Employees' Organizational Commitment and Their Perception of Supervisors'
Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors

by

Barbara B. Brown

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Human Development

Albert Wiswell, Chair

George Banks

Gabriella Belli

Letitia Combs

Eric McCollum

March 25, 2003

Falls Church, Virginia

Keywords: Leadership, Relations-Oriented, Task-Oriented, Commitment

Employees' Organizational Commitment and Their Perception of Supervisors' Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors

by

Barbara B. Brown

Albert Wiswell, Chair

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this research was to investigate the relationship between employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors and different types of *organizational commitment.*

Bass & Avolio's (1995) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ Form 5X) was used to measure *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors. Meyer & Allen's (1997) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was used to measure *organizational commitment.*

Participants in the research included 361 employees who worked for the city of Charlottesville, Virginia. These employees were located in eight departments that varied in the area of technical functioning, size, and academic levels.

Factor analyses, with principal component extraction and varimax rotation, were performed to determine how the MLQ Form 5X items would load onto a 2-factor model of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors. The *task-oriented* items of contingent reward loaded with the *relations-oriented* items, and the *non-leadership* items of laissez-faire loaded with the *task-oriented* items. These findings resulted in an arrangement of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* subscales that was different than the arrangement proposed by Bass & Avolio (1995).

Correlations for the MLQ Form 5X revealed multicollinearity among all the *relations-oriented* subscales and two of the *task-oriented* subscales, preventing any interpretations about the amount of variance that any particular type of *relations-oriented* or *task-oriented* leadership behavior might explain in *organizational commitment.* Factor scores were used to perform regressions and investigate the amount of variance *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors explained in *organizational commitment.*

Relations-oriented leadership behaviors explained the greatest amount of variance in affective commitment, somewhat less variance in normative commitment, and no variance in continuance commitment. The results for *task-oriented* leadership behaviors revealed the same pattern of relationships with the different types of *organizational commitment*, only weaker.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to my committee without whom this dissertation would not be possible. Bert Wiswell, thank you for holding my hand, massaging my ego, and soothing my nerves throughout this process. You always believed in me and never wavered in your support of what I was doing. Gabriella Belli, thank you for the hard work you put into reviewing and critiquing my materials. I am grateful. Letitia Combs, thank you for helping me put this process and product into perspective. You assured me that the corrections and revisions would result in a better product in the end. You were correct. Again, thank you, Leitita. Eric McCollum, thank you for hanging in there with me, being willing to read my documents, and offering your support. George Banks, you are a true friend. I am so honored that you agreed to serve on my committee and I am truly grateful for your positive words of encouragement.

I must also acknowledge the support and help of my very good friend and colleague, Randy Eppard. Randy, you and I began this journey together and are finishing together. Life has a way of bringing the right people together, at the right time, for the right reasons. Randy, you have been and will continue to be my true buddy and partner in the learning process.

I am also profoundly thankful for my husband's support. Michael, you tolerated my many hours of studying and you made me keep going when I wanted to give up. Thank you my darling, I love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER III – METHOD 33

CHAPTER IV – RESEARCH FINDINGS 50

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I
OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH

The study of leadership has been an important and central part of the literature on management and organization behavior for several decades. Indeed, "no other role in organizations has received more interest than that of the leader" (Schwandt & Marquardt, 2000, p. 177). The early examination of leadership behaviors included a separation of those behaviors into *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* categories.

Relations-oriented leadership behaviors focus on the quality of the relationship with followers, whereas, *task-oriented* leadership behaviors focus on the task to be accomplished by followers (Bass, 1990a). Throughout the years, researchers have used various terms to describe *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors.

Bass (1990a) provides an overview of terms used by several researchers. For example, descriptions of *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors have included consideration (Hemphill, 1950), building mutual trust (Misumi, 1985), participatory decision-making (Ouchi, 1981), interaction-oriented (Bass, 1967), supportive (Bowers & Seashore, 1966), democratic (Misumi, 1985), concern for people (Blake & Mouton, 1964), people centered (Anderson, 1974), emphasizing employee needs (Fleishman, 1957), and leadership (Zaleznik, 1977).

Conversely, descriptions of *task-oriented* leadership behaviors have included initiating structure (Hemphill, 1950), defining group activities (Fleishman, 1951), concerned with production (Blake & Mouton, 1964), autocratic (Reddin, 1977), achievement oriented (Indvik, 1986), focused on production (Katz, Maccoby, & Morse, 1950), production emphasizing (Fleishman, 1957), goal-achieving (Cartwright & Zander, 1960), goal emphasizing (Bowers & Seashore, 1966), and management (Zaleznik, 1977).

For both types of leadership behaviors, the most recent descriptions come from Bass & Avolio (1995, 1997). They describe *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors as idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation. Their *task-oriented* descriptions include contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), and management-by-exception (passive).

Leaders also exhibit behaviors that are considered *non relations-oriented* and *non task-oriented* (Bass, 1990a). These behaviors are called laissez-faire (Bass & Avolio, 1995, 1997),

although additional descriptions have included non *task* (Bass & Avolio, 1997), non *leadership* (Bass, 1990a; Bass & Avolio, 1997), and non *relations-oriented* and non *task-oriented* (Bass, 1990a). Laissez-faire leadership behaviors are characterized as inactive, which are contrary to typical proactive or reactive leadership behaviors (Bass, 1990a).

While researchers argue for the distinctiveness of their terminology, the terms are nonetheless related to each other. For example, *transformational leadership* and *transactional leadership* have been linked to *leadership* and *management* (Bass, 1985), respectively. *Consideration* and *initiating structure* have been linked to *transformational leadership* and *transactional leadership* (Seltzer & Bass, 1990), and *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors have been linked to *consideration* and *initiating structure* (Bass, 1990a).

For the purposes of this dissertation, I used the terms *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* to distinguish between various leadership behaviors. Some examples of where these distinctions occur are leadership and management, consideration and initiating structure, transformational and transactional, and democratic and autocratic. In some instances, the terms *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* have been enclosed in parentheses.

Effectiveness of Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors

Regardless of the terminology, researchers have continuously focused on the effectiveness of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors. Like the differing terms, research findings regarding the effectiveness of these leadership behaviors have been varied. Specifically, studies have supported the effectiveness of leadership behaviors that are *relations-oriented*, *task-oriented*, and a combination of both (Bass, 1990a).

Examples of studies supporting the effectiveness of *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors come from Fleishman & Harris (1962) who discovered that consideration leadership behaviors resulted in lower employee turnover. Yammarino, Spangler, & Bass (1993) found that charisma, individualized stimulation, and intellectual stimulation were positive predictors of job performance. Butler, Cantrell, & Flick (1999) reported that the leadership behaviors of individualized support and intellectual stimulation resulted in higher levels of job satisfaction.

Examples of findings supporting the effectiveness of *task-oriented* leadership behaviors come from Patchen (1962) who reported that obtaining rewards for followers had a positive

2

effect on job performance. Larson, Hunt, & Osborn (1974) found correlations between initiating structure and performance. Brown & Dodd (1999) discovered that contingent reward leadership behaviors resulted in greater satisfaction with supervisors and higher levels of productivity.

Examples of research supporting the effectiveness of a combined display of both *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors come from Klimoski & Hayes (1980) who found that the combination of task-centered and supportive leadership behaviors correlated positively with job performance and job satisfaction.   Thite (1999) discovered that managers who exhibited charisma, idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration as well as contingent reward and active management-by-exception leadership behaviors had more successful projects.

These various research findings demonstrate the broad impact of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors.   One overall measure of effectiveness that captures many of these individual findings is *organizational commitment.*

Organizational Commitment as a Measure of
Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors

Many factors influence employee commitment. These include commitment to the manager, occupation, profession, or career (Meyer & Allen, 1997). *Organizational commitment* focuses on employees' commitment to the organization. In explaining the significance of *organizational commitment*, Meyer & Allen (1997) refer to Morrow & McElroy's (1993) statement that *organizational commitment* is the most maturely developed of all the work commitment constructs.

As part of their research, Meyer & Allen (1991) developed a framework that was designed to measure three different types of organizational commitment: (a) *Affective commitment* refers to employees' emotional attachment, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment stay with the organization because they *want to*. (b) *Continuance commitment* refers to employees' assessment of whether the costs of leaving the organization are greater than the costs of staying. Employees who perceive that the costs of leaving the organization are greater than the costs of staying remain because they *need to*.   (c) *Normative commitment* refers to employees' feelings of obligation to

3

the organization. Employees with high levels of normative commitment stay with the organization because they feel they *ought to*.

In arguing for their framework, Meyer & Allen (1991) contended that affective, continuance, and normative commitment were components rather than types because employees could have varying degrees of all three. "For example, one employee might feel both a strong attachment to an organization and a sense of obligation to remain. A second employee might enjoy working for the organization but also recognize that leaving would be very difficult from an economic standpoint. Finally, a third employee might experience a considerable degree of desire, need, and obligation to remain with the current employer" (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 13). Even though the authors present this argument, they do not imply that there is a rationale for summing all the scales to obtain an overall score for *organizational commitment*. Consequently, for this research, the different scales will be referred to as types rather than components.

Studies have linked *organizational commitment* to measures of effectiveness that are similar to those found when investigating the outcomes of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors. Loui (1995), for instance, found that commitment was significantly related to trust, job involvement, and job satisfaction. Angle & Perry (1981) uncovered a relationship between commitment and turnover. Wiener & Vardi (1980) reported positive correlations between commitment and job performance.

Research has also linked *organizational commitment* to leadership behaviors that are *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented*. Jermier & Berkes (1979) discovered that employees who were allowed to participate in decision-making had higher levels of commitment to the organization. DeCotiis & Summers (1987) found that when employees were treated with consideration, they displayed greater levels of commitment. Bycio, Hackett, & Allen (1995) reported positive correlations between the leadership behaviors of charisma, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and contingent reward and affective, continuance, and normative commitment.

Organizational commitment provides a broad measure of the effectiveness of leadership behaviors. This relationship offers a way to further explore the subject of leadership.

4

Statement of the Problem

While research has shown that leadership behaviors affect employees' commitment to the organization, the literature does not offer guidance on how different types of *organizational commitment* are affected by *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors.

First, we do not know the relationship between employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors and different types of *organizational commitment*. Second, we do not know the relationship between employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *task-oriented* leadership behaviors and different types of *organizational commitment*. Finally, we do not how the interaction of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors are related to the different types of *organizational commitment*.

Significance of the Problem

Studies have documented the effectiveness of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors (Bass, 1990a). *Organizational commitment* is one way to measure the effectiveness of these leadership behaviors. This study contributes to the leadership literature by providing information on the relationship between *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* behaviors and different types of *organizational commitment*.

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this research was to investigate the relationship between employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors and different types of *organizational commitment.*

Research Questions

The following questions were proposed as part of this research:

1. What is the relationship between employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors and *organizational commitment* where…

   Relations-oriented leadership behaviors were initially measured as representing:

   a. idealized influence (attributed)
   b. idealized influence (behavior)
   c. inspirational motivation
   d. intellectual stimulation
   e. individualized consideration

   Organizational Commitment levels were initially measured as representing:

   a. affective commitment
   b. continuance commitment
   c. normative commitment

2. What is the relationship between employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *task-oriented* leadership behaviors and *organizational commitment* where…

   Task-oriented leadership behaviors were initially measured as representing:

   a. contingent reward
   b. management-by-exception (active)
   c. management-by-exception (passive)

   Organizational Commitment levels were initially measured as representing:

   a. affective commitment
   b. continuance commitment
   c. normative commitment

3. To what extent do employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented leadership* behaviors have an interactive effect on *organizational commitment*?

Based on findings from the preliminary analyses of my data, I changed the measures for *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors, *task-oriented* leadership behaviors, and *organizational commitment*. The actual measures were as follows: (a) *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors – idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and contingent reward; (b) *task-oriented* leadership behaviors – management-by-exception (active), management-by-exception (passive), and laissez-faire; (c) *organizational commitment* – affective commitment and normative commitment. A more detailed explanation involving the preliminary analyses and the reasons for these changes is presented in chapters three and four.

Summary

Discussions involving behaviors of leaders have dominated the leadership literature for decades and continue to do so today. *Relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors have been linked to several specific measures of individual and organizational effectiveness. *Organizational commitment* is one broad measure of effectiveness that embraces many of these more specific measures. Examining the impact that *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors have on *organizational commitment* contributes to our further understanding of leadership.

CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Research examining *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors began its domination in the 50's and has continued to this day. The study of these behaviors has resulted in many contributions to the leadership literature (Bass, 1990a). One important contribution has been the use of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* to differentiate and explain different types of leadership behaviors. Another contribution has been the use of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors as measures of individual and organizational effectiveness.

Relations-oriented and *task-oriented* behaviors are considered active forms of leadership (Bass, 1990a). That is, leaders take a proactive approach when performing their roles. Or, leaders perform in a reactive manner. Another approach to leadership involves being inactive. These leaders abdicate their responsibilities and avoid making decisions (Bass, 1990a). This form of leadership is considered laissez-faire.

Although laissez-faire leadership is not displayed as often as other leadership behaviors (Bass & Avolio, 1990), this leadership style is still exhibited and remains a legitimate approach to leadership (Bass, 1990a). Therefore, including laissez-faire leadership as part of the research on leadership behaviors can further our understanding of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors.

One overarching concept that offers an integrated approach to measuring the effectiveness of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors is *organizational commitment*. Research has linked *organizational commitment* to measures of effectiveness such as turnover, job performance, and job satisfaction (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The conclusion from many of these studies has been that employees who have high levels of commitment to the organization are more effective (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Because *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors affect individual and organizational effectiveness, these behaviors should also be related to employee levels of *organizational commitment*. An investigation into the relationship between *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors and *organizational commitment* can add to our knowledge of individual and organizational effectiveness.

8

The Emergence of Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors

The earliest theories of leadership focused on the deeds of great men. For example, "without Moses, the Jews would have remained in Egypt and without Winston Churchill the British would have given up in 1940" (Bass, 1990a, p. 37). Scrutiny of such heroic accolades gave rise to the Great Man Theory of Leadership, which contends that leaders are born, not made. This theory posits that certain individuals are endowed with leadership traits that cannot be learned (Cawthon, 1996).

Characteristics of great men focused on intelligence, energy, power, and influence. Early theorists such as Galton (1869) and Woods (1913) contended that great men were naturally endowed with characteristics obtained by virtue of inheritance. These characteristics naturally allowed them to lead others.

Great men were also considered to be biologically superior. Their lineage supposedly paralleled the "survival of the fittest" concept and they extended from the upper classes of society (Wiggam, 1931). The contention was that every society had individuals who possessed the superior traits required to lead the masses (Dowd, 1936), and these individuals would rise to the occasion when necessary.

Given the assumption that superior qualities separated leaders from followers, researchers then began to focus on identifying those qualities, which ultimately led to the introduction of trait theories of leadership (Bass, 1990a). Researchers such as Kohs & Irle (1920), Bernard (1926), Bingham (1927), Tead (1929), Page (1935), Kilbourne (1935), Bird (1940), Smith & Krueger (1933), and Jenkins (1947) all explained leadership in terms of traits of personality and characteristics. Emphasis on the pure trait theory of leadership remained dominant until the 1940s (Bass, 1990a).

When researchers began to question the types of traits that differentiated leaders from non-leaders, the focus of leadership studies transitioned from trait theories to behavioral theories. More specifically, researchers wanted to describe "individuals' behaviors while they acted as leaders of groups or organizations" (Bass, 1990a, p. 511). Hemphill (1949) and his associates are credited with being the first to investigate such behaviors.

Hemphill's (1949) research ultimately resulted in two primary leadership components: *initiation of structure* and *consideration* (Fleishman, 1951; Fleishman, 1953; Fleishman, 1957;

Halpin & Winer, 1957). Fleishman & Harris (1962) defined consideration and initiating structure as follows:

> *Consideration:* Includes behavior indicating mutual trust, respect, and a certain warmth and rapport between the supervisor and his group. This does not mean that this dimension reflects a superficial "pat-on-the-back," "first name calling" kind of human relations behavior. This dimension appears to emphasize a deeper concern for group members' needs and includes such behavior as allowing subordinates more participation in decision making and encouraging more two-way communication.
>
> *Initiating Structure:* Includes behavior in which the supervisor organizes and defines group activities and his relation to the group. Thus, he defines the role he expects each member to assume, assigns tasks, plans ahead, establishes ways of getting things done, and pushes for production. This dimension seems to emphasize overt attempts to achieve organization goals. (pp. 43-44)

This separating of leadership behaviors into two distinct constructs marked the beginning of a continuing effort to describe leadership behaviors as an either/or phenomenon. Considered the "classic" among leadership dichotomies (Denison, Hooijberg, & Quinn, 1995), consideration and initiating structure also provided the framework for characterizing leadership behaviors as either *relations-oriented* or *task-oriented*.

Characterizations of Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors

The examination of leadership from dual perspectives has been seen throughout history (Bass, 1990a). These researchers have primarily characterized leadership under the umbrella of *relations-oriented* or *task-oriented* behaviors. A review of the literature reveals similarities as well as differences in these characterizations.   Some of these differences and similarities appear in the titles of models or concepts used to categorize *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors; the types of leadership behaviors that are listed within those categories; and the instruments used to measure individual as well as categories of leadership behaviors.

Early Descriptions of Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors

In differentiating between *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership, early researchers attempted to identify the types of behaviors that fit each category.   In addition to the traditional terms of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented*, these researchers used terms such as authoritarian, autocratic, directive, and democratic to make distinctions among the leadership behaviors.

For instance, Lewin & Lippitt (1938) undertook a study of several groups, composed of five members each, of fifth and sixth graders. Their goal was to investigate the types of behaviors that distinguished authoritarian/autocratic (*task-oriented*) groups from democratic (*relations-oriented*) groups. They found that authoritarian/autocratic (*task-oriented*) leadership behaviors involved a focus on goals and tasks, as well as denying others involvement in the decision-making process. Contrarily, democratic (*relations-oriented*) leadership behaviors included praise, invitation to participate, and encouragement.

Nelson (1949; 1950) too looked at democratic (*relations-oriented*) leadership.   However, he juxtaposed democratic (*relations-oriented*) leadership with leadership behaviors that were directive, regulative, and manipulative (*task-oriented*). Two conclusions he drew from studies of the leadership styles of 220 foremen in a manufacturing organization were that (a) task-directed leadership behaviors involved initiating structure, providing information about tasks, issuing rules, and threatening punishment for disobedience; and (b) democratic leadership behaviors included two-way interactions with workers and emphasis on human relations.

Fleishman's (1953) conclusions regarding the *relations-oriented* versus *task-oriented* dimensions of leadership evolved from his validity and reliability studies on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), which measured the two constructs of consideration and initiating structure. Consideration included *relations-oriented* behaviors such as expresses appreciation, considers subordinates feelings, provides rewards for a job well-done. Initiating structure included *task-oriented* behaviors such as offers approaches to problem solving, tries out new ideas, and makes task assignments.

Stogdill (1963) also looked at the types of behaviors that represented consideration and initiating structure. He included the following in his descriptions: (a) consideration (*relations-oriented*)-regards comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers, and (b) initiating structure (*task-oriented*)-applies pressure for product output, clearly defines own role, and lets

followers know what is expected. In a further discussion of consideration and initiating structure, Akhtar & Haleem (1979) offered the following comment regarding the variety of terms:

> Review of the literature in this area brings to light a few facts. Firstly, 'employee-oriented', 'employee-centered,' 'supportive,' and 'considerate' are the various terms that have been used interchangeably. Similarly, 'production-centered,' job-centered,' and 'initiating structure' have been used. (p. 90)

Leadership Behaviors as Relations-Oriented "OR" Task-Oriented

Researchers have used various titles, models, and concepts to differentiate between *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors. Some of these approaches are similar in that many of the behaviors listed under the categories of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors are either identical or synonymous. On the other hand, some of these approaches are dissimilar in that researchers use different titles to categorize their *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors.

One method of capturing *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors comes from researchers who list these behaviors under the dual concepts of **leadership** and **management**. Some examples of how researchers differentiate between leadership and management are listed in Table 2.1. Bennis & Nanus (1985), for instance, juxtapose *focuses on people* with *focuses on systems and structures*. Kotter (1990) contrasts *motivating and inspiring* versus *controlling and problem solving*. Zaleznik (1977) differentiates between a *focus on what things mean to people* versus a *focus on how things get done*. Eicher (1998) pits *inspiring others* against *directing operations*.

