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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the impact of gender and transformational leadership on employee job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness within the National Sport Organizations. Leadership was measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), employee job satisfaction by the Job In General (JIG) Scale, and organizational effectiveness by the Survey of National Sport Organizations instrument.

While significant differences existed in the transformational leadership tendencies exhibited at the Executive Director level within the National Sport Organizations, no significant difference was uncovered between female and male Executive Directors. This finding supports the conclusions of Dobbin and Platz (1986), Goktype and Schneier, (1988), and Komives (1991) who concluded that executive leadership does not differ on the basis of gender. In addition, no significant difference existed between the employee job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness levels of organizations led by female Executive Directors compared to the same measures of organizations led by male Executive Directors. These findings align with the conclusions of Kushell and Newton (1986), and Stitt, Schmidt, Price and Kipnis (1983) who found no relationship between the gender of the leader and job satisfaction, and Bartol (1978) who found that the gender of the leader did not have an impact on organizations effectiveness.

It was also concluded that no significant difference existed between employee job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness levels of organizations led by high transformational leaders compared to the same measures for organizations led by low transformational leaders. These findings support the conclusions of Indvik (1988) and Keller (1989) who found no significant relationship between executive leadership and job
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CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

Leadership has been studied since ancient times, although it is only within the past two decades that females and gender\(^1\) differences have become an integrated part of the research (Bass, 1990; Heller, 1982). The relatively low status positions held by females in society made it difficult for them to emerge as leaders (Miner, 1993). Characteristics associated with leadership such as decision-making power and control were considered characteristic of the male domain, therefore making the path to the more prominent hierarchical levels in business and industry an onerous journey for females (Miner, 1993).

The slow progress made by females within society and business has afforded them a small percentage of leadership positions in contrast to those held by males (Bass, 1990). The socialization process reinforcing the notion that masculinity is something to be rewarded and femininity is to be devalued has been transferred from one generation to the next (Miner, 1993). Within organizations, females faced barriers such as gender stereotyping, the "glass-ceiling", and sometimes discrimination based on gender, disenfranchising them from becoming leaders in their respective fields (Schwartz & Zimmerman, 1992).

The leadership opportunities available to females have been largely limited to positions in all female institutions, such as women's suffrage, nunnery and all-

---

\(^1\)The term sex is commonly used to differentiate men and women according to biological differences. The term "gender" is used to differentiate people according to behaviors which are deemed within their society as being masculine or feminine. The field of sport management has used the term "gender" to denote both biological and behavioral distinctions. In keeping with this trend the researcher will use the term "gender" when differentiating men from women, assuming that the biological males will assume a masculine identity and the biological females will assume a feminine identity.
girls' schools (Bass, 1990). Females have been assigned to occupations like grade
school teaching and nursing where their femininity would not be reduced.
However, the administration in these settings was typically male dominated
(Schwartz & Zimmerman, 1992). As of 1990, one-half of all working females
could be found in just 21 occupations.

This phenomenon occurs in Portugal, Britain, the Soviet Union, Ireland
and elsewhere, as well as in North America. The jobs held exclusively by
women are likely to be both lower paid and less likely to lead to
advancement in administration or executive positions; they are more likely
to be transient opportunities and to call for less training and commitment
(Bass, 1990, p.714).

Sutton and Moore (1985) concluded that most people believe females have to be
exceptional to succeed in business. Females believed they had to struggle to
reach the senior hierarchical levels of administration (Sutton & Moore, 1985).

Females still face obstacles to their upward mobility (Powell, 1988).
Despite their advancements at work, many females still assume the role of
traditional housewife when away from the office. They have a role conflict
between being an economic provider and a primary care-giver (Bass, 1990).
Many females are forced to focus on the latter role, diminishing their influence
and position of power in the workplace or relinquishing opportunities for
advancement (Ehlrich, 1989).

Although more females are moving into higher level management
positions, the promotion of females into positions of authority has not kept pace
(Bass, 1990). There are fewer females in advanced hierarchical positions to serve
as mentors and role models to other females (Powell, 1988). Females often fail
to obtain the sponsorship needed to identify them as highly talented and to give them the direction needed for career advancement (Noe, 1988). "From the organization’s perspective, the failure to identify and utilize talented women reduces effectiveness (within the organization)" (Noe, 1988, p.65). In addition, females are unable to break into the network commonly labelled the "old boys club".

Within the sports environment, girls and women are still facing barriers that inhibit their participation as athletes, coaches, and administrators (Coakley, 1990). One of the major obstacles faced by females in sport is that they are being judged on male-based criteria. Not only is sport governed by men's rules, people in positions of power insure that male standards become generalized as generically human standards of behaviour for males and females (Stone, 1979). Success in sport is perceived to be associated with masculine characteristics. The language of sport, teams mascots, and school logos often serves to reinforce this issue (Miner, 1993).

For female coaches and administrators, there is little doubt their athletic destiny is controlled by men. Although there has been a recent increase in the number of sport participation options for females, a contrasting decrease has occurred in the number of coaching and administrative positions open to females within the university environment (Coakley, 1990; Únick, 1991). Females perceive the main reason for their under representation to be the result of men's efficient use of the "old boys' club" to fill positions. In contrast, the men in university
coaching and administrative positions see the lack of qualified female participants as the main reason for the low female representation (Acosta & Carpenter, 1988). These perceptions are very important since men are in positions of power in many female sport programs. Male perceptions shape whom they recruit, interview, hire, and promote into leadership positions (Coakley, 1990). "As long as women lack the power to define their program philosophies and their role as coaches and administrators... inequalities will remain" (Coakley, 1990, p.189).

The majority of organizations have a gender structure in which males typically occupy the more powerful positions and females the less powerful positions (Hall, Cullen, & Slack, 1990). Within Canada, females in leadership positions at the national government level are greatly under-represented (Hall et al., 1990). Within Sport Canada, females account for 29% of all Chief Executive Officers, Director Generals, Executive Directors and Managing Directors (Sport Canada, 1989). Males believe that the lack of female administrators within Sport Canada is because females lack the necessary qualifications whereas as the females view family constraints and lack of female mentors as the main reasons for the under-representation (Hall et al., 1990).

Before a problem can be solved there must be recognition that one exists. There is a lack of females in leadership positions in the majority of organizations (Hall et al., 1990). If the situation is to improve, males and females must be aware of what females can offer to the area of leadership. Data must be gathered and analyzed so that conclusions can be drawn as to whether there is a significant
difference between males' and females' ability to be effective leaders.

Women may indeed be the most radical force available in bringing about organizational change; however they can not do this as isolated tokens. Women must learn to value their own experiences, believe in their own values and listen to their own inner voices and the voices of other women if indeed they are to speak "in a different voice" in the organization for which they work. If women can find ways of bringing their whole selves into the organization, not as saintly mothers or dutiful daughters but as mature women, the result will be both liberating for women and humanizing for organizations (Grant, 1988, p.63).

**Females in Leadership**

Within mixed groups, males tend to emerge as leaders more often than females (Aries, 1976). It is the influence of status and sex role stereotyping that often prevents females from attaining leadership positions (Bass, 1990). However, females do possess traits different from males that give females the opportunity to lead and to succeed as leaders.

Females' style of conversation and communication is systematically different from males due to a socialization difference (Bass, 1990). The female's style of speech is personal and facilitative. Howard and Bray (1988) found that females were superior in oral presentations and possessed slightly heightened verbal ability. Females tend to focus more on interpersonal success in groups, whereas males are concerned with being successful in completing the task. There is a focus on harmony and on creating a more positive group when females are leaders (Bass, 1990). There is a tendency for females to be more involved and relations-oriented than their male counterparts (Bass, 1990).
Petty and Bruning (1980) reported that females display more consideration for followers than their male counterparts. Female managers were found to display less "management by exception" than male managers (Bass, 1990). These characteristics support the notion that females have more transformational tendencies than males. Subordinates' level of satisfaction has changed little when the managers and supervisors are females (Bass, 1990). Studies have failed to find differences in employees' satisfaction with the manager that were related to the gender of the manager (Bass, 1990).

Changes are rapidly occurring for females in leadership roles. It is necessary to continue to give consideration to the underlying dynamics and dimensions of importance to the success and effectiveness of female leaders (Bass, 1990). As females' role in society continues to gain respect and importance, female leaders will be able to function with more freedom.

**Theoretical Proposition**

Female leaders are purported to be higher transformational leaders than male transformational leaders (Bass, 1990). High transformational leaders are purported to positively impact both the job satisfaction levels of staff members and the effectiveness of the organization (Bass, 1990; Hunt, 1991; and Pincus, 1986). The theoretical proposition of this study is that the female Executive Directors (ED) from the National Sport Organizations (NSO) will be more transformational than the male Executive Directors from the National Sport Organizations. The staff members of organizations led by high transformational
leaders will be more satisfied than those led by low transformational leaders.

Finally, the NSOs led by high transformational leaders will be more effective than the NSOs led by low transformational leaders.

**Research Questions**

The study was designed to address the following five research questions:

1. Is there a significant difference between the transformational leadership scores of female Executive Directors and male Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations?

2. Is there a significant difference between the job satisfaction scores of employees administered by high transformational Executive Directors and the job satisfaction score of employees administered by low transformational Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations?

3. Is there a significant difference between the job satisfaction scores of employees administered by female Executive Directors and the job satisfaction scores of employees administered by male Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations?

4. Is there a significant difference between the organizational effectiveness of National Sport Organizations administered by high transformational Executive Directors and the organizational effectiveness of National Sport Organizations administered by low transformational Executive Directors?
5. Is there a significant difference between the organizational effectiveness of National Sport Organizations administered by female Executive Directors and the organizational effectiveness of National Sport Organizations administered by male Executive Directors?

The following research hypothesis was constructed to answer the first research question:

\( H_1 \) - A significant difference exists between the transformational leadership scores of female Executive Directors and the transformational leadership scores of male Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations.

The following research hypothesis was constructed to test the second research question:

\( H_2 \) - The job satisfaction scores of employees administered by high transformational Executive Directors will be significantly higher than the job satisfaction scores of employees administered by low transformational Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations.

The following research hypothesis was constructed to test the third research question:

\( H_3 \) - Job satisfaction scores of employees administered by female Executive Directors are significantly higher than the job satisfaction scores of employees administered by male Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations.

The following research hypothesis was constructed to test the fourth
research question:

H₄ - The effectiveness rating of National Sport Organizations administered by high transformational Executive Directors is significantly higher than the effectiveness ratings of National Sport Organizations administered by low transformational Executive Directors.

The following research hypothesis was constructed to test the fifth research question:

H₅ - The effectiveness rating of National Sport Organizations administered by female Executive Directors is significantly higher than the effectiveness rating of National Sport Organizations administered by male Executive Directors.

**Definition of Terms**

**Trait leadership theory**

Trait leadership theory emphasizes the personal qualities of the leader. The success of the leader is attributed to the possession of extraordinary abilities (Yukl, 1981).

**Behaviour leadership theory**

Behaviour leadership theory focus is on what the leader does. It attempts to describe the typical behaviour patterns and activities of leaders (Yukl, 1981).

**Situational leadership theory**

Situational leadership theory focuses on the importance of situational
factors (i.e., time, place, and circumstance). The nature of the task, the leader's authority and discretion to act, the role expectations imposed by superiors, peers and subordinates and other situational factors determine the relevant traits, skills, and behaviour of the leader (Yukl, 1981).

**Transactional leadership theory**

Transactional leadership theory is based on the "quid pro quo" relationship. The current needs of the followers are satisfied through an exchange process (Yammarino & Bass, 1990). The leader exchanges promises of rewards to subordinates for the fulfilment of agreements with the leader (Bass, 1990).

**Transformational leadership theory**

Transformational leadership theory focuses on the leader's ability to have followers transcend their own self-interest for the good of the group, organization, or society. Followers consider their long-term needs for development instead of their needs of the moment. The followers become more aware of what is really important (Bass, 1990). Transformational leadership was measured using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X) developed by Bass and Avolio (1990).

**Individual Consideration**

Individual consideration is the attention a leader gives to each individual employee and his/her needs. The leader ensures the employee has the help and resources needed to achieve the goals of the organization (Avolio, Waldman, & Yammarino, 1991).
**Intellectual Stimulation**

Intellectual stimulation is the concern the leader shows in providing ways and reasons for people to change the way they think. As a consequence followers develop their own capabilities to recognise, understand and solve future problems (Avolio et al., 1991).

**Inspirational Motivation**

Inspirational motivation is the leader’s ability to make followers feel valued, self-confident, and assured that the leader will overcome any obstacles and ensure the group meets new challenges and opportunities (Avolio et al., 1991).

**Idealised Influence**

Idealised influence is the leader building respect for others and building on their confidence and trust in the overall mission. By followers observing the leader achieve desired results, they are more likely to emulate the leader (Avolio et al., 1991).

**Gender**

For this study the term gender assumes that females exhibit a feminine identity and males exhibit a masculine identity.

**Employee job satisfaction**

Employee job satisfaction is the pleasurable or positive emotional state obtained from the appraisal of the employee’s job (Pincus, 1986). Employee job satisfaction was measured by the Job-In-General Index developed by Ironson,

**Organizational Effectiveness**

Organizational effectiveness is an evaluation of an organization's performance by comparing it to predetermined standards or objectives (Cameron, 1986). Organizational effectiveness was measured by the Survey of National Sport Organizations developed by Chelladurai and Haggerty (1991).

**National Sport Organizations**

National Sport Organizations (NSO) are formally structured sport agencies that are in charge of a wide range of activities which include the sanctions and administration of national championships, the endorsement of their sport, fund raising, administrative development, and technical development (Bell, 1990).

**Executive Director**

The Executive Director (ED) provides direction in the accomplishment of goals and directives of the NSO, provides administrative support for all NSO programs, guarantees that the NSO is operating in an appropriate business manner, has communications with the sporting community, corporate sector, media and the public in regards to the NSO and its business (Bell, 1990).

**Consideration**

Consideration is a pro-social behaviour which aims to produce and maintain the well-being and integrity of others. It involves showing concern for subordinates and attending to subordinates' development (Bass, 1990).
Initiation of Structure

Initiation of Structure shows the extent to which a leader initiates activity in the group or organization. The leader defines the ways the work is to be done, insists on maintaining standards and decides in detail what will be done and how it will be done (Bass, 1990).

Management by Exception

"Management by exception" is when leaders take corrective action and intervene only when failures and deviations occur (Bass, 1990). "Management by exception" can be active or passive.

Glass Ceiling

The glass ceiling is a barrier that is so subtle it is transparent but strong enough to prevent minorities from moving up the management hierarchy (Ehrlrich, 1989).

Limitations of the Study

The researcher acknowledges the following limitations:

1. The use of a single questionnaire may produce data that is limited in utility. The data reflect a single moment in time which may be affected by any recent events or incidents (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1985).

2. Superordinates and subordinates may inflate their Executive Director's transformational score if the organization is perceived as being successful and may deflate the executive director's transformational score if the organization is perceived as being unsuccessful. Other reasons may also produce the same effect.
3. Despite the assurance of confidentiality, superordinates and subordinates may be hesitant to accurately describe their leader’s behaviour due to perceptions of negative consequences associated with the offering of negative input.

4. The variations in organizational size may have an impact on the leader’s ability to display transformational characteristics.

5. The subjects may not appreciate or understand the importance of the research, and therefore may not contribute sufficient time or thought to their responses.

6. Leadership is not necessarily delivered at the Executive Director’s level and in some circumstances is provided by the volunteer Board of Directors and/or the volunteer President.

