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CHAPTER I
BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

Introduction
Leadership has captured the fancy and imagination of researchers and theorists like the no other topic in the social science area. Academics and practitioners alike have struggled throughout time to quantify and understand this phenomenon with relatively little success. Bennis' (1959) statement that no other topic in the behavioral science field has received so much attention with so little been known holds true in describing the current situation. As testimony to the struggle theorists have had in attempting to grasp the concept, Stogdill's (1974) classic Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research contains an entire chapter devoted to defining this seemingly elusive concept. Bennis and Nanus (1985) stated that decades of inquiry have produced more than 350 definitions of leadership. "Like love, leadership continued to be something everyone knew existed but nobody could define" (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 5).

Bass (1981) noted that "there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept" (p. 7). Nanus (1989, p.
45) noted that "countless philosophers, scholars, and poets have consumed oceans of ink and forests of paper on the subject." Hollander (1986) submitted that academics remain impaired by their inability to reach a consensus on a definition of leadership, despite the overwhelming attention granted the concept. "Never have so many labored so long to say so little" (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 4). Leadership remains one of society's most studied, yet least understood terms. Despite the criticisms directed at leadership theorists and researchers for their perceived lack of progress, Yukl (1989b) suggested that a great deal has been accomplished towards quantifying and understanding the concept. Stogdill (1974) submitted that the leadership field remains a vibrant and challenging medium for research.

While the struggle to understand the concept of leadership has been difficult, the path that leadership researchers have travelled in this pursuit is much clearer and can be documented in four distinct phases. Prefatory research initiatives began with a focus on the traits and characteristics of the leader which were followed by a succession of studies designed to uncover the behavior patterns of successful and unsuccessful leaders. The third research focus considered the situational factors impacting on the leadership act and the corresponding affect on leader effectiveness while the final thrust,
labelled transformational or visionary leadership theory, represents a constellation of the three focuses reflected in the earlier efforts. Yukl (1989b) suggested that early research efforts were too narrow rather than . . . "taking a broader view of the way traits, power, behavior and, situation all interact to determine leadership effectiveness" (p. 254). The new thinking in leadership accounts for this shortcoming.

Many researchers have been interested in analysing the leader's behavior and accompanying subordinate performance. Katz and Kahn (1978), Mintzberg (1973), and Sashkin and Fulmer (1986) have all stated that this direction has served its purpose and that it is time to focus more on the leader. Green (1977) concurred with the position that there has been an overemphasis by researchers on the leader-follower dyad and he called for reform in leadership research initiatives. He elaborated by stating that most of the research directed at leader behavior and concomitant subordinate performance has produced insignificant results. Furthermore, he suggested that these disappointing discoveries may be explained by methodological shortcomings, specifically with respect to considering the aspects of the leader and precisely classifying dimensions of both leader behavior and subordinate performance. His view that these two elements are generally classified in too narrow a fashion is a
Contemporary thrusts that focus more on the leader and his/her effect on productivity and satisfaction within the organization have been met with some degree of satisfaction.

Early studies in leadership research were characterized as the "trait theories" of leadership. These efforts focused on the personal traits and characteristics deemed to separate leaders from non-leaders. Researchers typically attempted to identify and quantify these magical traits and characteristics thought to be essential to lead groups. Labelled the "Great Man" theories of leadership, these efforts operated on the assumption that leaders require a requisite number of personal traits and characteristics in order to emerge as a leader and be successful in the role. While theorists pursued this line of thinking, Ralph Stogdill's review and synthesis of the trait leadership research propelled him to state that no clear cut traits and characteristics were evident to separate leaders from non-leaders. Sashkin (1987, p. 19) summarized the situation by noting that:

Stogdill found that of over 100 research studies, none showed any clear evidence that leaders were strikingly or substantially different from non-leaders. Oh, there were a few consistent, minor differences: leaders are a bit taller, a bit heavier, a bit brighter, and so on. But none of these "bits" was especially significant, nor did they come together to form a picture of a "special" leader personality.
Sashkin and Burke (1988) suggested that while this finding was important to formulating the path of leadership research initiatives, Stogdill's (1948) second conclusion, that specific "sets" of personal characteristics consistently emerged in leaders, may have been the more important, yet overshadowed finding. The trait theory of predicting and describing leadership served as the first platform for research in the field and helped lay the groundwork for the second thrust in leadership research--the behavioral approach.

The "behavior theories" of leadership focused on the actions of those thought to be leaders. Different leadership behaviors, generally measured on "task" and/or "supportive" leadership style continuums were studied. Task leadership behavior was exhibited by leaders concerned with production while supportive leadership behavior was reflective of a leader offering emotional support to the subordinate. Most of the research in the behavioral vein originated out of the Harvard, Michigan and Ohio State Universities (Sashkin and Burke, 1988). Researchers working independently arrived at similar conclusions that leaders exhibiting both high task and high supportive leadership behaviors were the most effective (Sashkin and Burke, 1988). Researchers scurried to prepare models that could be applied to management situations, and in doing so, ensure that effective
leadership behavior would surface to produce maximal subordinate satisfaction and productivity. The "Managerial Grid" proposed by Blake and Mouton (1964) plotted an individual's task and supportive leadership behaviors and is one example of such a model that had practical appeal to both the practitioner and academic. However, the behavioral theories of leadership also fell out of favor when subsequent research studies uncovered that high task-high supportive leaders were not effective in all situations.

Although these two phases of leadership research were helpful in furthering the work in the leadership vein, they gave way to the more popular "situational leadership theories". Research theorists believed that the situation, overlooked in both the trait and behavioral leadership theories, played a large role determining leadership effectiveness. The situational theories considered time, place and other circumstances encompassing the leadership act. Fiedler's Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness (Least Preferred Co-worker Scale) and Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory (SLT) were two examples of popular situational leadership models proposed to maximize leadership effectiveness. Fiedler's (1966) model accounted for both the personality traits of the leader and the situation while the Hersey and Blanchard model (1969) accounted for the leader's behavior
(task and supportive) in concert with the situation (Sashkin, 1987). Interest in leadership research waned following the situational theory approach to leadership, perhaps due to a false sense that all that was needed to be known was understood or total frustration with the apparent lack of progress in the field.

The fourth categorizable thrust which has recently emerged includes both the "transactional leadership" and "transformational or visionary leadership" theories. The latter area of leadership theory has rekindled an interest in the study of leadership. While transactional leadership theory suggests that leaders can moderately influence subordinate performance by withholding and providing desired rewards (Bass, 1985; Kurnhert and Lewis, 1987), transformational or visionary leadership operates on the higher level needs of subordinates (Bennis and Nanus, 1985). This type of leader has the ability to . . .

inspire followers to high levels of achievement by showing them how their work contributes to worthwhile ends. It is an emotional appeal to some of the most fundamental of human needs--the need to be important, to make a difference, to feel useful, to be part of a successful and worthwhile enterprise (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 93).

In leading this way, subordinate motivation, goals and commitment exceed previously believed levels resulting in a more productive organization and pleasant organizational climate. Burns (1978, p. 4) outlined the impact that a visionary leader can have on an organization
by stating that "the result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents". Through the process of appealing to the subordinates' higher order needs, the visionary leader is held in higher esteem by subordinates who are subsequently more motivated to perform at levels previously believed to be beyond their capabilities (Bass, 1985; Yukl, 1989b). Furthermore, Yukl (1989b) suggested that visionary leaders empower their subordinates to participate in the process of "transforming and revitalizing" the organization.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) equated transactional leadership with "managing" and visionary leadership with "leading". Zaleznik (1977) has been most instrumental in distinguishing between the two terms that are often used interchangeably. Managing is held as a process of adhering to the routine tasks, providing the technical, human and capital resources necessary for employees and providing rewards to people on the basis of their performance (Bennis and Nanus, 1985). Conversely, leading is believed to be giving an organization a sense of purpose and direction. Bennis and Nanus (1985) suggested that when this purpose, direction and desired future state are vividly shared and accepted by members of the organization
"... individuals are able to find their own roles both in the organization and in the larger society of which they are a part. This empowers individuals and confers status upon them because they can see themselves as part of a worthwhile enterprise. They gain a sense of importance, as they are transformed from robots blindly following instructions to human beings engaged in a creative and purposeful venture" (p. 90-91).

Bennis (1989) and Nanus (1989) believe that American society is in the midst of a leadership void and organizations are being over-managed and underled. Bennis (1989) concluded that the primary reason many American corporations are being overtaken in world markets and in domestic competitions can be directly traced to a nullity of leadership. "Effective leadership is as rare as an Olympic record, and often as temporary, especially at the top of large organizations and institutions that set policy and direction for the entire nation" (Nanus, 1989, p. 6).

Tichy and Devanna (1986) referred to leadership as the essential and critical element for an organization challenged by an increasingly competitive environment. Leadership is an important aspect of directing an organization and those that have leadership are generally effective; those void of leadership frequently flounder (Bennis, 1984a; Bennis, 1984b; Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Sashkin, 1987; Yukl, 1989). Fiedler and Garcia (1987, p. 1) noted that the "quality of leadership is one of the most important factors in determining the success and
survival of groups and organizations. Specific to the concept of visionary leadership, Bradford and Cohen (1984) distinguished visionary leadership as being the critical element separating the top 100 United States highest growth mid-sized companies from their contemporaries.

**Significance of Visionary Leadership**

Sashkin (1986a) asserted that the great leaders of today in business, politics and social causes share characteristics and behaviors not addressed in earlier studies. He labelled this type of leadership "visionary leadership" and purported that the visionary leader (a) has a mental image of the current and possible future status of his or her organization, (b) understands the critical components that need to be carried out to realize this long-term desired end, and (c) has the ability to relate this focus to followers in a charismatic fashion so that they take ownership for the vision and are committed to making it a reality. Tichy and Devanna (1986) strongly suggested that leaders must have a vision as it provides their organization with the focus necessary for it to be "transformed". Bennis and Nanus (1985) and Bennis (1989) further substantiated the need for leaders to be visionary to (a) provide a focus and direction for the organization, (b) illustrate their (leader's) values, and (c) provide a mental image of where the organization currently stands in relation to a desired end. "Vision animates, inspirits,
transforms purpose into action" (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 30).

Sashkin (1987) pronounced that there are certain personal characteristics inherent in effective visionary leaders that include (a) a high need for power that is channelled for subordinate gain (not directly for the leader's benefit), (b) a high need for achievement, and (c) a participative management style that incorporates both a task and supportive emphasis. Bennis (1984) purported that visionary leaders are outstanding communicators who consistently display respect for themselves and those for they lead. Furthermore, Bennis (1984b) noted that these leaders are not fearful of taking calculated risks.

The ability of the leader to create a vision for the organization appears to be a major component of the new "visionary" theory of leadership. Theories hold that these leaders have the ability and willingness to empower followers, transforming their motivation into striving for both personal and organizational goals (Lundberg, 1984).

Visionary leadership provides the basis for creating organizations that are extremely effective in terms of any criterion of performance or profit, that contribute to society a vision that benefits members, clients, and the larger public, and that provide an extremely high "quality of work life" for all employees. It is hard to imagine what more one might ask of organizations . . . or leaders (Sashkin, 1987, p. 13).
The most prominent organizational culture researchers refer to the term as the deep rooted values, norms and philosophies held and practiced by members of an organization that shape the boundaries of the organization (Bass, 1985; Deal, 1986; Gorman, 1989; Potter, 1989; Schein, 1986; 1990; Tregoe, Zimmerman, Smith & Tobia, 1989; Yukl, 1989a). Schein (1990) cautions researchers to distinguish organizational culture from organizational climate and corporate identity. Moreover, he suggested that organizational culture refers to the shared meanings held by organizational members that determine an organization's climate and identity.

Hofstede, Neuijen, Daval Ohayv and Sanders (1990) noted that the term "organizational culture" is a relatively new term first introduced to North American organizational behavioral enthusiasts in 1979 by Pettigrew (On Studying Organizational Cultures). The concept has robustly captured the interests of contemporary researchers, theorists and organizational consultants who have attempted to understand, quantify and apply the concept.

Schein (1990) purported that the important concepts of leadership and organizational culture are intertwined. He highlighted (1990, p. 2) the need for leaders to be concerned with their organization's culture by suggesting that "the only thing of real importance that leaders do is
create and manage culture". Furthermore, he offered that "much of what is mysterious about leadership becomes clearer if we separate leadership from management and link leadership specifically to creating and changing culture" (Schein, 1990, p. ix).

Statement of the Problem and Need for the Study

The concept of visionary leadership is a relatively new yet important thrust that holds great promise for the study of leadership. Sashkin and Burke (1988) suggested that this research focus represents the only true, efforts to understand "leadership" as opposed to the previous leadership research initiatives that in actuality, focused on "management".

The study of leadership has generally been directed in two areas (a) uncovering the predictor variables that account for leadership emergence in a particular situation, and (b) determining the outcome measures associated with various leadership styles or behaviors respective of prescribed situations. While these directions have served leadership researchers well in the past and still require further refinement and exploration, this study focuses on one of the outcome measures clearly associated with the visionary leader's function. The leader's role in formulating, transmitting and maintaining an organizational culture suited to the mission of the organization has been identified as an
important, if not the most important (Schein, 1985; 1990) component of the leader's role. The researcher endeavors to examine the relationship between and effect of visionary leadership on the development and penetration of organizational culture throughout the administrative levels in Campus Recreation Programs. While the predictors of visionary leadership and/or the development of a model explaining the other related outcome measures (e.g., job satisfaction, organizational performance) associated with varying aspects of visionary leadership are important and would contribute to the existing body of knowledge, they fall beyond the scope of this study. The researcher has chosen to challenge the profession to research these aspects as well as challenging himself to retain a research profile that will embody the other research questions uncovered but unanswered by this investigation.

Based on the evidence that leadership is the pivotal force behind successful organizations, and that visions are required to focus and stimulate all members of an organization (Bennis and Nanus, 1985), the researcher will investigate the concept of visionary leadership within the context of recreational sports based in institutions of higher learning. Institutional financial support appears to be waning as evidenced by budget freezes, despite inflationary increases and decreases in the support offered in the form of government grants and subsidies.
The need for effective leadership is also heightened by the onset of competing off-campus organizations that offer programs and services which frequently parallel those offered by Campus Recreation Programs. These units are encroaching on a once-perceived exclusive target population. Generally, these competing entities have resources in excess of the Campus Recreation Program, thereby making the challenge of "competing" even more arduous (Weese and Sutton, 1987).

Furthermore, the offering of a comprehensive Campus Recreation Program requires an immense staffing complement (full time professional staff, support staff, student supervisory staff, student employees), who bring varied interests, attitudes, and motivations to the program. Directors are faced with the requirement of ensuring maximum employee productivity channelled in a direction that will result in the attainment of the organization's aims and objectives. Moreover, staff members continue to seek if not demand high levels of job autonomy and job satisfaction from their positions.

Decentralized organizational structures have become the norm in most organizations (Barham and Rassam, 1989). This trend is particularly reflective of the recreational sports profession within higher education where large numbers of staff members are required to plan and carry out their activities. It is apparent that leaders of these
programs need to instill a "corporate identity" which allows for high employee autonomy while preserving the necessary order, values and direction for the organization (Barham and Rassam, 1989). The establishment of a strong, positive organizational culture for the department may be the essential and most critical role of the program director if both the needs of the employee and the program are to be realized.

Employees who do not perform to exceptional levels can impact on the quality of the program, regardless of their level within the organizational hierarchy. This is particularly important in light of the stiff competition for the target population's limited time and budget for recreational endeavors. Clearly the need for effective, visionary leadership to focus and motivate a large and diverse work-force is paramount within the field of Campus Recreation. Leaders need to focus the efforts of a large work force and create and/or maintain an organizational culture that facilitates both harmony and excellence. Schein (1990, p. 327) highlighted the impact that leadership and organizational culture can have on an organization by noting that "leadership and culture management are so central to understanding organizations and making them effective that we can not be complacent about either one."
Is this the case? Are Campus Recreation Directors empirically determined to be more visionary and more effective in influencing the development of a strong organizational culture than their colleagues who garner lower visionary leadership scores? Are directors who obtain higher visionary leadership scores more effective than their lower scoring counterparts in transmitting this positive, functional culture throughout the administrative levels of the organization? Are Campus Recreation Programs that possess both a strong organizational culture and a visionary leader more effective in satisfying their major target market as compared to those empirically determined to be deficient in either their director's visionary leadership and/or cultural strength? Is it possible that strong, positive organizational cultures facilitate staff members investing greater levels of energy and effort to effectively meet the needs of the major target population?

This study will address some of these questions and leave the remaining queries for other researchers. The results of this research will be especially valuable if one adopts the findings of Sashkin (1988) who noted that leaders scoring higher in visionary leadership measures are perceived to have (a) more productive organizations, (b) employees with greater perceptions of job satisfaction, and (c) organizational cultures reflective of excellence.
Leadership research set in sport situations has been primarily limited to "emergent leadership" (i.e., team captains, formal and informal leaders of sports teams) and "prescribed leadership" (i.e., coaching/leadership styles and accompanying performance). Jamieson (1987) noted that relatively little research in the leadership area has been conducted in the sports management domain.

Papers presented and published in sport management forums as well as topics addressed in sport management academic programs generally fall within the classification of "management". This practice is particularly true of the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association which is the "governing body" for the promotion of campus recreation/intramural sports throughout post-secondary colleges and universities. Published articles and presentations generally focus on the practical components of budgeting, computer utilization, marketing, legal liability and evaluation to list a few. Perhaps more emphasis needs to be placed on the topic of leadership if it is as essential as contemporary leadership theorists from other fields including organizational behavior suggest.

Yukl (1989b) observed that leadership researchers need to probe the specific leadership traits and behaviors that, when set in a specific situation, correlate with organizational success. He elaborated by commenting on his
recent synthesis of the leadership literature that uncovered a common component among effective leaders. Yukl (1989b) noted that effective leaders possess an ability to develop and effectively deliver a clear vision of a desired end for the organization to subordinates in a manner that they find both appealing and compelling. Consequently, subordinates of effective leaders assume an ownership for the vision and express a commitment for realizing the vision through their actions.

The area of leadership provides a vibrant and exciting area for research (Hersey and Blanchard, 1988). While many studies have been undertaken producing both exciting and disappointing results, there remains much to be explored relative to the executive hierarchial level, especially in light of the "new" thinking in leadership.

The recreational sports field within the framework of higher education provides an outstanding research medium for the study of leadership. The visionary or transformational leadership thrust is especially well suited to this environment in light of the many and varied tasks that a large number of full-time and student staff members must carry out to attain the programs objectives. The impact of visionary leadership, exhibited from the executive hierarchical level, on both the development and penetration of an organizational culture and consequently, organizational success has been well documented in
research studies set in business and educational settings (Bass, 1985; Bennis, 1984a; 1984b; Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Peters and Waterman, 1982; Sashkin, 1986a; Sashkin and Sashkin, 1990). The findings from a study based in Campus Recreation should be equally as interesting and contribute both to an understanding of the "new" thinking in leadership as well as provide pragmatic information to Directors of Campus Recreation programs.

With respect to the research process, Yukl (1989a) noted that leadership researchers have relied too extensively on the exclusive use of the questionnaire method of data collection which is subject to a variety of experimental errors. While the quantitative research approach (e.g., questionnaire method) is supported on the grounds of cleaner validity and reliability determinations as well as heightened precision in measurement, the quantitative method in isolation may not be well suited to social science research. The complexity associated with the study of people and organizations may require the use of a qualitative research methodology to complement or replace the quantitative measures. Robey (1986) and Schein (1990) noted that the study of organizational culture requires the utilization of the qualitative method if researchers wish to uncover the deep-rooted beliefs, values and attitudes of organizational members. Schein (1990) specifically called for researchers to look beyond
the artifacts of an organizational culture and probe deeper into the organization to accurately uncover and understand the culture. Specifically, he noted that researchers should triangulate their methods by integrating a qualitative interview schedule with organizational members who embody and can describe their respective organizational culture. The need to look beyond the observable elements perceived to reflect an organization's culture is reinforced by Schein (1990, p. 312) when he noted that "cultures are not visible; only its manifestations are". Furthermore, he highlighted the importance of culture researchers understanding the profession under review by noting that "as long as the researcher/consultant is from the same host culture, he should be able to understand much of what goes on in emerging and mature organizations" (Schein, 1990, p. 312). Robey (1986) shared Schein's (1990) orientation relative to the need to intensely study an organization's culture. His model for the study of organizational culture is presented in Figure 1.

Daft (1984, p. 397) noted that qualitative research is supported by those who "... argue that direct involvement in organizations and the use of human senses to interpret organizational phenomena are necessary for discovering new knowledge". Daft (1984) suggested that the "hands-on approach" is the only way to learn and
Surface level
Artifacts such as architecture, observable behavior, slogans, and logos

Subsurface level
Values that are shared by members, as reflected in symbols and language

Deep below the surface level
Basic assumptions that are hard for even members to detect without focused inquiry

Study of culture begins at the surface . . . .

. . . . then probes deeper for values . . . .

. . . . and hidden assumptions.

Figure 1. Researching Corporate Culture
(Robey, 1986, p. 429)
understand people and organizations. Bateman and Ferris (1984) stated that quantitative research carries the illusion of being more scientific and, therefore, is held as the superior method. Unfortunately, quantitative methods often only superficially address research phenomena (Jick, 1984). Qualitative research methods, such as interviews, case studies, and observational methods provide the researcher with a higher degree of data richness and depth, but these methods are generally costly in terms of time and money, limit external validity, and suffer from the perception of being an inferior methodology (Bateman and Ferris, 1984). Kerlinger (1973, p. 487) noted that "the interview, when coupled with an adequate schedule of pretested worth is a potent and indispensable research tool, yielding data that no other research tool can yield".

The triangulation approach, employed in this investigation, blends the strengths and accounts for the weaknesses of both methods. Sashkin and Sashkin (1990) suggested that the most appropriate method for studying leadership is the triangulation method. This complementary approach is particularly necessary when attempting to measure and understand both visionary leadership and organizational culture (Buono & Nichols, 1985; Deal, 1986; Robey, 1986; Sashkin and Sashkin, 1990).
Theoretical Proposition

The theoretical proposition underlying this study was that Campus Recreation Directors who attain higher visionary leadership ratings have influenced the presence of a stronger organizational culture which has penetrated their organization to a greater degree. This strong, penetrated culture has influenced staff members to carry out, to a greater extent, the four critical cultural functions that relate to the delivery of a program that is more favorably received by the major target market.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The study is designed to answer the following seven research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture score for the program?

2. Do Campus Recreation Programs administered by high visionary leaders differ from those directed by low visionary leaders relative to carrying out the four critical culture building activities?

3. Are high visionary leaders more effective than low visionary leaders at penetrating the organizational culture throughout the top four administrative levels of the organizational hierarchy?

4. Is there a relationship between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and
student satisfaction with the program?

5. Is there a relationship between the organizational culture scores for the Campus Recreation Program and student satisfaction with the program?

6. Is there a relationship between each of the four critical culture building activity scores for the Campus Recreation Program and student satisfaction with the program?

7. Do more favorably held Campus Recreation Programs (student rating) hold different organizational values and critical success factors than those rated less favorably?

The following four null hypotheses and alternatives were constructed to test the first research question:

H01 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores of their program.

H1 - A direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and organizational culture scores of their program.

H02 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership behavior scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores of their program.

H2 - A direct relationship exists between high visionary leadership behavior scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores of their program.

H03 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership characteristics scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores of their program.
H3 - A direct relationship exists between high visionary leadership characteristics scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores of their program.

H04 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary culture building scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores of their program.

H4 - A direct relationship exists between high visionary culture building scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores of their program.

The following five null hypotheses and alternatives were constructed to test the second research question:

H05 - The "culture building activities" scores for Campus Recreation Programs lead by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.

H5 - The "culture building activities" scores of Campus Recreation Programs lead by high visionary leaders are significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.

H06 - The "managing change" scores of Campus Recreation Programs lead by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.

H6 - The "managing change" scores of Campus Recreation Programs lead by high visionary leaders are significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.

H07 - The "achieving goals" scores of Campus Recreation Programs lead by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.
H7 - The "achieving goals" scores of Campus Recreation Programs lead by high visionary leaders are significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.

H08 - The "customer orientation" scores of Campus Recreation Programs lead by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.

H8 - The "customer orientation" scores of Campus Recreation Programs lead by high visionary leaders are significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.

H09 - The "coordinated teamwork" scores of Campus Recreation Programs lead by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.

H9 - The "coordinated teamwork" scores of Campus Recreation Programs lead by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.

The following three null hypotheses and alternatives were constructed to test the third research question:

HO10 - The level two organizational culture scores for Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the level two organizational culture scores for the Campus Recreation Programs led by a low visionary leaders.

H10 - The level two organizational culture scores for Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are significantly higher than the level two organizational culture scores for the Campus Recreation Programs led by a low visionary leaders.

HO11 - The level three organizational culture scores for Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the level three
organizational culture scores for the Campus Recreation Programs led by a low visionary leaders.

H11 - The level three organizational culture scores for Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are significantly higher than the level three organizational culture scores for the Campus Recreation Programs led by a low visionary leaders.

H012 - The level four organizational culture scores for Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the level four organizational culture scores for the Campus Recreation Programs led by a low visionary leaders.

H12 - The level four organizational culture scores for Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are significantly higher than the level four organizational culture scores for the Campus Recreation Programs led by a low visionary leaders.

The following four null hypotheses and alternatives were constructed to test the fourth research question:

H013 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program.

H13 - A direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program.

H014 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership behavior scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program.

H14 - A direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership behavior scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program.
H015 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership characteristics scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program.

H15 - A direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership characteristics scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program.

H016 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary culture building scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program.

H16 - A direct relationship exists between the visionary culture building scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program.

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

H017 - No direct relationship exists between the strong, positive organizational culture scores of the Campus Recreation Program and student satisfaction with the program.

H17 - A direct relationship exists between the strong, positive organizational culture scores of the Campus Recreation Program and student satisfaction with the program.

The following four null hypotheses and alternatives were constructed to test the sixth research question:

H018 - No direct relationship exists between the Campus Recreation Program's "managing change" score and student satisfaction with the program.

H18 - A direct relationship exists between the Campus Recreation Program's "managing change" score and student satisfaction with the program.

H019 - No direct relationship exists between the Campus Recreation Program's "achieving goals" achievement" score and student satisfaction with the program.
H19 - A direct relationship exists between the Campus Recreation Program's "achieving goals" score and student satisfaction with the program.

H020 - No direct relationship exists between the Campus Recreation Program's "coordinated teamwork" score and student satisfaction with the program.

H20 - A direct relationship exists between the Campus Recreation Program's "coordinated teamwork" score and student satisfaction with the program.

H021 - No direct relationship exists between the Campus Recreation Program's "customer orientation" score and student satisfaction with the program.

H21 - A direct relationship exists between the Campus Recreation Program's "customer orientation" score and student satisfaction with the program.

Definition of Terms

Leadership

The process of influencing the activities of an individual or group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation (Hersey and Blanchard, 1988, p. 86).

Leader

Refers to the person who is elected or appointed or who has emerged from the group to direct and coordinate the group members' efforts toward some given goal (Fiedler and Garcia, 1987, p. 2).

Visionary (Transformational) Leadership

Refers to the process of influencing major changes in the attitudes and assumptions of organizational members and
building commitment for the organization's mission, objectives, and strategies. Transformational leadership involves influence by a leader on subordinates, but the effect of the influence is to empower subordinates to participate in the process of transforming the organization (Yukl, 1989b, p. 269).

Management
The process of working with and through other individuals and groups and other resources to accomplish organizational goals (Hersey and Blanchard, 1988, p. 5).

Manager
Individual responsible for coordinating organizational resources so that the organization can attain its goals. A manager carries out position responsibilities.

Second Level of Administration
Refers to the hierarchical level in the organizational chart that rests one level below the level of the Director of Campus Recreation.

Third Level of Administration
Refers to the hierarchical level in the organizational chart that rests two levels below the level of the Director of Campus Recreation.

Fourth Level of Administration
Refers to the hierarchical level in the organizational chart that rests three levels below the level of the Director of Campus Recreation.
Target Population
Operationally defined as the full and part-time students eligible to participate in the Campus Recreation Program under investigation.

Vision
Something seen in the imagination or in a dream; foresight and wisdom in planning (Hawkins, 1986, p. 756).

Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ)
A fifty item instrument developed by Dr. Marshall Sashkin to measure visionary leadership within an executive leader–subordinate(s) environment. The instrument is a self/other instrument which produces interval data by calling for both leader and subordinate measures of the leader. The instrument can be partitioned into three visionary leadership scores (Visionary Leadership Behavior Score, Visionary Leadership Characteristics Score, and Visionary Culture Building Score) and ten scales of visionary leadership (focused leadership, communication leadership, trust leadership, respectful leadership, risk leadership, bottom-line leadership, empowered leadership, long-term leadership, organizational leadership, and cultural leadership).

Visionary Leadership Behavior Score
Total score for the five scales (focused leadership, communication leadership, trust leadership, respectful leadership, risk leadership) of the LBQ instrument that
pertain to how the leader uses visionary leadership behavior as perceived by the leader and two subordinates (Sashkin, 1988).

**Visionary Leadership Characteristic Score**

Total score for the three scales (bottom-line leadership, empowered leadership, long-term leadership) of the LBQ Instrument that pertain to the degree that the leader possesses the personal characteristics associated with being a visionary leader (Sashkin, 1988).

**Visionary Culture Building Score**

Total score for the two scales (organizational leadership, and cultural leadership) of the LBQ Instrument that measure the extent of the impact the leader is making on the organization's culture (Sashkin, 1988).

**Focused Leadership**

Scale one of the LBQ Instrument designed to assess the extent to which the leader is able to focus subordinate attention on the key components of his or her vision. "Bennis found that effective visionary executives paid especially close attention to people with whom they were communicating. They "focused in" on the key issues under discussion and helped others see the issues clearly. They had clear ideas about the relative importance or priorities of different issues under discussion concentrating only on the important issues" (Sashkin, 1988, p. 7).
**Communication Leadership** (Sashkin, 1988 Instrument Guide)

Refers to the ability of the leader to effectively transmit his/her vision to the group members so that they have the opportunity to align with his/her direction. This is the second scale in the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (Sashkin, 1988).

**Trust Leadership**

Scale three in the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire which measures the leader's perceived trustworthiness, reliability and consistency in all activities and communications (Sashkin, 1988).

**Respectful Leadership**

Refers to the level of respect that a leader has for himself ("Management of Self" according to Bennis, 1984) and for those he/she leads. This scale (fourth in the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire) monitors the way that leaders treat others and themselves on a day-to-day basis (Sashkin, 1988).

**Risk Leadership**

Refers to the extent to which the leader is willing to take and show commitment to calculated risks. Scale five of the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (Sashkin, 1988).

**Bottom-Line Leadership**

Scale six of the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire which measures the perceived impact that the leader believes he/she can make on organizational members, events and
organizational achievements (Sashkin, 1988).

**Empowered Leadership**

Scale seven of the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire. This scale measures the degree to which leaders transfer power and authority to subordinates so they have total ownership of their responsibilities (Sashkin, 1988).

**Long-term Leadership**

This scale (eight of the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire) measures time frame spanning the organizational vision. "Effective visionary leaders are able to think clearly over relatively long spans of time, at least a few years" (Sashkin, 1988, p. 12).

**Organizational Leadership**

This scale measures the leader's ability to identify and appropriately react to environmental cues, maintain a spirit of cooperation within the organization, and clarify and uphold a shared set of values and beliefs (Sashkin, 1988).

**Cultural Leadership**

Scale ten of the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire which measures the extent that the leader shapes and maintains organizational values (Sashkin, 1988).

**NIRSA - National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association**

National Association which exists to foster the growth of quality recreational sports programs by providing for the
continuing growth and development of recreational sports professionals (Holsberry and Kovac, 1990).

**Job Satisfaction**

An attitude towards work; how one feels toward his or her job (Robbins, 1983, p. 540). Refers to the attitudes that staff members have relative to their positions. These perceptions are often influenced by pay, promotion, job enrichment, perceived opportunities for growth, and supervisor and coworker relations (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1987).

**Job Productivity**

A performance that incorporates effectiveness and efficiency measures (Robbins, 1983). A measurement of the degree to which an individual and/or organization's resources are coordinated to accomplish a desired end (Cleland, 1989).

**Follower-Centered Leadership**

Refers to the extent to which the leader creates an atmosphere of togetherness within the group. Followers believe that teamwork is important to the mission and that they are in control of their own destiny.

**Supportive Management**

A management style that reflects a manager's primary orientation towards the concern for the emotional status of his/her employees.
Goal-Oriented Management

Refers to a management style that places the premium on group members attaining predetermined organizational goals.

Task-Centered Management

Refers to the leader's clear differentiation of the roles and responsibilities (task delineation) of the group members so that the organizational goal can be attained efficiently and effectively.

Influence

The ability of an individual to get another individual to do something they would otherwise not have done without the manipulation of rewards or punishments (Filley, House and Kerr, 1976).

Charisma

Any combination of unusual qualities in an individual which are attractive to others and result in special attachments, if not devotion, to his leadership (Zaleznik, 1984, p. 256).

Executive Leadership

Senior leader of an organization (Director of Campus Recreation - Recreational Sports in this study).

Organizational Culture

A collection of beliefs, attitudes, norms and values held by members of an organization which reflect the organization's personality (Bass, 1985; Robbins, 1983;
Strong Organizational Culture

A measure of the organization's beliefs, attitudes, norms and values held by members of an organization that relate to the characteristics Deal and Kennedy (1982) associated with high performing companies.

Culture Strength Assessment (CSA)

A 25 item instrument designed by Rollin Glaser and Marshall Sashkin (1989) to measure the strength or weakness of an organization's culture relative to Deal and Kennedy's (1982) characteristics of strong, positive organizational cultures. The instrument produces interval data.

