

ABSTRACT

EXPLORATION OF LEADERSHIP VALUE TRANSCENDENCE IN A COLLEGE RECREATION ORGANIZATION

by

Benjamin E. Cashion

December 2021

Chair: Debra Jordan, Re.D.

Major Department: Recreation Sciences

Abstract:

This was a mixed-methods study that explored the emergence, transmission, and reception of leadership values in an American southeast college recreation organization (CRO). A structured interview was conducted with the CRO director to determine his leadership values. Questions were designed to elicit specific values held by the director that were reflective of his leadership. Results from the in-depth interview elicited themes around the values of the director, methods of transmission of values of the director, skills the director had that he considered necessary to lead, and how the director governs his values in the work-environment. Based on the director's responses, a questionnaire was created and distributed to the CRO's frontline employees (FEs) to understand if the director exhibited these values and if these values were present in the work environment. The study occurred during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic when campus was largely closed. The FE questionnaire was electronically distributed to 220 employees. The response rate was low with 48 FEs attempting the questionnaire and 22 FEs completing questions related to the CRO director's values and method of value

transmission; 23 FEs completed questions related to values present in the CRO and method of value transmission from direct supervisors. While descriptive, the results from the FE questionnaire identified four tiers of value congruence between the director and CRO. There was also a difference in the methods of transmission with FE supervisors rated higher than the director on communication via actions, language, and written communication.

EXPLORATION OF LEADERSHIP VALUE TRANSCENDENCE IN A COLLEGE
RECREATION ORGANIZATION

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Recreation Sciences

East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of:

M.S. IN RECREATION SERVICES AND INTERVENTIONS

Concentration: Recreation and Park Administration

by

Benjamin E. Cashion

December 2021

© Copyright 2021

Benjamin E. Cashion

EXPLORATION OF LEADERSHIP VALUE TRANSMISSION IN A COLLEGE
RECREATION ORGANIZATION

by

Benjamin E. Cashion

APPROVED BY:

DIRECTOR OF THESIS: _____

Debra Jordan, Re.D.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: _____

Edwin Gómez, Ph.D.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: _____

Clifton E. Watts, Ph.D.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: _____

Karen Jones, Ph.D.

CHAIR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF

RECREATION SCIENCES: _____

Edwin Gómez, Ph.D.

DEAN OF THE

GRADUATE SCHOOL: _____

Paul J. Gemperline, Ph.D.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank East Carolina University, the College of Health and Human Performance, the Department of Recreation Sciences, the chair of the Department of Recreation Sciences, my advisor, my committee, and my committee chair, for all the hard work, patience, kindness, good and sometimes tough advice, in helping me achieve the completion of this study. A special thank you to my wife who over the past five years has endured this process. And to all the people lost along the journey, may the future efforts of my research and entrepreneurial ventures help bring about a world that is transparently equal and accepting of all truths and all life.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Background.....	4
Transactional Leadership Theory.....	4
Transformational Leadership Theory.....	5
Ethical Leadership Theory.....	8
Servant Leadership Theory.....	10
Values Orientation Theory.....	11
Methods.....	14
Study Area.....	14
Interview Questions.....	15
Analysis of Qualitative Interview.....	16
Creation of the Front-line Employee Questionnaire.....	17
Distribution and Collection of Quantitative Survey.....	18
Results.....	19
Qualitative Analysis Results.....	19
Results from FE Questionnaire.....	26
Analysis of Value Transmission.....	31
Conclusions and Discussion.....	33
Conclusion.....	37
Limitations and Suggestions.....	38
References.....	41
Appendix A: University and Medical Center Institutional Review Board Approval.....	49
Appendix B: Study Interview Questions.....	52
Appendix C: Value Themes with Codes.....	54
Appendix D: Quantitative Student Questionnaire.....	61
Appendix E: Extended Literature Review.....	67

Introduction

Leadership has been described, defined, categorized, and explained over centuries. For the purpose of this research, leadership is defined as “an asymmetrical (albeit interactive and mutual) influence process that serves to articulate, clarify, and facilitate the accomplishment of a group's (organization's, community's, society's) objectives (including, importantly, survival)” (Marturano et al., 2013, p. 1). Modern leadership theories support and identify leader roles such as supervisors, managers, directors, and executive directors as sources of influence within organizational hierarchies. Post-modern leadership theories suggest leadership can be a standalone entity in organizations where leadership can be recognized as an independent source of influence that is formed from the collective input of the organization (Ronald & Julia, 2021). Both types of theories suggest that leadership roles and hierarchies are an organization’s source of guidance, not the leaders themselves. From this point of view, leadership, as defined in this study, occurs regardless of the leader(s) within an organization. Leadership happens because an organization’s policies and procedures govern the actions of an organization’s employees – including its leadership staff – more directly than leaders themselves. Conversely, leadership values, most often defined in terms of what leaders find important, originate not with an organization’s policies but with the individual leaders’ experiences over time in both supervisory and subordinate roles. However, understanding the relationship between organizational values and leadership values involves finding out what, if any, values are present in an organization and if those values are recognized by individuals in that organization. Equally important is discovering how those values are perceived to be transmitted and if they are understood by followers.

After assessing existing approaches to leadership, Andersen (2018), devised two approaches to describing leadership theories: the trait approach and situational approach. The trait approach has pre-selected attributes that define leaders, and the situational approach names the situation in which the person is as an indication of arising leadership and style, if at all. Ronald and Julia (2021) arrived at three general assumptions: (a) people not in leadership roles can have traits known for leaders (and vice versa) and are aware of that; (b) people in leadership positions are aware about the impact of followership and actively work on strengthening it; (c) positive employee followership is more important than any other aspect of leadership. The current study used a situational approach that explored a single example of a leader's values and how the leader thought their values were transmitted throughout the existing work environment at the time.

This mixed methods case study focused on leadership values present in a campus recreation organization (CRO) independent from a trait style approach moving away from using pre-existing categories of traits that have described and defined leadership theory types for decades. This approach allowed the leader to self-identify leadership values without being labeled under past trait surveying methods. One drawback to this kind of independent situational approach is that it depends on self-identification and self-reporting. Typically, people evaluate themselves in a positive light, which is not always accurate. However, this complication is outweighed by the benefit of being able to draw upon the knowledge and experience of the CRO's followers and, thus, the ability to balance results by considering leadership values that are recognized by followers. In other words, by taking a non-categorical, "transference-of-values" approach to research the study focused on identifying the values of leadership and the ability of

leaders to transmit these values to Frontline Employees (FEs) who were farthest from them in the organization's hierarchical structure.

The research approach for this study utilized a qualitative interview to discover the values an executive director of a CRO holds and how those values transmit to FEs. Results were then used to create a questionnaire for FEs to understand if values were present and the extent to which values were transmitted from the CRO director and the FE's direct supervisor. FE responses in the survey were focused on recognizing how the CRO's executive leader's values were transmitted through actions, verbal, and written communication by the CRO's executive director. Given that it is typically FEs who are first to communicate with and usually have most contact with customers within a CRO, it was hypothesized that executive leadership values would show to emanate from the highest levels of leadership to the lowest levels of workers. Furthermore, it was predicted that data from this study would support the position that leaders and their leadership values can be unique to themselves or to an organization, and that these values can be identified and traced to the leader through the organization.

Background

During the turn of the 21st century, scholars taught two basic views of organizational culture. One of those views was that an organizational culture is represented within its people. The other was that an organizational culture has procedures and policies that are followed by all (Hatch, 1993). Hatch found that when people within an organization created and maintained their own culture, that such culture was difficult to change unless the people in that organization had the will to do so. When people join an organizational culture that is already created and is maintained by organizational policies and procedures, which are themselves designed to shape and change people toward acceptance the organization's protocols, cultural clash can happen. In the scholarship that currently exists, four main forms of leadership theory take precedence. Transactional, Transformational, Ethical, and Servant leadership theory.

Transactional Leadership Theory

According to Nikezckic et al. (2012), transactional leadership theory was first conceptualized by Weber. Transactional leadership theory consists of principles that focus on maintaining the status quo, exchanges with followers, enforcing formal authority, and accounting for responsibility within an organization (Basri et al., 2017; Brown & Treviño, 2006; Nikezic et al., 2012). Nikezcic et al. explained that Weber found that transactional leaders value clear coercive measures, obedient followers, strict discipline, rational values, agreements, rules, fixed wages, and no right to appeal. Other scholars, like Burns (1978), envisioned transactional leaders as involving incremental change through political give and take, and found fairness in offering jobs for votes and changing legislation for campaign contributions. Across the board, transactional leadership theory is based on a leader's transactional behaviors that either reward employees for their effort and performance or punish and discipline them when there are

unsatisfactory outcomes (Gandolfi & Stone, 2017; Jensen et al., 2018). This traditional approach assumes employees will be motivated through pre-defined standards and that those standards are dependent on an organization's leader's ability to direct employees using systems of rewards and punishments. Ghazali et al. (2015) found that followers reported feeling controlled under such conditions and that they lacked self-motivation.

Transformational Leadership Theory

Transformational leadership, first introduced by Burns (1978), describes how leaders can influence followers by channeling followers' self-interest toward the greater well-being of their work environments. Likewise, Andersen (2018) defined transformational leadership theory as leadership occurring when one or more persons engage in activities with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise their mutual relations and relationships to perform at a higher level of motivation and morality. According to both, transformational leaders interact with their work environments, which include their followers, and help them advance to higher levels of morale, motivation, and skill. They also have confidence in their followers, encourage them to solve problems and think independently, and instill them with self-confidence to meet challenges. According to transformational leadership theory, transformational leaders impact followers through four dimensions: (1) idealized influence, (2) inspirational motivation, (3) intellectual stimulation, and (4) individualized consideration (Andersen, 2018; Bass et al., 2003; Deinert et al., 2015). A brief review of each dimension follows.

Bass et al.'s (2003) concept of *idealized influence* was described as how leaders model behavior, self-identify, and behave as role models. According to Bass et al., *inspiring motivation* in followers was when leaders "behave in ways that motivate those around them by proving meaning and challenge to their followers' work. Individual and team spirit is aroused.

Enthusiasm and optimism are displayed. The leader encourages followers to envision attractive future states, which they can ultimately envision themselves” (p. 208). Bass et al. explained that *individualized consideration* was displayed when a transformational leader knew their followers’ needs and ambitions and provided new learning opportunities that supported the transformation and growth of each individual follower. Lastly, when leaders engage in *intellectual stimulation* they encourage followers to have original ideas, reframe approaches to old ideals, and voice questions to be solved as a group.

After Burns’ 1978 publication, other scholars began to enter the conversation and argue that leaders use a mixture of leadership styles. Bass (1990) is one of the foremost examples. For Bass, a transformational leader’s influence on their organization’s mission and values are dependent on that leader’s relational and emotional effect on their followers. According to Bass, no matter what tactics transformational leaders employ to inspire others, those efforts ought to be rooted in understanding followers’ needs and ambitions. Those needs and ambitions are supported through the provision of new learning opportunities in a supportive climate that provides pathways to work environment satisfaction and/or encouragement to continue on to a followers’ true aspiration.

Along similar lines, Burch and Guarana (2014) theorized a transformational leaders’ job is to transform followers’ views of their work role and to develop skills that align with organizational goals. Deinert et al. (2015) agreed that no single characteristic, trait, or behavior caused leaders to succeed. Thus, having multiple qualities, a flexible personality, and the ability to use different leadership approaches in combination may help leaders be successful in leading followers, transferring their leadership values, and assure congruence between leader and follower. As Zhu and Akhtar (2014) explained, transferring leadership values from

transformational leaders to their followers will align visions, build trust, and strengthens messages leaders are conveying. To put it another way, when value transference is successful, followers may reciprocate behaviors and develop traits resembling their leader's.

A leader's affect and approach may explain the situations and climate that aid in value transference. Hoch et al.'s (2018) work on positive leadership behaviors indicated that when leaders use positive affect towards their followers, follower confidence increases as do prosocial behaviors and self-development. However, they warn that transformational leaders, in efforts to transform their followers, can behave in ways that are largely unethical or immoral. Given such transformational capacity, transformational leaders must make decisions about whether they will act ethically while in positions of leadership.

New employees tend to form commonly held beliefs about the workplace environment from long-standing employees (Burch & Guarana, 2014; Jensen et al., 2018; Zhu & Akhtar, 2014). Thus, as Jensen et al. and Lajoie et al. (2017) concluded, transformational leaders function best with new employees and when able to communicate in person regularly. They determined that transformational leaders may not function well in large organizations where interacting one-on-one daily is not possible and when an employee is well-established in an organization.