Further examination of these leadership and management distinctions highlights, once again, the synonymous aspect of terminology. For example, Bennis & Nanus's (1985) leadership behavior of *focus on people* is similar to Kotter's (1990) *motivating and inspiring,* Zaleznik's (1977) *focus on what events mean to people,* and Eicher's (1998) *inspiring others*.

An examination of the management behaviors reveals an equal similarity with word or phrase exchanges. First, *relies on control* (Bennis & Nanus, 1985) is similar to *emphasis on rationality and control* (Zaleznik, 1977). Second, *short-range view* (Bennis & Nanus, 1985) is

12

Table 2.1: Leadership Versus Management Descriptions

Source	Leadership Behaviors	Management Behaviors
Zaleznik (1977)	adopts a personal and active attitude toward goals, are proactive, develop fresh ideas, explore new options, develop excitement in others, accept high-levels of risk, seek out opportunities, concerned with ideas, relates to people in intuitive ways, focus on what events mean to people, attract strong feelings of identity, are able to intensify individual motivation	adopts an impersonal/passive attitude toward goals, reactive, emphasis on rationality and control, focus on strategies and decision making, planning, rewarding, punishments, emphasis on acceptable compromises, limit choices, operates using a survival instinct, tolerates mundane and practical work, relates to people according to the other person's role, focuses on how things get done, communicates to subordinates indirectly, uses inconclusive signals when communicating
Bennis & Nanus (1985)	innovative, original thinking, develops, focuses on people, inspires trust, long-range perspective, originates, challenging, does the right thing	administers, copies, maintains, focuses on systems and structure, relies on control, short-range view, imitates, accepts status quo, does things right
Kotter (1990)	coping with change, setting a direction, aligning people, motivating and inspiring	coping with complexity, panning and budgeting, organizing and staffing, controlling and problem solving
Eicher (1998)	guiding others and the organization, personally developing others, promoting opportunities for growth, being future oriented, embracing uncertainty, communicating organization direction, developing key relationships, inspiring others	administering rules and policies, demonstrating and clarifying expectations, setting standards of performance, improving operations, maintaining focus on present needs, directing operations, developing the organization, reinforcing performance

similar to *maintaining focus on present needs* (Eicher, 1998). Finally, *accepts the status quo* (Bennis & Nanus, 1985) is similar to *tolerates mundane and practical work* (Zaleznik, 1977).

Other examples of the various titles, models, and concepts researchers use to distinguish between *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors can be found under Bass's (1990a) presentation of **democratic** and **autocratic** leadership concepts. This list of 29 dichotomous characterizations demonstrates the expansive array of terms used to differentiate between *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors.

Bass (1990a) also found the same similarity of terms between his **democratic** and **autocratic** characterizations that exist in the literature with regards to **leadership** and **management**. For example, Bass (1990a) explains that autocratic and/or authoritarian (Lewin & Lippitt, 1938) leadership is also described as directive (Bass & Barret, 1981; Heller, 1969). Similarly, Bass (1990a) commented that Theory X (McGregor, 1960) is also defined as coercive and persuasive (Bass, 1960) or concerned with production (Blake & Mouton, 1964). The same situation exists with the democratic and/or person-related concepts. For instance, it is not difficult to find commonalities in the terms employee centered (Katz et al., 1950) and employee emphasis (Fleishman, 1957). A similar argument could be made for the phrases: human relations oriented (Mann, 1965), *relations-oriented* (Fiedler, 1967), and people centered (Anderson, 1974).

Leadership Behaviors as Relations-Oriented "AND/OR" Task-Oriented

Other researchers in the field of leadership have suggested that the behaviors of leaders were either a direct result of their circumstances or should be based on their circumstances (Bass, 1990a). In other words, the display of *relations-oriented* or *task-oriented* leadership behaviors was determined by the situation. Several researchers have offered theories, models, or concepts in this area.

McGregor's (1960) Theory X (*task-oriented*) and Theory Y (*relations-oriented*) Model proposed two distinct theories of human beings: One basically negative, labeled Theory X; and the other basically positive, labeled Theory Y.   McGregor (1960) uses the term managerial to describe both Theory X and Theory Y behaviors.

His theories contend that managerial behaviors are based on assumptions about employees. A Theory X assumption involves the belief that employees dislike work and will avoid it if at all possible. Managerial behaviors in this instance will include coercing employees, controlling their tasks and activities, and directing their behaviors. A Theory Y assumption involves the belief that employees can view work as a positive experience given the right conditions. Managerial behaviors in this instance include providing encouragement, positive reinforcement, and rewards.

Hersey & Blanchard's (1977) Situational Leadership Theory purports that leadership behaviors fall into two dimensions: (a) leader's concern with the task (structuring or task orientation), and (b) leader's concern with the relationship (socio-emotional support or relationship orientation). These behaviors are labeled as delegating, participating, selling, and telling.

As an employee gains in maturity (i.e. capacity, ability, education, experience, motivation, self-esteem, confidence), the need for socio-emotional support increases, while the need for structuring declines. Beyond a certain level of maturity, the need for both types of orientation decreases. In other words, as the employee matures, selling and telling are replaced with negotiating and participating, and all are eventually terminated or applied only on an "as needed" basis.

House's (1971) Path-Goal Theory, which evolved from the expectancy theory of motivation, suggests that leadership behaviors that increase the opportunities for goal achievement will result in greater employee motivation and satisfaction. The essence of such behaviors includes clarifying goals for employees as well as explaining the paths to achieving those goals. House (1971) posited that both the leadership behaviors of consideration (*relations-oriented*) and initiating structure (*task-oriented*) influenced employee satisfaction and motivation to pursue goals.

Fiedler's (1967) Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) Model offers another way to distinguish between leadership behaviors that were *relations*-oriented versus *task-oriented*. His model holds the distinction of being "the most widely researched on leadership" (Bass, 1990a, p. 494).

In describing their Least Preferred Coworker, individuals select terms that characterize the other individual as having a "task emphasis" or a "relations emphasis." Individuals who select negative behaviors (e.g. unfriendly, rejecting, frustrating) to characterize their Least

Preferred Coworker are considered to prefer a *relations-oriented* leadership style. Whereas, individuals who choose positive behaviors (e.g. friendly, accepting, satisfying) to describe their Least Preferred Coworker are believed to prefer a *task-oriented* leadership style.

The situational aspect of Fielder's (1967) theory exists because he portends that leaders (and non-leaders) should be placed in situations that complement their preferences toward *relations-oriented* versus *task-oriented* behaviors. Such placements are based on the "favorability" of the group to be led, with "favorability" meaning that the task is structured, clear, simple, and easy to solve; and the leader has positional power and legitimacy. The result is individuals who prefer *relations-oriented* behaviors should lead groups where conditions are neither high nor low in favorability (medium structure and power), and individuals who prefer *task-oriented* behaviors should lead groups where conditions are very unfavorable (high structure and power) or unfavorable (low structure and power).

Vroom & Yetton (1973) created the Vroom-Yetton Model of Leadership. A decision-making model, its premise is that the most effective "leadership decision style" depends on whether the leader desires a high-quality decision, or is more concerned with subordinates' acceptance of the decision. The model's purpose is to predict when leaders should or should not allow subordinates to participate in the decision-making process. It is composed of seven rules from the decision-making literature, with three focusing on decision quality and four emphasizing decision acceptance. In effect, a leader can choose to display democratic (*relations-oriented*) behaviors and encourage participation and input from employees, or be autocratic (*task-oriented*) and make decisions without input, or use a combination of both types of behaviors.

Bass (1985) presented a model of Transformational Leadership and Transactional Leadership which include behaviors that, while distinct, serve to complement each other. Transformational (*relations-oriented*) leadership behaviors are those that instill followers with the personal desire to achieve goals. Transactional (*task-oriented*) leadership behaviors are those that obtain commitment for the achievement of goals through a promise of rewards or agreed upon exchanges and by taking corrective actions for inadequate performance.

Bass (1985) argued that a leader could exhibit both transformational and transactional leadership behaviors. But while both types of behaviors are important, transformational leadership has the greatest power to engender loyalty and commitment (Bass, 1990b). That's

16

because leaders who exhibit transformational behaviors "motivate their followers by raising their followers' level of awareness about the importance and value of designated outcomes, and by transforming followers' personal values to support the collective goals/vision for their organization" (Jung & Avolio, 2000, p. 949).

Bass's (1985) transformational leadership and transactional leadership categories represent the most recent descriptions of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors. The specific types of leadership behaviors within each category remain the same with two exceptions. Charisma is now labeled idealized influence (attributed and behavior) and laissez-faire leadership is presented as a separate category of *non-leadership* rather than a type of transactional leadership behavior (Bass & Avolio, 1995, 1997).

Laissez-Faire Leadership: Non Relations-Oriented/Non Task-Oriented Behaviors

In the 1100-plus page *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*, Bass (1990a) devotes an entire chapter to the discussion of laissez-faire leadership. Within this chapter, there are many examples of behaviors that represent a "do nothing" or "hands-off" approach. Such behaviors include staying away from employees, shirking supervisory duties, and being "inactive, rather than reactive or proactive" (Bass, 1990a, p. 550).

Bass (1990a) uses the following statement to differentiate laissez-faire leadership from other types of leadership behaviors and styles:

> Laissez-faire leadership should not be confused with democratic, relations-oriented, participative, or considerate leadership behavior. Nor should it be confused with delegation or management by exception. Delegation implies the leader's active direction of a subordinate to take responsibility for some role or task. The active delegative leader remains concerned and will follow up to see if the role has been enacted or the task has been successfully completed. The leader who practices management by exception allows the subordinate to continue on paths that the subordinate and the leader agreed on until problems arise or standards are not met, at which time the leader intervenes to make corrections. (p. 545)

Linking Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors

While researchers argue for the distinctiveness of their terminology, the terms and concepts upon which those terms are based are related to each other. This means that researchers use different terms to talk about the same concepts.

One broad example that supports this position comes from *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*. Part V of this VIII part book is devoted to discussions, theories, models, research, and concepts surrounding **leadership** and **management**. Within the broad categories of leadership and management, Bass (1990a) includes specific chapters addressing the following: leadership versus management; autocratic/authoritarian versus democratic/egalitarian leadership; directive versus participative leadership; *task-oriented* versus *relations-oriented* leadership; consideration versus initiating structure; and laissez-faire leadership versus motivation to manage.

In each chapter, Bass (1990a) presents theories, concepts, and research that emphasize the thread connecting *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors to all the other types of leadership. This is the case for even the primary category of leadership and management.

A specific example of this tendency to link one set of terms or concepts with another can be found in Bass's (1985) explanation of transformational and transactional leadership. In arriving at the dimensions for transformational and transactional leadership, Bass (1985) specifically compared these dimensions to leadership and management behaviors. In doing so, Bass (1985) used the term Parallel Structures and showed the relationship between his descriptions of transformational and transactional leadership and Zaleznik's (1977) descriptions of leaders and managers:

> Based on clinical observations, the psychoanalytically trained Zaleznik
> distinguished between "managers" and "leaders." His managers displayed
> transactional leadership; his leaders, transformational leadership. Paralleling our
> first factor of charisma, he wrote that leaders, but not managers, attract strong
> feelings of identity and intense feelings of love and hate. Leaders send clear
> messages of purpose and missions, not ambiguous signals. Zaleznik noted that
> leaders, but not managers, generate excitement at work and heighten expectations

through the images and meanings they provide. Paralleling our third factor of individualized consideration, he wrote that leaders, but not managers cultivate, establish, and break off intensive one-to-one relationships. They reveal empathy for individuals, as such, and what different events mean to different individuals. On the other hand, managers see themselves as role players engaged in an activity whose meaning lies in itself as a process. Paralleling our fifth factor of intellectual stimulation, he wrote that leaders, but not managers, were more concerned with ideas rather than process, ideas which the leaders can articulate and project onto images.

On the other hand, consistent with our analyses, Zaleznik's managers engaged more often in transactional activities than did his leaders. As with our second factor of contingent reward, Zaleznik's managers, but not his leaders, made flexible use of rewards and punishments. Similar to our fourth factor of management-by-exception, Zaleznik observed that managers, but not leaders, tried to maintain (not change) a controlled, rational, equitable system. Zaleznik indicated that his leaders were likely to be more active; his managers were likely to be more passive. While managers tolerate the mundane, leaders react to it "as to an affliction. (Bass, 1985, pp. 229-230)

Another specific connection among terms or concepts is demonstrated by Seltzer & Bass (1990) who reported that consideration and initiating structure were linked to transformational leadership and transactional leadership. The following statement highlights the extent of this relationship:

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate whether the transformational scales would add to the variance of outcome measures explained by initiation and consideration. Indeed, they did. Although the transformational scales were positively correlated with initiation and consideration, they accounted for 7 to 28% more variability in the outcome measures. As previous research had shown that transformational leadership augments transactional leadership, we have demonstrated here that it also augments initiation and consideration. (p. 701)

Measuring Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors

Given that researchers have used different terms to describe similar concepts, it is no surprise that researchers also use different instruments to measure similar types of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors. Table 2.2 contains a sample listing of items captured from four different instruments that may be interpreted as measuring *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors.

Research Involving Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors

Findings involving the effects of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors have produced mixed results. In general, findings have revealed that *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors are effective; that *task-oriented* leadership behaviors are effective; and that the combined display of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors is effective.

Studies involving the non *relations-oriented* and non *task-oriented* behaviors of laissez-faire leadership have concluded that this "do nothing" approach is the least effective (Bass, 1990a). The following explanation highlights the impact of all three types of behaviors:

> Although consideration, relations orientation, and participation alone promote satisfaction, the combination of high initiation and consideration, high orientation task and relations orientation, and high direction and participation may be the most conducive to effective leadership. Depending on which outcome is considered the next most efficacious combination is active engagement in either one or the other. But the least efficacious is a combination of low initiation and consideration, low task and relations oriented, and low direction and participation—an equivalent of laissez-faire leadership. (Bass, 1990a, p. 559)

Early Research

The early studies of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership involved making comparisons between categories of leadership behaviors such as leadership and management, democratic and autocratic leadership, and Theory X and Theory Y. In general, the findings

Table 2.2: Sample of Items From Different Instruments

Instrument and Author	Relations-Oriented Statements	Task-Oriented Statements
Leader-Manager Feedback Form, *Eicher (1998)*	1. Ask about the outcomes employees want and work to create a solution that includes both the organization's goals and their goals 2. Schedule blocks of time for coaching employees 3. Take the time to build long-term relations with employees in all workgroups	1. Provide employees with exact performance standards such as service levels, revenue targets, and report writing 2. Describe roles, responsibilities, and ownership of work tasks 3. Outline the steps for improvement when an employee misses targeted objectives
MLQ Form 5X, *Bass & Avolio (1995)*	1. Spends time teaching and coaching 2. Helps me develop my strengths 3. Acts in ways that build trust	1. Directs my attention toward failures to meet standards 2. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved 3. Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards
Managerial Grid, *Blake & Mouton (1964)*	1. Encourages team to participate when it comes to decision-making time and trying to implement their ideas and suggestions 2. Enjoys coaching people on new tasks and procedures 3. Encourages employees to be creative about their jobs	1. Nothing is more important than accomplishing a goal or task 2. Closely monitors the schedule to ensure a task or project will be completed in time 3. When seeing a complex task through to completion, ensures that every detail is accounted for
LBDQ Form XII, *Stogdill (1963)*	1. Makes pep talks to stimulate the group 2. Is friendly and approachable 3. Encourages initiative in the group	1. Assigns group members to particular tasks 2. Pushes for increased production 3. Maintains definite standards of performance

focused on demonstrating which category of leadership behaviors was most effective-*relations-oriented* only, *task-oriented* only, or both *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented.*

Research Supporting Relations-Oriented Leadership Behaviors. Several studies from Bass's (1990a) list of autocratic versus democratic leadership concepts provide examples for this group. One such illustration comes from Katz, Maccoby, & Morse (1950) whose focus involved production-centered versus employee-centered leadership. From their studies involving 24 section heads and 419 non-supervisory employees in high and low productivity sections, they concluded that supervisors in high-producing groups exhibited more employee-oriented behaviors rather than production-oriented behaviors.

Fleishman & Harris (1962) looked at the impact that initiating structure and consideration had on labor grievances and employee turnover. From their examination of 57 production foremen and their work groups, they pronounced: "both grievances and turnover were highest in groups having low consideration foremen, regardless of the degree of Structuring behavior shown by these same foremen" (p.62).

House, Filley, & Kerr (1971), looked at how initiating structure and consideration affected job satisfaction. Their study involved three large organizations where participants numbered 104, 118, and 234. While there were some variations, results from all three companies revealed a positive correlation between consideration and job satisfaction.

Meyer (1968) investigated the effect of leadership perceptions regarding Theory X and Theory Y. He explored these theories by studying two plants of employees, one managed according to Theory X and the other according to Theory Y. Findings revealed that workers who were exposed to Theory Y leadership behaviors had a more positive experience and as a result felt greater responsibility, more warmth, and personally rewarded.

Downey, Sheridan, & Slocum (1975) conducted a study involving 68 managers and 68 machine operators. They discovered that both groups had higher levels of satisfaction with their immediate supervisors when those supervisors exhibited considerate leadership behaviors.

Some of the most profound evidence attesting to the superior effects of *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors comes from studies conducted at the University of Michigan. During their 20 years of research (1950 to 1970), researchers discovered that democratic leadership behaviors

resulted in greater job satisfaction and productivity than autocratic leadership behaviors (Bass, 1990a).

Research Supporting Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors. The military is one group that tends to value the use of authoritarian/autocratic over democratic leadership behaviors (Bass, 1990a). In their study of 30,735 U.S. Army superiors, peers, and subordinates of commissioned and non-commissioned officers, Penner, Malone, Coughlin, & Herz (1973) found that superiors gave higher performance ratings to officers who displayed authorization/autocratic leadership behaviors.

Supportive evidence for *task-oriented* over *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors can be found elsewhere. One such study comes from Hodge (1976) who found that first-line managers felt more satisfied with superiors (second-level managers) who displayed higher levels of initiating structure behaviors.

Another comes from Dunteman & Bass (1963) who studied foremen who displayed *relations-oriented* versus *task-oriented* behaviors. They reported that groups whose leaders portrayed *task-oriented* behaviors were more productive.   Lastly, in a study of one state mental health institution, Larson, Hunt, & Osborn (1974) found that initiating structure leadership behaviors were more highly related to group performance than consideration behaviors.

Research Supporting Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors. Studies in this area involve the use of various models and methods.   Klimoski & Hayes (1980) looked at *task-oriented* versus *relations-oriented* leadership in the production department of a large information-processing firm. After examining the relationships among effort, performance, and satisfaction of 241 assistants, they concluded that all three outcomes were enhanced if the supervisors demonstrated behaviors that were both task centered and supportive.

In a study of Situational Leadership, Hambleton & Gumpert (1982) found that when the supervisors of 189 employees applied the Hersey & Blanchard (1982) model, the job performance of those employees increased.   That is, supervisors made determinations about the amount of structure support versus emotional support was needed based on the maturity of the employee.

Another positive finding comes from Blake & Mouton's (1964) Managerial Grid. After a study of 716 managers from a single firm, Blake & Mouton (1964) reported that managers who displayed a combination of people-oriented and production-oriented behaviors advanced more quickly in their careers than managers with other styles.

Later Research

Later research emphasized an examination of the specific behaviors within the categories of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership. Transformational (*relations-oriented*) leadership and transactional (*task-oriented*) leadership were two categories that contained some specific subsets of leadership behaviors.

Like the broad categories of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership, research investigating specific leadership behaviors has produced findings in three major areas. First, research looking at the specific *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors of idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration has revealed varying levels of effectiveness among each. Second, studies involving the *task-oriented* leadership behaviors of contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), and management-by-exception (passive) have found contingent reward to be more effective. Third, researchers examining the specific *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors together have reported positive correlations with some *task-oriented* leadership behaviors, even when the *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors are better predictors of outcomes.

