

What are we Missing?:

A qualitative look at leadership, vision and culture in for-profit and nonprofit organizations

Kathleen Short Saunders

University of Tennessee at Knoxville

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	4
Chapter 1	
Introduction.....	5
Rationale.....	6
Chapter 2	
Literature Review.....	8
Leadership.....	8
Idealized Influence	
Individualized Consideration	
Intellectual Stimulation	
Leadership and Culture.....	11
Culture Type	
Linking Culture Type to Leadership	
Culture and Effectiveness	
Leadership and Vision.....	15
Vision and Culture	
Statement of the Problem.....	18
Chapter 3	
Method.....	20
Participants.....	20
Instrumentation.....	21
Chapter 4	
Analysis and Findings.....	24
Analysis.....	24
Leadership	
Culture	
Vision	
Findings.....	48
For-profit.....	48
Nonprofit.....	49
Chapter 5	
Discussion.....	49
Leadership.....	49
Culture.....	50
Vision.....	50
Leadership and Vision.....	50
Comparisons.....	52
Servant-leadership.....	52
Organizational Change and Phasing Out.....	53
Chapter 6	
Conclusion and Future Research.....	54
Conclusion.....	54
Future Research.....	54
Limitations.....	55

Implications for Leadership Training.....	55
Appendix A.....	57
References.....	59

Abstract

Leaders are an integral part of every group and their influence often contributes to the overall success or failure of an organization. Taking into account the literature on transformational leadership, organizational culture and communication of vision, this study sought to examine how leaders enact these three ideas and make recommendations for improving leadership training in a way that creates more effective leaders across all organizations. Interviews with 16 respected leaders in the community of a mid-sized southern city revealed a relationship between a neglect of the transformational quality of intellectual stimulation and a deficiency in the vision characteristic of specifying goals and measures. Also, in the interviews leaders across organization types and cultures referenced the themes of enacting servant-leadership and attempting to phase out of the organization. Thus according to these results, leadership training literature can be enhanced by increasing the focus on demonstrating intellectual stimulation and specifying a vision. Through showing leaders how to demonstrate servant-leadership and create a sustainable organization by preparing to phase out, training materials can become more practical for the leaders themselves and more effective in helping them achieve their organizational goals.

Chapter 1

Introduction

The world of leadership research is vast in its scope as many scholars attempt to discover the secrets behind what makes a great leader in a given context. Through study and practical experience, many recognize the integral part a leader plays in any group, but especially in a formal organization. The idea has been studied from several angles, from organizational outcomes to personality traits and many extremely helpful strategies for discovering or becoming a leader have emerged. Much of this research has entered the practical realm through non-academic books and inspirational conference speakers. In 1985, Bernard Bass wrote a pivotal book on this topic titled *Leadership Beyond Expectations*. In this great work, he outlined the idea of transformational leadership in which the leader and the employee are both empowered to perform at their highest potential. The transformational leadership theory has guided research in leadership since it hit the press nearly 30 years.

A leader communicates many things in his or her interactions with followers, and among those are vision and organizational culture. Embedded within the theory of transformational leadership is the idea of vision. Similar to leadership theory, scholars have attempted to discover what constitutes an exceptional vision and how it can be communicated through leaders to employees. Vision is only one way messages are communicated to employees, and by creating a specific organizational culture leaders communicate strong messages to their employees about what they value and desire to emphasize in the organization(Chatman & Cha, 2003; Davis, 1984; Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006; Sarros, Cooper & Santora, 2008; Schein, 1985). Since these two concepts are central to how leadership is enacted in organizations, it is important to study them in detail in a way that provides insight for future leaders to communicate both vision and culture

effectively in their organizations.

These three ideas -- leadership, culture, and vision – are so integral to the way an organization operates that leaders and those who train leaders need to be made aware of all the nuances that make up these themes. In the current study, the researcher attempts to shed light on how the three concepts are enacted by leaders to provide some guidance for future research and leadership training. The goal is that organizations may become as effective as possible in reaching their goals through the excellent leadership of those in authority over them. Interviews with respected leaders in a community were coded for the transformational leadership qualities of idealized influence/inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation; the organizational cultures of clan, hierarchy, adhocracy, and market; and the excellent vision characteristics of future orientation, employee involvement, specificity, and value. With interviews from leaders in both the for-profit and nonprofit sectors, comparisons and contrasts could be made between the leaders of different organizational types. The analysis provided for several themes and connections that give a detailed look at which qualities leaders tend to lack and how training can be enhanced to address these areas.

Rationale

The effectiveness of the leader of an organization is integrally tied to how the organization functions. The most effective leader, according to research, is a transformational leader (Bass, 1985). These leaders exhibit transformational leadership through enacting idealized influence/inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation (Bass, 1985; Bass, 1999; Oke, Munshi & Walumbwa, 2009). Practically, as leaders enact transformational leadership in these characteristics, they also influence the organizations by creating a culture and articulating a vision (Baum, Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1998; Chatman & Cha,

2003; Davis, 1984; Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006; Sarros, Cooper & Santora, 2008; Schein, 1985). The organizational cultures that they create can be divided into four types according to the literature: clan, adhocracy, hierarchy and market (Cameron & Quinn, 1999; Masood, Dani, Burns & Backhouse, 2006; Smart & St. John, 2006). Although no systematic categorization of vision dimensions is in the current literature, in order to study the way that the leaders enact their vision the researcher drew concepts from the existing literature to create the four dimensions of effective visions: future orientation, employee involvement, specificity and defense of value (Berson, et al, 2001; Sosik & Dinger, 2007; Strange & Mumford, 2002).

Since leaders are central to the functioning of the organization, it is essential to understand how their leadership is enacted both for the organizations themselves, but also for the development of future leaders. By discovering how specific leaders enact transformational leadership, create culture and articulate vision through specific the specific dimensions of each idea mentioned previously, practical leadership training can be enhanced to provide insight into how to become a more effective leader in any industry. Leadership training is in abundance, but a study of how leaders both enact and fail to enact transformational leadership, culture and vision can provide the means by which these materials can be enhanced.

Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

The literature concerning leadership, culture, and vision demonstrates their importance in how an organization functions as a whole. Research has focused on all areas of leadership including its characteristics, its effectiveness, the employee and organizational performance related to it, and a leader's personal influence. The relationship between leadership and culture has also been prominent in the literature. Leaders are often considered a central influence on culture, which in turn is a critical factor in how an organization functions. Organizational culture is a shared social knowledge about prevalent rules, norms or values that shape the preferences or actions of the participants (Tsui, Zhang, Wang, Xin & Wu, 2006). These norms and values can greatly impact the effectiveness and quality of an organization. Vision on the other hand, is almost exclusively articulated by the leaders themselves. Although some employee involvement may be present in the defining of an organization's vision, the leader is the one who ultimately decides on and articulates that vision. This mission statement, set of values, or general idea is the basis for why the organization functions as it does and where it will be in the future. The literature on this subject has sought to discover how visions are articulated as well as the aspects present in visions that make them effective.

Leadership

The effects of leadership, both high quality and low quality are felt throughout the organization. Due to their importance, leaders have been studied in a variety of different ways for many decades. Waldman & Yammarino (1999) propose that the effects of charismatic leadership are felt even by employees separated by several hierarchical levels because the leader is able to form relationships with a subset of subordinates who then communicate the leader's message and

mission (Waldman & Yammarino, 1999). Inspirational relationships between leaders and their followers will result in heightened team cohesion and effort, especially when the external environment seems volatile, and foster performance even at lower levels of the organization (Waldman & Yammarino, 1999). Therefore, leadership is essential to understanding the way an organization works.

Transformational leadership, a subcategory of leadership research as well as the construct generally accepted as highly effective leadership, has three dimensions that are examined in the current study (Bass, 1985). A meta-analysis conducted by Lowe and Galen in 1996 of 39 transformational leadership studies supported the belief that transformational leadership is associated with work unit effectiveness. A second meta-analysis was conducted in 2000 of 62 correlational estimates of the linkages between transformational leadership and organizational factors (DeGroot, Kiker & Cross). They found that transformational qualities, especially charisma, have a strong effect on leader effectiveness (DeGroot, Kiker & Cross, 2000). The dimensions analyzed presently are idealized influence/inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation. Although they are considered essential parts of transformational leadership, very little research has been done on each quality individually. They have been defined individually and studied as a whole.

Idealized Influence/Inspirational Motivation. Oke, Munshi & Walumbwa (2009) define idealized influence as the extent to which followers hold a leader in high regard and seek to identify with him or her, as well as how leaders demonstrate this by acting as role models and considering needs of others above their own (Oke, Munshi & Walumbwa, 2009). They go on to define inspirational motivation as the extent to which leaders are able to motivate and inspire their followers by giving new opportunities, providing challenges and identifying a strong vision

for the future. Enthusiasm, optimism, and the ability to communicate realistic expectations are important parts of inspirational motivation (Oke, Munshi & Walumbwa, 2009). Bass (1999) combines the two ideas, as the researcher does in the current study, in a review of two decades of transformational leadership research. He says the inspirational motivation and idealized influence occur when a leader envisions a desirable future, articulates how it can be reached, sets an example to be followed, sets high standards of performance, and shows determination or confidence (Bass, 1999).

Individualized Consideration. Leaders who exhibit the quality of individualized consideration focus on followers' need for achievement, development, growth, and support (Oke, Munshi & Walumbwa, 2009). These leaders engage in coaching and mentoring, create new learning opportunities, and value diversity (Oke, Munshi & Walumbwa, 2009). Another definition of this quality is that leaders who display individualized consideration pay attention to followers' developmental needs, support and coach their progress, and delegate assignments as opportunities for growth (Bass, 1999).

Intellectual Stimulation. A leader's ability to challenge followers to re-examine some of their assumptions and encourage innovation and creativity through imagination, intellectual curiosity and novel approaches is intellectual stimulation (Oke, Munshi & Walumbwa, 2009). Bass (1999) says intellectual stimulation is simply when leader helps followers to become more innovative and creative.