While there continues to be debate about the success of certain leadership principles, it is clear that regardless of whether followers are being commanded through consequence, motivated through passions, guided toward an agreement, or bonded through belief, each leadership theory is a representation of accepted values that are learned. For example, Liden et al. (2016) believed that CEOs created, set, and distributed an organization's tempo, tone, flow of information, and access to resources regardless of the leadership style employed. Executive leaders exerted

influence during social exchange(s) in their work environment(s) and a leader's personal values are thought to intertwine with each other. Values that are continually being transmitted from a source of leadership over time are thought to be absorbed by employees within that work environment. If leadership values are transferred within an organization's structure, a likely starting point would be the top of that organization's hierarchical structure on the executive level.

Ethical Leadership Theory

Brown et al. (2005) defined ethical leadership as “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships and the promotion of such conduct to follower through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (p. 105). Recent reviews of ethical leadership use Bandura's (1971) social learning theory to explain why workers were more attentive and often emulated attractive credible role models (Bedi et al., 2016). Bedi and colleagues explained that ethical leadership impacts followers most when leaders were integrous and held high ethical standards for themselves and others around them. Research by Tang et al. (2015) between ethical leaders and followers found that value congruence formed over time. Brown and Treviño (2014) identified traits and behaviors of ethical leaders as honest, trustworthy, having integrity, caring about people, being open to input, and having principled decision-making abilities. They also emphasized that a leader's ethic(s) are reflected in work environment ethic(s), which are influenced by a leader's traits and behaviors. In other words, leaders function as role models for their subordinates in work environments.

Bedi et al. (2016) conducted a meta-analytical review of role modeling and discussed the importance and representation of what constitutes right, normative, common, and culturally

accepted behavior. Ethical leadership was defined by Brown et al. (2005, p. 120) as “the demonstration of normative appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision making.” According to Brown et al., such moral lessons must originate from strong ethical role-models and that those role-models are often parents, friends, religious organizations, and demographic origins. Bedi et al. (2016) discussed ethical work environments and how employees within such work environments succeed when reaching an agreed upon belief system that affected employee behavior and conduct towards the agreed upon or enforced upon ethic. Thus, it is the role of the ethical leader to challenge, encourage, inspire, grow, have perception, and notice individualization of followers.

According to Brown and Treviño (2006) research in ethical leadership should concentrate on how ethical work environments are designed, how ethical pedagogies are formed, how each are maintained, or the content used to do so. To this end, researchers have found that negative relationships within ethical cultures can arise when subcultures disagree or contain abusive constituent(s) who do not align with what is considered fair and respectful treatment (Bedi et al., 2016; Hernandez et al., 2014).

In a similar vein, Brown and Treviño (2014) discussed negative leaders, who they referred to as Machiavellianists. Machiavellianists are defined as individuals using guile, deceit, and opportunism in interpersonal relations. Other traits of Machiavellianists include manipulation for personal gain, willingness to lie, pay for or receive illegal kickbacks or activities, and tendencies of distrust. Interestingly enough, Brown and Treviño also found that despite the negative impact on followers and organizations from unethical, Machiavellian leaders, that positive relationships existed between Machiavellianism, charisma, and perceived

greatness. Despite the existence of these positive relationships, Brown and Treviño warn that most leaders who display such qualities most often have negative impacts on followers and work environments. Transference of ethics from leader to follower is something that all leaders innately strive to do, and it is this internal desire to lead by serving followers that draws followers to such leaders.

Servant Leadership Theory

Greenleaf's (1970) philosophy of servant leadership placed stakeholder and follower needs first and noted that "a servant leader is servant first and must begin with natural feelings that one wants to serve and then through conscious choice people will have aspiration to lead" (p. 27). Greenleaf believed that it is a leader's aspiration to lead that is most important rather than a follower's growth or organizational goal achievement, and this belief has in many ways come to define servant leadership.

While being distinct, servant leadership shares similarities with other leadership theories. Andersen (2018) compared transformational leadership and servant leadership, noting strong similarities between Greenleaf's essay on servant leadership and Burns' transformational leadership ideology. Coetzer et al. (2017) found servant leadership theory to be relational and ethical. Servant leaders are multi-dimensional and believe in working through a higher purpose while living with simple definable standards. Andersen identified servant leaders as being trustworthy, empowering visionaries. Servant leaders share power and information, create a higher purposed vision and strategy, establish standards and simple procedures, generate growth and pathways of development, and guide customers to participate and bond based on their similarities and interests (Coetzer et al.). At the center of this is personal purpose, which is the preparation servant leaders need to undergo to earn the trust and respect of followers (Bordas,

1995) Bordas explained that personal purpose starts with a desire to connect with the greatest good within oneself and one's surrounding culture. According to Bordas, articulating one's values is the first step in finding personal purpose and support for how values guide servant leaders can be found throughout the literature.

Andersen (2018) purported that social responsibility is a defining trait of a servant leader and all institutions serving society should be just, equal, and oppose social injustices and human rights inequalities while also concentrating on serving the needs of their community. Servant leadership theory researchers agree that servant leaders make positive differences in work environments by facilitating follower development and encouraging employee well-being to achieve long-term organizational goals (Coetzer et al., 2017; Hoch et al., 2018). Servant leaders are humble, relevant, and empowering; however, servant leaders are aware that they "cannot empower others if they are not competent themselves" (Coetzer et al., p.14). According to Hoch et al. and Coetzer et al., servant leaders model success that could be described as the leader's achievement of self-awareness combined with the leader's ability to instill a set of chosen values to accomplish a common goal, and for a leader to instill those values, the leader must understand where those values originated and if those values align to the organization's values and work environment.

Values Orientation Theory

Perhaps it is this focus defining values that led researchers to formulate Values Orientation Theory. Rokeach (1973, p. 5), for example, defined values as "enduring beliefs influencing modes of conduct and end states where each value transcends specific symbols and experiences that are personally and socially preferred and are not in opposition to the selected set of modes of conduct and end states". As Schmeltz (2014) indicated, it is important to remember

that values are not entirely stable and are completely subjective. Values are imprinted over a lifetime, learned from personal, political, and social surroundings that may change slightly, not significantly, and are in order of importance an individual has arranged them.

Values Orientation Theory suggests that all societies have a finite number of universal problems that must be answered with value-based solutions and the answers to each society's universal problems are limited in quantity and are universally known by that society. Jenkins (2013) and Schwartz (2012) identified three universal requirements that are social and institutional demands for group welfare being met, basic biological survival, and social interaction Shamir (1990) proposed that for a leader's message, or value delivery system, to be effective with followers, the leader's values and ideologies must already exist and be congruent among their followers' values and ideologies. Furthermore, Schmeltz (2014) indicated that shared value systems are building blocks for organizational identity.

How values align, as well as socio-cultural congruencies within organizations, have been the focus of several studies. Painter et al. (2019), Lajoie et al. (2017), and Yu and Verma (2018) found that when objectives, strategies, plans, and decisions vertically fit, meaning an organization's internal values are in agreement throughout the upper and lower levels of the organization's hierarchical structure, those organizations tended to have an optimal working environment that has positive influence on employees' attitudes. Socio-cultural alignment, defined by Reich and Benbasat (2000), happens when employees and their organization share values, beliefs, habits, and feelings of purpose from social and cultural perspectives. Value congruence occurs when characteristics of employees and their organizations match.

Seggewiss et al. (2019) challenged conventional views of value congruence when they surveyed commitment from employees by testing similarities between an organization's values

and its employees' values. They found that employee values did not have to align, and ordinarily did not, with an organization's values for goals to be accomplished. Thus, Seggewiss and colleagues recommended not looking for congruency of values between organization and employee, and to instead explore person-centered values that are shared among an organization's population. As Jensen et al. (2018) cautioned, too much overt and intentional influence on employee values by leadership can cause negative effects in work environments when values between parties are not in alignment. Incongruences among values and formal rules can cause individuals to experience conflict between their personal and social identity, or fluctuations in their support of the establishment (Gerxhani & van Breemen, 2019). In fact, organizational leaders reported that even when employees followed clear pathways and completed objectives, conflicts with employees' personal and social identities may make social identities less relevant, thus diminishing "support for the rules that embody social identity" (Gerxhani & van Breemen, 2019; p. 263). Therefore, creating an organization with all likeminded employees required removing anyone not in agreement with that organization's social normative rules or that organization's regulations.

Methods

This case study utilized a two-step data collection process. An in-person interview was conducted with a CRO leader to determine his values and methods of transmitting those values to FE employees. The qualitative interview consisted of four questions, each having two or more follow up prompts that were designed to further the leader's comments to gain a clearer and more complete understanding of the initial response. The interview was recorded on the researcher's cell phone using a transcription application called Temi™ on March 3, 2021. The interview began at 3:24 pm and lasted twenty-four minutes. It was conducted at the convenience of the CRO director's schedule. The second step, the FE questionnaire, was distributed by email from the associate director of leadership and programs to 220 FEs on June 14, 2021, July 15, 2021, and August 2, 2021. The time between the interview and the questionnaire distribution was spent on analyzing the interview and creating the questionnaire.

Study Area

The study took place at a campus recreation organization (CRO) in a southeastern state university. The university enrollment approaches 30,000 students, 80% of whom are undergraduates. The racial composition of the university is 65.0% white, 16.4% African American, 7.4% Hispanic, 2.7% Asian, and 8.5% identified as other to include multiracial and other racial backgrounds. The CRO manages two campus recreation centers, two large outdoor intramural areas, high and low ropes courses, a climbing wall, and a pool. The CRO offers employment in the following areas: adventure programs, aquatics, club sports, customer service, group fitness, intramurals, personal training, special events, and summer camps.

The CRO director has worked in the field of campus recreation for 30 years. He has served as a director of campus recreation at five different colleges and universities for the past 22 years and has been in his current role for the past five years.

Interview Questions

Interview questions were designed to encourage the CRO director to list, describe, and define his leadership values (see Appendix A). In the beginning of the interview, the director was asked to state his name, title, and years in his position and then to list his leadership values (interview question 1). Subsequent probing questions were “How do you implement your values in your work environment?”, “How do you communicate your values in your work environment?”, and “How do you know your values have been communicated and accepted by your staff?” These questions were designed to appeal to the director’s sense of self, what values he held, and how he communicates and instills these values. The second probe – “How do you communicate your values in your work environment?” – was aimed toward the director’s personal vision or version of leadership values transmission.

In the second interview question, the CRO director was asked, “What qualities, skills, and processes does it take to be a successful leader for a CRO?” Probing questions to support the second question include: “What personal and professional experiences did you have during your career that developed your skills, qualities, and methods to being a leader?”, “How do you feel you communicate your vision/version of your leadership values to your followers?”, “How do you know your followers understand your leadership values?”, “What do you do when employees do not understand your leadership values?”, and “How do you encourage your employees to align themselves to your leadership values?” These questions were formulated to

explore how the CRO director used his leadership values to guide and motivate employees towards a common goal, organizational objective, or personal desire.

The third set of questions attempted to discover what organizational values did not align with the personal values of the CRO director. The initial question asked, “What leadership values do you not find appealing, do not use, and/or would describe as harmful to use in a leadership context?” Probing questions to support this line of inquiry included, “What values do you consider to directly oppose your values”, and “What did you do during moments in your career when your staff did not align with your core value system?”

The fourth question for the CRO director asked, “How do leaders know their values are communicated to all employees in their work environment?” It was followed by asking the following probe, “How do you know your values are being absorbed by your followers?” Such questions were designed to examine the CRO director’s awareness of value transference in the organization.

Analysis of Qualitative Interview

The Temi™ application was used to record, transcribe, and deliver an e-document three minutes after the interview ended. The investigator first read-through the transcript without writing anything to refamiliarize himself with the interviewee’s responses. During the second read-through, the investigator used open emergent descriptive codes to begin the analysis process. In this study, these emergent open *in vivo* descriptors indicated the self-perceived values of the CRO director, the director’s methods of transmitting his values, the director’s systems of rewards and punishments to maintain his values, and how value transmission was supported in the CRO work environment. These four major themes were repeated throughout the interview and were therefore assumed important to the CRO director. Throughout the second re-coding

period, the investigator identified open emergent descriptive statements that supported the initial emergent discovery of categories and open emergent *in vivo* gerund statements that supported key actions the CRO director stated he used (see Appendix B). Gerund codes are clusters of action statements of how the investigator perceived the interviewee to feel towards the open emergent descriptive codes.

