
	15		2.035	0.045		
	31		4.418	0		
	44	14.5	2.134	0.035	0.31	

(table continues)

<u>Null Hypothesis</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>F Value</u>	<u>T Stat</u>	<u>Sig</u>	<u>R-Sq.</u>
	19		3.246	0.002	
	31		3.698	0	
Extra Effort and Intellectual Stim.	42	17.783	0.91	0.365	0.355
	2		3.176	0.002	
	30		3.087	0.003	
	32		2.223	0.029	
	44	14.535	1.237	0.219	0.31
	2		3.147	0.002	
	30		2.695	0.008	

Transactional Leadership

With the elimination of weak variables, ANOVA tests of the sub hypothesis show that null hypothesis as it relates to transactional leadership and the outcomes of effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction can be rejected. The tests performed as listed in Table 6 showed that transactional leadership independent variables had a negative relationship on the dependent outcomes of effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction. The sub null hypotheses tested for transactional leadership that warranted a rejection of the null hypotheses are as follows:

1. There will be no difference in the outcome of satisfaction as it relates to the transactional variables of management by exception active and management by exception passive,

2. There will be no difference in the outcome of effectiveness as it relates to the transactional variables of management by exception active and management by exception passive.

3. There will be no difference in the outcome of extra effort as it relates to the transactional variables of management by exception passive.

The various other outcomes regressed against transactional variables did not have F values, t test scores or P ($2-t$) significant scores to warrant a rejection of the null hypothesis.

Table 6

Transactional Leadership

<u>Null Hypothesis</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>F Value</u>	<u>T Stat</u>	<u>Sig.</u>	<u>R-Sq</u>
Satisfaction and MBE-Active	41	9.868	8.358	0	0.168
	24		-2.274	0.025	
Satisfaction and MBE-Passive	41	11.629	8.832	0	0.265
	20		-3.188	0.002	
	12		-2.705	0.008	
Satisfaction and MBE-Active	38	10.171	7.037	0	0.172
	3		-2.324	0.022	
	20		-2.781	0.006	
	20		-2.781	0.006	
Effectiveness and MBE-Active	43	10.943	9.181	0	0.183
	24		-2.077	0.04	
	27		-2.358	0.02	
Effectiveness and MBE-Passive	37	16.025	8.257	0	0.246
	3		-3.155	0.002	
	20		-3.264	0.002	
Effectiveness and MBE-Active	40	8.596	7.747	0	0.21
	20		-2.728	0.008	
Effectiveness and MBE-Passive	43	14.514	9.377	0	0.229
	3		-2.161	0.033	
	12		-2.73	0.008	

(table continues)

<u>Null Hypothesis</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>F Value</u>	<u>T Stat</u>	<u>Sig.</u>	<u>R-Sq</u>
Extra Effort and MBE-Passive	44	11.967	8.503	0	0.27
	12		-3.082	0.003	
	20		-2.737	0.007	
	42	12.495	8.823	0	0.279
	12		-2.523	0.013	
	20		-2.517	0.013	

The result of the elimination of the unnecessary variables concluded with Table 5 and Table 6. Both tables clearly indicate that the null hypothesis that states there is no difference in the outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction as they relate to transformational leadership and transactional leadership can be rejected. In the regression tests performed the ANOVA yielded *F* values that exceeded the *F* critical value of 2.45; therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected in that all of the coefficients were jointly zero.

The second test performed was the *t* test which tests that a particular coefficient estimate is actually zero rather than the value estimated in the regression. Using the 2-rule of thumb test (actually 1.96 at a 95% confidence level) the *t* values for the variables tested exceeded 2; therefore, each individual null hypothesis presented was rejected. Also, in determining the overall significance of the variable, the significance two-tailed test was analyzed. If the value is less than .05 it was concluded that the coefficient tested was significant. The significance value is the probability of rejecting a true hypothesis. If a significance value is high, the consequences of mistakenly rejecting a true hypothesis can lead to a wrong conclusion (Hair, 2006). For the selected variables, the significance test indicated that the variables were significant. The *R*-squared tests resulted in a weaker

result. This test indicates the value of the independent variables chosen for the model in explaining the model.

The *R*-squared explains the percent of the output dependent variable explained by the selected independent variables (Gujarati, 2003). The tests yielded positive test numbers for the transformational variables in the *t* test which indicate that transformational leadership lead to positive outcomes in extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction. The *t* test results for transactional leadership led to negative numbers that indicate that this type of leadership had a negative impact on the dependent variables of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction.

Organizational Culture Dimensions and Transformational and Transactional Leadership

The second research question and null hypothesis was concerned with whether there was no difference in the leadership styles of transformational and transactional as it relates to the organizational culture dimensions of conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organizational clarity, warmth and support, and leadership. The data tested as it stated in Table 7 indicates that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. This indicates that there is no relationship between organizational culture dimension variables and the variables concerned with transformational and transactional leadership. In only a few cases did the *F* value exceed the critical value of 2.45. The dependent variables in these tests were the organizational culture questions and the independent variables were the questions that indicated if the leadership type was transformational or transactional. As is indicated in Table 7, very few of the variables exceeded 2 in the *t* test which indicated that they were weak variables and had no significant relationship to the dependent

variable. This result was substantiated by the P (two-tail) significance test and very weak R -squared results. Therefore the second null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The sub hypotheses that were tested were as follows:

1. There will be no difference in the organizational dimension of conformity as it relates to the transformational and transactional variables of idealized influence active, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration.

2. There will be no difference in the organizational dimension of conformity as it relates to the transactional variables of contingent reward, management by exception active, and management by exception passive.

3. There will be no difference in the organizational dimension of responsibility as it relates to the transformational variables of inspirational motivation and individual consideration.

4. There will be no difference in the organizational dimension of responsibility as it relates to the transactional variables of management by exception active and management by exception passive.

5. There will be no difference in the organizational dimension of standards as it relates to the transformational variables of inspirational motivation,

6. There will be no difference in the organizational dimension of standards as it relates to the transactional variables of management by exception passive.

