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ABSTRACT

Exploring the Quality of the Leader-Follower Relationship and its Effect on Followers’ Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in a Public-Service Organization

by Kristina Zaragoza

Purpose: The purpose of this sequential, explanatory mixed-methods study was to identify and describe to what extent the quality of the leader-follower relationship, as perceived by followers, affects followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors in a public-service organization.

Methodology: A sequential mixed-methods study was the chosen design for this study as it allowed the researcher to conduct the study in phases. The first phase consisted of quantitative research in the form of a survey questionnaire that measured followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors demonstrated toward individuals and the organization. The researcher then conducted semistructured, face-to-face interviews that measured the quality of the leader-follower relationship to gain a deeper understanding of the effect the leader-follower relationship has on followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors.

Findings: Followers working in a public-service organization engage in organizational citizenship behaviors at a moderate to high level, freely giving their time to assist coworkers and to a lesser extent, their organization. Those who identified experiencing a high-quality leader-follower relationship spoke highly of their leader, the opportunities they are given to be creative in their service to the public, and their ability to work as a team to accomplish desired results.
Conclusions: Followers working in a public-service organization understand and accept the responsibilities that come with keeping the public trust and achieve personal satisfaction in fulfilling the needs of others. Public-service followers go above and beyond in their job duties regardless of the quality of relationship they experience with their leader. However, public-service followers who experience a high-quality relationship with their leader experience a deeper satisfaction in their work relationships, in their contributions, and in public service.

Recommendations: Additional research is needed in the area of public-service leadership, public-service followership, and the public-service customer. It would be beneficial to replicate this study in one or more public-service organizations to gain further data that can help better understand the leader-follower relationship and its effect on followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors in a public-service organization.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The United States of America finds itself in a precarious situation; its infrastructure is crumbling (Friedman & Mandelbaum, 2011), stringent regulations and burdensome taxes are challenging U.S. businesses (Gattuso & Katz, 2016), many U.S. businesses have relocated overseas or have outsourced key components of their business (Amadeo, 2017), and American family incomes remain stagnant (Proctor, Semega, & Kollar, 2016). President Trump met with key U.S. business leaders on his first full business day in office to address the challenges facing America. He advised the prominent business group that he intended to reduce business regulations in the United States by approximately 75% (Fox Business, 2017), further indicating the urgency to free American businesses of cumbersome regulations and taxes.

Less than a year into his presidency, the advanced estimate of GDP released by the Bureau of Economic Analysis reported the real gross domestic product (GDP) increased by 3.0% in the third quarter of 2017, and the second quarter of 2017 the GDP increased 3.1% (Aversa, 2017). While this is encouraging news, economic strategists suggest something more than reduced regulations and taxes are needed. According to the American Customer Satisfaction Index (2014), “Without strong consumer demand, the economic recovery will continue to be tepid” (p. 2).

Consumer spending in the United States accounts for approximately two thirds of the GDP (Mataloni, 2017), indicating a direct connection between consumers, business, and the U.S. economy. Furthermore, researchers have determined customer satisfaction is a crucial element to securing the success of most businesses (Berry, Parasuraman, & Zeithaml, 1988, 1994; Chang, 2016; Heymann, 2015). The American Customer
Satisfaction Index ([ACSI], 2014) was created to track customer satisfaction, providing insight into companies’ or an industry’s financial stability and potential success or failure. The October 2017 national ACSI report shows national consumer satisfaction increased each quarter of 2016 and the first quarter of 2017 but then dropped .4% to 76.7 in the second quarter of 2017 (Fornell, 2017). Looking specifically at the customer satisfaction rate for the government sector, the October 2017 report shows a score of 68 for the federal government and a score of 72.5 for local government (ACSI, 2017), both well below the national customer satisfaction rate of 76.7.

Customer satisfaction is a phenomenon that has been a topic of research for many years as both private and public-sector organizations seek to meet customer expectations (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Berry et al., 1988; Chang, 2016; Heymann, 2015; Marson, 1993; Parasuraman & Zeithaml, 2006; Poister & Henry, 1994; Schepers, Falk, de Ruyter, de Jong, & Hammerschmidt, 2012; Zeithaml, Berry, & Parasuraman, 1988). While private-sector businesses need to maintain customer satisfaction levels to remain profitable, public-sector organizations must exist to serve the public at large and do not face elimination based on customer satisfaction levels. Yet public-sector leaders continue to strategize ways to improve customer satisfaction levels (Hanson, 2011; Lavigna, 2015; Molina, 2015).

In 2015, the Obama Administration sought to address low customer satisfaction by announcing its intention to “overhaul public services to make them more customer-centric” (Government Business Council, 2015, p. 2). However, public-sector leaders, unlike their private-sector counterparts, are tasked with maintaining or improving the lives of others by providing access to services such as utilities or by providing social
benefits such as Cash Aid or Food Stamps (Bakker, 2015; Hanson, 2011; Potter, 1988). Kelly (2005) suggested the public-sector leaders strive to meet customer expectations to be accountable to the citizens, while Brick (2010) reported public-sector organizations can face cuts in social programs, funding, staff, service levels, and political support. Both justify the need for strong, effective public leaders to ensure public services not only are provided but also meet the expectations of the public being served.

Background

Public-sector organizations are dynamic and complex and exist to service the public in a variety of ways (Getha-Taylor, Holmes, Jacobson, Morse, & Sowa, 2011). Still, the public sector continues to receive less than acceptable customer satisfaction rates (American Customer Satisaction Index, 2017) while public-sector leaders and scholars continue to look for ways to improve the delivery of public-sector services (Lavigna, 2015). The following sections provide an overview of the public-sector organization, leadership, followership within the public-sector organization, and public-service delivery.

Public-Sector Organizations

The efficiency and effectiveness of public-sector organizations continue to be the topic of discussion for researchers, public administrators, and those receiving services. Those who are determined to improve public-sector organizations have continued to look to the private sector in hopes that proven operational efficiencies are transferable (Brewer, 2007; Lobato-Calleros, Rivera, Serrato, & Gomez, 2017; Potter, 1988). In addition to addressing operational efficiencies, attention has been given to the many obstacles that hinder a public-service leader such as the public’s perception of fraud,
waste, and abuse (Aziz, Rahman, Alam, & Said, 2015); lack of necessary funding; strict local, state, and federal regulations; unionized labor; and a lack of resources to guide the public-sector leader (Chapman et al., 2016). While the public sector has been ignored in much of the empirical research, there is literature to support that the answer to improving public-sector organizations lies within the organization, with the leaders and followers (Brick, 2010; Tummers & Knies, 2013; Wirtz & Jerger, 2016).

Organizational Ideology and Culture

Organizational ideology has been described as a component of the culture of an organization that develops through the organization’s beliefs and value system (Geertz, 1973). Katz and Kahn (1978) stated that organizational ideology also provides the “justification for the organization’s existence and functions” (p. 101). Haase and Raufflet (2017) submitted ideology is significant to the core functions of an organization because it is the ideology that drives the direction and purpose of the organization.

Organizational culture is uniquely important to a public-sector organization because a positive organizational culture is critical to maintaining organizational integrity (Bryson, 2004). Furthermore, a public-sector organization should be careful to adopt systems that are supportive of a service culture while also recognizing it is the individuals within the organization who must choose to be true public servants (Brick, 2010).

Leadership Styles

Burns (1978) explained all leaders hold some level of power; however, all those who hold power are not necessarily leaders. He further stated, “And the genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders see and act on their own and their followers’ values and motivations” (Burns, 1978, p. 381). Early leadership styles
developed by Lewin and Lippitt in the late 1930s included authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire styles; however, only the latter is considered relevant today (Stogdill & Bass, 1981).

**Transformational, Transactional, Laissez-Faire**

Bass’s (1985a) full-range leadership model suggests there are three styles of leaders: transformational, transactional and laissez-faire. A transformational leader provides a purposeful vision that inspires followers to support the leader and his or her cause (Lutz Allen, Smith, & Da Silva, 2013). A transactional leader identifies the performance outcomes needed, the task requirements of his or her subordinates, and the reward that is requisite to ensure the needed performance outcomes (Bass, 1985a). Laissez-faire leadership entails a leader who is disengaged, absent, and withdraws from making leadership decisions (Courtright, Colbert, & Choi, 2014). Bass (1985a) believed transformation leadership was the most effective style of leadership but also believed, “Transformational leadership is presented to augment transactional approaches to management, since it is often more effective in achieving higher levels of improvement and change among employees” (p. 27). Consequently, transformational leadership is the most often studied leadership practice (Caillier, 2014). Bass’s full-range leadership model has proven to be effective across organizations and leadership positions (Lutz Allen et al., 2013).

**Leadership Theories**

Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory brings together concepts from role theory and social exchange theory and explores the relationship between the leader/follower dyad (Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999). The dyad achieves either a high-
quality or low-quality relationship. A high-quality relationship produces a more engaged dyad; the follower performs increased organizational citizenship behaviors, which results in the follower performing above the leader’s expectations (Buch, Thompson, & Kuvaas, 2016; Dunegan, Duchon, & Uhl-Bien, 1992; Matta, Scott, Koopman, & Conlon, 2015). The high-quality dyadic relationship is analogous to that of a transformational leader/follower relationship (Boer, Deinert, Homan, & Voelpel, 2016). A low-quality dyad was defined by Howell and Hall-Merenda (1999) as a transactional style relationship in which the leader influences the follower through exchange behaviors, formal roles are maintained, and goals are often undefined. Research completed by Boer et al. (2016) determined, “LMX facilitates the process by which transformational leaders influence followers’ work outcomes” (p. 895).

Role theory was born in the field of psychology and is fairly popular in the social sciences (Zai, 2015). Initial elements of role theory were developed by Linton in 1936, and at that time, status was defined as a position within an organization and role as the behaviors demonstrated through that position (George, 1993). Role theory evolved over time, and the definition now includes both the status and the behaviors linked to that status (George, 1993). Zai (2015) explained role theory is “how an individual performs within a society, a given culture, or a simple interaction” (p. 9). Carpenter and Lertpratchya (2016) asserted role theory is helpful as it connects behaviors to the expectations of others; however, those expectations may at times be ambiguous. They cautioned future role theoreticians to expand the literature specific to role expectations.
Public-Sector Leadership

Public-sector leadership refers to leadership that occurs in a public-sector organization and is focused on public service and creating public value (Chapman et al., 2016). Researchers have continued to debate whether public-sector leadership should be explored separately from general leadership to focus on the unique challenges and values found in the public sector (Getha-Taylor et al., 2011). Oberfield (2014) posited while many public-sector studies have been done, few have investigated the relationship between public leaders and followers over time. He argued time is of great importance because leaders often “implement change at one time and followers act or think differently at a later time” (Oberfield, 2014, p. 408). As the public sector faces a never-ending number of changes and demands, researchers concur that leadership studies specific to public organizations require greater attention (Vogel & Masal, 2015).

Followership

During the Industrial Age, the term follower brought with it perceptions of subordination and submissiveness (Rost, 2008). Today, followers are considered an integral piece of the leadership team (Kelley, 2008); however, the practice of followership is an underresearched subject and not fully understood (Leroy, Anseel, Gardner, & Sels, 2015). Followership is viewed through two different perspectives; one perspective sees followership as a position or role while the other sees followership as social exchange process with the leader (Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, & Carsten, 2014). Most organizations consist of more followers than leaders, and as such, leaders should recognize the importance of followers and the potential they bring to the organization (Hamlin, 2016). Leadership expert Warren Bennis (2008a) cautioned that followership
done well is not easy as followers often work under vulnerable conditions, receive little recognition, and must behave with tact. Leaders who correct negative working conditions will benefit greatly as effective followers are engaged in their work with their leaders and diligently work toward achieving organizational goals (Howell & Mendez, 2008). Junker, Stegmann, Braun, and Van Dick (2016) stated, “Individually held assumptions about how followers are and how they should be—is still in its infancy” (p. 1205).

**Organizational Citizenship Behaviors**

In 1938, Barnard (2006) explored the dynamics of an organization by examining the individual within the organization. His work is considered to be one of the earliest on leaders, followers, and organizational effectiveness (Goldstein & Hazy, 2006). Barnard (2006) was interested in the relationship between the individual and the organization and how the two function as one. By examining the individual, Barnard determined individuals make a variety of choices throughout their work day; his focus surrounded the individual’s decision to cooperate. Katz’s (1964) research focused on what motivated individuals; he concluded that what was most motivational to individuals was the social interaction with others in the organization.

Organ (1988) added to the research by submitting his definition of organizational citizenship behavior: “Behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (p. 86). Researchers are attracted to organizational citizenship behaviors because these behaviors cannot be compared to employee behaviors that are required through contractual requirements that come with negative consequences if
performance is not satisfactory (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983a). However, few researchers have explored the significance of employees’ organizational citizenship behaviors and the role those behaviors play toward customers (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). This research may be of significant importance to service organizations as Chan, Gong, Zhang and Zhou (2017) determined that organizational citizenship behaviors can be reciprocated, meaning employees perform above and beyond for the customer and the customer may duplicate the behavior, resulting in higher praise for the organization or business.

**Public-Service Delivery**

Scholars continue to investigate the role followers play in achieving quality customer service (Hong, Liao, Hu, & Jiang, 2013). Research indicates it is highly motivated followers engaging in organizational citizenship behaviors who are at the core of service excellence (Heracleous & Wirtz, 2010). Antecedents of service excellence include developing and maintaining a strong service culture and climate and securing leaders who value and model service excellence (Wirtz & Jerger, 2016). Empirical research conducted in the public sector confirms that the quality of interaction between the public-sector worker and the private citizen receiving the services influences the citizen’s overall satisfaction with the service delivery (Brown, 2007). Chapman et al. (2016) encouraged leadership scholars to “think big” in terms of broader approaches to public-sector research and “look closer” at existing models that can contribute to a stronger integration of literature and organizations (p. 126).
Statement of the Research Problem

Customer expectations in the public sector continue to rise as the public demands increased efficiency and effectiveness and a positive customer experience from the government (Government Business Council, 2015; Public Sector Research Centre, 2007). Public-service agencies exist to fulfill a variety of needs for the public at large: from providing working utilities to enforcing health and safety codes and ensuring families have food on the table. Clearly public-service agencies play a significant role in the daily lives of families.

The key to successfully meeting public demands lies within the makeup of the public-service organization, namely the leaders and the followers. In his early work, Bass (1985b) suggested the most difficult organizational improvements require the touch of a transformational leader. Transformational leadership has also been credited with inspiring followers to demonstrate organizational citizenship behaviors; as Organ, Podsakoff, and MacKenzie (2006) stated, “Individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate, promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization” (p. 3). Considerable research has been done on transformational leadership and to a lesser extent followership and organizational citizenship behaviors. These organizational ingredients are critical to a public-service organization’s meeting the needs of the public.

Paarlberg and Lavigna (2010) suggested there is no one magic solution to organizational success; instead they support a multitude of complementary strategies to answer organizational challenges. Following their suggestion, it is necessary to explore different strategies to address the current issues facing public-service organizations. It
was the intent of this study to identify and describe to what extent the quality of the leader-follower relationship, as perceived by followers, affects followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors in a public-service organization.

Researchers have found leadership can and often does influence organizational outcomes (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Tummers, 2013), signifying further research will not be fruitless. However, followership is an underresearched topic (Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2015; Leroy et al., 2015) and has not been investigated thoroughly in the transformational leadership literature (Guay & Choi, 2015). According to Shim and Rohrbaugh (2014), organizational citizenship behaviors have been linked directly to “organizational performance including both productivity and efficiency” (p. 808); therefore, they are worthy of inclusion in this study. Much research has been conducted related to transformational leadership, followership, and organizational citizenship behaviors; but few studies have explored these topics within a public-service organization, and research has yet to be conducted on how each may contribute to customer experiences and outcomes in a public-service organization. Supporting the need for continuing research, Van Wart (2013) stated, “Well-designed studies would be welcomed by various public sector industries, jurisdictions, and levels of administration” (p. 537). Furthermore, through additional research public-service leaders and followers can better understand how to develop and complement each other’s talents to best meet the needs of the public-service customer.
Purpose Statement

The purpose of this sequential, explanatory mixed-methods study was to identify and describe to what extent the quality of the leader-follower relationship, as perceived by followers, affects followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors in a public-service organization.

Research Questions

1. How do followers working in a public-service organization perceive their level of organizational citizenship behaviors?
2. To what extent are followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward other individuals?
3. To what extent are followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward their organization?
4. To what extent does the quality of the leader-follower relationship affect the followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors in public-service organizations?

Significance of the Problem

Public-service organizations are struggling to meet the demands of the 21st century. Public-service leaders are challenged with reduced budgets and staff and calls from citizens to evolve into a more responsive, efficient, and effective government (Vigoda-Gadot & Beeri, 2012). Considering public-service organizations provide critical services to the public at large, public servants at all levels of the organization must perform at the highest levels if the needs of the 21st-century customer are to be met.

Many individuals look to an organization’s leader to ensure the success of the organization, and the public sector is no exception. Leadership, in general, has been
studied at length, and the consensus is that leadership behaviors can motivate followers to improve work performance (Caillier, 2014). More specifically, Bellé (2013) identified transformational leadership as “one of the most powerful factors motivating purposeful action and high public employee performance” (p. 109). While the literature provides a strong foundation on which to build, few studies have explored the effects of transformational leadership on followers in a public-service organization (Guay & Choi, 2015) and even fewer are recent enough to include the current obstacles facing public-sector organizations.

Conversely, it is not enough to look just at the public-service leader. Stech (2008) argued that no one leader has all the knowledge and skills needed to achieve the desired mission; the leader must rely on his or her followers. Currie and Ryan (2014) agreed, stating, “Effective followers are as important to organizational success as are leaders” (p. 15). However, the followership phenomenon is in dire need of additional research (Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2015; Leroy et al., 2015). Blanchard, Welbourne, Gilmore, and Bullock (2009) argued that much time and effort has been devoted to how leaders affect organizational behavior, yet determining how followership affects organizational behavior is equally important. Bennis (2008b) argued followership has become increasingly important as global issues have become so complex as to require the collaboration of both leaders and followers. Thus, there is support and a need for additional research on the topic of followership.

Another phenomenon equally important to followership is organizational citizenship behaviors. Organizational citizenship behaviors are individual behaviors that are optional, not recognized through a formal reward system, and contribute to the
success of an organization (Organ et al., 2006). Podsakoff and Mackenzie (1997) determined organizational citizenship behaviors contribute significantly to organizational effectiveness. Public-service organizations are likely to benefit from further research on organizational citizenship behaviors, especially as customer expectations continue to rise. While several studies on organizational citizenship behaviors exist (Choo, 2016; Decoster, Stouten, Camps, & Tripp, 2014; Guay & Choi, 2015; Lyu, Zhu, Zhong, & Hu., 2016; Vigoda-Gadot & Beeri, 2012), few examine the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and customer expectations and/or outcomes in a public-service organization. Should research indicate such behaviors have significant influence on customer experiences, specific training courses and educational literature can be created by public-service organizations to help improve the customer experience.