Research Supporting Specific Relations-Oriented/Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors. The specific *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors within this group are captured under the headings of transformational (*relations-oriented*) and transactional (*task-oriented*) leadership. Findings have revealed varying degrees of effectiveness among the *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors of idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration, as well as among the *task-oriented* leadership behaviors of contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), and management-by-exception (passive).

In a study of 138 subordinates of managers who were part-time students in an MBA program, Seltzer & Bass (1990) reported positive correlations between transformational leadership and three outcome areas: subordinate's perceptions of their leader's effectiveness; subordinate's extra effort; and subordinate's satisfaction. Among the specific transformational leadership behaviors, individualized consideration correlated most strongly with leaders effectiveness and subordinate's satisfaction. Individualized consideration had the stronger relationship with subordinate's extra effort. Intellectual stimulation revealed the weakest relationship among all three outcome areas.

Using a study of 1,376 nurses, Bycio, Hackett, & Allen (1995) examined how transformational leadership and transactional leadership affected employee levels of affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Findings revealed that transformational leadership was a better predictor of affective, continuance, and normative commitment than transactional leadership. An examination of the specific transformational and transactional leadership behaviors revealed the following: (a) charisma had the strongest relationship with affective commitment, (b) contingent reward had the stronger relationship with normative commitment, and (c) management-by-exception had the strongest relationship with continuance commitment. Individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation demonstrated the greatest strength with affective commitment.

Hater & Bass (1988) compared the effects of transformational and transactional leadership behaviors on subordinates who worked for top-performing managers versus ordinary-performing managers. There were 171 subordinates in the top-performing group and 141 subordinates in the ordinary-performing group. The purpose was to determine subordinate's perceptions regarding supervisory effectiveness and job satisfaction. A comparison of both groups revealed stronger correlations between transformational leadership than transactional leadership.

As for the separate transformational leadership behaviors, subordinates reporting to the top-performing managers and ordinary-performing managers viewed charisma as the strongest leadership behavior. Individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation measured second respectively among the transformational leadership subscales.

For transactional leadership, subordinates of ordinary-performing managers saw contingent reward as the most important leadership behavior. However, subordinates of the top-

performing managers group viewed management-by-exception (active) as the more powerful leadership behavior. For both groups, management-by-exception (passive) was negatively correlated.

In a study of 276 United States Naval Officers, Yammarino, Spangler, & Bass (1993) discovered that transformational leadership was a better predictor of military performance than transactional leadership. While the researchers did not report individual correlations for the individual transformational leadership behaviors, they did provide these data for the transactional leadership behaviors. Specifically, neither the management-by-exception (active) nor management-by-exception (passive) leadership behaviors correlated with performance. Additionally, management-by-exception (passive) was negatively correlated.

Using a sample of 78 managers, Howell, & Avolio (1993) examined the effect that transformational leadership and transactional leadership behaviors would have on business goals. Specific findings involving the transactional behaviors revealed that contingent reward and management-by-exception (active) had a negative impact on unit performance, while management-by-exception (passive) was positively related to performance. The transformational leadership behaviors of charisma, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration were all positively correlated with unit performance.

Thite (1999) investigated the effect that transformational leadership behaviors and transactional leadership behaviors had on project outcomes. Participants in the study included 18 senior managers of an informational technology project, 70 project managers, and 228 subordinates of the project managers.

For managers of the most successful projects, as well as managers of the least successful projects, the transformational leadership behaviors of charisma, idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration had a greater effect on performance outcomes than the transactional leadership behaviors of contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), and management-by-exception (passive). Specific strengths of the leadership behaviors occurred in the following descending order: attributed charisma, individualized consideration, idealized influence, contingent reward, intellectual stimulation, management-by-exception (active), and management-by-exception (passive).

Simon (1994) examined the effect that transformational leadership behaviors had on organizational commitment. Participants in the study included 228 employees from three

different organizations. An examination of the specific leadership behaviors revealed that, as a group, the transformational leadership behaviors were positively correlated with normative commitment (strongest relationship) and affective commitment. However, a negative correlation existed with continuance commitment.

As for the individual leadership behaviors, inspirational motivation was the strongest positive predictor of affective commitment, while both charisma and inspirational motivation were equally strong positive predictors of normative commitment.   In contrast, each of the transformational leadership behaviors was negatively related to continuance commitment, with intellectual stimulation showing the strongest negative relationship.

Some researchers have offered findings on a few specific *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors. For instance, Brown & Dodd (1999) conducted a study involving 660 employees. The researchers discovered a positive relationship between contingent reward and the outcome variables of job satisfaction and productivity. Patchen's (1962) study of manual workers revealed that supervisors who obtained rewards for workers had a positive effect on performance. Finally, as a result of their research involving 78 members of self-directed work teams, Butler, Cantrell, & Flick (1999) reported that individualized support and intellectual stimulation resulted in higher levels of job satisfaction.

Laissez-Faire Leadership: Non Relations-Oriented/Non Task-Oriented Behaviors

Researchers have consistently reported that laissez-faire leadership is the least satisfying and least effective style of leadership (Bass, 1990a). That's because these leadership behaviors are accompanied by little sense of accomplishment, little clarity, and little sense of group unity (Bass, 1990a).   It's probably for these reasons that many researchers choose to exclude laissez-faire leadership from their research involving transformational leadership and transactional leadership.

One study that validates the non-effectiveness of laissez-faire leadership comes from Hater & Bass (1988) who compared supervisors' appraisals of 54 managers. Hater & Bass (1988) found negative correlations between laissez-faire leadership and supervisor's appraisals regarding the manager's performance and promotability.

Another example in this group comes from Yammarino, Spangler, & Bass (1993) whose research involving 276 United States Naval Officers revealed negative correlations between laissez-faire leadership and military performance.

<div align="center">

Organizational Commitment

</div>

The many studies involving the broad categories of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors, as well as specific behaviors within those categories, have demonstrated that these behaviors impact both individual and organizational effectiveness. *Organizational commitment* is a construct that explores effectiveness outcomes in similar areas.

The Relationship Between Organizational Commitment and Outcome Measures

In general, *organizational commitment* is considered a useful measure of organizational effectiveness (Steers, 1975). In particular, "organizational commitment is a "multidimensional construct" (Morrow, 1993) that has the potential to predict organizational outcomes such as performance, turnover, absenteeism, tenure, and organizational goals" (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 12).

For example, in a study involving 109 workers, Loui (1995) examined the relationship between the broad construct of *organizational commitment* and the outcome measures of supervisory trust, job involvement, and job satisfaction. In all three areas, Loui (1995) reported positive relationships with *organizational commitment*. More specifically, perceived trust in the supervisor, an ability to be involved with the job, and feelings of job satisfaction were major determinants of *organizational commitment*.

Angle & Perry (1991) undertook a study to determine the effect that organizational commitment had on turnover. The participants included 1,244 bus drivers. Findings revealed a negative relationship between turnover and organizational commitment. In short, employees who intended to leave the job were not committed to the organization.

Wiener & Vardi (1980) looked at the effect that *organizational commitment* had on commitment to the job and career commitment. Their participants included 56 insurance agents and 85 staff professionals. The researchers reported positive relationships between *organizational commitment* and the two other types of commitment.

Jermier & Berkes (1979) collected data on *organizational commitment* from over 800 police officers. The researchers were investigating the relationship between job satisfaction and *organizational commitment*. Findings revealed that employees who were more satisfied with their job had higher levels of *organizational commitment*.

DeCotiis & Summers (1987) undertook a study of 367 managers and their employees. The researchers examined the relationship between *organizational commitment* and the outcome measures of individual motivation, desire to leave, turnover, and job performance. *Organizational commitment* was found to be a strong predicator for each of these outcome areas.

The Relationship Between Organizational Commitment and Leadership Behaviors

Further investigation into the multidimensionality of *organizational commitment* revealed different relationships between commitment and *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors. For instance, Reichers (1986) claimed that *organizational commitment* was in reality a collection of commitments to multiple coalitions and constituencies (e.g. owners/managers, rank-and-file employees, customers/clients). In an examination of this claim, Reichers (1986) undertook a study to measure the commitment of 124 mental health professionals. Her only significant correlation was between *organizational commitment* and top management's goals and values.

In another study involving 763 employees, Becker (1992) examined whether employees' commitment to different constituencies or to the overall organization were better predictors of job satisfaction, intention to quit, and prosocial behavior. He discovered that employees' commitment to top management, supervisors, and work groups contributed significantly beyond commitment to the organization.

During later research, Becker, Billings, Eveleth, & Gilbert (1996) also explored whether commitment to the supervisor or to the organization had the greatest impact on the performance ratings that supervisors gave to newly hired employees. From their study of 281 participants, the researchers found that commitment to the supervisor and the supervisor's values was more strongly related to performance ratings than was employee commitment to the organization.

Summarizing these multiple constituency findings, Meyer & Allen (1997) offered the following:

It should be kept in mind, however, that when we as researchers measure commitment to the organization as a whole, we are probably measuring employees' commitment to "top management" (Reichers, 1986) or to a combination of top management and more local foci (Becker & Billings, 1993; Hunt & Morgan, 1994). If, on the one hand, our intention is to use commitment as a means of understanding or predicting behavior of relevance to the organization as a whole (or top management specifically), it would seem that our purpose can be well served with global measures of *organizational commitment*. (p. 19)

The Three Types of Organizational Commitment

Meyer & Allen (1991) offer the following definition of their three types of *organizational commitment*:

Affective Commitment refers to the employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement with the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment continue employment with the organization because they want to do so. Continuance Commitment refers to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Employees whose primary link to the organization is based on continuance commitment remain because they need to do so. Finally, Normative Commitment reflects a feeling of obligation to continue employment. Employees with a high level of normative commitment feel that they ought to remain with the organization. (p. 67)

In arriving at this definition, Meyer & Allen (1997) examined the differences and similarities of descriptions from other researchers. In arguing for three separate types of commitment, Allen & Meyer (1990) offered:

Affective, continuance, and normative commitment are best viewed as disguisable components, rather than types, of attitudinal commitment; that is, employees can experience each of these psychological states to varying degrees. Some employees, for example, might feel both a strong need and a strong obligation to

30

remain, but no desire to do so; others might feel neither a need nor obligation but a strong desire, and so on. The 'net sum' of a person's commitment to the organization, therefore, reflects each of these separable psychological states. (p. 4)

Research Involving Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment

While Meyer & Allen (1991) have used affective, continuance, and normative commitment to capture the multidimensional nature of *organizational commitment*, affective commitment is considered a more effective measurement of *organizational commitment*. Meyer & Allen (1997) buttressed their support for the importance of affective commitment by explaining that employees with strong affective commitment would be motivated to higher levels of performance and make more meaningful contributions than employees who expressed continuance or normative commitment.

In nine studies involving 2,734 persons, Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda (1994) examined how participatory management and supervisory feedback influenced employee levels of affective, continuance, and normative commitment. The researchers found that when supervisors provided feedback about performance and allowed employees to participate in decision-making, employee levels of affective commitment was stronger than both continuance and normative. That is, employees indicated staying with the organization was more related to wanting to, rather than needing to or feeling they ought to.

In a study of 238 nurses, Cohen (1996) investigated the relationship between affective, continuance, and normative commitment and the following other types of commitment: work involvement, job involvement, and career commitment. Findings revealed that affective commitment was more highly correlated with all the other types of commitment. In other words, employees who remained with the organization because they wanted to were more likely to exhibit higher levels of commitment to their work, their job, and their career.

Irving, Coleman, & Cooper (1997) investigated the relationship between affective, continuance, and normative commitment and the outcome measures of job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Total participants for the study included 232 employees. Results revealed that job satisfaction was positively related to both affective and normative commitment.

31

However, job satisfaction was negatively related to continuance commitment. All three types of commitment were negatively related to turnover intentions, with continuance commitment having the strongest negative relationship.

Cohen & Kirchmeyer (1995) undertook a study to investigate the relationship between affective, continuance, and normative commitment and the non-work measure of resource enrichment. Their participants included 227 nurses from two hospitals. The researchers found positive relationships between resource enrichment and both affective and normative commitment. However, the relationship between continuance commitment and resource enrichment was negative. In effect, employees who were staying with the organization because they wanted to or felt they ought to, indicated higher involvement and enjoyment with work activities. Whereas, employees who were staying with the organization because they felt they needed to indicated less involvement and dissatisfaction with work activities.

Summary

Researchers have advocated the value of both *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors. Investigations into the impact of specific types of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors reveal varying degrees of effectiveness.

The literature has also attested to the significant value of *organizational commitment*, finding it linked to several outcomes of individual and organizational effectiveness. As such, *organizational commitment* can serve as an overarching measure for many areas of effectiveness. Plus, the specific types of *organizational commitment* (affective, continuance, normative) offer an opportunity to conduct a more specialized investigation.

Relations-oriented and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors directly affect *organizational commitment*. Consequently, examining the relationship between *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors and different types of *organizational commitment* is an important undertaking.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

This chapter addresses the approach to the study. It provides an explanation of the research design, details regarding the sample, the variables to be examined, chosen measurement instruments, means of data collection, and data analysis. The chapter concludes with a summary of the research questions and analysis that were used to answer them.

In conducting this study, I collected information about *relations-oriented*, leadership behaviors, *task-oriented* leadership behaviors, and levels of *organizational commitment* from employees. Specifically, employees were asked to rate their perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors. These employees were also asked to rate their own level of commitment to the organization.

The purpose of this research was to investigate the relationship between employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors and different types of *organizational commitment*. First, I examined the relationship between employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors and different types of *organizational commitment*. Second, I examined the relationship between employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *task-oriented* leadership behaviors and different types of *organizational commitment*. Third, I examined to what extent employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors had an interactive effect on different types of *organizational commitment*.

I also collected demographic data of the study participants. These data included sex, age, education, ethnicity, and race. Data was also collected regarding whether participants supervised other employees, length of time working for the city of Charlottesville, and length of time working for their immediate supervisor.

Below is a description of the leadership and commitment terms that were used in this research:

Leadership

- Idealized Influence (attributed): instills pride and builds trust.
- Idealized Influence (behavior): emphasizes collective sense of mission, and talks about values and beliefs.
- Inspirational Motivation: expresses enthusiasm, optimism, and confidence.
- Intellectual Stimulation: encourages problem solving, critical thinking, and creativity.
- Individualized Consideration: develops, coaches, and teaches.
- Contingent Reward: recognizes accomplishments and clarifies expectations.
- Management-by-Exception (active): takes immediate action to correct problems and highlights mistakes or errors.
- Management-by-Exception (passive): waits for problems to become chronic or serious before correcting.
- Laissez-Faire: acts non-involved, displays indifference, overlooks achievements, and ignores problems.

Commitment

- Affective Commitment: *wants to* stay with the organization and feels emotionally attached.
- Continuance Commitment: *needs to* stay with the organization because the cost of leaving is too high.
- Normative Commitment: feels *obligated to* stay with the organization because it is the moral and right thing to do.

Description of the Sample

The sample for this study was drawn from the Charlottesville, Virginia City Government. Charlottesville voters, at large, elect a five-member council to serve as the city's legislative and governing body. The members serve four-year terms and they elect one councilor to serve as Mayor and one as Vice Mayor for two years. Municipal elections are held in May in even-numbered years. The terms of council members are staggered so that three are elected in one

year and two are elected two years later. If a vacancy occurs, the council elects a new member to serve out the un-expired term. The city council appoints the city manager, the director of finance, the city assessor, the clerk of the council and members of major policy-making boards and commissions.

The workforce encompasses approximately 900 employees across the city's administration offices, the city manager's offices, and 20 departments. Departments vary in the area of technical functioning, size, and academic levels of employees. A total of 361 employees from 8 departments participated in this study. Study participants included both supervisory and non-supervisory employees. The departments and respective number of study participants are as follows:

1. Public Works (152)
2. Recreation (9)
3. Social Services (103)
4. Human Resources (3)
5. Neighborhood Development (18)
6. Economic Development (4)
7. Commissioner of Revenue (11)
8. Fire Department (61)

Description of the Instrumentation

This research was conducted using two separate instruments. The instruments were completed using a self-report, pencil and paper method. Following is an overview of the instrumentation selection process and a discussion of the instruments that were used as part of this research. This overview also provides reasons why certain instruments were rejected for use in this study.

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ Form 5X)

Prior to selecting the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ Form 5X) for this research, several other instruments were considered as possible measurements of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors.

Other Instruments

The first instrument considered as a measure of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors was the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). The LBDQ was developed by Fleishman (1951, 1953) who separated leadership behaviors into two categories: (a) *consideration* (measure of *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors), and (b) *initiating structure* (measure of *task-oriented* leadership behaviors). The LBDQ was later revised by Stogdill (1963) and named the LBDQ Form XII. The LBDQ Form XII contains 100 items. Research examining the psychometric properties of the LBDQ has produced mixed results. The *consideration* and *initiating structure* scales have been found to be independent (Schriesheim & Kerr, 1974) as well as correlated (Weissenberg & Kavanagh, 1972).

The LBDQ Form XII was not selected for this research because it was developed in 1963 and the language is not current. Also, the LBDQ Form XII has been used very little since the 70's (Tracy, 1987). This outdated language and limited use raises concerns about its usefulness as a current measure of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors.

The second instrument examined was Eicher's (1998) Leader-Manager Feedback Form. Contact with the publisher revealed that there is no validity and reliability information for the Feedback Form. Additionally, no published information involving the author's use of the instrument or use by other researchers could be located.

The Leader-Manager Feedback Form uses three subscales to measure key competencies of *leadership* (measure of *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors) and *management* (measure of *task-oriented* leadership behaviors). The three *leadership* subscales include communicate organization direction, develop key relationships, and inspire others. The three *management* subscales include direct operations, develop the organization, and reinforce performance. The form contains 36 items, with 6 items being used to measure each of the three subscales under *leadership* and *management*.

While the Leader-Manager Feedback Form is a current measure of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors, the instrument has not been subjected to validity and reliability studies. Consequently, the instrument could not be used with much confidence in this research.

Three other instruments considered as measures of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors include Blake & Mouton's (1964) Managerial Grid, Hersey & Blanchard's

(1969) Situational Leadership Questionnaire, and Fiedler's (1967) Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) Scale.

While these three instruments measure *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors, the subscales and items do not focus on a separation or differentiation of these behaviors.   Instead, the emphasis is on identifying the types of leadership behaviors that are most appropriate for the situation. Or, as is the case with the Managerial Grid, the focus is on recognizing the interaction of the different types of leadership behaviors (Bass, 1990a). For these reasons, neither the Managerial Grid, Situational Leadership Questionnaire, nor Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) was considered appropriate for this research.

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ Form 5X)

Bass's (1985) initial Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) included the five subscales of charisma, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, contingent reward, and management-by-exception. Later, Bass & Avolio (1990) introduced the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5R (MLQ Form 5R), which contained six subscales: charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reward, and management-by-exception.

In 1995, Bass & Avolio presented the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5X (MLQ Form 5X). This new version of the MLQ contained nine subscales: idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), management-by-exception (passive), and laissez-faire.

Bass & Avolio (1995) categorized these subscales into three groups: (a) idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration are considered *transformational leadership* (measures of *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors); (b) contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), and management-by-exception (passive) are considered *transactional leadership* (measures of *task-oriented* leadership behaviors); and (c) laissez-faire is considered *non-leadership* (measures neither *relations-oriented* nor *task-oriented* leadership behaviors).

The MLQ Form 5X is self-scoring and uses 36 items to measure the nine subscales. These items are rated using a 5-point Likert scale with anchors labeled as 0 = not at all, 1 = once in a while, 2 = sometimes, 3 = fairly often, 4 = frequently, if not always.

In developing items for the MLQ Form 5X, Bass & Avolio (1995) used several methods. First, they selected nine sample studies that had previously used the MLQ Form 5R. These samples were then subjected to a series of factor analysis, "which provided a base for selecting items that exhibited the best convergent and discriminant validities" (p. 9). Additional methods for item development included using partial least squares (PLS) analysis (Fornell & Larker, 1981) to select items for inclusion, soliciting recommendations from scholars in the field of leadership, and using Howell & Avolio's (1993) preliminary results with the earlier version MLQ Form 5R.

Results revealed high intercorrelations among the five *transformational* subscales, with the average correlation being $r =. 83$ and all being statistically significant with $p < .01$. Contingent reward, which is a *transactional* leadership measure, also correlated highly with the five *transformational* leadership subscales: idealized influence (attributed) $r = .68$; idealized influenced (behavior) $r = .69$, inspirational motivation $r = .73$, intellectual stimulation $r = 70$, individualized consideration $r =. 75$.

