

Stimulating Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) Research for Theory Development: Exploration of Leadership Paradigms

Abdu Ja'afaru Bambale, Dr. Faridahwati Mohd Shamsudin, Dr.
Chandrakantan A/L Subramaniam

College of Business, Universiti Utara Malaysia

Email: abdujafarubambale@yahoo.com, faridah@uum.edu.my, chandra@uum.edu.my

DOI Link: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v1-i3/100>

Published Date: 16 July 2011

Abstract

This paper synthesizes major leadership paradigms for the purpose of identifying possible ways of influencing Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) to improve the functioning of organizations. The leadership paradigms were extended to old and modern categories to provide for systematic understanding of their antecedents and potential influence patterns. The leadership approaches reported to have positive relationships with organizational citizenship behaviors include transformational leadership, charismatic leadership, and ethical leadership paradigms. We have found many modern leadership paradigms not to have been empirically investigated for possible relationships with OCB. This paper therefore discusses the dynamics and potentials for researches within the realms of the leadership paradigms and the OCB field.

Keywords: Leadership, Leadership Paradigm, Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

Introduction

Although a large number of researches were conducted on the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), there is still a wide range of research opportunities or gaps in the leadership field that need research attention to help further build the theory and literature of OCB and organizational behavior (OB). It has been found out, from the extensive leadership literature search of this paper, that there are many leadership paradigms, but only a few of them were researched for the purpose of establishing relationship with OCB. From the result of the content analysis of this paper, previous researches only established six leadership paradigms as having links with OCB. The leadership paradigms consist of: (1) transformational (Bass, 1985; Bennis, & Nanus, 1985; Burns, 1978; Conger, & Kanungo, 1987; Tichy, & DeVanna, 1986; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996); (2) charismatic leadership (Babcock-Roberson, & Strickland, 2010; Johnson, 2008; Sosik, 2005); (3) transactional leadership (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Howell, & Hall-Merenda, 1999; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Judge, & Piccolo, 2004); (4) ethical leadership (Adebayo, 2005; Bobek, & Hatfield, 2003);

Epstein, 1998; Piccolo, Greenbaum, Den Hartog, & Folger, 2010); (5) servant leadership (Ehrhart, 2004; Vondey, 2010; Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010) and (6) consideration dimension (Schnake, Cochran, & Dumler, 1995).

Considering the extant leadership approaches reported in the leadership literature, there is need for OCB research to explore possible relationships. This study presents a synthesis of major leadership paradigms and their relationships with some organizational and employee outcomes including the OCB. The contribution made by this paper did not exist in the extant leadership literature. This study, therefore, identifies new leadership-OCB research direction and opportunities for advancing leadership and OCB bodies of knowledge.

Conceptual Analysis of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Leadership

Organizational citizenship behavior has rapidly become one of the most extensively studied areas of applied psychology and organizational behavior (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Within the last forty four decades Katz (1964) found that organizations could not succeed by relying strictly on the performance of behaviors designated in job descriptions. Katz (1964) views organizational effectiveness to be dependent on the voluntary efforts of employees to take initiative in helping coworkers, voicing suggestions and protecting the organization. Smith, Organ, & Near (1983), on their own part, have conceptualized these discretionary behaviors as acts of citizenship undertaken to benefit some individuals or the organization. Organ (1988) has further described those discretionary behaviors as organization citizenship behaviors (OCBs) or the good soldier syndrome. Good soldier syndrome represents the willingness of people to invest effort and energy in their social environment beyond any formal requirement and with no expectation of formal rewards (Vigoda-Gadot, 2006).

Researchers have demonstrated that organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) make important contributions to individual, group and organizational effectiveness (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006). Organizational citizenship behaviors are particularly important as organizational contexts continue to become more uncertain and interdependent. In contexts and circumstances where it is difficult to formalize roles, organizations are heavily dependent on the efforts of employees to take initiative in displaying OCBs (Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007; Bowler, Halbesleben, & Paul, 2010). Organizational members exhibit a different levels of behaviors, from the minimum who does the least possible to justify membership to maximum those who go beyond expectations, engaging in extra-role behaviors to assist the organization in achieving its goals or to benefit others including employees and customers other than the actor (Van Dyne, Cummings, & Parks, 1995). Extra-role behaviors are therefore all discretionary behaviors that go beyond those measured by formal job evaluations, but are organizationally desirable.

Organ (1988) suggests that OCB is composed of five dimensions, namely: Altruism, Conscientiousness, Sportsmanship, Courtesy and Civic Virtue. Altruism consists of discretionary behaviors that aim at helping specific persons in face to face situations with an organizationally relevant task or problem. Conscientiousness refers to impersonal behaviors such as compliance with norms defining a good worker; it involves employees going beyond minimal requirements in carrying out their assigned tasks. Sportsmanship refers to behaviors of refraining from complaining about trivial matters or filing up petty grievances. Courtesy consists of actions such as consulting with others before taking decision, giving others advance notice, passing along information and issuing reminders to others. Civic virtue is concerned with keeping up with matters that affect the organization such as attending

meetings, contributing to discussions, and generally getting involved in organizational activities in order to assist and improve the organization (Schnake, Cochran, & Dumler, 1995). Civic virtue refers to as responsible participation in the political life of the organization (Graham, 1987). The OCBs are desirable because of their relationship with important organizational variables such as job satisfaction, system maintenance and productivity (Turnipseed, & Murkison, 1996). They went on to argue, based on their empirical findings, that managers may be able to foster OCB by creating or enhancing a positive work environment, rather than being forced to rely on the recruitment/selection process, or socialization to determine this behavior (Turnipseed, & Murkison, 1996).