A public-sector organization works well to the extent that the people within the organization work well together. Leaders and followers must find a way to meet the needs of the public-sector customer while simultaneously abiding by ever-changing federal, state, and local regulations; navigating through internal and external politics; and working with both antiquated and advanced technologies. Obtaining a deeper understanding of the dynamics of the leader-follower relationship will contribute to the literature used by many leaders and followers to realize the mission and goals of a public-service agency. Moreover, taking a focused look at organizational citizenship behaviors and how the leader-follower relationship influences those behaviors will help direct further training and development for the public-service employee. This study has the potential to inform improvements that will raise the government’s reputation due to increased trust between public-service organizations and the public they serve.
Definitions

**Followership.** “A follower shares in an influence relationship among leaders and other followers with the intent to support leaders who reflect their mutual purposes. This would mean that collaborative employees (followership) would be the very support system leaders need to lead effectively” (Adair, 2008, p. 139).

**Leader-member exchange (LMX).** Using the basic tenets of role theory and social exchange theory, LMX posits that leaders develop differentiated relationships with their subordinates that range from high-quality socioemotional relationships with some subordinates to low-quality transactional relationships with others (Matta et al., 2015).

**Leadership.** “Leadership over human beings is exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers” (Burns, 1979, p. 381).

**Organizational citizenship behaviors.** Organizational citizenship behaviors are “behaviors that are discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988, p. 86).

**Organizational ideology.** Ideology is an element of culture imbedded in an institution that is driven by beliefs and values that are articulated in a manner which inspires commitment and motivation (Geertz, 1973).

**Public-sector leadership.** Public-sector leadership has been described as “leadership for the common good, for the purpose of creating public value” (Getha-Taylor et al., 2011, p. 84).
Public-sector organizations. Public-sector organizations include government, quasigovernment agencies, and many nonprofit organizations devoted to community services and to the public interest and are most often publicly funded (Lewis & Gilman, 2005).

Public-service delivery. Public-service delivery is the manner in which the public services reach the citizens; the delivery mechanism is effective if citizens’ needs are met and grievances addressed; an effective public-service delivery mechanism leads to good governance (Sharma, Gangadharan, Kummamuru, Somasekhar, & Hartman, 2011).

Role theory. Role theory concerns characteristic behavior patterns or roles. It explains roles by presuming that persons are members of social positions and hold expectations for their own behaviors and those of other persons (Biddle, 1986).

Transactional leadership. A leader who engages in a relationship with a follower to exchange one thing for another, such as work in exchange for pay (Burns, 1978).

Transformational leadership. A process by which “leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation” (Burns, 1978, p. 20).

Delimitations

This study was delimitated to public-service workers employed in the city of Corona, a metropolitan area of Southern California located in the county of Riverside. Participants of the study included individuals who held line-level positions within the city and who had direct contact with the public.
Organization of the Study

This dissertation includes five chapters. Chapter I included an introduction and background for the study, research problem, purpose statement, research questions and the significance of the problem, a list of relevant operational and theoretical definitions, and the delimitations of the study. Chapter II includes a literature review of the following topics: public-sector organizations, leadership, followership, organizational citizenship behaviors, and public-service delivery. Chapter III includes the methodology utilized in this study. Chapter IV includes a summary of the data discovered. Chapter V includes major and unexpected findings, conclusions, implications for action, recommendations for further research, and finally, concluding remarks and reflections.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Public-service leaders are struggling to meet the demands of society. Universal healthcare, record numbers of food stamp recipients, and aging Baby Boomers are placing pressure on public-social service agencies to meet the increased public need. Additionally, public-service agencies that provide other types of public services, such as public utilities, transportation, and education, are also reacting to increased customer expectations. Common challenges include limited resources, poor accountability, decreased efficiencies, and low levels of motivation (Tria & Valotti, 2012). Box (2015) submitted that the public sector faces more than just normal government bureaucracy as the difficulties include the relationships between public-sector leaders, public-sector policy, and those who perform the daily tasks of public service.

Research indicates that public service is not appropriate for every individual; public-service workers enter the field because they want to help others and contribute to improving society (Bakker, 2015; Caldwell & Karri, 2005; Hernandez, 2012). A successful public-service organization requires a leader who can articulate his or her vision and inspire his or her followers to achieve extraordinary performance outcomes (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). However, according to Currie and Ryan (2014), followers can contribute significantly to an organization as they often bring “unique strengths to the organizational mix—ones that, in effect, complement and enhance conventional leadership” (p. 15). It is a combination of talent that works together to ensure the public’s expectations are met.
Public-Sector Organizations

Chapman et al. (2016) stated public administration “is inherently fractured in terms of the various sectors, multiple levels of governments and units of analysis involved in delivering public services” (p. 118). The public-sector organization is the vehicle the government uses to deliver public services to citizens (Sharma et al., 2011). Public-sector organizations play an important role in the lives of many; therefore, the next section delves deeper into the public-sector organization.

Historical Overview

Principles of consumerism were first applied to the public sector in the 1980s to place the recipients’ interests at the forefront of public-service discussions. Potter (1988) suggested it was time to balance the power between those who provide service and those who receive service by adopting a three-cornered relationship among those in power, the professionals, and the consumer. Potter (1988) advocated public-sector organizations value the public over employee time and convenience, allow the public to identify the scope of services to be provided, and most importantly be open to changing the status quo by creating that balance of power.

Years later, public-policy development continued to evolve from the traditional citizen-based model of public service to a consumer-based model (Brewer, 2007). Oosterom (2007) argued that the public sector is “the world’s largest service provider” and therefore must adopt and maintain a customer service model that focuses on the customer. However, Oosterom stated that as a public-service agency, attention should also be given to tightening the program budgets (Public Sector Research Centre, 2007). The consumer-based model has required public-sector organizations to shift their focus
from providing a service to the public to providing customer service to the public. Brick (2010) stated, “The prevailing mindset was: A government office isn’t a business and the people we serve aren’t customers” (p. 15). Research shows public-sector organizations could no longer afford to maintain this mindset; the public demanded changes.

Public-sector organizations had to address the public’s perception of government inefficiencies, failures, fraud, and abuse. The public demanded transparency and accountability from public-sector leaders, resulting in an expectation of “good governance” (Aziz et al., 2015). Good governance in the public-sector incorporates efforts toward accountability in achieving public-sector goals, including service outcomes, the impact policies have on communities, and efficiency in spending tax-payer monies (Almquist, Grossi, van Heiden, & Reichard, 2013). Vidal (2014) submitted that government agencies fall short in meeting the public’s expectations as they struggle to find the balance between quantitative efficiency and achieving customer satisfaction. To regain and maintain the public’s trust, public-sector organizations must combine expertise and solid ethical standards and demonstrate an authentic concern for customers (Jørgensen & Isaksson, 2015).

Over the span of decades, the public sector continues to look for customer service improvement methods. In 2015, the Obama Administration announced the adoption of a new customer-centric approach to service in government agencies after continuous complaints about federal service agencies (Government Business Council, 2015). P. Lawrence, McBride, and Harter (2014) stated that while the Obama Administration identified the need to improve customer service in government agencies, it was only the first step of many.
Organizational Ideology and Culture

In the early 1800s, French philosopher Antoine L. C. Destutt de Tracy was credited for identifying a nexus between ideas and knowledge, creating the term ideology ("Ideology,” 2016). Seminal research done by Geertz (1973) described ideology as an element of culture imbedded in an institution that is driven by beliefs and values that are articulated in a manner that inspires commitment and motivation. Alvesson (1987) recognized that definitions of ideology are plentiful; however, he stated there are some commonalities such as “a set of beliefs about the social world and how it operates, and what values and ideals are worth striving for” (p. 13). Ideology is relevant to the inner workings of an organization because it incorporates frameworks of ideas and belief systems that drive the organization’s direction and purpose (Haase & Raufflet, 2017).

Morgan (2006) offered a deeper definition by describing three basic organizational ideologies: unitary, pluralist, and radical. The unitary ideology takes the position that the organization’s needs come before the individual’s; a pluralist organization values diverse groups that influence others to maintain a balance of power; a radical ideology involves making radical changes to the organization, such as removing those in power, to ensure the voice of disadvantaged groups can be heard (Morgan, 2006). He further contended it is important to understand the different ideologies as these are what often influence leadership and management styles.

Messina and Wilde (2017) expressed their thoughts on ideology through the practice of leadership philosophy. They explained that most organizations focus on documents such as policies and procedures and vision and mission statements, which are then used to guide how the organization is managed. Messina and Wilde (2017)
recommended organizations instead focus on how the organization is being led using a collective leadership philosophy (CLP). A CLP not only illustrates how an organization is led but also documents the intent for organization-wide leadership (Messina & Wilde, 2017). The authors argued that it is through a collective, practiced leadership philosophy that an organization can focus on an organization-wide leadership improvement, which ultimately can improve the organizational culture (Messina & Wilde, 2017). Oberfield (2014) submitted that improved leadership results in “follower cooperation, satisfaction, and perception of work quality” (p. 407).

Alomiri (2016) posited a leader of an organization identifies the direction and purpose through his or her words and actions, and over time the culture of the organization is created. Berwick (2013) agreed and expounded on the subject: “Cultural change and continual improvement come from what leaders do, through their commitment, encouragement, compassion, and modeling of appropriate behaviors” (p. 15). Toister (2017) explored the alternative, asserting that when a leader lacks focus, “a company can unintentionally develop an anti-customer culture” (p. 11). Toister’s writings are supported by an administrative investigation into the unfortunate downfall of a public hospital in London, England known as Mid Staffordshire General Hospital.

Robert Francis led a commission to identify what led to the hospital’s unjustified decrease in patient care including increased patient deaths (Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust, 2013). The report documented how the culture of the organization led to a decrease in patient care. The following behaviors were identified as creating a negative culture in the Staffordshire Hospital which ultimately affected patient care (Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust, 2013):
• A lack of openness to criticism
• A lack of consideration for patients
• Defensiveness
• Looking inwards not outwards
• Secrecy
• Misplaced assumptions about the judgements and actions of others
• An acceptance of poor standards
• A failure to put the patient first in everything that is done. (pp. 65-66)

The Francis Report underlines the role leadership or lack thereof plays in organizational culture, employee performance, and customer outcomes. Edmonds (2014) concurred, stating, “Everything a leader does either helps, hurts, or hinders the creation of a great team culture” (p. 14).

Leadership Styles

Much research exists on leadership, including a variety of leadership theories. The consensus is that leadership styles are extremely important as they can influence employee performance (Caillier, 2014). There is value in understanding different leadership styles, including understanding how leadership has evolved over time. The following section explores leadership styles (past and present), investigates two leadership theories, leader-member exchange and role theory, and finally looks at the role of the public-sector leader.
**Historical Overview**

Early researchers Kurt Lewin and Ronald Lippitt have been credited for identifying and defining three leadership styles: authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire (Stogdill & Bass, 1981). Bradford and Lippitt (1945) explained each style:

*Authoritarian* (autocrat)—The characteristics of the authoritarian leader includes both the hardboiled and benevolent leader. The hardboiled leader is one who gives firm directives and expects immediate compliance, is firm in discipline, and does not offer praise as followers are being paid in return for their work product. The benevolent leader is one who dominates followers through constant reminders that he or she determines the follower’s performance standards. However, contrary to the hardboiled leader, the benevolent leader praises followers, promotes happiness in the workplace, and shows an interest in helping employees with their work. When followers fail to meet the benevolent leader’s expectations, the leader interprets that as disloyalty.

*Democratic*—The democratic leader is one who includes followers in decision making, assignments, and scheduling. The democratic leader shares the responsibility and success of the organization, yet when required to make a single decision, he or she explains to followers why the decision was made. The democratic leader is generous with praise but disciplines with tact when necessary.

*Laissez-faire*—The laissez-faire leader is one who lacks the ability to lead and therefore is unable to make necessary decisions to positively direct followers. Because the laissez-faire leader lacks confidence, he or she often retreats to an office or otherwise isolates himself or herself and therefore gives little direction or guidance to followers.
Lewin and Lippitt’s three leadership styles are now considered outdated as these styles address management styles not leadership styles (Flynn, 2015). Bennis (2015) supported the idea that leadership is different and preferred over management, stating, “Leaders conquer the context—the volatile, turbulent, ambiguous surroundings that sometimes seem to conspire against us and will surely suffocate us if we let them—while managers surrender to it” (p. 365). Other researchers recognized the need to expand the literature in this field; therefore, the literature on leadership continued to progress after Lewin and Lippitt.

James MacGregor Burns is widely known for his contributions to the topic of leadership and more specifically, transformational and transactional leadership. Burns (1979) asserted, “Leadership over human beings is exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers” (p. 381). Burns’s 1978 seminal study compared two separate and distinct leadership styles, transactional and transforming. Burns (1978) described transforming leadership as a process by which “leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation” (p. 20). He defined a transactional leader as a leader who engages in a relationship with a follower to exchange one thing for another, such as work in exchange for a paycheck (Burns, 1978). A transforming leadership style establishes a relationship between leader and follower while a transactional leadership style does not establish a relationship between leader and follower that expands beyond the transaction (Burns, 1978).
Building upon Burns’s theory, Bass (1985b) continued the research and developed four characteristics of transformational leadership, which became known as the “Four I’s.” Bass and Riggio (2006) described the Four I’s as follows:

- **Idealized influence**—Idealized influence covers both those behaviors demonstrated by the leader and those attributed to the leader by followers. Idealized influence refers to a leader who is an ideal role model for followers, demonstrates the highest of ethical and moral standards, and is respected and is trusted by followers.

- **Inspirational motivation**—Inspirational motivation is a leadership behavior that is achieved when a leader effectively communicates a vision and purpose that challenges, motivates, and inspires followers to contribute willingly to a goal or cause. The combination of idealized influence and inspirational motivation is commonly recognized as charismatic-inspirational leadership.

- **Intellectual stimulation**—Intellectual stimulation entails the leader’s empowering followers to think in new ways, questioning the status quo, taking initiative in problem solving, and being innovative in improving business practices.

- **Individualized consideration**—Individualized consideration involves a leader engaging with a follower on an individual level, serving as a mentor or coach. The leader will discover what is important to the follower and will create opportunities for growth, assisting the follower in achieving his or her full potential. Hence, the leader demonstrates a sincere desire to help the follower obtain his or her personal and/or career goals.

Expanding upon the “Four I’s,” Bass and Avolio (1994) developed the full-range leadership model to illustrate a leadership range to include transformational,
transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles. They held a strong position that there was a need for transactional leadership behaviors when addressing organizational performance. They identified two characteristics of transactional leadership: contingent reward and management by exception. Contingent reward refers to the work-for-pay practice. Management by exception refers to a leader who focuses on poor follower performance to engage in immediate corrective action (Bass, 1985a). As part of his transactional theory, Bass (1985a) suggested leaders separate organizational improvements into two categories: “higher order” and “lower order” (p. 27). Bass (1985a) believed the transactional leadership style is appropriate when addressing minor organizational change while more significant improvements require the use of transformational leadership behaviors. Moreover, Bass (1985a) supported his position stating, “Transformational leadership is presented as a way to augment transactional approaches to management, since it is often more effective in achieving higher levels of improvement and change among employees” (p. 27).

The laissez-faire leadership style has been described as both an effective and ineffective leadership style (Flynn, 2015). Bass and Avolio (1994) identified it as the absence of leadership while others stated that laissez-faire leadership is a leadership style in which the leader lacks the ability or chooses not to (a) actively direct subordinates in everyday work activities; (b) take an active role in the decision-making process; and (c) relinquish his or her leadership duties (Bass et al., 2003; Courtright et al., 2014; Deluga, 1990).

Challengers of laissez-faire leadership behaviors suggest this is an ineffective leadership style because the leader is disengaged with his or her followers and therefore
unable to create an environment in which followers can reach their full potential (Flynn, 2015). Hater and Bass (1988) stated the laissez-faire leader will avoid supervisory duties and decision making, which can negatively affect followers and the work environment (Lutz Allen et al., 2013). It should also be noted that laissez-faire leadership has been identified as a predictor of high employee turnover (Hyson, 2016); and perhaps most concerning, research indicates laissez-faire leadership behaviors increase the number of workplace bullying victims (Nielsen, 2013).

Other researchers see laissez-faire leadership from a different perspective. Bass and Riggio (2006) posited that laissez-faire leadership behaviors may be appropriate only when an issue is of no concern to the supervisor, manager, or others in the organization. Deluga (1990) believed laissez-faire leaders give followers tremendous freedom, which allows followers to “maximize their power and influence” (p. 192). Similarly, Flynn (2015) reported laissez-faire leaders don’t create distance from their followers, they allow distance because they have tremendous trust in followers.

Early work by Stogdill and Bass (1981) may reveal a key understanding of the issue. Stogdill and Bass proposed that when followers are “skilled, professional and self-starting” a leader may demonstrate “participative leadership” which may mirror laissez-faire leadership behaviors (p. 397). However, participative leadership requires that boundaries be set for intrinsically motivated and competent followers (Stogdill & Bass, 1981). The authors cautioned readers not to confuse laissez-faire leadership and participative leadership.
Leader-Member Exchange

Leader member exchange (LMX) theory has evolved since its inception over 40 years ago. Utilizing the basic tenets of role theory and social exchange theory, LMX subscribes to the belief that leaders develop differential relationships with followers, and it is the quality of those relationships that determine the success of individuals and the organization (Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999). Pillay and James (2015) expounded on the social exchange piece of LMX, stating there are three dimensions of social exchange:

- **Relationship maintenance**—Based on the ideology that human behavior involves the constant exchange of rewards (tangible or social); individuals evaluate the cost of involvement and the value of the reward. It is believed face-to-face contact results in greater satisfaction for both parties.

- **Exchange processes**—The actual reciprocal exchange between leader and follower; if the exchanges are not reciprocal, the relationship deteriorates.

- **Social interaction**—Based on the belief that leaders and followers develop a relationship through social interaction; social interaction is needed to meet individual and organizational expectations; the quality of the interaction affects the quality of reciprocal exchange.

Throughout the LMX literature, the nexus between social exchange theory and LMX is evident as leaders and followers are constantly in the mode of “exchanging” either through communication or more tangible means, such as new assignments or supplemental pay. However, role theory may be somewhat concealed within the LMX literature; therefore, role theory is discussed in more detail later.
Matta et al. (2015) submitted that the significant contribution LMX makes to the leadership conversation is that the concentration is on the dyadic relationship rather than leadership behaviors and traits, which are often the focus of other leadership theories. LMX has been recognized as a viable approach to organizational leadership as LMX has been credited with positive job attitudes, less workplace conflict, increased organizational citizenship behaviors, higher creativity, and increased performance (Dulebohn, Bommer, Liden, Brouer, & Ferris, 2012; Gerstner & Day, 1997).

Within the LMX dyad are high- and low-quality relationships, high-quality being the preferred relationship. A high-quality relationship is one that has achieved mutual trust, respect, and commitment between leader and follower (Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999). Followers who enjoy a high-quality relationship with their leaders engage their leaders regularly, are supported and encouraged by their leader, and are considered “trusted assistants” (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Furthermore, the leader-follower dyad that achieves a high-quality relationship results in followers demonstrating organizational citizenship behaviors, which positively affects a follower’s ability to deliver beyond expectations (Buch et al., 2016; Dunegan et al., 1992; Matta et al., 2015).