Creation of the Front-line Employee Questionnaire

Once coding of the interview transcript was completed and analyzed, a questionnaire for FEs was generated and developed in Qualtrics for electronic distribution (see Appendix C). The questionnaire asked for demographic information including year in school (student standing), length of employment, CRO department where they worked, gender, and race. A screener question asked if the participant knew the CRO director. If the participant responded “no” the participant skipped all work-related values for the CRO director and was directed to the questions related to values present in the CRO. Those replying “yes” to the screener question, were then directed to questions on the work-related values of the CRO director; specifically, the participants were asked to check all the values the CRO director holds from a list of values identified in the qualitative data analysis.

Following the values questions for the CRO director and CRO, participants were asked to identify the frequency with which specific forms of communication were used in transmitting values from the CRO director and the CRO. These included how the CRO director communicated values through his actions, through his language (what he said), and through written messages (emails or memos). Similar questions were posed for the FE’s direct supervisors related to actions, language, and written messages. Other questions explored values transmission from the staff handbook and staff trainings.

A pilot test was not performed with the survey instrument due to time and situational limitations. As indicated earlier, the questionnaire was distributed during the coronavirus pandemic and the investigator had limited opportunity to recruit a pilot study group. Prior to distribution, the questionnaire was reviewed by the researcher's thesis mentor, underwent eight edits over a two-month period, and then submitted for university IRB review. The questionnaire passed review in April of 2021.

Distribution and Collection of Quantitative Survey

The questionnaire was directed to employees who were considered FEs. For the purposes of this study, FEs are defined as employees who do not supervise anyone, who are being supervised by others, and who are hierarchically furthest from the CRO director. The survey was distributed through email with a link to the questionnaire sent three times: June 14, 2021; July 15, 2021; and August 2, 2021. Each time the questionnaire was sent to the same 220 FEs. The total time for data collection was six months. This was enough time for the researcher to conduct the director interview, code the data, generate an electronic questionnaire, distribute, and collect the questionnaire data.

Results

The results of this study reflect the analysis process of both the director interview and FE questionnaire. This two-step study utilized an in-depth qualitative interview to determine the CRO director's values and communication style with employees. During the coding process, leadership values specific to the CRO director emerged and became the basis for the questionnaire distributed to FEs. Results are reported for the qualitative analysis followed by findings from the study questionnaire to address the study's research objectives. As mentioned earlier, the current study faced difficulties related to the COVID-19 pandemic as the university was largely online during the study period (March 2021 through August 2021). The university closures and restrictions limited use and availability of the CRO and staff during this time, which also impacted the investigator's access to staff and facility.

Qualitative Analysis Results

As previously described, the qualitative analysis utilized a three-step process to identify values through a thematic analysis. The results elicited 19 values from the interview with the CRO director. Values included being approachable, appreciative, committed to service, compassionate, giving, growth, honest, integrity, mindful, open communication, respectful, supporting staff, team-focused, trust, values employees, dedication, purposeful, forward thinking, and being a role model. A summary of codes with corresponding quotations is contained in Appendix B. Results from this analysis will focus on each value, an interpretation of the value, and illustrative quotations from the CRO director as evidence of each value theme. The identified values are reported in order of importance and negligible values have been omitted.

Value 1: Respectful

Approximately 14.1% of the assigned codes were related to how the director knew his values were getting across to his FEs. He gave an explanation of how he engaged his FEs to have open conversations about values, however, he did not use the words *respect* or *respectful*. The investigator inferred this concept based on how the director stated that he interacted with his FEs during staff training. He explained:

“I think you have to ask. And I don’t think it’s a, it’s an ask often, I think a lot of times there’s that checklist where I’m going to send you a little quiz and here’s eight values pick the five that we have, that’s okay, but the answer is still on the page. I like it better in an open conversation. So, some of our staff training typically what we will do will be 15-minute sessions we break them into really small groups, like 15 or 20 students and just have that conversation. So, we are not spitting out the ten commandments and sticking them on the wall we are asking them where they are coming from and then we may have that conversation with values but it’s not so much a literal dunking or regurgitation.”

Value 2: Forward-Thinking

Approximately 10.1% of the codes focused on forward-thinking. These were coded such as they indicated steps to ensuring future success. He expressed:

“There are four schools that I have been at that we created with the students and the full-time staff what some values were and they’re still there at those universities; the same values are guiding those departments.”

and

“We built a ten-million-dollar recreation center and playing field. Five years later, I was talking to the students about, okay now we need to add some more, I’m going to be back

in five more years and add some more and in twenty years we will have built what you needed today and building cost will have gone from 175 a square foot to 400 dollars a square foot.”

and

“But I think the reflection of what happens two, three, five years later is a representation of your values.”

Value 3: Open Communication

Approximately 7.4% of the assigned codes mentioned open communication. The first code focused on the ability to communicate and its value in serving patrons and recruiting staff.

The CRO director stated:

“Communication is a second one that if you can’t reach people, if you can’t tell your story, if they can’t get to you from a marketing and communication standpoint you have much less value.”

He added a few minutes later the importance to provide the correct resources in an ever-changing work environment. He stated:

“The pandemic is a good example of that if there’s one area that we have actually added resources, and this is marketing and communication and computers and technology during a virtual world.”

Value 4: Team-Focused

Approximately 7.2% of the codes were assigned to comments related to being team-focused. The director spoke about working relationships and being a team player. He commented:

“Working relationships at a university is what makes you successful or your organization successful”

and

“Here’s a cover letter and in that cover is the word ‘I’ 28 times and they’re trying to sell me the job advertisement said be a team player, be part of something else and they haven’t used the word we or team, at all.”

Value 5: Approachable

Approximately 6.9% of the assigned codes to the CRO director’s interview responses focused on the CRO director being approachable. Approachable as a value was not directly stated, however, being approachable was supported by the idea of taking and instilling one’s own values and adapting them to fit a shared vision. Specifically, the CRO director had to adapt to the organization’s shared vision rather than the organization adapting to his. In doing so, he had to listen to what was important to his FEs. He made himself available and was therefore approachable to find out what was important to staff. He stated that:

“There are three other schools that I have gone to that I might have carried my values to, but I asked for a shared vision and shared value, and so it’s different words, it’s different interpretations, here at (a southeast university) we have a different set of values than I would have brought forward because it was a shared vision with the students and the staff, as far as how they felt about what was important.”

Value 6: Supporting Staff

Approximately 6.7% of the assigned codes covered how the director supported his employees. He mentioned that he “spent a hundred million dollars on facilities and resources and things like that” at various universities he had worked at in the past. And later he mentioned,

“I cannot be your friend, I can be your supporter, I can be your supervisor, I can be a peer, but I can’t be your friend and then truly shape you and the department and move along”

Value 7: Purposeful

Approximately 5.4% of the assigned codes were related to the director’s purposefulness. These are highlighted in three codes, two towards his values and one that involved actions. The first response was after he was asked how he communicated his values to his employees. He said, “I think I lay them out clearly and then I walk away for a united vision of what mine are.” He later stated:

“I don’t think my values are just standalone, these are not 10 commandments, but purposeful of why they are there.”

This last quote was interpreted by the researcher also a statement of purpose, “I am strategic, I invest.”

Value 8: Resourceful

Approximately 4.6% of the assigned codes were about giving employees the tools necessary to get their job done. The director supported his employees through funding the supplies that he considered necessary to do the job. He discussed three different pillars; one of those was technology. He stated:

“Technology is a good point where I talked the talk and I signed the checks and buy all the hardware and stuff, but don’t ask me to sit down and do the software you need to do your job, that’s something different”

Value 9: Trust

Approximately 4.6% of the assigned codes focused on trust or how to deal with trust when it was an issue. The director stated:

“...created social opportunities for them to get together and have conversations and share, and maybe find some common points, you know, because at some point when you’re struggling, maybe whether you like to use the word or not, maybe there is not trust, they think there is an ulterior motive or something else going on.”

Value 10: Values Employees

Approximately 4.4% of the codes were attached to when the director mentioned valuing student employees. He explained:

“It’s easy to say treat people the way you want to be treated, um, being a value judgement, and that my values are that students are extremely valuable.”

Value 11: Being a Role Model

Approximately 4.2% of the codes assigned the director’s responses reflected being a role model as a value. While the word, *role model*, was not directly mentioned, the director stated how he felt about his values, how he managed his values, and how he perceived his values. He stated:

“I operate with a management value I called them pillars, so at every institution I’ve been, and I’ve been fortunate to be at several, they are pillars for me.”

Value 12: Dedication

Approximately 4.1% of codes assigned to the conversation reflected dedication. Although not directly stated, he talked about his dedication through the time it took to be able to share his

opinion after he replaced a director who had been at the CRO for a long time and had left a friend-oriented work environment. He stated:

“It was very hard here because the previous director had been here for 34 plus years, so just the discussion of being able to share your opinion about values took a little extra time.”

Value 13: Committed to Service

Approximately 3.1% of the assigned codes were spent on being committed to service; this was directly stated by the director about felt about himself and individuals he hired. He stated:

“Personally, my style I think is because I’m service driven, okay? I think I have a servant heart and I look for serving hearts in our employees and people that work with us.”

Value 14: Integrity

Approximately 3.1% of the interview codes were about integrity. Although not directly stated, what the director did say was when people tried to sway him in one direction or another that was not his direction, he would always behave the same way no matter the situation. He explained:

“If you ask me the question six different ways, I’m trying to answer it the same way, but if you’re trying to get me to say something different my actions are going to clarify whatever words came out of there.”

Value 15: Appreciative

Approximately 2.8% of the assigned codes were identified as appreciativeness. Appreciativeness was not directly stated by the director but inferred by investigator through the

director's awareness of being fortunate to being at the right place in life and appreciating opportunities that were happenstance. The director stated:

“You're not going to know until you leave. My expression has been since I have been fortunate to be at the right place at the right time.”

Value 16: Mindful

Approximately 2.6% of the total time spent talking about values were assigned to responses related to how the director provided for his employees. He had experienced moments earlier in his career when he could not provide, due to lack of funding, and those experiences shaped how he behaved later in his career when he could provide.

“the crux goes back to; I knew what to do without money so that I was a little more mindful of when we did have resources on how we allocated those”

As mentioned previously, once the values were assigned, the investigator created an online questionnaire that was used to survey FEs.

Results from FE Questionnaire

Once created, the questionnaire (see Appendix C) was distributed to 220 FEs and out of those, 48 FEs attempted the questionnaire, and 46 completed the demographic questions. Of those 46 FEs, 23 reported knowing the CRO director and completed questions pertaining to the CRO director's values and the modes of communication to transmit those values. Twenty-two FEs completed questions about values and modes of transmission within the work environment. A total of nine employees addressed questions about both the CRO director and the CRO itself with respect to values and methods of transmission. The small sample size limited the ability of the investigator to test bivariate relationships between methods of transmission and values attributed to the CRO director and the CRO. The results for this section are reported as

descriptive only with comparisons of similarities between the CRO director and CRO in terms of values present and methods of communicating values.

Table 1 presents demographic data for the sample. The sample consisted mostly of students in their senior year (56.3%) followed by lower division students (22.9%), and then graduate students (16.8%). More than half of the sample had worked at the CRO for less than a year (54.3%) with the remaining working there for a year or more. The small sample was quite homogeneous with 81.3% being white, while those in the remaining sample were non-white students who were African American, Asian, and mixed-race (not specified). More than two-thirds of the study sample identified as female (67.4%) with the remaining portion of the sample reporting their gender as male.

Table 1

Demographics (N=46)

Category	Subdivision	Frequency (N = 46)	%
Class standing	Lower division (\leq Juniors)	11	23.9
	Senior	27	58.7
	Graduate student	8	17.4
Year of employment	Less than one year	26	56.5
	One year or more	20	43.4
Race	White	39	84.8
	Person of color	7	15.2
Gender	Female	29	63.0
	Male	14	30.4

Not included in Table 1 but worth mention is 43.8% (21 FEs) reported working in the customer service department, 16.7% (8 FEs) were from the outdoor adventure department, and the remaining seven departments (e.g., aquatics, club sports, group fitness, intramurals, personal training, special events, summer camps) had fewer than nine percent for each category.

Values Analysis

Central to this study was identifying the CRO director's values and the extent to which these values were present in the CRO environment (as noted by FEs). Table 2 presents the extent to which FEs observed the value in the CRO director and, separately, within the CRO itself. Data are presented in descending order by the percentage of FEs who reported the value being transmitted by the CRO director. The data are secondarily sorted by the percentage who reported the value being present in the CRO environment. As a reminder, only nine FEs completed questions for both the CRO and the CRO environment; the other ratings are separate and independent of each other. When examining the data, it can be described as having four tiers of value congruence between the director and CRO.