Cultural Building Activities Assessment (CBA)

An instrument to measure the ways that people in the organization think and act relative to the organization's culture. Developed by Rollin Glaser and Marshall Sashkin (1989), this instrument produces interval data for 20 questions that measures the degree of effectiveness that an organization carries out the Parsonian critical functions that form its unique culture. The instrument produces interval data.

Cultural Assessment Inventory (CAI)

Label used to describe the combination of the Culture Strength Assessment (CSA) and Culture Building Activities (CAB) instruments used in this study. These two instrument
were presented to study participants as the Culture Assessment Inventory (CAI).

**Critical Success Factors**
The limited number of tasks which need to be carried out successfully if the organization is to prosper and satisfy the values reflected in the organizational culture (Bullen and Rockart, 1981; Hitt, 1988).

**Organizational Climate**
The overall favorability of member attitudes and perceptions with reference to specific activities and features of an organization (Hodgetts, 1984, p. 494).

**Relationship Leadership Behavior**
The leader has close, personal relationships with the members of the group, and there are open communications and psychological and emotional support (Luthans, 1985, p. 504).

**Task Leadership Behavior**
The leader organizes and defines roles for the subordinates, the leader explains the tasks that each subordinate is to do and when, where, and how the subordinate is to do them (Luthans, 1985, p. 504).

**Semi Directed Focused Interview (SDFI)**
A research procedure that refers to asking general open-ended questions from a prepared text.
**Triangulation**
The use of multiple research methods to examine the same dimension or corresponding dimensions of a research problem (Jick, 1984, p. 365).

**Campus Recreation**
Holistic label for the intramural-recreational sports program generally at the post-secondary level of education. Programs usually include intramural leagues, special events, sport clubs, aquatics, open recreation, and fitness programs and services.

**Target Population Satisfaction Index**
A measure of the degree to which a Campus Recreation Program satisfies the recreational needs of the population being studied.

**Ex post facto Research**
Systematic empirical inquiry in which the scientist does not have direct control of independent variables because their manifestations have already occurred or because they are inherently not manipulable (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 379).

**Presupposition Questions**
Refers to the type of interview questions that will be used in this research. The presupposition question doesn't inquire into the presence of a phenomenon, but more accurately, goes to the next stage by asking respondents to describe the phenomenon (Patton, 1980).
Limitations of the Study

The researcher acknowledges the following limitations of this research project and has undertaken measures to eliminate or minimize their effect.

1. The subjects may be reluctant to accurately describe the director's leadership characteristics and/or behaviors due to perceived repercussions associated with offering negative input.

2. The director's visionary leadership scores is only based on the results of three Leadership Behavior Questionnaire measures (one LBQ-self and two LBQ-other measures). Subordinates may inflate visionary leadership scores if the program is perceived as being successful and underestimate the visionary leadership scores if the program is perceived to be unsuccessful (Yukl, 1989a)

3. The subjects may be too busy to conscientiously complete the study instruments or seriously participate in the Semi-Directed Focused Interviews.

4. The subjects may not appreciate the objectives of this research, and as a result not contribute sufficient time or thought to their responses.

5. The study relies on perceptions (director, staff members, and randomly selected students) which may not represent the true situation.
7. Ex post facto research methodology does not allow for the manipulation of independent variables or randomization (Kerlinger, 1973).

8. The researcher will rely on study participants recalling information relative to the 1989-90 program which could be forgotten, embellished or discounted over the span of time.

9. Although students comprise the vast majority of participants in a Campus Recreation Program, the researcher recognizes that other groups, including faculty, staff, alumni and members of the community also participate in most programs.

10. The researcher recognizes that the "target population satisfaction" measure used in this study is only one indicator of program success.

11. The study is limited by the restrictions imposed by the validity and reliability measures of the instruments.

**Delimitations of the Study**

The researcher has chosen the following delimitations for the study:

1. The study is restricted to the Campus Recreation Programs from Big Ten and Mid American Conference schools.

2. The study is restricted to the Campus Recreation Programs within these conferences that possess a director who has high autonomy in his/her position, has served in the executive leadership position for a minimum of three
years, and has at least two full-time, professional staff members who have worked in the program for a minimum of two years.

3. Student satisfaction measures were limited to sophomores, juniors and seniors who were aware of the Campus Recreation Program at their university.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature is presented in six sections which include (a) Leader-Manager Controversy, (b) Path of Leadership Theory, (c) Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness, (d) Leadership and Organizational Culture, (e) Role and Function of Campus Recreation in Higher Education, and (f) Other Studies Utilizing the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire Instrument.

Leader - Manager Controversy

Leadership is a complex, multi-faceted term that has been studied from virtually every conceivable angle, set in a multitude of different settings. Immense time and energy have been devoted to the study of effective and ineffective leaders of sports teams, political parties, business organizations and social movements, with tempered if not minimal success. The romantic, heroic and sometimes mysterious phenomenon of leadership has moved decades of researchers interested in quantifying and understanding this concept. Fiedler and Garcia (1987, p. v) captured the struggle that theorists and practitioners have had in developing an understanding of leadership when they stated that "if leadership was easy to understand we would know
all about it by now".

Perhaps the ambiguity surrounding the concept of leadership is partially explained by the popular, yet erroneous assumption that leading is synonymous with managing. The terms are often used interchangeably in the literature. However, Bennis (1976, p. 154) noted that the two terms are categorically different by stating that leading does not mean managing; the difference between the two is critical. There are many institutions that are very well managed and very poorly led. They (managers) may excel in the ability to handle all the routine inputs each day, yet they may never ask whether the routine should be preserved at all.

Ackerman (1985) suggested that the most appropriate way to distinguish between leadership and management was to focus on the underlying basis for both terms. Leadership is based on the premise of influence while management is linked to the manager's position responsibilities within an organization (Tannenbaum, Wescheler and Massarik, 1961). In the former case, an individual complies with the leader because he/she is "moved" by that person while in the latter situation, the subordinate adheres to the manager because of his/her elevated position within the organizational hierarchy. Hunt (1984) concurred by suggesting that management is position-based while leadership is influence-based. Managers carry out position responsibilities. Bennis (1984a) stated that "leaders are people who do the right
thing; managers are people who do things right" (p. 8). He elaborated by stating that often people in high administrative positions do the wrong things well, and consequently are not leading. "It is obvious that a person can be a leader without being a manager, and a person can be a manager without leading" (Yukl, 1989b, p. 253). Nanus (1989) offered that there are plenty of excellent managers; but few leaders.

Zaleznik (1977; 1989) has been unrelenting in his quest to clearly draw a distinction between the terms leadership and management. His article "Managers and Leaders: Are They Different" appeared in the May-June 1977 issue of the Harvard Business Review and sparked wide debate amongst both practitioners and academics. Despite the criticism he received by "attempting to make something out of nothing", Zaleznik has been consistent in his insistence to differentiate "leading" from "managing". He stated that the two terms are fundamentally in opposition, and that the practicality of a manager's "mindset" may be an impediment to success in a leadership role. Managers are presented as deductive problem solvers while Zaleznik suggested that leaders employ a more inductive approach to solving problems and leading organizations. Theorists appear to have accepted the argument that leadership and management are distinct concepts.

There have been conceptual commonalities of what
leadership represents. For example, Hosking (1988) suggested two common linkages in the thinking relative to the process of leadership. She stated that the majority of leadership theorists agree that (a) leadership is a social phenomenon based on the imparting of influence, and (b) leaders are recognized by followers as possessing this ability to influence. Filley, House and Kerr (1976) and Yukl (1989b) were all instrumental in forwarding the notion that leadership is synonymous with influence.

Theorists have labored throughout time to develop an understanding of what leadership represents. While there has been considerable debate amongst theorists relative to the conceptualizations of leadership, the evolution of leadership theory can be categorized in four distinct phases. Each stage of development furthered the understanding of the area and served as the foundation for subsequent leadership theory initiatives. Ironically, the final stage, labelled transformational or visionary leadership represents a constellation of the other three major theories of leadership.

Paths of Leadership Theory

The research path for the study of leadership has unfolded in distinct, categorizable phases. The initial efforts focused on the traits of the leader and suggested that characteristics such as physical appearance, intelligence, speaking ability and other personal
attributes believed to separate leaders from non-leaders. Leaders were thought to possess positive features that their non-leading associates did not possess. This theory helped further the understanding of identifying leaders, but the trait, or "Great Man" theories were later discounted when subsequent studies concluded that not all leaders possessed the traits deemed essential to emerging as a leader (Chelladurai, 1985; Sashkin, 1986a; Stogdill, 1974).

It is interesting to note that there has been a resurgence of some components of the trait theory approach as evidenced in the more refined, leadership studies of present times. Contemporary leadership theorists support the claim that a few traits, notably high self confidence, stress tolerance, high energy, dominance, and high intelligence are inherent in all leaders (House and Baetz, 1979; Yukl, 1989b). Sashkin and Fulmer (1986) purported that two personality variables, namely a need for power used to empower staff members, and cognitive ability with respect to knowing how to get things done are also requisite characteristics of leaders. McClelland and Burham (1976) concurred with the belief that leaders seek power so they can empower others to attain their individual goals, which ultimately need to be coaligned with the organization's goals.

Finally, leaders have been characterized as people
who are strong-willed with a passion to make a difference (Bennis, 1984a). Bennis has been most instrumental in supporting the trait theory of leadership as a possible explanation of the complex construct and its recent resurgence is in large part, due to his persistence. Yukl's (1989b) review of past and present trait leadership theories led him to conclude that a balance of the noted traits essential to effective leadership is more important than highs or lows of various traits.

Fiedler and Garcia (1987) reviewed the literature pertaining to the relationship between an individual's tenure in the leadership position and his/her success. They noted that experience is often overlooked as a variable that might impact leader effectiveness. Fiedler (1966) and Fiedler and Chelmers (1968) asserted that tenure within an organization and experience were not necessarily positively correlated to leader effectiveness. In fact, they produced evidence suggesting that organizational performance may decline with an individual's extended occupation of the leadership role.

Following the general disfavor with the trait approach as a means of understanding and identifying leaders, theorists turned their attention to the behavioral activities of leaders. Theorists shifted their focus from the makeup of the leader to how he or she behaved. The premise behind the behavioral theories was
that leaders behaved differently than non-leaders, and that people could learn to be effective leaders. The early leadership theorists focused on the training of group members in patterns of behavior reflective of successful leaders. These theorists suggested that "individuals profit from such training, becoming more active and effective leaders" (Stogdill 1974, p. 198). The actions or behaviors of the leader remained the focal point of the leadership theorists throughout this phase.

Like the trait approach to leadership, the behavioral approach also fell into disfavor when a specified set of leadership behaviors were not found to be transferable between situations. Leaders effective in one setting where found to be ineffective in another. This obvious theoretical shortcoming led theorists to turn their attention to the popular situational leadership theories. The perspective of time has subsequently provided leadership theorists to re-evaluate this decision and the consensus today is that leadership researchers need to consider the effective behaviors that correlate with leadership effectiveness (Yukl, 1989a). Although the behavioral and trait theories of leadership were discounted in an earlier period of leadership research history, more precise measures utilized in contemporary studies are prompting theorists to suggest that leader traits and behaviors do impact leadership effectiveness.
(Yukl, 1989b).

The situational theories were based on the hypothesis that leadership behavior could not be static, and that leaders need to alter their style of leadership to match the specifics of the situation. Leaders could not lead all followers the same way as suggested in the behavioral theories of leadership. Leadership style needed to be congruent with the requisite situation, and the matching of leadership style with the specific situation was paramount to the success of the leadership process.

The most publicized of the situational leadership theories was the Situational Leadership Theory (SLT), produced by Hersey and Blanchard (1982) and later updated to the Situational Leadership Theory II (SLII) by Blanchard (1985). The former model matched the leadership style or behavior with the abilities of the followers. Leadership style was operationalized on two continuums, "task leadership behavior" (guidance and direction for the subordinate emphasized) and "consideration leadership behavior" (socioemotional support for the subordinate emphasized). The key to the model rested with the individual's leadership style adapting to suit the ability and willingness of the follower. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) vehemently expounded that "there is no one best way to lead subordinates". As a subordinate became more proficient, Hersey and Blanchard (1982) purported that the
accompanying leadership style needed to change from a task-focused leadership style to a more supportive-based leadership style. Therefore, effective leadership behavior could not be categorized without first quantifying the ability and willingness levels of subordinates. Termed "maturity" and divided into one of four quadrant levels, the subordinate's ability and willingness levels were measured by a "Manager's Rating Form" and a "Self Rating Form" (Hersey and Blanchard, 1988). The Situational Leadership Model is presented in Figure 2.

The Situational Leadership Theory model generated wide appeal with participants of management seminars but garnered minimal support from leadership scholars who empirically tested the model and uncovered minuscule evidence for the theory (Yukl, 1989b). Blanchard (1985), in response to criticism that the original model oversimplified the classifications of the follower and leader, redefined the characteristics of both aspects in the SLII model. Specifically, "task behavior" was replaced by "directive behavior" that ranged along the horizontal axis of the model from "low" to "high". A high "directive" leadership style was described as being reflective of a leader employing close supervision, one-way communications and explicit instructions (Blanchard, 1985). The former "consideration" leader behavior category was replaced by "supportive" leader behavior which was plotted on the
Figure 2. Situation Leadership Model

(Hersey and Blanchard, 1982, p. 152)
A high "supportive" leadership style was reflective of two-way communications, praise, facilitation techniques, attentive listening, and moral support (Blanchard 1985). Blanchard (1985) labelled each of the four possible leadership styles in the following manner:

- **S1** - high directive, low supportive leadership style;
- **S2** - high directive, high supportive leadership style;
- **S3** - low directive, high supportive leadership style, and;
- **S4** - low directive, low supportive leadership style.

According to Blanchard (1985), the most appropriate leadership style employed (ranging from S1 to S4) depended solely on the needs of the follower.

With respect to the follower dimensions, Blanchard (1985) redefined the "abilities" continuum to be a dual measure of the "competency and commitment" levels of the follower. "Competency" was quantified as the "knowledge and skills which can be gained from education, training and/or experience" while Blanchard (1985, p. 4) operationalized "commitment" as "a combination of confidence and motivation". This measure is plotted along the bottom of the model and has four levels which Blanchard (1985) labelled as:

- **D1** - follower with low competency and high commitment;
- **D2** - follower with moderate competency and low commitment;
- **D3** - follower with high competency and variable commitment, and;
- **D4** - follower with high competency and high commitment.
Blanchard (1985) suggested that when an individual is confronted with a new task he/she generally attacks the task with high enthusiasm although he or she generally possesses limited knowledge relative to the task (D1 level). The leader in this situation would be best served employing an S1 leadership style. With experience, the individual understands the task requirements to a greater degree but frequently finds the execution of the task to be more or less interesting and/or difficult than initially anticipated resulting in some level of disillusion (D2 level). According to Blanchard (1985), an S2 leadership style would be most effective for leading the follower at this particular stage of development. With time, the follower's knowledge base continues to increase, but as Blanchard (1985) declared, these individuals still experience periods of self doubt or uncertainty (D3 level) and are best served by a leader employing an S3 leadership style. With time and continued support, the follower becomes more competent and confident in his/her abilities and moves into the the final follower stage (D4 level) which Blanchard terms as the "peak performer". Following the basis of the model, Blanchard (1985) offered that an S4 leadership style would be the most appropriate method of leading the "peak performer". Blanchard (1985, p.5) suggested that "individuals move from one level of development to another, from being an enthusiastic
beginner to a disillusioned learner to a reluctant contributor to a peak performer. The Situational Leadership Model II is presented in Figure 3.

The leadership literature clearly supports the contention that there is no one best way of leading others, and successful leaders are able to adapt their leadership style to fit the requirements of the situation (Blanchard, 1985; Hersey and Blanchard, 1988). Maximum subordinate satisfaction and productivity can only be attained by matching the appropriate leadership style to the current level of the subordinate readiness (Hersey and Blanchard, 1988). Hall and Donnell (1979) determined that leaders were promoted faster relative to their peers when they used the foresight to recognize the need for adapting their leadership style to suit the situation. These leaders had the ability to recognize the needs of the follower and the situation and employ the appropriate leadership style to fit each situation. This requires a leader who has the ability and confidence to employ both a supportive or directive leadership style to suit the situation. Stogdill (1974) noted that leaders require versatility and flexibility in their leadership style and behavior if they are to be successful in adapting to the demands of each situation.

Blanchard (1985) suggested that the two most common errors relative to leading people in a organizational
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situation are (a) not matching the appropriate leadership style to the development of the follower, and (b) not modifying the leadership style to parallel changes in follower development. Therefore, it is essential that the leader fully understand the development levels of the followers and implement the appropriate leadership style best suited to each specific situation. It is equally important that the leader continually assess the development of the follower so that the leadership style varies as the follower grows or regresses from one development level to the next.

Following the thrusts in the situational leadership theories were the developments in both transactional and transformational or visionary leadership theories. Transactional leadership theory is founded on the exchange process whereby something of value held by the leader (e.g., reward, promotion, praise, etc.) is exchanged for something held (e.g., knowledge, completion of task, etc.) by the follower (Kuhnert and Lewis, 1987). It is important to note that this reciprocal exchange must be beneficial to both parties. Follower compliance is based on the association of the leader holding something of value to the follower. Followers recognize that the way to attain the valued end is to comply with the leader's desires (Kuhnert and Lewis, 1987). Leaders recognize that the way to accomplish tasks within their organization is through
the collective efforts of subordinates who are motivated to perform in exchange for the valued rewards. This leadership theory is based on the two way exchange of valued ends. The ability to execute the task (follower control) or deliver the reward (leader control) must be within the perceived capabilities of the person wishing to participate in the exchange process.

This type of leadership has its limits as outlined by Bass (1985). He suggested that transactional leadership may be most effective in situations where marginal improvement or the maintenance of the organization's status quo is desirable. Performance above and beyond the call of duty will generally not be attained by a leader exercising transactional leadership.

Transformational or visionary leadership theory is based on a higher order of influence. While transactional theory might be based on the exchange of intangible rewards (e.g., praise) and/or tangible rewards (e.g., financial bonus), transformational leaders are able to respond to followers primarily on an intangible basis. Followers influenced by a transformational leader are motivated to be the best that they can be, which, if channelled in the proper direction, can exponentially improve the organization (Kuhnert and Lewis, 1987). Bass (1985) purported that transformational leaders elevate the needs of subordinates, who in turn, become more self-
directed and self-reinforcing individuals. These individuals subsequently often become leaders in their own right.

Transformational leadership arouses the transcendental interests in followers and/or elevates their need and aspiration levels. In doing so, transformational leadership may result ultimately in a higher level of satisfaction and effectiveness among the led (Bass, 1985, p. 32).

Tichy and Devanna (1986) reported seven characteristics that distinguish transformational leaders from other types of leaders. According to Tichy and Devanna, transformational leaders (a) believe they can make a difference by their ability to inspire followers to attain higher goals, (b) are risk takers who follow their convictions and are committed to their decisions, (c) empower others, making them feel essential to the organization and its mission, (d) are consistent with respect to what they value, (e) view mistakes as learning opportunities, (f) identify critical components of complex problems and focus attention on what action is required, and (g) conceptualize a desired end which they successfully translate to others in ways that followers are anxious to support. This final characteristic dealing with the "vision" of a transformational leader has captured the attention of many contemporary leadership researchers who have initiated studies that fall under the classification of "visionary leadership".

Bass (1985) submitted that transformational leaders
hold and operate on a personal value system based on
effort, integrity and justice. Through the expression of
their own standards, the transformational leader is able
to appeal to and influence followers to upgrade their
beliefs and attitudes (Kuhnert and Lewis, 1987). This
"leading by example" and subsequent influence process
results in individuals and the organization achieving more
than what was originally thought possible (Bass, 1985).
While there are inherent differences in the influence
basis for both types of leadership, Bass (1985) is quick
to illustrate that transactional and transformational
leadership are not mutually exclusive and leaders can and
do exhibit both types of leadership.

Tichy and Devanna (1986) categorized the process of a
leader transforming an organization in three stages. First
of all, the leader must recognize the need for
revitalization. Slumping productivity, decreased
competitiveness, or a stagnant workforce may serve as
indicators of an organizational in need of revitalization.
Tichy and Devanna (1986) suggested that a challenge for
the leader may rest in alerting members of the threats
from the environment and the need to recharge and
revitalize to remain competitive. "Creating the vision"
refers to the second step in the transformational process.
Here the leader is concerned with focusing the attention
of organizational members on a bright and prosperous
future. This "vision" provides the spark that ignites members of the organization to strive towards the attainment of a desired end that is known and accepted by the organizational work force (Nanus, 1989). This process of visioning, although described in a slightly different manner, is consistent with the necessary phase outlined by the two most prolific writers in the field of visionary leadership, Marshall Sashkin and Warren Bennis.

The third step in the process outlined by Tichy and Devanna (1986) involves the institution of the vision. It is during this step that the leader attempts to solidify his/her vision with the members of the organization. It is believed that the long-term adoption of the vision is comforting to the leader as it assists in stabilizing his/her leadership position (Tichy and Devanna, 1986).

It is easy to recognize an organization lead by an individual without a vision. You find a confusing blur of intentions, people moving here and there, doing this and that, all seeming to have purpose but adding up to-what? When a futures-creative leader offers a convincing vision of the future, it is as if one has been looking at a fuzzy image through a camera lens, twisted the lens, and suddenly all comes into focus" (Nanus, 1989, p. 105).

Transformational or visionary leaders require the conceptual ability to visualize a "big picture" for the organization over the a particularly lengthy time frame (Sashkin, 1988). Typically, a front line supervisor is involved in more of the day-to-day operations of an organization and therefore, requires a shorter time frame
relative to where the organization is moving (Sashkin and Fulmer, 1986b). The next level manager, frequently referred to as a "middle manager", serves as an intermediate step between upper and front line management and therefore needs to communicate with both levels of management. This individual requires a longer-ranged perspective relative to the front line manager, but considerably less than the upper executive level manager. Sashkin and Fulmer (1985b) indicated that these managers often employ transactional leadership.

The top level leader is responsible for setting policies and procedures for the organization and planning for the organization over the long term. Often referred to as the executive leader, this individual requires the conceptual skills proposed by Katz and Kahn (1978) to see the "big picture" and the implications of each decision. In addition, this individual needs to have a clear vision for where the organization is currently operating in addition to where the organization might be headed in the future. The executive leader needs to be visionary, especially when compared to the front line supervisor. They need to be responsible for creating a vision for the organization and implanting an organizational culture that facilitates the organization operating in a satisfying and productive fashion.

Sashkin and Fulmer (1985a; 1985b; 1986) reinforced
the process of "visioning" as the essential function of executive leadership although they indicated that the majority of executive leaders create visions for shorter terms (i.e., one to two years), rather than the 10 - 20 year time frame that truly distinguishes the visionary leader. Bennis (1976, p. 161) stated that

... the leader, at every level, must be partly a conceptualist, something more than an "idea" man. By that I mean someone with a kind of entrepreneurial vision, a sense of perspective, and most of all, the time to spend thinking about the forces that will affect the destiny of that person's shape for that institution.

Leaders need to take the time to reflect, however, as indicated by Maas (1991) and Weese (1985), managers of sport programs generally concern themselves with the day-to-day activities of their organizational unit. However, a leader's role must encompass taking time to reflect and maintain a sense of perspective for the organization. A leader who does this, and can communicate this perspective in a compelling fashion to followers in the form of a mission statement, along with a set of clear, challenging, yet attainable goals would be well served in a position of leadership (Bennis, 1976). The person who ensures that all tasks get accomplished correctly and on time is a manager (Bennis, 1976).

This definition of a leader's position bodes support for Mackenzie's (1990) position that managers at higher organizational levels should "do less" and "conceptualize
more" relative to managers at lower hierarchical levels in the organizational structure. Bennis and Nanus (1985) suggested that effective leadership is synonymous with a leader's ability to develop and impart a powerful and well communicated vision. Yukl (1989b) noted that effective leaders not only have formulated a vision for their organization, but in addition, they have the prowess to effectively communicate this vision to members of the organization. Effective leaders must possess the ability to instill organizational members with a sense of ownership for the vision and a quest to attain this desired end.

Sashkin (1986b) believed that a visionary leader represented someone who could (a) determine the long range (i.e., 10 - 20 years) vision for what the organization could and should become, (b) understand the key components of the vision, and (c) communicate the vision in such a compelling fashion that members of the organization support and strive to realize this end. However, it is important to note that the vision can't remain the property of the leader, as followers have to align with and share the vision if it is to have any chance of being attained (Bennis, 1984a). The vision has to penetrate and be adopted throughout the various levels of the organizational network.

Visionary leaders empower the work force in ways that
often differentiate successful from unsuccessful leaders (Bennis, 1984a). Bass (1985) reported results from studies conducted within business, industry, education, and government settings that substantiated the high correlation between leaders classified as "visionary" and elevated levels of employee satisfaction.

Additional leadership studies have uncovered some interesting findings relative to the visionary leader. For example, Bennis (1984a, p. 8), thorough inquiry of 90 visionary leaders produced the following information.

The median age was 56. Most were white men, with six black men and six women in the group. The only surprising finding was that all the Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) not only were married to their first spouse, but also seemed enthusiastic about the institution of marriage.

Bennis' research (1984a) also uncovered four visionary competencies in this group which included (a) management of attention, (b) management of meaning, (c) management of trust, and (d) management of self. A discussion of the visionary leader's competencies as outlined by Bennis (1984b) is presented below:

Management of Attention. Bennis (1984b) cited the ability of the manager to draw others into his/her vision by presenting a supreme focus as an essential skill of a visionary leader. This individual knows exactly what is necessary and employees have unbridled faith in the leader to lead them in the correct direction without undue delay or effort. These leaders have an agenda. Their intentions
are always clearly evident and followers know that their own time and energy will be focused on the critical aspects of the task, not extraneous factors.

Management of Meaning. Bennis (1984b) described the "management of meaning" as the ability of the leader to communicate meaning to followers, and in doing so, align them to work in harmony. Words take on meaning for this leader and the followers have faith in the leader's ideas. The leader is consistent in all aspects of the communication and behavior, leaving no doubt as to his or her beliefs and/or orientations. These leaders provide the essential direction to the organization and its members. If the leader is unsure of his/her agenda, or cannot communicate it in a compelling fashion, the organization runs the risk of carrying out activities that in actuality may be operating at cross purposes (Nanus, 1989).

Management of Trust. This competency is described by Bennis (1984b) as the ability to convey a feeling of integrity to the followers so that they understand what the leader believes in and that he/she can be counted on, even if his/her personal opinion or viewpoint runs counter to other members within the organization. These individuals are perceived as being both predictable and reliable (Nanus (1989)).
Management of Self. The final visionary competency proposed by Bennis (1984b) is that the leader understands and is accepting of him/herself, the mistakes that he/she makes, and his/her reactions to these mistakes. Visionary leaders are willing to accept risks and view mistakes as learning opportunities. This type of management requires an individual who is confident in his/her abilities and accepting of his/her limitations. Bennis (1976, p. 140) stated that "the task, then of the leader is to lead. To lead others, he must first of all know himself". Nanus (1989) noted that these leaders set an admirable example for all organizational members to observe and emulate.

It is interesting to note Yukl's (1989b) observation that there appears to be a contradiction relative the origin of the organizational vision. Some authors suggest that the vision is the leader's creation while others suggest that a vision derived from the input of all staff members is the "true" organizational vision. Nanus (1989) indicated that this collectively produced vision is often the most accepted focus for the organization. Yukl (1989b) offers a compromise by stating that the leader needs to tap the followers relative to their ideas and integrate their perspectives into a vision which can be persuasively communicated to organizational members. Certainly the leader needs to have some idea as to the current and anticipated future state of his/her organization although
this vision needs to consider the wants, needs and desires of the entire organizational membership.

In the end, the leader may be the one who articulates the vision and gives it legitimacy, who expresses the vision in captivating rhetoric that fires the imagination and emotions of followers, who--through the vision--empowers others to make decisions and get things done. But if the organization is to be successful, the image must grow out of the needs of the entire organization and must be "claimed" or "owned" by all of the important actors (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 109).

McGregor (1960) purported that the integration of organizational goals with those of staff members is critical to organizational success. Furthermore, McGregor (1960) suggested that the approach taken by a leader in presenting the organizational goals impacts the acceptance and adoption of these goals as personal goals. The leader who is effective in communicating the organizational goals in an appealing fashion will be more successful in gaining employee support and adoption (Bennis, 1984b). Charisma coupled with heightened communication skills are viewed as requisite leadership skills in contemporary leadership theory (Conger, 1989; House, 1977). Schein (1990) highlighted the importance of leaders being charismatic so they could effectively communicate their vision to organizational members in a compelling fashion.

Hersey and Blanchard (1988) pronounced the significance of distinguishing between management goals and subordinate goals. These goals may be in opposition and/or compatible but according to Hersey and Blanchard
(1988), they are rarely identical. The need to closely assimilate the goals of management with the goals of the subordinates is an important function of the leader. Two organizations with varying degrees of goal integration are presented in Figure 4 and Figure 5. Hersey and Blanchard (1988) noted that the closer subordinate and management goals co-align with the goals of the organization, the greater the degree of organizational goal attainment. Note that the co-alignment of subordinate and managerial goals with the goals of the organization as illustrated in Figure 5 results in a greater degree of goal attainment when compared to the situation depicted in Figure 4. Leaders need to communicate a vision throughout the organization to provide direction, stability and a common purpose to all members of the organization. Furthermore, leaders need to clearly mesh the organizational goals with the goals of subordinates. Allowing for subordinate involvement in the establishment of organizational goals may be helpful in integrating goals within the organizational agenda. Finally, the leader's role in presenting organizational goals and continually reinforcing them appears to be a major component of visionary leadership theory. Nanus (1989, p. 107) observed that true leaders have the ability to heighten subordinate motivation by presenting the vision in a compelling fashion, especially in times of crises. These leaders are
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effective in illustrating to staff members "of the tough things that need to be accomplished and the reasons for them. Elevate their aspirations. Show them a brighter, more successful future for themselves if the organization achieves its vision".

**Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness**

The literature is filled with contradictory claims on the importance of leadership to an organization. Kelly (1988) suggested that not all corporate success is due to expert leadership as many leadership enthusiasts would like people to believe. He pointed out that the abilities and motivational levels of followers is a frequently overlooked variable. "Without his armies, after all, Napoleonic was just a man with grandiose ambitions" (Kelly, 1988, p. 142). Pfeffer (1977) discounted the importance of leadership by stating the organizational effectiveness was due to a number of other factors beyond the leader's control. Lieberson and O'Connor's longitudinal research (1972) of United States' corporations produced results prompting them to conclude that leaders had a minimal impact on organizations. Hambrick and Mason (1984) concurred with the Lieberson and O'Connor finding. However, Thomas (1988) analysed these studies and suggested that their findings were misleading due to methodological shortcomings. Fiedler and Garcia (1987) were vehemently supportive of the positive effects of
leadership on an organization. Bennis (1984a) stated that leadership has a tremendous impact on an organization. Hersey and Blanchard (1988, p. 85) noted that "the successful organization has one major attribute that sets it apart from unsuccessful organizations: dynamic and effective leadership". Schein (1990) noted that leadership impacts the organizational culture which in turn influences organizational success. "There are now many claims that the organizational culture can determine the degree of effectiveness of the organization, either through its "strength" or through its "type" (Schein, 1990, p. 24). Bennis (1984a) declared that leadership "gives pace and energy to the work and empowers the work force. Empowerment is the collective effect of leadership" (p. 11). Hosking (1988) supported this contention by stating that "leadership is central to the dynamics of the organization" (p. 147). Bennis (1984a) submitted that empowerment makes people feel (a) significant in that they make a difference to the success or failure of the organization, (b) that they are having the opportunity to learn, (c) that they are part of a team or community, and (d) that work is stimulating. His research into corporate America revealed depressing findings relative to the state of the workforce.

Fewer than 25 percent of the workforce believed that they were working at full capacity, 75 percent stated that they could be significantly more effective and almost 60 percent of the sample believed that they
"do not work as hard as they used to" (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 7).

These authors state that the situation is getting worse, not better, and perhaps leaders need to empower followers and in doing so, inject pride and meaning into employee work roles. Klaus (1989) noted that diminished American competitiveness in world markets has caused some business leaders to adopt an eastern hemisphere approach to management. Specifically, Klaus suggested that some organizations are dismantling the traditional pyramid organizational structures in favor of flatter, decentralized structures. This severe adaptation may result in the transformation of the organization through the uncovering of "hidden leaders", an empowered workforce and heightened contributions from a committed workforce previously oppressed by an excessively bureaucratic, centralized mechanism. Although these potential conclusions appear enlightening, additional research into the effects of visionary leaders on the organization's work-force appears warranted before conclusive statements can be made relative to the specific effects of a visionary leader on an organization.

Likert (1967) suggested that leadership effectiveness over an extended period of time is influenced by three items including (a) causal variables, (b) intervening variables, and (c) end-result variables. Casual variables refer to those factors that are established by the
organization (e.g., policies and procedures) that impact on the success of the organization (Likert, 1967). Since the organizational leaders are ultimately responsible for the design and implementation of these factors, they can also influence modification of these items if they are deemed to be counter to organizational effectiveness (Likert, 1967). Relative to the Campus Recreation field, eligibility regulations are developed by the organization and can impact the participation ratios produced by the unit. A modification of a rigid eligibility regulation which currently impedes participation rates would be an example of a leader affecting a causal variable.

Likert (1967) described intervening variables as the internal climatic conditions within an organization. Staff motivation, staff commitment to the organization and the quality of organizational communications are examples of intervening variables (Likert, 1967). A Campus Recreation Director trying to increase employee morale and effectiveness by empowering staff members, implementing a staff newsletter to enhance communications and employing a participative decision making style would be an example of a leader altering the intervening variables.

End-result variables were defined by Likert (1967) as the measurement scale employed to measure organizational success. In industry, production quotas and profit margins are common end-result variables. Specific to the field of
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Campus Recreation, participation rates represent the most popular method of measuring organizational success although other measures including consumer satisfaction and/or attrition rates are also used and thus could be considered as end-result variables.

