Leadership Behavior and Organizational Climate: An Empirical Study in a Non-profit Organization

Joseph B. Holloway
Regent University

The primary purpose of this research paper is to present an empirical study framed by the theory that task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors are positively related to the employees' perceptions of organizational climate. The study examined the following research question: Are task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors related to different dimensions of organizational climate in a non-profit organization? The study introduces the theoretical perspective and examines the relevant literature that supports the significance of leadership behavior and organizational climate. The methodology for collecting the data was through the combination of two quantitative instruments into a web-based questionnaire consisting of 79 questions aimed at determining the relative contribution that the independent variables (task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors) have on the dependent variables (the different dimensions of organizational climate). The following control variables were collected from the sample and were statistically controlled in the data analysis: age, educational level, gender, job rank, and job tenure. The results of the study show that certain leadership behaviors do have an impact on a few dimensions of organizational climate.

Non-profit organizations have a more central role in society's response to social problems than ever before (Smith, 2002). Many non-profit organizations are small, ill equipped, and undercapitalized to respond to the growing demands of public funders for accountability. Non-profit organizations around the world are functioning in an increasingly competitive and complex world as they fiercely compete for funding sources, qualified staff, and clients (Jaskyte & Kisieliene, 2006; Trautmann, Maher, & Motley, 2007). This shortfall of available resources has increased the reliance that non-profit organizations have on corporate sponsorship, which has impacted the governance of their organizations (Gray & Bishop Kendzia, 2009).

Drucker (1990) believed that one of the basic differences in non-profit organizations and for-profit organizations is that non-profit organizations have many more constituencies to deal with than for-profit organizations. Leaders of non-profit organizations have never had the luxury of planning in terms of one constituency. Leaders of non-profit

Emerging Leadership Journeys, Vol. 5 Iss. 1, pp. 9- 35.

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

organizations are responsible for their staff, customers, Board of Directors, multiple funding sources, and to their own particular clients and projects (Brinkerhoff & Brinkerhoff, 2002; Malloy & Agarwal, 2010). Even though planning for multiple constituencies may lead to differences in leadership behavior (Phipps & Burbach, 2010), Drucker (1990) reported that the toughest, most important task that non-profit leaders face is getting the different groups of constituencies to agree on the long-term goals of the organization. This task alone can create differences in how leaders of non-profit organizations behave.

Without positive daily interactions with their employees, or the human side of their work, the other aspects of a leader's responsibilities will suffer (Cangemi, Burga, Lazarus, Miller, & Fitzgerald, 2008). Leadership is a two-sided engagement between leaders and employees to achieve a common goal (Antelo, Henderson, & St. Clair, 2010; Eagly, 2005; Northouse, 2010). This engagement actuates leaders to influence their employees' behavior while simultaneously influencing their employees' perceptions. This leads to expectations of appropriate conduct that becomes ingrained in the organizational climate (Grojean, Resick, Dickson, & Smith, 2004).

In many cases, effective leaders possess both a concern for the task while establishing an individual relationship with their employees. Since there is a relative direct connection between employees, their productivity, and the organization's performance (Wang & Shyu, 2008), it is essential for leaders to maintain a positive work environment to maximize and enhance their employees' efforts to reach organizational efficacy. Kouzes and Posner (2010) found that a leader's behavior explains nearly 25 percent of the reason that people feel productive, motivated, energized, effective, and committed in their workplaces. As a result, the specific research question that addresses the theory in this paper is:

Research Question 1: Are task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors related to different dimensions of organizational climate in a non-profit organization?

The primary purpose of this empirical study is framed by the theory that task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors are positively related to the employees' perception of organizational climate. This study introduces the theoretical perspective and examines the relevant literature that supports the significance of leadership behavior and organizational climate. The methodology for conducting the study was the use of two quantitative instruments aimed at determining the relative contribution that the independent variables (task-oriented or relations-oriented leadership behaviors) have on the dependent variables (the different dimensions of organizational climate).

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

Theoretical Perspective

The central importance of the study lies in the concept that employees are potentially the highest value within organizations (Chien, 2004). Although the research domains of leadership and organizational climate are implicitly entwined (Kozlowski & Doherty, 1989), there has been little theoretical development or empirical research that addresses the impact that task-oriented or relations-oriented leadership behaviors have on organizational climates in non-profit organizations. Hui, Chiu, Yu, Cheng, and Tse (2007) found that some authors conceptualize leadership behavior as a precursor to organizational climate (e.g. Dickson, Smith, Grojean, & Ehrhart, 2001; Koene, Vogelaar, & Soeters, 2002; Litwin & Stringer, 1968). Momeni (2009) found that more than 70% of employees' perceptions of organizational climate are shaped directly by their leader's style of leadership and behavior.

Kozlowksi & Doherty (1989) noted that early theorists (e.g. Blake & Mouton, 1964; Indik, 1968; Lewin, 1951; Likert, 1967; Litwin & Stringer, 1968; McGregor, 1960) regarded leadership as an important organizational factor that affected employees' perceptions of climate. Momeni (2009) concluded that a leader's behavior has a great influence on employees' attitudes, behaviors, emotions, morale, and perceptions. Thus, it is perceived through the examination of the literature that a leader's behavior can potentially lead to the creation and continual survival of a positive, thriving organizational climate in a non-profit organization.

Leadership Behavior

Hooijberg, Lane, and Diversé (2010) explained that there has been an extensive collection of theories studied that give emphasis to behavioral approaches to leadership ranging from Fiedler's (1967) LPC theory to House's (1971) path-goal theory to Quinn's (1988) competing values framework (CVF) and Bass' (1985) transformational leadership theory. A leader's behavior is a powerful display of mannerisms that convey the expectations and values of the organization that sets the tone for the organizational climate (Grojean et al., 2004). According to Yukl (2006), researchers have spent more time and energy conducting research on leadership behavior than on any other aspect of leadership. Research in leadership behavior falls into one of two categories: the first line of research examines how leaders spend their time throughout the day, their particular pattern of activities, and their job responsibilities. The second line of research focuses on identifying effective leadership behavior. Despite the fact that there could potentially be numerous leadership behaviors, Farris (1988) identified two specific kinds of leadership behaviors: task-oriented behaviors and relations-oriented behaviors.