Table 2 presents the first tier of CRO and CRO director value agreement. It contains values where more values were named by the director more than 50% of the time and the sample reporting that the value was exhibited by both the CRO director and within the CRO environment. Being approachable (68.2% CRO director, 60.9% CRO), supporting staff (63.6% CRO director, 65.2% CRO), and values employees (63.6% CRO director, 60.9%) exhibited the greatest consistency in reporting; this is where the CRO director and CRO are rated most similarly for the top tier.

Committed to service (50.0% CRO director, 73.9% CRO) and open communication (50.0% CRO director, 73.9% CRO) were identified as values present in the CRO were higher

values exhibited by the CRO director himself. Notably, the respectful value was most highly observed in the CRO (86.4%), and somewhat less in the CRO itself (69.6%). For this top tier, the aforementioned values were observed most and most consistently for the CRO director and recognized by CRO FEs. These are cases where the value agreement between director and FEs was high and interpreted to be overarching leadership values throughout the organization.

Table 2

Tier 1 Director and Work Environment Value Agreement

Value	Values from Director (n = 22)		Values within CRO (n = 23)	
	Freq	%	Freq	%
Respectful	19	86.4	16	69.6
Approachable	15	68.2	14	60.9
Supporting staff	14	63.6	15	65.2
Values employees	14	63.6	14	60.9
Committed to service	11	50.0	17	73.9
Open communication	11	50.0	17	73.9

Table 3 presents the second tier of FE and CRO director value agreement. It identifies values where the CRO identified values more than 50% of the time and FEs agreed with the director that they perceived the value in the CRO below 50% for the assigned value. These include the values of being team-focused (45.5% CRO director, 73.9% CRO), mindful (40.9% CRO, 56.5% CRO director), and growth (22.7% CRO director, 56.5% CRO). This second tier represents cases where the value was clearly present (more than a 50% rating) in the organization, but not well observed in the CRO director. These are cases where value transmission from leader to CRO was interpreted to be present in the environment but not explicitly modeled or reinforced by the CRO director.

Table 3

Tier 2 Director and Work Environment Value Agreement

Value	From Director (<i>n</i> = 22)		Values within CRO (<i>n</i> = 23)	
	Freq	%	Freq	%
Team-focused	10	45.5	17	73.9
Mindful	9	40.9	13	56.5
Growth	5	22.7	13	56.5

Table 4 presents the third tier of FE perceptions of CRO values and CRO director value agreement. The third tier of value agreement were cases where the value was reported less than 50% for both the CRO director and CRO, but the value was reported higher for the CRO than the CRO director. This included being honest (36.4% CRO director, 47.8% CRO), integrity (40.9% CRO director, 43.5% CRO), dedication (31.8% CRO director, 43.5% CRO), trust (27.3% CRO director, 43.5% CRO), and purposeful (22.7% CRO director, 34.8% CRO). These are cases where the value was observed by less than half the sample in both the CRO director and CRO but attributed more to the CRO.

Table 4

Tier 3 Director and Work Environment Value Agreement

Value	From Director (<i>n</i> = 22)		Values within CRO (<i>n</i> = 23)	
	Freq	%	Freq	%
Integrity	9	40.9	10	43.5
Honest	8	36.4	11	47.8
Forward-thinking	8	36.4	10	43.5
Dedication	7	31.8	10	43.5
Trust	6	27.3	10	43.5
Purposeful	5	22.7	8	34.8

Table 5 presents the fourth tier of CRO and CRO director value agreement. The fourth tier of value agreement were cases where the value was reported less than 50% for both the CRO director and CRO, but the value was reported higher for the director than the CRO. These include being appreciative (45.5% CRO director, 30.4% CRO), being a role model (40.9% CRO director, 30.4% CRO), compassionate (45.5% CRO director, 30.4% CRO), and giving (40.9% CRO director, 30.4% CRO). These are cases where the value was observed for less than 50% of the sample in rating the director and CRO, and the value was attributed more to the CRO director than the organization.

Table 5

Tier 4 Director and Work Environment Value Agreement

Value	From Director (<i>n</i> = 22)		Values within CRO (<i>n</i> = 23)	
	Freq	%	Freq	%
Compassionate	10	45.5	9	39.1
Appreciative	10	45.5	7	30.4
Being role model	9	40.9	7	30.4
Giving	9	40.9	7	30.4

Analysis of Value Transmission

The second purpose of this investigation was to examine the modes of value transmission from the director (as the interview revealed) and within the organization through FE perceptions of the CRO values they recognized. Following value recognition, participants were asked to evaluate the CRO director and their immediate supervisors on three different modes of values transmission. For each method of communication, participants were asked how clearly the CRO director (and later, direct supervisor) communicated his or her values through his/her actions (what he or she does), language (what he or she says), and through written communication (e.g.,

via emails, memos). The questions were presented on a nine-point (0-8) Likert scale ranging from not at all clear to very clearly. Table 6 presents the results of a Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test that compares the mean ranks of scores for the CRO director and the direct supervisor for each area with the idea that the supervisor serves as a channel through which director values are transmitted to FEs. While not significantly different, FEs indicated the clarity of the message was more observable in supervisors than from the CRO director for each method of communication.

Table 6

Modes of Value Transmission from the CRO Director and Direct Supervisors

Mode of Transmission	Via Director (<i>n</i> = 20) Descriptives		Via Direct Supervisor (<i>n</i> = 20) Descriptives		Wilcoxon Signed Rank Statistics	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Z	<i>p</i>
Actions	6.05	2.35	7.00	2.02	1.78	.076
Language	5.75	2.59	7.00	2.00	1.92	.055
Written	5.39	2.89	6.28	2.40	1.48	.138

Conclusions and Discussion

This researcher of this case study set out to explore leadership value transference in a college recreation organization. Part of the study included a review of leadership theory and sought to explore a recommendation by Catrin et al. (2014) who provided the challenge to researchers to utilize mixed methods studies that explored how and if leaders communicated their leadership values to their followers. That challenge led to the main objective of this study: to explore and identify if value transference was occurring between a leader and his followers, specifically whether the CRO director's currently held values were recognized by his employees who were furthest away from him in the organization's hierarchical structure. The study used a two-step process to address the study hypotheses. The first part of the study utilized an in-depth, structured qualitative interview to identify the CRO director's values. From this interview a survey tool was developed for this study as part of a new approach to identify leadership value transmission. Nineteen values were identified through a three-step coding process. Participants were asked to rate the presence of these values as exhibited by the CRO director and as evident in the CRO environment. Participants were also asked to rate how clearly these values were communicated through actions, language (words), and written communication (emails, memos) by the CRO director and their direct supervisor with the idea that the supervisor was an indirect link between the CRO director and FEs.

Catrin et al. (2014, p. 150), suggested that scholars need to "seek to explain how leadership is enacted, and cultural and contextual phenomena influence leadership in a particular setting at a given moment". The current study attempted to accomplish this objective, but faced difficulties related to the COVID-19 pandemic as the university was largely online during the study period (March 2021 through August 2021). To that end, this study did not have enough

data to formulate complex statistical analysis; however, descriptive data from the study questionnaire suggests that there is value transmission between the CRO director and his FEs. This study also found descriptive evidence that the CRO director's values were present in the CRO work-environment as well. Descriptive analyses compared the CRO director and CRO environment on the degree to which each entity expressed the identified values from the qualitative interview. From this analysis four tiers were identified.

The first tier contained values that were identified by over half of the FEs for both the CRO director and the CRO itself. These values were being respectful, appreciative, supporting staff, values employees, committed to service, and open communication. The results suggest that these are prevailing values of the entire CRO as both the director and environment were strongly linked to these values. Values-based leadership is based on workplaces having a shared set of beliefs. The alignment of the director and CRO itself seems to suggest that these values are exhibited, prioritized, and transmitted through the organization. Studies by Lajoie et al. (2017) and Yu and Verma (2018) indicate that when objectives, strategies, plans, and decisions align, an organization's internal values are in agreement throughout the upper and lower levels of the organization's hierarchical structure. In these cases, organizations tend to have an optimal working environment that has positive influence on employees.

The second tier of comparisons were those cases where the CRO director was rated at less than 50% for exhibiting the values, while the CRO environment was above 50% for the specific values. In other words, these values were evident in the environment, even though they were not exhibited as strongly from the CRO director. Values that fell into this second tier were being team focused, mindful, and supporting growth. As the director intimated these were values that he held, it is reasonable to suggest that the CRO supervisors and fellow staff were

responsible for reinforcing these values. Value congruence is thought to be a phenomenon where employee values match those of the organization (Reich & Benbasat, 2000).

While this study did not specify the values of FEs, findings suggested that the CRO environment has value congruence with the CRO director, as he indicated these values in the in-depth interview. Frontline supervisors are able to reinforce values such as teamwork, being mindful, and supporting growth and this would be most evident to FEs as they evaluated the CRO environment. It is important to recognize that leaders often transmit their values through subordinates who in turn reach those employees most distant from the influence of the leader. The findings related to values transmission suggest that frontline supervisors were rated higher in the transmission of values through their actions, language, and written communication. This might explain why these values were so highly rated for the organization and less so for the CRO director.

The third tier reflects values rated below the 50% mark and where value congruence between the CRO director and CRO environment is one where the director was rated lower than the environment with respect to exhibiting the specific value. This third tier contains the values trust, integrity, honesty, forward thinking, dedication, and being purposeful or intentional in practice. All but one of these values (being purposeful) were rated above 43% for the CRO environment, which suggest that these values are present, but not to the extent of the values in the first two tiers. The values of trust, integrity, and honesty all reflect on values that are ethical. Ethical leadership is marked by conduct that is deemed appropriate and is observed through personal actions and interpersonal relationships (Brown, Treviño & Harrison, 2005). The environment suggests that elements of ethical leadership such as two-way communication are reflected in how frontline supervisors communicate with FEs. While these values are clearly

present in the CRO environment, they are not prevailing values and suggest that value congruence may not be as strong between the director and frontline supervisors for these particular values.

The fourth tier of values congruence between the CRO director and CRO is reflective of cases where the value is reported below 50% for director and CRO, and where the director is rated higher than the CRO. These include being appreciative, a role model, compassionate, and giving. Each of these values were rated at over 40% for the CRO director and just over 30% for the CRO itself. The fourth tier contains values that lack value congruence between the CRO director and environment. Given the lack of context and limitations of the data, it is difficult to say why this schism exists between the director and environment, but the findings align with an organization that relies on the leader to be a role model, show appreciation and compassion, and be giving. In this case, the CRO director indicated in his interview that he initiates activities to fund equipment and trainings. It is clear that the FEs in this study link the CRO director to these values.

Based on this investigation linking values from a director and their environment to leadership theories could be interpreted as follows. First-tier values were primary values of the director, CRO environment, and FE supervisors. The second-tier values were also primary values of the CRO environment and FE supervisors that were transmitted from the director through the CRO environment, but not recognized from the director. The third and fourth-tier values were secondary values. However, all values described by the director were considered primary at least primary to the director.

The primary values identified from tier one were: Respectful, Approachable, Supporting Staff, Values employees, Committed to service, Open Communication; and tier two were: Team

Focused, Mindful, and Growth. The director stated the importance of being Committed to Service and hiring people that are alike hinted towards a servant leader position. At the same time, some values described an ethical leader who was supportive, approachable, valued employees, respected employees, and communicated well to employees. He also was perceived to have created an environment that was team-focused, mindful of the employees, and had clear pathways for growth. Bedi et al. (2016) reported that ethical leaders hold values that are principled, honest, and fair. Ethical leaders communicate a shared ethos by using systems of rewards and punishment (transactional leadership) to encourage similar ethical behaviors (Hoch et al, 2018). Brown and Treviño (2014) identified traits and behaviors of ethical leaders as honest, trustworthy, having integrity, caring about people, being open to input, and having principled decision-making abilities.

Conclusion

This study started the conversation with a recreational leader of a CRO about what his values were and how he transmits his values to employees. After a review of leadership literature, an overall blueprint of a leadership theory could be summarized as a study of how a leader is leading at a given time within an organization. The time it takes to explore what is valued by the leader(s) and how values are transmitted within organization(s) is a process of exploration that has taken years, and in most cases like Greenleaf (1970), Burns (1978), Bass (1990), and Brown and Treviño (2005), decades or lifetimes to accomplish.

