University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1987

Shared Organizational Culture and Leader Communication: A Study of Correlation

Anthony F. Smith EdD
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Smith, Anthony F. EdD, "Shared Organizational Culture and Leader Communication: A Study of Correlation" (1987). *Dissertations*. 508.

<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/508>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

SHARED ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND
LEADER COMMUNICATION: A STUDY
OF CORRELATION

by
Anthony F. Smith

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

University of San Diego
1987

Dissertation Committee

Joseph C. Rost, Ph.D., Director

William P. Foster, Ed.D.

Jerome J. Ammer, Ph.D.

Copyright © 1987

by

Anthony F. Smith

All Rights Reserved

DEDICATION

To my parents who never had
the opportunity to pursue such
an education, but insisted
that their children must.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Any project of this magnitude is never a result of individual endeavor. This dissertation is no exception. My deepest gratitude must be extended to Dr. Joe Rost. His high standards for work and character were always matched by his personal example. What an honor and privilege it was to have Dr. Rost as my dissertation chair and doctoral advisor. I will always cherish his friendship and utmost regard for personal and professional excellence.

My appreciation is also extended to Dr. Bill Foster, whose depth of understanding and incredible insights, painful and encouraging, provided significant intellectual contribution to both this project and my doctoral career. A very special thanks must also be given to Dr. Jerry Ammer, whose statistical and methodological prowess became a saving grace in the late stages of this dissertation. His care and concern were a constant source of encouragement and inspiration.

I must also thank individuals such as Dr. Susan Hellweg and Dr. Al Weitzel of San Diego State University for providing me with such an excellent foundation from which this degree was built. I would also like to thank Dean DeRoche for his unassuming passion for students; his caring presence was not only seen regularly but it also was always felt.

As with any major project, the dissertation process demanded extraordinary backup support. My dear friend and typist, Mary Lou Nagle, who has patiently been with me

since my freshman year in college, again provided superior guidance and support in typing and editing this document. I am also indebted to my good friend Steve Williams for his computer assistance in the data analysis of this study. Steve's expertise transformed a potentially frustrating process into a stimulating exercise.

A special acknowledgement must be extended to Kevin L. Freiberg, Chief Executive Officer of the San Diego Consulting Group. My friendship and care for Kevin have grown beyond those imaginative adjectives conventionally used to describe special friendships. I would have never made it to, much less complete, such a degree without Kevin's constant agape spirit.

Finally, I must acknowledge my dear bride Erin Jean for her unprecedented love, patience, and support. My sanity would have escaped years ago had it not been for this precious blessing from above.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF APPENDICES	x
 CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE .	 1
Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Hypotheses and Research Questions	5
Definition of Terms	8
Leadership	8
Shared culture	9
Communication competence	10
Homophily	10
Relevance to Leadership	10
Organization of the Dissertation	11
CHAPTER TWO: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
Introduction	13
Literature Survey	13
Leadership	13
Organizational Culture	20
Communication Competence	26
Homophily	31
Attitude homophily	34
Value homophily	35

	Page
Background homophily	35
Appearance homophily	36
Integration of Research	37
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY . . .	42
Overview	42
Transforming Leadership of the CEO	42
Data Collection	46
Site Selection	46
Sample Selection	46
Description of Instrumentation	47
Procedure	54
Data Analysis	54
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	57
Survey Results	57
Descriptive Statistics	58
Hypothesis One	64
Hypothesis Two	66
Hypothesis Three	67
Hypothesis Four	67
Hypothesis Five	68
Research Questions	69
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND DISCUSSION .	75
Summary	75
Conclusions	77
Discussion	83
Strengths and Weaknesses	90

	Page
Considerations for Future Research	98
Final Comments	102
REFERENCES	104
APPENDICES	117

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Hypotheses Table	1
2 Reliability Coefficients for All Variables . . .	59
3 Descriptive Statistics for All Variables	60
4 Frequency Summary of Survey Response	62
5 Hypotheses Summary of Correlations	65
6 Summary of Research Questions One, Two, Three, and Four	70
7 Research Question Five: Regression Summary . . .	72
8 Regression Summary for Combined Variables . . .	73

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1 Deductive Model of Variables	40

LIST OF APPENDICES

	Page
APPENDIX A: SHARED CULTURAL VALUES QUESTIONNAIRE . .	108
APPENDIX B: COMMUNICATOR COMPETENCE QUESTIONNAIRE .	111
APPENDIX C: HOMOPHILY SCALE	112
APPENDIX D: COVER LETTER	113

ABSTRACT

Shared Organizational Culture and Leader Communication:

A Study of Correlation

SMITH, Anthony F., Ed.D. University of San Diego, 1987
123 pp.

Director: Joseph C. Rost, Ph.D.

Considerable literature has mounted concerning the central theme of leadership. The perspective of this study is that leadership inherently involves the process of shaping and maintaining a desirable organizational culture. A critical means by which a leader shapes and maintains an organizational culture is through effective and competent communication. The present study sought to explore the relationship between an organizational member's perception of the communication competence and homophily of his/her leader and the member's degree of shared culture, as espoused by the leader.

Five hypotheses were advanced as well as five research questions regarding the relationship and predictive power of the communication variables (encoding, decoding, and homophily) on the degree of shared culture. To test the hypotheses and research questions, data generated from the Communicator Competence Questionnaire, the Homophily Scale, and a shared culture instrument developed by the researcher were subjected to correlation and regression analysis. Thirty subjects responded to the survey regarding the chief executive officer of a major restaurant chain based in San

Diego.

All but one null hypothesis were retained, which indicates that the shared culture between the leader and followers is not significantly correlated with either the leader's communication competence or the existing homophily between leader and follower, or both variables collectively. The results did indicate that a leader's decoding competence is a statistically significant correlate of the followers' degree of shared culture. The results also indicate that encoding and decoding are highly correlary and that all instruments are highly reliable. The study concludes by presenting possible explanations which account for the results and implications, and considerations for future research.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Introduction

A young man might go into military flight training believing that he was entering some sort of technical school in which he was simply going to acquire a certain set of skills. Instead, he found himself all at once enclosed in a fraternity. And in this fraternity, even though it was military, men were not rated by their outward rank as ensigns, lieutenants, commanders, or whatever. The world was divided into those who had it and those who did not. This quality, this it, was never named, however, nor was it talked about in any way. (Wolfe, 1979, p. 39)

For years, researchers in the fields of business, administration, political science, sociology, and communication have been attempting to discover and call their own this mysterious it that is central to leadership. Obviously, those in the field of communication argue that the mysterious it is simply the process of effective communication. Whether the mysterious it is communication or not, one would not argue that communication is essential in the

leadership process. Given that there is little consensus among researchers as to the exact nature of leadership, considerable uncertainty continues to mount concerning the relationship between communication and leadership. Such ambiguity has given way to persistent conceptual and methodological problems in the literature of the two genres (Sigman, Sigman, & Husband, 1984). Coupled with the new trends, metaphors, and strategies of organizational development, the need for a sound understanding of leadership and communication has become intensified.

In the 1960s, decentralization was in vogue in management. In the 1970s, corporate strategy became the buzzword. Now, in the 1980s, corporate culture seems to be the magic phrase (Salmans, 1983). It has become evident that organizational researchers are beginning to transcend traditional boundaries of organizational theory by recognizing organizational phenomena as cultural phenomena. In turn, this conceptualization of culture has prompted interest in the reconceptualization of leadership and in a humanistic concern over the interpretive sense-making of organizing and communicating (Pacanowsky, 1982).

Although much attention has been given to the notion of organizational culture to date (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Frost, Moore, Louis, Lundberg, & Martin, 1985; Gudykunst, Steward, & Toomey, 1985; Hickman & Silva, 1984; Meyer & Scott, 1983; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Schein, 1985; Sergiovanni & Corbally, 1984), there are no empirical studies in the organizational communication or leadership

literature that examined the relationship of a leader's ability to communicate and the phenomena of organizational culture. It appears that the majority of the scholars simply assume that communication skills are an essential component of leadership. Given the centrality of leadership and communication to organizational life, it would seem rudimentary to further explore these two variables in the context of organizational culture. Such exploration will also provide insight into the pragmatic relationship between a leader's communication skills and the culture of the organization. Although the significance of such a relationship has been implied and assumed, it has yet to be empirically tested.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research is to investigate the relationships among the shared organizational culture between a leader and his followers and the followers' perceptions of their leader's communication competence and homophily. As Sigman et al. (1984) contended, the majority of leadership studies have neglected the examination and consideration of the followers' perceptions of their leader. Indeed, without examining the followers' perceptions of leaders, one's understanding of leadership becomes inherently flawed. Some may contend that perceptions lack richness as research data, but as Langer (1978) and Roloff (1981) have suggested, perceptions are critical and fundamental to the understanding of social relationships and exchanges in various contexts. Even the foremost behaviorist B. F.

Skinner did not ignore the importance of perception, but like many behaviorists, Skinner considered perceptions another form of behavioral response to some external stimuli (Skinner, 1974). Furthermore, any analysis that examines communication as a variable must consider the issue of perception, given that the process of communication itself is principally dependent upon people's perceptions (Burke, 1969).

This research focuses on the chief executive officer (CEO) and the top executives of a multimillion dollar restaurant chain to determine the extent to which the followers' perception of communication competence and homophily of the CEO correlates with the followers' degree of shared culture as espoused by the CEO. Although several approaches to the study of leadership have appeared in the literature (e.g., the trait approach; the situational approach; the cognitive approach), the approach adopted in this research is the transformational/cultural approach. Advocates of this approach would contend that the essence of leadership is the shaping and development of a desired organizational culture which elevates followers to higher levels of morality and motivation (Burns, 1978; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Schein, 1985; Sergiovanni & Corbally, 1984). Although there may exist several means by which a leader could feasibly shape an organization's culture, it is the belief of several scholars (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1982; Peters & Austin, 1985; Pondy, 1978; Schein, 1985; Siehl & Martin, 1984) that a leader's ability to communicate effectively is necessary and

requisite to transforming an organization's culture.

Hypotheses and Research Questions

In consideration of the foregoing statement of purpose which strongly implies that communication is an essential element for leaders in the establishment of a strong organizational culture, the following hypotheses were posited in this study.

H₁: The followers' score of shared culture will not yield a significant statistical correlation ($p < .05$) with the followers' perception of the encoding ability of the leader.

H₂: The followers' score of shared culture will not yield a significant statistical correlation ($p < .05$) with the followers' perception of the decoding ability of the leader.

H₃: The followers' score of shared culture will not yield a significant statistical correlation ($p < .05$) with the followers' perception of the communication competence (encoding and decoding) of the leader.

H₄: The followers' score of shared culture will not yield a significant statistical correlation ($p < .05$) with the followers' perceived homophily with the leader.

H₅: The followers' score of shared culture will not yield a significant statistical correlation ($p < .05$) with the followers' perceptions of the

communication competence and homophily of the leader.

Four research questions were also posited to determine the correlations existing between the various communication variables. A regression question was also posited to determine the most significant predictor of the communication variables tested.

- RQ₁: What relationship exists between communication competence and homophily?
- RQ₂: What is the relationship between encoding and decoding?
- RQ₃: What relationship exists between encoding and homophily?
- RQ₄: What is the relationship between decoding and homophily?
- RQ₅: What communication variable, independently or collectively, will be the most significant predictor of a follower's score of shared culture?

Only the data generated from the instruments employed in this study will determine the score of shared culture, the followers' perceptions of the decoding and encoding abilities of the leader, and the existing homophily between leader and follower (see Appendices A, B, and C for samples of instruments).

For clarification, Table 1 illustrates the variables under investigation. As Table 1 illustrates, the researcher hypothesized that the perceptions of the leader's homophily

Table 1

Hypotheses Table

Hypothesis	Measure	Analysis
H ₁ : The followers' shared culture will not correlate with the leader's encoding competence.	1a: The Communication Competence Questionnaire (#1, 3, 5, 7, 8, & 10) 1b: The Shared Cultural Value Questionnaire	Pearson product moment correlation between 1a and 1b.
H ₂ : The followers' shared culture will not correlate with the leader's decoding competence.	2a: The Communication Competence Questionnaire (#2, 4, 6, 9, 11, & 12) 2b: The Shared Cultural Value Questionnaire	Pearson product moment correlation between 2a and 2b.
H ₃ : The followers' shared culture will not correlate with the leader's communication competence collectively.	3a: The Communication Competence Questionnaire 3b: The Shared Cultural Value Questionnaire	Pearson product moment correlation between 3a and 3b.
H ₄ : The followers' shared culture will not correlate with the homophily of the leader.	4a: The Homophily Scale 4b: The Shared Cultural Value Questionnaire	Pearson product moment correlation between 4a and 4b.
H ₅ : The followers' shared culture will not correlate with the communication competence and homophily of the leader collectively.	5a: The Communication Competence Questionnaire 5b: The Homophily Scale 5c: The Shared Cultural Value Questionnaire	Pearson product moment correlation between 5a and 5b collectively and 5c.

and communication competence directly relate to the shared organizational culture of each participating member, both collectively and individually.

The dependent variable in this study is the score of the followers' shared culture. The score of shared culture is determined by the followers' responses on a rating scale to the cultural elements (values, vision, purpose, metaphors, etc.) espoused by the leader (Appendix A). The independent variables in this study are the followers' perceptions of the leader's (a) encoding competence, (b) decoding competence, and (c) the followers' perceived homophily with leader. The competence scores are determined by the Communicator Competence Questionnaire (Appendix B), and the homophily scores are determined by the homophily questionnaire (Appendix C).

Definition of Terms

To avoid ambiguity, which is likely given the concepts employed in this study, the following definitions are operational in this research.

Leadership. Although this study has not been designed to study leadership per se, it is designed to study a particular aspect of leadership as represented by one leader. The definition of leadership used in this study reflects both Burns's (1975) delineation of transformational leadership and Schein's (1985) description of culture shaping leadership.

Transforming leadership, according to Burns (1975),

"occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (p. 20). This process of transformation is accomplished in part by the establishment and adherence to an organizational culture which promotes such motivation and morality. As Schein (1985) suggested, "the unique and essential function of leadership is the manipulation of culture" (p. 317). In Rost's (1985b) delineation of transforming leadership, he stated that the first and overwhelming point concerning transformational leaders is that they "shape the culture of the organization to make it do the job they have in mind" (p. 5). More specifically, Rost argued that within their organizations, transforming leaders develop a vision, shape values, lead by example and education, are concerned about future generations, and finally they create institutional purpose that is customer centered. Given the transformational and culture approaches, leaders can be viewed as individuals who, through the manipulation of culture, raise followers to higher levels of motivation and morality.

Shared culture. This term refers to the degree to which the organizational members' beliefs and behaviors reflect the cultural elements as espoused by the leader. The operational model of organizational culture parallels that of Deal and Kennedy (1982) which incorporated such elements as values, vision, and purpose, as well as other elements such as norms, metaphors, and slogans.

Communication competence. The ability to send messages effectively (encoding) as well as receive and respond to messages effectively (decoding) is the operational definition of communication competence. These two factors, considered independently and collectively, will provide the basis for researching communication competence (Monge, Bachman, Dillard, & Eisenberg, 1981).

Homophily. Homophily refers to the perceived similarity of an organizational member to the leader in reference to attitude, value, background, and appearance (McCroskey, Richmond, & Daly, 1974).