7. The study is limited by the restrictions imposed by the validity and the reliability properties of the instruments.

**Delimitations of the Study**

The researcher had outlined the scope of the study in the following ways:

1. The study is restricted to Canadian National Sport Organizations that have female Executive Directors and parallel Canadian National Sport Organizations that have male Executive Directors.

2. Leadership was measured only at the Executive Director’s hierarchical level within the Canadian National Sport Organizations.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of the related literature. The review is presented in six sections which include: (a) Introduction to Leadership; (b) Transformational Leadership Theories; (c) Leadership and Gender; (d) Leadership, Gender, and Job Satisfaction; (e) Leadership, Gender, and Effectiveness, and; (f) Summary.

Introduction to Leadership

The phenomenon of leadership has been a topic of interest since the development of civilization (Weese, 1994c). The history of the world has developed around the study of leaders. From the philosophical teachings of Confucius, to the concepts of leadership exemplified by the Greek heroes in Homer's Iliad, to the scholarly thesis of Machiavelli, leadership has been a universal preoccupation (Bass, 1990).

The literature on leadership has focused predominantly on theoretical issues (Bass, 1990) and can be partitioned into four distinct phases which include: (a) trait leadership theory; (b) behaviour leadership theory; (c) situational leadership theory, and; (d) transformational leadership theory (Yukl, 1981; Bass, 1990). Each phase was developed to account for the emergence and success of leaders by examining the different aspects and perspectives of leadership (Bass, 1990).
The trait approach to leadership was based on the assumption that some individuals were "natural leaders" (Yukl, 1981). The early leadership researchers were unsure of what traits were essential for leadership effectiveness but were confident these traits could be identified through empirical research. However, by the late 1940's, the trait approach came under attack by researchers. "A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits... the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers" (Stogdill, 1948, p.64). The early studies could not produce a consistent list of traits to account for why one individual was more successful as a leader than another (Yukl, 1981). These studies failed to support the thesis that an individual must possess a particular set of traits in order to emerge and become a successful leader (Yukl, 1981).

The second approach to leadership research was the behavioral approach. This approach focused on what leaders did in order to be effective (Yukl, 1981). A variety of different research methods, such as continuous observation and activity sampling, were used to chronicle and interpret the activities and behaviour of leaders. Researchers uncovered that effective and ineffective leaders behaved in similar ways which led to the demise of the behavioral theories of leadership. The next leadership theory to emerge was the situational leadership theory (Yukl, 1981).
While researching the situational approach to leadership, theorists did not attempt to disprove the trait and behaviour approaches to leadership. These theorists expanded on the trait and behaviour theories. They discovered that different traits and behaviours were important for leadership effectiveness in different situations. These theories also became known as contingency theories because the leader's effect on subordinates was contingent on situational aspects that enhance or nullify the influence of a leader's traits or behaviour (Yukl, 1981). However, as with most theories and approaches, there were deficiencies in the situational leadership theories.

The research suffers from problems such as lack of comparable situational measures from study to study, lack of accurate measures of leader behaviour and intervening variables and reliance on correlational studies that do not permit strong inferences about the direction of causality in relationships among variables. The lack of conclusive results in research on situational theories is also due to conceptual deficiencies on the theories themselves (Yukl, 1981, p.167).

Following the discovery of deficiencies with the situational leadership theories, researchers began to examine the nature of the relationship between the leader and the follower (Hater & Bass, 1988). The study of the leader-follower relationship focused on an equitable exchange relationship. Burns (1978) identified leaders by their actions and the impact those actions had on others. He identified the transactional leader, referring to this leader as an individual who takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of making an exchange of something of value (Burns, 1978). Transactional leadership is the exchange in which the superior and subordinate influence one another.
reciprocally so that each derives something of value (Yukl, 1981).

The transactional leader provides reward or punishment in return for the subordinate's effort (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fretter, 1990). Bass (1990) noted that the relationships between leaders and followers is comprised of transactions (e.g., increase in salary for increase in production; wage deductions for poor quality of output). However, on a higher level, transactional leadership may involve promises or commitments that are exchangeable values, such as respect and trust (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987).

Even with the leader gaining the respect and trust of the followers, he/she is not always able to influence followers toward the achievement of the organizational goals (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). Transactional leaders often influence followers to comply, resulting in contributions that are ordinary or status quo. Burns (1978) recognized that another type of leader was able to influence followers to perform beyond expectations. These leaders established a relationship of mutual stimulation between leader and follower and elevation that converted followers into leaders and converted leaders into moral agents (Burns, 1978). They inspired followers by appealing to their higher-ordered needs - the need to feel important, to make a difference, to be valued, and to be part of a worthwhile enterprise (Weese, 1994b). These individuals were termed transformational leaders.

The current approach to leadership theory is labelled transformational leadership. Burns (1978) first made the distinction between transformational and
transactional leaders. Transactional leaders were those individuals who attempted to satisfy the current needs of followers. They made resources available to followers in exchange for follower contributions. Transformational leaders tried to raise the needs of followers and promote dramatic changes of individuals, groups, and organizations (Yammarino & Bass, 1990).

The transformational leader seeks to satisfy the higher needs of the followers to engage the full commitment of each follower. Transformational leadership results in the mutual stimulation and elevation that transforms followers into leaders and leaders into moral agents (Bass, 1990).

**Transformational Leadership Theories**

The terms charismatic (House, 1977), visionary (Sashkin, 1988), transformational (Avolio & Bass, 1988; Tichy & Devanna, 1986) and inspirational (Yukl & Fleet, 1982) have been used interchangeably to describe those leaders who are able to develop, intellectually stimulate, and inspire followers to transcend their own self-interest for a higher collective purpose (Howell & Higgins, 1990).

While each of these approaches differs somewhat in the specific behaviours they associate with transformational leadership, all of them share the common perspective that effective leaders transform or change the basic values, beliefs and attitudes of followers so that they are willing to perform beyond the minimum levels specified by the organization (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990, p. 108).

According to Keller (1992) "the transformational leader gains a greater commitment from subordinates and induces them to transcend personal self-
interest for the betterment of the group and organization not only with charisma but also by serving as a coach, teacher or mentor” (p. 490). Burns (1978) developed the earliest transformational leadership theory by drawing the distinction between transformational leaders and transactional leaders. Numerous studies emerged from his work on leadership (Bass 1985; 1988, Bass & Avolio, 1990; Hater & Bass, 1988; Keller, 1992; Sashkin, 1986; and Tichy & Devanna 1986). Transformational leadership promoted achievement and self-development in the followers. As a result there was development and progress for the group and the organization (Bass & Avolio 1990).

Bass (1990) identified four components to his theory of transformational leadership which included: (a) Inspirational Motivation; (b) Idealised Influence; (c) Intellectual Stimulation, and; (d) Individual Consideration. Each of these four factors is discussed below.

**Inspirational Motivation.** Bass (1990) noted the transformational leader is able to motivate followers by expressing goals which the followers want to attain. The goals must be vivid to strengthen and uplift the followers. The leaders use their expressive behaviour and eloquence to effectively communicate these goals with the followers (Bass, 1990). By doing so, the followers feel valued, self-confident, and assured of their leader’s ability to overcome obstacles and meet new challenges and opportunities (Avolio et al., 1991).

**Idealised Influence.** Followers share a social philosophy with their leaders. The followers feel more powerful because of the efforts made by the leader.
Leaders are knowledgable, enlightened, and sensitive to the problems at hand therefore gaining the trust of their followers (Bass, 1990). By respecting others and building their confidence and trust in the overall mission, transformational leaders are able to have followers accomplish objectives which build on the leaders' influence for future missions and objectives (Avolio et al., 1991).

**Intellectual Stimulation.** The leader becomes part of the interactive creative process. Intellectual stimulation contributes to the independent thinking of the followers. The leader prevents the habituation of followership. The leader promotes innovation and creativity among members of the group or organization and encourages experimentation (Bass, 1990). The leader provides ways and reasons for followers to change the way they think about technical problems, human relation problems, and their personal attitudes and values (Avolio et al., 1991). Consequently, followers develop their own capabilities to recognize, understand, and solve future problems (Avolio et al., 1991).

**Individual Consideration.** The leader expresses appreciation for good work, stresses the importance of job satisfaction, maintains and strengthens the self-esteem of subordinates. The leader is concerned with the welfare of the group. There is a support system between the leader and the followers (Bass, 1990). However, the leader pays attention to individual employees and their individual needs. The leader ensures that each employee has the help and resources necessary to achieve the organizational goals (Avolio et al., 1991).
Transformational leadership is not just a leader-oriented theory. Transformational leaders help foster follower independence (House & Howell, 1992). They help to create followers who are more capable of leading themselves. The transforming effect is on the organization, the leader, and the followers (House & Howell, 1992; Weese, 1994c). Transformational leadership focuses on all three aspects.

Transformational leadership calls for personalities that are proactive and not reactive, creative and novel, radical and reforming, more risk prone, and less inhibited in their ideal search for solutions (Avolio & Howell, 1992). Bass (1988) identified seven attributes that are thought to be characteristic of a transformational leader which include: (a) expressive behaviour, (b) self-confidence, (c) self-determination, (d) insight, (e) freedom from internal conflict, (f) eloquence, and (g) activity and energy level. Each of these attributes is discussed below.

Expressive behaviour. According to Bass (1988), transformational leaders are able to express their emotions in a nonverbal manner to captivate his or her followers. There is more to their communication style than just verbal cues. Transformational leaders must behave in ways that advance the vision step by step. They physically perform a sequence of actions that represent steps towards attainment of the vision (Sashkin, 1988).

Self-Confidence. Transformational leaders exude self-confidence in their position and in their capabilities. In doing so, followers have more confidence in
the leaders and are more loyal to them (Bass, 1988). Bennis and Nanus (1985) suggest the more effective transformational leaders are those who have been able to capture the loyalty and trust of their followers.

**Self-Determination.** Self-determination is what sets transformational leaders apart from the ordinary individual (Bass, 1988). Transformational leaders are able to free themselves of everyday routine by seeing the future and setting new attainable values and goals. In doing so, there may be risks involved in attaining the values and goals, however the leader must make a commitment to the risks (Sashkin, 1986).

**Insight.** Transformational leaders use their insight to assess the needs, values, and hopes of followers. "They have the ability to both conceive and articulate goals that lift people out of their petty preoccupations" (Bass, 1988, p.48). They are able to bring individuals together in order to achieve goals for the common good. The key to the leaders' insight is that their actions are congruent with the vision and the goals to be attained (Lee, 1993).

**Freedom from Internal Conflict.** Transformational leaders are free from internal conflict because of their ability to see the importance of their vision. Convinced of their purpose and the quest for achieving the goal of the organization, these leaders are free of self doubt and conflicting emotions (Bass, 1988).

**Eloquence.** The use of the language and the ability to deliver inspiring speeches is an important aspect of transformational leadership. These leaders
must come across with emotion and flair to impact upon their followers (Bass, 1988). Communicating and articulating the vision is a key behaviour of transformational leaders (Podsakoff et al., 1990). They must communicate the vision to the followers in ways that are compelling and make the followers want to buy into the vision to make it happen (Sashkin, 1988).

Activity and Energy Level. Leaders seen as being more active and taking stronger stands on issues of concern to the leaders and to the followers are considered to be more transformational. The energy level displayed by these leaders contributes to the confidence the followers have in them (Bass, 1988). Transformational leaders have no energy to spare on peripheral tasks. All of their efforts go towards achieving their goals (Sashkin, 1988).

In early leadership research, Stogdill attempted to illustrate that it was difficult to identify any unique characteristics inherent in leaders but absent in non-leaders (Yukl, 1981). However, Bennis (1989) studied 90 of the most successful leaders in the United States in an effort to identify common traits. After several years of research, Bennis uncovered four competencies evident to some extent in all leaders. The four competencies were known as: (a) Management of Attention, (b) Management of Meaning, (c) Management of Trust, and (d) Management of Self.

Management of Attention. Transformational leaders must be able to draw individuals into their vision. They are able to focus the attention of their followers through a compelling vision. It helps to align the individuals together
for a greater commitment (Bennis, 1989). It may be necessary for these leaders to be involved with odd, unusual, and creative actions to capture and concentrate attention on the important aspects of a vision (Sashkin, 1988).

**Management of Meaning.** In order for leaders to bring meaning to their vision and have their followers working together towards achievement of their vision, they must be able to communicate the vision to the followers. "Leaders make ideas tangible and real to others so they can support them. The leader's goal is not merely explanation or clarification but the creation of meaning" (Bennis, 1989, p.37). To do so, the leaders must have the skills used to implement policies and programs that reflect and operationalize the leader's organizational philosophy (Sashkin, 1988).

**Management of Trust.** The management of trust is extremely important to all organizations. In order for leaders to gain trust they must be consistent and reliable with their actions (Bennis, 1989). Individuals will not follow a leader who is irrational and unpredictable with his or her decisions and actions. Individuals may not always agree with the leaders but the individuals trust the leaders because "they say what they mean and mean what they say" (Sashkin, 1988, p.144).

**Management of Self.** For transformational leaders to be effective they must know themselves. They must be aware of their personal strengths and weaknesses. They must have the ability to build on the strengths and overcome their weaknesses. Transformational leaders are unfamiliar with the concept of failure. Instead, they view mistakes as learning opportunities and proceed to the
next step (Bennis, 1989). Transformational leaders create and take calculated risks. The focus is on making risk work, not on avoiding, minimizing or recovering from failure (Sashkin, 1988).

For transformational leaders to be effective, they must be successful in taking their group or organization through a process of buying into a vision. Only after this process is complete can transformational leaders become effective.

According to Tichy and Devanna (1986), the transformation process can be traced through three stages or acts for each the individual and the organization. For the individual act one is concerned with endings. To make the transition it is necessary to start with endings. If individuals cling to the old way of doing things they will be unable to adjust to new demands that must be met. There must be a disengagement with the past while learning new behaviours (Tichy & Devanna, 1986).

**Act two** is the transition stage. Individuals must take this opportunity to remove themselves from the past and make an emotional commitment to the future. This act is often viewed as non-productive, however it is pertinent to the success of the organizational transformation (Tichy & Devanna, 1986).

The **final act** introduces new beginnings. Individuals are now ready to deal with the new organization. They are prepared to deal with frustration that accompanies failure when switching from the old organization to the new organization (Tichy & Devanna, 1986).
Within the organization, *act one* is concerned with the need for change triggered by environmental pressures. The leader must accept the change in the environment in order to convince key decision-makers within the organization that there is a need for change. Failure to do so may result in the demise of the organization (Tichy & Devanna, 1986).

During *act two*, the leader must create a vision of change. It must be acceptable to the individuals and desirable for the organization. The vision and the way it is communicated to the organization must be compatible with the leader's philosophy and style if the individuals are going to accept and adopt the vision (Tichy & Devanna, 1986).

In the final *act*, the transforming organization must institutionalize the change. It is in this stage that the new way of thinking becomes a day-to-day practice. The organization requires shaping and the new culture needs reinforcing to fit the revitalized organization (Tichy & Devanna, 1986).

In order for people and organizations to change there must be an exchange. Individuals have to "unlearn and relearn, exchange power and status, and exchange old norms and values for new norms and values" (Tichy & Devanna, 1986, p.3). It is the transformational leader who is able to assist individuals through these changes and to help them appreciate the importance of the transformation (Tichy & Devanna, 1986).

The research on transformational leadership is extensive. Bass (1990) suggests that transformational leadership augments the effects of transactional
leadership. Transformational leadership is generating positive outcomes for subordinates and organizations of transformational leaders (Bass, 1990). It is an area of investigation that should be undertaken to promote success in organizations.