Leadership follows what could be considered the only constant to all life which is change. For example, a small fishing village of an eastern coastal U.S. community has a set of values all the local generational fishers know, however, these values are not written down. The same occurred in a west coast fishing village. Although the eastern and western villages are

doing the same task, fishing. How the fishers learned to perform their task, the values they have due to who lead them to their skills, and if the fishers themselves recognize those values and the sources the values come from is a good example of what this study is designed to clarify. This study could be used in future to examine leadership value(s) for any recreation organization. Further conclusions on how values traveled within a CRO would involve interviews with the supervisors between the director and the FEs and would need multiple surveys or a longer survey.

This study attempted to discover what leadership values were transmitted from a director of a CRO. Due to low survey participation the investigator can only speculate that the leadership values were transmitted and received inside the recreation organization's work-environment. An attempt was made to identify what values appeared to be most congruent between the leader and the environment, what values were getting transmitted indirectly by supervisors, and what values were attributed to the leader but not congruent with the CRO environment.

Limitations and Suggestions

The COVID-19 pandemic presented this study with many challenges in terms of access and availability of the CRO and its staff. Given the time of this investigation (late spring semester through the summer), the investigator was unable to engage in a member check with the CRO director. A member check is used in qualitative studies to verify the interpretation of the study investigator (Thomas, 2017). As Thomas explains, member checks are typically a process where participants have the opportunity to review, comment, and correct what was interpreted by the investigator. Member checks are most effective in situations where research is participatory or collaborative. Without confirming meaning the CRO director, the interpretations of the interview were entirely dependent upon the investigator of this study. This limits the

trustworthiness of the findings from the qualitative interview (Henderson, 2006), which were used to construct the survey instrument. While the coding process was reviewed by the investigator's thesis mentor, a member check would have added to the trustworthiness of the qualitative portion of this study. Another limitation is this was a case study and the results are not generalizable.

With respect to the quantitative survey, the most noticeable limitation was the low response rate. The low response rate was exacerbated by the fact that students were not on campus, not in the CRO, and not at work. Therefore FEs (who are students) may not have 'cared about' anything related to the CRO since they were not actively working on campus and often living away from the university. Another limitation to consider is the use of email as the survey administration method. The COVID-19 pandemic made it impossible to survey FEs in person. While electronic survey methods are considered an efficient method of survey distribution, face-to-face data collection typically yields a higher response and completion rate (Evans & Mathur, 2017; Schneider, 2015). As the pandemic eases, it is recommended that similar studies distribute and gather questionnaires on site using paper copies of the questionnaire during a staff training event or be conducted in person in the same visit over a whole day to increase the response rate. This data gathering could also span more than one semester to increase response rates however being careful to not have duplicate responses. Another adjustment is how the language in the questionnaire asked about the values in the work-environment and not from the FE's direct supervisor(s). Additional questions would need to get at the specific role of supervisors in this process, as opposed to inferring information from questions related to how values are communicated. Furthermore, if future investigators wished to understand value congruence better, it is recommended that studies explore what values are held by FEs. As noted earlier,

value congruence is throughout an organization and this study did not account for the perspective of all followers within this organization.

References

- Andersen, J. (2018). Servant leadership and transformational leadership: From comparisons to farewells. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 39(6), 762-774.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-01-2018-0053>
- Andersen, J., & Jonsson, P. (2006). Does organization structure matter?: On the relationship between the structure, functioning and effectiveness. *International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management (IJITM)* ,3(3), 237-263.
<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219877006000788>
- Bandura, A.. (1971). *Social learning theory*. New York: General Learning Press.
- Basri, H., Rashid, I., Bintiabashah, A., & Samah, I. (2017). The impact of Malay transactional leadership style on employee performance; the Malaysia pharmacy industry perspective. *International Journal of Information, Business and Management*, 9(2), 45-52.
<https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/impact-malay-transactional-leadership-style-on/docview/1903812715/se-2?accountid=10639>
- Bass, B. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organization Dynamics*, 1, 19-31. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(90\)90061-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S)
- Bass, B., Avolio, B.J., Jung, D.I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), pp. 207-218. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.207>
- Bedi, A., Alpaslan, C., & Green, S. (2016). A meta-analytic review of ethical leadership outcomes and moderators. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 139, 517-536.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2625-1>

- Brown, M. & Treviño, L. (2014). Do role models matter? An investigation of role modeling as an antecedent of perceived ethical leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 122, 587-598. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1769-0>
- Brown, M. & Treviño, L. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 595-616. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004>
- Brown, M., Treviño, L., & Harrison, D. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002>
- Burch, T. & Guarana, C. (2014). The comparative influences of transformational leadership and leader-member exchange on follower engagement. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(3), 6-25. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21334>
- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Perennial.
- Bordas, J. (1995). Power and passion: Finding personal purpose. *Reflections of leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant leadership influenced today's top management thinkers*, 1, 179-193.
- Catrin, J., Vernon, D., & Solange, H. (2014). Communication competence improves organizational effectiveness. *Strategic Direction*, 30(8), 28-31. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-02-2013-0007>
- Coetzer, M., Bussin, M., & Geldenhuys, M. (2017). The functions of a servant leader. *Administrative Sciences*, 7(5), 1-32. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci7010005>
- Deinert, A., Homan, A., Boer, D., Voelpel, S., & Gutermann, D. (2015). Transformational leadership sub-dimensions and their link to leaders' personality and performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(6), 1095-1120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.08.001>

- Evans, J. R., & Mathur, A. (2018). The value of online surveys: A look back and a look ahead. *Internet Research*, 28(4), 854-887. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IntR-03-2018-0089>
- Fry, L. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6), 693-727. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.001>
- Gandolfi, F. & Stone, S. (2017). The emergence of leadership styles: A clarified categorization. *Review of International Comparative Management*, 18(1), 18-30.
- Gerxhani, K. & Van Breemen, J. (2019). Social values and institutional change: An experimental study. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 15(2), 259-280
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1744137418000231>
- Ghazali, R., Ahmad, M., & Zakaria, N. (2015). The mediating role of knowledge integration in effect of leadership styles on enterprise systems success: The post-implementation stage. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 28(4), 531-555. [DOI:10.1108/JEIM-08-2014-0083](https://doi.org/10.1108/JEIM-08-2014-0083)
- Greenleaf, R. (1970). *The servant as leader (an essay)*. Greenleaf Organization.
- Hatch, M. (1993). The dynamics of organizational culture. *The Academy of Management Review*, 18(4), 657-693. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258594>
- Henderson, K. A. (2006). *Dimensions of choice: A qualitative approach to recreation, parks, and leisure research* (2nd ed.). Venture Publishing, Inc.
- Herkes, J., Churruca, K., Ellis, L., Pomare, C. & Braithwaite, J. (2019). How people fit in at work: Systematic review of the association between person–organization and person–group fit with staff outcomes in healthcare. *BMJ Open Access*, 9, 1-9.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-026266>

- Hernandez, M., Long, C., & Sitkin, S. (2014). Cultivating follower trust: Are all leader behaviors equally influential? *Organization Studies*, 35(12), 1867-1892.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0170840614546152>
- Hoch, J., Bommer, W., Dulebohn, J., & Wu, D. (2018). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 44(2), 501-529.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0149206316665461>
- Jenkins, M. (2013). Organizational values: A dynamic perspective. *Organization Studies*, 34(4), 495-514. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0170840612467155>
- Jensen, U., Andersen, L., & Jacobsen, C. (2018a). Only when we agree! How value congruence moderates the impact of goal-oriented leadership on public service motivation. *Public Administration Review*, 79(1), 12-24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13008>
- Jensen, U., Andersen, L., Bro, L., Bøllingtoft, A., Eriksen, T., Holten, A., Jacobsen, C., Ladenburg, J., Nielson, P., Salomonsen, H., Westergard-Nielsen, N., & Würtz, A. (2016). Conceptualizing and measuring transformational and transactional leadership. *Administration & Society*, 51(1), 3-33. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0095399716667157>
- Jensen, U., Moynihan, D., & Salomonsen, H. (2018). Communicating the vision: How face-to-face dialogue facilitates transformational leadership. *Public Administration Review*, 78(3), 350-361. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12922>
- Kluckhohn, F. & Strodtbeck, F. (1961). Variations in value orientations, New York: Row, Peterson. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1962.64.4.02a00170>

- Kraaykamp, G., Cemacilar, Z., & Tosun, J. (2019). Transmission of work attitudes and values: Comparisons, consequences, and implications. *Annal AAPSS*, 682, 8-24.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0002716219831947>
- Lajoie, D., Boudrias, J-S., Rousseau, V., & Brunelle, E. (2017). Value congruence and tenure as moderators of transformational leadership effects. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38(2), 254-269. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-04-2015-0091>
- Liden, R., Fu, P., Liu, J., & Song, L. (2016). The influence of CEO values and leadership on middle manager exchange behaviors: A longitudinal multilevel examination. *Nankai Business Review International*, 7(1), 2-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/NBRI-12-2015-0031>
- Liu, X. & Dooren, W. (2015). How to measure leader's impact on organizational performance: Implications from the comparative case study. *Public Organization Review*, 15, 193-206.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-013-0268-1>
- Marturano, A., Wren, T. and Harvey, M. (2013). Editorial: the making of leadership and the humanities. *Leadership and the Humanities*, 1(1), 1-5.
- Meglino, B. & Ravlin, E. (1998). Individual values in organizations: Concepts, controversies, and research. *Journal of Management*, 24(3), 351-389.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F014920639802400304>
- Miller-Stevens, K., Taylor, J., Morris, J., & Lanivich, S. (2018). Assessing value differences between leaders of two social venture types: Benefit corporations and nonprofit organizations. *International Society for Third-Sector Research*, 29(5), 938-950.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11266-017-9947-9>

- Nikezic, S., Puric, S., & Puric, J. (2012). Transactional and transformational leadership: Development through changes. *International Journal of Quality Research*, 6(3), 285-296. [http://ijqr.net/UDK-378.014.3\(497.11\)](http://ijqr.net/UDK-378.014.3(497.11))
- Nygaard, A., Biong, H., Silkoset, R., & Kidwell, R. (2017). Leading by example: Values-based strategy to instill ethical conduct. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 145, 133-139. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2885-9>
- Painter, M., Pouryousefi, S., Hibbert, S., & Russon, J. (2019). Sharing vocabularies: Towards horizontal alignment of values-driven business functions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 155, 965-979. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3901-7>
- Peng, J. & Lin, J. (2017). Mediators of ethical leadership and group performance outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 32(7), 484-496. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JMP-10-2015-0370>
- Reich, B. & Benbasat, I. (2000). Factors that influence the social dimension of alignment between business and information technology objectives. *MIS Quarterly*, 1, 81-113. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3250980>
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. Free press.
- Rokeach, M. (1974) Change and stability in American value systems, 1968-1971, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 38(2), 222-238. <https://doi.org/10.1086/268153>
- Ronald, B. & Julia, B. (2021). If managers lead, do employees follow? – Rethinking the role of followership for modern leadership. *Advances in Management*, 14(2), 12-32.
- Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S., & Peng, A. (2011). Cognition-based and affect-based trust as mediators of leader behavior influences on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 863. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022625>

- Schmeltz, L. (2014). Identical or just compatible? The utility of corporate identity values in communicating corporate social responsibility. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 51(3), 234-258. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2329488414525439>
- Schneider, J. (2015). Rock, paper, survey. *Marketing Health Services*, 35(2), 22-27. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2329488414525439>
- Schwartz, S. (2012). An overview of the Schwartz theory of basic values. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 1-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1116>
- Seggewiss, B., Boeggemann, L., Straatmann, T., Mueller, K. & Hatstrup, K. (2019). Do values and value congruence both predict commitment? A refined multi-target, multi-value investigation into a challenged belief. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 34, 169-187. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-9534-0>
- Shamir, B. (1990). Calculations, values, and identities: The sources of collectivistic work motivation. *Human relations*, 43(4), 313-332. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F001872679004300402>
- Spears, L. (2010). Character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders. *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership*, 1(1), 25-30.
- Steinbauer, S., Renn, R., Taylor, R., & Njoroge, P. (2014). Ethical leadership and followers' moral judgment: The role of followers' perceived accountability and self-leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120, 381-392. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1662-x>
- Thomas, D. R. (2017). Feedback from research participants: are member checks useful in qualitative research? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 14(1), 23-41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2016.1219435>

- van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1228-1261. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0149206310380462>
- Xenikou, A. (2017). Transformational leadership, transactional contingent reward, and organizational identification: The mediating effect of perceived innovation and goal culture orientations. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(154), 1-13.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01754>
- Yu, K. & Verma, K. (2018). Investigating the role of orientation in job seekers' experience of value congruence. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 68(1), 83-125.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12152>
- Zhu, Y. & Akhtar, S. (2014). How transformational leadership influences follower helping behavior: The role of trust and prosocial motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(3), 373-392. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1884>

Appendix A: University and Medical Center Institutional Review Board Approval



EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board
4N-64 Brody Medical Sciences Building· Mail Stop 682
600 Moyer Boulevard · Greenville, NC 27834
Office 252-744-2914 · Fax 252-744-
2284 · rede.ecu.edu/umcirb/

Notification of Exempt Certification

Social/Behavioral IRB

From:

To: [Benjamin Cashion](#)

CC: [Deb Jordan](#)

Date: 2/22/2021

Re: [UMCIRB 20-002951](#)

Exploration of Leadership Value Transcendence in a Campus Recreation Organization

I am pleased to inform you that your research submission has been certified as exempt on 2/22/2021. This study is eligible for Exempt Certification under category # 2ab.