Relevance to Leadership

As Burns (1978) has suggested, "Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (p. 2). The phrase least understood has plagued researchers for decades and the generation of studies on leadership has not declined. It does appear, however, that some consensual agreement is beginning to emerge. For instance, scholars do seem to agree now that organizations do form cultures, and it is the task of the leader(s) to shape and maintain a desirable culture. There also appears to be agreement in that a principle means of shaping culture is the communication of the values and beliefs of the organization to the members of that organization in a compliant manner. Given these two fundamental agreements, it would appear that the means of leadership are essential to the partial ends of leadership, or that a leader's communication competence and

homophily are essential to the process of shaping organizational culture. Thus, one could assume that the communication competence and homophily of a leader and the degree of shared culture of organizational members are three salient variables in the study, understanding, and practice of leadership. As Porter and Roberts (1976) argued a decade ago, organizational communication and leadership studies have suffered from a lack of ties to specific organizational variables, such as the degree of shared culture. Therefore, the central purpose of this research is to take the implied relationship of communication and leadership, which dates back to Chester Barnard (1938), and empirically test the degree to which a leader's communication competence impacts the degree to which the followers share the espoused culture of the leader.

Organization of the Dissertation

In examining the relationship between organizational culture and the impact of a leader's communication competence, the second chapter of this dissertation presents a review of the literature in the areas of leadership, organizational culture, communication competence, and homophily. The third chapter describes the design and methodology employed in the study. Also included in this chapter is a description of the organization and individuals involved within the study. Some background information on the various questionnaires is also presented. Chapter four presents the results of the statistical analysis,

including the reliability of the instruments, the correlation coefficients, the regression equations, and a graphic representation of the findings. Chapter five concludes the dissertation by presenting a discussion and interpretation of the results as well as delineating the implications and recommendations for theoretical and pragmatic purposes.

CHAPTER TWO

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this review is to discuss relevant literature pertaining to the various topics under investigation. The review begins with the topic of leadership which is followed by those of organizational culture, communication competence, and homophily. The review of leadership literature is the most extensive given that it incorporates literature regarding organizational culture and communication. The chapter ends with a brief integration of the research and a model illustrating the hypothesized relationship of the variables under investigation.

Literature Survey

Leadership

Historically, the concept of leadership has been operationalized within a variety of theoretical frameworks (Bass, 1981; Kellerman, 1984; Rosenbach & Taylor, 1984). This diversity has contributed to both the richness and ambiguity within the leadership literature. Although leadership remains a confusing phenomenon, there is a consensus beginning to emerge that suggests leadership is a transforming process which shapes and guides the culture

of a given organization.

Burns (1978) provided the foundation of transformational leadership by stating that "Transformational leadership occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (p. 20). Unlike previous views of leadership (trait approach, situational approach, great man theory, etc.), Burns's view and description of transformational leadership incorporates an element of morality and contends that transforming leaders seek to raise the moral aspirations of followers by addressing themselves "to [the] followers' wants, needs, and other motivations, as well as their own, and thus serve as an independent force in changing the makeup of the followers' motive base through gratifying their motives" (p. 20). Although the needs and wants of the followers may not be initially congruent with the leader's, the transformational process, initiated by the leader, will ultimately fuse the two incongruent parties into a mutually bonded relationship where both "continuously transform each other and the organization to higher levels of motivation and performance based on higher standards of moral and ethical conduct" (Rost, 1985a, p. 5). The means by which leaders accomplish such transformation is not as clear as the ends, as described by Burns and Rost. However, as Rost suggested, transforming leaders do shape the culture of the organization to accomplish the desired ends of transformation. Several core components of the organization's

culture must be considered by the transforming leader.

A central concern for a transforming leader must be the component of core values for the organization. As Deal and Kennedy (1982) contended, "Values are the bedrock of any corporate culture. As the essence of a company's philosophy for achieving success, values provide a sense of common direction for all employees and guidelines for their day-to-day behavior" (p. 21). Hofstede (1984) explained that values are "a broad tendency to prefer certain states of affairs over others" (p. 18). Deal and Kennedy also suggested that organizations only succeed because the members of the organization identify, embrace, and act on the values of the organization. Moreover, values become a reality in the minds of most organizational members which in turn define the fundamental character of their organization. Beyer (1981) contended that the values and ideology embedded within an organization emerge through the exercise of leadership. Peters and Austin (1985) explained that transforming leaders are, above all else, value shapers. The transformational leader is in many ways similar to what Selznick (1957) described as the institutional leader:

The formation of an institution is marked by the making of value commitments, that is, choices which fix the assumptions of policy makers as to the nature of the enterprise, its distinctive aims, methods and roles.

. . . The institutional leader is primarily an expert in the promotion and protection of values. Institutional survival, properly understood, is a matter of

maintaining values and distinctive identity. (pp. 28, 152-153)

Thus, the shaping of organizational values can be seen as central to the success of transformational leadership. As Rost (1985a) concluded, transformational leaders influence organizational members' behaviors, thoughts, relationships, and ultimately the products by shaping the values of the organization.

The second component of culture which the transforming leader shapes is the vision of the organization. Naisbitt and Aburdene (1985) suggested that:

A successful corporate vision links a person's job with his or her life purpose and generates alignment--that unparalleled spirit and enthusiasm that energizes people in companies to make the extra effort to do things right--and to do the right thing. That is what makes a corporation uncommonly successful. (p. 27)

Furthermore, Naisbitt and Aburdene (1985) argued that a corporate vision serves not only as an organizing principle but the catalytic force underlying every function in the organization. Rost (1985a) emphasized that organizational vision is much more than an ordinary picture of the organization. The vision of the organization transcends purpose with higher moral and ethical standards which become the cause of and drive the organization. Corporate vision essentially becomes the guiding light for the organization and its members. Without such a vision, not only will the organization perish, but so too will the transforming

leader.

The third core component of an organization's culture is the purpose or mission. Selznick (1957) stated that:

The inbuilding of purpose is a challenge to creativity because it involves transforming men and groups from neutral, technical units into participants who have a peculiar stamp, sensitivity, and commitment. This is ultimately an educational process. . . . The art of the creative leader is the art of institution building, the reworking of human and technological materials to fashion an organism that embodies new and enduring values. (p. 28)

Although organizational values are what lie at the heart of any organization, it is the purpose and mission that propel that organization to a desired end state. As Sergiovanni (1984) asserted, leaders working within the cultural perspective consciously work to build unity, order, and meaning within the organization as a whole by "giving attention to organizational purposes . . . which define the way of life in the organization for purposes of socialization and obtaining compliance" (p. 9).

When one considers the means by which transformational leaders shape the values, vision, and purposes of an organization, it becomes apparent that one of the means leaders use is effective communication that directs and responds to the needs and wants of the followers. As Zaleznik (1983) argued, it is with an imaginative capacity and the ability to effectively communicate that leaders are

able to reform the individual goals and desires of followers into a raised state and broader world view. McCoy (1985) argued that effective communication not only encourages a proper understanding of the corporate culture, but it also provides an awareness that "provides the means for developing ownership of corporate values, commitment to its culture, and loyalty to the corporate community" (p. 207). Rost (1985a) also argued that transformational leaders teach and communicate their values by embodying them in the myriad and isolated events of every day.

They articulate their values in memos, speeches, conferences with followers, meetings, retreats, and ceremonial occasions. Their actions speak loudly because they do their values; they live them in everything that they do. They understand the symbolic importance of what they do and say, and they communicate their values in very deliberate ways by their words and actions. (pp. 7-8)

According to Peters (1983), transforming leaders communicate their vision by living it before it becomes a reality in the organization. Leaders also communicate their vision and purpose in such a way that meaning is fostered throughout the organization. As Bennis and Nanus (1985) articulated, meaning is established in the organization through the effective means of communication. "The management of meaning, mastery of communication, is inseparable from effective leadership" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 33). More specifically, transforming leaders

articulate their values through special language and jargon, typically employing metaphors and symbols (Edelman, 1977; Hirsch, 1980); organizational stories and scripts (Martin, 1982; Wilkins, 1978); rituals and ceremonies (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Gephart, 1978); physical arrangements such as dress and decor (Peters & Waterman, 1982; Pfeffer, 1981); and particularly through deliberate interaction with organizational members (Siehl, 1985). Sergiovanni (1984) contended that the interactive process of leadership can be viewed as cultural expression. "When leadership skills, antecedents, and meanings are successfully articulated into practice, we come to see leadership as less a behavioral style or management technique and as more a cultural expression" (Sergiovanni, 1984, p. 111). Similarly, Bennis (1984) suggested that leadership is manifested in terms of vision, purpose, and values and other aspects of organizational culture that are brought forth through the interactive process. It is within this interactive process that transformational leaders externalize their assumptions and embed them gradually and consistently in the values, vision, and purpose of the organization (Schein, 1985).

Although some scholars generally assert that leadership is the changing and renewing of organizational culture (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Hickman & Silva, 1984; Peters & Austin, 1985; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Schein, 1985; Sergiovanni & Corbally, 1984), others have specifically implied that the essence of transforming leadership is the manipulation and deliberate control of language which

directs the organization's culture to a desired end (Pondy, 1978; Smircish & Morgan, 1982). It is through this manipulation of language that leaders provide pictures (Weick, 1983) and create symbols and myths (Pettigrew, 1979) in an attempt to form a desired organizational culture. Thus, the shared symbols and meanings, constituted communicatively, may be considered the actual organizational culture (Gudykunst, Steward, & Toomey, 1985).

In summary, the literature regarding transformational leadership suggests that the process of leadership is a complex and sophisticated phenomenon. As noted, however, there is a consensus beginning to emerge that contends that the process of transformational leadership is one which primarily focuses on the elevation of the follower's morality and motivation. This elevation of followers, as well as the leader, is accomplished through several means, but in particular, by effective communication of values, vision, and purpose. This communication process is one of education and example that draws upon the use of stories, metaphors, specialized language, and other symbolic means to establish an organizational culture which continues to foster moral and motive transformation.

Organizational Culture

The notion of organizational culture is rooted in both anthropology and sociology. For years, anthropologists emphasized the close description of relatively small, remote, and self-contained societies (Van Maanen & Barley, 1985).

Descriptive details are organized as ethnographies wherein the presence of culture is displayed by language, rituals, taboos, codes, rites, symbols, standards of behavior, and moral codes shared by members. As Van Maanen and Barley (1985) further argued, "Culture is cast as an all-embracing and largely taken-for-granted way of life shared by those who make up the society" (p. 32). Thus, these foundations of action can also be seen as present in organizational life.

In the early 1980s, the notion of organizational culture began to flourish as a means to study organizations and communication within the organizational context. Aided by such best sellers as Corporate Culture (Deal & Kennedy, 1982) and In Search of Excellence (Peters & Waterman, 1982), the focus of culture has been widely accepted in both academic and business communities. Schein (1985) argued that the term culture should be restricted to basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by members of an organization. Van Maanen (1979) suggested that central to the notion of culture are observed behavioral regularities which revolve around language. The dominant values and purposes of an organization are also viewed as central to the concept of organizational culture (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). Symbols have also been an area of interest to many organizational researchers. Pfeffer (1981b) noted that the use of symbols is critical in the exercise of power. Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo (1982) asserted that when organizational members "talk, sing, fake an illness, exchange symbols, they are communicating; and they are constructing

their culture" (p. 123). Mitroff and Kilman (1976) suggested that organizational culture is constructed through the use of stories and myths, or, as Bormann (1983) termed it, organizational sagas. Morgan (1980) asserted that the concept of culture "draws attention to the symbolic aspects of organizational life, and the way in which language, rituals, stories, myths, etc., embody networks of subjective meaning which are crucial for understanding how organizational realities are created and sustained" (p. 616). Salmans (1983) added a self-identification element, defining culture as "the amalgam of beliefs, mythology, values and rituals that, even more than its products, differentiates it from other companies" (p. 1). Concurring with Salman's definition, Pettigrew (1979) defined culture as "an amalgamation of beliefs, ideology, language, ritual, and myth that we collapse into the label of organizational culture" (p. 572).

Although organizational culture has been described in terms of language and symbols, one should not underestimate the significance of an organization's culture. In their discussion of organizational culture, Wharton and Worthley (1981) stated that all organizations have a culture that affects individual and group behavior in a predictable way:

To the extent that this culture affects behavior, it will determine perceptions of what the organization really is, what its prospects for success are, and who counts. Where the culture is well defined and articulated, individual expressions about the

organization and its members are suppressed. The pressure is in favor of the individual supporting the norms and beliefs of the culture rather than voicing beliefs that run counter to the culture. (pp. 357-358)

Although the concept of culture is somewhat intangible, its significant impact on organizational behavior cannot be overlooked. As Nieburn (1973) argued several years ago, Culture and its parts [values, vision, and purpose] are abstractions, but are also tools that man grasps in dealing with his life and times. Therefore, it embodies a strong reality principle that endows whatever passes for truth with the incandescence of significance and legitimacy. (p. 38)

In this sense, one can see the significance of the culture of an organization, particularly if one combines the previous description with the findings of a study conducted by Margulies (1969) which supported his hypothesis that key organizational culture elements (values, vision, and purpose) are related to the degree of self-actualization of the members of the organization. In other words, the more moral and ethical the values are of an organization, the greater the likelihood will be that the members of the organization will also be moral and ethical. Given this argument, one should be able to clearly see that the manipulation of an organization's culture carries with it tremendous responsibility and consequences. Although an individual's values, morals, and ethics impact the culture of an

organization, the collective culture of an organization stands to impact the individual more significantly (in the context of the organization) given the sheer influence of number and size. In an extensive description attempting to establish a relationship between organizational members and culture, Evan (1974) concluded that "the underlying assumption of our organizationally relevant model of culture is that an appreciable amount of the variance in the behaviors and performance of organizational members is accountable by cultural variables, such as values, purpose, and vision" (p. 14).

By examining the culture of an organization, tremendous insight into the individuals and the leadership of the organization can be achieved. As Smith and Steadman (1982) contended, by examining organizational culture, one is able to identify recurrent values and purposes impacting the organizational leadership and decision making process. Hence, the organizational culture approach appears to be an appropriate framework for examining leadership and communication effectiveness. As Smith and Steadman (1982) concluded, "As it does in all cultures, tradition plays an important role in maintaining corporate cultures. But corporate cultures are more circumscribed, more easily altered, and more manageable than the cultures of society" (p. 74). As indicated in the literature, organizational cultures can be viewed as manageable and leadable phenomena; they can be significantly impacted by effective communication exemplified by the leader at any discrete level of the organization.

Given the complexity and pervasiveness of culture, it would be ludicrous to attempt to study the culture of an organization comprehensively; furthermore, it would be just as ludicrous for a leader to attempt to impact and transform an organization's culture completely. Thus, the researcher and leader alike must concentrate on the values, vision, and purpose of the organization in order to understand and impact the organization's culture with any probability of success.

The organizational culture metaphor has become quite popular in the leadership and administrative sciences. Although there exist differences in definitions, one would not argue that an organization's culture significantly impacts the beliefs and behaviors of the organizational members. The view being developed here extends on this concept and advances that an organization's culture is influenced by leadership within the organization. Thus, it becomes the task of the transformational leader to impact the organization's culture in terms of morality and motivation through the process of communication. Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo (1983) summarized this view as follows:

Not only are organizational cultures manipulated and transformed by communication, but cultures also come into being through various processes of communication. Therefore, one strength of the organizational culture position is its invitation--or more accurately, its directive--to observe, record, and make sense of the communicative behavior of the organizational members and [its leaders]. (p. 129)

Communication Competence

The importance of communication competence and an explication of the functions of communication within an organization can be traced to the writings of Chester Barnard (1938), who concluded that the first function of the executive is to develop and maintain a system of effective communications. The deliberate analysis of communication competence was first addressed in linguistic and sociolinguistic circles. The linguist who had the greatest impact on the concept of communication competence was Noam Chomsky, who is best noted for his work with transformational grammar. Chomsky's (1965) notion of communication competence was a parsimonious one: "Competence is the speaker-hearer's knowledge of his language" (p. 4). As Chomsky argued,

The speaker is ideal--an autonomous individual in a completely homogeneous speech community, who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance.

(p. 3)

Chomsky separated competence, which he argued was the proper domain of linguistic inquiry, from performance, which he placed outside of the domain of linguistic theory and investigation (Chomsky, 1967).

