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Abstract

In an effort to better understand leadership and turnover in the nonprofit sector, this study investigated the impact of transactional and transformational leadership style on work attitudes, motivation, and work outcomes in nonprofit organizations. Hierarchical multiple linear regression analyses were conducted. Neither transactional leadership nor transformational leadership were significant predictors of turnover. Only transactional leadership was found to be a significant predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors. Transactional leadership was a significant predictor of perceived organizational support, affective commitment, procedural justice, and continuance commitment. Transformational leadership was a significant predictor of job satisfaction, perceived organizational support, and procedural justice. Finally, mediation analyses were conducted to determine if work attitudes and motivation mediate the relationship between transactional and transformational leadership styles and work outcomes. Affective commitment, job stress, satisfaction, and procedural justice collectively fully mediate the effect of transactional leadership on turnover and also fully mediate the effect of transformational leadership on turnover. Work and meaning, perceived organizational support, and public service motivation collectively fully mediate the effect of transactional leadership on organizational citizenship behaviors and also fully mediate the effect of transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behaviors. This study presents initial evidence of the relationship between public service motivation and organizational citizenship behaviors in the nonprofit context. Further exploration of transformational leadership in the nonprofit context needs to be conducted given that this study was not able to confirm several findings in the previous research literature regarding public and private sector employees.

Keywords: nonprofit organizations, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, public service motivation, organizational citizenship behaviors, turnover, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work and meaning, perceived organizational support, procedural justice
Chapter 1

Introduction

The United States has one of the largest nonprofit sectors in the world in both size and scope (Collins, 2011). Nonprofit organizations account for a substantial and increasing share of the workforce in the U.S. (Benz, 2005). Hidden in the growth of the nonprofit sector is the concerning issue of high turnover and the related recruitment and retention issues (Salamon & Geller, 2007). In 2016, the average total turnover rate in nonprofit organizations was estimated at 19%, an increase from 16% in 2013 (Nonprofit HR Solutions, 2016). The direct monetary costs of turnover range from 10% to 60% of an individual’s salary depending on the wage and role (Boushey & Glynn, 2012; Mitchell, Holtom, & Lee, 2001). The indirect costs associated with employee turnover include the loss of efficiency before the employee actually leaves the organization, the impact on their coworker’s productivity, and the loss of productivity while a new employee achieves mastery of the new position (Boushey & Glynn, 2012; Mitchell, et al., 2001; Mor Barak, Nissly, & Levin et al., 2001; Opportunity Knocks, 2010). Retention of employees in any industry is a serious concern for leaders but this is especially serious in the nonprofit sector where the ability to successfully and effectively achieve their important social mission depends heavily on their employees (Guo, Brown, Ashcraft, Yoshioka, & Dong, 2011; Kim & Lee, 2007; Seldon & Sowa, 2015; Walk, Schinnenburg, & Handy, 2014; Word, 2014). What can be done to reduce turnover and prevent the associated costs in the nonprofit sector?

Through quantitative research this study examines the impact of transformational leadership on work attitudes (ex. work and meaning, perceived organizational support, procedural justice, organizational commitment, job stress, role stressors, and job satisfaction), worker motivation (ex. public service motivation), and work outcomes (ex. turnover intentions and organization citizenship behaviors) in nonprofit organizations. Information gained from this study holds practical implications for nonprofit leadership and will have a direct impact on reducing turnover and the associated costs. Gaps exist in the current literature around the impact of
leadership and worker motivation in the nonprofit sector. This study may fill in the gaps and
provide practical information for leaders to improve job satisfaction, increase organizational
citizenship behaviors, and reduce turnover. In order to understand the substance and context of
this dissertation, the introductory chapter is organized as follows: definition, size and scope of the
nonprofit sector, the nonprofit workforce, definition of leadership, problem statement driving the
study, theoretical/conceptual framework guiding this study, purpose of this study, research
questions, overview of context and methods, significance of the study, and summary.

The dissertation is organized in five chapters. In Chapter one, an introduction to the study
is presented. Chapter two explores the current literature around transformational leadership, work
attitudes, public service motivation, and work outcomes. The chapter concludes with the
hypotheses and a depiction of the research model. Chapter three details the methodology,
including survey design, data collection procedures, population and sample, sampling procedures,
instrumentation, and data analysis. Chapter four provides the presentation of results. The
dissertation concludes with chapter five, which describes a summary, findings related to the
literature, conclusions, limitations, implications, and recommendations for further research.

Definition of Leadership

What is leadership? The topic of leadership is found pervasively within the practical and
academic literature and must be explored prior to application in the nonprofit sector. Day and
Antonakis (2012) asserted that leadership is the most studied social science topic. Fiedler (1971)
noted “there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are leadership theories—and
there are almost as many theories of leadership as there are psychologists working in the field” (p.
1). Ciulla (1995) noted the similarities of the many definitions and described leadership as the
process of influencing the movement of a group toward the attainment of a particular outcome.
Similarly, Hollander (1964) described leadership as a social influence process and explained
“which person achieves and retains leadership will therefore depend upon the perceptions of
others from ongoing social interaction” (Pierce & Newstrom, 2010, p. 121). Lord and Maher
(1991) described leadership as the process of being perceived by others as a leader. French and Raven (1959) defined power as the ability to exercise influence and define influence in terms of psychological change and that power has the ability to induce change in the environment. Pierce and Newstrom (2010), building on the work of French and Raven (1959), depicted leadership as the leader’s “ability to exercise reward, coercive, referent, expert, and or legitimate power” (p. 128). Bass (1990) identified leaders as “agents of change” (p. 19) and defined leadership as “an interaction between two or more members of a group that often involves a structuring or restructuring of the situation, and the perceptions and expectations of the members” (p. 19).

Burns (1978) asserted leadership as an aspect of power:

Leadership over human beings is exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with other, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage and satisfy the motive of followers. This is done in order to realize goals mutually held by both leaders and followers. (p. 18)

Day and Antonakis (2012) believed leadership scholars would agree that “leadership can be defined in terms of (a) an influence process—and its resultant outcomes—that occurs between a leader and followers and (b) how this influencing process is explained by the leader’s dispositional characteristics and behaviors, follower perceptions and attributions of the leader, and the context which the influencing process occurs” (p. 5). Understanding the definition of leadership provides a foundation and before applying leadership concepts to the nonprofit context, it is important to grasp the definition, size, and scope of the nonprofit sector.

**Definition, Size, and Scope of the Nonprofit Sector**

The nonprofit sector or the “third sector” is the collection of private, voluntary, and nonprofit organizations and associations (Anheier, 2005). Nonprofit organizations are private and separate from the government, although they may receive significant financial support from the government (Collins, 2011). Nonprofit organizations are “those entities that are organized for
public purpose, are self-governed, and do not distribute surplus revenue as profits” (Boris & Steurle, 2006, p. 67). Nonprofit organizations must serve a collective purpose and are subject to the non-distribution constraint in which net income is not distributed to shareholders (Dimaggio & Anheier, 1990). Salamon and Anheier (1997) characterize the nonprofit sector as being organized, formal, and institutionalized as signified by a formal charter of incorporation and also demonstrated through following rules of procedures, holding regular meetings, maintaining officers, and possessing some degree of organizational durability. Another defining feature of nonprofit organizations is that nonprofit organizations do not coerce participation, citizens are not mandated to give their time or money but must choose to do so freely (Frumkin, 2012). A third defining feature is that nonprofit organizations exist without simple and clear lines of accountability and ownership, which clearly separates this sector from government or business, and nonprofit and voluntary organizations have multiple accountability stakeholders: donors, clients, board members, employees, and the community (Frumkin, 2012). Nonprofit organizations are typically defined as private organizations that are governed by a board of directors or trustees who are responsible for providing policy direction, setting and revising the mission and vision, ensuring fiscal viability, and hiring and firing the executive director who is responsible for all day-to-day operations (Dicke, 2011). Nonprofits are very diverse and include: museums, orchestras, schools, universities, adult education organizations, research institutions, policy think-tanks, health organizations, human services, credit and savings, environment and natural resources, local development and housing, humanitarian relief associations, human rights organizations, rural farmers associations, religious organizations, foundations, service organizations, fraternities and sororities, advocacy groups, and self-help groups (Anheier, 2005).

Nonprofit organizations are defined in terms of their tax status by the U.S. tax code (Word, 2011). Over 30 categories of tax-exempt organizations exist and are defined by the Internal Revenue Code (Roeger, Blackwood, & Pettijohn, 2011). Public charities (designated as 501 (c) 3 organizations) make up the largest category of the more than 30 types of tax-exempt
nonprofit organizations defined by the Internal Revenue Code and included are: arts, culture, and humanities organizations; education organizations; health care organizations; human services organizations; and other types of organizations (Roeger, Blackwood, & Pettijohn, 2011; McKeever & Pettijohn, 2014). Almost one million organizations in 2012 were classified as public charities, which makes up two-thirds of all registered nonprofits (McKeever & Pettijohn, 2014). Between 2002 and 2012, the number of public charities grew 29.6% (McKeever & Pettijohn, 2014). Human services groups, including homeless shelters, food banks, services for youth, sports organizations, legal services, and family services constitute 35.5% of all public charities (McKeever & Pettijohn, 2014). Small organizations comprised the majority of public charities in 2012; 66.4% of reporting public charities had less than $500,000 in gross receipts composing less than 2% of public charity expenditures (McKeever & Pettijohn, 2014).

The nonprofit sector encompasses a large and progressively significant part of the U.S. economy (Word, 2011). The nonprofit sector has experienced steady growth since 1999. In 2009 the total number of registered nonprofits increased to 1.4 million up from 1.2 million in 1999, representing an increase of 19% (Roeger, Blackwood, & Pettijohn, 2011). In 2012, 1.44 million nonprofits were registered with the IRS demonstrating an increase of 8.6% from 2002 (McKeever & Pettijohn, 2014). These reporting nonprofits indicated $2.16 trillion in revenues and $4.84 trillion in assets (McKeever & Pettijohn, 2014). The nonprofit sector contributed $887.3 billion to the U.S. economy in 2012, which makes up 5.4% of the US’s gross domestic product (McKeever & Pettijohn, 2014). Fees for services and goods from private sources constitute 50% of the total revenue for public charities, followed by fees for services and goods from government sources at 23.1%, private contributions of 12.9%, government grants of 9.2% investment income at 3.6%, and other income at 1.2% (McKeever & Pettijohn, 2014). In 2014, according to the 2015 Giving USA Annual Report, total charitable giving was an estimated $358.38 billion, representing a 7.1% increase from 2013. In 2013, more than 25% of adults in the US volunteered with a nonprofit organization contributing an estimated 8.1 billion hours valued at $163 billion.
Understanding the definition, size, and scope of the nonprofit sector provides context for understanding the significance of the nonprofit workforce.

**Nonprofit Workforce**

In the U.S., nonprofits comprise a considerable and increasing share of the workforce (Benz, 2005). According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, nonprofits provided 11.4 million jobs in 2012, accounting for 10.3% of the U.S.’s workforce (Independent Sector, 2014). Employment in the nonprofit sector grew 18% between 2000 and 2012, which is at a rate faster than the overall U.S.’s economy (Independent Sector, 2014). Overall nonprofit employment has been growing at a rate faster than overall employment in the U.S. due to the heavy concentration of nonprofit work in service fields (Salamon, Sokolowski, and Geller, n.d). Out of wages paid in the U.S., nonprofit employees account for 9.2% and the nonprofit sector paid $587 billion in wages and benefits to its employees in 2010 (Independent Sector, 2014). Nonprofit jobs are primarily concentrated in three service areas: health care (57%), education (15%), and social assistance (13%) that together account for 84% of U.S. nonprofit jobs (Salamon, Sokolowski, and Geller, n.d).

Hidden in the growth of the nonprofit sector is the disconcerting issue of high turnover and the related recruitment and retention challenges (Capelli, 2005; Salamon & Geller, 2007; Word, 2014). Capelli (2005) found that nonprofit organizations reported an annual turnover rate of 3.1%, compared to 2.7% in the business sector, and 1% in the public sector. In research conducted by Opportunity Knocks (2010), the average turnover rate for sampled nonprofit organizations was 16% and more than 37% of nonprofits reported that retention is a major problem for their organization. Of the sectors participating in the survey, the sectors experiencing the highest turnover rates included: human services, youth development, health care, culture and humanities, and arts (Opportunity Knocks, 2010). Nonprofit HR Solutions research (2016) found an average turnover rate of 19%, including a voluntary turnover rate (resignations and retirements) of 13%, which demonstrates an increase since 2013 in which overall turnover was
16%, with a voluntary turnover rate of 10%. Salamon and Geller (2007) found that eight out of 10 organizations had experienced at least one staff departure in the preceding year.

Due to the high rate of voluntary turnover, nonprofit leaders experience abundant challenges in the recruitment, selection, and retention of staff (Gazley, 2009; Kim & Lee, 2007; Nonprofit HR Solutions, 2012; Salamon & Geller, 2007). Turnover of nonprofit executives is also an important concern (Salomon & Sandahl, 2007; Tierney, 2006; Word, 2014). Bell, Moyers and Wolford (2006) conducted a survey among nonprofit executives and found that three-quarters of the executives planned to leave their job within five years. Of the 87% of sampled organizations that indicated recruiting for staff positions in the preceding year, 84% indicated it was at least somewhat challenging (Salamon & Geller, 2007). The research literature identified two contributing factors: limited job advancement and inability to offer competitive benefits (Salamon & Geller, 2007). Approximately one-third of the organizations surveyed indicated overall negative impacts from staff turnover (Salamon & Geller, 2007).

Nonprofit organizations experience a negative impact from staff turnover (Kim & Lee, 2007; Salamon & Geller, 2007; Word, 2014). Between 35% and 39% reported a negative impact from staff turnover on staff productivity, morale, and burnout and approximately 25% indicated negative effects in their ability to fulfill the organization’s mission, quality of programming, and quantity of programming (Salamon & Geller, 2007). Over 50% indicated that staff recruitment and retention was affecting the ability of the organization to operate effectively (Salamon & Geller, 2007). Research conducted by Nonprofit HR Solutions found that 90% of organizations surveyed did not have formal retention strategies despite the fact that the organizations have identified retention as one of their most challenging issues (Nonprofit HR, 2013). Employees in the nonprofit sector may be vulnerable to burnout due to the mission-driven nature of the work (Dewa, 2011). Forty-eight percent of surveyed organizations used current staff to support new programs and initiatives despite the fact that this strategy often results in employee stress, employee dissatisfaction, and higher turnover (Nonprofit, HR, 2013). Additionally, not giving
proper recognition and failing to pay competitively may also lead to higher levels of
dissatisfaction and turnover (Opportunity Knocks, 2010; Nonprofit HR, 2013). See the table
below for a detailed look at perceived staff recruitment and retention problems.

Table 1.

*Perceived Staff Recruitment and Retention Problems*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruiting and Retention Problem</th>
<th>Nonprofits Indicating Significant or Very Significant Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inability to offer competitive salaries</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting people of color</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting professional and support staff</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting people of color as officers and senior managers</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee burnout</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining professional and support staff</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to offer competitive benefits</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting officers and senior managers</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining people of color as staff</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining people of color as officers and senior managers</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining officers and senior managers</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Salmon & Geller, 2007, p. 9)

Nonprofit organizations incur significant direct and indirect costs as a result of employee
turnover (Boushey & Glynn, 2012). The direct monetary costs of turnover range from 10% to
60% of an individual’s salary depending on the wage and role (Boushey & Glynn, 2012;
Mitchell, Holtom, & Lee, 2001). The direct costs of turnover are grouped into three categories:
separation costs, which include exit interviews, administration, functions related to
administrations, separation pay, and unemployment tax; replacement costs, which include
communicating job vacancies, pre-employment administrative functions, interviews, and exams;
and training cost, which includes formal classroom training and on-the-job instruction (Mitchell
et al., 2001; Mor Barak et al., 2001; Opportunity Knocks, 2010). The indirect costs associated
with employee turnover include the loss of efficiency before the employee actually leaves the
organization, the impact on their coworker’s productivity, and the loss of productivity while a
new employee achieves mastery of the new position (Mitchell et al., 2001; Mor Barak, et al.,
2001; Opportunity Knocks, 2010). Departing employees often take with them knowledge and
expertise gained through experience (Mitchell et al., 2001). Turnover causes devastating effects for clients served by the nonprofit organization and also for the remaining employees when positions are vacated and then filled by inexperienced personnel (Mor Barak et al., 2001). High turnover also has implications for the quality, consistency, and stability of an organization (Mor Barak et al., 2001), which may be especially problematic for the nonprofit sector.

**Problem Statement**

While the literature contains a vast number of studies on transformational leadership there has been little empirical research on transformational leadership in nonprofit organizations (McMurray, Islam, Sarros, & Pirola-Merlo, 2012; McMurray, Pirola-Merlo, Sarros, & Islam, 2009; Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004; Rowald & Rohmann, 2009). Several studies within the nonprofit context found positive relationships between transformational leadership and key work attitude and outcome variables (Druskat, 1994; McMurray et al., 2009; McMurray et al., 2012; Rowald & Rohmann, 2009). One nonprofit study also found support for Bass’ (1985) theory that transformational leadership augmented transactional leadership (Rowold & Rohmann, 2009). To increase understanding of the complexity of leadership in the nonprofit context more research examining transformational leadership in the nonprofit sector need to be conducted (McMurray et al., 2009; McMurray et al., 2012; Riggio et al., 2004; Rowald & Rohmann, 2009). The current study aims to explore this important and understudied segment of the nonprofit sector.

Scant research has explored the relationship between transformational leadership and worker motivation in the nonprofit sector (Park & Rainey, 2008; Vandenabele, 2008). Research consistently shows that public-sector employees have different motivations than private-sector employees (Crewson, 1997; Jurkiewicz et al., 1998; Perry, 1996). What about the motivation of nonprofit employees? Nonprofit employees are motivated by more than just money; there is a credible notion that nonprofit employees derive some kind of utility or value from work (Benz, 2005; Mirvis & Hackett, 1983; Preston, 1989). Nonprofit employees are more likely to cite accomplishing something worthwhile and meaningful as their reason to come to work, rather than
earning a paycheck (Borzaga & Tortia, 2006; Lee & Wilkins, 2011; Light, 2002; Light, 2003; Mirvis & Hackett, 1983; Steen, 2009; Word, 2014). Similarly, nonprofit employees exhibited stronger motivations and higher satisfaction linked to the meaningfulness of their work, even though they experienced lower pay, shortages of staff and resources, and excessive workloads compared to their government and private counterparts (Borzaga & Tortia, 2006; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Light, 2002). Mann (2006) found that nonprofit managers are motivated not by market rewards, but by public service. All of this suggests that nonprofit employees are significantly motivated “by a desire to serve the public interest” (Word, 2014, p. 397).

Public service motivation is a well-studied theory that has only recently been applied to the non-profit sector (Chen, 2011; Houston, 2006; Lyons et al., 2006; Mann, 2006; Park & Word, 2012; Taylor, 2010; Word & Carpenter, 2013). The public service motivation literature suggests that nonprofit employees and public sector employees are more likely than private employees to possess attitudes that have a prosocial motivation (Taylor, 2010). Only three studies are found in the research literature specifically measuring PSM in the nonprofit sector (Lee & Wilkons, 2011; Park & Word, 2012; Word & Carpenter, 2013). Otherwise, very little research has examined the unique aspects of motivation within the nonprofit sector (Mann, 2006; Park & Word, 2012; Word, 2014; Word & Carpenter, 2013). Employee motivation is one of the determining factors of a nonprofit organizations development and success (Park & Word, 2012). If nonprofit leaders understand and correctly use nonprofit public service motivation theory in the practice of human resource management they could potentially increase job satisfaction and reduce employee turnover (Park & Word, 2012; Word & Carpenter, 2013). Several studies link public service motivation with work attitudes, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the public sector but there is little research to be found on the impact of work attitudes and work outcomes in nonprofits (Camilleri, 2006; Cerase & Farinella, 2006; Castaing, 2006; Crewson, 1997; Kim, 2005; Naff & Crum, 1999; Park & Rainey, 2008; Steijn, 2006). This study has potential to create new knowledge for the field around worker motivation in the nonprofit sector.
Understanding the connection between leadership and motivation in the nonprofit workforce holds potential for implications to improve work attitudes, reduce turnover, and increase organizational citizenship behaviors in nonprofit organizations.

Theoretical/Conceptual Framework

The current study is based on the theory of transformational leadership, specifically the Podsakoff Transformational- Transactional Leadership Model, and the public service motivation (PSM) theory in the context of nonprofit organizations. Transformational leadership involves moving the follower beyond immediate self-interests “through idealized influence (charisma), inspiration, intellectual stimulation, or individualized consideration” (Bass, 1999, p. 11).

Transformational leadership involves four components of behavior (known as the four I’s): intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, idealized influence, and individualized consideration (leaders provide support and encouragement to followers) (Antonakis, 2012; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004; Yukl, 2002). Transformational leadership “transcends” transactional leadership “because it is built around the notion that leaders and followers are held together by some higher-level, shared goal or mission, rather than because of some personal transaction” (Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004, p. 50). Evidence in the research literature indicates that transformational leadership results in followers exceeding expected performance, high levels of follower satisfaction, and high levels of organizational commitment (Bass, 1985, 1998). In addition to transformational leadership theory, this study is also based on the application of the PSM theory, and exploring employee motivation in the nonprofit sector.

Research consistently shows that public-sector employees have different motivations than private-sector employees (Crewson, 1997; Jurkiewicz et al., 1998; Lee & Wilkins, 2011; Perry, 1996). Public service motivation theory originates from the notion that unique motives are found among public sector employees that are different from private sector employees (Perry et al., 2010). Public service motivation is further discussed as a “value or attitude that motivates individuals to engage in behaviors that benefit society” (Gould-Williams, Mostafa, & Bottomley,
2013, p. 3). More broadly defined public service motivation is characterized as a reliance on intrinsic rewards versus extrinsic rewards (Crewson, 1997). The most noticeable difference between public and private sector employees is a “sense of accomplishment takes precedence over issues more directly related to monetary incentives such as performance rewards and promotions” among public sector employees (Crewson, 1997, p. 505).

The public service research literature has demonstrated that public service motivation influences job satisfaction (Kim, 2005; Naff & Crumm, 1999; Park & Rainey, 2008; Perry & Wise, 1990; Rainey, 1982; Steijn, 2006), organizational commitment (Camilleri, 2006; Cerase & Farinella, 2006; Castaing, 2006; Crewson, 1997), turnover intentions (Naff & Crumm, 1999; Park & Rainey, 2008), and organizational citizenship behaviors among public sector employees (Kim, 2006; Pandey, Wright, & Moynihan, 2008; Steen, 2008). Building on the public service motivation literature and extending the theory to the nonprofit context, this current study has potential to create new knowledge for the field around worker motivations. Limited research has explored the impact of leadership on the development and enhancement of worker motivation in nonprofit organizations. Understanding the connection between leadership and motivation in the nonprofit workforce holds potential implications to improve job satisfaction, reduce turnover, and increase organizational citizenship behaviors in nonprofit organizations.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of transformational leadership on work attitudes (job satisfaction, work and meaning, perceived organizational support, organizational commitment, procedural justice, job stress, and role stressors), worker motivation (public service motivation), and work outcomes (turnover intentions and organizational citizenship behaviors) in nonprofit organizations. This current study aims to fill the existing gaps in the nonprofit literature around the impact of transformational leadership on work attitudes, motivation, and work outcomes. By extending the literature addressing these topics in the for-profit and public sectors, this study seeks to quantitatively test two theories in the nonprofit sector: transformational
leadership and public service motivation. The framework used to guide this study asserts that the Podsakoff et al. (1990) Transformational-Transactional Leadership Model will influence work attitudes, work motivations, and work outcomes in nonprofit organizations. Additionally, this study will explore the impacts of Perry’s (1996) concept of public service motivation on work attitudes and work outcomes in nonprofit organizations.

**Research Questions**

This current study examines the theory of transformational leadership and the public service motivation theory in the context of nonprofit organizations. The study aims to answer the following overarching research question: How does transformational leadership influence work attitudes (work and meaning, perceived organizational support, organizational commitment, job stress, role stressors, procedural justice, and job satisfaction), worker motivation (public service motivation), and work outcomes (turnover intentions and organization citizenship behaviors) in nonprofit organizations? The study also aims to answer the following secondary questions: Does a significant relationship exist between transformational and transactional leadership styles and work outcomes? Do transformational and transactional leadership styles exhibit differential effects on work attitudes and motivation in nonprofit organizations? Do work attitudes and motivation mediate the relationship between leadership and work outcomes?

**Overview of Context and Methods**

This study utilized a web-based, cross-sectional survey design. The researcher employed various measures to increase the response rate of the web-based survey, including: emailed introduction letters, frequent reminders through email, personalized email messages, piloting the web-survey with a small number of respondents, appealing invitation designs and informed consent methods, and offering an incentive through a lottery (Braun et al., 2011; Cho & Perry, 2011; Elkordy, 2013; Fan & Yan, 2010; Yasin Ghadi et al., 2011; Guterrez et al, 2012; Ko & Hur, 2013; Newcomer & Triplett, 2015; Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006; Sanchez-Fernandez et al., 2012; Vandenabeele, 2014; Word & Carpenter, 2013; Wright et al., 2012). This study utilized
convenience sampling, a type of non-random/non-probability sampling, in which the most conveniently available people are used as study participants (Polit & Beck, 2004). The target participants for this research study were employees of nonprofit organizations in Virginia over the age of 18. The researcher utilized existing networks in Virginia to recruit participants. The research design follows a multi-phase, quantitative approach that seeks to uncover statistical evidence regarding how transformational leadership influences work attitudes, worker motivation, and work outcomes in nonprofit organizations.

**Significance of the Study**

What can be done to prevent costs associated with turnover in the nonprofit sector? In an effort to provide answers to that question this study investigates the impact of leadership on work attitudes, worker motivation, and work outcomes in nonprofit organizations. This study will build on knowledge gained from studies conducted in the public and for-profit private sectors and expand knowledge regarding transformational leadership, worker motivation, work attitudes, and work outcomes in the nonprofit sector. Information gained from this study has practical implications for nonprofit leadership and may have an impact on reducing turnover and the associated costs. Gaps exist in the current literature around the impact of leadership and worker motivation in the nonprofit sector. By understanding the relationship between leadership, motivation, work attitudes, and work outcomes nonprofit leaders will be better equipped to reduce turnover and increase organizational citizenship behaviors. Human resource management functions related to turnover, such as recruitment, selection, and retention of employees in the nonprofit sector requires increased attention from researchers and practitioners (Guo et al., 2011; Park & Word, 2012; Seldon & Sowa, 2015; Watson & Abzug, 2004; Word & Carpenter, 2014).

With the nonprofit sector being such a large component of the U.S. economy and workforce this study has potential to yield implications for nonprofit leaders and managers for decreasing turnover, and increasing organizational citizenship behaviors in an effort to reduce costs and improve organizational performance. An important task for nonprofit leaders is to
motivate employees (Fisher, 2009; Vinnicombe & Singh, 2003). The rousing power of social and public missions is not a given, it needs to be cultivated (Wright, Moynihan, & Pandey, 2011). Understanding what motivates employees in the nonprofit sector is crucial to halting the current “human capital crisis” (Lee and Wilkins, 2011, p. 45) and is a pressing issue for nonprofit managers (Word & Carpenter, 2013). If used properly, nonprofit public service motivation, can theoretically increase job satisfaction and reduce turnover (Word & Carpenter, 2013). Leaders are more effective when working from a theory base; therefore, it is necessary to provide education to nonprofit leaders so they can better understand leadership and motivation theories and make practical applications in their organization (Fisher, 2009). Transformational leaders use words and actions to guide and inspire their employees and must model behaviors that reinforce the vision and help employees develop confidence and pride in their nonprofit organizations goals and service (Wright et al., 2011). Information from this study may guide the development and implementation of leadership training, specifically incorporating the transformational leadership theory and behaviors that cultivate motivation, improve work attitudes, increase organizational citizenship behaviors, and reduce turnover. Unless nonprofit organizations endeavor to make improvement to their efforts in human resource management issues of turnover will continue to be a challenge (Kang, Huh, Cho, & Auh, 2014; Word & Carpenter, 2013). Findings from this study can inform the development and implementation of human resource management improvement efforts in the nonprofit sector to address and foster key work attitudes associated with low turnover, such as job satisfaction, perceived organizational support, affective organizational commitment, and procedural justice.

**Summary**

Very little research exists on the impact of leadership on work attitudes, worker motivation, and work outcomes within the nonprofit sector. While the research literature contains a vast number of studies on transformational leadership there has been very little empirical research on transformational leadership in nonprofit organizations (McMurray, Islam, Sarros, &
Pirola-Merlo, 2012; McMurray, Pirola-Merlo, Sarros, & Islam, 2009; Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004; Rowald & Rohmann, 2009). There is a call for more research studies examining transformational leadership in the nonprofit sector to be conducted (McMurray et al., 2009; McMurray et al., 2012; Riggio et al., 2004; Rowald & Rohmann, 2009). Additionally, further research around public service motivation in the nonprofit context is needed (Lee & Wilkinson, 2011; Mann, 2006; Word & Carpenter, 2013). This study will build on knowledge gained from studies conducted in the public and for-profit private sectors and expand knowledge regarding leadership, work attitudes, worker motivations, and work outcomes in the nonprofit sector. Additionally, existing studies only examine one or two work attitudes in conjunction with attitudinal work outcomes. This current study investigates these attitudes together and examines the impact on intention to turnover and organizational citizenship behaviors.

The dissertation is organized in five chapters. In Chapter one, an introduction to the study was presented. Chapter two explores the current literature around transformational leadership, work attitudes, public service motivation, and work outcomes. The chapter concludes with the study hypotheses and a depiction of the research model. Chapter three details the study methodology, including survey design, data collection procedures, population and sample, sampling procedures, instrumentation, and data analysis. Chapter four provides the presentation of findings/results. The dissertation concludes with chapter five, which describes a summary of the study, findings related to the literature, conclusions, and limitations of the study, implications, and recommendations for further research.
Chapter 2

Literature Review and Theory

Introduction

Examining the empirical literature on transformational leadership, work attitudes, public service motivation, and work outcomes provides foundation and context for the current study. The literature review is organized into subtopics presented in the following order: brief history of leadership studies, transformational leadership theory, transformational leadership and nonprofit organizations, transformational leadership impact on work attitudes, work motivation, and work outcomes, public service motivation theory, public service motivation theory impact on work attitudes and work outcomes, applicability of public service motivation for the nonprofit sector, work outcomes. After the literature review the research questions, hypotheses, the research model, and tables linking key themes to the study hypotheses are presented.