It is your responsibility to ensure that this research is conducted in the manner reported in your application and/or protocol, as well as being consistent with the ethical principles of the Belmont Report and your profession.

This research study does not require any additional interaction with the UMCIRB unless there are proposed changes to this study. Any change, prior to implementing that change, must be submitted to the UMCIRB for review and approval. The UMCIRB will determine if the change impacts the eligibility of the research for exempt status. If more substantive review is required, you will be notified within five business days.

Document	Description
Cashionb00Thesis2021: Exploration of Leadership Value Transcendence in a Campus Recreation Organization(0.01)	Study Protocol or Grant Application
Cashionb00Thesis2021: Interview Questions (0.01)	Interview/Focus Group Scripts/Questions
Cashionb00Thesis2021: Survey Questions (0.01)	Surveys and Questionnaires
Cashionb00Thesis2021_Survey-Research-Consent-Email for Expedited Research.doc(0.02)	Recruitment Documents/Scripts
Director Interview Consent Paragraph(0.02)	Consent Forms

Student Survey Consent Paragraph(0.01)

Consent Forms

For research studies where a waiver or alteration of HIPAA Authorization has been approved, the IRB states that each of the waiver criteria in 45 CFR 164.512(i)(1)(i)(A) and (2)(i) through (v) have been met. Additionally, the elements of PHI to be collected as described in items 1 and 2 of the Application for Waiver of Authorization have been determined to be the minimal necessary for the specified research.

The Chairperson (or designee) does not have a potential for conflict of interest on this study.

IRB00000705 East Carolina U IRB #1 (Biomedical) IORG0000418

IRB00003781 East Carolina U IRB #2 (Behavioral/SS) IORG0000418

Appendix B: Study Interview Questions

Name of study: Exploration of Leadership Value Transmission in a Campus Recreation Organization
March 2, 2021 – 3:24pm

Purpose of Interview:

The purpose of this interview is to explore emergent leadership values, skills, communication, and governance in a CRO from the perspective of the director.

1. State your name, job title, and years in your position

Please, list your leadership values.

- How do you communicate your values in your work environment?
- How do you know your values have been communicated and accepted by your staff?

2. What qualities, skills, and processes does it take to be a successful leader for a CRO?

- What personal and professional experiences did you have during your career that developed your skills, qualities, and methods to being a leader?
- How do you feel you communicate your vision/version of your leadership values to your followers?
- How do you know your followers understand your leadership values?
- What do you do when employees do not understand your leadership values?
- How do you encourage your employees to align themselves to your leadership values?

3. What leadership values do you not find appealing, do not use, or would describe as harmful to use in a leadership context?

- What values do you consider to directly oppose your values?
- What did you do during moments in your career when your staff did not align with your core value system?

4. How do leaders know their values are communicated to all employees in their work environment?

- How do you know your values are being absorbed by your followers?

Appendix C: Value Themes with Codes

The following values were identified by the investigator after several readings and application of appropriate coding techniques. Each code is followed by the time code as recorded during the interview. Following that are sample quotes (excerpts) that illustrate the assigned code (quotation marks are omitted).

Approachable

(10.43-11.10)

There are three other schools that I have gone too that I might have carried my values to, but I asked for a shared vision and shared value, and so it's different words, it's different interpretations, here at (a south-east university) we have a different set of values then I would have brought forward because it was a shared vision with the students and the staff, as far as how they felt about what was important

Appreciative

(23.22-23.33)

You're not going to know until you leave. My expression has been since I have been fortunate to be at the right place at the right time.

Committed to service

(6.47-6.59)

personally, my style I think is because I'm service driven okay, I think I have a servant heart and I look for serving heart in our employees and people that work with us

Compassionate

(16.33-16.35)

I can do it compassionately and a lot of other things

Giving

(13.12-13.30)

Technology is a good point where I talked the talk and I signed the checks and buy all the hardware and stuff, but don't ask me to sit down and do the software you need to do your job, that's something different

Growth

(2.25-2.36)

you must have the hardware and software to maintain what you're doing but also to grow and evolve

(8.27-8:40)

so, my first couple of schools, you know, a pen and pencil were big expense and then I have been able to be at places where we have planted seeds and had a lot of growth

(16.26-16.32)

I really can't be your friend if I'm really going to mentor you, help you, guide you, and help you grow

Honest

(14.11-14.13)

I don't think I know everything

Integrity

(3.55-4.07)

If you ask me the question six different ways, I'm trying to answer it the same way, but if you're trying to get me to say something different my actions are going to clarify whatever words came out of there

Mindful

(8:50-9:00)

the crux goes back to, I knew what to do without money so that I was a little more mindful of when we did have resources on how we allocated those

Open communication

(2:45-3:01)

communication is a second one that if you can't reach people, if you can't tell your story, if they can't get to you from a marketing and communication standpoint you have much less value

(4:22-4:35)

Pandemic is a good example of that is there's one area that we have actually added resources, and this is marketing and communication and computers and technology during a virtual world

Respectful

(22.14-23.09)

I think you have to ask. And I don't think it's a, it's an ask often, I think a lot of times there's that checklist where I'm going to send you a little quiz and here's eight values pick the five that we have, that's okay, but the answer is still on the page. I like it better in an open conversation.

So, some of our staff training typically what we will do will be 15-minute sessions we break them into really small groups, like 15 or 20 student and just have that conversation. So, we are not spitting out the ten commandments and sticking them on the wall we are asking them where they are coming from and then we may have that conversation with values but it's not so much a literal dunking or regurgitation.

Supporting staff

(8.40-8.43)

Spent a hundred million dollars on facilities and resources and things like that at...

(15.47-16.10) *

I cannot be your friend, I can be your supporter, I can be your supervisor, I can be a peer, but I can't be your friend and then truly shape you and the department and move along

Team-focused

(9.50-10.01)

working relationships at a university is what makes you successful or your organization successful

(14.33-14.50)

Here's a cover letter and in that cover is the word I 28 times and they're trying to sell me the job advertisement said be a team player, be part of something else and they haven't used the word we or team, at all.

Trust

(20.32-20.50)

Created social opportunities for them to get together and have conversations and share, and maybe find some common points, you know, because at some point when you're struggling, maybe whether you like to use the word or not, maybe there is not a trust, they think there is an ulterior motive or something else going

Values employees

(1.45-2.02)

It's easy to say treat people the way you want to be treated, um, being a value judgement, and that my values are that students are extremely valuable

(10.56-11.09)

here at (a south-east university) we have a different set of values then I would have brought forward because it was a shared vision with the students and the staff, as far as how they felt about what was important

Dedication

(11.11-11.27)

It was very hard here because the previous director had been here for 34 plus years, so just the discussion of being able to share your opinion about values took a little extra time

Purposeful

(10.13-10.22)

I think I lay them out clearly and then I walk away for a united vision of what mine are

(14.14-14.23)

I don't think my values are just standalone, these are not 10 commandments, but purposeful of why they are there

(17.37-17.40) *

I am strategic I invest

(23.41-23.48) *

But I think the reflection of what happens two, three, five years later is a representation of your values

Forward-thinking

(10.24-10.40)

there are four schools that I have been at that we created with the students and the full-time staff what some values were and they're still there at those universities; the same values are guiding those departments

(15.47-16.10) *

I cannot be your friend, I can be your supporter, I can be your supervisor, I can be a peer, but I can't be your friend and then truly shape you and the department and move along

(17.37-17.40) *

I am strategic I invest

(18.30-18.46)

We built a ten-million-dollar recreation center and playing field. Five years later I was talking to the students about, okay now we need to add some more, I'm going to be back in five more years and add some more and in twenty years will have build what you needed today and building cost will have gone from 175 a square foot to 400 dollars a square foot

(23.41-23.48) *

But I think the reflection of what happens two, three, five years later is a representation of your values

Being a role model

(2.05-2.22)

I operate with a management value I called them pillars, so at every institution I've been, and I've been fortunate to be at several, they are pillars for me.

Appendix D: Quantitative Student Questionnaire

1. What year are you in at ECU?

First year, sophomore, junior, senior, senior+, graduate school

2. How long have you been employed at CRW?

Less than 1 year, 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, 4 years, 4+ years

3. What department do you work for?

Adventure, Aquatics, Challenge Course Programing, Club Sports, Customer Service,
Group Fitness, Intramural Sports, Personal Training, Safety Courses, Special Events,
Summer Camps, Youth Programs

4. How do you self-identify regarding gender? _____

5. What is your race/ethnicity?

White/Caucasian, Black/African American, Native American, Asian, Other Pacific
Islander, Mixed race, or Other (not listed)

6. From the list below and based on your knowledge of the director of CRW, check all of the work-related values you think he holds.

I do not know (cannot tell what the CRW Director's work-related values are) #skip
approachable, appreciative, committed to service, compassionate, giving, growth, honest,
integrity, mindful, open communication, respectful, supporting staff, team focused, trust,
values employees, dedication, purposeful, forward-thinking, being a role model.

7. How often do you interact with the CRW Director? (skip to 11 if never)

Never, daily, weekly, monthly, only during staff training, other frequency _____

8. Please indicate how often the CRW Director talks about his values.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 NA

Never

All the time

9. Please indicate how often the CRW Director asks you if you know what his values are.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 NA

Never

All the time

10. Please indicate how frequently the CRW Director shares his vision (future) for the CRW.

Never, daily, weekly, monthly, only during staff training, other frequency_____

11. I know the CRW Director's work-related values.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 NA

Strongly Disagree

Strongly Agree

12. The majority of frontline employees know the work-related values of the CRW Director.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 NA

Strongly Disagree

Strongly Agree

13. Please indicate how clearly the CRW Director communicates his values through his

ACTIONS (what he does).

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 NA

Not at all clearly

Very Clearly

14. Please indicate how clearly the CRW Director communicates his values through his

LANGUAGE (what he says).

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 NA

Not at all clearly

Very Clearly

15. Please indicate how clearly the CRW Director communicates his values through his

WRITTEN MESSAGES (email or memos).

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 NA

Not at all clearly

Very Clearly

16. I find the CRW Director to be a good role model.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 NA

Strongly Disagree

Strongly Agree

Section 2

Having thought about the CRW Director’s Values, now I’d like you to think about the overall values of the CRW.

17. Which of the following are values of the CRW?

I do not know (cannot tell what values are in the CRW) #skip

approachable, appreciative, committed to service, compassionate, giving, growth, honest, integrity, mindful, open communication, respectful, supporting staff, team focused, trust, values employees, dedication, purposeful, forward-thinking, being a role model.

18. Are CRW values identified in the employee handbook?

Yes/No/Not sure/I don’t know

19. How frequently are CRW values talked about (by anyone) in staff orientation or trainings?

Never, daily, weekly, monthly, only during staff training, other frequency_____

20. Please indicate how clearly your supervisor communicates their values through their

ACTIONS (what they do).

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 NA

Not at all clearly

Very Clearly

21. Please indicate how clearly your supervisor communicates their values through his
LANGUAGE (what he says).

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 NA

Not at all clearly Very Clearly

22. Please indicate how clearly your supervisor communicates their values through their
WRITTEN MESSAGES (email or memos).

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 NA

Not at all clearly Very Clearly

23. How frequently are you reminded through emails, memos, signage, by supervisor, or director
of CRW, about CRW Values?

Never, daily, weekly, monthly, only during staff training, other frequency_____

24. How frequently are you formally evaluated?

Never, Once a semester, Twice a semester, Once a year, Some other frequency (fill in the
blank)

25. Please indicate how often you are recognized for your productivity at work.

Never, Once a semester, Twice a semester, Once a year, Some other frequency (fill in the
blank)

Section 3: I have just a few more questions...