In 1972, Hymes criticized Chomsky's conceptualization

of competence for its theoretical and pragmatic weaknesses. He stated that Chomsky's model is inadequate on the grounds that it does not realistically account for actual language behavior (1972, p. 271). Hymes, in turn, reformulated the notion of competence by first expanding the label to communicative competence and stating:

I should take competence as the general term for the capabilities of a person. Competence is dependent on both (tacit) knowledge and (ability for) use. Knowledge is distinct, then, from both competence and from systemic possibility (to which its relation is an empirical matter). The specification of ability for use as part of competence allows for the role of noncognitive factors, such as motivation, as partly determining competence. (p. 282)

This reconceptualization went far beyond the narrowness of Chomsky's notion to allow for the inclusion of communicative behaviors and the social/cultural factors which actually determine the competence of the communication. Bostrom (1984) noted that the contributions of these two scholars provided the foundation for the inquiry into communication competence.

Recent research in communication reflects a developing interest in the concept of communication competence (Allen & Wood, 1978; Bostrom, 1984; Hale, 1980; McCroskey, 1982; Moore, 1981; Monge, Bachman, Dillard, & Eisenberg, 1981; Spitzberg, 1983; Wiemann, 1977). Various theoretical approaches have been proposed in the study of communication

competence. Spitzberg (1983) conducted a thorough review of the literature and has synthesized existing perspectives into five basic approaches to conceptualizing communication competence. The following is a brief summary of each approach.

Fundamental competence and efficacy theories refer to the means by which people interpersonally adapt to and deal with changing environmental conditions. Competence is said to be an individual attribute and effective interaction can be attributed to one's own capability.

Linguistic theories of competence refer to the constitutive or basic societal rules for the construction and interpretation of linguistic codes. Competence is determined by an individual's ability to manage semantic and syntactic relations between verbal symbols. These theories also focus on the adaption of rules to specific listeners and situations.

Social skills and social competence theories concentrate on the behavioral components or skills that underlie all forms of effective interactions. Behavioral dimensions such as empathy, role-taking, and interaction management imply an ability to achieve a desired goal.

Theories of strategic and interpersonal competence focus on an individual's interpersonal ability to adapt to and control his/her immediate environment. Strategies are developed in light of goal achievement in an interpersonal context.

The final approach presented in Spitzberg's review is

the relational competence theories. These theories refer to the relationship between competent communication and competent outcome. In evaluating competence, the appropriateness of dyadic interaction as well as effective outcomes are employed as criteria. Specific components include reinforcement, satisfaction, and appropriate attention directed toward the other participant.

As is typical of many of the constructs in organizational communication, "the definitions of communicator competence are roughly equivalent to the broader definitions of social or interpersonal competence which were developed in the field of social psychology" (Monge et al., 1981, p. 505). Many of these general definitions or descriptions, however, are helpful in understanding communicator competence in the organizational context. Larson, Backlund, Redmond, and Barbour (1978) defined communicator competence as "the ability of an individual to demonstrate knowledge of the appropriate communicative behavior in a given situation" (p. 16). As McCroskey (1982) suggested, "The key to this definition is the demonstration of appropriate communicative behavior" (p. 2). Monge et al. (1981) also argued that the fundamental element underlying nearly all communication competence research is that competent communicators are those who are effective at achieving their desired goals. Additionally, Parks (1977) contended, "a competent communicator is a person who maximizes his or her goal achievement through communication" (p. 1).

Various scholars have defined communication competence

in terms of process (Allen & Brown, 1976; Backlund, 1978; Duran, Zakahi, & Parrish, 1981; Hale, 1980; Hoseman, 1979). These definitions are derived from early definitions, such as Habermas (1970), who described a competent communicator as one who masters the ideal speech situation, or as Argyle (1969) contended, a competent communicator is one who communicates appropriately in social presentations. Spitzberg (1981) noted that a "competent communicator [as judged by appropriateness] must avoid significant violation, qualitatively and quantitatively, of the social norms and expectations governing the situation" (p. 6). Spitzberg and Cupach (1981) elaborated on this definition by stating that "competent communication can be viewed as a form of interpersonal influence, in which an individual is faced with the task of fulfilling communicative functions and goals (effectiveness) while maintaining conversational and interpersonal norms (appropriateness)" (p. 1).

Given all the proposed definitions and descriptions, a communicator competence construct restricted to the organizational setting should focus on observable communication behaviors (Monge et al., 1981). Furthermore, as Monge et al. (1981) argued, when individuals, such as employees, assess the communication competence of others, they are not likely to consider a large number of dimensions. This point becomes of great importance given the fact that the communication competence of individuals is essentially assessed by individual recipients of the communication in specific contexts. As Rubin (1977) explained, communication

competence can be viewed as "an account of mechanisms underlying message adaptation" (p. 67). Message adaptation is an important element in any communication construct, particularly within the organizational context (Duran, 1982; Hale & Delia, 1979). Given that the receiver of the speaker-receiver process determines the effectiveness of the communication by perceiving the appropriateness of it, the element of adaptation becomes central to the construct of communication competence. The behaviors and attitudes of the organizational members are ultimately influenced by their perceptions of how the leader communicates in the organization. Because organizational settings are significantly different from interpersonal and intimate settings, Monge et al. (1981) argued that a communicator competence construct, from an organizational perspective, is likely to be structured as a single factor or at most two factor model (encoding and decoding), with both factors being highly correlated.

Although there appears to be a general understanding and conceptualization of communication competence, there are limited empirical studies of communication competence and other organizational variables such as shared culture.

Homophily

Researchers in the fields of communication and social psychology have, for many years, recognized the importance of homophily as a component of communication, particularly in terms of source evaluation. Homophily, along with communication competence, is the central means by which

individuals evaluate communication sources (Andersen & de Mancillas, 1978; Monge et al., 1981). Although the term homophily is relatively new to the lexicon, the term refers to the degree of similarity between source and receiver in reference to a single attribute or a group of attributes (McCroskey, Richmond, & Daly, 1974). The notion of homophily was actually observed, in an intuitive sense, by such noted philosophers as Aristotle, Tarde, and Burke. Lazarsfeld and Merton (1954) chose to use the term homophily rather than similarity in order to accentuate the importance of varying degrees of sameness or likeness. Subsequently, Rogers and Shoemaker (1972) employed the term homophily to describe opinion leader characteristics.

The concept of homophily has been applied to a number of research contexts. Scholars investigating such areas as group (Homans, 1950; Shaw, 1971) and family (Jaco & Shepard, 1975) processes, political choice behavior (Andersen, 1975; Byrne, Bond, & Diamond, 1969), decision making under ambiguous situations (Festinger, 1954), opinion leadership in the classroom (Richmond, 1974), diffusion of new information (Rogers, 1973; Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971), loan granting (Golightly, Huffman, & Byrne, 1972), interpersonal attraction and initial interaction activities (Byrne, 1971; Heider, 1959), as well as friendship formation and maintenance (Lazarsfeld & Merton, 1954; Newcomb, 1961) have all emphasized the major impact homophily has had.

Organizational researchers have also studied the concept of homophily. Such researchers as Argyris (1964),

Bass (1960), Graham (1971), James (1951), and Pfiffner (1951) have indicated that informal groups within organizations may be linked by member similarity. Good and Good (1974) found that the more attitudinally homophilous an individual perceives an organization to be with him or her, the more positive the person's affective responses to that organization. Additionally, Flowers and Hughes (1973) noted that a primary motive for employee stability within the organization was the compatibility felt by the person with the organization.

In an extensive review of homophily and supervisory effectiveness, Daly, McCroskey, and Falcione (1976) noted that three distinct conceptual bases have emerged out of the literature explaining the role of homophily in the organizational context. The first explanation is labeled the cognitive dimension. Theories revolving around the notion of cognitive consistency (e.g., Heider, 1959; Newcomb, 1961) suggest that individuals with greater similarity in feelings toward an object or group of objects will like each other more. Naturally, areas held in common are likely to include background, appearance, and occupation, given that these aspects tend to predict (at least initially) attitudes and values. The second approach centers on the reinforcing nature of similarity. Byrne and his colleague (Byrne, 1971; Clore & Byrne, 1976) provided extensive evidence supporting his conceptualization that individuals who share viewpoints, background, job, values, and even appearance similar to ours will likely make us feel good. Byrne argued that individuals attach positive feelings to those things they find

reinforcing, and naturally similarity is reinforcing. In short, we like those who make us feel good about ourselves. The third approach explains the relationships between homophily and various affective variables in terms of its functional nature. Berger and Calabrese (1975) noted that when an individual realizes someone is homophilous with him/her on any number of dimensions, that individual can predict the other person's behavior with greater accuracy. In a sense, homophily reduces one's uncertainty about the other person and the environment associated with him/her, and consequently one's affective responses to the similar other should be more positive (Altman & Taylor, 1973). All three of these interpretations, while positing different approaches to homophily, indicate that four principle dimensions impact the effectiveness of the communication exchanged between interacting parties. These dimensions are attitude, value, background, and appearance.

Attitude homophily. This is perhaps the most examined dimension of homophily, particularly within the organizational context. Attitude homophily centers on the degree of attitudinal similarity existing between various individuals within an organization. Research has indicated that the more similar in attitudes an individual is to her or his superiors, interviewers, and coworkers, the more likely both the organization and the individual will benefit (Daly et al., 1976). Congruence between superior and subordinate on leadership style preference and orientation (which are

essentially attitudes) results in higher levels of subordinate satisfaction with both supervision and coworkers (DiMarco, 1972; Fiman, 1973; Wood & Soebel, 1970).

Value homophily. This dimension refers to the notion that similarity between superiors and subordinates on values will lead to greater subordinate effectiveness and satisfaction as well as affect positive performance ratings made by superiors of subordinates. In their review of literature, Daly et al. (1976) suggested that an individual's success in an organization is likely to be related to the congruence of values between the individual and the organization. DiMarco (1974) noted that subordinate satisfaction with supervision is at least partially a function of value homophily. Working with research and development personnel, LaPorte (1965) found that when scientists and managers shared similar values, the amount of conflict was low which, in turn, enhanced satisfaction with the job and supervision. As a consequence, an organization had low turnover and productivity was extremely high. Senger (1971) also found that subordinates who were rated high in overall performance by a superior tended to have a value structure homophilous with the superior, whereas those who were rated low had a dissimilar value structure.

Background homophily. This is simply the degree to which individuals share a common background. In researching the process of interviewing, Wexly and Nemoroff (1973) used biographical homophily as an independent variate. They

found that interviewees similar to the decision maker were evaluated more favorably than dissimilar applicants. Over recent years, a greater proportion of people being placed in leadership positions within organizations have come from internal sources (Rambo, 1982). As a function of this procedure, these individuals often tend to share with subordinates more of the same background characteristics (LaPorte, 1965). This similarity has been observed to lead to less superior-subordinate conflict (LaPorte, 1965) as well as greater subordinate satisfaction with supervision (DiMarco, 1974).

Appearance homophily. This dimension has been relatively ignored by empirical researchers in the organizational context. Although difficult to generalize, observations of the effects of physical appearance homophily seems to be evident in modern organizations (Daly et al., 1976). Uniforms, insignia, and dress standards, depending on the individual's status, further underline the possible relevance of this variable. Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) provided clear evidence of the effects of appearance homophily in diffusing new information into foreign institutions. In short, it appears that what others look like, and how much they seem to look like us, affects our feelings toward them.

In summary, organizational research has clearly demonstrated that variables such as subordinate-superior relationships, work effectiveness, and evaluative decisions may be strongly affected by the degree of homophily present

in the relationship. Previous investigations, however, have failed for the most part to recognize the multidimensionality of the homophily construct. Furthermore, although the relationships between organizational outcomes and homophily have been validated, little research has been conducted recently. Therefore, given the new models and conceptualizations of leadership and organizations, research must be continued to develop greater understanding of these concepts.

Integration of Research

If one is to take Burns (1978) seriously, the concept of transformational leadership does not happen arbitrarily. As Burns stated, transformational leadership is purposeful and intentional. As evidenced in the review of literature, a transformational leader elevates the morality and motivation of his/her followers by shaping the organization's culture through various means. Two consistent and common themes underlie most of the leadership literature. First, leadership is constantly viewed as a social influence process whereby the leader exerts some degree of influence over the culture of the organization. It is through this element of influence that leaders transform the morality and motivation of their followers. Thus, a necessary component of leadership can be seen as the exercise or evidence of influence (Bass, 1960; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Burns, 1978; Hollander, 1978; McCall, 1977; Peters & Austin, 1985; Schein, 1986; Sergiovanni & Corbally, 1984). The second theme that

emerges is that leadership is generally viewed as an interpersonal and symbolic process involving interaction between two or more persons aimed at developing mutual goals of leader and led (Barge & Johnson, 1985; Bass, 1981; Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Hollander, 1978; Kochan, Schmidt, & Decotis, 1975; McCall & Lombardo, 1978; Mintzberg, 1973; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Schein, 1985). Indeed, without followers, there can be no leader.

Given that influence and the interpersonal/symbolic process are communicative in nature, it would appear that deeply embedded within the process of leadership lies communication. It would also appear that the more effective a leader's communication, the more effective the leader's ability to impact on the organization's culture. Bormann (1983) implied such a relationship when he defined organizational culture as "the sum total ways of living, organizing, and communing built up in a group of human beings and transmitted to newcomers by means of verbal and nonverbal communication" (p. 100). Moreover, Barge & Johnson (1985) contend that a leader's communication ability is critical for creating and maintaining the social reality known as leadership. As many scholars have indicated, the task of a leader is to effectively articulate and communicate to employees the values, vision, and purposes as determined by the organizational leader (Barnard, 1938; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Harrison, 1984; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Pfeffer, 1981; Pondy & Smircish, 1983; Rost, 1985b; Schein, 1985; Selznick, 1957).

Interestingly enough, although the importance of communication of leaders and organizational culture is implicitly embedded within most leadership studies, there are no empirical studies to date that have researched and tested the relationship of a leader's communication competence and the degree to which the followers have shared the espoused organizational culture of the leader. As Pendly, Hawkins, and Peterson (1984) have revealed, little attention has been paid to the communication competence of organizational members and leaders; instead, research has focused on communication structure and attitudinal outcomes such as communication satisfaction. Moreover, as Ebben (1985) contended, a leader's communication competence may well explain the follower's commitment to the organization and its culture above and beyond what other variables such as decision making and power are capable of explaining. Thus, the purpose of this study is to test such a contention. Figure 1, a model illustrating the deductive relationships between the variables, is presented for clarification.

Beginning with the transformational leadership variable, the shaping of an organization's culture is logically deduced as a critical function of leadership, which is realized by the communication variables of the leader, both communication competence and homophily. The deductive model illustrates the following: shaping organizational culture is a significant part of transformational leadership, which is accomplished in part by the followers' perceptions of

Figure 1. Deductive Model of Variables

communication competence, both encoding and decoding, and their perception of the existing homophily, in terms of attitudes, values, backgrounds, and appearance, with their leader.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Overview

To fulfill the purpose of this study and generate appropriate data to test the hypotheses and research questions posited, a factorial design was employed. In the traditional sense, factorial designs essentially consist of studies which employ two or more independent variables to test for their independent and joint effects on a dependent variable (Kerlinger, 1979). The factorial approach has been a significant design in that it allows the research of complex problems and hypotheses to be studied. Such designs, Kerlinger stated, have several advantages, the three most important of which are: (a) more sophisticated theory could be formulated and tested; (b) more realistic problems could be investigated; and (c) the joint influence of variables could be studied (p. 94).

Transforming Leadership of the CEO

Given the nature of the study, one important condition had to be verified in order to accomplish the purposes of this study. The condition is that the leader of the organization must have exemplified the nature of transformational

leadership as described herein. Specifically, there needed to be evidence that indicated the leader was a culture shaper, one who has created real intended social change, one who develops vision, purpose, and values while raising the motivation and morals of those around him through education and example, and above all is customer centered (Rost, 1985b).