Leadership and Culture

Researchers have defined organizational culture as shared social knowledge about prevalent rules, norms or values that shape the preferences or actions of the participants (Tsui, Zhang, Wang, Xin & Wu, 2006). Throughout the literature, leaders have been identified as key

sources of influence on organizational culture (Davis, 1984; Schein, 1985; Chatman & Cha, 2003; Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006; Sarros, Cooper & Santora, 2008). Waldman & Yammarino's (1999) work on charismatic leadership (another label for transformational leadership in the literature) demonstrates that transformational leaders will influence culture through the use of organizational stories, rites and rituals, symbols, slogans, logos and other cultural elements. The leader can set the tone, atmosphere and philosophy of the organization, all contributing to its overall culture (Waldman & Yammarino, 1999). This is especially important when organizations are undergoing periods of change because communication and a transparent change process are central to the organization's success after the change (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006). A leader is an essential part of how this communication and these interactions occur (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006).

Jaskyte conducted an exploratory study in 2004 of nonprofit human service organizations in South Carolina and Florida that connected transformational leadership, organizational culture and innovativeness in nonprofit organizations. The aspects of organizational culture specifically examined were consensus, structure and values (Jaskyte, 2004). According to the study, transformational leadership is positively correlated with the team orientation value of the employees (Jaskyte, 2004). Specifically, the transformational attributes of encouraging the heart (part of idealized influence, in the current study) and enabling others to act (part of intellectual stimulation in the current study) were significantly correlated with this team orientation dimension (Jaskyte, 2004). In a theory proposal of leadership effects on enterprise resource planning implementation through fostering organizational culture, Kei & Wei (2008) assert that the top management team's citizenship behavior relates to tolerance for conflicts; their power sharing behavior relates to a pattern of power-sharing; their inquisitive behavior relates to

knowledge sharing and learning in the organization; and the setting up of a learning structure relates to comprehensive communication between employees (Kei & Wei, 2008). The two also propose that with a knowledge of how to influence followers, leaders are able to influence culture by transforming the operation from employee individualism to collectivism and value-orientation (Kei & Wei, 2008). Tsui, et al, (2006) discovered that organizational culture is a result of institutional forces and processes, some of which exist independent of the leader while others can be created or molded by the leader or founder. Both leaders and followers are a part of the conceptualization of culture because although head leaders are the primary sources, transmitters and maintainers of organizational culture, people within the organization often produce their own implicit theories on how the organization operates (Tsui, et al, 2006).

Culture Types. The literature on organizational culture has laid out four distinct culture types by which to categorize organizations. These types are: hierarchy, market, adhocracy, and clan (Smart & St. John, 2006; Cameron & Quinn, 1999; Masood, Dani, Burns & Backhouse, 2006). Smart & St. John (1996) defined the culture types in their test of the culture type and strong culture hypotheses in higher education. They set out to test the link between organizational culture and effectiveness in four-year colleges and universities. The researchers defined bureaucracies (hierarchies in the current study) as organizations in which there is internal positioning, short-term orientation, and an emphasis on stability, control and predictability (Smart & St. John, 1996). Leaders of bureaucracies are coordinators and organizers who create rules and policies as bonding mechanisms for the organization (Smart & St. John, 1996). Markets, according to the study, also value stability, control and predictability, but are externally positioned with a long-term orientation that focuses on competitive actions and achievements (Smart & St. John, 1996). The study defines clan cultures as those that exhibit flexibility,

individuality, spontaneity and a short-term focus where leaders are mentors or facilitators who emphasize loyalty, tradition, human resources and cohesion (Smart & St. John, 1996). Adhocracy cultures in the study were those that emphasize spontaneity, flexibility, and individuality with external positioning and long term focus whose leaders are entrepreneurs and innovators and desire innovation, development and growth (Smart & St. John, 1996).

Masood and colleagues (2006) conducted research on the leaders and followers of three manufacturing companies in Pakistan to discover the link between transformational leadership and organizational culture. They defined hierarchies as organizations that are formalized and structured where leaders are coordinators and organizers and smooth-running processes are important (Masood, et al, 2006). Hierarchies were also defined as places where stability, predictability and efficiency are emphasized, formal rules and policies are put in place, and hierarchical levels of leadership are present (Masood, et al, 2006). Markets in the study were defined as being oriented to the external environment and results as well as emphasizing winning and the achieving of stretch goals with a clear strategy for success (Masood, et al, 2006). Also, the leaders of market cultures were seen as competitors and producers who focus out-pacing the competition and leading the market (Masood, et al, 2006). The researchers defined clans as those cultures in which the organization operated like a family that values teamwork, commitment, and employee involvement to achieve high cohesion, morale and loyalty (Masood, et al, 2006). Leaders were described as mentors who determine success on the basis of the internal environment and concern for people (Masood, et al, 2006). Adhocracy cultures were defined as dynamic, entrepreneurial, and creative where leaders are visionaries and innovators who emphasize growth and the acquisition of new resources as well as producing new products or services (Masood, et al, 2006).

Linking Culture Type and Transformational Leadership. Using transformational leadership theory, situational strength and Organizational Culture Assessment Index questionnaires, researchers concluded that 95% of leaders prefer adhocracy or clan cultures (Masood, et al, 2006). Strong & St. John (1996), however find that there is no one best culture type, but rather different cultures are related to higher performance on different effectiveness dimensions. They also found that clan cultures *were* the most common and preferred in higher education (Smart & St. John, 1996).

Culture and Effectiveness. Denison & Mishra (1995) in attempting to articulate a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness, show evidence for four cultural traits and their relationships to effectiveness. These traits are involvement, consistency, adaptability and mission (Denison & Mishra, 1995). Through interviews with organizational members and a questionnaire developed along the four traits, they found that all four showed a significant positive relationship with organizational effectiveness (Denison & Mishra, 1995). Specifically, they found that high involvement made organizations more effective because it fostered a strong sense of psychological ownership and commitment to the organization and its goals (Denison & Mishra, 1995). In a chapter for the *Next Generation Business Series: Leadership* written by Chatman & Cha (2003), the authors propose several ways in which a leader creates an ideal culture for success. They suggest not only that a leader use culture instead of rules to motivate employees, but also that when an organization creates a culture in which there is high commitment to the values, then it leads them to success (Chatman & Cha, 2003).

Leadership and Vision

Organizational visions have been the subject of much research over the past two decades and the definitions for the term are in abundance. Vision has been defined as an ideal that

represents or reflects the shared values to which the organization should aspire. (House & Shamir, 1993). Bennis & Nanus (1985) define it as the projected mental image of the products, services and organization that a business leader wants to achieve. Others say it is an idealized goal state to be achieved in the future, and still more say it is an image of the future that articulates the values, purposes and identity of followers (Conger, 1999; Boal & Bryson, 1988). With a focus on follower actions, Strange & Mumford (2002) define vision as a set of beliefs about how people should act and interact to attain some idealized future state.

Articulating an effective vision despite its varied conceptions is an essential part of transformational leadership and the second focus of the current study (Baum, Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1998). Waldman & Yammarino (1999) in the article mentioned in the preceding sections assert that charismatic leadership, even at a hierarchical distance from the employee is a function of symbolic behaviors, such as articulating vision, creating sagas, and storytelling. Baum and colleagues (1998) studied vision and its communication within 183 entrepreneur-CEO and employee pairs and evaluated visions based on seven characteristics: brevity, clarity, abstractness, challenge, future orientation, stability and ability to inspire. They were one of the first scholars to discover that visions have organization-level effects and can influence venture growth (Baum, Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1998). They noted that performance is influenced directly through vision and indirectly through vision communication (Baum, Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1998).

Strange & Mumford (2002) conducted a study about a decade ago on leadership and vision content in which they coded biographies of 60 notable leaders for charismatic (or transformational) behaviors and historical outcomes. They differentiate between ideological and charismatic leadership on the basis of differences in their vision. Charismatic leaders were found

to focus on social needs while ideological leaders embrace personal values (Strange & Mumford, 2002). The researchers conclude that a good vision is one that provides personal meaning for the leader and interpersonal meaning with respect to the followers, or for the current study, provide for high employee involvement in the vision (Strange & Mumford, 2002). The pair also suggest that charismatic leaders stress the need for change and articulate a better future through that change, the optimistic future dimension of visions in the current study (Strange & Mumford, 2002).

In 1996, Kirkpatrick & Locke studied charismatic leadership as it is communicated through vision in the context of students being motivated by a leader. The components of the study were vision, vision implementation and communication style, and they acquired professional actors to enact different combinations of these factors to the classroom participants (Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1996). The researchers found that visions were strongly related to attitudes, and that the leader's vision affects employee performance to the extent that they inspire followers to set specific goals, the specificity dimension in the current study (Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1996). Task cues were also significant determinants of performance and are represented in the specificity dimension in the current study as well (Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1996).

Berson, Shamir, Avolio & Popper (2001) conducted a study in which they asked leaders to formulate a vision statement during a two three-day leadership conference to discover the links between vision, leadership and context. The findings of the study, which included almost exclusively non-profit organizations, were that optimism and confidence are the two most salient themes of strong visions, and that passive leadership negatively correlates with vision themes (Berson, et al, 2001). Additionally, the researchers discovered that an organization's size was negatively related to vision themes, but proposed that these leaders may feel less capable of

articulating a strong vision because they feel they have less influence in the organization (Berson, et al, 2001).

Sosik & Dinger (2007) created a fourteen-week leadership development course at the end of which they asked 183 corporate leaders to craft vision statements for a university alumni association. They measured personal attributes, need for social power, need for social approval, self-monitoring, ratings of leadership and vision content (Sosik & Dinger, 2007). The researchers found that leaders who showed inspirational motivation and idealized influence (combined in the current study) but not intellectual stimulation positively correlated with inspirational vision themes and negatively related to instrumental vision themes (Sosik & Dinger, 2007).