Brief History of Leadership Studies

Research on leadership has progressed significantly from the “Great Man” and trait theories. The “Great Man” theory of leadership was the predominate view of leadership in the nineteenth and early twentieth century which asserted that certain individuals were born destined to lead (Pierce & Newstrom, 2010). Starting in the early twentieth century scholars viewed leadership as a “psychological phenomenon” in that leaders possessed capacities, motives, and behaviors that set them apart from non-leaders (Pierce and Newstrom, 2010, p. 63). At that time the “Great Man” theory evolved into trait theories, which emphasized that the characteristics of leaders were different from non-leaders rather than focusing on heredity (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 2010, p. 73). In the 1950’s researchers began focusing on behavioral styles of leadership, which focused on behaviors leaders engaged in and how leaders treated followers (Day & Antonakis, 2012). Two very influential studies, the Ohio State studies conducted by Stogdill and Coons (1957) and the University of Michigan studies conducted by Katz et al. (1951) identified two overarching leadership elements: consideration (i.e. supportive, person-oriented leadership) and
initiating structure (i.e. directive, task-oriented leadership) (Day & Antonakis, 2012). From there leadership studies moved to contingency theories. Fiedler (1972) and House and Mitchell (1974) articulated contingency theories incorporating the powerful role that the leader’s environment plays in leader effectiveness. Vroom and Jago (2007) acknowledge Fiedler (1972) as a pioneer for moving leadership research beyond “the purely trait or purely situational perspectives that preceded his contributions” (p. 20) despite theoretical and methodological controversies. House and Mitchell’s (1974) Path-Goal Theory of Leadership postulates the satisfaction, motivation and performance of the subordinates is contingent on the behavior of a leader. After the contingency movement came a focus in the research on relationships between the leader and followers (Day & Antonakis, 2012). The leader-member exchange (LMX) theory describes relationships between the leader and follower as either being high quality, based on trust and mutual respect, or low-quality, based on fulfillment of contractual obligations (Graen &, Uhl-Bien, 1995). Studies conducted by Bass (1985, 1988), Bass and Avolio (1994), Bennis and Nanus (1985), Conger and Kanungo (1987) promotes visionary and charismatic leadership theories which revived the field of leadership studies and provided new theoretical development, such as the development of transformational leadership (Day & Antonakis, 2012).

**Transformational Leadership Theory**

In the Pulitzer Prize winning book entitled, *Leadership*, Burns (1978) first introduced the concepts of transactional and transformational leadership. Burns (1978) asserted there were two basic types of leadership: the transactional and the transforming. According to Burns (1978) transactional characterizes the relationships between most leader and followers, “leaders approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another: jobs for votes, or subsidies for campaign contributions” (p. 4). Transforming leadership is distinguished from transactional as being more complex and more powerful:

The transforming leader recognizes and exploits an existing need or demand of a potential follower. But, beyond that, the transforming leader looks for potential motives in all
followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower. The result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents. (Burns, 1978, p. 4)

Transactional leaders offer financial reward for efficiency and production or deny a financial reward for low productivity (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transactional leaders motivate followers through the use of contingent rewards, contingent punishment, and active management by exception (Pierce and Newstrom, 2010). Transformational leaders use their personal values, vision, and commitment to a mission, and passion to motivate and move others (Burns, 1978). According to Bass (1999) “whereas transformational leaders uplift the morale, motivation, and morals of their followers, transactional leaders cater to their follower’s immediate self-interests” (p. 9). Pierce and Newstrom (2010) assert that transformational leadership yields trust and veneration in the leader, which causes the follower to accomplish the extraordinary by going above and beyond. Bass (1985, 1998) built on the work of Burns (1978) with his “full-range leadership theory” or the “transformational-transactional” leadership theory and asserted that transformational leadership, a different form of leadership from transactional (typically based in an exchange), accounted for follower outcomes centered on a sense of purpose and idealized mission (Avolio & Bass, 1991; Day & Antonakis, 2012). With transformational leadership, idealized and inspiring behaviors of the leader motivates followers to surpass their own self-interests for those of the greater good (Antonakis & House, 2002).

What do transactional and transformational leaders actually do? The Full Range Leadership model involves three components of transactional leader behavior, the four components of transformational leadership, and includes non-leadership behavior, known as laissez-faire leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The Full Range Leadership model posits that every leader exhibits some degree of both transactional and transformational factors “but each leader’s profile involves more of one and less of the other” (Bass, 1999, p.11). Transactional leadership involves contingent reward; the leader assigns what needs to be done by the follower
and promises rewards offered in exchange for successfully completing the task (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transformational leadership involves moving the follower beyond immediate self-interests “through idealized influence (charisma), inspiration, intellectual stimulation, or individualized consideration” (Bass, 1999, p. 11). Transformational leadership involves four components of behavior (known as the four I’s): intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, idealized influence, and individualized consideration (Antonakis, 2012; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004; Yukl, 2002). Intellectual stimulation involves the leader empowering and intellectually challenging the followers resulting in an expansion of the followers skills and abilities to be innovative and creative problem solvers (Antonakis, 2012; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004; Yukl, 2002). With inspirational motivation the leader inspires and motivates the followers to reach challenging and extraordinary goals (Antonakis, 2012; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004; Yukl, 2002). Idealized influence, also known as charismatic leadership, elicits strong emotions in the follower and the follower identifies with the leader thereby using the leader as a role model for their behavior (Antonakis, 2012; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004; Yukl, 2002). In individualized consideration leaders provide support and encouragement to followers by focusing on the followers specific needs and goals (Antonakis, 2012; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004; Yukl, 2002). Laissez-faire leadership is the absence of leadership and represents a nontransaction; all leadership responsibilities are ignored (Antonakis, 2012; Bass & Riggio, 2006). After developing an understanding of the behavior of transactional and transformational leaders it is important to understand how these two leadership styles are connected.

What is the relationship between transactional and transformational leadership? Riggio, Bass, & Orr (2004) asserted that transformational leadership “transcends” transactional leadership “because it is built around the notion that leaders and followers are held together by some higher-level, shared goal or mission, rather than because of some personal transaction” (p. 50). Evidence in the research literature indicates that transformational leadership results in followers exceeding
expected performance, high levels of follower satisfaction, and high levels of organizational commitment (Bass, 1985, 1998). Bass (1985) proposed an augmented relationship between transactional and transformational leadership and asserted that transformational leadership augments transactional leadership in predicting follower satisfaction and performance. Transformational leadership accounts for unique variance beyond what is accounted for by transactional leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

The Podsakoff Transformational-Transactional Leadership Model is conceptually similar to the Full Range Leadership Model proposed by Bass and Riggio (2006). The Podsakoff Model emphasizes six factors of transformational leadership: developing and articulating a vision (identifying new opportunities, developing, articulating, and inspiring others with a vision of the future), providing an appropriate role model (sets an example for employees to follow, being a good role model, “doing” rather than “telling”), fostering the acceptance of group goals (promoting cooperation and teamwork among employees, moving employees to work together toward a common goal), high performance expectations (setting challenging goals, articulating high expectations for excellence, quality and high performance), providing individualized support (considering the feelings of others, respecting others, demonstrating concern for employees feelings and needs, and intellectual stimulation (challenges employees to think differently, rethink their work and how it can be performed) (Bass and Riggio, 2006; Podsakoff et al., 1990).

**Transformational Leadership and Nonprofit Organizations**

Transformational leadership theory is a suitable model for explaining leadership in nonprofit organizations (Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1996; Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004). Nonprofits are frequently less bureaucratic than for-profit organizations which following Bass’ (1985) assertion that transformational leadership should be more effective in flexible, less bureaucratic structures (Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1996). Service- and community-oriented missions are the central and driving force for nonprofit organizations and mission is also at the heart of transformational leadership (Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004; Wright,
Transformational leadership aims to develop a shared understanding “that bonds leader and followers in a moral commitment to a cause that goes beyond their own self-interests” (Bass, 1998, p. 26), ultimately converting followers into leaders and moral agents (Bass, 1985). Transformational leaders seek to envision the future and enlist support from followers to join in pursuing new directions by inspiring a shared vision (Jaskyte, 2004). The sense of moral good and ardent commitment to the cause or mission involved in transformational leadership makes this theory very appropriate for explaining leadership in nonprofit organizations where commitment to the cause and commitment to the greater good are prevalent themes in this sector (Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004). Transformational leaders embrace an ethical philosophy and believe studying the broadest range of its stakeholders to meet their needs best serves the organization (McMurray et al., 2012). The idealized influence component of Bass’ (1998) theory of transformational leadership is relevant to nonprofit organization leaders as this behavior results in the development of admiration and respect toward the leader and followers imitate the leader’s commitment and often view the leader as the personification of the values and mission of the organization leading to increased follower commitment to the organization (Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004). Inspirational motivation is particularly important for nonprofit leaders tasked with motivating volunteers and staff to strive toward challenging and extraordinary goals (Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004). A nonprofit leader must be sensitive to the different motivations that cause volunteers and staff to become involved with the organization so the concept of individualized consideration becomes especially critical (Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004).

Understanding the history of leadership studies and the progression into the development of the transformational leadership theory provides framework for the current study. The behaviors enacted by transactional and transformational leadership and understanding how the two leadership styles connect provides a further foundation for application to the nonprofit sector. The next section examines the literature regarding the impact of transformational leadership on attitudes, motivation, and outcomes.
Transformational Leadership Impact on Attitudes, Motivation, and Outcomes

Transformational leadership impacts work attitudes, such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction, meaning in work, job stress, and role stressors. Using Podsakoff et al.’s (1990) transformational leadership behavior inventory, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Bommer (1996) found that transformational leadership and substitutes for leadership contributed to the variance in general job satisfaction (71%), organizational commitment (48%), role clarity (52%), and role conflict (28%) among employees of several large companies in the U.S. and Canada. In a study examining the predictors of organizational commitment among employees of human service organizations, Glisson and Derrick (1998), found leadership as the best predictor of organizational commitment. The sub-dimensions of transformational leadership were strongly and positively associated with affective commitment among nurses employed by a large public hospital (Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995). A study among public healthcare workers using the multifactor leadership questionnaire found a positive association between transformational leadership and organizational commitment among employees (Avolio, Zhu, Koh, and Bhatia, 2004). Transformational leadership had the most impact on affective commitment in nonprofit organizations (Rowold, Borgman, & Bormann, 2014). Transformational leadership was found to impact both job satisfaction and organizational commitment of faculty and executives enrolled in a MBA program (Elkordy, 2013). Employees with customer service roles in banking and grocery store companies managed by a transformational style leader had a higher level of organizational commitment and higher levels of job satisfaction (Emery & Barker, 2007). Utilizing the multifactor leadership questionnaire, Bogler (2001) conducted a study among teachers in Israel and found that the principal’s transformational leadership both directly and indirectly affected teacher’s job satisfaction. Transformational and empowerment leadership was related positively to job satisfaction among defense firm employees (Yun, Cox, & Sims, 2007). Among teachers in Tanzania transformational leadership factors explained 33% of the variance in teacher’s job satisfaction (Nguni, Sleeers, & Denessen, 2006). Several studies conducted with government
employees found that transformational-oriented leadership had a statistically significant effect on job satisfaction (Moynihan, Pandey, & Wright, 2009; Park & Rainey, 2008; Trottier, Van Wart, & Wang, 2008). Individual perceptions of supervisor’s transformational leadership were positively related to individual follower’s job satisfaction among academic faculty members at a large research University in Germany (Braun, Peus, Weisweiler, & Frey, 2013). Among healthcare workers, theoretical arguments suggested that transformational leadership is positively associated with perceiving work as meaningful (Arnold, Turner, Barling, Kelloway, & McKee, 2008). Transformational leadership created meaning in work among followers in a study of employees working in the for-profit sector (Yasin Ghadi, Fernando, & Caputi, 2013).

Transformational leadership also impacts work motivation. In a study among federal employees, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Bommer (1996) found that transformational leadership alone accounted for 4% of the variance in altruism. Transformational leadership at the supervisory level influenced the levels of public service motivation among federal employees in Belgium (Vandenabelle, 2014). Transformational leaders behave in ways that enhances public service motivation among their employees and increase employee public service-oriented behaviors (Park & Rainey, 2008). Empirical evidence indicated transformational leadership was directly associated with fostering high public service motivation among federal employees in the U.S (Moynihan, Pandey, & Wright, 2009; Wright, Moynihan, & Pandey, 2012).

Along with work attitudes and work motivation, transformational leadership impacts work outcomes, such as turnover intentions, and organizational citizenship behaviors. Transformational leadership factors explained 28% of the variance in Tanzanian teacher’s turnover intentions (Nguni et al, 2006). Transformational leadership positively influenced organizational citizenship behaviors among defense firm employees (Yun, Cox, & Sims, 2007). In a study of private sector employees, transformational leadership was associated with eliciting organizational citizenship behaviors among followers, in particular this relationship was strongest
when followers perceived a high leader-member exchange\textsuperscript{1} (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006).

Transformational leadership had positive and direct effect on employee organizational citizenship behaviors among public sector workers in Malaysia (Asgari, Silong, Ahmad, & Samah, 2008). The initial studies examining the antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior found four categories of characteristics: organizational, individual, task, and leader behaviors (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Smith et al., 1983). Podsakoff et al. (1996) and Podsakoff et al. (1990) expanded upon the early research and identified transformational and transactional leader behaviors as antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior (Podsakoff et al., 2000). In a later comprehensive and critical review, in addition to concluding that leaders play a key role in influencing employees’ organizational citizenship behaviors, Posakoff et al. (2000) found, “transformational leadership behavior also had consistent effects on every form of organizational citizenship behaviors. Perhaps this should not be surprising, since the heart of transformational leadership is the ability to get employees to perform above and beyond expectations” (p. 532). Jung and Lee (2000) demonstrated that transformational and transactional leadership had direct and positive relationships with organizational citizenship behaviors.

While very little research on the impact of leadership on work attitudes, worker motivation, and work outcomes has been conducted within the nonprofit sector, what does exist clearly demonstrates a positive impact and provides support for the current study. While the literature contains a vast number of studies on transformational leadership there has been little empirical research on transformational leadership in nonprofit organizations (Fisher, 2009; McMurray, Islam, Sarros, & Pirola-Merlo, 2012; McMurray, Pirola-Merlo, Sarros, & Islam, 2009; Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004; Rowald & Rohmann, 2009). In Roman-Catholic religious orders, a positive relationship existed between transformational leadership and outcome criteria

\textsuperscript{1} Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) define Leader-Member Exchange theory (LMX) as a unique dyadic social exchange between leaders and subordinates “that begins with more limited social “transactions”, but for those who are able to generate the most effective LMX relationship the type of leadership that results is transformational (p. 239).
(Druskat, 1994). In a study of employees in a church-based nonprofit, strong positive relationships were found between employee ratings of supervisor’s transformational leadership and employee ratings of well-being and commitment among employees (McMurray et al., 2009). In a study of members of a nonprofit choir organization, transactional leadership accounted for 24%-33% of the variance in extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction with the four scales of transformational leadership accounting for an additional 23% to 29% of the variance among members, which lends support for Bass’ (1985) theory that transformational leadership augmented transactional leadership (Rowold & Rohmann, 2009).

The research literature demonstrates the influence of transformational leadership on attitudes, motivation, and work outcomes in the public, private, and nonprofit sectors. In order to increase our understanding of the complexity of leadership in the nonprofit context more research studies examining transformational leadership in the nonprofit sector need to be conducted (McMurray et al., 2009; McMurray et al., 2012; Riggio et al., 2004; Rowald & Rohmann, 2009). The current study aims to explore this important and understudied segment of the nonprofit sector. The next section illustrates the work attitudes of interest in this current study.

**Work Attitudes**

Several work attitudes have been found to relate to turnover and organizational citizenship behavior: job satisfaction, meaning in work, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, procedural justice, continuance commitment, job-stress, and role stressors.

*Job satisfaction.* Job satisfaction is the “positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Locke, 1976, p. 1300). Theories of employee turnover have suggested that turnover intentions are influenced by an individual’s job satisfaction (Chen, 2011; Kang, 2014; Park & Rainey, 2008). Central to most turnover theory is the notion that job satisfaction directly and negatively relates to employees’ intentions to quit their jobs (i.e. turnover intentions), which in turn positively relate to actual turnover as documented by a meta-analysis reviewing over 100 empirical studies (Chen, Ployhart, Thomas, Anderson, & Bliese, 2011). The
unfolding model of turnover details that job satisfaction can change due to a result of “shocks” employees experience at work and that decrease in satisfaction can lead to turnover (Lee, Mitchell, Wise, & Fireman, 1996; Lee, Mitchell, & Holtom, 1999). Several studies in nonprofit organizations revealed that job satisfaction is the most important attitude influencing employee turnover (Benz, 2005; Mor Barak et al., 2001; Moynihan & Pandy, 2007). Podsakoff et al. (1996) found that job satisfaction mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors.

*Meaning in work.* Meaningful work is defined not just in terms of meaning (whatever work means to people) but as work that is both significant and positive in meaningfulness (Steger, Dik, & Duffy, 2012). Meaningful work is “therefore work experienced as particularly significant and holding more positive meaning for individuals” (Rosso, Dekas, & Wrzniewski., 2010, p. 95). Higher meaning of work is positively associated with job satisfaction and organizational commitment and negatively associated with intention to turnover (Steger et al., 2012).

*Perceived organizational support.* Perceived organizational support refers to the employees’ perception regarding the extent to which the organization values their contribution to the organization and cares about their well-being, specifically, “employees develop global beliefs concerning the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being” (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa, 1986, p. 501). Perceived organizational support has been found to have important consequences for employee performance and well-being and is associated with organizational commitment (Byrne et al., 2011; Eisenberger et al., 1986, Guterrez et al., 2012). There has been accruing evidence that suggests support from supervisors is instrumental in worker retention and that workers who perceive organizational support are less likely to quit (Allen, Shore, & Griffeth, 2003; Firth et al., 2003; Leung & Lee, 2006; Ko & Hur, 2014; Mor Barak et al., 2001). Perceived organizational support has also been found to be a positive predictive of organizational citizenship behaviors in social service organizations (Hopkins, 2002).
Affective and continuance commitment. Organizational commitment is a robust belief in the goals and values of the organization, a willingness to exercise substantial effort on behalf of the organization, and a strong desire to continue as a member of the organization (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Organizational commitment “describes the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Continuance commitment refers to the awareness by the employee of the costs that would be associated with leaving the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Employees with high levels of continuance commitment remain working for the organization because they need to do so (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Affective commitment is the employee’s emotional attachment to the organization, their identification with the organization, and their involvement in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Several studies demonstrated the positive relationship between transformational leadership and affective commitment (Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Kim, 2001, 2007; Koh, Steers, & Terborg, 1995). Employees with a strong affective commitment continue to work for their organization because they want to do so (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Employees that are committed to their organizations are less likely to exhibit turnover intentions (Freund, 2005; Mattieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer and Allen, 1997; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982).

Procedural justice. Procedural justice involves the perceived fairness and transparency by which decisions are made, including the fairness of the distribution of rewards and the fairness in penalty of wrongdoing or poor performance (Ko & Hur, 2014). The employee perceptions of the level of procedural justice have an impact on their job satisfaction and turnover intention (Colquitt et al. 2001; Ko & Hur, 2014). Additionally, Shore and Shore (1995) suggested that repeated examples of fairness in the decisions related to resource distribution in the organization have a strong and cumulative effect on developing perceived organizational support. Consistently in the research literature, procedural justice is positively related to organizational citizenship behaviors (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Moorman, Niehoff, & Organ, 1993; Organ, 1988, 1990;
Podsakoff et al., 2000; Smith et al., 1983) and is also found to mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

*Job-related stress and role stressors.* Job-related stress includes burnout, anxiety, and somatic complaints. The range of factors that lead to job-related stress (role ambiguity, work-overload, role conflict, and work-family conflict) are consistently found to be related to turnover (Firth, Mellor, Moore, & Loquet, 2003; Tate, Whatley, & Clugston, 1997). Role ambiguity is the best predictor of satisfaction (Glisson & Durick, 1988). Role ambiguity, role conflict, and work overload are negatively related to organizational citizenship behaviors (Eatough et al., 2011).

Empirical literature indicates that attitudes, such as job satisfaction, meaning in work, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, procedural justice, continuance commitment, job-related stress, and role stressors impact turnover intentions and organizational citizenship behaviors; however, the majority of this research has examined these attitude in the private sector. Little research on how work attitudes influence work outcomes has been conducted in nonprofit organizations. Existing studies only examine one or two work attitudes in conjunction with attitudinal work outcomes. It is important to look at these attitudes together and examine the impact on job satisfaction, intention to turnover, and organizational citizenship behaviors. Few studies have explored the influence of leadership on work attitudes. Understanding the influence of these attitudes is crucial to reducing turnover and increasing organizational citizenship behaviors. The theory of public service motivation is presented in the next section.

**Public Service Motivation Theory**

Research consistently shows that public-sector employees have different motivations than private-sector employees (Crewson, 1997; Jurkiewicz et al., 1998; Lee & Wilkins, 2011; Perry, 1996). The concept of public service motivation is defined as an “individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions” (Perry, 1996, p. 6) and “at the heart of the construct is the idea that individuals are oriented to act in the public domain
for the purpose of doing good for others and society” (Perry, Hondeghem, & Wise, 2010, p. 687). Public service motivation originates from the notion that unique motives are found among public sector employees that are different from private sector employees (Perry et al., 2010). Public service motivation encompasses six dimensions: attraction to public-policy making, commitment to public interest, civic duty, social justice, self-sacrifice, and compassion (Perry, 1996). Perry (1996) developed a measurement scale comprising of four dimensions (24 items): attraction to public policy formation, commitment to civic duty and public interest, compassion, and self-sacrifice. Public service motivation is further discussed as a “value or attitude that motivates individuals to engage in behaviors that benefit society” (Gould-Williams, Mostafa, & Bottomley, 2013, p. 3). Public service motivation is often equated “with a desire to serve the public interest, or more generally, with altruism” (Dur and Zoutenbier, 2014, p. 145) and further characterized within individuals as “possessing an other-directed or prosocial orientation” (p. 148). More broadly defined public service motivation is characterized as a reliance on intrinsic rewards versus extrinsic rewards (Crewson, 1997). Public service motivation represents a predisposition toward altruism and the delivery of meaningful community services, even it requires self-sacrifice (Mesch, Tschirhart, Perry, & Lee, 1998; Perry, 1996). Intrinsic rewards are rewards employees give themselves, such as a feeling of accomplishment or self-worth contrasted to extrinsic rewards which are rewards given to individuals by someone else, such as health benefits, promotions, and pay raises (Crewson, 1997; Houston, 2000). The most noticeable difference between public and private sector employees is a “sense of accomplishment takes precedence over issues more directly related to monetary incentives such as performance rewards and promotions” among public sector employees (Crewson, 1997, p. 505). Empirical evidence suggests public employees are more likely to highly value the intrinsic rewards of work, such as the importance of the work and the feeling of accomplishment; whereas private sector employees are more likely to highly value extrinsic rewards such as high income and short work hours.
(Houston, 2000). The literature review continues into the relationship between motivation and attitudes, and motivation and outcomes.

**Public Service Motivation Impact on Work Attitudes and Work Outcomes**

Public service motivation influences work attitudes, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Employment in the public service sector may serve a distinctive source of job satisfaction for public sector employees (Rainey, 1982). A link exists between public service motivation and job satisfaction among employees in the public sector (Perry & Wise, 1990). Evidence suggests that public service motivation is positively related to organizational commitment among public sector employees (Crewson, 1997; Kim, 2005; Naff & Crum, 1999; Park & Rainey, 2008; Steijn, 2006). Public sector employees who prefer service over monetary rewards were found to have higher levels of organizational commitment (Crewson, 1997). Another correlation exists between public service motivation and organizational commitment, specifically affective organizational commitment was the most important (Camilleri, 2006; Cerase & Farinella, 2006; Castaing, 2006). Conversely, one study found that public service motivation did not have a significant relationship to job satisfaction of public sector employees (Bright, 2008).

Motivation influences attitudinal work outcomes, such as turnover intentions and organizational citizenship behaviors. Employees with high levels of public service motivation were less likely to leave their jobs while employees with low levels of public service motivation are more likely to consider leaving the organization (Naff & Crumm, 1999). Public-service motivation was positively associated with lower levels of turnover intentions (Naff & Crumm, 1999; Park & Rainey, 2008). Conversely, one study demonstrated that public service motivation did not have a significant relationship to turnover intentions of public employees (Bright, 2008). Several studies in the public service research literature indicate that public service motivation is an antecedent of organizational citizenship behaviors among public sector employees (Kim, 2006; Pandey, Wright, & Moynihan, 2008; Steen, 2008). A study of Korean public sector employees
found that individuals with high levels of PSM are more likely to engage in organizational
citizenship behavior, such as taking on extra responsibilities voluntarily or engaging in prosocial
behavior (Kim, 2006). Pandey et al. (2008) found that public service motivation fostered
interpersonal citizenship behaviors in organizations, such as being more considerate to coworkers
and more likely to help a coworker with work-related tasks, in a study of U.S. state employees.

**Applicability of Public Service Motivation to the Nonprofit Sector**

What motivates nonprofit workers? Nonprofit employees are motivated by more than just
money; there is a credible notion that nonprofit employees derive some kind of utility or value
from work (Benz, 2005; Mirvis & Hackett, 1983; Preston, 1989). Compared to workers in federal
government and private sector, employees in the nonprofit sector are more likely to indicate they
joined their organization for “the chance to make a difference rather than for salary and benefits”
who take jobs in the nonprofit sector at lower rates of pay than they could earn in the for-profit
sector precisely because their priorities are to be of service to others” (p. 47). Rossi (2001)
depicted the phenomenon of the donative labor hypothesis, found in the labor market behavior
literature, whereas because of the nature of the good or service being produced by the nonprofit
organization, employees derive well-being from participating in the nonprofit initiative and are
willing to work for a lower wage (Francois, 2003; Frank, 1996; Leete, 2000; Leete, 2006;
Preston, 1989). The donative labor hypothesis explains the wage differentials between for-profit
employees and non-profit employees (Becchetti, Castriota, & Depedri, 2013; Frank, 1996;
Hansmann, 1980; Preston, 1989; Rose-Ackerman, 1996). Another way to describe this
phenomenon is that “the theoretical model of the nonprofit labor market suggests that workers
supply labor to nonprofit organizations at lower than market wages in return for the opportunity
to provide goods with positive social externalities” (Preston, 1989, p. 438). Research literature
postulates that nonprofit employees have greater intrinsic motivations, are more altruistic, and are
more willing to accept lower wages in exchange for the linkage between their principled
motivations and the goals of the nonprofit organization (Handy & Katz, 1998; Mirvis, 1992; Sen, 1985). In a study examining this concept, Becchetti et al. (2013) found support for this wage-differential hypothesis in that individuals moving from the for-profit sector to the non-profit sector in the presence of negative wage differentials, reported higher levels of job satisfaction as the non-monetary benefits outweighed the negative difference in monetary compensation.

Nonprofit employees are more likely to cite accomplishing something worthwhile and meaningful as their reason to come to work, rather than earning a paycheck (Borzaga & Tortia, 2006; Lee & Wilkins, 2011; Light, 2002; Light, 2003; Mirvis & Hackett, 1983; Steen, 2009; Word, 2014). Nonprofit employees exhibited stronger motivations and higher satisfaction linked to the meaningfulness of their work, even though they experienced lower pay, shortages of staff and resources, and excessive workloads compared to their government and private counterparts (Borzaga & Tortia, 2006; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Light, 2002). Compared to public employees, nonprofit employees exhibited more positive work attitudes (Chen, 2011). Nonprofit employees are motivated to participate in their organization’s mission or to be involved with the development of a public good they see as desirable for humanity (Benz, 2005; Kim & Lee, 2007). Several studies confirmed that compared to private employees, nonprofit employees demonstrate stronger levels of altruistic and service motivation (Chen, 2014; De Cooman, De Gieter, Pepermans & Jegers, 2011; Schepers, De Gieter, Pepermans, Du Bois, Caers, & Jegers, 2005). Additionally, nonprofit employees demonstrated evidence of being motivated by their preferences for working with and for people, personal growth, opportunities to learn, and social contacts (Schepers et al., 2005). Mann (2006) found that nonprofit managers are motivated not by market rewards, but by public service. All of this suggests that nonprofit employees are significantly motivated “by a desire to serve the public interest” (Word, 2014, p. 397).

Public service motivation is a well-studied theory that has only recently been applied to the non-profit sector (Chen, 2011; Houston, 2006; Lyons et al., 2006; Mann, 2006; Taylor, 2010; Word & Carpenter, 2013). Rainey (1982) contended that while public service motivation was
significant in the public sector the concept of public service motivation clearly transcends the sector. Due to the high prevalence of public service motivation in the nonprofit sector, a need emerged to broaden the public-private dichotomy (Mann, 2006). The public service motivation literature suggests that nonprofit employees and public sector employees are more likely than private employees to possess attitudes that have a prosocial motivation and public and nonprofit employees show similar patterns of PSM-related attitudes (Houston, 2008; Taylor, 2010). Similar to Houston (2006) and Lyons et al. (2006), Taylor (2010) asserted that in the context of PSM and civic participation, public sector employees share more similarities to nonprofit workers than private employees. Also, nonprofit employees and public sector employees reported engaging in more non-electoral political and prosocial activities than private workers (Taylor, 2010). Public service and nonprofit employees are “more alike than different” in that both “attract individuals having a desire to serve the public interest, face the problem of goal ambiguity, and lack precise performance indicators for managers to motivate their subordinates” (Chen et al., 2011, p. 4). The practice of public administration has significantly progressed over 30 years as “new public management” stemming from reform in the 1980’s and 1990s has led to a current public service delivery system that functions through a network of contracts between government, nonprofit organizations, and for-profit businesses delivering “public” services (Word & Carpenter, 2013, p. 317). Light (2002) and Mann (2006) also assert that nonprofit employees are part of the new public service. Public service motivation is seen as a useful construct, not only in public organizations but also in nonprofit organizations, to account for behavior and distinctive dimensions of public service motivation are important in different settings (Perry, 1990; Steen, 2009; Tschirhart, Mesch, Perry, Miller, & Lee, 2001).