Howell and Hall-Miranda (1999) defined a low-quality LMX relationship as “a unidirectional downward influence, economic exchange behaviors, formal role-defined relations, and loosely coupled goals” (p. 682). These characteristics can be compared to transactional leadership behaviors (Bass, 1985a), which are based on a quid pro quo exchange between leader and follower. As such, it can be expected that followers experiencing a low-quality LMX relationship with the leader will be less productive and demonstrate a lower level of commitment to the organization (Buch et al., 2016).
Leaders who engage in low-quality relationships with followers typically maintain a distance from followers, provide followers little support, and are dependent upon the formal employment contract as a relationship guide (Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999).

Matta et al. (2015) conducted research to better understand the perceived relationship on the part of both leader and follower and how those perceptions influence employee engagement and organizational citizenship behaviors. Their research indicated when the leader and follower agreed on the quality of their relationship, work engagement was higher. When the leader and follower disagreed on the quality of their relationship, employee engagement decreased (Matta et al., 2015). A most interesting finding by Matta and his colleagues (2015) indicated that a leader and follower who both agreed the relationship quality was low (or based on an economic transaction) still benefited from higher levels of employee engagement. Matta et al. (2015) found LMX agreement is more beneficial as it relates to employee engagement than is LMX quality.

Early LMX research focused on differential relationships at the individual level; however, more recent research has expanded to the group level (Lee, Chae, & Shin, 2016). Research illustrates the benefits of high-quality relationships with not just a few but all members of a group. Multiple LMX studies (Graen, Novak, & Sommerkamp, 1982; Graen & Scandura, 1987; Graen, Scandura, & Graen, 1986) concluded that overall group performance (hard productivity) increased significantly when leaders achieved high-quality relationships with all followers in the group.

While multiple researchers contended that high-quality relationships between leaders and groups can result in positive organizational results, other researchers cautioned that there are often obstacles to achieving such relationships. Haynie, Cullen,
Lester, Winter, and Svyantek (2014) suggested leaders may treat followers differently for a variety of reasons, such as “time and resource constraints, leader-member similarities, or equitable treatment based on subordinate work efforts” (p. 914). Leaders should also take note that LMX differentiation in a group setting has been associated with within-group conflict, which results in decreased performance outcomes (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Haynie et al., 2014; Le Blanc & González-Romá, 2012).

Schyns and Day (2010) defined LMX excellence as a combination of high-consensus (low group differentiation) and positive relationship quality (high average LMX quality). Research conducted by Le Blanc and González-Romá (2012) found low-level LMX differentiation combined with a high LMX group consensus resulted in high levels of team performance and effective team commitment. Based on their research, Le Blanc and González-Romá (2012) encouraged leaders to bring together group members who hold similar work values as the leaders will be more likely to achieve low levels of LMX differentiation and high LMX group consensus. This achievement not only increases chances of high group performance and team commitment but assists the leader in meeting the group’s needs and desires (Le Blanc & González-Romá, 2012). However, as other research indicated, if the leader is unsuccessful in his or her ability to create low levels of LMX differentiation, team performance and outcomes may suffer (Graen et al., 1982; Graen & Scandura, 1987; Graen et al., 1986; Le Blanc & González-Romá, 2012).

The LMX theory has been utilized in many studies as it offers the opportunity to peek into the leader-follower relationship at the individual and group levels. The data retrieved from such studies have been utilized to assist researchers, leaders, followers, and organizations in better understanding how relationships affect (positively and
negatively) organizational outcomes. Through their research, Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) determined effective leadership is achieved “through the development and maintenance of mature leadership relationships” (p. 220), suggesting there is a deliberate process that requires time for the relationship to “mature.” Cropanzano, Dasborough, and Weiss (2017) stated strong leader-member relationships are most advantageous; therefore, high-quality LMX relationships should be studied, duplicated, encouraged, and nurtured, advocating the need for further research in this area.

**Role Theory**

Role theory is fairly popular in the social sciences and provides a platform for studying a plethora of social issues. According to Carpenter and Lertpratchya (2016), organizations are composed of a number of individuals who all “adjust their behaviors to meet the role expectations of leadership, coworkers, and social groups” (p. 450). Biddle (1986) conveyed that role theory engages three concepts: “patterned and characteristic social behaviors, parts or identities that are assumed by social participants, and scripts or expectations for behavior that are understood by all and adhered to by performers” (p. 68). Simply put by Biddle (1986), “Role theory concerns one of the most important features of social life, characteristic behavior patterns or roles” (p. 67).

Seminal work by Graen and Cashman (1975) sought to gain a deeper understanding of dyadic development and structures and leadership-associated outcomes. They began by observing roles and how those roles are created within organizational units. Role making has been defined as a series of events or processes in which two interdependent individuals determine the parameters of the relationship, including the
actions each will take related to specific work situations (Graen & Cashman, 1975).

Graen and Scandura (1987) detailed the three phases of the dyad experiences:

- **Role taking**—In this first phase, the leader will identify the skills and abilities of the follower through the use of varied assignments. The leader provides directives; the follower performs the desired tasks. The leader evaluates the follower to identify appropriate roles and boundaries.

- **Role making**—During this phase, the dyadic relationships evolves. The leader and follower connect through unstructured tasks, testing the dyadic relationship through problem-solving opportunities. Additionally, the leader and follower begin to experience the codependent piece of the relationship, and collaboration and negotiation are utilized. This phase is critical and can affect a follower’s promotional abilities.

- **Role routinization**—During this phase, the leader and follower solidify their relationship through the successful collaboration on unstructured tasks. The relationship becomes more structured; the behavior between leader and follower is reciprocal; and trust, respect, loyalty, and support begin to crystalize.

In addition to the three dyadic phases, there are other components of role theory. Consensus and conformity are two components found in role theory that illuminate the source of an agreement. Consensus refers to each individual arriving at a decision by way of his or her own thought process; conformity denotes there was some level of influence that assisted the individual in arriving at his or her conclusion (Zai, 2015). When there is consensus between follower(s) and leader(s) on how a role is to be performed, those involved share the same role expectation and role performance.
(Richards, 2015). Biddle (1986) determined that when consensus is achieved, minimal conflict is experienced.

Ebrahimi, Wei, and Rad (2015) identified role ambiguity, role conflict, and role overload as *role stressors*. Role ambiguity occurs when an individual’s role in the organization is not clear or codified (Stogdill & Bass, 1981), which results in the inability to drive desired behavior (Biddle, 1986). Role conflict occurs when the individual performing a role has different expectations than supervisors or other group members (Stogdill & Bass, 1981) or when an individual is expected to perform a number of different roles and the behavior required for each role is incompatible (Hirsh & Kang, 2016) or unmanageable (Richards & Templin, 2012). Role overload is said to occur when an individual lacks the time, resources (Ebrahimi et al., 2015), and/or the energy or ability to meet the role expectations (Richards & Templin, 2012).

Numerous researchers have found role stressors, which include role conflict and role ambiguity, have a negative impact on an organization and those working within the organization (Eatough, Chang, Miloslavic, & Johnson, 2011; Ebrahimi et al., 2015; Hirsh & Kang, 2016; Stogdill & Bass, 1981). Role ambiguity and role conflict are damaging to followers’ attitudes, a leader’s performance and satisfaction (Stogdill & Bass, 1981), and the overall effectiveness of the organization (Ebrahimi et al., 2015). Role conflict has been associated with increased anxiety, reduced job satisfaction (Hirsh & Kang, 2016), and reduced organizational citizenship behaviors (Eatough et al., 2011). Role overload, another role stressor, has both negative and positive outcomes. For example, an individual who experiences role overload may struggle with excessive demands or may enjoy increased challenges and responsibilities (Eatough et al., 2011).
Role theory has been divided into a variety of perspectives including organizational role theory, which focuses on the interaction of roles within an organization (Zai, 2015). Organizational role theory is most often used to study employee behavior and also serves to support human resource policy development (Wickham & Parker, 2007). Katz and Kahn (1978) articulated the importance of organizational research: “Because the organization consists of the patterned and motivated acts of human beings, it will continue to exist only so long as the attitudes, beliefs, perceptions, habits and expectations of human beings evoke the required motivation and behavior” (p. 187).

Researchers continue to use the tenets of role theory as a valid foundation upon which to build LMX-supported research. Followers perform to meet current and evolving roles and will take great effort to meet the needs or demands they perceive as a function of their role (Matta et al., 2015). Therefore, leaders should take note that articulating clear roles creates an understanding of expectations and a platform for accountability and relieves ambiguity and stress that often leads to workplace conflict (Cavanaugh, 2016). The concept of role theory serves as a path to a deeper understanding of the individual and the organization; combined, they create the foundation upon which an organization is built (Katz & Kahn, 1978).

**Influence of Transformational Leaders**

Many individuals have attempted to determine how leadership behaviors directly or indirectly affect other pieces of the organizational puzzle. Researchers have uncovered that leaders who demonstrate transformational leadership behaviors move followers to perform organizational citizenship behaviors, resulting in increased follower
performance, outcomes, and creativity (Ritz, Giauque, Varone, & Anderfuhrren-Biget, 2014; Sarwar, Mumtaz, & Ikram, 2015). Leadership experts Bass and Riggio (2006) noted that transformational leaders have the ability to influence the performance of employees who possess high mission valence by creating clear goals related to the organization’s mission.

Zhu, Newman, Miao, and Hooke (2013) investigated the relationship between transformational leadership, trust, and followership. Their study revealed trust was an important component in the leader-follower relationship and when present, inspired followers to “exhibit greater commitment, work harder for their employers and engage in more fruitful citizenship behaviors” (Zhu et al., 2013, p. 104). Other research indicated that transformational leadership directly and positively affects employee performance outcomes (Caillier, 2014; Grant, 2012) and beneficiary contact (Grant, 2012). Moynihan, Pandey, and Wright (2012) strongly suggested researchers investigate the indirect influences of transformational leadership as overlooking this important piece undervalues its true potential.

Flynn (2015) stated it is important to understand different styles of leadership behaviors as these behaviors add insight to dyadic and group interactions, including how the quality of leader-follower relationships directly affect organizational outcomes. Bennis (2015) demonstrated foresight when notifying American businesses that if they are to succeed in the 21st century, they will need leaders not managers, and those leaders must embody the best of leadership qualities. Bass (1985b) asserted the importance of transformational leadership to an organization: “Transformations that result in the fulfillment of real needs will prove to be more beneficial to the organization than
transformations that deal with manufactured needs and group delusions” (p. 39). Later research by Caillier (2014) was strong enough to suggest “transformational leadership is critical to agencies” (p. 232).

Empirical research conducted by Moynihan et al. (2012) helped to elucidate the potential of transformational leadership behaviors on followers, organizations, and their customers. Moynihan et al. (2012) suggested “leaders set the table for success” (p. 159) by identifying and creating the appropriate organizational conditions through goal clarity and a developmental culture. They also supplemented the leader versus manager debate by harmonizing the evidence. They submitted that transformational leaders influence followers through performance systems while concurrently creating and managing a culture that ensures the success of those systems. They further indicated that while addressing performance system needs, transformational leaders must also model desired behaviors and stimulate followers’ performance. Moynihan et al. (2012) posited, “Effective transformational leaders must pull the levers of formal organizational systems” (p. 159) and completed their thought by stating, “These systems require skilled leaders” (p. 159).

Public-Sector Leadership

Public-sector leadership was defined by Chapman et al. (2016) as “leadership in and for public service” (p. 112) and by Getha-Taylor et al. (2011) as “leadership for the common good, for the purpose of creating public value” (p. 84). While many studies on the public sector have been conducted (Chapman et al., 2016; Getha-Taylor et al., 2011; Lavigna, 2015; Wright, Moynihan, & Pandey, 2012), there have been few broad-scale empirical analysis specifically on leadership (Chapman et al., 2016; Trottier, Van Wart,
A recent study by Chapman et al. (2016) revealed that less than 3% of public administration literature over the last 25 years has been focused on the topic of public-sector leadership. Vandenabeele et al. (2014) postulated that the lack of research on public-sector leadership may be related to a shortage of funding and time and the hesitancy to utilize transformational leadership competencies in a public-sector setting.

Current research supports the belief that public-sector leadership involves a complexity of issues (Lavigna, 2015). Carpenter and Krause (2011) recognized that public-sector leaders serve multiple audiences and are often required to balance their responses to meet the needs of all concerned. Molina (2015) submitted similar information, stating that the public-sector leader often has to resolve a variety of conflicts that surface from opposing values of multiple parties. Chapman et al. (2016) identified additional difficulties: (a) public-sector leaders must overcome a lack of necessary funds to adequately reward followers; (b) a requirement to work within strict personnel guidelines; and (c) a lack of relevant literature to help guide the public-sector leader.

Perhaps the biggest challenge facing the public-sector leader is the growing demand from the public to eradicate the fraud, waste, and abuse frequently connected to government agencies (Aziz et al., 2015).

In addition to the previously mentioned challenges, public-sector leaders have attempted to deliver needed services within the confines of the bureaucracy that often accompanies government-funded programs. In addition to the bureaucracy, those responsible for delivering services can also impede the success of a public-service organization (Brown, 2007). Many researchers have studied the issues to assist leaders in
improving the efficacy and service experience of public-service organizations (Bakker, 2015; Brown, 2007; Chapman et al., 2016; Cooper, 1987; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Potter, 1988). Aziz et al. (2015) suggested that a variety of leadership styles are needed to successfully instill a culture of accountability for the public sector at large. Included in accountability is the actual delivery of services. Brown (2007) drew attention to the fact that public-sector leaders rarely have control over the regulations that govern the services they provide; however, they do have control over how those services are delivered.

A review of the literature provided a number of strategies public-sector leaders can use to be effective in a government setting. Research by Paarlberg and Lavigna (2010) explored how public-service motivation can assist in improving managerial practices. As a result of their research, they determined, “No single tactic will abruptly and radically improve organizational outcomes. In other words, there is no silver bullet. Instead, we argue for a ‘silver buckshot’ approach in which the identified tactics work collectively and reinforce one another” (Paarlberg & Lavigna, 2010, p. 716). Aziz et al. (2015) supported those findings, suggesting a variety of leadership styles are required to address a number of complicated situations experienced within public-sector organizations.

Bass and Riggio (2006) suggested that to be successful, leaders must use their voice to express a well-defined and appealing organizational vision and mission. Additionally, they stated that leaders must articulate through their actions those behaviors that reinforce their vision. Furthermore, a leader should ensure his or her actions are consistent with followers’ expectations; if not, the leader is apt to see a decrease in work performance at the individual and group levels (Subramaniam, Othman, & Sambasivan,
2010). Equally important, Bass and Riggio (2006) suggested leaders should make a concerted effort to assist followers in building conviction and confidence in organizational goals and activities. However, in a review of federal service data, researchers determined in addition to technical and management skills, public-sector leaders need additional training in transformational competencies with a focus on creating a clear vision and inspirational motivation (Trottier et al., 2008).

An experimental study by Bellé (2013) supported general management research indicates that to be truly effective, a leader must be authentic, and his or her messages must prove to be credible. Especially as the leader’s message relates to the organization’s mission, the leader’s message should be inspirational and reinforced often (Wright et al., 2012). Ritz et al. (2014) posited that public-sector leaders who emphasize the values of the organization to followers can have a positive effect on follower behavior. Adding to the public-service discussion, Molina (2015) stated, “Public service values are values that, when acted on, manifest themselves as attitudes, skills and behaviors that are crucial for serving the public in a manner that is consistent with those public values” (p. 51). Molina (2015) identified the nexus between the organization’s public-service values and the public-service worker’s attitudes, skills, and behaviors. Congruent with that message, Currie and Ryan (2014) stated that public-service workers who strive to align their goals with those of the organization are the best employees because they are focused on organizational success and not individual success.

Ritz et al. (2014) advised public-sector leaders that they must inspire followers to contribute to the success of the organization through tasks and activities that go above and beyond role expectations (organizational citizenship behaviors). In two separate
studies related to the public sector, researchers determined public-sector leaders can improve organizational effectiveness by redesigning work-related tasks to highlight direct ties to the organization’s mission and purpose (Bellé, 2013; Grant, 2012). Schepers et al. (2012) suggested a public-sector leader improves the work environment by limiting rulebooks and micromanaging behaviors to allow employees to take ownership of the customer service experience. The researchers argued that by doing so, the employees’ intrinsic sense of moral responsibility will flourish (Schepers et al., 2012).

Current research indicates customer contact is also an important variable that leaders need to recognize and actively address. Public-sector research shows transformational leadership improved follower performance and outcomes at higher levels when customer contact was involved (Bellé, 2013; Grant, 2012). The research indicates follower behaviors were more significant in combination with customer contact and a follower’s belief that his or her actions were contributing to something bigger than himself or herself (Bellé, 2013; Grant, 2012). Moreover, Grant (2012) suggested that when possible, leaders should allow customers to share personally how public servants have a positive impact on lives; it is through the customers’ own words that followers can truly understand the difference they make to others.

The effectiveness of public-sector organizations continues to be the subject of debate as researchers and organizational leaders look for ways to strengthen the performance of public-sector organizations. According to Chapman et al. (2016), “There has been a steady drumbeat calling for greater attention to the role, impact and relevance of leadership in public administration” (p. 122). Aziz et al. (2015) proposed future research should address the characteristics of leadership in an effort to increase
accountability in the public sector. Vogel and Masal (2015) addressed the issues from a different perspective and argued research on public sector leadership needs to turn attention to “publicness itself” (p. 1179). More specifically, their research indicated past research on public-sector leadership investigated general leadership concepts but failed to incorporate the unique dynamics of public leadership.

Followership

Junker et al. (2016) stated, “Leadership and followership are two sides of the same coin” (p. 1205) and in fact, a leader does not exist without at least one follower (Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2015). Baker, Anthony and Stites-Doe (2015) posited that followers can and do affect leaders, and the relationship between the two affects organizational outcomes. It is therefore advantageous to appreciate followership and how followers contribute to organizations. The following section reviews followership, follower types, courageous follower dimensions, follower qualities, and how followers influence organizations.

Historical Overview

The concept of followership appeared in the literature as early as 1938 in a paper written by Chester Barnard. The paper explored the relationship between the individual and the organization. While Barnard (2006) did not use the term follower or followership at that time, he did recognize individuals within an organization are autonomous agents yet dependent on direction and resources and are driven by the organizational purpose. It is true that Barnard’s 1938 work was focused on leadership and management within an organization; however, his work is also relevant from a followership perspective.
Rost (2008) related that the term follower was born during the industrial period and at that time referred to “subordination, submissiveness, passivity, lacking responsible judgment and willingness to allow others to control their lives and activities” (p. 57).

Seminal work done by Kelley (1988) offered a new understanding of the term follower:

People who are effective in the follower role have the vision to see both the forest and the trees, the social capacity to work well with others, the strength of character to flourish without heroic status, the moral and psychological balance to pursue personal and corporate goals at no cost to either, and, above all, the desire to participate in a team effort for the accomplishment of some greater common purpose. (p. 147)

Kelley’s (2008) work was controversial at that time, but he believed “leaders neither exist nor act in a vacuum without followers” (p. 5). Kelley (1988) felt exploring followership was vital. Hamlin (2016) stated that Kelley is now considered “one of the founding fathers of the modern exploration on followership” (p. 8). Kelley managed to pave the way for further research, and the subject of followership slowly gained momentum.