When organizations undergo change, the need for a new vision is apparent (Farmer, Slater & Wright, 1998). In a longitudinal study of an organization undergoing leadership change to determine the relationship between shared vision and communication activities, scholars found a significant relationship between the two concepts (Farmer, Slater & Wright, 1998). They also discovered that employees who are more informed about the leader's vision are more likely to agree with it (Farmer, Slater & Wright, 1998). The implications are that communication professionals should help leaders craft messages about organizational values and emphasize the communication process for its importance to achieving goals (Farmer, Slater & Wright, 1998).

Vision and Culture. Visions also play a distinct role in shaping culture (Bass, 1985; Jaskyte, 2004). CEOs and founders who are cultural leaders have been found to be charismatic, dynamic and have a vision (Tsui, et al, 2006). Sarros and colleagues (2008) examined how transformational leadership affected innovation in performance-oriented cultures for over a thousand managers (market cultures in the current study). They found that those leaders who articulated a vision clearly had strong correlations to high organizational innovation and to

competitive, performance cultures (Sarros, et al, 2008).

Statement of the Problem

Leadership, vision and culture have been studied from many angles, and although this is helpful it can cause confusion for those who wish to develop leadership training materials for the non-academic community. These materials are widely available for leaders of all organizations through books and conferences, but can provide a variety of confusing and sometimes contradicting information. Although the authors address many critical issues in these books and manuals, these materials need to be enhanced through an understanding of the things real leaders fail to enact on a regular basis.

The previous research gives strong support to the transformational leadership hypothesis and its characteristics – intellectual stimulation, idealized influence, and individualized consideration – so examining how leaders enact these qualities is essential. Another essential investigation is how these leaders communicate the vision they have for the group. These visions guide both culture and performance and are often integral to the success of the organization. Studying the ways in which leaders lack strong visions can provide practical insight for leaders who desire to become more effective.

The current study uses interviews with key leaders in a specific community to discover how they enact or fail to enact transformational leadership and vision qualities across culture and organizational types. Through better understanding how both non-profit and for-profit leaders within various types of culture enact these things, training materials can be enhanced to help leaders in areas that tend to be neglected. If specific characteristics within each category are deficient, leadership literature should focus on these elements and provide avenues for leaders to improve their performance on both the personal and organizational level. Therefore, the research

questions that guide the current study are as follows:

R1: What are the ways that leaders enact and fail to enact transformational leadership qualities?

R2: What are the ways that leaders communicate and fail to communicate excellent visions?

R3: How do leaders within various cultures and organization types enact transformational leadership and vision?

Chapter 3

Method

Participants

The researcher conducted interviews with sixteen individuals who were leaders of organizations in the corporate and non-profit settings. Interviewers were obtained through recommendations, and all individuals were considered by their peers to be good leaders. The industries in which these participants conducted their business were as follows: engineering (2), financial (2), developing (1), manufacturing (1), restaurant ownership/franchising (2), and non-profit (8). The following are the exact job descriptions of the leaders and their tenure at the organization about which they were interviewed.

Mr. A: Founder, Owner and CEO of an Engineering Consulting Company for 18 years

Mr. B: Manager of Commercial Banking at a Local Bank for 4 years

Mr. C: Director of Quality and Regulatory Affairs and Director of a Business Unit in a Medical Engineering Company for 10 years and 3 years, consecutively.

Mr. D: Vice President of a Developing Corporation for 15 years

Mr. E: Manager of a \$100 million/year sales arm of a Manufacturing Company for 33 years

Mr. F: Executive Director for 6 years of a community-wide, faith-based Nonprofit Organization

Mr. G: Executive Director for 21 years of an Urban Youth Outreach Nonprofit Organization

Mr. H: Lead Pastor for 10 years at a Protestant Church

Mr. J: Founder and President for 16 years of a Nonprofit Organization that Facilitates Donations

Mrs. K: Co-chair of the Volunteer Structure for 3 years at a Hospital

Mr. L: Area Director for 10 years of a Community-Wide Youth Nonprofit Organization

Mr. M: President for 18 years of an Umbrella Nonprofit Organization

Mr. N: Founder and Central Investment Officer for 10 years of a Financial Institution

Mr. O: Founder and President starting 20 years ago of a Restaurant Franchising Group

Mr. P: Restaurant Owner for 8 years

Mr. Q: Clinical Manager for three years in a Large Hospital

Instrumentation

The participants were asked questions from one researcher. The outline of these questions can be found in Appendix A. The interviews lasted between 10 and 60 minutes, depending on the length of the participant's responses. They were recorded with a voice recorder in various settings including offices, restaurants and coffee shops. The interviews were then analyzed for transformational leadership qualities, organizational culture, and vision characteristics.

The analysis was conducted on the basis of the previous literature in these three areas. Specifically, transformational leadership qualities were assessed on the basis of dimensions derived from the Northouse (2009) adaption of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire created by Bass and Avolio (1990) and Bass's (1999) summation of two decades of leadership studies. These dimensions are: *idealized influence/inspirational motivation*, *intellectual stimulation*, and *individualized consideration*. A leader was judged to have idealized influence or inspirational motivation if he or she demonstrated the following characteristics in the interview: envisioning a desirable future, articulating how that future can be reached, setting an example to be followed, setting high performance standards, and showing determination or confidence. A leader was judged to have individualized consideration if he or she demonstrated the following characteristics: paying attention to the developmental needs of the followers, supporting or coaching followers' development, and delegating assignments as opportunities for growth. A leader was judged to have intellectual stimulation if he or she demonstrated the following

characteristics: encouraging creativity, helping followers become more innovative, and using novel approaches .

Organizational Culture Type was assessed using the Organizational Culture Assessment Index (Cameron & Quinn, 2011), the description of culture in Masood, Dani, Burns & Backhouse's (2006) article "Transformational Leadership and Organizational Culture: The Situational Strength Perspective", and Smart & St. John's (1996) explanation of these cultures in their article on organizational culture and higher education. The types of culture assessed were: *hierarchy*, *market*, *clan*, and *adhocracy*. In answering questions about their organization, if a leader described the characteristics of one culture type predominately, their organization was judged to have that culture. For hierarchy cultures, they emphasized stability, control, predictability, rule-making, organizing, and efficiency. For market cultures, leaders emphasized achievements, competition, winning, and results. For clan cultures, leaders emphasized loyalty, tradition, cohesion, family, mentoring and a concern for people. For adhocracy cultures, they emphasized flexibility, innovation, development, growth, entrepreneurship, and creativity.

Vision was assessed on the basis of dimensions created by the researcher from Berson, Shamir, Avolio & Popper's (2001) categories of vision statements of transformational leaders and Strange & Mumford's (2002) characteristics of vision-based outstanding leadership. These dimension are: *future orientation*, *employee involvement*, *specificity*, and *defense of vision's value*. Leaders whose vision had future orientation presented an optimistic picture of the future, highlighted tomorrow's opportunities, and expressed confidence that the vision is achievable. The visions that have employee involvement stated the importance of followers' participation. The visions that are specific compared the vision to other efforts, stated a specific mission, tied goals or examples to the vision, and stated a specific time frame for vision. The visions that

defended their value linked the vision to specific values, linked the visions to both extrinsic and intrinsic benefits, and stated the importance of the mission.

Chapter 4

Analysis and Findings

Analysis

Leadership. The following is an overview of the each leader's answers about their personal leadership style and an analysis of the similarities and differences between them.

Mr. A perceived himself to be a "laissez-faire" leader who pays little attention to detail but rather remains focused on "[picking] the person carefully" upon initial employment. He values having a high "level of trust" with his employees which "serve[s] to motivate the employees" in his opinion. In speaking of the future of the company, he stated that "at the senior level, we always knew...we grew the company to sell it" and that "the senior managers had to have an exit strategy." Mr. A seems to recognize that transformational leaders should move beyond personal interests to the interest of the group, so he allows all employees to take full credit for the research they do and places their name as the authors of the study not the organization, showing high *intellectual stimulation*. Also, the "recognition" the employees receive for projects they develop "helps [the organization] retain hot talent." He also shows *individualized consideration* by helping his employees develop their strengths by promoting and supporting further education as well as offering training programs and bonus systems.

Mr. B's leadership style as he described it is "relational, team-oriented, [and] trying to put people in slots where they can succeed." He makes decisions by "listening well to the facts being presented" and "trying to bring all of that situation to a point where you can make a decision." Mr. B's leadership style demonstrates multiple aspects of transformational leadership. He expresses confidence in the future of the organization by emphasizing its stability and net worth in the midst of much environmental change, displaying *idealized influence*. In talking about the

future of the company with employees, he feels it important to help the employees in the anxiety that some may feel amidst the changes of the organization by "remind[ing] them of the stability of where they work that it is a company with a great net worth [and] great stability...reminding them that they are in a good place." He demonstrates *individualized consideration* as he develops the strength of the employees in a method of leadership he compares to coaching.

Mr. C says an essential aspect of his leadership style is his focus on "sharing a vision" and "helping people figure out what their best is." He noted that sometimes he makes the decisions unilaterally, but he "trie[s] to involve the team in making decisions" and "identify risks, rewards." In speaking about the future of the company to his employees, he said it "was something I had to learn how to do." Eventually, he "tried to stress where [the company] was going" and "how can we make the products better and the processes better." Mr. C exemplifies the *intellectual stimulation* characteristic of transformational leaders and specifically says that he likes to encourage creativity in the way his employees think and operate. He describes himself as "energetic, involved, supportive, encourag[ing] creativity, encouraging, [and] involving others in making decisions." He is also high in *individualized consideration* as he is supportive of employees in pursuing their personal best. He also "tried to get others to think creatively and when they did [he] tried to champion it" which shows great concern for the employees themselves. His *idealized influence* is found in the way he frames the conversations of value about the company's products.