This evolution of public service into the nonprofit sector prompted an exploration of the concept of PSM in the nonprofit sector (Lee & Wilkins, 2011; Mann, 2006; Park & Word, 2012; Word and Carpenter, 2013). Mann (2006) explored the literature available on public service motivation and asserted that the prevalence of public service motivation in the nonprofit sector
broadens the public-private dichotomy. Several studies in the U.S. demonstrated plausibly that public service motivation might be higher in the nonprofit sector than in the public sector (Light, 2003; Lyons et al, 2006; Mann, 2006). Only three studies found in the literature specifically measure PSM in the nonprofit sector. In a study comparing public and nonprofit job motivations, Lee and Wilkins (2011) asserted that the motivation behind nonprofit employment might overlap with several dimensions of PSM given that both public and nonprofit organizations produce public goods and service. Park and Word (2012) found that the desire to serve the public and public interest (public-service oriented incentive) accounted for 23.31% of the variance in motivation among nonprofit employees. Word and Carpenter (2013) tested a theoretical model of nonprofit service motivation based on an adaptation of Perry’s (1996) public service-motivation, which was found to be a good fit. Similar to public sector employees, nonprofit sector employees are significantly intrinsically motivated and the constructs that make up PSM are similar to those that make up nonprofit service motivation (Word & Carpenter, 2013).

Otherwise, very little research has examined the unique aspects of motivation within the nonprofit sector (Mann, 2006; Park & Word, 2012; Word, 2014; Word & Carpenter, 2013). Employee motivation is one of the key determining factors of a nonprofit organizations development and success (Park & Word, 2012). If nonprofit leaders understand and use nonprofit public service motivation theory in the practice of human resource management they could potentially increase job satisfaction and reduce turnover (Park & Word, 2012; Word & Carpenter, 2013). This study has potential to create new knowledge for the field around worker motivations. Scant research has explored the impact of leadership on the development and enhancement of worker motivation. Perry and Hondeghem (2009) assert that leaders can influence public service motivation but the processes are not well understood and have put out a call for more research to better understand the role of leaders in the development of public service motivation. As part of their recruitment and retention plans, nonprofit leaders should emphasize the importance of their service missions to continue to attract employees who value the unique nonmonetary benefits
offered by the nonprofit sector (Park & Word, 2012). Understanding the connection between leadership and motivation in the nonprofit workforce holds potential for tremendous implications to reduce turnover, and increase organizational citizenship behaviors in nonprofits.

**Work Outcomes (Turnover Intentions and Organizational Citizenship Behavior)**

Many retention/turnover studies use “intention to leave” instead of actual turnover as the outcome variable (Mor Barak et al., 2001). Before actually leaving a job, there is evidence that workers typically make a conscious decision to do so but there is time between when that decision is made and when the worker actually leaves the company (Mor Barak et al., 2001). Intentions are the most immediate determinants of actual behavior (Firth et al., 2003). Previous studies utilized turnover intentions as an organizational outcome (Chen et al., 2011; Firth et al., 2003; Mitchell et al., 2001; Mor Barak, 2011; Park & Rainey, 2008). In a cross-sectional study it is more practical to ask employees of their intentions to quit rather than actually tracking them down through a longitudinal study to see if they have left or to conduct a retrospective study (Firth et al., 2003; Mor Barak et al., 2001). Intention to quit is the single strongest predictor of turnover and is legitimate to use as an outcome variable in turnover studies (Firth et al., 2003; Mor Barak et al., 2001). Three categories of turnover antecedents emerge from empirical studies of human service workers: 1) professional perceptions, including job satisfaction, emotional exhaustion, and work-life-balance; 2) organizational conditions such as perceived organizational support; and 3) demographic factors that are both personal and work-related, including age, education, gender, race/ethnicity and work life conflict (Mor Barak et al., 2001).

Professional perceptions and organizational conditions are among the most consistent predictors of turnover (Mor Barak et al., 2001). Job satisfaction is a consistent predictor of turnover behavior and employees who are satisfied with their jobs are less likely to quit (Firth et al., 2013; Mor Barak et al., 2001; Park & Rainey, 2008). Central to most turnover theory is the notion that job satisfaction directly and negatively relates to employees’ intentions to quit their jobs, which in turn positively relate to actual turnover (Chen et al., 2011). Meta-analysis
reviewing over 100 empirical studies has documented the negative relationships of job satisfaction with turnover intentions and actual turnover (Chen et al., 2011). Organizational conditions are also a common predictor of turnover. Accruing evidence suggests support from supervisors is instrumental in worker retention and employees who believe their supervisor are willing to listen to work-related problems and can be relied upon when things get difficult at work are less likely to quit (Mor Barak et al., 2001). In education, support from supervisors was negatively related to teacher burnout (Leung & Lee, 2006). Perceptions of supervisor’s support acted to reduce intention to quit (Firth et al., 2003). In a summation of 15 years of research on turnover, perceived organizational support was identified as an attitude associated with an individual’s intent to quit (Mitchell et al., 2001). In addition to turnover, organizational citizenship behaviors are another important work outcome for nonprofits (Hopkins, 2002).

Organizational citizenship behaviors are a dimension of performance that result in positive outcomes for both organizations and staff members (Eatough et al., 2011; Gould-Williams et al., 2013). Organizational citizenship behavior is defined as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988, p. 4). The behavior goes above and beyond stated job descriptions and has important benefits for the organization (Steen, 2008). Employees exhibiting organizational citizenship behaviors complete tasks beyond those outlined in their job descriptions, such as assisting their coworkers with their duties, avoiding unnecessary conflicts, and encouraging a positive work environment (Gould-Williams et al., 2013; Kim 2005). These voluntary and informal behaviors contribute to improved organizational effectiveness and performance (Gould-Williams et al., 2013; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Ahearne, 1998; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Vigoda-Gadot & Beeri, 2012). Podsakoff et al. (1990) built upon the work of Organ (1988) and identified the five major categories of organizational citizenship behavior: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. Altruism is defined as “discretionary behaviors on the part of the employees that
have effects of helping a specific other with an organizationally relevant problem” (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006, p. 251). Conscientiousness encompasses “discretionary behaviors on the part of the employee that go well beyond the minimum role requirements of the organization in the areas of attendance, obeying rules and regulations, taking breaks, and so forth” (p. 251). The authors define sportsmanship as the “willingness of the employee to tolerate less than ideal circumstances without complaining” (p. 251). Courtesy encompasses “discretionary behavior on the part of an individual aimed at preventing work-related problems with others from recurring” (p. 251). Finally, civic virtue is defined as behavior that indicates participation, involvement, or concern about the life of the organization (p. 251).

Several studies in the public service research literature indicate that public service motivation is an antecedent of organizational citizenship behaviors among public sector employees (Kim, 2006; Pandey, Wright, & Moynihan, 2008; Steen, 2008). Procedural justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment have been found to be antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors with procedural justice being the strongest predictor in private for-profit organizations (McBain, 2004; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Moorman, 1993; Schnake & Dumbler, 2003). In a literature review, Organ (1988), suggested that job satisfaction “as far and away the most prominent correlate of OCB” (p. 107). In a later review, Organ et al. (2006) posit that the most prominent mediators between leader behavior and organizational citizenship behavior are managerial trust, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and perceptions of procedural justice (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Moorman, 1991; Moorman, Niehoff, and Organ, 1993; Organ 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983).

But why are organizational citizenship behaviors important? Organizational citizenship behaviors are linked to organizational performance and success in the research literature regarding the private sector (Organ, 1988; Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997; Podsakoff et al., 2000). Organ (1988) suggested that conceptually organizational citizenship behaviors make organizations more efficient and effective in that it
“places more resources at the disposal of the organization and obviates the need for costly formal mechanisms to provide functions otherwise rendered informally by the OCB” (Organ & Konovsky, 1989, p. 157). Regarding the link between OCB and effectiveness, Organ and Konovsky (1989) stated:

OCB derives its practical importance from the premise that it represents contributions that do not inhere formal role obligations. The presumption is that many of the contributions aggregated over time and persons, enhance organizational effectiveness. [However], this presumption rests more on its plausibility than direct empirical support. (p. 157)


- May free up resources for more productive purposes (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; MacKenzie et al., 1991, 1993; Organ, 1988; Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff, McKenzie, & Hui, 1993).
- May reduce the need to devote scarce resources to purely maintenance functions (Organ, 1988; Organ et al., 2006).
- May serve as effective means of coordinating activities between team members and across work groups (Karambayya, 1990; Organ et al., 2006; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983).
- May enhance the organizations ability to attract and retain the best people by making it a more attractive place to work (George & Bettenhusen, 1990; Organ, 1988).
- May enhance the stability of organizational performance (Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997).

---

2 Organ et al. (2006) identified limitations in Karamayya’s (1990) study and further research (Ahearne, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2004; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Ahearne, 1996; Podsakoff et al., 1997; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994) examining the link between organizational citizenship behaviors and organization effectiveness “in a manner that avoided many of the limitations of Karamayya’s research” (p. 206).
• May enhance the organizations ability to adapt to environmental changes (Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997).
• May enhance organizational effectiveness by creating social capital (Bolino, Turnley, & Bloodgood, 2002; Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997).

Although, much of the research has been focused on the for-profit sector, given the unique challenges faced by nonprofit organizations, the key dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviors may be especially applicable to the nonprofit sector (Hopkins, 2002). One study found that perceived organizational support was positively related to organizational citizenship behaviors among nonprofit social service workers (Hopkins, 2002).

Building on the foundation of the transformational leadership and public service motivation, this study seeks to expand the knowledge by testing these two well-documented theories in the nonprofit context. While empirical studies present the factors influencing intention to quit and organizational citizenship behaviors, few studies address these factors in nonprofit organizations. This study seeks to fill in the gaps of the current literature on predicting intention to turnover and organizational citizenship behaviors in the nonprofit sector.

This study holds potential for practical implications on how nonprofit leaders can reduce turnover and increase organizational citizenship behaviors in an effort to reduce costs and improve organizational performance. If the study yields significant results practical implications and recommendations could be disseminated throughout the field, such as encouraging nonprofit management practices to include identifying, recruiting, and selecting individuals with a predilection to exhibit organizational citizenship behaviors (Organ et al., 2006). Exploring human resource practices of the organization may also be beneficial and further elucidate this issue: How are employees selected for hire?; What criteria are utilized?; How is best-fit ensured?; Are exit interviews conducted? Training and development procedures could be used to enhance the motivation and ability of nonprofit employees to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors (Organ et al., 2006). Leaders could utilize motivational assessment scales to ensure task alignment between roles, skills, and interests (Meyer and Allen, 1991). Leaders could help
employees become emotionally connected to the organization, help people flourish, encourage people to thrive, and create a healthy workplace so that people are satisfied and productive (Meyer and Allen, 1991). Both managements’ assessing and monitoring of employee workloads, and improving supervisor-subordinate relationships have potential to not only reduce stress, but increase job satisfaction, and commitment to the organization (Firth et al., 2003). To increase job satisfaction managers could provide education to upgrade employee’s job skills and enhance self-confidence as a way to reduce emotional exhaustion; provide a comprehensive orientation program to assist workers in forming a clear idea of their job role and a more complete understanding of the environment in which they work; and promote a sense of community to help create support from both peers and supervisors (Kalliath & Morris, 2002). The next section presents the research questions and hypotheses driving this study.

**Questions and Hypotheses**

This current study examines the theory of transformational leadership and the public service motivation theory in the context of nonprofit organizations. The study aims to answer the following overarching research question: How does transformational leadership influence work attitudes (job satisfaction, meaning in work, perceived organizational support, affective organizational commitment, procedural justice, continuance organizational commitment, job-related stress, and role stressors), worker motivation (public service motivation), and work outcomes (turnover intentions and organization citizenship behaviors) in nonprofit organizations?

- Does a significant relationship exist between transformational and transactional leadership styles and work outcomes? This question will be tested by the following hypotheses:
  - Hypothesis 1.1: A significant negative relationship exists between transactional leadership style and intention to turnover in nonprofit organizations.
  - Hypothesis 1.2: A significant negative relationship exists between transformational leadership style and intention to turnover in nonprofit organizations.
  - Hypothesis 1.3: Transformational leadership style will exhibit stronger effects than transactional leadership style on intention to turnover in nonprofit organizations.
  - Hypothesis 1.4: A significant positive relationship exists between transactional leadership style and organizational citizenship behaviors.
Hypotheses 1.5: A significant positive relationship exists between transformational leadership style and organizational citizenship behaviors.

Hypothesis 1.6: Transformational leadership style will exhibit stronger effects than transactional leadership style on organizational citizenship behaviors in nonprofit organizations.

Table 2.

Work Outcomes and Expected Relationships with Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Intention to Turnover</th>
<th>Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>Transformational Leadership Inventory (TLI)</td>
<td>(-) stronger</td>
<td>(+) stronger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990) (23 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>Contingent Reward Behavior Scale</td>
<td>(-) weaker</td>
<td>(+) weaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1984) (5 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentions to Turnover</td>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kelloway, Gotlieb, &amp; Barham (1999) (4 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship</td>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990) (24 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Do transformational and transactional leadership styles exhibit differential effects on work attitudes and motivation in nonprofit organizations? This question will be tested by the following hypotheses:

  o Hypothesis 2.1: A significant relationship exists between transactional leadership style and work attitudes in nonprofit organizations.
  o Hypothesis 2.2: A significant relationship exists between transformational leadership style and work attitudes in nonprofit organizations.
  o Hypothesis 2.3: Transformational leadership style will exhibit stronger effects than transactional leadership style on work attitudes in nonprofit organizations.
  o Hypothesis 2.4: A significant positive relationship exists between transactional leadership styles and motivation in nonprofit organizations.
  o Hypothesis 2.5: A significant positive relationship exists between transformational leadership style and motivation in nonprofit organizations.
  o Hypothesis 2.6: Transformational leadership style will exhibit stronger positive effects than transactional leadership style on motivation in nonprofit organizations.
Table 3.

**Work Attitudes and Expected Direction of Relationship with Leadership Styles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Expected Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Global Job Satisfaction Scale- Hackman &amp; Oldham (1976) (3 items)</td>
<td>TF (+) stronger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work and Meaning Inventory- Steger (2011) (10 items)</td>
<td>TA (+) weaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived organizational support</td>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support Scale- Eisenberger (1986) (8 items)</td>
<td>TF (+) stronger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>Affective Commitment Scales- Meyer &amp; Allen (1984) (6 items)</td>
<td>TA (+) weaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>Procedural Justice- Ko &amp; Hur (2014) (6 items)</td>
<td>TF (+) stronger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>Continuance Commitment Scale- Meyer &amp; Allen (1984) (6 items)</td>
<td>TA (-) weaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related Stress</td>
<td>Job-related Stress Scale- Firth et al. (2003) (8 items)</td>
<td>TF (-) stronger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role stressors</td>
<td>Role stressors- Firth et al. (2003) (12 items)</td>
<td>TA (-) weaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Public Service Motivation Scale- Perry (1996) (32 items)</td>
<td>TF (+) stronger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Do work attitudes and motivation mediate the relationship between leadership and work outcomes? This question will be tested by the following exploratory hypotheses:

  - Hypothesis 3.1: Work attitudes and motivation mediate the relationship between leadership and intention to turnover in nonprofit organizations.
  - Hypothesis 3.2: Work attitudes and motivation mediate the relationship between leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors in nonprofit organizations.

Table 4.

**Expected Mediated Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Intention to Turnover (IT)</th>
<th>Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership Style (TF)</td>
<td>Transformational Leadership Inventory (TLI) Podskoff et al. (1990) (23 items)</td>
<td>-WA mediate the relationship between TF and IT</td>
<td>-WA mediate the relationship between TF and OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-M mediates the relationship between TF and IT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Summary of Literature Review and Linkages to the Study Hypotheses

Retention of employees in any industry is a serious concern for leaders but this is especially serious in the nonprofit sector where the ability to successfully and effectively achieve their important social mission depends heavily on their employees (Ban, Drahnak-Faller, & Towers, 2003; Guo, Brown, Ashcraft, Yoshioka, & Dong, 2011; Seldon & Sowa, 2015; Walk, Schinnenburg & Handy, 2014; Word, 2014). This study presents a first step to address the concern by investigating the impact of transformational leadership on work attitudes (ex. job satisfaction, meaning in work, perceived organizational support, affective organizational commitment, procedural justice, continuance organizational commitment, job-related stress, and role stressors), worker motivation (ex. public service motivation), and work outcomes (ex. turnover intentions and organization citizenship behaviors) in nonprofit organizations. Information gained from this study holds practical implications for nonprofit leadership and will have an impact on reducing turnover and the associated costs. Gaps exist in the current literature around the impact of leadership and worker motivation in the nonprofit sector. This study will help fill in the gaps and provide practical information for leaders to increase organizational citizenship behaviors, and reduce turnover. Due to the complexity of the variables, see the tables below for key findings from the literature and the relationship to the study hypotheses.

Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Key Themes</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition, Size, &amp; Scope of the Nonprofit Sector</td>
<td>The nonprofit sector or the “third sector” is the collection of private, voluntary, and nonprofit organizations and associations.</td>
<td>Anheier (2005); Dimaggio &amp; Anheier (1990); Frumkin (2012); Collins (2011); Dicke (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The US has one of the largest nonprofit sectors in the world.</td>
<td>Collins (2011); Word (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The nonprofit sector is a large and progressively significant part of the US economy.</td>
<td>Roeger, et al. (2011); McKeever &amp; Pettijohn (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The nonprofit sector is very diverse.</td>
<td>Roeger et al. (2011); McKeever &amp; Pettijohn (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The nonprofit sector has experienced steady growth since 1999.</td>
<td>Roeger et al. (2011); McKeever &amp; Pettijohn (2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Nonprofit Workforce** | Nonprofits account for a substantial & increasing share of the workforce in the US.  
Hidden in the growth of the nonprofit sector is the issue of high turnover and the related recruitment and retention issues.  
Turnover costs nonprofits money, loss of efficiency, productivity, knowledge, and expertise and has implications for the quality and stability of an organization. | Benz (2005)  
Capelli (2005); Dewa (2011); Gazley (2009); Mitchell et al. (2001); Salamon & Geller (2007); Salamon, Sokolowski, and Geller (n.d); Word (2014)  
Boushey, & Glynn (2012); Kim & Lee (2007); Mitchell et al. (2001); Mor Barak, et al. (2001); Opportunity Knocks (2010); Salamon & Geller (2007); Word (2014) |
| **Definition of Leadership** | Leadership as the process of influencing the movement of a group toward the attainment of a particular outcome.  
Leadership as a social influence process.  
Process of being perceived by others as a leader.  
Leaders as agents of change.  
Leadership as a process, exercising influence over followers, guide toward attainment of a mutual goal. | Ciculla (1995)  
Hollander (1964)  
Lord & Maher (1994)  
Bass (1990)  
Burns (1978); Pierce & Newstrom (2010); Day & Antonakis (2012) |
| **Transformational Leadership Theory** | Two basic types of leadership: transactional and transforming.  
Transactional leadership involves contingent reward.  
Transformational leaders use their personal values, vision, and commitment to a mission, and passion to motivate and move others.  
Full range of leadership model: Laissez-faire, transactional (contingent reward, active, and passive management-by-exception); transformational (intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, idealized influence, and individualized consideration).  
The Podsakoff Model: developing and articulating a vision, providing an appropriate role model, fostering the acceptance of group goals, high performance expectations, providing individualized support, and intellectual stimulation. | Burns (1978)  
Bass & Riggio (2006); Pierce & Newstrom (2010)  
Burns (1978); Pierce & Newstrom (2010); Avolio & Bass (1991); Antonakis & House (2002)  
Bass and Riggio (2006); Podsakoff et al. (1990); Day & Antonakis (2012) |
| **Transformational Leadership Theory** | Transformational leadership theory is a suitable model for explaining leadership in nonprofits. | Bass (1985, 1988); Den Hartog, et al. (1996); Riggio et al. (2004); MacMurray et al. (2012) |
### Table 6.

**Literature on the Impact of Transformational Leadership on Work Attitudes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Themes</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Relationship to Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive association between transformational leadership:</td>
<td>Arnold et al. (2008); Avolio et al. (2004); Braun et al. (2011); Bycio et al. (1995); Elkordy (2013); Emery &amp; Barker (2007); Glisson and Durick (1998); McMurray et al. (2009); Monihan et al. (2009); Nguni, et al. (2006); Park &amp; Rainey (2008); Podsakoff et al. (1996); Rowold &amp; Rohmann (2009); Rowold et al. (2014); Bogler (2001); Trotter et al. (2008); Wright et al. (2012); Yasin Ghadi et al. (2013); Yun, Cox, &amp; Sims (2007)</td>
<td>H 2.1: A significant relationship exists between transactional leadership styles and work attitudes in nonprofit organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• affective organizational commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>H 2.2: A significant relationship exists between transformational leadership styles and work attitudes in nonprofit organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>H 2.3: Transformational leadership style will exhibit stronger effects than transactional leadership style on work attitudes in nonprofit organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• role clarity</td>
<td></td>
<td>H 2.4: A significant positive relationship exists between transactional leadership styles and organizational citizenship behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• meaning of work</td>
<td></td>
<td>H 2.5: A significant positive relationship exists between transformational and transactional leadership styles and motivation in nonprofits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• goal clarity</td>
<td></td>
<td>H 2.6: Transformational leadership style will exhibit stronger positive effects than transactional leadership style on motivation in nonprofits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative association between transformational leadership:</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• role conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership impacts the development of public service motivation.</td>
<td>Park &amp; Rainey (2008); Moynihan et al. (2009); Vandenabelle (2014); Wright et al. (2012)</td>
<td>H 2.5: A significant positive relationship exists between transformational and transactional leadership styles and motivation in nonprofits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership explained significant variance in altruism.</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership is positively associated with organizational citizenship behaviors.</td>
<td>Yun, Cox, &amp; Sims (2007); Piccolo &amp; Colquitt (2006); Asgari et al. (2008)</td>
<td>H 1.1: A significant negative relationship exists between transactional leadership style and intention to turnover in nonprofit organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership is negatively associated with intention to turnover.</td>
<td>Nguni, Sleegers, &amp; Denessen (2006)</td>
<td>H 1.2: A significant negative relationship exists between transformational leadership style and intention to turnover in nonprofit organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership is negatively associated with intention to turnover.</td>
<td></td>
<td>H 1.3: Transformational leadership style will exhibit stronger effects than transactional leadership style on intention to turnover in nonprofit organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership explained significant variance in altruism.</td>
<td></td>
<td>H 1.4: A significant positive relationship exists between transactional leadership style and organizational citizenship behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership is positively associated with organizational citizenship behaviors.</td>
<td></td>
<td>H 1.5: A significant positive relationship exists between transformational leadership style and organizational citizenship behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership is negatively associated with intention to turnover.</td>
<td></td>
<td>H 1.6: Transformational leadership style will exhibit stronger effects than transactional leadership style on organizational citizenship behaviors in nonprofit organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.

**Literature on Work Attitudes and Relationship with Outcome Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Themes</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work attitudes with a negative association to intention to turnover:</td>
<td>Allen, Shore, &amp; Griffeth (2003); Benz (2005); Byrne et al. (2011); Chen et al. (2011); Cho &amp; Perry (2009, 2011); Colquitt et al. (2001); Freund (2005); Firth et al. (2003); Lee et al. (1996); Lee et al. (1999); Leung &amp; Lee (2006); Kang (2014); Kim (2001); Kim (2007); Kim (2013); Ko &amp; Hur (2014); Mattieu &amp; Zajac (1990); McMurray et al. (2009); McMurray et al. (2012); Meyer and Allen (1997); Mitchell et al. (2001); Mor Barak et al. (2001); Mowday, Porter, &amp; Steers (1982); Park &amp; Rainey (2008); Riggio et al. (2004); Rowold &amp; Rohmann (2008); Steger et al. (2012); Tate et al. (1997)</td>
<td>H 3.1: Work attitudes and motivation mediate the relationship between leadership and intention to turnover in nonprofit organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• meaning of work,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• affective organizational commitment,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• perceived organizational support,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• job satisfaction,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• perception of procedural justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work attitudes with a positive association with intention to turnover:</td>
<td>Eatough et al. (2011); Firth et al. (2003); Glisson &amp; Durick (1988); Meyer &amp; Allen (1991); Tate et al. (1997)</td>
<td>H 3.2: Work attitudes and motivation mediate the relationship between leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors in nonprofit organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the range of factors that lead to job-related stress (role ambiguity, work-overload, role conflict, and work-family conflict)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• continuance commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work attitudes with a positive association with organizational citizenship behaviors:</td>
<td>Bateman &amp; Organ (1983); Cho &amp; Ringquist (2010); Colquitt et al. (2007); Moorman et al. (1993); Organ (1988, 1990); Podsakoff et al. (2000); Smith et al. (1983)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• affective organizational commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• perception of procedural justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work attitudes found to fully mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors:</td>
<td>Bateman &amp; Organ (1983); Kim (2013); Moorman (1992); Organ (1988); Podsakoff et al. (2000); Smith et al. (1983)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• affective organizational commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• procedural justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8.

**Literature on Public Service Motivation and Relationship to Outcome Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Themes</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Nonprofit workers are motivated by more than just money (donative labor theory). | Benz (2005); Becchetti et al. (2013); Borzaga & Tortia (2006); Chen (2014); De Cooman et al. (2011); Francois (2003); Frank (1996); Hackman & Oldham (1976); Hansman (1980); Mervis & Hackett (1983); Kim & Lee (2007); Lee & Wilkins (2011); Leete (2000, 2006); Light (2002, 2003); Mirvis (1992); Preston (1989); Rossi (2001); Schepers et al. (2005); Sen (1985); Steen (2009); Word (2014) | H 3.1: Work attitudes and motivation mediate the relationship between leadership and intention to turnover in nonprofits.  
H 3.2: Work attitudes and motivation mediate the relationship between leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors in nonprofits. |
| Public service motivation (PSM) is an individual’s predisposition to be motivated uniquely in public institutions by a desire to serve the public interest (altruism). | Perry (1996); Perry et al. (2010); Dur & Zoutenbier (2014); Gould-Williams et al. (2013); Crewson, (1997); Houston (2000) |                                                              |
| PSM is a well-studied theory that has only recently been applied to the nonprofit sector. | Chen (2011); Houston (2006); Lee & Wilkins (2011); Light (2002); Lyons et al. (2006); Mann (2006); Park & Word (2012); Perry (1990); Steen (2008); Taylor (2010); Tschirhart et al. (2001); Word & Carpenter (2013) |                                                              |
| PSM is negatively associated with intention to turnover. | Naff & Crum (1999); Park & Rainey (2008) |                                                              |
| PSM is positively associated with organizational citizenship behaviors. | Kim (2006); Pandey et al. (2008); Steen (2008) |                                                              |

### Table 9.

**Literature on Outcome Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Themes</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Many retention/turnover studies use “intention to leave” instead of actual turnover as the outcome variable. | Chen et al. (2011); Firth et al. (2003); Mitchell et al. (2001); Mor Barak et al. (2001); Park & Rainey (2008) | H 3.1: Work attitudes and motivation mediate the relationship between leadership and intention to turnover in nonprofits.  
H 3.2: Work attitudes and motivation mediate the relationship between leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors in nonprofits. |
| Work attitudes are among the most consistent predictors of turnover. | Firth et al. (2003); Chen et al. (2011); Lee et al. (1990); Lee et al. (1996); Leung & Lee (2006); McBain (2004); Mitchell et al. (2001); Moorman (1993); Mor Barak et al. (2001); Kelloway, Gotlieb, & Barham (1999); Organ (1988); Organ et al. (2006); Schnake & Dumler (2003) |                                                              |
| Organizational citizenship behavior is defined as individual behavior that goes above and beyond job descriptions, not explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, promotes the effective functioning of the organization. | Gould-Williams et al. (2013); Kim (2005); Organ et al. (2006); Podsakoff et al. (1990); Podsakoff et al. (1994); Podsakoff et al. (2000); Podsakoff & MacKenzie (1997); Steen (2008) | H 3.2: Work attitudes and motivation mediate the relationship between leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors in nonprofits. |
| Organizational citizenship behaviors are a dimension of performance that result in positive outcomes for both organizations and staff members. | Eatough et al. (2011); Gould-Williams et al. (2013); Kim (2005); MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Ahearne (1998); Organ (1988); Organ et al. (2006); Podsakoff et al. (1990); Podsakoff et al. (1994); Podsakoff et al. (2000); Podsakoff & MacKenzie (1997); Steen (2008); Vigoda-Gadot & Beeri (2012) |                                                              |
Chapter 3
Methodology

Overview

The purpose of this quantitative study is to examine the effects of transformational leadership on work attitudes (job satisfaction, work and meaning, perceived organizational support, organizational commitment, job-related stress, and role stressors), worker motivation (public service motivation), and work outcomes (turnover intentions and organizational citizenship behaviors) in nonprofit organizations. This chapter explains the methods used for this study: survey design, data collection plan and timetable, population and sample, instrumentation, participants, variables in the study, data analysis procedures, and ethical considerations.