Bass & Avolio's (1995) findings regarding the *transactional* subscales revealed that management-by-exception (active) and management-by-exception (passive) subscales were negatively correlated with the *transformational* leadership subscales. The *non-leadership* subscale of laissez-faire also had negative correlations with the *transformational* leadership subscales. Management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire were also negatively correlated with the contingent reward subscales. However, management-by-exception (active) and contingent reward resulted in a non-significant $r = .03$. These three subscales were statistically significant with $p < .01$, and somewhat strongly in one instance, correlated with each other: (a) management-by-exception (active) correlated with management-by-exception (passive) at $r = .28$, and laissez-faire at $r = .18$; and (b) management-by-exception (passive) correlated with laissez-faire at $r = .74$.

Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman (1997) also investigated the internal consistency of the MLQ subscales. Their study group consisted of approximately 1200 employees from several diverse organizations (commercial businesses, health-care organizations, welfare

institutions, and local governments). Reliability (alphas) for the subscales of *transformational* leadership ranged from .72 to .93; transactional leadership ranged from .58 to .78; and laissez-faire leadership was .49.

Correlations for *transformational*, *transactional*, and laissez-faire subscales were all statistically significant with $p < .01$. Laissez-faire and management-by-exception (passive) correlated positively with each other but negatively with all other subscales, including management-by exception (active). Correlations among the *transformational* leadership subscales were somewhat strong, $r = .67$ to $r = .75$. However, in this instance, contingent reward correlated almost as high with management-by-exception (active), $r = .39$, as it did with the *transformational* leadership subscales $r = .40$ to $r = .50$.

Howell & Hall-Marenda (1999) tested the reliability and validity of the MLQ when they undertook a study to determine the impact that leader-follower relationships had on performance. The authors used all the subscales of the MLQ except laissez-faire. The aggregated reliability for the *transformational* leadership subscales was .93. Reliabilities for the subscales of contingent reward was .95, management-by-exception (active) was .86, and management-by-exception (passive) was .90.

Correlations among the subscales were all statistically significant with $p = .05$. Relatively strong positive correlations were found between the *transformational* leadership subscales and contingent reward $r = .79$. Even though the management-by-exception (active) and management-by-exception (passive) subscales correlated positively with each other, $r = .38$, they correlated negatively with the *transformational* leadership subscales, $r = -.41$ and $r = -.62$ and contingent reward, $r = -.36$ and $r = -.49$.

Questions about the MLQ have primarily involved correlations among the *transformational* leadership subscales and the *transactional* subscale of contingent reward. Bass (1985) as well as Bass & Avolio (1995) have argued for retaining this subscale within the *transactional* leadership grouping. This position stems from Bass's (1985) contention that leaders can be both *transformational* and *transactional*. Bass & Avolio (1995) offered the following explanation for the high correlations and justification for classifying contingent reward as one measure of *transactional* leadership:

First, both transactional and transformation leadership represent active, positive forms of leadership. Second, leaders have been shown in repeated investigations to be both transactional and transformational. Third, as Shamir (1995) argues, the consistent honoring of transactional agreements builds trust, dependability, and perceptions of consistency with leaders by followers, which are each a basis for transformational leadership. (p. 11)

Examples of items from the MLQ-Form 5X questionnaire include: (a) *transformational* - talks optimistically about the future; (b) *transactional* – directs my attention towards failures to meet standards, (c) *contingent reward* - provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts, and (c) *laissez-faire* - avoids making decisions.

Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)

Prior to selection of Meyer & Allen's (1997) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), another identically-named questionnaire was considered as a measure of *organizational commitment*. This alternate Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was developed by Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian (1974).

Porter's et al. Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)

Constructed to measure employees' satisfaction and level of involvement in the organization, the Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian (1974) OCQ is a 15-item instrument. An examination of the psychometric properties of the OCQ by Mowday, Steers, & Porter (1979) revealed internal consistency among the items, test-retest reliability, and evidence for the predictive validity of the instrument. However, the authors offered several cautions to users of the instrument. One was that respondents could easily manipulate the scores. Another was that the internal consistency of a 9-item scale was "generally equal to the full instrument" (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979, p. 244).

Comments by the authors caused concern about the OCQ's usefulness as a measure of *organizational commitment*. Also, the Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian (1974) OCQ does not specify a clear delineation among the types of *organizational commitment*. For these reasons,

40

the Meyer & Allen (1997) OCQ was selected as the measure of *organizational commitment* for this research.

Meyer & Allen's (1997) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)

Meyer & Allen (1984) initially proposed making distinctions between two types of commitment: affective commitment and continuance commitment. Affective commitment denoted a sense of belonging and emotional attachment to the organization, whereas, continuance commitment emphasized the perceived costs of leaving the organization.

Allen & Meyer (1990) subsequently introduced a third component of commitment, normative commitment, which reflected the perceived obligation to remain with the organization. Later, Meyer, Allen, & Smith (1993) revised the normative commitment scale to clarify the distinction between affective commitment and normative commitment.

While the earlier versions (Meyer & Allen, 1984, 1991; Allen & Meyer, 1990) of the OCQ contained 24 items (8 items for each scale), the later version by Meyer, Allen, & Smith (1993) and Meyer & Allen (1997) only contained 18 items (6 items for each scale). Although the items were reduced, this change primarily affected the normative scale, not the affective and continuance scales (Meyer et al., in press).

The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) is a self-scoring questionnaire. Responses to each of the 6 items are rated using a 5-point Likert scale with anchors labeled: 0 = strongly disagree, 1 = disagree, 2 = neither agree nor disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree.

Allen & Meyer's (1990) examination of the relationships between the commitment scales revealed that the continuance commitment scale was relatively independent: affective ($p < .001$, $r = .06$) and normative ($p < .001$, $r = .14$). However, the correlations between the affective and normative scales were statistically significant and relatively strong ($p < .001$, $r = .51$). Cohen (1996) reported similar findings: normative and affective ($p < .001$, $r = .54$), normative and continuance (non-significant, $r = .06$), and continuance and affective (non-significant, $r = .02$).

Several studies have examined the reliability (alphas) of the OCQ. Allen & Meyer (1990) reported .87 for affective, .75 for continuance, and .79 for normative. Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda (1994) found alpha ranges of .74 to .87 for affective, .73 to .81 for continuance, and .67 to .78 for normative. Cohen (1996) discovered alphas of .79 for affective, .69 for continuance, and .65 for normative.

Finally, Meyer et al. (in press) performed a meta-analysis of studies using both the 6-item and 8-item OCQ. They collected data from people who had sought permission to use the OCQ during the last 15 years as well as from computer databases dating back to 1985. The mean reliability from all the studies was .82 for affective, .73 for continuance, and .76 for normative.

Examples of items from the OCQ questionnaire include: (a) *affective commitment* - I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization; (b) *continuance commitment* - it would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to; and (c) *normative commitment* - this organization deserves my loyalty.

Dependent and Independent Variables

Table 3.1 lists the dependent and independent variables that were part of this research. Three separate measures of *organizational commitment* were used as dependent variables. These measures are the affective commitment scale, continuance commitment scale, and normative commitment scale of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). Variables measuring *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors were considered separately. The subscales for these variables are contained in the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ Form 5X).

Data Collection Procedures

The approach I used in conducting this research involved five steps. First, I met with the city manager and the director of human resources for the city of Charlottesville, Virginia to gain approval for the research. Second, the city manager sent a letter to all members of the city's 28-member leadership team advising them of the city's interest in participating in the research. The leadership team comprises individuals who manage the administration offices and 20 departments that were invited to participate in this study. They are considered department managers and have several supervisors at the division and office level who report to them. The department managers have decision-making power to approve the research for all employees in their particular department. Participation, while encouraged by the city manager, was voluntary.

Table 3.1: Dependent and Independent Variables

Dependent Measures (Criterion)		
Instrument	*Variables*	*Scales*
OCQ	Organizational Commitment	Affective Commitment Continuance Commitment Normative Commitment
Independent Measures (Predictor)		
Instrument	*Variables*	*Subscales*
MLQ Form 5X	Relations-Oriented Leadership Behaviors	Idealized Influence (Attributed) Idealized Influence (Behavior) Inspirational Motivation Intellectual Stimulation Individual Consideration
	Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors	Contingent Reward Management-by-Exception (Active) Management-by-Exception (Passive)
	Non Relations-Oriented and Non Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors	Laissez-Faire

Third, I attended a meeting with the entire leadership team of the city. I explained the research, provided copies of the questionnaires and answered questions from the team members. The Leadership Team was informed that the results would be provided at both the department level and the city level. That is, statistical information would be provided regarding how employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors affect employee commitment to the department and to the city. This reporting process was for the city only. Data contained in this document was compiled by using the total scores for all participants. There was no separation by department.

Fourth, I contacted each of the 20 department managers individually by telephone to determine if they were interested in participating in the research. This contact occurred after the meeting with the entire leadership team. For those departments that were interested in participating, I recorded the total number of participants. These department managers were also asked to provide a coordinator for further follow-up. Managers of these departments (or their coordinators in some instances) were contacted later to schedule dates and times for administering the questionnaires.

Fifth, I administered the questionnaires to each department's employees. This was done by actually going to the location where the employees worked and either administering the questionnaires in a training room or a conference room.

The MLQ Form 5X and OCQ, along with the demographic form, were stapled together and presented as one questionnaire. A statement at the top of the questionnaire emplaned that participation in the survey was voluntary and information would remain confidential. Prior to administering the questionnaires, I created codes for each department and used an automatic stamper to pre-stamp the codes. This automatic stamper placed the numbers consecutively on each questionnaire for each department. This allowed me to differentiate among the departments. The department codes were as follows:

1. Public Works (Code 100)

2. Recreation (Code 200)

3. Social Services (Code 300)

4. Human Resources (Code 400)

5. Neighborhood Development (Code 500)

6. Economic Development (Code 600)

7. Commissioner of Revenue (Code 700)

8. Fire Department (Code 800)

Most employees completed the questionnaires in 15 minutes, with a few taking as long as 25 minutes to answer all the questions.

For each department, I greeted employees and explained the questionnaires as well as reiterated that participation was voluntary and responses would remain confidential. I remained during the entire time and collected all the questionnaires after everyone was finished.

I used several strategies to protect anonymity of the survey participants. First, when providing reports to the city management, the results were reported at the department level only. In instances where there were less than 20 employees participating in the research, I recorded those results at the city level only. Finally, employees did not include names or any other identifying unit, section, or office information on their questionnaires.

Description of the Analyses

Research Questions

The following three questions were proposed as part of this research:

1. What is the relationship between employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors and *organizational commitment* where…

    Relations-oriented leadership behaviors were initially measured as representing:

    a. idealized influence (attributed)
    b. idealized influence (behavior)
    c. inspirational motivation
    d. intellectual stimulation
    e. individualized consideration

Organizational Commitment levels were initially measured as representing:

   a. affective commitment
   b. continuance commitment
   c. normative commitment

2. What is the relationship between employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *task-oriented* leadership behaviors and *organizational commitment* where…

Task-oriented leadership behaviors were initially measured as representing:

   a. contingent reward
   b. management-by-exception (active)
   c. management-by-exception (passive)

Organizational Commitment levels were initially measured as representing:

   a. affective commitment
   b. continuance commitment
   c. normative commitment

3. To what extent do employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented leadership* behaviors have an interactive effect on *organizational commitment*?

Preliminary Analyses

SPSS® version 10.0 for Windows (SPSS® Base 10.0 Applications Guide, 1999) was the statistical software program used to perform all procedures. As a preliminary step to my data analyses, I examined statistical information in several areas. First, I analyzed the mean differences of my demographic data. Second, I used descriptive statistics to examine the mean scores, standard deviation, and other information about the MLQ Form 5X subscales and the OCQ scales. Third, I conducted additional analyses to determine if there were any statistically significant differences in the mean scores for affective, continuance, and normative commitment based on demographics. These analyses included independent sample t-tests for race, sex, and supervise others; Pearson correlations for time with the city of Charlottesville and time with immediate supervisor; and Spearman correlations for age and education. Fourth, I conducted factor analyses, with principal component extraction and varimax rotation, on the *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* items in the MLQ Form 5X questionnaire. Fifth, I examined the

reliability (alphas) of both the MLQ Form 5X and the OCQ. Lastly, I examined the correlations for the MLQ Form 5X subscales and the OCQ scales.

Based on findings from the preliminary analyses of my data, I changed the measures for *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors, *task-oriented* leadership behaviors, and *organizational commitment* types, as well as the statistical approaches used to investigate the relationships among these variables. First, during the factor analyses, the contingent reward items (*task-oriented*) loaded on the *relations-oriented* factor, and the laissez-faire items (*non-leadership*) loaded on the *task-oriented* factor. I used these factor scores as a basis for including contingent reward with the *relations-oriented* subscales and eliminating it from the *task-oriented* subscales, as well as to include laissez-faire as a *task-oriented* subscale.

Next, there were high correlations among all the *relations-oriented* subscales. There were also high correlations between two of the *task-oriented* subscales. As such, it was not possible to make interpretations about the variance that any particular type of *relations-oriented* or *task-oriented* leadership behavior explained in *organizational commitment*. Therefore, while questions one and two involved using stepwise multiple regressions, the regressions were not reasonable given the correlation results. Instead, results from the factor analyses, which included a 2-factor model **with** laissez-faire and a 2-factor model **without** laissez-faire, were used to investigate the variance explained by *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors. These 2-factor models were also used to examine the *interaction* as proposed in question three.

Lastly, none of the *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* subscales were correlated with continuance commitment. The absence of a relationship between continuance commitment and the *relations-oriented* as well as *task-oriented* subscales made it unnecessary to perform regression analyses using this scale.

The Tables containing results of these analyses and a more detailed description of the findings are presented in Chapter four.

Data Analyses

As stated earlier, results from the factor analyses were used to perform the data analyses necessary to examine the amount of variance *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors, *task-oriented* leadership behaviors, and the *interaction* of these two types of leadership behaviors explained in affective and normative commitment.

Relationship Between Employees' Perceptions of Their Immediate Supervisors' Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors and Affective and Normative Commitment. To investigate the amount of variance that *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors explained in affective commitment and normative commitment, I used both 2-factor models (**with** and **without** laissez-faire) and performed regressions using the enter method and inputting the variables in separate blocks. This involved separate analyses for affective commitment and normative commitment. In each case, regressions were performed by entering the *relations* and *task* factors first and entering the *relations* and *task* factors last, along with the *interaction*.

To What Extent do Employees' Perceptions of Their Immediate Supervisors' Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors Have an Interactive Effect on Affective and Normative Commitment. To investigate the amount of variance that the *interaction* explained in affective commitment and normative commitment, I first created new variables from the factor scores in the 2-factor model **without** laissez-faire, and from the factor scores in the 2-factor model **with** laissez-faire. I then created the *interaction* variable by multiplying the *relations* factor times the *task* factor in the 2-factor model **without** laissez-faire and in the 2-factor model **with** laissez-faire. For each *interaction* variable, I performed regressions using the enter method and inputting the variables in separate blocks. This involved separate analyses for affective commitment and normative commitment. In each case, regressions were performed by entering the *interaction* first and entering the *interaction* last, along with the independent *relations* and *task* factors.

Summary

The research methods described in this chapter offers insights into the amount of variance that different types of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors explained in *organizational commitment*. Information from these employees provides a better understanding of how they perceive the leadership behaviors of their immediate supervisors. These employees also provided information about their level of commitment to the organization. The results from the different types of analyses and instruments as described in this chapter helps to enhance our

understanding of the relationships between employees' perceptions about their immediate supervisors' leadership behaviors and the commitment they feel toward their organizations.

CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH FINDINGS

This chapter contains results of the study. Findings about the demographics of study participants, preliminary analyses of the data, and the statistical analyzes used to answer the research questions. The chapter concludes with a summary of the findings.

Sample

I collected demographic data in several areas (see Table 4.1). These statistics revealed that 79% of the study participants were white and 66% were males. The mean time for working with the city of Charlottesville was 12½ years and time working for their immediate supervisor was a little over 5½ years. Over 60% were non-supervisors. Education levels varied, with 33% having a high school diploma or less, 24% having some college credits, and 43% falling in the range of possessing an Associate of Arts degree to having some Post Masters degree credits.

Descriptive Statistics for Leadership and Commitment

I used descriptive statistics as a way to examine the mean, standard deviation and other information of my data. Table 4.2 contains descriptive data for the five *relations-oriented* subscales, three *task-oriented* subscales, and one laissez-faire subscale. Table 4.3 contains information for the three *organizational commitment* scales. In both instances, distribution of scores for my sample contained reasonable variance and normality for use in subsequent analyses.

The overall scores of my data for the *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* subscales were, in some instances, slightly less than what Bass & Avolio (1997) consider "ideal" levels for effective leadership. Suggested scores for the most effective leaders include a mean of 3.0 or higher for idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation. Mean scores for my data ranged from 2.2 to 2.4. The suggested score for contingent reward is 2.0, only slightly lower than my sample data mean of 2.3. The score for management-by-exception (active) was 1.8; this was within the suggested

Table 4.1: Demographics

Demographics	N	Percent	Demographics	N	Percent
Ethnicity (N=325)			**Sex** (N=343)		
Hispanic	8	2%	Male	226	66%
Non-Hispanic	317	98%	Female	117	34%
Supervise Others (N=334)			**Race** (N=339)		
Yes	125	37%	White (non-Hispanic)	269	79%
No	209	63%	Black (non-Hispanic)	62	18%
			Others (Hispanic)	8	2%
Age (N=333)			**Education** (N=332)		
< 26 Years	21	6%	Not complete HS	41	12%
26 to 35 Years	96	29%	Completed HS only	70	21%
36 to 45 Years	87	26%	Some College	81	24%
46 to 55 Years	92	28%	Associate Arts Degree	24	7%
56 to 65 Years	36	11%	Bachelors Degree	63	19%
66 Years Plus	1	3%	Some Masters Credits	16	5%
			Masters Degree	35	11%
			Post Masters Credits	2	1%

Demographics	N	Percent	Mean	Standard Deviation
Time Worked for City (N=330)				
< 12 Years	172	52%		
> =12 Years	158	48%	12.50	10.06
Time Worked for Supervisor (N=321)				
< 5 Years	208	65%		
> = 5 Years	113	35%	5.60	6.37

Table 4.2: Descriptive Statistics for Relations-Oriented, Task-Oriented, and Laissez-Faire Subscales

	Cronbach's alpha	Mean	Standard. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Idealized Influence (attributed)	.77	2.4	.95	-.27	-.63
Idealized Influence (behavior)	.75	2.2	.89	-.36	-.27
Inspirational Motivation	.82	2.4	.93	-.29	-.52
Intellectual Stimulation	.77	2.3	.88	-.26	-.24
Individualized Consideration	.76	2.3	.99	-.18	-.69
Contingent Reward	.79	2.3	.95	-.31	-.56
Management-by-Exception (active)	.67	1.8	.87	.06	-.62
Management-by-Exception (passive)	.70	1.5	.93	.35	-.45
Laissez-Faire	.75	1.1	.91	.63	-.36

Five Relations-Oriented: Idealized Influence (attributed), Idealized Influence (behavior), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized Consideration.
Three Task-Oriented: Contingent Reward, Management-by-Exception (active), Management-by-Exception (passive).
One Laissez-Faire: Laissez-Faire
Note: Each subscale has 4 items and N=361.

Table 4.3: Descriptive Statistics for Commitment Scales

	Cronbach's alpha	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Affective Commitment	.75	3.3	.75	-.15	-.19
Continuance Commitment	.59	3.1	.64	.05	-.04
Normative Commitment	.75	3.1	.74	-.07	-.05

Note: Each scale has 6 items and N=361.

range of 1.0 and 2.0. Suggested scores for management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire are between 1.0 and 0.0; however, mean scores for my data had slightly higher ranges of 1.5 and 1.1, respectively.