Mr D. describes his leadership style by saying that he "delegates", likes to "train and explain the situation" and is willing to "take input." He perceives himself to be "pretty quick on decision-making" and he tries "not to second-guess [himself]." When asked about his communication about the future to his employees, he displayed frustration with the lack of this

concept in the corporation. He attributed this to things like "we don't have a retirement plan" and that "profit sharing [is] lacking" and that the company could do better with "job security." He continues on to say that the corporation is a "great training ground, and they're gonna want to move on." Mr. D's leadership has one of the characteristics of a transformational leader. He has high *individualized consideration*, especially in his financial support of his employees. Not only does he pay an above-average wage for the industry, he helps pay for non-business conferences such as marriage conferences, and helps with down-payments on cars and houses. His *inspirational* leadership is very employee-focused in that he wants to see the staff live achieve their full potential, but his vision for the organization and setting of goals and standards is lacking according to what Bass (1999) would consider transformational in nature.

Mr. E explains that his leadership style is "open", "communicative" and focused on "management by objective." To make decisions, Mr. E tries to "collect the data that is available" and "talk to the people that are knowledgeable" as well as listening to "gut feeling." The conversations about the future of the organization are framed in a way that shows the importance of the employee's "contribution to the company's success" to instill a "sense of ownership", and a "sense of purpose in each person." Mr. E shows high levels of *intellectual stimulation* in helping his employees be more innovative and creative by jointly developing their goals instead of asking employees to follow organization goals he sets for them. He also shows high *individualized consideration* as he attempts to instill purpose, show ownership and emphasize the contribution of the employees. He seeks to "come to a joint agreement" on "core goals", and he uses "legitimate praise for success" to instill a "sense of commitment to common goals." He demonstrates a relatively high level of *idealized influence* in his focus on morality and ethics that

is "very very high because of the corporate culture", and he emphasizes that "the leader sets the ethical tone by describing their values."

When Mr. F communicates about the future in the organization, it revolves around survival, according to Mr. F, and how they are going to "physically and emotionally survive" in what he says to be a "tough three years financially" for the organization. He also shows an even further lack of this communication by saying that they "don't have a five-year plan" and that "there's not been a real clear direction" in recent years. Mr. F demonstrates high levels of *individualized consideration* because he says he is "a very collegial leader" who "very, very seldom makes unilateral decisions." He also demonstrates some level of *intellectual stimulation* in allowing all decisions to be made jointly, giving employees creative involvement in the decisions of the organization.

Mr. G has a leadership style of a "designer" or "developer." He also describes himself as "relational," "open," and "accessible," and in decision-making he uses a "team approach" in which he voices ideas and tries to "look for affirmation." According to Mr. G, they work annually on their "key initiatives for the year...as well as look out about three to five years." He tries to make sure that the staffing and leadership are "able to successfully plan for the organization." Mr. G shows high levels of *intellectual stimulation* and *individual consideration* as he focuses on developing an employee to a place where they can operate and create in their position on their own. He is always trying to get a program or process to "a place where someone can maintain it and run it and [he] can move on to what's next." He also shows *idealized influence* by setting both personal and organizational missions and showing employees that the vision is reached by linking their personal lives to their calling.

Mr. H describes leadership as "the management of attention", and he is "a huge believer in the integrated whole of your life." He emphasizes his "deep respect for the belief this is not about us...[that] this does not exist for our own agenda." He is "open-hearted" and "honest," valuing "high accountability" and being "interpersonal," "relational," and "empowering." In situations of conflict, he believes "every criticism [he] receive[s] has some truth in it. Mr. H shows high *idealized influence* in the organization. He supports his vision for the future to be "a church not yet imagined" by pointing out examples of how the vision is reached and says, "I hope I am a compelling voice of vision." The standards he sets are high, but he shows his confidence through consistency of mission. He fosters *intellectual stimulation* through championing the ideas of his staff that are creative and in line with the vision. He also shows a large amount of *individualized consideration* as he attempts to empower his staff by coaching and cultivating them. His belief in a "plurality of leadership" allows his staff to have many opportunities for growth.

Mr. J describes his leadership style as a "team-builder" and an "encourager" who seeks to "find information by asking questions instead of making statements." He perceives his decision-making style to be "very contextual" but tries to "gather as much information as possible," showing a preference for "facts," "numbers" and "statistics." Within these facts and figures, however, he finds that morality and ethics are "the non-negotiables...if it's not ethically right, there's no decision to make." When talking about the future of the company, he says that is "has a very rapid growth curve" and they "have spent the last two years defining [their] goals." He uses "short, frequent meetings" to promote "committed employees that buy in to what [they] are doing." The first answers Mr. J gives to the question about leadership display high *individualized consideration* because he focuses on building and encouraging the team of staff members. He

intellectual stimulates employees by asking questions instead of making statement in decision making and organizational activities. He has *idealized influence* by articulating how the vision is reached in terms of generosity.

Mrs. K's leadership style is to "lead by example" and be "approachable." In decision-making she tries to "get the facts first before [she] jump[s] to any conclusion" and by "training by [the hospital]" and "watching other co-chairs." She tries to keep the pattern of "giving them some positive feedback then constructive criticism." When she talks about the future in meetings, she tries to "show that [the volunteer structure] will grow and change" and is "continually communicating to them [the volunteers] how important it was." Mrs. K demonstrates high *individualized consideration* in being approachable and attempting to understand all sides of a situation. She also focuses on receiving and implementing feedback. She shows *idealized influence* by constantly reminding employees and volunteers why they are there and how important the cause is.

Mr. L says being a "servant leader" is the "foremost" part of his leadership style, and that part of this style is being "really relational." He finds himself to be an "encourager which is a blessing and a curse" in that "confrontation is not natural to [him]." In order to make decisions, he uses a team oriented approach in which he "watches the waves and the momentum" of the group sentiment. If this momentum is difficult to find he says, "since I feel like God has placed me in the position of leadership, I just make the decisions." They evaluate "gifts and passions [and] where those passions particularly fit in the ministry." Mr. L is high in *individualized consideration* through encouraging and supporting staff members through training and investing in them personally. He also shows high *idealized influence* in communicating the vision for the organization consistently and looking for ways the vision is being lived out.

Mr. M describes his leadership style as "fair", "focused", "discerning", and "perceptive." He also emphasizes that "attention to details is key." The conversations about the future of the organization Mr. M says are "brand new communication" in which recently the organization went through a "branding process [and] came up with this family of ministries logo." This process helps him "communicate clearly" that the organization is about "connecting communities of resource with communities of need." He says, "my personal challenge is saying things in the same way...so that other people may pick it up as well." Mr. M shows a moderate level of *individualized consideration* as uses his trust to support and develop his employees. He also shows his emotional support for them in attempting to be perceptive of the issues they are dealing with in their personal lives.

The first thing Mr. N says about his leadership style is that he is "very fair." He also comments, "I believe the best way to lead is by serving...[and] I don't ask my employees to do something I haven't already done." His decision-making varies based upon the magnitude of the decision. He says, "For small decisions I just make the decision; if its a big decision, I bring in my team." Conversations about the future of the company are not often held with the staff. In talking about long term strategic plans, he comments, "the five to ten year [planning] would be more me and my wife." Mr. N shows high *individualized consideration* as he focuses on servant-leadership as well as the good of the staff under him.

Mr. O self-assesses his style of leadership as "servant leadership." He says, "Servant leadership...is basically about caring about the needs of other people before my wealth and fame." He gives several traits that characterize these types of leaders, of which he considers himself to be one: "being a good listener, pay[ing] good benefits and high wages," and "not just caring about customers but employees [and] vendors as well." He rarely talks about the future of

the organization with his employees. He says, "To be honest with you, with my business, I've gotten to the point where I don't really have to do anything anymore." The leadership style of Mr. O shows high *individualized consideration* as he supports the employees' progression professionally, giving employees "whatever they need to succeed," "delegat[ing] and empower[ing] people." He also gives much freedom in which employees can be creative and come up with their own ideas leading to high *intellectual stimulation*.

As a leader, Mr. P is "comfortable," "personable," "analytical," and "decisive." He says that morality and ethics are a "number one" priority to the organization and in his phrasing, "do it right, do it legal, do it safe." He also notes that "a lot of that stuff [morality and ethics] comes in with the survival" of the company. Mr. P exhibits well the characteristics of a transformational leader. He shows *individualized consideration* through showing employees how they are and can be more a part of the future of the company. He makes decisions in two ways: he either walks the employee through it or lets him or her make the decision on their own. He also shows *intellectual stimulation* through brainstorming new ideas with staff members. Finally, he shows *idealized influence* through showing what the organization could be in the future and supporting that through decisions and passion. He talks about the future "internally with growth opportunities and new and different things coming down the road" and likes to "dangle the carrot" saying "if we are successful, this is what can happen...this is how you can be a part of it."

Mr. Q uses a "diplomatic, generalistic approach" to leadership in his organization. He describes his role like this: "They think they're giving 120% and I have to be the one telling them they're not." He "lets people make small failures and gets them to learn from them." He also invests in "seeing talent in others" and starting to "grow that person" into leadership roles. When asked about the future, he says, "I have an ongoing strategic plan in my mind." Mr. Q shows

individualized consideration for his employees in providing training and mentoring to those who show leadership promise. He believes that "it takes everybody to get the job done, even the weakest link." He shows *intellectual stimulation* by allowing employees to make mistakes and learn from them in their own ways, leading to greater creativity with less fear of repercussions. Staff members are also encouraged away from scripted interactions with patients and towards their own "style" of good patient care. He shows *idealized influence* as he considers his profession as an "art" rather than just a job. In all these things, he demonstrates the essential qualities of a transformational leader.

Culture. The following is a summary of how each leader described their organization's culture in the interview.