Survey Design

This study utilized a self-administered, web-based, cross-sectional survey design. Utilizing survey design is a reasonable method to examine the impact of transformational leadership on work attitudes, worker motivation, and work outcomes (Cho & Perry, 2011; Cho & Ringquist, 2010; Ko & Hur, 2013; Leung & Lee, 2006; McMurray et al., 2012; Park & Rainey, 2008; Podsakoff et al., 1996; Vandenabeele, 2014; Word & Carpenter, 2013; Wright et al., 2012). The survey design has many advantages including low cost and fast turnaround time (Creswell, 2009; Lin & Van Ryzin, 2011; Newcomer & Triplett, 2015). In a review of 50 empirical studies published in the 2010/2011 issues of the Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly (NVSQ), more than half utilized survey data of some kind, and web-based surveys and mail surveys were the most frequently used methods for examining nonprofit organizations (Lin & Van Ryzin, 2011). Previous studies indicate that web-based surveys can be administered faster than mail surveys that allows for a quicker analysis of the data (Couper, 2000; Dolnicar et al., 2009; Jones & Pitt, 1999; Newcomer & Triplett, 2015). A web-based survey also offers additional anonymity, data security, and lower costs compared to mailed surveys (Newcomer & Triplett, 2015). Web-based surveys allow researchers to create complex surveys with the ability to create skip patterns and
recall information from previous questions (Newcomer & Triplett, 2015). Although mail surveys elicit a higher response rate than web-based surveys for nonprofits, if supplementary measures are implemented it is possible for web-based surveys to attain higher response rates than traditional mail surveys (Van Ryzin, 2011). In a comparison of mailed surveys and Internet surveys, both rated the same in terms of response rates (Newcomer & Triplett, 2015). Several studies examining the constructs of leadership, motivation, attitudes, and work outcomes elicited response rates between 13% and 90%, with an average of a 45% response rate (Braun et al., 2011; Cho & Perry, 2011; Elkordy, 2013; Yasin Ghadi et al., 2011; Guterrez et al, 2012; Ko & Hur, 2013; Piccolo & Colquitt; 2006; Vandenabeele, 2014; Word & Carpenter; 2013; and Wright et al., 2012). This study utilized several supplementary measures found in the research literature to increase the response rate: personalized email messages, piloting the web-survey with a small number of respondents, appealing invitation designs and informed consent methods, reminders through social media, frequent reminders through email, avoided open-ended questions, and offered an incentive through a lottery (Braun et al., 2011; Cho & Perry, 2011; Elkordy, 2013; Fan & Yan, 2010; Yasin Ghadi et al., 2011; Guterrez et al., 2012; Manfreda & Vehovar, 2002; Newcomer & Triplett, 2015; Piccolo & Colquitt; 2006; Sanchez-Fernandez et al., 2012).

**Data Collection Plan and Timeline**

The survey instrument was finalized after receiving approval of the dissertation proposal in March 2016. Once dissertation approval had been attained the research protocol was submitted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at James Madison University and the study acquired IRB approval in May 2016. Pilot testing occurred prior to the survey deployment. Twenty people participated in the pilot testing and estimated that it would take participants 15-20 minutes to complete the survey. Qualtrics was utilized to distribute the instrument to employees of nonprofit organizations in Virginia during June and July 2016. The researcher created a website using the following URL: [http://virginianonprofitsurvey.org](http://virginianonprofitsurvey.org) in order for participants to easily access the survey from their computer after receiving the survey invitation via email. The website contained
details about the purpose of the study as well as informed consent documents. The online survey also contained a section at the beginning for participants to consent to participate in the study.

**Population and Sample**

This study utilized convenience sampling, a type of non-random/non-probability sampling, in which the most conveniently available people are used as study participants (Creswell, 2009; Polit & Beck, 2004). This study utilized convenience sampling for the following advantages: it is the least expensive way to select a sample; thereby, good for use in a study with a limited budget, works well to recruit hard-to-reach populations, and it ensured the inclusion of the types of participants needed for this study (ex. employees of nonprofit organizations in Virginia) (Creswell, 2009; Kumar, 2005; Newcomer, Hatry, & Wholey, 2015; Polit & Beck, 2004). Despite the advantages, there are disadvantages associated with convenience sampling that include: the sample is not a probability sample, the findings must be interpreted with caution as they cannot be generalized to the population as a whole, and the most accessible participants may have unique characteristics making them atypical representatives of the population pertaining to critical study variables (Creswell, 2009; Kumar, 2005; Newcomer, Hatry, & Wholey, 2015; Polit & Beck, 2004). The target participants for this research study were employees of nonprofit organizations in Virginia that are over the age of 18. The researcher utilized the following existing networks in Virginia to recruit participants:

- Members of the Healthy Community Council (Harrisonburg-Rockingham),
- Alumni of the Non Profit Institute (northwest region of Virginia),
- Alumni of the Academy for Nonprofit Excellence (Hampton Roads),
- Members of the Alliance for Nonprofit Partnerships (greater Harrisonburg),
- Members of the Center for Nonprofit Excellence (greater Charlottesville),
- Members of ConnectVA (greater Richmond),
- Members of the Partnership for Nonprofit Excellence (greater Richmond),
- Alumni of the Central Virginia Academy for Nonprofit Excellence (Lynchburg City, Amherst, Appomattox, Bedford and Campbell Counties)
- Members of the Association of Fundraising Professionals (Virginia Chapters: First Chapter, Shenandoah Chapter, Central Chapter, Piedmont Chapter)
- Members of the Page Alliance for Community Action (Shenandoah and Page Counties)
- Partner Agencies with local United Way organizations within Virginia
- Big-Brothers-Big Sister member agencies (Virginia)
• Boys and Girls Clubs (Virginia)
• Alzheimer’s Association Organizations (Virginia)
• Salvation Army chapters (Virginia)
• American Cancer Society agencies (Virginia)
• HIV/AIDS Services Organizations (Virginia)
• Habitat for Humanity Organizations (Virginia)
• Court Appointed Special Advocates (Virginia)
• March of Dimes (Virginia)
• Head Start agencies (Virginia)
• United Ways throughout Virginia (Virginia)

The researcher contacted each network via email and provided an introductory letter detailing the purpose of the study, the recruitment process, and instructions. Once the network agreed to participate in the recruitment efforts, another letter was emailed for the contact person to email out to all members of their network that contained details of the population being sought and a link to access the web-based survey. A follow-up email was sent approximately two weeks after the second letter was distributed. According to Field (2009) with 16 predictor variables a minimum of 232 cases would be needed, the most stringent rule on the minimum number of cases needed to test a multiple regression model is $104 + 8k$ (k=# of predictors). The threshold was met since the study sample size was 394 participants.

Individual characteristics collected of the sample included age, gender, race, household income, education, number of years worked in the nonprofit sector, and number of years worked at current organization. Research indicates that in general the following populations are more likely to respond to surveys:

- Females (Curtin, Presser, & Singer, 2000; Moore & Tarnai, 2002; Sax, Gilmartin & Bryant, 2003; Singer, Van Hoewyk, & Maher, 2000; Tolonen et al., 2006; Underwood, Kim, & Matier, 2000)
- White individuals (Curtin et al., 2000; Groves, Singer, & Corning, 2000; Underwood et al., 2000; Voight, Koepsell & Daling, 2003)
- Individuals with higher education and higher income levels (Curtin, Presser, & Singer, 2000; Goyder, Warriner, & Miller, 2002; Tolonen et al., 2006)
- Younger individuals (Moore & Tarnai, 2002; Kaplowitz, Hadlock, & Levine, 2004; Tolonen et al., 2006)
This study reports similar findings in regards to the aforementioned survey responsiveness and sample demographics were similar to the demographics of the nonprofit workforce. The sample was evenly distributed by age, but with the slight majority of participants under the age of 45 (51.5%) compared to participants over the age of 46 (48.5%). The majority of survey respondents were female (85%) but this sample fairly matches the demographics of the nonprofit sector in the US, which is estimated between 67%-68% female (Benz, 2005; Leete, 2006; Word, 2014). Historically the nonprofit labor force has been dominated by women as many of the activities associated with the nonprofit sector are in health and human services where it is estimated that 75% of the jobs in these service industries are in female-dominated occupations (Burbridge, 1994; Gibelman, 2000). The majority of survey respondents were white (90.1%) which matches the makeup of the nonprofit workforce estimated at 83.8% but is higher than the white population in Virginia of 70% (Leete, 2006; US Census, 2016). Regarding education, 82.2% of respondents indicated they possessed a bachelor’s degree or beyond, which is much higher than the 42% reported by Leete (2006). Looking at the length of time respondents have been employed by their current organization, 56.9% reported they had been there less than five years. See Table 10 for the individual characteristics of the sample demographics.

Table 10.
Respondent Demographics- Individual Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>n=394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 years old and over</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>n=393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>335</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>n=393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>355</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000 - $59,999</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000 - $69,999</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$70,000 - $79,999</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000 - $89,999</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$90,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than $150,000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school graduate, diploma or the equivalent</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some college credit, no degree</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade/technical/vocational training</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional degree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPLOYMENT STATUS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed part time</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed looking for work</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS IN NP SECTOR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 years or more</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS AT ORG</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 years or more</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational characteristics collected of the sample include nonprofit type and organizational budget size. Not surprisingly, 49.2% of respondents worked for a human service nonprofit organization and the second highest frequency was 13.7% indicating they worked for a health organization. According to Collins (2011) over one–third of nonprofit organizations are in the human service category followed by 13% in the health care category. Examining the
organizational characteristics by budget size reveals that 39.1% had operational budgets between $500,000 and $2,000,000. See Figure 2 and Figure 3 for a detailed look at the respondent’s organizational characteristics.

Figure 2.

**Nonprofit Type Indicated by Survey Respondents**

![Nonprofit Type Chart](chart1.png)

Figure 3.

**Organizational Budget Size Indicated by Survey Respondents**

![Organizational Budget Chart](chart2.png)
Instrumentation

The researcher utilized the Qualtrics platform to develop a web-based survey. The survey was comprised of 164 items. Demographic information was obtained through 14 items and the remaining items were scales found in the research literature measuring the variables of interest and demonstrating validity and reliability: transformational leadership, transactional leadership, turnover, job satisfaction, meaningful work, perceived organizational support, role stressors, job stress, affective commitment, continuance commitment, procedural justice, organizational citizenship behaviors, and public service motivation. See page 148 of the Appendix for the full survey instrument.

Transformational-Transactional Leadership

Transformational leadership has been operationalized and reliably measured by the Transformational Leadership Behavior Inventory (TLI) developed by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter (1990). The TLI measures six dimensions and covers behaviors including developing and articulating a vision, providing an appropriate role model, fostering the acceptance of group goals, high performance expectations, providing individualized support, and intellectual stimulation (Bass and Riggio, 2006; Podsakoff et al., 1990). McMurray et al. (2012) utilized the TLI developed by Podsakoff et al. (1990) asserting that the instrument “contains factors that better represent the conditions pertinent to non-profit organizations” (p. 530), in particular “the factors of ‘fosters acceptance of goals’ and ‘provides individual support’ are very much consistent with the culture of cooperation and mutual respect in non-profit organizations” (p. 530). Podsakoff et al. (1990) conducted a confirmatory factor analysis and results confirmed the six factors of transformational leadership thereby demonstrating content and construct validity (Bass, 1990; McMurray et al., 2012). Each of the six factors exhibited high internal reliability with Cronbach’s alphas ranging between .78 to .92 (Podsakoff et al., 1990).

In addition to examining the six sub-factors, researchers also utilized an aggregated measure of transformational leadership (Avolio, Zhu, Koh & Bhatia, 2004; Kim, 2011;
MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Jarvis, 2005; Podsakoff et al., 1990). Podsakoff et al. (1990) created a “core” transformational leader behaviors measure, by developing a composite variable of items from articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model, and fostering the acceptance of group goals with high internal reliability with a Cronbach’s alpha of .87. Conceptually, Avolio et al. (2004), MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Jarvis (2005), and Kim (2011) asserted that transformational leadership can be modeled as an aggregated or formative measure, meaning transformational leadership is a function of charisma, idealized influence, inspirational leadership, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass 1985). McMurray et al. (2012) created a total transformational leadership measure by summing the average of the scores on all six factors of Podsakoff et al.’s (1990) TLI and with a Cronbach’s alpha of .93 it exhibited high internal reliability. This study also created an aggregated measure of transformational leadership utilizing the McMurray et al. (2012) procedure.

Transactional leadership was measured using five items from the Contingent Reward Behavior Scale developed by Podsakoff et al. (1984), which demonstrated high internal consistency reliability with a Cronbach’s alpha .80. Contingent reward behavior involves the notion of exchange, which Bass identified as the main behavior in transactional leadership (Bass, 1985; Podsakoff et al. 1990). Contingent reward leadership “involves the leader assigning or obtaining follower agreement on what needs to be done with promised or actual rewards offered in exchange for satisfactorily carrying out the assignment” (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 8).

Work Attitudes

Several work attitudes have been found to relate to turnover intention and organizational citizenship behavior: meaning in work, job-related stress, role stressors, continuance commitment, affective commitment, perceived organizational support, procedural justice, and job satisfaction:

*Meaning in work.* Steger et al. (2012) define meaningful work not just in terms of meaning (whatever work means to people) but as work that is both significant and positive in
meaningfulness. Meaningful work is “therefore work experienced as particularly significant and holding more positive meaning for individuals” (Rosso et al., 2010, p. 95). This study utilized Steger et al.’s (2012) 10-item scale, the Work and Meaning Inventory (WAMI) which demonstrated internal consistency reliability with Cronbach’s alpha of .82 or greater.

Role stressors and job-related stress. The range of factors that lead to job-related stress include: role ambiguity, work-overload, role conflict, and work-family conflict and is measured by eight items developed by Tate et al. (1997) and adapted by Firth et al. (2003). Role stressors include, role ambiguity, role conflict, and work-family conflict was measured by 12 items developed by Firth et al. (2003) and adapted from Tate et al. (1997). The two scales demonstrate adequate internal reliability for each factor of the scale falling between .61 and .91. Additionally, the authors utilized an aggregated measure of job-related stress and role stressors, with demonstrated internal reliability of Cronbach’s alphas of .87 in Tate et al. (1997) and .60 in Firth et al. (2003). This study created an aggregated measure of job-related stress and role stressors by summing the items in each scale as conducted in Firth et al. (2003) and Tate et al. (1997).

Organizational commitment. Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) defined organizational commitment as a robust belief in the goals and values of the organization, a willingness to exercise substantial effort on behalf of the organization, and a strong desire to continue as a member of the organization. Organizational commitment “describes the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Meyer and Allen (1991) define continuance commitment as referring to the awareness by the employee of the costs that would be associated with leaving the organization. Employees with high levels of continuance commitment remain working for the organization because they need to do so (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Affective commitment is the employee’s emotional attachment to the organization, their identification with the organization, and their involvement in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Employees with a strong affective commitment continue to work for their organization because they want to do so (Meyer & Allen,
This study utilized the six-item Affective Commitment Scale (acceptable internal reliability with Cronbach’s alpha of .84-.87) and the six-item Continuance Commitment Scale (acceptable internal reliability with Cronbach’s alphas between .74 and .82) to measure organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991).

**Perceived organizational support.** Perceived organizational support refers to the employees’ perception regarding the extent to which the organization values their contribution to the organization and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Eisenberger et al. (1986) contended that “employees develop global beliefs concerning the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being” (p. 501). This study utilized the shortened version of the POS Scale, consisting of eight items demonstrating high internal reliability with a Cronbach’s alpha of .97, developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986).

**Procedural justice.** Procedural justice involves the perceived fairness and transparency by which decisions are made, including the fairness of the distribution of rewards and the fairness in penalty of wrongdoing or poor performance (Ko & Hur, 2014). This study utilized the six-item scale developed by Ko & Hur (2014) influenced by research conducted by Rubin (2009) to measure Procedural Justice and this scale has been found to have moderately high internal reliability with a Cronbach’s alpha of .86.

**Job satisfaction.** Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as the “positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (p. 1300). Hackman and Oldham (1975) and (1976) developed and refined the Job Diagnostics Survey, which included a measure of Global Job Satisfaction that demonstrated internal reliability with a Cronbach’s alpha of .76.

**Worker Motivation**

Perry (1996) developed and defined the concept of public service motivation (PSM) as an “individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions” (p. 6). Gould-Williams et al. (2013) define PSM as a “value or attitude that motivates individuals to engage in behaviors that benefit society” (p. 3). Public service motivation is often
equated, according to Dur and Zoutenbier (2014) “with a desire to serve the public interest, or more generally, with altruism” (p. 145). Taylor (2010) characterizes PSM as “possessing an other-directed or prosocial orientation” (p. 1085). More broadly, Crewson (1997) defined PSM as being characterized as a reliance on intrinsic rewards versus extrinsic rewards. Intrinsic rewards are rewards employees give themselves, such as a feeling of accomplishment or self-worth contrasted to extrinsic rewards which are rewards given to individuals by someone else, such as health benefits, promotions, and pay raises (Crewson, 1997; Houston, 2000).

Public service motivation originally encompassed six dimensions: attraction to public-policy making, commitment to public interest, civic duty, social justice, self-sacrifice, and compassion (Perry, 1996). Perry (1996) further refined the measurement scale by combining highly correlated dimensions that exceeded .89 (civic duty correlated with public interest .93, social justice correlated .96 with public interest) and conducted confirmatory factor analysis on a four-factor model: attraction to public policy making, commitment to civic duty and the public interest, compassion, and self-sacrifice. Perry (1996) found that the public interest and self-sacrifice dimensions were correlated at .89 and he conducted analysis combining these dimensions in a three-dimensional model: attraction to public policy making, commitment to civic duty and the public interest, and compassion. Results found the goodness of fit for both the four and three dimension models to be quite similar (Perry, 1996). Perry (1996) ultimately retained self-sacrifice as an independent dimension because of his belief of the historical connection to PSM but the three-dimension model coincides with Knoke and Wright-Isak’s (1982) three-dimension model, which served as the basis for Perry’s development of the PSM, and since there were little to no differences between the four- and the three-dimension model, the three-dimension model was utilized in this study (attraction to public policy formation, commitment to civic duty and public interest, and compassion). Similarly, DeHart-Davis, Marlowe and Pandey (2006) classified and utilized PSM with three dimensions: compassion, attraction to policy making, and commitment to public service providing further support of this
study’s use of the three-dimension model. The overall coefficient alpha for the 24-item PSM scale was .90 indicating high internal validity, with the coefficient alpha on the subscales ranged from .69 to .74 indicating moderate internal validity (DeHart-Davis et al., 2006). Coursey and Pandey (2007) utilized Perry’s (1996) exploratory three-dimension scale that included 16 items and represented the dimensions of attraction to public policymaking, commitment to public interest/civic duty, and compassion. Strong support was found for this shortened scale compared to Perry’s (1996) original findings. This study utilized the three-dimension, 16-item scale.

Additionally, an aggregated or formative approach has been repeatedly applied in research on PSM in the literature, either by summing or averaging all of the items with a range of coefficient alphas between .70 and .83. In the PSM literature, new empirical evidence continues to be developed using either shorter one-dimensional measures or global measures of PSM and this current study is modeled after this trend (Wright, Christenson, & Pandey, 2013). Kim (2011) found evidence supporting PSM as a formative measure asserting that PSM is formed by a combination of all the factors with each factor contributing uniquely and “can be measured by a linear sum of its dimensions” (p. 541). Furthermore, by measuring all of the dimensions of PSM and summing the averages of each dimension, Kim (2011) and Wright et al. (2013) asserted that this procedure makes it a simpler and more useful way to measure PSM. This study utilized an aggregated measure of PSM by summing the average of each of the three dimensions.

Work Outcomes

Turnover Intentions

Before actually leaving a job, there is evidence that workers typically make a conscious decision to do so but there is time between when that decision is made and when the worker

---

actually leaves the company (Mor Barak et al., 2001). Intentions are the most immediate determinants of actual behavior (Firth et al., 2003). Previous studies utilized turnover intentions as an organizational outcome (Chen et al., 2011; Firth et al., 2003; Mitchell et al., 2001; Mor Barak, 2011; Park & Rainey, 2008). Intention to quit is the single strongest predictor of turnover and is legitimate to use as an outcome variable in turnover studies (Firth et al., 2003; Mor Barak et al., 2001). To assess turnover intentions this study utilized Kelloway, Gotlieb, and Barham’s (1999) four-item scale measuring turnover intentions with demonstrated internal reliability with a Cronbach’s alpha of .92 and .93.

**Organizational Citizenship Behaviors**

Organizational citizenship behavior is defined as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988, p. 4). The behavior goes above and beyond stated job descriptions and has important benefits for the organization (Steen, 2008). Employees exhibiting organizational citizenship behaviors complete tasks beyond those outlined in their job descriptions, such as assisting their coworkers with their duties, avoiding unnecessary conflicts, and encouraging a positive work environment (Gould-Williams et al., 2013; Kim 2005). Podsakoff et al. (1990) built upon the work of Organ (1988) and identified the five major categories of organizational citizenship behavior: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. Altruism is defined as “discretionary behaviors on the part of the employees that have effects of helping a specific other with an organizationally relevant problem” (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006, p. 251). Conscientiousness encompasses “discretionary behaviors on the part of the employee that go well beyond the minimum role requirements of the organization in the areas of attendance, obeying rules and regulations, taking breaks, and so forth” (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006, p. 251). Organ, Podsakoff, and MacKenzie define sportsmanship as “willingness of the employee to tolerate less than ideal circumstances without complaining” (p. 251). Courtesy encompasses
“discretionary behavior on the part of an individual aimed at preventing work-related problems with others from recurring” (Organ, Posakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006, p. 251). Finally, civic virtue is defined as behavior from an individual that indicates participation, involvement, or concern about the life of the organization (Organ, Posakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006, p. 251).

Posakoff et al. (1990) developed a 24-item scale to measure the five categories of organizational citizenship behaviors with a 7-point likert scale ranging from strongly disagree through strongly agree with a neutral response and the subscales had a range of internal consistency reliability Cronbach’s alphas between .84 to .88 (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006). The majority of studies support the five-factor structure of the organizational citizenship behavior scale developed by Podsakoff et al. (1990) (Organ et al., 2006). Some studies in the literature explore the five factors of the Podsakoff et al. (1990) measure of organizational citizenship behaviors but additionally create an aggregated measure of organizational citizenship behaviors when OCB is studied as an outcome variable (Kim, 2014; Nguni et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Podsakoff et al., 2000). Podsakoff, Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Maynes, and Spoelma (2014) found that over 54% of the studies in their review utilized a “general” or composite measure of OCB. This study involves the use of OCB as an outcome variable and utilized Goodwin, Wofford, and Whittington’s (2001) procedures for creating an aggregated measure of OCB by collapsing the five subscales into one overall dimension of OCB by averaging the items and found high internal reliability with a Cronbach’s alpha of .95 (Organ et al., 2006). Other studies conducted by Kim (2014), Koys (2001), Walz and Neihoff (2000), and Zhang, Wan, and Jia (2008) utilized similar procedures to create an aggregated measure of OCB from altruism, courtesy, civic virtue, sportsmanship, and conscientiousness.

---

Additionally, many studies found in the research literature around leadership, public service motivation, work attitudes, turnover, and organizational citizenship behaviors included demographic control variables in addition to the independent and dependent variables of interest. Prior studies demonstrated that age, income level, education level attained, tenure in the sector, and tenure in the current organization were consistently found to be predictors, so these variables were included in the multiple regression analyses in order to control for the effect of these potential predictors on the outcome variables (Avolio et al., 2004; Moynihan & Pandey, 2007; Pandey et al., 2008; Perry, 1997; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Taylor, 2010; Vandenabeele, 2014; Word & Carpenter, 2013; and Word & Park, 2009).

**Variables in the Study**

This current study examined the theory of transformational leadership and the public service motivation theory in the context of nonprofit organizations. The study aimed to answer the following overarching research question: How does transformational leadership influence work attitudes (work and meaning, perceived organizational support, organizational commitment, job stress, role stressors, and job satisfaction), worker motivation (public service motivation), and work outcomes (turnover intentions and organizational citizenship behaviors) in nonprofit organizations? Overall, the dependent variables of interest include work outcomes—turnover intentions and organizational citizenship behaviors. This study asked three additional research questions and proposes three sets of hypotheses to further explore the overarching question.

The first question investigated: Does a significant relationship exist between transformational and transactional leadership styles and work outcomes? In the first set of hypotheses (H1.1-H1.6), transformational and transactional leadership are the independent variables of interest influencing the outcome variables, turnover intentions and organizational citizenship behaviors. In order to control for other potential predictors on the outcome variables, job satisfaction, work and meaning, perceived organizational support, affective organizational commitment, procedural justice, continuance commitment, job-related stress, role stressors,
motivation, and demographic variables were added to the model. See Table 11 for the variables in hypotheses 1.1-1.6.

Table 11

*Variables in Hypotheses 1.1-1.6*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>Transformational Leadership Inventory- Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>Contingent Reward Behavior Scale- Podsakoff et al. (1984)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Global Job Satisfaction Scale- Hackman &amp; Oldham (1976)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Meaning</td>
<td>Work and Meaning Inventory- Steger et al. (2011)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support Scale- Eisenberger (1986)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>Affective Commitment Scales- Meyer &amp; Allen (1984)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>Procedural Justice Scale- Ko &amp; Hur (2014)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>Continuance Commitment Scales- Meyer &amp; Allen (1984)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related Stress</td>
<td>Burnout, Anxiety, and Somatic Complaints Scale- Firth et al. (2003)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Stressors</td>
<td>Role Ambiguity, Role Conflict, Work Overload, and Work-Family Conflict Scales- Firth et al. (2003)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Public Service Motivation- Perry (1996)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>What is your age?</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>What is your total household income?</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>What is the highest degree of level of school you have completed?</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in Sector</td>
<td>Total number of years worked in the nonprofit sector</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in Organization</td>
<td>How long have you worked at your current organization?</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>Turnover Intentions Scale- Kelloway, Gotlieb, &amp; Barham (1999)</td>
<td>DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Citizenship Behaviors</td>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale- Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>DV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second question investigates: Do transformational and transactional leadership styles exhibit differential effects on work attitudes and motivation in nonprofit organizations? In the
second set of hypotheses, transformational and transactional leadership are the independent
variables influencing the outcome variables work attitudes and motivation. Each of the eight work
attitudes (job satisfaction, work and meaning, perceived organizational support, affective
commitment, continuance commitment, job stress, and role stressors) serve as the dependent
variables in each model. Additionally, in a separate model, motivation is the dependent variable.
In order to control for other potential predictors on the outcome variables, demographic
variables were added to the models. See Table 12 for the variables in hypotheses 2.1-2.4. The
next section provides details on the data analysis.

Table 12.

Variables in Hypotheses 2.1-2.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Global Job Satisfaction Scale-Hackman &amp; Oldham (1976)</td>
<td>DV; IV in other work attitude models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Meaning</td>
<td>Work and Meaning Inventory- Steger et al. (2011)</td>
<td>DV; IV in other work attitude models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support Scale- Eisenberger (1986)</td>
<td>DV; IV in other work attitude models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>Affective Commitment Scales- Meyer &amp; Allen (1984)</td>
<td>DV; IV in other work attitude models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>Procedural Justice Scale- Ko &amp; Hur (2014)</td>
<td>DV; IV in other work attitude models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>Continuance Commitment Scales- Meyer &amp; Allen (1984)</td>
<td>DV; IV in other work attitude models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related Stress</td>
<td>Burnout, Anxiety, and Somatic Complaints Scale- Firth et al. (2003)</td>
<td>DV; IV in other work attitude models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Stressors</td>
<td>Role Ambiguity, Role Conflict, Work Overload, and Work-Family Conflict Scales- Firth et al. (2003)</td>
<td>DV; IV in other work attitude models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Public Service Motivation- Perry (1996)</td>
<td>DV; IV in other work attitude models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>Transformational Leadership Inventory- Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>Contingent Reward Behavior Scale-Podsakoff et al. (1984)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>What is your age?</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>What is your total household income?</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>What is the highest degree of level of school you have completed?</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in Sector</td>
<td>Total number of years worked in the nonprofit sector</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The third research question seeks to further explain the relationships: Do work attitudes and motivation mediate the relationship between leadership and work outcomes? In the third set of hypotheses, transformational and transactional leadership are the independent variables, work attitudes found to be significant influencers in the MLR analysis described in the preceding paragraphs and motivation are the mediator variables influencing the relationship between leadership and the outcome variables (turnover intentions and organizational citizenship behaviors). See Table 13 for the variables in hypotheses 3.1 and 3.2.

### Table 13.

**Variables in Hypotheses 3.1 and 3.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>Turnover Intentions Scale- Kelloway, Gotlieb, &amp; Barham (1999)</td>
<td>Y1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Aggregated measure of organizational citizenship behaviors (Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale- Podsakoff et al.,1990)</td>
<td>Y2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Behaviors</td>
<td>Transformational Leadership (Transformational Leadership Inventory- Podsakoff et al.,1990)</td>
<td>X1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>Contingent Reward Behavior Scale- Podsakoff et al. (1984)</td>
<td>X2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>The work attitudes found to be significant influencers in the MLR models will be entered as separate mediators</td>
<td>M1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Attitudes</td>
<td>Aggregated measure of public service motivation</td>
<td>M9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis**

Several strategies were employed to improve data quality, prior to administration, during administration, and post administration. In a study examining the effect of questionnaire length on participations and indicators of response quality in a web survey, Galesic and Bosnjak (2009) found that data quality was improved for surveys approximately 10 minutes long compared to surveys that were 30 minutes long. Prior to survey administration, due to a concern about survey
length during the development process the original questionnaire was reduced by the omission of several initially selected variables (goal clarity, managerial trustworthiness, intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction, and performance oriented culture) and the survey length was reduced from approximately 20-30 minutes to approximately 10-15 minutes. To ensure consistent quality throughout the dataset and to reduce survey satisficing and the bias of survey fatigue, the 164 items were divided into blocks and randomized, so that each participant would receive the questions in a different order (Fan & Yan, 2010; Galesic & Bosnjak, 2009; Huang, Curran, Keeney, Poposki, & DeShon, 2012; Manfreda & Vehovar, 2002; Malhotra, 2008; Meade & Craig, 2012). The survey administration system was set to prohibit multiple entries from the same respondents (Meade & Craig, 2012). Additionally, the data screening techniques most appropriate for the detection of insufficient-effort respondents were identified prior to survey administration (Desimone, Harms, and Desimone, 2014). During the study administration, respondents were timed so that post administration the data could be screened (Desimone et al., 2014).

At the conclusion of the data collection window surveys had been collected from 546 participants. The data was downloaded from Qualtrics to SPSS version 23 and inspected for completeness. The researcher utilized several different best practices for data screening and careless response detection/insufficient effort methods as recommended by Meade and Craig (2012), Huang et al. (2012), and Desimone et al. (2014). First, all cases that did not have at least 95% of the survey completed were deleted, reducing the number down to 473. Based on the recommended procedures using two seconds per item as the cutoff, cases were deleted based on total duration, reducing the number to 456 (Desimone et al., 2014; Huang et al., 2012; and Malhotra, 2008). Also based on duration, extreme outliers were removed (those one standard deviation above the mean) further reducing the data set to 447 cases (Malhotra, 2008). The identification of careless responders utilized the longstring method, which is the number of identical responses in a row, but no cases were found to have more than 15 extreme responses in a row, so the data set was not further reduced (Desimone et al., 2014; Huang et al., 2012;
Johnson, 2004). Finally, cases were removed based on missing data from any of the key study variables (turnover, organizational citizenship behaviors, transformational leadership, transactional leadership) resulting in a final data set of 394 cases.