Task-oriented leadership behaviors. Task-oriented leaders are primarily concerned with reaching goals. They help their employees accomplish their goals by defining roles, establishing goals and methods of evaluations, giving directions, setting time

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

lines, and showing how the goals are to be achieved. As a rule, task-oriented leaders use a one-way communication method to clarify what needs to be done, who is responsible for doing it, and how it needs to be done. Task-oriented leaders coordinate, plan, and schedule work-related activities. They provide their employees with the necessary motivation, equipment, supplies, and technical assistance for completing the task (Northouse, 2010).

Task-oriented behaviors include clarifying roles and objectives, monitoring individual performance and operations, and short-term planning (Yukl, O'Donnell, & Taber, 2009). Clarifying behaviors include assigning tasks, explaining job responsibilities, and setting performance expectations. Monitoring behaviors include inspecting the progress and quality of work. Planning behaviors include determining staffing requirements and how to fittingly use them to reach the goals and objectives of the organization.

Relations-oriented leadership behaviors. Relations-oriented leaders, on the other hand, are more concerned with developing close, interpersonal relationships. They involve a two-way communication method to show social and emotional support while helping their employees feel comfortable about themselves, their co-workers, and their situations (Northouse, 2010). Relations-oriented leaders demonstrate an understanding of their employees' problems. They help to develop their employees' careers. They provide their employees with enough information to do the job, they allow individual autonomy in work, and they show appreciation.

According to Yukl (2006), relations-oriented leadership behaviors include supporting behaviors, developing behaviors, and recognizing behaviors. Supporting behaviors include showing acceptance, concern, and confidence for the needs and feelings of others. Developing behaviors provide potential benefits to new, inexperienced supervisors, colleagues, peers, or subordinates. Recognizing behaviors show praise and appreciation to others for effective performances, significant achievements, and important contributions to the organization. Table 1 includes additional explanations of task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors.

Table 1

The 12 Leadership Dimensions According to Stogdill

Task-oriented behaviors	Relations-oriented behaviors
Production emphasis – applies pressure for productive output.	*Tolerance of freedom* – allows staff members scope for initiative, decision, and action.
Initiation of structure – clearly defines own role and lets followers know what is expected.	*Tolerance of uncertainty* – is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset.
Role assumption – actively exercises the	*Demand reconciliation* – reconciles conflicting

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others.	demands and reduces disorder to system.
Persuasion – uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions.	*Predictive accuracy* – exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately.
Superior orientation – maintains cordial relations with superiors, has influence with them, and strives for higher status.	*Integration* – maintains a close-knit organization and resolves intermember conflicts.

Note. Adapted from "Preferred leadership style differences: Perceptions of defence industry labour and management," by P. R. Lucas, P. E. Messner, C. W. Ryan, and G. P. Sturm, 1992, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 13*(7), p. 19.

Organizational Climate

Although the concept of organizational climate stemmed from McClelland-Atkinson's theory or human motivation, Litwin and Stringer (1968) defined organizational climate as the set of measurable properties of the work environment that is either directly or indirectly perceived by the employees who work within the organizational environment that influences and motivates their behavior. According to Litwin and Stringer (1968), the operational definition of organizational climate is the sum of individual perceptions working in the organization. Reichers and Schneider (1990) explained that it is the shared perceptions of "the way things are around here" (p. 22). Organizational climate is a molar concept that pinpoints the organization's goals and means to obtain these goals. Organizational climate is the formal and informal shared perceptions of organizational policies, practices, and procedures (Schneider, 1975). In terms of relationships among organizational members, organizational climate focuses on its members' perceptions of the way things are. It is the employees' perceptions and attitudes toward their organization at any given time (Momeni, 2009).

Organizational climate is influenced by and shapes organizational culture (Hunt & Ivergard, 2007). Organizational culture is more defined than organizational climate; thus organizational culture is a broader pattern of its beliefs and stems from employees' interpretations of the assumptions, philosophies and values that produces the experienced climate within an organization (Brown & Brooks, 2002). Organizational climate is a manifestation of the organization's culture; it is the here and now (Sowpow, 2006). Organizational climate attempts to identify the environment that affects the behavior of the employees. It deals with the way(s) employees make sense out of their environment (Reichers & Schneider, 1990). It is primarily learned through the socialization process and through symbolic interactions among the organization's members. If the shared perceptions of practices and procedures change or differ in any

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

way, then the results of these changes or differences could produce a different organizational climate (Muchinsky, 1976).

Litwin and Stringer (1968) established nine separate a priori scales for organizational climate. The six dimensions used in this study and their descriptions are described below in Table 2.

Table 2

Dimensions of the Litwin and Stringer Organizational Climate Questionnaire

Scale*	Description
Structure (8 items)	The feeling that employees have about the constraints in the group, how many rules, regulations, procedures there are; is there an emphasis on "red tape" and going through channels, or is there a loose and informal atmosphere.
Responsibility (7 items)	The feeling of being your own boss; not having to double-check all your decisions; when you have a job to do, knowing that it is *your job*.
Identity (4 items)	The feeling that you belong to a company and you are a valuable member of a working team; the importance placed on this kind of spirit.
Reward (6 items)	The feeling of being rewarded for a job well done; emphasizing positive rewards rather than punishments; the perceived fairness of the pay and promotion policies.
Warmth (5 items)	The feeling of general good fellowship that prevails in the work group atmosphere; the emphasis on being well-liked; the prevalence of friendly and informal social groups.
Conflict (4 items)	The feeling that managers and other workers want to hear different opinions; the emphasis placed on getting problems out in the open, rather than smoothing them over or ignoring them.

Note. Adapted from "*Motivation and Organizational Climate*," by G. H. Litwin and R. A. Stringer, 1968, pp. 81-82. Copyright 1968 by **Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.**

*Only these six dimensions were used to study the organizational climate within the non-profit organization.