The Multiple Linkage Model (Yukl, 1989a) also considered intervening variables in his attempt to measure the effect of leadership on organizational success (See Figure 6). Six intervening variables are considered based on the following breakdown (a) two describing the subordinate (effort and role clarity), (b) two characterizing the group or unit (organization of work and cohesiveness/cooperation), and (c) two (resources/support and external cooperation) depicting the particular unit's interaction with the larger organization (Yukl, 1989a). Furthermore, Yukl (1989a) noted that organizational performance is contingent on the interaction of all six of the intervening variables. Deficiencies in one of the variables will lower organizational performance, regardless of the other values.

Yukl (1989a) also suggested that situational variables influence organizational performance at three distinct points. The situational variables labelled "neutralizers" impact one or more of the intervening variables. For example, role clarity will be very important if the task requirements are complex. External
co-ordination will not be at issue if the organization is an autonomous enterprise (Yukl, 1989a).

The second grouping of situational variables, labelled "substitutes" impact the specific level of the intervening variables. For example, if an organization introduces an employee incentive program, the intervening variable (subordinate effort) may escalate (Yukl, 1989a). Economic fluctuations may influence the resource/support variable.

The third set of situational variables proposed by Yukl (1989a) refers to the constraints that constrict a leader's ability to impart influence. Rigid organizational rules or company policies are examples of these situational variables. "The extent to which a leader is capable of doing something in the short run to improve any of the intervening variables is limited by position authority, organizational policies, and legal-contractual restrictions" (Yukl, 1989a, p. 126).

Yukl (1989a) offered that short-term organizational effectiveness will be greater when leaders correct deficiencies in the intervening variables while long-term effectiveness will be maximized when the leader modifies the situation so that it is most favorable. Yukl (1989a) suggested that (a) building a trusting organizational climate, (b) gaining greater control over resources, and (c) modifying the culture of the organization to
facilitate high intrinsic motivation and the development of organizational values and norms that project ownership and heightened quality are methods of improving a situation.

While the Multiple Linkage Model has practical appeal to the student of leadership, Yukl (1989a) admitted that little is known about the patterns of leadership behavior that truly impact the intervening variables. Similarly, the leader's impact on the situational variables also leaves many questions unanswered. Research efforts directed toward the role of the visionary leader and his/her effect on the shaping and transmission of organizational culture may prove helpful in uncovering the mysteries of creating a favorable situation, and according to Yukl (1989a), influencing long-term effectiveness.

The most consistent measures of leadership effectiveness within the organizational context have been employee satisfaction and/or employee productivity measures (Hersey and Blanchard, 1988; Tosi, 1982). Many authors (Brayfield and Crockett, 1955; Stogdill, 1974; Herzberg, Mausner, Petterson & Capwell, 1957, and Vroom, 1964) cited the ambiguity in studies attempting to measure employee response to leadership behavior. Tosi (1982) highlighted the difficulty in accurately measuring both job satisfaction and productivity due to the vast number of intervening factors that may produce measurement error.
Locke (1984) suggested that job satisfaction is a popular dependent variable measured in leadership studies. Despite the vast attention job satisfaction has received from researchers in the field, there appears to be a debate surrounding the effect of job satisfaction on organizational effectiveness. Lawler and Porter (1983) expounded that there is a small but consistent relationship between employee satisfaction and productivity. They noted that the relationship between low employee satisfaction and employee withdrawal (e.g., absenteeism and turnover) was more pronounced than the relationship to productivity. Locke (1984) suggested that the lack of association may be due to the managerial safeguards such as employee supervision meetings and production quotas which may dissuade dissatisfied employees from lowering their outputs within an organization.

Fiedler and Garcia (1987) were more direct when they questioned the need for employee satisfaction measures. They noted that employee satisfaction is important, but unquestionably secondary to the function of most organizations; getting the job accomplished. However, the direct association between job satisfaction and employee withdrawal was supported in the findings of Beehr and Gupta, 1978; Locke, 1984, and; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand and Meglino, 1979.
O'Brien (1984) and Stogdill (1974) observed that empirical studies have yielded inconsistent findings relative to the association between leader behavior and employee productivity. They cite the vast number of extraneous factors influencing the productivity measure as the principle reason for the inconsistency in the literature.

While job satisfaction and/or productivity measures create unique challenges for researchers interested in measuring the effect of leadership on an organization, they remain the most popular measures employed in contemporary research studies. Schriesheim, Mowday and Stogdill (1979) suggested that measures of organizational success should include both components.

Leadership and Organizational Culture

Organizational or corporate culture has emerged as another popular research avenue for academics interested in studying organizations. Despite this popularity, Schein (1990) submitted that organizational culture theorists remain impaired by the confusion surrounding the concept. A multitude of definitions and interpretations of organizational culture bodes support for his claim.

An organization's culture is comprised of the collective beliefs of attitudes of organizational members and reflects an identity of the organization, specifically what is important for the organization, what it believes
in and values, and a general code of appropriate conduct for all associated with the organization (Barham and Rassam, 1989; Deal, 1985; Schein, 1986). Connor & Lake (1988) defined "organizational values" as the shared ideals that guide behavior within an organization while "organizational norms" were defined as the formal and informal rules and codes of appropriate and inappropriate behavior within an organization. Wheelen and Hunger (1986) defined organizational culture as "a collection of beliefs, expectations and attitudes shared by the corporation's members" (p. 113). They elaborated by noting that the culture does not only represent the values and beliefs of members working within an organization, but more accurately, conveys a sense of identity for the organization.

Manzini (1988) and Gilmore (1988) both noted that culture shapes the personality and climate of an organization as well as impacting the behavior of employees and ultimately the success of the organization. Dennison (1984) affirmed that organizational culture outlines the dominant orientation of an organization, providing insight into the inner workings of the organization, what it stands for, and offering a frame of reference to employees relative to expected behavior codes and the reasoning behind some of the organization's activities. This position is supported by Connor and Lake
(1988) as they referred to organizational culture as the "social glue" binding organizations together by producing behavior and activity norms for members of the organization. Often taken for granted in the past, an organization's culture will be a dominant theme for both organizational behavior researchers and corporate leaders of the future (Miller, 1984). Schein (1990) extended this notion by noting that an organization's culture impacts the success of the enterprise. Potts and Behr (1987) suggested that organizational cultures have always existed and been valued as the solidifying agent holding an organization together and giving it a sense of identity, although the term "organizational culture" was rarely used to describe the phenomenon.

Alkhafaji (1989) declared that an organization's culture distinguishes it from others and that it is shaped by history, tradition, leaders and the basic values of individuals attracted to the organization. A strong organizational culture is important at all times, but particularly in times of bringing new staff members to the organization as a strong culture assists in quickly acclimatizing these members. Barham and Rassam (1989) noted that a strong organizational culture is most important in organizational settings employing a decentralized organizational structure. Bennis (1989) concurred that an organization's culture is the most
significant and influential element because employees adopt and reflect the organizational culture. This position is also supported by both Deal and Kennedy (1982) and Gorman (1987; 1989). Blake and Mouton (1986) also offered support for this position when they observed that an organization's culture impacts everything within the organization, especially the "bottom-line consequences". Hitt (1986) suggested that cultures guide all organizational activities by providing the framework for the organization's belief system, philosophy of operation and consequently, its activities.

An organization's culture is an important and necessary element and consequently, needs to be coaligned with the mission of the enterprise (Wheelen and Hunger, 1986). How members of an organization structure their goals, define their objectives, serve their constituents, and promote their organization is reflected and encompassed by the organization's culture (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Schein, 1986; 1990).

Manzini (1988) suggested that while an organization's culture is generally presented in positive terms, it is possible for organizations to possess a negative culture which potentially could contribute to decreased teamwork, reduced cohesiveness and stunted organizational goal attainment. These negative cultures are generally based on individual accomplishment and greed (Manzini, 1988).
Parsons' (1960) framework has been widely accepted as a method of understanding and applying the concept of organizational culture to the organizational setting. Parsons (1960) as well as Sashkin and Sashkin (1990) noted that organizations need to possess a culture that facilitates the four critical functions which contribute to organizational success and survival. They asserted that the four functions include (a) adapting to change, (b) achieving relevant or desired goals, (c) maintaining teamwork, and (d) creating and/or maintaining a customer-oriented culture of shared values that embrace the other three critical functions. Parsons' framework of cultural values has been incorporated into a number of instruments measuring organizational cultural including the third edition of the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ) (Sashkin, 1988), the Cultural Functions Inventory (CFI) (Sashkin, 1986) and the Culture Building Activities (CBA) instrument (Glaser and Sashkin, 1989).

Culpan (1989) expounded that establishing and maintaining a positive organizational culture has been the most dominant theme of the best-selling management books over the past ten 10 years. For example, Peters and Waterman (1982) linked organizational success to the presence of a strong, positive organizational culture. Connor & Lake (1986) suggested that successful companies are such because of an organizational culture that
provides a clear, unambiguous, shared understanding of the organization's value system and what it stands for in all activities. Sashkin and Sashkin (1990) noted that the "essential factor underlying effective schools is an "ethos" or "culture" of excellence, and that effective school leaders are culture builders" (p. 2). Ledford, Mohrman, Mohrman and Lawler (1989) suggested that organizations successful over an extended period of time are more likely to possess a strong, well-defined culture. They also purported that an organization's culture does not have to be positive. A negative culture that restricts innovation or adversely impacts employee recognition and/or satisfaction may exist and consequently impede organizational success.

Deal and Kennedy (1982) suggested that organizations with weak cultures generally possess an ambiguous belief and value system, decreased continuity between staff members relative to any beliefs or values, and organizational members working in opposition due to a lack of purpose and/or direction. Furthermore, Deal and Kennedy (1982) offered that the symptoms of organizations with negative cultures include (a) poor staff morale, (b) a short term orientation to goals and the production of immediate results, (c) a failure to monitor and react to external factors in the market place, (d) inconsistent decision making and behaviors exhibited by organizational
members, and (e) frequent emotional outbursts from staff members.

Deal and Kennedy (1982) purported that an organization's culture can be diagnosed through a variety of methods. For example, assessing the physical appearance of the workplace, critically analysing organizational documents and promotional literature, conducting observational techniques to monitor employee behavior and interviewing staff members are methods of uncovering an organization's culture. Some questions that they pose to organizational members in an attempt to uncover the organizational culture (Deal and Kennedy, 1982, p. 132-133) include:

a) Tell me about the history of the company?  
b) What were its beginnings?  
c) Why is the company a success?  
d) What explains its growth?  
e) What kind of people work here?  
f) Who generally gets ahead in the long term?  
g) What kind of place is this to work in?  
h) What is your average day like?  
i) How do things get done?

The contention that leaders can impact the formulation or modification of an organization's culture is held by other theorists (Chapman, 1990; Potts and Behr, 1987; Veltrop and Harrington, 1988). Schein (1990) noted that the leader's role in shaping and maintaining the organizational culture may be his/her most essential contribution. He offered (1990, p. 316-317) that "leadership is intertwined with culture formation,
evolution, transformation and destruction. Culture is created in the first instance by the actions of the leader; culture is also embedded and strengthened by leaders". Bryman (1986) concurred by highlighting the visionary leader's important role in formulating and maintaining the organizational culture. "Today's leading chief executives are visionary, daring, aggressive managers who do not flinch from the hardest decisions affecting the very foundations and identities of their organizations" (Potts and Behr, 1987, p. 210).

Tichy and Ulrich (1984) observed that Lee Iacocca and Ray Kroc thoroughly understood their own personal philosophies and the desired organizational cultures for their companies (Chrysler Corporation and McDonalds restaurants respectively). Both leaders were instrumental in the formulation and transmission of a positive organizational culture throughout all levels within their organization. Their vision for the corporation shaped the culture, which in turn, attracted the organizational membership to the cause and heightened their commitment to this end (Tichy and Ulrich, 1984). Furthermore, Iacocca shaped the participative and mutuality culture when he assumed the Chrysler leadership by stating that the struggle will be difficult for everyone (Torbert, 1990). Iacocca effectively communicated to all organizational members that through their committed efforts the company
could be successful, but only if everyone made sacrifices (e.g., work hard, give more to their positions, build better products, market their products in a more robust fashion, and take pay cuts initially) to see Chrysler through the initial stage of transformation. Iacocca's salary cut to one dollar for his first year of employment with Chrysler set the stage for developing an organizational culture based on sacrifice and an enduring commitment to the cause.

Bass (1985) also noted that the leader can have an impact on shaping and/or changing the culture of an organization. Sashkin and Sashkin (1990) stated that the relationship is so strong that leadership and organizational culture are "intertwined". Peters and Waterman (1982, pp. 293 - 294) offered that:

The top performers (leaders) create a broad shared culture, a coherent framework within which charged-up people search for appropriate adaptations. Their ability to extract extraordinary contributions from very large numbers of people turns on the ability to create a sense of highly valued purpose.

Bennis (1989), Bryman (1986), Sashkin (1988), and Schein (1990) all concurred that the visionary leader can play a tremendous role in formulating and/or modifying the culture of an organization. Bennis and Nanus (1985) noted that leaders shape the organizational culture by creating a vision which, if effectively transmitted, focuses and unites the members of the organization in efforts designed to accomplish organizational goals.
Getting the message across unequivocally at every level of the organization is an absolute key. Basically it is what the creative process is all about and what, once again, separates the managers from the leaders (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 43).

Schein (1990) also highlighted a number of methods that leaders can employ to institute and/or modify their organization's culture. He suggested that the leader's own behavior, their reactions to critical incidents, their human resource decisions, their reference to company "heroes" and their influence on the physical work environment impact their respective organization's culture.

Miller (1984) noted that successful transmission of the culture to members of the organization is difficult and that the organizational culture perceived by senior executives in an organization may bear minimal resemblance to the culture perceived at the middle manager, supervisory or worker level within the organizational hierarchy. Louis (1985) suggested that applicability of the culture was essential for it to be diffused and accepted throughout the various organizational levels. She submitted that organizational meanings which have applicability to all levels of the organization will be penetrated further than meanings that apply to fewer divisions of the organization. For example, Louis (1985) noted that the Avis slogan "We try harder" has applicability to all levels of the workforce. If all
organizational members adopt this theme and indeed "try harder", the organization can be transformed to a higher functioning unit.

Bennis (1989) cautioned leaders to be sensitive to the realities of organizational culture, specifically with respect to the leader needing to understand and ensure that all employees reflect the culture of the organization. Leaders need to understand the orientations, values and beliefs of organizational members before embarking on a campaign to modify the overall culture of the organization. Leaders are essential to shaping the organizational culture, especially those visionary leaders who can instill vision, meaning and trust in followers, who in turn, are motivated beyond initial expectations and strive toward the attainment of organizational goals (Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Sashkin and Burke, 1988). Bennis and Nanus (1985) vehemently declared that leaders shape the culture of an organization and that "organizations cannot be successful without effective leadership" (p. 20). Specifically, they noted that a leader's vision, developed and refined in numerous ways including consulting with organizational members, unifies the organization and has the potential of aligning organizational members toward a common purpose. This shared focus can represent a portion of the organizational culture, taking the form of "enthusiasm, commitment,
Pride, willingness to work hard and go the extra mile" (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 91) for the organization. The vision can and must be incorporated into the culture of the organization. It is clear that visionary leadership is positively related to the development and transmission of organizational culture within organizations (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Sashkin and Burke, 1989; Sashkin and Sashkin, 1990). Furthermore, Deal and Kennedy (1982) observed that successful companies know what they stand for, have effectively communicated this stance to the membership and are successful in getting the membership to adopt the culture. The values noted above relate to organizational culture which leaders have the potential of influencing.

Sashkin and Sashkin (1990, p. 9) noted that "the more one engages in visionary leadership behaviors, the better the organization's culture looks in terms of Parsons' crucial four functions" (goal attainment, adaptation, teamwork and customer orientation). The strongest association between visionary leadership and culture was reported in the integration or "teamwork" measure (Sashkin and Sashkin, 1990). Bennis (1989, p. 155) captured the importance of the leader relative to the culture of an organization by noting that:

People in authority must be social architects, studying and shaping what we call the "culture of work", examining the values and norms of organizations and the ways that they are transmitted
to the individual, and whenever necessary, altering them.

Blake and Mouton (1986) concurred by noting that leaders significantly impact the culture of an organization by (a) projecting a vision and action plan for where the organization wants to go, (b) illustrating a model of behavior, values and behavior norms through verbal and nonverbal communications, and (c) indicating what he or she and the organization stands for and believes in. Schein (1985) asserted that leaders develop and maintain organizational culture by (a) reinforcing their personal priorities and opinions, (b) reacting to crises in certain ways that highlight these values, (c) role modelling, (d) allocating rewards in support of certain values or priorities, and (e) selecting and/or promoting individuals that share a similar value system and priority listing. How the leader behaves, what he or she reinforces through verbal, nonverbal and written modes of communication and where leaders allocate resources make strong statements about the leader's value system, as well as having the potential of impacting the culture of an organization (Schein, 1985). Peters and Waterman (1982) noted that clarifying and living the defined corporate culture are the greatest contributions that a leader can offer an organization. Buono & Nichols (1985) suggested that leaders must act in accordance with the corporate culture or trust, stability, cohesion and ultimately
organizational performance could be in jeopardy. This position is also supported by Badaracco and Ellsworth, (1989).

Tichy and Ulrich (1984) purported that a leader's vision for their respective organization, whether derived in an autocratic or participatory fashion, is generally accompanied by a mission statement and a listing of organizational objectives related to the mission. This strategy converts the theoretical into the practical and allows members of the workforce to strive towards the attainment of the mission. Bullen and Rockart (1981) also proposed a methodology to translate the organizational culture into practical terms. "Critical success factors" refer to the action items related to the organizational culture that must be coaligned with the values of the organization if the organizational culture is to be strong. These factors refer to the few, essential tasks that an organization has to adhere to if it is to be successful. Hitt (1988) identified the values of a publishing company and the "critical success factors" that were associated with each value. Hitt (1988, p. 96) suggested that the "critical success factor method is a practical approach for helping us move from the abstract to the concrete--to identify those specific areas that will ensure successful performance in light of the organization's values".
Role and Function of Campus Recreation in Higher Education

Unquestionably, sport consumes a major portion of our attention and permeates all levels of North American society. Siedentop (1980) offered that North American interest in the sport and fitness boom has reached an unparalleled state. Eitzen and Sage (1982) served testimony to this position when they reported that over one-tenth of the World Almanac is annually devoted to sport.

Sport has also integrated our educational settings at the elementary, secondary and post-secondary levels. This integration has been within the participation ranks (e.g., intramural sport participation) as well as high performance levels (e.g., interscholastic or intercollegiate athletics). Within the elementary and secondary educational systems, most schools offer physical education classes (some schools on a refreshing daily basis), in-house intramural sports programs and interschool athletics.

Despite the apparent increase in the value placed on physical fitness and expression, intramural programs across North America have generally declined and been granted "second class status (Siedentop, 1980) within the secondary levels while interscholastic athletic programs have flourished (Eitzen and Sage, 1982). Siedentop (1980) concurred on the importance of quality intramural
programming within the elementary and secondary levels of education when he states that "programs of intramurals and club sports are extremely important because they create environments within which the skills developed in physical education may be tested, practiced and further extended" (p. 278).

To counter this decreased emphasis afforded intramural programs in Canada, the Canadian government generously subsidizes the Canadian Intramural Recreation Association (CIRA). This body serves as an advocate of quality intramural programs and to this end, provides resources and support to professionals committed to elevate the status of intramural sports within the three levels of education in Canada. The National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) fulfills a similar function in the United States although its mandate is more aligned with the post-secondary level of education.

At the post-secondary level of education, intramural and athletic programs assume an entirely different meaning and orientation. "Intramurals" as a label for the in-house program of activities has been replaced on many post-secondary campuses with the term "Campus Recreation". This term is viewed by many in the field to be a more accurate label for the wide scope of activities and services offered by contemporary programs. Some programs have held firm with the "Intramural-Recreational Sports" label
(e.g., The Ohio State University program) for their programs.

The field of Campus Recreation at the post-secondary level has undergone tremendous expansion since the initial intramural event was staged in the United States on the campus of Princeton University in 1857 (Mueller and Reznik, 1971). Many Campus Recreation Programs of today offer a wide variety of activities and services, including the traditional men's and women's competitive intramurals, co-recreational competitive intramurals, special events, tournaments, and sports clubs. Campus Recreation programs also offer a diverse schedule of services in a variety of instructional classes (e.g., golf, tennis, windsurfing, etc.), personal enhancement services such as nutritional counselling, fitness assessment and guidance, yoga, and wellness to list but a few. Outdoor recreation programs, popular open recreation programs for self-directed activities, aerobic dance programs and many other activities round out the diverse programs that are offered on most post-secondary campuses throughout Canada and the United States. Most of these programs are administered by a staff of full-time administrators, especially in the American institutions, where programs can be of such magnitude that they operate on million dollar budgets and operate out of their own exclusive buildings (Matthews, 1984). Although the programs are smaller in Canadian post-
secondary institutions, they generally offer the same diversity of service.

The mission of any institution of higher learning is both broad and nebulous, leaving vast opportunity for individual interpretation (Dressel and Faircy, 1972). Generally, institutions of higher learning are considered the forerunners of society with their uncovering of new information through research and the dissemination of this knowledge through teaching. Globally speaking, institutions of higher education are generally respected for their contribution to educating, and thus preparing the future generations. Boaz (1987, p. 9) suggested that "higher education is respected for its contribution to human advancement, to improved quality of life, to individual and group fulfilment and to a highly significant role in society". Furthermore, institutions of higher learning frequently state that the "pursuit of excellence" is their "raison d'etre" which is broad enough to allow the multifaceted subunits that comprise a university to operate within and strive towards the institutional mission.

Campus Recreation Programs exist for reasons that put the field directly in line with the overall mission of the university—namely education, enhancing the quality of student life, and preparing people for the future. For example, from a co-curricular perspective, these programs
have the potential of developing and/or refining the recreational skills and interests of students so that they can continue to enjoy and accrue the benefits of recreational sports involvement in their post graduation years. Other program mandates justify program existence by stating that the program serves as a means of promoting school spirit and a feeling of affiliation with other students and the institution. Some suggest that recreational sports programs in higher education serve to provide a socially acceptable means for students to offset the pressures associated with higher education (Shannon, 1987) as well as playing a large role in student retention (Smith, 1991). Finally, some authors claim that recreational sport programs exist to enhance the quality of student life and make the educational experience more enjoyable (Lass, 1986).

Unquestionably, the socialization element is an important contribution that Campus Recreation programs make to the quality of student life. However, this is just one of the many contributions that these programs have the potential to make. For example, in an attempt to serve a diverse target group, many Campus Recreation programs have adopted the "something for everyone" marquee that implies that regardless of an individual's skill level, interest or previous experience, the program will provide an activity that members of the campus community will find
interesting and enjoyable. The recent boom in the sports club area has allowed participants to learn and refine their desired recreational skills on a regular basis (Cleave, 1984). The development and/or refinement of the individual's recreational skills is a precious gift that the institution can give to the participant, so that he/she might enjoy continued involvement in a chosen activity long after leaving the institution. In addition to maximizing the benefits derived from sports participation on a life-time basis, Weiner and Hunt (1983) reported that people who experience problems enjoying their leisure time may also experience problems in the workplace and with the quality of their lives. What people do in their leisure is of great concern to the United States (Matthews, 1984) and Canadian (Ferris, Kisby, Craig, Landry, 1987) governments. This concern supports the need for Campus Recreation to continue to provide its necessary and required services to individuals who are preparing to enter the "real world". Campus Recreation Programs can and do combat this reality, and the many participants who consume the programs while on campus have grasped the opportunity to develop the skills and interests necessary to continue participating following graduation.

The signals that society is moving to a "quality of life" mode are manifest. The puritan work ethic seems to
be taking a subordinate position relative to the desire of many who strive for an enhanced "quality of life" (Weiner and Hunt, 1983). With the increased practices of job sharing, shortened work weeks, flexible work schedules and a higher premium placed on the "quality of life", one can only speculate on the important role that Campus Recreation will play in preparing future generations for the challenges of utilizing leisure time in an enjoyable fashion.

Bonnano (1987, p. 49) described intramurals as "an important educational tool that can be used to develop character, promote fitness, foster lifetime recreational habits, and instill in the individual a sense of pride and confidence". Without question, the state of national fitness, especially among the youth of Canada and the United States is of great concern to both governments. The President's Council on Physical Fitness (1985) reported unsatisfactory levels of physical fitness within school-aged children in the United States (Politino, 1987). Ferris, et al., (1987) reported a similar finding for young Canadians as determined by the Canada Fitness Survey of 1985. Furthermore, they noted that a study commissioned by the Government of Canada in the early 1970's determined that Canadians were among the least fit individuals in the world.
The situation is not different in the United States. Summerfield and Priest (1987) noted that more than 50% of Americans pursuing enhanced fitness levels drop out of their programs within six months. They suggested that perhaps the fun element and the intrinsic reward of enjoyment were missing. It is this author's view that Campus Recreation Programs can instill this intrinsic value of ensuring the play element exists in all recreational pursuits. While attempting to instill this value and educate people on the merits of being active, the program can also increase the individual's fitness level. This assumption is supported by Rimmer and Kelly (1987) who indicated that a twice-per-week aerobics program, performed for 35-40 minutes each session, significantly improved cardiovascular fitness, lowered body fat and maintained the interest and attendance of the college-aged students throughout a 14 week semester. Perhaps this group enjoyed its association to such an extent that it continued to participate in comparable recreational activities upon leaving the institution? This long term goal of the program is certainly one of the best measures of the impact that Campus Recreation Programs within higher education has on its participants.

Raugh and Wall (1987) reported that self-improvement, having fun, enjoying the activity and improving total fitness were found to be the factors that motivated
university-aged students to remain participants. Campus Recreation Programs do place high premium on student leadership and student accountability for their own actions. Matthews (1984) noted that participant ownership and control over their own recreational expression are key ingredients to maintaining participant involvement over an extended period of time.

Essentially, the basic overall value of sport activities lies in the area of student involvement in the direction and implementation of such a program, thereby enabling each student participant to acquire many of the techniques essential to effective group living (Matthews, 1984, p.3).

The presence of a program implies nothing about the quality or the progress towards attaining the objectives listed above. The profession and program boundaries of campus recreation in higher education are ever-changing and progressive, forcing directors to stay current in the field or lag behind other schools. Furthermore, the communities housing institutions of higher learning offer a wide diversity of programs that are expertly prepared and marketed to the same student population that appeared to be a captive participant group for the campus recreation program (Weese and Sutton, 1987). Program directors must ensure that required program offerings are expertly conceived, promoted, staged and evaluated if his/her program is to survive in a competitive program market. To do so may require a transformed, empowered workforce that collectively strives toward the attainment
of pre-determined objectives and the fulfilment of an organizational vision.

Institutions have assumed a responsibility for providing for the leisure needs of their constituents (Shannon, 1987). However, in times of tight financial constraints, government reductions and other groups competing for the "campus population", strong leadership is required within the Director of Campus Recreation ranks.

Other Studies Using the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire Instrument

The Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ) was first developed in 1984 and has been used extensively in organizational leadership research and training. Sashkin (1988) noted that the instrument has been administered to over 20,000 North American managers with nearly ten percent of those data collected for the purposes of research. The LBQ has garnered considerable research support and is accepted as a valid measure of visionary leadership (Sashkin and Burke, 1989; Sashkin and Sashkin, 1990).

Sashkin and Sashkin (1990) utilized the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire to uncover the visionary leadership activities of leaders within a small school district and the relationship between leadership and building an organization's culture. A strong and clear relationship
was reported between visionary leadership behavior and productive team functioning. Caring and trusting leadership behaviors exhibited by the school district leaders directly correlated to the cultural measures. These relationships were consistent with the theories of visionary or transformational leadership (Sashkin and Sashkin, 1990).

Three doctoral dissertations have been completed utilizing the LBQ instrument and three others are currently underway (Sashkin, 1989).

Major (1988) conducted an ex post facto research study that measured the relationship between the success of high schools and the visionary leadership scores of principals (Sashkin, 1989). Principals of the 30 high performing secondary schools as measured by California Achievement test scores received higher visionary leadership ratings than the principals from the 30 low performing schools.

Stoner-Zemel (1988) focused on the relationship between absence or presence of visionary leaders on employees' perception of their work environment. Using LBQ-other measures, she uncovered a relationship between high visionary leadership scores and positive work environments (Sashkin, 1989).

Valley (1987) studied the relationship between visionary leadership in pastors and congregation growth.
While he reported no significant relationship, he did note that upon further inquiry, congregation growth was not perceived as a pastoral goal.

There are also three ongoing doctoral research projects that are employing the LBQ instrument (Sashkin, 1989). One study out of the University of Maine at Orono calls for the measurement of a relationship between LBQ scores of residence leaders and residence morale. A second study (Ray, 1988) originating out of East Texas State University will measure the effect of visionary leadership in mid-sized manufacturing plants. The third ongoing study is originating out of the University of Colorado-Boulder and is designed to study the relationship of LBQ scores of YMCA executives with other measures related to the executives and the organization.

Squire (1989) studied the relationship of visionary leadership scores within the National Sport Organization administrative offices of the Canadian Government in a masters degree thesis. She concluded that it is both desirable and possible to be a visionary leader in these offices and higher positioned officials procurred higher visionary leadership scores than lower ranking officials. She noted that this finding may be due to the Canadian Government's increased pressure on these high ranking officials to be more proactive and accountable for a detailed, long-term plan.
These researchers and others note that the LBQ instrument is an effective instrument for measuring visionary leadership in organizations. The utility and application of the LBQ instrument has been high despite its relatively recent development. The instrument will continue to serve researchers and organizational trainers seeking to measure the visionary leadership activities within organizations and groups.

**Summary**

The review of related literature has been presented in six sections. The leader-manager debate was presented with applications from the field of business. The debate was also presented in the context of the Director of Campus Recreation position. The second section of the review traced the distinct paths that the leadership theorists have charted beginning with the primitive trait theory approaches, through the behavioral leadership theories, past the situational leadership theories up to the contemporary transformational or visionary leadership theories. The third and fourth sections of the chapter focused on two outcome measures related to visionary leadership, organizational effectiveness and organizational culture. Theorists supporting or discounting the role of leadership on organizational culture and effectiveness were cited in these two sections. The fifth component of the "Review of
Literature" chapter delved into the role and function of Campus Recreation within the context of higher education. The final segment of this chapter presented other studies using the LBQ instrument. It was noted that this instrument has gathered considerable support as a research tool for those interested in measuring visionary leadership within groups.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the procedures that were utilized to explore the relationship and effect of visionary leadership on the development and penetration of organizational culture within Campus Recreation Programs. In addition, the researcher addressed the relationship between visionary leadership and organizational culture on program success as measured by student satisfaction with their respective program. Permission to conduct the study was granted after review by the Ohio State Human Subject Review Board (Protocol #90B0996).

The researcher utilized survey research methods and exploratory techniques to generate descriptive data for this study, which according to Miller and Smith (1983) are subject to five major types of errors. Frame error, selection error, sampling error and non-response error pose threats to external validity which limit the generalizability of the results beyond the selected sample. Measurement error threatens internal validity and limits the degree to which the results of the study are attributed to the factors considered in the study. The procedures used in this study to control for these errors
are outlined in this Chapter.

The main sections of this chapter include (a) Research Design, (b) Population and Subject Selection, (c) Pilot Study, (d) Instrumentation, (e) Data Collection Procedures, and (f) Data Analysis Procedures.

Research Design

The quasi-experimental research employed in this study was an ex post facto design as defined by Campbell and Stanley (1963). Data were collected "after the fact" as they occurred in the natural environment during the 1989-90 program year (September 1, 1989 - May 30, 1990). The ex post facto design allowed for measuring variables exclusively unlike experimental research methodologies that facilitate variable manipulation (Ary, et al., 1985). Despite this shortcoming, the selected design was appropriate for this study given the chosen population and the stated research objectives.

The researcher employed triangulation data collection methods which allowed for the integration of both quantitative and qualitative data. Utilizing multiple data collection methods has garnered considerable support in social science literature and been specifically supported as a valuable research methodology for organizational behavior research (Jick, 1984). Patton (1990, p. 187) suggested that triangulating methods is "one important way to strengthen a study design. The triangulation method was
used in this study to cross validate (Patton, 1990) and enrich the quantitative data produced by the paper and pencil measurements and allowed the researcher further opportunity to explore the relationships between visionary leadership, organizational culture, and student satisfaction scores. Where triangulation data collection methods were utilized, the quantitative measurements preceded the qualitative methods.

The Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ) instrument was used (with permission) in the study to measure the visionary leadership tendencies of the Campus Recreation Directors. This instrument has drawn considerable research support as a valid measure of visionary leadership at the executive levels of leadership (Sashkin and Burke, 1988; Sashkin and Sashkin, 1990). The instrument is designed to measure both the leader's perception of his/her visionary leadership tendencies and his/her subordinates' perceptions of the same construct. Sashkin (1988) noted that these multiple measures contribute to enhanced data validity and provide a more enriched indication of the visionary leadership situation. However, the use of subordinate measures do create problems if respondent confidentiality is not clearly indicated and respected. Respondent confidentiality was assured and observed in the study.
The LBQ instrument allows for further partitioning of the overall visionary leadership score into three distinct scales of visionary leadership. These three scales have been frequently identified in the literature as components of visionary leadership. The three scales include (a) visionary leadership behavior scale, (b) visionary leadership characteristics scale, and (c) visionary culture building scale. These scales provide more specific information relative to the different components of visionary leadership (e.g., the leaders' actions, traits and the team building activities) and the corresponding relationship to organizational culture and student satisfaction with their respective program.