Descriptive analysis data on all of the independent and dependent variables in the study were conducted. The majority of the scales have been utilized extensively in private and public research as well as in the nonprofit context and have moderate to high internal reliability coefficients, all ranging between .70 and .95 (see Instrumentation section for a detailed look at the Cronbach’s alphas for each scale). The internal consistency of the scales utilized in this study were assessed through a reliability analysis using the Cronbach alpha statistic (Creswell, 2009; Fields, 2009; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Bivariate correlations were conducted to assess the relationships among leadership, public service motivation, work and meaning, perceived organizational support, organizational commitment, job stress, role stressors, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and organizational citizenship behaviors. After the examination of descriptive statistics, the correlation table was analyzed in order to explore the relationship between the dependent, independent, and control variables in the study. A bivariate correlation analysis revealed significant correlations between all main variables of interest with a range of $r$ values between .16 and .78. According to Field (2013) if there are no substantial correlations ($r > .9$) revealed then there is no multicollinearity in the data. Further exploration of these relationships through the use of multivariate procedures is justified. In addition to the correlation matrix, multicollinearity was also assessed through an examination of the variance inflation factor (all were well below 5) and the tolerance statistic (all well above .2) for all of the models (Field, 2013; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). SPSS version 23 was utilized to test the study hypotheses.

An iterative set of hierarchical multiple linear regression (MLR) analyses was conducted to test hypotheses 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, and 1.5. Given the study research questions, MLR is the most appropriate and widely used method for examining the relationship between several independent variables and a single dependent variable (Field, 2013; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007; Vandenabeele,
Regression procedures can be applied to data in which the independent variables are correlated with one another and also with the dependent variables, which is the case in this study (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The goal of using MLR is to be able to examine the relationship between a dependent variable and several independent variables with the “effect of other independent variables statistically eliminated” (p. 118) and allows the researcher to “compare the ability of several competing sets of IVs to predict a DV” (Tabachnick & Fidell, p. 118). In hierarchical multiple regression the researcher is able to enter predictors into the model in order based on previous studies or on a theoretical basis (Field, 2013). Additionally, since hierarchical multiple regression allows the researcher to add predictors to the model in stages it is possible to see whether the additions to the model at each stage actually improve the model and assess the strength of the independent variables influence on the dependent variable (Field, 2013; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). In these MLR models transactional leadership was entered first and transformational leadership entered second based on Bass’s (1985) assertion that transformational leadership augments transactional leadership and Bass & Riggio’s (2006) findings that transformational leadership accounts for unique variance beyond what is accounted for by transactional leadership. Third, the work attitudes and motivation were entered together in a stepwise manner in the block as no past research has clearly determined their order of importance. Additionally in this block, the demographic control variables were entered in a stepwise manner. Entering the variables into the model in this manner allows the effects of transactional and transformational leadership to be isolated prior to the addition of the other independent variables. Two models were tested, one with intention to turnover as the dependent variable, and one with organizational citizenship behaviors as the dependent variable to determine if a significant, direct relationship exists between transformational and transactional leadership behaviors exists:

The MLR also tests hypotheses 1.3 and 1.6, as examining the standardized beta values will determine whether transformational leadership exhibits stronger effects than transactional leadership on the outcome variables of interest, while holding the other independent variables
constant (Fields, 2013; Schroeder, Sjoquist, & Stephan, 1986; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Standardized beta variables are directly comparable and provide better information on the weight of a predictor on the outcome because they are measured in units of standard deviation and indicate the number of standard deviations the outcome variable will change as the result of one standard deviation change in the predictor variable (Field, 2009). Effect size using Pearson’s correlation coefficient \( r = \sqrt{t^2 / t^2 + df} \) was calculated to determine practical significance, an objective measure of the importance of the effect (Fields, 2009). Effect size was assessed on the following scale according to Cohen (1988, 1992); \( r = .10 \) (small effect, explains 1% of the total variance), \( r = .30 \) (medium effect, explains 9% of the total variance) and \( r = .50 \) (large effect, explains 25% of the variance) (Fields, 2009; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). According to Field (2009) with 16 predictor variables, the most stringent rule on the minimum number of cases needed to test a multiple linear regression model and be able to test the overall fit of the model as well as test the individual predictors is \( 104 + 8k \) (k=# of predictors), a minimum of 232 cases would be needed. The threshold has been met, as the study sample size was 394 participants. Table 14 describes the proposed study multiple regression models for hypotheses 1.1-1.6.

Table 14.

Proposed Study Hierarchical Multiple Regression Models for Hypotheses 1.1-1.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Model 1.1 | Intention to Turnover | 1st block- Transactional Leadership  
2nd block – Transformational Leadership  
3rd block- Satisfaction, work and meaning, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, procedural justice, continuance commitment, job-related stress, role stressors, motivation, age, income, education, tenure in sector, and tenure in organization |
| Model 1.2 | Organizational Citizenship Behaviors | 1st block- Transactional Leadership  
2nd block – Transformational Leadership  
3rd block- Satisfaction, work and meaning, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, procedural justice, continuance commitment, job-related |
Nine hierarchical multiple linear regression (MLR) analyses were conducted to test hypotheses 2.1-2.6. Each work attitude (job satisfaction, work and meaning, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, procedural justice, continuance commitment, job-related stress, and role stressors) was a dependent variable in the model, with transformational leadership, transactional leadership, motivation, and the demographic control variables as the independent variables. An additional model with motivation as the dependent variable and transformational leadership, transactional leadership, the eight work attitudes, and the demographic control variables as the independent variables was analyzed. In these MLR models transactional leadership was entered first and transformational leadership entered second based on Bass’s (1985) assertion that transformational leadership augments transactional leadership and Bass & Riggio’s (2006) findings that transformational leadership accounts for unique variance beyond what is accounted for by transactional leadership. Third, the work attitudes and motivation were entered together in a stepwise manner in the block as no past research has clearly determined their order of importance. Additionally in this block, the demographic control variables were entered in a stepwise manner. Entering the variables into the model in this manner allows the effects of transactional and transformational leadership to be isolated prior to the addition of the other independent variables.

Examining the standardized beta values will determine whether transformational leadership exhibits stronger effects than transactional leadership on the outcome variables of interest, while holding the other independent variables constant (Fields, 2009; Schroeder, Sjoquist, & Stephan, 1986; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). As described in the preceding paragraph effect size using Pearson’s correlation coefficient was calculated and assessed by Cohen’s rubric. Table 15 describes the proposed study multiple regression models for hypotheses 2.1-2.6.
Table 15.

*Proposed Study Hierarchical Multiple Regression Models for Hypotheses 2.1-2.6*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Model 2.1      | Job Satisfaction   | 1st block- Transactional Leadership  
2nd block- Transformational Leadership  
3rd block- Work and meaning, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, procedural justice, continuance commitment, job-related stress, role stressors, motivation, age, income, education, tenure in sector, and tenure in organization |
| Model 2.2      | Work and Meaning   | 1st block- Transactional Leadership  
2nd block- Transformational Leadership  
3rd block- Satisfaction, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, procedural justice, continuance commitment, job-related stress, role stressors, motivation, age, income, education, tenure in sector, and tenure in organization |
| Model 2.3      | Perceived Organizational Support | 1st block- Transactional Leadership  
2nd block- Transformational Leadership  
3rd block- Satisfaction, work and meaning, affective commitment, procedural justice, continuance commitment, job-related stress, role stressors, motivation, age, income, education, tenure in sector, and tenure in organization |
| Model 2.4      | Affective Organizational commitment | 1st block- Transactional Leadership  
2nd block- Transformational Leadership  
3rd block- Satisfaction, work and meaning, perceived organizational support, procedural justice, continuance commitment, job-related stress, role stressors, motivation, age, income, education, tenure in sector, and tenure in organization |
| Model 2.5      | Procedural Justice | 1st block- Transactional Leadership  
2nd block- Transformational Leadership  
3rd block- Satisfaction, work and meaning, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, continuance commitment, job-related stress, role stressors, motivation, age, income, education, tenure in sector, and tenure in organization |
| Model 2.6      | Continuance Organizational Commitment | 1st block- Transactional Leadership  
2nd block- Transformational Leadership  
3rd block- Satisfaction, work and meaning, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, procedural justice, job-related stress, role stressors, motivation, age, |
income, education, tenure in sector, and tenure in organization

Model 2.7  Job-related Stress

1st block- Transactional Leadership
2nd block- Transformational Leadership
3rd block- Satisfaction, work and meaning, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, procedural justice, continuance commitment, role stressors, motivation, age, income, education, tenure in sector, and tenure in organization

Model 2.8  Role Stressors

1st block- Transactional Leadership
2nd block- Transformational Leadership
3rd block- Satisfaction, work and meaning, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, procedural justice, continuance commitment, job-related stress, motivation, age, income, education, tenure in sector, and tenure in organization

Model 2.9  Motivation

1st block- Transactional Leadership
2nd block- Transformational Leadership
3rd block- Satisfaction, work and meaning, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, procedural justice, continuance commitment, job-related stress, role stressors, age, income, education, tenure in sector, and tenure in organization

The third set of hypotheses involves investigating potential mediator variables (work attitudes and motivation). Work attitudes found to be significant predictors of turnover intention and organizational citizenship behaviors and motivation were entered into the mediation model as potential mediators in the relationship between leadership behavior and turnover intention and organizational citizenship behaviors. To test Hypotheses 3.1 and 3.2 a parallel multiple mediation analysis using a special SPSS PROCESS macro developed by Hayes (2013) was conducted to test for mediation. In this type of mediation analysis, the predictor variable (X) is modeled as influencing the outcome variable (Y) directly, as well as, indirectly through two or more mediator variables with the constraint of the mediators being independent with no causal relationship between any of the mediator variables (Hayes, 2013). The procedure will confirm the significance of the initial IV and DV (X→Y), the significance of the relationship between the initial IV and
the mediators (X➔M), the significance of the relationship between the mediator and the DV in
the presence of the IV (M|X➔Y), and the insignificance (or the meaningful reduction in effect)
of the relationship between the initial IV and the DV in the presence of the mediator (X|M➔Y)
(Hayes, 2013). Table 16 describes the study parallel multiple mediator models for hypotheses 3.1
and 3.2. While there are advantages to using structural equation modeling for this type of study,
Hayes (2013) asserted that SEM is “neither necessary or better” (p. 159) for the estimation of a
parallel or serial multiple mediation model. Hayes (2013) further argued that “inferential tests for
the path coefficients from an SEM program are more likely to be slightly in error in smaller
samples, as p-values from an SEM program are usually derived from the normal distribution
rather than the t distribution…in small samples, the t distribution used by an OLS procedure is
more appropriate for the derivation of p-values for regression coefficients” (p. 161). See Table 16
for the proposed study parallel multiple mediator models for H3.1 and 3.2.

Table 16.

Proposed Study Parallel Multiple Mediator Models for Hypotheses 3.1 and 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 3.1</td>
<td>Intention to Turnover (Y1)</td>
<td>- Transformational Leadership (X1)&lt;br&gt;- Transactional Leadership (X2)&lt;br&gt;- Significant Work Attitudes (M1-8)&lt;br&gt;- Motivation (M9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3.2</td>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (Y2)</td>
<td>- Transformational Leadership (X1)&lt;br&gt;- Transactional Leadership (X2)&lt;br&gt;- Significant Work Attitudes (M1-8)&lt;br&gt;- Motivation (M9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conducting a mediation analyses further explained the relationships between the independent
variables and the outcome variables in a way that the previous multiple regression models cannot.
In the regression models it is possible to ascertain the effects of each independent variable while
controlling for all of the other independent variables but that type of analysis does not explain
how the independent variables impact or alter the relationship between the independent variable
Mediation involves the complex situation in which the relationship between a predictor variable and an outcome variable can be explained by their relationship to a third variable, the mediator variable (Field, 2013; Hayes, 2013). The mediators help explain the underlying mechanism of the relationship between transactional and transformational leadership (IVs) and turnover and organizational citizenship behaviors (DVs).

**Ethical Considerations**

Human subjects were utilized in this research study and this process received approval from the Institutional Review Board prior to study implementation. Participation in the survey was completely voluntary and all interaction was conducted by email. No identifiable information was collected. All survey data was stored in the researcher’s password-protected Qualtrics account and downloaded to the researcher’s desktop computer, which is also password-protected.

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the effects of transformational leadership on work attitudes, worker motivation, and work outcomes in nonprofit organizations. Additionally, this study sought to answer the practical question- Can transformational or transactional leadership behaviors reduce turnover and prevent the associated costs in the nonprofit sector? The next chapter presents the results and findings of the study.
Chapter 4

Results

Introduction

The results of the research data presented in this chapter provide a depiction of the impact of the relationship between leadership style and work attitudes, motivation, and work outcomes among employees of nonprofit organizations in Virginia. This chapter discusses the significance of these relationships as evidenced by multivariate statistical analysis methods. The results section details the statistical results of the bivariate correlation analysis, the hierarchical multiple regression models, and the mediation analysis conducted to test three sets of hypotheses in the current study. Following the results section, the final concluding chapter discusses the results in the context of the research questions, the implications, future research, and study limitations.

Hierarchical multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to determine if a significant relationship existed between transactional and transformational leadership and work outcomes. Regarding intention to turnover, although the full model is significant, neither transactional leadership nor transformational leadership are significant predictors if the effects of all of the other independent variables are held constant. Regarding organizational citizenship behaviors, although the full model is significant, only transactional leadership was found to be a significant predictor if all of the other independent variables are held constant at the p<.10 level. Additional hierarchical multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to determine if significant relationships existed between transactional and transformational leadership and each of the eight work attitudes and motivation. While the full models were significant for each work attitude, only the relationship between transactional leadership and transformational leadership and procedural justice turned out as expected while holding all other independent variables constant. Transactional leadership and transformational leadership were not found to be significant predictors for work and meaning, job-related stress, and role stressors while holding all other independent variables constant. Transactional leadership was a significant predictor of
perceived organizational support, affective commitment, procedural justice, and continuance commitment. Transformational leadership was a significant predictor of job satisfaction, perceived organizational support, and procedural justice. Unexpectedly, neither transactional leadership nor transformational leadership were significant predictors of public service motivation. Finally, mediation analyses were conducted to determine if work attitudes and motivation mediate the relationship between transactional and transformational leadership styles and work outcomes. Affective commitment, job stress, satisfaction, and procedural justice collectively fully mediate the effect of transactional leadership on turnover and also fully mediate the effect of transformational leadership on turnover. Work and meaning, perceived organizational support, and public service motivation collectively fully mediate the effect of transactional leadership on organizational citizenship behaviors and also fully mediate the effect of transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behaviors.

**Descriptive Statistics**

Prior to conducting statistical analysis descriptive statistics of the study variables were examined. Table 17 provides a detailed look at the sample size, range, minimum value, maximum value, mean, standard error of the mean, the standard deviation, skewness statistic and standard error, and kurtosis statistic and standard error for all study variables. According to Field (2013) the further the value of the skewness and kurtosis statistics from zero, the more likely that the data are not normally distributed. Several variables exhibit negative skewness values between -0.85 and -1.34 (transactional, satisfaction, work and meaning, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, procedural justice, and education) indicating a slightly higher concentration of values on the right side of the distribution. One variable exhibits positive skewness greater than .55, years at the organization is 1.71, indicating a slight concentration of values on the left side of the distribution.
Table 17

Descriptive Statistics for the Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAMI</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCJUST</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB_STRESS</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRESSORS</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP_YEARS</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG_YEARS</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNOVER</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation Analysis

After the examination of descriptive statistics, the correlation table was analyzed in order to explore the relationship between the dependent, independent, and control variables in the study. The scales utilized demonstrated high reliability with Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .80 to .97. A bivariate correlation analysis revealed significant correlations between all main variables of interest (see Table 18). As anticipated, a significant negative relationship exists between transactional (r=-.4) and transformational (r=-.47) leadership and intention to turnover at the p<.01 level. A significant positive relationship exists between transactional (r=.25) and transformational (r=.31) leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors at the p<.01 level. Additionally, as anticipated, in the bivariate analysis transformational leadership exhibits a stronger effect over both intention to turnover and organizational citizenship behaviors compared to transactional leadership. Significant relationships exist between transactional and transformational leadership and work attitudes, and in all cases, transformational leadership
exhibited larger correlation coefficients compared to transactional leadership. Regarding the control variables, while relationships were statistically significant, the correlations were generally weak (none greater than .29). Thus, further exploration of these relationships through the use of multivariate procedures was warranted. Additionally, examining the correlation matrix allowed for a preliminary identification of multicollinearity. None of the variables are correlated at above .8 or .9, the most typical cutoff values (Berry & Feldman, 1985; Field, 2013; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2009) but there were five correlations amongst variables that fall between .71 and .78 (transactional and transformational leadership are correlated at .74, transformational leadership and procedural justice are correlated at .78, procedural justice and perceived organizational support are correlated at .78, perceived organizational support and affective commitment are correlated at .71) so it will be necessary to examine collinearity diagnostics (namely the VIF and tolerance) as part of the multiple linear regression analysis as recommended by Field (2013) and Tabachnick and Fidell (2009).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>WAMI</th>
<th>POS</th>
<th>ACS</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>CCS</th>
<th>JS</th>
<th>STRESS</th>
<th>PSM</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>INC</th>
<th>EDU</th>
<th>NPY</th>
<th>OY</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>OCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>(.97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFORM</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATISFACTION</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAMI</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROC_JUST</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB_STRESS</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.49**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRESSORS</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.48**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.102*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP_YEARS</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG_YEARS</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNOVER</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>-.65**</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
<td>-.64**</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-1.3*</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). Cronbach’s alphas are in parenthesis on the diagonal for the scaled variables.
Multiple Regression Analysis

Hypotheses 1.1-1.6, Models 1.1 and 1.2

To test hypotheses 1.1-1.6, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were employed to determine if a significant relationship existed between transactional and transformational leadership and work outcomes (turnover and organizational citizenship behaviors). This type of multiple regression procedure allows the researcher to examine the relationship between a dependent variable and several independent variables while keeping the effect of the other independent variables held constant thus enabling comparison of competing independent variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Additionally, since in hierarchical multiple regression predictors are added to the model in stages, it is possible to see if the addition of independent variables actually improves the model and assess the strength of the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable (Field, 2013; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). In these MLR models transactional leadership was entered first and transformational leadership entered second based on Bass’s (1985) assertion that transformational leadership augments transactional leadership and Bass & Riggio’s (2006) findings that transformational leadership accounts for unique variance beyond what is accounted for by transactional leadership. Third, the work attitudes and motivation were entered together in a stepwise manner in the block as no past research has clearly determined their order of importance. Additionally in this block, the demographic control variables were entered in a stepwise manner. Entering the variables into the model in this manner allowed the effects of transactional and transformational leadership to be isolated prior to the addition of the other independent variables.

The data analysis plan involves 11 multiple regression models and four mediation models and since the greater the number of statistical tests being conducted on the same data, the greater the probability of the incidence of spurious significance (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2015). In order to reduce the chance for Type I error, the Bonferroni correction was utilized as suggested by Cohen et al. (2015), Field (2013) and Tabachnick & Fidell (2007). According to the
Bonferroni correction the adjusted alpha level is calculated as desired alpha divided by the number of tests, so in this analysis the adjusted alpha for significance testing is .003 (.05/15) (Cohen et al., 2015; Field, 2013; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

**Multiple Linear Regression Assumptions**

The multiple regression models met all of the required assumptions as indicated by Field (2013) and Tabachnick & Fidell (2007). Normal distribution of residuals was assessed by examining the histogram and P-P plots. Multicollinearity was assessed by examining the correlation matrix (no values correlated higher than .78), the variance inflation factor (all were less than 4.4), and the tolerance statistic (all above .23). The most commonly acceptable maximum VIF levels in the literature are 10 and five (Field, 2013; Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995; Kutner, Nachtsheim, & Neter, 2004; Marquardt, 1970; Neter, Wasserman, & Kutner, 1989; Rogerson, 2001; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). A lack of autocorrelation was assessed by examination of the Durbin-Watson statistic (values were very close to 2, no values were less than one or greater than three). Linearity and heteroscedasticity were assessed by an examination of the plot of standardized residuals against standardized predicted values and scatterplots of the outcome variable and predictors were also examined. Additionally, the data was further examined for influential cases using the Mahalanobis d and Cook’s distance (there were no values remotely close to one).

**Model 1.1: Turnover**

In Model 1.1 the dependent variable is turnover. In step 1, the model is significantly better at predicting turnover than using the mean as “the best guess”. Transactional leadership alone accounts for 16% of the variance in turnover. Transformational leadership was added in step 2, where the model is significantly better at predicting turnover and it explains an additional 7% of the variance. Together transactional leadership and transformational leadership account for 23% of the variance in turnover. The eight work attitudes, public service motivation, and the
control variables (age, household income, education, tenure in nonprofit sector, and tenure with organization) were added in step 3 and the model is significantly better at predicting turnover. Adding the work attitudes, public service motivation, and control variables explained an additional 32% of the variance in intention to turnover, explaining a total of 55% of the variance in turnover. The overall $r$ value in the full model is .74, which is classified as a large effect according to Cohen (1988, 1992) indicating that the magnitude of this effect is important and the model holds practical significance in addition to statistical significance. Table 19 displays the $R^2$, adjusted $R^2$, $R^2$ Change, $F$ change, and the significance levels at each step.

Table 19

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Intention to Turnover (Model 1.1)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>66.47</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSM, CCS, STRESSORS, WAMI, ACS, JOB_STRESS, SATISFACTION, PROC_JUST, POS AGE, INCOME, EDU, NP_YEARS, ORG_YEARS</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=TURNOVER, n=346, Bonferroni adjusted $\alpha$=.003

Based on the coefficient table (Table 20 below), the significant predictors of intention to turnover are affective commitment, job stress, and job satisfaction. Affective commitment is the most influential predictor. These values indicate that as affective commitment increases by one standard deviation, intention to turnover decreases by .3 if the effects of the other independent variables are held constant. None of the control variables were significant predictors of turnover. Examining step 2, which has only transactional and transformational leadership in the model, transformational leadership ($t=-5.57$, standardized $\beta=-.39$, $p<.001$) exhibits stronger negative effects on turnover compared to transactional leadership ($t=-1.65$, standardized $\beta=-.12$, $p=.099$);
however, neither transactional nor transformational leadership are significant predictors of intention to turnover when the other independent variables are held constant.

Table 20.

Coefficient Table Summary for Variables Predicting Intention to Turnover (Model 1.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SATISFACTION***</td>
<td><strong>-0.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.11</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.27</strong></td>
<td><strong>-4.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAMI</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACS***</td>
<td><strong>-0.22</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>-4.83</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROC_JUST*</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOB_STRESS***</td>
<td><strong>0.16</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.03</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.64</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRESSORS</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD_INCOME</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP_YEARS</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORG_YEARS</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependendent Variable=TURNOVER, n=346, ***p<.001, **p<.05, *p<.10

Model 1.2: Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

In Model 1.2 the dependent variable is organizational citizenship behaviors. Table 21 displays The R², adjusted R², R² Change, F change, and the significance levels at each step is displayed in Table 5. In step 1, the model was significantly better at predicting organizational citizenship behavior than using the mean and transactional leadership alone accounts for 6.5% of the variance in organizational citizenship behaviors. Transformational leadership was added in
step 2, where the model is significantly better at predicting organizational citizenship behaviors and accounting for an additional 4% of the variance and together transactional leadership and transformational leadership account for 11% of the variance in organizational citizenship behaviors. The eight work attitudes, public service motivation, and the control variables were added in step 3 and the model is significantly better at predicting turnover. Adding the work attitudes, public service motivation, and the control variables explained an additional 28% of the variance in organizational citizenship behaviors; all of the independent variables together explain 39% of the variance in organizational citizenship behaviors. The effect size for the full model is large at .62 (Cohen, 1988, 1992).

Table 2

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behavior (Model 1.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL, PSM, CCS, STRESSORS, WAMI, ACS, JOB_STRESS, SATISFACTION, PROC_JUST, POS, AGE, INCOME, EDU, NP_YEARS, ORG_YEARS</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NP_YEARS, ORG_YEARS</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=OCB, n=346, Bonferroni adjusted α=.003

Based on the coefficient table (Table 22 below), significant predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors at the p<.05 level are work and meaning and public service motivation. Within this model, unlike Model 1.1 with turnover as the outcome, two of the control variables, education and age were also significant at the p<.05 level. As a curious finding, education is negatively related to organizational citizenship behaviors meaning that as education levels decrease, organizational citizenship behaviors increase. Conversely, as age increases, organizational citizenship behaviors also increase. Work and meaning is the most influential predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors.
Within the more fully specified model, an unexpected result occurred regarding the relationship between transactional leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. As transactional leadership increased by one standard deviation, organizational citizenship behaviors decreased by .12. It should be noted that in the first two steps of the hierarchical regression model, transactional leadership was positively associated with organizational citizenship behaviors, but in the fully specified model the relationship changed to a negative one. The bivariate relationship was also positive (r=.25). The change in sign may be a result of suppression. Although in step 2, which had only transactional and transformational leadership in the model, transformational leadership exhibited stronger effects on organizational citizenship behaviors compared to transactional leadership as expected; however, transformational leadership was not a significant predictor of organizational citizenship behavior when the other independent variables are taken into account.

Table 22

Coefficient Table Summary for Variables Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behavior (Model 1.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>98.26</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>57.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>93.25</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>44.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL*</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WAMI</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>0.51</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.07</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>POS</strong></td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ACS</strong></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PROC_JUST</strong></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CCS</strong></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>JOB_STRESS</strong></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STRESSORS</strong></td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Results for the First Set of Hypotheses

Overall results of the data analysis do not support the first set of hypotheses. Regarding intention to turnover, although the full model is significant, neither transactional leadership nor transformational leadership are significant predictors if the effects of all of the other independent variables are held constant. In step 2, when transactional and transformational leadership are in the model alone transformational leadership ($\beta=-.12$) is significant at the $p<.001$ level and transactional leadership ($\beta=-.39$) is significant at the $p<.10$ level but once the work attitudes, motivation, and control variables are added to the model neither leadership style is significant. So transactional and transformational leadership matter but their strength is constrained by other job factors, attitudes and personal characteristics. There is no support for Hypothesis 1.1 (a significant negative relationship exists between transactional leadership style and intention to turnover in nonprofit organizations). There is no support for Hypothesis 1.2 (a significant negative relationship exists between transformational leadership style and intention to turnover in nonprofit organizations). There is limited support for Hypotheses 1.3 (transformational leadership style will exhibit stronger effects than transactional leadership style on intention to turnover in nonprofit organizations). When examining the step in which both leadership behaviors are in the model alone (without the work attitudes, motivation, and control variables) transformational leadership ($t=-5.57$, standardized $\beta=-.39$, $p<.001$) exhibits stronger effects on turnover compared to transactional leadership ($t=-1.65$, standardized $\beta=-.12$, $p=.099$); however, once the other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.19</th>
<th>0.06</th>
<th>0.16</th>
<th>3.14</th>
<th>0.002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSM**</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE**</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSEHOLD_INCOME</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-2.87</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION**</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>0.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP_YEARS</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG_YEARS</td>
<td>61.49</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=OCB, n=346, ***p,.001, **p<.05, *p<.1
independent variables are in the model, neither transformational nor transactional remain
significant influencers of turnover.

Regarding organizational citizenship behaviors, although the full model is significant, only transactional leadership was found to be a significant predictor if all of the other independent variables are held constant, and that was only at the p<.10 level. Unexpectedly, however, this relationship is negative—as transactional leadership increases, organizational citizenship behaviors decrease which indicated no support for Hypotheses 1.4 (a significant positive relationship exists between transactional leadership style and organizational citizenship behaviors). There is no support for Hypothesis 1.5 (a significant positive relationship exists between transformational leadership style and organizational citizenship behaviors). Finally, transactional leadership exhibited stronger effects on organizational citizenship behaviors indicating no support for Hypothesis 1.6 (transformational leadership style will exhibit stronger effects than transactional leadership style on organizational citizenship behaviors in nonprofit organizations).

Results from Model 1.1 and Model 1.2 were also utilized to create the mediation models developed to test the third set of hypotheses. As indicated in Table 23 below, satisfaction, affective commitment, procedural justice, and job stress were demonstrated to be significant predictors of turnover and will be used as mediators in Model 3.1 and Model 3.2 described later in this chapter. Work and meaning, perceived organizational support, and public service motivation were significant predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors and were used as mediators in Model 3.3 and Model 3.4 described later in this chapter.

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Comparisons</th>
<th>Model 1.1</th>
<th>Model 1.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DV: TURNOVER</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV: OCB</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Model Comparison Table Summary for Variables Predicting Turnover and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (Hypotheses 1.1-1.6)*
To test hypotheses 2.1 to 2.6 a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine if significant relationships existed between transactional and transformational leadership and each of the eight work attitudes and motivation. The strength of the relationship between the dependent variable and several independent variables was assessed while keeping the effect of the other independent variables constant. Additionally, the improvement of the model was assessed after the addition each set of independent variables. In these MLR models transactional leadership was entered first and transformational leadership entered second based on Bass’s (1985) assertion that transformational leadership augments transactional leadership and Bass & Riggio’s (2006) findings that transformational leadership accounts for unique variance beyond what is accounted for by transactional leadership. Third, the remaining work attitudes and motivation were entered together in a stepwise manner in the block as no past research has clearly determined their order of importance. Additionally in this block, the demographic control variables were entered in a stepwise manner. Entering the variables into the model in this manner allows the effects of transactional and transformational leadership to be isolated prior to the
addition of the other independent variables. Nine separate models were tested with each of the eight work attitudes and motivation as the dependent variable.