Leadership and Gender

Although there has been some research conducted on gender and leadership (Eagly & Karau, 1991; Gecalone, 1988; Goktepe & Schneier, 1988, and; Goktepe & Schneier, 1989), none of these studies defined gender. When used as a variable in these studies, gender meant one of the two sexes, male or female. Social theorists differentiate between "gender" as the socially constructed differences between men and women and "sex" as being biologically male or female (Coakley, 1990). Gender has become a social and theoretical category just like class, race, and ethnicity. It is an analytical tool to help understand major societal changes involving relations between males and females (Hall, Slack, & Whitman, 1991).

Researchers have concluded that effective leadership is perceived to require traits stereotyped as masculine. Despite evidence that females are just as successful as males in most leadership situations, there is still congruency between the views of "good leader" and "typical male" (Cann & Siegfried, 1990). Cann and Siegfried (1990) assessed the relationship between leadership styles and sex-typed behaviour styles. The first part of the study rated leader behaviour associated with consideration and initiating structure on a masculine-feminine dimension.
The second part rated the gender-typed behaviours to reflect differences in leadership style (i.e., consideration versus initiating structure). Cann and Siegfried (1990) found that there was a gender-based distinction between consideration and initiating structure. The significance of their finding was that consideration, characteristic of transformational leadership, was rated as a feminine quality while initiating structure, characteristic of transactional leadership, was rated as a masculine quality.

Dobbin and Platz (1986) conducted a meta-analysis of 17 studies examining gender difference in leadership. Contrary to Cann and Siegfried (1990), they found that male and female leaders exhibit equal amounts of initiating structure and consideration.

Eagly and Karau (1991) also conducted a meta-analysis of the gender and leadership literature. They uncovered that males emerged as leaders in short-term groups and in groups carrying out tasks that did not require social interaction. However, when social interaction was a factor, females emerged as leaders more frequently than males. Gender differences in the emergence of leaders are a result of societal gender roles which influence group behaviour. Males tend to specialize more in behaviours oriented to task or initiating structure and females specialize more in socially facilitative or considerate behaviours (Eagly & Karau, 1991).

Goktepe and Schneier (1988) concluded that there were no significant differences in the effectiveness ratings given by followers to male and female
leaders in laboratory experiments. Male and female leaders received equivalent effectiveness ratings regardless of gender.

Gerber (1988) tested the hypothesis that leader-follower roles determine the ways gender stereotyped traits are typically assigned to males and females. Previously, traits associated with leaders and followers were similar to those which have been found to be characteristic of males and females. Leaders are expected to been assertive and influential whereas followers are conditioned to be accommodating and responsive. In line with cultural and social stereotypes, males were strong in task behaviour and weak in communion; females were strong in communion and weak in task behaviour (Gerber, 1988). Gerber studied marriage relationships to test whether the traits associated with the typical male and female are determined by the assumptions of roles in marriage. She noted that, regardless of gender, the leader was perceived as assertive and influential; the follower was perceived as accommodating and responsive.

Komives (1991) examined how same-gender and cross-gender work pairs related to the workers' view of their supervisor. She studied hall directors and their student residence assistants. The hall director was the supervisor and the residence assistants were the subordinates. The research "investigated the differences between gender of employee and supervisor work pairs on select employee outcome measures and perceptions of leadership of supervisors" (Komives, 1991, p.360). She found no difference in residence assistants' job satisfaction or the residence assistants' perception of the hall director's
transformational and transactional leader behaviours. The gender of the residence assistants in conjunction with the gender of their supervisor did not effect the outcome. Both male and female hall directors were viewed as equally effective by both male and female residence assistants.

Kushell and Newton (1986) analyzed the effects of leadership style and gender on subordinate satisfaction. They determined that participants were highly dissatisfied with an autocratic style of leadership. Females perceived this style of leadership more negatively than males. However, the gender of the leader did not influence subject's satisfaction levels. Leadership style rather than the leader's gender was the significant determinant of employee satisfaction.

Hackman, Furniss, Hills, and Paterson (1992) noted that people generally associate leadership with masculinity. They suggested that these stereotypes still influence the way individuals perceive the potential and the performance of leaders. Females are often seen as too feminine and therefore inappropriate as leaders. However, when females display masculine leadership characteristics they are rated negatively for failing to be feminine. Hackman et al. (1992) uncovered a significant relationship between both feminine and masculine factors and transformational leadership. However, the relationship between femininity and transformational leadership was stronger than the relationship between masculinity and transformational leadership.

Hackman, Hills, Paterson, and Furniss (1993) noted that both male and female leaders are perceived by subordinates as being effective and satisfying to
work with regardless of whether the leader exhibited masculine or feminine characteristics. Female leaders, regardless of their masculine or feminine characteristics, were perceived to create a more satisfying work environment. However, female leaders were only perceived as effective when they exhibited masculine characteristics. The females were perceived as ineffective when they exhibited feminine characteristics. Also, female subordinates perceived leaders displaying feminine gender-role characteristics as less effective than leaders who displayed masculine gender-role characteristics.

Megargee (1969) conducted a study on the influence of gender-roles on the emergence of leadership. It was believed that individuals high in dominance would emerge as leaders regardless of the gender of the work-pair partner, who was low in dominance. Megargee (1969) found that high dominant individuals emerged as leaders over low dominant individual after a task was assigned except when the high dominant individual was a female and the low dominant individual was a male.

When Carbonell (1984) replicated Megargee's study, she found that despite all of the "consciousness-raising" that had taken place in the previous 15 years, high dominant females, when paired with low dominant males were still likely to assume the non-leadership position. However, during the study Carbonell (1984) found that the task involved using "masculine" skills. The study was therefore extended to include a task which involved using skills feminine in appearance. When high dominant females were paired with low dominant males and the
nature of the task was feminine, the females were more likely to emerge as leaders. Unfortunately, in the real world, the nature of the task can not be easily altered and therefore one would expect high dominant females to be reluctant to assume a leadership position (Carbonell, 1984).

The results of leadership and gender studies are conflicting. There are researchers who have determined that females are more considerate than men in leadership positions (Cann & Siegfried, 1990) and other scholars who found no difference in the exhibition of consideration between male and female leaders (Dobbin & Platz, 1986). There are researchers who suggest females are less likely to emerge as leaders (Megargee, 1969) and others who indicate females will emerge as leaders if the nature of the task is appropriate (Carbonell, 1984). With such contradictory findings, it is necessary to continue investigations into the impact of gender and leadership on organizational outcomes.

Leadership, Gender and Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been studied intensely by organizational researchers (Pincus, 1986). In general terms, job satisfaction is considered to be an employee’s perceptual and emotional reaction to important facets of his or her work (Pincus, 1986). Opportunities for recognition, achievement, advancement, growth, and the challenge of the work itself have been identified as the origins of job satisfaction (Snyder, 1990). Job satisfaction is a structural component which is an important social interaction within the organization (Pfeffer, 1991).
Leadership is purported to impact on organizational climate, and have an indirect effect on job satisfaction (Snyder, 1990). Female subordinates felt more integrated into an organization and felt more supported when the leader displayed considerate characteristics (component of transformational leadership). The considerate behaviour expressed by the leader also influenced the morale of the male followers. Males were more likely to prefer a highly considerate leader. Leaders who were concerned with the needs of the subordinates had direct and indirect effects on the satisfaction levels of female subordinates and only had direct effects on the satisfaction levels of male subordinates (Snyder, 1990).

In studies analyzed by Bass (1990) leaders high in initiating structure and low in consideration were rated higher in performance. However, he also indicated that there was an increase in absenteeism and high turnover among the employees of these leaders. High employee absenteeism and turnover are symptomatic factors of low job satisfaction (Bartol, 1979). Studies have confirmed a strong relationship between leader consideration and employee job satisfaction (Bass, 1990).

Pincus (1986) stated that the more open, trusting, and participative the leader-follower relationship is perceived to be by the subordinates, the more satisfied the subordinates are likely to be with their jobs and organization. Open, trusting, and participative relationships are promoted by transformational leaders (Bass, 1990).
Skaret and Bruning (1986) found that task environment factors work in conjunction with leader behaviour to influence subordinate job satisfaction. Their results reinforce trends toward a more team-oriented style of leadership rather than the traditional hierarchical directive style of leadership.

The relationship between job satisfaction and leader behaviours, such as providing contingent rewards, allowing subordinate participation, and exhibiting supportiveness of subordinates, has been established (Farh, Podsakoff, & Organ, 1990). Farh et al. (1990) stated that employee satisfaction with leadership is derived from cognitive appraisal of leader's behaviour in terms of fairness.

Effective communication skills, characteristic of transformational leadership (Bass, 1990; Sashkin, 1988), are significantly related to job satisfaction (Pincus, 1986). Pincus (1986) stated that a high communications-oriented environment contributes to the effectiveness of the organization.

However, studies conducted by Ritchie and Miles (1970), Mitchell (1970), and Porter and Lawler (1965) contradicted these findings. These studies found that satisfaction was dependant on rank within the organization. As rank increased, so did the satisfaction levels. Other studies found that satisfaction was related to earnings (Bass, 1990), level of education (Klein & Maher, 1968), or performance (Porter & Lawler, 1968).

With females entering all facets and types of organizations in increasing numbers, the integration of females into organizational leadership positions has become a major issue. The stereotypical view that females lack successful
leadership characteristics has led to two basic assumptions: (a) females are ineffective leaders, and (b) female leaders elicit lower employee job satisfaction levels than male leaders (Stitt, Schmidt, Price, & Kipnis, 1983). Stitt et al. (1983) found that follower satisfaction with the leader and satisfaction with task were not significantly influenced by the leader's gender. Therefore, no support was garnered for the assumption that female leaders elicit lower levels of employee satisfaction than male leaders.

Kushell and Newton (1986) studied leadership style, gender, and subordinate satisfaction. They found that subordinates were less satisfied with an authoritarian style of leadership. However, they also determined that gender of the leader did not influence the subordinates' satisfaction levels, a finding consistent with that of Stitt et al. (1983). These contradictory findings further illustrate the need for additional research to determine the impact of gender and leadership on job satisfaction.

**Leadership, Gender, and Organizational Effectiveness**

Within the literature there is a multitude of findings on the relationship between leadership and organizational effectiveness. Bass (1990) cited numerous research studies investigating the relationship between leadership and organizational effectiveness. Some scholars (Bass, 1990; Sashkin, 1988) found a correlation between the charisma of leaders and the effectiveness of their leadership. Organizational effectiveness is a critical aspect of the leader's accomplishment of organizational task (Hunt, 1991). Hunt (1991) examined
effectiveness from four perspectives: (a) goal attainment; (b) strategic systems; (c) strategic constituencies, and; (d) competing values. Goal attainment measures effectiveness by the ends rather than the means. Strategic systems account for effectiveness based on the organization's ability to acquire resources, maintain itself internally as a social system, and interact successfully with the external environment. The strategic constituencies perspective examines effectiveness by measuring the satisfaction of strategic constituencies from whom support is required for the organization to continue existence. The competing values approach recognizes that contradictory measures must be considered when attempting to measure effectiveness. The leader must decide the importance of each along with the goals of the organization. This approach allows for different effectiveness criteria to be emphasized throughout the organizational life cycle (Hunt, 1991).

Bass (1990) reported on studies showing correlations between a leader's charisma rating as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1990) and both the effectiveness of the leader and the satisfaction of the subordinates. Leaders that had high charismatic scores led organizations with higher effectiveness and subordinate satisfaction ratings. The reverse scenario was also true (Bass & Avolio, 1990).

Other studies reviewed by Bass (1990) reported that the ideal amount of control and the actual amount of control over group members used by a leader was related to effectiveness ratings. When researchers examined the effects of
ideal and actual amounts of control by leaders over members of female groups, it was found that the amount of control did not increase the coordination of leadership but that leadership did contribute to the group's effectiveness.

Bass (1990) stated that contingent reinforcement and transformational leadership may be a more effective style of leadership than the styles that place emphasis on authority or democracy. Transformational leaders high in charisma were more effective in increasing productivity despite normative resistance among subordinates.

Schein (1985) stated that leaders must be consistent in their behaviour to produce the desired results from their subordinates. If leaders become inconsistent with their actions, subordinates and colleagues will waste time trying to understand what the leaders' behaviour is reflecting and eventually ignore the influence attempts (Schein, 1985). This will ultimately decrease the effectiveness of the organization.

Fiedler (1987) stated that the effectiveness of the leader is measured by the success with which a group performs the assigned task. Therefore, a measure of performance for the group becomes the determinant of effectiveness. The primary function of groups or organizations is the accomplishment of a task. Success or failure is defined by the progression towards the achievement of the task (Fiedler, 1987).

According to Hunt (1991) the fit between leader behaviour and follower prototype can influence organizational effectiveness and employee satisfaction.
Also, effectiveness is seen as being a function of the fit between a micro situational variable and leadership style.

Opposing views in the literature relative to the effect of female leadership on effectiveness (Bass, 1990). Eskilson and Wiley (1976) found that female-led groups were more productive than groups led by males. Smith (1986) noted that in creative tasks, groups led by females outperformed the groups led by males. Hansen (1974) found that female supervisors had less impact on the climate of their departments than male supervisors. Bartol (1978) found that gender of the leader was not a consistent factor in determining a group's productivity. As in the previous sections, the impact of female leaders is the subject of debate highlighting the need for additional research.

**Summary**

The research completed on transformational leadership has focused on the relationship between the leader and the followers (Bass, 1990; Bennis, 1989; Burns, 1978; Sashkin, 1986; Weese, 1994c). It is the leader's ability to uplift the consciousness of the followers that aids the transformational process. The transformational leader affects the trust, support, beliefs, and values of the followers (Bass, 1990). "Transformational leadership is about change, innovation and entrepreneurship. This brand of leadership is a behavioral process capable of being learned and managed (Tichy & Devanna, 1986, p. vii)."

Evidence has been presented to support the notion that gender and executive leadership impact upon employee job satisfaction levels (Farh et al.,

The review of leadership traced the development of leadership theory from the trait approach to the current thinking in transformational leadership. Although employee job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness are common output measures of leadership effectiveness, a relatively few number of scholars have addressed the area of leadership from a gender perspective. Those studies that have included gender as an independent variable have produced inconsistent results justifying the need for additional research.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This chapter will outline the procedures utilized to investigate the variables gender, transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness within the Canadian National Sport Organizations (NSO). The chapter is presented in five sections which include: (a) Research Design; (b) Study Population; (c) Instrumentation including: (i) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), (ii) Job In General (JIG) Scale, (iii) Survey of National Sport Organizations Instrument, and (iv) Interview Schedule; (d) Data Collection Procedures, and; (e) Data Analysis Procedures.

Research Design

The researcher investigated the interaction of gender, transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness within matched National Sport Organizations (NSO) in the National Sport and Fitness Administration Centre. The study was a causal-comparative research project and therefore the independent variables, gender, and transformational leadership were not manipulated. The subjects were grouped according to the gender and the leadership rating of each Executive Director selected for the research. The researcher attempted to measure corresponding job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness levels and relate these measures back to the gender and leadership factors.
Measurement error occurs when the respondent misinterprets an item of the questionnaire (Gay, 1987). The design of this study is strengthened and measurement error controlled by (a) enriching the quantitative data collection and analysis procedures with the qualitative data procedures (Patton, 1990), (b) gathering multiple measures of the executive leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness variables (Jick, 1984; Sashkin, 1988), and (c) assessing the validity of the instrument. Bass and Avolio (1990) and Weese (1994d) noted that leaders tend to have inflated perceptions of themselves. Transformational leadership scores were collected from the Executive Directors (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-Self) as well as from the volunteer presidents and subordinates (MLQ-Rater) to increase the validity of the data.