26. Please indicate how frequently CRW staff engage in work-related social activities.

Never, daily, weekly, monthly, only during staff training, other frequency_____

27. I feel like the employees at the CRW are all focused in the same direction.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 NA

Strongly Disagree

Strongly Agree

28. I feel like I am part of a team working at the CRW.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 NA

Strongly Disagree

Strongly Agree

29. I believe that open communication is valued among employees at the CRW.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 NA

Strongly Disagree

Strongly Agree

30. I believe that employees at CRW are service-oriented.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 NA

Strongly Disagree

Strongly Agree

31. How frequently does your direct supervisor talk about the importance of marketing for your program area?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 NA

Never

All the time

32. If you have made a “major” mistake on the job, were you given a second chance to be successful at work? This do not apply to me, Yes, No.

Thank you for participating in my study, you have been a great help in completing my research for my thesis!

Appendix E: Extended Literature Review

Background

During the turn of the 21st century, scholars taught two basic views of organizational culture. One of those views was that an organizational culture is represented within its people. The other was that an organizational culture has procedures and policies that are followed by all (Hatch, 1993). Hatch found that when people within an organization created and maintained their own culture, that such culture was difficult to change unless the people in that organization had the will to do so. When people join an organizational culture that is already created and is maintained by organizational policies and procedures, which are themselves designed to shape and change people toward acceptance the organization's protocols, cultural clash can happen. In the scholarship that currently exists, four main forms of leadership theory take precedence. Transactional, Transformational, Ethical, and Servant leadership theory.

Transactional Leadership Theory

According to Nikezckic et al. (2012), transactional leadership theory was first developed by Weber. Even beyond Weber's research, transactional leadership theory consists of classic principles that focus on maintaining status quo, exchanges with followers, enforcing formal authority, and accounting for responsibility within an organization (Basri, Rashid et al., 2017; Brown & Treviño, 2006; Nikezic et al., 2012). Nikezic et al. (2012) explain that Weber found that transactional leaders value conditions, clear coercive measures, obedient followers, strict discipline, rational values, agreements, rules, fixed wages, and no right to appeal. Other scholars, like Burns (1978), envisioned transactional leaders as involving incremental change through political give and take, and found fairness in offering jobs for votes and changing legislation for campaign contributions. Across the board, transactional leadership theory is based on a leader's transactional behaviors that either reward employees for their effort and performance or punish

and discipline them when there are unsatisfactory outcomes (Gandolfi & Stone, 2017; Jensen et al., 2018a). This traditional approach assumes employees will be motivated through pre-defined standards and that those standards are dependent on an organization's leader's ability to direct employees using systems of rewards and punishments. However, Ghazali et al. (2015) found that followers reported feeling controlled under such conditions and that they lacked self-motivation.

Transformational Leadership Theory

Transformational leadership, first introduced by Burns (1978), describes how leaders can influence followers by channeling followers' self-interest toward the greater well-being of their work environments. Likewise, Andersen (2018) defined transformational leadership theory as leadership occurring when one or more persons engage in activities with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise their mutual relations and relationships to perform at a higher level of motivation and morality. According to both, transformational leaders interact with their work environments, which include their followers, and help them advance to higher levels of morale, motivation, and skill. Studies conducted by transformational scholars have consistently shown that successful transformational leaders are attentive to followers' needs, act as mentors and supporters to them, and foster working environments that are open to communication, respectful, and celebratory. Such studies have also consistently shown that successful leaders are willing to learn from their followers, willing to take risks, and able to make tasks meaningful. They also have confidence in their followers, encourage them to solve problems and think independently, and instill them with self-confidence to meet challenges. In other words, as Andersen (2018), Lajoie et al. (2017), Jensen et al. (2016), Tony (2018), Xenikou (2017), and others have repeatedly asserted, successful transformational leaders are role models who are trusted and respected.

After Burns' publication in 1978, other scholars began to enter the conversation and argue that leaders use a mixture of leadership styles and not just one. Bass (1990) is one of the foremost examples. He said that leaders used varying amounts of either transactional or transformational leadership styles to interact and engage employees, and that the ratio of transactional to transformational elements depended upon the preference of individual leaders. According to transformational leadership theory, transformational leaders impact followers through four dimensions: (1) idealized influence, (2) inspirational motivation, (3) intellectual stimulation, and (4) individualized consideration (Andersen, 2018; Bass et al., 2003; Deinert et al., 2015). A brief review of each dimension follows.

Bass, Avolio, Jung, and Berson (2003) concept of *idealized influence* was how leaders model behavior, self-identify, and behave as role models. According to Bass et al., *inspiring motivation* in followers was when a leader "behave in ways that motivate those around them by proving meaning and challenge to their followers' work. Individual and team spirit is aroused. Enthusiasm and optimism are displayed. The leader encourages followers to envision attractive future states, which they can ultimately envision themselves (Pg. 208)." Bass et al. explanation of *individualized consideration* was for each transformational leader to know what their followers' needs and ambitions were while the leader provided new learning opportunities that supported the transformation and growth of each individual follower. Lastly, *intellectual stimulation* was when leaders encouraged followers to have original ideas, reframe approaches to old ideas, and voice questions to be solved as a group.

After Burns' publication (1978), other scholars began to enter the conversation and argue that leaders use a mixture of leadership styles and not just one. Bass (1990) is one of the foremost examples. For Bass, a transformational leader's influence on their organization's

mission and values are dependent on that leader's relational and emotional effect on their followers. According to Bass, no matter what tactics transformational leaders employ to inspire others, those efforts ought to be rooted in understanding followers' needs and ambitions. These needs and ambitions are supported through the provision of new learning opportunities in a supportive climate that provides pathways to work environment satisfaction and/or encouragement to continue on to a followers' true aspiration.

Along similar lines, Burch and Guarana (2014) theorized a transformational leaders' job is to transform followers' views of their work role and to develop skills that align with organizational goals. They argued that successful leaders must be charismatic, have positive influence, a vision, and be inspiring so they are appealing to their followers. As Deinert et al. (2015) corroborated, no single characteristic, trait, or behavior caused leaders to succeed. Thus, having multiple qualities, a flexible personality, and the ability to use different leadership approaches in combination may help leaders be successful in leading followers, transferring their leadership values, and assure congruence between leader and follower. Followers will judge their leader's ability, integrity, and reliability as having positive, negative, or no influence at all on their perceptions of these leaders. While it is true that impressions of a transformational leader's values may become established through written communication, public speeches, and informal verbal communication, it is also true that their character traits can become modeled behavior for their followers through continual observations and engagements with their leaders (Hoch et al., 2018). As Zhu and Akhtar (2014) explained, transferring leadership values from transformational leaders to their followers will align visions, build trust, and strengthens messages leaders are conveying. To put it another way, when value transference is successful, followers may reciprocate behaviors and develop traits resembling their leader's (Zhu & Akhtar, 2014).

A leader's affect and approach may explain the situations and climate that aid in value transference. Hoch et al.'s (2018) work on positive leadership behaviors indicated that when leaders use positive affect towards their followers, follower confidence increases as do prosocial behaviors and self-development. However, they do warn that transformational leaders, in efforts to transform their followers, can behave in ways that are largely unethical or immoral. Given such transformational capacity, transformational leaders must make decisions about whether they will act ethically while in positions of leadership.

Even still, the bulk of scholarship on transformational leadership theory has shown that personality traits have profound effects on employee motivation, values, perception, personal and social behavior, and adherence to organizational culture (Bedi et al., 2016). For example, Deinert et al. (2015) found links between behaviors of leaders and sub-dimensions of transformational leadership theory governing the examination of leadership character traits and whether or not such traits had equal spheres of influence within organizations. Their results showed that leaders who inspire motivation produced employees with higher performance reviews. For example, when results indicated that leaders had an idealized influence, leaders were perceived by their followers as better role models. Likewise, when leaders produced creative and innovative work environments for their followers, followers reported being intellectually stimulated. When leaders expressed individualized consideration for their followers, they were viewed by their followers as being more caring (Deinert et al, 2015).

In terms of how best to approach leadership, Jensen et al. (2018) found that communicating effectively in transformational organizations is best done face-to-face because it ensures clarification between an organizational vision and an employee direction. Results from their study also showed that tenured employees usually contribute to and form an organization's

core purpose, which can lead to misinterpretations of leadership perception, promoting employee self-persuasive reflection. Furthermore, new employees formed commonly held beliefs of workplace environment from long-standing employees (Burch & Guarana, 2014; Jensen et al., 2018; Zhu & Akhtar, 2014). Thus, as Jenson et al. (2018) and Lajoie et al. (2017) concluded, transformational leaders function best with new employees and when able to communicate in person regularly. Transformational leaders may not function well in large organizations where interacting one-on-one daily is not possible and when an employee is well-established in an organization (Jensen et al., 2018; Lajoie et al., 2017).

Bass (1990) believed transformational leadership theory to be superior to all other forms of leadership and to outperform all other types of leadership. Not all researchers agree with Bass, however. Andersen and Jonsson (2006), for example, argued that there is little evidence of transformational leadership increasing organizational effectiveness when measuring follower performance against organizational goal attainment. Perhaps it is because of this research difficulty that, over the past three decades, transformational leadership theory has been the most studied leadership theory by scholars. Numerous empirical studies on transformational leadership theory's effectiveness through testing variables such as follower attitudinal outcomes, organizational climate, job satisfaction, supervisor satisfaction, engagement, turnover rate, and performance from an individual, group, and organizational point-of-view have been completed (Hoch et al., 2018).

While there continues to be debate about the success of certain leadership principles, it is clear that, regardless of whether followers are being commanded through consequence, motivated through passions, guided toward an agreement, or bonded through belief, each leadership theory is a representation of accepted values that are learned. For example, Liden, Fu,

Liu, and Song (2016) believed that CEOs created, set, and distributed an organization's tempo, tone, flow of information, and access to resources regardless of the leadership style employed. Executive leaders exerted influence during social exchange(s) in their work environment(s) and a leader's personal values are thought to intertwine with each other. Values that are continually being transmitted from a source of leadership over time are thought to be absorbed by employees within that work environment. If leadership values are transferred within an organization's structure, a likely starting point would be the top of that organization's hierarchical structure on the executive level.

Ethical Leadership Theory

Brown et al. (2005) defined ethical leadership as “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships and the promotion of such conduct to follower through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (p. 120). Cotton et al. (2017), Nygaard et al. (2017); and Steinbauer et al. (2013) all agree that ethics can be described as an underlying value in organizations and have redefined ethics as organizational behaviors that support reductions of occurrences of ethical issues concerning products, services, and industrial effects that may cause harm to their surroundings. Recent reviews of ethical leadership used Bandura's social learning theory (1971) to explain why workers were more attentive and often emulated attractive credible role models (Bedi et al., 2016). Brown and Treviño (2006; 2014) also concluded that followers preferred trustworthy supervisors who are fair and willing to report issues to higher management.

Similarly, Bedi et al. (2016) reported that ethical leaders hold values that are principled, honest, and fair. Ethical leaders communicated a shared ethos by using systems of rewards and punishment to encourage similar ethical behaviors (Hoch et al, 2018). Research by Tang et al.

(2015) between ethical leaders and followers found that value congruence is formed over time. Followers mimicked behaviors of their leaders as more time is spent together developing shared trust, affective expression, and symmetrical values (Nygaard, et al., 2017). Brown and Treviño (2014) identified traits and behaviors of ethical leaders as honest, trustworthy, having integrity, caring about people, being open to input, and having principled decision-making abilities. They also argued that a leader's ethic(s) are reflected in work environment ethic(s), which are influenced by a leader's traits and behaviors. Furthermore, it is critical that followers believe leaders to be moral people and moral managers. In this sense, a moral person is honest, trustworthy, integrous, caring, receptive, respectful, and decisive where a moral leader may display discipline and use reward and punishment to communicate importance of ethic(s), set standard(s), and maintain accountability of ethic(s) and standard(s).

Research shows that ethical leaders influence followers through relationships and systems of rewards and punishments that create and maintain an ethical leaders' work environment(s) and personal surroundings (Hoch et al., 2018; Steinbauer et al., 2014; Tu & Lu, 2016). Bedi and colleagues explained that ethical leadership impacts followers most when leaders were integrous and held high ethical standards for themselves and others around them. Research by Tang et al. (2015) between ethical leaders and followers found that value congruence formed over time. Brown and Treviño (2014) identified traits and behaviors of ethical leaders as honest, trustworthy, having integrity, caring about people, being open to input, and having principled decision-making abilities. They also emphasized that a leader's ethic(s) are reflected in work environment ethic(s), which are influenced by a leader's traits and behaviors. In other words, leaders function as role models for their subordinates in work environments.