**Model 2.1: Job Satisfaction**

In Model 2.1 the dependent variable is job satisfaction. In step 1, the model is significantly better at predicting job satisfaction than using the mean and transactional leadership alone accounts for 22% of the variance in job satisfaction. Adding transformational leadership in step 2, accounts for an additional 10% of the variance and together transactional leadership and transformational leadership account for 32% of the variance in job satisfaction. Adding the work attitudes, public service motivation, and the control variables in step 3, explained an additional 35% of the variance in job satisfaction, and together all of the independent variables together explain 68% of the variance in job satisfaction. The overall r value in the full model is .82, which is classified as a large effect according to Cohen (1988, 1992). Table 24 displays the $R^2$, adjusted $R^2$, $\Delta R^2$, $\Delta F$, and the significance levels at each step.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>96.10</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>52.72</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSM, CCS, STRESSORS, WAMI, ACS, JOB_STRESS, PROC_JUST, POS, AGE,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>INCOME, EDU, NP_YEARS, ORG_YEARS</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>27.70</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=SATISFACTION, n=346, Bonferroni adjusted $\alpha=.003$

Based on the coefficient table (Table 25 below), significant predictors of job satisfaction at the p<.05 level are work and meaning, job stress, transformational leadership, and affective commitment. None of the control variables are significant at the p<.05 level. Work and meaning is the most influential predictor of job satisfaction. An unexpected result occurred regarding the positive relationship between job stress and work and meaning. The data reveals that as job stress
increases so do the scores on the work and meaning inventory. None of the control variables were significant predictors of job satisfaction.

Examining step 2, which has only transactional and transformational leadership in the model, transformational leadership ($t=7.26$, standardized $\beta=.48$, $p<.001$) exhibits stronger effects on job satisfaction compared to transactional leadership ($t=1.770$, standardized $\beta=.116$, $p=.078$); however, transactional leadership is not a significant predictor of job satisfaction when the other independent variables are held constant, while transformational leadership remains significant in the fully specified model. Transformational leadership continues to influence job satisfaction even when accounting for the other independent variables, while transactional leadership does not.

Table 25

Coefficient Table Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Job Satisfaction (Model 2.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>9.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td><strong>0.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAMI**</td>
<td><strong>0.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.38</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACS**</td>
<td><strong>0.07</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.93</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROC_JUST</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOB_STRESS**</td>
<td><strong>-0.07</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>-3.89</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRESSORS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSM*</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD_INCOME</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDUCATION*</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP_YEARS</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model 2.2: Work and Meaning

In Model 2.2 the dependent variable is work and meaning. In step 1, the model is significantly better at predicting work and meaning than using the mean, and transactional leadership alone accounted for 8% of the variance in work and meaning. When transformational leadership is added in step 2, the amount of variance accounted for increased by 4% and together transactional leadership and transformational leadership account for 10% of the variance in work and meaning. Adding the work attitudes, public service motivation, and the control variables in step 3 explained an additional 46% of the variance in work and meaning, and together all of the independent variables explain 57% of the variance in work and meaning. The model demonstrates a large effect with an overall $r$ value of .7 (Cohen, 1988, 1992). Table 26 displays the $R^2$, adjusted $R^2$, $R^2$ Change, $F$ change, and the significance levels at each step.

Table 26

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Work and Meaning (Model 2.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>27.73</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>13.32</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSM, CCS, STRESSORS, ACS, SATISFACTION, JOB_STRESS, PROC_JUST, POS, AGE, INCOME, EDU, NP_YEARS, ORG_YEARS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NP_YEARS, ORG_YEARS</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=WAMI, $n=346$, Bonferroni adjusted $\alpha=.003$

Based on the coefficient table (Table 27 below), the significant predictors of work and meaning at the $p<.05$ level are job satisfaction, public service motivation, and affective commitment. Job satisfaction is the most influential predictor of work and meaning. None of the control variables were significant predictors of work and meaning.
Transactional and transformational leadership are not significant predictors of work and meaning when the other independent variables are held constant. Examining step 2, which has only transactional and transformational leadership in the model, transformational leadership ($t=3.65$, standardized $\beta=.28$, $p<.001$) exhibits stronger effects on work and meaning compared to transactional leadership ($t=.94$, standardized $\beta=.07$, $p=.348$).

Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient Table Summary for Variables Predicting Work and Meaning (Model 2.2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=WAMI, n=346, ***$p<.001$, **$p<.05$, *$p<.10$
Model 2.3: Perceived Organizational Support

In Model 2.3 the dependent variable is perceived organizational support. In step 1, the
to model is significantly better at predicting perceived organizational support than using the mean.
Transactional leadership alone accounts for 47% of the variance in perceived organizational
support. Transformational leadership was added in step 2, increasing by 11% the variance
accounted for and together transactional leadership and transformational leadership account for
58% of the variance in perceived organizational support. Adding the work attitudes, public
service motivation, and the control variables in step 3 explained an additional 20% of the variance
in perceived organizational support, and all of the independent variables together explain 77% of
the variance in perceived organizational support. The overall $r$ value in the full model is .88
indicating a large effect according to (Cohen, 1988, 1992). Table 28 displays the $R^2$, adjusted $R^2$,
$R^2$ Change, $F$ change, and the significance levels at each step.

Table 28

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Perceived Organizational
Support (Model 2.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>305.43</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>84.46</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSM, CCS, STRESSORS, WAMI, ACS, JOB_STRESS, SATISFACTION, PROC_JUST, AGE, INCOME, EDU, NP_YEARS, ORG_YEARS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=POS, n=346, Bonferroni adjusted $\alpha=.003$

Based on the coefficient table (Table 29 below), the significant predictors of perceived
organizational support at the $p<.05$ level are affective commitment, procedural justice,
transactional leadership, and role stressors. Affective commitment is the most influential
predictor of perceived organizational support. None of the control variables were significant
predictors of perceived organizational support.
Unlike the previous models, transactional (p<.05 level) and transformational leadership (p<.10 level) are both significant predictors of perceived organizational support when the other independent variables are held constant. In the full model, unexpectedly, transactional leadership exhibits stronger effects on perceived organizational support compared to transformational leadership.

Table 29

Coefficient Table Summary for Variables Predicting Perceived Organizational Support (Model 2.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>14.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL***</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACS***</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROC_JUST***</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOB_STRESS*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRESSORS**</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SATISFACTION*</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAMI</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD_INCOME</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP_YEARS</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORG_YEARS</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=POS, n=346, ***p<.001, **p<.05, *p<.10
Model 2.4: Affective Commitment

In Model 2.4 the dependent variable is affective commitment (see Table 30 for the $R^2$, adjusted $R^2$, $R^2$ Change, F change, and the significance levels at each step). In step 1, the model is significantly better at predicting affective commitment than using the mean and transactional leadership alone accounts for 21% of the variance in affective commitment. Transformational leadership was added in step 2 adding 10% of the variance accounted for and together transactional leadership and transformational leadership explain 31% of the variance in affective commitment. In step 3, adding the work attitudes, public service motivation, and the control variables explained an additional 33% of the variance in affective commitment and all of the independent variables together explain 64% of the variance in affective commitment. The fully specified model exhibits a large effect with an overall $r$ value of .80 (Cohen, 1988, 1992).

Table 30

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Affective Commitment (Model 2.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>92.58</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>47.23</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSM, CCS, STRESSORS, WAMI, JOB_STRESS, SATISFACTION, POS, PROC_JUST, AGE, INCOME, EDU, NP_YEARS, ORG_YEARS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>22.98</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>22.98</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=ACS, n=346, Bonferroni adjusted $\alpha=.003$

Based on the coefficient table (Table 31 below), the significant predictors of affective commitment at the $p<.05$ level are perceived organizational support, procedural justice, job satisfaction, and work and meaning. Perceived organizational support is the most influential predictor of affective commitment. Only one of the control variables, tenure in organization was a significant predictor of affective commitment. It is not surprising that as the tenure in the organization increases so would the level of affective commitment to the organization.
Neither transactional nor transformational leadership were significant predictors at the p<.05 level of affective commitment when the other independent variables are held constant. Transactional leadership was significant only at the p<.10 level but, unexpectedly, transactional leadership has a negative relationship with affective commitment. The bivariate relationship between transactional leadership and affective commitment was positive (r=.45) so the change in sign is likely due to suppression. Also, contrary to expectations, in the full model, transactional leadership exhibited stronger effects on affective commitment compared to transformational leadership.

Table 31

Coefficient Table Summary for Variables Predicting Affective Commitment (Model 2.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>17.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>10.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL*</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROC_JUST**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOB_STRESS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRESSORS</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SATISFACTION**</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAMI**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS***</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD_INCOME</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP_YEARS</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORG_YEARS**</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-2.07</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=ACS, n=346, ***p<.001, **p<.05, *p<.10
Model 2.5: Procedural Justice

In Model 2.5 the dependent variable is procedural justice. In step 1, the model is significantly better at predicting procedural justice than using the mean. Transactional leadership alone accounts for 48% of the variance in procedural justice. Adding transformational leadership in step 2, added an additional 19% of the variance and together transactional leadership and transformational leadership account for 67% of the variance in procedural justice. Adding the work attitudes, public service motivation, and the control variables in step 3 explained an additional 8% of the variance in procedural justice, and all of the independent variables together explain 76% of the variance in procedural justice. The overall $r$ value in the full model is .87, which is a large effect (Cohen, 1988, 1992). See Table 32 for the $R^2$, adjusted $R^2$, $R^2$ Change, $F$ change, and the significance levels at each step.

Table 32

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Procedural Justice (Model 2.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>322.91</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>203.33</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSM, CCS, STRESSORS, WAMI, ACS, JOB_STRESS, SATISFACTION, POS, AGE, INCOME, EDU, NP_YEARS, ORG_YEARS</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=PROC_JUST, $n=346$, Bonferroni adjusted $\alpha=.003$

Based on the coefficient table (Table 33 below), the significant predictors of procedural justice at the $p<.05$ level are transformational leadership, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, and transactional leadership. None of the control variables were significant predictors at the $p<.05$ level.

Transformational leadership is the most influential predictor of procedural justice. Transactional and transformational leadership are both significant predictors of procedural justice.
when the other independent variables are held constant. In the full model, transformational leadership exhibits stronger effects on procedural justice compared to transactional leadership.

Table 33

Coefficient Table Summary for Variables Predicting Procedural Justice (Model 2.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>17.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>18.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>14.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL**</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL***</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS*</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOB_STRESS</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRESSORS</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SATISFACTION</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAMI</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS***</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACS**</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD_INCOME</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-1.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP_YEARS*</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORG_YEARS</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=PROC_JUST, n=346, ***p<.001, **p<.05, *p<.1

Model 2.6: Continuance Commitment

In Model 2.6 the dependent variable is continuance commitment (see Table 34 for the R², adjusted R², R² Change, F change, and the significance levels at each step). In step 1, the model is not significantly better at predicting continuance commitment than using the mean although p=.020, due to the Bonferroni adjustment, the corrected alpha for significance testing is .003
When transformational leadership was added in step 2, the model is significantly better at predicting continuance commitment than using the mean (p<.003). Together transactional leadership and transformational leadership account for only 6% of the variance in continuance commitment. Adding the work attitudes and public service motivation in step 3 explained an additional 11% of the variance in continuance commitment, and all of the independent variables together explain 16% of the variance in continuance commitment (p<.003). The overall r value in the full model is .41, which is classified as a medium effect according to Cohen (1988, 1992).

Also, it is worthwhile to note that Model 2.6, so far has the lowest effect size and contains larger p-values than seen for all of the previously analyzed models in step 1 (p=.02) and step 3 (p=.002).

Table 34

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Continuance Commitment (Model 2.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSM, STRESSORS, WAMI, ACS, JOB_STRESS, SATISFACTION,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROC_JUST, POS, AGE, INCOME, EDU, NP_YEARS, ORG_YEARS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NP_YEARS, ORG_YEARS</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=CCS, n=346, Bonferroni adjusted α=.003

Interestingly, the strongest predictors of continuance commitment are tenure in the nonprofit sector and household income, two of the control variables, both at the p <.05 level. As tenure in the nonprofit sector increases, so does the level of continuance commitment to the organization. Fitting with theory and construct development it stands to reason that as household income decreases, continuance commitment increases. See Table 35 below.

It was anticipated that transactional leadership would have a negative relationship with continuance commitment which is supported by the bivariate correlation (r=-.12) and the first step of the multiple regression model but the full model (step 3) results indicated that a positive relationship exists, this change in sign may be a result of suppression. Transactional leadership
was only significant at the $p<.10$ level and transformational leadership was not a significant predictor of continuance commitment when the other independent variables are held constant.

Contrary to the hypotheses, in the full model, transactional leadership exhibited stronger effects on continuance commitment compared to transformational leadership but the direction of the relationship is unexpected.

Table 35

*Coefficient Table Summary for Variables Predicting Continuance Commitment (Model 2.6)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>22.90</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOB_STRESS</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRESSORS</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SATISFACTION</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAMI</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROC_JUST*</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD_INCOME**</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP_YEARS**</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORG_YEARS</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>7.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=CCS, n=346, ***p<.001, **p<.05, *p<.10
Model 2.7: Job Stress

In Model 2.7 the dependent variable is job stress (see Table 36). In step 1, the model is significantly better at predicting job stress than using the mean and transactional leadership alone accounts for 16% of the variance in job stress. Adding transformational leadership in step 2 explains an additional 4% of the variance and together transactional leadership and transformational leadership accounted for 20% of the variance in job stress. Adding the work attitudes and public service motivation in step 3 explained an additional 44% of the variance in job stress, all of the independent variables together explain 64% of the variance in job stress. The overall r value in the full model is .8, indicating a large effect (Cohen 1988, 1992).

Table 36

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Job Stress (Model 2.7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>Adj R^2</th>
<th>ΔR^2</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>65.62</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>18.009</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSM, CCS, STRESSORS, WAMI, ACS, SATISFACTION, PROC_JUST, POS, AGE, INCOME, EDU, NP_YEARS, ORG_YEARS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>31.34</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=JOB_STRESS, n=346, Bonferroni adjusted α=.003

Based on the coefficient table (Table 37 below), the significant predictors of job stress at the p<.05 level are role stressors and job satisfaction. Role stressors are the most influential predictor of job stress. Only one control variable, education was found to be a significant predictor of job stress at the p<.05 level. As education levels decrease, job stress increases.

Transactional and transformational leadership are not significant predictors of job stress when the other independent variables are held constant. Examining step 2, which has only transactional and transformational leadership in the model, transformational leadership (t=-4.24, standardized β=-.30, p<.001) exhibits stronger effects on job stress compared to transactional leadership (t=-2.49, standardized β=-.18, p=.013).
Table 37

Coefficient Table Summary for Variables Predicting Job Stress (Model 2.7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>21.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>31.29</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>19.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRESSORS***</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SATISFACTION***</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAMI*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS*</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROC_JUST</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD_INCOME</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDUCATION**</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP_YEARS</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORG_YEARS</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=JOB_STRESS, n=346, ***p<.001, **p<.05, *p<.10

Model 2.8: Role Stressors

In Model 2.8 the dependent variable is role stressors (see Table 38 below). In step 1, the model is significantly better at predicting role stressors and transactional leadership alone accounts for 17% of the variance in role stressors. Transformational leadership was added in step 2, increasing by 2.3% the variance explained and together transactional leadership and transformational leadership accounted for 19% of the variance in job stress. Adding the work
attitudes and public service motivation in step 3 explained an additional 44% of the variance in role stressors and all of the independent variables together explain 63% of the variance in role stressors. The fully specified model demonstrates a large effect with an overall $r$ value of .8 (Cohen, 1988, 1992).

Table 38

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Role Stressors
(Model 2.8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>68.49</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSM, CCS, WAMI, JOB_STRESS, ACS, SATISFACTION, PROC_JUST, POS, AGE, INCOME, EDU, NP_YEARS, ORG_YEARS</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>30.78</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=STRESSORS, n=346, Bonferroni adjusted $\alpha=.003$

Based on the coefficient table (Table 39 below), the significant predictors of role stressors are job stress and perceived organizational support. Three control variables are also significant predictors of job stress at the $p<.05$ level: education, tenure in the nonprofit sector, and income. As education, tenure in the nonprofit sector, and income levels increase, role stressors also increase. It should be noted that in the bivariate analysis, there was not a significant relationship between household income and role stressors. The control variables are much more powerful in this model than in all previous models. Job stress, however, is the most influential predictor of role stressors.

Neither transactional nor transformational leadership are significant predictors of role stressors when the other independent variables are held constant. Examining step 2, which has only transactional and transformational leadership in the model, unexpectedly transactional leadership ($t=-3.37$, standardized $\beta=-.24$, $p=.001$) exhibits stronger effects on role stressors compared to transformational leadership ($t=-2.49$, standardized $\beta=-.13$, $p=.002$).
Table 39

Coefficient Table Summary for Variables Predicting Role Stressors (Model 2.8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL -0.65</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-8.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant) 44.59</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL -0.38</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL -0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant) 48.16</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL -0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL 0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSM -0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SATISFACTION 0.02</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAMI 0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS** -0.28</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACS 0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROC_JUST -0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS 0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOB_STRESS*** 0.76</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>14.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGE -0.31</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD_INCOME** 0.27</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDUCATION** 0.88</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP_YEARS** 0.52</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORG_YEARS -0.08</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant) 19.17</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=STRESSORS, n=346, ***p<.001, **p<.05, *p<.10

Model 2.9: Public Service Motivation

In Model 2.9 the dependent variable is public service motivation (see Table 40). In step 1, the model is not significantly better at predicting public service motivation than using the mean with, R²=.022, adjusted R²=.02, F (1, 344)=7.763, p=.006, since the Bonferroni adjusted alpha is .003. Transformational leadership was added in step 2, but unexpectedly the model is not significantly better at predicting public service motivation with R²=.02, adjusted R²=.02, R² change=.002, F(2,343)=4.189, p=.430. The eight work attitudes and the control variables were added in step 3 and the model is significantly better at predicting public service motivation than using the mean with R²=.27, adjusted R²=.23, R² change=.24, F(15,330)=7.98, p<.001. Adding
the work attitudes explained an additional 24% of the variance in public service motivation and all of the independent variables together explain 27% of the variance in public service motivation. The overall $r$ value in the full model is .52, which is classified as a large effect according to Cohen (1988, 1992).

Table 40

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Public Service Motivation (Model 2.9)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS, WAMI, STRESSORS, ACS, JOB_STRESS, SATISFACTION, PROC_JUST, POS, AGE, INCOME, EDU, NP_YEARS, ORG_YEARS</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=PSM, n=346, Bonferroni adjusted $\alpha$=.003

Based on the coefficient table (Table 41 below), the only significant predictor of public service motivation at the $p<.05$ level is work and meaning. Only one control variable, education is significant at the $p<.05$ level. As education levels increase, public service motivation also increases. Overall, however, work and meaning is the most influential predictor of public service motivation.

Contrary to the hypotheses expectations, transactional and transformational leadership are not significant predictors of public service motivation when the other independent variables are held constant and in fact are not significant predictors prior to the work attitudes and control variables entering the model. Transactional leadership in step 1 is significant with all other variables being held constant but when examining step 2, which has only transactional and transformational leadership in the model, neither transactional ($p= .19$) nor transformational ($p= .43$) leadership are significant predictors. At step 2 when transformational leadership was added the model is not significantly better at predicting public service motivation. If employees
are motivated by the mission of the organization or the desire to serve the public good, it appears from this analysis that leadership, then, does not matter much.

Table 41

**Coefficient Table Summary for Variables Predicting Public Service Motivation (Model 2.9)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL (Constant)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>56.71</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>38.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL (Constant)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>29.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONAL (Constant)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SATISFACTION*</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WAMI***</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PROC_JUST</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JOB_STRESS</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STRESSORS</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD_INCOME*</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EDUCATION***</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NP_YEARS</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ORG_YEARS*</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>35.68</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable=PSM, n=346, ***p<.001, **p<.05, *p<.10

**Summary of Results for the Second Set of Hypotheses**

Prior to a discussion regarding the second set of hypotheses an examination of the overall summary comparison of the performance of the independent variables (utilizing β and p-values for ease of comparison) across all nine models is beneficial. An examination across all nine models reveals that transactional leadership is a significant predictor at the p<.05 level of perceived organizational support, procedural justice, and role stressors and a significant predictor
at the p<.10 level of affective commitment and continuance commitment when controlling for the effect of all other independent variables. Contrary to hypothetical expectations, transformational leadership did not emerge as significant predictor in most of the models. At the p<.05 level, transformational leadership style was a significant predictor of job satisfaction, procedural justice, and role stressors. At the p<.10 level, transformational leadership was a significant predictor of perceived organizational support. See Table 42 below.
Table 42

Model Comparison Table Summary for Models 2.1-2.9 (Hypotheses 1.1-1.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Model 2.1</th>
<th>Model 2.2</th>
<th>Model 2.3</th>
<th>Model 2.4</th>
<th>Model 2.5</th>
<th>Model 2.6</th>
<th>Model 2.7</th>
<th>Model 2.8</th>
<th>Model 2.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DV: WAMI</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>.094 .094</td>
<td>.094 .094</td>
<td>.094 .094</td>
<td>.094 .094</td>
<td>.094 .094</td>
<td>.094 .094</td>
<td>.094 .094</td>
<td>.094 .094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p )</td>
<td>.001 .001</td>
<td>.001 .001</td>
<td>.001 .001</td>
<td>.001 .001</td>
<td>.001 .001</td>
<td>.001 .001</td>
<td>.001 .001</td>
<td>.001 .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p )</td>
<td>.090 .090</td>
<td>.090 .090</td>
<td>.090 .090</td>
<td>.090 .090</td>
<td>.090 .090</td>
<td>.090 .090</td>
<td>.090 .090</td>
<td>.090 .090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV: ACS</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>.603 .603</td>
<td>.603 .603</td>
<td>.603 .603</td>
<td>.603 .603</td>
<td>.603 .603</td>
<td>.603 .603</td>
<td>.603 .603</td>
<td>.603 .603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p )</td>
<td>.44 .44</td>
<td>.44 .44</td>
<td>.44 .44</td>
<td>.44 .44</td>
<td>.44 .44</td>
<td>.44 .44</td>
<td>.44 .44</td>
<td>.44 .44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV: PJ</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>-.03 -.03</td>
<td>-.03 -.03</td>
<td>-.03 -.03</td>
<td>-.03 -.03</td>
<td>-.03 -.03</td>
<td>-.03 -.03</td>
<td>-.03 -.03</td>
<td>-.03 -.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p )</td>
<td>.397 .397</td>
<td>.397 .397</td>
<td>.397 .397</td>
<td>.397 .397</td>
<td>.397 .397</td>
<td>.397 .397</td>
<td>.397 .397</td>
<td>.397 .397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV: CCS</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>-.19 -.19</td>
<td>-.19 -.19</td>
<td>-.19 -.19</td>
<td>-.19 -.19</td>
<td>-.19 -.19</td>
<td>-.19 -.19</td>
<td>-.19 -.19</td>
<td>-.19 -.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p )</td>
<td>.400 .400</td>
<td>.400 .400</td>
<td>.400 .400</td>
<td>.400 .400</td>
<td>.400 .400</td>
<td>.400 .400</td>
<td>.400 .400</td>
<td>.400 .400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=346, ***p<.001, **p<.05, *p<.10
Results of the data analysis provide limited support for the second set of hypotheses. While the full models for each work attitude were significant only the relationship between transactional leadership and transformational leadership and procedural justice turned out as expected while holding all other independent variables constant. Transactional leadership and transformational leadership were not found to be significant predictors for work and meaning, job-related stress, and role stressors while holding all other independent variables constant. Transactional leadership was a significant predictor of perceived organizational support, affective commitment, procedural justice, and continuance commitment. Transformational leadership was a significant predictor of job satisfaction, perceived organizational support, and procedural justice. Therefore, there is partial support for Hypothesis 2.1 (a significant relationship exists between transactional leadership style and work attitudes), Hypothesis 2.2 (a significant relationship exists between transformational leadership style and work attitudes) and Hypothesis 2.3 (transformational leadership style will exhibit stronger effects than transactional leadership style on work attitudes). Neither transactional leadership nor transformational leadership were significant predictors of public service motivation, so there is no support for Hypothesis 2.4 (significant positive relationship exists between transactional leadership styles and motivation), Hypothesis 2.5 (a significant positive relationship exists between transformational leadership style and motivation), and Hypotheses 2.6 (transformational leadership style will exhibit stronger effects than transactional leadership style on work motivation). While the full model was significant, the step in which transactional and transformational are entered in the model alone was not significant. See Table 43 and Table 44 below for the mixed results.
Table 43

A Comparison of Hypothesized Results and Actual Results (H 2.1, H 2.2, H 2.4, and H 2.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Hypothesized Relationship</th>
<th>Actual Results</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>TF (+) TA (+)</td>
<td>TF (+) TA not significant</td>
<td>r = .82</td>
<td>Partial support of hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Meaning</td>
<td>TF (+) TA (+)</td>
<td>TF not significant TA not significant</td>
<td>r = .75</td>
<td>Does not support hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>TF (+) TA (+)</td>
<td>TF not significant TA (+)</td>
<td>r = .88</td>
<td>Partial support of hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>TF (+) TA (+)</td>
<td>TF not significant TA not significant</td>
<td>r = .80</td>
<td>Does not support hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>TF (+) TA (+)</td>
<td>TF (+) TA (+)</td>
<td>r = .87</td>
<td>Supports hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>TF (-) TA (-)</td>
<td>TF not significant TA not significant</td>
<td>r = .41</td>
<td>Does not support hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related Stress</td>
<td>TF (-) TA (-)</td>
<td>TF not significant TA not significant</td>
<td>r = .80</td>
<td>Does not support hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role stressors</td>
<td>TF (-) TA (-)</td>
<td>TF not significant TA not significant</td>
<td>r = .80</td>
<td>Does not support hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>TF (+) TA (+)</td>
<td>TF not significant TA not significant</td>
<td>r = .52</td>
<td>Does not support hypotheses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 44

*A Comparison of Hypothesized Results and Actual Results (H 2.3 and H 2.6)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Hypothesized Relationship</th>
<th>Actual Results</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>TF (+) stronger, TA (+) weaker</td>
<td>TF (+) stronger, TA not significant</td>
<td><em>r</em> = .82</td>
<td>Supports hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Meaning</td>
<td>TF (+) stronger, TA (+) weaker</td>
<td>TF not significant, TA not significant</td>
<td><em>r</em> = .75</td>
<td>Does not support hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>TF (+) stronger, TA (+) weaker</td>
<td>TF (+) weaker, TA (+) stronger</td>
<td><em>r</em> = .88</td>
<td>Does not support hypotheses (opposite of expectation occurred)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>TF (+) stronger, TA (+) weaker</td>
<td>TF not significant, TA (-) stronger</td>
<td><em>r</em> = .80</td>
<td>Does not support hypotheses (opposite of expectation occurred)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>TF (+) stronger, TA (+) weaker</td>
<td>TF (+) stronger, TA (+) weaker</td>
<td><em>r</em> = .87</td>
<td>Supports hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>TF (+) stronger, TA (+) weaker</td>
<td>TF not significant, TA (+) stronger</td>
<td><em>r</em> = .41</td>
<td>Does not support hypotheses (opposite of expectation occurred)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related Stress</td>
<td>TF (-) stronger, TA (-) weaker</td>
<td>TF not significant, TA not significant</td>
<td><em>r</em> = .80</td>
<td>Does not support hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role stressors</td>
<td>TF (-) stronger, TA (-) weaker</td>
<td>TF not significant, TA not significant</td>
<td><em>r</em> = .80</td>
<td>Does not support hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>TF (+) stronger, TA (+) weaker</td>
<td>TF not significant, TA not significant</td>
<td><em>r</em> = .52</td>
<td>Does not support hypotheses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mediation Analysis

Work attitudes found to be significant predictors of turnover intention and organizational citizenship behaviors and motivation were entered into the mediation model as potential mediators in the relationship between leadership behavior and turnover intention and organizational citizenship behaviors. To test Hypotheses 3.1 and 3.2 a parallel multiple mediation analysis using a special SPSS PROCESS macro developed by Hayes (2013) was conducted to test for mediation. Work attitudes found to be significant predictors of turnover intention and
organizational citizenship behaviors and motivation in Models 1.1 and 1.2 were entered into the mediation model as potential mediators in the relationship between leadership behavior and turnover intention and organizational citizenship behaviors. In this type of mediation analysis, the predictor variable (X) is modeled as influencing the outcome variable (Y) directly, as well as, indirectly through two or more mediator variables with the constraint of the mediators being independent with no causal relationship between any of the mediator variables (Hayes, 2013). The procedure will confirm the significance of the initial IV and DV (X→Y), the significance of the relationship between the initial IV and the mediators (X→M), the significance of the relationship between the mediator and the DV in the presence of the IV (M|X→Y), and the insignificance (or the meaningful reduction in effect) of the relationship between the initial IV and the DV in the presence of the mediator (X|M→Y) (Hayes, 2013). Conducting a mediation analyses further explained the relationships between the independent variables and the outcome variables in a way that the previous multiple regression models cannot. In the regression models it is possible to ascertain the effects of each independent variable while controlling for all of the other independent variables but that type of analysis does not explain how the independent variables impact or alter the relationship between the independent variable and the outcome variable. Mediation involves the complex situation in which the relationship between a predictor variable and an outcome variable can be explained by their relationship to a third variable, the mediator variable (Field, 2013; Hayes, 2013). The mediators help explain the underlying mechanism of the relationship between transactional and transformational leadership (IVs) and turnover and organizational citizenship behaviors (DV).  