Structure. Structure is the employees' perceptions that the organizational structure, policies, and responsibilities are well defined (Downey, Hellriegel, & Slocum, 1975). Leaders shape organizational climates by providing meaning to policy and practices through the way they enact the organization's strategies and goals (Wimbush &

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

Shepard, 1994). Litwin and Stringer (1968) found that the leaders that assign roles and tightly define employees' spheres of operation maintain order and structure within the organization. Through these behaviors, leaders set the tone for the organizational structure, which sets the order for the structure's atmosphere.

Responsibility. Whereas it is the leader's responsibility to provide support and employee development, Badawy (2007) explained that it is the employees' responsibility to take the opportunities provided and build his or her career upon them. Although task-oriented leaders are concerned with the job and reaching their goals, they are inclined to promote individual responsibility so that the organization can reach its goals. Litwin and Stringer (1968) found that leaders that value goal-oriented results encourage their employees to take personal responsibility for their specific job tasks and the results of these tasks. By doing so, employees set high standards for themselves and for the organization. In a sense, it is as they feel as though they are their own bosses.

Identity. Employees tend to fear discouraging behaviors such as being put down, humiliated, disrespected, and talked to sarcastically (Cangemi et al., 2008). These types of behaviors create mistrust in the organization. Caldwell, Hayes, and Tien Long (2010) found that an employee's trust increases in his or her leader when the leader's behavior is perceived as trustworthy. Leaders that fail to display trust tend to set negative tendencies for organizational climates as their employees struggle to properly discern truths from everything else. The display of truth and respect fosters a sense of moral fiber that employees are able to identify with.

H1: Task-oriented leadership behaviors are positively related to organizational climate dimensions of structure, responsibility, and identity.

Reward. Reward is the feeling that a leader's encouragement and humanitarian efforts are important factors of the reward system (Downey et al., 1975). Successful leaders adjust their behavior in accordance with the organizational requirements or according to the demand of the situation (Bodla & Nawaz, 2010; Bruno & Lay, 2008; Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2001). Leaders that behave according to the moment or situation help to create an organizational climate with less stress and worry. When leaders adjust their behavior accordingly, they reduce employee turnover and burnout, which as Momeni (2009) stated, allows organizations to operate more efficiently and maximize performance. This helps to create the perception of fairness within the organization.

Warmth. Warmth is the employees' perceived sense of ubiquitous friendliness and trust in the organization (Downey et al., 1975). Leaders that are intent on building relationships with their employees often do well with improving cohesion within the organization, which limits the turnover rate and reduces the number of days absent from the job. A positive climate in the warmth dimension creates less burn-out, which too reduces employee turnover rate (Taylor, 1995). Leaders that are in tune with the

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

warmth dimension of their organization's climate often create an atmosphere where friendly attitudes and perceptions prevail (Day & Bedeian, 1991). These coincide with Litwin and Stringer's (1968) description of the warmth dimension of organizational climate.

Conflict. An open climate describes the authenticity and openness of interaction between leaders and their employees (Raza, 2010). Leaders that are open and honest in communications and relationship build trust over time (Hess & Bacigalupo, 2011). Leaders that fail to establish an open and honest environment create organizational climates that lack the strategic data conducive for taking proper risks and making proper decisions (Cangemi et al., 2008). Although openness is one of the Big Five Personality Factors, Northouse (2010) explained that it was the tendency to be creative, curious, informed, and insightful. Leadership behavior that is open leads to transparency, and transparency promotes organizational intelligence, which fosters a positive organizational climate. Leaders help by uniting their employees to create and maintain a close-knit bond.

H2: Relations-oriented leadership behaviors are positively related to organizational climate dimensions of reward, warmth, and conflict.

Method

Sample

The data were collected from a sample of employees of a non-profit organization in southeast Georgia that provides human services to the residents within its allotted catchment area. Of the 303 employees, 89 participated in the survey. Since two of the 89 completed surveys lacked sufficient data, they were discarded; thus, the study sample contained 87 employees (N = 87). The response rate was 29 percent. Participation was voluntary and their identity remained anonymous. The participants were not compensated in any way for their participation in the study. Table 3 through Table 7 provides demographic information for the non-profit organization and participants.

Table 3

Demographic Information (Age)

Age	Employee %	Participant %
18 to 30 Years of Age	7.8%	9.2%
31 to 40 Years of Age	28.6%	29.9%
41 to 50 Years of Age	25.0%	32.2%
51 to 60 Years of Age	25.0%	20.0%

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

Over 60 Years of Age	12.0%	8.0%

Table 4

Demographic Information (Education Level)

Education Level	Employee %	Participant %
High School Graduate	57.8%	24.1%
Associate's Degree	8.9%	18.4%
Bachelor's Degree	15.5%	16.1%
Graduate Degree	9.6%	18.4%
Advanced Degree or Licensure	8.3%	23.0%

Table 5

Demographic Information (Gender)

Gender	Employee %	Participant %
Male	33.0%	20.5%
Female	67.0%	79.3%

Table 6

Demographic Information (Job Rank)

Job Rank	Employee %	Participant %
Administrative	7.2%	14.9%
Management	5.0%	17.2%
Direct Care	77.9%	43.7%
Support Staff	6.6%	14.9%
*Other	3.3%	9.2%

Note. *Other includes maintenance, pharmacy, custodial, etc.

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

Table 7

Demographic Information (Job Tenure)

Job Tenure	Employee %	Participant %
Zero to Five Years	51.3%	39.1%
Six to 10 Years	25.4%	23.0%
11 to 20 Years	19.1%	26.4%
21 to 30 Years	2.9%	8.0%
Over 30 Years	1.3%	3.4%

The demographic information for the non-profit organization and the participants provided in Table 3 through Table 7 show that the sample percentage was relatively consistent with the organization's percentages in terms of age and gender. In terms of education level, there was an overweight of employees with a higher level of education. Additionally, there was an overweight in administrative employees. And finally, there was an underweight in direct care staff compared to the other job rank categories.

Procedure

The methodology for collecting the data was through the combination of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and Litwin and Stringer's (Form B) (1968) Organizational Climate Questionnaire (LSOCQ) into a web-based survey using the website http://www.surveyqizmo.com. Each of the 303 employees from the non-profit organization was invited to participate in the study via an organizational wide email that contained a link to the web-based questionnaire. The initial email was sent on May 24, 2011, with a follow up email on June 1, 2011. The data were collected June 6, 2011.