Having discussed the concept of OCB, the other aspect of the paper is concerned with leadership paradigms. Leadership has been defined in different ways, but most definitions share the belief that it involves an influence process concerned with facilitating the performance of a collective task (Bambale, 2008). Literarily, a leader is a person who guides others toward a common goal and creating an environment in which other organizational members feel actively involved in the entire process. Leadership is typically a process of social influence, in which one or more persons affect one or more followers by clarifying what needs to be done, and providing the tools and motivation to accomplish set goals (Babcock-Roberson, & Strickland, 2010).

Leadership Paradigms and the Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs)

A lot of researches from prominent leadership authors have found consistently that leadership affects the followers' attitudes and performance (Avolio, & Yammarino, 2002; Bass, 2008; Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Lord, & Maher, 1993). The objective of this section is to specifically synthesize leadership paradigms that have significant relationship with OCBs. According to the literature search for this paper six leadership paradigms, namely transformational, transactional, charismatic, ethical, servant and consideration were empirically investigated vis-à-vis OCBs. They were all found to have positive relationship with OCBs.

Transformational Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs)

Burns (1978) defines transformational leadership as the process of pursuing collective goals through the mutual tapping of leader's and followers' motive bases towards the achievement of the intended change. Similarly, Bass (1985) defines transformational leadership as superior leadership performance that occurs when leaders broaden and elevate the interests of their employees, and inspire followers to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group. Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) state that transformational leaders motivate followers in three important ways (1) by increasing follower self-efficacy, (2) by facilitating followers' social identification with their group or organization, and (3) by linking the organization's work values to follower values. Many research findings about transformational leadership approaches have shown that leaders who articulate a vision have positive effects on employee attitudes, role clarity, and extra-role behaviors (Bass, 1985; Bennis, & Nanus, 1985; Burns, 1978; Conger, & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1977; Tichy, & DeVanna, 1986; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996). One variable that enhances transformational leadership is the display of self-sacrificial behaviors by the leader (Choi, & Mai-Dalton, 1999; De Cremer, & van Knippenberg, 2002, 2004; van Knippenberg, De Cremer, & Hogg, 2004; Yorges, Weiss, & Strickland, 1999). Transformational leadership studies suggest

that leaders' self-sacrificial behaviors influence followers by influencing norms of reciprocity (Choi, & Mai-Dalton, 1999), by projecting leaders as role models and by demonstrating the personal importance that leaders themselves attach to the vision (Shamir et al., 1993).

Transactional Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs)

Transactional leader behavior has been a focus of concern to some researchers for more than two decades (Avolio, Bass, Walumbwa, & Zhu, 2004). Transactional leadership helps followers identify what must be done to accomplish organizations' desired goals and objectives (Bass, 2008). In other words called contingent reward transactional (Walumbwa, Wu, & Orwa, 2008) transactional leaders provide tangible or intangible support and all forms of resources to followers in exchange for their efforts and performance, they specify rules of the game, and they set and maintain standards. Transactional leadership employs a series of rewards including pay increases and promotions, or punishment including disciplinary actions and job termination. The transactional leaders might not be successful when they could not control the rewards or punishments, or when the employees do not want the reward or act out of fear to avoid punishment (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003). Researchers have established that positive relationship exists between transactional leadership and followers' attitudes and behaviors (Bass et al., 2003; Howell, & Hall-Merenda, 1999; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000; Judge, & Piccolo, 2004; Podsakoff, Bommer, Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006; Walumbwa, Wu, & Ojode, 2004). Based on the extant literature, only a few numbers of researches were conducted to find relationship between transactional leadership and OCBs. Recent studies (Rubin, Bommer, & Bachrach, 2010; Walumbwa, Wu, & Orwa, 2008) found a significant relationship between contingent reward/ transactional leadership and OCBs.

Charismatic Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCBs)

Charismatic leaders emerge when social situation is stressed (Weber, 1922). Elaborating about conditions for the emergence of charismatic leaders, Shamir, House, & Arthur (1993) identified four situations as follows: (1) when situation threatens some important values, (2) when relationship between performance and goal accomplishment is unclear or ambiguous (3) when the situation is unstable, and (4) when the situation requires exceptional efforts. Avolio and Gibbons (1988) described charismatic leaders as those who influence followers through their use of symbols, images, stories and rhetoric to perform at extraordinary levels. They are leaders who typically stood for some cause, had a vision of a better future, and are most of times willing to sacrifice everything to prove to their followers how committed they are to achieving the vision. Charismatic leadership has an interwoven relationship with transformational leadership, of which some writers present them as one thing. Specifically, in view of the reviewed literature, there a few studies that examined charismatic leadership, independently not as a subset of transformational leadership with OCBs (Babcock-Roberson, & Strickland, 2010; Johnson, 2008; Sosik, 2005).

Ethical Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs)

The organizational crises and ethical scandals in business, government, sports, non-profits and even religious organizations have increased the motivation for research in ethics and ethical leadership (Brown, & Trevino, 2006). In attempt to define ethical leadership, (Brown, Trevino, & Harrison, 2005, p. 120) defined ethical leadership as "the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships,

and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making". Piccolo et al. (2010) explain that ethical leaders focus on moral values and fairness in all their decisions, consider the impact of organizational decisions on the external parties and clearly communicate to employees how their actions at work contribute to the overall goals of the organization. Ethical leadership therefore is about properly and morally influencing people in the right direction towards attaining organizational objectives. Such kind of leadership forms the foundation of effective performance and practices in organizations (Bambale, 2008). Research results (Adebayo, 2005; Bobek, & Hatfield, 2003; Epstein, 1998) reveal significant negative relationship between unethical attitudes and pro-social behavior. More recently, Piccolo et al. (2010) found that employees in jobs rated high in task significance who perceives their leaders to be ethical put more efforts in their jobs and engage more in organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs).