7. There will be no difference in the organizational dimension of rewards as it relates to the transformational variables of intellectual stimulation.

8. There will be no difference in the organizational dimension of rewards as it relates to the transactional variables of management by exception active.

9. There will be no difference in the organizational dimension of organizational clarity as it relates to the transformational variables of intellectual stimulation.

10. There will be no difference in the organizational dimension of organizational clarity as it relates to the transactional variables of management by exception active.

11. There will be no difference in the organizational dimension of warmth and support as it relates to the transformational variables of intellectual stimulation.

12. There will be no difference in the organizational dimension of warmth and support as it relates to the transactional variables of management by exception active.

13. There will be no difference in the organizational dimension of leadership as it relates to the transformational variables of individual consideration.

14. There will be no difference in the organizational dimension of leadership as it relates to the transactional variables of management by exception passive.

Table 7

Organizational Culture

<u>Null Hypothesis</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>F Stat</u>	<u>T Stat</u>	<u>Sig.</u>	<u>R-Sq</u>
Conformity and Idealized Influence A	46	0.745	18.227	0	0.03
	10		0.653	0.515	
	18		-0.84	0.403	
	21		1.16	0.249	
	25		0.926	0.357	
Conformity and Inspirational Mot.	46	0.687	18.281	0	0.028

(table continues)

<u>Null Hypothesis</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>F Stat</u>	<u>T Stat</u>	<u>Sig.</u>	<u>R-Sq</u>
	9		1.055	0.294	
	13		0.877	0.383	
	26		0.694	0.49	
	36		0.421	0.674	
Conformity and Intellectual Stim.	46	0.966	17.583	0	0.039
	2		1.304	0.195	
	8		0.369	0.713	
	30		0.303	0.763	
	32		0.545	0.587	
Conformity and Individual Consid.	46	1.662	21.191	0	0.065
	15		1.329	0.187	
	19		-0.544	0.588	
	29		-0.184	0.854	
	31		1.677	0.097	
Conformity and Contingent Reward	46	3.032	11.312	0	0.112
	1		-1.07	0.287	
	11		-2.579	0.011	
	16		0.394	0.695	
	35		2.445	0.016	
Conformity and MBE Active	46	3.079	7.358	0	0.114
	4		2.459	0.016	
	22		2.474	0.015	
	24		-0.079	0.938	
	27		-2.261	0.026	
Conformity and MBE Passive	46	2.43	6.185	0	0.092
	3		1.643	0.104	
	12		-0.335	0.739	
	17		2.137	0.035	
	20		0.221	0.826	
Responsibility and Inspirational Mot.	47	3.666	8.173	0	0.132
	9		1.79	0.077	
	13		1.612	0.11	

(table continues)

<u>Null Hypothesis</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>F Stat</u>	<u>T Stat</u>	<u>Sig.</u>	<u>R-Sq</u>
	26		-0.062	0.95	
	36		1.8	0.075	
Responsibility and Intellectual Stim	47	1.707	8.798	0	0.082
	2		0.797	0.427	
	8		1.3	0.197	
	30		1.601	0.113	
	32		-0.928	0.356	
Responsibility and Individual Consid.	47	2.862	11.044	0	0.107
	15		-0.005	0.996	
	19		3.027	0.003	
	29		0.723	0.471	
	31		-0.74	0.461	
Responsibility and MBE Active	47	2.197	6.929	0	0.084
	1		0.038	0.969	
	11		-1.903	0.06	
	16		-1.397	0.166	
	35		1.598	0.113	
Responsibility and MBE Passive	47	1.827	6.661	0	0.071
	4		-0.417	0.667	
	22		1.047	0.298	
	24		-1.445	0.152	
	27		-1.01	0.315	
Standards and Inspirational Mot.	48	1.442	16.379	0	0.057
	9		-1.695	0.093	
	13		1.315	0.192	
	26		0.495	0.622	
	36		1.29	0.2	
Standards and MBE Passive	48	1.109	5.618	0	0.044
	3		1.041	0.301	
	12		-0.276	0.784	
	17		1.592	0.115	
	20		0.05	0.96	
Rewards and Intellectual Stim	49	1.432	11.392	0	0.056

(table continues)

<u>Null Hypothesis</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>F Stat</u>	<u>T Stat</u>	<u>Sig.</u>	<u>R-Sq</u>
	2		1.492	0.145	
	8		-0.545	0.587	
	30		0.066	0.948	
	32		1.285	0.202	
Rewards and MBE Active	49	1.688	4.144	0	0.066
	4		0.485	0.629	
	22		1.755	0.082	
	24		0.226	0.822	
	27		0.371	0.711	
Organ. Clarity and Intellectual Stim	50	0.09	14.688	0	0.004
	2		-0.297	0.767	
	8		0.02	0.984	
	30		-0.431	0.668	
	32		0.401	0.69	
Organ. Clarity and MBE Active	50	1.924	6.305	0	0.074
	4		-0.266	0.791	
	22		-0.658	0.512	
	24		-0.156	0.877	
	27		2.496	0.014	
Warmth & Sup. And Intellectual Stim.	51	1.991	15.477	0	0.077
	2		1.496	0.138	
	8		-0.609	0.544	
	30		-1.353	0.179	
	32		-1.083	0.282	
Warmth & Sup. And MBE Active	51	0.319	7.069	0	0.013
	4		0.573	0.568	
	22		-0.614	0.541	
	24		-0.249	0.804	
	27		-0.226	0.822	
Leadership and Individual Consid	52	1.429	16.273	0	0.07
	15		-0.327	0.744	
	19		-1.698	0.093	
	29		1.048	0.297	

(table continues)

<u>Null Hypothesis</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>F Stat</u>	<u>T Stat</u>	<u>Sig.</u>	<u>R-Sq</u>
	31		1.285	0.202	
Leadership and MBE Passive	52	0.868	6.451	0	0.035
	3		1.061	0.292	
	12		-1.744	0.084	
	17		-0.619	0.537	
	20		0.385	0.701	

Comparison of the Means

An analysis of the overall type of leadership that this organization exhibited was performed by comparing the means of the instruments. The 45 questions from MLQ are rated on a 5-point scale where 0 is not at all, 1 is once in a while, 2 is sometimes, 3 is fairly often, and 4 is frequently or always. The 7 question organizational culture instrument had a scale of 1 to 10 whereby 1 was the weakest and 10 was the strongest. Table 8 lists the results of a comparison of the means.