The primary outcome variables were two measures of the organizational culture. These data were produced by two instruments (both used with permission) which included the Culture Strength Assessment (CSA) form and the Culture Building Activities (CBA) form. The CSA form measures the ways that people in the organization think and act relative to the organization's culture while the CBA instrument measures the degree to which the organization carries out the four critical, cultural activities that Parsons (1960) as well as Sashkin and Sashkin (1990) suggested were essential to organizational success and survival. Schein (1990) also offered support for the culture activities forwarded by Parsons (1960).
Sashkin and Sashkin (1990, p. 9) noted that "the more one (leader) engages in visionary leadership behaviors, the better the organization's culture looks in relation to Parsons' (1960) four critical functions". Both of these forms were packaged together and presented to study participants as one instrument which was labelled the Culture Assessment Instrument (CAI).

The secondary outcome variable was student satisfaction with their respective Campus Recreation Program as measured by the Target Population Satisfaction Index (TPSI). This instrument was administered to a stratified random sample of sophomore, junior and senior students as outlined in the "Data Collection Procedures" section of this Chapter.

A thorough description of the variables and the instruments designed to measure them appears in the "Instrumentation" section of this chapter.

Population and Subject Selection

The initial population for this study was all of the Campus Recreation Directors and selected staff members from Big Ten and Mid American Athletic Conference universities. There are ten universities in the Big Ten Conference and nine universities comprising the Mid American Conference. A description of each institution is presented in Appendix A.
Each university in the population offered a comprehensive Campus Recreation Program, had an organizational hierarchy suitable for the purposes of this study, and was located in close geographic proximity to allow the researcher to make campus visitations and conduct indepth interviews with study participants. In addition, each institution is relatively homogeneous with others in the respective conference. A complete listing of the population for the study is presented in Table 1.

Frame error occurs when there is incongruence between a list of the population and the actual population. Frame error was not a threat to the external validity of this research because the researcher used a complete listing of all the schools in each respective conference as listed in the College Blue Book (1990). Selection error occurs when individuals or groups appear more than once on a frame list, and therefore, they have a greater chance of being selected in the sample. The frame employed in this investigation was free of duplications, and therefore, selection error was controlled.

The 19 universities were reduced to eight (four from each conference) on the basis of the directors' visionary leadership scores as measured by the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire. The indepth analyses occurred with these eight schools. Since each school had an equal opportunity to be selected on the basis of their director's LBQ score,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Big Ten Conference</th>
<th>Mid American Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>Ohio University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>Ball State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>Bowling Green State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>Kent State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>University of Miami (Ohio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>University of Toledo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sampling error was controlled and did not pose a threat to external validity. While the reduced number of schools decreased the extent to which the results could be generalized, this strategy strengthened the internal validity of the research.

Campus Recreation Directors from each of the 19 universities were identified from the National Intramural Recreational Sports Directory (Holsberry and Kovac, 1990). Each director was mailed an introductory package and asked to complete and return a completed "Preliminary Information Form" and a Leadership Behavior Questionnaire-self instrument. In addition, the director was asked to provide the researcher with a current staff directory and organizational chart as well as the names of the two subordinates (selected on the basis of the researcher's criteria) who would be completing the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire-other instruments. These subordinates were required to be "high ranking" staff members positioned one level below the director on the organizational chart. Specifically, the directors were asked to secure the involvement of their most senior administrator at that level and a second person at the same organizational level who has worked in the program for at least two years. If more than one individual met the second condition, the subordinate who's last name began with the letter closest to "Z" in the alphabet was selected. These two
subordinates also provided data for round one of the research procedure designed to reduce the population to a manageable number.

Four institutions were drawn from each of the two conferences on the basis of Leadership Behavior Questionnaire scores of the Campus Recreation Directors (director's LBQ - self ratings and the two subordinate LBQ - other ratings for their respective director). The two directors with the highest LBQ scores for each conference and the two directors with the lowest LBQ scores comprised the selected sample (N=8). The high visionary leadership group from the Big Ten and Mid American Conferences was coded B1, B2, M1 and M2 while the low visionary leadership group was coded B3, B4, M3, and M4. To be considered for the selective sample, directors must have served in the executive leadership position at that school for a minimum of three years and indicate that they have a high degree of autonomy in their administrative role. Directors who did not meet these conditions were not considered in the selected sample.

The mean scores of the high visionary leader group and the low visionary leader group for each conference were tested for statistical difference using the two-sample t test for the difference in means procedure. The calculated t was compared to the critical t' value at the .05 level of significance.
Round two of the research procedure required indepth analyses of the eight schools selected on the basis of the round one results. Staff members from four hierarchical levels (first, second, third and fourth) of the organization from each school were selected using the systematic sampling procedure to participate in the proposed quantitative and qualitative research procedures. In total, 15 staff members (the director, two level two subordinates, four level three subordinates, and eight level four subordinates) were included in the round two data collection procedures from each campus. Within the second, third, and fourth levels, study participants were randomly selected utilizing the systematic random sampling technique. The breakdown of selected staff members from each of the four organizational levels appears in Figure 7. Round two data collection procedures were undertaken to determine the relationship between visionary leadership and organizational culture.

A stratified random sampling of students provided a measure of the campus satisfaction with the program. Sample size was determined using the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table which accounts for .05 percent of the population proportion at the 95 percent level of confidence. The Registrar's Office at each of the eight institutions was contacted to determine the specific classes that attract large numbers of non-freshmen
executive leadership level

one level below

two levels below

three levels below

1 Director

2 Associate Directors, Assistant Directors or senior ranking staff members

4 Program Co-ordinators or Supervisors

8 student managers, instructors or convenors

Figure 7. Sample from Each Organizational Hierarchy
students from a variety of academic disciplines. Once determined, the professors of these classes were contacted and arrangements made for the researcher or research assistant to attend the beginning portion of the class and administer the two-minute Target Population Satisfaction Index (TPSI) questionnaire. The researcher and researcher assistant also distributed TPSI questionnaires at the campus student center. The completed questionnaires were sorted on the basis of the respondents' academic ranks (e.g., freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) so that the respondent pool reflected the composition of total student population. The complete listing of sampled strata for each student level (sophomore, junior, senior) at each of the eight schools selected to participate in rounds two and three of the data collection procedures appears in Appendix A.

This research called for extensive, indepth analysis at each of the eight schools selected to participate in rounds two and three of the study. Researching either visionary leadership (Karmel, 1984) and/or organizational culture requires this degree of research rigor (Schein, 1990).

Pilot Study

A pilot study was carried out with two Canadian schools not included in the study sample that closely assimilated the Big Ten and Mid American Conference
schools chosen for this research. The University of Western Ontario and McMaster University are located in Southern Ontario and compete in varsity athletics within the Ontario University Athletic Association (O.U.A.A.). These two institutions possess the administrative structure within their Campus Recreation Program required for this research project. A description of these two institutions is presented in Appendix A.

The researcher employed all of the research procedures in the pilot study that would unfold in the dissertation research. The pilot study provided a valuable opportunity to evaluate and if necessary, modify all methods, instructions, instruments, data collection and evaluation procedures. In addition, the pilot study generated data from a population similar to the selected study population. The data produced in the pilot study was used to compute additional validity and reliability measures for all of the instruments employed in the investigation. The results of the validity and reliability procedures are presented in the Instrumentation section of this chapter.

Instrumentation

Seven instruments were used in the study to gather information required to meet the objectives of the study. Measurement error was reduced by utilizing appropriate data collection procedures and employing instruments that
were valid, reliable and suitable for the study. The seven instruments included (a) Preliminary Information Form, (b) Leader Behavior Questionnaire (self), (c) Leader Behavior Questionnaire (other), (d) Cultural Assessment Instrument, (e) Semi-Directed Focused Interview Technique (Director's script), (f) Semi-Directed Focused Interview Technique (Subordinate's script), and (g) Target Population Satisfaction Index.

**Preliminary Information Form.** This form is an original instrument that was used to gather preparatory information relative to the Campus Recreation Program and the subordinates who would be participating in the study by meeting the round one subject selection criteria. The form is comprised of three sections that uncovered (a) general information pertaining to the Campus Recreation Director, (b) information on the Campus Recreation Program at that particular institution, and (c) the two subordinates completing the LBQ-other instrument relative to the director. Also included in this form is a question designed to empirically determine the self-perceived degree of job autonomy held by each Campus Recreation Director and a question to uncover the most convenient day and time that subjects would be available in the event that they were selected to participate in subsequent aspects of the research. The "Preliminary Information Form" is presented in Appendix B.
Leader Behavior Questionnaire-self (LBQ-self). The Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ) was developed by Marshall Sashkin (1984) as both a research and training instrument (Sashkin, 1988). The LBQ instrument incorporates ten separate indices of visionary leadership which also contribute to one of three major scales of visionary leadership that also are measured by the instrument. The three scales include (a) visionary leadership behavior, (b) visionary leadership characteristics, and (c) visionary culture building. The ten specific indices of visionary leadership include (a) focused leadership, (b) communication leadership, (c) trust leadership, (d) respectful leadership, (e) risk leadership, (f) bottom-line leadership, (g) empowered leadership, (h) long-term leadership, (i) organizational leadership, and (j) cultural leadership. An explanation of the visionary leadership behavior scales, the specific indices, and items that comprise each indice are presented in Table 2. Similar information relative to the visionary leadership characteristics scale and the visionary culture building scales are presented in Table 3 and Table 4 respectfully. The actual LBQ-self and LBQ-other instruments (used with permission) are presented in Appendix C and Appendix D.

The third edition (1988) was based on considerable research and syntheses of the visionary leadership
Table 2

**Visionary Leadership Behavior Scale**

**Indice 1 - Focused Leadership** (Items 1, 11, 21, 31, 41)
Measures the leader's ability to clearly distinguish the important tasks and issues and focus the attention of others on these issues.

**Indice 2 - Communication Leadership** (Items 2, 12, 22, 32, 42)
Measures the leader's effectiveness in communicating issues and tasks to the membership in meaningful and appealing ways.

**Indice 3 - Trust Leadership** (Items 3, 13, 23, 33, 43)
Measures the leader's consistency in taking and holding a position and being honest with all members of the organization.

**Indice 4 - Respectful Leadership** (Items 4, 14, 24, 34, 44)
Provides a measure of the leader's respect for him/herself and other members of the organization as individuals.

**Indice 5 - Risk Leadership** (Items 5, 15, 25, 35, 45)
Measures the extent to which leaders take calculated risks in formulating a vision and his/her commitment to the vision once it is formulated. This indice also measures the extent to which the leader garners the commitment of others to the risk.

(Sashkin, 1988)
Table 3

Visionary Leadership Characteristics Scale

Indice 6 - Bottom-Line Leadership (Items 6, 16, 26, 36, 46)
Measures the extent to which that the leader believes he/she can influence people, organizational activities and bottom-line outcomes.

Indice 7 - Empowered Leadership (Items 7, 17, 27, 37, 47)
Measures the extent to which leaders gain power and influence for the purposes of empowering others to fulfil the vision of the organization.

Indice 8 - Long-term Leadership (Items 8, 18, 28, 38, 48)
Determines the extent to which the leader thinks and projects a vision over an extensive time frame. Visionary leaders focus on the long-term views and plans.

(Sashkin, 1988)
Table 4

**Visionary Culture Building Scale**

**Indice 9 - Organizational Leadership** (Items 9, 19, 29, 39, 49)

Measures the extent to which that the leader has an impact on the four organizational cultural functions identified by Parsons (1960) as (1) attaining organizational goals, (2) adapting to change, (3) coordinating the efforts of organizational members, and (4) positively contributing to the organization's culture.

**Indice 10 - Cultural Leadership** (Items 10, 20, 30, 40, 50)

Measures the extent to which leader can shape the culture of the organization so that it strengthens the functioning of the organization.

(Sashkin, 1988)
literature. The changes in the instrument were carried out to incorporate measures that parallel contemporary thinking in leadership research. The two earlier editions measured visionary leadership behaviors exclusively. The most recent edition of the LBQ instrument (1988) produces data relative to visionary leadership characteristics (e.g., the leader's belief that he/she can make an impact on the organization, his/her need for power to empower subordinates in the organization, and a determination of the time frame spanning the leader's vision). Furthermore, the 1988 version of the LBQ quantifies the leader's visionary culture building measures (e.g., the degree to which the leader impacts the development of the organization's culture relative to the four cultural functions related to organizational success, and whether or not the leader has developed a strong culture within his/her respective organization). Sashkin (1988) noted that these additions have strengthened the instrument advancing it to the current thinking in leadership. Unlike other instruments designed to measure visionary leadership (Kouzes and Posner's Leadership Practices Inventory and Bass' Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) the LBQ instrument is geared to the executive leader and includes all components of visionary leadership including the leader's personal characteristics, behaviors, and relative situational factors (Sashkin, 1989). Sashkin
noted that

... those using the LBQ were interested in the new concepts of leadership, not the old. These new approaches to leadership emphasize the leader's role in creating cultures that support excellence (Schein, 1985) and in 'transforming' followers and organizations (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). Our term for this concept is "visionary leadership" (1988, p. 1).

The instrument is a self-administered questionnaire designed to procure information on the three major scales and ten indices of visionary leadership for the individual under review. The instrument is designed to uncover both self-perceived (LBQ-self instrument) and subordinate-perceived measures (LBQ-other instrument) of the leader's behavior, characteristics and culture building tendencies. The instrument is comprised of 50 items, with five items providing a score for each of the ten indices. Sashkin (1988) noted that for each indice, "two items (40 percent) are negatively stated (this is not always obvious) and three (60 percent) positively stated, to help reduce social desirability bias" (p. 7).

The instrument utilizes a five-point likert scale scoring system and produces interval data. Respondents must select from one of five responses which range from: "completely true", "mostly true", "somewhat true", "a little true", and "not at all true". The instrument author noted that both he and the publisher of the instrument have secured the comments of LBQ users as a method of improving the design, wording and instructions associated
with the LBQ instrument (Sashkin, 1988). Sashkin noted that minor improvements in item wording have taken place since the 1984 edition of the instrument. The instrument is (1) based on the current thinking in visionary leadership, (2) authored by one of the forerunners in the field, and (3) founded exclusively on the research and theory pertaining to visionary leadership thereby rendering the LBQ instrument content valid (Sashkin, 1988). Face validity was assessed in the pilot study and respondents indicated that the questions were clearly presented and neither threatening nor offensive.

Scale reliability measures of the LBQ items were conducted by Stoner-Zemel (1988) for the first five indices of the instrument and with the pilot data produced in this investigation for the ten indices. Sashkin and Burke (1988) noted that the Stoner-Zemel (1988) reliability coefficients were found to be consistently stronger that those uncovered by Sashkin and Fulmer (1985). The scale reliability calculations from the pilot study exceeded those uncovered by Stoner-Zemel (1988) in four of the five common indices. The reliability measures of internal consistency (cronbach alphas) for both the Stoner-Zemel (1988) research and the pilot study are presented in Table 5.

Goodwin (1989) computed cronbach alpha's for each LBQ instrument indice. Her results indicated that there
Table 5.
Cronbach Alpha Reliability Measures for the LBQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. focused leadership</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. communication leadership</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. trust leadership</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. respectful leadership</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. risk leadership</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. bottom-line leadership</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. empowered leadership</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. long-term leadership</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. organizational leadership</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. cultural leadership</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Visionary Leadership Behavior Score .89
B. Visionary Leadership Characteristics Score .80
C. Visionary Culture Building Score .77
Overall Visionary Leadership Score .88
was no consistent pattern of inter-correlation and each indice of the LBQ measured a relatively unique component of visionary leadership.

Sashkin (1988) noted that the LBQ instrument has been used to determine if visionary leadership is related to (a) organizational productivity (Major, 1988, in progress), (b) perceived job satisfaction (Stoner-Zemel, 1988, in progress), and (c) the quality of the organization's culture (Ray, 1988, in progress). Based on these studies and his personal research, Sashkin (1988) noted that concurrent validity is satisfied in that "research data are continually demonstrating that LBQ scores are clearly associated with a variety of measures of organizational effectiveness" (p. 5).

The Organizational Design and Development group has collected data sets and produced norms from researchers using the LBQ instrument in management settings. The data presented in Table 6 outlines the norms gleaned from research studies using the revised LBQ instrument set in various management settings. The data are presented in three forms including (a) average scores for each of the ten indices, (b) scores for each of the three major scales of visionary leadership (visionary leadership behavior, visionary leadership characteristics, and visionary culture building), and (c) total visionary leadership scores for each of the five samples. The means and
Table 6.
Leader Behavior Questionnaire (self and other) Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A (s)</th>
<th>A (o)</th>
<th>B (s)</th>
<th>C (s)</th>
<th>D (s)</th>
<th>E (***</th>
<th>F (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Index I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (s)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (s)</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (s)</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (s)</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (***</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (s)</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLB</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>10.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLC</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCB</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  
**X = 193.3**  
**sd = 19.98**

Samples:  
A = Directors of Residence Halls;  
B = Adult Educators;  
C = Community Educators;  
D = Public School Principals;  
E = Samples A, B, C, D combined, and;  
F = Telecommunication managers  

(Sashkin, 1988, p. 24)
standard deviations for the LBQ-self and LBQ-other data generated in the pilot study are presented in Table 7.

**Leader Behavior Questionnaire-other (LBQ-other).** The Leader Behavior Questionnaire-other (LBQ-other) instrument (used with permission and presented in Appendix D) was used to obtain information relative to subordinate's perceptions of the visionary leadership elements of their respective director. This instrument was designed specifically for the subordinate measures with the language and content paralleling the LBQ-self instrument. The LBQ-other is identical to the LBQ-self except that the wording of the LBQ-other is written in the "third person". All items, scales, indices, type of data produced, and scoring procedures mirror the LBQ-self instrument.

**Cultural Assessment Instrument.** The Culture Assessment Instrument (CAI) is comprised of the Cultural Strength Assessment (CSA) form and the Culture Building Activities (CBA) form. Both of these instruments were developed by Rollin Glaser and Marshall Sashkin (1989) and used with permission in this study. For the purposes of this research, the two instruments were presented to respondents under one cover and entitled the Culture Assessment Instrument (CAI). In addition, the language used in the two instruments was slightly modified to reflect the Campus Recreation environment.
Table 7.

Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (self and other): Pilot Study Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indice:</th>
<th>Campus Recreation Director</th>
<th>Senior Subordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LBQ - self N = 2</td>
<td>LBQ - other N = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. focused leadership</td>
<td>X = 20.5</td>
<td>X = 21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd = 7.07</td>
<td>sd = 2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. communication leadership</td>
<td>X = 18.0</td>
<td>X = 18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd = 0.00</td>
<td>sd = 2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. trust leadership</td>
<td>X = 21.0</td>
<td>X = 20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd = 1.41</td>
<td>sd = 3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. respectful leadership</td>
<td>X = 21.0</td>
<td>X = 23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd = 0.00</td>
<td>sd = 2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. risk leadership</td>
<td>X = 20.0</td>
<td>X = 21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd = 1.41</td>
<td>sd = 2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>X = 100.5</td>
<td>X = 103.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Score</td>
<td>sd = 7.07</td>
<td>sd = 10.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. bottom-line leadership</td>
<td>X = 24.0</td>
<td>X = 21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd = 1.41</td>
<td>sd = 2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. empowered leadership</td>
<td>X = 20.0</td>
<td>X = 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd = 4.24</td>
<td>sd = 2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. long-term leadership</td>
<td>X = 21.5</td>
<td>X = 19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd = 3.53</td>
<td>sd = 5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>X = 65.5</td>
<td>X = 47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics Score</td>
<td>sd = 9.19</td>
<td>sd = 18.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. organizational leadership</td>
<td>X = 24.0</td>
<td>X = 31.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd = 0.00</td>
<td>sd = 20.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. cultural leadership</td>
<td>X = 22.0</td>
<td>X = 20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd = 2.82</td>
<td>sd = 3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Visionary Culture</td>
<td>X = 46.0</td>
<td>X = 37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Score</td>
<td>sd = 2.82</td>
<td>sd = 11.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Overall Visionary</td>
<td>X = 212.0</td>
<td>X = 203.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Score</td>
<td>sd = 7.07</td>
<td>sd = 16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Cultural Strength Assessment (CSA) measures the magnitude of the organization's culture based on the characteristics Deal and Kennedy (1982) associated with successful organizations. Deal and Kennedy (1982) noted that successful corporations (a) possessed a widely accepted philosophy of management, (b) held numerous ceremonies to celebrate organizational successes, (c) frequently referred to corporate "heros", (d) possessed numerous informal rules and codes of conduct that everyone followed, and (e) had adopted a "character" that was reflective in company traditions (Glaser and Sashkin, 1989). The questionnaire contains 25 items scored on a Likert scale which produce interval data related to the strength of the "organizational culture" characterized by Deal and Kennedy (1982).

The instrument is extensively based on the acclaimed work of Deal and Kennedy (1982) and therefore is rendered content valid. The questionnaire was tested for face validity with the pilot study sample and determined to be clear and straightforward. The mean scores for the three levels of the two schools that participated in the pilot study are presented in Table 8. Furthermore, two reliability measures were also computed for the CSA instrument based on the pilot study data. Cronbach alphas were computed to test the internal consistency of the instrument and a coefficient of .90 was uncovered. In
Table 8

**Culture Strength Assessment (CSA) Pilot Study Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Program A</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(University of Western Ontario)</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level two (N = 2)</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level three (N = 4)</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level four (N = 5)</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Program B</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(McMaster University)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level two (N = 1)</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level three (N = 4)</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level four (N = 6)</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
addition, the split-half reliability procedure was carried out to determine the reliability estimation and a coefficient of .92 was produced. A corrected Spearman-Brown reliability estimation was also computed producing a .96 split-half reliability estimation.

The Culture Building Activities (CBA) instrument is comprised of 20 questions which will also produce interval data. In order to discourage response set measurement errors, 13 of the questions are stated in positive terms while seven of the questions are stated in negative fashion. The instrument measures the perceptions of respondents relative to the way people in the organization behave and act as well as measuring the degree to which an organization carries out the four organizational cultural functions that Parsons (1960) and Sashkin and Sashkin (1990) suggested were critical to organizational success and survival. The four functions include (a) the organization's ability and willingness to adapt to change and meet the demands of the environment ("managing change"), (b) the degree to which the organization's members are focused on organizational goals ("goal focused"), (c) the degree to which the activities of staff members are coordinated to attain organizational goals ("coordinated teamwork"), and (d) the basic values and beliefs that support what customers/clients ("customer orientation") need (Sashkin, 1986). The data presented in
Table 9 are the norms for four samples (including the pilot study sample) subjected to the Culture Building Activities (CBA) instrument.

The instrument was assessed for face validity with the pilot study sample and determined to be suitable for the purposes of this investigation. Cronbach alphas were computed with the data generated in the pilot study and the coefficients were extremely low (See Table 10). The researcher uncovered a problem with the scoring key which was brought to the attention of the instrument author and subsequently corrected. The corrected instrument was used in the dissertation research. Sashkin (1990) expressed satisfaction that the instrument holds great promise for the assessment and study of organizational cultures.

Developing a positive organizational culture has been identified as a critical aspect of the leader's role (Bennis, 1984; Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Sashkin, 1986; Sashkin and Burke, 1988; Sashkin and Sashkin, 1990, and; Yukl, 1989a). Schein (1985) noted that this function of creating a positive organizational culture was the most important component of the leadership role. Moreover, Sashkin (1988) confirmed that individuals scoring high in visionary leadership as measured by the LBQ instrument (a) lead more productive organizations, (b) have more satisfied employees, and (c) lead organizations that possess a stronger organizational culture related to the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Managing Change</th>
<th>Achieving Goals</th>
<th>Coordinated Teamwork</th>
<th>Customer Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Key:
I = Hospital administrators, Medical Center (N=12)
II = Managers in simulation training program (N=22)
III = Managers in simulation training program (N=19)
IV = Weese Pilot Study Data (N=22)
Table 10.

Cronbach Alphas for the Culture Building Activities (CBA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Weese Pilot Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cronbach Alpha</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Change</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving Goals</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Teamwork</td>
<td>-.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Orientation</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parsonian functions.

A copy of the Culture Assessment Instrument (CAI) is presented in Appendix E.

**Semi-Directed Focused Interview Schedules.** This interview technique is used as part of the triangulation method to complement and enrich the quantitative data obtained through the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ) and the Cultural Assessment Instrument (CAI) instruments. Appointments were made at each of the eight schools for personal interviews with the Director of Campus Recreation, two "level one" staff members, four "level two" staff members and eight "level three" staff members. All interviews followed an interview schedule that was pretested for content validity by a panel of experts and tested for face validity with the pilot study sample.

The visionary leadership and organizational culture components of the interview scripts assimilated the LBQ and CAI instruments and were evaluated by two different panels of experts. The individuals serving on the visionary leadership and organizational culture panel of experts along with their instructions for conducting their assessments are presented in Appendices I and J respectively. The pilot study sample confirmed that the questions were straightforward and non-threatening. The interview schedules were modified on the basis of content and face
validity assessments. Patton (1990) offered that the use of an interview schedule minimizes interview effects and facilitates data analysis procedure.

The interview schedules included a variety of open-ended questions presented in presupposition form. Patton (1980, 1990) noted that the use of the presupposition format is advantageous in that questions do not produce dichotomous responses and facilitate more flowing dialogue between the interviewer and interviewee.

Interviews with the directors followed a "Director's Script" that contained a variety of open-ended questions specific to his/her leadership and the program's organizational culture. The "Director's Script" is presented in Appendix F. Subordinate interviews followed the Subordinate's Interview Script schedule (presented in Appendix G) which contained a listing of open-ended questions specific to the leadership of the director and the culture existing within the organization.

Interviews with each Campus Recreation Director were 60 minutes in duration while the interviews with each of the other 14 staff members required 20 minutes to complete. Where possible, subordinate interviews were conducted on campus. In the event that this was not possible, the researcher attempted to meet the individual at another location for a personal interview. Failing these two conditions, the interview was conducted over the
telephone. All interviews were tape recorded to ensure accuracy of information and facilitate the data analyses. Interviewee confidentiality was guaranteed and respected.

**Target Population Satisfaction Index.** The Target Population Satisfaction Index (TPSI) is an original instrument designed to uncover perceptual information from members of the campus community relative to their personal satisfaction with their Campus Recreation Program (See Appendix H). The mandate of Campus Recreation Programs generally includes a statement related to the provision of required programs and services to meet the recreational activity needs of a specific target population. Since the vast majority of participants in a Campus Recreation Program are students, they were selected as the target population for this measure.

The TPSI instrument was designed to uncover the level of satisfaction that the campus community has for their program. The researcher recognized that a satisfaction measure is only one indicator of program success. Other measures including staff retention and renewal, participant ratios, or size of budget may be additional success indicators. The researcher was interested in the degree to which the program satisfies the major target population and therefore the measure of student satisfaction was appropriate.
The TPSI instrument is comprised of closed-ended questions measured on a Likert scale which produced interval data. The content for the instrument was drawn from the literature and tested for face validity with a randomly selected group of students from The Ohio State University. Appropriate changes were made to the instrument including the provision of a "not applicable" response. The instrument was forwarded to a panel of experts for an assessment of content validity. A listing of the panel of experts along with their instructions is presented in Appendix K. The instrument was also tested for face validity with the participants in the pilot study. Cronbach alphas were computed (.87) on the pilot study data to assess the internal consistency of the instrument. The split-half reliability assessment was computed for the pilot data and yielded a reliability coefficient of .69. A corrected Spearman-Brown reliability estimation was also computed for these pilot data producing a split-half reliability assessment of .81. The instrument was determined to be a valid and reliable measure of campus satisfaction with a Campus Recreation Program.

To detect response set errors, three of the 14 questions had a reverse scoring system. Obvious response set errors were detected by comparing these questions with the other eleven questions. Respondent's questionnaires
were not considered if obvious response set errors appeared on the completed questionnaire. In addition, respondents indicating that they were not aware of the Campus Recreation Programs were eliminated from the sample frame.

Data Collection Procedures

The procedures for collecting data and maximizing return rates for this research were guided by the recommendations of Ary et al. (1985), Dillman (1978) and Isaac and Michael (1987). It was anticipated that non-response error would be minimized or eliminated through the employment of these techniques, therefore not posing a threat to external validity.

An introductory letter was carefully prepared and forwarded to each of the 19 Campus Recreation Directors at the Big Ten and Mid American Conference schools. This letter introduced the investigator, the purpose of the research, the importance of their participation in the study, and the financial support and endorsement of the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA). The letter explained the research project and asked directors to give consideration to the two subordinates who would be providing LBQ-other data in the round one data collection procedures (respecting the conditions outlined in the "Population and Sample Selection" section of this Chapter). The directors were
advised that the research package would be forwarded to them in three days. A copy of this letter appears in Appendix L.

The research package that followed the introductory letter was mailed flat to the Director of Campus Recreation at each of the 19 institutions. The package included information for the director to complete and return to the researcher as well as two sealed packages, one for each of the two subordinates who were also instructed to return the completed information directly to the researcher. The director packages included an instructional letter (See Appendix M), a "Preliminary Information Form", one LBQ-self instrument, a self-addressed, stamped envelope, and an incentive candy. Directors were asked to forward to the researcher a copy of their organizational chart and staff directory. The subordinate packages were also presented flat and each included an introductory letter (See Appendix N), one LBQ-other instrument, a self-addressed, stamped envelope, and an incentive candy. Both groups were instructed to forward their completed information to the researcher within three days of receiving the introductory package and were given a fax number in the event that they preferred to fax their materials. Respondents were assured that their completed questionnaires would be held in strict confidence to facilitate sincere responses. All respondents were offered
an article summarizing the findings and outlining the implications for the practitioner.

If the LBQ instruments were not returned within ten days, a postcard reminder was forwarded directly to the non-respondent reminding him/her to complete and return the instrument. A copy of the reminder postcard that was forwarded to non-responding directors appears in Appendix O while the reminder postcard that was sent to non-responding Subordinates appears in Appendix P. A phone call reminder took place after 17 days and the final deadline for return of these materials was five weeks after the initial distribution of the LBQ instrument packages.

Round two of the data collection procedures with the eight schools that qualified for inclusion in subsequent data collection rounds of the study began after the analysis of the round one data. An introductory letter outlining the in-depth nature and details of this segment of the study was forwarded to the selected directors (See Appendix Q) advising them of their selection in the extensive portion of the research. Research Assistants were identified on each campus by the Campus Recreation Director. These individuals were contacted by the researcher and advised of the proposed research study. A letter summarizing their duties and responsibilities was prepared and forwarded to them (See Appendix R). Round two
packages were forwarded directly to each of the research assistants.

The researcher and research assistant from each institution identified the 14 selected subordinates to complete the Cultural Assessment Instruments and participate in the Semi-Directed Focused Interviews. A systematic random sampling method was employed as outlined in the "Population and Subject Selection" section of this chapter. Each of the 14 subordinates was subsequently presented with a research package that included an instructional letter (Appendix S), a Culture Assessment Instrument (CAI) questionnaire presented flat, guarantee of confidentiality, an enclosed return envelope or the option to fax the researcher his/her completed materials, and a promise of an article upon completion of the research. Study participants were asked to return their completed materials to the research assistant or the researcher within three days.

The third and final data collection phase of this study was the qualitative data collection procedures inherent in the triangulation method. The researcher scheduled appointments for each of the eight campuses to conduct the Semi-Directed Focused Interviews with each Campus Recreation Director and the fourteen subordinates completing the CAI materials for each school. The research assistant from each institution facilitated the scheduling
of these appointments. A copy of the letter confirming the agreed upon campus visitations appears in Appendix T.

The interviews were tape recorded allowing the researcher to be attentive to the interviewee. The qualitative data was transcribed verbatim which according to Patton (1990, p. 349) is "the essential raw data for qualitative analysis".

The researcher also collected round three data from a stratified random selection of students (sophmores, juniors, and seniors) relative to their satisfaction with the Campus Recreation Program. Three hundred and seventy five completed TPSI forms that met both the program awareness and no response set error conditions were collected to complete the sample frame for each school. The researcher spent a minimum of two days on each campus collecting round three data through the quantitative and qualitative methods. In an attempt to minimize measurement error in the qualitative data collection procedures, the researcher incorporated the suggestions for conducting face-to-face interviews offered by Dillman (1978), Kidder and Judd (1986), and Patton (1990). The campus visitations and Semi-Directed Focused Interviews were conducted over a six-week period.

Data Analysis Procedures

This portion of the chapter outlines how the data were analyzed relative to the seven research objectives of
the study. The researcher used the computer services and resource support of The Ohio State University Statistical Consulting Services Department. An IBM-XT computer was also utilized to store and analyse the data. Data analyses were facilitated through the use of "Statistix", "SPSS" and "SAS" statistical computer programs. The researcher ensured the accurate recording of data into the computers and entered data were checked for accuracy prior to data analyses.

The correlation computations for each conference were reported based on the degree of association chart (Davis, 1971) that appears in Table 11. Hypotheses testing for each research question utilized the combined data from both conferences. All computed values were compared to critical values at the .05 level of significance.

The "Preliminary Information Form" provided informative data relative to the study participants and a means for identifying the best mode of communications between the researcher and the study participants. This form also provided an empirical measure of the degree of autonomy held by the Campus Recreation Director. Directors who did not indicate that they possessed a high degree of autonomy in their position were eliminated from the second and third rounds of the study.

The LBQ (self) and the LBQ (other) provided a visionary leadership score for all 19 Campus Recreation
Directors participating in the study. A visionary leadership score for each director was calculated based on the LBQ-self and two LBQ-other data. Director's scores could range from a minimum of 150 to a maximum of 750. The two directors from each conference who attained the highest LBQ scores comprised the high visionary leadership group while the two lowest scoring directors from each conference were included in the low visionary leadership group. The high and low visionary leadership groups were tested for a statistical difference using the two-sample t test for the difference of means test procedure.

Research objective one was addressed utilizing correlation statistical analyses. Pearson product moment correlations were computed to determine the direction and magnitude of the relationship between the visionary leadership scores (LBQ measures) of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores (CSA measures). The statistical treatments considered four components of visionary leadership including the total visionary leadership score and the three visionary leadership scale scores for the Campus Recreation Directors. The use of correlation analyses was appropriate given the research objective and the interval nature of the data.