This pattern of scores for my data suggests that some employees perceived their immediate supervisors as not exhibiting the "ideal" levels of *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors. These behaviors included engendering trust, inspiring a shared vision, generating enthusiasm, encouraging creativity, and providing coaching. The mean for contingent reward suggests that some employees perceived their immediate supervisors as doing an above average job of clarifying expectations and recognizing accomplishments. This was also the case for the management-by-exception (active) mean, which implies that some employees perceived their immediate supervisors as taking corrective action in a timely manner. Mean scores for management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire suggests some employees perceived that their immediate supervisors tended to wait too long before resolving a problem or taking corrective action.

In describing the application of their Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) scales, Meyer & Allen (1997) do not provide guidance about expected, desired, average, or ideal means for affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Instead, Meyer & Allen (1997) and other researchers (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994; Hackett, Bycio, & Hausdorf, 1994; Whitener & Walz, 1993; Lee, 1992; Vardi, Wiener, & Popper, 1989) examined whether there was a positive or negative relationship between the different types of *organizational commitment* and the outcomes that are being measured, as well as the pattern for those findings. The desired pattern is highest scores for affective commitment, followed by normative commitment, then continuance commitment. The mean scores for my data reflect that affective commitment scores were only marginally higher than continuance commitment and normative commitment.

Demographics and Organizational Commitment

I conducted additional analyses to determine if there were any statistically significant differences in the mean scores for affective, continuance, and normative commitment based on demographics. For race (White and Black), sex, and supervise others, I performed independent

sample t-tests. The only statistically significant differences were between supervisors and non-supervisors. For these two groups, differences occurred for all three areas of commitment, with $p < .004$ in all cases. Supervisors were higher in all three areas. The mean differences were .26 for affective, .21 for continuance, and .30 for normative. The effect sizes, which were derived by dividing the mean differences by the standard deviation, ranged from .32 to .42. These effect sizes were between small and medium, therefore the mean differences were not major.

Employees listed the number of years and months they had worked for the city of Charlottesville and the number of years and months they had worked for their immediate supervisor. In analyzing these data, I performed Pearson correlations between the three types of commitment and the years and months reported by employees for both areas. Although the correlations were statistically significant with $p < .01$ for continuance commitment, they were only .18 for time with the city and .15 for time with immediate supervisor.

For the six age groups and eight education groups, I performed Spearman correlations. There were no statistically significant relationships between the age groups and commitment. However, there was a statistically significant correlation of .23 ($p < .01$) between education and affective commitment. For the eight education groups and affective commitment, I then performed a one-way ANOVA with a Scheffe' post hoc test to determine where this statistically significant difference occurred. The statistically significant (df = 7, F = 2.8, $p < .01$) difference occurred between employees who had not completed high school (mean of 2.9) and those who possessed a Bachelors Degree (mean of 3.5).

Factor Structure of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

I conducted a factor analysis (see Table 4.4), with principal component extraction and varimax rotation, on all 36 items in the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ Form 5X). For the factor analysis, under principal components, I selected 2 factors to be extracted. I wanted to see if the items for the five *relations-oriented* subscales would load together under one factor, and similarly, if the items for the three *task-oriented* subscales would load together. This was an important part of the analysis because

54

Table 4.4: Factor Analysis (2 Factors) With Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Items

	Factor 1 Relations-Oriented	Factor 2 Task-Oriented
Idealized Influence (attributed)		
MLQ10	**.77**	-.17
MLQ18	**.68**	-.04
MLQ21	**.77**	-.19
MLQ25	**.49**	.22
Idealized Influence (behavior)		
MLQ6	**.41**	.11
MLQ14	**.78**	.08
MLQ23	**.68**	-.03
MLQ34	**.76**	.04
Inspirational Motivation		
MLQ9	**.64**	-.03
MLQ13	**.73**	.07
MLQ26	**.74**	.07
MLQ36	**.77**	-.09
Intellectual Stimulation		
MLQ2	**.55**	.04
MLQ8	**.51**	.05
MLQ30	**.73**	-.07
MLQ32	**.76**	.03
Individualized Consideration		
MLQ15	**.72**	-.08
MLQ19	**.57**	-.29
MLQ29	**.46**	-.10
MLQ31	**.82**	-.15
Contingent Reward		
MLQ1	**.72**	-.15
MLQ11	**.68**	-.07
MLQ16	**.69**	-.04
MLQ35	**.75**	-.17
Management-by-Exception (active)		
MLQ4	-.08	**.70**
MLQ22	.29	**.44**
MLQ24	-.01	**.65**
MLQ27	.09	**.66**
Management-by-Exception (passive)		
MLQ3	-.33	**.46**
MLQ12	-.45	**.49**
MLQ17	.10	**.50**
MLQ20	-.33	**.56**

Bass & Avolio (1995) contend that MLQ Form 5X contains five *relations-oriented* and three *task-oriented* subscales, and my research design involved using items from the MLQ Form 5X to make distinctions in these two areas.

Factor Analysis With Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Items

Findings from the factor analysis showed that the *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* items did load onto two different factors with one exception. This exception was the *task-oriented* items within the contingent reward subscale. All the contingent reward items had high loadings (.68 to .75) on the *relations-oriented* factor. It is also notable that item 22 had a moderate cross-loading on the *relations-oriented* factor and item 12 had a high cross-loading on the *relations-oriented* factor. The eigenvalues for the two factors were 11.7 and 2.9, with a total variance explained of 46%. While Bass & Avolio (1995) include contingent reward as a *task-oriented* subscale, the fact that these items loaded as *relations-oriented* parallels findings by several researchers who have reported that the contingent reward subscale correlates strongly with the *relations-oriented* subscales (Bass & Avolio, 1995; Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997; Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999).

Nevertheless, Bass (1985, 1998) as well as Bass & Avolio (1995, 1997) have argued for retaining this subscale within the *task-oriented* leadership category. They contend that leaders can be both *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* and that contingent reward actions elevate levels of employee trust and provides a foundation for greater receptivity of *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors. They also state that such correlations are expected because contingent reward and *relations-oriented* behaviors represent active, positive forms of leadership. Shamir (1995) supports their argument by claiming that a positive correlation is expected because contingent reward behaviors build trust among subordinates, which is a basis for *relations-oriented* leadership.

While, as stated earlier, research suggests contingent reward is really more *relations-oriented* than *task-oriented*, my decision to include contingent reward as a *task-oriented* subscale when designing my research questions was based on the authors' arguments for using the MLQ Form 5X. However, given that my findings support those of other researchers, I used these factor scores as a basis for including contingent reward with the *relations-oriented* subscales and eliminating it from the *task-oriented* subscales.

Factor Analysis With Relations-Oriented, Task-Oriented, and Laissez-Faire Items

I also investigated a 2-factor structure of the *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* items along with items for laissez-faire (see Table 4.5). This was done to determine how the laissez faire items, which are considered *non-leadership* (Bass, 1990a), loaded with the other *leadership* items.

Results of the factor analysis revealed that the laissez-faire items, in contrast to Bass's (1990a) position, had positive loadings with the *task-oriented* items. Another impact was that item 22, a management-by-exception (active) item, cross-loaded on the two factors and had a slightly higher loading on the *relations-oriented* factor. However, item 12 did not have as strong a cross-loading. The eigenvalues for the two factors were 11.4 and 4.3, with a total variance explained of 44%.

While my research design included laissez-faire as a separate subscale, the fact that these items loaded as *task-oriented* is similar to findings by researchers (Bass, 1990a, Bass & Avolio, 1995, 1997; Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997) who have reported that the laissez-faire subscale correlates with management-by-exception (passive) and/or management-by-exception (active). Still, Bass (1985, 1998) as well as Bass & Avolio (1995, 1997) have argued that laissez-faire is non *relations-oriented* and non *task-oriented*. They suggest that the level of indifference and inactivity displayed by this type of leader is extreme enough to justify not considering them as fitting into either of the two leadership categories.

I included laissez-faire in this research was to investigate any relationship this subscale might have with either the *relations-oriented* or *task-oriented* subscales and accordingly how much variance laissez-faire would explain in the three types of *organizational commitment*. Since laissez-faire loaded with the *task-oriented* items, I used these factor scores as a basis for including this subscale with the *task-oriented* subscales.

Reliability of the MLQ and OCQ

I examined the reliability (Chronbach's alpha) of both the MLQ Form 5X and the OCQ (see Table 4.6). For the MLQ Form 5X, I conducted reliabilities for each of the *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* subscales. For the OCQ, I conducted reliabilities for each of the *organizational commitment* scales. The reliabilities were conducted by examining the total

Table 4.5: Factor Analysis (2 Factors) With Relations-Oriented, Task-Oriented, and Laissez-Faire Items

	Factor 1 Relations-Oriented	Factor 2 Task-Oriented
Idealized Influence (attributed)		
MLQ10	**.76**	-.21
MLQ18	**.66**	-.17
MLQ21	**.73**	-.30
MLQ25	**.50**	.04
Idealized Influence (behavior)		
MLQ6	**.44**	.09
MLQ14	**.77**	-.07
MLQ23	**.67**	-.10
MLQ34	**.76**	-.05
Inspirational Motivation		
MLQ9	**.64**	-.05
MLQ13	**.73**	-.04
MLQ26	**.74**	-.04
MLQ36	**.75**	-.16
Intellectual Stimulation		
MLQ2	**.54**	-.08
MLQ8	**.52**	.07
MLQ30	**.72**	-.14
MLQ32	**.76**	-.08
Individualized Consideration		
MLQ15	**.71**	-.17
MLQ19	**.54**	-.30
MLQ29	**.46**	-.06
MLQ31	**.80**	-.21
Contingent Reward		
MLQ1	**.69**	-.26
MLQ11	**.67**	-.15
MLQ16	**.69**	-.07
MLQ35	**.73**	-.22
Management-by-Exception (active)		
MLQ4	-.02	**.61**
MLQ22	**.32**	.26
MLQ24	.04	**.50**
MLQ27	.16	**.56**
Management-by-Exception (passive)		
MLQ3	-.26	**.58**
MLQ12	-.37	**.63**
MLQ17	.17	**.46**
MLQ20	-.24	**.67**
Laissez-Faire		
MLQ5	-.24	**.65**
MLQ7	-.20	**.60**
MLQ28	-.25	**.46**
MLQ33	-.16	**.62**

Table 4.6: Reliability Analysis (Chronbach's alpha)-MLQ Form 5X Subscales and Commitment Scales

Relations-Oriented Subscales and Items									
Idealized Influence (Attributed): **Alpha = .77**		Idealized Influence (Behavior): **Alpha = .75**		Inspirational Motivation: **Alpha = .82**		Intellectual Stimulation: **Alpha = .77**		Individualized Consideration: **Alpha = .76**	
If Item Deleted		If Item Deleted		If Item Deleted		If Item Deleted		If Item Deleted	
MLQ10	.67	MLQ6	.78	MLQ9	.78	MLQ2	.73	MLQ15	.69
MLQ18	.71	MLQ14	.62	MLQ13	.75	MLQ8	.77	MLQ19	.74
MLQ21	.65	MLQ23	.69	MLQ26	.77	MLQ30	.66	MLQ29	.76
MLQ25	.80	MLQ34	.64	MLQ36	.78	MLQ32	.69	MLQ31	.63
Task-Oriented Subscales and Items									
Contingent Reward: **Alpha = .79**			Management-by-Exception (Active): **Alpha = .67**			Management-by-Exception (Passive): **Alpha = .70**			
If Item Deleted			If Item Deleted			If Item Deleted			
MLQ1	.76		MLQ4	.60		MLQ3	.63		
MLQ11	.73		MLQ22	.66		MLQ12	.57		
MLQ16	.75		MLQ24	.57		MLQ17	.75		
MLQ35	.71		MLQ27	.58		MLQ20	.54		
Commitment Scales and Items									
Affective Commitment: **Alpha = .75**			Continuance Commitment: **Alpha = .59**			Normative Commitment: **Alpha = .75**			
If Item Deleted			If Item Deleted			If Item Deleted			
OCQ3	.75		OCQ1	.61		OCQ2	.74		
OCQ6	.76		OCQ4	.53		OCQ5	.70		
OCQ8	.68		OCQ7	.51		OCQ11	.69		
OCQ10	.69		OCQ9	.48		OCQ13	.73		
OCQ12	.72		OCQ14	.58		OCQ15	.69		
OCQ16	.69		OCQ17	.52		OCQ18	.73		

alpha for the subscales and scales, as well as examining the alpha "if the item were deleted."

Results for the MLQ Form 5X revealed reasonably high alphas for each of the *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* subscales: idealized influence (attributed) was .77, idealized influence (behavior) was .75, inspirational motivation was .82, intellectual stimulation was .77, individualized consideration was .76, contingent reward was .79, management-by-exception (active) was .67, and management-by-exception (passive) was .70.

Results for the OCQ scales revealed moderate to high alphas: affective commitment was .75, continuance commitment was .59, and normative commitment was .75. While not a universal finding, other researchers (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994; Cohen, 1996; Meyer et al., in press) have reported that the continuance commitment scales have lower reliability than the affective commitment scales and in some instances the normative commitment scales. While acknowledging this lower reliability, Allen & Meyer (1996) and Meyer & Allen (1997) state that the full continuance commitment scale is acceptable and that further development is not necessary. A primary reason for this position is that the continuance commitment items reflect a common underlying theme: costs associated with leaving the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer, Allen, & Gellatly, 1990).

For a few of the subscales and scales, deletion of one item would have slightly improved the reliability. For the MLQ Form 5X, these subscales included item 25 for idealized influence (attributed); item 6 for idealized influence (behavior); and item 17 for management-by-exception (passive). For the OCQ, these scales included item 6 for affective commitment and item 1 for continuance commitment. Since deletion of these items would not have greatly improved the reliability of their specific subscale, these items were retained.

Correlations Among Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Subscales

I examined correlations for all the subscales within the MLQ Form 5X. Given findings from the factor analyses, when presenting my correlation findings, I grouped contingent reward with the *relations-oriented* subscales and laissez-faire with the *task-oriented* subscales. Specifically, *relations-oriented* subscales include idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized

consideration, and contingent reward. *Task-oriented* subscales include management-by-exception (active), management-by-exception (passive), and laissez-faire.

Correlations Among Relations-Oriented Subscales

Results revealed high correlations (see Table 4.7) among the *relations-oriented* subscales, $r = .66$ to $r = .80$. All were statistically significant with $p < .01$. Specific correlation results from other researchers support these findings. Bass & Avolio (1997) reported correlations of $r = .68$ to $r = .87$. Bycio, Hackett, & Allen (1995) reported correlations of $r = .70$ to $r = .90$. Tejeda, Scandura, & Pillai (2001) found correlations of $r = .62$ to $r = .76$.

As stated earlier, Bass (1985, 1998) and Bass & Avolio (1995, 1997) contend that high correlations among contingent reward and the other *relations-oriented* subscales are expected because all these behaviors represent active, positive forms of leadership. Bass & Avolio (1997) also suggest that the intercorrelations among these subscales provides empirical support for (a) the theory upon which *relations-oriented* leadership is based, and (b) the theoretical links between *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership.

The high correlations among the *relations-oriented* subscales presented multicollinearity problems (Archdeacon, 1994). Given this problem, it was not possible to make interpretations about the amount of variance that any particular subscale explained in *organizational commitment*. Therefore, while stepwise multiple regressions were proposed, they were not reasonable given the correlation results. Instead, results from both 2-factor models were used to investigate the variance explained by *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors.

Correlations Among Task-Oriented Subscales

Correlations (see Table 4.7) among the *task-oriented* subscales ranged from $r = .24$ to $r = .64$. All were statistically significant with $p < .01$. The strongest correlation, $r = .64$, occurred between management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire. A much weaker correlation, $r = .31$, occurred between management-by-exception (active) and management-by-exception (passive). The weakest correlation, $r = .24$, was between management-by-exception (active) and laissez-faire.

Table 4.7: Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Correlations

	Relations-Oriented						Task-Oriented		
	IIA	IIB	IM	IS	IC	CR	MBEA	MBEP	LF
IIA	1.0	.73**	.77**	.70**	.75**	.78**	.04	-.38**	-.45**
IIB		1.0	.80**	.70**	.68**	.75**	.07	-.28**	-.28**
IM			1.0	.66**	.69**	.76**	.03	-.29**	-.33**
IS				1.0	.72**	.71**	.06	-.27**	-.32**
IC					1.0	.78**	-.08	-.36**	-.36**
CR						1.0	-.02	-.36**	-.42**
MBEA							1.0	.31**	.24**
MBEP								1.0	.64**
LF									1.0

N=361
**Correlation is statistically significant with $p < .01$.

Relations-Oriented: IIA-Idealized Influence (attributed), IIB-Idealized Influence (behavior), IM-Inspirational Motivation, IS-Intellectual Stimulation, IC-Individualized Consideration, CR-Contingent Reward.
Task-Oriented: MBEA-Management-by-Exception (active), MBEP-Management-by-Exception (passive), LF-Laissez-Faire.

Other research supports these correlation findings. Tejeda, Scandura, & Pillai (2001) conducted four studies and found the correlations between laissez-faire and management-by-exception (passive) were $r = .70$, $r = .75$, $r = .77$, and $r = .79$. Howell & Avolio (1993) reported no statistically significant correlations between management-by-exception (passive) and management-by-exception (active). In a review of nine studies, Bass & Avolio (1997) reported an average correlation of $r = .28$ between management-by-exception (passive) and management-

by-exception (active), management-by-exception (active) had a $r = .18$ correlation with laissez-faire, and management-by-exception (passive) had a $r = .74$ correlation with laissez-faire.

Bass & Avolio (1997) explain that this pattern of correlations is expected because the three subscales represent successively higher frequencies of "inactive" leadership behavior. That is, management-by-exception (active) involves taking *immediate* corrective action, management-by-exception (passive) involves taking *delayed* corrective action, and laissez-faire involves taking *no* corrective action. Following this pattern, management-by-exception (passive) would have a stronger correlation with laissez-faire and a weaker correlation with management-by-exception (active), which it does for this sample.

A review of items on the MLQ Form 5X further support my correlation results, findings by other researchers, and Bass & Avolio's (1997) position. For example, an item for (a) management-by-exception (active) is *concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures*; (b) management-by-exception (passive) is *fails to interfere until problems become serious*; and (c) laissez-faire is *avoids getting involved when important issues arise*.

This explanation of the pattern among the three subscales also supports the relatively low correlations between the two "exception" subscales: management-by-exception (active) and management-by-exception (passive). Specifically, even though the two "exception" subscales have a common component of "correcting mistakes," one aspect of managing-by-exception is passive and the other is active (Bass, 1998).

The correlations between laissez-faire and management-by-exception (passive) presented multicollinearity problems. Given this problem, it was not possible to make interpretations about the amount of variance that any particular subscale explained in *organizational commitment*. Therefore, while stepwise multiple regressions were proposed, they were not reasonable given the correlation results. Instead, results from both 2-factor models were used to investigate the variance explained by *task-oriented* leadership behaviors.

Correlations Between Pairs of Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Subscales

Management-by-exception (passive) had negative, although not very strong, $r = -.27$ to $r = -.38$, correlations with all the *relations-oriented* subscales. This finding suggests that when supervisors were perceived to display *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors, they were not

perceived as having a strong tendency to wait until problems became chronic before taking corrective action. Bass & Avolio (1995, 1997) go so far as to state that a strong negative relationship with *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors may suggest that some highly effectively leaders "do" take corrective action when necessary and actually avoid passive management-by-exception.

The laissez-faire subscale, had a similar pattern of correlations, $r = -.28$ to $r = -.45$, with all the *relations-oriented* subscales. This finding suggests that when supervisors were perceived to display *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors, they were not perceived as having a strong tendency to ignore problems. Bass & Avolio (1997) state that these relationships are expected given that laissez-faire represents the least active and least positive of the leadership behaviors.

Management-by-exception (active) did not have statistically significant correlations with the *relations-oriented* subscales. Bass & Avolio (1995, 1997) contend that such correlations are expected given that *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors represent a more "positive" leader orientation such as taking risks and developing employees. Conversely, leaders who "actively" manage-by-exception, generally avoid such risks by identifying and eradicating mistakes. They also overlook development. The result is a near zero correlation (Bass & Avolio, 1997), which is consistent with my findings.