Equally controversial was Chaleff’s (1995) work on a different aspect of followership: the courage to stand up to a leader. Chaleff was eager to learn the dynamics of followership; he sought to understand how so many people from one country could follow such a “vicious leader” as Adolf Hitler (Chaleff, 2003, p. xvii). Chaleff began researching Nazi ideology to gain a deeper understanding of the leader-follower relationship. He determined that the closer a follower is to a leader who is abusing his or her power, the more difficult it is to speak up for fear of retribution. His research caused him to recognize, “Proximity and courage are the critical variables in the prevention of
the abuse of power” (Chaleff, 2003, p. xviii). Chaleff’s work was the first of its kind because he put the onus on the follower to take advantage of his or her position within an organization and have the courage to intervene when a leader is abusing his or her power (Chaleff, 2003).

While research in the field of followership was growing in a brave way, the term followership had yet to appear in many dictionaries and would display as a misspelling when typed into an electronic document (Kellerman, 2008). Indeed, some progress was being made as the term followership was accepted as part of the organizational vocabulary (Kelley, 2008). The academic and corporate worlds began to accept the concept of followership as followership courses were added to university and corporate curricula. Today, the term followership is likely to resonate with most people as most have some experience serving in a follower role (Hamlin, 2016; Tanoff & Barlow, 2002).

**Followership Styles**

Kelley’s (1988) early work provided a platform for followership research. Blanchard et al. (2009) postulated that Kelley’s concept of two followership dimensions, independent critical thinker and active engagement, and the interaction between the two is perhaps his strongest contribution to the followership literature. Kelley (1992) developed a series of questions that helped identify the dimension to which a follower belonged: independent critical thinking or active engagement. Followers who are independent critical thinkers analyze and assess information and situations, making judgments regardless of the political penalties (Kelley, 1992). Followers who demonstrate active engagement take initiative, assume ownership, demonstrate high
levels of organizational citizenship behaviors, and employ extraordinary efforts in completing job-related tasks. The questions developed by Kelley (1992) are as follows:

1. Do they think for themselves? Are they independent critical thinkers? Or do they look to the leader to do the thinking for them?

2. Are they actively engaged in creating positive energy for the organization? Or is there negative energy or passive involvement? (Kelley, 2008, p. 7)

Kelley’s (2008) two dimensions led to the development of five basic styles of followership:

- The sheep—are passive and are dependent on the leader to think for them and provide motivation.
- The yes-people—are positive, always on the leader’s side, but still depend on the leader for thinking, direction, and vision.
- The alienated—think for themselves but have a lot of negative energy. They are skeptical and cynical and believe they are the only ones courageous enough to question the leader.
- The pragmatics—will wait to see what direction the leader is headed before getting on board. They will wait it out until the storm of change blows over.
- The star followers—think for themselves, are very active, and have positive energy. They do not automatically accept the leader’s decision without doing their own full analysis of the decision.

**Courageous Followership Dimensions**

Based on his research, Chaleff (2003) developed five dimensions of courageous followership. Four of the dimensions can be utilized within an organizational group, and
the fifth dimension can be used within or outside the organizational group. Chaleff (2003) developed these dimensions to explore and develop followership roles. The dimensions include the following:

- **The courage to assume responsibility**—Courageous followers willingly take responsibility for themselves and their organizations; they take responsibility for their own growth and security; they create opportunities to grow professionally and add to the value of the organization; they take initiative in improving internal and external activities based on personal and organizational values; they understand and take ownership of the organizational purpose.

- **The courage to serve**—Courageous followers willingly serve the leader regardless of the challenges. They take on additional assignments to assist the leader and the organization. They support the leader by utilizing their unique skills when needed. They support their leader and their decisions and are equally passionate in achieving the organizational purpose.

- **The courage to challenge**—Courageous followers address inappropriate policies and behaviors; they accept the risk involved with questioning the action of the leader; while they value organizational harmony and a healthy relationship with the leader, what is most important is the organizational purpose and their personal integrity.

- **The courage to participate in transformation**—Courageous followers identify when behaviors put the common purpose in jeopardy and recommend the need for transformation. They act as a change agent and work with the leader and other followers through the transformational change process.
• The courage to take moral action—Courageous followers recognize when they must stand separate from the leader when they feel the need to take a moral stand. This action comes with a personal risk to the courageous follower, but the follower believes he or she is required to speak up to protect the organization and ensure the common purpose can be achieved. If his or her attempt at correcting the issue is unsuccessful, he or she must consider when to become a whistleblower, which also comes with increased risks.

Chaleff (2003) summarized the Five Dimensions of Courageous Followership by imploring leaders to have the courage to listen to their followers. He explained a leader must be open to and support courageous followership and respond accordingly.

**Followership Qualities**

Tanoff and Barlow (2002) conducted research utilizing Kelley’s (1992) followership model to determine whether effective followers and effective leaders engage in similar behaviors. Their research found that followers who demonstrated high critical thinking skills and rated high on active engagement are analogous with effective leaders. Tanoff and Barlow (2002) proclaimed their research “is a significant beginning in the analysis of followership” (p. 163).

Dixon and Westbrook (2003) conducted research utilizing Chaleff’s (1995) courageous follower theory. In their study, they found participants demonstrated a moderate level of courageous followership behaviors, including assuming responsibility, serving, challenging, engaging in transformation, and taking moral action. They found these behaviors were similar to independent critical thinking skills and active
engagement, which are the two dimensions identified in Kelley’s (1988) followership model.

Blanchard et al. (2009) tested Kelley’s (1992) two followership dimensions and were able to validate both with a slight variance on the groupings. As it relates to active engagement, their study found the active engagement dimension was positively related to organizational commitment and job satisfaction. They also found the dimension of independent critical thinking was negatively related to normative commitment (connection to the organization because of obligation) and extrinsic job satisfaction (satisfied with work features such as pay and working conditions) and was marginally related to affective commitment (emotional connection to and identification with the organization). Based on their research, Blanchard et al. (2009) postulated that the independent critical thinkers, through the very nature of their skill set, may more easily recognize the negative aspects of their work and/or organization, which could lead to lower commitment and job satisfaction. They further stated independent critical thinking is unique in that it can improve intrinsic job satisfaction when the follower has high active engagement but can have negative effects on active engagement. The researchers concluded, “Active engagement is by far the stronger driver of the relationship to commitment and satisfaction” (Blanchard et al., 2009, p. 128).

Other researchers have explored the topic of followership and determined excellent followers utilize their unique talents in the roles they undertake to enhance conventional leadership (Currie & Ryan, 2014; Hamlin, 2016; Kellerman, 2008; Leroy et al., 2015); align their goals with those of the organization (Currie & Ryan, 2014); unite their work with the mission of the organization (Currie & Ryan, 2014); take personal
responsibility in furthering their knowledge and skill levels (Currie & Ryan, 2014; Hamlin, 2016); are good stewards of resources and opportunities (Hamlin, 2016); and maintain their moral compass (Kellerman, 2008; Kelley, 2008).

**Influence of Followership**

Hurwitz and Hurwitz (2015) posited that while a leader is important, a leader cannot successfully ignite a movement without “that first courageous follower” (p. 16). Sweet (2012) concurred, suggesting the best way to ignite a movement is to be a follower who demonstrates to others how to follow. Followers who combine their efforts to generate action can be the determining factor in an organization achieving its purpose (Hamlin, 2016). It is incumbent upon leaders then to understand the dynamics of the leader-follower partnership (Carsten & Bligh, 2008). Chaleff (2003) described that partnership stating, “Followers and leaders both orbit around the purpose; followers do not orbit around the leader” (p. 13). As followers are usually the largest group in any organization, a leader needs to look to those followers for their individual and collective efforts that can help the leader focus on and achieve the organizational purpose (Hamlin, 2016).

Leadership expert Warren Bennis (2008b) explained that in many ways, followership is harder than leadership because there are more dangers, fewer rewards, and more reason for caution. Bennis (2008b) added,

Great followership has never been more important, if only because of the seriousness of the global problems we face and the fact that they must be solved collaboratively, not by leaders alone but by leaders working in tandem with able and dedicated followers. (p. xxvi)
Crowley (2011) added to the followership research by concluding, “Workers who feel cared for and happy generate significantly and consistently greater financial performance” (p. 32). Currie and Ryan (2014) suggested followers add value to an organization by identifying and securing work relationships that help motivate them to complete even the most mundane of tasks. Hurwitz and Hurwitz (2015) postulated that followership should be considered “a dynamic, different, yet equal complement to leadership. Both are important and both should be appreciated” (p. 225).

Followership is an underresearched topic with an organizational and research bias toward leadership (Leroy et al., 2015). This is true even though followers are a required piece of the leadership phenomenon (Hamlin, 2016). Hurwitz and Hurwitz (2015) suggested researchers replicate leadership studies through a followership lens. Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) supported their research colleagues by declaring, “The significance of following for leadership means that our understanding of leadership is incomplete without an understanding of followership” (p. 84).

To address the demand for additional followership research, Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) developed two theoretical frameworks for use in the prolonged study of followership. One framework utilizes a role-based approach that studies followership from a hierarchical context and involves an exploration into how “followers influence leader attitudes, behaviors, and outcomes” (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014, p. 89). The other, a construct approach, studies followership from a relational development context and is based on the premise that leadership and followership are “co-constructed in social and relational interactions” (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014, p. 89).
In addition, Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) offered an advanced definition of the study of followership: “The study of followership involves an investigation of the nature and impact of followers and following in the leadership process” (p. 89). They explained the intentional wordsmithing of this definition recognizes followership as a “role” and as a “social process,” supporting both their theoretical frameworks. Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) called for researchers to assist in advancing followership research, advocating for the development of new constructs and variables and imploring researchers be loyal to the followership constructs. This is of the utmost importance as “it is in following that leadership is created” (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014, p. 90).

**Organizational Citizenship Behaviors**

Organizational citizenship behaviors are advantageous to any organization that strives to achieve extraordinary outcomes (Yildiz, 2016). Public-sector leaders who encourage public servants to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors have the ability to counteract the bureaucratic red tape and increasing regulations, eventually improving organizational performance (Vigoda-Gadot & Beeri, 2012). The following section further explores the phenomenon known as organizational citizenship behaviors.

**Historical Overview**

Barnard (2006) discussed the role of the individual and his or her actions relating to the organizational purpose. He suggested that the organizational purpose was the driving factor of an individual’s decision to cooperate, and he cautioned organizations not to become a barrier between the individual and the organizational purpose. Barnard is believed to be the first executive to have an open discussion about leadership while at the
same time describing what would one day be known as organizational citizenship behaviors (Goldstein & Hazy, 2006).

Over 25 years later, Katz (1964) researched what motivated individuals and what could be done to stimulate that motivation within working individuals. He identified three basic behaviors that he believed are essential for organizational efficiency:

1. Individuals must be enticed to accept and maintain a position within an organization
2. Individuals must perform their role in an acceptable manner
3. There must be innovative and spontaneous activity in achieving organizational objectives which go beyond the role specifications. (Katz, 1964, p. 132).

Katz (1964) recognized that individuals working in an organization are human, and as such, they demand physical and psychological interaction. He believed it was the positive interaction with others in the organization that served as the most “potent form of motivation” (Katz, 1964, p. 144). He continued to explore how that motivation can be promoted and utilized to achieve organizational goals.

Over 2 decades later, Smith et al. (1983a) explored the concept of organizational citizenship behaviors and through their research identified two separate dimensions of citizenship behavior, altruism, and general compliance. Altruism was identified as helping behaviors directed at those needing assistance while general compliance was identified as completing a task for the good of the organization (Smith et al., 1983a). Their research concluded that moderating factors of general compliance are an individual’s need for social approval and support from the leader (Smith et al., 1983a). Additionally, they argued that their research supported the need for additional studies of
the effects of organizational citizenship behaviors. Researchers were attracted to the phenomenon of organizational citizenship behaviors because these behaviors cannot be “accounted for by the same motivational bases as those that induce people to join, stay, and perform within contractual, enforceable role prescriptions” (Smith et al., 1983a, p. 654).

Organ (1988) refined his definition of organizational citizenship behaviors:

“Behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (p. 86). He also refined and added to the dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviors, identifying five dimensions:

- **Altruism (original dimension)—** voluntarily helping others, such as helping others do *their* work, or helping new employees learn their job (Organ, 1988).
- **Civic virtue—** “A posture of responsible, constructive involvement in the political or governance process” (Organ, 1988, p. 24); behavior that acts as the organization’s conscience (Organ, 1988).
- **Sportsmanship—** overlooking or handling a problem or complaint oneself “conserves the stamina of administrators that can be devoted to constructive purposes” (Organ, 1988, p. 23).
- **Conscientiousness (originally general compliance)—** compliant behavior that goes beyond the work contract such as following rules, regulations, policies, and procedures; identifying and suggesting ways to improve organizational performance (Organ, 1988).
- **Courtesy—** not causing additional work for others (Organ, 1988).
A variety of dimensions and taxonomies have been proposed by a number of researchers, yet a consensus has yet to be achieved (Mendes, Carlos, & Lourenco, 2014). However, Organ’s (1988) five-dimension taxonomy, as identified previously, is considered to be “one of the most important conceptualizations for theory development” (Mendes et al., 2014, p. 114). In addition to the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior, researchers have been interested in its antecedents, of which four have been identified by Park, Song, Yoon, and Kim (2013):

- Individual characteristics—ability, professional orientation, and independence
- Task characteristics—feedback, routine, and meaningfulness
- Leadership behaviors—transactional and transformational styles, support, and role clarification
- Organizational characteristics—formalization, structural rigidity, perceived support, and group cohesion.

Researchers have considered and included these identified antecedents when conducting their studies. For example, data obtained by Atta and Khan (2015) found transformational and transactional leadership behaviors were significant predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors. However, individualized consideration (a characteristic of transformational leadership) and management-by-exception-active (a characteristic of transactional leadership) were found to be insignificant predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors in a public-sector setting. Other researchers have obtained empirical evidence to support Atta and Khan’s (2015) findings that transformational leadership is a significant predictor of organizational citizenship

**Significance of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors**

The significance of organizational citizenship behaviors has been documented even in the early research. Smith et al. (1983a) articulated the importance by stating, “Substantively, citizenship behaviors are important because they lubricate the social machinery of the organization” (p. 653). A review of the literature shows organizational citizenship behaviors positively influence the success of an organization by improving productivity, effective use of resources, improved teamwork, improved work environment, employee retention, performance stability, and ability to adapt to environmental change (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997). Atta and Khan (2015) submitted that the dynamic, positive relationship between the leader and follower stimulates organizational citizenship behaviors that lead to other positive, progressive behaviors in the workplace.

Organizational citizenship behaviors have been associated with improving public service, removing bureaucratic obstacles, and improving team performance (Vigoda-Gadot & Beeri, 2012). Chan et al. (2017) submitted that organizational citizenship behaviors can be directed to customers and by customers (customers’ citizenship behaviors) through the social exchange—reciprocity process. They further explained that employees who demonstrate organizational citizenship behaviors toward their customers can inspire their customers to reciprocate that behavior by completing customer service surveys or to speak highly of the organization to others. This discovery should be of particular interest to public administrators as the pressures of environmental changes in
public organizations require public-service workers to be innovative and creative in the decision-making process (Vigoda-Gadot & Beeri, 2012). Organizational citizenship behaviors have been and continue to be a topic of interest to those who seek a greater understanding of the inner workings of organizations (Mendes et al., 2014; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997; Shim & Rohrbaugh, 2014; Smith et al., 1983a; Vigoda-Gadot & Beeri, 2012; Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, & Chen, 2005).

**Public-Service Delivery**

A study conducted by Lam and Mayer (2014) indicated customer service quality can be enhanced by encouraging followers to voice concerns and ideas that have a positive impact on service delivery. Additionally, public-sector leaders must ensure the service values are identified and aligned across the organization (Getha-Taylor et al., 2011). The following section explores the dynamics of public-service delivery.

**Historical Overview**

The 1980s brought with it a demand for a new approach to public-service delivery (Potter, 1988). Hanson (2011) acknowledged that government entities exist to fulfill a particular mission: to maintain order in communities, educate the public, provide a wide variety of services, and be good stewards of the public’s assets. Public-sector managers have realized they must consider citizen satisfaction to properly determine their level of organizational performance (Brown, 2007). Potter (1988) stated, “It [public demand] has created a climate in which public services are looking to the best of the private sector for inspiration” (p. 157).

In the late 1980s, an attempt was made to change the approach to public-service delivery. The public sector adopted five consumer principles from the private sector that
would redirect the focus to the consumers of public service (Potter, 1988). It was determined that those who need services must have access to those services. It was noted that public-sector consumers did not always have an equal opportunity to voice their preferences; therefore, a method for them to do so was suggested. Additionally, consumers of public services also needed a choice of services. While it was recognized this is not always possible in the public sector, a process would be developed to recognize and address consumers’ interests. To help consumers make appropriate decisions, it was determined that public-sector consumers needed as much information as possible. It was also believed that public-sector consumers needed information related to the public sector’s goals and objectives, standards of service, their rights to service, their responsibilities in receiving services, and how and why decisions are made. Redress was identified as a need for public-sector consumers as consumers required a process in which to express complaints. It was decided the grievance process would be swift and simple and should be seen as an opportunity to perform quality control measures. Representation was also considered important as those receiving public services often do not have the resources to represent their own interest. Potter (1988) stated that the five principles of consumerism had been adopted by many public-sector organizations, especially in public utilities, local government services, and health care services.

By the early 1990s, there was great interest in addressing quality and service in both business and government (Brick, 2010; Poister & Henry, 1994). However, for the public sector, a move toward customer service could not be timelier. In 1990, the Volcker Commission published a report that identified the public perception of government was at an all-time low as the public perceived high levels of government
corruption, waste, and ineffectiveness (Poister & Henry, 1994). Public-sector administrators understood the need to improve quality and customer satisfaction and began experimenting with a variety of strategies (Poister & Henry, 1994).

**Dynamics of Public-Service Delivery**

Followers play a significant role in achieving customer service goals as they are the employees who work most directly with the public. Crowley (2011) stated, “Consistent and sincere efforts which make people feel safe, connected, understood, appreciated, and significant affect people at their core and draw out greatness” (p. 35). The onus is often on the leader to create a positive work environment. However, Hurwitz and Hurwitz (2015) believed that while leaders create an atmosphere conducive to employee engagement, it is the followers themselves who must determine their level of participation.

When followers are not working to their full potential, the organization suffers, and in the case of a public-service organization that means the customer in need of service suffers. J. Lawrence (2015) stated,

As a business designs its products and services, it is no longer enough for them to just think about the product or service itself, but they also must think about the whole customer experience and what expectations the customers are bringing with them. (p. 4)

Schepers et al. (2012) studied the impact leaders had on employee outcomes. They stated, “Rather than controlling employee behavior with rules and monitoring, stewardship theorists assert that perceptions of problem ownership and responsibility underlie employees’ determination to perform because they become vested in customer
outcomes” (Schepers et al., 2012, p. 2). Supporting that research, Leroy et al. (2015) suggested followers perform at the highest of levels when they experience autonomous motivation. Research in this field can assist public-service organizations by identifying strategies public-service leaders can utilize to meet beneficiaries’ expectations. The need for additional investigations is supported by research in the public sector, which indicates that only 56% of respondents were satisfied with services from public agencies (Government Business Council, 2015).