Table 8

Comparison of the Means for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

Questions 1-45 and the Organizational Culture Questionnaire (OCQ) Questions 46-52

Question Number	Mean	Question Number	Mean
1	2.41	2	1.91
3	2.35	4	2.36
5	1.69	6	1.70
7	1.76	8	1.71
9	1.89	10	1.80
11	2.06	12	2.13
13	1.77	14	1.67
15	1.62	16	2.17
17	2.30	18	1.70
19	1.74	20	2.32
21	1.80	22	1.88

(table continues)

Question Number	Mean	Question Number	Mean
23	1.90	24	2.14
25	2.12	26	1.67
27	2.03	28	1.70
29	1.55	30	1.58
31	1.63	32	1.62
33	1.88	34	1.71
35	2.12	36	2.02
37	1.67	38	1.62
39	1.78	40	1.66
41	1.91	42	1.83
43	2.08	44	1.74
45	2.14	46	6.60
47	6.45	48	6.66
49	5.80	50	6.34
51	4.54	52	5.67

Transformational Leadership Means

The mean scores for transformational leadership showed a general weakness with no mean averages over 2.0. The mean average for the questions relating to Idealized Influence Attributed (IIA) was 1.855. The average means scores for Idealized Influence Behavior (IIB) questions was 1.745. The mean average for the questions relating to Inspirational Motivation (IM) was 1.837. The mean average for Intellectual Stimulation (IS) questions was 1.705. The mean average for the questions relating to Individual Consideration (IC) was 1.635. The total average means scores for all questions relating to transformational leadership was 1.755 which is in the higher range between once in a while and sometimes. The comparison of the means for transformational leadership show that the Lee County, Florida commissioner's office is not operated in a transformational leadership style.

Transactional Leadership Means

The means for those questions relating to transactional leadership were somewhat stronger than the transformational questions. The mean averages for the Contingent Reward (CR) questions were 2.189. The mean averages for the Management by Exception Active (MEA) questions were 2.102 and for the Management by Exception Passive (MEP) questions were 2.275. The total mean average for questions relating to transactional leadership was 2.188 or the lower range between sometimes and fairly often. The laissez-faire questions had a mean average of 1.757. A comparison of the means show that the Lee County Commissioner's office is operated in a transactional style of leadership.

Mean Outcomes of Effectiveness, Extra Effort, and Satisfaction

The dependent variable questions also showed a general weakness in the means. The amount of effort average mean was 1.763; effectiveness mean average was 1.888 and for employee satisfaction the mean average was 1.767. These means were all in the upper range between the once in a while and sometimes. The results are clearly below what would be expected in a transformational leadership environment.

Organizational Culture Dimension Means

The organizational culture questionnaire had a 10-point response scale. The lowest mean score was 4.54 and the highest was 6.66. The lowest number on the conformity question indicates that conformity is not characteristic of the organization and the highest indicates that conformity is very characteristic of the organization. The mean score for this question was 6.60 on the 10-point scale. The lowest number on the

responsibility question indicates that no responsibility is given in this organization and the highest number indicates there is a great emphasis on personal responsibility. The mean score for responsibility was 6.45. As to standards, a low score indicates that standards are low where a higher score indicates that high standards are set. The mean score was 6.66; therefore, standards are high. The rewards question indicates that a low score means that members are ignored, punished, or criticized whereby a high number shows that members are rewarded. The mean score was 5.80 which is slightly above for positive rewards. In organizational clarity, a low score indicates that the organization is disorderly, confused, and chaotic while a high score indicates that it is well organized. The mean score of 6.34 indicates that the organization is well organized. A low score for the question of warmth and support indicates that it is not existent in the organization. A high score indicates that warmth and support is very characteristic. The mean score for this question was 4.54 which was slightly below the middle indicator. The final organizational leadership question was on leadership. The lowest number indicates that leadership is not rewarded where the highest number accepts and reward leadership based on expertise. The mean for this question was 5.67 which indicates that the results were not conclusive. With the highest mean in the organizational culture questions being 6.66 and the lowest 4.54, the results indicate a middle ground area which does not yield a solid conclusion as to the culture dimensions.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to demonstrate that a transformational style would improve the organization selected for this research. Chapter 4 reported the results from

the research questions and the null hypotheses. The quantitative results were collected from the MLQ and from Kolb's (1995) organizational culture questionnaire. The tests performed using regression analysis included descriptive statistics, multivariate analysis (MANOVA), Wilks's Lambda, Hoetelling's Trace, the analysis of variance (ANOVA), the F test, t statistic, the significance or P (two-tail) test, and the R -squared statistic.

The first null hypothesis stated that there will be no difference in the outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness as they relate to the style of transactional and transformational leadership. MANOVA tests could not conclude that the null hypotheses could be rejected because of the weakness of many of the tested variables. In performing a Pearson correlation and eliminating the weak variables, the ANOVA and the subsequent F stat, t tests, and significance test could be tested as a linear regression. This produced a subset of null hypotheses based on the outcome variables tested against each independent variable. The data indicated that the null hypothesis should be rejected and that there is a difference in the outcome dependent variables of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness. Transformational leadership had a positive relationship with the dependent outcome variables, while transactional leadership had a negative relationship with the outcome variables.

The second null hypothesis that there will be no relationship in the leadership styles of transformational and transactional as it relates to the organizational culture dimensions of conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organizational clarity, warmth and support, and leadership cannot be rejected. Each organizational culture dimension was tested against the independent variables that explain each leadership set of

variables. These tests were individual hypothesis tests that examined the F statistic, the t test, and the P (two-tail) significance test. Only in a few instances was a relationship established. Further testing of leadership styles and organizational culture dimensions is warranted in that no firm conclusion could be reached.