Mr. A. described the culture as "one of research and development" that is very "technically innovative." When asked about his hiring practices, he stated that the candidate's resume and "intellectual capital" are highly important as well as his or her previous work experience. Of secondary importance, he noted that "interpersonal skills and ability to work with other people" is essential because "in a matrix organization you are always working with other people." Mr. A perceived his company as valuing "engineering integrity" above all else. The cultural characteristics of Mr. A's organization exemplifies an *adhocracy* culture that is entrepreneurial, innovative and takes risks in development. These organizations, like that of Mr. A, consider success to be the producing of original products and services.

Mr. B described the culture of the the bank as a "community bank [that has] gotten kind of large." He perceives it to "run more like a family-type business, employees are considered more like family." Mr. B says the bank is oriented toward "caring a lot for customers [and] our employees." In hiring, Mr. B says, "We look for people who will fit in well with the other people

in the organization." He noted the importance of being "very qualified with experience", but he emphasized that the company guards against those who are "more competitive against other people or somehow wouldn't fit in well with the team." He summarized by saying, "we wouldn't hire you just because you have the work qualifications." The company, as he perceives it, emphasizes "humility with people" and defines success as "providing quality service" with a "much longer term approach than our competitors." He notes that "our success is built on a long term reputation." He desired to "make money...make sound decisions...[and] create and environment where our customers feel good about the bank." The organization that Mr. B leads can be characterized as a *clan* culture. His emphasis on the communal atmosphere and treatment of employees as family attests to this, and he shows a high commitment to employees in his low firing frequency. He defines success in relational terms both with customers and employees and acts as a mentor with them, characteristic of clan culture leaders. Cohesion is so important in the organization that qualified employees are not hired if they will not fit well with the team already in place in the organization.

Mr. C described the culture of his organization by saying that each person has "a lot of individual ownership of what [they] did" and "felt like [they] were contributing to something significant [and] doing something good for humanity." The products produced by the company "could change people's lives" and this is central to the organizational culture. In hiring, Mr. C looks for people who "could fit together as a team" and have a "sense of compassion, sense of mission." He focuses on people who appear to be "dedicated to what they were doing." Success in the organization is defined by "fully complying with expectations" and providing services in a "timely manner." He emphasizes that "we were there to serve the other guys." The organizational culture in Mr. C's company is a *clan* culture. Success is defined by not only accuracy and quality

but by a high concern for serving the fellow employees and customers. Another aspect of clan culture strong in Mr. C's organization is the idea of the team and the concern for the employees to buy in to the goals of the organization. The OCAI also suggests that management values teamwork and consensus, which are two things Mr. C mentions in the interview about his decision-making (Cameron & Quinn, 2011).

Mr. D perceives his corporation to have the "mindset of a sole proprietorship even though it is a multimillion dollar company." He rated their cultural level of delegation and freedom to make decisions as average and wished these could change. He characterized the people the corporation hired as "people who come to conform or are pleasers", and that many "get frustrated because they want to do more." In terms of values, he noted both "relationships" and "time requirements", and claims the success for the organization "has to be the bottom line...but the second thing is the employees, they have to enjoy being there." The organization Mr. D leads seems to have a *hierarchy* culture. The organization is very formal and structured in what he describes as the mindset of a sole proprietorship. He alludes to their standardized procedures when he speaks of the employees conforming but wanting to do more. When asked about what the organization values, he emphasizes the time requirements in the industry which reflects the organization need for efficiency, control and smooth operations. Mr. D also shows the need for stability and long-term orientation as he says that reputation is essential to his client relations (Cameron & Quinn, 2011).

Mr. E describes his organizational culture as an "open, first-name basis organization" that is "prone to sharp-shooting and second-guessing." The organization is very "proud of its position as first in the industry" and "care[s] about long-term relationships." In hiring, he looks for people "that had a strong customer focus." The company places high value on "integrity", and Mr. E

demonstrates this by saying that he "never had to apologize for [the company's] ethical standard." He also mentions a focus on "quality" and "loyalty." Success in the organization is defined by "share of market" and "profit margins." Mr. E leads a *market* culture organization, displayed in his external orientation towards the customers, and his emphasis on share of the market as essential to the organization's operations. He focuses on management by objective which revolves around setting and achieving goals, an essential trait of market cultures.

Mr. F considers the culture to be "like a family" both because it is a very small organization (only 4 full-time and 2 part-time employees) and because the organization's "goal is not to become an ever-growing, ever-expanding faith-based nonprofit." Some verbs he uses in describing the culture are that they "love," "support," "laugh," and "fight." In hiring he looks for people who have "mercy, compassion, kindness [and] a willingness to forebear with one another in love." Mr. F has created a *clan* culture in his organization, described as a family in which they love and support each other. Employee involvement is high, especially in decision-making and concern for people is of utmost importance.

Mr. G attempts to create a culture that has a "strong work ethic, high values, and high commitment." He also lauds his employees as being from a "strong talent pool" with "a real desire to get better and to learn." He looks for "mission alignment" and the "ability to relate to our urban culture" in his hiring processes. The organizational culture values of "community," "whole-person ministry approach," "accountability," and the focus on trying to "address our weaknesses" define them. Success in the organization to Mr. G is "stewardship," "doing what you say you're going to do," and "longevity of the people you are serving as well as the people working with you." Mr. G operates in a *clan* culture in which their mission and operations are

highly focused on individuals. As a leader he is accessible and open, which is characteristic of the entire community he calls his staff.

Mr. H uses these words to describe his organizational culture: "mutually submissive, respectful, dynamic, passionate and in transition." He says he is "committed to a plurality of leadership" and that trust "creates an enormous amount of creativity. In interesting imagery, Mr. H describes the people he looks to hire as those who "when you talk about change their energy goes up." He also wants people on staff who "get excited about what that other person's potential is" and "want to learn from the older generation." The organization values, according to Mr. H, "plurality", "mutuality", "humility", and non-anxious presence." Success in this church is defined by "making disciples" that are "now trying to produce the vision." The loyalty and trust that are essential to accomplishing Mr. H's vision for the organization lead him to create a *clan* culture. As a leader, Mr. H is a facilitator by supporting the ideas of others and allowing leadership to be shared. He emphasizes cohesion by hiring people who pursue others' success as well as the success of the team before their own.

Mr. J would characterize his organization as "kingdom-focused...built around the idea of serving people." In new employees he looks for a variety of things, depending on the position, but all "have to fit with the organization." The organization as a whole values "creativity," "integrity," "confidentiality," "attitude" and "action." Success is defined by "the number of people [an employee] works with" generating "an increase materially in giving." Mr. J's organizational culture is hard to categorize as one type on the assessment, but could be described as a combination of *market* and *clan* cultures. He defines success both in terms of concern for people and in client and material increases. He emphasizes both creativity in reaching the market as well as the attitude and cohesion of the staff.

Mrs. K says the culture in the organization is characterized by volunteers and staff being "willing to help each other." She does say, however, that there is the presence of a "little bit of politics" and that "some people [are] doing it for social reasons" instead of to help the hospital. The people in the organization, according to Mrs. K have a "positive attitude," are "hardworking," are "willing to be flexible," and "willing to take the time to help." She attempts to emphasize that "this is for the [hospital]" by defining success as "communication," receiving "feedback," and "being visible." Mrs. K's organization operates as a *clan* culture. The success is defined in terms of human relations and the ability of the staff to communicate with the volunteers as well as how they help the hospital.

Mr. L focused on the leadership aspect of the organizational culture, saying his employees have "a really strong ability to lead" but that they are trying to look for leaders not just managers. As Mr. L calls it, they are "look[ing] for folks who inspire" which is, incidentally, his definition of the difference between leaders and managers. He defines success by "momentum" both "financially" and with "the kids in the schools." Through these cultural characteristics as well as Mr. L's leadership style, he seems to have created a *clan* culture within the organization. Being an encourager and being relational enhances him as a clan leader. The momentum he looks to for measuring success is based solely on care for people. Trust and loyalty are essential as he develops his employees through finding their gifts and passions.

Mr. M finds the organizational culture to be dependent on "getting the right people on the bus" in terms of hiring and "getting everybody to completely buy in." Although a candidate may be "incredibly talented", Mr. M focuses on making sure they are "going to fit in." He operates with the motto "hire slow and fire fast." When asked about organizational values, he admits there is "a list of values we have I can't remember [them]", but he says "most of them are intuitive." He

goes on in an attempt to describe them saying, "There's stuff like we value risk, we value community development, we value the city, we value God's role in the city, we value relationships." Although it is hard to place, it seems that Mr. M's culture is one in transition from *hierarchical* to *clan* type cultures. Through the interview, he displayed both of these simultaneously, emphasizing that the organization is undergoing some major changes to the current system. He is very concerned with efficiency and stability along with being very attentive to detail, characteristics of a leader in a hierarchical organization. He is also the controller and coordinator of the organization and has recently taken note that many of the employees are not aware of his values and vision for the organization. He appeared in the interview to have recently taken some of these factors into consideration and that a more communal, or clan for this study, culture might be more beneficial to the organization so he has begun focusing on hiring slowly and hiring the right people.

Mr. N considers the culture of the organization to be a "very family oriented" culture in which he says "our employees are really like family to us and our clients are like family to us." When hiring new staff Mr. N looks for "ability to perform their job," ability to "interact with the rest of the staff," sharing of "similar value systems," and displaying positive attitudes. The organization values "put[ting] other people's needs first," "honesty," and "being transparent." Success to him revolves around the client; he answers the researcher's questions about success, "I would say success would be based on clients being served correctly every single time, and the client having a great experience every single time." The culture Mr. N describes is a *clan* culture as he considers clients and employees to be family, the buzzword of clan cultures. The cohesiveness and honesty of the staff, two adjectives on the leadership items of the OCAI, are of utmost importance in the organization (Cameron & Quinn, 2011).