Other research shows agency control and customer stewardship control have a direct effect on employee customer service levels. Schepers, Falk, de Ruyter, de Jong, and Hammerschmidt (2012) stated, “Employees become stewards and develop a self-regulatory mechanism in which customer welfare is an important personal objective” (p. 6). Research completed by Schepers et al. (2012) found a positive correlation between customer stewardship control and in-role behaviors. However, they found with increased agency control, customer stewardship control did not allow employees the time and effort needed to achieve extra role behaviors. The researchers posited, “Although agency control makes employees work within specified service scripts and CSC prompts them to go the extra mile to satisfy the customer, the combination of both systems erodes their effectiveness” (Schepers et al., 2012, p. 16). Therefore, by limiting employees’ time or ability to make customer service decisions, an organization then limits the employees’ ability to exceed customer expectations.

Grant (2012) explored the relationship between transformational leadership, employee performance, and beneficiary contact. He found a positive relationship between transformational leadership and employee performance, finding a statistically
significant relationship when beneficiary contact was high (Grant, 2012). Taking a slightly different approach, Bellé (2013) conducted extensive research into the relationship between transformational leadership, perceived social impact, and public-service motivation. Bellé’s (2013) findings supported work completed by Grant (2012) and found a positive relationship between transformational leadership, employee performance, and beneficiary contact.

Public-service leaders can benefit from studies that explore avenues to achieving success in a public-service organization despite the challenges. Bakker (2015) suggested that public-service managers should hire employees with high levels of public-service motivation because of their “sense of calling [and] motivation to mobilize their own daily job resources in order to stay engaged and perform well” (p. 723). Tummers and Knies (2013) suggested that when public-service leaders develop healthy relationships with followers, followers are given more opportunities to participate and are given greater latitude in the decision-making process, positively contributing to organizational outcomes, including customer service. Wirtz and Jerger (2016) advised that followers are critical to the service delivery discussion as they are often the ones who meet directly with the public; they determine the customer’s service experience; they often have the best understanding of a customer’s needs and can respond accordingly; they have the ability to build relationship with customers; and they can affect organizational resources. Brick (2010) articulated the importance of the follower public servant role: “When we focus on the quality of the service delivery, we embody respect for the office we hold and the people we serve” (p. 40).
Conclusion

The organizational literature has overlooked public-sector leadership in much of the empirical research done to date (Chapman et al., 2016; Trottier et al., 2008; Vandenabeele et al., 2014). The literature that does exist indicates public-sector leaders play a key role in ensuring the public-sector customer receives the services requested and in the appropriate fashion (Aziz et al., 2015). Followers have been recognized as an important part of the leadership puzzle (Hamlin, 2016), yet researchers acknowledge “it is the least explored element of public leadership concerns” (Vogel & Masal, 2015, p. 1181). Chapman et al. (2016) stated, “There is a need to understand public leadership in a broader context (apart of exceptional cases) and how effective leadership may make a difference in public organizations, advancing public service and the principles of effective and equitable governance” (p. 114).
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Overview

Chapter III discusses the methodology used in this sequential, explanatory mixed-methods study. This chapter includes a restatement of the purpose and research questions. The population, sample, and instrumentation are described, followed by an explanation of the data collection and analysis process. A discussion of the limitations and a summary end the chapter.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this sequential, explanatory mixed-methods study was to identify and describe to what extent the quality of the leader-follower relationship, as perceived by followers, affects followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors in a public-service organization.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. How do followers working in a public-service organization perceive their level of organizational citizenship behaviors?
2. To what extent are followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward other individuals?
3. To what extent are followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward their organization?
4. To what extent does the quality of the leader-follower relationship affect the followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors in public-service organizations?
Research Design

According to McMillan and Schumacher (2010), “A research design describes the procedures for conducting the study, including when, from whom, and under what conditions the data will be obtained” (p. 20). This section identifies each part of the research design including the rationale for the design, the implementation process, and the data collection process.

Including both quantitative and qualitative methods when designing a research study is believed to be the best tactic for obtaining comprehensive answers to research questions (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). Mertens (2013) supported the use of mixed-methods research by stating, “Mixed methods researchers are extending our understanding of how to understand complex social phenomenon, as well as how to use research to develop effective interventions to address complex social problems” (p. 215).

After careful study of different mixed-methods research designs, it was determined that a sequential, explanatory mixed-methods approach best met the needs of this study. McMillan and Schumacher (2010) stated, “In a sequential explanatory design, quantitative and qualitative data collection is implemented in two phases, with the primary emphasis on quantitative methods” (p. 401). After the quantitative data are collected and analyzed, the qualitative data are collected and analyzed. The intent of collecting the qualitative data is to utilize the data to gain a deeper understanding of the quantitative data. Figure 1 depicts the sequential, explanatory research design used in this study; the capital letters represent that the priority status was assigned to the quantitative data.
Figure 1. Sequential, explanatory mixed-methods research design with priority status assigned to the quantitative data collection.

Phase 1 of this study, the quantitative phase, included the use of a survey questionnaire that was provided to line-level followers (public-service employees) who had direct contact with the public. The survey questionnaire assessed followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors. Phase 2 of this study, the qualitative phase, included semistructured, face-to-face interviews with followers who volunteered to be interviewed by the researcher. The rationale for adopting this approach included the ability to subsequently analyze quantitative and qualitative data to gain a deeper understanding of the answers to the research questions.

**Phase 1: Quantitative survey questionnaire.** Surveys are popular for a number of reasons; they are efficient and inexpensive to use, they can be used to gather information from a large population, and data can be gathered from a number of different variables (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). Creswell (2014) stated, “A survey design provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of the population by studying a sample of that population” (p. 155). A survey questionnaire was determined to be the best, most efficient way to collect data for use in this study. Participants were asked to answer questions related to their own organizational citizenship behaviors. McMillan and Schumacher (2010) stated that online surveys are
easy for most participants to use; they reach the highest number of participants and result in a high response rate.

The researcher utilized an online survey company, Survey Monkey, to facilitate the online survey process. Sending an online survey questionnaire through Survey Monkey allowed participants’ identities to remain secure, and each participant received the same set of questions (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). The survey questionnaire asked participants to what extent they demonstrate organizational citizenship behaviors toward individuals and toward the organization throughout the work day.

**Phase 2: Qualitative semistructured interviews.** After collecting and analyzing the quantitative data, a qualitative inquiry was conducted. The qualitative portion of the study was completed to gain a richer understanding of the collected quantitative data. The researcher obtained participants’ perspectives through semistructured, face-to-face interviews. According to Patton (2015), “Open-ended questions and probes yield in-depth responses about people’s experiences, perceptions, opinions, feelings, and knowledge” (p. 14). The interviews were semistructured, allowing the researcher to ask a set of standard questions to all participants but expand the questions when needed to achieve a deeper meaning of the gathered data. Qualitative interviewing generally uses a semistructured format as the process is flexible and allows for focused and evolving information to be gathered (Bamberger, Rugh, & Mabry, 2012).

The questions asked during the qualitative portion of the study covered two areas: (a) outlier data collected during the quantitative phase and (b) Liden and Maslyn’s (1998) LMX-MDM survey instrument. The quantitative data collected through the online survey identified two areas in which respondents rated their behavior lower than the other
areas. The researcher asked two questions related to organizational citizenship behaviors demonstrated toward individuals and the organization to help clarify the outlier information. Additionally, one question was created to represent each of the behaviors measured by the LMX-MDM survey instrument that measured respect, loyalty, individual contribution, and the affect a positive relationship can have on a leader and follower. The results of the study are intended to assist public-service organizations in capitalizing on those behaviors that help achieve organizational performance standards, including those behaviors that improve customer service.

**Population**

Patten (2012) described population as “the group in which researchers are ultimately interested” (p. 45). The population of this study was public-service workers employed in the state of California. Table 1 displays the number of public-service employees employed in the state of California in 2016, as reported to the California State Controller’s Office (n.d.).

A target population was defined by McMillan and Schumacher (2010) as “a group of elements or cases, whether individuals, objects, or events that conform to specific criteria and to which we intend to generalize the results of the research” (p. 129). The target population selected for this study was public-service workers employed by the city of Corona, a metropolitan area of Southern California, located in the Inland Empire. The city limits comprise 39.2 square miles with a population of over 160,000. Based on the California State Controller’s Office statistics, the city of Corona employed 907 people in 2016; 220 of those met the criteria for participation in this study.
Table 1

Number of Public-Service Employees Employed in the State of California in 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public employer</th>
<th>Number of employers reporting</th>
<th>Number of public employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>324,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>364,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special districts</td>
<td>3,052</td>
<td>159,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State agencies and departments</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>247,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior courts</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>291,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California state universities</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>119,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community college districts</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>159,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 education</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>636,573 (approx. 75% unreported)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First 5 commissions</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairs and expos</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4,507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample

In research, a sample refers to the participants who provided data for use in the study (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). The sample used for this study included those individuals who work for the city of Corona, hold line-level positions, and have direct contact with the public.

This study utilized a purposeful sampling methodology. Patton (2015) stated purposeful sampling is used to access participants who are “information rich” (p. 46) and can contribute to a deeper understanding of a particular phenomenon. This study utilized public-service employees who are members of the Corona General Employees Association (CGEA), a recognized nonsupervisory unit by the city of Corona.
Phase 1: Quantitative Survey Questionnaire

Each CGEA member was sent an e-mail explaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the study. The e-mail then invited the potential participant to partake in Phase 1 of the study by completing the online survey questionnaire. At the end of the survey questionnaire, participants were asked whether they would be interested in volunteering for Phase 2 of the study. Contact information for those who answered in the affirmative was maintained separately from the questionnaire data to ensure confidentiality.

Phase 2: Qualitative Semistructured Interview

Phase 2 of the study involved qualitative semistructured, face-to-face interviews. Bamberger et al. (2012) explained qualitative sampling methods are far different than quantitative methods in that qualitative methods have a need to delve deeper into the data. They further stated qualitative evaluation strives to appreciate the individual by achieving a phenomenological understanding, or his or her personal perspective.

The participants of Phase 2 were identified using purposeful sampling. Patten (2012) described purposeful sampling as a method researchers utilize when they purposively identify participants based on the belief the participants can contribute greatly to their study. Purposeful sampling permitted the researcher to contact those participants from Phase 1 who volunteered to participate in Phase 2.

Instrumentation

The research design of this sequential, explanatory mixed-methods study utilized two phases. The first phase, which was the quantitative phase, used a valid and reliable survey questionnaire. The researcher created the survey questionnaire in an online
format. The second phase, the qualitative phase, consisted of semistructured, face-to-face interviews.

**Phase 1: Quantitative Survey Questionnaires**

Lee and Allen (2002) created an organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) survey (Appendix A) that was in part based on the Organizational Citizenship Measure authored by Smith, Organ, and Near (1983b) and other OCB measurement tools that were previously created. OCBs were defined by Organ (1988) as “behaviors that are discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (p. 86). Additionally, Lee and Allen (2002) removed those items that measured negative behavior to create a survey tool that measured those behaviors that are beneficial to individuals (OCBI) and to the organization (OCBO). Their final measurement tool utilized eight items specific to OCBI and eight items specific to OCBO and utilized a 7-point Likert scale ranging from never to always.

**Phase 2: Qualitative Semistructured Interview**

The second phase of this study employed semistructured interviews with Phase 1 participants who indicated they were willing to participate in Phase 2. Creswell (2014) stated that qualitative survey instruments deployed after quantitative data are collected can provide a deeper understanding of the quantitative data. A phenomenological approach was used when structuring the interview questions as the researcher sought to attain each participant’s perception of his or her lived experience within his or her workplace (Patton, 2015). Additionally, the researcher developed an alignment table to
ensure each interview question was aligned with one or more research question (Appendix B).

The semistructured, face-to-face interviews used in this study comprised two predetermined questions based on the quantitative data. After analyzing the quantitative data, the researcher identified two areas that required further clarification. The researcher developed two questions to help glean additional information that could result in a better understanding of the quantitative data. Additionally, the researcher asked four questions based on Liden and Maslyn’s (1998) LMX-MDM survey instrument (Table 2) that measured respect, loyalty, individual contribution, and the affect a positive relationship can have between leader and follower. The researcher created one question that summarized each measured behavior. As the interviews were semistructured in nature, the researcher was able to incorporate subsequent questions, allowing the researcher to gather the most significant, meaningful data from each participant (Bamberger et al., 2012). Additionally, an expert panel was used to review the predetermined interview questions, feedback was requested and provided, and the researcher made necessary revisions. This process was used to provide credibility to Phase 2 of this study.

**Data Collection**

Phase 1 of this sequential, explanatory mixed-methods study utilized a survey questionnaire that measured organizational citizen behaviors directed toward individuals and the organization. Phase 2 of this study employed semistructured, face-to-face interviews to obtain a deeper understanding of the leader-follower relationship and how that relationship affects OCBs.
Table 2

Definitions of LMX-MDM Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LMX-MDM dimension</th>
<th>Dimension definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>The mutual affection members of the dyad have for each other based primarily on interpersonal attraction, rather than work or professional values. Such affection may be manifested in the desire for and/or occurrence of a relationship which has personally rewarding components and outcomes (e.g., a friendship).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>The expression of public support for the goals and the personal character of the other member of the LMX dyad. Loyalty involves a faithfulness to the individual that is generally consistent from situation to situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>Perception of the current level of work-oriented activity each member puts forth toward the mutual goals (explicit or implicit) of the dyad. Important in the evaluation of work-oriented activity is the extent to which the subordinate member of the dyad handles responsibility and completes tasks that extend beyond the job description and/or employment contract; and likewise, the extent to which the supervisor provides resources and opportunities for such activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional respect</td>
<td>Perception of the degree to which each member of the dyad has built a reputation, within and/or outside the organization, of excelling at his or her line of work. This perception may be based on historical data concerning the person, such as personal experience with the individual; comments made about the person from individuals within or outside the organization; and awards or other professional recognition achieved by the person. Thus, it is possible, though not required, to have developed a perception of professional respect before working with or even meeting the person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Phase 1: Quantitative Survey Questionnaire

SurveyMonkey is a company that uses cloud-based software to provide survey development and survey implementation services to the public. The public-service
employees who work for the city of Corona and who met the sample criteria were sent an invitation via e-mail to participate in the survey. The invitation included an explanation of the study and directions on how to take the survey. Embedded in the e-mail invitation was a SurveyMonkey link that directed participants to the questionnaires utilized for this study. In addition to the questionnaire, participants were asked to voluntarily provide demographic information such as gender, age range, years in public service, and years employed by the city of Corona (Appendix C). Participants were also asked whether they were interested in participating in Phase 2 of the study. Those who were interested were asked to provide their contact information.

**Phase 2: Qualitative Semistructured Interviews**

Phase 2 of this sequential, explanatory mixed-methods study used semistructured, face-to-face interviews to gain a deeper understanding of the quantitative data collected during Phase 1. During Phase 1, participants were asked whether they wished to participate in Phase 2. Those who showed an interest were invited to participate in Phase 2; therefore, purposeful sampling was used to identify Phase 2 participants. Each participant was interviewed individually and face-to-face. The interviews were conducted in a quiet, secluded location acceptable to both the participant and the researcher. The researcher recorded each interview with permission of the participant using two recording devices to ensure the data remained secure. The researcher also took notes to assist in identifying subsequent questions that could assist in achieving a richer understanding of participants’ answers. At the completion of the interviews, the researcher sent the recordings to a third-party transcription service to ensure accuracy.
Confidentiality

Maintaining confidentiality is an important responsibility belonging to each researcher. Confidentiality refers to the agreement made between researcher and participant regarding what information can be shared, such as the participant’s name and the information provided by the participant (Roberts, 2010).

Protecting confidentiality Phase 1. Those choosing to participate in the online survey related to this study were provided an informed consent form at the beginning of the survey process (Appendix D). The electronic informed consent form advised the participant the purpose of the study, the fact that participation was voluntary, the potential outcomes of the study, and the efforts made to maintain confidentiality. To advance to the survey questionnaires, each participant was required to acknowledge his or her understanding of the informed consent form including the understanding that participation was voluntary and that he or she was a willing participant. Once the researcher obtained data results from SurveyMonkey, the researcher created electronic folders to secure all data through a password-protected entry. Data received from SurveyMonkey were free from participant names and other identifying information. At the end of the survey, participants were invited to participate in Phase 2 of the study. The survey instrument then directed the participant to the next question where the participant was asked to enter his or her name and e-mail address so the researcher could make contact in preparation for the Phase 2 semistructured interviews. If participants chose not to participate in the second phase of the study, they were directed to click on the submit button, which would then submit their survey responses.
Protecting confidentiality Phase 2. Phase 2 entailed semistructured, face-to-face interviews with Phase 1 participants who volunteered to participate in Phase 2. To ensure that the participants felt comfortable answering questions related to their work behavior and work environment, the researcher conducted the in-person interviews in a location deemed appropriate by the participant. The locations included a private office located at a city-owned building or other facility close to the participant’s work or home location. The researcher requested only that the locations were safe and quiet so the interview could be audio recorded successfully.

The researcher began each interview by reviewing the informed consent form (Appendix D) with each participant and providing each participant a copy of the Participant’s Bill of Rights form (Appendix E). Next, the researcher requested permission to interview the participant and audio record the verbal interaction for transcription and coding purposes. Each participant was assigned pseudo-identification in the form of letters and a number to maintain the personal identifying information of all participants. The interviews varied in time between 14 and 45 minutes. After the content of each interview was accurately transcribed, the researcher destroyed each audio recording to maintain participants’ confidentiality. The transcriptions of all interviews were maintained in a locked file cabinet that was only accessible by the researcher. Proper research protocol suggests a researcher preserve raw data for 3 years (American Psychological Association, 2012). Accordingly, the raw data from this study were preserved for 3 years, at which time the researcher properly disposed of all data obtained throughout the execution of this study.
Written Consent

Those participating in this study were provided information related to the study, including the purpose of the study, the data collection process, how the data would be used, and the measures taken by the researcher to ensure confidentiality of all participants. Additionally, participants were advised that the data would be viewed by the researcher and an expert advisor only; however, no personal identifying information would be seen by anyone other than the researcher. As stated earlier, Phase 2 participants were assigned a unique number, removing the need to use personal identifying information. As such, the researcher was able to provide data to the expert advisor without breaching confidentiality.

Institutional Review Board Approval

Conducting research can create situations in which the participant is at risk, especially those participants who belong to a vulnerable population (Creswell, 2003). The role of an IRB, which includes verifying informed consent and confidentiality processes are effectively followed, is to identify potential activities that may cause participants harm, especially potential ethical violations (Roberts, 2010).

Brandman University Institutional Review Board (BUIRB) examined the methodology proposed in this study to identify any potential threats to potential participants. After thorough review of all research activities identified in this study, the BUIRB approved this study, allowing the researcher to move into the data collection phase of the dissertation journey.
Data Analysis

Creswell (2003) advised that a sequential, explanatory mixed-methods study is designed to collect and analyze quantitative data, followed by qualitative data collection and analysis. The sequential, explanatory mixed-methods design involves clearly identified stages for data collection and analysis (see Figure 1), making the process easy to use and easy to articulate verbally and in writing (Creswell, 2003).