Servant Leadership

Greenleaf (1970) defines servant leadership as "a practical altruistic philosophy which supports people who choose to serve first, and then lead as a way of expanding service to individuals and institutions. Servant leadership encourages collaboration, trust, foresight, listening, and the ethical use of power and empowerment. De Sousa and Van Dierendonck, (2010) proposed that servant leadership is particularly suited for knowledge driven organizations because of its worker-centered and growth-oriented approach. Servant leaders have been found to be effective because the needs of followers are so looked after that they reach their full potential, hence perform at their best (McCrimmon, 2010). Furthermore, previous research findings have found significantly positive relationship between servant leadership and employee OCB (Ehrhart, 2004; Liden et al., 2008; Neubert, et al., 2008; Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010; Vondey, 2010). Despite the positive aspects of servant leadership, it was not without observed weaknesses. Bambale (2008); Bowie and Werhane (2005); McCrimmon (2010) concurred that serving people's needs alone in any social group creates the image of being slavish or subservient, not a very positive image, because people's interest is seen as an end in itself not a means to an end.

Consideration and Initiating Structure

Consideration and Initiating Structure were leadership dimensions or approaches that were argued to be different from contemporary theories of leadership that are vision-based (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999; Bass, 1985; Conger, Kanungo, 1988; Hunt, Boal, & Dodge, 1999; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993; Bass, 1985; Avolio, Bass, Walumbwa, & Zhu, 2004; Bligh, et al, 2010). These old leadership styles/dimensions have provided a strong framework on which most modern paradigms have used to theorize and expand the field of leadership. Consideration is the degree to which a leader shows concern and respect for followers, improve their welfare, appreciates their support and generally look after their personal needs while the Initiating Structure is the degree to which a leader defines and organizes his/her role and the roles of followers, establishes goals, provides structured orientation toward goal attainment and establishes well-defined patterns and channels of communication in the organization (Schreisheim, & Stogdill, 1975). Consideration was found to have a strong relation with follower satisfaction, motivation, and leader effectiveness. Initiating Structure, on the other hand has slightly stronger relation with leader job performance and group-organization performance. Furthermore, consideration was strongly related to satisfaction, motivation, and effectiveness (Judge et al., 2004). However, long before Judge et al. (2004),

consideration dimension was demonstrated to have significantly positive relationship with OCB (Schnake, Cochran, & Dumler, 1995).

Leadership Approaches with No Research Link to Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs): Exploring Possible Relationships

This section consists of synthesized leadership approaches that, from the paper's investigation, have not been explored in relation to OCB research. The leadership paradigms have been classified into old and modern categories. The classification of the leadership paradigms into old and modern categories was based on the Bryman (1992) differentiation of leadership styles. Bryman (1992) argues that in the old approaches, leadership was primarily concerned with the visions, innovation of the leader and learning in the organization. On the other hand, the new leadership approaches are concerned with motivation, inspiration, organizational commitment, empowerment, and stimulating extra performance from followers.

Old Leadership Approaches: Exploring Relationship with Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

The leadership approaches that have been categorized under the old leadership approaches include autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, bureaucratic, initiating structure and consideration. It is observable that most of the new or modern leadership paradigms have their roots from these old approaches. The old leadership approaches include autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles.

Autocratic, Democratic, & Laissez-faire Leadership Styles

Autocratic style of leadership is the one in which the manager retains as much power and decision-making authority as possible (Peterson, 1997). The manager does not consult employees, nor are they allowed to give any input (De Hoogh, & Den Hartog, 2008). Employees are expected to obey orders without receiving any explanations. Aronson (2001) describes despotic leadership which is a variation of autocratic leadership as leadership based on personal dominance and authoritarian behavior that serves the self-interest of the leader, and the leader is self-aggrandizing and exploitative of others. Despotic leaders are domineering, controlling, and vengeful (Bass, 1990; House, & Howell, 1992; Howell, & Avolio, 1992; McClelland, 1975). Precisely, autocratic leaders score low on the factor of consideration as identified by the Ohio State studies (Judge, Piccolo, & Ilies, 2004). Empirical evidence has further shown that autocratic leaders negatively influence group stability and effectiveness (Van Vugt, Jepson, Hart, & De Cremer, 2004), group climate, and feelings of being content and happy (Bass, 1990). This therefore means subsequent self-sacrificial behaviors including OCBs would be difficult to be influenced using the autocratic style of leadership (De Cremer, 2006). Although autocratic style might look rough, the style could produce desirable work behaviors in some unusual situations. It was found, for example, that directive leadership was more effective when trauma severity was high or when the team was inexperienced (Seokhwa, Samer, & Henry, 2005). Directive leadership was more effective than alternate leadership approach in severe trauma situation because trauma team typically exists for only a very short period of time and the patient may go into shock and die from complications. Furthermore, directive leadership was more effective when an inexperienced team treated a severely injured patient, whereas empowering leadership was more effective when an inexperienced team treated a not-severely injured patient.

The democratic leadership style also called the 'participative style' is an opposite of autocratic leadership style. It encourages employees to be a part of the decision making process (Daft, 2005). The democratic leader keeps his or her employees informed about everything that affects their work and shares decision making and problem solving responsibilities (Daft, 2005; Yukl, 2006). This style requires the leader to be a coach who has the final say, but gathers information from staff members before making a decision. Many employees like the trust they receive from democratic leaders and respond with cooperation, team spirit, and high morale (Jayasingam, 2009). Therefore, research on democratic leadership style and OCB construct using the original conceptualization of democratic leadership can reveal significant organizational and individual relationships.