To describe his organizational culture, Mr. O informs the interviewer of the "four core values" of the organization: "people," "leadership," "quality," and "teamwork." When hiring employees, Mr. O looks for those that have a "track record of work ethic" and "look like they would be fun to work with." Success is determined within the company as "making a profit" primarily and secondarily showing that they "care about one another." The culture Mr. O describes resembles an *adhocracy* culture. As the leader of the organization, Mr. O is an entrepreneur that leads the creativity and risk-taking essential to adhocracy cultures. The organization is very innovative and focuses on growth. As a franchise, pursuing new ventures is essential to the fabric of the company.

Mr. P considers his company to be "very locally based," "very personable," and "very unique." He says that "you've got to create a niche in the market", and that the culture of his organization is "all about survival...everyday we are going into battle." When it comes to hiring practices, he believes it to be "almost 100% personality based" because his company is about "taking care of people, working with people, [and] serving people." The "number one criteria" he uses to define success is "survival", but he includes "loyalty," "longevity," and "satisfaction of the employees" to the definition because they ultimately lead to the success he desires to have. Mr. P's organization exemplifies a *market* culture. They are constantly focused on surviving and excelling in the competitive marketplace. His definition of success is results-oriented and even the other factors that he includes all lead to the final goal of survival.

Mr. Q describes the organizational culture in his department as one of "high expectations", and says that he desires to see "120%" effort from his employees. The hiring process involves a "peer group interview" in which front-line staff as well as managers look to see if the candidate is "a good fit personality-wise." He also looks at the applicant's reasons for

pursuing the profession and whether or not they are "engaged in the conversation." He says that "employment is like a relationship...you both have to give 100% to make it work." He defines success based on the number of lives saved and "seeing patients improve." Mr. Q says his goal is "that we can see all the patients that present to the front door." He also emphasizes that "volume [of patients] is important." The culture Mr. Q describes is a *market* culture where high expectations and performance standards guide the organization. Mr. Q typifies a market leader as he consistently emphasizes the need for employees to give 100% or even 120% during the workday.

Vision. The following are summaries of how each leader articulated his or her vision and which dimensions of their vision were strong.

Mr. A's vision as a leader is that he "wanted to make sure that the company was where we could have a good time." He tries to create "a relaxed work environment" that is "more of a family work environment." To communicate this vision, he said that "it is a top-down driven corporate personality." The leadership attempted to instill some practical ways in which this idea of relaxation and fun amidst a highly competitive and innovative organization could be realized. Mr. A's vision scores very low in the categories used in this study to describe transformational leaders. He does, however, link the vision to intrinsic benefits by promoting a fun and relaxed environment, and states a specific vision though this vision is not supported by time frame or specific goals. Through these things he shows a moderate level of the *specificity* and *value* dimensions. The relationship between passive leadership and weak vision found by Berson and his colleagues (2001) is seen here with Mr. A.

Mr. B's vision seems to be dictated by the organization as he says, "I think the [institution] wants me as a leader to help the people that are under me or help maintain a

customer base in a, you know, excellent manner." He also tries to ensure that "employees are doing their jobs, but that they are also satisfied and fulfilled in doing their job." His vision includes "financial goals" as well as the ability to "maintain the relationships that [the institution] has in a good way." Ultimately, he wants to be "working in a way that makes [him] feel fulfilled at the end of the day or at the end of [his] career." He also promotes to the employees that they "really are making a difference in the community." He communicates his vision both in "group settings" and "one-on-one" by "letting people shine publicly, complimenting them." He notes that "we individually succeed the most when the bank does the best. Mr. B's vision, as articulated in the interview, has several characteristics of a strong leader's vision. He emphasizes the importance of the *employee involvement* in the vision by saying, "We individually succeed the most when the bank does the best." He also makes efforts to point out and praise those following the vision well, which helps to *specify* the vision though not completely. His vision is linked to the *values* of personal fulfillment, community enhancement, personal faith, and relationship maintenance that give the vision intrinsic benefits. He highlights the opportunities of the *future* by emphasizing stability within the company, and shows the extrinsic benefits of the vision as he shows employees that the company will succeed and grow financially as they do.

Mr. C's vision was distinct in that he described discovering his vision "by talking to other people, by reading, [and] by doing." In the end, his vision is to try and "make our product a clinical reality", a vision very tied to the corporation's economic goals. To communicate this, he used a combination of one-on-one's and email to see "where [they] are going, where the issues are." He saw his vision become a reality in that the "main product was highly successful" and is "making a difference in health care treatment and survival." The vision Mr. C articulates lives up to some of the standards of exceptional visions but not all of them. His vision is to make his

product a clinical reality, making it successful in identifying a better *future* state. Other parts of the interview indicate the *value* he places on this vision in that he believes it to be good for humanity and truly influential in people's lives. He stressed the importance of *employee involvement* in pushing them to think creatively and championing their ideas when they did.

Mr. D's vision is to see his employees "match their potential" and tries to go what he calls "a little deeper, like family." His vision tends to become a reality holistically through seeing his employees "move up the economic ladder" and "become better parents, better spouses." Mr. D's vision is very high on the *employee involvement* dimension. In fact his vision is almost entirely centered around developing deeper relationships with his employees and seeing them match their potential. He also shows the intrinsic and extrinsic *value* for his vision in saying that his employees have become better parents as well as have progressed economically.

Mr. E paraphrases the vision of the company as "to provide value...to the customers by meeting a range of their equipment needs [and] allowing them to obtain the equipment in multiple ways." This is "supported by critical success factors", according to Mr. E and these factors formed the "goals," "objectives," and "work plans" for the employees. His personal vision is "supporting the values of the organization" by making sure his unit is "contributing to the company's success." His vision is *specific* and measured by success factors translated into goals and work plans. Although the vision was determined by top management, Mr. E shows a concern that the *employees* understand how they personally contribute to that vision.

Mr. F says his vision is the same as that of the organization which is "to inform, equip and unite (or connect) churches to transform lives in the community." He communicates this vision through recalling the organization and its members to "consistency" and "excellence." He sees his vision become a reality when a church had "implemented everything [they] had talked

about and its was working." His vision has a *future orientation* towards how the community will be affected by the organization. He *defends the vision* by personally role modeling the consistency and excellence he requires out of the team. He emphasizes the vision's intrinsic value throughout the interview by connecting it to the great need he believes his organization is filling. He displays how the *employees* must be involved in the consistency of excellence to make the organization a success, but does not give specific goals or results of vision accomplishment.

Mr. G says his mission is "tied to the organization itself" and that mission is "to raise up Christian leaders in our communities [and raise up] young people who contribute and give back." He personally wants "to see all programs, management, funding work at a high level where my role is minimized and I can focus more on the community." He can see the vision becoming a reality when "the kids are engaging" and the "young people [from the program]...are coaching in the neighborhood, teaching at the school...being a Godly mother or father to their own kids." The vision Mr. G articulates is optimistic in its *future orientation* and creates an image in which all of the youth served by the organization are contributing to their own communities in some way. The *intrinsic value* in this is evident throughout the interview as well as through all the materials distributed by the organization. He shows the *employee involvement* must be high as he shares thoughts and goals related to the mission during staff meetings.

Mr. H quotes the mission of the organization as being "to glorify God by pursuing the Christ-life and engaging the world." His personal vision is take "part in empowering and equipping the next group of people to lead the next generation." He tries to, what he calls, "get the ball in the hands of the younger leader" and "be their biggest fan." He communicates his vision "very intentionally" through "conversations" by "managing attention" and trying to "catch the vision working and name it and celebrate it." His vision for the *future* is optimistic and

specific, supported by his indicating of accomplishments in line with the vision. He is high on *employee involvement* as well as he emphasizes his role as putting leadership in what he calls the next generation of the church. His measurement of vision accomplishment is through pointing out when the vision is enacted both by staff and by members of the organization. He also links his vision to faith-based *values* that his staff shares.

Mr. J says the mission of the organization is "to encourage, equip, and produce generosity." To communicate this, he will "talk specifically about what it means to be generous" and "defin[e] what it means to be generous." Mr. J sees his vision becomes a reality when his clients "begin to become more generous." His vision implies *future* state and goals, and has *specific* goals and measurements for the vision achievement and communicates those to his employees. He demonstrates the *value* of his vision both in intrinsic and extrinsic ways as he communicates the changed lives internally and externally created by the donations.

Mrs. K defined her vision as "to help [the hospital] raise money, while giving them a great name in the community and just showing all the volunteers what a great project this is." She communicates her vision through "videos" and "listening to the president of the hospital." She watches her vision become a reality through "seeing families be helped" and the things the hospital has "specifically bought with the money." Mrs. Knotes the desirable and achievable *future* of bringing money and reputation to the hospital. She also shows the importance of the *staff* and volunteers as she talks about the network of people in the area that have accomplished this vision. The *value* of the vision is communicated through seeing the families that have been helped by the money the organization has raised.

Mr. L's vision as a leader is to "grow deeper [where] the leadership base is really pursuing Jesus [and] that group has a vision for the schools to get involved." He communicates this vision

in bi-weekly staff meetings as well as monthly Friday night "gatherings" with volunteers in which he says "sometimes we encourage, sometimes we train." His vision is a reality when his volunteers having growing relationships with the youth in the ministry. His vision shows a high regard for *employee* development and involvement while painting a picture of what will be in the organization. He links his vision to the Christian *values* to which he and his staff adhere, giving vision accomplishment intrinsic benefits.

Mr. M's vision is made up of the values he mentions in relation to his leadership, and he communicates these through a strategic planning process once every three years. He recognizes that as an organization "we haven't looked at [the values] in a while" and that "[his] role moving forward needs to be a lot more teaching those values, talking about them, [and] beginning to instill these in the rest of the organization." His vision does not score very high in the categories used to analyze visions in this study. He does not portray a picture of the future, nor is he very optimistic about it as he tells the interviewer he is not sure that the organization could continue if he was no longer able to lead it. He mentions the need for employee involvement, but demonstrates that this has not been emphasized enough in the recent past. He also links no goals or values to the vision for the organization and has no specific way to measure its accomplishment.