Job satisfaction was measured by the Job-In-General (JIG) Index. The JIG was developed to examine employees satisfaction with their job in its entirety. The JIG was distributed to the direct subordinates of the Executive Directors.

The second dependent variable, organizational effectiveness, was assessed through the Survey of National Sport Organizations. This instrument was developed by Chelladurai and Haggerty (1991) to quantitatively measure the effectiveness of government sport organizations. The instrument was distributed to the respective volunteer presidents and subordinates of each of the NSOs participating in the study.

Patton (1990) states that study design is strengthened through mixing qualitative and quantitative data collection and analyses approaches. The study
included a qualitative component through the utilization of a pretested interview schedule. The purpose of the open-ended interview was to attain a more enriched perspective of the executive leadership, employee satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness levels present in each of the National Sport Organizations. The qualitative data was used to enrich and interpret the quantitative findings. The interview schedule was developed by the researcher and was pretested for content validity by a panel of experts. The instrument was also subjected to a battery of face validity assessments.

**Study Population**

The population for this study consisted of 34 National Sport Organizations (i.e., all 17 NSOs led by female Executive Directors and 17 matched NSOs led by male Executive Directors). The 17 male-led NSOs were selected by a NSFAC official on the basis that they matched their sister organization on the following criteria: (a) mandate; (b) staff size, and; (c) budget. The matching method was employed to provide partial control of inter-subject differences (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh 1985). A complete list of the selected and matched NSOs participating in the study appears in Appendix A.

Sampling bias occurs when the sample is not representative of the population from which it is taken (Ary et al., 1985). It is systematic and is generally the fault of the researcher (Gay, 1987). Sampling bias was reduced by having a Sport Canada Official match the organizations led by females Executive Directors with the organizations led by male Executive Directors.
The Executive Directors of the selected NSOs were chosen for the research because they serve as the executive leader for their respective organization. Bass (1990) noted that focusing on the macro level of leadership has considerable benefits in clarifying the role and function of leadership in organizational life. The Executive Director is responsible for providing direction in the accomplishment of the goals and the directives of the NSO. This individual provides administrative support for all NSO programs and is responsible for ensuring that the NSO is operating in an appropriate business manner. The Executive Director is responsible for communication with the sporting community, corporate sector, media, and the public in regards to the NSO and its business. Finally, the Executive Director is responsible for ensuring continuity during a change in the elected Board of Directors (Bell, 1990).

The study frame is a complete list of the organizations and people comprising the study population. Frame error occurs if incongruence exists between the list and the actual study population (Wallace, 1993). Frame error was controlled by using the most current directory of Sport Canada employees.

In addition to the 34 Executive Directors who participated in the study, each NSO's volunteer president and all the Executive Directors' subordinates were also asked to complete the MLQ (MLQ-Rater) to measure the transformational leadership tendencies of their respective Executive Director. Bass (1990) and Sashkin (1986) stated that multiple measures of leadership increases the validity of the measure. Job satisfaction was measured using the
Job-in General (JIG) Scale. The JIG was distributed to all the subordinates of the respective Executive Directors participating in the study. Organizational effectiveness was measured using the Survey of National Sport Organizations. This instrument was distributed to the volunteer presidents and subordinates of the respective Executive Directors.

Sampling error is an expected or chance variation that occurs when a sample is selected from a population (Gay, 1987). Sampling error was controlled by employing a census technique (Ary et al., 1985). A census survey was administered to all of the subordinates from the selected NSOs. Consequently, sampling error was not a concern. The strength in a census procedure rests with the fact that the findings are irrefutable. However, a single time survey design limits the validity of the findings by confining data collection to a single limited population at a specific point in time (Ary et al., 1985).

Round two of the research involved the qualitative data collection procedures. The two Executive Directors having the highest average MLQ scores were interviewed along with two randomly selected subordinates with at least one year's experience with their respective National Sport Organization. In addition, the two Executive Directors having the lowest average MLQ scores were interviewed along with two randomly selected subordinates with at least one year's experience with their respective National Sport Organization. Each interviewee was asked open-ended questions with regards to the leadership tendencies of the Executive Director, employee job satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness.
from a pretested interview schedule.

Instrumentation

Three quantitative instruments were used to gather quantitative data on executive leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness. One interview schedule was employed to gather qualitative data on the same three measures. Measurement error was decreased by using valid and reliable instruments and by enriching the quantitative data with qualitative data (Patton, 1990). All instruments were used with the permission of the authors and were deemed to be valid, reliable, and suited to the objectives of the research. The three instruments include: (a) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), (b) Job-In-General (JIG) Scale, and; (c) Survey of National Sport Organizations. The next section will provide an explanation for each instrument as well as convey the psychometric properties of each scale.

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

This instrument was developed as a valid and reliable measure of the transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles of executive leaders. It provides "self" and "other" perspectives of the leadership situation at the executive level. The leader's perception of his/her leadership tendencies is measured by the MLQ (Self-Rating) instrument (see Appendix B) and the superordinate and/or subordinate perceptions of the executive leader's transformational leadership tendencies are measured by the MLQ (Rater). This form is presented in Appendix C. The MLQ was developed by Bass and Avolio
(1990) and is based on the research of prominent theorists in the field of leadership. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, the MLQ was considered to be content valid.

The MLQ contains a total of 142 items related to leadership behaviour. They were generated from a theoretical review of literature and on the basis of responses to an open-ended survey of 70 senior executives (Bass & Avolio, 1990). The items were then reviewed by 11 graduate students enrolled in a seminar on leadership. The students sorted the items into three categories: (a) transformational; (b) transactional, and; (c) "can't say". The 73 items were selected after eight or more judges identified them as transformational.

The MLQ is partitioned into four components which include: (a) transformational leadership factors, (b) transactional leadership factors, (c) nonleadership factor, and; (d) outcomes. The transformational leadership factors examine attributed charisma, idealized influence, inspirational leadership, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. The transactional leadership factors include contingent reward and management by exception. The nonleadership factor is laissez-faire. The outcome factors investigate extra effort, effectiveness and satisfaction. A list of the instrument scales are presented in Appendix D.

Internal consistency measures produced scores of .75 for inspirational motivation, .74 for idealized influence, .71 for intellectual stimulation and .70 for individual consideration (Bass & Avolio, 1989). Yammarino and Bass (1990)
reported internal consistency coefficients of .94 for idealized influence, .88 for intellectual stimulation, .86 for individual consideration and .82 for inspirational motivation. A summary of the internal consistency properties are presented in Appendix E.

The MLQ has been utilized in a number of settings such as: (a) Full-time managers, (b) Methodist clergymen, (c) large business firms and (d) MBA students participating in a computer simulation (Seltzer & Bass, 1990). Within the field of sports and recreation the MLQ was used in a study of General Managers in the Canadian Hockey League (Bourner, 1994) and in a study of the Executive Directors of the National Sport Organizations in the Netherlands (Pruijn, 1994). A summary of the inter-item consistency assessments for the MLQ instrument set in these two sport management-based areas also appear in Appendix E.

Permission to use the instrument was granted by the instrument authors (See Appendix F).

Job In General (JIG) Scale

The Job-In-General (JIG) scale was developed by Balzer and Smith (1990) to measure overall employee job satisfaction to supplement the Job Description Index (JDI). The JIG has been utilized at a number of different levels from CEOs to janitorial staff (Balzer, & Smith, 1990). Within the sport management field, Wallace (1993) used the JIG to measure the job satisfaction of employees in Canadian Y.M.C.A. organizations. In addition, Kikulis (1987) employed the JIG
to measure the effects of generalized personal attributions and organizational climate on perceived volunteer satisfaction in Ontario Amateur Sport Associations.

When the JDI was being developed there was recognition for an overall evaluation of how individuals feel about their jobs (Balzer & Smith, 1990). The development of the JIG was guided by the definition of global satisfaction (Ironson et al., 1989). Global job satisfaction is the overall, integrative feeling of satisfaction when all aspects of the job are considered (Balzer & Smith, 1990). The JIG was developed to give global, long-term evaluation of the job (Balzer & Smith, 1990).

The JIG was constructed based on a theoretical review of the literature by a panel of experts and is rendered content valid (Balzer & Smith, 1990). The JIG was constructed from a collection of 42 evaluative adjectives and short phrases concerning summary feelings about the job. Items that were evaluative, global and had a long-term frame of reference were chosen (Balzer & Smith, 1990).

To test for reliability and validity the collection of 42 items was distributed to a sample of 1149 employees. From this study the creators of the JIG selected the best items from the pool of 42 factors using the following criteria:

a. High item-total correlations. Results indicated that all r's for the selected items were greater than .45, with a median r equal to .65 (Balzer & Smith, 1990, p.51).

b. High loadings on the first principle component. A principal components analysis with VARIMAX rotation of all 42 items showed two clear but correlated factors. The first component was a general factor, typical items were "Better than most," "Rotten," "The
pits," and "Acceptable." This component accounted for 67.8 percent of the variance. The second component was unmistakably stress. The five items loading highly on this component were "Stressful," "Tense," "Nerve-wracking," "Hectic" and "Pressured." This component accounted for 14.5 percent of the variance (Balzer & Smith, 1990, p.51).

c. Adequately precise measurement throughout the satisfaction continuum. Here, the authors considered the percent of respondents endorsing each item. In addition, 53 students rated each of the items for favourableness. Items were tentatively chosen to spread as evenly as possible across the range of favourableness while eliminating extremes (Balzer & Smith, 1990, p.51).

Data collected from 4490 respondents from numerous organizations were analyzed. Extreme items, such as those answered either favourably or unfavourably a high majority of the time, were deleted. Items that did not discriminate among persons high and low on the underlying attitude continuum were also removed. Items most discriminating were chosen and spaced across the favourableness continuum and with small standard errors at each of these positions were selected. The result is an 18 evaluative and global item scale (Balzer & Smith, 1990).

The JIG follows the same format to be compatible with the JDI (Wallace, 1993). It uses an adjective check list format rather than complex statements which could be full of vague qualifying adverbs and phrases. The simplistic language of the JIG make it possible to administer to a variety of organizational levels (Wallace, 1993). The JIG is presented in Appendix G. The reliability and validity assessments of the JIG are summarized in Table 1.
The JIG has proven to be a valid and reliable measure of overall employee job satisfaction (Wallace, 1993). The psychometric properties of the instrument are presented in Table 2.

Permission to use the instrument was granted by the instrument creators (See Appendix H).

Survey of National Sport Organizations

The organizational effectiveness instrument was regarded as a valid and reliable measure to assess perceived effectiveness of National Sport Organizations (Chelladurai & Haggerty, 1991). The instrument contains 27 items pertaining to various organizational throughput processes inherent in the field of organizational effectiveness (Chelladurai & Haggerty, 1991).

The 27 items were grouped under the following three process sub-scales: (a) organization, (b) decision making, and (c) personnel relations. The internal consistency measures produced scale reliabilities of .92 for organization, .92 for decision making, and .91 for personnel relations (Chelladurai & Haggerty, 1991).

Each statement within the instrument is worded positively. The subjects are asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with each statement. Each score is recorded on a 9-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (9). The instrument is presented in Appendix I. Permission to use the instrument was granted from the instrument authors.

Interview Schedules

An interview schedule was developed to enrich the quantitative findings with
Table 1

The Reliability and Validity Assessments for the Job In General Scales

Reliability. In each of the samples from the Bowling Green data pool with $N > 100$, coefficient alpha reliability estimates exceeded .90 (Total $N=3566$). The information function (calculated using latent trait theory), which gives the standard error of measurement at different levels of the latent trait, showed success in obtaining accurate measurements throughout the range (Balzer & Smith, 1990, p.52).

Validity. Several methods of validation are possible for a general satisfaction scale. Convergent validity was demonstrated by correlation with other global measures of satisfaction: The Brayfield-Rothe (1951) is a classic; also used was a rating scale with pre-scaled adjectives as anchors (Ironson & Smith, 1981), the "Faces" scale (Kunn, 1955) and a simple numerical rating scale (-100 to +100). Correlations with the JIG ranged from .66 to .80 (Balzer & Smith, 1990, p. 52).

Construct Validity. Construct validity was clearly evident in the pattern of correlations with 18 other tests for a sample of 670 employees. The JIG consistently correlated more highly with global measures including intention to leave, life satisfaction, identification with the work organization, and trust in management, while the Pay, Promotion and Coworkers scales correlated more highly with relevant specific measure. Furthermore, a treatment designed to improve supervisory behaviour showed substantial improvement in the JDI supervision scale within a few months, but not in the overall JIG measures, which is as one would expect for a short term versus long term measure (Balzer & Smith, 1990, p.52).
Table 2

Item Statistics for the Job In General Scale

IRT

Parameters b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Total r</th>
<th>% responding favourably</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad c</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste of time c</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesirable c</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse than most c</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than most</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreeable c</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make me content</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate c</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotten c</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>-.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor c</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sample consisted of civil service workers in a large county in Florida, N=1,053.

Favourable responses are yes to a positive item and no to a negative item.
Proportion responding yes ranged from .05 to .85. b Item response theory (IRT) parameters; a=discriminant (favourability).
parameter c=Reversed scored

(Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, & Paul, 1989, p.195)
qualitative data. To complement and enrich the quantitative findings in this study, the qualitative data were used to investigate leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness. The interview schedule (See Appendix J) was reviewed by a panel of experts (see Appendix K) for content validity and a pilot study was conducted to test the face validity of the interview schedule. The interview schedule minimized the interview effects and facilitated data analysis procedure (Patton, 1990).

The interview schedule was open-ended in presupposition format. Patton (1990) stated that presupposition format increases the likelihood that the respondent will have a response and negates dichotomous responses.

Interviews were conducted with the two Executive Directors attaining the highest average leadership rating along with two randomly selected members of their staff with a minimum of one year’s experience with their respective National Sport Organization. Interviews were also conducted with the two Executive Directors garnering the lowest average leadership rating as well as two randomly selected subordinates from each of their staff also with a minimum of one year’s experience with their National Sport Organization. All interviews were recorded to ensure accuracy of information and facilitate data transcription and analysis. All interviewees were ensured of the confidential treatment of their information.

Data Collection Procedures

Permission to conduct the study was sought from the Executive Directors of all selected NSOs. A pre-study letter was forwarded to advise the NSOs of the
purpose of the study and the importance of their participation. The letter also
outlined the procedures for the study and advised the NSOs that a research
package would soon arrive. The pre-study letter is presented in Appendix L.

Data were collected from the NSOs in two separate stages. In the first
stage, each Executive Director was sent a research package containing a leader
package, staff envelopes, and a President's envelope. The leader package
contained an explanatory letter (see Appendix M), an MLQ (Self-Rating), and a
stamped, self-addressed envelope. The staff envelopes, each personally addressed
and sealed, contained an instructional letter (see Appendix N), an MLQ (Rater)
form, a JIG instrument, a Survey of National Sport Organizations instrument, and
a stamped self-addressed envelope. The President's envelope was also mailed
directly. The contents of the President's envelope included an instructional letter
(see Appendix L), an MLQ (Rater), a Survey of National Sport Organizations
instrument and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Each questionnaire was
coded to facilitate the data analysis procedure.