Other studies support my correlation findings among the *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* subscales. Bycio, Hackett, & Allen (1995) reported that correlations between management-by-exception (passive) and all the *relations-oriented* subscales were $r = -.15$ to $r = -.34$. Tejeda, Scandura, & Pillai (2001) found that correlations between laissez-faire and all the *relations-oriented* subscales were $r = -.11$ to $r = -.50$. In a review of nine studies, Bass & Avolio (1997) found that average correlations among management-by-exception (passive) and all the *relations-oriented* subscales ranged from $r = -.34$ to $r = -.54$. Average correlations for laissez-faire and all the *relations-oriented* subscales ranged from $r = -.29$ to $r = -.53$. Management-by-exception (active) and contingent reward had a positive, average correlation of $r = .03$, however, average correlations between management-by-exception (active) and the other *relations-oriented* subscales ranged from $r = -.03$ to $r = -.12$.

The differences in correlations that management-by-exception (active) had with the *relations-oriented* subscales, and the correlations that management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire had with the *relations-oriented* subscales could be attributed to "how" the feedback

about problems or mistakes was delivered.   Specifically, all three types of *task-oriented* leadership behaviors involve the use of negative feedback at two extremes (Bass, 1985, 1990a). At one extreme, the negative feedback may be accompanied by clarification and encouragement, while at the other extreme the negative feedback may be accompanied by disapproval or reprimand (Bass, 1985).

Leaders who wait until problems become chronic before taking action (passive management-by-exception) or who ignore problems altogether (laissez-faire), are not perceived as delivering negative feedback in a timely manner (Bass & Avolio, 1997), no matter how it's delivered. This is not the case for leaders who practice active management-by-exception. They react immediately when things go wrong; taking steps to highlight mistakes and identify errors. Negative feedback from these leaders may be perceived as being delivered in a timely manner or being delivered too frequently (Bass, 1985).

Given the possible perceptions about the timeliness of negative feedback (problems must become chronic, problems are ignored, or problems are reacted to immediately), how that feedback is delivered might explain the correlations that management-by-exception (active) has with *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors.   Specifically, active management-by-exception that is accompanied by clarification and encouragement might contribute to employees' perceptions about their immediate supervisors *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors. However, active management-by-exception that is accompanied by disapproval or reprimand might detract from employees' perceptions about their immediate supervisors *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors.   Since my results revealed an absence of correlations among management-by-exception (active) and the *relations-oriented* subscales, it is not possible to conclude whether this leadership behavior was perceived as either contributing or detracting from employees' perceptions about their immediate supervisors' *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors.

Tejeda, Scandura, & Pillai (2001) conducted four studies that support these interpretations about the ways management-by-exception (active) might or might not contribute to employees' perceptions about their immediate supervisors' *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors.   In one study of 319 participants, management-by-exception (active) had no correlations with contingent reward, $r = -.23$ with individualized consideration, $r = -.25$ with intellectual stimulation, $r = -.19$ with inspirational motivation, $r = -.22$ with idealized influence ((behavior), and $r = -.38$ with idealized influence (attributed). Another study of 314 participants

65

revealed that management-by-exception (active) had no correlation with inspirational motivation, $r = -.14$ with contingent reward, $r = -.18$ with individualized consideration, $r = -.16$ with intellectual stimulation, $r = -.11$ with idealized influence ((behavior), and $r = -.30$ with idealized influence (attributed). The third study of 288 participants revealed that management-by-exception (active) had $r = -.31$ with contingent reward, $r = -.42$ with individualized consideration, $r = -.46$ with intellectual stimulation, $r = -.40$ with inspirational motivation, $r = -.36$ with idealized influence (behavior), and $r = -.46$ with idealized influence (attributed). For the final study, there were 159 participants and management-by-exception (active) had no correlations with contingent reward, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence (behavior). However, management-by-exception (active) did have correlations with the other three subscales of $r = -.19$ with individualized consideration, $r = -.18$ with intellectual stimulation, and $r = -.23$ with idealized influence (attributed).

Correlations Among Organizational Commitment Scales

I also examined correlations for all the scales within the OCQ. For the *organizational commitment* scales (see Table 4.8), there was a moderately strong correlation between affective commitment and normative commitment at $r = .69$. This finding is consistent with results from other researchers (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Cohen, 1996; Meyer et al., in press). In discussing this overlap, Meyer et al (in press), state that results have been mixed among studies where regression analyses have been used to investigate the independent contributions of affective commitment and normative commitment on organizational behavior. They support the distinctiveness of the two scales with the following line of reasoning:

> Even if there is a strong natural link between affective and normative
> commitment, it does not rule out the possibility that employees can experience an
> obligation to pursue a course of action in the absence of a desire to do so. (p. 24).

Table 4.8: Commitment Correlations

	Affective	Normative	Continuance
Affective	1.0	.69**	.01
Normative		1.0	.13*
Continuance			1.0

N=361
**Correlation is statistically significant with $p < .01$.
*Correlation is statistically significant with $p < .05$.

Another argument for the distinctiveness of the two scales comes from Meyer, Allen, & Smith (1993) who contend that despite the moderately high correlations between affective commitment and normative commitment, the correlations these two scales have with other outcome variables (e.g. performance, satisfaction) are sufficiently different to warrant retaining both scales.

Correlations Between the Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Subscales and the Organizational Commitment Scales

Additionally, I investigated how the *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* subscales correlated with the *organizational commitment* scales (see Table 4.9). These findings are presented below.

Correlations Between Relations-Oriented Subscales and Organizational Commitment

All the *relations-oriented* subscales had positive, statistically significant ($p < .01$), correlations with affective commitment. These correlations were as follows: idealized influence (attributed), $r = .45$; inspirational motivation, $r = .41$; idealized influence (behavior), $r = .39$; contingent reward, $r = .39$; individualized consideration, $r = .38$; and intellectual stimulation, $r = .36$.

67

Table 4.9: Commitment, Relations-Oriented, and Task-Oriented Correlations

	Affective Commitment	Normative Commitment	Continuance Commitment
Relations-Oriented			
IIA	.45**	.33**	.01
IIB	.39**	.32**	.03
IM	.41**	.31**	.00
IS	.36**	.31**	-.04
IC	.38**	.27**	-.07
CR	.39**	.30**	-.08
Task-Oriented			
MBEA	-.08	-.11*	.11*
MBEP	-.34**	-.27**	.08
LF	-.39**	-.18**	.08

N=361
**Correlation is statistically significant with $p < .01$.
*Correlation is statistically significant with $p < .05$.

The *relations-oriented* subscales also had positive, statistically significant ($p < .01$), correlations with normative commitment. However, these correlations were somewhat lower: idealized influence (attributed), $r = .33$; idealized influence (behavior), $r = .32$; inspirational motivation, $r = .31$; intellectual stimulation, $r = .31$; contingent reward, $r = .30$; and individualized consideration, $r = .27$. There were no statistically significant correlations among any of the *relations-oriented* subscales and continuance commitment.

These findings suggest that there is a positive, although not very strong, relationship between the *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors and both affective commitment and normative commitment. For affective commitment, this suggests that leadership behaviors which involve building trust, inspiring a shared vision, encouraging creativity, emphasizing development, and recognizing accomplishments is somewhat positively related to how employees feel about *wanting to* stay with the city of Charlottesville. For normative commitment, my findings suggest that these same leadership behaviors are similarly positive, though more weakly related to how employees feel about their *obligation to* stay with the city.

According to Meyer & Allen (1997), this similar, though slightly weaker, pattern of relationships is expected given that many of the work experiences that influence affective commitment also influence normative commitment. The finding that *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors have a weaker relationship with normative commitment than with affective commitment is also appropriate since employees who stay with an organization because they feel *obligated to* do not exhibit the same enthusiasm and involvement as employees who stay with an organization because they *want to* stay (Meyer & Allen, 1997). As such, *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors may not be as strongly related to normative commitment as to affective commitment.

Other researchers have found positive relationships between actions that are similar to *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors and both affective commitment and normative commitment. For affective commitment, these include leader consideration (DeCotiis & Summers, 1987; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990), supervisor supportiveness (Mottaz, 1988; Withey, 1988), participation in decision-making (Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994; Rhodes & Steers, 1981), receptiveness of management to employee ideas (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Lee, 1992), fairness (Allen & Meyer, 1990), and mission being consistent with cultural values (Vardi, Wiener, & Popper, 1989). For normative commitment, these include participatory management

(Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994), supportive relationships (Allen & Meyer, 1996), mission being consistent with cultural values (Vardi, Wiener, & Popper, 1989), and psychological contracts related to economic exchange or perceptions about reciprocal obligations (MacNeil, 1985; Roussearu, 1989).

As for the lack of statistically significant correlations between the *relations-oriented* subscales and continuance commitment, this finding suggests that *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors may not be related to how employees feel about *having to* stay with the city of Charlottesville. Rather, continuance commitment is more likely related to transferability of skills (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Lee, 1992; Withey, 1988), education (Lee, 1992), retirement money, status, and job security (Whitener & Walz, 1993), and alternative employment opportunities (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Lee, 1992; Meyer, Bobocel, & Allen, 1991). However, the relationship between supervisory behaviors such as participatory management and continuance commitment could vary based on employees' perceptions of their ability to find another job with similar characteristics (Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994).

Meyer & Allen (1997) even suggest that employees who have a strong continuance commitment stay with the organization because they do not want to lose the amount of time, money, or effort invested or because they think they have no employment alternatives. While employees who do not care about losing the amount of time, money, or effort invested, or who think they have several employment alternatives, have weaker continuance commitment. I included continuance commitment in my research design because it was one of the three types of *organizational commitment* and findings from my research would provide an opportunity to investigate whether there was a relationship among *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors, *task-oriented* leadership behaviors, and *organizational commitment*.

Correlations Between Task-Oriented Subscales and Organizational Commitment

Management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire had statistically significant ($p < .01$) correlations with affective commitment. These relationships were negative at $r = -.34$ and $r = -.39$, respectively. There was no statistically significant correlation between management-by-exception (active) and affective commitment.

These correlations suggest that leadership behaviors involving waiting until problems become serious before correcting or ignoring problems completely, are negatively though not

very strongly, related to how employees feel about *wanting to* stay with the city of Charlottesville. Given the discussion about the ways negative feedback involving management-by-exception (active) might contribute or detract from employees' perceptions, it is not possible to conclude whether leadership behaviors that involved highlighting mistakes, complaints, and failures are related to how employees feel about *wanting to* stay with the city.

All three *task-oriented* subscales had negative and statistically significant ($p < .01$) correlations with normative commitment. Management-by-exception (active) was very weak at $r = -.11$; laissez-faire was similarly weak at $r = -.18$; and management-by-exception (passive) was slightly stronger at $r = -.27$.

These correlations, though rather weak, suggest a range in the strengths of negative relationships. First, leadership behaviors that involve highlighting problems have almost no relationship to how employees feel about their *obligation to* stay with the city. Next, leadership behaviors that involve ignoring problems are slightly more related. Last, leadership behaviors that involve waiting for problems to become serious before taking action have the strongest relationship.

Management-by-exception (active) had a positive, but weak, $r = .11$, correlation with continuance commitment. However, management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire did not have any statistically significant correlations continuance commitment. These almost non-existent correlations suggest that leadership behaviors involving highlighting problems, ignoring problems, or waiting for problems to become serious before taking action may not be related to how employees feel about *having to* stay with the city. This is the case even though there was a statistically significant relationship between management-by exception (active) and continuance commitment. That's because this correlation is almost meaningless given that it is so close to the non-statistically significant correlations of management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire.

My findings are consistent with other research involving these *task-oriented* leadership behaviors and *organizational commitment*. For instance, Bycio, Hackett, & Allen (1995) reported that management-by-exception (passive and active) were negatively related to both affective and normative commitment, however there was no statistically significant relationship between management-by-exception (passive and active) and continuance commitment. Mathieu & Zajac (1990) conducted a meta-analysis of 48 studies and found that overall *organizational commitment* was low when employees were unsure about what was expected of them (role

ambiguity).   In nine studies, Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda (1994) found that employees understanding about the significance of their tasks was somewhat positively related to affective commitment, but not related to normative or continuance commitment.

Several observations are possible regarding the findings for management-by exception (active). First, even though this subscale had statistically significant correlations with normative and continuance commitment, the relationships were so low as to be almost meaningless. As such, the pattern of relationships that management-by exception (active) had with the three *organizational commitment* scales is similar to the pattern that existed with the *relations-oriented* subscales. Lastly, given the discussion about negative feedback with regards to management-by-exception (active), it is not possible to conclude whether this leadership behavior contributed to or detracted from employees' levels of affective, normative, or continuance commitment.

General Observations Involving the Correlations Between the Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Subscales and the Organizational Commitment Scales

All the *relations-oriented* subscales were more highly correlated with each other than they were with the *organizational commitment* scales.   Management-by-exception (active) had no correlations with any of the *relations-oriented* subscales. Additionally, management-by-exception (active) had no correlations with any of *organizational commitment* scales. The other *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* subscales were correlated with affective commitment and normative commitment, however, there were no correlations with continuance commitment. The absence of a relationship between continuance commitment and the *relations-oriented* as well as *task-oriented* subscales made it unnecessary to perform regression analyses using this scale.

The Variance in Organizational Commitment Explained by Relations-Oriented Leadership Behaviors, Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors, and the Interaction of Both

As stated earlier, the stepwise multiple regressions that were proposed to answer **questions one and two** were not performed because of the high correlations. Instead, scores from both 2-factor models (see Tables 4.4 and 4.5) were used to investigate the amount of variance that *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors explained in *organizational commitment*. Additionally, the factor scores were used to investigate whether the *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors had an *interactive* effect on

organizational commitment. Lastly, the absence of a relationship between continuance commitment and the *relations-oriented* as well as *task-oriented* subscales made it unnecessary to perform regression analyses using this scale. Results from these analyses are described below, as an answer to the **third research question:**

> To what extent do employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented leadership* behaviors have an interactive effect on *organizational commitment*?

My goal in answering this question was to investigate whether the combination of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* variables together would perhaps interact and be a better predictor of *organizational commitment* than the individual variables. To answer this question, I investigated the *interactions* by first creating new variables from the factor scores in the 2-factor model **without** laissez-faire, and from the factor scores in the 2-factor model **with** laissez-faire. I then created the *interaction* variable by multiplying the *relations* factor times the *task* factor in the 2-factor model **without** laissez-faire and in the 2-factor model **with** laissez-faire. For each interaction variable, I performed regressions using the enter method and inputting the variables in separate blocks (see Table 4.10). This involved separate analyses for affective commitment and normative commitment. In each case, regressions were performed by entering the *interaction* first and entering the *interaction* last, along with the independent *relations* and *task* factors.

As stated earlier, the absence of a relationship between continuance commitment and the *relations-oriented* as well as *task-oriented* subscales made regressions unnecessary for this variable. Therefore, regressions were performed using only the affective commitment and normative commitment variables. Results describing the independent and combined variance that the *relations* factor, *task* factor, and *interaction* explained in these two types of *organizational commitment* are presented below.

Table 4.10: Predicting Affective and Normative Commitment with Relations-Oriented, Task-Oriented, and Interaction Factors

Model	R² Change	Beta	p Value	Model	R² Change	Beta	p Value
Affective Commitment _2 Factors "without" Laissez-Faire R² .229_				**Affective Commitment** _2 Factors "with" Laissez-Faire_ _R² .250_			
Factor 1 (relations)	.189	.425	.000*	Factor 1 (relations)	.159	.397	.000*
Factor 2 (task)	.033	-.176	.000*	Factor 2 (task)	.085	-.284	.000*
Factor 1 x 2	.008	-.091	.062	Factor 1 x 2	.006	-.076	.113
Factor 1 x 2	.020	-.091	.009*	Factor 1 x 2	.014	-.076	.032*
Factor 1 (relations)	.178	.425	.000*	Factor 1 (relations)	.156	.397	.000*
Factor 2 (task)	.031	-.176	.000*	Factor 2 (task)	.080	-.284	.000*
Normative Commitment _2 Factors "without" Laissez-Faire R² .140_				**Normative Commitment** _2 Factors "with" Laissez-Faire_ _R² .138_			
Factor 1 (relations)	.110	.325	.000*	Factor 1 (relations)	.097	.309	.000*
Factor 2 (task)	.027	-.160	.001*	Factor 2 (task)	.034	-.176	.000*
Factor 1 x 2	.004	-.064	.214	Factor 1 x 2	.007	-.082	.109
Factor 1 x 2	.011	-.064	.055	Factor 1 x 2	.012	-.082	.044*
Factor 1 (relations)	.104	.325	.000*	Factor 1 (relations)	.095	.309	.000*
Factor 2 (task)	.025	-.160	.002*	Factor 2 (task)	.031	-.176	.001*

_p_ Value is statistically significant with _p_ < .05.

<u>Independent Variance in Affective Commitment Explained by Relations-Oriented</u>
<u>Leadership Behaviors, Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors, and the Interaction of Both</u>

The greatest amount of variance in affective commitment explained by the *relations* factor was 19%, and resulted from the model **without** laissez-faire.   The most variance explained by the model **with** laissez-faire was 16%. These results occurred when the factors were input before the interaction. The Betas reflect a positive relationship, which is consistent with the correlations.   The difference between the variance explained by the *relations* factors in the models **with** and **without** laissez-faire occurred because the addition of the laissez-faire items caused a change in the factor scores. As a result, the *relations* factor explained more of the variance in affective commitment when laissez-faire was not included and less when laissez-faire was included.

Findings for the *relations* factor suggest that leadership behaviors which involve building trust, inspiring a shared vision, encouraging creativity, emphasizing development, and recognizing accomplishments do explain some (19%) of the variation in whether employees *want to* or *do not want to* stay with the city.

The greatest amount of variance in affective commitment explained by the *task* factor was 9%, and resulted from the model **with** laissez-faire. These results occurred when the factors were input before the interaction. The most variance explained by the model **without** laissez-faire was 3%. The order of input did not affect the variance explained in these models because each pair of factor scores was independent due to varimax rotation of the factors. The Betas reflected a negative relationship, which is consistent with the correlations. Like the *relations* factors, the difference between the variance explained by the *task* factors in the models **with** and **without** laissez-faire occurred because the addition of the laissez-faire items caused a change in the factor scores. However, in this instance, the *task* factor explained more of the variance in affective commitment when laissez-faire was included and less when laissez-faire was not included.

Findings for the *task* factor suggest that leadership behaviors involving ignoring problems or waiting for problems to become serious before taking action explain very little (9%) of the variation in whether employees *want to* or *do not want to* stay with the city.   Specifically, immediate supervisors who display these leadership behaviors can have a negative impact on

how employees' feel about *wanting to* stay with the city. Additionally, the more supervisors display these leadership behaviors, the less employees' may *want to* stay with the city.

The greatest amount of variance in affective commitment explained by the *interaction* was 2%, and resulted from the model **without** laissez-faire. These results occurred when the interaction was input first. The most variance explained by the model **without** laissez-faire was 1%. Whether considered alone or after the two factors, the *interaction* of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* behaviors do not explain an appreciable amount of affective commitment. The miniscule amount of variance explained by the *interaction* factor suggests that the *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors were each related to affective commitment in different ways. For example, a review of items on the MLQ Form 5X indicates that a relationship between affective commitment and *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors might be tied to congruency in employee-leader values, whereas *task-oriented* leadership behaviors might be tied to feedback about tasks.   The impact of these two different relationships is that while a change in either *relations-oriented* or *task-oriented* leadership behaviors might cause a change in affective commitment, changes in both types of leadership behaviors is not required in order for affective commitment to change. In other words, these two leadership behaviors are independent.

Independent Variance in Normative Commitment Explained by Relations-Oriented Leadership Behaviors, Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors, and the Interaction of Both

The greatest amount of variance in normative commitment explained by the *relations* factor was 11%, and resulted from the model **without** laissez-faire.   The most variance explained by the model **with** laissez-faire was 10%. These results occurred when the factors were input before the interaction. The Betas reflect a positive relationship, which is consistent with the correlations.

Findings for the *relations* factor suggest that leadership behaviors which involve building trust, inspiring a shared vision, encouraging creativity, emphasizing development, and recognizing accomplishments explain very little (11%) of the variation in whether employees *feel obligated to* or *do not feel obligated to* stay with the city.

The greatest amount of variance in normative commitment explained by the *task* factor was 3%, and resulted from **both** models. The order of input did not affect the variance explained

in these models because each pair of factor scores was independent due to varimax rotation of the factors. The Betas indicate a negative influence, which is consistent with the correlations. Findings for the *task* factor suggest that leadership behaviors involving ignoring problems or waiting for problems to become serious before taking action explain almost none (3%) of the variation in whether employees *feel obligated to* or *do not feel obligated to* stay with the city. Specifically, immediate supervisors who display these leadership behaviors can have a negative influence on how employees' feel about their *obligation to* stay with the city. Additionally, the more supervisors display these leadership behaviors, the less employees may *feel obligated to* stay with the city.