Overall the data revealed that the Lee County, Florida, commissioner's office is operated in a transactional environment. Transformational variable means were generally low on the 5-point scale, and for the transactional variables the means were generally high. Employees responding to the instruments generally indicated that the government unit operated in a transactional atmosphere. The means for the organizational culture dimensions on a 10-point scale ranged between the low 4s and the high 6s. The sample evaluated was 102 completed instruments. A definite conclusion might have been derived with results that indicated either higher or lower means with a larger sample.

CHAPTER 5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter is a discussion of the importance and meaning of the exploration of leadership styles exhibited in the commissioner's office in Lee County, Florida. The purpose of this study was to demonstrate that a transformational style would improve the organization selected for this research. The results show that a transformational style of leadership will lead to greater effectiveness, satisfaction, and extra effort. This chapter begins with a summary of the research and a brief statement of results. Conclusions are stated as they relate to research questions and hypotheses. Other sections in this chapter include implications for practice, recommendations for future research, limitations of the study, possible social change significance, and a concluding statement.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to compare the outcomes in a transactional and transformational setting and to see if the transformational setting was more positive. The expected outcomes of satisfaction, effectiveness, and extra effort may not be realized in a transactional environment. Does a transactional style of leadership lead to higher effectiveness, satisfaction, and extra effort of local government employees, or would a transformational approach yield better results? This study clearly indicated that a transformational leadership style leads to higher outcomes in effectiveness, satisfaction, and extra effort. These outcomes can result in a more productive delivery of services to the taxpayer. What is the relationship between transactional and transformational

leadership and organization culture dimensions? The data derived from this study did not provide results that were conclusive regarding a relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and organizational culture. The purpose was to come to a conclusion and make recommendations for the local government selected in this study. The study was done to promote an improvement in local government leadership.

The study was survey research that used a self-administered instrument mailed to 500 possible respondents. The response rate was 20% for a total return of 102 surveys. This research included three dependent outcome variables: effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction. The organizational culture dependent variables were conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organizational clarity, warmth and support, and leadership. Governments are generally thought to use a transactional style of leadership (Caiden, 1981). Until the 1980s, transactional leadership was the primary leadership style taught to government managers. The main point of transactional leadership is the exchange between the leader and the employee (Burns, 1978). The employee performs and delivers to the elected official in return for a reward in most cases (Burns, 1978). The government and nonprofit sectors lag behind the for-profit sector regarding leadership training. One of the problems of local government and nonprofit leadership is that many officials in these organizations do not have the knowledge or skills to lead their organization in today's rapidly changing world (Riggio & Orr, 2004). As Burns (1978) indicated, transformational leadership allows for leaders and followers to raise one another to higher levels of motivation and results. This study was an evaluation of the leadership style, outcomes, and culture dimensions for one local government entity.

The first research question was what are the differences in extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness of those who are responsible to a transactional leader and those who are responsible to a transformational leader? The null hypothesis stated that there will be no difference in extra effort, effectiveness, and job satisfaction of those who are responsible to a transactional leader and those who are responsible to a transformational leader. The second research question and null hypothesis focused on the differences of leadership styles between transformational and transactional related to the organizational culture dimensions of conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organizational clarity, warmth and support, and leadership. The second null hypothesis stated that there will be no difference in the leadership styles of transformational and transactional as it relates to the organizational culture dimensions of conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organizational clarity, warmth and support, and leadership.

The first research question and null hypotheses were analyzed using linear regression methods employing MANOVA and ANOVA. The data for these analysis were from the Bass and Avolio (2004) MLQ. MANOVA tests and Pearson correlations indicated that too many weak variables were present and that the null hypothesis could not be rejected using all of the variable data. The main null hypothesis—that there will be no difference in the outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness as they relate to the leadership style of transactional and transformational—had to be subdivided into numerous sub hypotheses in order to test the strength of the individual independent

variables. The testing of these sub hypotheses allowed the researcher to derive data in order to state a conclusion.

The second research question and null hypothesis—that there will be no difference in the leadership styles of transformational and transactional as it relates to the organizational culture dimensions of conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organizational clarity, warmth and support, and leadership—also had to be subdivided into sub hypothesis. The second null hypothesis was also tested using regression analysis. To determine the type of leadership that the governmental unit in general exhibited, descriptive statistics were evaluated.

The MANOVA tests of Wilks's Lambda and Hotelling's Trace did not yield results sufficiently definitive to accept or reject the null hypotheses. To further study the data, related to the main hypotheses (that there will be no difference in the outcomes effectiveness, satisfaction, and extra effort) were analyzed. The results using ANOVA, the F value, the t test, and the P (two-tail) significance test indicated that the first null hypothesis could be rejected. Therefore, there is a positive relationship between effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction as it relates to transformational leadership. Transactional leadership showed a negative relationship between effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction.

The second null hypothesis (that there would be no difference in the leadership styles of transformational and transactional as it relates to the organizational culture dimensions of conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organizational clarity, warmth and support, and leadership) could not be rejected. Both MANOVA testing and

ANOVA testing of the F value, the t test, the significance test, and the R -squared percentage did not produce numbers that would allow for the rejection of the second null hypotheses.

Conclusions

The data analyzed in this research showed a positive relationship between transformational leadership and the outcomes of effectiveness, satisfaction, and extra effort. The data also showed that transactional leadership had a negative relationship with the outcomes of effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction. No relationship was established between transformational and transactional leadership with the organizational culture dimensions tested. The first null hypothesis tested stated that there is no difference in effectiveness, extra effort, and job satisfaction of those who are responsible to a transactional leader and those who are responsible to a transformational leader. The goal of the null hypothesis was to explore leadership style of the governmental unit as a whole as perceived by the employees. The results demonstrated that effectiveness, satisfaction, and extra effort were increased with a transformational style of leadership. The results also showed a negative result in transactional leadership as regressed against the outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction. In general, local governments are believed to be administered in a transactional style (Caiden, 1981), and a comparison of the means clearly indicated that the selected governmental unit is operated in a transactional style.