The Executive Directors were asked to evaluate their own leadership
tendencies (MLQ Self-Rating). The subordinates and volunteer Presidents were
asked to evaluate the leadership tendencies of their respective Executive Director
(MLQ Rater) and the organizational effectiveness of their respective NSO. In
addition, the subordinates were asked to evaluate their personal job satisfaction
levels. All respondents were given the researcher's assurance of confidentiality.
Participants were asked to complete and return the completed materials within
five days.

Each respondent was instructed to place the completed questionnaire in the self-addressed, pre-stamped envelope, and return the package directly to the researcher. Participants were also given the option to fax their information to the University of Windsor. Participants who chose to fax in their responses were made aware that in using this method of response, confidentiality could not be ensured.

A three step non-response procedure was established to maximize the return rates. Subjects who do not respond within 14 days of the initial mail-out were faxed a reminder memorandum (see Appendix M). After 21 days of the initial mailing, a reminder phone call was placed to the non-respondents. If a subject indicated a misplacement, another was forwarded immediately. After 30 days of the initial mailing, non-respondents were eliminated from the study. A follow-up phone call was made to a random sample of non-respondents to inquire as to why they chose not to participate in the study. This information was obtained to ascertain whether non-respondents answers did or did not significantly differ from those of the participants.

The second stage of the data collection procedures involved collecting the qualitative data. Individuals identified to participate in the second round of data collection were faxed a memorandum to ask for their cooperation (see Appendix P). Appointments were scheduled with the individuals identified to participate in the qualitative data collection procedures. Each interview was tape recorded
allowing the attention of the interviewer to be focused on the interviewee. The data were transcribed and analyzed using the procedures outlined by Patton (1990).

Data Analysis

The researcher employed the computing services of the University of Windsor to analyze the data. The SPSS computer package was used through the University of Windsor main frame computer for the statistical computation.

A t-test was used to answer the first research question. A t-test is used to test whether there is a significant difference between the means of two independent samples at a selected probability level (Gay, 1987). The computed values were compared to the critical values at the .05 level of significance.

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to address the second and fourth research questions. The second and fourth questions examined the independent variable leadership with job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness. The second question investigated if a significance difference existed between the job satisfaction scores of employees led by high transformational Executive Directors and the job satisfaction scores of employees led by low transformational Executive Directors. The fourth question determined if a significant difference existed between the organizational effectiveness of NSOs led by high transformational Executive Directors and the organizational effectiveness of NSOs led by low transformational Executive Directors. The MANOVA results determined the effects of leadership on employee job satisfaction and
organizational effectiveness.

The MANOVA results were also used to address the third and fifth research question. The third and fifth research questions examined the second independent variable, gender, with both job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness. The third question focused on determining if a significant difference existed between the job satisfaction scores of employees led by female Executive Directors and the job satisfaction scores of employees led by male Executive Directors. The fifth question allowed the researcher to investigate if a significant difference existed between the organizational effectiveness of NSOs led by females and the organizational effectiveness of NSOs led by males. The MANOVA results determined the effects of gender on job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter contains the results of the quantitative and qualitative data analysis procedures. The quantitative data were produced through three instruments designed to measure transformational leadership, employee job satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness within the National Sport Organizations. This chapter has been partitioned into the following six sections which are: (a) Reliability Assessments; (b) Transformational Leadership; (c) Employee Job Satisfaction; (d) Organizational Effectiveness; (e) Personal Interviews, and; (f) Research Questions and Hypothesis Testing.

Reliability Assessments

Inter-item (Cronbach alpha) and Gutman split-half reliability ratings were calculated for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1990) and the Survey of National Sport Organizations instrument (Chelladurai & Haggerty, 1991). These results are presented in Table 3.

Interitem reliability computations were carried out on the five scales of transformational leadership for the MLQ Self-Rating and MLQ Rater instruments. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients were calculated to demonstrate the reliability of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Each of the five scales of transformational leadership produced an acceptable level of reliability. The Gutman split-half reliability coefficient was calculated as .98. This calculation confirms consistency of responses between the first and last half of the
Table 3

Cronbach Alpha Reliability Measure for the MLQ (Form 5X) and the Survey of National Sport Organizations instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Indice</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attributed Charisma</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Idealized Influence</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inspirational Leadership</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Individual Consideration</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey of National Sport Organizations                                           | .91              |

Gutman Split-half Reliability Coefficient

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X)                                  | .98              |
Survey of National Sport Organizations                                           | .95              |
instrument.

An interitem reliability score of .91 was achieved for the Survey of National Sport Organizations instrument. In addition, a Gutman split-half reliability coefficient of .95 was produced. The Cronbach alpha and the Gutman split-half reliability ratings provide evidence for the reliability of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and the Survey of National Sport Organizations instrument. Therefore both instruments were deemed appropriate for the investigation.

**Transformational Leadership**

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ - Form 5X) was distributed during the first phase of the data collection procedures to selected National Sport Organization Executive Directors and their respective volunteer presidents and staff members as listed in the *Canadian Sport and Fitness Administration Centre Directory* (January, 1994). Each individual was asked to complete the MLQ to measure executive leadership within the Executive Director hierarchical level. There were 204 questionnaires distributed and 98 were returned for a response rate of 48%. No responses were obtained from the 34 volunteer presidents. However, researchers have confirmed that superordinate and subordinate ratings of leadership tendencies are significantly correlated (Weese, 1994d). Therefore the data obtained from the subordinates was sufficient to represent the MLQ-Rater perspectives. Two National Sport Organizations notified the researcher that their organizations would be unable to participate in
the study because of recent turnovers in the Executive Director position. Another Executive Director informed the researcher his organization would not participate in the study due to time constraints.

Complete data sets (organizations completing one MLQ self-rating form and at least two MLQ rater forms) were collected from 16 organizations of the total 34 organizations surveyed. The overall return rate was 47.1%. This return rate was deemed acceptable by the researcher. Kerlinger (1973, p.414) noted that "responses to mail questionnaires are generally low. Returns of less than 40 or 50 percent are common. Higher percentages are rare".

High and low transformational leadership groups were formed on the basis of mean MLQ scores (from the three sources) for the Executive Director of each National Sport Organization. The high transformational group consisted of the seven Executive Directors with the highest transformational leadership scores. The instrument author (Avolio, 1994) noted that a score of 3.0 on the 4.0 scale for the five transformational leadership scales is an indication of transformational leadership. The mean transformational leadership score for the high leadership group was 142.0 which converts to a mean of 3.02 for the transformational leadership scales. Therefore, it was deemed that there was evidence of transformational leadership at the Executive Director levels with the selected National Sport Organizations. The low transformational group consisted of the seven Executive Directors with the lowest transformational leadership scores. The data was grouped on the basis of the Executive Director's MLQ mean scores.
Seven National Sport Organizations comprised the high transformational leadership group while seven other National Sport Organizations were placed in the low transformational group. The two National Sport Organizations that were in the middle of these two distinct groups were eliminated from the analysis. A two sample t-test revealed that a significant difference existed ($t=7.31; p<.05$) between the high and low transformational leadership groups (See Table 4).

**Employee Job Satisfaction**

The Job In General Scale (JIG) was also distributed during the first phase of data collection procedures to measure employee job satisfaction. Each subordinate from the 34 National Sport Organizations received the JIG scale. Ninety-eight of the 170 JIG scales were returned for a response rate of 57.6%. The mean job satisfaction score for the high transformational leadership group was 43.2 on a scale that ranged from 1 to 54 ($SD=5.28, N=7$). The mean job satisfaction score for the low transformational leadership group was 47.36 ($SD=2.75, N=7$). An individual scoring below 27 on the scale is considered to have low job satisfaction while someone scoring above 27 was considered to possess a high level of employee job satisfaction (Balzer and Smith, 1990). A complete data set for an organization was constituted by a minimum of two JIG instruments being returned.

**Organizational Effectiveness**

The Survey of National Sport Organizations instrument was also distributed with the MLQ and JIG instruments during the first phase of the data collection procedures. The instrument was designed to measure organizational effectiveness within the National Sport Organizations (Chelladurai & Haggerty, 1991). Each President and all subordinates of the 34 organizations participating
Table 4

Difference Between High and Low Transformational Leadership Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean MLQ Score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>142.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>7.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level of confidence
in the study received an instrument. A response rate of 57.6% was obtained
from the 170 surveys forwarded to the subordinates. The mean organizational
effectiveness score for the high transformational leadership group was 163.5 on a
scale that ranged from a minimum of 27 to a maximum of 243 (SD=27.81, N=7).
The mean organizational effectiveness score for the low transformational
leadership group was 191.1 (SD=31.26, N=7). A minimum of at least 2
completed Survey of National Sport Organizations instruments constituted a
complete data set for each organization.

**Personal Interviews**

The qualitative data for this study were collected during the second phase
of the data collection procedures. The researcher conducted personal interviews
using a pre-tested interview schedule with the organizations led by the two highest
transformational leaders and the organizations led by the two lowest
transformational leaders. Interviews were scheduled with the Executive Director
and two randomly selected subordinates in each of the four National Sport
Organizations. One individual withdrew from the interview just prior to the
scheduled interview time.

The purpose of these interviews was to enrich the quantitative findings of
this study. The interview schedule, pretested with a panel of experts, was
constructed to coincide with the quantitative instruments on leadership, employee
job satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness.
Research Questions and Hypothesis Testing

A two sample t-test was computed to determine if a significant difference existed between the mean transformational leadership scores of the female Executive Directors and the mean transformational leadership scores of male Executive Directors (See Table 5). The t-test result indicated no significant difference (t=.51; p>.05) existed between the transformational leadership scores of female Executive Directors and the transformational leadership scores of the male Executive Directors.

A MANOVA was computed to test the multivariate effects of leadership and gender on job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness using an approximate F-statistic based on Wilks-Lambda criteria. The overall MANOVA result indicated no significant difference existed between the high and low transformational leadership groups for either employee job satisfaction (F=1.05; p>.05) or organizational effectiveness (F=1.05; p>.05). The MANOVA result also indicated no significant difference existed between employee job satisfaction (F=1.05; p>.05) or organizational effectiveness (F=1.05; p>.05).

The first question of this study was stated as:

1. Is there a significant difference between the transformational leadership scores of female Executive Directors and the transformational leadership score of the male Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations?
Table 5

**Difference Between Female and Male Leadership Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean MLQ Score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>125.40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.48</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>119.77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level of confidence*
The research hypothesis developed to examine the first research question was:

\[ H_1: \text{A significant difference exists between the transformational leadership scores of female executive directors and the transformational leadership scores of the male Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations.} \]

The first research hypothesis was rejected \((t = .51; p > .05)\) (see Table 5). The mean transformational leadership score for the female Executive Directors was 125.40 which converts to a mean score of 2.66 for the 5 MLQ transformational scales. The mean transformational leadership score for the male Executive Directors was 119.77 which computes to a mean 2.55 score for the 5 transformational leadership scales. Both the female and male average scores rank below the 2.0 criterion point outlined by Avolio (1994) for the transformational leadership designation. However, the high transformational group consisted of both female and male Executive Directors. One high transformational Executive Director noted that "men and women play to their own individual strengths." A staff member led by a high transformational Executive Director noted that "a lot of leadership has to do with people's experiences." Another staff member led by a low transformational Executive Director noted that females and males do not necessarily lead differently. "The person at the top, whether it is male or female... leads in basically the same way."

The second research question of this investigation was:

2. Is there a significant difference between the job satisfaction scores of employees administered by high transformational Executive
Directors and the job satisfaction scores of employees administered by low transformation Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations?

The research hypothesis developed to test the second research question was:

\[ H_2 - \text{The job satisfaction scores of employees administered by high transformational Executive Directors will be significantly higher than the job satisfaction scores of employees administered by low transformational Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations.} \]

This hypothesis was rejected \((F=3.92; p>.05)\) at the 95\% confidence interval (See Table 6). No significant difference existed for the employee job satisfaction score of organizations led by high transformational leaders and the satisfaction scores of staff members led by low transformational leaders. One staff member led by a high transformational leader noted that "my Executive Director doesn’t influence my happiness with my position. I am dissatisfied with my job, not my Executive Director’s leadership." A staff member of a low transformational leader stated that she was very satisfied with her job. A staff member lead by a high transformational leader also said that she was tremendously satisfied with her job.

The third research question was stated as:

3. Is there a significant difference between the job satisfaction scores of employees administered by female Executive Directors and the
Table 6
Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Leadership and Employee Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.40</td>
<td>66.40</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>152.58</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>218.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level of confidence*
job satisfaction scores of employees administered by male Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations?

The research hypothesis generated to test the third research question was:

\[ H_3 \quad \text{Job satisfaction scores of employees administered by female Executive Directors are significantly higher than the job satisfaction scores of employees administered by male Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations.} \]

This research question was rejected (\( F=1.25; \ p>.05 \)) on the basis of the statistical analysis at the .05 confidence interval (see Table 7). No significant difference existed between the job satisfaction scores of staff members led by female Executive Directors compared to the job satisfaction scores of staff members led by male Executive Directors. One staff member led by a male Executive Director noted that his "satisfaction has nothing to do with the environment." Another staff member of a female Executive Director stated that: "I have been here for five years, it has to have been satisfying to keep me here that long."

The fourth research question was stated as:

4. Is there a significant difference between the organizational effectiveness of National Sport Organizations administered by high transformational Executive Directors and the organizational effectiveness of National Sport Organizations administered by low transformational Executive Directors?
### Table 7

**Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Gender and Employee Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.21</td>
<td>21.21</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>152.58</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>173.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level of confidence*
The research hypothesis developed to address the fourth research question was:

\[ H_4 - \text{The effectiveness rating of National Sport Organizations administered by high transformational Executive Directors is significantly higher than the effectiveness ratings of National Sport Organizations administered low transformational Executive Directors.} \]

This research hypothesis was rejected \((F=2.50; p>.05)\) on the basis of the results of the statistical analysis (See Table 8). No significant difference existed between the effectiveness of organizations led by high transformational leaders and the effectiveness of organizations led by low transformational leaders. A staff member of a high transformational leader noted that "the same sort of leadership style makes the organization effective and sometimes ineffective". A staff member of a high transformational Executive Director stated that "overall, I think the Executive Director has a good influence on the organization." Another staff member of a low transformational Executive Director noted that: "I think the Executive Director's leadership helps 75-80% of the time. It is a very positive force."

The fifth research question was stated as:

5. Is there a significant difference between the organizational effectiveness of National Sport Organizations administered by female Executive Directors and the organizational effectiveness of National Sport Organizations administered by male Executive Directors?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2489.47</td>
<td>2489.47</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8961.93</td>
<td>995.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11451.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level of confidence*
The research hypothesis developed to test the fifth research question was:

\[ H_5 \cdot \text{The effectiveness rating of National Sport Organizations administered by female Executive Directors is significantly higher than the effectiveness rating of National Sport Organizations administered by male Executive Directors.} \]

This research hypothesis was also rejected at the 95% confidence interval (\( F = .17; p > .05 \)) (See Table 9). No significant difference existed between the organizational effectiveness ratings of organizations led by female Executive Directors compared to the organizational effectiveness ratings of organizations led by male Executive Directors. A staff member led by a male Executive Director noted that "I think the Executive Director's leadership affects organizational effectiveness a lot because he is the one who is really pushing the teamwork aspect." However, by contrast, a staff member led by a female Executive Director stated that her leader "keeps everyone working towards the policies of the federation. We are working with them in the legal and constitutional context."
Table 9

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Gender and Organizational Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>172.93</td>
<td>172.93</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8961.93</td>
<td>995.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9134.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level of confidence
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the impact of gender and transformational leadership on employee job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness within the National Sport Organizations. This chapter contains a summary and interpretation of the results of this study along with a discussion of the implications. The chapter has been partitioned into five sections which include: (a) Summary and Discussion of the Findings; (b) Conclusions; (c) Implications for Sport Management; (d) Implications for the National Sport Organizations, and; (e) Recommendations for Future Research.