For normative commitment, the amount of variance explained by the *relations* and *task* factors was the same **with** or **without** laissez-faire. This suggests that even though laissez-faire created a change in the factor scores, this change did not affect the amount of variance that the *relations* and *task* factors explained in normative commitment.

The greatest amount of variance in normative commitment explained by the *interaction* was 1%, and resulted from **both** models. Whether considered alone or after the two factors, the *interaction* of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* behaviors do not explain an appreciable amount of normative commitment. As stated when reporting my findings for affective commitment, the miniscule amount of variance explained by the *interaction* factor suggests that the *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors were each related to normative commitment in different ways. These factors were independent and did not interact.

Combined Variance in Affective Commitment and Normative Commitment Explained by Relations-Oriented Leadership Behaviors, Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors, and the Interaction of Both

The greatest amount of variance explained by any of the models was 25%, and resulted from the model **with** laissez-faire. The next largest amount of variance, 23%, resulted from the 2-factor model **without** laissez-faire. In both instances, results reflected the amount of variance that the *relations* factor, *task* factor, and *interaction* explained in affective commitment. The next largest amount of variance in normative commitment, 14%, was explained by the *relations* factor, *task* factor, and the *interaction*.

The pattern of relationships reflected in these findings follows my correlation results and mirrors the variance explained by the independent variables. That is, the combined variance of the *relations* factor, *task* factor, and the *interaction* was greatest for affective commitment, followed by normative commitment. Additionally, the 2-factor model **with** laissez-faire, explained a greater amount of variance than the 2-factor model **without** laissez-faire.

The combined variance explained by both factors and the *interaction* suggest that leadership behaviors which involve building trust, inspiring a shared vision, encouraging creativity, emphasizing development, recognizing accomplishments, ignoring problems, and waiting for problems to become serious before taking action explain some (25%) of the variation in whether employees *want to* or *do not want to* stay with the city; but explain little (14%) of the variation in whether employees *feel obligated to* or *do not feel obligated* to stay with the city.

General Observations Involving the Variance in Organizational Commitment Explained by Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors

The best 2-factor regression model explained 25% of the variance. This resulted from the model **with** laissez-faire and reflected the variance in affective commitment explained by the *relations* factor, the *task* factor, and the *interaction*. The most variance explained by the *relations* factor was 19% and the greatest amount of variance explained by the *task* factor was 9%. The largest amount of variance explained by the *interaction* was a miniscule 3%.

Even though *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors do not explain large amounts of variation in whether or not employees *want to* or feel *obligated to* stay with the city, this variation is nonetheless notable given the many other factors that can influence *organizational commitment*: (a) age, sex, race, personality, attitudes, climate, and culture (Steers, 1977); and (b) values, fairness of policies, decentralization, competence, job challenges, degree of autonomy, and variety of skills used (Meyer & Allen, 1997) .

Summary

While the MLQ Form 5X did distinguish between *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors, it did not do so in the way intended by Bass & Avolio (1995, 1997). Rather, the contingent reward subscale correlated more strongly with the *relations-oriented* subscales than the *task-oriented* subscales, and laissez-faire, a *non-leadership* (Bass, 1990a)

subscale, correlated with the *task-oriented* subscales. Additionally, the management-by-exception (active) subscale had low correlations with the other *task-oriented* subscales, did not correlate with the *relations-oriented* subscales, and had meaningless correlations with the *organizational commitment* scales.

Additional findings include the high correlations among all of the *relations-oriented* subscales and two of the *task-oriented* subscales, the absence of correlations between management-by-exception (active) and the *relations-oriented* subscales, and the low correlations between management-by-exception (active) and the other *task-oriented* subscales. Due to this multicollinearity and the correlation results with management-by-exception (active), I was unable to make interpretations about the amount of variance explained by any particular type of leadership behavior. Therefore, the stepwise multiple regressions were not performed. Instead, the factor scores were used to investigate the variance in *organizational commitment* that was explained by *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors.

Even though the OCQ did serve as a suitable measure of *organizational commitment*, the continuance commitment scale did not correlate with any of the *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* subscales. Therefore, continuance commitment was not included as a criterion variable.

The *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors did not correlate strongly with either affective or normative commitment. *Task-oriented* leadership behaviors had even lower correlations with the two types of *organizational commitment*. Regression results based on factor scores revealed the following: (a) the greatest amount of variance in affective commitment (25%) was explained by the 2-factor model that included laissez-faire items, (b) the *relations* factor explained the greatest amount of variance in affective commitment (19%) and normative commitment (11%), (c) the *relations* factor and the *task* factor each explained more variance in affective commitment than normative commitment, and (d) the *interaction* factor explained almost no variance in either affective commitment or normative commitment, neither beyond what the factors explained individually nor alone.

Chapter five will discuss these findings in greater detail. In addition, the chapter will discuss the limitations of the findings and suggest implications for further research.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

There are many factors that can influence *organizational commitment*: (a) age, sex, race, personality, attitudes, climate, and culture (Steers, 1977); and (b) values, fairness of policies, decentralization, competence, job challenges, degree of autonomy, and variety of skills used (Meyer & Allen, 1997). However, some researchers suggest that even though other factors are involved, commitment to the organization is probably most reflective of how employees feel about leaders and the behaviors they exhibit. Research in these areas has involved top management (Reichers, 1986; Becker & Billings, 1993; Hunt & Morgan, 1994), participatory management (Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994), supervisors (Becker, 1992; Becker, Billings, Eveleth, & Gilbert, 1996), and supervisory feedback (Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994). This study offers additional insight into how *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors are related to *organizational commitment*.

Relations-oriented leadership behaviors focus on the quality of the relationship with followers, whereas, *task-oriented* leadership behaviors focus on the task to be accomplished by followers (Bass, 1990a). *Relations-oriented* leadership behaviors are considered the most effective, followed by *task-oriented* leadership behaviors (Bass, 1998; Bass & Avolio, 1995, 1997).

Organizational commitment focuses on employees' commitment to the organization in three areas: (a) affective commitment exists when employees stay with the organization because they *want to,* (b) continuance commitment exists when employees stay with the organization because they *need to,* and (c) normative commitment exists when employees stay with the organization because they feel they *ought to* (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Affective commitment results in better performance and more meaningful contributions, followed by normative commitment, followed by continuance commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Research Questions

The purpose of this research was to investigate the relationship between employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership

behaviors and the three types of *organizational commitment.*   The following three questions were proposed as part of this research:

1. What is the relationship between employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors and *organizational commitment* where…

Relations-oriented leadership behaviors were initially measured as representing:

   a. idealized influence (attributed)
   b. idealized influence (behavior)
   c. inspirational motivation
   d. intellectual stimulation
   e. individualized consideration

Organizational Commitment levels were initially measured as representing:

   a. affective commitment
   b. continuance commitment
   c. normative commitment

2. What is the relationship between employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *task-oriented* leadership behaviors and *organizational commitment* where…

Task-oriented leadership behaviors were initially measured as representing:

   a. contingent reward
   b. management-by-exception (active)
   c. management-by-exception (passive)

Organizational Commitment levels were initially measured as representing:

   a. affective commitment
   b. continuance commitment
   c. normative commitment

3. To what extent do employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented leadership* behaviors have an interactive effect on *organizational commitment*?

Findings

Bass & Avolio's (1995) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ Form 5X) was used to measure the *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors. Meyer & Allen's (1997) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was used to measure *organizational commitment*. Based on findings from the factor analyses (see Table 4.4 and 4.5) and correlations (see Tables 4.8 and 4.9), I changed the measures for *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors, *task-oriented* leadership behaviors, and *organizational commitment*. Contingent reward was included as a *relations-oriented* subscale and eliminated as a *task-oriented* subscale; laissez-faire was included as a *task-oriented* subscale; and continuance commitment was eliminated as a criterion variable. I also used results from both 2-factor models to investigate the variance explained by *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors and to investigate the interaction.

The *relations-oriented* subscales (including contingent reward) had high correlations (see Table 4.7) with each other ($r = .66$ to $r = .80$). These subscales also had a positive, although not very strong ($r = .36$ to $r = .45$), correlation with affective commitment, and a somewhat weaker correlation ($r = .27$ to $r = .33$) with normative commitment. The greatest amount of variance in affective commitment explained by the *relations* factor was 19%, and resulted from the model **without** laissez-faire. The most variance explained by the model **with** laissez-faire was 16%. The greatest amount of variance in normative commitment explained by the *relations* factor was 11%, and resulted from the model **without** laissez-faire. The most variance explained by the model **with** laissez-faire was 10%.

The *task-oriented* subscales of management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire were strongly correlated ($r = .64$) with each other, whereas, management-by-exception (passive) and management-by-exception (active) were weakly correlated ($r = .31$) with each other. Management-by-exception (active) did not correlate with any of the *relations-oriented* subscales, however, the other two subscales had negative correlations.

Management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire had negative, although not very strong correlations, $r = -.34$ and $r = -.39$, with affective commitment. There was no statistically significant correlation between management-by-exception (active) and affective commitment. Correlations with normative commitment were also negative and somewhat weak: management-

by-exception (active) at $r = -.11$, management-by-exception (passive) at $r = -.27$, and laissez-faire at $r = -.18$.   The greatest amount of variance in affective commitment explained by the *task* factor was 9%, and resulted from the model **with** laissez-faire. The most variance explained by the model **without** laissez-faire was 3%.   The greatest amount of variance in normative commitment explained by the *task* factor was 3%, and resulted from **both** models.

The greatest amount of variance in affective commitment explained by the *interaction* was 2%, and resulted from the model **without** laissez-faire.   The most variance explained by the model **without** laissez-faire was 1%.   The greatest amount of variance in normative commitment explained by the *interaction* was 1%, and resulted from **both** models.

The best 2-factor regression model (see Table 4.10) explained 25% of the variance.   This resulted from the model **with** laissez-faire and reflected the variance in affective commitment explained by the *relations* factor, the *task* factor, and the *interaction*.

There were no statistically significant correlations among any of the *relations-oriented* subscales and continuance commitment (see Table 4.9).   Among the *task-oriented* subscales, management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire did not have any statistically significant correlations with continuance commitment, while management-by-exception (active) had a positive, but weak ($r = .11$), correlation with continuance commitment.

Means for the *relations-oriented* subscales ranged from 2.2 to 2.4, means for the *task-oriented* subscales ranged from 1.1 to 1.8, and means for the *organizational commitment* scales ranged from 3.1 to 3.3.

Conclusions

My findings for affective commitment suggest that *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors which involve building trust, inspiring a shared vision, encouraging creativity, emphasizing development, and recognizing accomplishments explains some of the variation in whether employees *want to* or *do not want to* stay with the city of Charlottesville. For normative commitment, these same *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors explain a little less of the variation in whether employees feel *obligated to* or *do not feel obligated to* stay with the city. According to Meyer & Allen (1997), this similar pattern of relationships between the two types

of *organizational commitment* is expected given that many of the work experiences that influence affective commitment also influence normative commitment.

Results for affective commitment suggest that *task-oriented* leadership behaviors which involve ignoring problems or waiting for problems to become serious before taking action explain very little of the variation in whether employees *want to* or *do not want to* stay with the city. These same *task-oriented* leadership behaviors explain almost none of the variation in whether employees *feel obligated to* or *do not feel obligated to* stay with the city.

The miniscule amount of variance explained by the *interaction* factor suggests that *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors were independent and did not interact.

This absence of correlations with continuance commitment suggests that *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors may not be related to how employees feel about *having to* or *not having to* stay with the city. Rather, continuance commitment is more likely related to transferability of skills (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Lee, 1992; Withey, 1988), education (Lee, 1992), retirement money, status, and job security (Whitener & Walz, 1993), and alternative employment opportunities (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Lee, 1992; Meyer, Bobocel, & Allen, 1991).

The three *task-oriented* subscales represent successively higher frequencies of "inactive" leadership behavior: management-by-exception (active) involves taking *immediate* corrective action, management-by-exception (passive) involves taking *delayed* corrective action, and laissez-faire involves taking *no* corrective action (Bass & Avolio, 1997). Active management-by-exception that is accompanied by clarification and encouragement might contribute to employees' perceptions about their immediate supervisors *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors (Bass, 1985), or might contribute to *organizational commitment*. Conversely, active management-by-exception that is accompanied by disapproval or reprimand might detract from employees' perceptions about their immediate supervisors *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors, or detract from *organizational commitment*. Given the absence of correlations for management-by-exception (active), it was not possible to conclude whether this leadership behavior was perceived as either contributing or detracting from employees' perceptions about their immediate supervisors' *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors or *organizational commitment*.

When compared to the ideal scores as recommended by Bass & Avolio (1997), the mean for contingent reward suggests that some employees perceived their immediate supervisors as doing an above average job of clarifying expectations and recognizing accomplishments. Whereas, mean scores for the other *relations-oriented* subscales suggest some need for improvement. The mean for management-by-exception (active) suggests that some employees perceived their immediate supervisors' as taking corrective action in a timely manner. However, the means for the other two *task-oriented* subscales suggest some employees perceived that their immediate supervisors tended to wait too long before resolving a problem or taking corrective action. For the OCQ, the desired pattern of scores is highest scores for affective commitment, followed by normative commitment, then continuance commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Means for my study suggest that some employees felt almost the same about *wanting to* stay with the city as they did about *having to* stay and their *obligation to* stay.

Limitations and Delimitations

One limitation existed with the MLQ Form 5X. That is, even though the instrument did serve as a measure of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors, it did not do so in the way suggested by Bass & Avolio (1995).

The population is also a consideration for this study. My sample consisted of government employees who lived in a city with a population of 40,009 (Charlottesville Community Profile, 2003). Employees for local businesses are drawn from a seven-county area that has a combined population of more than 215,000. Of the top eleven industries, there is one car dealership, three financial institutions, and one university. As the seat of both the city and county governments, Charlottesville serves as the economic, cultural, and educational center of this multi-county region in Central Virginia. Approximately 900 employees work for the city government and the majority of my sample (152) came from the public works department. These employees perform jobs such as maintenance repair, trash collection, water and gas maintenance, design and construction of streets, transportation services, and maintenance of city parks, playgrounds, and golf courses (Public Works Administration, 2003).

This profile suggests that there might be a lot of outside competition for city jobs. It also suggests that many employees in my sample performed blue-collar jobs. Additionally, government employees, more so than private sector employees, are usually more interested in

environmental factors such as flexible work hours (Curphey, M., 2002), job security (McConnell, S., 2002), and benefits (Yip, P., 2003).

Given this profile, the *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors that were part of this questionnaire may not have been extremely important factors in determining employees' levels of *organizational commitment*. Instead, environmental factors may have been more important for these employees. Additionally, results might be different for employees who were employed by private companies.

Another consideration involves the demographics. Results might have been different if percentages for race, age, sex, age, time with city, time with immediate supervisor, ethnicity, and education were different.

Implications for Practice

My findings suggest that *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors are positively related to affective and normative commitment. Immediate supervisors might want to acquire, enhance, or exhibit *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors such as building trust, inspiring a shared vision, encouraging creativity, emphasizing development, and recognizing accomplishments.

My findings also suggest that the *task-oriented* leadership behaviors of management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire are negatively related to affective and normative commitment. These behaviors focus on "when" feedback is provided about negative performance (Bass & Avolio, 1997). Specifically, management-by-exception (passive) involves feedback that occurs only when problems become chronic, and laissez-faire involves no feedback. The longer leaders wait to deliver negative feedback about tasks, the greater the negative effect on employee performance (Bass, 1997). In my study, negative feedback about tasks that was either *delayed* or *non-existent* had a negative effect on commitment. Therefore, improving the "timeliness" of negative feedback about tasks might reduce the negative effect on affective and normative commitment.

There is also an implication that "how" negative feedback is delivered can reduce the negative effect of management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire (Bass, 1985). Negative feedback about tasks that is accompanied by disapproval or reprimand rather than clarification and encouragement has a negative effect on employee performance (Bass, 1985). As such, using

constructive language when delivering negative feedback about tasks might also reduce the negative effect on affective and normative commitment.

The *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors were independent and did not have an interactive effect on affective and normative commitment. These two types of leadership behaviors do not have to be displayed simultaneously in order for a change to occur in commitment. Therefore, immediate supervisors' might be able to increase employees' levels of affective or normative commitment by improving *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors or improving "when" and "how" negative feedback is delivered.

Future Research Needs

Research should be conducted to develop an instrument that represents a more appropriate measure of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors. For my study, the MLQ Form 5X was the best available instrument. However, as described earlier, there were problems with this instrument. Of particular note were the high correlations among the *relations-oriented* subscales. This suggests that these subscales were not distinct measures of the different types of *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors. The contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), and laissez-faire subscales posed additional problems. A better measure of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors might result in more variance explained in *organizational commitment* and should allow for interpretations about the amount of variance explained by specific types of leadership behaviors.

Additional research should be conducted to determine the appropriate *names* for the two categories of leadership behaviors. This research should also investigate why the *names* of the two categories attributed to *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors keep changing. The first two categories that distinguished leadership behaviors were *consideration* and *initiating structure*, however, numerous categories have emerged since then, with the latest being *transformational* and *transactional*. The long history involving the two-dimensional approach to leadership reveal that researchers will (a) rename the two categories, (b) rename the specific subcategories under the two categories, and (c) reword the specific items under the subcategories. The result is that different terminology is used to describe similar categories, subcategories, and items. If researchers and practitioners have a common terminology, the result

might be greater clarity regarding the effectiveness of leadership behaviors and better understanding about how these leadership behaviors can be developed or improved.

Research also needs to be conducted on the subcategories and items that are included under the categories of *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership. Bass & Avolio (1995, 1997) list three categories of leadership behaviors: *relations-oriented*, *task-oriented*, and laissez-faire. However, my study, as well as findings by other researchers, suggest that the *task-oriented* leadership behavior of contingent reward is really *relations-oriented*; that laissez-faire is really a *task-oriented* leadership behavior; and that management-by-exception (active) does not serve as an adequate measure of *task-oriented* leadership behavior.

As for the items, Bass & Avolio's (1995, 1997) *task-oriented* items seem to have an overall narrow focus on "when" negative feedback about tasks is given. However, *task-oriented* leadership behaviors also include "how" feedback is given as well as "what" supervisors do to facilitate the accomplishment of tasks (Bennis & Nanus, 1995; Eicher, 1998; Hersey & Blanchard, 1977; Kotter, 1990; and Zaleznik, 1977). A broader and more positive focus would include leadership behaviors that involve giving constructive feedback about performance, providing resources to accomplish tasks, and implementing procedures to improve work processes. Such changes would allow for inclusion of the wide array of leadership behaviors that affect individual or organizational effectiveness.

Research involving the categories, subcategories, and items might also reveal why the *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors did not interact. Given that all the *task-oriented* leadership behaviors, except management-by-exception (active), were negatively related to the *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors, a possibility would be that the simultaneous improving of *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors along with improving "when" and "how" negative feedback is delivered would result in increased levels of affective commitment and normative commitment. If better measures existed, *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors may interact.

The high correlations ($r = .69$) between affective commitment and normative commitment suggest a need for additional research. Meyer & Allen (1997) state that the relationships each of these scales have with outcome measures is sufficiently different to warrant retaining both. However, my findings did not support this contention. Affective commitment had the same pattern of relationships with *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership

88

behaviors as normative commitment, only stronger. Further examination of the items that are used to measure these two types of *organizational commitment* is warranted. Or, the authors should provide clarification about the types of outcome measures that are related to affective commitment versus normative commitment.

Lastly, researchers might further examine the particular circumstances under which leadership behaviors might influence continuance commitment. Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, (1994) suggest that this relationship could vary based on employees' perceptions of their ability to find another job with similar characteristics. Insight in this area could improve leaders' ability to have a positive influence on employees who stay with the organization because they feel they have no other choice.

Summary

For this study, *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors explained more of the variance in affective commitment than the variance in normative commitment. The variance that *task-oriented* leadership behaviors explained in the two types of *organizational commitment* was the same, only weaker. Neither *relations-oriented* nor *task-oriented* leadership behaviors explained any variance in continuance commitment.