The researcher verified the leadership of the CEO by a two-fold process. The first step involved interviewing five members of the organization who knew the CEO well and had regular, face-to-face interaction with him. The interviews were brief (five minutes), given that they were conducted over the phone and the members being interviewed were obviously busy executives. To generate descriptive information concerning the CEO's transformational leadership, the researcher asked these open ended questions:

1. Is your CEO consistently elevating the levels of motivation of his followers by means of example, symbols, vision, and education?
2. Does your CEO consistently seek to accomplish not only his needs and wants but those of his followers as well?
3. Does your CEO consistently attempt to raise the morals and ethics of his followers?
4. Does an organizational culture exist which reflects the values and morals of your CEO?

The responses generated from these questions were overwhelmingly positive in terms of transformational leadership.

To be sure, all of the respondents did not necessarily agree with all the beliefs and behaviors of their CEO, but all certainly agreed that their CEO was surely a man of moral stature who elevated the morals and motivation of his followers. Several accounts emerged from the interviews indicating that the CEO has significantly shaped the cultural values of his organization. All respondents commented on the CEO's concern for the customer, his concern for his employees, and above all the integrity of the organization as he shaped it. The respondents told a number of stories that clearly described the CEO as an educator, mentor, and model in relating to his immediate followers.

Also emerging from the interviews were several accounts concerning the leader's passion not only for his people and product, but also for society in general. As a leader of a restaurant chain, it was rather surprising to hear that this CEO is a leading advocate in raising the nutritional standards in all restaurant foods. Several industry standards concerning nutrition and consumer protection were, in fact, initiated by this CEO. The respondents also commented on the many philanthropic activities initiated by their leader which have resulted in significant societal change, such as the establishment of halfway houses for troubled youth in this community.

Although there was more than sufficient evidence validating each element of leadership, the most significant conclusion which emerged from the interviews was the CEO's utmost regard for his employees' betterment and morality.

The second step in this validation process consisted of a face-to-face interview with the CEO. The researcher used the open-ended questions above with obvious modifications and then followed up with questions regarding the means by which the CEO exercised transformational leadership. The conclusions drawn from this interview also served to validate the assumption that this CEO was truly a transformational leader. For example, in the course of the interview, the CEO frequently commented on the care he felt for his employees and customers. His passion for people was clearly exemplified in the stories he told concerning his successful employees--those who had made something out of their lives--and who, in turn, had a significant impact on the organization. These examples gave living proof of his repeated attempts to ensure that the goals of both leader and follower were mutually achieved through an effective, cohesive corporate value system. Several of the respondents stated that the CEO has brought about significant positive change in lives of his employees through his example and continues to do so through his daily activities. His primary mission is to morally educate, or in his words, to "educate by doing, not saying." When asked about the value of education, the CEO responded passionately that a strong corporate culture can best be established by no other means. Many other responses such as these emerged in the course of the interview, all of which led the researcher to conclude that the CEO was a transformational leader in his role as chief executive of this major food service

organization. Many of the comments from the interview were ultimately employed as descriptors for the shared cultural values questionnaire which the researcher used in this study (Appendix A).

Data Collection

Site Selection

This study was conducted at the corporate offices of a major restaurant chain which realized \$560 million in sales for 1986. The firm's revenue in 1986 should qualify it as San Diego's largest private company. In 1986 there were 830 franchises with 6,480 employees. The company was selected for this study not only on the basis of its national reputation as an excellent company (based on annual sales, employee satisfaction and customer satisfaction), but primarily on the basis of the leader's reputation among local chief executives for creating a strong organizational culture. The CEO asked that the company remain anonymous in reporting this research; therefore, further description of the company and the CEO is not possible.

Sample Selection

The sample for this study includes only those individuals who have been with the organization for at least two years and who regularly (weekly) interact (face-to-face) with the CEO. Such regular interaction allowed for a more accurate evaluation of communicator competence and homophily

of the CEO. The sample consists of 21 males and 12 females. The CEO referred to these 33 individuals as his "circle." Of the 33 individuals, 15 are vice presidents and the remaining 18 are senior division managers. These 33 individuals are the only individuals in the company who directly report to the CEO on a weekly basis, usually two to three times a week. Other than the Board of Directors, these individuals are the top 33 managers in the company.

Thirty of the 33 individuals responded to the survey which was distributed in early October, 1986. A 92% response rate was achieved, which is favorable for a volunteer survey study. Although the sample may appear small, given the nature of the study, 30 respondents are sufficient for a correlational analysis (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jars, 1979). Secluding the sample to this core group of 30 allowed for a valid sample in that these individuals were the only employees in the company who could have accurately responded to the communication questionnaires, given the nature of the questions. As Borg and Gall (1983) indicated, studies that employ correlational analysis through survey instruments demand more of the subjects than observational studies, and consequently it is virtually impossible to obtain the cooperation of all subjects selected by random, which results in a volunteer sample.

Description of Instrumentation

The shared cultural value questionnaire (see Appendix A) was constructed to determine the degree to which the 30

participants shared the cultural values of the CEO. The researcher developed the instrument according to the considerations for questionnaire development established by Borg and Gall (1983). These considerations included developing questions congruent with the language of the sample or organization, establishing clarity, avoiding lengthy items as well as items which may appear as psychologically or professionally threatening (p. 419). The development of the questionnaire involved two steps in generating data for constructing the items.

The first step consisted of two one-hour interviews with the CEO. The purpose of these interviews was to gather descriptors of the organization's cultural values as espoused by the CEO. The interviews were highly interactive in nature. The researcher would first summarize a general response to a question made by the CEO, which took perhaps five minutes, and then reduced this explanation to a specific statement which reflected a general cultural value of the organization. Once the statement was formulated, the CEO was asked to agree or disagree with the statement. Basically, the CEO had to analyze the meaning of the statement and evaluate its accuracy in reflecting a cultural norm of the CEO and the organization.

When the CEO disagreed with the formulated statement, a discussion would follow until some consensus was achieved on a reformulated statement. When the CEO agreed that a statement was accurate, the researcher proceeded to the next statement. In this way, the cultural norms were codified

much as Borg and Gall (1983) suggested: "if open-ended questions are used in survey research, the 'open-ended' information that is obtained must be codified so that it can be analyzed and reported quantitatively" (p. 406).

A seven point Likert scale was utilized to not only comply with the other instruments, but to allow for consistency in familiarity for the respondents and statistical ease for the researcher. Although Likert scales could involve any number of points, Likert himself suggested that the seven point scale is not only reliable but discriminates well for an interval scale (Likert, 1932).

The first interview resulted in the generation of 27 codified items. In the second interview, which was conducted one week later, the researcher generated another eight items, which included four opposite descriptors to create reflective items for reliability analysis (see Appendix A, numbers 7, 15, 23, and 27 for reflective items). These negative items guarded against the temptation for respondents to assume all items were positive, and therefore answering all the questions in a blanket fashion. The second interview began with a review of the first 27 items generated in the previous conference to make sure that the CEO was still in agreement with the statements. Some minor changes did result from this review, but the focus of the second interview remained the generation of additional statements of cultural norms as well as items which could be termed countercultural values (values in opposition to those articulated by the CEO).

The second phase of developing the shared cultural

values questionnaire consisted of allowing the CEO to review the 35 items on his own for two weeks. This researcher encouraged the CEO to keep the items exposed on his desk to promote constant review and provide ample opportunity to make those revisions which he felt appropriate. Again, minor changes in phraseology resulted from this process.

The statements were sent back to the researcher and Likert-type scales (Likert, 1932) were attached to each statement. As Blalock and Blalock (1968) suggested, Likert-type scales are very appropriate for correlational analysis where the item responses are analyzed collectively. They further argued that, "there is no apparent reason why the Likert model should not apply as well to cognitive- and behavioral-subject scales as to the affective-subject scales. The only modification required for application to these other classes of scales is in the content of the item pool" (p. 97).

To establish validation of the questionnaire items, an expert panel consisting of two organizational researchers and a research methodologist was assembled. Each panel member was selected on the basis of his/her expertise in research and methodology in the organizational sciences. All three members are nationally known in their respective disciplines for their research expertise. The three panel members are quantitative researchers with ample experience in instrument development and have considerable background in the study of organizational culture. Two members hold the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree in organizational

communication while the other individual holds the Ph.D. in statistics and methodology. All three members are active researchers in the organizational sciences as well as acting professors at the University level. Although the panel never converged collectively, each member was sent the questionnaire independently and was asked for his/her contribution by mail or phone. Upon receipt of their input, the suggestions were integrated into the questionnaire. This process was repeated twice before all members granted approval of the instrument.

The purpose of this panel was to determine the face validity, or in Kerlinger's (1979) terms, the content validity of the questionnaire. Although the panel made several suggestions that resulted in changes of phraseology, they agree that by using the language specific to the organization, respondents were able to not only identify with the values stated in the instrument, but also the general concept which underlies these values. Additionally, the panel agreed that the instrument not only maintains content validity, but it also appears to have construct validity, which is paramount in this study. In achieving the construct validity of the instrument, the panel also provided input into the development of the instructions of the questionnaire, which are critical in clarifying to the respondent the intent and objective of the study. As Blalock and Blalock (1968) suggested, construct validity should be determined in reference to variables, not people per se. "Although people are the source of data, social

science is interested in the variables which people represent" (p. 391). Thus, when the panel evaluated the items and instructions of the instrument collectively, they agreed that the questionnaire would determine the degree to which organizational members share the cultural values of the CEO.

The questionnaire was typed, printed, and distributed in early October, 1986. The respondents were asked to rate the degree to which their beliefs and/or behaviors at their job site reflect each item. The aggregate score for the 35 items serves as the respondents' score for shared culture.

The Communicator Competence Questionnaire (CCQ) (Appendix B) designed by Monge et al. (1981) was incorporated into the study to determine the respondents' perception of the CEO's communication competence. The items represent encoding and decoding skills appropriate in an organizational context. Seven encoding items focus on behaviors such as the ability to express one's ideas clearly, having the ability to get right to the point, and being easy to understand. Five decoding items focus on skills such as listening, responding to messages quickly, and sensitivity to others. Several studies have used the CCQ, all of which reported reliability coefficients (Cronbach's Alpha) of over .80 (Monge et al., 1981). The developers established the validity of the instrument by use of several item analyses which yielded a range of coefficients from .76 to .92. Having employed the instrument in over four major studies, Monge et al. (1981) concluded that the CCQ is not only

predictively valid, but it also maintains construct validity. Smith and Hellweg (1985) also employed the CCQ in their study of supervisors' communication competence and found the questionnaire to be reliable, yielding a .87 alpha level.

The homophily instrument (Appendix C) developed by McCroskey, Richmond, and Daly (1974) is employed in this study to determine the followers' perception of homophily between the leader and themselves. The instrument contains 16 semantic differential items, four reflecting each of the following dimensions: (a) attitude, (b) value, (c) background, and (d) appearance. All internal reliability coefficients were computed for the instrument, and they ranged from .80 to .86. McCroskey and Richmond (1979) reviewed eight studies employing these homophily scales and concluded that, "taken together, these studies indicate that the homophily scales indeed have predictive validity" (p. 5). Chillcoat and Dewine (1984) also found the homophily scales to be extremely reliable, ranging from .69 to .92 in their study of homophily and electronic mediated communication. Research conducted by Andersen and Kibler (1976) as well as Andersen and de Mancillas (1978) also provided similar findings regarding the validity of the homophily scales. In their studies of political candidates, Andersen and his associates reported reliability coefficients ranging from .74 to .84, further supporting the validity of the scale.

Procedure

The participants received the three questionnaires, a cover letter (Appendix D), and a stamped envelope for the return of the materials. The questionnaires were sent directly to the individuals through the mail. The cover letter stressed that their responses were strictly confidential, that they would only be used for research purposes, and that they would be reported anonymously in aggregate form. The cover letter had also stressed that the study had been approved by their CEO, but that it was not initiated by him. A brief description of the purpose of the study was included for the respondents. Participation in the study was voluntary and anonymous. Given principles underlying survey research, particularly via mail, a response rate of 50% or better is considered acceptable (Babbie, 1973). Therefore, with a response rate of 92%, a second mailing was not needed.

Data Analysis

Scoring for the questionnaires was based on a seven point scale, with seven being the most positive response and one being the most negative response, with reflective items reversed to follow this order. The scoring of the instruments was consistent with the authors of the CCQ and the homophily questionnaire. The researcher collapsed the seven point scales into three groups (1 through 3.5 as low; 3.5 through 4.5 as moderate; 4.5 through 7 as high) so that he could analyze the data for frequency of responses in

these three groups.

When the data were received and entered into a computer, a preliminary test was performed to assess the reliability of all three instruments. The reliability program in SPSS (Hull & Nie, 1981) was employed, using Cronbach's Alpha for internal consistency. The computation program for reliability is designed to be used in those situations where the goal is to assess how reliable a sum or weighted sum across variables is as an estimate of a case's true score. In general, the concept of reliability refers to how accurate, on the average, the estimate of the true score is in a population of subjects to be measured.

For the main analysis, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients were computed to test for hypotheses one through five and the first four research questions. The fifth research question concerning prediction was tested by employing a stepwise multiple regression analysis. A subsequent frequency test was employed to provide a representation of the cluster range of responses regarding culture and communication competence as well as culture and homophily. The 35 items on the shared cultural values questionnaire were analyzed collectively, with a possible point spread of 35 to 245. The aggregate sum was subsequently factored in the analysis as the dependent or criterion variable. This shared culture score was then subjected to correlational and regression analysis with the homophily data, which constituted the points generated from

a 15 point homophily scale, with a possible spread of 15 to 105. The shared culture score was also subjected to correlational and regression analysis with the points generated from the communication competence questionnaire. The subscales of the competence questionnaire consisted of six items with a possible spread of 6 to 421 and collectively consisted of twelve items with a possible spread of 12 to 84. The homophily data and the communication competence data, both encoding and decoding, were factored into the analysis as the independent variables. The correlation and regression analyses provided the statistical data necessary to test all hypotheses and research questions posited in the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Survey Results

The data generated from this study were subjected to a variety of statistical procedures. Three instruments were employed to generate the data necessary for analyzing the relationship between communication competence, homophily, and a follower's degree of shared culture. It should be noted that in all hypotheses and research questions, the variable of shared culture is always determined by the data generated by the shared cultural values questionnaire (all 35 items). The homophily variable referred to in this study is always determined by the homophily questionnaire (all 16 items) whereas the communication competence variable is always determined by the communicator competence questionnaire (CCQ) (all 12 items), with encoding competence determined by items 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 10 on the CCQ, and decoding competence determined by items 2, 4, 6, 9, 11, and 12 respectively.

In order to ensure valid data, all three instruments were first subjected to the SPSS reliability program (Hull & Nie, 1981) which employs Cronbach's Alpha to determine the internal consistency of the responses. All instruments proved to be reliable and consistent with past results,

yielding alpha levels of .65 to .87 respectively (see Table 2). Although the homophily measure yielded an alpha level of only .65, which is not optimal for research (Blalock & Blalock, 1968), it was sufficient to be included in the study. Therefore, all items were included in the subsequent testing of hypotheses. The two subscales of the communication competence questionnaire proved to be reliable when analyzed collectively, yielding an alpha of .83. The encoding subscale, however, yielded an alpha of .53 with the decoding subscale yielding an alpha of .82. Therefore, the results concerning the encoding variable must be interpreted with limited confidence.

An expert panel was assembled to determine the content validity of the shared cultural values questionnaire. This was the only questionnaire of the three reviewed by the panel, given that the communication competence and homophily questionnaires have been previously validated by their authors (McCroskey et al., 1974; Monge et al., 1981).