A more liberal leadership style among all leadership styles within the old context is laissez-faire leadership. Bass et al., (2003) describes this form of leadership as the passive form of transactional leadership or passive-avoidant leadership. It is leadership style in which the manager provides little or no direction and gives employees as much freedom as possible. The leader fails to provide goals and standards for followers and refuses to clarify expectations for the followers (Rowold, & Heinitz, 2007). Though, laissez-faire leadership might look as a weak style of leadership, the approach could be effective when employees are highly skilled, experienced, and educated. The approach could be tested against the OCBs using empirical research especially in organizations where high skills or expertise are the major work requirements.

Modern Leadership Paradigms: Exploring Relationship with Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs)

This section has identified the modern or contemporary leadership paradigms that as far as the writers' literature search was concerned no literature was found connecting the leadership paradigms to OCBs. These modern leadership paradigms include adaptive, dispersed, authentic, respectful, spiritual, transcendent, empowering, level 5, and open leadership paradigms.

Adaptive Leadership

Adaptive leadership involves the leaders to craft future visions that inspire others to accept change and become participants in the journey forward. The characteristics of adaptive leadership as perceived by Garrity (2010) include: being competent in one's field; being objective in handling decisions and problems; being reflective in looking at one's own attitudes and behavior; being trustworthy in dealing with other's interests; being innovative in the pursuit of better performance; being focused in an attempt to maintain efficient operations; being open-minded in considering relevant information and perspectives; being confident that meaningful outcomes may be achieved; being intuitive in considering tacit knowledge and experience; having character by exhibiting exemplary morals and values; having initiative and being willing to take action; and having the courage to take a stand for principle.

Dispersed Leadership

A new leadership model that radically departs from the traditional concept of leadership that presupposes a clear demarcation between the leader and the follower is called 'dispersed leadership' (Gordon, 2010). Under this leadership paradigm the dualistic nature of the power relationships between leaders and followers are not visible. The new model of

dispersed leadership promotes the sharing of power between leaders and followers (Gordon, 2002). The model has been described by different leadership theorists using different titles: Super leadership (Manz, & Simms, 2001); Self-Leadership (Kirkman, & Rosen, 1999; Uhl-Bien, & Graen, 1998; Kouzes, & Posner, 1993; Bono, & Judge, 2003); Distributed Leadership (Senge, 1999); Empowerment leadership (Srivastava, Bartol, & Locke, 2006) and more recently, Shared Leadership (Pearce, Manz, & Sims, 2008). Studies suggest that dispersed leadership may indeed provide a more robust leadership approach than traditional leadership that is centralized and vertical in nature (Pearce, Manz, & Sims, 2008). Additionally, in Pearce, Manz and Sims (2008) state that dispersed leadership appears to be under-researched and therefore deserve more theoretical and empirical research. They also argue that studying the new leadership paradigm offers a promising approach for ameliorating potential corruption in executive leadership. Against this backdrop, this study suggests a similar research effort to provide meaningful insight into the possible relationship between dispersed leadership paradigm and OCBs. The empirical research findings would no doubt espouse new leadership strategy for organizational efficiency and effectiveness and hence add to the existing leadership and OCB bodies of knowledge.

Authentic Leadership

Authentic leadership is another new leadership paradigm that presents an exciting leadership research context for the OCB field. Luthans, & Avolio (2003) define authentic leadership as a process that combines positive leader capacities and a highly developed organizational context. The authentic leader is true to him/her self and his/her exhibited behavior positively transforms, and develops employees into leaders (Luthans, & Avolio, 2003). According to Avolio, Luthans, & Walumbwa, (2004) authentic leaders are individuals who are deeply aware of how they think, behave and perceived by others as being aware of their own and others' moral perspective, knowledge and strengths (Avolio, Luthans, & Walumbwa, 2004). Authentic leadership appears to overlap with ethical leadership specifically in terms of individual characteristics. The authentic leadership contains features of authenticity and self-awareness that are not part of the ethical leadership construct. Being true to oneself which is the authenticity was not found with ethical leadership, ethical leaders show extreme care and concern for others not themselves (Trevino, & colleagues, 2000). Although researchers had raised their attentions to authentic leadership development in recent years, empirical studies in that direction are limited (Leilei, & Peilan, 2009). Therefore, the good qualities of authentic leadership still present potential research opportunity within the OCB field.

Respectful Leadership

In their attempt to put respectful leadership in a clear perspective, the pioneer authors van Quaquebeke and Eckloff, (2010) define respectful leadership by identifying 19 behavioral or attitudinal aspects from their research respondents. The behavioral or attitudinal categories are: trusting, conferring responsibility, considering needs, maintaining distance, appreciating, being error-friendly, granting autonomy, acknowledging equality, promoting development, being open to advice, accepting criticism, excavating potential, seeking participation, taking interest on a personal level, being reliable, being attentive, supporting, and interacting friendly. Interpersonal respect between leaders and their subordinates, which is akin to respectful leadership is highly relevant for productive cooperation in organizations, and even more so in contexts that rely strongly on committed and cooperation-minded

employees (van Quaquebeke, & Eckloff, 2010). When people feel respected at work, especially by leaders, people would not only personally be more satisfied, but also more likely to identify with the organization and exert effort on behalf of it (Boezeman, & Ellemers, 2008; Lind, & Tyler, 1988; Simon, & Sturmer, 2003; Tyler, & Blader, 2000; Tyler et al., 1997). With this background, respectful leadership could represent a paradigm that interests OCB researches could be undertaken. The new leadership paradigm has potentials to produce significant relationships with the OCBs.