Measures

Leadership behavior. The instrument used to measure task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors was the LBDQ (Appendix A). Halpin (1957) reported that the LBDQ affords employees that have observed his or her leader in action the opportunity of describing the leader's behavior. The 30 item questionnaire is divided into two dimensions, Initiating Structure and Consideration Structure, each containing 15 items per dimension. Initiating Structure refers to the leader's behavior in assigning, defining, and delegating ways of getting the job done (task-oriented behaviors), while Consideration Structure refers to the leader's behavior indicative to building friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth (relations-oriented behaviors). The questionnaire uses a five-point Likert scale anchored by (Always to Never). The Cronbach alpha in

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

this sample for task-oriented leadership behaviors was .78 and .91 for relations-oriented leadership behaviors.

Organizational climate. The instrument used to measure organizational climate was the LSOCQ (Appendix B). Using a four-point Likert scale anchored by (Definitely Agree to Definitely Disagree), this questionnaire consists of 50 statements about an organization, which are comprised of nine separate *a priori* dimensions. Of the nine separate *a priori* dimensions, only six dimensions were used in this study resulting in 34 statements. As mentioned above, the six dimensions used within this sample were: (a) structure, (b) responsibility, (c) identity, (d) reward, (e) warmth, and (f) conflict. Sims and LaFollette (1975) found that these six dimensions of Litwin and Stringer's organizational climate questionnaire actually measured a general affect tone toward other people and management rather than structures or standards; thus, these six dimensions are appropriate for this study since the hypotheses are aimed at leadership behavior and organizational climate rather than structures or standards. The Cronbach alpha in this sample for structure was .76, responsibility .50, identity .75, reward .81, warmth .75, and conflict .48. Only the second and third items of the conflict were used since the combination of the four items resulted in a Cronbach alpha value of .23.

Control variables. Prior research has shown that there are differences among gender perceptions regarding organizational climate. For example, Phillips, Little, and Goodine (1996) found that organizational climate impacts a woman's personal projects and degree of satisfaction with work to a much greater degree than their male counterparts. Also, women are more attuned and responsive to the organizational climate than men, and they tend to operate with a different perspective as well. Additionally, Iqbal (2011) found that researchers must consider other personal factors such as age, educational level, job rank, and job tenure when studying organizational climate as they were all found to have a positive and significant relationship with various organizational climate dimensions. Kerlinger and Lee (2000) explained that anything that affects the controls of a research design presents a problem for internal validity. As a result, personal demographics such as age, educational level, gender, job rank, and job tenure were statistically controlled in the data analysis.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

The survey's responses were entered into SPSS (Version 18.0). The means and standard deviations are shown in Table 8 for the predictor, criterion, and control variables. Leadership behavior was measured using a five-point Likert scale and organizational climate was measured using a four-point Likert scale.

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics (*N* = 87)

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Task-oriented Behaviors	2.20	4.89
Relations-oriented Behaviors	2.58	.44
Structure	2.45	.36
Responsibility	2.58	.41
Identity	2.27	.32
Reward	2.53	.34
Warmth	2.50	.37
Conflict	2.65	.35
Age[a]	2.89	1.08
Education Level[b]	2.98	1.51
Gender[c]	1.79	.41
Job Rank[d]	2.86	1.13
Job Tenure[e]	2.14	1.13

Note. [a]Age was measured in years (1 = *18 to 30 Years of Age*, 2 = *31 to 40 Years of Age*, 3 = *41 to 50 Years of Age*, 4 = *51 to 60 Years of Age*, and 5 = *Over 61 Years*)

[b]Educational level was measured on a five-point Liker scale (1 = *High School Graduate*, 2 = *Associate Degree*, 3 = *Bachelor Degree*, 4 = *Graduate Degree*, and 5 = *Advanced Degree or Licensure*)

[c]Gender was measured by (1 = *Male*, 2 = *Female*)

[d]Job rank was measured on a five-point Likert scale (1 = *Administrative*, 2 = *Management*, 3 = *Direct Care*, 4 = *Support Staff*, and 5 = *Other*)

[e]Job tenure was measured in years on a five-point Liker scale (1 = *Zero to Five Years*, 2 = *Six to 10 Years*, 3 = *11 to 20 Years*, 4 = *21 to 30 Years*, and 5 = *Over 30 Years*)

Correlations

A correlation analysis was performed to examine the nature and degree of relationship among the predictor and criterion variables. The results of the correlation analysis and internal consistencies are shown in Table 9.

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

Task-oriented leadership behaviors and structure, responsibility, and identity. There is a negative and insignificant correlation between task-oriented leadership behaviors and the organizational climate dimension structure (r = -.05, ns). There is a positive and insignificant correlation between task-oriented leadership behaviors and the organizational climate dimension responsibility (r = .05, ns). There is a positive and insignificant correlation between task-oriented leadership behaviors and the organizational climate dimension identity (r = .19, ns).

Relations-oriented leadership behaviors and reward, warmth, and conflict. There is a positive and significant correlation between relations-oriented leadership behaviors and the organizational climate dimension reward (r = .19, p = .06). There is a positive and significant correlation between relations-oriented leadership behaviors and the organizational climate dimension warmth (r = .41, p < .01). There is positive and insignificant correlation between relations-oriented leadership behaviors and the organizational climate dimension conflict (r = .05, *ns*).

Other correlations. There is a positive and significant correlation between age and responsibility (r = .36, p < .01), and there is a positive and significant correlation between age and job tenure (r = .32, p < .01). There is a negative and significant correlation between gender and relations-oriented leadership behaviors (r = -.37, p < .01); thus, as the number of females (Female = 2) increases, the mean for the relations-oriented leadership behavior decreases. There is also positive and significant correlation between gender and the organizational climate dimension structure (r = .23, p < .05).