Summary and Discussion of the Findings

The results of Bass' (1990) investigations into the concept of transformational leadership prompted him to conclude that females have a predisposition to the transformational style of leadership. Women are purported to possess heightened communication skills (Bass, 1990) and to be more human relations oriented (Eagly & Karau, 1991), two major components of transformational leadership theory. However, Cann and Siegfried (1990) noted that despite women being more considerate, many of the other characteristics associated with effective leadership, such as assertiveness and orientation to task, are typically male characteristics. Finally, there have been theorists who found no difference in the leadership exhibited by females and males (Dobbin & Platz, 1986). The results of this study support the conclusions of Dobbin and Platz.
(1986) who found no significant difference between female and male leaders. The results of this study indicated no significant difference in the amount of transformational leadership exhibited by female and male Executive Directors.

Considerable support has been provided for the linkage between transformational leadership and employee job satisfaction (Bass, 1990; Pincus, 1986; Skaret & Bruning, 1986; and Snyder, 1990; Wallace, 1993). Leaders possessing characteristics associated with transformational leadership managed employees who were more satisfied (Snyder, 1990). However, there have been a number of theorists (Mitchell, 1970; Porter & Lawler, 1965, and; Ritchie & Miles, 1970) who suggested that job satisfaction is due to a number of factors, many of which fall outside the influence of the transformational leader. The findings of this study support the latter theorists. It was concluded by the researcher that no significant difference exists in the job satisfaction levels of employees administered by high transformational Executive Directors and the job satisfaction of employees administered by low transformational Executive Directors.

This study was designed to determine if transformational leaders in general, and female transformational leaders in particular, significantly impacted the level of employee job satisfaction. The results indicated that no significant difference existed between the executive transformational leadership or the gender of the leader and employee job satisfaction levels.
Pincus (1986) concluded that the more transformational a leader is perceived to be by subordinates, the more satisfied the subordinates are likely to be with their jobs. Skaret and Bruning (1986) noted that task environment factors work in conjunction with the leader behaviour to influence subordinate job satisfaction. However, Bryman (1992) questioned the direction of causality between employee job satisfaction and leadership. He suggested that employee job satisfaction may determine the style of leadership exhibited. With regards to the gender of the leader, Stitt et al. (1983) established that follower satisfaction with the task was not significantly influenced by the leader’s gender. The results of this study allowed the researcher to conclude that no significant difference exists in job satisfaction levels of employees administered by high transformational Executive Directors compared to the employees administered by low transformational Executive Directors. In addition, no significant difference was uncovered in job satisfaction levels of employees administered by female Executive Directors compared to the job satisfaction of employees led by male Executive Directors.

The final variable under investigation in this study was organizational effectiveness. Some theorists offered that a significant positive relationship exists between executive leadership and organizational effectiveness (Bass, 1990; Bass & Avolio, 1990; Sashkin, 1988, and; Fiedler, 1987). Transformational leaders are purported to focus and inspire followers to such a degree that the organization becomes a more effective enterprise (Weese, 1994c). The findings of this study
did not support this contention. Rather, the results of this investigation supported the claims of Bryman (1992), Pettigrew (1987), and Lord and Maher (1991) who all noted that organizational effectiveness often falls outside the realm of a leader’s direct influence. No significant difference existed in the effectiveness of organizations administered by high transformational Executive Directors compared to the effectiveness of organizations administered by low transformational Executive Directors.

Following the contention of Bass (1990), female leaders are expected to be more transformational and consequently, lead more effective organizations. The results of this study did not substantiate his claims. Female leaders were not more transformational than male leaders and organizational effectiveness was not affected by the gender of the leader. These findings align with the conclusions of Bartol (1978) who noted that the gender of the leader is not a factor in determining effectiveness.

The theoretical proposition of the study was that females would be higher transformational leaders than male leaders and that the high transformational leaders would positively impact employee job satisfaction levels and the effectiveness of the organization.

To investigate this theoretical proposition the researcher developed five research questions and accompanying research hypotheses. Each question is presented in the next section along with the results of the statistical computations, the decision made for each question, and interpretations of the findings. A
summary of the research questions and the decisions rendered for each is summarized in Table 10.

**Research Question #1**

The first research question of this study was:

1. Is there a significant difference between the transformational scores of female Executive Directors and male Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations?

A review of the leadership literature prompted the researcher to conclude that it has only been within the last two decades that gender has become an integrated part of the leadership research (Bass, 1990). Recently, theorists have begun to examine the relationship between gender and leadership (Bass, 1990; Cann & Siegfried, 1990; Dobbin & Platz, 1986; Eagly & Karau, 1991; Gerber, 1988; Goktype & Schneier, 1988; Komives, 1991). However, many conflicting claims emerge in the literature relative to the question of whether men and women are different types of leaders. Some theorists argued (Cann & Siegfried, 1990; Eagly & Karau, 1991) that differences exist as a result of societal gender roles which influence group behaviour. However, others (Dobbin & Platz, 1986) suggested that females and males exhibit similar leadership behaviour.

Dobbin and Platz (1986) found that females and males exhibited equal amounts of initiating structure and consideration. Contrary to Dobbin and Platz' findings, Cann and Siegfried (1990) theorized that consideration was a feminine quality and initiating structure was a masculine quality. There are theorists who have empirically uncovered differences in the way men and women lead (Bass,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there a significant difference between the transformational leadership score of female Executive Directors and male Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is there a significant difference between the job satisfaction scores of employees administered by high transformational Executive Directors and the job satisfaction scores of employees administered by low transformational Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is there a significant difference between the job satisfaction scores of employees administered by a female Executive Director and the job satisfaction scores of employees administered by male Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is there a significant difference between the organizational effectiveness of National Sport Organizations administered by high transformational Executive Directors and the organizational effectiveness of National Sport Organizations administered by low transformational Executive Directors?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is there a significant difference between the organizational effectiveness of National Sport Organizations administered by female Executive Directors and the organizational effectiveness of National Sport Organizations administered by male Executive Directors?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1990; Cann & Siegfried, 1990; Eagly & Karau, 1991; Gerber, 1988; Hackman, Furniss, Hills & Paterson, 1992). Yet there are other theorists who have uncovered no differences between female and male leaders (Dobbin & Platz, 1986; Goktype & Schneier, 1988; Komives, 1991). The results of this research align with the latter group.

The gender of the Executive Director did not have any significant bearing on whether the person was considered a transformational leader. Although the MLQ scores of female leaders were found to be slightly higher than the MLQ scores of male leaders, the difference was not significant at the .05 level. Transformational leaders were found in the Executive Director's position within the National Sport Organizations, however no significant difference existed between the transformational leadership scores of female Executive Directors compared to the transformational leadership scores of male Executive Directors. These findings are contrary to the stereotypical beliefs that leadership emergence requires masculine traits (Powell, 1988). However, it is significant to note that only 17 of the 74 National Sport Organizations have female Executive Directors, confirming the claim of Sutton and Moore (1985) that women have an uphill climb to emerge in the higher echelon leadership positions even though no significant difference exists in their transformational leadership tendencies. Structural barriers may still exist for women within the National Sport Organizations.
These findings were also supported through the qualitative data collected and analyzed by the researcher. One staff member who works for a female Executive Director stated that:

"if anything, women may be more sensitive to the issues and implications than men... but in reality, with the organizations I have worked with, I don’t really see a big difference."

A male Executive Director noted that:

there are no differences in the analytical skill, interpersonal skills, sense of accountability, or corporate relations. Men and women play to their own individual strengths. You see people who are good at it and people who are not. I haven’t seen tremendous differences between men and women.

The results of this study prompted the researcher to conclude that no difference exists between the transformational leadership tendencies of female Executive Directors and the transformational leadership tendencies of male Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations. It is quite possible that the finding of no difference was due to environmental factors that exist within the National Sport and Fitness Administration Centre. The sport management environment is one that typically supports the masculine aspects of leadership and this might be perpetuated by recruiting, hiring, and promoting individuals based on their similarities to those in power. Given that 57 out of 74 Executive Directors are males, it might be possible that the existing structure is more easily sustained and potential differences to the status quo to be surpressed.

**Research Question #2**

The second research question of this investigation was:
2. Is there a significant difference between the job satisfaction scores of employees administered by high transformational Executive Directors and the job satisfaction scores of employees administered by low transformational Executive Directors for the National Sport Organization?

The current literature on leadership and job satisfaction suggest that a positive relationship exists between the two variables (Bass, 1990; Farh, Podsakoff & Organ, 1990; Pincus, 1986;). Other scholars have uncovered that job satisfaction is dependent on an individual's hierarchical position within the organization (Mitchell, 1970; Porter & Lawler, 1965; Ritchie & Miles, 1970).

Various scholars (Indvik, 1988; Keller, 1989; Schriesheim & Schriesheim, 1980) have indicated that no relationship exists between employee job satisfaction and leadership. The results of this research prompted the researcher to conclude that no significant difference exists in the job satisfaction levels of employees led by high transformational leaders and employees led by low transformational leaders with the National Sport Organizations. Regardless of whether the organization was administered by a high or low transformational leader, the National Sport Organizations staff members reported universal high levels of employee job satisfaction. Employees led by high transformational Executive Directors varied in their satisfaction levels as did employees led by low transformational Executive Directors. Snyder (1990) noted that opportunities for recognition, achievement, advancement, growth, and the challenge of the work itself are all factors influencing one's perception of their job satisfaction. Each of these components may be outside the control of the Executive Director depending on the structure
of the National Sport Organization.

With regards to leadership, the structure of the organization may limit the leader's ability to influence an employee's job satisfaction level. One female staff member of a high transformational Executive Director commented on how the Executive Director's leadership affected her job satisfaction:

In some ways very little because the structure of my job doesn't allow me to go beyond this... I love the people I work with, I love the volunteers I work for and I find working for my Executive Director is great but there is only so much that can be done.

It may be possible for the Executive Director to have an influence on the environment which has an indirect impact on job satisfaction. Leaders have the ability to empower followers, to create a feeling of importance, to build a team atmosphere, all factors purported to influence employee job satisfaction (Lord & Maher, 1991). One high transformational Executive Director noted that:

The people that are here right now have had other opportunities for jobs. Our administration staff can turn around and get a job tomorrow somewhere else and probably get paid $5,000 more because of their abilities, but they are quite happy to work here, in this environment and they like having fun. We can work hard but then we can also have laughter and good times together. So I think I try and influence that environment and I guess through my leadership abilities and management abilities I can try and make this a fun place to work.

Bryman (1992) suggested that researchers are looking at the leadership-job satisfaction dichotomy the wrong way. Leaders might adjust their styles in response to group performance or job satisfaction. The causality of the relationship may be in the reverse order.
The outcome of the quantitative data analysis guided the researcher to conclude that no significant difference existed between the job satisfaction levels of employees led by high transformational Executive Directors and the job satisfaction scores of employees led by high transformational Executive Directors.

Research Question #3

The third research question was stated as:

3. Is there a significant difference between the job satisfaction scores of employee led by female Executive Directors and the job satisfaction scores of employees led by male Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations?

Within the literature the majority of researchers suggest that no relationship exists between the gender of the leader and employee job satisfaction (Kushell & Newton, 1986; Stitt, Schmidt, Price & Kipnis, 1983). The findings of this research align with this prevailing opinion. No significant difference was uncovered between the job satisfaction levels of employees led by female Executive Directors and the job satisfaction levels of employees led by male Executive Directors. The National Sport Organizations exhibited high levels of employee job satisfaction regardless of the gender of the Executive Director.

This finding contradicts the stereotypical view that female leaders elicit lower employee job satisfaction levels than male leaders (Stitt et. al, 1983). Female Executive Directors led subordinates with varying levels of job satisfaction as did male Executive Directors. Of the staff members interviewed, none indicated that the gender of their respective Executive Director impacted their personal job satisfaction level.
However, many individuals indicated the current economic hardship experienced by their respective organization negatively affected their perceptions of job satisfaction. With the financial cutbacks all National Sport Organizations are experiencing, many staff members were limited within the functions of their jobs. One Executive Director stated that: "the biggest hang up the staff members have right now is the financial situation. The organization does not having enough money to do everything it wants to do." Another dissatisfied staff member noted:

I get into this job and try to deal with the financial situation, but they are always cutting the perks, such as attending or making presentations. For that reason I am less and less satisfied with my job.

Again, there is support that the leader could have an indirect impact on job satisfaction without gender having an influence. Their ability to influence the environment may have a positive effect on the employees job satisfaction levels. The leader has the ability to enact policies which alter the working conditions for employees (Weese, 1994). Leaders develop and institutionalize policies which can initiate change within an organization (Lord & Maher, 1991). One male Executive Director stated that: "I would like to think the environment we have set up allows them to be satisfied." The influence of the environment may have an indirect link with the leadership of the Executive Directors.

**Research Question #4**

The fourth question of this investigation was stated as:

4. Is there a significant difference between the
organizational effectiveness of National Sport Organizations administered by high transformational Executive Directors and the organizational effectiveness of National Sport Organizations administered by low transformational Executive Directors?

Studies conducted on the topics of leadership and organizational effectiveness have produced conflicting findings relative to the impact of leadership on outcome measures such as organizational effectiveness. Some researchers (Bass, 1990; Bass & Avolio, 1990; Fiedler, 1987; Schein, 1985) adamantly supported the claim that transformational leadership significantly impacts organizational effectiveness. Others (Bryman, 1992; Lord & Maher, 1991; Pettigrew, 1987; Weese, 1994a) argued that organizational effectiveness is influenced by many factors. They offered some concession by noting that leadership might be one of the factors, and leaders might indirectly impact organizational effectiveness. The results of this investigation align with the latter group of scholars promoting the claim that no relationship exists between leadership and organizational effectiveness.

Weese (1994a) suggested that organizational success may be due to circumstances unique to each organization which are not controllable by the leader. Lord and Maher (1991) noted that leadership may have an effect on organizational effectiveness but this impact is indirect and frequently not attributed to the leader. Leaders may enact policies which alter working conditions or initiate culture changes both of which may have implications on the effectiveness of the organization (Lord & Maher, 1991). Leaders may have an
influence on the environment, which in turn, affects organizational effectiveness.

Several staff members and Executive Directors of the National Sport Organizations suggested that teamwork is the key to their respective organization's success. Keller (1992) noted that transformational leaders are able to gain greater support from their subordinates which shifts their focus from self-interest toward group and organizational success. Howell and Higgins (1990) stated that transformational leaders are those who are able to inspire followers to transcend their own self-interest for a higher collective purpose. The following are quotes from staff members who support this notion:

I think in some ways that fact that we have very competent people and the fact that we get along so well. The team work is there. We are a small group with a lot of tasks, we work together and try to support each other in every way. This makes the organization effective.

This organization’s effectiveness arises out of the team effort. By working collectively, instead of working as individuals, the organization will experience synergy and be more effective. A staff member of a high transformational Executive Director noted that teamwork was a necessity for organizational effectiveness.

I think in coordinating and using that team work all the way down the line it has proved to be most beneficial... If we didn’t have the team work we wouldn’t be effective.

Another staff member of a high transformational Executive Director noted the importance of the team and not individuals.

We are focused more on a team rather than individuals. I think that is what makes it the organization work.
This notion aligns with the thinking of Howell and Higgins (1991) and Keller (1992) who noted the significance of the employee's ability to transcend personal interest for the good of the organization. The qualitative findings from this research supported the notion that leaders can indirectly affect the organizations' effectiveness by initiating a teamwork environment.