The second research objective allowed the researcher to determine if a significant difference existed between
programs (those led by high visionary leaders and those led by low visionary leaders) relative to carrying out each of the four culture building activities. The CBA instrument is comprised of four different culture building activities which were considered in the selected multivariate statistical treatment. A MANOVA statistical treatment was employed to consider the differences in leadership rating, conference, and the four culture building activities. In the event that a significant difference was produced, the researcher employed separate ANOVA computations to analyse the difference between the high visionary leadership group and the low visionary leadership group relative to the specific culture building activity. The researcher also investigated interaction effects that existed between leadership ranking (high or low) and conference relative to each specific culture building activity.

A 2 X 2 X 3 factorial design was employed to address the third research objective. The researcher sought to determine if a difference existed between the high and low leadership groups relative to the penetration of organizational culture at the second, third and fourth levels of administration. The factorial design also accounted for the effects of conference. Computed F ratios were measured against the critical F ratios at the .05 level of confidence in all main and interaction effect
comparisons.

The fourth, fifth and sixth research objectives required the researcher to study the relationship between (a) the directors' visionary leadership scores, (b) the strength of the strong organizations' culture, and (c) the organizations' culture building activities (collectively and independently) with student satisfaction scores for their respective Campus Recreation Program. Target Population Satisfaction Index (TPSI) scores were tabulated and mean scores computed for each program. Mean scores produced by this instrument could range from 14 to 70 points. "Not Applicable" responses were assigned the strata mean score for that school and question (Sonquist and Dunkelberg, 1977).

The selected statistical treatments were appropriate for each of these objectives given the interval nature of the data and the research objectives. The researcher recognized that correlation analyses indicate relationship only which can not lead to cause and effect conclusions.

Research objective seven required the researcher to perform "inductive analyses" which Patton (1980) referred to as the study of natural variation in the data. This type of reflection, termed "content analysis" called for a thorough analyses of the interview data by coding and classifying the data into unique categories. This intuitive process and struggle was described by Patton
(1980, p. 313) when he noted that

... uncovering patterns, themes, and categories is a creative process that requires making carefully considered judgements about what is really significant and meaningful in the data. Since qualitative analysts do not have a statistical test to tell them when an observation or pattern is significant, they must rely on their own intelligence, experience, and judgement.

The high rated programs were compared to the low rated programs to determine if significant difference existed between the two groups. A two-sample t statistic was computed and compared to the critical t value at the .05 level of confidence. The organizational values and critical success factors offered by interviewees from both the high rated and low rated groups were compared to determine if a significant difference existed. The recorded interview tapes were content analysed with major tendencies and supporting quotations extracted and reported.

The study is presented graphically in Figure 8.
Table 11
Magnitude of Association for Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Perfect Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70 - 0.99</td>
<td>Very High Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50 - 0.69</td>
<td>Substantial Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30 - 0.49</td>
<td>Moderate Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10 - 0.29</td>
<td>Low Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01 - 0.09</td>
<td>Negligible Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Davis, 1971)
TRIANGULATED
DATA COLLECTION METHODS
(PER PROGRAM)

QUANTITATIVE
- 3 LBQ MEASURES
- 15 CSA MEASURES
- 15 CBA MEASURES
- 375 TPSI MEASURES

QUALITATIVE
- 15 INTERVIEWS

ROUND ONE
DATA COLLECTION
AND ANALYSES


determine

difference between high visionary
group and low visionary group

Test:
Two sample t-test using
LBQ-self and LBQ-other
quantitative data.

ROUND TWO
DATA COLLECTION
AND ANALYSES

1. Relationship between visionary leadership
   and organizational culture.
2. Difference between high and low
   leadership groups - culture building
   activities.
3. Difference between high and low
   leadership groups - penetration of
   organizational culture.

Test:
1. Correlation between
   LBQ scores and CSA scores
2. MANOVA between the
   high and low leadership
   groups for the four
   culture building
   activities (LBQ, CBA)
3. 2x2x3 factorial design
   (2 = leadership, LBQ)
   (2 = conference)
   (3 = level)
   culture * CSA

ROUND THREE
DATA COLLECTION
AND ANALYSES

4. Relationship between visionary
   leadership and student satisfaction.
5. Relationship between organizational
   culture and student satisfaction.
6. Relationship between culture building
   activities (4) and student satisfaction.
7a. Difference between high and low
    rated programs (student satisfaction
    score) - organizational values.
7b. Difference between high and low
    rated programs (student satisfaction
    score) - critical success factors.

Test:
4. Correlation between LBQ
   and TPSI scores.
5. Correlation between CSA
   and TPSI scores.
6. Correlation between CBA
   (4) and TPSI scores.
7a. Two sample t-test of
    high and low rated
    programs. Content
    analysis of qualitative
    data.
7b. Two sample t-test of
    high and low rated
    programs. Content
    analysis of qualitative
    data.

Figure 8. Graphic Presentation of the Study
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the statistical computations for the data produced by the quantitative and qualitative research procedures undertaken to answer the seven research questions. The quantitative data were generated by instruments specifically developed to measure either visionary leadership, organizational culture, or student satisfaction with the Campus Recreation Program. The results of reliability tests for each instrument utilized are also presented in this Chapter. The qualitative data, used to confirm and enrich the qualitative findings were derived from 120 interviews (15 from each program).

The chapter is presented in four main sections which include (1) visionary leadership, (2) organizational culture, (3) student satisfaction, and (4) research questions and hypotheses testing. Each of the seven research questions are answered in the Chapter.

Visionary Leadership

Round one data collection procedures produced a collective return rate of 84.21% for the Big Ten and Mid American Conference schools. Nine of the 10 Big Ten
Conference Campus Recreation Directors and seven of the nine Mid American Conference Campus Recreation Directors returned their completed research instruments prior to the final deadline date. Completed Leadership Behavior Questionnaire-other (LBQ-other) forms were received from a total of 31 subordinates. A single LBQ-other was completed and returned from one university. Upon further inquiry, it was determined that the administrative structure within the Campus Recreation Program at this institution was inappropriate for the purposes of this research and the program was declared ineligible for rounds two and three of the data collection procedures. The descriptive statistics computed on the LBQ-self and LBQ-other data sets are presented in Table 12. In addition, cronbach alphas were computed on the study data to determine the interitem reliability of the LBQ instrument scales and categories. These data appear in Table 13.

A summation of the LBQ-self and two LBQ-other measures provided an overall visionary leadership score for each Campus Recreation Director represented in the sample. The top two scores from each conference were compared to the lowest two scores from each conference. A two sample t test uncovered a significant difference between the high and low visionary leadership groups within each conference. A calculated t value of 7.43 was
Table 12

Leadership Behavior Questionnaire Descriptive Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indice</th>
<th>Campus Recreation (N = 16)</th>
<th>Senior Subordinates (N = 31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LBQ - self</td>
<td>LBQ - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focused leadership</td>
<td>X = 20.4</td>
<td>X = 19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 1.36</td>
<td>SD = 3.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication leadership</td>
<td>X = 18.7</td>
<td>X = 17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 1.99</td>
<td>SD = 3.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trust leadership</td>
<td>X = 20.5</td>
<td>X = 19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 2.16</td>
<td>SD = 3.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respectful leadership</td>
<td>X = 22.7</td>
<td>X = 20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 1.39</td>
<td>SD = 3.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risk leadership</td>
<td>X = 20.8</td>
<td>X = 18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 1.74</td>
<td>SD = 3.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISIONARY LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCORE (VLBS)</td>
<td>X = 103.3</td>
<td>X = 95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 5.32</td>
<td>SD = 15.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bottom-line leadership</td>
<td>X = 22.1</td>
<td>X = 19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 1.99</td>
<td>SD = 3.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empowered leadership</td>
<td>X = 19.6</td>
<td>X = 17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 3.22</td>
<td>SD = 2.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long-term leadership</td>
<td>X = 21.2</td>
<td>X = 18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 3.17</td>
<td>SD = 3.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISIONARY LEADERSHIP CHARACTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTICS SCORE (VLCS)</td>
<td>X = 62.9</td>
<td>X = 55.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 7.16</td>
<td>SD = 8.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizational leadership</td>
<td>X = 21.9</td>
<td>X = 19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 2.12</td>
<td>SD = 4.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural leadership</td>
<td>X = 19.7</td>
<td>X = 18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 2.15</td>
<td>SD = 2.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISIONARY CULTURE BUILDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCORE (VCBS)</td>
<td>X = 41.6</td>
<td>X = 38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 3.50</td>
<td>SD = 6.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>X = 207.8</td>
<td>X = 189.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score (Total)</td>
<td>SD = 13.94</td>
<td>SD = 29.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13
Cronbach Alpha Reliability Measures for the LBQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indice</th>
<th>LBQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(self and other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 self; 31 other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. focused leadership</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. communication leadership</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. trust leadership</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. respectful leadership</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. risk leadership</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. bottom-line leadership</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. empowered leadership</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. long-term leadership</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. organizational leadership</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. cultural leadership</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. VLBS   .92
B. VLCS   .83
C. VCBS   .80
Total     .95
produced for the Big 10 Conference while a calculated t value of 13.45 was computed for the Mid American Conference schools (see Table 14). It was determined that the groups were significantly different at the 95% confidence level based when both calculated t values were found to exceed critical value of 3.18 (df = 3).

Organizational Culture Findings

The Culture Assessment Inventory (CAI) was completed by 14 selected subordinates from each of the eight schools for a 100% response rate. The CAI is comprised of two separate organizational culture instruments, the Culture Strength Assessment (CSA) and the Culture Building Activities form (CBA). The descriptive statistics for the CSA and CBA data appear in Tables 15 and 16 respectively.

A split-half reliability test yielded a reliability coefficient of .70 for the CSA instrument based on the study data. Consistent with the split-half reliability assessment procedure, a corrected Spearman-Brown reliability estimation of .83 was also computed. The actual reliability for the culture strength rests between these two coefficients. A cronbach alpha coefficient of .89 was produced as a measure of interitem reliability for the CSA instrument.

Interitem reliability coefficients were also computed for each of the four culture building functions represented in the CBA instrument. The results of these
Table 14
Differences Between High and Low Visionary Leadership Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean LBQ Score</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>617.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>7.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>513.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = .017

Mid American Conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean LBQ Score</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>617.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>13.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>536.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = .005
Table 15

Descriptive Statistics for Visionary Leadership and Culture Strength Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N = 2</th>
<th>N = 4</th>
<th>N = 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>68.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>53.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>83.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

Descriptive Statistics for Visionary Leadership and Culture Building Activities Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Managing Change</th>
<th>Achieving Goals</th>
<th>Coordinated Teamwork</th>
<th>Customer Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td>19.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>18.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>17.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>16.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>17.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>21.14</td>
<td>18.28</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>19.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>18.21</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>18.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>19.64</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>19.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 14
computations produced the following cronbach alpha coefficients: (1) .62 for the "managing change" item, (2) .34 for the "achieving goals" item, (3) .24 for the "coordinated teamwork" item, and (4) .22 for the "customer orientation" item.

**Student Satisfaction**

The Target Population Satisfaction Index (TPSI) was administered to representative number of sophomores, juniors and freshmen from each of the eight schools under investigation. Three hundred and seventy five respondents completed the instrument in each of eight institutions (except B4) using the qualifying criteria outlined in Chapter III. One hundred and thirty completed TPSI forms (seniors only) were returned from the B4 institution. An analysis of variance procedure was conducted using the sophomore, junior, and senior data produced by the seven institutions. No significant differences were uncovered between the three ranks at the .05 level of confidence (see Table 17). Therefore, "senior" only data from the B4 institution was considered representative for the purposes of this investigation and used throughout the remaining segments of the study. The group means for each of the three student ranks appear in Table 18.

Reliability measures were undertaken for the TPSI instrument using the study data. A split-half reliability estimate produced a coefficient of .67 while a corrected
Table 17

Analysis of Variance for Student Satisfaction and Student Status

<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>2</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>153.60</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>156.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = .829

critical F (2,18) = 3.55 (.05 level of confidence)
Table 18

Descriptive Statistics for TPSI Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Student Rank</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean TPSI Score</th>
<th>Calculated TPSI Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>48.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>47.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>49.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>55.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>50.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>51.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>49.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>50.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>50.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>42.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>51.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>48.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>48.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>53.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>51.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>53.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>46.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>45.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>44.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>49.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>52.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>53.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spearman-Brown coefficient of .80 was produced for the same data set. The true reliability coefficient is embedded between these two calculations. In addition, an overall interitem reliability test produced a cronbach alpha of .79 for the TPSI study data set.

Research Questions and Hypotheses Testing

Pearson product moment statistical treatments were performed on the aggregate data for both conferences to test the hypotheses relating to research questions one, four, five, and six. Data were also analysed by conference and reported in comparison to the Davis (1971) magnitude of association classifications (see Table 11). Grouped data from both conferences were used to test hypotheses and address each of the four research questions. Calculated r values were compared to the critical r values at the 95% level of confidence. If the calculated r value for the combined data exceeded the critical r value (df = 6), the null hypothesis under review was rejected.

Research question two required the use of MANOVA and ANOVA statistical treatments. Research question three called for a 2 X 2 X 3 factorial design. Grouped data from both conferences were used in the statistical computations. If the calculated F value for the combined conference data exceeded the critical F value, the hypothesis in question was rejected at the .05 confidence interval. Research questions were answered based on the results of the
hypotheses tests.

The seventh research question was addressed by comparing the qualitative data from high rated programs (student satisfaction ratings) with the qualitative data from the low rated programs.

Research Question #1

1. Is there a relationship between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture score for the program?

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were computed on the interval data produced by the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ) and Culture Strength Assessment (CSA) instrument. The researcher failed to reject each of the four null hypotheses related to the first research question. Therefore, it was concluded that no significant relationship exists between visionary leadership and organizational culture. The results of the statistical computations related to the first research question are presented in the following section.

Visionary Leadership Scores and Organizational Culture Scores

A very high association \( (r = .74) \) was uncovered between the overall visionary leadership scores of Big Ten Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational cultures for the respective administrative units. A
substantial association ($r = .51$) was produced for the same measures within the Campus Recreation Programs housed in the Mid American Conference schools. These data appear in Table 19.

The results of the qualitative data analyses supported the findings relative to the first research question. The Campus Recreation Program at Bl obtained the highest organizational culture score within the Big Ten Conference ($Bl = 995$). A level three staff member from this program commented that the director has greatly enhanced the organizational culture since his appointment four years ago, primarily due to improving the physical characteristics of the office. In her opinion, the addition of carpet for staff offices, fresh paint around the facility, and business cards for full time staff members has improved staff morale and made for a better working environment. By contrast, a level two staff member from the program that procured the lowest organizational culture score ($B4 = 765$) relayed that his director has been ineffective in focusing the organization, resulting in a confused, disjointed organization. Different components of the program operate in isolation without any coordination or integration. A level three staff member from the same program commented that she is rarely made aware of events transpiring in other areas of the department unless she reads about them in the school.
newspaper. Staff members do not know fellow employees or have an appreciation for their contribution to the mandate of the department. Another level two staff member from B4 commented that the director "may have a vision for the department, but he doesn't share it with us. I'd like to have more of a focus than we currently have. (For example) Here's where we are today, here's where we hope to be five years from now, here's what it might take to get there".

Examples of the relationship between visionary leadership and organizational culture within the Mid American Conference were also gleaned from the qualitative data collection procedures. Communication skills are requisite to being a visionary leader (Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Sashkin, 1987). The direct relationship between low visionary leadership and organizational culture is illuminated in the comment "I know what I want to happen, but I don't always get my message across effectively" made by the director of the M3 (low leadership group). The organizational culture score for the M3 program was 972 (lowest in the Mid American Conference). Conversely, a level three staff member from the program earning the highest organizational culture score (M2) commented that his director is effective as a leader because of his advanced communication abilities. This staff member commented that his director communicates in such a way that "he makes you feel that you are the most important
part of the operation, and that he counts on you as much as the next person. As a result, you're willing to go the extra mile for him".

The first null hypothesis was:

HO1 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores of their program.

This hypothesis was tested at the .05 level of confidence by computing a Pearson product moment correlation coefficient using the aggregate data from both conferences. A correlation coefficient of .48 was uncovered which did not exceed the critical r value of .707 (df = 6) and consequently, the first null hypothesis could not be rejected. The data appear in Table 19.

Visionary Leadership Behavior Scores and Organizational Culture Scores

Within the Big Ten Conference schools, a very high association (r = .75) was uncovered between the visionary leadership behavior scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores for their respective administrative unit. A substantial association (r = .62) was found between the same variables for the Mid American Conference schools (see Table 20).
Table 19

Relationship Between Visionary Leadership Scores and Organizational Culture Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Big Ten</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>570.3</td>
<td>67.29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>900.8</td>
<td>97.44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid American</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>576.8</td>
<td>47.31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>1084.3</td>
<td>94.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Both</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>573.5</td>
<td>53.96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>992.5</td>
<td>132.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

critical r (df = 6) = .707
The second null hypothesis was:

**HO2 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership behavior scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores of their program.**

A correlation of the aggregate data for the visionary leadership behavior scores and the organization culture scores produced a correlation coefficient of .53. The second null hypothesis could not be rejected at the .05 level of confidence. The data and calculations supporting this decision are presented in Table 20.

**Visionary Leadership Characteristics Scores and Organizational Culture Scores**

A very high association ($r = .75$) was determined between the visionary leadership characteristics scores of Big Ten Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture score for their respective organization. The correlation between the same two variables within the Mid American Conference schools produced a correlation coefficient of .30 (moderate association). These data appear in Table 21.

The third null hypothesis for the study was:

**HO3 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership characteristics scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores of their program.**

A correlation coefficient of .48 was produced for the two variables within both conferences. The third null hypothesis could not be rejected at the .05 level of
Table 20

**Relationship Between Visionary Leadership Behavior Scores and Organizational Culture Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Big Ten</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership Behavior</td>
<td>289.3</td>
<td>36.35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>900.8</td>
<td>97.44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid American</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership Behavior</td>
<td>294.0</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>1084.3</td>
<td>94.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Both</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership Behavior</td>
<td>291.6</td>
<td>27.73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>992.5</td>
<td>132.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

critical $r$ (df = 6) = .707
Table 21

Relationship Between Visionary Leadership Characteristics Scores and Organizational Culture Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Big Ten</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>165.5</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>900.8</td>
<td>97.44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid American</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>170.8</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>1084.3</td>
<td>94.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Both Conferences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>168.1</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>992.5</td>
<td>132.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

critical r value (df = 6) = .707
confidence. The data and relationships appear in Table 21.

**Visionary Culture Building Scores and Organizational Culture Scores**

A very high association ($r = .70$) was determined between the visionary culture building scores of Big Ten Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores for their respective administrative unit. A similar calculation within the Mid American Conference produced a correlation coefficient of $0.58$ (substantial association) (see Table 22).

**Visionary Culture Building Scores and Organizational Culture Scores**

A very high association ($r = .70$) was determined between the visionary culture building scores of Big Ten Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores for their respective administrative unit. A similar calculation within the Mid American Conference produced a correlation coefficient of $0.58$ (substantial association) (see Table 22).

The fourth null hypothesis was:

$H_{04}$ - No direct relationship exists between the visionary culture building scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores of their program.

A correlation coefficient of $0.32$ was produced between visionary culture building scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores for their administrative unit. This aggregate coefficient did not
exceed the critical \( r \) value (.05 confidence level) and the fourth null hypothesis could not be rejected (see Table 22).

**Research Question #2**

2. Do Campus Recreation Programs administered by high visionary leaders differ from those directed by low visionary leaders relative to carrying out the four critical culture building activities?

A MANOVA statistical treatment was employed to test the fifth null hypothesis and answer the second research question. A significant difference was found between the high and low leadership groups relative to the degree that their programs carry out culture building activities. Consequently, the second research question was answered in the affirmative.

Four univariate ANOVA computations were computed to determine the specific culture building activities that separate the high and low leadership groups. The results of all statistical computations related to the second research question are presented in the following section.

The MANOVA statistical treatment accounted for the leadership rating (high and low) measured by the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ), conference (Big Ten and Mid American) and the collective presence of four different culture building activities (managing change, achieving goals, customer orientation, and coordinated
Table 22

**Relationship Between Visionary Culture Building Scores and Organizational Culture Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Big Ten</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>900.8</td>
<td>97.44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid American</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>1084.3</td>
<td>94.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Both</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>113.8</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>992.5</td>
<td>132.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

critical r (df = 6) = .707
teamwork) measured by the Culture Building Activities (CBA) form. The ANOVA statistical treatments considered each of the four culture building activities carried out by the Campus Recreation Programs independently. The main effects of leadership as well as the interaction effects were compared to the critical F values at the 95% level of confidence.

The MANOVA statistical treatment produced a significant F ratio at the .05 level of confidence. Consequently, the fifth null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted at the 95% confidence interval. Campus Recreation Programs administered by high visionary leaders do significantly differ from those programs directed by low visionary leaders relative to carrying out of culture building activities. The results of the ANOVA statistical treatments indicated that the specific difference between the two groups existed in the "customer orientation" activity (eighth null hypothesis was rejected).

The other calculated F ratios did not exceed the critical F values (.05 level of significance) and they could not be rejected. The results of the statistical treatments related to the second research question of this study are presented in the next section.
Leadership and Culture Building Activities

The fifth null hypothesis was:

H05 - The "culture building activities" scores for Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.

The MANOVA statistical treatment allowed the researcher to test the fifth null hypothesis. A Wilk's Criterion statistical treatment produced an F ratio of 3.43 (df = 4,105; p = .011) which is significant at the .05 level of significance. Consequently, the fifth null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted at the 95% confidence level.

Additional MANOVA statistical treatments which factored out the effects of conference and leadership ranking were also computed. The results of these MANOVA calculations produced an insignificant F ratio (df = 4,105) of .43 (p = .76) for the leadership effect and an insignificant F ratio (df = 4,105) of 1.56 (p = .19) for the conference effect. The descriptive data used in these calculations appear in Table 23.

Leadership and Managing Change

The Big Ten Campus Recreation Director earning the highest visionary leadership score (Bl) also administered the program with the highest "managing change" score. A Bl level three staff member commented that the program is adaptable and "driven by the interests of students".
Table 23
Descriptive Statistics - Leadership Ranking, Conference and Culture Building Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Managing Change</th>
<th>Achieving Goals</th>
<th>Customer Orientation</th>
<th>Coordinated Teamwork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Big Ten Conference</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Leadership Group</strong></td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.36 3.12</td>
<td>16.39 2.44</td>
<td>18.93 2.09</td>
<td>17.14 2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Leadership Group</strong></td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.50 3.10</td>
<td>16.18 3.41</td>
<td>17.11 2.36</td>
<td>17.25 2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Both Groups</strong></td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.93 3.11</td>
<td>16.29 2.94</td>
<td>18.02 2.39</td>
<td>17.20 2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid American Conference</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Leadership Group</strong></td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.93 3.39</td>
<td>17.25 2.38</td>
<td>18.32 2.39</td>
<td>17.86 1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Leadership Group</strong></td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.93 2.57</td>
<td>16.89 2.63</td>
<td>19.07 1.84</td>
<td>17.21 2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Both Groups</strong></td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.93 3.03</td>
<td>16.68 2.74</td>
<td>18.36 2.29</td>
<td>17.37 2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similarly, the Mid American Conference school with the highest "managing change" score also possessed a director with a high visionary leadership score (M2). This director commented that his success was contingent on his ability to retain forward thinking, creative staff members who turn down other opportunities to stay at M2. These progressive people are active within Campus Recreation professional associations and aware of the latest developments in the field. This may assist in keeping the program at M2 on the "cutting edge" of the profession and more sensitive to the activity offerings that are capturing student interest on other post-secondary campuses. A new state-of-the-art facility programmed to parallel the current programming trends in the field of Campus Recreation provides support for the high "managing change" score obtained for the M2 Campus Recreation Program.

The sixth null hypothesis was:

H06 - The "managing change" scores of Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.

This hypothesis was tested through the use of the ANOVA statistical treatment. A calculated F ratio of .37 was produced which is not significant at the .05 level of significance (df = 3,108). Therefore, the sixth null hypothesis could not be rejected. The results of the ANOVA appear in Table 24.
Table 24

**Analysis of Variance for Managing Change**

<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>3</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1009.14</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1019.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = .777

critical F value (3,108) = 2.68 (.05 level of confidence)

**Interaction Effect**

Leadership Ranking and Conference: F = .55; p = .46
Leadership and Organizational Achievement

The seventh null hypothesis was:

H07 - The "achieving goals" scores of Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.

The ANOVA statistical treatment yielded an F ratio of .87 which is less than the critical F value of 2.68 (df = 3,108) at the .05 level of significance. As a result, the seventh null hypothesis could not be rejected (see Table 25).

The content analysis of the interview data produced findings to support of quantitative results. The "achieving goals" quantitative scores were low for all programs. Interviewees commented that goal setting was not emphasized within their program. Most directors could produce both long term and annual goal documents for their programs, however in many cases, they commented that the procedure was more of a paper exercise than a productive administrative procedure. Some interviewees extended the point by suggesting that the field of Campus Recreation doesn't lend itself to goal setting due to the fluctuating interests of students and the ever-changing field.

Leadership and Customer Orientation

The eighth null hypothesis was:

H08 - The "customer orientation" scores of Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low
Table 25

**Analysis of Variance for Achieving Goals**

<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>3</td>
<td>19.71</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>814.71</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>834.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ p = .458 \]

Critical F value (3,108) = 2.68 (.05 level of confidence)

**Interaction Effect**

Leadership Ranking and Conference: \( F = .02; \ p = .89 \)
visionary leaders.

An ANOVA statistical treatment was employed to address the ninth null hypothesis. An F ratio of 4.70 was produced by the analysis which is significant at the .05 level of significance (df = 3, 108). The eighth null hypothesis was rejected and the eighth alternative hypothesis was accepted. The data appear in Table 26. In addition, an interaction effect was uncovered between the leadership ranking and conference variables. The calculated F ratio of 9.72 is significant at the .05 level (see Table 26). The disordinal interaction is illustrated in Figure 9.

In the Big Ten, the directors with the highest visionary leadership scores (B1 and B2) administer programs that have the highest "customer orientation" scores. This finding was also supported by the qualitative data. For example, the B2 director commented that he "is very concerned and listens very carefully to what people have to say". A number of staff members from the second, third and fourth levels of administration commented that their director (B1) is an outstanding listener who places student interests first when making decisions.

Within the Mid American Conference, the school with the lowest visionary leadership score (M4) administers a program with the highest "customer orientation" score. This result is supported by the comments of staff members from levels two, three and four shared with the researcher
Table 26

Analysis of Variance for Customer Orientation

<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>3</td>
<td>67.21</td>
<td>22.40</td>
<td>4.70 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>514.50</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>581.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = .004

critical F value (3,108) = 2.68 (.05 level of confidence)

Interaction Effect

Leadership Ranking and Conference: F = 9.72; p = .002 *

* = significant
Figure 9. Disordinal Interaction of Leadership Ranking and Conference
that their director (M4) was sensitive to customers desires and exhibited a passion for understanding the student perspective.

Leadership and Coordinated Teamwork

The ninth null hypothesis was:

H09 - The "coordinated teamwork" scores of Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.

The ANOVA statistical treatment was utilized to produce the data necessary to address the ninth null hypothesis. A calculated F ratio of .55 is less than the critical F value of 2.69. Therefore, the ninth null hypothesis could not be rejected. The data appear in Table 27.

The coordinated team scores were comparable for programs led by either high or low visionary leaders in both conferences. The results of the qualitative data analysis provided support for the findings uncovered in the quantitative data computations. All eight directors listed "teamwork" as an important function of their director's position. At M1, staff members refer to their administrative unit as a "family". The director commented that she "really believes that if she makes employees feel important, that they're worthwhile and recognized, they will stay with the program". A level four employee from M2 explained that she recently took a semester off to work in
Table 27

Analysis of Variance for Coordinated Teamwork

<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>3</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>594.82</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>603.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = .646

critical F value (3,108) = 2.68 (.05 level of confidence)

Interaction Effect

Leadership Ranking and Conference: F = .71; p = .39
another department on campus but returned as soon as she could because she "missed the people and atmosphere of Campus Recreation". A level 3 employee from Bl highlighted the coordination role carried out by her director when she referred to him as "the hub of a wheel and all staff members are the spokes. We all need to function together to make the wheel (program) go".

Research Question #3

3. Are high visionary leaders more effective than low visionary leaders at penetrating the organizational culture throughout the top four administrative levels of the organizational hierarchy?

Based on the results of the three hypotheses tests related to this research question, the researcher concluded that there is no significant difference between high and low visionary leaders relative to their success in penetrating the organizational culture throughout the top four administrative levels. The results of the statistical treatments related to the third research question are presented in the next section.

Three null hypotheses were prepared to address the third research question:

H010 - The level two organizational culture scores for Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the level two organizational culture scores for the Campus Recreation Programs led by a low visionary leaders.
H011 - The level three organizational culture scores for Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the level three organizational culture scores for the Campus Recreation Programs led by a low visionary leaders.

H012 - The level four organizational culture scores for Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the level four organizational culture scores for the Campus Recreation Programs led by a low visionary leaders.

A 2 X 2 X 3 factorial design was employed to test the three null hypotheses related to the third research question. This statistical computation provided calculated F ratios that were compared to the critical F values at the .05 level of confidence. Although the hypotheses tests relate to culture penetration, the factorial design also provided data to determine if a significant difference exists between conference (Big Ten and Mid American Conferences and leadership ranking (high visionary and low visionary leadership groups).

Within the Big Ten Conference, culture strength scores of the visionary leadership group increased from the second through fourth levels of administration. The exact opposite situation was uncovered for the high visionary leadership group from the Mid American Conference while the low leadership group culture scores increased from the second to third levels and decreased from the third to fourth levels of administration.
Table 28

Analysis of Variance for Leadership, Conference, Hierarchical Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5369.64</td>
<td>28.10</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1482.64</td>
<td>77.60</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference x Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.23</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>394.29</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference x Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>953.38</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership x Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>201.06</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference x Leadership x Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>262.58</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = significant (.05 level of confidence)
Significant differences were not found between the high and low leadership groups ($f = 1.03; p = .360; 95\%$ confidence interval) relative to the penetration of organizational culture. Consequently, the researcher failed to reject the three null hypotheses (HO10, HO11, and HO12) and concluded that there is no significant difference between the high and low visionary leadership groups relative to the penetration of organizational culture throughout the administrative hierarchy.

Significant $F$ ratios were uncovered at the .05 level of significance for both the conference variable ($f = 28.10; p = .001$) and leadership rating variable ($f = 7.76; p = .006$) relative to the strength of the organizational culture. No significant interaction effects were uncovered (.05 level of significance). The ANOVA results appear in Table 28 and the descriptive data are presented in Table 29.

The culture strength scores ($X = 77.45$) for the Mid American Conference programs were significantly higher at the 95% confidence interval ($t = 4.87; p = .001$) than the same measures for the Big Ten Conference programs ($X = 64.34$). In addition, the culture strength scores (both conferences combined) of Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders ($X = 74.43; S.D. = 15.29$) were significantly higher ($t = 2.45; p = .01$) than the culture scores from low visionary led programs ($X = 67.36; S.D. =$
Table 29

Descriptive Statistics for Leadership Ranking and the Penetration of Organizational Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Culture Scores</th>
<th>Level Two</th>
<th>Level Three</th>
<th>Level Four</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Ten Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Leadership Group</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>61.50</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>67.50</td>
<td>17.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Leadership Group</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>15.68</td>
<td>61.13</td>
<td>16.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Groups</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>58.25</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>64.31</td>
<td>16.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Culture Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level Two</th>
<th>Level Three</th>
<th>Level Four</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>85.88</td>
<td>10.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.25</td>
<td>17.29</td>
<td>80.75</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Groups</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.94</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>73.81</td>
<td>16.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High Visionary Leadership Group: $X = 74.43$; $S.D. = 15.29$
Low Visionary Leadership Group: $X = 67.36$; $S.D. = 15.30$
Research Question #4

4. Is there a relationship between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program? Pearson product moment correlations were computed to address each of the null hypotheses related to this research question. The data were analysed separately by conference and collectively for the purpose of hypotheses testing. Each of the four null hypotheses (H013, H014, H015, and H016) could not be rejected at the .05 confidence interval. Therefore, it was concluded that there is no significant relationship between the visionary leadership tendencies of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program. The results of the correlation computations related to the fourth research question are presented in the following section.

Visionary Leadership Scores and Student Satisfaction Scores

A substantial association ($r = .65$) was yielded between the overall visionary leadership scores of Big Ten Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with their respective Campus Recreation Program. A moderate association ($r = .34$) was uncovered for similar analyses of the data produced from Campus Recreation Programs in the Mid American Conference universities. These data
The 13th null hypothesis was:

H013 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program.

A correlation coefficient of .52 was found between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program. This value does not exceed the critical $r$ value of .707 (df = 6) at the 95% confidence level, and the 13th null hypothesis could not be rejected. The relationship between visionary leadership and student satisfaction with the program is presented in Table 30.

Visionary Leadership Behavior Scores and Student Satisfaction Scores

A substantial correlation coefficient of .68 was produced between the visionary leadership behavior scores of Big Ten Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction scores for the program. A moderate coefficient ($r = .46$) was uncovered for the same measures in the Mid American Conference. The data are presented in Table 31.

The 14th null hypothesis was:

H014 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership behavior scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program.

A correlation coefficient of .59 was produced between the Campus Recreation Directors' visionary leadership
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Ten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>570.30</td>
<td>67.29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>576.80</td>
<td>47.31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>49.93</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>573.50</td>
<td>53.96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>48.95</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

critical r (df = 6) = .707
behavior scores and student satisfaction with their respective program. This calculated coefficient does not exceed the critical $r$ value of .707 ($df = 6$; .05 level of confidence), and the 14th null hypothesis could not be rejected. The data appears in Table 31.

**Visionary Leadership Characteristics Scores and Student Satisfaction Scores**

A substantial association was uncovered between the visionary leadership characteristics scores of Big Ten Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program ($r = .69$). A low association ($r = .12$) was uncovered between the same measures within the Mid American Conference (see Table 32).