Phase 1: Data Analysis

After obtaining the data results, the researcher reviewed the data to ensure each questionnaire was thoroughly completed. Descriptive statistics were used as McMillan and Schumacher (2010) advised “to transform a set of numbers . . . into indices that describe or characterize the data” (p. 149), which helped the researcher to summarize the data. The data were also evaluated for outlier cases; the researcher made note of the outliers to address the phenomenon during Phase 2 as suggested by Creswell (2003). Any outliers found must be addressed and reported to maintain ethical standards and proper research protocol (Roberts, 2010).

Phase 2: Data Analysis

Phase 2 of this study consisted of semistructured, face-to-face interviews, which were conducted to gain a deeper understanding of the quality of the leader-follower relationship and how that relationship affected followers’ OCBs. After the Phase 2 data were transcribed, the data were organized and grouped together by theme. The researcher then coded each group. According to Creswell (2013), coding involves the researcher evaluating the data, developing clusters of like data, and assigning a label to each data group. The coded data were then analyzed to develop inferences from the data.
Interrater reliability is achieved when two or more researchers analyze the same data sets then compare results to ensure researcher bias has not breached the data analysis process (Roberts, 2010). The researcher conducting this study provided 10% of the data collected in Phase 2 to an independent researcher to conduct the interrater reliability check. This process limited researcher bias and increased the validity of the data analysis process and findings.

**Validity and Reliability**

Roberts (2010) stated validity refers to the degree a research instrument measures what it was designed to measure; reliability refers to the degree a research instrument consistently measures what it was designed to measure. In mixed-methods research, Creswell (2003) stated that an analysis of the data “occurs both within the quantitative . . . and qualitative . . . approach, and often between the two approaches” (p. 220), which helps to increase the validity of the findings. The threat to internal validity was decreased by use of a proven valid survey instrument.

Lee and Allen (2002) tested the reliability of the survey questionnaire they developed and found, “Confirmatory factor analysis (N = 155) clearly showed that the two-factor model is preferred to the one-factor model and hence confirmed an empirical distinction between OCBI and OCBO. Reliabilities were .83 (OCBI) and .88 (OCBO)” (p. 135). Lee and Allen’s (2002) measurement tool was made available in the public domain; therefore, permission for use was not required.

Bamberger et al. (2012) suggested a researcher conduct pilot interviews to obtain feedback related to potential problems to the design and outcomes of the interview questions. This is particularly important when the researcher is using a semistructured
interview process as the participant is not given answers from which to choose; instead, the questions are intended to invoke an individual’s response (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). Therefore, it is helpful to test the questions for clarity and understanding. This researcher invited three public-service employees who were not eligible for the study to serve in a role of interviewee for purposes of testing the semistructured interview questions. The researcher then solicited the help of an experienced researcher to evaluate the pilot data and provide suggestions for improvement. The researcher revised the interview questions where needed.

**Limitations**

Research studies are always influenced by one or more limitations, which are usually things that the researcher cannot control (Roberts, 2010). One limitation of this study was that the research was limited to line-level staff who worked for the city of Corona and who were members of CGEA. The outcomes of this study may not relate to employees at different levels of the organization as the experiences and opinions of higher level employees may differ. Additionally, the survey questionnaire that measured OCBs is a self-assessment tool; and while the tool has been proven reliable, it is possible that participants over- or underreported their levels of citizenship behaviors. Finally, it is possible that Phase 2 participants did not fully disclose information requested during the face-to-face interview process.

**Summary**

Chapter III discussed the methodology used in this sequential, explanatory mixed-methods study. This chapter reiterated the purpose and research questions and identified the population and sample used in this study. The survey instrument and interview
process were identified and explained as were the data collection and data analysis processes. Finally, the researcher disclosed the limitations of the study. Chapter IV follows with findings of the quantitative and qualitative data. Chapter V concludes the study, providing a complete analysis of the totality of the research findings, the implications of the research findings, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH, DATA COLLECTION, AND FINDINGS

This study strived to add to the public-sector literature by exploring to what extent the quality of the leader-follower relationship affects organizational citizenship behaviors demonstrated by followers working in a public-sector organization. Chapter I provided the background for the study; identified the purpose statement, research questions, and the significance of the problem; included definitions of the terms; and concluded with the organization of the study. Chapter II provided a review of the literature relevant to public-sector organizations, including leadership, followership, and public-service delivery. Chapter III examined the methodology used in this study, including the research design, population and sample, instrumentation used, and the data collection and data analysis procedures. Chapter IV reviews the purpose, research questions, and methodology of this mixed-methods study. Additionally, Chapter IV discusses the data collection process and population and sample and concludes with a presentation of the quantitative and qualitative data collected.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this sequential, explanatory mixed-methods study was to identify and describe to what extent the quality of the leader-follower relationship, as perceived by followers, affects followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors in a public-service organization.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions guided this study:

1. How do followers working in a public-service organization perceive their level of organizational citizenship behaviors?
2. To what extent are followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward other individuals?

3. To what extent are followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward their organization?

4. To what extent does the quality of the leader-follower relationship affect the followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors in public-service organizations?

**Research Methods and Data Collection Procedures**

This sequential, explanatory mixed-methods study utilized two phases during the data collection process. Phase 1 of this study, the quantitative phase, included the use of a survey questionnaire that was provided to line-level followers (public-service employees) who had direct contact with the public. The survey questionnaire was a self-assessment of followers’ OCBs and sought to identify how followers working in a public-service organization perceived their level of OCBs. Phase 1 also sought to determine to what extent followers’ OCBs were directed toward other individuals and to what extent OCBs were directed toward the organization. Phase 2 of this study, the qualitative phase, included semistructured, face-to-face interviews with followers who volunteered to be interviewed by the researcher. The questions asked during the semistructured interviews included three questions that sought to clarify data gathered during the quantitative phase and five questions that sought to gather information about the quality of the leader-follower relationship. The rationale for adopting this approach included the ability to subsequently analyze quantitative and qualitative data to gain a deeper understanding of the data relevant to the research questions.
Population

Patten (2012) described population as “the group in which researchers are ultimately interested” (p. 45). The population of this study was public-service workers employed in the state of California. A target population was defined by McMillan and Schumacher (2010) as “a group of elements or cases, whether individuals, objects, or events that conform to specific criteria and to which we intend to generalize the results of the research” (p. 129). The target population selected for this study was public-service workers employed by the city of Corona.

Sample

In research, a sample refers to the participants who provided data for use in the study (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). The sample population utilized in this study included public-service employees who were current members of the Corona General Employees Association (CGEA), a recognized nonsupervisory bargaining unit in the city of Corona. Additionally, this study utilized a purposeful sampling methodology. Patton (2015) stated purposeful sampling is used to access participants who are “information rich” (p. 46) and can contribute to a deeper understanding of a particular phenomenon.

The sample population totaled 220 CGEA members who worked in a variety of departments located in the city of Corona. Table 3 illustrates the number of participants who accessed the SurveyMonkey link that was utilized in Phase 1 of this sequential, explanatory mixed-methods study. Participants who declined to participate after reading the informed consent form were automatically disqualified from the study. Additionally, all incomplete surveys were not considered in the data analysis process. Only data obtained from completed survey questionnaires were analyzed as part of this research.
study. Phase 2 involved face-to-face interviews with 10 CGEA members who volunteered to participate in the face-to-face interview process.

Table 3

*Phase 1 Participant Numbers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey status</th>
<th># of surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of CGEA employees accessing SurveyMonkey</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of disqualified surveys</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of incomplete surveys</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of completed, qualified surveys</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demographic Data**

Demographic data are background information that is collected from each participant and can include information such as age, gender, and years employed (Patten, 2012). Demographic data were collected from each participant who completed the online survey questionnaire and the semistructured face-to-face interview with the researcher. Table 4 illustrates the demographic information of each participant.

**Presentation and Analysis of Data**

A mixed-methods research design was determined to be the best approach to answering the research questions identified in this study. Mertens (2013) supported the use of mixed-methods research by stating, “Mixed methods researchers are extending our understanding of how to understand complex social phenomenon, as well as how to use research to develop effective interventions to address complex social problems” (p. 215). Creswell (2003) advised that a sequential, explanatory mixed-methods study is designed
Table 4

Demographic Information of Phase 1 and Phase 2 Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th># of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1, $N = 35$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2, $N = 10$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to collect and analyze quantitative data, followed by qualitative data collection and analysis, which was the process used in this study. As such, Phase 1 of this study utilized Lee and Allen’s (2002) OCB survey questionnaire (Appendix A), which incorporated 16 questions that self-assess the levels of OCBs demonstrated by those completing the survey questionnaire. Lee and Allen’s measurement tool utilized eight items specific to OCBIs (OCBs directed toward individuals) and eight items specific to OCBOs (OCBs directed toward the organization) and utilized a 7-point Likert scale ranging from never to always. Phase 2 of this study consisted of semistructured, face-to-face interviews, which were conducted to gain a deeper understanding of the quality of the leader-follower relationship and how that relationship affected followers’ OCBs.

The following paragraphs report the findings from Phase 1 and Phase 2 of this study. Research Questions 1, 2, and 3 all relate to OCBs; therefore, the presentation of data is combined. Research Question 4 follows, with data specific to the leader-follower relationship.

**Findings for Research Question 1, 2, and 3**

1. How do followers working in a public-service organization perceive their level of organizational citizenship behaviors?

2. To what extent are followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward other individuals?

3. To what extent are followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward their organization?

Research Questions 1, 2, and 3 were addressed in both Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the study. Phase 1, the quantitative phase, addressed Research Questions 1, 2, and 3 utilizing
Lee and Allen’s (2002) OCB survey questionnaire. Table 5 displays each survey question, participant responses, and the weighted average of each question. The shaded questions are specific to OCBIs, while the nonshaded questions are specific to OCBOs. There were 35 completed survey questionnaires, of which all 35 (100%) participants reported demonstrating some level of OCBs during their work day. The overall weighted average of the OCBI and OCBO survey responses was 4.86, indicating followers in a public-service organization engage in OCBs often to always. The data also indicate followers in a public-sector organization demonstrate OCBs more often toward their coworkers than their organization.

Phase 2 addressed Research Questions 1, 2, and 3 through Interview Questions 1, 2, and 3. Interview Question 1 was designed to better understand the quantitative data collected in Survey Questions 8 and 14, both of which related to OCBIs and both scored below the overall weighted average of 4.86. Interview Question 1 asked, “To what extent and under what conditions do you sacrifice your time to accommodate coworkers?” All participants (100%) acknowledged accommodating coworkers during the work day as the need arises. CG7 addressed the conditions upon which he helps coworkers: “I do condition that [help] or limit it based on the person asking, their reputation and relationship, and their approach to it [request for help].” CG4A stated if helping others interfered with his “dad duties” in any way, he would not offer his assistance. CG19 explained that he is not always eager to help his colleagues if a deadline needs to be met; but he feels compelled to contribute for the greater good of the department. Answers from CG7, CG4A, and CG19 helped to better understand the conditions upon which public-service workers accommodate their coworkers. Other responses to Interview
Table 5

**OCB Survey Questionnaire Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey question number</th>
<th>Never (0)</th>
<th>Rarely (0)</th>
<th>Sometimes (4)</th>
<th>Often (6)</th>
<th>Very often (8)</th>
<th>Almost always (7)</th>
<th>Always (10)</th>
<th>Weighted average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. I help others who have been absent</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>11.43% (4)</td>
<td>17.14% (6)</td>
<td>22.86% (8)</td>
<td>20.00% (7)</td>
<td>28.57% (10)</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I willingly give my time to help others who have work-related problems.</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>2.86% (1)</td>
<td>11.43% (4)</td>
<td>11.43% (4)</td>
<td>11.43% (4)</td>
<td>37.14% (13)</td>
<td>25.71% (9)</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I attend city functions to help support the organizational image.</td>
<td>8.57% (3)</td>
<td>37.14% (13)</td>
<td>34.29% (12)</td>
<td>5.71% (2)</td>
<td>11.43% (4)</td>
<td>2.86% (1)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would adjust my work schedule to accommodate other employees’ request for time off.</td>
<td>2.86% (1)</td>
<td>11.43% (4)</td>
<td>31.43% (11)</td>
<td>8.57% (3)</td>
<td>14.29% (5)</td>
<td>11.43% (4)</td>
<td>20.00% (7)</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I keep up with the developments in the organization.</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>8.57% (3)</td>
<td>11.43% (4)</td>
<td>17.14% (6)</td>
<td>20.00% (7)</td>
<td>17.14% (6)</td>
<td>25.71% (9)</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I defend the organization when other employees criticize it.</td>
<td>8.57% (3)</td>
<td>22.86% (8)</td>
<td>34.29% (12)</td>
<td>17.14% (6)</td>
<td>8.57% (3)</td>
<td>5.71% (2)</td>
<td>2.86% (1)</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I go out of the way to make newer employees feel welcome in the work group.</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>2.86% (1)</td>
<td>2.86% (1)</td>
<td>20.00% (7)</td>
<td>28.57% (10)</td>
<td>8.57% (3)</td>
<td>37.14% (13)</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I show pride when representing the organization in public.</td>
<td>2.86% (1)</td>
<td>11.43% (4)</td>
<td>14.29% (5)</td>
<td>11.43% (4)</td>
<td>14.29% (5)</td>
<td>20.00% (7)</td>
<td>25.71% (9)</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey question number</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Weighted average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. I show genuine concern and courtesy toward coworkers, even under the most trying business or personal situations.</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>2.86% (1)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>14.29% (5)</td>
<td>17.14% (6)</td>
<td>17.14% (6)</td>
<td>48.57% (17)</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I give up time to help others who have work or non-work-related problems.</td>
<td>2.86% (1)</td>
<td>5.71% (2)</td>
<td>20.00% (7)</td>
<td>17.14% (6)</td>
<td>20.00% (7)</td>
<td>11.43% (4)</td>
<td>22.86% (8)</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization.</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>5.71% (2)</td>
<td>14.29% (5)</td>
<td>14.29% (5)</td>
<td>25.71% (9)</td>
<td>25.71% (9)</td>
<td>14.29% (5)</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I express loyalty toward the organization.</td>
<td>5.71% (2)</td>
<td>11.43% (4)</td>
<td>11.43% (4)</td>
<td>20.00% (7)</td>
<td>11.43% (4)</td>
<td>14.29% (5)</td>
<td>25.71% (9)</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I assist others with their duties.</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>8.57% (3)</td>
<td>20.00% (7)</td>
<td>20.00% (7)</td>
<td>31.43% (11)</td>
<td>20.00% (7)</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I share resources with others to help their work.</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>8.57% (3)</td>
<td>17.14% (6)</td>
<td>14.29% (5)</td>
<td>22.86% (8)</td>
<td>37.14% (13)</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I take action to protect the organization from potential problems.</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>5.71% (2)</td>
<td>11.43% (4)</td>
<td>20.00% (7)</td>
<td>17.14% (6)</td>
<td>14.29% (5)</td>
<td>31.43% (11)</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I demonstrate concern about the image of the organization.</td>
<td>2.86% (1)</td>
<td>2.86% (1)</td>
<td>14.29% (5)</td>
<td>28.57% (10)</td>
<td>14.29% (5)</td>
<td>14.29% (5)</td>
<td>22.86% (8)</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 1 were more accommodating. The major themes that emerged from Interview Question 1 and the correlating frequencies were support (12), collaboration/teamwork (7), and public service (5). Table 6 illustrates all themes and frequencies that emerged
from Interview Question 1. CG23 exemplified the importance of peer support in the following statement: “I currently am the peer support coordinator. We have a team of peers where we basically kind of just look out for each other when someone goes through something traumatic or has a personal problem—and that’s all voluntary!” CG22 shared that many of his coworkers are new and inexperienced. He stated the success of his department is contingent upon his and one other coworker’s supporting new staff through on-the-job training and sharing historical knowledge. CG16 identified the importance of teamwork stating, “I’ve always been about the team mentality. . . . I’ve always thought about being a united front when it comes to the services.” CG2 affirmed teamwork was critical because his work group is quite small and they need to “work with and for each other.” He stated as a group they try to share the labor load and effectively communicate to ensure each team member is given the appropriate time off to spend with family and friends. Public service was also mentioned as a reason to accommodate a coworker. CG4 illustrated the reality of public service stating, “The biggest reason we’ve had to sacrifice our time to accompany coworkers is because of emergency situations. We don’t get to pick when murders or fatal car crashes or other city emergencies happen, but when they do happen my partner and I have to decide who will handle the call.” CG1 expressed that the library provided a number of different age-specific literacy programs, and the success of those programs is dependent upon employees working together. CG1 stated many of their patrons would be deeply disappointed if those programs were not implemented as announced.
Table 6

*Interview Question 1 Themes and Frequencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/teamwork</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above and beyond</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job emergencies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With conditions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procrastination</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small reward</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal appreciation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work ethic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Question 2 was designed to better understand the quantitative data collected in Survey Questions 7 and 10; both related to OCBOs and both scored below the overall weighted average. Survey Questions 16 and 20 also related to OCBOs and also scored below the overall weighted average but only slightly. Interview Question 2 asked, “To what extent is the image of your organization important to you and why?” All 10 participants (100%) felt the image of the organization was very important or extremely important. CG7A believed the image of his organization was very important; however, he stated the image of the organization was not a positive one at the time of the interview. CG7A stated, “I think generally speaking, our department has a very poor image to the general public, and it’s primarily because it’s a very politically driven department and there’s a lot of political influence and there’s been a lot of press about our
department and where the funds are coming from and where the funds are going.” CG7A further stated for those reasons that it was very important to him that he operate in a legitimate manner and that he demands the same from his coworkers and supervisors. In contrast, the top themes and frequencies that emerged from Interview Question 2 were public service (7), commitment (4), organization focused (3), and positive relationships (3). Table 7 illustrates all themes that emerged from Interview Question 2. CG7 articulated the significance of having a positive organizational image: “The image of the organization or the city of Corona is very important to me; how we do things affects public perception of our competency, our skills, and responsiveness.” CG4 explained the nexus between the image of an organization and public service:

The image of our organization is extremely important, not only to me but to the public because we work for a government agency. We’re in the service industry; people know they can expect good, quality service from us, and we can deliver that service!

CG19 voiced his commitment to the residents of the city in the following statement: “It is important to do my best and put a good light towards the residents of the city that have entrusted us with their funds and their services.” CG23 shared the benefit of remaining focused on organizational values stating, “I always say if we stick to our department’s golden values we can assume that we’ll have the respect of most in our communities.” CG22 made a similar statement: “I want to not be perceived as a lazy, typical government worker but rather someone that really does work hard and cares for the organization and success of it.” CG2 believed his department had a very good rapport and relationship with the community. He expressed the organization’s public image and having a positive
relationship with his community was very important to him and he worked every day to maintain that image and relationship.