Within the sample, there is a negative and significant correlation between job rank and education level (r = -.28, p < .01); thus, the higher the job rank (5 = Other, 4 = Support Staff, 3 = Direct Care, 2 = Management, and 1 = Administration), the lower the mean for educational level (1 = High School Graduate, 2 = Associate's Degree, 3 = Bachelor's Degree, 4 = Graduate Degree, and 5 = Advanced Degree or Licensure). There was a positive and significant correlation between job tenure and age (r = .32, p < .01). There was a negative and significant correlation between job tenure and gender (r = -.28, p < .05); thus, as the number of years worked increase, less women continue to work for the organization. Finally, there was a negative and significant correlation between job tenure and job rank (r = -.23, p < .01); thus, as the number of years worked increase, the number of employees that remain in the other, support staff, and direct care positions decline.

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

Table 9

Intercorrelations (N = 87)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Task-oriented Behaviors	-												
2. Relations-oriented Behaviors	.52**	-											
3. Structure	-.05	-.05	-										
4. Responsibility	.05	-.01	.54**	-									
5. Identity	.19	.10	-.02	.02	-								
6. Reward	.16	.19	.17	.23	.11	-							
7. Warmth	.37**	.41**	.10	.04	.37**	.31**	-						
8. Conflict	-.02	.05	.02	.24*	-.01	.20	.22*	-					
9. Age	-.10	-.18	.11	.36**	-.02	.08	.10	.03	-				
10. Education Level	-.08	.08	.21	.18	-.04	.17	.16	-.00	-.01	-			
11. Gender	-.14	-.37**	.36**	.23*	-.10	-.04	-.04	-.03	-.81	.11	-		
12. Job Rank	.09	.03	-.01	.05	.03	-.06	-.03	-.02	.04	-.28**	-.04	-	
13. Job Tenure	-.13	-.06	-.08	.14	-.02	.10	-.06	.06	.32**	-.06	-.22*	-.23*	-

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Hierarchical Regression Analysis

Hierarchical multiple regression was conducted on each of the six organizational climate dimensions to examine the contribution of specific theory driven variables in explaining the hypotheses. In order to control for possible confounding influences of extraneous variables, age, education level, gender, job rank, and job tenure were first entered into the hierarchical procedure and represent Step One in each of the six organizational climate dimensions. Table 10 through Table 15 provides the regression analysis results.

Structure. After the variables were entered in Step One, the model explained 19.8 percent of the variance. In Step Two, adding task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors, the model explained 19.9 percent of the variance in the organizational climate dimension structure. When testing the organizational climate dimension structure, F = (6, 80) = 3.31, p = .006, R2 = .001. The beta weights suggest gender (β = .50, t = 3.58, p = .001) contributes the most to the explanation of the organizational climate dimension structure. Additionally, gender is the only variable

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

with a significant contribution to this organizational climate dimension. Task-oriented leadership behaviors do not cause a unique or significant contribution to the organization climate dimension structure; thus, this portion of H1 is not supported. The regression analysis results for structure are shown in Table 10.

Table 10

Hierarchical Regression Analysis – Structure (*N* = 87)

Structure	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Age	.05	.04	.15
Education Level	.52	.03	.22
Gender	.33	.09	.37
Job Rank	.02	.04	.05
Job Tenure	-.01	.04	-.03
Step 2			
Age	.05	.04	.15
Education Level	.05	.03	.22
Gender	.33	.09	.37**
Job Rank	.02	.04	.50
Job Tenure	-.01	.04	-.02
Task-oriented Leadership Behaviors	.02	.08	.02

Note. R^2 = .20 for Step 1. Adjusted R^2 = .14 for Step 2; *p < .05, **p < .01

Responsibility. The same hierarchical procedures were followed to examine the relationship between the predictor variables on the organizational climate dimension responsibility. Step Two is represented by the addition of the predictor variables task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors. After Step One, the model explained 26 percent of the variance. In Step Two, adding task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors, the model explained two percent of the variance in the organizational climate dimension responsibility. When testing the organizational climate dimension responsibility, F = (6, 80) = 5.17, p = 000, R2 = .024. The beta weights suggest age (β = .34, t = 3.38, p = .001) contributes the most to the explanation of the organizational climate dimension responsibility. Gender (β = .32, t = 3.23, p = .002) is the next significant contributor to the regression equation. Age and gender were the

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

only two variables with a significant contribution as $p < .01$. Education level was significant as $p < .05$. Task-oriented leadership behaviors do not cause a unique or significant contribution to the organizational climate dimension responsibility; thus, this portion of H1 is not supported. The regression analysis results for responsibility are shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Hierarchical Regression Analysis – Responsibility (*N* = 87)

Responsibility	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Age	.12	.04	.33**
Education Level	.06	.03	.23*
Gender	.29	.10	.29**
Job Rank	.05	.04	.15
Job Tenure	.05	.04	.15
Step 2			
Age	.13	.04	.34**
Education Level	.07	.03	.24*
Gender	.32	.10	.32**
Job Rank	.05	.04	.14
Job Tenure	.06	.04	.17
Task-oriented Leadership Behaviors	.13	.08	.16

Note. $R^2 = .28$ for Step 1. Adjusted $R^2 = .23$ for Step 2; *p < .05, **p < .01

Identity. The same hierarchical procedures were followed to examine the relationship between the predictor variables on the organizational climate dimension identity. Step Two is represented by the addition of the predictor variables task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors. After Step One, the model explained one percent of the variance. In Step Two, adding task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors, the model explained one percent of the variance in the organizational climate dimension identity. When testing the organizational climate dimension identity, F = (6, 80) = .30, p = .934, R2 = .009. The beta weights suggest task-oriented leadership behaviors (β = .10, t = .873, p = .39) contribute the most to the explanation of the organizational climate dimension identity. While task-oriented

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

leadership behaviors contribute the most explanation for this organizational climate dimension, they do not cause a unique or significant contribution to the organizational climate dimension identity as p > .05; thus, this portion of H1 is not supported. The regression analysis results for identity are shown in Table 12.