Mr. N articulates his vision in saying, "I want to be known within my employees as someone they know they can trust and who cares about them personally." He also says that he is "working on being the face of the company" and moving into that role with less responsibility in daily business activities. He communicates this in a "very transparent" way with his employees. Mr. N says his vision becomes a reality through "surround[ing] [himself] with great people," "working on the business rather than just in the business," and "be[ing] transparent and

communicating [his] values." Mr. N's vision does not line up with many of the dimensions of excellent visions. He does, however, emphasize that the *employees* must be involved in order for him to accomplish his goals for the institution.

Mr. O's vision is a personal one in which he wants to achieve what he calls "pinnacle" leadership which is when "people want to follow you because they respect you." He does not communicate this with his employees because he says he is "past that for [his] company", but if the followers want to grow the company he is there for advice. Mr. O's vision is a personal one, so it is hard to measure by the dimensions used in this study. By the standards used to analyze these interviews, he only shows one element of excellent visions and that is an optimistic view of the *future*.

Mr. P's vision is to "create a successful well-being for all the employees and associates with the brand." He communicates this vision "one-on-one...face-to-face" and finds these meetings "very open, very casual." He says that "most of the time [he] defer[s] the decision to them [the employees]." Mr. P's vision focuses on *employee involvement* as he meets with the employees and shows them how they can be a part of the vision, and it provides an optimistic picture of the *future* in which the brand is entirely successful. He does not display specificity in his vision or the measurements surrounding it, nor does he strongly display the value of that goal to his followers.

Mr. Q articulates his mission by saying, "I want every staff member to be able to provide the care I expect my family members to get in that way that I would give it to them, but in their own own style." He has a vision to "continue to grow and expand" the department and "driv[e] quality to the highest level that we can." He communicates this through setting stretch goals and pursuing those goals consistently. He says, "We're not about benchmarks when you can have a

goal of zero." Mr. Q displays all of the characteristics of a transformational vision. His vision creates a real picture of an optimistic *future* by setting these high standards. Mr. Q encourages the *employees* to become involved by stressing the "relationship" aspect of employment and the need for everyone, even the weakest member. He *specifies* his goal as the number zero, or perfect achievement of goals. He attaches these to *values* by connecting goals to saving lives and improving patient health.

Findings

In the categories of leadership, 68.75% of interviewees demonstrated high or moderate idealized influence, 100% demonstrated these levels individual consideration, and 62.5% demonstrated these levels of intellectual consideration. In the cultural analysis, 17.5 % had hierarchical cultures, 25% had market cultures, 17.5% had adhocracy cultures, and 50% had clan cultures. For vision categories, 62.5% displayed a future orientation, 81.25% displayed employee involvement, 31.25% displayed use of specific goals and measures, and 68.75% displayed a defense of their vision's value.

One of the goals of the study was to determine whether or not organization type influenced how transformational leadership and vision were articulated. The following are the results after separating out for-profit organizations and non-profit organizations.

For-profit. In the categories of leadership, 62.75% of for-profit participants demonstrated high or moderate idealized influence, 100% demonstrated these levels individual consideration, and 62.5% demonstrated these levels of intellectual consideration. In the cultural analysis, 17.5 % had hierarchical cultures, 25% had market cultures, 25% had adhocracy cultures, and 37.5% had clan cultures. For vision categories, 50% displayed a future orientation, 87.5% displayed

employee involvement, 25% displayed use of specific goals and measures, and 62.75% displayed a defense of their vision's value.

Non-profit. In the categories of leadership, 75% of nonprofit participants demonstrated high or moderate idealized influence, 100% demonstrated these levels individual consideration, and 62.5% demonstrated these levels of intellectual consideration. In the cultural analysis, 17.5 % had hierarchical cultures, 25% had market cultures, none had adhocracy cultures, and 62.5% had clan cultures. For vision categories, 75% displayed a future orientation, 75% displayed employee involvement, 37.5% displayed use of specific goals and measures, and 75% displayed a defense of their vision's value.

Since clan culture was the most prominent in both organization types, the researcher examined the data from the participants who led organizations with clan cultures. Upon analysis, only 50% of clan cultures showed high intellectual stimulation, 75% high idealized influence, and 100% high individualized consideration. Analyzing the relationship between clan cultures and vision, 87.5% show strong future orientation, 100% strong employee involvement, 87.5% strong defense of value, and 25% strong specificity of goals and measures.

A significant relationship between leadership characteristics and vision characteristics was found in the interviews. Eleven of the sixteen interviews showed a positive relationship between high individualized consideration and strong employee involvement in the vision. Also, nine of the sixteen leaders showed a positive relationship between both strong future orientation and strong defense of value of the vision.

Chapter 5

Discussion

Leadership

One of the goals of the study was to begin to find what aspects of transformational leadership are accepted and implemented by leaders across organizational types. In the study, it was found that *all* participants showed either high or moderate levels of individualized concern when asked questions about their leadership style and vision for the organization. This is a significant finding, even though the sample was small. All the leaders who participated in the study were perceived to be effective by their peers, which supports the finding in Denison & Mishra's (1995) study that high involvement among the employees leads to high organizational effectiveness and greater commitment to the organization and its goals. It appears that leaders tend to understand intellectually and implement practically the idea of individualized consideration. This wide acceptance links to the prevalence of this aspect of transformational leadership in leadership literature and training outside of academia.

In contrast, more than 25% of leaders in the study did not effectively articulate or implement idealized influence and intellectual stimulation, two important aspects of vision formulation and transformational leadership. This is seen in the fact that only half the leaders strongly demonstrated three or more aspects of a transformational vision. Intellectual stimulation was the least implemented of the three, and its strong similarity to the specificity of goals and measures component of great vision could be grounds for its link to the weakness of this area in many leaders' visions. Only five individuals interviewed showed significant strength in defining the goals and measurements of vision accomplishment, a problem in need of further research and practical training in leadership. Sosik & Dinger (2007) found this relationship as well and noted

that leaders who did not show intellectual stimulation also failed to develop challenging ideas that define means to accomplish the vision.

Culture

Although the sample size was small, no leaders of adhocracy or hierarchy cultures demonstrated strong visions in more than one aspect investigated in the study. For hierarchical cultures, this could be related to its emphasis on standardized procedures and control, rather than vision and inspiration with followers (Masood, et al, 2006). The link to adhocracy leadership was unexpected but is probably a result of the small sample size.

Vision

The most well-implemented and articulated component of excellent visions was the emphasis on employee involvement. About 80% of leaders demonstrated a knowledge of the importance of employees buying into the vision and becoming a part of it. This has a logical connection to the individualized consideration component of transformational leadership as it emphasizes support and development of the employees. In fact, this is the strongest relationship between two components found in the study. Almost 70% of participants who showed individualized consideration also articulated employee involvement as an important aspect of their vision.

Leadership and Vision

Two of the leaders in the study displayed highly all the components of both transformational leadership and excellent visions. In examining their interviews, there were a few similarities that could be useful for further study and inclusion in leadership training materials. Interestingly, they did not share the same organizational culture. Evidence to the fact that culture may be more dependent on the purpose of the organization than on leadership style.

One of the leaders is a pastor of a church that exhibits a clan culture, but the other is the leader of the emergency department of a hospital that has a market culture. This result supports and furthers the Smart & St. John's (1996) finding that there is no one best culture type that is most effective in higher education.

These leaders, both from nonprofit organizations, articulated a vision measured by extremely lofty standards, bordering on perfection. Mr. H, one of these exceptional leaders, described his vision as becoming "the church not yet imagined" and Mr. Q, the other transformational leader, said he wants every staff member to care for patients like he would want his own family to be cared for. Mr. Q also sets the standard of zero mistakes, rather than making benchmarks or goals of only three or four mistakes, which is common in his field. Although they demonstrate some similarities their differences are also notable, and further research and training literature should take this into account. Exceptional leadership may look practically very different in different situations, but the concepts that form the basis for transformational leadership are still present.

Another helpful comparison in the study was that of the two lowest-scoring leaders. These two leaders demonstrated only one or two aspects of transformational leadership or effective vision. The most prominent similarity was the lack of employee development through formal programs and processes. Even though these leaders demonstrated some informal training which they found to be helpful, in light of the current study, those practices were not sufficient. These leaders may have been judged as highly effective by their peers because of the scope of their organizations and not because of their personal leadership excellence.

Comparison of For-profit and Nonprofit Leaders

No significant difference was found between non-profit leaders and for-profit leaders.

Although there is a growing realization of this fact, individuals must be aware that exceptional leadership is the same for both for-profit and non-profit leaders. Transformational leadership can be found in both contexts, and no distinction should be made between one leader's emphasis on specificity or employee involvement. These two characteristics are often seen to be distinguishing factors between the two leadership types, but the results of this study demonstrate that they should not be thought of in this way.