Descriptive Statistics

Table 3 reports the descriptive statistics for each of the variables included in this study. Given that each questionnaire utilized a seven point Likert scale, this researcher divided each group of data into three categories. These categories were based on a per item average. An average score of 1 to 3.5 was considered low, an average score of 3.5 to 4.5 was considered moderate, and an average score of 4.5 to 7 was considered high. Given the nature

Table 2

Reliability Coefficients for All Variables

Variable	Number of Items	Number of Cases	Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha)
Shared Culture	35	30	.868
Communication Competence	12	30	.833
Encoding Subscale	6	30	.536
Decoding Subscale	6	30	.821
Homophily	16	30	.654

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for All Variables

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Number of Cases
Shared Culture (245 possible)	186.92	18.33	(147 to 228)	30
Communication Competence (84 possible)	63.07	8.73	(43 to 75)	30
Encoding Subscale (42 possible)	31.84	3.31	(25 to 36)	30
Decoding Subscale (42 possible)	31.23	6.15	(18 to 39)	30
Homophily (112 possible)	54.96	9.87	(41 to 72)	30

of the variables involved in the study, this breakdown and categorization of data is not only appropriate, but it also provides clarification in interpreting the data. The frequencies of responses for each questionnaire are reported in Table 4.

The shared cultural values questionnaire has a total of 35 items and a possible score of 245. Therefore, a total score of 35 to 122.5 is considered a low degree of shared culture; a total score of 122.5 to 157.5 is considered moderate; and a total score of 157.5 to 245 is considered a high degree of shared culture. The mean generated by the shared cultural values questionnaire was 186.92 with a standard deviation of 18.33, which, according to the categorized breakdown, is a high degree of shared culture. The responses of shared culture ranged from a low of 147 to a high of 228. Of the 30 respondents, 27 fell into the high range, 3 fell into the moderate range, and none fell into the low range. Therefore, in terms of the cultural values depicted on the questionnaire, the existing shared culture among the responding sample is very high. This high degree of shared culture also serves to implicitly reinforce the precondition of the CEO as a transformational leader.

The communicator competence questionnaire is comprised of 12 items, 6 of which refer to encoding (sending) competence and 6 of which refer to decoding (receiving) competence. A total score of 84 is possible, with 12 to 42 considered low competence, 42 to 54 considered moderate competence, and

Table 4

Frequency Summary of Survey Response

Variable	Low	Moderate	High	Total Cases
Shared Culture (possible 245)	0 (35-122.5)	3 (122.5-157.5)	27 (157.5-245)	30
Communication Competence (possible 84)	0 (12-42)	9 (42-54)	21 (54-84)	30
Encoding (possible 42)	0 (6-21)	5 (21-27)	25 (27-42)	30
Decoding (possible 42)	4 (6-21)	6 (21-27)	20 (27-42)	30
Homophily (possible 112)	16 (16-56)	13 (56-72)	1 (72-112)	30
Communication Competence and Homophily Combined (possible 196)	7 (28-98)	15 (98-126)	8 (126-196)	30

54 to 84 considered high communication competence. The mean generated by the respondents on the competence measure was 63.07 with a standard deviation of 8.73. The responses ranged from 43 to 75, with zero responses falling into the low category, 9 falling into the moderate category, and 21 falling into the high category. Therefore, two-thirds of the participants perceived their CEO to be a highly competent communicator in terms of encoding and decoding skills, with the other third perceiving him to be a moderately competent communicator. In terms of the six encoding items, a mean of 31.84 was generated with a standard deviation of 3.31. A total score of 42 is possible, with 6 to 21 as low encoding competence, 21 to 27 as moderate, and 27 to 42 as high. The scores ranged from 25 to 36, with none in the low category, 5 in the moderate category, and 25 falling in the high category. The decoding subscale also consists of 6 items, generating a mean of 31.23 and a standard deviation of 6.15. A greater range resulted with the decoding measure, with a low of 18 and a high of 39. Four scores fell into the low category, with 6 falling into the moderate range and 20 into the high competence category. Therefore, the majority of respondents perceived their CEO to be a highly competent decoder, with a third, however, perceiving him to be moderate to low in this category.

The homophily scale consists of 16 items, with a possible total score of 112. The resulting mean was 54.96 with a standard deviation of 9.87. The responses ranged

from 41 to 72, with the majority of respondents falling into the low or moderate categories. Specifically, 16 scores fell into the low category, with 13 falling into the moderate range. Thus, the majority of respondents perceived their CEO to be different from themselves in terms of values, attitude, appearance, and background.

A general summary of the resulting correlation and regression analysis follows with specific results from each hypothesis and research question.

Hypothesis One

Correlational analysis was used to test whether a follower's shared culture score will yield a statistically significant correlation with the follower's perception of the leader's encoding ability (items 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 10 on the CCQ). The null hypothesis was retained with a low correlation yielding an r of .98 ($p = .34$). See Table 5 for the results of the correlational procedures for each of the hypotheses.

Although the literature cited in this study suggests that a leader's ability to send messages effectively (encoding competence) ultimately impacts on various organizational outcomes such as shared culture, the results of the study failed to confirm such a relationship. Moreover, the relationship between encoding and shared culture, which is referred to in the first hypothesis, failed to yield a statistically significant correlation. Based on the data analysis in the study, not only did encoding competence fail

Table 5

Hypotheses Summary of Correlations

Hypothesis	r	r ²	Sample	Significance
H ₁ : Culture by Encoding	.08	.006	30	.34
H ₂ : Culture by Decoding	.34	.116	30	.04
H ₃ : Culture by Communication Competence (encoding and decoding)	.27	.072	30	.09
H ₄ : Culture by Homophily	.07	.004	30	.36
H ₅ : Culture by Communication Competence and Homophily	.18	.032	30	.20

to yield a statistically significant correlation, it also failed to be a statistically significant predictor in determining the degree of shared culture among the followers. From a possible 42 points, the leader in this study achieved an average of 32 (or 5.3 per item on the 7 point scale) which is relatively high, based on the three categories of low, moderate, and high. This indicates that the leader was an effective message sender; however, the perceptions of his competence did not significantly correlate with the followers' degree of shared culture, based on the correlational analysis performed.

Hypothesis Two

A correlational procedure was again used to determine if a follower's score of shared culture would yield a significant correlation with the follower's perception of the leader's decoding ability (items 2, 4, 6, 9, 11, and 12 on the CCQ). The null hypothesis was rejected with a resultant r of .34 ($p = .04$). Although this correlation is rather modest, it is the most significant correlation of all variables tested as well as the only one that rejected the null hypothesis.

With a possible 42 points, the leader in this study achieved an average of 31 on the decoding measure, similar to that of the encoding factor. This again is a relatively high per item rating, 5.2 on the 7 point scale. This finding indicates that the greater one's perception of the leader's decoding ability (i.e., sensitivity, listening well,

responses on target, etc.), the greater the likelihood will be of the follower sharing the culture of the organization as espoused by the leader. The decoding factor, however, was not a statistically significant predictor of the followers' degree of shared culture, as determined by the regression analysis.

Hypothesis Three

The correlational analysis was employed to test whether the followers' score of shared culture would yield a significant correlation with the followers' perception of the communication competence (encoding and decoding) of the leader. The correlation coefficient resulting from the analysis was an r of .27 ($p = .09$), which was insufficient to reject the null hypothesis. Although the decoding factor yielded a significant correlation, when factored into the correlation equation with the encoding variable, the resulting correlation coefficient diminished slightly, enough to deny a statistically significant correlation. The average rating was a 63 out of a possible 84, or a 5.2 per item average. Nearly a third of the respondents (9) perceive their leader to be a moderately competent communicator, with two-thirds (21) perceiving him to be highly competent. Given the wide variance of responses, the communication competence construct failed to emerge as a statistically significant correlate and predictor of the followers' degree of shared culture.

Hypothesis Four

The correlational procedure was used to determine if the

followers' score of shared culture would yield a significant correlation with the followers' perceived homophily with the leader. The resulting coefficient was the lowest of the five correlations with an r of .07 ($p = .36$), again resulting in the retention of the null hypothesis. The average rating for the homophily measure was 55 out of a possible 112. Unlike the previous communication variables, the homophily between the followers and the leader was only slightly above the moderate range, with an average per item rating of 3.4 on a 7 point scale. Sixteen of the 30 respondents indicate that a low degree of homophily exists between them and their leader, with 13 indicating that a moderate degree of homophily exists, and only one indicating that a high degree of homophily exists. Thus, the data suggest that the majority of sampled followers perceive themselves to have low to moderate levels of similarity in terms of attitude, value, background, and appearance.

Hypothesis Five

The correlational analysis was employed to test if the followers' score of shared culture would yield a significant correlation with the followers' perceptions of the communication competence and homophily of the leader. The null hypothesis was retained with the correlation yielding an r of .18 ($p = .20$). Given the results of the previous hypotheses, with the majority of correlations failing to establish statistical significance, it is not surprising

that this null hypothesis was also retained. From a possible 196, the average collective response was 118, or 4.2 per item average on a 7 point scale, which is only slightly above average. These results infer that communication competence and homophily collectively failed in establishing a statistically significant correlation with the followers' degree of shared culture. Given that homophily yielded such a low correlation when analyzed independently, it was not a surprise that the correlation resulting from the collective analysis (communication and homophily) also failed to establish statistical significance.

Research Questions

The four research questions which referred to correlations between the various communication variables revealed two interesting points. The first point is that homophily failed to correlate with encoding, decoding, or the collective construct. The second point is that the correlation between encoding and decoding established strong statistical significance and therefore was analyzed collectively as suggested by Monge et al. (1981). See Table 6 for the results of the correlational analysis for the first four research questions.

In research question one, a correlational analysis was used to determine the relationship between communication competence and homophily. The resulting correlation failed to establish statistical significance, yielding an r of .11 ($p = .29$).

A correlational analysis was employed in research

Table 6

Summary of Research Questions One,
Two, Three, and Four

Variable	r	r ²	Significance
RQ ₁ : Communication Competence by Homophily	.11	.012	.29
RQ ₂ : Encoding by Decoding	.67	.44	.001
RQ ₃ : Encoding by Homophily	.02	.0004	.45
RQ ₄ : Decoding by Homophily	.14	.019	.23

question two to determine the relationship between encoding and decoding of the communication competence questionnaire. The resulting correlation yielded an r of .67 ($p = .001$), establishing strong statistical significance. Encoding and decoding were subsequently analyzed collectively as a single construct. Given that the communication competence construct is comprised of two concepts, encoding and decoding, Monge et al. (1981) contended that they should be significantly correlated with each other. If there is not a significant correlation between the two, then the entire construct is questionable.

A correlational analysis was performed to determine the relationship between encoding and homophily. The correlation analysis yielded an r of .02 ($p = .45$), which also fails to establish statistical significance. A correlational analysis was also employed in research question four to test the relationship between decoding and homophily. This correlation resulted in an r of .14 ($p = .23$), which again fails to establish statistical significance.

In research question five, the researcher employed a stepwise regression analysis to determine which communication variable (encoding, decoding, communication competence, and homophily), independently or collectively, would be the most significant predictor of the followers' degree of shared culture (see Table 7). The homophily variable yielded the least significant result with a Beta of .006 and an F value of .000 ($p = .98$). The encoding variable yielded a Beta of

Table 7

Research Question Five: Regression Summary

Variable	Beta	F value	Significance
Homophily	.006	.000	.98
Encoding	-1.43	.95	.33
Decoding	1.52	3.61	.07
Communication Competence	(insufficient tolerance)		

-1.43 and an F value of .95 ($p = .33$). The decoding value yielded a Beta of 1.52 and an F value of 3.61 ($p = .07$); an F value of 4.23 ($p = .05$) is needed to establish statistical significance. The communication competence variable could not be analyzed at all due to insufficient tolerance.

Given that the data generated from the regression analysis failed to establish statistical significance, the researcher loaded all the variables into the regression analysis and the results yielded a multiple R of .39 ($R^2 = .15$) resulting in an F value of 1.3. ($p = .29$) (see Table 8).

Table 8

Regression Summary for Combined Variables

Variable	Multiple R	r square	Significance
Homophily, Communication Competence	.39	.15	.29

An F value of 2.74 is needed to establish a significant R value at a .05 alpha level. Thus, when all communication variables (communication competence and homophily) were analyzed collectively, the resulting predictor statistic (multiple R) fell shy of being a statistically significant predictor of the followers' shared culture. Therefore, the only predictor variable of the followers' degree of shared culture, for which a statistically significant correlation

was established, is the followers' perception of the decoding ability of the leader.

The correlational tests employed in this study revealed that all of the null hypotheses, with the exception of the second hypothesis, were retained on the basis that the correlation coefficients failed to establish statistical significance. Aside from the second research question, all of the research questions regarding the interrelationship of the communication variables failed to produce statistically significant results. As a result, several interesting points emerge concerning the nature of communication and transformational leadership. The following chapter discusses the conclusions drawn from this data and the relationship to leadership theory and research.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND DISCUSSION

Summary

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between the followers' perceptions of a leader's communication competence and homophily and the degree to which the followers share the cultural values espoused by the leader. A chief executive officer of a national restaurant chain was selected for this research based on his transformational qualities described in Chapter Three. Thirty of 33 high ranking executives responded to the survey instruments, which provided the data necessary for determining the relationship between the variables involved in this study. Three questionnaires were used, two of which (the Communicator Competence Questionnaire and the Homophily Scale) had been used in several other studies with successful validity and reliability measures. The researcher developed the shared culture instrument through a process of interviews with both the leader and a selected number of the followers. Content validity for the shared cultural values questionnaire was established through an expert panel who reviewed the instrument. Upon the completion of the review, the researcher

implemented the few recommendations made by the panel. These recommendations primarily dealt with the phraseology of items. The panel considered the instrument to maintain both content and construct validity. The reliability of each questionnaire was established through the reliability program of SPSS which analyzes internal consistency.

A review of literature provided the rationale for generating four hypotheses and five research questions. Each hypothesis refers to a question of correlation between the dependent variable of shared culture and the independent variables of communication competence, encoding, decoding, and homophily. The first four research questions refer to the correlation between the various communication variables (encoding, decoding, communication competence, and homophily). The fifth research question is one of prediction regarding the communication variables and shared culture. Only one statistically significant correlation emerges from the hypotheses. The followers' perceptions of the decoding competence of the leader positively correlated with the followers' degree of shared culture. Thus, the decoding perceptions are the most significant predictors of the followers' degree of shared culture. The encoding and decoding factors are also highly correlated. The conclusions and implications which emerge from the results of the data analysis are discussed in subsequent sections of this chapter.

Conclusions

Several conclusions can be advanced based on the results of this research. The first conclusion refers to the reliability and validity of the instruments employed in the study. The Communicator Competence Questionnaire and the Homophily Instrument again maintained their reliability in this study. Moreover, the content or face validity of these instruments is consistent with the validity found in previous studies conducted by their authors. When comparing the information received from the five random followers in the initial phone interviews establishing the transformational quality of the leader with the information received by the communication competence and homophily questionnaires, the researcher concluded that the two questionnaires accurately reflected the followers' general perception of the leader's communication competence and homophily.

The shared cultural values questionnaire developed in conjunction with the leader proved to be very reliable and was well received. Based on the review of the expert panel, the questionnaire was a valid indicator of the degree to which followers shared the cultural values espoused by the leader. Although an organization's true culture manifests itself through several means, the core of a culture clearly revolves around the central values of that organization and its leaders. Therefore, such an instrument as the shared cultural values questionnaire can be a very helpful tool for both researchers and practitioners in establishing the

degree of shared culture within an organization. An added feature of both the Communicator Competence Questionnaire and the Homophily Scale was the simplicity with which they could be administered and completed. These two aspects are extremely helpful in conducting research in the organizational context, particularly at the executive level.