Table 5 shows the results of the main null hypothesis that was broken down into sub hypotheses so that each dependent outcome variable could be tested against each question independent variable for transformational leadership. The F value, t test and P

(two-tail) significance clearly shows a positive relationship between the outcome dependent variables and the individual independent variables. The tests revealed that some independent variables were stronger than others in their relationship to the dependent variable. The overall research indicates that transformational leadership qualities will enhance the outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness in the tested governmental unit. Table 6 shows the results for transactional leadership using various tests derived from regression analysis. Again, in order to derive a conclusion from the tests, each dependent variable question was regressed against each independent variable question. The results clearly indicate that the dependent variable outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness were negatively affected by transactional leadership. The outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness were clearly lower when the employee viewed the government as transactional in its leadership style.

According to the results of the study, transformational leadership will be beneficial to the leaders of local government in attaining increased employee job satisfaction, effectiveness, and extra effort. This will make the local government more efficient in the delivery of services to the public. The transactional style utilized in local government is inhibiting the potential of the local government to be the best that it can be.

Null hypothesis 2 stated that there will be no difference in the leadership styles of transformational and transactional leadership as related to the organizational culture dimensions of conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organizational clarity, warmth and support, and leadership. This organizational culture test was developed by

Kolb and Osland (1995) in order to rate each dimension. Multivariate tests, as with the first null hypothesis, did not yield conclusive test results. Therefore, the main null hypothesis was subdivided into sub hypotheses for further analysis.. While a few independent variables had strong results, in general the F value, t test, P (two-tail) significance test and the R -squared test all indicated that a relationship could not be determined. This research was a beginning examination of leadership style and organizational culture in local government. Organizational culture is an important component of leadership (Hersey, 2001); therefore, further research into how transformational and transactional leadership impacts a government's organizational culture is warranted.

In the compilation of the descriptive statistics from the regression model, great variation in the means was apparent. Table 8 displays the means for each question used in this research. Those questions relating to transformational leadership generally exhibited a low score, which showed that governmental leaders do not use a transformational leadership style. The means for those questions relating to a transactional type of leadership were generally high. These findings showed that the local governmental leaders tend to use a transactional style. The mean scores for the organizational culture dimension were generally neutral.

Each question on the instrument was an individual variable, either dependent or independent. The conformity variable showed a variance whereby a higher score indicated that conformity is characteristic of the organization. The mean score for this question was 6.60 on a 10-point scale. Therefore, in general, the employees perceived

governmental leaders as being somewhat strong in conformity. The responsibility variable showed a variance whereby a high score indicated emphasis on personal responsibility in the organization. The mean for this question was 6.45, which indicated that the government leans towards personal responsibility. Standards in organization culture were analyzed whereby a high score indicated that the governmental leaders set high standards in the organization. The mean for this variable was 6.66. The final dimension that had a significant score was organizational clarity whereby the higher the score, the more the organization was well organized with clearly defined goals. The results are not a surprise in that government is the classic bureaucratic organization, and these results are consistent with Weber (1958).

Recommendations

Empirical evidence produced in this study indicates transformational leadership can increase the outputs of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness in a government environment. The research showed that county government leaders use a transactional leadership style. Management and leadership training could improve the delivery of government services to the public. Training in transformational leadership could be held at the annual state meetings of the various county elected organizations. This training could also extend to the staff's of the elected officials. This research needs to be replicated in different sections of the country with different government units from different size governments. Many researchers have found the same results, but research in the local government area has been lacking (Suarva, 2002; Wallach, 1988). This study adds to the current body of literature of transformational and transactional leadership, but

the results suggest a need for more research on local government leadership to better understand how transformational leadership can lead to better performance and more productivity. Would studies of other governmental units come to the same conclusions as this study? Would the outcomes of effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction have the same results? Would the transactional outcomes be negative, as was demonstrated by this study?

In a transformational setting, leaders and followers raise themselves to a higher level of performance (Nanus, 1992); this needs to happen in local government. This study confirmed what other studies have found in that higher productivity accrues from transformational leadership in government (Wofford, Whittington, & Goodwin, 2001). Government in general has been thought to be transactional. The transactional style lends itself to rewards and punishments, similar to the behavior theories of B. F. Skinner (1965). What is unique in this study is that it focused on local government and not state and national government.

Substantial correlations were not found between transformational leadership and organizational culture. Organizational culture is an important component of a local government office and needs to be researched in greater detail. The questions researched in this study could not ascertain if there is a relationship between the transformational, transactional, and organizational culture variables. Further research into these questions could provide valuable information as to the how these variables are interrelated.

A comparison of the means in this research clearly indicated that this government unit operated in a transactional style of leadership. This study found strong relationships

between the dependent variables of the extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction, and it also established the validity and reliability of the MLQ in a local government environment. This research focused on the overall leadership and not of any particular office or official. Further research into other government units could offer evidence that the leadership style in use is the transactional style, which does not provide the highest performance. A case study of a government entity that practices transformational leadership could be compared with a government unit that utilizes a transactional approach. Another approach could be to have a pretest/posttest. The pretest would be before the treatment of leadership training and the posttest would be after the training.

Social Significance

There are tens of thousands of local government entities in the United States. Counties, cities, villages, townships, and special districts all need to exhibit the best leadership style possible. Elected and appointed officials come from all walks of life, with very few having any leadership training, yet they are put in charge of numerous employees with the ability to spend the taxpayers dollars in the delivery of services. These elected officials also have a huge impact on social change and are a determining factor in shaping the 21st century, both locally and nationally. Leaders who exhibit transformational leadership can make local government more responsive and efficient. The research clearly showed that the outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness increase with transformational style of leadership. Local elected officials will benefit from training in management and leadership techniques and in understanding

the elements that comprise the different leadership styles so that they can adapt and be responsive to the public.