Spiritual Leadership

Organizational researchers have started exploring spirituality at workplace and spiritual leadership after decades of isolating spirituality as an esoteric realm of intangible ideas and emotions (Reave, 2005). Several scholars have also expressed suspicion about the spirituality in the workplace movement, arguing that it could be used to manipulate and exploit workers to fulfill the selfish or materialistic objectives of some organizations (Cavanagh, & Bandsuch, 2002; Nadesan, 1999). However, societal and business turbulence of recent times has led people and organizational leaders to start search for spiritual solutions to ameliorate the resulting consequences (Giacalone, & Jurkiewicz, 2003).

According to Reave (2005) spiritual leadership could be seen as an observable phenomenon occurring when a person in a leadership position embodies spiritual values such as integrity, honesty, and humility, creating the self as an example of someone who can be trusted, relied upon, and admired. Spiritual individuals are more prone to demonstrate spiritual leadership; however individuals do not have to be spiritual or religious to provide spiritual leadership (Reave, 2005). Spirituality in the workplace could exist without pressuring individuals as spirituality expresses itself not so much in words or preaching, but in the embodiment of spiritual values such as integrity, honesty and humility as well as in the demonstration of spiritual behavior including caring and concern (Reave, 2005). Spiritual leadership presents a very interesting area for OCB researchers to explore and provide new knowledge for theory development and practical organizational problems. Spiritual leadership and OCB research could lead to positive significant relationship in especially the regions of the world where religion dictate the people's values and culture.

Transcendent Leadership

Luthans and Slocum (2004) explain that with an unprecedented economic, technological, socio-political, and ethical tumultuous sea of change, there is a need for new theories, new applications and just plain new thinking about leadership, hence transcendent leadership or strategic leadership. The new perspective of strategic leadership emphasizes the responsibilities managed by leaders at the top of the firm (Crossan, Vera, & Nanjad, 2008). Transcendent leadership is a departure from traditional leadership analysis that largely focused on individual and dyadic relationships. It is a departure from leadership theory that largely looks at leadership as the domain of organizational behavior anchored in a micro-oriented perspective (Waldman, Javidan, & Varella, 2004). A transcendent leader is a strategic leader who leads within and amongst the levels of self, others, and organization. Leadership of self is an emerging area in the leadership literature, while leadership of others has been the dominant focus of leadership research (Crossan, Vera, & Nanjad, 2008). In the view of Ireland and Hitt (2005) strategic leadership means a leader's ability to anticipate, envision, maintain flexibility, think strategically, and work with others to initiate changes that will create a viable future for the organization. The transcendent leadership paradigm of the 21st

century is a good field for empirical research about OCBs in addition to other behaviors in organizations. Researchers should explore the two constructs for possible positive relationship that could advance the frontier of OCB, leadership and OB as a whole which currently remain unexplored following the comprehensive literature review that preceded this paper.

Level Five Leadership

The Level Five Leadership is a leadership paradigm based on the idea that respect towards people, selflessness by the leader and a strong powerful commitment to achieve results help to produce the best performance from subordinates (Collins, 2001). Level 5 leaders are a paradoxical blend of fierce will and personal humility. They combined qualities including, stubbornness, ruthlessness and humility. They are humble, ambitious for their company and rarely allow their ego to be an obstacle for the success of their organization (Collins, 2001). Whenever they accomplish great things for their organizations, they attribute their remarkable accomplishments to their subordinates, external factors and sheer luck. Level 5 Leaders lead and become successful with the help of disciplined people, disciplined thought and disciplined action. Humility and will are the key ingredients of Level 5 leadership; the leaders are modest, willful, shy and fearless (Collins, 2001). From the review of the literature no study of Level 5 leadership was found to have been conducted against the background of OCB. The approach of Level 5 leaders could be significantly related to OCB depending on the leadership situation. The approach therefore presents a challenge to OCB researchers to explore the possible significant relationship between the leadership approach and OCBs.

Open Leadership

Open leadership is an approach of leading employees and customers using social technologies to allow for constant learning. Open leadership is a new way of building relationships with organization's most engaged and potentially most valuable customers and employees, especially when listening and learning that form the basic elements of open leadership are easy to adopt (Li, 2010). Open leaders are curious about customers, about their employees, about suppliers, about industry trends, and about the wider world (Li, 2010). The new leadership approach is not simply being authentic, transparent, or real, it is rather a mixture of mindset, temperament, learned behaviors, and skills that build on and amplify good leadership skills (Li, 2010). The open leadership being one of the new leadership constructs of the present time represents another challenging aspect of influencing organizational behavior. It is therefore interesting to organizational behavior and human resource management researchers to explore relationships between the open leadership and OCB. The results of the findings would enormously contribute towards building the OCB and leadership theories.

Conclusion

The content analysis of this paper reveals that only consideration dimension of Ohio University, charismatic, transactional, transformational, servant and ethical leadership paradigms have been linked to OCB in terms of empirical research. Transformational leadership paradigm, among the OCB related leadership paradigms, has attracted greater OCB research attention (e.g. Bass, 1985; Bennis, & Nanus, 1985; Boal, & Bryson, 1988; Burns, 1978; Conger, & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1977; Tichy, & DeVanna, 1986; Podsakoff, MacKenzie,

& Bommer, 1996). Transactional leadership although popular in leadership discussion has attracted only a few OCB research efforts (e.g. Rubin, Bommer, & Bachrach, 2010; Walumbwa, Wu, & Orwa, 2008). Charismatic leadership as an independent construct against the OCB field has also attracted a few research interests (Babcock-Roberson, & Strickland, 2010; Choa, & Dansereau, 2010). In addition, ethical leadership has started to get OCB research attention when referred to the works of Adebayo (2005); Bobek and Hatfield (2003); and Epstein (1998) that found significant negative relationship between unethical attitudes and pro-social behaviors.