The 15th null hypothesis was:

$$H_{015} - \text{No direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership characteristics scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program.}$$

The correlation coefficient of .44 produced between the visionary leadership characteristics scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program does not exceed the critical $r$ value of .707 ($df = 6$) at the 95% level of confidence. As a result, the 15th null hypothesis could not be rejected. The data appears in Table 32.
Table 31

Relationship Between Visionary Leadership Behavior Scores and Student Satisfaction Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Ten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Scores</td>
<td>289.30</td>
<td>36.35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Scores</td>
<td>294.00</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>49.93</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Scores</td>
<td>291.60</td>
<td>27.73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>48.95</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

critical r (df = 6) = .707
Table 32
Relationship Between Visionary Leadership Characteristics Scores and Student Satisfaction Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Ten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership Characteristics</td>
<td>165.50</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership Characteristics</td>
<td>170.80</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>49.93</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership Characteristics</td>
<td>168.10</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>48.95</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical r (df = 6) = .707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Visionary Culture Building Scores and Student Satisfaction Scores

The correlation coefficient \( r = .54 \) computed for the Big Ten Campus Recreation Directors' visionary culture building scores and student satisfaction with the program is a substantial association (Davis, 1971). The same measure in the Mid American Conference produced a moderate correlation \( r = .46 \). These data appear in Table 33.

The 16th null hypothesis was:

\[ H_{016} - \text{No direct relationship exists between the visionary culture building scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program.} \]

A correlation coefficient of .44 was computed between the visionary culture building scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with their program. This calculation coefficient did not exceed the critical \( r \) value of .707 (df = 6; .05 level of significance) and therefore, the 16th null hypothesis could not be rejected. The data to support this decision appear in Table 33.

Research Question #5

5. Is there a relationship between the organizational culture scores for Campus Recreation Programs and student satisfaction with the program?

A significant direct relationship exists between organizational culture scores and student satisfaction based on the results of the correlation coefficient computed between the two variables on the grouped data.
Table 33

Relationship Between Visionary Culture Building Scores and Student Satisfaction Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Culture Building Scores</td>
<td>115.50</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Culture Building Scores</td>
<td>112.50</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>49.93</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Culture Building Scores</td>
<td>114.00</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>48.95</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

critical r (df = 6) = .707
The relationship between the two variables supporting the affirmative answer to the fifth research question is presented in Table 34.

**Organizational Culture and Student Satisfaction**

The following null hypothesis was prepared to answer the fifth research question:

H017 - No direct relationship exists between the organizational culture scores of the Campus Recreation Program and student satisfaction with the program.

A correlation coefficient of .77 was produced between the organizational culture scores of Campus Recreation Programs and student satisfaction with the program. This calculated $r$ exceeds the critical $r$ value of .707 (df = 6) and the 17th null hypothesis was rejected at the 95% confidence interval (see Table 34).

In the Big Ten Conference, a very high association was found between the two variables ($r = .79$). A very high association ($r = .93$) was uncovered between the variables in the Mid American Conference.

Support for the very high associations was garnered from the results of the qualitative data analysis. The two programs (M2 and M4) from the Mid American Conference with the highest culture strength scores also earned the highest ratings of student satisfaction (TPSI scores). The M4 Director commented that he attempted to clearly delineate the roles of all staff members to provide employees with ownership for their portion of the program.
Table 34

Relationship Between Organizational Culture Scores and Student Satisfaction Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Big Ten</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture Scores</td>
<td>900.80</td>
<td>97.44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid American</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture Scores</td>
<td>1084.25</td>
<td>94.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>49.93</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Both</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture Scores</td>
<td>992.50</td>
<td>132.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>48.95</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

critical r (df = 6) = .707

* = significant (95% confidence interval)
Furthermore, he suggested that it was important for him to maintain a close liaison with his staff members to support them and encourage excellence. A level two employee from M2 commented that his director is held in such high regard within the NIRSA membership that he "just had to come to work for him to see if the reputation was actually warranted". The staff member suggested that the reputation was valid.

Research Question #6

6. Is there a relationship between each of the four critical culture building activity scores for the Campus Recreation Program and student satisfaction with the program?

Each of the correlation coefficients computed to address the sixth research question failed to exceed the critical r value at the .05 confidence interval. Consequently, it can be concluded that there is no significant relationship between each of the four critical culture building activities and student satisfaction with the program. The results for each of the four culture building activities are presented separately under each culture building activity heading.

"Managing Change" and Student Satisfaction

A negative, low association was uncovered ($r = -.20$) between the "managing change" for the Big Ten Campus Recreation administrative units and student satisfaction
with the program. A comparable measure within the Mid American Conference Campus Recreation Programs yielded a moderate association reflected in the correlation coefficient of .35 (see Table 35).

The following null hypothesis was created to address the sixth research question:

\[ H_{018} \] - No direct relationship exists between the Campus Recreation Program's "managing change" score and student satisfaction with the program.

A correlation coefficient of .16 was found between the "managing change" scores of Campus Recreation administrative units and student satisfaction scores. This calculated \( r \) does not exceed the critical \( r \) value of .707 (\( df = 6 \)) and consequently, the 18th null hypothesis could not be rejected at the 95% confidence interval. The data supporting this decision appears in Table 35.

"Achieving Goals and Student Satisfaction"

A substantial, negative association (\( r = -.58 \)) was produced by the analysis of the relationship between the "achieving goals" scores of the Big Ten Conference schools and the student satisfaction scores. A similar calculation with the Mid American Conference schools uncovered a very high association of .89 (see Table 36).

The following null hypothesis addressed the sixth research question:

\[ H_{019} \] - No direct relationship exists between the Campus Recreation Program's "achieving goals" score and student satisfaction with the program.
Table 35

Relationship Between "Managing Change" Scores and Student Satisfaction Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Ten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Change</td>
<td>264.50</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Change</td>
<td>267.00</td>
<td>26.58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>49.93</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Change</td>
<td>265.80</td>
<td>19.11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>48.95</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

critical r (df = 6) = .707
A correlation coefficient of .28 was computed as a measure of the relationship between the Campus Recreation Programs "achieving goals" score and student satisfaction with the program. This calculated value did not exceed the required level (critical $r = .707; \ df = 6$) for the .05 level of significance and the 19th null hypothesis could not be rejected. The data appear in Table 36.

"Coordinated Teamwork" and Student Satisfaction

There was a negative, low association ($r = -.15$) in the correlation calculation designed to measure the relationship between the "coordinated teamwork" scores of Big Ten Campus Recreation Programs and student satisfaction scores. Within the Mid American Conference, a substantial association of .56 was produced for the same two measures. These data appear in Table 37.

The twentieth null hypothesis was:

$H_{020} = \text{No direct relationship exists between the Campus Recreation Program's "coordinated teamwork" score and student satisfaction with the program.}$

A correlation coefficient of .21 (see Table 36) was produced between the Campus Recreation Programs' "coordinated teamwork" scores and the student satisfaction scores. This value did not exceed the critical $r$ value (.707) for 95% level of confidence ($df = 6$), and the 20th null hypothesis could not be rejected.
Table 36

Relationship Between "Achieving Goals" Scores and Student Satisfaction Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Big Ten</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving Goals</td>
<td>229.50</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid American</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving Goals</td>
<td>239.00</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>49.93</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Both</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving Goals</td>
<td>234.30</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>48.95</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

critical r (df = 6) = .707
"Customer Orientation" and Student Satisfaction

A substantial association (r = .60) was computed between the customer orientation scores of Big Ten Campus Recreation Programs and student satisfaction scores. Within the Mid American Conference, a moderate association was yielded as evidence by the correlation coefficient of .31 (see Table 38).

The following null hypothesis was prepared to address the sixth research question:

H021 - No direct relationship exists between the Campus Recreation Program's "customer orientation" score and student satisfaction with the program.

A substantial association (r = .55) was produced in the correlation computations for "customer orientation" scores of Campus Recreation Programs and student satisfaction scores. This calculated r value does not exceed the critical r value (.707; df = 6) for the 95% confidence level. The 21st null hypothesis could not be rejected. The data are presented in Table 37.

Research Question #7

7. Do more favorably held Campus Recreation Programs (student rating) hold different organizational values and critical success factors than those rated less favorably?

No difference exists between the between the list of organizational values or critical success factors offered by directors of high rated programs compared to the lists
Table 37
Relationship Between "Coordinated Teamwork" Scores and Student Satisfaction Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Big Ten</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Teamwork</td>
<td>243.00</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid American</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Teamwork</td>
<td>249.50</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>49.93</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Both</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Teamwork</td>
<td>246.30</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>48.95</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

critical $r (df = 6) = .707$
Table 38
Relationship Between "Customer Orientation" Scores and Student Satisfaction Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Big Ten</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Orientation</td>
<td>252.30</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid American</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Orientation</td>
<td>261.80</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>49.93</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Both</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Orientation</td>
<td>257.00</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>48.95</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

critical r (df = 6) = .707
produced by the directors of low rated programs.

The four Campus Recreation Programs with the highest student satisfaction (TPSI) scores (M2, M4, B2, B3) were compared to the four Campus Recreation Programs (M1, M4, B1, B4) with the lowest student satisfaction scores. A two sample t test uncovered a significant difference between the two groups at the .05 level of confidence level (t = 2.91; p = .027). The qualitative data were analysed to determine if the high rated programs honored different organizational values and/or critical success factors than lower rated programs.

A content analysis of the qualitative data produced a high degree of similarity between the organizational values of both groups. Teamwork, honesty, communication, initiative, quality and professional growth were consistently presented to the researcher as organizational values respected by all the Campus Recreation Programs irrespective of the leadership ranking of the director or conference.

The differences between the critical success factors offered by directors of high and low rated programs (TPSI scores) were also minuscule. Seeking student input regarding program offerings and policies was noted by all directors as a critical success factor. Establishing suggestion boxes in prominent locations and making sure that suggestions were followed up were functions reported
by the directors as support for the stated critical success factor. Directors also noted that student advisory councils were utilized although there was variance between the directors as to the impact made by the council on their program.

The higher rated programs (TPSI scores) had newer, better equipped facilities (with the exception of one facility at B4) than those programs that were rated less favorably (TPSI scores). The higher rated programs (TPSI scores of B2, B3, M2, and M4) have capitalized on the contemporary student's desire for high quality facilities and fitness equipment compared to their lower rated counterparts who have not seized this opportunity for a variety of reasons including facility limitations. The directors from the high rated programs unanimously reinforced the need for clean, well maintained facilities as well as an uninhibited access schedule to account for the students' schedule. The M2 facility is open each day at 6:00 a.m. and closes at 2:00 a.m. Thursdays through Sundays. On the other days, the facility closes at 12 midnight.

M1 is planning a new facility which should materialize in the near future while the director at M3 is also involved in the facility planning process. Their critical success factors included gaining institutional support for this endeavor.
Since all the Big Ten Programs had high quality facilities, the "building" factor was not a variable affecting student satisfaction scores. The Campus Recreation Programs at B1 and B4 operate newer facilities for fitness and self-directed activities, however, their programs garnered lower TPSI scores than B2 and B3.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The study was undertaken to investigate the effect of visionary leadership on the development and penetration of organizational culture within Campus Recreation Programs in higher education. In addition, the researcher sought to investigate the relationship between both visionary leadership and organizational culture with measures of student satisfaction with the Campus Recreation Program. This chapter presents a summary of the results as well as the implications and conclusions derived from the study. The chapter is presented in four sections which include (1) summary and interpretation of the findings, (2) conclusions, (3) implications for the campus recreation profession, and (4) recommendations for future research.

Summary and Interpretation of the Findings

The theoretical proposition underlying the study was that Campus Recreation Directors who attain higher visionary leadership scores have influenced the presence of a stronger organizational culture which has penetrated their organization to a greater degree. This strong, penetrated culture has influenced staff members to carry out, to a greater extent, the four critical cultural
functions that relate to the delivery of a program that is more favorably received by the major target population.

Seven research questions and 21 null hypotheses were constructed to guide the study. Eighteen of the null hypotheses were accepted and three null hypotheses were rejected at the .05 level of confidence. The relationships between variables and the differences between groups were reported independently for each conference and collectively for the purposes of hypotheses testing. The results of the hypotheses tests served as the basis for answering the research questions.

The employed research strategy called for deeper inquiry with a smaller sample (N=8). The triangulation data collection approach produced more enriched information, however the low sample size probably proved to be a limitation in establishing significant differences between groups and/or relationships between variables at the .05 level of significance. Each of the research questions are presented and addressed in the following section. In addition, an interpretation of the results accompanies each research question.

Research Question #1

Is there a relationship between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture score for the program?

Four null hypotheses were constructed to answer the first research question. None of the null hypotheses
satisfied the rejection condition at the .05 level of confidence. Consequently, the researcher concluded that no significant relationship exists between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and organizational culture scores for the program. A summary of the hypotheses and decisions related to this conclusion appears in Table 39.

The relationships between the various categories of visionary leadership and organizational culture could not be statistically supported at the 95% confidence interval. The small sample size resulted in a low degrees of freedom (6) and consequently a high critical r value of .707 (df = 6) that could not be exceeded for any of the calculations employed to test the four null hypotheses related to the first research question. Although the researcher must conclude on the basis of hypotheses testing that there is no significant relationship between the two variables at the .05 level of confidence, the different coefficients and qualitative findings between the two conferences warrant further exploration.

An interesting disparity was uncovered between the conferences relative to the relationship between each of the four measures of visionary leadership and organizational culture. In each instance, the correlation coefficient was higher for the Big Ten Conference. These discrepancies are due in large measure to the different staffing arrangements that exist within the programs in
Table 39

Hypotheses and Decisions for Research Question One

Research Question:

1. Is there a relationship between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture score for the administrative unit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H01 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores of their program.</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H02 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership behavior scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores of their program</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H03 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership characteristics scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores of their program</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H04 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary culture building scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the organizational culture scores of their program</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
each conference. Specifically, Campus Recreation Programs in the Big Ten have a greater number of full-time staff members occupying positions at the second and third levels of administration. Full time associate directors assume the positions at the second level of administration while full time assistant directors fill positions at the third level of administration. By contrast, the Mid American Conference Campus Recreation Programs generally have fewer full time staff members occupying the second level positions while the third hierarchical level positions are frequently filled with graduate assistants or senior undergraduate students. This contrast has significant implications for the Campus Recreation Director attempting to heighten the organizational culture for his/her program.

Another key distinction between the Campus Recreation Programs from the two conferences rests with the seniority of staff members in these positions. In the Big Ten Conference, level two staff frequently have 20 or more years experience in the profession, and in some cases, in the same position (B1 and B2) while the level three positions in the same settings are generally occupied by individuals with eight to 12 years experience. The organizational culture within these programs has "become institutionalized or embedded in the structure and major processes of the organization" (Schein, 1990, p. 283).
Within the Mid American Conference, the level two positions are frequently occupied by staff members who have considerably less seniority in the profession compared to their Big Ten Conference counterparts. The third hierarchical level employees in the Mid American Conference Programs rarely exceed a span of two years in the position.

The relationship between visionary leadership and organizational culture may be more pronounced in the Big Ten Conference (very high association; $r = .74$) due to the special needs that exist for level two and three staff members in these programs. This finding supports the theory of Schein (1990, p. 317) who suggested that the "unique and essential function of leadership is the manipulation of culture". Manipulating an existing culture is a more arduous task for leaders than developing a new culture through the appointment and indoctrination of new employees, which is often the case for the Mid American Conference programs due to a relatively rapid turnover of senior and graduate student assistants. Consequently, high visionary leaders may be more effective than low visionary leaders at modifying or maintaining an existing organizational culture (Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Schein, 1990) in stable, more experienced organizations that do not turn over rapidly (e.g., Big Ten Conference Campus Recreation Programs). Perhaps staff members employed in
Big Ten Conference programs administered by high visionary leaders feel better about their work environment and their role in the program more than their counterparts from low visionary led programs. Perhaps the clearer vision articulated by the high visionary leader is comforting to these staff members who in turn realize that the organization is on course, that they are contributing to a worthwhile end, and that their efforts are both necessary and appreciated. In the Big Ten Conference, this scenario is highlighted in the discrepancy (54.3 culture score differential) between the organizational culture scores of a program administered by a high visionary leader (B1) compared to one administered by a low visionary leader (B4). While the challenge of all Campus Recreation Directors rests with ensuring that the organizational culture for their program is both strong and positive, the approach used may differ for Big Ten Conference programs as opposed to those from the Mid American Conference.

The organizational culture should be strong in the Big Ten Conference programs, due to staff members' longevity in the level two and three positions. Instead of attempting to build a strong culture, the Big Ten Conference Campus Recreation Directors may need to transform an existing negative culture into one which is more positive. This is exactly the case in the B3 Campus Recreation Program. At B3, a relatively new director has
been brought in from outside the field to lead a program that is rich in tradition and administered by an experienced core of staff members, especially at the second level of administration. In a relatively short period of time this individual has drastically altered the direction of the program to parallel the new developments in the campus recreation field, and modified the administrative operation to a more participative, decentralized unit. These changes, while well founded on the basis of the campus recreation and management science literature, countered the existing organizational culture, especially at the second level of administration. The inertia that this director has encountered is beginning to release although it has been a slow process. This finding is consistent with Schein's (1990, p. 291) observation that

"even when the leadership knows where it wants to go and is open about it, it takes time and energy to get large numbers of people to hold different basic assumptions about something fundamental. Similarly, the metaphor "Rome wasn't built in a day" reminds us that, even when there is consensus on the sense of direction, it takes a lot of effort to turn concepts into behavioral realities and to embed them into all the daily routines."

Whereas staff members rarely leave the level two and three positions in the Big Ten programs, there is rapid turnover in the Mid American Conference programs at the second and third levels. Therefore the need for effective leadership may be more pressing relative to ensuring the
organization has a strong, positive organizational culture.

**Research Question #2**

Do Campus Recreation Programs administered by high visionary leaders differ from those directed by low visionary leaders relative to carrying out the four critical culture building activities?

An overall null hypothesis was developed to address the research question and four additional null hypotheses were created to test for a difference between the high and low visionary leadership groups for each of the four culture building activities. The researcher concluded that a significant difference existed between the two leadership groups relative to their organization carrying out culture building activities. The specific difference was uncovered through subsequent hypotheses testing and found to rest only within the "customer orientation" activity.

The overall null hypotheses (H05) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted indicating that a significant difference existed between the two groups at the .05 level of confidence. The null hypothesis (H08) was accepted at the 95% confidence interval confirming that the difference was nested in the "customer orientation" culture building activity variable. The other three null hypotheses could not be rejected at the .05 level.
It was concluded that Campus Recreation Programs administered by high visionary leaders carry out culture building activities to a higher degree than programs directed by low visionary leaders. Furthermore, the specific difference was found in the degree to which the programs led by high visionary leaders carry out the "customer orientation" culture building activity. A summary of the hypotheses and decisions related to the second research question are presented in Table 40.

A significant interaction effect between the leadership ranking and conference was also uncovered in this analysis. While the "customer orientation" culture building activity is greater for high visionary leaders in the Big Ten Conference programs, the opposite situation exists for the Mid American Conference programs. This can be explained by the pronounced effect of a director's visionary leadership tendencies on the "customer orientation" variable in the Big Ten Conference compared to the minimal effect of visionary leadership relative to the "customer orientation" culture building activity in the Mid American Conference programs. In the Big Ten Conference programs, the mean "customer orientation" score rises 1.82 points when comparing the low visionary leadership group to the high visionary leadership group. The same comparison in the Mid American Conference produced a slight decrease in the mean score (−.75).
Table 40

**Hypotheses and Decisions for Research Question Two**

2. Do Campus Recreation Programs administered by high visionary leaders differ from those directed by low visionary leaders relative to carrying out the four critical culture building activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H05 - The &quot;culture building activities&quot; scores of Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H06 - The &quot;managing change&quot; scores of Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H07 - The &quot;achieving goals&quot; scores of Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H08 - The &quot;customer orientation&quot; scores of Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H09 - The &quot;coordinated teamwork&quot; scores of Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the scores for Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders.</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The high incidence of student staff members in level three and four positions in the Mid American Conference Campus Recreation Programs may explain why the effect of visionary leadership is less significant compared to the Big Ten Conference. The large number of student employees holding senior, decision-making positions in the administration would make the Mid American Conference programs more sensitive to the student needs regardless of the director's influence. Consequently, the minimal difference between programs led by a high visionary leader and those led by a low visionary leader are not surprising.

In the Big Ten, full time professional staff members occupy positions comparable to those filled by students in the Mid American Conference programs. As a result, high visionary leaders have a greater effect in influencing staff members to be sensitive to the needs of consumers relative the low visionary leadership group. Due to the vast number of students holding senior administrative positions in the Mid American Conference programs, the effect of leadership on "customer orientation" activities is not a concern. The disordinal interaction is explainable on the basis of the staffing complement differences that exist between the programs from the two conferences.
Research Question #3

Are high visionary leaders more effective than low visionary leaders at penetrating the organizational culture throughout the top four administrative levels of the organizational hierarchy?

Three null hypotheses were constructed to address the third research question. Each hypotheses was tested for significance at the .05 level of significance. None of the null hypotheses could be rejected and the researcher concluded that no significant difference exists between the high visionary leaders and low visionary leaders relative to penetrating the organizational culture throughout the three levels of administration. A summary of the hypotheses and decisions related to the third research question appear in Table 41.

Main effects for conference (Big Ten and Mid American) and leadership ranking (high visionary leadership group and low visionary leadership group) were uncovered in the statistical treatments for the culture strength measure (95% confidence level). The cultural strength scores were found to be (1) significantly higher for the Mid American Conference scores as compared to the Big Ten Conference, and (2) significantly higher for programs administered by high visionary leaders as compared to the programs administered by the low visionary leadership group.
Research Question:

3. Are high visionary leaders more effective than low visionary leaders at penetrating the organizational culture throughout the top four administrative levels of the organizational hierarchy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HO10 - The level two organizational culture scores for Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the level two organizational culture scores for the Campus Recreation Programs led by a low visionary leaders.</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO11 - The level three organizational culture scores for Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the level three organizational culture scores for the Campus Recreation Programs led by a low visionary leaders.</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO12 - The level four organizational culture scores for Campus Recreation Programs led by high visionary leaders are not significantly higher than the level four organizational culture scores for the Campus Recreation Programs led by a low visionary leaders.</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The higher culture scores produced throughout each of the second, third and fourth administrative levels within the Mid American Conference programs may be explained by the "family" atmosphere that exists in each of the four programs researched from this conference. The majority of senior staff members in the Mid American Conference programs are younger professionals or students compared to the more experienced and older level two and three staff members in the Big Ten Conference Programs. An analysis of the qualitative data prompted the researcher to conclude that the levels of cooperation and companionship are greater in the Mid American Conference programs as compared to those from the Big Ten Conference. Finally, another distinguishing characteristic may be that Mid American Conference programs are smaller and frequently housed in one building. The opportunity for a strong organizational culture to develop may be enhanced through daily staff interaction that may occur more in the Mid American Conference programs as compared to the interaction opportunities in the larger, more dispersed Big Ten Conference programs (especially B2 and B4).

The finding that Campus Recreation Programs administered by high visionary leaders possess stronger organizational cultures scores than programs led by low visionary leaders is consistent with the literature.
Research Question #4

Is there a relationship between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and the student satisfaction with the Campus Recreation Program?

No significant relationships exists between any measure of visionary leadership and student satisfaction measures. Four null hypotheses were tested to address the fourth research question. Although all four null hypotheses could not be rejected (.05 level of confidence).

There were some interesting relationships uncovered between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with their Campus Recreation Program. The low sample size (N=8) resulted in the need for a large calculated $r$ value to exceed the critical $r$ value of .707 (df = 6) and reject the null hypotheses. In these four instances, the critical value was not exceeded. A summary of the hypotheses and decisions related to the fourth research question are presented in Table 42.

In all comparisons involving the different components of visionary leadership (three categories and the overall visionary leadership score) with the student satisfaction measures, the calculated coefficient was higher for the Big Ten Conference programs than the calculated value in
Table 42

Hypotheses and Decisions for Research Question Four

Research Question:

4. Is there a relationship between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H013 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program.</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H014 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership behavior scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program.</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H015 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary leadership characteristics scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program.</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H016 - No direct relationship exists between the visionary culture building scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program.</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Mid American Conference programs. Although the researcher cannot draw cause and effect conclusions from the results of correlation coefficients, it appears that visionary leadership has a more pronounced effect in the Big Ten Conference programs than it does in the Mid American Conference programs. Possible factors contributing to this finding may include staff members being less impressionable in the Big Ten Conference programs (due to their age and vast experience) which places a greater premium on the need for high visionary leaders to inspire and focus the work-force. In contrast, the enthusiasm and energy exhibited by the senior staff members in the Mid American Conference programs may override the need for visionary leaders to inspire a staff. The leaders of Mid American Conference programs may be better served by focusing staff members' energies as a means to offering a better program to more effectively satisfy the student consumer.

Research Question #5

Is there a relationship between the organizational culture scores for the Campus Recreation Program and student satisfaction with the program?

The null hypothesis that addressed the fifth research question was rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted at the .05 level of confidence. It was concluded that a significant relationship exists between the
Table 43

Hypotheses and Decisions for Research Question Five

Research Question:

5. Is there a relationship between the organizational culture scores for the Campus Recreation Program and student satisfaction with the program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H017 - No direct relationship exists between the strong, positive organizational culture scores of the Campus Recreation Program and student satisfaction with the program.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H17  - A direct relationship exists between the strong, positive organizational culture scores of the Campus Recreation Program and student satisfaction with the program.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
organizational culture scores of Campus Recreation Programs and student satisfaction with the program.

The correlation between organizational culture and student satisfaction in the Big Ten Conference was .79 while the same measure in the Mid American Conference produced a .93 correlation. Overall, the culture strength scores were higher for the Mid American Conference programs than the Big Ten Conference programs. In addition, the results from this research question coupled with the results of research question #3 support the notion that high visionary leaders positively impact the organization's culture to a extent greater than low visionary leaders. This is especially true in the Big Ten Conference programs, due to the different staffing arrangements that exist within these programs compared to the programs from the Mid American Conference.

Furthermore, an organization's culture is significantly related to organizational success. These two findings bode support for the work of Schein (1990) who declared that the most important function of a leader is to develop and maintain a strong, positive organizational culture. "One might go as far as to say that the "unique" function of "leadership" as contrasted with "management" or "administration" is the creation and management of culture" (Schein, 1990, p. 171).
On the basis of this result and within the limitations of the statistical treatments, it appears that high visionary leaders do impact a Campus Recreation Program's organizational culture which support activities leading to organizational success. This finding is consistent with both the visionary leadership and organizational culture literature.

Research Question #6:

Is there a relationship between each of the four critical culture building activity scores for the Campus Recreation Program and student satisfaction with the program?

No relationship exists between any of the four culture building activities and student satisfaction measures.

Four null hypotheses were constructed to address the sixth research question. The results of the data analyses did not allow the researcher to reject any of the null hypotheses at the .05 level of confidence. However, the statistical computations produced interesting results for both the Big Ten and Mid American Conferences. A summary of the stated hypotheses and decisions appear in Table 44.

Negative correlation coefficients were produced for the Big Ten Conference programs for each of the culture building activities (except for the relationship between the "customer orientation" activity and student
Table 44

Hypotheses and Decisions for Research Question Six

Research Question:

6. Is there a relationship between each of the four critical culture building activity scores for the Campus Recreation Program and student satisfaction with the program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H018 - No direct relationship exists between the Campus Recreation Program's &quot;managing change&quot; score and student satisfaction with the program.</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H019 - No direct relationship exists between the Campus Recreation Program's &quot;achieving goals&quot; score and student satisfaction with the program.</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H020 - No direct relationship exists between the Campus Recreation Program's &quot;coordinated teamwork&quot; score and student satisfaction with the program.</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H021 - No direct relationship exists between the Campus Recreation Program's &quot;customer orientation&quot; score and student satisfaction with the program.</td>
<td>Failed to Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
satisfaction) while positive correlation coefficients were produced between the separate culture building activities and student satisfaction scores in the Mid American Conference programs. The greatest disparity was discovered between the two conferences on the "achieving goals" variable. The correlation produced for the Big Ten Conference programs was -.58 while the same correlation computation with the Mid American Conference programs produced a coefficient of .89. A possible explanation for this wide discrepancy may by related to the smaller size and centralized location of each Mid American Conference program contrasted with the much larger, frequently dispersed Big Ten Conference programs. The Mid American Conference program staffs are small enough and housed in a central location to facilitate daily interaction and perhaps a more unified, focused approach to delivering the program. This may contribute to a more effective delivery of the program which satisfies students to a greater degree.

Although Campus Recreation Directors sampled generally did not consider goal setting to be a critical success factor, the Mid American Conference programs may be small enough and centrally located to facilitate daily interaction of staff members which contributes to a better understanding of the unit's plans and priorities.
This may not be true for Big Ten Conference programs. Frequently these programs are so large that they are geographically dispersed in different buildings throughout a college campus. Staff members may not see some of their colleagues for weeks at a time. Consequently, the need for a goal focus may be greater in these programs. "Having a clear focus on explicit goals has been proven repeatedly to have a strong relationship to actual success and achievement" (Glaser and Sashkin, 1989, p. 5). The differences in size and partitioning of programs may also explain the disparity between the Big Ten and Mid American Conference programs relative to the relationship between the "coordinated teamwork" variable and the measure of student satisfaction with the program.

Research Question #7:

Do more favorably held Campus Recreation Programs (student rating) hold different organizational values and critical success factors than those rated less favorably?

No difference exists between the list of organizational values and/or critical success factors for high rated programs compared to the list of organizational values and/or critical success factors of lower rated programs.

The interview questions pertaining to the respected organizational values and critical success factors were
thought provoking for the respondents (exception B4 who immediately provided a listing of the organizational values honored in his program). However, this produced list does not guarantee that organizational members have adopted the values (Hitt, 1986) which is the case at B4 based on an analysis of the qualitative data gathered from this institution.

As a group, the Campus Recreation Directors generally operate in a more programmatic fashion and consequently, did not have immediate answers to the questions relating to organizational values and critical success factors. After a lengthy period of contemplation in each case, the director provided the a verbal listing (exception was B4 director) of the organizational values and critical success factors believed to be honored in their respective program. There was little discrepancy between the organizational values and critical success factors offered by the directors of more favorably rated programs (B2, B3, M2, M4) compared to the listings forwarded by the directors of less favored programs (B1, B4, M1, M3). Perhaps a more entrepreneurial spirit emphasized in the B3 and M4 Campus Recreation Programs coupled with program emphasis on fitness and self-directed activities evident in B2, B3, M2, and M4 aid in explaining the disparity in program ratings.
Teamwork was the most popular organizational value to surface from the qualitative data collection procedures. One level 3 staff member from M2 relayed a team building story where the director insisted that his name not be placed at the top of a staff "in-out" board, but in sequential alphabetical order like every other staff member in the program. The level three staff member interpreted that critical incident as a message that "we are all in this together" and "together is the only way we can be successful". The director from M1 shared a similar feeling that pervades her program. She indicated that the theme "together we can do it" is shared and promoted by all staff members regardless of their level in the organizational hierarchy. The B2 director believes so much in the team approach that he had his full time and support staff participate in a "ropes" team building course prior to the 1990-91 program year. The B3 director has attempted to enhance the "team" atmosphere in his organization by empowering his staff members to create a "community of leaders". He has also attempted to involve everyone on a variety of ad hoc and standing committees structured to address a variety of issues pertaining to the Campus Recreation Program at B3. It is his feeling that staff members who are given the opportunity to be successful and provide input on decisions that will affect them will take greater pride in the organization and work more
effectively as a team. The director from M1 shared a similar feeling that pervades her program.

Maintaining tradition is a critical success factor held in higher regard for the Big Ten Conference programs (except B3 where risk taking and an entrepreneurial spirit is valued to a greater degree) while an entrepreneurial value appears to underlie the Mid American Conference programs (exception M3 where tradition pervades). Teamwork was listed as a value by staff members from programs in both the high and low rated groups, however, the value was made operational different ways for the two conferences.

The critical success factors related to the teamwork value for Big Ten Conference programs revolved around getting full time staff members working cooperatively. In most cases, directors were dealing with older, more experienced staff members in these settings. By contrast, the Mid American Conference Campus Recreation Directors noted teamwork-based critical success factors that support recruiting and retaining enthusiastic, personable student employees. Many student employees from Mid American Conference programs referred to the bonding that they've experienced to the program. One level four student employee from M4 commented that he had been unsuccessful in uncovering the reasons why he is so committed to his program. He stated that he keeps "coming back and doing things I'm not called upon to do, or thinking about ways
to improve what we do here. There is something that binds me to this place". A level two employee from M1 affectionately discussed the team or "family" feeling that exists in their program and is perpetually revived at an annual reunion that transpires for former student and full time employees.

Another critical success factor that was a popular response of staff members from both the high and low rated programs was the lobbying or positioning role that directors need to fulfill on a post-secondary campus. Positioning the Campus Recreation Program within the framework of higher administration at the institution was listed as a critical success factor in seven of the eight schools (the exception was M3 which according to the director has fallen behind other Mid American Conference Campus Recreation Programs in the area of facility development and/or expansion).

While the listing of organizational values and critical success factors from the high rated and low rated programs were closely assimilated, the difference between the two groups may rest in the execution of the two values and success factors. For example, the directors of higher rated programs may be more successful than their counterparts in transmitting the organizational values throughout the staffing levels of the organization. In addition, the directors from the more favorably rated
programs may be more successful due to a more effective execution of the critical success factors. Additional research that quantifies these differences in execution appears warranted.

Conclusions

The results of testing seven research questions led to the following seven conclusions:

1. No significant relationship exists between visionary leadership scores and organizational culture scores.

2. Campus Recreation Programs administered by high visionary leaders carry out culture building activities to a greater degree that Campus Recreation Programs administered by low visionary leaders. The specific difference between the two groups was found on the "customer orientation" culture building activity.

3. No significant difference exists between high visionary leaders and low visionary leaders relative to the penetration of organizational culture throughout the top four levels of the organizational hierarchy.