The *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors were positively related with affective and normative commitment, although not very strongly. This means that leadership behaviors which involve engendering trust, inspiring a shared vision, generating enthusiasm, encouraging creativity, providing coaching, and recognizing accomplishments do explain some of the variation in how employees feel about *wanting to* or feeling *obligated to* stay with the city of Charlottesville. The more they display these behaviors, the more employees may *want to* or feel *obligated to* stay.

Task-oriented leadership behaviors had a negative relationship with normative commitment and explained even less of the variance than *relations-oriented* leadership behaviors. This means that leadership behaviors which involve ignoring problems or waiting for problems to become chronic before taking action explain very little of the variation in how employees feel about *wanting to* or feeling *obligated to* stay with the city of Charlottesville. Supervisors may be able to improve their *task-oriented* leadership behaviors by giving negative feedback in a timely manner and using language that is both clarifying and encouraging.

Overall findings from this study suggest that *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors do play important roles in determining levels of affective commitment and normative commitment. The suggestions for future research offer additional opportunities to further investigate the amount of variance that *relations-oriented* and *task-oriented* leadership behaviors explain in all types of *organizational commitment*.

References

Akhtar, S. & Haleem, A. (1979). Differences between newly-promoted supervisors and workers with regard to 'consideration' and 'initiating structure. *Journal of Psychological Research, 24*(2), 90-95.

Allen, N. & Meyer, J. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*, 1-18.

Allen, N. & Meyer, J. (1996). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*, 1-18.

Anderson, D. (1974). *Leadership effectiveness in education as related to congruence between human behavior types and leadership styles.* Dissertation Abstractions International, 34, 6887.

Angle, H. & Perry, J. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 26*, 1-14.

Archedeacon, T. (1994). *Correlation and regression analysis*: A historian's guide. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Bass, B. (1960). *Leadership, psychology, and organizational behavior*. New York, NY: Harper.

Bass, B. (1967). Some effects on a group of whether and when the head reveals his opinion. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 2*, 375-382.

Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. (1990a). *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership* (3rd ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B. (1990b). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*(3), 19-31.

Bass, B. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Bass, B. & Avolio, B. (1990). *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Bass, B. & Avolio, B. (1995). *MLQ Multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Bass, B. & Avolio, B. (1997*). Full range leadership development: Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Bass, B. & Barret, G. (1981). *People, work and organizations: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Becker, T. (1992). Foci and bases of commitment: Are they decisions worth making? *Academy of Management Journal, 35*, 232-244.

Becker, T. & Billings, R. (1993). Profiles of commitment: An empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *14*, 177-190.

Becker, T., Billings, R., Eveleth, D., & Gilbert, N. (1996). Foci and bases of employee commitment: Implications for job performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*, 464-482.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Bernard, L. (1926). *An introduction to social psychology*. New York, NY: Holt.

Bingham, W. (1927). *The psychological foundations of management*. New York, NY: Shaw.

Bird, C. (1940). *Social Psychology*. New York, NY: Appleton-Century.

Blake, R. & Mouton, J. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf.

Brown, F. & Dodd, N. (1999). Rally the troops of make the trains run on time: The relative importance and interaction of contingent reward and transformational leadership. *Leadership & Organizational Development, 20*(6), 291-299.

Butler, J., Jr., Cantrell, S., & Flick, R. (1999). Transformation leadership behaviors, upward trust, and satisfaction in self-managed work teams. *Organization Development, 17*(1), 13-25.

Bycio, P., Hackett, R., & Allen, J. (1995). Further assessment's of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*, 468-478.

Cartwright, D., & Zander, A. (1960). *Group dynamics-research and theory*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Cawthon, D. (1996). Leadership: The great man theory revisited. *Business Horizons, 39*, 1-4.

Charlottesville Community Profile (2003). Retrieved 4/2/03, from http://www.charlottesville.org/default.asp?

Cohen, A. (1996). On the discriminant validity of the Meyer and Allen measure of organizational commitment: How does it fit with the work commitment construct? *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 56*, 494-503.

Cohen, A., & Kirchmeyer, C. (1995). A multidimensional approach to the relations between organizational commitment and nonwork participation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 46*, 189-202.

Curphey, M. (2002, April). From public to private, painlessly. *Guardian Unlimited*. Retrieved from http://society.guardian.co.uk/careers/story.

DeCotiis, T. & Summers, T. (1987). A path analysis of a model of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. *Human Relations, 40*, 445-470.

Den Hartog, M., Van Muijen, J. & Koopman, P. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. *70*, 19-43.

Denison, D., Hooijberg, R., & Quinn, R. (1995). Paradox and performance: Toward a theory of behavioral complexity in managerial leadership. *Organization Science, 6*(5), 524-540.

Dowd, J. (1936). *Control in human societies*. New York, NY: Appleton-Century.

Downey, H., Sheridan, J., & Slocum, J. (1975). Analysis of relationships among leader behavior, subordinate job performance and satisfaction: A path goal approach. *Academy of Management, 18*, 253-262.

Dunham, R., Grube, J., & Castaneda, M. (1994). Organizational commitment: The utility of an integrative definition. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79,* 370-380.

Dunteman, G., & Bass, B. (1963). Supervisory and engineering success associated with self, interaction, and task orientation scores. *Personnel Psychology, 16*, 13-22.

Eicher, J. (1998). Leader-Manager Profile. King of Prussia, NJ: HRDQ.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Fleishman, E. (1951). *Leadership climate and supervisory behavior*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board.

Fleishman, E. (1953). The description of supervisory behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 37*, 1-6.

Fleishman, E. (1957). A leader behavior description for industry. In R. Stogdill & A. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

Fleishman, E., & Harris, E. (1962). Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievances and turnover. *Personnel Psychology, 15*, 43-56.

Fornell, C. & Larker, D. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18*, 39-50.

Galton, F. (1869). *Heredity Genius*. New York, NY: Appleton.

Hackett, R., Bycio, P., & Hausdorf, P. (1994). Further assessments of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 15-23.

Halpin, A. & Winer, B. (1957). A factorial study of the leader behavior descriptions. In R. Stogdill & A. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement* . Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

Hambleton, R. & Gumpert, R. (1982). The validity of Hersey and Blanchard's theory of leader effectiveness. *Group and Organization Studies, 7*, 225-242.

Hater, J. & Bass, B. (1988). Superiors evaluations and subordinates perception of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*(4), 695-702.

Heller, F. (1969). *Managerial decision making*. London, UK: Human Resources Center, Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.

Hemphill, J. (1949). The leader and his group. *Journal of Educational Research, 28*, 225-229.

Hemphill, J. (1950). *Leader behavior description*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. (1982). *Management of organization behavior: Utilizing human resources* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hersey, R. & Blanchard, T. (1969). *Management of Organizational Behavior* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hodge, J. (1976). *The relationship between styles of supervision and need satisfaction of two levels of management employees.* Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 1987.

House, R. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 16*(3), 321-338.

House, R., Filley, A., & Kerr, S. (1971). Relation of leader consideration and initiating structure to R and D subordinates' satisfaction. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 16*(1), 19-30.

Howell, J. & Avolio, B. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 891-902.

Howell, J. & Hall-Marenda, K. (1999). The ties that bind: The impact of leader-member exchange, transformational and transactional leadership, and distance on predicting follower performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(5), 680-694.

Hunt, S. & Morgan, R. (1994). Organizational commitment: One of many commitments or key mediating construct? *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 1568-1587.

Indvik, J. (1986). *Path-goal theory of leadership: A meta-analysis.* Paper presented at the Academy of Management, Chicago, Ill.

Irving, P., Coleman, D., & Cooper, C. (1997). Further assessments of a three-component model of occupational commitment: Generalizability and differences across occupations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(3), 444-452.

Jenkins, W. (1947). A review of leadership studies with particular reference to military problems. *Psychological Bulletin, 44*, 54-79.

Jermier, J. & Berkes, L. (1979). Leader behavior in a police command bureaucracy: A closer look at the quasi-military model. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24*, 1-23.

Jung, D. & Avolio, B. (2000). Opening the black box: An experimental investigation of the mediating effects of trust and value congruence on transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*, 949-964.

Katz, D., Maccoby, N., & Morse, N. (1950). *Productivity, supervision, and morale in an office situation.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.

Kilbourne, C. (1935). The elements of leadership. *Journal of Coast Artillery, 78*, 437-439.

Klimoski, R. & Hayes, N. (1980). Leader behavior and subordinate motivation. *Personnel Psychology, 33*, 541-555.

Kohs, S. & Irle, K. (1920). Prophesying army promotion. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 4*, 73-87.

Kotter, J. (1990). What leaders really do. *Harvard Business Review*, 103-105.

Larson, L., Hunt, J., & Osborn, R. (1974). Correlates of leadership and demographic variables in three organizational settings. *Journal of Business Research, 2*, 335-347.

Lee, K. (1992). A study of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization, Unpublished master's thesis, Sung Kyun Kwan University, Seoul, Korea.

Lewin, K. & Lippitt, R. (1938). An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy: A preliminary note. *Journal of Social Psychology, 10*, 271-301.

Licht, M. (1995). *Multiple regression and correlation*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Loui, K. (1995). Understanding employee commitment in the public organization: A study of the juvenile detention center. *International Journal of Public Administration. 18*(8), 1269-1295.

Mann, F. (1965). Toward an understanding of the leadership role in formal organizations. In R. Dubin (Ed.), *Leadership and productivity* . San Francisco, CA: Chandler.

Mathieu, J. & Zajac, D. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 171-194.

MacNeil, I. (1985). Relational contracts: What we do and do not know. *Wisconsin Law Review*, 485-525.

McConnell, S. (2002). Should you take a chance in public? *Guardian Unlimited*. Retrieved from http://society.guardian.co.uk/careers/story.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Meyer, M. (1968). The two authority structures of bureaucratic organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 13*, 211-228.

Meyer, J., Stanley, D., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (in press). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates and consequences.

Meyer, J. & Allen, N. (1984). Testing the 'side-bet theory' of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 372-378.

Meyer, J. & Allen, N. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*(1), 61-89.

Meyer, J., & Allen, N. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Meyer, J., Allen, N., & Gellatly, I. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 710-720.

Meyer, J., Allen, N., & Smith, C. (1993). Commitment to Organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 538-551.

Meyer, J., Bobocel, D., & Allen, N. (1991). Development of organizational commitment during the first year of employment: A longitudinal study of pre- and post-entry influences. *Journal of Management, 17*, 717-733.

Misumi, J. (1985). *The behavioral science of leadership: An interdisciplinary Japanese research program.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Morrow, P. (1993). *The theory and measurement of work commitment.* Greenwich, CT.: JAL.

Morrow, P. & McElroy, J. (1993). Introduction: Understanding and managing loyalty in a multi-commitment world. *Journal of Business Research, 26*, 1-2.

Mowday, R., Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14*, 224-247.

Nelson, C. (1949). *The development and evaluation of a leadership attitude scale for foremen.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago.

Nelson, C. (1950). *Differential concepts of leadership and their function in an industrial organization.* Paper presented at the Paper, American Psychological Association, State College, PA.

Ouchi, W. (1981). *Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Page, D. (1935). Measurement and prediction of leadership. *American Journal of Sociology, 41*, 31-43.

Patchen, M. (1962). Supervisory methods and group performance norms. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 7*, 275-294.

Penner, D., Malone, D., Coughlin, T., & Herz, J. (Eds.). (1973). *Satisfaction with U.S. Army leadership*: U.S. Army War College, Leadership Monograph Series, No. 2.

Porter, L, Steer, R., Mowday, R., Boulian, P. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 59*, 603-609.

Public Works Administration (2003). Retrieved from the world wide web 4/2/03. http://www.charlottesville.org/default.asp?

Reddin, W. (1977). An integration of leader-behavior typologies. *Group and Organization Studies, 2*, 282-295.

Reichers, A. (1986). Conflict and organizational commitments. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 508-514.

Rhodes, S. & Steers, R. (1981). Conventional vs. worker-owned organizations. *Human Relations, 12*, 1013-1035.

Rousseau, D. (1989). Psychological and implicit contracts in organizations. *Employee Rights and Responsibilities Journal, 2*, 121-139.

Schriesheim, C. & Kerr, C. (1974). Psychometric properties of the Ohio State leadership scales. *Psychological Bulletin, 81*, 756-765.

Schwandt, D. & Marquardt, M. (2000). *Organizational Learning: From world-class theories to global best practices*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press LLC.

Seltzer, J. & Bass, B. (1990). Transformational leadership: Beyond initiation and consideration. *Journal of Management, 16*(4), 693-703.

Shamir, B. (1995). Social distance and charisma: Theoretical notes and an exploratory study. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*, 19-47.
Simon, L. (1994). *Trust in leadership: Its dimensions and mediating role*. Unpublished Dissertation, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS.

Smith, H. & Krueger, L. (1933). *A brief summary of literature on leadership*. Bloomington: Indiana University, School of Education Bulletin.

SPSS® Base 10.0 Applications Guide (1999). Chicago, IL: SPSS Inc.

Steers, R. (1975). Problems in the measurement of organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 20*, 546-558.

Steers, R. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 22*, 46-56.

Stogdill, R. (1963). *Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire--Form XII*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

Tead, O. (1929). The technique of creative leadership, *Human Nature and Management*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Tejeda, M., Scandura, T., Pillai, R. (2001). The MLQ revised psychometric properties and recommendations. *The Leadership Quarterly, 12*, 31-52.

Thite, M. (1999). Identifying key characteristics of technical project leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development, 20*(5), 253-261.

Tracy, L. (1987). Consideration and initiating structure: Are they basic dimensions of leader behavior? *Social Behavior and Personality, 15*(1), 21-33.

Vardi, Y, Wiener, Y., & Popper, M. (1989). The value content of organizational mission as a factor in the commitment of members. *Psychological Reports, 65*, 27-34.

Weissenberg, P. & Kavanagh, M. (1972). The independence of initiating structure and consideration: A review of the evidence. *Personnel Psychology, 25*(1), 119-130.

Whitener, E. & Walz, P. (1993). Exchange theory determinants of affective and continuance commitment and turnover. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42*, 265-281.

Wiener, Y. & Vardi, Y. (1980). Relationships between job, organization, and career commitments and work outcomes: An integrative approach. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 26*, 81-96.

Wiggam, A. (1931). *The biology of leadership*. New York, NY: Pitman.

Woods, F. (1913). *The influence of monarchs*. New York: Macmillan.

Yammarino, F., Spangler, W., & Bass, B. (1993). Transformational leadership and performance: A longitudinal investigation. *Leadership Quarterly, 4*, 81-102.

Yip, P. (2003, March 31, 2003). Public-sector plans have more protections than private sector's. *The Dallas Morning News*.   Retrieved from http://www.kmsb.com/business/news.

Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review, 55*(5), 67-80.

APPENDIX - A

Employee Opinion Survey-OCQ

Employee Opinion Survey-OCQ

You are being asked to participate in a survey to provide the city of Charlottesville with information that will help improve the working environment for employees. Participation in this survey is voluntary and confidentially is assured. No individual data will be reported. THANK YOU! ---

The following statements concern how you feel about the **department** where you work. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by **circling** a number from 1 to 5. Please **do not put your name on this questionnaire**.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

1. It would be very hard for me to leave my department right now, even if I wanted to………………………………………………………. 1 2 3 4 5
2. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer….……… 1 2 3 4 5
3. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this department 1 2 3 4 5
4. One of the few negative consequences of leaving this department would be the scarcity of available alternatives……………………………………. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now…………………………………………………………. 1 2 3 4 5
6. I really feel as if this department's problems are my own……………….. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Right now, staying with my department is a matter of necessity as much as desire……………………………………………………………………..1 2 3 4 5
8. I do not feel a strong sense of "belonging" to my department……………. 1 2 3 4 5
9. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this department…… 1 2 3 4 5
10. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this department…………………. 1 2 3 4 5
11. I would feel guilty if I left my organization now……………………….. 1 2 3 4 5
12. I do not feel like "part of the family" at my department………………….. 1 2 3 4 5
13. This organization deserves my loyalty…………………………………. 1 2 3 4 5
14. If I had not already put so much of myself into this department, I might consider working elsewhere…………………………………………….. 1 2 3 4 5
15. Would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it…………………………………………... 1 2 3 4 5
16. This department has a great deal of personal meaning for me…………… 1 2 3 4 5
17. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my department now……………………………………………………… 1 2 3 4 5
18. I owe a great deal to my organization……………... …………………… 1 2 3 4 5

NOTE: This questionnaire is reproduced with permission and is not to be reproduced without permission of the authors' John Meyer and Natalie Allen.

APPENDIX - B

Employee Opinion Survey-Sample MLQ Items

Employee Opinion Survey-Sample MLQ Items

You are being asked to participate in a survey to provide the city of Charlottesville with information that will help improve the working environment for employees. Participation in this survey is voluntary and confidentially is assured. No individual data will be reported. THANK YOU! --

The following statements concern how you feel about the **department** where you work. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by **circling** a number from 1 to 5. Please **do not put your name on this questionnaire**.

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

Idealized Influence (Attributed)

10. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her …………………………. 0 1 2 3 4

Inspirational Motivation

9. Talks optimistically about the future ………………………………………... 0 1 2 3 4

Contingent Reward

1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts ……………………….. 0 1 2 3 4

Management-by-Exception (Active)

24. Keeps track of all mistakes …………………………………………………..... 0 1 2 3 4

Laissez-Faire

5. Avoids getting involved when important issues arise …………………………… 0 1 2 3 4

APPENDIX - C

Employee Opinion Survey-Demographic Questions

Demographic Questions

The following questions concern your position and other personal information. Completion of this information is voluntary and confidentially is assured. No individual data will be reported. THANK YOU!

1. What is your Sex?
❑ Male
❑ Female

2. What is your Job Title?

_____

3. Do you Supervise others?
❑ Yes
❑ No

4. How long have you worked for the city of Charlottesville?

_____ Years _____ Months

5. How long have you worked for your Immediate Supervisor?

_____ Years _____ Months

6. What is your Age Group?
❑ Under 26   ❑ 46 to 55
❑ 26 to 35   ❑ 56 to 65
❑ 36 to 45   ❑ 66 or older

7. What is your highest level of Education?
❑ Did not complete High School   ❑ Some master's credits, no degree
❑ High school degree/equivalent   ❑ Master's degree
❑ Some college, no degree   ❑ Some post-master's credits, no degree
❑ Associate's/2-year degree   ❑ Doctorate degree or professional degree
❑ Bachelor's degree

8. Are you of Hispanic background?
❑ Yes
❑ No

9. What is your Race?
❑ White   ❑ Black
❑ Asian/Pacific Islander   ❑ Native American
❑ Other

Barbara B. Brown

Education

Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)
  Human Development
  Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
  Blacksburg, Virginia, May 2003

Masters of Science (M.S.)
  Human Resource Development
  Towson State University
  Towson, Maryland, May 1996

Bachelors of Science (B.S.)
  Business Administration
  Towson State University
  Towson, Maryland, May 1990

Experience

1993 to Present (Independent Consultant): Work as an independent consultant, specializing in designing interventions and leadership development programs that help managers drive high performance.

  Clients: Served as a contractor for over 25 federal government agencies which include Department of Defense, Department of Treasury, Department of Transportation, and Department of Agriculture; 3 state government agencies; 2 educational institutions; 3 non-profit organizations; 2 professional associations; and 5 private companies.

  Services: Provide a variety of services that include design and delivery of training programs, facilitating meetings, delivering keynote speeches, analyzing leadership styles, and designing leadership interventions.

1973 to 1993 (Government Employee): Held several senior-level, middle-level, and first-line management positions.

  Director, *Operations Analysis Staff*. Supervised 65 employees.
  Responsible for identifying methods and techniques to improve the quality and quantity of processing workloads for an organization of 4,000 employees.

Deputy Director, *Management Services Staff*. Supervised 350 employees. Responsible for managing and administering all aspects of training, budget and facilities for an organization of 4,000 employees.

Executive Officer, *Office of Management Support*. Supervised 6 employees. Responsible for monitoring the development, implementation and coordination of all aspects of training for an organization of 3,500 employees.

Manager, *Administrative Staff*. Supervised 12 employees. Responsible for activities involving staffing and union-management issues for an organization of 4,000 employees.