Contemporary organizations need to go beyond depending on the in-role performance of their employees in fulfilling their customers' requirements and overall organizational goal achievement. Management organizations have to focus more on stimulating OCB more than before to enable their organizations to effectively function at a lesser cost. Finally, this paper is useful for providing direction for new and deeper research on leadership-OCB relationships. Therefore, paper has made new and further leadership-OCB research possible by providing a synthesis of major leadership paradigms that can have potential significant relationships with OCB. Further, the paper provides a good framework for easy conceptualization of existing leadership paradigms and new directions for OCB and leadership research in many years to come.

References

- Adebayo, D. O. (2005). Ethical attitudes and prosocial behaviour in the Nigeria police: Moderator effects of perceived organizational support and public recognition. *Policing*, 28(4), 684-705.
- Aronson, E. (2001). Integrating leadership styles and ethical perspectives. In De Hoogh, A H. B., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 297–311.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1985). Charisma and beyond. . In Jay A. Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(4), 637-64.<http://www.jstor.org/stable/258069>. Accessed: 22/02/2011 23:43
- Avolio, B. J., & Gibbons, T. C. (1988). Developing transformational leaders: a life span approach. In J. A. Conger, & Kanungo, R. N. (ed.) *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.
- Avolio, B., & Yammarino, F. (2002). Transformational and charismatic leadership. In Choa, J., & Dansereau, F. (2010). Are transformational leaders fair? A multi-level study of transformational leadership, justice perceptions, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 3, 409-421.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(4), 441-462.
- Babcock-Roberson, M. E., & Strickland, O. J. (2010). The relationship between charismatic leadership, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Journal of Psychology*, 144(3), 313–326.
- Bambale, A. J. (2008). Ethical requirements for leadership as a tool for organizational Sustainability. *Bayero Journal of Interdisciplinary studies*, 1(1), 33- 46.

- Bass, B. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. In Crossan, M, & Mazutis, D. (2008). Transcendent leadership. *Business Horizons*, 51, 131–139.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). Bass, & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications, 3 ed. In De Hoogh, A H. B., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 297–311.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 207–218.
- Bass, B. M. (2008). The Bass handbook of leadership. In Choi, Y., & Mai-Dalton, R. R. (1999). The model of followers' responses to self-sacrificial leadership: an empirical test. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(3), 397-421.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: the strategies for taking charge. In Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22(2), 259-298.
- Boal, K. B., & Bryson, J. M. (1988). Charismatic leadership: A phenomenological and structural approach. In J. G. Hunt, B. R. Baliga, H. P. Dachler, & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.). *Emerging leadership vistas* (pp. 11 –28). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Bobek, D. D., & Hatfield, R. C. (2003). An investigation of the theory of planned behaviour and the role of moral obligation and tax compliance. In Adebayo, D. O. (2005). Ethical attitudes and prosocial behaviour in the Nigeria police: Moderator effects of perceived organizational support and public recognition. *Policing*, 28(4), 684-705.
- Boezeman, E. J., & N. Ellemers. (2008). Pride and respect in volunteers' organizational commitment. In van Quaquebeke, N., & Eckloff, T. (2010). Defining respectful leadership: what it is, how it can be measured, and another glimpse at what it is related to. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 91, 343–358.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Core self-evaluations: A review of the trait and its role in job satisfaction and job performance. *European Journal of Personality*, 17, pp. S5 - S18.
- Bowler, W. M., Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Paul, J. R. B. (2010). If you're close with the leader, you must be a brownnose: The role of leader–member relationships in follower, leader, and coworker attributions of organizational citizenship behavior motives. *Human Resource Management Review* 20, 309-316.
- Brown, M. E., Trevino, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: a social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), 117–134.
- Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 595–616.
- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and Leadership in Organizations*. Sage Publications, London.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. In Choi, Y. and Mai-Dalton, R. R. (1998). On the leadership function of self-sacrifice. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4, 475-502.
- Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessment of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 468-78.

- Cavanagh, G. F., & Bandsuch, M. R. (2002). Virtue as a benchmark for spirituality in business. In Reave, L. (2005). Spiritual values and practices related to leadership effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 655–687.
- Choi, Y., & Mai-Dalton, R. R. (1999). The model of followers' responses to self-sacrificial leadership: an empirical test. In Singh, N., & Krishnan, V. R. (2008). Self-sacrifice and transformational leadership: mediating role of altruism. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(3), 261-274.
- Collins, J. (2001). Why some companies make the leap others do not: good to great organization. *Harvard Business Review*, 2001.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Towards a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637-47.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness. In Babcock-Roberson, M. E., & Strickland, O. J. (2010). The relationship between charismatic leadership, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Psychology*, 144(3), 313–326.
- Crossan, M., Vera, D., & Nanjad, L. (2008). Transcendent leadership: Strategic leadership in dynamic environments. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 569-581.
- Daft, R. L. (2005). The leadership experience. (3rd ed.). In Jayasingam, S. & Cheng, M. Y. (2009). Leadership style and perception of effectiveness: enlightening Malaysian managers. *Asian Social Science*, 5,(2), 56.
- De Cremer, D., & Van Knippenberg, D. (2002). How do leaders promote cooperation: The effects of charisma and procedural fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 858–866.
- De Cremer, D. (2006). Affective and motivational consequences of leader self-sacrifice: The moderating effect of autocratic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 79 - 93.
- De Hoogh, A. H. B., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 297–311.
- De Sousa, M. C., & Van Dierendonck, D. (2010). Knowledge workers, servant leadership and the search for meaning in knowledge-driven organizations. *The Horizon*, 18(3), 230-239.
- Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 57, 61-94.
- Epstein, E. M. (1998). Business ethics and corporate social policy. In Adebayo, D. O. (2005). Ethical attitudes and prosocial behaviour in the Nigeria police: Moderator effects of perceived organizational support and public recognition. *Policing*, 28(4), 684-705.
- Garrity, R. (2010). Future leaders: putting learning and knowledge to work. *The Horizon*, 18(3), 266-278.
- Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2003). Toward a science of workplace spirituality. In Reave, L. (2005). Spiritual values and practices related to leadership effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 655–687.
- Gordon, R. D. (2002). Conceptualizing leadership with respect to its historical contextual antecedents to power. In Gordon, R. D. (2010). Dispersed leadership, power and change: An empirical study using a critical management framework. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24(2), 260-287.