4. No significant relationship exists between the visionary leadership scores of Campus Recreation Directors and student satisfaction with the program.

5. A significant direct relationship exists between organizational culture scores and student satisfaction with the program.
6. No significant relationship exists between any of the four culture building activities and student satisfaction with the program.

7. No difference exists between the lists of organizational values and critical success factors of high rated programs (student satisfaction measures) and the lists of organizational values and critical success factors of low rated programs.

In addition, the statistical treatments provided support for the following two supplemental conclusions.

1. Campus Recreation Programs administered by high visionary leaders have significantly higher organizational culture scores than programs administered by low visionary leaders.

2. Mid American Conference programs have significantly higher organizational culture scores than the Big Ten Conference programs.

The researcher was able to statistically establish that there are high visionary leaders and low visionary leaders occupying the senior administrative positions in Campus Recreation Programs housed in the Big Ten and Mid American Conferences. Although no significant relationship between visionary leadership and organizational culture was uncovered (Research Question #1), there were some interesting differences reported between the coefficients produced in the Big Ten Conference programs and those
produced in the Mid American Conference programs. The relationships were found to be higher for the Big Ten Conference programs in each instance.

The high visionary leadership group did produce significantly higher organizational culture scores than the low visionary leadership group (Research Question #3). Furthermore, a significant direct relationship was uncovered between organizational culture scores and program success as measured by student satisfaction scores (Research Question #5). These findings support the acclaimed work of Bennis and Nanus (1985), Deal and Kennedy (1982), Sashkin and Fulmer, (1986a), Sashkin and Sashkin (1990), and Schein (1990). The CSA instrument, used in this study to measure organizational culture, is based on the work of Deal and Kennedy (1982) and specifically measures the degree to which organizations have a philosophy of management comprehended by most staff members, a feeling of importance and respect for what they are attempting to do as an organization, a positive tradition that continues to be passed down to new employees, and a "corporate character" that exemplifies a passion for excellence and continual improvement. No significant difference was uncovered between the high and low visionary leadership group relative to their effect on penetrating the organizational culture throughout the top levels of the administration (Research Question #3).
High visionary leaders were found to administer programs that carried out culture building activities to a greater degree than the low visionary leadership group (Research Question #2). The specific difference between the two groups was uncovered in the "customer orientation" culture building activity (H08). Upon further inquiry, it was determined that the more pronounced effect of leadership on the carrying out of this activity in the Big Ten Conference programs is opposite to the situation uncovered in the Mid American Conference, producing a disordinal interaction. The difference between the two leadership groups on the other three culture building activity measures were not significant (Research Question #2). Additional research with a larger sample size and a more refined measurement of "culture building activities" to increase the sensitivity of these measures is warranted.

No significant relationships were determined between visionary leadership and student satisfaction with the program (Research Question 4), or any of the culture building activities and student satisfaction with the program (Research Question #6). The interesting differences in the coefficients produced between the two conferences were reported and warrant additional investigation.

No differences were uncovered in the organizational values or critical success factors offered by the
directors of high rated Campus Recreation Programs compared to the low rated programs (Research Question #7). Perhaps the directors of high rated programs are more effective in cultivating the organizational values with staff members and carrying out the critical success factors than their counterparts from the low rated programs. However, additional research is required to substantiate such claims.

The differences in staffing complements uncovered between the two conferences appear to be important relative to visionary leadership and organizational culture. The Campus Recreation Programs in the Big Ten Conference may require a different type of influence from visionary leaders than those in the Mid American Conference programs. The higher relationships uncovered between all measures of visionary leadership and organizational culture produced for the Big Ten Conference programs suggest that visionary leadership may be more important in the larger, decentralized programs that are frequently dispersed throughout a college campus. Additional research investigating this area is warranted prior to substantiating this notion.

Based on the results of the qualitative data analyses, directors of Big Ten Conference Campus Recreation Programs need to be more concerned with maintaining strong organizational cultures, or carrying
out the more difficult assignment of transforming a negative culture into one that is positive.

Directors of Campus Recreation Programs from the Mid American Conference attempting to build the culture of their program need to ensure that sound hiring decisions and effective orientation practices transpire in light of the rapid turnover in senior administrative ranks. The distinct and different leadership needs of programs from the two conferences were also illuminated in the interaction effect relative to the "customer orientation" culture building activity. Directors need to effectively focus their organization to the needs of customers. Directors of Big Ten Conference Campus Recreation Programs may have the greater challenge in fulfilling this duty in that students do not generally occupy decision-making positions in their administrative structures. The staffing arrangement is different for the Mid American Conference Campus Recreation Programs. This finding may help explain the finding where the M4 program (low leadership group from the Mid American Conference) generated high organizational culture scores as well as high student satisfaction scores.

**Implications for the Campus Recreation Profession**

The following implications for the Campus Recreation profession can be extracted from the results of this research:
1. The effect of visionary leaders appears to be more pronounced in larger, dispersed programs like those from the Big Ten Conference.

2. Directors need to instill and maintain a strong, positive organizational culture for their program. Organizational culture does significantly correlate to program success as measured by student satisfaction scores. As Schein (1990) suggested, culture building may be the most important component of a leader's role.

3. Directors of Campus Recreation Programs that experience low turnover within the senior administrative levels have the more difficult challenge of modifying an existing culture for their respective program.

4. Campus Recreation Directors from programs that experience more frequent turnover can create a new, more positive culture through effective hiring and orientation practices.

5. The inclusion of students in senior administrative positions and/or employing a student advisory council may enhance the "customer orientation scores" relative to the most involved target population on a college campus.

6. Directors of Campus Recreation Programs that have full time professional staff members in the senior administrative positions need to heighten efforts to orient staff members to the recreational activity needs of students.
7. Campus Recreation Directors who lead programs that are dispersed throughout a college campus have a greater challenge in maintaining a strong, positive organizational culture for their program than their counterparts who lead centrally located operations. Directors in these settings would be well served emphasizing the "coordinated teamwork" culture building activity to facilitate the development of a harmonious, united staff.

8. Campus Recreation Directors of widely dispersed programs need to align and unite their operation towards a common purpose or end. Culture building activities related to "achieving goals" will assist directors in clarifying an organizational purpose and mission as well as focus the entire organization towards a desired end. The culture building activity variable ("achieving goals") has a strong relationship to success in the smaller, centrally located programs found in the Mid American Conference that do not have the same geographical barriers that exist in dispersed programs.

9. Campus Recreation Programs that emphasize fitness programming and self-directed activities are rated more favorably by students than programs that emphasize more traditional campus recreation activities (e.g., intramurals, special events, etc.).
Recommendations for Future Research

The topic of leadership has been a popular yet elusive topic for research studies set in a variety of different environments. Within sport management, the concept has been identified (Paton, 1987) as the most prevalent theme of research initiatives. The "new" approach, labelled "visionary leadership" will undoubtedly continue to capture the attention of researchers from a variety of fields including sport management.

In addition, the organizational culture area holds great promise for future research, particularly those studies integrating the concepts of visionary leadership and organizational culture. The organizational culture variable may serve as the essential and previously overlooked intermediate factor in leadership studies addressing the effect of leadership on follower satisfaction and/or productivity.

The following recommendations for future research are based on the researcher's experience with this study:

1. Explore the interaction effects of leadership rating and type of conference with a larger sample size and/or an increased alpha level.

2. Investigate the difference between high and low visionary leaders relative to their effect on modifying the organizational cultures of Campus Recreation Programs (i.e., investigate only Big Ten Conference schools).
3. Increase the number of LBQ-other measures for the executive leader. The number of LBQ-other measures should be increased from two to four. Investigators are advised to secure two measures from both the second and third hierarchical levels.

4. Include a measure of the institution's organizational culture as a variable as it may assist or impede the effect of a visionary leader in Campus Recreation.

5. Include other qualitative data collection procedures in the study (e.g., document analysis and observational measures of staff meetings and programs).

6. Improve the Culture Building Activities instrument (CBA) prior to employing it in subsequent studies.

7. Develop a more comprehensive (in addition to student satisfaction), universal measure of success in Campus Recreation prior to replicating the study.

8. Conduct a five year longitudinal study on the effect of visionary leadership using the findings from this study as antecedent data.

9. Design a study that considers the effect of visionary leaders on various types of organizational cultures (e.g., collegial, personalistic, formalistic).

10. Consider some of the exploratory (relationship) findings and conduct confirmatory (experimental) studies on the effect of visionary leadership on organizational
culture and program success.

11. Replicate the study (with an increased N) in another area of sport management (e.g., athletics, community recreation programs).

In summary, Campus Recreation Directors securing higher visionary leadership scores (1) lead programs that possess a stronger organizational culture and, (2) lead programs that carry out the "customer orientation" activity to a greater degree than programs administered by low visionary leaders. The degree of relationship in both cases is more pronounced in the Big Ten Conference. In addition, a significant relationship was uncovered between the organizational culture scores and student satisfaction measures. Insignificant relationships were produced between the (1) leadership rating and organizational culture, (2) leadership rating and student satisfaction, and (3) each of the culture building activities and student satisfaction. Non-significant differences were also uncovered between the two leadership groups relative to the effect of leadership on the penetration of organizational culture throughout the organizational hierarchy. High rated programs did not differ from the low rated programs relative to their organizational values or critical success factors.
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APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTION OF SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY
Note: Sources of these data included: (a) The Right College (1988), (b) The College Blue Book (1989), and (c) the 1990 Recreational Sports Directory 1990).

BIG TEN INSTITUTIONS

Purdue University

General Information:

* Located in West Lafayette, Indiana
* Founded in 1869.
* Undergraduate profile: 76% state residents, 2% Asian-American, 3% Black, 1% Hispanic, 94% White
* 6% undergraduate foreign student population
* 46% of students live in campus housing
* 70% participate in intramurals
* Full Time undergraduate enrollment = 29,537
  Freshmen = 6,960
  Sophomores = 8,098 (37% of 375 or S = 139)
  Juniors = 7,111 (33% of 375 or S = 124)
  Seniors = 6,530 (30% of 375 or S = 112)
Faculty/Staff = 4,000

University of Michigan

General Information:

* Located in Ann Arbor, Michigan (population 100,000)
* Founded in 1817.
* Undergraduate profile: 68% state residents, 3% Asian-American, 5% Black, 3% Hispanic, 1% American Indian or Eskimo, 87% White
* 2% undergraduate foreign student population
* Average undergraduate age is 20 years
* 45% of students live in campus housing
* 40% participate in intramurals
* Full Time undergraduate enrollment = 23,156
  Freshmen = 5,170
  Sophomores = 5,566 (32% of 375 or S = 120)
  Juniors = 6,174 (34% of 375 or S = 128)
  Seniors = 6,174 (34% of 375 or S = 128)
Faculty/Staff = 5,000

Michigan State University

General Information:

* Located in East Lansing, Michigan
* Founded in 1855
* Undergraduate profile: 91% state residents, 2% Asian-American, 6% Black, 1% Hispanic, 84% White
* 1% undergraduate foreign student population
* Average undergraduate age is 20 years
* 55% of students live in campus housing
* 35% participate in intramurals
* Full Time undergraduate enrollment = 42,866
  Freshmen = 9,383
  Sophomores = 9,054 (36% of 375 or S = 135)
  Juniors = 8,375 (33% of 375 or S = 123)
  Seniors = 7,735 (31% of 375 or S = 117)
  Faculty/Staff = 5,000

Northwestern University

General Information:
* Located in Evanston, Illinois
* Founded in 1851
* Undergraduate profile: 27% state residents, 10% Asian-American, 8% Black, 2% Hispanic, 78% White
* 2% undergraduate foreign student population
* 80% of students live in campus housing
* 75% of students participate in intramurals
* Full Time undergraduate enrollment = 7,363
  Freshmen = 1,900
  Sophomores = 1,834 (34% of 375 or S = 127)
  Juniors = 1,755 (32% of 375 or S = 121)
  Seniors = 1,827 (34% of 375 or S = 127)
  Faculty/Staff = 2,000

University of Illinois

General Information:
* Located in Champaign-Urbana, IL (population 100,000)
* Founded in 1867
* Full time undergraduate enrollment - 14,351 men and 11,775 women.
* Undergraduate profile: 95% state residents, 7% Asian-American, 5% Black, 3% Hispanic, 83% White
* 0.09% undergraduate foreign student population
* Average undergraduate age is 20 years
* 32% of students live in campus housing
* 74% participate in intramurals

University of Iowa

General Information:
* Located in Iowa City, Iowa
* Founded in 1847.
* Full time undergraduate enrollment - 8,725 men and 8,808 women.
* Undergraduate profile: 71% state residents, 2% Asian-American, 2% Black, 1% Hispanic, 91% White
* 3% undergraduate foreign student population
* Average undergraduate age is 21 years
* 25% of students live in campus housing
* 40% participate in intramurals

Indiana University

General Information:

* Located in Bloomington, Indiana (population 60,000)
* Founded in 1820.
* Full time undergraduate enrollment - 11,467 men and 13,752 women.
* Undergraduate profile: 72% state residents, 1% Asian-American, 4% Black, 1% Hispanic, 91% White
* 3% undergraduate foreign student population
* Average undergraduate age is 19 years
* 50% of students live in campus housing
* 80% participate in intramurals

The Ohio State University

General Information:

* Located in Columbus, Ohio
* Founded in 1873.
* Full time undergraduate enrollment - 18,592 men and 15,526 women.
* Undergraduate profile: 89% state residents, 2% Asian-American, 5% Black, 1% Hispanic, 87% White
* 2% undergraduate foreign student population
* 20% of students live in campus housing
* 20% participate in intramurals

University of Wisconsin

General Information:

* Located in Madison, Wisconsin
* Full time undergraduate enrollment - 13,652 men and 13,668 women.
* Undergraduate profile: 75% state residents, 2% Asian-American, 2% Black, 1% Hispanic, 1% American Indian or Eskimo, 92% White
* 2% undergraduate foreign student population
* Average undergraduate age is 21 years
* 24% of students live in campus housing
University of Minnesota

General Information:

* Located in Minneapolis, Minnesota
* Full time undergraduate enrollment - 16,341 men and 14,623 women.
* Undergraduate profile: 97% state residents, 5% Asian-American, 2% Black, 1% Hispanic, 1% American Indian or Eskimo, 90% White
* 2% undergraduate foreign student population
* Average undergraduate age is 22 years
* 10% of students live in campus housing

MID AMERICAN CONFERENCE

Eastern Michigan University

General Information:

* Located in Ypsilanti, Michigan
* Founded in 1842
* Undergraduate profile: 96% state residents, 1% Asian-American, 8% Black, 1% Hispanic, 86% White
* 4% undergraduate foreign student population
* Average undergraduate age is 22 years
* 16% of students live in campus housing
* 14% of students participate in intramurals
* Full Time undergraduate enrollment = 19,199
  
    Freshmen = 4,542  
    Sophomores = 4,803 (33% of 375 or S = 124)  
    Juniors = 4,153 (28% of 375 or S = 105)  
    Seniors = 5,615 (39% of 375 or S = 146)  
  
    Faculty/Staff = 1,500

Central Michigan University

General Information:

* Located in Mount Pleasant, Michigan
* Founded in 1897
* Undergraduate profile: 99% state residents, 1% Asian-American, 2% Black, 1% Hispanic, 1% American Indian or Eskimo, 94% White
* 1% undergraduate foreign student population
* Average undergraduate age is 20 years
* 36% of students live in campus housing
* 50% of students participate in intramurals
* Full Time undergraduate enrollment = 15,628
  
    Freshmen = 3,702  
    Sophomores = 3,726 (32% of 375 or S = 120)  

Western Michigan University

General Information:
* Located in Kalamazoo, Michigan
* Founded in 1903
* Undergraduate profile: 95% state residents, 1% Asian-American, 5% Black, 1% Hispanic, 90% White
* 3% undergraduate foreign student population
* Average undergraduate age is 20 years
* 37% of students live in campus housing
* 57% of students participate in intramurals
* Full Time undergraduate enrollment = 15,658
  Freshmen = 4,431
  Sophomores = 4,162 (37% of 375 or S = 139)
  Juniors = 3,776 (34% of 375 or S = 127)
  Seniors = 3,270 (29% of 375 or S = 109)
  Faculty/Staff = 1,400

Miami University

General Information:
* Located in Oxford, Ohio
* Founded in 1809
* 3% undergraduate foreign student population
* Average undergraduate age is 20 years
* 60% of students live in campus housing
* 90% of students participate in intramurals
* Full Time undergraduate enrollment = 14,467
  Freshmen = 4,280 (39% of 375 or S = 146)
  Sophomores = 3,112 (29% of 375 or S = 109)
  Juniors = 3,531 (32% of 375 or S = 120)
  Faculty/Staff = 1,550

Ohio University

General Information:
* Located in Athens, Ohio
* Founded in 1804
* Full time undergraduate enrollment - 6,500 men and
  6,500 women.
* Undergraduate profile: 75% state residents, 1% Asian-American, 7% Black, 1% Hispanic, 1% American Indian or Eskimo, 81% White
* 9% undergraduate foreign student population
* Average undergraduate age is 20 years
* 60% of students live in campus housing
* 75% of students participate in intramurals

Ball State University

General Information:

* Located in Muncie, Indiana
* Founded in 1918
* Full time undergraduate enrollment - 6,577 men and 7,992 women.
* Undergraduate profile: 95% state residents, 1% Asian-American, 4% Black, 1% Hispanic, 1% American Indian or Eskimo, 92% White
* 1% undergraduate foreign student population
* Average undergraduate age is 20 years
* 41% of students live in campus housing
* 60% of students participate in intramurals

Bowling Green State University

General Information:

* Located in Bowling Green, Ohio
* Founded in 1910
* Full time undergraduate enrollment - 5,777 men and 8,371 women.
* Undergraduate profile: 93% state residents, 1% Asian-American, 4% Black, 1% Hispanic, 93% White
* 2% undergraduate foreign student population
* Average undergraduate age is 21 years
* 50% of students live in campus housing
* 70% of students participate in intramurals

Kent State University

General Information:

* Located in Kent, Ohio (population 30,000)
* Founded in 1910
* Full time undergraduate enrollment - 6,914 men and 8,804 women.
* Undergraduate profile: 91% state residents, 1% Asian-American, 5% Black, 91% White
* 3% undergraduate foreign student population
* Average undergraduate age is 20 years
* 41% of students live in campus housing
* 50% of students participate in intramurals
University of Toledo

General Information:

* Located in Toledo, Ohio (population 350,000)
* Founded in 1872
* Full time undergraduate enrollment - 6,307 men and 6,005 women.
* Undergraduate profile: 92% state residents, 1% Asian-American, 6% Black, 1% Hispanic, 82% White
* 7% undergraduate foreign student population
* Average undergraduate age is 24 years
* 14% of students live in campus housing
* 25% of students participate in intramurals

PILOT STUDY SCHOOLS

University of Western Ontario

General Information:

* Located in London, Ontario, Canada
* Founded in 1878
* Full time undergraduate enrollment (9,406 men and 9,535 women.
* 3% undergraduate foreign student population
* Average undergraduate age is 25 years
* 30% of students live in campus housing

McMaster University

General Information:

* Located in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada
* Founded in 1930
* Full time undergraduate enrollment - 5,500 men and 6,000 women.
* extensive intramural program
APPENDIX B

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION FORM
Instructions

1. Please complete this form, the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire - Self instrument and forward the information along with a copy of your organizational chart and staff directory to Jim Weese.

Fax Number: 614-293-9396 or mail to Jim Weese
Room 172
Jones Graduate Tower
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210
(Phone: 614-293-9396)

2. Please pass on the enclosed Subordinate packages to the prescribed individuals.

3. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this valuable research.

Note: This research supported by a National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) Research Grant.

A. GENERAL INFORMATION:

School: ________________________________

Director's Name: ________________________ # Years as Director (this school): _____

Please rate (check) the degree of autonomy you have to administer your overall operation:
High Autonomy: _____ Moderate Autonomy: _____ Low Autonomy: _____

Office Phone: (___)____-____ Home Phone: (__)____-____

Best Day: __________________ Time: __________ to contact by telephone

Fax Number (if applicable): ____-____

B. PROGRAM INFORMATION (for all sanctioned programs during the September 1, 1989 - May 30, 1990 time frame):

Participation Data:

a. total number of participations (including multiple participations):
   a1. ________ participations (total - i.e. students, faculty, staff)
   a2. ________ student (full and part time) participations

b. Describe method for recording/source:
c. Your perception of the degree of accuracy of these measures:
   (i.e., 100% - 1%):
   a1. ___% accuracy           a2: ___% accuracy

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

d. Total number of participants (individuals participating in the program)
   d1. _______ total participants
   d2. _______ students (full and part time) participants

   e. Describe method for recording/source:

f. Your perception of the degree of accuracy of these measures:
   (i.e., 100% - 1%):
   d1. ___% accuracy           d2: ___% accuracy

C. SELECTED SUBORDINATE INFORMATION:

1. Selected Subordinate A: (your most senior subordinate who is positioned in the
   second level within your organizational hierarchy - i.e., one level below you).

   Name: ____________________________________________
   Job Title: ____________________________________________
   Office Phone: (  ) ____-____ Home Phone: (  ) ____-_____
   Best Day: __________________ Time: ________________ to contact by telephone

2. Selected Subordinate B: (a subordinate who has worked in the program for at least two years and is also positioned in the second level within your
   organizational hierarchy - i.e., one level below you. Ties are broken by selecting
   the individual who's surname begins with the letter that is closest to the end of
   the alphabet - i.e., Z).

   Name: ____________________________________________
   Job Title: ____________________________________________
   Office Phone: (  ) ____-____ Home Phone: (  ) ____-_____
   Best Day: __________________ Time: ________________ to contact by telephone

   Thank you for your support.
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LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR

DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE (LBQ) - SELF
PLEASE NOTE

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.
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LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR

QUESTIONNAIRE (LBQ) - OTHER
APPENDIX E

CULTURE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT
APPENDIX F

SEMI-DIRECTED FOCUSED INTERVIEW

DIRECTOR SCRIPT
Campus Recreation Director's Script

"My name is Jim Weese and I am the Co-ordinator of Campus Recreation at the University of Windsor. I am conducting a research project funded in part by the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association and I'm delighted that you are participating in the project.

As part of my research procedure, I will be asking you open-ended questions relative to your leadership style and what it is like to work in the program. I'd like to tape record the interview so that I can capture every word you say accurately. If at any time you would like to turn the recorder off, please press this button and the recorder will shut off.

You have my assurance that your responses will be handled confidentially. It is essential that you answer every question as accurately as you can. Ask me to clarify a question if you have any uncertainty as to what is being asked. I encourage you to be as honest and frank as possible.

A paper summarizing the collective results from all of the schools I researched will be forwarded directly to you upon the completion of my study."

Part A. LEADERSHIP

The first series of questions will relate to your leadership tendencies.

1. Do you consider yourself to be a leader? Explain?

2. If so, what are your strengths as the leader of the Campus Recreation Program at your University (for example - you set an admirable work ethic standard; you are an effective communicator; you have a clear direction for where the program is going)?
3. What are your weaknesses as the leader of the Campus Recreation Program at your University?

4. What are your priorities (things that you want accomplished or carried out) relative to operating a successful Campus Recreation Program at your institution?

5. How do you communicate these priorities to your staff members?

6. How successful are you in communicating these priorities throughout all levels of the organization? Explain?

7. What do you find yourself doing more frequently — sticking to your original opinion or changing your opinion? Please provide an example.

8. To what degree do you consider yourself a risk-taker (for example — would you offer new activities never tried before on your campus)? Explain and provide an example of your risk taking tendencies.

9. How much of an effect do you have on the success of your organization? Explain?

10. Tell me about your philosophy of delegating to staff members?

11. What are your top two goals for the Campus Recreation Program over the next year?; Five years (if applicable)? Ten years (if applicable)?

12. Do you share your long term goals with other staff members? If so, how?

13. How have you attempted to create a "team" approach within your operation? Have your efforts been successful?

14. Describe the most important common or shared view or perspective amongst people who work in the program.

15. Do you recognize (formally/informally) other's strengths and contributions? If so, how?

Part B. Organizational Culture

The second series of questions will relate to the organizational culture surrounding the Campus Recreation Program at your institution.

1. How would your participants/clients describe your program (specifically your activities and offerings)?
2. How would they describe your administrative operation?

3. Do you have any informal rules that you expect all staff members to follow? Explain?

4. What do you think it is like (staff member's perspective) to work here (for Campus Recreation)?

5. Do you have any ceremonies/events to acknowledge, honour or recognize your staff members?

6. How do you know what your target market wants from their Campus Recreation Program?

7. What does your Campus Recreation Program stand for with respect to:

Values (for example: hard work, honesty, teamwork, consistency, quality, openness, professionalism).

Are there behavioral expectations to support these values (for example: the way things are done around here - punctuality, following through on commitments, attending meetings, being courteous to all clients).

8. How well do the people in your organization clearly understand their role in the program? Explain?

9. To what extent do staff members assist others to benefit the organization regardless of who's responsibility the task may be? Explain?

Part C. Critical Success Factors

The third series of questions relate to the critical success factors ("things that must go right" or "the factors that you focus your resources/time on which spell the difference between success and failure)

For example: designing a program that meet the needs of the target population, expertly promoting this required program to potential participants, acquiring a competent, enthusiastic staff, lobbying central administration for additional fiscal support, etc.

1. Please tell me, in whatever order comes to mind, the things that you see as critical success factors in your position as the Director of the Campus Recreation Program.

2. Stated another way, what one, two or three critical success factors would concern you the most if they did not
get accomplished?

3. Relative to the ___ values you stated earlier (reviewed for respondent), what critical success factors would you associate with each value?

For example:

Value: Professionalism

Critical Success Factor: encourage staff to publish in professional journals

or

Value: Teamwork

Critical Success Factor: Promote staff involvement in social activities outside the work environment

Value 1. _______________________

Value 2. _______________________

Value 3. _______________________

Value 4. _______________________

Value 5. _______________________

4. Prior to ending this interview, would you like to add anything that has not been addressed by my questions?

Thank you for your time and valuable information.
APPENDIX G

SEMI-DIRECTED FOCUSED INTERVIEW

SUBORDINATE SCRIPT
"My name is Jim Weese and I am the Co-ordinator of Campus Recreation at the University of Windsor. I am conducting a research project funded in part by the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association and I'm delighted that you are participating in the project.

As part of my research procedure, I will be asking you a series of open-ended questions relative to your Program Director and what it is like to work in Campus Recreation at your school. I'd like to tape record the interview so that I can capture every word you say accurately. If at any time you would like to turn the recorder off, please press this button and the recorder will shut off.

You have my assurance that your responses will be handled confidentially. It is essential that you answer every question as accurately as you can. Ask me to clarify a question if you have any uncertainty as to what is being asked. I encourage you to be as honest and frank as possible.

A paper summarizing the collective results from all of the schools I researched will be forwarded directly to you upon the completion of my study."

Part A. General Information

1. Relative to your position in the Campus Recreation Program:

   a) what is your position? status?
   b) how long have you been in this capacity?
   c) how long have you been associated with the Campus Recreation Program?

Part B. LEADERSHIP

1. Would you describe your Program Director as a leader? Please discuss why/why not?
2. If so, what are his/her greatest strengths as a leader (for example, sets a good example, works hard, shows genuine interest in his/her staff, get results)?

3. What would you suggest are two of his/her weaknesses as the leader of the Campus Recreation Program at your University?

4. Are you made aware of his/her priorities (things that he/she wants accomplished/carried out) relative to operating a successful Campus Recreation Program at your institution?

5. How does he/she communicate these priorities to you?

6. Do you know exactly what your Director values (for example, integrity, effort, excellence, professionalism, teamwork, tight bureaucratic control, consistency)?

7. Would you state that your Director is one who generally changes his/her opinion or is he/she more likely to stick to his/her original idea. Please explain and provide an example of the most frequent tendency.

8. To what degree does your Director take risks (for example - would he/she agree to offer a new activity never tried before on your campus or allow an administrative a policy to be changed without thoroughly testing it first)? Explain?

9. How much of an effect does he/she have on the success of your organization? Explain?

10. Would you consider your Director to be an effective delegator? Do you get an opportunity to display your skills and abilities?

11. What are the top two goals for the Campus Recreation Program over the next year?; Five years (if applicable)? Ten years (if applicable)?

12. Do you ever discuss the long term goals for the Campus Recreation Program with the Director?

13. Has the Director instilled a team approach amongst staff members? Explain?

14. Describe the most important common or shared view or perspective among people who work in the program.
Part C. Organizational Culture

The third series of questions will relate to the organizational culture surrounding the Campus Recreation Program at your institution.

1. How would your participants/clients describe your program's activities and offerings?

2. How would your participants/clients describe your administrative operation?

3. What informal rules exist that staff members must follow?

4. What is it like to work here (for Campus Recreation)?

5. Do you set goals for your area of responsibility that relate to the Campus Recreation goals?

6. What does your Campus Recreation Program stand for with respect to:

   Values (for example: hard work, honesty, teamwork, consistency, quality, openness, professionalism).

   Are the behavioral expectations to support these values (for example: the way things are done around here - punctuality, following through on commitments, attending meetings, being courteous to all clients)?

7. To what extent do staff members assist others to benefit the organization regardless of who's responsibility the task may be? Explain?

8. Prior to ending this interview, would you like to add anything that has not been addressed by my questions?

Thank you for your time and valuable information.
APPENDIX H

TARGET POPULATION SATISFACTION INDEX
TARGET POPULATION SATISFACTION INDEX

INSTRUCTIONS
The following statements apply to the Intramural - Recreational Sports Program (also known as the Campus Recreation Program) at your school. Please circle the response that best describes your feelings for the program. It will only take two minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Thank you for your time and information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status (Fr, So, Jr, Sr, Grad Student, Faculty Member, Staff Member)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Were you enrolled at this institution during the 1989-90 academic year? yes ___ no ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Are you aware of the Campus Recreation Program at your institution? yes ___ no ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Did you participate in the Campus Recreation Program during 1989-90? yes ___ no ___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS USING THE FOLLOWING KEY:

- completely true (CT)
- mostly true (MT)
- somewhat true (ST)
- a little true (LT)
- not at all true (NT)

1. Our Campus Recreation Program meets my recreational activity needs ........................................
2. My friends/coworkers speak highly of the program .................................................................
3. Our Campus Recreation activities are effectively promoted ...................................................
4. Our Campus Recreation Program has expanded my recreational activity interests ..................
5. The Campus Recreation staff members collectively demonstrate that they know their business.
6. My friends/coworkers would prefer to participate in off-campus activities than enroll in comparable activities offered by Campus Recreation.
7. Our Campus Recreation Program contributes to the quality of campus life at this institution.
8. Defaults/no shows are a large problem in our Campus Recreation Program ..........................
9. Campus Recreation activities are not in demand at our school ...........................................
10. Our Campus Recreation activities provide outstanding opportunities to meet other people.
11. Our Campus Recreation Program prepares the campus community for life-long participation in recreational activities.
12. Our Campus Recreation Program is a prominent component of this institution.
13. Our Campus Recreation Program offers something for everyone.
14. I know exactly how to register for Campus Recreation activities ........................................

Sincere thanks
APPENDIX I

PANEL OF EXPERTS WHO ASSESSED CONTENT VALIDITY OF
THE VISIONARY LEADERSHIP COMPONENT
OF INTERVIEW SCRIPT

Prior to Final Draft
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Dr. Dorothy Zakrajsek  Director, Faculty of Physical Education and Health  The Ohio State University  Columbus, Ohio  43210

2. Dr. Jerald Greenberg  Professor, Management of Human Resources  The Ohio State University  Columbus, Ohio  43210

3. Dr. Mary Daniels  Assistant Vice Provost  The Ohio State University  Columbus, Ohio  43210

OTHER EXPERTS

4. Dr. Robert Backoff *  Professor, Public Policy and Management  The Ohio State University  Columbus, Ohio  43210


6. Dr. Jay Conger  Assistant Professor, Faculty of Management  McGill University  Montreal, Quebec  H3A 1G5  514-398-4032  514-398-3876 (fax)

7. Dr. Robert Boucher  Associate Professor  Faculty of Human Kinetics  University of Windsor  Windsor, Ontario  N9B 3P4  519-253-4232  519-973-7058 (fax)

* did not complete assessment
Dr. Jay Conger, Assistant Professor,
Faculty of Management
McGill University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada
H2W 1S4

June 26, 1990

Dear Jay:

******************************************************************************
* Please enjoy the enclosed candy while you are assessing the interview script *
******************************************************************************

I am conducting an exciting research study that is designed to measure the effect of visionary (transformational) leadership on Campus Recreation Programs housed in higher education settings. Specifically, I am looking at the effect of visionary leadership on the development and penetration of strong, positive organizational cultures as well as the corresponding effect on campus satisfaction with the recreational sports program. My design calls for a triangulation methodology which will blend both quantitative and qualitative research procedures. I have enlisted other colleagues to assess the content validity of the organizational culture and campus satisfaction measures, however, I do need your expertise and assistance in assessing the content validity of the visionary leadership "interview schedule" which is attached for your review.

I have chosen to use Marshall Sashkin's (1988) Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ) to quantitatively measure the visionary leadership tendencies of Campus Recreation Directors. To complement and enrich the interval data garnered through this instrument, I wish to employ a triangulation methodology by including an interview schedule. I will be conducting the necessary reliability and validity measures for the LBQ instrument, but lack content validity measures on the attached "leadership" interview schedule. I have closely assimilated the interview script with the LBQ instrument items.

College of Education
Enclosed you will find a listing of my research objectives and the leadership interview script which contains a variety of open-ended questions related to visionary leadership. Please assess the appropriateness and clarity of each question as it relates to content validity (visionary leadership). I encourage you to add any comments or suggestions at the end of the instrument in the space provided.

Please return the information to me in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope within five days of receiving the package. For your convenience, I also have a fax machine to receive your completed materials and encourage you to fax me your reply if this method is more convenient.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at one of the two telephone numbers listed below. I thank you with all sincerity for your expert assistance and I'll anxiously await your reply.