Table 7

*Interview Question 2 Themes and Frequencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important (organizational image)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization focused</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive relationships</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While all 10 participants felt the image of the organization was important, the quantitative data showed some public-service followers stopped short of expressing loyalty to the organization or defending the organization when it was criticized. Probing questions helped to understand the quantitative findings. Participants expressed that at times, the organization and/or their leader create obstacles that hinder their ability to perform their duties and meet the needs of the public. When the public-service follower determines the organization and/or the leader is not acting in the best interest of the customer, he or she will verbally separate themselves from the organization. The public-service follower believes the organization’s values no longer align with his or her own.
Interview Question 3 was designed to answer Research Question 1, 2, and 3. Question 3 asked, “What role does your leader play in inspiring you to go above and beyond in your work duties?” Table 8 illustrates the 20 themes that emerged from Question 3. The top three themes and frequencies were effective communication (5), personal connection (4), and values (4). CG16 asserted that her leader ensures that all employees are aware of everything that is going on with the city, even if employees do not understand the importance at the time. CG16 stated that effectively communicating the department’s goals allows the employees to prioritize their work. CG22 made a similar statement: “During group meetings we discuss the direction of management and any new developments that are going to impact our work and how we interact with our customers.” Personal connections also received a high frequency. CG4A stated that when his leader takes the time to speak with each employee, finds out how they are and how their weekend was, it shows the leader legitimately cares about his employees. CG4A further explained that when a leader shows him personal respect, he always gives an extra effort because he does not want to let his leader down. CG1 also felt having a personal connection with her leader inspired her to go above and beyond in her work duties. CG1 stated her leader not only acknowledges all employees but also listens to all employees and their ideas. In response to Interview Question 3, four of the 10 participants identified values played a role. Two of the four participants stated they were inspired to work above and beyond in their job duties knowing they and their leader embraced the same work values. The other two participants were adamant that it is not the leader who inspires them to work above and beyond, but it is their own personal value system that serves as the foundation of their inspiration.
Table 8

*Interview Question 3 Themes and Frequencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal connection</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above and beyond</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/teamwork</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead by example</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work ethic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization focused</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct communication</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal appreciation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings for Research Question 4**

Phase 2 of this study employed semistructured, face-to-face interviews to obtain a deeper understanding of the leader-follower relationship and how that relationship affects OCBs. In addition to the interview questions that focused on OCBs, the researcher asked four additional questions based on Liden and Maslyn’s (1998) LMX-MDM survey instrument (Table 2 in Chapter III) that measured *respect, loyalty, individual contribution,* and *affect.* The researcher created one question that summarized each measured behavior. As the interviews were semistructured in nature, the researcher was able to incorporate probing questions, allowing the researcher to gather the most
significant, meaningful data from each participant (Bamberger et al., 2012). The
following paragraphs document the findings from Interview Questions 4 (respect), 5
(loyalty), 6 (contributions), and 7 (affect).

Interview Question 4 was, “What behaviors does your leader demonstrate that you
most admire and respect?” There were 21 themes and 40 frequencies that emerged from
Interview Question 4 and are documented in Table 9. The top five themes received three
frequencies each: effective communication, honesty, integrity, personal connection, and
respect.

Table 9

_Interview Question 4 Themes and Frequencies_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal connection</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive relationships</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making input</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication barrier</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct communication</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-door policy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work ethic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant leader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead by Example</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/teamwork</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supporting the data, CG16 stated effective communication is important to her and she truly appreciated her leader’s ability to convey the same message to all employees in the organization. After considerable thought, CG4 shared that he admires his leader’s ability to speak to the masses effectively, regardless whether the leader was sharing positive or negative information. Honesty and integrity are behaviors that were both mentioned, often in the same sentence. Participants also admired and respected those leaders who were able to achieve a personal connection with followers. CG22 stated that his leader is very perceptive and knows her staff. He shared that his leader once noticed that he was not feeling well and she personally spoke with him about his well-being. CG22 was very moved that his leader knew him well enough to know when he was not feeling well. CG19 spoke of his previous leader who often reached out to every person on staff, creating that personal connection. CG23 posited that when her leader included line staff in the decision-making process, the respect bar rose for that leader. CG7A shared that he respects his leader for her knowledge and background and her willingness to help all staff.

Interview Question 5 was, “In what ways has your leader demonstrated that he or she has confidence in you and your work?” There were 20 themes and 43 frequencies that emerged from Interview Question 5 and are documented in Table 10. The themes receiving the highest frequencies were verbal appreciation (10), written appreciation (5), and competency (5). Many participants relayed that their leader showed confidence in their work through verbal and written appreciation. CG22 stated that his leader tells him and his coworker that she values their depth of experience, including their historical knowledge. CG19 shared that his prior supervisor would always make a verbal statement
at the end of each project such as, “The project was a much better project due to your diligence and input.” CG1 was appreciative of her leader not only sharing her personal appreciation but also often sharing positive comments made by the public either in person or through customer service surveys. Participants also stated their leader showed confidence in them by allowing them to do their job without constant oversight. CG4 stated that the best example was when his leader admitted, “I could never do what you do!” CG4 explained that he respects a leader who can admit that they do not know everything.

Table 10

*Interview Question 5 Themes and Frequencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal appreciation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written appreciation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New opportunities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above and beyond</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small reward</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal connection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization focused</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead by example</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure without consequences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview Question 6 was, “What inspires you to work above and beyond your normal job duties to help your leader achieve work goals?” Table 11 documents the 17 themes and 38 frequencies that emerged from Interview Question 6.

Table 11

*Interview Question 6 Themes and Frequencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal appreciation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work ethic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership focus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization focus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct communication</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job emergencies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The themes receiving the highest frequencies were public service (7), verbal appreciation (6), intrinsic motivation (4), and work ethic (4). The act of public service inspired participants, such as CG23 who stated she views her job as “serving the community.” CG4A similarly stated, “We work in this field to help people.” Verbal appreciation was also identified as a source of inspiration. CG23 shared that what inspires her are the families she meets in court who thank her for the work she completed that benefited their family. These families often meet her with tears in their eyes and
appreciative hugs. CG16 also shared a moving example of her inspiration: “It is incredibly rewarding to have them [patrons] thank me right after story time. I even have grandmas telling me that is the best story I have every heard!” Intrinsic motivation was also acknowledged in response to Interview Question 6. CG19 explained that his intrinsic motivation comes from a belief that “I try to go above and beyond because the world is a better place if people behave in that manner!” CG22 stated, “My inspiration comes from a belief that I am working for a higher power.” CG7 simply stated, “I don’t need external motivation!” Participants also identified work ethic as a source of inspiration and also identified work ethic as intrinsic in nature.

Interview Question 7 was, “What personal qualities does your leader utilize to create a fun, positive work environment?” There were 17 themes and 36 frequencies that emerged from Interview Question 7 and are documented in Table 12. The themes receiving the highest frequencies were small rewards (6), personal connection (5), humor (4), open-door policy (3), and collaboration/teamwork (3). CG22 shared that his leader often provides small rewards that make the work environment fun and positive. CG22 stated his leader purchased pads of paper in the shape of a “high-five” and “high-five clappers.” CG22 stated his leader instructed employees to share a “high-five” with coworkers who they noticed were doing a great job. CG1 shared that her leader celebrates National Library Week and gives staff a small gift each day during that week. Participants felt that a fun and positive work environment can be achieved by the leader by making a personal connection with followers. CG2 stated that personal connections often lead to positive relationships, which helps make the work environment a positive one. CG7A believes celebrating personal events such as a new baby, a wedding, or
Table 12

*Interview Question 7 Themes and Frequencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small rewards</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal connection</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-door policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/teamwork</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written appreciation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal appreciation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure without consequences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication barrier</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christmas can help create a fun, positive work environment by creating a path for personal connections to grow. CG4 felt a fun and positive work environment developed over time with coworkers, and the leader had little influence. Humor was also identified as a behavior that helped make the work environment fun and positive. CG16 and CG23 agreed that a leader who allows followers to laugh and joke in the workplace not only creates a fun, positive work environment but also helps relieve work-related stress. In answering Interview Question 7, CG1 responded, “She is quirky! A personality really makes a boss!” CG16 commented on the benefit of a leader having an open-door policy: “I think just how open and friendly my current supervisor is. I don’t feel intimidated at all to come and report something that might be bothering me.” CG7 commented that his
leader has an open-door policy: “If you’re having a problem, his door is always open to you.” Collaboration/teamwork was identified by participants as something that contributed to a fun, positive work environment. CG7 shared that when a new project is started, his leader brings everyone on the team together to ensure everyone is on board. CG22 stated that his leader inspires the team to work together and do the best job they can for the public.

Interview Question 8 was designed to answer Research Questions 1, 2, 3, and 4. Interview Question 8 was an open-ended question that allowed participants to share information that they had not already given but felt was important to the study. Interview Question 8 asked, “Is there any other information you would like to share that will help me better understand your willingness to go above and beyond in your work duties?” Seven of the 10 participants (70%) stated their motivation to go above and beyond in their work duties was intrinsic in nature. Of the seven participants who stated their motivation came from within, five shared it was their love for their department, city, or public service that drove them to go above and beyond in their everyday job duties. Participant CG23 explained that her willingness to go above and beyond came from within because in her experience, leadership was inconsistent. She further explained that if she allowed her leader to influence her motivation, her motivation would be as inconsistent as the leadership. Based on her experience, she decided years prior to be the best employee possible because the citizens of Corona expected and deserved her full effort. Participant CG4 shared that going above and beyond is part of their organizational culture because “that is just the overall type of employee that works in the government organization.” Similarly, CG19 stated, “My motivation comes from my internal concern
for people’s safety and livelihood.” Of the remaining three participants, each shared that it was a personal connection with their leader or small rewards that motivated them to go above and beyond in their work duties. CG22 shared that he is motivated by leaders who notice the contributions he makes to the organization and the public. CG22 stated, “A leader who adds that personal touch and actually makes observations, I think for anyone, it makes them feel included in the team.” CG16 felt it was small rewards that inspired her to go above and beyond. She shared that her leader went on vacation and brought back a small souvenir for her and her coworkers. She said she knew then that her leader thought about her outside of work and she felt truly appreciated by that small gesture.

Summary

The overall findings of Research Question 1 indicated that followers working in a public-service organization perceived their level of OCBs as moderate to high, based on the quantitative data (see Figure 2). The qualitative data indicated that followers freely give their time to assist coworkers and to a lesser extent, the organization. Additionally, seven out of 10 participants (70%) stated their willingness to go above and beyond in their job duties was inspired from within.

The quantitative findings for Research Question 2 indicated that in most situations, followers direct OCBs toward other individuals at a significant level. As illustrated in Figure 2, the overall weighted average of OCBI was 5.28125. All OCBI responses were above the overall OCBI/OCBO weighted average of 4.86 with the exception of the responses to Survey Questions 8 and 14, both of which deal with giving of one’s time to accommodate a coworker’s work or non-work-related need. The highest OCBI weighted average was 5.91 that was seen in Question 13, which indicates followers
show genuine concern for coworkers even under the most trying business or personal situations. The qualitative data related to Research Question 2 showed participants felt collaboration/teamwork was important in meeting the needs of the public. Participants also indicated effective communication from their leaders was important to keep all employees informed of new developments, management priorities, and anything that may affect how they interact with customers.

![Figure 2. OCBI/OCBO weighted average by question.](image)

The quantitative findings for Research Question 3 indicated that followers direct OCBs toward their organization to a lesser extent than to their coworkers. As illustrated in Figure 2, the overall weighted average of OCBOs was 4.44375. Responses to Survey Questions 7, 10, 16, and 20 scored below the overall OCBI/OCBO weighted average of 4.8625. The four OCBO questions scoring below the overall weighted average of 4.8625 involved participants defending the organization when others criticized it, attending a city
function to help support the organization’s image, and expressing loyalty to the organization. Probing questions asked during the qualitative phase offers an explanation of these findings. Followers will distance themselves from the organization when they believe the organization is no longer acting in the best interest of the customer. When this happens, public-service followers feel the organization’s values no longer align with their own. The four OCBO questions that scored above the overall weighted average of 4.8625 involved keeping up with organizational developments, showing pride when representing the organization, offering ideas to improve the organization, and taking action to protect the organization.

Research Question 4 was addressed entirely through face-to-face interview questions. Participants shared they admired and respected leaders who had integrity, were honest, showed respect toward others, and took the time to communicate effectively and develop personal connections with employees. Participants stated their leaders demonstrated they had confidence in their work through verbal and written appreciation and acknowledging their workers were competent in their respective positions. Participants expressed it was their commitment to public service, their work ethic, their intrinsic motivation and verbal appreciation, that inspire them to go above and beyond in their work duties to assist their leader in achieving work goals. Participants identified small rewards, humor, and having a personal connection with their leader as things that helped create a fun, positive work environment. Finally, half of the participants stated it was their love for their department, city, or public service that inspires them to go above and beyond in their everyday job duties. The majority of participants stated they are
intrinsically motivated to go above and beyond in their work duties and their leader has little influence. CG23 pointedly stated,

My willingness comes from within; I don’t think the leader makes a difference.

Don’t get me wrong; I’ve been unmotivated because of bad leaders, but I always push through it. It certainly would be easier if the leader was good and respected.

It certainly would be easier for everyone as a whole to be better.
CHAPTER V: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter begins with a review of the purpose statement, research questions, methodology used, and the population and sample. The major findings, unexpected findings, conclusions, and implications for action will follow. Closing the chapter are recommendations for further research and the researcher’s concluding remarks and reflections.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this sequential, explanatory mixed-methods study was to identify and describe to what extent the quality of the leader-follower relationship, as perceived by followers, affects followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors in a public-service organization.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. How do followers working in a public-service organization perceive their level of organizational citizenship behaviors?

2. To what extent are followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward other individuals?

3. To what extent are followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward their organization?

4. To what extent does the quality of the leader-follower relationship affect the followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors in public-service organizations?
Methodology

A sequential, explanatory mixed-methods study was the chosen design for this study as it allowed the researcher to conduct the study in phases. The first phase consisted of quantitative research in the form of a survey questionnaire that measured followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors demonstrated toward individuals and toward the organization. The researcher then conducted semistructured, face-to-face interviews that measured the quality of the leader-follower relationship to gain a deeper understanding of the effect the leader-follower relationship has on followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors.

Population

Patten (2012) described population as “the group in which researchers are ultimately interested” (p. 45). The population of this study was public-service workers employed in the state of California. A target population was defined by McMillan and Schumacher (2010) as “a group of elements or cases, whether individuals, objects, or events that conform to specific criteria and to which we intend to generalize the results of the research” (p. 129). The target population selected for this study was public-service workers employed by the city of Corona.

Sample

The sample population utilized in this study included public-service employees who were current members of the Corona General Employees Association (CGEA), a recognized nonsupervisory bargaining unit in the city of Corona. Additionally, this study utilized a purposeful sampling methodology. Patton (2015) stated purposeful sampling is used to access participants who are “information rich” (p. 46) and can contribute to a
deeper understanding of a particular phenomenon. The sample population totaled 220 CGEA members who worked in a variety of departments located in the city of Corona.

**Major Findings**

Multiple major findings were discovered as a result of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of this study. These findings are explained as each finding corresponds to the respective research question.

**Major Finding 1**

1. *How do followers working in a public-service organization perceive their level of organizational citizenship behaviors?*

   The quantitative and qualitative data indicated that followers working in a public-service organization engage in OCBs on a regular basis. Of the 50 themes identified in the qualitative data, public service received the highest frequency. For those who participated in the face-to-face interviews, the concept of public service was not just a concept but a mission, a sincere desire to help those in need of a variety of services.

   Followers identified those things which attracted them to public service:

   1. They believe in a duty to serve;
   2. They understand and accept the grand responsibility of being entrusted with public funds;
   3. They achieve personal satisfaction knowing they went above and beyond to help a customer;
   4. They enjoy working with others who understand the role and responsibility of a true public servant.
The data obtained in this study support other research that indicates a position in public service does not attract the masses; those who enter a life of public service do so because they have a need to help others and contribute to improving society (Bakker, 2015; Caldwell & Karri, 2005; Hernandez, 2012).

**Major Finding 2**

2. *To what extent are followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward other individuals?*

The quantitative data indicated followers working in a public-service organization engage in OCBIs to a larger extent than they engage in OCBOs. However, followers do set conditions when assisting and/or accommodating coworkers. The qualitative data provided a deeper understanding of the process followers use when deciding to assist coworkers. The major finding was the thought process the follower takes in considering whether to assist other individuals, mainly coworkers:

1. Does the coworker always ask for help?
2. Did the coworker fail to plan?
3. Is the coworker facing a hard deadline?
4. Will the public be negatively affected?
5. Will the leader or organization suffer?

Research and subsequent literature by Organ (1988) identify five dimensions of OCBs: altruism (helping others do their work or assisting new employees); civic virtue (behaviors that act as the organization’s conscience); sportsmanship (overlooking or handling problems/complaints oneself); conscientiousness (following rules, regulations,
and policies and suggesting ways to improve the organization; and courtesy (not causing additional work for others or abusing the rights of others).

The data discussed in Major Finding 2 reflected the five dimensions identified by Organ (1988): Followers help new and seasoned coworkers with their work (altruism); followers make decisions with the public’s interest in mind (civic virtue); followers use problem-solving skills to determine when/how to appropriately help coworkers (sportsmanship); followers make suggestions to improve the organization (conscientiousness); followers consider a variety of factors prior to assisting others to ensure their time and efforts are wisely spent (courtesy).

Major Finding 3

3. To what extent are followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward their organization?

The major finding of Research Question 3 was related to how followers viewed their relationship with their organization. The quantitative data indicated that while followers do perform OCBOs, they were reluctant to commit fully to their organization by expressing loyalty or verbally defending the organization when it faced criticism. As followers discussed their role, job duties, and service to the public, they rarely mentioned their organization. It appeared some followers saw their organization more as a bridge they must cross to reach their customer instead of an organization supportive of their efforts. Some followers viewed the bridge as strong, stable, and supportive of creativity and innovation. Most, however, viewed the bridge as narrow, uninviting, and restrictive.

Followers who stopped short of expressing loyalty or fully committing to their organization did so for a reason. Specifics related to those reasons were not addressed in
this study. However, an explanation may be found in the LMX research that defines a low-quality leader-follower relationship as one that is less productive and results in followers demonstrating a lower level of commitment to the organization (Buch et al., 2016). Howell and Hall-Merenda (1999) posited that leaders who experience low-quality relationships with followers tend to lead from a distance, provide followers little support, and employ transactional leadership behaviors.

**Major Finding 4**

4. *To what extent does the quality of the leader-follower relationship affect the followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors in public-service organizations?*

Expounding on the bridge analogy used previously, those who viewed the bridge in a positive light spoke very highly of their leader. They spoke with excitement and enthusiasm for their leader, their work, their coworkers, and the public they serve. They shared examples of how their leader supported their ideas and how those ideas positively affected their customers. They beamed with pride when detailing how their ideas and actions contributed to improving the communities they serve. They voiced sincere appreciation for being given the opportunity to work for and with an amazing person they called their leader. They willingly went above and beyond in their job duties for their leader and their customer.

In contrast, those who viewed the bridge as more of a hindrance avoided speaking about their current leader. When asked leadership-related questions and responding with a positive answer, they clarified they were speaking of a previous leader. When discussing their motivation to go above and beyond in their current work duties, they prefaced their response by stating their motivation came from within and their leader
neither played an inspirational role nor influenced their job performance. One follower acknowledged that poor leadership resulted in her coworkers’ and her becoming demotivated. However, she clarified she was able to utilize her strong work ethic and commitment to public service as an internal motivator to “push through” and perform to the level she knew the public expected and deserved.