Aside from the qualitative approaches advanced to study organizational culture, few if any quantitative methodologies have been developed in an attempt to study this phenomenon. Because culture is such an abstract and often times intangible reality, researchers in the past have rarely attempted to reduce the concept of culture to a tangible set of values and concepts worthy of quantified measure. Although the instrument developed in this study is by no means the final answer to quantifying culture, it does represent a step towards measuring the degree to which followers share the values of their leader which ultimately become the central core of some resultant culture. At the present time, it is probably accurate to state that culture can not be measured, it can only be described. Activities can be documented, behaviors can be recognized, and values can be determined, but we cannot measure an organization's culture because in the purest sense of the word, a culture is the amalgamation of the assumptions and behaviors of every person in the organization and the result of environmental impact and the past histories of the organization and society.

The second conclusion which emerges from this research

is that the followers perceived the leader to be a highly competent communicator; however, the degree of perceived homophily (similarity in terms of values, attitudes, background and appearance) by his followers is relatively low to moderate. In spite of these perceptions by the followers, their degree of shared culture with the leader was very congruent. This high degree of shared culture also serves to reinforce the fact that the leader in this study had truly established a strong organizational culture, in terms of both excellence and morality. Although it cannot be said conclusively, the leader in this study exemplified his transformational ability by first articulating his values, vision, and purpose, as evidenced in the questionnaire, and second, by establishing a high degree of congruence among his followers, as evidenced by the results. Such themes as morality, honesty, integrity, customer care and motivation consistently appear throughout the questionnaire. In such a competitive industry as food service, it is rare to find individuals who are more concerned with raising the morality and motivation of their followers than raising the value of their stock in the market.

A third conclusion resulting from this research is that communication competence and homophily failed to establish a statistically significant correlation with the followers' degree of shared culture. When considering just the low degree of homophily indicated by the followers, the conclusion is easily understood; however, given that the degree of shared culture was high among followers and their

perceptions of the leader's communication competence was also high, the conclusion becomes a bit more perplexing. Although this researcher still maintains that communication is an essential element of transformational leadership, it is evident that the communication variables examined in this study (encoding and decoding) failed to represent the central means by which leaders communicate their values to an organization.

Although the results of this research are surely not conclusive, they may reveal that leaders in large organizations must rely on other measures of communication than encoding and decoding ability to induce cultural values into their followers. Effective encoding and decoding skills are not sufficient in and of themselves to create a strong organizational culture. The results of this research do not suggest that communication competence and homophily are unimportant to transformational leadership, but rather this study failed to establish a statistically significant correlation between communication competence, homophily, and shared culture. One cannot argue, based on the results of this study, that the greater a leader's communication competence and perceived homophily, the greater the likelihood for his/her followers to share the espoused values of the leader. Had the resulting correlation coefficients established statistical significance, such a conclusion could have been considered.

As a result of the data analysis, a statistically significant correlation did emerge from the second hypothesis.

A modest, but significant, correlation was identified between the followers' perceptions of the leader's decoding competence and the degree of the followers' shared culture. Although the decoding variable yielded a modest correlation, it was the only communication variable tested, independently and collectively, which resulted in a statistically significant correlation. This implies that a leader's sensitivity, empathy, and listening behaviors can potentially impact the degree to which followers share in the organizational value system. To be sure, correlational analysis does not determine cause or effect. However, in the context of this research, the data analysis revealed that a leader's listening capacity (decoding competence) is statistically correlated with the followers' degree of shared culture with the leader. If transformational leadership is truly meeting of mutual goals and sincere care for the followers, then it logically follows that the more competent a leader is in the process of decoding, the greater the accuracy of information he/she will receive from followers, and thus, the better the position of the leader will be in to make decisions that reflect not only his/her values but also the wants and needs of the followers.

Most scholars of transformational leadership would argue that a leader must be knowledgeable and empathic of his/her followers. This knowledge and empathy are most likely attained through the process of listening and follower responsiveness. Therefore, elements of this decoding process are likely to appear in the pragmatic application of

transformational leadership.

The fourth conclusion emanating from this research involves the relationship between encoding and decoding. This correlation was found to be statistically significant, indicating that both variables are closely related. Monge et al. (1981) argued that a communication competence construct in an organizational context is likely to contain only two factors, encoding and decoding, which should be highly correlated. These scholars advocated that communication competence is one construct, but contains two correlational variables. Their argument is predicated upon the fact that encoding and decoding must be correlated in order to assume that communication competence is one behavioral construct. If encoding and decoding were not correlated, the communication competence construct would have to be reexamined for its validity. It is possible that encoding and decoding are two separate competencies independent of each other and therefore warrant independent analysis. But this research and that of other scholars lends support to the view that encoding and decoding are two parts of one construct labeled communication competence.

The homophily construct failed to establish a significant correlation among encoding, decoding, and communication competence. Although homophily between supervisor and subordinate has been found to be a statistically significant correlate to many other organizational variables (i.e., employee satisfaction, employee stability, productivity, etc.), it appears that the construct may have limited impact

in the realm of transformational leadership. Although, from a psychological standpoint, perceived similarity is an important determinant in the process of social bonding (shared culture), there may be other factors of homophily than appearance, value, background, and attitude that are more relevant to the process of transformational leadership and shared organizational culture. These more relevant factors may be similar goals, similar levels of organizational commitment and passion, similar background assumptions, and other such variables.

Discussion

This study explores the relationship of a leader's communication competence and the degree to which his followers shared his espoused values which comprise the organization's culture. The results of this study failed to establish a statistically significant relationship between the followers' shared culture and their perceptions of the leader's communication competence and homophily. The results of this research did reveal that decoding is a statistically significant correlate and predictor of the followers' shared culture relative to the other communication variables examined (encoding, communication competence, and homophily). In light of these findings, several interesting implications arise concerning the nature of transformational leadership and communication.

From Stogdill's (1974) study which identified 43 traits of leaders, to Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) situational

approach, traditional theories of leadership have consistently stated that a leader's behavioral traits (i.e., communication skills, consideration, initiating structure, flexibility, etc.) are directly related to his/her success as a leader. With the onset of alternative views such as Burns (1978), Bennis (1985), Schein (1985), and Peters and Austin (1986), traditional views of leadership have come under serious question. As Rost (1985b) suggested, "These are sure signs that something significant is in the wind, that a whole new paradigm is emerging giving a new definition to the concept of leadership" (p. 3). Although many qualitative and historical scholars of leadership have voiced support for the notion that transformational leadership is much more complex than just a set of behavioral traits, they continue to advocate that particular conditions and higher characteristics, such as morality, motivation, passion, etc., are necessary for the leaders in the process of transformation. The fact remains that the scholars of transformational leadership are simply introducing a new set of traits and conditions believed to make up the construct of leadership. The evolving view of transformational leadership is, perhaps, that some traits are necessary in the process of leading, but the traits that Burns, Peters and Austin, Bennis, and Schein cite (morality, motivation, educate by example, passion, vision, etc.) are much more abstract and intangible than those that were typically researched in the 1950s and 1960s.

Many of the early studies on leadership attempted to

isolate the characteristics of people, distinguishing leaders from nonleaders. Nearly every trait and behavior, from weight to activity, has been examined, but the results have been equivocal. The initial belief that leaders shared common characteristics across situations has not been borne out (McCall, 1983). In his extensive review, Stogdill (1974) failed to reveal any conclusive traits common to all leaders. Although several characteristics were identified, Stogdill maintained that the characteristics found were only associated with some aspect of leadership. Stogdill characterized leaders as having:

a strong drive for responsibility and task completion, vigor and persistence in pursuit of goals, venturesomeness and originality in problem solving, drive to exercise initiative in social situations, self-confidence and sense of personal identity, willingness to accept consequences of decision and action, readiness to absorb interpersonal stress, willingness to tolerate frustration and delay, ability to influence other persons' behavior, and capacity to structure social interaction systems to the purpose at hand. (p. 81)

A careful reading of these traits reveals that the consideration of the followers' morality and motivation as well as their overall well being is totally neglected. For all due purposes, an individual such as Hitler would be considered a leader according to these various traits.

Perhaps the most devastating flaw in the early studies of leadership is the confusion between leadership and

management. As Bass (1981) contends, there can be no new theory of leadership until scholars understand the difference between management and leadership. When considering the traits identified by Stogdill (1974), it is nearly impossible to differentiate between management and leadership characteristics. Within the new evolving view of transformational leadership there lie traits and principles that transcend the behavioral and personality characteristics of early definitions. This new evolving view is creating an understanding of leadership distinctly different from the concept of management. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the new set of traits emerging is much more philosophical, intangible, and even spiritual than those identified in earlier studies. As Burns (1978) advocated, transformational leaders are concerned with mutual goal attainment between leader and follower, not just personal goal attainment as described by Stogdill (1974). Leaders exercise influence, not authority--they compete for followers, rather than have the followers assigned to them (Burns, 1978). Leaders have vision and purpose to elevate their followers to higher levels of morality and motivation, not to simply meet organizational objectives (Rost, 1985b). Leaders persistently communicate their vision to establish unity and common purpose resulting in a strong organizational culture (Peters & Austin, 1985; Schein, 1985). Above all, leaders transform their own wants and needs and those of their followers to higher levels of ethical aspirations and conduct (Rost, 1985b). This transformational process is achieved through constant

education, particularly education by example, not prescription. Although there are many differences between leadership and management, the distinguishing factor with leadership is the inherent concern for the followers. It is this very theme that leads this researcher to maintain that effective listening (decoding) practices on the part of the leader are an essential element in not only determining the wants and needs of the followers, but also in meeting them.

With the exception of the decoding element, the variables examined in this study (communication competence and homophily) appear to fall into the more traditional category stemming from the human relations movement of the 1930s and the updating of that same movement in the 1960s and the 1970s. The results of this study, therefore, lend credence to the new view of leadership that the human relations traits are not what is important to transforming leadership but the higher level, follower oriented, traits may be.

In terms of communication, this researcher still maintains that communication competence and homophily are necessary to transformational leadership, but the factors that make up these two communication constructs are likely inappropriate. As stated earlier, homophily or perceived similarity is necessary to any form of social bonding such as shared culture, but not necessarily in the form of appearance, background, values, and attitudes. Furthermore, communication competence is also necessary for leaders, but

perhaps more of a focus needs to be put on the decoding factor or follower responsiveness. For example, in a recent study, Redmond (1985) found that the relationship between perceived communication competence and perceived empathy yielded a correlation coefficient of .98, indicating that communication competence is nearly synonymous with perceived empathy. Similar studies (Smith & Hellweg, 1985) also suggest that the traditional view of communication competence (eloquent, articulate, dynamic, etc.) is being replaced by a view that emphasizes empathy and sensitivity (decoding) and deemphasizes dynamism and elocution (encoding). For even in the midst of receiving messages (decoding), a message is being sent; in other words, someone may say that he/she cares, but it is the person who shows it that is more effectively communicating.

Although this research failed to establish what traits are necessary for leaders to have, it should encourage further research into the skills and traits necessary for leaders to be effective at transforming organizational cultures. Aside from examining the relationship between communication competence and shared culture, the intent of this research is to encourage scholars of leadership to begin investigating a new set of traits or skills that more accurately reflect what transforming leaders need to shape an organizational culture.

Most modern leadership theorists contradict themselves by decrying trait theories of leadership while at the same time producing a new list of traits that they believe are

necessary for transformational leaders. In the opinion of this researcher, they would better serve the emerging theories of leadership by openly admitting that they are suggesting a whole new set of traits or skills for transforming leaders. In that way they could reject the old theories because of the traits selected but at the same time they would honestly admit that what they are, in part, doing is developing a new set of traits to incorporate into transformational leadership theory.

To develop a list of skills and traits seems intuitively necessary if transformational leadership theory is going to serve practicing leaders as well as those aspiring to practice leadership. In order for the theory and practice of leadership to be continually advanced, tangible concepts must be researched to allow for the construction of theories that are both understandable intellectually and attainable behaviorally. Moreover, given that training has traditionally echoed theory, it is of particular importance to both researcher and practitioner that leadership theory accurately state the traits and skills necessary for transformational leadership.

Although it may be more intellectually pure to glorify such concepts as transformational leadership by not developing any practical theories that leaders could use, it is not really intellectually fruitful or very helpful. If Lewin (1951) is right in stating that "there is nothing more practical than a good theory," there must be more to a theory than just an interrelated set of concepts. This

is not to say that all science and theory must be practical, for surely that is not the case. However, if the intent of generating leadership theory is to benefit society in any particular context--which this researcher believes it is--then leadership theorists must always keep the practicing leader in mind, for the ultimate purpose of any inquiry is to benefit humanity by having an impact on the quality of our lives. If transformational leadership is educating by example, promoting value, vision, and purpose, raising the morals and motivation of followers, attaining mutual goals, and creating a strong organizational culture, then let us not be ashamed to say it. Anyone astute to the system of language is surely aware that inherent in the exchange of language is diminished meaning, distorted reality, and even squelshed glory. Scholars must keep in mind that transformational leadership is not only glorious, it is greatly needed in today's society and organizations. As conscientious educators and scholars, let us not quarantine the truth of leadership by secretly guarding the concept by strategic, intellectual rhetoric. We must realize that more damage is caused by keeping transformational leadership an intellectual philosophy than by reducing it to a common set of traits, behaviors, or skills that practicing leaders can use to be more effective in transforming organizations and ultimately society.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Constraints common to all quantitative and qualitative

survey research certainly apply to this study. In all qualitative survey research, complex and abstract phenomena such as culture, communication competence, and homophily become reduced to a series of items on a questionnaire. In qualitative research which was employed to construct the shared cultural value questionnaire, the information--the cultural descriptors--was isolated to the language and phraseology of the leader. Therefore, the issues of validity and generalizability are always pressing ones.

Quantitative studies, on the other hand, are often misleading to the readers if they are unaware of the analysis used in determining the results. For example, in this study, it is easy to assume that communication competence and homophily are not salient variables in the manifestation of transformational leadership and shared culture. This, however, is not indicated by this study at all. Rather, in this research design communication competence and homophily do not individually or simultaneously correlate with the followers' shared culture. Correlational studies such as this should serve as only exploratory investigations into hypothesized relationships never before studied. Correlational studies should never be interpreted as conclusive evidence of what is important or not, and particularly, what variable causes some effect.

A serious concern in this study revolves around the choice of the person studied and whether or not he is a transformational leader. This is a concern because this is a study of transformational leadership and if the CEO

is not a transforming leader, the research is useless as a study of such leadership. Since it would have taken a complete study in and of itself to precisely determine the transformational quality of this leader, the researcher had to make some decisions on whether the CEO was a transforming leader on the basis of the background knowledge the researcher obtained concerning the CEO's leadership, the reputation the CEO has as a leader among other executives in Southern California, and the information collected by interviewing both the leader and selected followers.

Although any subjective (qualitative) inquiry may appear to be the antithesis of objective (quantitative) inquiry, it is often the integration of the two approaches that yields the richest data. In achieving that kind of integration in this study, the researcher is confident that not only did he select a real transforming leader but that he researched the relationship between transformational leadership and communication competence and homophily in the shaping of an organization's culture.

Although 30 out of a possible 33 responded to the survey, the sample may still be considered relatively small. With this sample size, it is impossible to achieve a randomized sample. Furthermore, given that the sample consisted of high ranking executives, there is a considerable degree of homogeneity likely among the sample, thus affecting the results in terms of variation and deviation of responses. This, in part, could have accounted for the insignificant correlations between the communication

variables and shared culture. Generally speaking, the greater the variance in responses, the more likely a correlation will result, either positively or negatively, if any relationship between variables will result at all.

Although several conditions may have accounted for the statistically insignificant correlations, the validity of the shared cultural values questionnaire must be subjected again to careful examination. As acknowledged by the expert panel, the instrument did maintain face validity; however, it may have discriminatory weakness in differentiating between high and low levels of shared cultural values. Therefore, without discriminatory power, the resulting data may fail to significantly correlate with any independent variable.