**Model 3.1: Turnover—Transactional Leadership and Mediators**

In model 3.1, turnover (Y1) is the dependent variable while the predictor variable is transactional leadership (X1) and the mediator variables are affective commitment (M1), job stress (M2), satisfaction (M3), and procedural justice (M4). The first step of the mediation model confirmed that transactional leadership is a significant predictor of turnover while ignoring the
mediator variables F (1, 375)= 73.78, R^2=.17, p<.001 and b=-.30, t(372)=-8.59, p<.001. Step 2 showed that the regression of transactional leadership on each of the mediators was significant: affective commitment (b=.43, t=9.79, p<.001), job stress (b=.53, t=8.14, p<.001), satisfaction (b=.21, t=10.11, p<.001), and procedural justice (b=1.25, t=18.17, p<.001). In step 3, while controlling for transactional leadership, affective commitment (b=-.23, t=-5.87, p<.001), job stress (b=.11, t=4.78, p<.001), and satisfaction (b=-.48, t=-5.80, p<.001) were significant in predicting turnover intentions while procedural justice (b=-.04, t=-1.72, p=.0864) was not significant. Step 4 revealed that when controlling for the mediators (affective commitment, job stress, satisfaction, and procedural justice), transactional leadership was not a significant predictor of turnover intentions (b=.01, t=.298, p=.76) indicating full mediation. Hayes (2013) and Field (2013) recommend not using the normal theory approach (Sobel test) to inference regarding the indirect effects but suggest it is preferable to conduct an inferential test of the total indirect effects using a bootstrap confidence interval. Following that advice by utilizing a 95% bootstrap confidence interval, the total indirect effect of transactional leadership through all four mediators simultaneously is between -.3812 and -.2390 (b=-.31). This finding supports the assertion that affective commitment, job stress, satisfaction, and procedural justice collectively mediate the effect of transactional leadership on turnover. See Figure 4 below for a diagram of the mediation model including the regression coefficients.
Figure 4

Model of Transactional Leadership as a Predictor of Turnover Intentions, Mediated by Affective Commitment, Job Stress, Satisfaction, and Procedural Justice (Model 3.1)

Model 3.2: Turnover—Transformational Leadership and Mediators

In model 3.2, turnover (Y1) is the dependent variable while the predictor variable is transformational leadership (X2) and the mediator variables are affective commitment (M1), job stress (M2), satisfaction (M3), and procedural justice (M4). The first step of the mediation model confirmed that transformational leadership is a significant predictor of turnover while ignoring the mediator variables $F(1, 375)= 115.38$, $R^2=.24$, $p<.001$ and $b=-.09$, $t(372)=-10.74$, $p<.001$. Step 2 showed that the regression of transformational leadership on each of the mediators was significant: affective commitment ($b=.14$, $t=12.47$, $p<.001$), job stress ($b=-.16$, $t=-9.44$, $p<.001$), satisfaction ($b=.07$, $t=13.00$, $p<.001$), and procedural justice ($b=.39$, $t=26.57$, $p<.001$). In step 3, while controlling for transformational leadership, affective commitment ($b=-.23$, $t=-5.87$, $p<.001$), job stress ($b=.11$, $t=4.78$, $p<.001$), and satisfaction ($b=-.48$, $t=-5.74$, $p<.001$) were significant in predicting turnover intentions while procedural justice ($b=-.04$, $t=-1.51$, $p=.133$) was not significant. Step 4 revealed that when controlling for the mediators (affective commitment, job stress, satisfaction, and procedural justice), transformational leadership was not
a significant predictor of turnover intentions ($b=.003, t=.2256, p=.8214$) indicating full mediation. Utilizing a 95% bootstrap confidence interval, the total indirect effect of transformational leadership through all four mediators simultaneously is between -.1230 and -.0745 ($b=-.10$). This finding supports the assertion that affective commitment, job stress, satisfaction, and procedural justice collectively mediate the effect of transformational leadership on turnover. See Figure 5 below for a diagram of the mediation model including the regression coefficients.

**Figure 5**

*Model of Transformational Leadership as a Predictor of Turnover Intentions, Mediated by Affective Commitment, Job Stress, Satisfaction, and Procedural Justice (Model 3.2)*

**Model 3.3: Organizational Citizenship Behaviors—Transactional Leadership and Mediators**

In model 3.3, organizational citizenship behaviors (Y2) is the dependent variable while the predictor variable is transactional leadership (X1) and the mediator variables are work and meaning (M5), perceived organizational support (M6), and public service motivation (M7). The first step of the mediation model confirmed that transactional leadership is a significant predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors while ignoring the mediator variables $F(1, 372)= 23.85, R^2=.06, p<.001$ and $b=.41, t(371)=4.88, p<.001$. Step 2 showed that the regression of transactional leadership on each of the mediators was significant: work and meaning ($b=.30,$
$t=5.47, p<.001$), perceived organizational support ($b=.90, t=17.51, p<.001$), and public service motivation ($b=.20, t=2.68, p=.0078$). In step 3, while controlling for transactional leadership, work and meaning ($b=.52, t=6.89, p<.001$), perceived organizational support ($b=.33, t=4.33, p<.001$), and public service motivation ($b=.14, t=2.64, p=.0087$) were significant in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors. Step 4 revealed that when controlling for the mediators (work and meaning, perceived organizational support, and public service motivation), transactional leadership was not a significant predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors ($b=-.08, t=-.8351, p=.4042$) indicating full mediation. Utilizing a 95% bootstrap confidence interval, the total indirect effect of transactional leadership through all three mediators simultaneously is between .3336 and .6547 ($b=.49$). This finding supports the assertion that work and meaning, perceived organizational support, and public service motivation collectively mediate the effect of transactional leadership on organizational citizenship behaviors. See Figure 6 below for a diagram of the mediation model including the regression coefficients.

Figure 6

*Model of Transactional Leadership as a Predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, Mediated by Work and Meaning, Perceived Organizational Support, and Public Service Motivation (Model 3.3)*

Direct effect, $b=.4071, p<.001$

Indirect effect, $b=.4877, 95\% CI [.3336, .6547]$
Model 3.4: Organizational Citizenship Behaviors—Transformational Leadership and Mediators

In model 3.4, organizational citizenship behaviors (Y2) is the dependent variable while the predictor variable is transformational leadership (X2) and the mediator variables are work and meaning (M5), perceived organizational support (M6), and public service motivation (M7). The first step of the mediation model confirmed that transformational leadership is a significant predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors while ignoring the mediator variables F(1, 372)=37.67, R^2=.09, p<.001 and b=.13, t(371)=6.14, p<.001. Step 2 showed that the regression of transformational leadership on each of the mediators was significant: work and meaning (b=.09, t=6.48, p<.001), perceived organizational support (b=.25, t=19.26, p<.001), and public service motivation (b=.05, t=2.36, p=.0078). In step 3, while controlling for transformational leadership, work and meaning (b=.52, t=6.91, p<.001), perceived organizational support (b=.28, t=3.47, p<.0006), and public service motivation (b=.14, t=2.65, p=.0084) were significant in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors. Step 4 revealed that when controlling for the mediators (work and meaning, perceived organizational support, and public service motivation), transformational leadership was not a significant predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors (b=.008, t=.2923, p=.7702) indicating full mediation. Utilizing a 95% bootstrap confidence interval, the total indirect effect of transformational leadership through all three mediators simultaneously is between .0826 and .1699 (b=.12). This finding supports the assertion that work and meaning, perceived organizational support, and public service motivation collectively mediate the effect of transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behaviors. See Figure 7 below for a diagram of the mediation model including the regression coefficients.
Summary of Results for the Third Set of Hypotheses

In Model 3.1 and Model 3.2, affective commitment, job stress, satisfaction, and procedural justice collectively mediate the effect of transactional and transformational leadership on turnover providing support for Hypothesis 3.1 (work attitudes and motivation mediate the relationship between leadership and turnover). Transactional and transformational leadership were only significant predictors of turnover when ignoring the mediators, once the effect of the mediators were taken into account, there was no longer a direct effect. In Model 3.3 and Model 3.4, work and meaning, perceived organizational support, and public service motivation collectively mediate the effect of transactional leadership on organizational citizenship behaviors and also the effect of transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behaviors providing support for Hypothesis 3.2 (work attitudes and motivation mediate the relationship between leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors in nonprofit organizations). Transactional leadership and transformational leadership were only significant predictors of
organizational citizenship behavior when ignoring the mediator variables, once the effect of the mediator variables was taken into account, there was no longer a direct effect.

Summary of All Results

Hierarchical multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to determine if a significant relationship between transactional and transformational leadership and work outcomes (turnover and organization citizenship behaviors). Overall results of the data analysis do not support the first set of hypotheses. Regarding intention to turnover, although the full model is significant, neither transactional leadership nor transformational leadership are significant predictors if the effects of all of the other independent variables are held constant. Regarding organizational citizenship behaviors, although the full model is significant, only transactional leadership was found to be a significant predictor if all of the other independent variables are held constant, and that was only at the p<.10 level. Unexpectedly, however, this relationship is negative—as transactional leadership increases, organizational citizenship behaviors decrease. The bivariate relationship was also positive (r=.25) so it should be noted that the change in sign may be a result of suppression.

Additional hierarchical multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to determine if significant relationships existed between transactional and transformational leadership and each of the eight work attitudes and motivation. Results of the data analysis provide limited support for the second set of hypotheses. While the full models were significant for each work attitude, only the relationship between transactional leadership and transformational leadership and procedural justice turned out as expected while holding all other independent variables constant. Transactional leadership and transformational leadership were not found to be significant predictors for work and meaning, job-related stress, and role stressors while holding all other independent variables constant. Transactional leadership was a significant predictor of perceived organizational support, affective commitment, procedural justice, and continuance commitment. Transformational leadership was a significant predictor of job satisfaction, perceived
organizational support, and procedural justice. Unexpectedly, neither transactional leadership nor transformational leadership were significant predictors of public service motivation. It is worthwhile to note that transactional leadership and transformational leadership have a bivariate correlation of .74, which is a high correlation, and may be a potential explanation for why not much support was found for the first two sets of hypotheses.

Finally, mediation analyses was conducted to determine if work attitudes and motivation mediate the relationship between transactional and transformational leadership styles and work outcomes (turnover and organizational citizenship behaviors). Results indicate support of the third set of hypotheses. Affective commitment, job stress, satisfaction, and procedural justice collectively fully mediate the effect of transactional leadership on turnover and also fully mediate the effect of transformational leadership on turnover. Work and meaning, perceived organizational support, and public service motivation collectively fully mediate the effect of transactional leadership on organizational citizenship behaviors and also fully mediate the effect of transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behaviors. These findings provide a depiction of the impact of leadership style on work attitudes, motivation, and work outcomes among employees of nonprofit organizations in Virginia. The interpretations of the results, findings related to the literature, implications of the study, recommendations for further research, and limitations of the study are presented in Chapter Five.
Chapter 5

Discussion

Introduction

This final dissertation chapter provides a summary of the study and a detailed discussion of the research data presented in the previous section. The chapter is organized into a summary of the study, interpretations of the results and findings related to the literature, implications of the study, limitations of the study, and recommendations for further research. Final concluding remarks will also be presented.

Summary of the Study

Retention of employees in the nonprofit sector is a serious concern, particularly in the U.S. where nonprofit organizations account for a substantial and increasing share of the workforce (Ban et al., 2003; Benz, 2005; Guo et al., 2011; Seldon & Sowa, 2015; Walk et al., 2014; Word, 2014). What can be done to prevent costs associated with turnover in the nonprofit sector? In an effort to provide answers to that question this study, through multivariate statistical analysis procedures this study investigated the impact of transactional and transformational leadership style on work attitudes (work and meaning, perceived organizational support, managerial trustworthiness, procedural justice, organizational commitment, job stress, role stressors, and job satisfaction), motivation (public service motivation), and work outcomes (turnover intentions and organization citizenship behaviors) in nonprofit organizations. An extensive examination of the empirical literature provided the foundation and context for the current study.

This current study aimed to fill the existing gaps in the nonprofit literature around the impact of transformational leadership and by extending and building upon the literature addressing these topics in the for-profit and public sectors, this study sought to quantitatively test two theories in the context of the nonprofit sector: transformational leadership and public service motivation. The following research questions guided the study: How does transformational
leadership influence work attitudes, worker motivation, and work outcomes in nonprofit organizations? Does a significant relationship exist between transformational and transactional leadership styles and work outcomes? Do transformational and transactional leadership styles exhibit differential effects on work attitudes and motivation in nonprofit organizations? Do work attitudes and motivation mediate the relationship between leadership and work outcomes? This study applied a web-based, cross-sectional survey design and utilized existing networks in Virginia to recruit participants with a sample size of 394 participants completing the 164-item survey through the Qualtrics platform to answer the research questions. Hierarchical multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to assess the first two sets of hypotheses and a mediation analysis was conducted to assess the third set of hypotheses. As presented in the previous chapter, overall results of the data analysis do not support the first set of hypotheses but there was partial support found for the second set of hypotheses, and full support found for the third set of hypotheses. The next section provides detailed descriptions of the interpretation of results and the findings related to the literature.

**Interpretation of Results/Findings Related to the Literature**

Despite some of the mixed results, this study makes several contributions to the nonprofit literature. The results of this study are not consistent with the findings in the research literature which indicated transformational leadership influenced turnover intentions. The study results are not consistent with the empirical studies that found that transformational leadership was a significant influencer of organizational citizenship behaviors. This study presents initial evidence of the relationship between public service motivation and organizational citizenship behaviors in the nonprofit context. No previous studies examined work and meaning as a predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors and this study can add to the body of literature regarding these constructs as work and meaning was found to be a predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors in this study. While the full models were significant for each work attitude, only the relationship between transactional leadership and transformational leadership and procedural
justice turned out as expected based on previous findings in the research literature (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Transformational leadership was not found to be a significant predictor of public service motivation as anticipated from the literature review of these variables in the public sector and the nonprofit sector. Affective commitment, job stress, satisfaction, and procedural justice collectively fully mediate the effect of transactional leadership on turnover and also fully mediate the effect of transformational leadership on turnover. Work and meaning, perceived organizational support, and public service motivation collectively fully mediate the effect of transactional leadership on organizational citizenship behaviors and also fully mediate the effect of transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behaviors. It is worthwhile to note that transactional leadership and transformational leadership have a bivariate correlation of .74, which is a high correlation, and may be a potential explanation for why not much support was found for the first two sets of hypotheses. Additionally as indicated in the results section, some of the results should be interpreted with caution as suppression may be a factor. The following pages provide a detailed discussion of the specific themes of the study.

*Leadership and Turnover in the Nonprofit Sector*

Although the full model examining influencers of intention to turnover was significant, surprisingly, neither transactional leadership nor transformational leadership are significant predictors of turnover if the other independent variables are held constant. While there were limited studies examining the impact of transformational leadership on turnover intentions, the results of this study are not consistent with the findings in the research literature which indicated transformational leadership influenced turnover intentions (Baruch & Ramalho, 2006; Nguni et al, 2006). When examining the hierarchical step in which only transactional and transformational leadership variables were in the model, there was limited support of Bass (1985) and Bass and Riggio’s (2006) assertion that transactional leadership is augmented by transformational leadership and transformational leadership accounts for unique variance beyond what is
accounted for by transactional leadership. It appears that this assertion holds true in the nonprofit context and confirms the findings of Rowold and Rohmann (2009).

The mediation analysis results support the findings based on the results of the previous hierarchical multiple linear regression models (Model 1.1). Transactional and transformational leadership were found to be significant predictors of turnover when ignoring the other independent variables (confirmed by the initial steps in the mediation analysis) but once the other variables were entered into the model transactional and transformational leadership were no longer significant predictors of turnover (confirmed by the final steps in the mediation analysis). Affective commitment, job stress, satisfaction, and procedural justice collectively fully mediate the effect of transactional leadership on turnover and also fully mediate the effect of transformational leadership on turnover.

*Work Attitudes and Motivation Influencing Turnover in the Nonprofit Sector*

Mixed results were found regarding the influence of various work attitudes and motivation on intention to turnover. Consistent with the research literature, job satisfaction (Benz, 2005; Chen, 2011; Kang, 2014; Moynihan & Pandey, 2007; Park & Rainey, 2008), affective commitment (Freund, 2005; Mattieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer and Allen, 1997), procedural justice (Colquitt et al., 2001; Ko & Hur, 2014) and job stress (Firth et al., 2003; Tate et al., 1997) were found to be significant predictors of turnover. Meaning in work (Steger et al., 2012), perceived organizational support (Allen et al., 2003; Firth et al., 2003; Leung & Lee, 2006; Ko & Hur, 2014), and role stressors (Firth et al., 2003; Tate et al., 1997) were not found to be predictors of turnover as anticipated by the review of previous studies. Studies examining public service motivation were mixed regarding the relationship between public service motivation and turnover intentions. Naff & Crumm (1999) and Park & Rainey (2008) found a significant relationship while Bright (2008) did not, so this study is in line with the latter, as public service motivation was not found to be a significant predictor of turnover intentions. There may be other variables impacting the relationship between public service motivation and turnover intentions in the
nonprofit sector, such as person-organization fit, which is the congruence between individual characteristics (skills, values, goals) and organizational characteristics (resources, culture, values) (Bright, 2008). Future research should include some measure of person-organization fit to better understand the functioning of public service motivation on turnover intentions in the nonprofit context.

Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in the Nonprofit Sector

The study results are not consistent with the empirical studies that found that transformational leadership was a significant influencer of organizational citizenship behaviors (Asgari et al., 2008; Jung & Lee, 2000; Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Yun et al., 2007). Furthermore, the fact that transactional leadership was found to have a negative relationship with organizational citizenship is in direct opposition to the findings of Jung and Lee (2000). Although the full model is significant, only transactional leadership was found to be a significant predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors, and that was only at the p<.10 level. Unexpectedly, however, this relationship is negative—as transactional leadership increases, organizational citizenship behaviors decrease. It should be noted that in the first two steps of the hierarchical regression model, transactional leadership was positively associated with organizational citizenship behaviors, but in the fully specified model the relationship changed to a negative one. The bivariate relationship was positive (r=.25) and in the mediation analysis (Model 3.3) transactional leadership has a positive indirect relationship with organizational citizenship behaviors. The change in sign may be a result of suppression so this should be interpreted with caution.

The mediation analysis results support the findings based on the results of the previous hierarchical multiple linear regression models (Model 1.2). Transactional and transformational leadership were found to be significant predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors when ignoring the other independent variables (confirmed by the initial steps in the mediation analysis) but once the other variables were entered into the model transactional and transformational
leadership were no longer direct significant predictors of turnover (confirmed by the final steps in the mediation analysis). Work and meaning, perceived organizational support, and public service motivation collectively fully mediate the effect of transactional leadership on organizational citizenship behaviors and also fully mediate the effect of transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behaviors. Podsakoff et al. (1996) found that job satisfaction mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors and Podsakoff et al. (2000) found that procedural justice mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors, but in this study these results were not confirmed. The work of Podsakoff et al. (1996) and Podsakoff et al. (2000) was in the private sector so perhaps the variables interact in a different way in the nonprofit environment. Not many studies examined for this dissertation explored the role of mediator variables on organizational citizenship behaviors in the context of the nonprofit sector so even though this study could not confirm the findings of Podsakoff et al. (1996) and Podsakoff et al. (2000) results do provide new information for the sector regarding the role of work and meaning, perceived organizational support, and public service motivation in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors. None of the examined studies explored the role of public service motivation in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors so this is another exciting finding. Work Attitudes and Motivation Influencing Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the Nonprofit Sector

Mixed results were found regarding the influence of various work attitudes and motivation on organizational citizenship behaviors. Consistent with the research literature perceived organizational support (Hopkins, 2012) and public service motivation (Kim, 2006; Pandey, Wright, & Moynihan, 2008; Steen, 2008) were found to be significant predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors. However, the previous findings were in the public service context, so this study presents initial evidence of the relationship between public service motivation and organizational citizenship behaviors in the nonprofit context. No previous studies
examined work and meaning as a predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors and this study can add to the body of literature regarding these constructs as work and meaning was found to be a predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors in this study. Procedural justice (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Moorman et al., 1993; Organ, 1988, 1990; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Smith et al., 1983) and roles stressors (Eatough et al., 2011) were not found to be predictors of turnover as anticipated by the review of previous studies.

Influence of Transactional and Transformational Leadership on Work Attitudes

Results of the data analysis provide limited support for the second set of hypotheses regarding the relationship between leadership style and work attitudes. An examination across all nine models reveals that transactional leadership is a significant predictor at the p<.05 level of perceived organizational support, procedural justice, and role stressors and a significant predictor at the p<.10 level of affective commitment, and continuance commitment when controlling for the effect of all other independent variables. Contrary to suppositional expectations, transformational leadership did not emerge as significant predictor in most all of the work attitude. At the p<.05 level, transformational leadership style was a significant predictor of job satisfaction, procedural justice, and role stressors. At the p<.10 level, transformational leadership was a significant predictor of perceived organizational support.

While the full models were significant for each work attitude, only the relationship between transactional leadership and transformational leadership and procedural justice turned out as expected based on previous findings in the research literature (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Transactional leadership and transformational leadership were not found to be significant predictors for work and meaning (Arnold et al., 2008; Yasin Ghadi et al., 2013) and role stressors (Podskaoff et al., 2000) as indicated in the previous research findings. Regarding work and meaning, more research needs to be conducted in order to determine whether work and meaning develops because meaningful workers are attracted to particular organizations due to their mission or if work and meaning is something that can be fostered by organizational leadership.
From this study it does not appear that leadership style fosters work and meaning. The majority of studies examined for this dissertation focused on transformational leadership as the main leadership style variable of interest so there is not much in the field regarding the influence of transactional leadership on perceived organizational support, affective commitment, procedural justice, and continuance commitment so the results of this study can add knowledge to the field. Consistent with the findings in the literature, transformational leadership was a significant predictor of job satisfaction\(^5\). While this is not a new finding, it does add to the evidence of the influence of transformational leadership on job satisfaction in the nonprofit context. Contrary to previous studies, transformational leadership was not found to be a significant predictor of organizational commitment in this study.\(^6\) Unexpectedly, transactional leadership has a negative relationship with affective commitment, as transactional leadership increases, levels of affective commitment decrease. The bivariate relationship between transactional leadership and affective commitment was positive \((r=.45)\) so the change in sign is likely due to suppression so these results should be interpreted with caution. No previous studies reviewed for this dissertation demonstrated the influence of transformational leadership and perceived organizational support, and procedural justice in the nonprofit context and this study can add to the body of literature regarding these constructs as transformational leadership was found to be a predictor of perceived organizational support, and procedural justice in this study.

*Perceived Organizational Support and Procedural Justice*

Looking across all of the multiple regression models, both transactional and transformational leadership seemed to matter most for perceived organizational support (Model 2.3) and procedural justice (Model 2.5) and it was only in these two models that both leadership

---

\(^5\) Bogler, 2001; Braun et al., 2013; Elkordy, 2013; Emery & Barker; Glisson & Derrick, 1998; Nguni et al., 2006; Moynihan et al., 2009; Park & Rainey, 2008; Podsakoff et al., 1996; Trottier et al., 2008; and Yun et al., 2007.

\(^6\) Avolio et al., 2004; Bycio et al., 1995; Elkordy, 2013; Emery & Barker, 2007; Glisson and Derrick, 1998; Podsakoff et al., 1996; Rowold et al., 2014.
styles remained significant predictors after the other independent variables were added in. With perceived organizational support, both leadership styles exhibited a positive relationship, with transactional leadership exhibiting stronger effects. With procedural justice, both exhibited a positive relationship but with transformational leadership having marginally stronger effects. In an organizational setting, transactional leaders lead their employees through a social exchange in contrast to transformational leaders who lead employees by simulating and inspiring them to accomplish prodigious outcomes (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transactional leadership involves contingent reward; the leader assigns what needs to be done by the follower and promises rewards offered in exchange for successfully completing the task (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Perceived organizational support refers to the employees’ perception regarding the extent to which the organization values their contribution to the organization and cares about their well-being, specifically, “employees develop global beliefs concerning the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being” (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986, p. 501). It makes sense that in a transactional leader relationship, if an employee receives a positive evaluation of their performance, whether it be praise or a tangible reward as part of a social exchange, their scores of perceived organizational support would increase more so than in a transformational leader relationship.

**Continuance Commitment**

Across all models, the model predicting continuance commitment had the lowest effect size ($r=.41$). While this is still classified as a medium effect according to Cohen (1988, 1992), it is lower than the other 10 regression models and only 17% of the variance in continuance commitment. The strongest predictors at the $p<.05$ level of continuance commitment were household income (negative) and years working in the nonprofit sector (positive), two control variables. Only two of the independent variables of interest were significant and only at the $p<.10$ level (transactional leadership and procedural justice). Continuance commitment refers to the awareness by the employee of the costs that would be associated with leaving the organization.
Meyer & Allen, 1991). Employees with high levels of continuance commitment remain working for the organization because they need to do so and not because they want to do so (Meyer & Allen, 1991). The antecedents of continuance commitment reflect the recognition of costs associated with leaving the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). It is understandable, then, that the strongest influencers out of the variables included in this study were household income and length of time in the sector. Other variables may impact continuance commitment that were not included in this study, such as a measure of perceived transferable skills, perceived confidence, perceived ability, investments made to the job and/or organization, or available alternatives (Guitierrez, Candela, & Carver, 2012; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997).

Influence of Transactional and Transformational Leadership on Motivation

The model predicting public service motivation did not perform as expected. Transformational leadership was not found to be a significant predictor of public service motivation as anticipated from the literature review of these variables in the public sector7 and the nonprofit sector8. In Model 2.9, transactional leadership alone was significant in step 1, but in step 2, with transactional and transformational leadership in the model together, the overall model was not significant. Adding in the work attitudes and control variables to transactional and transformational leadership in step 3 was significant. In the fully specified model, work and meaning (positive) and education (positive) were significant at the p<.05 level. At the p<.10 level, job satisfaction (negative), tenure at the organization, and household income were significant. Is it the case that since employees are motivated by the organizational mission or the desire to serve the public good then leadership does not matter much? Or is it the case that public service motivation is not a good fit for the nonprofit context? Further research exploring the role and applicability of public service motivation in the nonprofit context is warranted. Also, this

---

7 Park & Rainey, 2008; Moynihan et al., 2009; Podsakoff et al., 1996; Vandenabeele, 2014; Wright et al., 2012.
study analyzed an aggregated measure of public service motivation, perhaps one of the individual dimensions is a better fit for the nonprofit context and better predicted by transactional and transformational leadership styles.

*Relationships Between the Independent Variables*

Outside of the main relationships of interest there were some notable findings on the relationship between the independent variables. In Model 2.1, looking at variables predicting job satisfaction, surprisingly, public service motivation is found to be negatively related to job satisfaction. As public service motivation decreases, job satisfaction increases. The directionality was also confirmed in Model 2.9 with public service motivation as the dependent variable. As job satisfaction decreases, public service motivation increases. While a person loses the satisfaction they find in their job it appears that their motivation to serve the public good increases. Further investigation is needed to better understand this relationship. In Model 2.2, examining variables influencing work and meaning, unexpected result occurred regarding the positive relationship between job stress and work and meaning. The data reveals that as job stress increases so do the scores on the work and meaning inventory. The more stress an individual feels while working, the more meaning they find in their work is another way to look at this relationship. The directionality was also confirmed in Model 2.7 with the dependent variable being job stress, as work and meaning increase so does job stress. Perhaps if individuals identify their work as meaningful then maybe that adds stress to their job in wanting to fulfill their meaningful work mission.

*Effects of Control Variables*

Regarding the control variables, across all models education level and household income were the most consistent significant predictors. Education level was a significant predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors (negative), job stress (negative), role stressors (positive), and public service motivation (positive) at the p<.05 level and satisfaction (negative) at the p<.10 level. Household income was a significant predictor of continuance commitment (negative) and
role stressors (positive) at the p<.05 level and public service motivation (negative) at the p<.10. Fitting with theory and construct development it stands to reason that as household income decreases, continuance commitment increases. Continuance commitment refers to the awareness by the employee of the costs that would be associated with leaving the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Employees with high levels of continuance commitment remain working for the organization because they need to do so (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Across all models, age and years worked at the organization were the least significant across all of the multiple regression models. Age was only a significant positive predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors (p<.05) and organizational tenure was only a significant positive predictor of affective commitment (p<.05).

**Effect Size**

One of the strengths of the study is the effect size of the multiple linear regression models. While statistical significance testing assesses the reliability of the association of the dependent variables and the independent variables, effect size quantifies the magnitude of how much association exists between the dependent variables and the independent variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2009). With large sample sizes, statistical significance will almost always be found, but very small differences even if significant, can often be meaningless from the practical perspective (Field, 2013). With the exception of continuance commitment (r=.41) all of the models exhibited large effect sizes, with overall r-values ranging between .52 and .88 indicating not only statistical significance but that the findings hold practical significance as well. The independent variables explain anywhere from 27% to 77% of the variance in the models.

**Distinctiveness of the Sample**

It is important to consider the nature of the study sample (both individual and organizational characteristics) when reflecting on the interpretation of results and discussion. The sample is fairly evenly distributed by age but with the slight majority of participants under the age of 45 (51.5%) compared to participants over the age of 46 (48.5%). The majority of survey respondents were female (85%) but this sample fairly matches the demographics of the nonprofit
sector in the US, which is estimated between 67%-68% female (Benz, 2005; Leete, 2006; Word, 2014). Historically the nonprofit labor force has been dominated by women as many of the activities associated with the nonprofit sector are in health and human services where it is estimated that 75% of the jobs in these service industries are in female-dominated occupations (Burbridge, 1994; Gibelman, 2000). The majority of survey respondents were white (90.1%) which matches the makeup of the nonprofit workforce estimated at 83.8% but is higher than the white population in Virginia of 70% (Leete, 2006; US Census, 2016). Regarding education, 82.2% of respondents indicated they possessed a bachelor’s degree or beyond, which is much higher than the 42% reported by Leete (2006). The sample is distinct in regards to a high level of education which may have some bearing on the findings of this study. Approximately 26% of respondents have been employed in the nonprofit sector less than 5 years and 56.9% of respondents were employed by their current organization for less than 5 years (in itself this may illustrate the turnover issue in the nonprofit sector). Organizational characteristics collected of the sample include nonprofit type and organizational budget size. Not surprisingly, 49.2% of respondents worked for a human service nonprofit organization and the second highest frequency was 13.7% indicating they worked for a health organization. According to Collins (2011) over one-third of nonprofit organizations are in the human service category followed by 13% in the health care category. Examining the organizational characteristics by budget size reveals that 39.1% had operational budgets between $500,000 and $2,000,000. There is potential that the findings are a result of some uncontrolled preexisting difference between groups.