Respectfully,

W. James Weese

Phone Number: 614-293-9396 (Ohio State Office)
Fax Number: 614-293-9396 (Ohio State Office)

Phone number (Weekends) 519-256-8911 (Windsor, Ontario, Canada)
INTERVIEW SCRIPT CONTENT VALIDATION FORM

Visionary Leadership Section

(to be used to complement the interval data generated by the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire - Sashkin, 1988)

Reviewers Note: All interviewees will be given a prepared introduction to the study and the procedures that I will be using (i.e., taping of the session, anonymity, etc).

VALIDATION SECTION I: Item appropriateness and clarity

Directions: Please rate each question (by circling "yes" or "no") on two criteria (1) appropriateness of the item in representing the content, and (2) the clarity of the question. If the question is appropriate but unclear, please suggest a rewording of the question on the blank lines below the question.

---------------------------------------------------------------

LEADERSHIP INTERVIEWS WITH CAMPUS RECREATION DIRECTORS

The first series of questions will relate to your leadership tendencies.

L1. What are your strengths as the leader of the Campus Recreation Program at your University?

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

---------------------------------------------------------------

L2. What are your weaknesses as the leader of the Campus Recreation Program at your University?

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

---------------------------------------------------------------
L3. What are your priorities relative to operating a successful Campus Recreation Program at your institution?
Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

L4. How do you communicate these priorities to your staff members?
Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

L5. Are you successful in communicating these priorities throughout all levels of the organization? Explain?
Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

L6. What methods do you use to communicate with your staff members?
Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

L7. Are you an effective communicator? Explain?
Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

L8. Are you an individual who sticks to his/her convictions? Explain?
Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No
L9. How well do you know your staff members away from the organization?
Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

L10. Is it important to you to know your staff away from the organization?
Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

L11. Would you consider yourself to be an leader who takes risks (i.e., program offering never attempted before) or do you prefer to offer status quo programs that have been successful. Explain?
Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

L12. How much of an effect do you have on the success of your organization? Explain?
Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

L13. Tell me about your philosophy of delegating to staff members?
Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No
L14. What are your goals for this program over the next year? Five years (if applicable)? Ten years (if applicable)?

Appropriate? Yes No
Clear? Yes No

L15. Do you share your goals with other staff members? Explain?

Appropriate? Yes No
Clear? Yes No

L16. Have you attempted to create a coordinated, "team" approach to your operation? Explain? If yes, have your efforts been successful?

Appropriate? Yes No
Clear? Yes No

L17. Do you feel that you have an impact on specific values and attitudes that are reflective of your organization?

Appropriate? Yes No
Clear? Yes No

L18. Do you consider yourself to be a leader? Explain?

Appropriate? Yes No
Clear? Yes No
LEADERSHIP INTERVIEWS WITH SUBORDINATES

S1. How would you describe your Program Director as a leader? What are his/her strengths as the leader of the Campus Recreation Program at your University? What are his/her weaknesses as the leader of the Campus Recreation Program at your University?

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

S2. Do you know his/her priorities? If so, how are they communicated to you? Would you consider him/her successful in communicating his/her priorities to you? Is your Director an effective communicator? Why? Why not?

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

S3. Is your Director someone who sticks to his convictions? Explain?

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

S4. Does you Director show an interest in your activities outside of your involvement with the program? Explain?

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

S5. Does your Director take risks (i.e., program offering never attempted before) or does he/she prefer to offer status quo programs that have been successful. Explain?

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No
S6. How much of an effect do he/she have on the success of the program? Explain?

Appropriate? Yes No
Clear? Yes No

S7. What were the goals for the 1989-90 program (if known)? What are the long-term (i.e., 5 years) for this program (if known)?

Appropriate? Yes No
Clear? Yes No

S8. In your opinion, does the leader facilitate a working environment that is based on team work and coordination? Explain?

Appropriate? Yes No
Clear? Yes No

S9. Do you consider your Director to be a leader? Explain?

Appropriate? Yes No
Clear? Yes No

VALIDATION SECTION II: Comments

In addition to any of the changes you have made thus far, do you think anything should be added, deleted, or modified?


Thank you
APPENDIX J

PANEL OF EXPERTS WHO ASSESSED CONTENT VALIDITY OF
THE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE COMPONENT
OF INTERVIEW SCRIPT
Prior to Final Draft
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVISORY COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dr. Dorothy Zakrajsek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Faculty of Physical Education and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, Ohio 43210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dr. Jerald Greenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor, Management of Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, Ohio 43210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dr. Mary Daniels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Vice Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, Ohio 43210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dr. Marshall Sashkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Associate, Educational Research and Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C. 20208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dr. William Hitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Management Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battelle Memorial Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, Ohio 43201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dr. Trevor Slack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor, Department of Physical Education and Sport Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton, Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dr. Gordon Olafson *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Human Kinetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor, Ontario N9B 3P4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* did not complete assessment
June 26, 1990

Dear Dr. Trevor:

* * *

Please enjoy the enclosed candy while you are assessing the interview script.

* * *

I am conducting an exciting research study that is designed to measure the effect of visionary (transformational) leadership on Campus Recreation Programs housed in higher education settings. Specifically, I am looking at the effect of visionary leadership on the development and penetration of strong, positive organizational cultures as well as the corresponding effect on campus satisfaction with the program. My design calls for a triangulation methodology which will blend both quantitative and qualitative research procedures. I have enlisted other colleagues to assess the content validity of the visionary leadership interview script and campus satisfaction measures, however, I do need your expertise and assistance in assessing the content validity of the organizational culture "interview schedule" which is attached for your review.

I have chosen to use the Glaser and Sashkin (1989) "Cultural Strength Assessment" (CSA) and "Culture Building Assessment" (CBA) instruments (with permission) to uncover the organizational culture of the Campus Recreation Programs. These instruments measure the strength of the organization's culture relative to Deal and Kennedy's (1982) listing of requisite characteristics and the culture building activities (ability to adapt to change, achieve goals, team work, and the maintenance of a belief and value system linked to customer/client needs) purported by Parson's (1960) as being essential to organizational success and survival. In addition, I am interested in uncovering the organization's values and accompanying critical success factors for each of the institutions under investigation. To do so, I feel that an indepth, multiple method approach is required.
I endeavor to complement and enrich data garnered through my quantitative methods by employing a triangulation methodology. I have the necessary reliability and validity measures for my quantitative measures, but lack content validity measures for my organizational culture interview script. I have closely assimilated the interview script to the two instruments introduced above.

Enclosed you will find a listing of my research objectives and a listing of questions related to organizational culture. Please assess the appropriateness and clarity of each question in the interview script as it relates to content validity (organizational culture). I encourage you to add any comments or suggestions at the end of the instrument in the space provided.

Please return the information to me in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope within five days of receiving the package. For your convenience, I also have a fax machine to receive your completed materials and encourage you to fax me your reply if this method is more convenient.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at one of the two telephone numbers listed below. I thank you with all sincerity for your expert assistance and I'll anxiously await your reply.

Respectfully,

W. James Weese

Phone Number: 614-293-9396 (Ohio State Office)
Fax Number: 614-293-9396 (Ohio State Office)

Phone number (Weekends) 519-256-8911 (Windsor, Ontario, Canada)
INTERVIEW SCRIPT CONTENT VALIDATION FORM

Organizational Culture Section

(to be used to complement the interval data generated by the Glaser and Sashkin (1989) "Cultural Strength Assessment" (CSA) and "Culture Building Assessment" (CBA) instruments.

Reviewers Note: All interviewees will be given a prepared introduction to the study and the procedures that I will be using (i.e., taping of the session, anonymity, etc).

VALIDATION SECTION I: Item appropriateness and clarity

Directions: Please rate each question (by circling "yes" or "no") on two criteria (1) appropriateness of the item in representing the content, and (2) the clarity of the question. If the question is appropriate but unclear, please suggest a rewording of the question on the blank lines below the question.

---

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE - DIRECTOR SCRIPT

L1. How would your participants/clients describe your program? How would they describe your operation?

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

L2. Do you have any informal rules that you expect all staff members to follow? Explain?

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No
L3. What working atmosphere have you attempted to create for your employees? How?

Appropriate? Yes No

Clear? Yes No

L4. Do you have any ceremonies/events to acknowledge, honour or recognize your staff members?

Appropriate? Yes No

Clear? Yes No

L5. How do you know what your target market wants from their Campus Recreation Program?

Appropriate? Yes No

Clear? Yes No

L6. Do you have goals for your program? How are they communicated to staff members? Do you encourage your staff members to set and strive towards goals?

Appropriate? Yes No

Clear? Yes No

L7. What does your Campus Recreation Program stand for with respect to:

Values:

Appropriate? Yes No

Clear? Yes No
Behavioral Norms:
Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

L8. Do you believe that people in your organization clearly understand their role in the program? Explain?
Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

L9. Do you suspect that most organizational staff members assist others to benefit the organization regardless of who's responsibility the task may be? Explain?
Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS - DIRECTOR SCRIPT

The third series of questions relate to the critical success factors ("things that must go right" if the organization is to be successful).

L10. Please tell me, in whatever order comes to mind, the things that you see as critical success factors in your position as the Director of the Campus Recreation Program.
Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No
L11. Stated another way, what one, two or three critical success factors would concern you the most if they did not get accomplished?

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

L12. Relative to the ___ values you stated earlier (reviewed for respondent), what critical success factors would you associate with each value?

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

Value 1. 
Value 2. 
Value 3. 
Value 4. 
Value 5. 

-----------------------------

B. ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE - SUBORDINATE SCRIPT

S1. How would your participants/clients describe your program? How would they describe your operation?

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

S2. What is it like to work for the Campus Recreation Program?

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No
S3. What are the goals for the Campus Recreation Program? Do you set goals for your area of responsibility that relate to the Campus Recreation goals?

Appropriate? Yes No

Clear? Yes No

S4. What does your Campus Recreation Program stand for with respect to:

Values

Appropriate? Yes No

Clear? Yes No

Behavioral Norms

Appropriate? Yes No

Clear? Yes No

S5. Is there a feeling of teamwork and coordination amongst staff members?

Appropriate? Yes No

Clear? Yes No

VALIDATION SECTION II: Comments

In addition to any of the changes you have made thus far, do you think anything should be added, deleted, or modified?

Thank you
APPENDIX K
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Prior to Final Draft
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   Former C.I.R.A President  
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6. Dr. Robert Boucher  
   Former C.I.R.A President  
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   University of Windsor  
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   Former C.I.R.A President  
   Department of Recreation  
   Simon Fraser University  
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8. Mr. Joe MacDonald  
Current C.I.R.A President  
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Former N.I.R.S.A. President  
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Former N.I.R.S.A. President  
Campus Recreation  
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University of Illinois  
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11. Dr. Judi Bryant  
Former N.I.R.S.A. President  
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Current N.I.R.S.A. President  
Recreational Sports  
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Southern Illinois University  
Carbondale, IL  62901

* did not complete assessment
June 26, 1990

Dear Mike:

I trust that this letter finds you coming off another successful year and anxiously awaiting a well deserved summer vacation. Before you get away, I would like to tap your expertise.

I would be delighted if you would serve on a panel of experts (former Association Presidents) who will be assessing the content validity of items that will comprise a brief questionnaire designed to provide a measure of a campus' satisfaction with its respective Campus Recreation Program. I have attempted to capture the items that students, staff, and faculty might consider to be important in making such a judgement. Based on your vast experience in the field, I would like your opinion of the close-ended questions I have listed as well as any suggestions you might have relative to additional items. I will be administering the questionnaire to a systematic, random sample of students, staff and faculty members at each of the institutions participating in my study.

I will be using both quantitative and qualitative methods to uncover the effect of visionary leadership on the development and penetration of a positive organizational culture. I am also interested in investigating the possible relationships that might exist between these two phenomena and the degree to which the program satisfies its intended target population (limited to students, staff, and faculty). I have the necessary reliability and validity measures for my leadership and organizational culture measures, but lack content validity measures on the "Target Population Satisfaction Index" which is attached to this letter.
Enclosed you will find a listing of my research objectives and a copy of the instrument. Please assess the appropriateness and clarity of each item of the instrument as it relates to content validity (campus satisfaction). I encourage you to add any comments or suggestions at the end of the instrument in the space provided.

Please return the information to me in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope within five days of receiving the package. For your convenience, I also have a fax machine to receive your completed materials and encourage you to fax me your reply if this method is more convenient.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at one of the two telephone numbers listed below. I thank you with all sincerity for your expert assistance and I'll anxiously await your reply.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

W. James Weese

Phone Number: 614-293-9396 (Ohio State Office)
Fax Number: 614-293-9396 (Ohio State Office)

Phone number (Weekends) 519-256-8911 (Windsor, Ontario, Canada)
TARGET POPULATION SATISFACTION INDEX

(the degree to which the program satisfies the students, staff and faculty at each particular institution)

Reviewers Note: All study participants will be given a prepared introduction to the study and the response key. Study participants will be advised of the financial support of the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association Research Grant and my guarantee of respondent anonymity. Furthermore, the student's academic major and rank will be determined by a series of preliminary question that do not appear on this validation form.

VALIDATION SECTION I: Item appropriateness and clarity

Directions: Please rate each question (by circling "yes" or "no") on two criteria: (1) appropriateness of the item in representing the content, and (2) the clarity of the question. If the question is appropriate but unclear, please suggest a rewording of the question on the blank lines below the question.

Respondents will be asked to respond to the statements presented below relative to their Campus Recreation Program by circling their response.

Scale:

completely mostly somewhat a little not at all
true true true true true or or or or or
or descriptive descriptive descriptive descriptive descriptive

C M S L N

1. The Campus Recreation Program meets my recreational activity needs.

Appropriate? Yes No

Clear? Yes No
2. My friends/colleagues speak highly of the program.

3. The Campus Recreation activities are effectively promoted.

4. The Campus Recreation Program has expanded my recreational activity interests.

5. The Campus Recreation staff members collectively demonstrate that they know their business.
6. My friends/colleagues would prefer to participate in off-campus activities than enroll in comparable programs offered by Campus Recreation.

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

7. The Campus Recreation Program provides outstanding experiential learning opportunities for student employees.

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

8. Campus Recreation contributes to the quality of campus life at our institution.

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

9. Defaults/"no shows" are a large problem for our Campus Recreation Program.

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No
10. Campus Recreation activities are not in demand at our school.

C M S L N

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

11. Campus Recreation provides outstanding opportunities to meet other people.

C M S L N

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

12. The Campus Recreation Program prepares the campus community for life-long participation in recreational activities.

C M S L N

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No

13. The Campus Recreation Program is an important component of this institution.

C M S L N

Appropriate? Yes No Clear? Yes No
14. Our Campus Recreation Program offers "something for everyone".

   C   M   S   L   N

Appropriate? Yes No

Clear? Yes No


15. I know exactly how to register for Campus Recreation activities.

   C   M   S   L   N

Appropriate? Yes No

Clear? Yes No


VALIDATION SECTION II: Comments

In addition to any of the changes you have made thus far, do you think anything should be added, deleted, or modified?


Thank you
APPENDIX L

INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO CAMPUS RECREATION DIRECTORS
Dear Colleague:

June 22, 1990

As the Coordinator of Campus Recreation at the University of Windsor, I can appreciate the likelihood that you are in the process of wrapping up another busy year with your intramural-recreational sports program. While the events and activities associated with the 1989-90 edition of your program remain fresh in your mind, I am writing you to seek your involvement in an important research project funded in part by the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA). I am quite excited about the research project and trust that you share my enthusiasm for the study. The research represents the basis for my doctoral dissertation and the focus of the study will be nested in leadership, organizational culture, and target population satisfaction related to the field of recreational sports in higher education.

Through this research study, I hope to develop a framework for leading programs and developing an organizational culture suited to the accomplishment of the objectives of recreational sport programs in higher education. The topics of both leadership and organizational culture hold great promise for our area. I would like to contribute to the body of knowledge that exists in our special field and communicate my findings to other recreational sport professionals. However, to do so, I will need your help.
By design, I have selected a small sample of schools that are relatively homogeneous. Although the study will not take a great deal of your time, due to the small sample size, and the quality of information you can make available, your participation is vital. Respondent anonymity is guaranteed. All respondents will receive a copy of my research report upon the completion of the study.

A research package will be forwarded to you in three days. Enclosed in this package will be a research envelope with contents for you to complete and two envelopes that I will ask be distributed to two of your subordinates. These two subordinates must be "high ranking professional associates" who are positioned one level below you in the organizational hierarchy. One must be your most senior staff member at the prescribed level and the second will be from the same organizational level who has worked in the program for at least two years. If you have more than one individual who meets this criteria, please select the person whose surname begins with a letter closest to "Z" in the alphabet. This will also be explained in the research package.

For your convenience, a fax number as well as a self-addressed, stamped envelope will be provided in the package you are about to receive which should facilitate the prompt return of the completed materials.

In closing, I thank you for taking the time to read this letter and I trust that you share my enthusiasm for this research. Your participation is essential. Please look for the research package to arrive in three days.

Yours in recreation,

H. James Weese

Ohio State Office Phone Number : 614-293-9396
Ohio State Office Fax Number: 614-293-9396
Windsor Phone: 519-256-8911
APPENDIX M

RESEARCH PACKAGE (ROUND ONE) LETTER TO

CAMPUS RECREATION DIRECTORS
June 22, 1990

Dear Tony:

*****************************************************************************
* *
* Please enjoy the enclosed candy while you are filling out the *
* questionnaires *
* *
*****************************************************************************

Approximately three days ago, you received a letter from me introducing you to an exciting study that I am conducting in our field. I hope you have been anticipating the receipt of this research package and that you have selected the appropriate subordinates to participate in this phase of my research. You will recall that my research is related to the areas of leadership and organizational culture and pertains to the 1989-90 program year.

Enclosed you will find three envelopes. Please pass on the subordinate envelopes to the appropriate individuals based on selection criteria outlined below:

Subordinate A: your most senior professional staff member who is positioned on the second level (one below you) in the organizational hierarchy.

Subordinate B: another individual who is at the second level in your organizational hierarchy who has worked in the program for at least two years. If you have more than one individual who meets this condition, please select the person whose surname begins with a letter closest to "Z" in the alphabet. If you are having difficulty identifying this individual, please contact me by telephone.
Your envelope includes a "Preliminary Information Form", one Leadership Behavior Questionnaire - Self instrument, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. For your convenience, I have also listed my fax number at the bottom of this letter and I encourage you to use this method of returning the materials to me if it is more convenient. In addition, please forward me a copy of your organizational chart and a staff directory with your completed materials.

You will recall that I have selected a small sample so that I can do extensive research and hopefully, procure more meaningful data. I do require your full participation in the study. Please complete and return your materials to me within three days.

In closing, I thank you in advance for taking the time to complete and return the research materials and for passing on the enclosed envelopes to the appropriate subordinates. I remind you that the principles of confidentiality and anonymity will be strictly enforced and that all respondents will receive a copy of my research report upon the completion of the research.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
* * PLEASE RETURN COMPLETED MATERIALS *
* WITHIN IN THREE DAYS *
* *
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Yours in recreation,

W. James Weese

Ohio State Office Phone Number : 614-293-9396
Ohio State Office Fax Number: 614-293-9396
APPENDIX N

RESEARCH PACKAGE (ROUND ONE) LETTER

TO SELECTED SUBORDINATES
Dear Colleague:

June 22, 1990

As the Coordinator of Campus Recreation at the University of Windsor, I can appreciate the likelihood that you are in the process of wrapping up another busy year with your intramural-recreational sports program. While the events and activities associated with the 1989-90 edition of your program remain fresh in your mind, I am writing you to seek your involvement in an important research project funded in part by the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA). I am quite excited about the research project and trust that you share my enthusiasm for the study. The research represents the basis for my doctoral dissertation and the focus of the study will be nested in leadership, organizational culture, and target population satisfaction related to the field of recreational sports in higher education.

Through this research study, I hope to develop a framework for leading programs and developing an organizational culture suited to the accomplishment of the objectives of recreational sport programs in higher education. The topics of both leadership and organizational culture hold great promise for our area. I would like to contribute to the body of knowledge that exists in our special field and communicate my findings to other recreational sport professionals. However, to do so, I will need your help.
Your envelope will include a Leadership Behavior Questionnaire - Other instrument that I ask you to complete and return to me within three days in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. For your convenience, I have also listed my fax number at the bottom of this letter and I encourage you to use this method of returning the materials to me if it is more convenient. I have selected a small sample so that I can do extensive research and hopefully, procure more meaningful results. Therefore, it is essential that I receive your completed materials. Please complete and return your completed materials to me within three days.

In closing, I thank you in advance for taking the time to complete and return the materials to me. I remind you that the principles of confidentiality and anonymity will be strictly enforced and that all respondents will receive a copy of my research report upon the completion of the study.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
P****PLEASE RETURN COMPLETED MATERIALS****
**WITHIN IN THREE DAYS**
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Yours in recreation,

W. James Weese

Ohio State Office Phone Number: 614-293-9396
Ohio State Office Fax Number: 614-293-9396
APPENDIX O
POST CARD REMINDER TO ROUND ONE DIRECTORS
Attention: Lawrence Sierra

POST CARD FOLLOW-UP

YOUR RESPONSE IS CRITICAL

Last week an important package of research materials related to leadership and organizational culture was forwarded to your Director who was to pass on a specific package to you. I trust that it has safely arrived in your care.

If you have already completed and returned your response, 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 got misplaced, please call me immediately at 614-293-9396 and I will get another off to you today. For your convenience, I have a fax machine to receive your materials and I encourage you to fax me your materials if it is more convenient. My fax number is 614-***-****.

Thank you

Jim Weese
Ohio State (Columbus) Phone: 614-293-9396
Ohio State (Columbus) Fax: 614-***-****
Windsor, Ontario (home) Phone: 519-256-8911

PLEASE RESPOND TODAY IF YOU HAVEN'T DONE SO ALREADY
POST CARD FOLLOW-UP

YOUR RESPONSE IS CRITICAL

Dear Recreational Sports Colleague ________________:

Recently you should have received from your Director an important package of research materials related to leadership. I trust it has safely arrived. I've received many responses to date!

As of this today, I have not received your completed materials. If you have already completed and returned your materials, 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 is essential to my research.

If you did not receive the package, or it got misplaced, please call me immediately at 614-293-9396 and I will get another off to you today. For your convenience, I have a fax machine to receive your materials and I encourage you to fax me your materials if it is more convenient. My fax number is also 614-293-9396.

Thank you

Jim Weese  
Ohio State (Columbus) Phone: 614-293-9396  
Ohio State (Columbus) Fax: 614-293-9396  
Windsor, Ontario (home) Phone: 519-256-8911

PLEASE Respond today if you haven't done so already
APPENDIX Q

LETTER TO (ROUND TWO) CAMPUS RECREATION DIRECTORS
Dear Sally:

* Please enjoy the enclosed candy while you are reading this letter

It is hard to believe that the summer is slipping by at such a meteoric rate. It won't be too long before we're ambushed again by the countless students we serve each Fall. I trust that this summer has provided you with a well earned break from your duties and that you will have some additional time away prior to the commencement of the Fall term.

You will recall participating in a doctoral study that I am conducting relative to leadership and the development of organizational culture within recreational sport programs in institutions of higher learning. I thank you and your staff member's responses to my earlier request for information. I collected some exciting data relative to the leadership in our profession.

Furthermore, you may recall that the focus of my research rests in the areas of leadership and organizational culture as they relate to our field. This research represents the basis for my doctoral dissertation and is funded in part by a National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) research award.

By way of this letter, I wish to advise you that your leadership scores qualify you to participate in the more indepth (Round two) component of my study. I have a stringent criteria for selecting schools that I wish to thoroughly investigate as defined by my dissertation research methodology. I hope that I can count on you to assist me.
When the time is right for both of us, I would like to spend some time on your campus, interview you and some of your staff members, and collect the necessary data to answer my research questions. I endeavor to study your organization in greater detail relative to your leadership, the organizational culture you have facilitated and get a measure of your campus' satisfaction with your program. It is through this indepth, intensive research procedure that valuable data can be garnered to assist all of us in understanding the effect of leadership on organizational culture and ultimately program success.

I hope to employ one of your graduate students or a senior undergraduate student who can assist me in getting around your campus and arranging my interviews. Please recommend someone, give me their particulars on the attached form and mail it to me in the enclosed, self addressed, stamped envelope. I will contact this individual to introduce myself and make the appropriate financial arrangements. Also, if you have not sent me a copy of your organizational chart and staff directory, I'd be delighted to receive this information in the return package.

I will be in touch with you sometime in the near future to schedule my campus visit and my interview with you. I hope to make my visit sometime in early September at a time that is most convenient for you. My interview with you will take approximately one hour and my interviews with some of your staff members will be 20 minutes in duration.

In closing, I thank you for taking the time to read this letter and I trust that you share my enthusiasm for the remainder of this research. It will undoubtedly contribute to our field. I remind you that the principles of confidentiality will be strictly enforced and that all participants will receive a copy of my research report upon the completion of the study. Your school's participation is essential. I will look forward to hearing from you and seeing you again in the very near future.

Yours in recreation,

W. James Weese

Ohio State Office Phone Number: 614-293-9396
Ohio State Office Fax Number: 614-293-9396 (mornings)
Windsor, Ontario Phone Number: 519-256-8911 (weekends)
APPENDIX R

INSTRUCTIONAL LETTER TO THE RESEARCH ASSISTANTS
September 10, 1990

Dear Research Assistant:

By way of this letter, I'd like to introduce myself to you as the Coordinator of Campus Recreation at the University of Windsor. I am currently on an academic leave from the University of Windsor for the purposes of completing my doctoral dissertation at The Ohio State University. I thank you for agreeing to serve as my Research Assistant for your respective University. Your role is vital to the success of my research. I will be in contact with you via the telephone and through the mail although I ask that you feel free to contact me (call collect) if you have any questions relative to my study or your position as my Research Assistant. I don't believe that your involvement with this research will exceed five hours of work, although I am happy to pay you for the time you accumulate. Your pre-planning will be critical to getting things accomplished on schedule. Being a poor doctoral student, I hope that you'll agree that $8.00 per hour is fair compensation for your time and effort. Please contact me if your commitment exceeds seven hours.

This research project is funded in part by both the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) and the Canadian Intramural Recreation Association (CIRA). I also have the full support of your Director. The focus of the study is nested in the areas of leadership, organizational culture, and campus satisfaction related to the field of recreational sports in higher education. I believe that this study has great promise for our field and I trust you'll concur with my assessment.

I will be visiting your University on _________ and __________ to conduct my interviews (that I'll have you arrange) and retrieve the completed instruments that I'm forwarding to you today. It is essential that these forms get completed by the proper individuals as per my instructions outlined below.

College of Education
1. Distribute and retrieve the "Culture Assessment Instrument" (with attached instructional letter and blank envelope) to the 14 staff members (two from level two; four from level three; eight from level four). A possible scenario is presented below:

   Director of Rec. Sports
   Assistant Director
   Intramurals
   6 Supervisors
   20 Convenors

   Assistant Director
   Fitness
   6 Supervisors
   10 Instructors

   Assistant Director
   Aquatics
   6 Supervisors
   10 Lifeguards

Note that there are three members (I need data from two) at the second level and numerous staff who will qualify for the third and fourth levels (I need data from four and eight individuals respectively). I ask that you randomly select the desired number (put all possible names in a hat and pull out the required number for each level). I'm interested in factoring in the organizational level as an important variable and therefore it is important that you honour this condition. In addition, please indicate the staff member's level (two, three, four) on the outside of the envelope to facilitate my data analyses. The DIRECTORS do not complete the "Culture Assessment Instrument" however, you should consult with him/her (or call me collect) if you are having difficulty determining who fits a specific organizational level.

I will retrieve these completed forms (CAI) from you when I visit your campus.

I will also be individually interviewing each of the 14 respondents and I'd like you to assist me with the scheduling of these interviews. I'll be on your campus for two days and available any time (outside of the one hour interview that I've scheduled with your Director of Recreational Sports). Please schedule these interviews on half hour intervals (i.e. 11:00; 11:30; 12:00 noon, etc.) to allow for some break from the rigours of interviewing. If you could somehow find a location for these interviews (quiet, electrical outlet for tape recorder) within the recreational sports area, it would be much appreciated. I'll be in touch.

2. Arrange for the distribution and collection of the "Target Population Satisfaction Index".

My procedure calls for you to make arrangements for you to visit a cross discipline (i.e., Psych. 200; Soc. 200; English
200) class that has a large number of sophomore, junior and senior students and administer the two minute questionnaire at the end of class. You will need to make these arrangements with the professor prior to visiting the class. If you indicate that you are a representative from your Recreational Sports Program and that it will only take two minutes for students to complete the form, you will not have any problem. You may want to consider going to a couple of large classes to meet the determined number. Please save one copy of the TPSI in the event that you need to make extra copies (I've provided ample but one never knows).

Also, I'll need you (and some of your friends if they'll help you) to visit the student center on campus and randomly distribute these TPSI forms to students for completion. Please collect them as soon as they are finished. I ask that you attend the student center so that a "representative student" (non-freshman students from a variety of academic areas) completes the form. From your campus, we will need to collect these completed TPSI forms from:

_______ Year Two students
_______ Year Three students
_______ Year Four students

3. Borrow a copy of the University Phone Directory so that I may use it over the course of my two day visit to your campus.

In closing, I thank you in advance for your assistance with this project. I hope that you will view the experience as a fruitful endeavor (resume item as well). I will settle up the financial side of things when we meet during my visit. As you can deduct from this letter, this research calls for an extensive, indepth research methodology which will hopefully procure more meaningful results. Together we will make it happen to the betterment of our recreational sports profession.

I ask that you remind all respondents that I will be upholding the principles of confidentiality. In addition, I will be forwarding the 14 staff members a copy of my research report upon the completion of the study.

Please contact me if you have any questions. I will be in touch with you to determine my schedule and see how things are going. I look forward to meeting you real soon.

Yours in recreation,

W. James Weese
Ohio State Home/Office Phone Number : 614-293-9396
Ohio State Office Fax Number: 614-293-9396
Windsor Home Phone (weekends): 519-256-8911
APPENDIX S

LETTER TO (ROUND TWO) SELECTED SUBORDINATES
Dear Recreational Sports Colleague:

******************************************************************
* Participation is what we are all about . . . *
* and I need yours ! ! ! *
******************************************************************

By way of this letter, I'd like to introduce myself to you as the Coordinator of Campus Recreation at the University of Windsor. I am currently on an academic leave from the University of Windsor for the purposes of completing my doctoral dissertation at The Ohio State University. I am writing you as a staff member within the Recreational Sports Program at your University. I trust that I can count on your assistance by offering me your valuable input.

This research project is funded in part by both the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) and the Canadian Intramural Recreation Association (CIRA). I also have the full support of your Director. The focus of the study is nested in the areas of leadership, organizational culture, and campus satisfaction related to the field of recreational sports in higher education. I believe that this study has great promise for our field and I trust you'll concur with my assessment.

Enclosed you will find a "Culture Assessment Instrument" that will require approximately 10 minutes of your time to complete. Please place the completed form in the attached envelope, ensuring to write your name on the outside of the envelope and sealing it prior to submitting it to the designated Research Assistant listed at the bottom of this letter.

At some point during an upcoming campus visitation, I hope to interview you relative to your responses on the "Culture Assessment Instrument". Specifically, I'd like the opportunity to discuss your observations of the leadership and organizational culture you have witnessed through your association with the Recreational Sports Program at your University. I will be contacting you at a later point to arrange such an interview.

This research calls for an extensive, indepth research methodology which will hopefully procure more meaningful results. Therefore, it is essential that I receive your completed materials as soon as possible.
In closing, I thank you in advance for taking the time to complete and return the completed materials. I remind you that I will be upholding the principles of confidentiality and I will be forwarding all study participants a copy of my research report upon the completion of the study.

****************************  *
* PLEASE RETURN COMPLETED MATERIALS  *
* TO THE RESEARCH ASSISTANT  *
* WITHIN THREE DAYS  *
****************************  *

Yours in recreation,

W. James Weese

Ohio State Home/Office Phone Number: 614-293-9396
Ohio State Office Fax Number: 614-293-9396
Windsor Home Phone (weekends): 519-256-8911

****************************  *
* RESEARCH ASSISTANT: ____________________________  *
*  *
****************************  *

Note: I expect to be on your campus: ____________________________.

The Research Assistant will be arranging a 20 minute interview for us during my visit at a time that is convenient for you. I'll look forward to meeting you at that time.
APPENDIX T

CONFIRMATION LETTERS TO THE CAMPUS RECREATION DIRECTORS
Tom Jones  
Campus Recreation  
Central Michigan University  
101 Finch  
Mount Pleasant, MI  
48859  

September 10, 1990

Dear Tom:

Allow me to begin this letter by offering my sincere thanks to you for your cooperation thus far with my dissertation research. I am hopeful that the findings of my study will be of great interest to all of us in the field of recreational sports in higher education. The areas of leadership and organizational culture hold great promise for our area.

You will recall that I'm interested in the effect of leadership on the development of organizational cultures within recreational sport organizations. Since I already have the leadership measures, I'm interested in uncovering the organizational culture that exists on your campus. To do so, I will need a select number of your staff (full and part time) to complete my culture questionnaires and participate in 20 minute interviews. You may want to advise your staff of my visit (October 8/9, 1990) and my Research Assistant approaching them to arrange for their completing a questionnaire and participating in an interview with me during my visit. In addition, I will be meeting with you for one hour on Monday, October 8, 1990 (10:00 a.m.).

In closing, I trust that this letter confirms the arrangements we have made and that you continue to share my enthusiasm for the study. My campus visitations begin on September 21st and I will be "on the road" through October 18th. If you need to contact during this time frame, I ask that you call my home in Windsor and leave a message for me to return your call.

Thanks again and I'll see you on the 8th.

W. James (Jim) Weese  
Ohio State Home/Office Number: 614-293-9396  
Ohio State Office Fax Number: 614-293-9396  
Windsor Home Phone (weekends): 519-256-8911

* Note: The research has been made possible through a NIRSA Research Award