- Gordon, R. D. (2010). Dispersed leadership, power and change: An empirical study using a critical management framework. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24(2), 260-287.
- Graham, J. W. (1987). The essence of leadership: fostering follower autonomy, not automatic followership. In J. G. Hunt (ed.), *emerging leadership vistas*. Elmsford, N.Y.: Pergamon Press.
- Greenleaf, R. (1970). The Servant as Leader. In De Sousa, M. C., & van Dierendonck, D. (2010). Knowledge workers, servant leadership and the search for meaning in knowledge-driven organizations. *The Horizon*, 18(3), 230-239.
- Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 327-347.
- House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt, & L. L. Larson (eds.). *Leadership: the cutting edge*. Carbondale, Ill: South Illinois University Press.
- House, R. J., & Howell, J. M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. In De Hoogh, A H. B. and Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 297-311.
- Howell, J. N., & Hall-Merenda, K. E. (1999). The ties that bind: The impact of leader-member exchange, transformational leadership and transactional leadership, and distance on predicting follower performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 680-694.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation? In De Hoogh, A. H. B., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 297-311.
- Hunt, J. G., Boal, K. B., & Dodge, G. E. (1999). The effects of visionary and crisis-responsive charisma on followers: An experimental examination of two kinds of charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 423-448.
- Ireland, R. D., & Hitt, M. A. (2005). Achieving and maintaining strategic competitiveness in the 21st century: The role of strategic leadership. In Crossan M., Vera, D., & Nanjad, L. (2008). Transcendent leadership: Strategic leadership in dynamic environments. *Leadership Quarterly* 19, 569-581.
- Jayasingam, S., & Cheng, M. Y. (2009). Leadership style and perception of effectiveness: enlightening Malaysian managers. *Asian Social Science*, 5(2), 56.
- Johnson, S. K. (2008). I second that emotion: Effects of emotional contagion and affect at work on leader and follower outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 1-19.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. In Bowler, W. M, Halbesleben, J. R. B. and Paul, J. R. B. (2010). If you're close with the leader, you must be a brownnose: The role of leader-member relationships in follower, leader, and coworker attributions of organizational citizenship behavior motives *Human Resource Management Review*, 20, 309-316.
- Kirkman, B. L., & Rosen, B. (1999). Beyond self-management: antecedents and consequences of team empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(1), 58-74.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1993). The leadership challenge. In Gordon, R. D. (2010). Dispersed leadership, power and change: An empirical study using a critical

- management framework. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24(2), 260-287. DOI: 10.1177/0893318909360213.
- Leilei, Z., & Peilanl, G. (2009). Authentic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. Paper presented at the International Conference on Test and Measurement (ICTM) December 5 - 6, Hong Kong. Cited in <http://www.clocate.com/conference/2009-International-Conference-on-Test-and-Measurement-ICTM/321/>
- Li, C. (2010). *Open leadership how social technology can transform the way you lead*, (1st ed). Jossey-Bass: San Francisco
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 161–177.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). The social psychology of procedural justice. In van Quaquebeke, N., & Eckloff, T. (2010). Defining respectful leadership: what it is, how it can be measured, and another glimpse at what it is related to. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 91, 343–358.
- Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1991). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance*. London: Routledge.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytical review of the literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 385-425.
- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. (2003). Authentic leadership: A positive development approach. In Ilies, R., Frederick, P., Morgeson, F. P., et al (2005). Authentic leadership and eudaemonic well-being: Understanding leader- follower outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 373-394.
- Luthans, F., & Slocum, J. (2004). New leadership for a new time. In Crossan, M., Vera, D., & Nanjad, L. (2008). Transcendent leadership: Strategic leadership in dynamic environments. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 569-581.
- McCrimmon, M. (2010). Servant leadership. <http://www.leadersdirect.com/servant-leadership>
- McClelland, D. C. (1975). Power: the inner experience. In De Hoogh, A H. B., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 297-311.
- Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (2001). *The new super leadership: Leading others to lead themselves*. San Francisco: Berrett-Kohler.
- Nadesan, M. H. (1999). The discourses of corporate spiritualism and evangelical capitalism. In Reave, L. (2005). Spiritual values and practices related to leadership effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 655–687.
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie S. P. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. London: Sage Publications.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. In Bowler, W. M, Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Paul, J. R. B. (2010). If you're close with the leader, you must be a brownnose: The role of leader–member relationships in follower, leader, and coworker attributions of organizational citizenship behavior motives. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20, 309-316.