Although the qualitative findings of this study suggested that leaders might impact the organizational effectiveness by indirect means, the design of this research did not allow for this measurement. Consequently, on the basis of the results of the quantitative data analysis, the researcher concluded that the effectiveness of organizations led by high transformational leaders was not significantly higher than the effectiveness of organizations led by low transformational leaders.

Research Question # 5

5. Is there a significant difference between the organizational effectiveness of National Sport Organizations administered by a female Executive Director and the organizational effectiveness of National Sport Organizations administered by male Executive Directors?

Few researchers conducting organizational effectiveness studies have considered the gender of the leader as one of the factors important to the analysis. Bartol (1978) found that gender of the leader did not impact the organization's effectiveness. Eskilson and Wiley (1976) and Smith (1986) uncovered that female leaders have more of an impact on factors of organizational effectiveness while Hansen (1974) found that female leaders had
less impact or organizational effectiveness. The results of this investigation allowed the researcher to conclude that the gender of the Executive Directors had no bearing on the effectiveness of National Sport Organizations.

The effectiveness of organizations led by female and male Executive Directors was diverse. There was no link found between the gender of the Executive Director and the overall effectiveness of the organization. Staff members and Executive Directors found the influence on the organization to be indirect. One staff member of a male Executive Director's suggested that teamwork was essential to organizational success. In addition, she noted that her leader initiated and supported teamwork. A staff member of an effective organization noted the Executive Director's influence. "He is the one who is really pushing the teamwork aspect... He sort of leads the way to effectiveness."

Another staff member of an effective organization noted that: "the Executive Director instills the teamwork and the respect of others... We work well together in solving problems that might come our way as a team."

The teamwork theme was perceived by most interviewees to be a major factor influencing effectiveness of the organizations. Some staff members felt it was the leader's ability to instill the teamwork concept that made their organization effective. Although no direct relationship was found between leadership and organizational effectiveness, there may be an indirect link between the two (Lord & Maher, 1991). However, based on the quantitative findings of this study no significant difference exists between the effectiveness of
organizations led by female Executive Directors and the effectiveness of organizations led by male Executive Directors.

Conclusions

Some theorists have suggested that a relationship exists between effective leadership and both employee job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness (Bass, 1990; Farh et al., 1990; Fiedler, 1987). Others have purported that no direct relationship exists between leadership and the two outcome variables (Bryman, 1992; Pettigrew, 1987). The results of this investigation has prompted the researcher to align with the latter group.

Organizations administered by high transformational Executive Directors do not lead employees with significantly higher job satisfaction scores. In the same view, organizations administered by high transformational Executive Directors were not found to be more effective than those administered by low transformational Executive Directors.

From a gender perspective, organizations administered by female Executive Directors did not have employees with higher job satisfaction scores. In addition, organizations administered by female Executive Directors were not more effective than organizations administered by male Executive Directors.

The results of this study prompted the researcher to make the following six conclusions:

1. There is evidence of transformational leadership within the National Sport Organizations.
2. No significant difference exists between the transformational leadership tendencies of female Executive Directors and the transformational leadership tendencies of male Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations.

3. No significant difference exists between employee job satisfaction levels of staff members led by high transformational Executive Directors and the employee job satisfaction levels of staff members led by low transformational Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations.

4. No significant difference exists between employee job satisfaction levels of staff members led by female Executive Directors and employee job satisfaction levels of staff members led by male Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations.

5. No significant difference exists between the effectiveness of organizations led by high transformational Executive Directors and the effectiveness of organizations led by low transformational Executive Directors for the National Sport Organizations.

6. No significant difference exists between the effectiveness of organizations led by female Executive Directors of the National Sport Organizations and the effectiveness of organizations led by male Executive Directors of the National Sport Organizations.

Recommendations for the National Sport Organizations

The National Sport Organizations are non-profit organizations that
facilitate the work of the Canadian government to provide Canadians with a strong national sport and active living system (Canadian Sport and Fitness Administration Centre, 1994). Each organization provides support in four fundamental areas: (a) community support; (b) business services; (c) leadership development, and; (d) communications and marketing support. Included in this section are the four recommendations for the National Sport Organizations that emerged from the research.

1. Since the gender of the leader does not influence the typical outcome measures, (i.e., employee job satisfaction or organizational effectiveness) the National Sport Organizations should intensify their efforts to attract and promote female Executive Directors. Only 17 of the 74 resident organizations of the Canadian Sport and Fitness Administration Centre have a female Executive Director.

2. Since teamwork was emphasized by many as being crucial to organizational effectiveness, and is a factor that leaders can impact, the leaders of the National Sport Organizations should facilitate and emphasize teamwork between the volunteer Board of Directors and the full-time staff members. As well, efforts to instill a team approach would be well served within each National Sport Organization. Working together instead of against each other may be a key to organizational effectiveness within the volunteer organizations.
3. The National Sport Organizations should investigate why the high levels of employee job satisfaction exist with a view towards maintaining these high levels. The employees of the National Sport Organizations were found to have uniform high satisfaction regardless of the gender and the amount of transformational leadership exhibited by the Executive Director.

4. Executive Directors within the National Sport Organizations are thought to be in positions of leadership. However, some of the people interviewed by the researcher made reference to the importance of leadership at the Board of Director level. Sometimes the only recognized leadership comes from the Board of Directors or the volunteer President. Future researcher should consider the impact of this leadership on outcome measures like employee job satisfaction and/or organizational effectiveness prior to drawing inferences to the impact of the Executive Director.

**Recommendations for Future Sport Management Research**

The study and practice of sport management is a new and exciting area. This study was designed to add to the limited research base that exists within the sport management domain (Olafson, 1990; Paton, 1987). Based on the results of this study, the researcher has generated the following 14 recommendations for future sport management researchers relative to the areas of leadership, gender, job satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness:

1. This research was conducted as a descriptive, exploratory study. Future research should be conducted as experimental research (i.e., cause and
effect analysis) to more precisely analyze the impact of transformational leadership on outcome measures like employee job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness.

2. The Job-In-General Scale measures employee satisfaction with their jobs. This study empirically uncovered that transformational leadership does not impact employee job satisfaction which supports the findings of Bryman (1992). Future researchers should measure "satisfaction with the leader" to determine more precise effects of transformational leadership.

3. Sport management researchers should continue to analyze the gender and leadership research questions. As more women gravitate to leadership positions it will be easier to empirically test Bass’ (1990) claims that women are more transformational and consequently more effective leaders.

4. The two highest transformational leaders and the two lowest transformational leaders were interviewed for this study. Future researchers should interview the two highest female and two highest male transformational leaders in addition to the two lowest female and two lowest male transformational leaders to gain a better indication of gender similarities and differences and more effectively address the research questions of this study.

5. During the qualitative data collection procedures many staff members indicated the leader’s ability to influence the environment. More extensive research should be done on the relationship between leaders and their
ability to affect the environment and other indirect aspects (e.g., organizational culture, policies, etc.) as outlined by Lord and Maher (1991).

6. During the qualitative data collection procedures staff members noted the leader's ability to instill teamwork within the organization. Teamwork was presented as a key ingredient for an organization's effectiveness. Teamwork should be an outcome measure of future leadership studies.

7. The concept of leadership has been studied for centuries and is a very complex issue. A longitudinal study may provide a more in-depth and time rich perspective of leadership which would make a greater contribution to the understanding of the concept.

8. The low response rate received from the superordinates of the National Sport Organizations warrants changes in the data collection procedures for future researchers. Future researchers should address research packages directly to the volunteer Presidents' homes to ensure each individual personally receives their research package.

9. Bryman (1992) suggested that the cause and effect relationship between leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness has been examined in the wrong direction. Researchers have determined that leadership can influence job satisfaction but perhaps the stronger causality rests with the impact of organizational effectiveness and job satisfaction have on leadership. Future researchers should consider alternative
research designs.

10. The Cronbach alphas for the MLQ demonstrated the reliability of the instrument. However, respondents commented that the instrument was too long and repetitive. Perhaps a shorter version of the MLQ could be developed and be used in future studies.

11. The qualitative data added great insight and enrichment for the researcher relative to the areas of leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness. Future studies should involve more qualitative data collection and analysis procedures to provide more enriched findings.

12. The design of this study allowed for replication within business or social service organizations. Additional studies based in these diverse settings would provide interesting insights into the impact of leadership and gender on employee job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness.

13. The study design permitted parallel research within volunteer organizations (i.e., Big Brothers, Big Sisters). Studies set in a volunteer setting would provide knowledge into the recognition of leadership by volunteers and might assist in understanding the dynamics that exist in the National Sport and Fitness Administration Centre.

14. This study might be replicated within an educational sport environment such as the Canadian Interuniversity Athletics Union (CIAU) or the Canadian College Athletic Association (CCAA). Universities and colleges are perceived to be at the forefront of gender equity and therefore may provide a higher population of female leaders to analyze. Answers to the research questions of gender and leadership might be better answered at this time by analyzing this population.
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APPENDIX A
List of Matched National Sport Organizations
Matched National Sport Organizations

Organizations led by Female Executive Directors

Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation

Canadian Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute

Canadian Paralympic Committee

Canadian Sport Council

Canadian Colleges Athletic Association

Commonwealth Games Association of Canada

Canadian Parks and Recreation Association

Fair Play Canada

Water Polo

Field Hockey Canada

Judo Canada

Lawn Bowls Canada

Canadian Rhythmic Sportive Gymnastics

Ringette Canada

Organizations led by Male Executive Directors

Canadian Intramural and Recreation Association

Sport Information Resource Centre

Canada Games Council

Active Living Canada

Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union

Canadian Olympic Association

Centre for Drug-free Sport

Canadian Orienteering Federation

Canadian Lacrosse Association

Canadian Rugby Union

Canadian Amateur Boxing Association

Racquetball Canada

Synchro Canada

Softball Canada
Squash Canada
Volleyball Canada
Wheelchair Sports
Badminton Canada
Basketball Canada
Sport Medicine Council
APPENDIX B

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X)
Self-Rating
MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE SELF-RATING

YOUR NAME: ____________________________

ORGANIZATION: __________________________

This is a questionnaire developed by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio at the University at Binghampton, to provide information about your leadership. Please answer the questions by circling the letter that agrees with your opinion. When the item is irrelevant or does not apply, or where you are uncertain or don't know, leave the answer blank. Make no more than one mark for each question.

Directions: Listed below are descriptive statements about leaders. For each statement, I would like you to judge how frequently you have displayed the behavior described.

If you have any questions please contact me or Dr. Jim Weese.

Wendy Langley: Phone (519)252-8808
Dr. Jim Weese: Phone (519)256-8911 (home)
                           Phone (519)253-4232 (work)

CONFIDENTIALITY ASSURED

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Using the following for the five possible responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FA</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>OW</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently, if not always</td>
<td>Fairly often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Once in a while</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I make personal sacrifices for the benefit of others.
2. I avoid getting involved when important issues arise.
3. I talk to those I lead about my most important values and beliefs.
4. It requires failure to meet an objective for me to take action.
5. I set high standards.
6. I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards.
7. I emphasize the value of challenging assumptions.
8. I give those I lead what they want in exchange for their support.
9. I treat those I lead as individuals rather than just members of a group.
10. I take no action even when problems become chronic.
11. I remain calm during crises situations.
12. The work of those I lead has to fall below minimum standards for me to try to make improvements.
13. I emphasize the importance of being committed to our beliefs.
15. I envision exciting new possibilities.
16. I make clear to those I lead what they can expect to receive, if their performance meets standards.
17. I re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate.
18. I am absent when needed.
19. I listen attentively to the concerns of those I lead.
20. I fail to intervene until problems become serious.
21. I instill pride in those I lead in being associated with me.
22. I spend my time looking to "put out fires".
23. I specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.
24. I work out agreements with those I lead on what they will receive if they do what needs to be done.
25. I talk optimistically about the future.
26. I fail to follow-up requests for assistance.
27. I encourage those I lead to rethink ideas which have never been questioned before.
28. I tell those I lead what they have done wrong rather than what they have done right.
29. I provide useful advice for the development of those I lead.
30. I keep track of the mistakes of those I lead.
31. I go beyond my own self-interest for the good of our group.
32. I negotiate with those I lead about what they can expect to receive for what they accomplish.
33. I consider the moral and ethical consequences of my decisions.
34. I resist expressing my views on important issues.
35. I express my confidence that we will achieve our goals.
36. Things have to go wrong for me to take action.
37. I question the traditional ways of doing things.
38. I enforce rules to avoid mistakes.
39. I focus those I lead on developing their strengths.
40. I provide assistance to those I lead in exchange for those for their effort.
41. I provide reassurance that we will overcome obstacles.
42. I avoid making decisions.
43. I display conviction in my ideals, beliefs, and values.
44. I show that I am a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don’t fix it".
45. I provide continuous encouragement to those I lead.
46. My attention is directed toward failure to meet standards.
47. I seek differing perspectives when solving problems.
48. I tell those I lead what to do to be awarded for their efforts.
49. I spend time teaching and coaching those I lead.
50. I delay responding to urgent questions.
51. I display extraordinary talent and competence in whatever I undertake.
52. Problems must become chronic before I will take action.
53. I take a stand on difficult issues.
54. I search for mistakes before commenting on the performance of those I lead.
55. I focus the attention of those I lead on "what it takes" to be successful.
56. I make sure that those I lead receive appropriate rewards for achieving performance targets.
57. I suggest a new ways of looking at how we do our jobs.
58. I divert the attention of those I lead away from addressing work-related problems.
59. I treat each of those I lead as individuals with different needs, abilities, and aspirations.
60. I motivate those I lead to do more than they thought they could do.
61. My actions build respect from those I lead.
62. Those I lead earn credit with me by doing their tasks well.
63. I clarify the central purpose underlying our actions.
64. I talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished.
65. I encourage those I lead to express their ideas and opinions.
66. I teach those I lead to identify the needs and capabilities of others.
67. I display a sense of power and confidence.
68. I talk about how trusting each other can help us overcome our difficulties.
69. I arouse in those I lead an awareness of what is essential to consider.
70. I heighten the motivation to succeed of those I lead.
71. I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission.
72. I articulate a compelling vision of the future for those I lead.
73. I get those I lead to look at problems from many different angles.
74. I promote self-development among those I lead.
75. I behave in ways that are consistent with my expressed values.
76. I show determination to accomplish what I set out to do.
77. I encourage non-traditional thinking to deal with traditional problems.
78. I give personal attention to those I lead who seem neglected.
79. I get those I lead to do more than they expected they could do.
80. I express satisfaction when those I lead do a good job.
81. I encourage addressing problems by using reasoning and evidence, rather than unsupported opinion.