Bedi et al. (2016) conducted a meta-analytical review of role modeling and discussed the importance and representation of what constitutes right, normative, common, and culturally accepted behavior. Brown et al. (2005, p. 120) defined ethical leadership as “the demonstration of normative appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision making.” According to Brown et al. (2005), such moral lessons must originate from strong ethical role-models and that those role-models are often parents, friends, religious organizations, and demographic origins. Bedi et al. (2016) discussed ethical work environments and how employees within such work environments succeed when reaching an agreed upon belief system that affected employee behavior and conduct towards the agreed upon or enforced upon ethic. Thus, it is the role of the ethical leader to challenge, encourage, inspire, grow, have perception, and notice individualization of followers.

According to Brown and Treviño (2006) research in ethical leadership should concentrate on how ethical work environments are designed, how ethical pedagogies are formed, how each are maintained, or the content used to do so. To this end, researchers have found that negative relationships within ethical cultures can arise when subcultures disagree or contain abusive constituent(s) who do not align with what is considered fair and respectful treatment (Bedi et al., 2016; Hernandez et al., 2014).

In a similar vein, Brown and Treviño (2014) discussed negative leaders, who they referred to as Machiavellianists. Machiavellianists are defined as individuals using guile, deceit, and opportunism in interpersonal relations. Other traits of Machiavellianists include manipulation for personal gain, willingness to lie, pay for or receive illegal kickbacks or activities, and tendencies of distrust. Interestingly enough, Brown and Treviño also found that

despite the negative impact on followers and organizations from unethical, Machiavellian leaders, that positive relationships existed between Machiavellianism, charisma, and perceived greatness. Despite the existence of these positive relationships, Brown and Treviño warn that most leaders who display such qualities most often have negative impacts on followers and work environments. Transference of ethics from leader to follower is something that all leaders innately strive to do, and it is this internal desire to lead by serving followers that draws followers to such leaders.

Organizational values may or may not be ethical; however, they are based on values held by an organization's leader or on existing policies and procedures left from a predecessor (Brown & Treviño, 2014). Throughout early ages of individuals or organizations, sources of leadership are caregivers, parents, workers, extended family, or others an individual or organizational culture admires. Later in life, role models, proximity, experience, motivation, and other variables come to influence accepted values. Over time, accepted values can change. Some leaders evolve and develop newer and more socially progressive skills and adapt to changing values; others do not (Brown & Treviño, 2014). It is uncertain when an organization undergoes a change of value(s) or has an introduction of new and different ethic(s) that the new and different ethical value(s) will oppose or stand-alone from the previous ethical value(s). It is also uncertain whether each individual or group(s) within an organization will accept ethics-related changes.

Servant Leadership Theory

Greenleaf's (1970) philosophy placed stakeholder and follower needs first and noted that "a servant leader is servant first and must begin with natural feelings that one wants to serve and then through conscious choice people will have aspiration to lead" (p. 27). Greenleaf believed that it is a leader's aspiration to lead that is most important rather than a follower's growth or

organizational goal achievement, and this belief has, in many ways come to define servant leadership.

While being distinct, servant leadership shares similarities with other leadership theories. Andersen (2018) compared transformational leadership and servant leadership, noting strong similarities between Greenleaf's essay on servant leadership and Burns' transformational leadership ideology. Unsure if definitive differences separated each leadership theory, Andersen reviewed van Dierendonck's research from 2011. Van Dierendonck suggested that transformational leaders' visions supported organizations while servant leaders' visions supported the individual. Schaubroeck (2011) remarked that servant leaders appealed to followers' feelings of trust where transformational leaders used a cognitive-based trust approach. Schaubroeck explained that servant leaders will take time to understand their followers naturally learned systems of trust and discover which trust values aligned with organizational ones where a transformational leader will instill a company's policy-based system of trust that may or may not align with their followers.

Coetzer, Bussin, and Geldenhuys (2017) found servant leadership theory to be relational and ethical. Servant leaders are multi-dimensional and believe in working through a higher purpose while living with simple definable standards. Similarly, Andersen (2018) identified servant leaders as being trustworthy, empowering visionaries. Servant leaders share power and information, create a higher purposed vision and strategy, establish standards and simple procedures, generate growth and pathways of development, and guide customers to participate and bond based on their similarities and interests (Coetzer et al., 2017). Coetzer et al. found that servant leaders, when compared to leaders using other leadership styles, produce higher rates of organizational citizenship and commitment, work engagement and performance, and employee

retention. Moreover, Fry (2003) believed that servant leaders have intrinsic drive, motivation to learn, and ability to find meaning in their work. At the center of this is personal purpose, which is the preparation servant leaders need to undergo to earn the trust and respect of followers (Bordas, 1995) Bordas explained that personal purpose starts with a desire to connect with the greatest good within oneself and one's surrounding culture. According to Bordas, articulating one's values is the first step in finding personal purpose and support for how values guide servant leaders can be found throughout the literature.

Andersen (2018) commented that social responsibility is a defining trait of a servant leader and all institutions serving society should be just, equal, and oppose social injustices and human rights inequalities while also concentrating on serving the needs of their community. Servant leadership theory researchers agree that servant leaders make positive differences in work environments by facilitating follower development and encouraging employee well-being to achieve long-term organizational goals (Coetzer et al., 2017; Hoch et al., 2018). Servant leaders are humble, relevant, and empowering; however, servant leaders are aware of the fact that they cannot empower others if they are not competent themselves" (Coetzer et al., 2017, p.14). According to Hoch et al. and Coetzer et al., servant leaders model success that could be described as the leader's achievement of self-awareness combined with the leader's ability to instill a set of chosen values to accomplish a common goal, and for a leader to instill those values, a leader must understand where those values originated and if those values align to the organization's values and work environment. Spears (2010) agreed that servant leadership theory is ethical, practical, and meaningful and that servant leaders will serve those they lead with no ulterior motive. In addition, they have a genuine driving force to always serve those who follow them.

Values Orientation Theory

Perhaps it is this focus defining values that led researchers to formulate Values Orientation Theory. Rokeach (1973), for example, defined values as “enduring beliefs influencing modes of conduct and end states where each value transcends specific symbols and experiences that are personally and socially preferred and are not in opposition to the selected set of modes of conduct and end states” (p. 5). As Schmeltz (2014) indicated, it is important to remember that values are not entirely stable and are completely subjective. Values are imprinted over a lifetime, learned from personal, political, and social surroundings that may change slightly, not significantly, and are in order of importance an individual has arranged them. Values Orientation Theory suggests that all societies have a finite number of universal problems that must be answered with value-based solutions and the answers to each society’s universal problems are limited in quantity and are universally known by that society. Jenkins (2013) and Schwartz (2012) identified three universal requirements that are social and institutional demands for group welfare being met, basic biological survival, and social interaction Shamir (1990) proposed that for a leader’s message, or value delivery system, to be effective with followers, that leader’s values and ideologies must already exist and be congruent among their followers’ values and ideologies. Furthermore, Schmeltz (2014) indicated that shared value systems are building blocks for organizational identity.

Jensen, Andersen, and Jacobsen (2018) surveyed what employees desire from an organization and the compatibility of those employees’ desire to do good to benefit their organization and people in it. Their research on value congruence, person-organization fit, and value incongruence from an employee perspective reported high importance for an employee wanting to know what their organization considered good. This information was reported helpful

when employees wanted to know if an organization is a place they wanted to work (Herkes, Churruca, Ellis, Pomare, & Braithwaite, 2019).

Employees who had incongruent personal values compared to organizational values did not imply that they do not fit. Rather, they may not promote organizational values with the same enthusiasm as others who are organizationally aligned (Jensen, Andersen, & Jacobsen, 2018; Miller-Stevens et al, 2018). Kraaykamp, Cemacilar and Tosun (2019) observed that aligned values and attitudes are shaped by cultural, institutional, and personal forces and work values and attitudes are influenced by interpersonal exchanges, social norms, work environments, and life experiences oriented to an individual's goals and desires achieved from work.

Jenkins' (2013) agreed with Meglino and Ravlin (1998) and Rokeach (1974) about coherently aligned value systems being enduring and stable; however, such systems are not completely fixed or entirely malleable. These systems can be changed incrementally, although usually infrequently, and over time they maintain their continuity. When change to coherently aligned value systems occurs, it causes employees to learn and adapt. Change is usually caused when a divergent system of belief(s) that is not in alignment with an organization is imposed on its employees (Herkes et al., 2019; Peng & Lin, 2017).

Painter et al. (2019) said that to align a socio-cultural value it is most important that during the formation and continuation of the value(s) that followers can relate to and accept the value(s) set from the top executive of an organization. Organizational directors are dominant influencers of values and set precedence, flow of information, access to resources, promotions to levels of management, arrangement of employee structure, and communicate self and others' interest in a work environment (Liden, Fu, Liu, & Song, 2016). Schmeltz (2014) indicated that shared value systems are building blocks for organizational identity. He cautioned, however, that

values should not be opposed or in conflict due to causing incompatibilities between employee and organization. Shamir (1990) proposed that for a leader's message, or value delivery system, to be effective to their followers, that leader's values and ideologies must already exist and be congruent among their followers' values and ideologies. At the same time, however, each person's value(s) do not need to be identically aligned with organizational goals and each organization is made up of individuals that have their own personalized value systems.

How values align, as well as socio-cultural congruencies within organizations, have been the focus of several studies. Painter et al. (2019), Lajoie et al. (2017), and Yu and Verma (2018) found that when objectives, strategies, plans, and decisions vertically fit, meaning an organization's internal values are in agreement throughout the upper and lower levels of the organization's hierarchical structure, those organizations tended to have an optimal working environment that has positive influence on employees' attitudes. Socio-cultural alignment, defined by Reich and Benbasat (2000), happens when employees and their organization share values, beliefs, habits, and feelings of purpose from social and cultural perspectives. Value congruence occurs when characteristics of employees and their organizations match.

Seggewiss, Boeggemann, Straatmann, Mueller, and Hattrup (2019) challenged conventional views of value congruence when they surveyed commitment from employees by testing similarities between an organization's values and its employees' values. They found that employee values did not have to align, and ordinarily did not, with an organization's values for goals to be accomplished. Thus, Seggewiss and colleagues recommended not looking for congruency of values between organization and employee, and to instead explore person-centered values that are shared among an organization's population.

Peng and Lin (2017) investigated how leader affect impacted their followers and found that leader-held value(s) can influence an employee's attitude, cognition, and emotional quotient, which are known to regulate their behaviors. Yu and Verma (2018) explained that an individual's ability to experience need fulfilment as well as express and affirm their own values will significantly influence their decision in seeking and accepting job offers. Other factors that affect person-environment fit are national culture, degree of conscientiousness of employee and organization, job fit, and quality of leader-follower relationship (Yu & Verma, 2018). Seggewiss et al. (2019) challenged conventional roles of value congruence when they surveyed commitment from employees by testing similarities between an organization's values and its employees' values. They found that employee values did not have to align, and ordinarily did not, with an organization's values.

Seggewiss et al.(2019) also studied employee commitment and discovered that perceived organizational values adopted by employees led to an increase in positive performance evaluations. However, they noted that when employees continually received average or below average employee evaluations, there were reductions in motivation and employees did not have increases in motivation toward working for an organization. Thus, Seggewiss et al. recommended not looking for congruency of values between organization and employee, and to instead explore person-centered values that are shared among an organization's population. In their study, they discovered that strength, amount, and acceptance of a value increased employee commitment and attractiveness to an organization. They also found that congruence of values between organization and employee other than seeking promotions, approval, and positive work evaluations have little to no effect on individuals adopting organizational values.

As Jensen et al. (2018) cautioned, too much overt and intentional influence on employee values by leadership can cause negative effects in work environments when values between parties are not in alignment. Incongruences among values and formal rules can cause individuals to experience conflict between their personal and social identity, or fluctuations in their support of the establishment (Gerxhani & van Breemen, 2019). In fact, organizational leaders reported that even when employees followed clear pathways and completed objectives, conflicts with employees' personal and social identities may make social identities less relevant, thus diminishing "support for the rules that embody social identity" (Gerxhani & van Breemen, 2019; p. 263). Therefore, creating an organization with likeminded employees required removing anyone not in agreement with that organization's social normative rules or that organization's regulations.