- Pearce, C. L., Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P. Jr. (2008). The roles of vertical and shared leadership in the enactment of executive corruption: Implications for research and practice. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 353–359.
- Peterson, R. S. (1997). A directive leadership style in group decision-making can be both virtue and vice: Evidence from elite and experimental groups. In De Cremer, D. (2006). Affective and motivational consequences of leader self-sacrifice: The moderating effect of autocratic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 79 - 93.
- Piccolo, R. F., Greenbaum, R., Den Hartog, D. N., & Folger, R. (2010). The relationship between ethical leadership and core job characteristics. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 259-278.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, . H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22(2), 259-298.
- Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., Paine, J., & Bachrach, D. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. In Krishnan, V. R., & Arora, P. (2008). Determinants of Transformational Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Asia-Pacific Business Review*, IV(1), 34-43.
- Reave, L. (2005). Spiritual values and practices related to leadership effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 655–687.
- Rowold, J., & Heinitz, K. (2007). Transformational and charismatic leadership: assessing the convergent, divergent and criterion validity of the MLQ and the CKS. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 121–133.
- Rubin, R. B., Bommer, W. H., & Bachrach, D. G. (2010). Operant leadership and employee citizenship: A question of trust? *Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 400–408.
- Schnake, M., Cochran, D., & Dumler, M. (1995). Encouraging organizational citizenship: the effects of job satisfaction, perceived equity and leadership, *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 7(2), 209-52.
- Schreisheim, C. A., & Stogdill, R. M. (1975). Differences in the factor structure across three versions of the Ohio State Leadership scales. In Judge, T. A, Piccolo, & R. F, Ilies (2004). The forgotten ones? the validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(1), 36-51.
- Seokhwa, Y., Samer, F., & Henry P. S. Jr. (2005). Contingent leadership and effectiveness of trauma resuscitation teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1288-1296.
- Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. (1993). Motivational effects of charismatic leadership: self-concept based theory. *Organization science*, 4, 577-594.
- Simon, B., & Sturmer, S. (2003). Respect for group members: intragroup determinants of collective identification and group-serving behavior. In van Quaquebeke, N., & Eckloff, T. (2010). Defining respectful leadership: what it is, how it can be measured, and another glimpse at what it is related to. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 91, 343–358.
- Singh, N., & Krishnan, V. R. (2008). Self-sacrifice and transformational leadership: mediating role of altruism. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*. 29(3), 261-274.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 655– 63.
- Sosik, J. J. (2005). The role of personal values in the charismatic leadership of corporate managers: a model and preliminary field study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 221–244.

- Srivastava, A., Bartol, K. M., & Locke, E. A. (2006). Empowering leadership in management teams: Effects on knowledge sharing, efficacy, and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(6), 1239–125.
- Tichy, N., & DeVanna, M. (1986). The transformational leader. In Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B. & Bommer, H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22(2), 259-298.
- Trevino, L. K., Hartman, L. P., & Brown, M. E. (2000). Moral person and moral manager: How executives develop a reputation for ethical leadership. In Pearce, C. L., Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P. Jr. (2008). The roles of vertical and shared leadership in the enactment of executive corruption: Implications for research and practice. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 353–359.
- Turnipseed, D., & Murkison, G. (1996). Organization citizenship behavior: an examination of the influence of the workplace. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 17, 42–7.
- Uhl-Bien, M., & Graen, G. B. (1998). Individual self-management: analysis of professionals' self-managing activities in functional and cross-functional work teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(3), 340-350.
- Van Dyne L., Cummings, L. L., & Parks, J. M. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: in pursuit of construct and definitional clarity. *Res Organ Behavior*, 17, 215– 86.
- Van Knippenberg, D., van Knippenberg, B., De Cremer, & M. A. Hogg (2004). Leadership, Self, and Identity: A Review and Research Agenda. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 825–856.
- Van Quaquebeke, N., & Eckloff, T. (2010). Defining respectful leadership: what it is, how it can be measured, and another glimpse at what it is related to. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 91, 343–358.
- Van Vugt, M., Jepson, S. F., Hart, C. M., & De Cremer, D. (2004). Autocratic leadership in social dilemmas: a threat to group stability. In De Cremer, D. (2006). Affective and motivational consequences of leader self-sacrifice: The moderating effect of autocratic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 79 - 93.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2006). Compulsory citizenship behavior: theorizing some dark sides of the good soldier syndrome in organizations. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, 36(1), 77-93.
- Vondey, M. (2010). The Relationships among Servant Leadership, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Person-Organization Fit, and Organizational Identification. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(1), 3-27.
- Waldman, D. A., Javidan, M., & Varella, P. (2004). Charismatic leadership at the strategic level: A new application of upper echelons theory. In Crossan, M., Vera, D., & Nanjad, L. (2008). Transcendent leadership: Strategic leadership in dynamic environments. *Leadership Quarterly* 19, 569-581.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Wu, C., & Orwa, B. (2008). Contingent reward transactional leadership, work attitudes, and organizational citizenship behavior: The role of procedural justice climate perceptions and strength. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 251–265.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Oke, A. (2010). Servant Leadership, Procedural Justice Climate, Service Climate, Employee Attitudes, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Cross-Level Investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(3), 517-529.

- Weber, M. (1922). Gesammelte aufsaetze zur wissenschaftslehre. In Jcobsen, C., & House, R. J. (2001). Dynamics of transformational leadership: a process theory, simulation model and test. *Leadership quarterly*, 12, 75-112.
- Yorges, S. L., Weiss, H. M., & Strickland, O. J. (1999). The effect of leader outcomes on influence, attributions, and perceptions of charisma. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 428–436.
- Yukl, G. (2006). Leadership in organizations. In Jayasingam, S. and Cheng, M. Y. (2009). Leadership style and perception of effectiveness: enlightening Malaysian managers. *Asian Social Science*, 5(2), 56.