There were two major findings resulting from Research Question 4. The first major finding was that followers will engage in OCBs regardless of the quality of the relationship they experience with their leader. Matta and his colleagues (2015) explained that a leader and follower who enter into an agreed-upon, low-quality leader-follower relationship still benefited from higher levels of employee engagement. Matta et al. found LMX agreement is more beneficial than is LMX quality, which serves as a possible explanation as to why followers continue to engage in OCBs regardless of the quality of the relationship with their leader.

The second major finding was that leaders and followers who enjoy a high-quality relationship experience additional benefits. The data produced in this study supported other data found in LMX research. Matta et al. (2015) proposed the LMX theory is worthy of attention as it puts under the microscope the dyadic relationship and the benefits of achieving a high-quality leader-follower relationship. Research indicates a high-quality relationship between a leader and his or her followers can result in followers demonstrating high levels of organizational citizenship behaviors, which ultimately result in followers delivering beyond expectations (Buch et al., 2016; Dunegan et al., 1992; Matta et al., 2015).
Unexpected Findings

The unexpected finding that developed from this study was that seven of 10 followers (70%) who participated in the face-to-face interview process stated their motivation was intrinsic in nature and their leader did not influence their motivation. While some enjoyed a positive relationship with their leader, they felt their motivation would remain the same regardless. Additionally, followers willingly engaged in OCBs because of their commitment to public service and did not identify the relationship with their leader as a factor.

Conclusions

Several conclusions were identified in this study that can provide a deeper understanding of the leader-follower relationship and its effect on followers’ OCBs in a public-service organization. The following conclusions correspond to the aforementioned major findings:

Conclusion 1

Those who choose a career in public service do so for a variety of reasons: the opportunity to help those in need, to give back to their communities, and to contribute to something larger than themselves. They understand and accept the responsibilities that come with keeping the public trust and achieve personal satisfaction in fulfilling the needs of others. These behaviors are consistent with other research that indicates that follower behaviors are more positive and substantial when a follower believes his or her actions contribute to something bigger than himself or herself and the follower sees firsthand the impact his or her efforts make (Bellé, 2013; Grant, 2012).
Conclusion 2

Public-service followers play a complex role in the functioning of a public-service organization. In addition to their contractual duties, public-service followers are assisting coworkers with their work, training new employees, making decisions and taking action on behalf of the organization with the highest integrity, resolving complaints and conflict, and accomplishing it all within the federal, state, and local laws as well as department policies and procedures that govern public service.

Conclusion 3

Public-service followers will continue to serve the public, including performing OCBs, regardless of the quality of the relationship they experience with their leader. Furthermore, followers can successfully serve the public without feeling a strong connection (loyalty and commitment) to the organization. This conclusion is consistent with data and literature written by Matta et al. (2015).

Conclusion 4

Research has shown a high-quality leader-follower relationship is not required for a public-service organization to successfully meet the needs of the public (Matta et al., 2015). However, public-service followers who experience a high-quality relationship with their leader experience a deeper satisfaction in their work relationships, in their contributions, and in public service. Currie and Ryan (2014) stated that given the opportunity, followers can contribute significantly to an organization and often complement and enhance conventional leadership. A high-quality relationship brings people together, builds trust, and creates opportunities for new and innovative programs.
Implications for Action

The following implications for action are based on the preceding findings and conclusions. The implications for action serve as suggestions to public-service leaders who have the authority and opportunity to improve public-service leadership, public-service followership, and public-service delivery.

Implication for Action 1

The findings from this study indicate public-service followers have a strong need to serve and a strong desire to contribute to something larger than themselves. The data gathered during the qualitative phase indicated most public-service leaders are not capitalizing on the talents of public-service followers and have not invested in a high-quality leader-follower relationship. The following actions are recommended to increase opportunities for followers to contribute in ways meaningful to the individual and to maximize the benefits that come with high-quality leader-follower relationships:

- Provide a survey tool that evaluates the service interests of all employees. Place employees in positions or programs that allow them to serve the public in a way that is meaningful to the individual.

- Look for opportunities to partner with other public-service or nonprofit organizations that will provide additional options for followers to serve. This may also open opportunities for sharing resources, which is helpful for organizations with a limited budget and/or resources.

- Allow public-service followers to submit ideas for new/revised programs, improved policies, and customer service improvements.
• Provide leadership training to leadership staff that introduces the concept and consequences of developing a high-quality leader-follower relationship.

• Conduct quarterly meetings/annual events with leaders and followers; include presentations, group exercises, and discussions that create opportunities for the leader-follower relationship to grow.

• Create additional opportunities for public-service leaders to engage with their followers, such as mentorship and job-shadowing programs, or simply identify time the follower can spend with his or her leader.

• As the leader-follower relationship continues to grow, followers may feel more confident in sharing creative and innovative ideas. Leaders should be open to ideas and suggestions and should make an effort to listen and fully consider reasonable ideas.

Implication for Action 2

The findings from this study indicated public-service followers contribute greatly to their organizations and in a variety of ways. These efforts should be rewarded on a regular basis to show followers their efforts are noticed, appreciated, and worth celebrating. The following actions are recommended to properly thank and acknowledge public-service followers:

• Develop and implement a formal employee recognition program that allows the public-service leader to thank followers in front of their coworkers. The program should incorporate background stories, the sequence of efforts made, and the outcomes achieved. When possible, a short comment from the person who benefited from the follower’s actions can solidify the significance of the follower’s efforts.
• An informal recognition program should be developed and implemented that allows followers to recognize other followers. Often times they are the ones to witness great deeds on the part of coworkers. Efforts should be made create a process that is easy but respected. Specifics of the good deed should be included to add validity to the informal recognition program. The value of the program can be diminished if the integrity of the program is questioned.

• Customer satisfaction surveys should be offered to all external and internal customers. Followers being acknowledged for great service should receive a copy of the survey directly from their leader along with a verbal appreciation. A copy should also be placed in their personnel file and codified as part of their annual review.

Implication for Action 3

A concerning but not surprising finding from this study indicated followers showed some hesitation in verbalizing their loyalty to their organization or verbally defending their organization when others criticize it. This information is telling. Public-service leaders should address this occurrence as it could be an indication of more serious issues.

• Public-service leadership should investigate the employees’ (leaders and followers) connection to and perception of the organization. Through the use of a third-party, unbiased professional consultant, a thorough assessment could be conducted to identify reasons employees may feel a disconnect to the organization. What role do leaders and followers see their organization playing in serving the public? If given the opportunity, what changes would each individual make to the organization? What has to change to increase their loyalty to the organization? The consultant could assist in
exploring the reasons some employees stop short of voicing loyalty and commitment to the organization. Additionally, the consultant could begin the conversation regarding ways the organization can play a more significant role in supporting employees and the customers they serve.

**Implication for Action 4**

Low-quality leader-follower relationships that are acceptable to both parties can be productive and achieve desired results. However, research indicates high-quality leader-follower relationships may result in improved levels of production and overall employee satisfaction. The following actions are recommended to help public-service leadership explore this phenomenon and determine what is most beneficial to their organization:

- Public-service leadership should develop strategies to explore the current leader-follower relationship, as experienced by individuals, and the leader-follower relationship they desire; the method(s) used to collect information should ensure anonymity to produce a high response rate with honest and accurate responses. Additionally, the data collected needs to be specific to identify gaps between the current leader-follower relationship and the desired relationship. Once gaps are identified between current and desired relationships, public-service leaders should create committees that include representation from both leaders and followers. The next steps would include identifying and implementing appropriate ways to fill those gaps. Results of all surveys (positive and negative information) and detailed plans to grow and nurture relationships should be made available to all leaders and followers.
through the organization’s secured, internal website. It is beneficial for all those who participate in the process to be aware of the progress and outcomes.

**Implication for Action 5**

Today’s workforce is multigenerational and as such, brings opportunities for the generations to learn from each other. Much research has been done on individual generations, comparing one generation to another and identifying the work habits of each generation. The following actions are recommended to learn more about the leader-follower relationship specific to each generation.

- Researchers are encouraged to study the leader-follower relationship in public-service organizations with a specific focus on generational similarities and differences. Literature in this area would be extremely helpful to public-service leaders who can use the information to enhance relationships with all generations within their organization.

**Implication for Action 6**

Mid-level managers have direct contact with the organization’s leader and followers and therefore play a vital role in the public-service organization. Mid-level managers are in a position to assess the organization through the leader’s abilities and accomplishments as well as followers’ abilities and accomplishments. The following actions are recommended to utilize mid-level managers in improving relationships and performance in a public-service organization.

- Public-service leaders should develop a method for mid-level managers to document, analyze, and distribute information they observe or collect that would be helpful in
developing and maintaining a healthy organizational culture through improved relationships among all levels of employees.

- Public-service mid-level managers should create opportunities to mediate forums in which public-service followers can ask questions and voice concerns directly to the public-service leader. Public-service leaders and mid-level managers should be mindful that communication from both leadership levels should be clear, direct, and consistent. Public-service followers who are able to observe consistent communication and behaviors from both mid-level managers and the organization’s leader are more likely to have confidence in their organization and support the organization’s purpose.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Based on the findings and limitations of this study, the following are recommendations for further research:

1. Additional studies on public-service leadership should be conducted to identify the unique obstacles, struggles, and rewards as experienced by the public-service leader. Research of this nature could help identify additional training, education, and support needed to improve leaders’ skill sets.

2. A chronicle of positive and negative experiences involved with leading a variety of public-service organizations should be developed and used to gain a deeper understanding of the public-service leader. What can be done to improve the experience and outcomes?

3. Additional studies on public-service followership should be conducted to obtain followers’ perspectives and experiences on what is involved in being a public servant.
The research should include a broad spectrum of topics to gain a wide and deep amount of information that could assist in understanding public service based on followers’ experiences. What can be done to support and improve followers’ experiences in delivering services to the public and improving the customer experience?

4. A study on a variety of public-service organizations from the perspective of the customer would assist in obtaining a holistic understanding of the public-service organization. What does the customer see as strengths and weaknesses in an organization that exists to serve him or her? What insights and recommendations can they offer?

5. A deeper look at the reasons people choose to dedicate their careers to public service may be helpful in improving hiring practices for public-service organizations. If public-service organizations can hire individuals with an intrinsic need to serve others, employee performance and service delivery may improve.

6. This study experienced limitations in the amount of participation from the organization under study. Replicating this study in one or more public-service organizations on a larger scale would help to gain a deeper understanding of the leader-follower relationship and its effect on followers’ OCBs in a public-service organization.

7. While this study did not touch on the different generations within a public-service organization, additional research on the topic would be helpful to better understand each generation and how it can best contribute to a public-service organization.
Concluding Remarks and Reflections

In my 28 years in public service, I reported to many supervisors and managers and experienced many different leadership styles. Of all those who referred to themselves as leaders, one stands out above the rest. He demonstrated exemplary leadership behaviors. It was he who ignited my desire to learn more about leadership. It was not until he left for a position with the state of California that I fully realized the difference a great leader can make.

As I met with public-service followers during the qualitative phase of this study, I was again reminded of the difference a great leader can make. I met followers who respected and loved their leader, and I met followers who did not. The difference was vast. That difference, however, did not change the motivation and dedication to service on the part of the followers; their concern was always for the public they served.

The role of a public servant, leader or follower, is too important to ignore. Therefore, I commit to continue to research the dynamics of public service. I hope to find ways to improve public-service leadership and followership and ultimately to improve the customer service experience. I invite you to also contribute to the public-service literature. As Ralph Waldo Emerson once said, “The best way to find yourself is to lose yourself in the service of others.”
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APPENDIX A

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Survey Questionnaire

Using the scale below, indicate to what extent you engage in the following behaviors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I help others who have been absent.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I willingly give my time to help others who have work-related problems.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I attend functions that are not required but that help the organizational image.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I adjust my work schedule to accommodate other employees' request for time off.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I keep up with the developments in the organization.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I defend the organization when other employees criticize it.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. I go out of the way to make newer employees feel welcome in the work group.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. I show pride when representing the organization in public.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. I show genuine concern and courtesy toward coworkers, even under the most trying business or personal situations.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

10. I give up time to help others who have work or non-work problems.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

11. I offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

12. I express loyalty toward the organization.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

13. I assist others with their duties.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

14. I share personal property with others to help their work.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

15. I take action to protect the organization from potential problems.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

16. I demonstrate concern about the image of the organization.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
### APPENDIX B

**Alignment of Interview and Survey Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semistructured Interview Questions</th>
<th>RQ 1</th>
<th>RQ 2</th>
<th>RQ 3</th>
<th>RQ 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview Question 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Question 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Question 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Question 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Question 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Question 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Question 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Question 8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBI/OCBO Survey Questionnaire</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Demographic Questionnaire

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

For statistical purposes, please complete the following and return in the envelope labeled “demographic card.”

Gender:

☐ Male   ☐ Female

Age Range:

☐ 18-19   ☐ 20-29   ☐ 30-39   ☐ 40-49   ☐ 50-59   ☐ 60-69

☐ 70 +

Number of years employed with the City of Corona:

☐ 0-5   ☐ 5-10   ☐ 10-15   ☐ 15-20   ☐ 20 +
APPENDIX D

Informed Consent Form

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

BRANDMAN UNIVERSITY

16355 LAGUNA CANYON ROAD

IRVINE, CA 92618

INFORMATION ABOUT: “Exploring the Quality of the Leader-Follower Relationship and its Effect on Followers’ Organizational Citizenship Behaviors”

RESPONSIBLE INVESTIGATOR: Kristina Zaragoza

PURPOSE OF STUDY: You are being asked to participate in a research study conducted by Kristina Zaragoza, a doctoral student from the Organizational Leadership program at Brandman University. The purpose of this sequential, explanatory mixed-methods study is to identify and describe to what extent the quality of the leader-follower relationship, as perceived by the follower, affects followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors in a public-service organization. Obtaining a deeper understanding of the dynamics of the leader-follower relationship will contribute to the literature used by many leaders and followers to realize the mission and goals of a public-service agency. This study has the potential to inform improvements that will raise the government’s reputation by increasing trust between public-service organizations and the public they serve.

By participating in this study, I agree to complete an electronic survey using Survey Monkey or I may choose to complete a paper survey. I understand the survey will take approximately 10 – 15 minutes to complete. Additionally, I have the option to participate in the second phase of research, which I understand is a face-to-face interview with the
researcher. I understand the interview may take approximately 30 minutes. Completion of the surveys and interviews will take place February through March 2018.

I understand that:

a) There are minimal risks associated with participating in this research. I understand that the investigator will protect my confidentiality by keeping the identifying codes and research materials in a locked file drawer that is available only to the researcher.

b) I understand that the face-to-face interview will be audio recorded. The recordings will be available only to the researcher and the professional transcriptionist. The audio records will be used to capture the interview dialogue and to ensure the accuracy of the information collected during the interview. All information will be identifier-redacted and my confidentiality will be maintained. Upon completion of the study all recordings, transcripts and notes taken by the researcher and transcripts from the interview will be destroyed.

c) The possible benefit of this study to me is that my input may help add to the research regarding the leader-follower relationship, and its effect on followers’ organizational citizenship behaviors. The findings will be available to me at the conclusion of the study and will provide new insights about the leader-follower relationship, and the effect on organizational citizenship behaviors in a public-service organization. I understand that I will not be compensated for my participation.
d) If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Kristina Zaragoza at xxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx or by phone at (xxx) xxx-xxxx; or Dr. Jonathan Greenberg at xxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx.

e) My participation in this research study is voluntary. I may decide to not participate in the study and I can withdraw at any time. I can also decide not to answer particular questions during the interview if I so choose. I understand that I may refuse to participate or may withdraw from this study at any time without negative consequences. Also, the investigator may stop the study at any time.

f) No information that identifies me will be released without my separate consent and that all identifiable information will be protected to the limits allowed by law. If the study design or the use of the data is to be changed, I will be informed and my consent re-obtained. I understand that if I have any questions, comments, or concerns about the study or the informed consent process, I may write or call the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Brandman University, 16355 Laguna Canyon Road, Irvine, CA 92618, (949)341-7641.

I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this form and the “Research Participant’s Bill of Rights.” I have read the above and understand it and hereby consent to the procedure(s) set forth.

_______________________________________
Signature of Participant or Responsible Party

☐ I am interested in participating in a face-to-face interview with the researcher. Please contact me at: e-mail_____________________________ and/or phone number ________.
ELECTRONIC CONSENT: By clicking on “agree” you are moving forward from this webpage and acknowledge that you have read the informed consent and that you voluntarily agree to participate. If you do not wish to participate in this electronic survey, you may move away from this webpage.

☐ AGREE: I acknowledge receiving this Informed Consent Form. I have read the information and give my consent to participate in the study.

☐ AGREE: I am interested in participating in a face-to-face interview with the researcher.
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Brandman University Institutional Review Board

Research Participant’s Bill of Rights

BRANDMAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
Research Participant’s Bill of Rights

Any person who is requested to consent to participate as a subject in an experiment, or who is requested to consent on behalf of another, has the following rights:

1. To be told what the study is attempting to discover.

2. To be told what will happen in the study and whether any of the procedures, drugs or devices are different from what would be used in standard practice.

3. To be told about the risks, side effects or discomforts of the things that may happen to him/her.

4. To be told if he/she can expect any benefit from participating and, if so, what the benefits might be.

5. To be told what other choices he/she has and how they may be better or worse than being in the study.

6. To be allowed to ask any questions concerning the study both before agreeing to be involved and during the course of the study.

7. To be told what sort of medical treatment is available if any complications arise.

8. To refuse to participate at all before or after the study is started without any adverse effects.

9. To receive a copy of the signed and dated consent form.

10. To be free of pressures when considering whether he/she wishes to agree to be in the study.

If at any time you have questions regarding a research study, you should ask the researchers to answer them. You also may contact the Brandman University Institutional Review Board, which is concerned with the protection of volunteers in research projects. The Brandman University Institutional Review Board may be contacted either by telephoning the Office of Academic Affairs at (949) 341-9937 or by writing to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Brandman University, 16355 Laguna Canyon Road, Irvine, CA, 92618.

Brandman University IRB

Adopted

November 2013
The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research certifies that Kristina Zaragoza successfully completed the NIH Web-based training course "Protecting Human Research Participants".

Date of completion: 05/22/2016.

Certification Number: 2079947.
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IRB Approval

Institutional Review Board <my@brandman.edu>

Mar 5

Dear Kristine Zangrini,

Congratulations! Your IRB application to conduct research has been approved by the Brandman University Institutional Review Board. Please keep this email for your records, as it will need to be included in your research appendix.

If you need to modify your BUKE application for any reason, please fill out the "Application Modification Form" before proceeding with your research. The Modification form can be found at [BUKE Website].

Best wishes for a successful completion of your study.

Thank You,

BUKE

Academic Affairs
Brandman University
13033 Laguna Canyon Road

Irvine, CA 92618

buke@brandman.edu

[www.brandman.edu]

A Member of the Chapman University System

This email is an automated notification. If you have questions please email us at buke@brandman.edu