Implications for Leadership in the Nonprofit Context

An examination across all 11 multiple regression models reveals that transactional leadership is a significant predictor at the $p<.05$ level of perceived organizational support and procedural justice, and a significant predictor at the $p<.10$ level of organizational citizenship behaviors, affective commitment, and continuance commitment when controlling for the effect of
all other independent variables. Contrary to suppositional expectations, transformational leadership did not emerge as significant predictor in most all of the work attitude and motivation models. At the p<.05 level, transformational leadership style was a significant predictor of job satisfaction, procedural justice, and role stressors. At the p<.10 level, transformational leadership was a significant predictor of perceived organizational support. In looking across the four mediation models, transactional and transformational leadership were only significant predictors of turnover and organizational citizenship behaviors when ignoring the mediators, once the effect of the mediators were taken into account, there was no longer a direct effect.

This study illustrated through mediation analysis that transactional and transformational leadership style do not have a direct relationship with turnover but rather operate indirectly through affective commitment, job stress, satisfaction, and procedural justice. If an employee exhibits positive emotional attachment to the organization, leadership style did not have any direct effect on their turnover intentions; instead, leadership style indirectly influenced turnover intentions through affective commitment. Mediation analysis also illustrated that transactional and transformational leadership do not have a direct relationship with organizational citizenship behaviors but rather operates indirectly through work and meaning, perceived organizational support, and public service motivation. For example, if workers were getting what they needed and desired from their supervisors and managers (perceived organizational support) they were feeling content and personally rewarded; therefore, the leadership style did not have any direct effects on their engagement in organizational citizenship behaviors but rather leadership style indirectly affected organizational citizenship behaviors through perceived organizational support.

Although these effects are indirect, it does not mean they are of lesser importance. Since the effects are largely indirect, models that measure only direct effects, may fail to capture the importance of leadership style on employee behavior. This study found that transformational leadership can influence affective commitment, satisfaction, job stress, and procedural justice, and through these factors, can decrease turnover in nonprofit organizations. Additionally,
transformational leadership can influence work and meaning, perceived organizational support, and public service motivation, and through these factors, increase organizational citizenship behaviors.

Therefore, nonprofit organizations would benefit from incorporating leadership training for their managers and supervisors. Transformational leadership should be incorporated into all phases of employment: the hiring process, the promotion process, and training (Braun et al., 2013). Research has demonstrated that transformational leadership can be taught and learned (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Braun et al., 2013). Training nonprofit managers on transformational leadership style is likely to enhance affective commitment, job satisfaction, and procedural justice which in turn are likely to influence turnover within the organization. Likewise, with respect to developing organizational citizenship behaviors, transformational leadership style training is likely to influence work and meaning, perceived organizational support, and public service motivation which is likely to increase organizational citizenship behaviors in the nonprofit sector. Transformational leadership interventions might involve designing meaningful work tasks and linking team roles to better align with employees perceptions, skills, and interests as well as linking individual goals with the goals of the organization in order to increase affective commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Yasin Ghadi, Fernando, & Caputi, 2011). Additionally, transformational leaders might alter the way job stress is perceived amongst employees by reframing stressors as challenges to tackle rather than obstructive hindrances as a way to reduce job-stress induced turnover (Picollo & Colquitt, 2006). Transformational leadership can be developed and has important implications for the recruitment, selection, and retention of employees in nonprofit organizations (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Recognizing the importance of perceived organizational support on organizational citizenship behaviors, nonprofit leaders should focus on implementing supportive human resource practices and policies (ex. participation in decision-making, fairness of rewards, and growth opportunities) (Asgari et al., 2008; Hopkins, 2011). A meta-analysis revealed that the human resource practices
concerning promotion, participation, and job enrichment are the most influential practices leaders should implement for improving employees work attitudes (Kooij, Jansen, Dikkers, & Lange, 2010). A study conducted by Selden and Sowa (2015) found that four of the high performance work practices were associated with decreasing turnover intentions in nonprofit organizations: onboarding, leadership succession, compensation, and employee relations.

*Implications for Turnover in the Nonprofit Context*

Knowing what are the most important contributors to turnover, interventions that target these particular issues may be important for managers to implement in their organization (Mor Barak et al., 2001). In this study, affective commitment, job stress, job satisfaction, and procedural justice were found to be significant predictors of intention to turnover. The decision to leave one's job often follows from the intention to quit so managers and supervisors might benefit from periodic monitoring of their employees’ feelings of job satisfaction (Mor Barak et al., 2001). As consistent with the previous literature, job satisfaction was demonstrated to be a significant predictor of turnover intentions in the nonprofit context. While this is not necessarily new information for the field, it is still valuable information for nonprofit leaders to consider and strategize how job satisfaction in their organizations can be reduced. Mitchel et al. (2001) recommends that managers routinely assess job satisfaction and organizational commitment and to “make the gathering and public feedback of these data part of the organizational culture” and “be prepared to make changes based on these findings” (p. 105). Nonprofit leaders may increase job satisfaction by providing education to upgrade employee’s job skills and enhance self-confidence as a way to reduce emotional exhaustion; provide a comprehensive orientation program to assist workers in forming a clear idea of their job role and a more complete understanding of the environment in which they work; and promote a sense of community to help create support from both peers and supervisors (Kalliath & Morris, 2002).

Affective commitment was the strongest influence of turnover intentions; as affective commitment increased, turnover intentions decreased. From a practical standpoint organizational
leaders would benefit from aiming to increase the levels of affective commitment of their employees. Meyer and Allen (1991) define affective commitment as the employee’s emotional attachment to the organization, their identification with the organization, and their involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment continue to work for their organization because they want to do so (Meyer & Allen, 1991). There are various strategies for nonprofit leaders to implement that may increase affective commitment:

- Implement high commitment human resource practices (also known as high performance work practices) which are associated with the development of affective commitment in employees (Kooij et al., 2010). High commitment human resource practices include: job security, staffing and selection, rewards and benefits, performance management (including performance appraisal and pay), participation (including empowerment and grievance/suggestion schemes), information sharing (including communication), working in teams (including cooperation), work/life policies, and flexible work schemes (Kooij et al., 2010).
- Link individual goals with goals of the organization (Meyer and Allen, 1991).
- Align team roles with each employees skills and interests whenever possible (Meyer and Allen, 1991).
- Use motivational assessment scales exist to ensure task alignment (Meyer and Allen, 1991).
- Help employees to become emotionally connected to the organization by helping employees flourish and encouraging employees to thrive in order to help them enjoy the work they are doing (Meyer and Allen, 1991).
- Give praise and approval regularly and create a healthy workplace so that people are happy and productive (Meyer and Allen, 1991; Eisenberger et al., 1986).
- Increase team management and leadership skills which can help reduce employees’ reliance and dependence on continuance commitment (Meyer and Allen, 1991).
- Put a feedback mechanism in place by asking supervisors, managers, and directors to ask their employees positively framed, open-ended questions such as ‘what do you think are the best things about working here?’ and ‘what can we do to make it even better for you to work here?’ are additional potential strategies to increase organizational commitment (Gutierrez, Candela, & Carver, 2012). These types of open-ended questions can help identify the type and strength of organizational commitment as well as serve as a method to establish rapport and to make staff partners in creating a better workplace (Gutierrez, Candela, & Carver, 2012). The latter question can also help to reverse the feeling of a lack of perceived organizational support especially after employees begin to see changes being implemented.
- Create an “open” organizational learning culture that fosters teamwork, collaboration, and creativity where employees feel free to express their opinions, listen to other’s viewpoints, ask questions, and provide feedback which will help foster organizational commitment and satisfaction (Joo & Park, 2009). Within this organizational learning culture, assist managers and leaders in adopting new organizational roles as coaches and mentors through which they can provide
opportunities for employees to reach their potential and motivate them to pursue diverse tasks with the ultimate goal of increasing organization commitment (Joo & Park, 2009; McLean, 2006).

- Utilize socialization tactics to help new employees develop relationships with other employees in the organization to help “embed” the new employees in a “web of connections binding them to the organization” (Allen & Shanock, 2013, p. 364). Socialization tactics also help develop perceived organizational support (Allen & Shanock, 2013).

Job stress was the second strongest significant predictor of turnover intentions in nonprofit organizations. As job stress increases so do turnover intentions. Nonprofit leaders should seek to investigate individual causes of job stress in more detail in order to determine the most effective strategies. A brief survey could be developed to collect more specific information and be administered either through online platforms, paper/pencil version, or a face-to-face meeting with a supervisor or manager. Organizational leaders should consider what support or services are currently available for employees feeling emotionally drained, burned out, frustrated, and tense and consider ways to expand these services or implement new and expanded services. Consider awareness, access, and any barriers to employee use of the services. Management initiatives (ex. provision of relief time for staff to recover from negative customer/client encounters) that address factors associated with emotional exhaustion could also ultimately lead to a reduction in turnover (Deery et al., 2002). Organizations could implement a “recovery” training program to help employees recover from job stress and stressful work situations by increasing levels of psychological detachment, the ability for relaxation, capacity for control during job off-time, recovery self-efficacy, and improve sleep quality as demonstrated in the literature among public and private sector employees (Hahn, Binnewies, Sonnentag, & Mojza, 2011). Another intervention to consider for implementation is a psychological capital training session which has been demonstrated to increase efficacy, optimism, hope, and resilience to enable employees to effectively manage their job stress and protect them from negative stress symptoms (Avey, Luthans, & Jensen, 2009). Role stressors were found to be a significant predictor of job stress in this study. Reducing the stressors (work overload, work-life conflict, and
role conflict) identified above would also have the potential to impact employee levels of job stress. Organizations should consider policies that facilitate work-life balance and work-family enrichment, such as flextime, compressed workweek schedules, and telecommuting, which helps establish a supportive work environment mitigating role stressors and job stress and ultimately leading to increased job satisfaction and reduced turnover (McNall, Masuda, & Nicklin, 2009). Additionally, in this study job stress was the most significant predictor of job satisfaction so this strategy may potentially impact employee levels of job satisfaction as well. Another recommendation would be to explore the notion of job rotation or cross-training which has been found to influence satisfaction, role stress, job stress, and organizational commitment in health and human service organizations (Ho, Chang, Shih, & Liang; 2009). Job rotation not only allows for employees to learn job skills across different departments and broaden employee’s work experiences and skills, but has been demonstrated to reduce job fatigue, increase enthusiasm and improve morale in the private sector so there is potential for translational effects in the nonprofit sector (Ho et al., 2013; Jorgenson, Kotowski, Aedla, & Dunning, 2005; Triggs & King, 2000).

While this study utilized intentions to turnover rather than actual turnover data, it would be a beneficial practice for nonprofit organizations to calculate actual turnover rates for all positions throughout the organization in order to develop a baseline measure and further define the issue. From that data nonprofit leaders could explore the following questions: Do certain positions within the organization have higher turnover than others? Why do these positions have a higher turnover rate? What can be done at an organizational level to decrease turnover? Exploring human resource practices of the organization may also be beneficial and further elucidate this issue (explore how employees are selected for hire, what criteria are utilized, how is best-fit ensured? are exit interviews conducted? etc.). Developing a comprehensive and effective retention plan may help nonprofit organizations retain their best employees (Mitchell et al., 2001). Retention is not accomplished solely through money—a variety of on-the-job and off-the job factors are considered when developing a retention plan (Mitchell et al., 2001). Nonprofit
leaders could consider assessing both indirect (actual) and direct (perceived) measures of person-organization which is broadly defined as the compatibility between employees and the organization for which they work (Kristof, 1996). P-O fit has been linked to satisfaction, organizational commitment, job-stress, prosocial behaviors (organizational citizenship behaviors), and turnover intentions in the public and private sectors (Bright, 2007; Brown & Yoshioka, 2003; Kristof, 1996; Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Liu, Liu, & Hu, 2013; O’Reilly & Chapman, 1986).

Exploration of the concept of job embeddedness, defined by Mitchell et al. (2001) as the collection of factors that influence employee retention may also be beneficial. Mitchell et al. (2001) distinguished job embeddedness from turnover through emphasizing all of the factors that keep an employee on the job, rather than the psychological process one goes through when quitting a job (Mitchell et al., 2001; Reitz & Anderson, 2011). Mitchell et al. (2001) when introducing job embeddedness described the concept as consisting of three key components (links, fit, and sacrifice), each of which are important both on-the-job and off-the-job. Lee et al. (2004) further conceptualized the concept of job embeddedness as six dimensions: links, fit, and sacrifice between the employee and organization, and links, fit and sacrifice between the employee and the community. Links are the connections between a person and other people, groups, or organizations (Mitchell et al., 2001). Fit is the employee’s perception of their compatibility with the job, organization, and community. Sacrifice is the cost of what people have to give up to leave a job (Mitchell et al., 2001). Bergiel, Nguyen, Clenney, and Taylor (2009) asserted that human resource practices create the links, fit, and sacrifice that “embed” employees in their organization and prevent them from leaving their organization; therefore, managers should implement strategies based on the three dimensions of job embeddedness. Job embeddedness was found to fully mediate the relationship between compensation and turnover and partially mediate the relationship between supervisor support and turnover among public sector employees and warrants consideration for implementation in the nonprofit sector (Bergiel et al., 2009).
Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations inherent in this research study that need to be acknowledged and stated. This study employed a cross-sectional design which may constrain the strength of the casual inferences that can be made from these results thereby threatening internal validity (Creswell, 2009; Kumar, 2005; Newcomer et al., 2015; Polit & Beck, 2004). All of the data collected was self-reported and for some of the behavioral variables this may have led to higher scores as individuals may tend to rate themselves more favorably than a supervisor might rate them (for example, organizational citizenship behaviors). Data on all of the independent and dependent variables were collected from the same respondents so there is potential that some of the relationships may be inflated due to common-source/common-method bias. Podsakoff et al. (2003) recommended that to reduce common-source bias researchers should ensure anonymity in the survey administration, clearly communicate study goals, and improve items used to measure the constructs; this study followed those recommendations (Pandey et al., 2008). Podsakoff et al. (2003) additionally recommend utilizing well-tested and validated scales in order to reduce item ambiguity; all of the scales used in this research meet that criteria (Pandey et al., 2008). Based on past research, the way in which the data was analyzed in this study infers direction of causality, so the potential for plausible reverse causality explanations exists. Another limitation of the current study pertains to the demographic characteristics of the sample. The type of sampling used for this research was convenience sampling, a non-random/non-probability sampling, that holds potential for selection bias in that there may be some preexisting difference between groups and the groups may be nonequivalent since there was no random assignment (Creswell, 2009; Kumar, 2005; Newcomer et al., 2015; Polit & Beck, 2004). The majority of survey respondents were female (85%) but this sample fairly matches the demographics of the nonprofit sector in the US, which is estimated between 67%-68% female (Benz, 2005; Leete, 2006; Word, 2014). Historically the nonprofit labor force has been dominated by women as many of the activities associated with the nonprofit sector are in health and human services where it is estimated that
75% of the jobs in these service industries are in female-dominated occupations (Burbridge, 1994; Gibelman, 2000). The majority of survey respondents were white (90.1%) which matches the makeup of the nonprofit workforce estimated at 83.8% but is higher than the white population in Virginia of 70% (Leete, 2006; US Census, 2016). Regarding education, 82.2% of respondents indicated they possessed a bachelor’s degree or beyond, which is much higher than the 42% reported by Leete (2006). There is potential that the findings are a result of some preexisting difference among groups. As noted throughout the result and discussion there are several instances where the direction of the relationship between variables flipped (when comparing bivariate relationship to multivariate relationship) so suppression may have been an influencing factor. Additionally, this study was limited to nonprofit employees in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Further exploration of transformational leadership in the nonprofit context needs to be conducted given that this study was not able to confirm several findings in the previous research literature regarding public and private sector employees. This study utilized the Transformational Leadership Behavior Inventory (TLI) developed by Podsakoff et al. (1990) and created an aggregated measure of transformational leadership similar to other studies in order to answer the research questions (Avolio, Zhu, Koh & Bhatia, 2004; Kim, 2011; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Jarvis, 2005; Podsakoff et al., 1990). Data has been collected on all six dimensions of the TLI: developing and articulating a vision, providing an appropriate role model, fostering the acceptance of group goals, high performance expectations, providing individualized support, and intellectual stimulation (Bass and Riggio, 2006; Podsakoff et al., 1990). It was outside the scope of this study to examine the dimensions separately but a future study could be conducted examining the influence of each dimension of transformational leadership on the outcome variables of interest in this study: turnover and organizational citizenship behaviors. Perhaps one
or more of the six dimensions will demonstrate an influence on the outcome variables that could not be discerned using the aggregated measure.

The field would benefit from further investigation of public service motivation in the context of the nonprofit sector. This study utilized an aggregated measure of public service motivation as a first exploratory look at the application of this construct in the nonprofit sector. Future research could disaggregate the construct and examine if any of the separate public service motivation dimensions impact turnover intentions. Public service motivation originally encompassed six dimensions: attraction to public-policy making, commitment to public interest, civic duty, social justice, self-sacrifice, and compassion (Perry, 1996). Perry (1996) found that the public interest and self-sacrifice dimensions were correlated at .89 and he conducted analysis combining these dimensions in a three-dimensional model: attraction to public policy making, commitment to civic duty and the public interest, and compassion. This study utilized the three-dimensional model of public service motivation and created an aggregated measure. Each of the three dimensions separately may have an impact on turnover intentions where the aggregated measure does not. Data has also been collected on the social justice dimension, and while Perry (1996) ultimately dropped this dimension based on theoretical definitions, social justice may be a better depiction of public service motivation in the nonprofit sector and warrants further study.

There is a need to further explore the relationship between transformational leadership and public service motivation. Does transformational leadership influence any of the separate dimensions of public service motivation? Further research could explore the six dimensions of transformational leadership with an aggregate measure of PSM as well as with the three separate dimensions of PSM.

Additional research around organizational citizenship behaviors in the nonprofit context is needed. Looking at organizational citizenship behaviors as an outcome variable, in addition to looking at the aggregated measure as in this current study, creating a model for each dimension to better understand how leadership, work attitudes, and motivation influence the specific
dimensions of interest would be a positive next step. In this study participants self-reported their perceptions of their engagement in organizational citizenship behaviors, which may be overinflated in the positive direction compared to a supervisor rating of the participants display of organizational citizenship behaviors. Future research would benefit from obtaining measures of organizational citizenship behaviors from supervisors rather than from the participants themselves. Future research to measure the benefits of organizational citizenship behaviors and assess the link between organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational performance would also be beneficial and hold practical implications for the field. Based on the findings regarding organizational citizenship behaviors, nonprofit management practices would be encouraged to include identifying, recruiting, and selecting individuals with a predilection to exhibit organizational citizenship behaviors (Organ et al., 2006). Organizational citizenship behaviors are a dimension of performance that result in positive outcomes for both organizations and staff members (Eatough et al., 2011; Gould-Williams et al., 2013). Organizational citizenship behaviors are linked to organizational performance and success in the research literature regarding the private sector (Organ, 1988; Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997; Podsakoff et al., 2000). Organ (1988) suggested that conceptually organizational citizenship behaviors make organizations more efficient and effective in that it “places more resources at the disposal of the organization and obviates the need for costly formal mechanisms to provide functions otherwise rendered informally by the OCB” (Organ & Konovsky, 1989, p. 157). Although, much of the research has been focused on the for-profit sector, given the unique challenges faced by nonprofit organizations, the key dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviors may be especially applicable to the nonprofit sector (Hopkins, 2002). Training and development procedures could be used to enhance the motivation and ability of nonprofit employees to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors (Organ et al., 2006).

Concluding Remarks
Despite the previously stated limitations, this study makes several substantial contributions to the nonprofit sector as well as the field of leadership studies. The influence of transactional and transformational leadership on perceived organizational support and procedural justice in the nonprofit context found in this study adds to the body of literature regarding these constructs. The current study results provide new information for the nonprofit sector regarding the role of work and meaning, perceived organizational support, and public service motivation in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors. Workers’ perceptions of organizational support, their belief that the organization cares about them, supports them, and values their contributions is positively related to their engagement in organizational citizenship behaviors in nonprofit organizations as evidenced by this study. Recognizing the importance of perceived organizational support on organizational citizenship behaviors, nonprofit leaders should focus on implementing supportive human resource practices and policies. Findings suggest that the more that nonprofit employees perceive their work to be meaningful the more likely they are to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors. This study presents initial evidence of the relationship between public service motivation and organizational citizenship behaviors in the nonprofit context. Nonprofit employees with high levels of public service motivation are more likely to be associated with engaging in organizational citizenship behaviors than individuals with lower levels of public service motivation. These findings suggest that having nonprofit employees with a high level of public service motivation would be an important factor for enhancing organizational citizenship behaviors. Organizational citizenship behaviors are linked to organizational performance and success in the private sector research literature; therefore, finding ways to increase organizational citizenship behaviors among employees would yield important implications for nonprofit organizations. Since nonprofit organizations are constantly tasked by their stakeholders to “do more with less”, increasing organizational citizenship behaviors may play an important role in organizational performance.

**Appendix**
Survey Instrument

Demographic Questions

What is your age?
- Under 25
- 26-35 years old
- 36-45 years old
- 46-55 years old
- 56-65 years old
- 66 years old and over

What is your gender?
- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to answer

Please specify your ethnicity.
- Hispanic or Latino
- Not Hispanic or Latino

Please specify your race.
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White
- Other (with free response text box)

What is your marital status?
- Married
- Widowed
- Divorced
- Separated
- Never Married

What is your total household income?
- Less than $10,000
- $10,000 to $19,999
- $20,000 to $29,999
- $30,000 to $39,999
- $40,000 to $49,999
- $50,000 to $59,999
- $60,000 to $69,999
- $70,000 to $79,999
- $80,000 to $89,999
- $90,000 to $99,999
- $100,000 to $149,999
- $150,000 or more

How long have you worked at your organization?
- Less than 5 years
6-10 years
11-15 years
16-20 years
21-25 years
26 years or more

What is the highest degree or level of school you have **completed**?
- Some high school, no diploma
- High school graduate, diploma or the equivalent (for example: GED)
- Some college credit, no degree
- Trade/technical/vocational training
- Associate degree
- Bachelor’s degree
- Master’s degree
- Doctoral degree
- Professional degree

Are you currently...?
- Employed full time
- Employed part time
- Unemployed looking for work
- Unemployed not looking for work
- Retired
- Student
- Disabled

Are you currently an employee of an organization in the nonprofit sector (not-for-profit, tax-exempt, or charitable organization; includes Institutions of Higher Education, K-12 Schools)?
- Yes
- No

What type of nonprofit organization do you work for?
- Arts, culture, and humanities, such as museums, symphonies and orchestras, and community theatres;
- Education and research, such as private colleges and universities, independent elementary and secondary schools, and noncommercial research institutions;
- Environmental and animals, such as zoos, bird sanctuaries, wildlife organizations, and land protection groups;
- Health services, such as hospitals, public clinics, and nursing facilities;
- Human services, such as housing and shelter, organizers of sport and recreation programs, and youth programs;
- International and foreign affairs, such as overseas relief and development assistance;
- Public and societal benefit, such as private and community foundations, civil rights organizations, civic, social, and fraternal organizations;
- Religion, such as houses of worship and their related auxiliary services
- Mutual/Membership Benefit, such as professional societies and associations, fraternal societies, and pension and retirement funds; and
- Unknown

Total number of years worked in the nonprofit sector (not-for-profit, tax-exempt, or charitable organization; includes Institutions of Higher Education, K-12 Schools)
Less than 5 years
6 to 10 years
11 to 15 years
16 to 20 years
21 to 25 years
26 years or more
I have never worked in the nonprofit sector

All response options for the items below will be in a 5-point scale (1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree).
The items are grouped by construct. The scale names/authors will not be included in the Qualtrics survey.

**Turnover Intentions**—Kelloway, Gotlieb, & Barham (1999)
I am thinking about leaving this organization.
I am planning to look for a new job.
I intend to ask people about new job opportunities.
I don’t plan to be in this organization much longer.

**Global Job Satisfaction**—Hackman & Oldham (1976)
Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my job.
I am generally satisfied with the feeling of worthwhile accomplishment I get from doing this job.
I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in this job.

**The Work and Meaning Inventory (WAMI)**—Steger (2011)
I have found a meaningful career.
I view my work as contributing to my personal growth.
My work really makes no difference to the world.
I understand how my work contributes to my life’s meaning.
I have a good sense of what makes my job meaningful.
I know my work makes a positive difference in the world.
My work helps me better understand myself.
I have discovered work that has a satisfying purpose.
My work helps me make sense of the world around me.
The work I do serves a greater purpose.

**Perceived Organizational Support (POS)**—Eisenberger (1986)
The organization values my contribution to its well-being.
The organization fails to appreciate any extra effort from me.
The organization would ignore any complaint from me.
The organization really cares about my well-being.
Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to notice.
The organization cares about my general satisfaction at work.
The organization shows very little concern for me.
The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work.

**Stressors (role ambiguity, role conflict, work overload, and work-family conflict)**—Firth et al. (2003) adapted from Tate et al. (1997)
My job responsibilities are clear to me.
My job objectives are well-defined.
It is clear to me what others expect of me at my job.
At my job, I cannot satisfy everybody at the same time.
To satisfy some people at my job, I have to upset others.
At my job, I have to do things which should be done differently.
I am given enough time to do what is expected of me at my job.
It seems that I have more work at my job than I can handle.
My job requires I work very hard.
My job schedule interferes with my family life.
My job makes me too tired to enjoy my family life.
My job does not give me enough time for family activities.

Job stress (burnout, anxiety, and somatic complaints)—Firth et al. (2003) adapted from Tate et al. (1997)
I feel emotionally drained by my job.
I feel burned-out by my job.
I feel frustrated at my job.
I feel tense at my job.
I lose my appetite because of my job-related problems.
Job-related problems keep me awake at night.
Job-related problems make my stomach upset.

Affective Commitment Scale (ACS) and Continuance Commitment Scale (CCS)—Meyer & Allen (1984)
ACS
I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.
I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization.
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
I do not feel like “part of the family” at this organization.
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.

CCS
Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice—another organization may not match the overall benefits I have.
I feel I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.
One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.
It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided to leave my organization now.

Procedural Justice—Ko & Hur (2014)
Promotions in my work unit are based on merit.
I am satisfied with my involvement in decisions that affect my work.
I can disclose a suspected violation of any law, rule or regulation without fear of reprisal.
Managers communicate the goals and priorities of the organization.
My performance appraisal is a fair reflection of my performance.
In my work unit, steps are taken to deal with a poor performer who cannot or will not improve.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors—Podsakoff et al. (1990)
Altruism
I help other who have been absent.
I help others who have heavy work loads.
I help orient new people even though it is not required.
I willingly help others who have work-related problems.
I am always ready to lend a helping hand to those around me.

**Conscientiousness**
My attendance at work is above the norm.
I do not take extra breaks.
I obey company rules and regulations even when no one is watching.
I am one of my organization’s most conscientious employees.
I believe in giving an honest day’s work for an honest day’s pay.

**Sportsmanship**
I consume a lot of time complaining about trivial matters.
I always focus on what’s wrong, rather than the positive side.
I tend to make “mountains out of molehills”.
I always find fault with what the organization is doing.
I am the classic “squeaky wheel” that always needs greasing.

**Courtesy**
I take steps to try and prevent problems with other workers.
I am mindful of how my behavior affects other people’s jobs.
I do not abuse the rights of others.
I try to avoid creating problems for coworkers.
I consider the impact of my actions on coworkers.

**Civic Virtue**
I attend meetings that are not mandatory, but are considered important.
I attend functions that are not required, but help the company image.
I keep abreast of changes in the organization.
I read and keep up with organization announcements, memos, and so on.

**Public Service Motivation—Perry (1996)**

**Attraction to Policy Making**
Politics is a dirty word.
I respect public officials who can turn a good idea into law.
Ethical behavior of public officials is as important as competence.
The give and take of public policy making doesn't appeal to me.
I don't care much for politicians.

**Commitment to the Public Interest**
People may talk about the public interest, but they are really concerned only about their self-interest.
It is hard for me to get intensely interested in what is going on in my community.
I unselfishly contribute to my community.
Meaningful public service is very important to me.
I would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the whole community even if it harmed my interests.
An official's obligation to the public should always come before loyalty to superiors.
I consider public service my civic duty.

**Social Justice**
I believe that there are many public causes worth championing.
I do not believe that government can do much to make society fairer. (R)
If any group does not share in the prosperity of our society, then we are all worse off. I am willing to use every ounce of my energy to make the world a more just place. I am not afraid to go to bat for the rights of others even if it means I will be ridiculed.

Civic Duty
When public officials take an oath of office, I believe they accept obligations not expected of other citizens. I am willing to go great lengths to fulfill my obligations to my country. Public service is one of the highest forms of citizenship. I believe everyone has a moral commitment to civic affairs no matter how busy they are. I have an obligation to look after those less well off. To me, the phrase "duty, honor, and country" stirs deeply felt emotions. It is my responsibility to help solve problems arising from interdependencies among people.

Compassion
I am rarely moved by the plight of the underprivileged. Most social programs are too vital to do without. It is difficult for me to contain my feelings when I see people in distress. To me, patriotism includes seeing to the welfare of others. I seldom think about the welfare of people whom I don't know personally. I am often reminded by daily events about how dependent we are on one another. I have little compassion for people in need who are unwilling to take the first step to help themselves. There are few public programs that I wholeheartedly support.

Podsakoff et al. (1990)-Transformational Leadership Behavior Inventory (TLI)
Articulating a Vision
Has a clear understanding of where we are going
Paints an interesting picture of the future of our group
Is always seeking new opportunities for the organization
Inspires others with his/her plans for the future
Is able to get others committed to his/her dream

Provide an Appropriate Model
Leads by “doing” rather than simply by “telling”
Provides a good model for me to follow
Leads by example

Foster the Acceptance of Group Goals
Fosters collaboration among work groups
Encourages employees to be “team players”
Gets the group to work together for the same goal
Develops a team attitude and spirit among employees

High Performance Expectations
Shows that he/she expects a lot from us
Insists on only the best performance
Will not settle for second best

Providing Individualized Support
Acts without considering my feelings
Shows respect for my personal feelings
Behaves in a manner thoughtful of my personal needs
Teats me without considering my personal feelings

Intellectual Stimulation
Challenges me to think about old problems in new ways
Asks questions that prompt me to think
Has stimulated me to rethink the way I do things
Has ideas that have challenged me to reexamine some of basic assumptions about my work

Transactional Leadership- Contingent Reward Behavior Scale—Podsakoff et al. (1984)
Always gives me positive feedback when I perform well
Gives me special recognition when my work is very good
Commends me when I do a better than average job
Personally compliments me when I do outstanding work
Frequently does not acknowledge my good performance
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