Servant-leadership

A theme evident in many of the interviews conducted by the researcher was the theme of servant-leadership. This extension of transformational leadership theory has been developed only in the last decade and is an extremely helpful way of practically communicating good leadership in training materials (see Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002). The way the leaders in the current study articulated this idea are as follows. Mr. N said that he believed "the best way to lead is by serving", but that this can be difficult in a corporate setting. Mr. O gave a very specific and helpful outline for what he believed to be a servant leader. His definition was that servant leadership is "about caring about the needs of other people before my own wealth and fame." The characteristics he articulated for these leaders were "being a good listener," giving followers "whatever they need to succeed," an attempt to "delegate and empower people so they can be good enough to lead your organization," paying "good benefits and high wages," and caring about all involved with the business from customers to employees to vendors. When servant-leadership is emphasized, leaders will learn to not only inspire and include their followers, they will also achieve the illusive transformational characteristic of intellectual stimulation. This is because a basic idea behind this mentality is helping the followers by giving them both the resources and the freedom to achieve their potential

Organizational Change/Phasing Out

Another theme within the interviews was that of the leaders desiring to (or having achieved) a level of stability within the organization in which they could leave without the organization falling apart. The epitome of the phasing out theme was found in Mr. O's interview in which he said that he has worked himself out of a job. Things like vision-setting, decision-making and future goals are no longer really his role, he feels. He was able to let his employees run the company with little input. Although some of the leaders did not wish to attain separation to that extent specifically, they did want to make their organization sustainable for the future. Mr. G said that his organization was only "a few key pieces away ...so that [the organization] can be sustained whether I am here or not." To him, that was a significant measure of his leadership effectiveness. Mr. H uses a coaching analogy in saying that he wants to "get the balls in the hands of the younger leaders" of the church that he leads currently. Mr. J commented that he is working on creating a "systematization of [the organization's] management tools" so that he would not have to be in the place of leadership for the organization to function as efficiently as it does today. Mr. M wanted to get his organization to the point that if "tomorrow [he] got hit by a bus the organization would keep going" without him.

The theme of wanting to phase out of the organization on the practical level may in fact increase intellectual stimulation and specificity of goals, the two areas in which the leaders in the study showed deficiency. The only way that a leader can be free from micromanaging his employees is to empower them and show them how to reach their goals on their own. If leaders are taught how to create environments where they are not bogged down in the details, this will not only essentially include intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration, it will enable them to more fully focus on idealized influence.

Chapter 6

Conclusion and Future Research

Conclusion

Leadership training resources are available at every level of organizational management. For the most part, these materials understand and articulate the long-supported ideas behind transformational leadership as well as the importance of crafting high-quality vision statements. They could, however, greatly benefit from further emphasis on intellectual stimulation, specificity of goals and measures, formal training processes, servant-leadership, and phasing out in an effort to create the next generation of highly effective leaders.

Intellectual stimulation is the most difficult aspect of transformational leadership to accomplish. The findings of this study provide some insight into how leaders can be guided to reach the elusive quality through vision communication. Leaders who articulate visions that have a future orientation, employee involvement, defense of its value, and specificity of goals and measures may be more likely to provide intellectual stimulation for their employees. With a clear idea of the vision, employees are free to be creative and innovative within the organization's goals, and the leader can focus on the future of the organization rather than micromanaging their employees.

Future Research

Further research should investigate the connection between lack of intellectual stimulation and lack of specificity in visions as a way to better train leaders in this important part of vision and organizational effectiveness. Also, more studies are needed to identify the pervasiveness of the link between adhocracy and hierarchy cultures and weak visions as well as some factors contributing to it. More research should investigate the connection between high

individualized consideration and high employee involvement in the vision to enhance leadership training efforts by using transformational leadership literature as well as vision literature.

Limitations

The limitations of this study are mostly found in its small sample size. Larger sample sizes are needed to support the findings of the current study. Since the study was conducted through interviews, personal interpretation of leadership and vision qualities could have affected the data. Standardized research is needed to confirm its findings. Those interviewed were all from one mid-sized southern city, and the data could benefit from a more nationally-based study. Personal characteristics of the interviewer could have affected the responses given in the interviews, and a similar study conducted by another interviewer would be needed to control for these personality variables.

Implications for Leadership Training

Leadership training materials are an essential part of the development of leaders in both the corporate and nonprofit settings. They are popularized in corporations by books, speakers, and conferences attended by employees or management personnel. Despite the prominence and quality of these materials, they do not seem to be sufficiently effective in training leaders to demonstrate intellectual stimulation, meaning they did not encourage freedom and creativity on the part of the employees. This essential aspect of leadership needs to be more fully researched and integrated into training materials.

One way to enhance the deficient area found by the current study is to focus on how to create and communicate an effective vision. On the whole, the leaders in this study understood the importance of the vision, but did not link it to practical benchmarks or standards to guide their employees on how these goals would be accomplished. Materials that train leaders should

focus on crafting a vision for their organization that is both value-laden and specific in the ways articulated by the current study: linking it to extrinsic and intrinsic benefits, stating its importance, tying in goals or examples, comparing it to other efforts, and stating a specific time frame for it.

Another way to enhance the materials is to promote the idea of servant-leadership as defined in the current study by participant O. Servant-leadership can be a more practical and understandable way to articulate transformational leadership qualities. Also, leaders should be encouraged to think about how the organization would function if they were to leave it immediately. Through this, they can be pressed to create a more specific and measurable vision that empowers employees through intellectual stimulation.

Finally, leaders must learn that exceptional leadership is identical in its core values and characteristics in both for-profit and nonprofit organizations as well as among all culture types. Additionally, the absence of formal employee training processes in both low-scoring leaders is evidence to the fact that these programs are important and effective in fostering transformational leadership and ultimately organizational effectiveness. In sum, if all these things are taken into account when leaders are being trained, the program or book is more likely to produce highly effective leaders.

Appendix A

Interview Outline

The following is the outline of the questions the interviewer asked.

1. What is your name?
2. What is the name of your organization?
3. What is your position within the organization?
4. How many years have you been in this position?
5. How innovative is your company as compared to your competitors?
6. How would you describe the culture of your organization?
7. What are some of the defining characteristics of the people you hire?
8. What do you value as an organization? What do you emphasize?
9. How do you define success?
10. How would you describe your leadership style if you had to in a couple adjectives?
11. How do you make decisions in leadership?
12. What is the place of morality and ethics in your decision-making?
13. How do you talk about the future of the company?
14. In what settings do you talk about the future?
15. How do you develop your employees?
16. How do you handle a conflict situation both interpersonally and organizationally?
17. What is your mission/vision as a leader?
18. How do you communicate this to your employees?
19. How does your vision become reality?

20. On a scale of 1 to 10 (10 being as effective as you *could* be) as a leader, how effective a leader do you perceive yourself to be?

21. How do you measure that effectiveness?

References

- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1999) Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 9-32.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1990) *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Baum, J. R., Locke, E. A. & Kirkpatrick, S. A. (1998) A longitudinal study of the relation of vision and vision communication to venture growth in entrepreneurial firms. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 43-54. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.83.1.43.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Berson, Y., Shamir, B., Avolio, B. J. & Popper, M. (2001). The relationship between vision strength, leadership style, and context. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 53-73. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(01)00064-9.
- Boal, K. B. & Bryson, J. M. (1988) Charismatic leadership: A phenomenological approach and structural approach. In Hunt, J. G., Baliga, B. R., Dachler, H.P & Schriesheim, C. A. (Eds.), *Emerging Leadership Vistas*, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, pp. 11-28
- Cameron, K. S. & Quinn, R. E. (1999). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Longman.
- Chatman, J. A. & Cha, S. E. (2003) Leading by leveraging culture. *California Management Review*, 45(4), 20-34.
- Conger, J. A. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: An insider?

- perspective on these developing streams of research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 145-179.
- Davis, S. M. (1984) Managing corporate culture. New York, NY: Ballinger.
- DeGroot, T., Kiker, D. S. & Cross, T. C. (2000) A meta-analysis to review organizational outcomes related to charismatic leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 17(4), 356-372.
- Denison, D. R. & Mishra, A. K. (1995). Toward a theory of organizational effectiveness. *Organization Science*, 6(2), 204-223.
- Farmer, B. A., Slater, J. W. & Wright, K. S. (1998). The role of communication in achieving shared vision under new organizational leadership. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 10(4), 219-235. doi:10.1207/s1532754xjpr1004_01.
- House, R. J. & Shamir, B. (1993) Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic, and visionary theories. *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and Directions*. Chemers, M. M. (Ed) & Ayman, R. (Ed). San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press, 81-107.
- Jaskyte, K. (2004). Transformational leadership, organizational culture, and innovativeness in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 15(2), 153-168.
- Kavanagh, M. H. & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2006). The impact of leadership and change management strategy on organizational culture and individual acceptance of change during a merger. *British Journal of Management*, 17, 81-103.
- Kei, W., Wei, K. K. (2008). Organizational culture and leadership in ERP implementation. *Decision Support Systems*, 45(2), 208-218.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A. & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,

81, 36-51.

- Lowe, K. B & Galen, K. K. (1996) Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 385-426.
- Masood, S. A., Dani, S. S., Burns, N. D. & Backhouse, C. J. (2006) Transformational leadership and organizational culture: The situational strength perspective. *Journal of Engineering Manufacture*, 220(6), 941-949.
- Northouse, P. G. (2009). *Leadership: Theory and practice, fifth edition*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Oke, A., Munshi, N. & Walumbwa, F. (2009) The influence of leadership on innovation processes. *Organizational Dynamics*, 38, 64-72.
- Sarros, J. C., Cooper, B. K. & Santora, J. C. (2008). Building a climate for innovation through transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 15(2).
- Schein, E.H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sendjaya, S. & Sarros, J. C. (2002). Servant leadership: Its origin, development, and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9(2), 57-64.
- Smart, J. C. & St. John, E. P. (1996) Organizational culture and effectiveness in higher education: A test of the culture type and strong culture hypotheses. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 18(3), 219-241.
- Sosik, J. J. (2007). Relationships between leadership style and vision content: The moderating role of need for social approval, self-monitoring, and need for social power. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(2), 134-153.
- Strange, J. M. & Mumford, M. D. (2002). The origins of vision: Charismatic versus ideological

- leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(4), 343-377.
- Tsui, A. S., Zhang, Z. X., Wang, H., Xin, K. R. & Wu, J. B. (2006). Unpacking the relationship between CEO leadership behavior and organizational culture. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(2), 113-137.
- Waldman, D. A. & Yammarino, F. J. (1999). CEO charismatic leadership: Levels of management and levels of analysis effects. *The Academy of Management Review*, 24(2), 266-285.