Table 12

Hierarchical Regression Analysis – Identity (*N* = 87)

Identity	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Age	-.01	.04	-.02
Education Level	-.01	.03	-.04
Gender	-.08	.09	-.11
Job Rank	.00	.03	.01
Job Tenure	-.01	.04	-.03
Step 2			
Age	-.00	.04	-.01
Education Level	-.01	.03	-.03
Gender	-.07	.09	-.09
Job Rank	.00	.03	.01
Job Tenure	-.01	.04	-.02
Task-oriented Leadership Behaviors	.07	.08	.10

Note. R^2 = .02 for Step 1. Adjusted R^2 = -.05 for Step 2; *p < .05, **p < .01

Reward. The same hierarchical procedures were followed to examine the relationship between the predictor variables on the organizational climate dimension reward. Step Two is represented by the addition of the predictor variables task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors. After all of the variables were entered in Step One, the model explained five percent of the variance. In Step Two, adding task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors, the model explained five percent of the variance in the organizational climate dimension reward. When testing the organizational climate dimension reward, F = (6, 80) = 1.28, p = .28, R2 = .043. The beta weights suggest relations-oriented leadership behaviors (β = .23, t = 1.938, p = .06) contribute the most to the explanation of the organizational climate dimension reward. The relations-oriented leadership behaviors contribute the most explanation for this

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

organizational climate dimension. Since the significance level is approaching $p \leq .05$, it is considered significant at $p = .06$ because it would probably reach the significance level of $p < .05$ with a larger sample; thus, this portion of H2 is supported. The regression analysis results for reward are shown in Table 13.

Table 13

Hierarchical Regression Analysis – Reward ($N = 87$)

Reward	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Age	.02	.04	.05
Education Level	.04	.03	.18
Gender	-.01	.09	-.01
Job Rank	.00	.04	.01
Job Tenure	.03	.04	.10
Step 2			
Age	.03	.04	.10
Education Level	.04	.03	.16
Gender	.07	.10	.08
Job Rank	-4.55	.04	.00
Job Tenure	.03	.04	.11
Relations-oriented Leadership Behaviors	.18	.09	.23*

Note. $R^2 = .09$ for Step 1. Adjusted $R^2 = .02$ for Step 2; *p < .05, **p < .01

Warmth. The same hierarchical procedures were followed to examine the relationship between the predictor variables on the organizational climate dimension warmth. Step Two is represented by the addition of the predictor variables task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors. After all of the variables were entered in Step One, the model explained five percent of the variance. In Step Two, adding task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors, the model explained 20 percent of the variance in the organizational climate dimension warmth. When testing the organizational climate dimension warmth, $F = (6, 80) = 4.23$, $p = .001$, $R2 = .195$. The beta weights suggest relations-oriented leadership behaviors ($\beta = .09$, $t = 4.533$, $p = .00$) contribute the most to the explanation of the organizational climate dimension warmth. The relations-oriented leadership behaviors variable was the only variable that had a

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

significant contribution to the organizational climate dimension warmth as $p < .01$; thus, this portion of H2 is supported. The regression analysis results for warmth are shown in Table 14.

Table 14

Hierarchical Regression Analysis – Warmth (*N* = 87)

Warmth	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Age	.05	.04	.13
Education Level	.04	.03	.15
Gender	-.04	.10	-.04
Job Rank	-.01	.04	-.02
Job Tenure	-.04	.04	-.11
Step 2			
Age	.08	.04	.23
Education Level	.03	.03	.11
Gender	.14	.10	.15
Job Rank	-.01	.04	-.04
Job Tenure	-.03	.04	-.08
Relations-oriented Leadership Behaviors	.41	.09	.50**

Note. $R^2 = .24$ for Step 1. Adjusted $R^2 = .18$ for Step 2; *p < .05, **p < .01

Conflict. The same hierarchical procedures were followed to examine the relationship between the predictor variables on the organizational climate dimension conflict. Step Two is represented by the addition of the predictor variables task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors. After all of the variables were entered in Step One, the model explained four percent of the variance. In Step Two, adding task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors, the model explained two percent of the variance in the organizational climate dimension conflict. When testing the organizational climate dimension conflict, $F = (6, 80) = .749$, $p = .612$, $R2 = .018$. The beta weights suggest gender ($\beta = .105$, $t = 1.989$, $p = .05$) contributes the most to the explanation of the organizational climate dimension conflict. Relations-oriented leadership behaviors ($\beta = .10$, $t = 1.24$, $p = .22$) is the next significant contributor to the regression equation; however, they do not cause a unique or significant contribution to

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

the organizational climate dimension conflict as p > .05; thus, this portion of H2 is not supported. The regression analysis results for conflict are shown in Table 15.

Table 15

Hierarchical Regression Analysis – Conflict (*N* = 87)

Conflict	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Age	.01	.04	.02
Education Level	.00	.03	.00
Gender	.16	.10	.18
Job Rank	.00	.04	.01
Job Tenure	.03	.04	.09
Step 2			
Age	.02	.04	.05
Education Level	-.00	.03	-.01
Gender	.21	.11	.24
Job Rank	.00	.04	.00
Job Tenure	.03	.04	.10
Relations-oriented Leadership Behaviors	.12	.10	.15

Note. R^2 = .05 for Step 1. Adjusted R^2 = -.02 for Step 2; *p < .05, **p < .01

Hypothesis Testing Results

A negative and insignificant relationship was found between task-oriented leadership behaviors and the organizational climate dimension structure (r = -.05, ns). A positive and insignificant relationship was found between task-oriented leadership behaviors and the organizational climate dimensions responsibility (r = .05, ns) and identity (r = .19, ns); therefore, H1 is not supported. An insignificant relationship was found between relations-oriented leadership behaviors and the organizational climate dimension conflict (.05, ns). A positive and significant multivariate relationship was found between relations-oriented leadership behaviors and the organizational climate dimensions reward (r = .19, p = .06) and warmth (r = .41, p < .01). Since only two of the three organizational climate dimensions were found to have a significant multivariate relationship with relations-oriented leadership behaviors, H2 is only partially supported.

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

Discussion

The results of this present study indicate a positive and significant relationship between relations-oriented leadership behaviors and the organizational climate dimension reward ($r = .19$, $p = .06$) and warmth ($r = .41$, $p < .01$). These results confirm Litwin and Stringer's (1968) finding that distinct organizational climates can be created by varying leadership styles. These findings demonstrate that, if leaders want their employees to be more committed to the organization, which ultimately reduces turnover and the numbers of absent days, then they must develop close and interpersonal relationships with their employees. Relations-oriented leaders socialize and build relationships (Yukl, 2006), and through the formalization of relationships, leaders foster a sense of teamwork and cohesion that promotes positive relationships throughout the organization's atmosphere.