Globalization not only challenges the private sector to have better leadership but also increases the need for better leadership on a local governmental scale. The significance of transformational leadership in local government was confirmed by the empirical evidence presented in this study. Elected officials and their managers need management leadership training as much or more than their private sector counterparts. The research from this study can be used to inform the electorate and the elected officials that a transformational leadership style can lead to higher effectiveness and extra effort from the employees, and increased satisfaction of the employees in order to provide a higher level of public service.

Concluding Statement

With the public demanding more public services without providing the needed financial resources in many instances, local government must provide the best leadership possible. Responsibilities of local government officials increasingly involve issues not faced in the past. Cultural diversity and global issues now affect local government and are an important aspect of leadership. The research showed that transformational leadership can increase the outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction in the Lee County, Florida, commissioner's office. If this research can be reproduced to show validity, then transformational leadership should be used in county governments throughout the United States. Transformational government leaders can not only

positively influence the beliefs and goals of their employees but also the public. Leaders and followers in the local public sector need to be the best that they can be.

REFERENCES

- Avolio, B. J., Zhu, A., Koh, W., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 25(8), 951-968.
- Babbie, E. (2004). *The practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Thomson-Wadsworth.
- Barnard, C. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1990). *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*, Mind Garden, Inc.
- Bass, B. M. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1985, Winter). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organizational Dynamics*, 26-40.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bingham, R. D., & Felbinger, C. L. (2002). *Evaluation in practice*. New York: Chatham House.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1984). *The managerial grid III*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis*. London: Heinemann.
- Caiden, G. E. (1981). Ethics of public service. *Public Personnel Management*, 10, 146-152.
- CCAO (2006). County Commissioners Association of Ohio. Retrieved April 15, 2006, from www.ccao.org

- Cochran, C. E., Mayer, L. C., Carr, T. R., & Cayer, N. J. (2003). *American public policy*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ, Erlbaum.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R.N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R.N. & Menon, S.T. (2000). Charismatic leadership and follower effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(7), 747-767.
- Counties. (2006). Florida Association of Counties, Retrieved April 15, 2006, from www.fl.counties.com
- Deal, T., & Kennedy, A. (1988). *Corporate cultures*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Dillman, D. A., Sangster, R. L., Tarnai, J., & Rockwood, T. (1996). *Understanding differences in people's answers to telephone and mail surveys*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored design method*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Drucker, P. F. (1993). *Managing for the future*. New York: Truman Talley Books.
- Fayol, H. (1916). *Industrial and general administration*. Paris: Dunod.
- Fiedler, R. R. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gay, L. (1996). *Educational research competencies for analysis and application*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Golembiewski, R. (1994). *Practical public management*. New York: Marcel Decker.
- Gordon, J. R. (2002). *Organizational behavior*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Gujarati, D. N. (2003). *Basic econometrics*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. B., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ, Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Hatch, M. J. (1993). The dynamics of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Review* 18, 657-693.

- Hater, J., & Bass, B. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(4), 695-702.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (2001). *Management of organizational behavior: Leading human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- House, R. J. (1971, September). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 321-338.
- Ihrke, D. (2003). Leadership in organizations. *Encyclopedia of Public Administration and Public Policy*, 710-723.
- Javidan, M., & Waldman, D. A. (2003). Exploring charismatic leadership in the public sector: Measurement and consequences. *Public Administration Review*, 63(2), 229-242.
- Judy, R. W., & D'Amico, C. (1999). *Workforce 2020*. Indianapolis: Hudson Institute.
- Jung, D. I. (2001). Transformational and transactional leadership and their effects on creativity in groups. *Creativity Research Journal*, 13(2), 185-195.
- Kahn, R., & Katz, D. (1960). *Leadership practices in relation to productivity and morale*. Elmsford, NY: Row Paterson.
- Keller, R. T. (1992, September). Transformational leadership and the performance of research and development project groups. *Journal of Management*, 489-501.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E.A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits really matter. *Academy of Management Executive*, 48-60.
- Kolb, D., Osland, J., & Rubin, I. (1995). *Organizational behavior: An experimental approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kotter, J. P., & Schlesinger, L.A. (1979). Choosing strategies for change. *Harvard Business Review*, 106-114.
- Lewin, K., & Lippitt, R. (1938). An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy: A preliminary note. *Sociometry*, 1, 292-300.
- Maslow, A. H. (1948). Some theoretical consequences of basic need-gratification. *Journal of Personality*, 16(16), 402-416.

- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nanus, B. (1992). *Visionary leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Northouse, P. G. (2000). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ouchi, W. G. (1981). *Theory Z*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Parker, M. (2000). *Organizational culture and identity*. London: Sage Publications.
- Parry, K., & Proctor-Thompson, S. (2003). Leadership, culture and performance: The case of the New Zealand public sector. *Journal of Change Management*, 3(4), 376-391.
- Peters, T., & Waterman, R. (1982). *In search of excellence*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Rada, D. R. (1999, Summer-Fall). Transformational leadership and urban renewal. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 18-25.
- Riggio, R. E., & Orr, S. S. (2004). *Organization and leadership in non-profit organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Robbins, S. D., & Coulter, M. (2005). *Management*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership: A dynamic view*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schultz, M. (1995). *On studying organizational cultures: Diagnosis and understanding*. New York: DeGruyter.
- Seligman, L. G. (1950). The study of political leadership. *The American Political Science Review*, 44(4), 904-915.
- Simon, H. A. (1960). *The new science of management decisions*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Skinner, B. F. (1965). *Science and human behavior*. New York: Free Press.