In addition, the generalizability of the results remains questionable given that the study includes only one organization and its leader. However, because the research was conducted in an ongoing organization, the results are more generalizable to actual organizations than are laboratory results.

Another important aspect of this study is the characteristics of the organization and respondents from which the data were gathered. Because the organization in this study chose to remain anonymous, specific descriptions of the leader and followers are unfortunately not possible. Goldhaber, Yates, Porter, and Lesniak (1978) maintained that a more detailed explanation of the organization under study in terms of such things as structure, internal

properties, demographics of employees, and relationships to the environment will produce better descriptions of the context wherein communication and leadership variables are studied. For example, this study was limited to only a single organization that differed in unspecified ways from other organizations. In order to fully understand an organization's culture and leaders, there is a need to specify the defining attributes of the organizational setting within which communication and leadership is being studied.

Each of these limitations warrants serious attention on the part of the researcher. However, organizations should also aid researchers in their attempt to understand and ultimately impact organizations for the common good. In order for researchers to receive needed support and cooperation from organizations, applied research must be emphasized. As Goldhaber et al. (1978) contended:

Organizations are unlikely to contribute their resources to research if the results of research are irrelevant to the solution of their problems. In applied research, the quality of application is just as important as the quality of research, and a concern for developing practical solutions for the problems faced by organizations must become a central focus in the study of organizational communication. (p. 93)

The major strength of this study lies in its bold attempt in researching from a quantitative perspective two concepts that have traditionally been confined to the

qualitative realm of research: leader communication and shared organizational culture. With the pervasive influence of the transformational leadership model and the popularity of a cultural understanding of leadership and organizations, the need for quality research in these areas continues to intensify. Not only has this need intensified in academic circles, but practitioners in the organizations continue to voice their desire for more knowledge concerning these two variables. The demand (thirst) for understanding transforming leadership makes sense when considering that the literature on organizational culture reveals that effective and productive organizations maintain a sense of shared values which collectively propel such organizations to their desired ends.

Harrison (1984) maintained that transformational leaders align the values of their followers with the higher order values of the organization. If this view is accurate, both practitioners and researchers alike should be interested in determining the degree of alignment among organizational members. As a result, this study represents a revolutionary approach in determining not only what the organizational values are but also by proposing a method to measure the degree of alignment of these values. With such abstract concepts as transformational leadership and organizational culture, the methodological tendency is to approach these areas from a qualitative or ethnographic perspective. Such approaches are clearly superior when contrasted with quantitative approaches; however, they are not superior

when contrasted with a multiple method approach. As Siehl and Martin (1983) contended, multiple methods greatly enrich the credibility of research results, or as Porter and Roberts (1976) advocated, multiple methods greatly increase the validity and generalizability of the research findings. The results of this study suggest that a quantitative approach should be coupled with qualitative methods to create a more workable and effective multiple approach to understanding transformational leadership and organizational culture. This issue of methodology becomes a critical concern, because as Redding (1979) argued, the efficacy of any type of organizational theory, be it leadership or communication, is based upon researcher advocacy:

There are a number of acceptable "styles of inquiry."
. . . Each is based upon an interlocking set of philosophical assumptions, and so long as the researcher can rationally explicate these assumptions and their entailments, he or she can defend research carried out which is congruent with any one of these styles. (p. 315)

An additional strength, which is also related to methodology, is the fact that the followers' perceptions of the leader were a central element in the analysis of this study. Sigman et al. (1984) stated that the majority of leadership studies have neglected the examination and consideration of the followers' perceptions of their leader. Although perceptions may be problematic when

analyzing some variables, they tend to be accurate indicators of communication ability in that communication is significantly receiver based. Moreover, the only accurate judge of one's communicative ability is the individual being communicated with. The followers' perceptions are not only important for the researcher to recognize, they are also imperative for the leader to consider. In explaining the importance of followers, Hollander (1984) stated that:

The process called leadership very much depends upon the relationship between leader and followers. The leader is central to that process, and he or she is usually seen as the source of favorable or unfavorable features of the relationship and the results produced. But followers are not merely passive or inert, as the traditional view would have it. Leadership requires responsiveness, cooperation, and a distribution of labor. This fact necessitates a more active role for followers--"a piece of the action" in the vernacular--and its absence may be the basis for the current crisis in leadership. (p. 31)

The followers examined in this study consisted of individuals in positions of close proximity and high interaction with the leader, which enabled them to accurately and critically evaluate the communication competence and homophily of their leader. Often times the temptation to achieve a large sample results in surveying people who are not qualified for one reason or another to respond to the issues under investigation.

A common concern in the organizational communication and culture fields is the paucity of reliable measurement indices (Edwards & Monge, 1977). Hence, the Communication Competence Questionnaire should be a welcomed instrument given the continued high reliability achieved by the instrument. This researcher would, however, encourage the continued independent analysis of the encoding and decoding factors, given that the decoding measure appears to be emerging as a complete construct in and of itself. The Homophily Scale, on the other hand, warrants further scrutiny for its moderate reliability results. As stated earlier, the homophily construct may be a valid construct for understanding leadership; however, further research must be conducted to determine the most relevant factors that relate to transforming leaders shaping a shared organizational culture. The newly developed shared cultural values questionnaire, which achieved the highest reliability among these instruments, merits further investigation as it has considerable promise as a new instrument for effectively measuring shared culture.

Considerations for Future Research

This present study introduces an alternative approach to the study of shared culture and leader communication. Many new ideas emerged from this study that warrant future research. Future investigations in these areas may look at other mediums for communicating values. These mediums may be symbolic language, rituals, heroic action, norms,

storytelling, and the reward/reprimand structure of the organization. Although the respondents in this study did show a high degree of shared culture, they reported little agreement on the perceived homophily with their leader and moderate agreement on the communication competence of their leader. Such levels of agreement may be due in part to the fact that the leader may have been competent and homophilous in areas other than the factors explored in this study. If such a point is accurate, this could also account for the low correlations achieved in this study. The data indicate that the values espoused by the leader definitely permeated the group of followers and impacted on their behavior. Therefore, the message was communicated, but the communicated message was not primarily related to the communication competence and homophily of the leader.

The results of this study should also prompt researchers to investigate further the notion of shared leadership, rather than the leadership exercised by one individual. Such a notion could also have accounted for the results of this study. It would be interesting to explore the communication competence of a number of individuals known to exercise transformational leadership with the assumption being that true transformational leaders distribute and delegate particular tasks and functions to others to share in the transformational process. Shared leadership may also account for the fact that some transformational leaders appear to lack some particular trait or competence. In actuality, they may have simply allowed other leaders to

exercise their skills and thus share in the leadership process.

One specific dimension which warrants future investigation is the decoding skills or listening and responsiveness of the leader. Although the correlation between decoding competence of the leader and the degree of shared culture by the followers is a modest one, it is the only correlation generated by the hypotheses which proved to be statistically significant. Based on Redmond's (1985) research and now this study, aspects of decoding such as listening, responsiveness, and empathy appear to be conceptually significant in our attempt to understand transformational leadership.

A final consideration for future research involves the continued use of the shared cultural values instrument and its method of development. This researcher does not recommend that the instrument be used independently, but rather used as a subsequent instrument for validating qualitative data. This researcher would also recommend that this study be replicated at the management level to determine if communication competence and homophily are distinguishing factors between leadership and management. As noted in the literature review, the majority of organizational communication studies have focused on supervisors, managers, and positional leaders, not necessarily transformational leaders. As a result, the high correlations found in these studies could have been due in part to the fact that the individuals studied were actually managers and not leaders at all. Given the emerging conceptualizations of organizational

culture and transformational leadership, future researchers need to continually focus on refining these concepts and ultimately begin to explore the causal elements of an organization's culture and the transformational elements of leadership.

In conclusion, transformational leadership should be continuously studied in the realm of organizational culture. Researchers and scholars alike need to continually research, discover, and develop leadership skills and traits necessary for transforming followers by shaping organizational cultures. As Edgar Schein (1985) concluded:

A dynamic analysis of organizational culture makes it clear that leadership is intertwined with culture formation, evolution, transformation, and destruction. Culture is created in the first instance by the actions of leaders; culture also is embedded and strengthened by leaders. When culture becomes dysfunctional, leadership is needed to help the group unlearn some of its cultural assumptions and learn new assumptions. Such transformations require what amounts to conscious and deliberate destruction of cultural elements, and it is this aspect of cultural dynamics that makes leadership important and difficult to define. In fact, the endless discussion of what leadership is and is not could, perhaps, be simplified if we recognized that the unique and essential function of leadership is the manipulation of culture. (pp. 316-317)

Final Comments

There is increasing consensus that leaders are not born, they are taught. As researchers and educators of transformational leadership, it is time we become aggressive in our attempts to discover the tangible elements contained in the process of transformation. We cannot continue to advocate that leadership is a learned phenomenon while simultaneously disguising and guarding the concepts that underlie this phenomenon. Exploratory research such as this study should be continuously carried out in hopes of discovering, either by chance or elimination, the critical components that make up the construct of transformational leadership. Furthermore, if leaders are creators and shapers of organizational culture as Schein (1985) suggests, further investigation into this concept is also warranted for those of us involved in the process of leadership training. For one cannot be taught to drive a car without first understanding the various operational functions of the car--just as one cannot be taught to lead followers without first understanding the cultural values of the followers.

Leadership and culture are complex phenomena; we will never come to understand the complexity of these phenomena, let alone transfer the understanding, until we begin descriptively identifying the concepts comprised in each. If the result is a simplified theory of traits and concepts, so be it. For let it never be said that the crisis facing leadership today is our unwillingness to explore and describe the sometimes infamous features of transformational

leadership and organizational culture.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Allen, R. R., & Brown, K. L. (Eds.). (1976). Developing communication competence. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co.
- Allen, R. R., & Wood, B. (1978). Beyond reading and writing in communication competence. Communication Education, 27, 286-292.
- Allison, G. T. (1984). Public and private administrative leadership: Are they fundamentally alike in all unimportant respects? In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), Leadership and organizational culture (pp. 214-239). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Altman, T., & Taylor, D. A. (1973). Social penetration. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Andersen, P. A. (1975). The effects of source credibility, attraction, and homophily on voter preference. (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 31, 7068A.
- Andersen, P. A., & de Mancillas, W. R. T. (1978). Scales for the measurement of homophily with public figures. The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 43, 169-179.
- Andersen, P. A., & Kibler, R. J. (1976, April). The effect of source credibility, attraction, and homophily on voter preference. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Portland, OR.
- Argyle, M. (1969). Social interaction. New York: Atherton Press.
- Argyris, C. (1964). Integrating the individual and the organization. New York: John Wiley.
- Babbie, E. R. (1973). Survey research methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Backlund, P. M. (1978). Defining communication competence. In C. Larson, P. Backlund, M. Redmond, & A. Barbour (Eds.), Assessing functional communication. Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 153 275).
- Barge, J. K., & Johnson, K. M. (1985, November). Forms of conversation and perceptions of effective leadership in an organization. Paper presented at the Central States Speech Communication Association Convention, Indianapolis, IN.

- Barnard, C. I. (1938). The functions of the executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1960). Leadership, psychology, and organizational behavior. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bass, B. M. (1981). Stogdill's handbook of leadership. New York: Free Press.
- Bennis, W. (1984). Leadership and empowerment. New York: William Morrow.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders. New York: Harper & Row.
- Berger, C. R., & Calabrese, R. J. (1975). Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication. Human Communication Research, 1, 99-112.
- Beyer, J. M. (1981). Ideologies, values, and decision making in organizations. In P. C. Nystrom & W. H. Starbuck (Eds.), Handbook of organizational design (Vol. 2, pp. 166-202). London: Oxford University Press.
- Blalock, H. M., & Blalock, A. B. (1968). Methodology in social research. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1983). Educational research. New York: Longman.
- Bormann, E. G. (1983). Symbolic convergence: Organizational communication and culture. In L. L. Putnam & M. E. Pacanowsky (Eds.), Communication and organizations (pp. 99-122). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bostrom, R. R. (Ed.). (1984). Competence in communication. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Burke, K. (1969). A rhetoric of motives. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.
- Byrne, D. (1971). The attraction paradigm. New York: Academic Press.
- Byrne, D., Bond, M. H., & Diamond, M. J. (1969). Responses to political candidates as a function of attitude similarity and dissimilarity. Human Relations, 22, 251-262.
- Campbell, J. D., Dunnette, M. D., Lawler, E. E., & Weick, K. E. (1970). Managerial behavior, performance, and effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Chillcoat, Y., & Dewine, S. (1984, November). Electronically mediated communication and its impact on receiver perceptions of source credibility, interpersonal attractiveness, and homophily. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago, IL.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). Aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1967). Current issues in linguistic theory. New York: Mouton Press.
- Clore, G. L., & Byrne, D. (1974). A reinforcement affect model of attraction. In T. Huston (Ed.), Foundations of interpersonal attraction (pp. 143-170). New York: Academic Press.
- Daly, J. A., McCroskey, J. C., & Falcione, R. L. (1976, November). Homophily-heterophily and the prediction of supervisor satisfaction. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Portland, OR.
- Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyadic linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13, 46-78.
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. (1982). Corporate culture. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- DiMarco, N. J. (1974). Supervisor-subordinate life style and interpersonal need compatibilities as determinants of subordinate's attitudes toward the supervisor. Academy of Management Journal, 17, 575-578.
- Duran, R. L. (1982). Communicative competence: A question of context. Paper presented at the Eastern Communication Association Convention, Boston, MA.
- Duran, R. L., Zakahi, W. R., & Parrish, S. C. (1981, November). Communicative adaptability: An extension of content and construct validity. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Anaheim, CA.
- Eblen, A. L. (1985, November). Communication, leadership, and commitment in the organization. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago, IL.
- Edelman, M. (1977). Political language. New York: Academic Press.
- Edwards, J. A., & Monge, P. R. (1977). The validation of mathematical indices of communication structures. In B.

- Ruben (Ed.), Communication yearbook 1 (pp. 298-316). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Evan, W. (1974). Culture and organizational systems. Organization and Administration Science, 5, 1-16.
- Festinger, L. (1954). Theory of social comparison processes. Human Relations, 7, 117-140.
- Fimans, B. G. (1973). An investigation of the relationships among supervisory attitudes, behaviors, and output: An examination of McGregor's Theory Y. Personnel Psychology, 26, 95-105.
- Flowers, V. S., & Hughes, C. L. (1973). Why employees stay. Harvard Business Review, 51, 49-51.
- Frost, P. I., Moore, L. F., Louis, M. R., Lundberg, C. C., & Martin, J. (1985). Organizational culture. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gephart, R. (1978). Status degradation and organizational succession: An ethnomethodological approach. Administrative Science Quarterly, 23, 553-581.
- Gibb, C. A. (1969). Leadership. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology (2nd ed.) (Vol. 4, pp. 160-180). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Goldhaber, G., Yates, M., Porter, D., & Lesniak, R. (1978). Organizational communication: 1978. Human Communication Research, 5, 76-96.
- Golightly, C., Huffman, D. M., & Byrne, D. (1972). Liking and loathing. Journal of Applied Psychology, 56, 521-523.
- Good, L. R., & Good, K. C. (1974). Similarity of attitudes and attraction to an occupation. Psychological Reports, 35, 703-706.
- Graham, G. H. (1971). Interpersonal attraction as a basis for the informal organization. Academy of Management Journal, 11, 483-496.
- Gudykunst, W. B., Steward, L. D., & Toomey, S. T. (Eds.). (1985). Communication, culture, and organizational processes. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Habermas, J. (1970). Toward a theory of communicative competence. In H. P. Dreitzel (Ed.), Recent sociology (pp. 319-332). London: Macmillan.
- Hale, C. L. (1980). Cognitive complexity-simplicity as a determinant of communication effectiveness. Communication Monographs, 47, 304-311.