It is noteworthy that task-oriented leadership behaviors were found to have a positive and significant relationship with the organizational climate dimension warmth ($r = .37$, $p < .01$). Based on almost polar opposites of task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors, it appears that the organizational climate dimension warmth is receptive to both types of leadership behaviors. If task-oriented leaders are aware that their behavior impacts the warmth dimension of organizational climate, he or she could promote his or her goal, method of reaching this goal, and timeline for completion in such a way that creates a pleasant and friendly work environment. Just because a leader may be more task-oriented than relations-oriented does not mean that he or she cannot fully grasp the concept that his or her behavior can ultimately impact the organizational climate. And, if he or she would act accordingly within their task-oriented behaviors, they could, just as this study's results indicate, easily increase the employees' perception of the organizational climate dimension warmth.

The significant relationship between task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors with the organizational climate dimensions reward and warmth have practical implications. Because organizations may have leaders that are more task-oriented than relations-oriented or relations-oriented than task-oriented, they may choose to offer specific leadership trainings within their leadership development program(s) to educate their leaders on both task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors. The benefit of this could be twofold. First, leaders can show their employees that they care for the organization through the use of task-oriented leadership behaviors, and second, they can show their employees that they have a vested interest in them as well through the use of relations-oriented behaviors. The combination of the two leadership behaviors can better equip leaders to reach the organization's goals and objectives while responsibly interacting and leading their employees.

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

Limitations and Future Research

The first potential limitation to the study is that the tested theories were within a sample of employees at one non-profit organization in which the sample had a higher educational level average than organizational average. This limitation could likely lead to a common method variance, which, according to Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, and Podsakoff (2003), is a variance that is attributable to the method of measurement rather than constructs the variables represent. A second limitation was the procedure utilized for collecting data. As previously mentioned, the method of collecting data was through the combination of the two quantitative instruments into a web-based survey using the website http://www.surveyqizmo.com that was sent via email to each of the 303 non-profit organization's employees at multiple sites. As a result, the response rate was only 29 percent. Future researchers could correct both of these limitations by collecting data from multiple sources and multiple samples because he or she would have independent assessments of the variables (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986).

Another limitation of solely studying the behavior of a leader having an impact on organizational climate is because it limits its focus on task situations and personality traits of the leader (Farris, 1988). The final limitation to this study is the potential threat to the internal validity through repeated testing. Some of the employees of the non-profit organization participated in an organizational climate survey in October 2010, and although the instruments and the intent of the study were different than initially used, there is the possibility of the participants developing a bias of taking numerous surveys without the organization's leaders taking appropriate actions to improve the employees' perceptions of the organizational climate.

Organizational climate is impacted by numerous factors and dimensions (Iqbal, 2011), and as a result, future research can study the impact that task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors might have on other dimensions of organizational climate. Future studies could also examine potential relationships between other leadership dimensions, traits, or characteristics with different organizational climate dimensions. Additionally, future studies could examine whether or not, and to what extent, the full-range leadership theory might have on the different dimensions of organizational climate. Finally, future studies could go beyond a non-profit organization and examine whether, and to what extent, leadership behaviors might impact the organizational climate of for-profit organizations.

Conclusion

The purpose of this empirical study was to examine the relationship between task-oriented leadership behaviors and the organizational climate dimensions structure, responsibility, and identity, and the relationship between relations-oriented leadership behaviors and the organizational climate dimensions reward, warmth, and conflict. The

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

research results revealed that relations-oriented leadership behaviors have a positive and significant relationship with the organizational climate dimensions reward and warmth. The research also revealed that task-oriented leadership behaviors have a positive and significant relationship with the warmth organizational climate dimension. The sample used was a non-profit organization.

About the Author

Joseph B. Holloway is a doctoral student studying organizational leadership at the Regent University School of Global Leadership & Entrepreneurship. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Joseph B. Holloway, 3408 Wren Drive, Waycross, GA 31503. Email: josehol@regent.edu

---

References

Antelo, A., Henderson, R. L., & St Clair, N. (2010). Understanding the process model of leadership: Follower attribute design and assessment. *Journal of College Teaching and Learning*, *7*(4), 9-14.

Badawy, M. K. (2007). Managing human resources. *Research Technology Management*, *50*(4), 56-74.

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

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

Bodla, M. A., & Nawaz, M. M. (2010). Transformational leadership style and its relationship with satisfaction. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, *2*(1), 370-381.

Brinkerhoff, J. M., & Brinkerhoff, D. W. (2002). Government-nonprofit relations in comparative perspective: Evolution, themes and new directions. *Public Administration & Development*, *22*(1), 3-18.

Brown, R. B., & Brooks, I. (2002). Emotion at work: Identifying the emotional climate of night nursing. *Journal of Management Medicine*, *16*(5), 327-344.

Bruno, L. F. C., & Lay, E. G. E. (2008). Personal values and leadership effectiveness. *Journal of Business Research*, *61*(1), 678-683.

Caldwell, C., Hayes, L. A., & Tien Long, D. (2010). Leadership, trustworthiness, and ethical stewardship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *96*(1), 497-512.

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

Cangemi, J. P., Burga, B., Lazarus, H., Miller, R. L., & Fitzgerald, J. (2008). The real work of the leader: A focus on the human side of the equation. *Journal of Management Development*, *27*(10), 1026-1036.

Chien, M-H. (2004). A study to improve organizational performance: A view from SHRM. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, *4*(1/2), 289-291.

Day, D. V., & Bedeian, A. G. (1991). Predicting job performance across organizations: The interaction of work orientation and psychological climate. *Journal of Management*, *17*(3), 589-600.

Dickson, M. W., Smith, D. B., Grojean, M. W., & Ehrhart, M. (2001). An organizational climate regarding ethics: The outcome of leader values and the practices that reflect them. *Leadership Quarterly*, *12*(1), 197-217.

Downey, H. K., Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J. W. (1975). Congruence between individual needs, organizational climate, job satisfaction and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *18*(1), 149-155.