- Sosik, J., & Potosky, D. (2002). Adaptive self regulations: Meeting others' expectations of leadership and performance. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 142*(2), 211-232.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology, 25*, 35-71.
- Stogdill, R. H., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. (Research Monograph number 88). Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research.
- Suvara, J. H. (2002). Executive leadership in local government. *Encyclopedia of Public Administration and Public Policy, 474-479*.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *Principles of scientific management*. New York: Harper.
- Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 9*(1), 2-20.
- Vasu, M. L., Stewart, D. W., & Garson, G. D. (1998). *Organizational behavior and public management*. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.
- Wallach, P. H. (1988). Political leadership. *The Journal of Politics, 50*(4), 1091-1095.
- Weber, M. (1958). *Bureaucracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wofford, J. C., Whittington, J. & Goodwin, V. (2001). Follower motive patterns as situational moderators for transformational leadership effectiveness. *Journal of Management Issues, 13*(2), 196-207.
- Yammarino, F., & Bass, B. (1990). Transformational leadership at multiple levels of analysis. *Human Relations, 43*, 975-995.
- Yammarino, F. J., Spangler, W. D., & Bass, B. M. (1993). Transformational leadership and performance: A longitudinal investigation. *Leadership Quarterly 4*(1), 81-102.
- Yuki, G. A. (1989). *Leaders in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

APPENDIX A: SURVEY

For each of the seven organizational culture dimensions described, place a circle around the number that indicates your assessment of the organization's actual position on that dimension.

1. **Conformity.** The feeling that there are many externally imposed constraints in the organization: the degrees to which members feel that there are many rules, procedures, policies and practices to which they have to conform rather than able to do their work as they see fit. Lowest number: Conformity is not characteristic of the organization. Highest number: Conformity is very characteristic of this organization.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

2. **Responsibility.** Members of the organization are given personal responsibility to achieve their part of the organization's goals: the degree to which the members feel that they can make decisions and solve problems without checking with superiors each step of the way. Lowest number: No responsibility is given in the organization. Highest number: There is a great emphasis on personal responsibility in the organization.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

3. **Standards.** The emphasis the organization places on quality performance and outstanding production, including the degree to which members feel the organization is setting challenging goals for itself and communicating these goal commitments to members. Lowest number: Standards are very low or nonexistent in the organization. Highest number: High challenging standards are set in the organization.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

4. **Rewards.** The degree to which members feel that they are being recognized and rewarded for good work rather than being ignored, criticized or punished when something goes wrong. Lowest number: Members are ignored, punished or criticized. Highest number: Members are recognized and rewarded positively.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

5. **Organizational Clarity.** The feeling among members that things are well organized and that goals are clearly defined rather than being disorderly, confused, or chaotic. Lowest number: No organizational goals. Highest number: The organization is well organized with clearly defined goals.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

6. **Warmth and support.** The feeling that friendliness is a valued norm in the organization, that members trust one another and offer support to one another. The feeling that good relationships prevail in the work environment. Lowest number: There is no warmth and support in the organization. Highest number: Warmth and support are very characteristic of the organization.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

7. **Leadership.** The willingness of organization members to accept leadership and direction from qualified others. As need for leadership arise, members feel free to take leadership roles and are rewarded for successful leadership. Leadership is based on expertise. The organization is not dominated, or dependent on, one or two individuals. Lowest number: Leadership is not rewarded; members are dominated or dependent and resist leadership attempts. Highest number: Members accept and reward leadership based on expertise.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

APPENDIX B: MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRERATER FORM

NAME OF LEADER _____ DATE _____

ORGANIZATION ID# _____ LEADER ID# _____

This questionnaire is used to describe the leadership style of the above-mentioned individual as you perceive it. Answer all the items of this answer sheet. **If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.** Please answer this questionnaire anonymously.

Important (necessary for processing). Which best describes you?

___ I am at a higher organizational level than the person I am rating.
 ___ The person that I am rating is at my organizational level.
 ___ I am at a lower organizational level than the person I am rating.
 ___ Other than the above.

Descriptive statements (45) are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits the person you are describing. Use the following rating scale:

Not at all	Once in a While	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4

The Person I Am Rating . . .

- 1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts.....0 1 2 3 4
- 2. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate.0 1 2 3 4
- 3. Fails to interfere until problems become serious.....0 1 2 3 4
- 4. Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards..0 1 2 3 4
- 5. Avoids getting involved when important issues arise.0 1 2 3 4
- 6. Talks about his/her most important values and beliefs.....0 1 2 3 4
- 7. Is absent when needed.....0 1 2 3 4
- 8. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems.....0 1 2 3 4
- 9. Talks optimistically about the future.....0 1 2 3 4
- 10. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her.....0 1 2 3 4

Not at all 0	Once in a While 1	Sometimes 2	Fairly often 3	Frequently, if not always 4
-----------------	-------------------------	----------------	-------------------	-----------------------------------

11. Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets.0 1 2 3 4
12. Waits for things to go wrong before taking action.....0 1 2 3 4
13. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished.0 1 2 3 4
14. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.0 1 2 3 4
15. Spends time teaching and coaching.....0 1 2 3 4
16. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved.....0 1 2 3 4
17. Shows that he/she is a firm believer in “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.”0 1 2 3 4
18. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group.....0 1 2 3 4
19. Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of group.....0 1 2 3 4
20. Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action.....0 1 2 3 4
21. Acts in ways that builds my respect.....0 1 2 3 4
22. Concentrates full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints and failures.....0 1 2 3 4
23. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.....0 1 2 3 4
24. Keeps track of all mistakes.....0 1 2 3 4
25. Displays a sense of power and confidence.....0 1 2 3 4
26. Articulates a compelling vision of the future.....0 1 2 3 4
27. Directs my attention toward failures to meet standards.....0 1 2 3 4
28. Avoids making decisions.....0 1 2 3 4
29. Considers me as having different needs, abilities and aspirations from others.....0 1 2 3 4
30. Gets me to look at problems from many different angles.....0 1 2 3 4
31. Helps me to develop my strengths.....0 1 2 3 4
32. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments.....0 1 2 3 4
33. Delays responding to urgent questions.....0 1 2 3 4
34. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission.....0 1 2 3 4
35. Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations.....0 1 2 3 4

Not at all	Once in a While	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4

36. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved.....0 1 2 3 4
37. Is effective in meeting my job-related needs.....0 1 2 3 4
38. Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying.....0 1 2 3 4
39. Gets me to do more than I expected to do.....0 1 2 3 4
40. Is effective in representing me to higher authority.....0 1 2 3 4
41. Works with me in a satisfactory way.....0 1 2 3 4
42. Heightens my desire to succeed.....0 1 2 3 4
43. Is effective in meeting organizational requirements.....0 1 2 3 4
44. Increases my willingness to try harder.....0 1 2 3 4
45. Leads a group that is effective.....0 1 2 3 4

APPENDIX C: PERMISSION TO USE – DR. JOYCE OSLAND

"osland, joyce" <osland_j@cob.sjsu.edu>
[\[ADD TO ADDRESS BOOK\]](#)

<raykest@comcast.net>

RE: survey

Tue, 28 Feb 2006 18:42:08 +0000

You're welcome to use it but I don't think it's been validated. If you're doing serious research, you may need to find a different instrument. Check out Dan Denison's survey.
Good luck,
J.

-----Original Message-----

From: <http://mailcenter2.comcast.net/wmc/v/wm/44870A0E000472A5000072FC22058860149B9C0A05970E9D?cm>
[mailto:<http://mailcenter2.comcast.net/wmc/v/wm/44870A0E000472A5000072FC22058860149B9C0A05970E9D?cm>]
Sent: Tuesday, February 28, 2006 9:02 AM
To: osland, joyce
Cc: Lilburn P. Hoehn
Subject: survey

Dr. Osland: In addition to using the survey requested in the prior e mail, I would like to know if you have information concerning the validity and reliability of the seven dimension organizational culture survey that was used in your 1995 edition of Organizational behavior: an experimental approach.

Thank you for your consideration.
Ray Kest, MBA, CPA

INBOX: Email 23 of 23

Move to Folder



APPENDIX D: PERMISSION TO USE – DR. ROBERT MOST

Ray,
Thank you for asking about making a copy for your proposal.
Yes, you can copy it for your proposal.
I hope this meets your needs
Robb most

Robert Most, Ph.D.
Mind Garden, Inc.
650 322-6300
<http://www.mindgarden.com/>

"The problems that exist in the world today
cannot be solved by the level of thinking
that created them." --Albert Einstein

APPENDIX E: RAY KEST INTRODUCTION LETTER

RAY KEST, MBA, CPA
9321 Spring Run Blvd. #2905
Bonita Springs, Fl. 34135
Ph. 239-992-3009
Cell: 239-777-8943
e-mail: raykest@comcast.net

Dear Lee County Employee:

I am a doctoral student doing research on leadership. You have been selected at random to participate in a study of local government leadership. Your name and address, which is a public record, was provided to me by the Lee County Human Resources Director, Dinah Lewis.

Your response will be strictly confidential and there is no possibility of anyone knowing who responded because your name will not be on the returned survey. The survey is in two parts, one with 45 responses and the other with 7 responses. The survey will take only about 15 minutes of your time but will provide valuable information as to the leadership in local government offices.

You should answer the questions as you perceive the local government as a whole and just not your perceptions of your immediate supervisor. Please return the completed surveys in the self-addressed, stamped envelope that was provided.

Sincerely,

Ray Kest

APPENDIX F: CONSENT FORM

CONSENT FORM

Transformational Leadership and its Outcomes in a Local Government

You are invited to participate in a research study of local government leadership. You were selected as a possible participant due to your employment with the Lee County Commissioners office. Please read this form and ask any questions you may have before acting on this invitation to be in the study.

This study is being conducted by Ray Kest, a doctoral candidate at Walden University.

Background Information:

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the style of leadership and its outcomes in a local government.

Procedures:

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to answer the two questionnaires enclosed and mail back in the self addressed stamped envelope.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the Lee County Commissioners. If you initially decide to participate, you are still free to withdraw at any time later without affecting those relationships.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study:

There are no risks associated with participating in this study and there are no short or long-term benefits to participating in this study.

In the event you experience stress or anxiety during your participation in the study you may terminate your participation at any time. You may refuse to answer any questions you consider invasive or stressful.

Compensation:

There will be no compensation provided for your participation in this study.

Confidentiality:

The records of this study will be kept private. In any report of this study that might be published, the researcher will not include any information that will make it possible to identify you. Research records will be kept in a locked file and only the researcher will have access to the records.

Contacts and Questions:

The researcher conducting this study is Ray Kest. The researcher's faculty advisor is Lil Hoehn; e-mail lhoehn@waldenu.edu. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you may contact him via the e-mail address. The Research Participant

Advocate at Walden University is Leilani Endicott, you may contact her at 1-800-925-3368, extension 1210, if you have questions about your participation in this study.

You will receive a copy of this form from the researcher.

Statement of Consent:

I agree to the terms of the consent form by returning the surveys in the provided envelope.

APPENDIX H: CURRICULUM VITAE

Curriculum Vitae

Ray Thomas Kest

Bonita Springs, FL.

Employment:

2006 – Present Professor of Business Administration, International College, Naples, FL.

2005 – Present Adjunct Professor, Colorado Technical College On-line

1985 – 2004 Treasurer, Lucas County, Ohio

2002 – 2003 Adjunct Professor of Accounting, Cleveland State University

1985 – 1997 Adjunct Professor of Accounting, University of Toledo

1978 – 1985 Commissioner, Lucas County, Ohio

1975 – 1978 Toledo City Councilman

1972 – 1975 Staff Accountant, Ernst & Ernst CPA's, Toledo, Ohio

1971 - 1977 United States Army Reserves

Education:

1967 - 1968 Miami of Ohio, major business administration

1968 -1971 University of Toledo, BBA 1971, major business administration

1974 – 1978 University of Toledo, MBA 1978, major finance

2002 – 2003 pursuing Ph.D. in urban affairs, Cleveland State University

2004 – Present Walden University, pursuing Ph.D. in Applied Management and Decision Sciences