- Hale, C. L., & Delia, J. G. (1976). Cognitive complexity and social perspective-taking. Communication Monographs, 43, 195-203.
- Harrison, R. (1984). Leadership and strategy for a new age. In J. D. Adams, Transforming work (pp. 97-112). Alexander, VA: Miles River Press.
- Heider, F. (1959). The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: John Wiley.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). Management of organizational behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hickman, C. R., & Silva, M. A. (1984). Creating excellence. New York: New American Library.
- Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1979). Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hirsch, P. (1980). Ambushes, shootouts, and knights of the round table: The language of corporate takeovers. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Convention, Detroit, MI.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). Culture's consequences. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hollander, E. P. (1978). Leadership dynamics: A practical guide to effective relationships. New York: Free Press.
- Hollander, E. P. (1984). What is the crisis of leadership. In W. E. Rosenback & R. L. Taylor (Eds.), Contemporary issues in leadership (pp. 31-41). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Homans, G. C. (1950). The human group. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.
- Hoseman, L. A. (1979, November). Communicative competence: Adult's understanding of direct and indirect speech acts. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, San Antonio, TX.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics: Selected readings (pp. 6-24). Baltimore, MD: Penguin Press.
- Jaco, D. E., & Shepard, N. M. (1975). Demographic homogeneity and spousal consensus: A methodological perspective. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 37, 161-171.
- James, J. (1951). Clique organizations in a small

- industrial plant. Research Studies, State College of Washington at Pullman, 125-130.
- Kellerman, B. (1984). Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1979). Behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Kochan, T., Schmidt, S., & Decotis, T. (1975). Superior-subordinate relations: Leadership and headship. Human Relations, 28, 279-294.
- Langer, E. (1978). Rethinking the role of thought in social interaction. In J. Harvey, W. Ickes, & R. Kidd (Eds.), New directions in attribution research: Vol. 2 (pp. 35-58). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- LaPorte, T. R. (1965). Conditions of strain and accomodation in industrial research organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 10, 21-38.
- Larson, C. E., Backlund, P. M., Redmond, M. K., & Barbour, A. (1978, May). Assessing communicative competence. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Minneapolis, MN.
- Lazerfeld, P. F., & Merton, R. K. (1954). Friendship as a social process: A substantive and methodological analysis. In M. Berger, T. Abel, & C. Page (Eds.), Freedom and control in modern society (pp. 18-66). New York: D. Van Nostrand.
- Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory in social science. New York: Harper & Row.
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. Archives of Psychology, 140, 126-140.
- Margulies, N. (1969). Matching the individual to the organization. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 5(4), 491-508.
- Martin, J. (1982). Stories and scripts in organizational settings. In A. Hastorf & A. Isen (Eds.), Cognitive social psychology (pp. 148-161). New York: Elsevier-North Holland.
- McCall, M. W. (1983). Leaders and leadership: Of substance and shadow. In J. R. Hackman, E. E. Lawler, & L. W. Porter (Eds.), Perspectives on behavior in organizations (pp. 476-485). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McCall, M. W., & Lombardo, M. (1978). Leadership: Where else can we go? Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- McCoy, C. S. (1985). Management of values: The ethical difference in corporate policy and performance. Boston: Pitman Publishing Inc.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1982). Communication competence and performance: A research and pedagogical perspective. Communication Education, 31, 1-7.
- McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., & Daly, J. A. (1974, May). Toward the measurement of perceived homophily in interpersonal communication. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, New Orleans, LO.
- Meyer, J. W., & Scott, W. R. (1983). Organizational environments. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). The nature of managerial work. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mitroff, I. I., & Kilman, R. H. (1976). On organizational stories: An approach to the design and analysis of organizations through myths and stories. In R. H. Kilman, L. R. Pondy, & D. P. Steven (Eds.), The management of organizational design (pp. 80-102). New York: North Holland.
- Moore, M. R. (1981, November). A dynamic vs. a static perspective of communication competence: Implications for communication instruction in higher education. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Anaheim, CA.
- Monge, P. R., Bachman, S. G., Dillard, J. P., & Eisenberg, E. M. (1981). Communicator competence in the workplace: Model testing and scale development. In M. Burgoon (Ed.), Communication yearbook 5 (pp. 505-527). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Morgan, G. (1980). Paradigms, metaphors, and puzzle solving in organization theory. Administrative Science Quarterly, 30, 605-621.
- Naisbitt, J., & Aburdene, P. (1985). Reinventing the corporation. New York: Warner Books, Inc.
- Newcomb, T. M. (1961). The acquaintance process. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Nieburn, H. L. (1973). Culture storm. New York: St. Martin.
- Pacanowsky, M. E. (1982). Organizational identities as organization products: Presentation of self among Valley View police. The Communicator, 12, 18-34.

- Pacanowsky, M. E., & O'Donnell-Trujillo, N. (1982). Communication and organizational cultures. The Western Journal of Speech Communication, 46, 115-130.
- Pacanowsky, M. E., & O'Donnell-Trujillo, N. (1983). Organizational communication as cultural performance. Speech Monographs, 50, 126-147.
- Parks, M. R. (1977, August). Issues in the explication of communicative competency. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, Phoenix, AZ.
- Pendley, L. E., Hawkins, B., & Peterson, T. (1984). Supervisory interpersonal communication and leadership behavior. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Convention, Boston, MA.
- Peters, T. J. (1983). Leadership: Sad facts and silver linings. In Eliza G. C. Collins (Ed.), Executive success: Making it in management (pp. 202-213). New York: John Wiley.
- Peters, T. J., & Austin, N. (1985). A passion for excellence. New York: Random House.
- Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). In search of excellence. New York: Random House.
- Pettigrew, A. (1979). On studying organizational culture. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 570-581.
- Pfeffer, J. (1981a). Power in organizations. London: Pitman Press.
- Pfeffer, J. (1981b). Management as symbolic action: The creation and maintenance of organizational paradigms. In L. Cummings & B. Staw (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior (Vol. 5, pp. 206-231). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Pffiffner, J. (1951). The supervision of personnel: Human relations in the management of men. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Pondy, L. R. (1978). Leadership is a language game. In M. McCall & M. Lombardo (Eds.), Leadership: Where else can we go? (pp. 210-238). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Pondy, L. R., & Smircish, L. (Eds.). (1983). Organizational symbolism. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Porter, L. W., & Roberts, K. (1976). Communication in organizations. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 105-120).

Chicago: Rand-McNally.

- Rambo, W. W. (1982). Work and organizational behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Redmond, M. V. (1985). The relationship between perceived communication competence and perceived empathy. Communication Monographs, 52, 377-381.
- Richmond, V. P. (1974, November). The relationship of perceived competence and homophily to opinion leadership in the educational environment. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago, IL.
- Rogers, E. M. (1973). Mass media and interpersonal communication. In I. De Sola Pool, F. W. Frey, W. Schramm, N. Maccoby, & E. B. Parker (Eds.), Handbook of communication (pp. 218-240). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Rogers, E. M., & Shoemaker, F. (1971). Communication of innovations: A cross cultural approach. New York: Free Press.
- Roloff, M. E. (1981). Interpersonal communication: The social exchange approach. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Rosenback, W. E., & Taylor, R. L. (Eds.). (1984). Contemporary issues in leadership. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Rost, J. C. (1985a). Shaping the school culture for educational excellence: The nature of transforming leadership. Paper presented at the California Principal's Conference, Anaheim, CA.
- Rost, J. C. (1985b, October). Distinguishing leadership and management: A new consensus. Paper presented at the Symposium on Transforming Leadership, Organizational Development Network National Conference, San Francisco, CA.
- Rubin, D. L. (1977). Prologue to a theory of communicative competence. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.
- Salmans, S. (1983, January 7). New vogue: Company culture. New York Times, p. 1, Business Section.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schon, D. A. (1984). Leadership as reflection-in-action. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), Leadership and organizational culture (pp. 36-63). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

- Selznick, P. (1957). Leadership and administration: A sociological interpretation. New York: Harper & Row.
- Senger, J. (1971). Managers' perceptions of subordinates' competence as a function of personal value orientation. Academy of Management Journal, 14, 415-423.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Leadership as cultural expression. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), Leadership and organizational culture (pp. 105-114). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Corbally, J. E. (Eds.). (1984). Leadership and organizational culture. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Shaw, M. E. (1971). Group dynamics. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Siehl, C. (1985). After the founder: An opportunity to manage culture. In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), Organizational culture (pp. 125-140). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Siehl, C., & Martin, J. (1983). Measuring organizational culture. (Research Paper No. 654). Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- Siehl, C., & Martin, J. (1984). The role of symbolic management: How can managers effectively transmit organizational culture? In J. G. Hunt, D. M. Hosking, C. A. Schriesheim, & R. L. Stewart (Eds.), Leaders and managers (pp. 109-138). New York: Pergamon.
- Sigman, G. R., Sigman, J. A., & Husband, R. L. (1984, November). Leadership: The interpersonally conjunctive crossroads of organizational life. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago, IL.
- Skinner, B. F. (1974). About behaviorism. New York: Knopf.
- Smircish, L., & Morgan, G. (1982). Leadership: The management of meaning. Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences, 18(3), 257-273.
- Smith, A. F., & Hellweg, S. A. (1985, May). Work and supervisor satisfaction as a function of subordinate perceptions of communication competence of self and supervisor. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Honolulu, HI.
- Smith, G. D., & Steadman, L. E. (1982). The present value of corporate history. Harvard Business Review, 4, 69-74.
- Spitzberg, B. H. (1981, November). Competence in

communicating: A taxonomy, review, critique, and predictive model. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Anaheim, CA.

- Spitzberg, B. H. (1983). Communication competence as knowledge, skill, and impression. Communication Education, 32, 323-329.
- Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (1981, November). Self-monitoring and relational competence. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Anaheim, CA.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). Handbook of leadership. New York: Free Press.
- Van Maanan, J. (1979). The fact of fiction in organizational ethnography. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 539-551.
- Van Maanan, J., & Barley, S. R. (1985). Cultural organization: Fragments of a theory. In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), Organizational culture (pp. 31-55). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Weick, K. E. (1983). Organizational communication: Toward a research agenda. In L. L. Putnam & M. E. Pacanowsky (Eds.), Communication and organizations (pp. 13-30). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Wiemann, J. M. (1977). Explication and test of a model of communication competence. Human Communication Research, 3, 195-213.
- Wilkins, A. L. (1978). Organizational stories as an expression of management philosophy: Implications for social control in organizations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.
- Wharton, J., & Worthley, J. (1981). A perspective on the challenge of public management: Environmental paradox and organizational culture. Academy of Management Review, 6(3), 357-361.
- Wolfe, T. (1979). The right stuff. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, Publishers.
- Wood, M. T., & Soebel, R. S. (1970). Effects of similarity of leadership style at two levels of management on the job satisfaction of first level managers. Personnel Psychology, 23, 577-590.
- Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and leaders: Are they different? Harvard Business Review, 55(3), 67-78.

Zaleznik. A. (1983). Managers and leaders: Are they different? In Eliza G. C. Collins (Ed.), Executive success: Making it in management (pp. 123-139). New York: John Wiley.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SHARED CULTURAL VALUES QUESTIONNAIRE

The following is a list of quotes, concepts, values, and goals that may or may not be evident at your company. Please rate the degree to which your beliefs and/or behaviors at your company reflect each item. I am attempting to determine the degree to which these items are commonly shared and practiced at your company. Your responses are strictly confidential.

7 = behaviors and/or beliefs are strongly reflective
 1 = behaviors and/or beliefs are not at all reflective
 (please circle appropriate number)

1. If it's worth doing, it's worth doing well.
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. Treat others as you would like to be treated.
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. Practice what you preach.
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. Don't ask people what you are unwilling to do.
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. Our company is working toward becoming the Nordstrom's
 of fast food.
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. Business is a system--the input is reflective of the
 output.
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. To be successful, work should be your life.
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. Always do your very best.
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. Work should be a good time.
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. The best way to lead is by example.
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. Involvement leads to success.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. Always be concerned with the individual.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. Quality and Service are the fundamental goals.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. Consistency is necessary for success.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. Bottomline is more important than morals and ethics.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. Consider every option before making a decision.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. Work should not be your god.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. Balance in life is necessary for success.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. When in question, always do what is morally and ethically right.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. Integrity is of utmost importance in business.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. Admitting mistakes is healthy.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. Always service the guest.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. Satisfy yourself before the customer.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24. Professionalism is essential.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. Friendliness is a key to success.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26. Work should be your second family.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27. One success equals some other failure.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28. Work relationships and friendships should be somewhat separate.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
29. Differences are healthy.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
30. You must like what you are doing in order to do it well.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
31. Change is the life blood of an organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
32. Education and learning are cornerstones for this company's employees.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
33. This company is not a democratic society: only the central players should be the decision makers.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
34. Without a clear goal, neither people nor the company will get very far.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
35. Work life and family/social life should remain separate.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

APPENDIX B

COMMUNICATOR COMPETENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

In this series of questions, I would like you to describe how your CEO communicates. Think about his behavior in general, rather than about specific situations.

In responding to the statements below, please use the following scale:

<u>YES!</u> = very strong agreement	<u>NO!</u> = very strong disagreement
YES = strong agreement	NO = strong disagreement
yes = mild agreement	no = mild disagreement
? = neutral feelings or don't know	

1. The CEO has a good command of the language.
YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!
2. The CEO is sensitive to others' needs of the moment.
YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!
3. The CEO typically gets right to the point.
YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!
4. The CEO pays attention to what other people say to him.
YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!
5. The CEO can deal with others effectively.
YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!
6. The CEO is a good listener.
YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!
7. The CEO's writing is difficult to understand.
YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!
8. The CEO expresses his ideas clearly.
YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!
9. The CEO is difficult to understand when he speaks.
YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!
10. The CEO generally says the right thing at the right time.
YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!
11. The CEO is easy to talk to.
YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!
12. The CEO usually responds to messages (memos, phone calls, reports, etc.) quickly.
YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

Thank you for your response

APPENDIX C

HOMOPHILY SCALE

The following items concern your perception of the CEO in this study. Your responses will remain anonymous; the CEO will not see your responses to these items. Place an X on the appropriate position for each scale item.

Economic situation different from mine	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Economic situ- ation like mine
Morals unlike mine	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Morals like mine
Looks similar to me	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Looks different from me
Status like mine	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Status different from mine
Doesn't resemble me	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Resembles me
Shares my values	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Doesn't share my values
Similar to me	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Different from me
Treats people like I do	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Doesn't treat people like I do
Behaves like me	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Doesn't behave like me
Different size than I am	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Same size as I am
Doesn't think like me	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Thinks like me
Sexual attitudes unlike mine	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Sexual attitudes like mine
Unlike me	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Like me
Background different from mine	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Background simi- lar to mine
Appearance like mine	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Appearance unlike mine

APPENDIX D
COVER LETTER

Enclosed you will find three brief questionnaires regarding your thoughts on your company and your CEO. Your CEO was kind enough to allow me to interview him as well as allow me to conduct this study for the final phase of my doctoral dissertation at the University of San Diego.

Given that there are only 33 of you participating in this study, it is critical for me to receive all of your responses. The three questionnaires should not take any longer than 7-10 minutes. I realize your time is precious, and therefore I have made these questionnaires as brief as possible.

I am attempting to assess the correlation between the perceived communication competence of a CEO and the degree to which individuals agree or adhere to various values of the organization. You should be assured that all responses are strictly confidential. All responses will be anonymous and reported only in aggregate form. Please return the completed questionnaires to me in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope at your earliest convenience.

I will send you a brief copy of the results upon completion. Again, I wish to thank you for your time and concern. I hope you realize the degree to which your participation helps me in this important step of my education.

If you have any questions regarding the questionnaires or the study itself, please feel free to contact me at 295-7879.

Sincerely,

Anthony F. Smith