Drucker, P. F. (1990). *Managing the nonprofit organization: Principles and practices*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Eagly, A. (2005). Achieving relational authenticity in leadership: Does gender matter? *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*(1), 459-474.

Farris, G. F. (1988). Technical leadership: Much discussed but little understood. *Research Technology Management*, *31*(2), 12-16.

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

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2001). Primal leadership: The hidden driver of great performance. *Harvard Business Review*, *79*(11), 41-51.

Gray, G. C., & Bishop Kendzia, V. (2009). Organizational self-censorship: Corporate sponsorship, nonprofit funding, and the educational experience. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, *46*(2), 161-177.

Grojean, M. W., Resick, C. J., Dickson, M. W., & Smith, D. B. (2004). Leaders, values, and organizational climate: Examining leadership strategies for establishing an organizational climate regarding ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *55*(1), 223-241.

Halpin, A. W. (1957). *Manual for the leader behavior description questionnaire*. Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, The Ohio State University.

Hess, J. D., & Bacigalupo, A. C. (2011). Enhancing decisions and decision-making processes through the application of emotional intelligence skills [Special issue]. *Management Decision*, *49*(5).

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

Hooijberg, R., Lane, N., & Diversé, A. (2010). Leader effectiveness and integrity: Wishful thinking? *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *18*(1), 59-75.

House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *16*(3), 321-38.

Hui, C. H., Chiu, W. C. K., Yu, P. L. H., Cheng, K., & Tse, H. H. M. (2007). The effects of service climate and the effective leadership behaviour of supervisors on frontline employee service quality: A multi-level analysis. *Journal of Occupation and Organizational Psychology*, *80*(1), 151-172.

Hunt, B., & Ivergard, T. (2007). Organizational climate and workplace efficacy: Learning from performance measurement in a public-sector cadre organization. *Public Management Review*, *9*(1), 27-47.

Indik, B. P. (1968). The scope of the problem and some suggestions toward a solution. In B. P. Indik & F. K. Berrien (Eds.), *People, Groups, and Organizations* (pp. 3-30). New York: Teachers College Press.

Iqbal, A. (2011). The influence of personal factors on the perceived organizational climate: Evidence from the Pakistani industrial organizations. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, *2*(9), 511-527.

Jaskyte, K., & Kisieliene, A. (2006). Determinants of employee creativity: A survey of Lithuanian nonprofit organizations. *Voluntas*, *17*(2), 128-136.

Kerlinger, F. N., & Lee, H. B. (2000). *Foundations of behavioral research* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.

Koene, B. A. S., Vogelaar, A. L. W., & Soeters, J. L. (2002). Leadership effects on organizational climate and financial performance: Local leadership effect in chain organizations. *Leadership Quarterly*, *13*(1), 193-215.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2010). *The truth about leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kozlowksi, S. W. J., & Doherty, M. L. (1989). Integration of climate and leadership: Examination of a neglected issue. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *74*(4), 546-553.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in the social sciences*. New York, NY: Harper.

Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization: Its management and value*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Litwin, G. H., & Stringer, R. A. (1968). *Motivation and organizational climate*. Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

Lucas, P. R., Messner, P. E., Ryan, C. W., & Sturm, G. P. (1992). Preferred leadership style differences: Perceptions of defence industry labour and management. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *13*(7), 19-22.

Malloy, D. C., & Agarwal, J. (2010). Ethical climate in government and nonprofit sectors: Public policy implications for service delivery. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *94*(1), 3–21.

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

Momeni, N. (2009). The relation between managers' emotional intelligence and the organizational climate they create. *Public Personnel Management*, *38*(2), 35-48.

Muchinsky, P. M. (1976). An assessment of the Litwin and Stringer organization climate questionnaire: An empirical and theoretical extension of the Sims and LaFollette Study. *Public Personnel*, *29*(1), 371-392.

Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Phillips, S. D., Little, B. R., & Goodine, L. A. (1996). *Organizational climate and personal projects: Gender differences in the public service*. Canadian Centre for Management Development. Retrieved from https://www.csps-efpc.gc.ca/pbp/pub/pdfs/P74_e.pdf

Phipps, K. A., & Burbach, M. E. (2010). Strategic leadership in the nonprofit sector: Opportunities for research. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, *11*(2), 137-154.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. C., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(5), 879-903.

Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, *12*(4), 531-544.

Quinn, R. E. (1988). *Beyond rational management: Mastering the paradoxes and competing demands of high performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Raza, S. A. (2010). Impact of organizational climate on performance of college teaches in Punjab. *Journal of College Teaching and Learning*, *7*(10), 47-51.

Reichers, A. E., & Schneider, B. (1990). Climate and culture: An evolution of constructs. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Organizational Climate and Culture* (pp. 1-39). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schneider, B. (1975). Organizational climates: An essay. *Personnel Psychology*, *28*(1), 447-479.

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu

Sims, H. P., & LaFollette, W. (1975). An assessment of the Litwin and Stringer organization climate questionnaire. *Personnel Psychology*, *28*(1), 19-38.

Smith, S. R. (2002). Social services. In L. M. Salamon (Ed.), *The State of Nonprofit America* (pp. 149-186). Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Sowpow, E. (2006). The impact of culture and climate on change programs. *Strategic Communication Management*, *10*(6), 14-17.

Stogdill, R. M. (1963). *Manual for leadership behavior description, Questionnaire – Form XII: An experimental revision*. Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Taylor, C. S. (1995). Using volunteers in economic development. *Economic Development Review*, *13*(3), 28-30.

Trautmann, K., Maher, J. K., & Motley, D. G. (2007). Learning strategies as predictors of transformational leadership: The case of nonprofit managers. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *28*(3), 269-287.

Wang, D-S., & Shyu, C-L. (2008). Will the strategic fit between business and HRM strategy influence HRM effectiveness and organizational performance? *International Journal of Manpower*, *29*(2), 92-110.

Wimbush, J. C., & Shepard, J. M. (1994). Toward an understanding of ethical climate: Its relationship to ethical behavior and supervisory influence. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *13*(1), 637-647.

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Yukl, G., O'Donnell, M., & Taber, T. (2009). Influence of leader behaviors on the leader-member exchange relationship. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *24*(4), 289-299.

ISSN 1941-4684 | editorelj@regent.edu