For questions 82 through 85, please answer according to the following format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not effective</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td>effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82. The overall effectiveness of your group made up those you lead and yourself can be classified as _______?
83. How effective are you in representing your group to higher authority?
84. How effective are you in meeting the job-related needs of those with whom you work?
85. How satisfied are you with your leadership abilities?
86. In all, how satisfied are you with the methods of leadership you use to get your group's assignments completed?
   A. Very dissatisfied
   B. Somewhat dissatisfied
   C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   D. Fairly satisfied
   E. Very satisfied

87. In all, how satisfied are you with the methods of leadership you use to get your group's job done.
   A. Very dissatisfied
   B. Somewhat dissatisfied
   C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   D. Fairly satisfied
   E. Very satisfied

88. Your position is ______________. (leave blank if not applicable)
   A. First-level (lowest level of supervision or equivalent)
   B. Second-level (supervises first level)
   C. Third-level
   D. Fourth-level
   E. Fifth-level or higher
89. If the alternatives below, which is the highest level existing in your organization? (leave blank if not applicable)
   A. First-level (lowest level of supervision or equivalent)
   B. Second-level (supervises first level)
   C. Third-level
   D. Fourth-level
   E. Fifth-level or higher

90. Your primary educational background is (mark as many as apply).
   A. Science, engineering or technical
   B. Social Science or humanities
   C. Business
   D. Professional (law, health field, social services)
   E. Other educational background.
APPENDIX C

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X)
Rater
MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE-RATER

YOUR NAME: ________________________________

ORGANIZATION: ________________________________

This is a questionnaire developed by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio at the University at Binghamton. The questionnaire provides a description about leadership. Please answer the questions by circling the letter that agrees with your opinion. When the item is irrelevant or does not apply, or where you are uncertain or don’t know, leave the answer blank. Make no more than one mark for each question.

Directions: Listed below are descriptive statements about the Executive Director of your organization. For each statement, I would like you to judge how frequently this person has displayed the behavior described.

Using the following for the five possible responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FA</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>OW</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently, if not always</td>
<td>Fairly often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Once in a while</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Could you please return this questionnaire directly to me in the self addressed stamped envelope provided. If you have any questions, please contact me or my advisor Dr. Jim Weese.

Wendy Langley: (519)252-8808
Dr. Jim Weese: (519)256-8911 (home)
(519)253-4232 (office)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE
1. Makes personal sacrifices for the benefit of others.
2. Avoids getting involved when important issues arise.
3. Talks to us about his/her most important values and beliefs.
4. It requires failure to meet an objective for him/her to take action.
5. Sets high standards.
6. Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards.
7. Emphasizes the value of questioning assumptions.
8. Gives me what I want in exchange for their support.
9. Treats me as an individual rather than just a member of a group.
10. Takes no action even when problems become chronic.
12. Work has to fall below minimum standards for him/her to try to make improvements.
13. Emphasizes the importance of being committed to our beliefs.
15. Envisions exciting new possibilities.
16. Makes clear what I can expect to receive, if my performance meets designated standards.
17. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate.
18. Is absent when needed.
19. Listens attentively to the concerns of those I lead.
20. Fails to intervene until problems become serious.
21. Instills pride in being associated with him/her.
22. Spends his/her time looking to "put out fires".
23. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.
24. Work outs agreements with me on what I will receive if I do what needs to be done.
25. Talks optimistically about the future.
26. Fails to follow-up requests for assistance.
27. Encourages us to rethink ideas which have never been questioned before.
28. Tells me what I've done wrong rather than what I've done right.
29. Provides useful advice for my development.
31. Goes beyond his/her own self-interest for the good of our group.
32. Negotiates with me about what I about what I can expect to receive for what I accomplish.
33. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of his/her decisions.
34. Resists expressing his/her views on important issues.
35. Expresses his/her confidence that we will achieve our goals.
36. Things have to go wrong for him/her to take action.
37. Questions the traditional ways of doing things.
38. Enforces rules to avoid mistakes.
39. Focuses me on developing my strengths.
40. Provides his/her assistance in exchange for my effort.
41. Provides reassurance that we will overcome obstacles.
42. Avoids making decisions.
43. Displays conviction in his/her ideals, beliefs, and values.
44. Shows he/she is a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it".
45. Provides continuous encouragement.
46. Directs his/her attention toward failure to meet standards.
47. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems.
48. Tells me what to do to be awarded for my efforts.
49. Spends time teaching and coaching me.
50. Delays responding to urgent questions.
51. Displays extraordinary talent and competence in whatever he/she undertakes.
52. Problems must become chronic before he/she will take action.
53. Takes a stand on difficult issues.
54. Searches for mistakes before commenting on my performance.
55. Focuses my attention on "what it takes" to be successful.
56. Makes sure that we receive appropriate rewards for achieving performance targets.
57. Suggests new ways of looking at how we do our jobs.
58. Diverts his/her attention away from addressing work-related problems.
59. Treats each of us as individuals with different needs, abilities, and aspirations.
60. He/she motivates me to do more than I thought I could do.
61. His/her actions build my respect for him/her.
62. I earn credit with him/her by doing my job well.
63. Clarifies the central purpose underlying our actions.
64. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished.
65. Encourages me to express my ideas and opinions.
66. Teaches me how to identify the needs and capabilities of others.
67. Displays a sense of power and confidence.
68. Talks about how trusting each other can help us overcome our difficulties.
69. Arouses awareness of what is essential to consider.
70. He/she heightens my motivation to succeed.
71. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission.
72. Articulates a compelling vision of the future.
73. Gets me to look at problems from many different angles.
74. Promotes self-development.
75. Behaves in ways that are consistent with his/her expressed values.
76. Shows determination to accomplish what he/she sets out to do.
77. Encourages non-traditional thinking to deal with traditional problems.
78. Gives personal attention to members who seem neglected.
79. He/she gets me to do more than I expected I could do.
80. Expresses his/her satisfaction when I do a good job.
81. Encourages addressing problems by using reasoning and evidence, rather than unsupported opinion.

For questions 82 through 85, please answer according to the following format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not effective</td>
<td>Extremely effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82. The overall effectiveness of the group made up the person you are rating, yourself, and colleagues can be classified as ______?  

83. How effective is the person in presenting his or her group to higher authority?  

84. How effective is the person in meeting the job-related needs of those with whom he/she works?  

85. How effective is the person in meeting the requirements of the organization?  

86. In all, how satisfied are you with the leadership abilities of the person you are rating?  
   - A. Very dissatisfied  
   - B. Somewhat dissatisfied  
   - C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied  
   - D. Fairly satisfied  
   - E. Very satisfied

87. In all, how satisfied are you with the methods of leadership used by the person you are rating to get your group's job done.  
   - A. Very dissatisfied  
   - B. Somewhat dissatisfied  
   - C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied  
   - D. Fairly satisfied  
   - E. Very satisfied

88. My position is _________________. (leave blank if not applicable)  
   - A. First-level (lowest level of supervision or equivalent)  
   - B. Second-level (supervises first level)  
   - C. Third-level  
   - D. Fourth-level  
   - E. Fifth-level or higher
89. Of the alternatives below, which is the highest level existing in your organization? (leave blank if not applicable)
A. First-level (lowest level of supervision or equivalent)
B. Second-level (supervises first level)
C. Third-level
D. Fourth-level
E. Fifth-level or higher

90. My primary educational background is (mark as many as apply).
A. Science, engineering or technical
B. Social Science or humanities
C. Business
D. Professional (law, health field, social services)
E. Other educational background.
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Instrument Scales for the MLQ (Form 5X)
Instrument Scales for the MLQ (Form 5X)

1. **Attributed Charisma** (Items 1, 11, 21, 31, 41, 51, 61, 67)
   Assesses the leader's ability to have followers identify with and emulate them as leaders.

2. **Idealized Influence** (Items 3, 13, 23, 33, 43, 53, 63, 68, 71, 75)
   Measures the leader's ability to influence followers in achieving the desired goals.

3. **Inspirational Leadership** (Items 5, 15, 25, 35, 45, 55, 64, 69, 72, 76)
   Measures the leader's aptitude for providing symbols and simplified emotional appeal to increase awareness and understanding of mutually desired goals.

4. **Intellectual Stimulation** (Items 7, 17, 27, 37, 47, 57, 65, 73, 77, 81)
   Evaluates the leader's proficiency to encourage followers to question their old way of doing things or to assist the followers in breaking with the past.

5. **Individualized Consideration** (Items 9, 19, 29, 39, 49, 59, 66, 74, 78)
   Surveys the leader's ability to treat followers differently but equitably on a one-to-one basis.

6. **Contingent Reward** (Items 8, 16, 24, 32, 40, 48, 56, 62, 80)
   Measures the interaction between leader and follower that emphasizes an exchange.

7. **Management-by-Exception (Active)** (Items 6, 14, 22, 30, 38, 46, 54)

8. **Management-by-Exception (Passive)** (Items 4, 12, 20, 28, 36, 44, 52)

9. **Laissez-faire** (Items 2, 10, 18, 26, 34, 42, 50, 58)
   Assesses the absence of leadership and/or the avoidance of intervention.

10. **Extra Effort** (Items 60, 70, 79)
    Evaluates the extent to which co-workers or followers exert beyond the ordinary as a result of leadership.

11. **Effectiveness** (Items 82, 83, 84, 85)
    Measures the leader's effectiveness as seen by both self and others.

12. **Satisfaction** (Items 86, 87)
    Assesses how satisfied both the leader and co-workers or followers are with the leader's style and methods, and how satisfied they are in general with the leader.

13. **Biographical** (Items 88, 89, 90)
APPENDIX E

Cronbach Alpha Reliability Measures
For the MLQ
## Cronbach Alpha Reliability Measures for the MLQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>RELIABILITIES*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUPERVISEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td>.90 (.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiration</td>
<td>.84 (.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>.88 (.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>.85 (.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>.87 (.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception</td>
<td>.79 (.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>.77 (.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Effort</td>
<td>.82 (.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>.93 (.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.95 (.92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Supervisee and self sample involved 1,006 followers rating 251 business and industrial leaders. Co-worker and self sample involved 474 co-workers rating 169 leaders. Each scale varied from 0= "Not at all" to 4= "Frequently, if not always."

(Bass & Avolio, 1990)
Cronbach Alpha Reliability Measures for the MLQ (Form 5X)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICE</th>
<th>(Pruijn, 1994)</th>
<th>(Bourner, 1994)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>RATER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributed Charisma</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Leadership</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception (Active)</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception (?passive)</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Effort</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Letter of Permission to Use the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
APPENDIX G

Job In General Scale
COPYRIGHT PERMISSION

The Job In General (JIG) Scale is a sub-scale of the Job Descriptive Index
(JDI) Scale. Both scales are copyrighted by Bowling Green State University.
The purchaser is granted permission to reproduce the Job In General (JIG)
scale. The number of copies that the purchaser can make is listed below. The
rights to reproduce additional copies must be purchased through Bowling Green
State University (see below).

The notation "Copyright Bowling Green State University, 1982, 1985" must
be included on each copy of the JIG.

Date: 3-29-94

Purchaser: Wendy Langely

Address: ____________________________
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Job in General Scale

Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it like most of the time. In the blank beside each word of phrase below, write

- Y for "Yes" if it describes your job
- N for "No" if it does NOT describe it
- ? if you cannot decide

***************

**JOE IN GENERAL**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste of time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesirable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse than most</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreeable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE RETURN COMPLETED MATERIALS

MATERIALS WITHIN FIVE DAYS

-THANK YOU
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APPENDIX I

Survey of National Sport Organizations
Survey of National Sport Organizations

Please indicate the extent to which you agree (or disagree) with each of the following statements by circling an appropriate number. These items are designed to elicit your overall perceptions regarding several aspects of the organization and administration of your NSO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In your NSO, decisions are made where the where the most adequate and accurate information is available.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When decisions are being made, the person affected are asked for their ideas.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In your NSO, information is widely shared so that those who make decisions have access to all available know-how.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The administrators make good decisions and solve problems well.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. People in your NSO share information about important events and situations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The job responsibilities are sensibly organized in your NSO.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Different units of the NSO plan together and coordinate their efforts.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The provincial plans are consistent with the national plan.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Persons in your NSO know what their jobs are, and know how to do them well.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In your NSO, the committee structures are efficient.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The administrative structure of the NSO is efficient.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. In your NSO, the distribution of responsibilities among the administrators is appropriate.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. In your NSO, goals and objectives are clear cut and reasonable.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Your NSO is successful in fulfilling its mission and achieving its goals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Your NSO is productive.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Your NSO is successful in securing the necessary human and financial resources.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Your NSO’s operations are smooth and efficient.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Those in control are receptive to new ideas.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Your NSO is able to respond to unusual work demands placed upon it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Your NSO is able to interact effectively with the government agencies.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Your NSO is able to interact effectively with private sector organizations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Your NSO has a real interest in the welfare and happiness of those who work in it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Your NSO tries to improve working conditions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. The volunteer and professional administrators plan together and coordinate their efforts.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. There is complete confidence and trust among the people in your NSO.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The volunteer and professional administrators get along well.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The responsibilities of the various administrators match their skills and abilities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE RETURN COMPLETED MATERIAL WITHIN FIVE DAYS
APPENDIX J

Interview Schedule
Interview Schedule: Executive Directors (Self)

Leadership
1. How would you describe your leadership? Can you give me an example?
2. How would your staff members describe your leadership? Can you give me an example?

Employee Job Satisfaction
1. In your opinion, how satisfied are your employees with their job?
2. In what ways does your leadership affect employee job satisfaction?

Organizational Effectiveness
1. What aspects of this organization make it effective? How effective is your organization? What factors contribute to the effectiveness of your organization?
2. How does your leadership affect this organization’s effectiveness?

Gender and Leadership
1. Based on your experience in this organization and similar organizations, do men and women lead organizations in a different way?

Interview Schedule: Staff Members (Rater)

Leadership
1. How would you describe your Executive Director’s leadership?
2. What valuable leadership characteristics does your Executive Director possess?

Employee Job Satisfaction
1. How satisfied are you with your job?
2. In what ways does your Executive Director’s leadership affect your job satisfaction?

Organizational Effectiveness
1. What aspects of this organization make it effective? How effective is your organization? What factors contribute to the effectiveness of your organization?
2. How does your Executive Director’s leadership style affect this organization’s effectiveness?

Gender and Leadership
1. Based on your experience in this organization and similar organizations, do men and women lead organizations in a different way?
APPENDIX K

Panel of Experts
Panel of Experts

Leadership Experts

Bernard Bass
Barry Mitchelson
Marshall Sashkin

Jane Howell
Noel Tichy

Job Satisfaction Experts

Pat Smith
Karen Danylchuck
Shirley Cleave
Dan Soucie

Organizational Effectiveness Experts

P. Chelladurai
Terry Haggerty
Wendy Frisby
Kim Cameron

SUNY Binghamton
University of Alberta
Department of Education (Washington, D.C)
University of Western Ontario
University of Michigan

Bowling Green State University
University of Western Ontario
University of New Brunswick
University of Ottawa

The Ohio State University
University of New Brunswick
University of British Columbia
University of Michigan
APPENDIX L

Pre-Study Information Letter
APPENDIX M

Explanatory Letter for
the Executive Directors
APPENDIX N

Instructional Letter
APPENDIX O

Fax Follow-up
FOLLOW-UP FAX

YOUR RESPONSE IS CRITICAL

Dear ________,

Last week an important package of research materials related to transformational leadership, organizational effectiveness and job satisfaction was forwarded to you. I trust it arrived safely. I have received many responses from other National Sport Organizations’ administrators to date.

To date I have not received your completed materials. If you have already returned your response and forwarded the subordinate packages, please accept my sincere thanks for your valuable assistance. If you have not, this note will serve as a friendly reminder to do so today.

Your response and those of your staff members are essential to my research.

If you did not receive the package, or it has been misplaced, please call me immediately at (519)252-8808 or contact my advisor, Dr. Jim Weese at (519)256-8911. I will be happy to forward you another package.

Thank you!

Wendy Langley
c/o Faculty of Human Kinetics
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4

PLEASE RESPOND TODAY IF YOU HAVE NOT DONE SO ALREADY
APPENDIX P

Memorandum Fax
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Vita auctoris</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Birth:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Birth:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>