

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

***Dr.P.Prabakaran, ** Mr.K.B.Inian, ***Mr.Sanilkumar.V.K**

**Assistant Professor, Madras School of Social Work, Chennai, Tamilnadu*

***Research Scholar, Madras Christian College, Chennai, Tamilnadu*

****DC School of Management & Technology, Chennai, Tamilnadu*

Abstract

Since decades, leadership and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) stayed at apex in the field of organizational behavior research and has gained significance among the scholars pursuing to define multifaceted dynamics of leadership and their influence on follower's behavior at work. The voluntary behavior of Organizational citizenship improves organizational effectiveness, and it goes beyond formal job duties. The present study is an attempt to analyze the impact of leadership styles on OCB of subordinates in the selected firms in Coimbatore city.

Keywords: Leadership, Behavior and Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

Introduction and Problem Statement

Leadership styles in today's world are an increasingly complex and a popular organizational dynamic to work upon. Different leadership styles are appropriate in distinct situations. If an inappropriate style is adopted by the leader, it may pose several challenges for the workers, managers and human resources departments in the planning and execution of work in an organization. There are two positions with respect to the importance of the top management team on strategic decision making. According to the theory of the Ecology of Organizations the management team does not influence the organization's outcomes; conversely, several studies have shown how the top management team does influence certain aspects of the strategic decision-making process, and therefore, influences the organization's performance or effectiveness. The theory of the Ecology of Organizations states that there is a natural selection process for the species of organizations, which implies that the environment will determine who survives.

The implication is that the top management team is composed of passive agents that have a minimum impact on corporative development. However, it was stated in their seminal work that an organization's outcomes (i.e. strategic decisions and performance are partially predetermined by the features of those who participate in its administration. The basis of their study is supported by the idea that in a limited rationality context the point of view is limited by the cognitive base and values, thus influencing selective perception, interpretation, management perception, and strategy selection. There are several studies that support this view, demonstrating that diversity, leadership style, and top management team size are variables that can influence the decision-making processes, and consequently, the effectiveness of the organization. The present nature of leadership is that it has posed some consequences on the organization citizenship behavior.

This study explores how superior leadership styles may impact subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The importance of leadership style as predictor of OCB has been well established in Western settings. However, there is scant research explore the indirect effects between this two variables. Hence, the inclusion of subordinates' competence and downward influence tactics served to investigate the role of intervening effect between leadership styles and OCB. Several researchers have suggested that leadership research needs to focus more on the "fundamental" issues, such as influence processes that characterize leader-follower interaction. Research has also shown that effective leaders must have the ability to recognize when to use different tactics of influence as well as the skill necessary to effectively carry out these influence attempts. Moreover, in terms of using downward influence tactics effectively, several empirical studies offer strong support for the

idea that the most effective leaders in organizations should understand the nature of influence, “what” influence tactics are available to them, and “how” and “when” to use those tactics. These works seems to infer that influence is important in all human relationships. On the other hand, studies on OCB around the issue of interpersonal relationships have been driven by the conviction that sound superior-subordinate relationship is crucial to organizational success. Positive interpersonal relationship at workplace should enhance positive OCB among the employees. Subordinates with high levels of OCB are more likely to be committed to the organization.

Therefore, it is worthwhile for the superior to be aware of his/her leadership style in work situations and how it promotes subordinates’ OCB. It have been indicated that superior’s leadership style and subordinates’ OCB are inter-related. Inappropriate leadership styles may trigger negative consequences, which might further increase the sensitivity and susceptibility to misunderstanding that may lead to organizational dysfunction such as decline in work performances, absenteeism and high turnover. Thus, prevention of subordinates’ negative outcome is important visa-vis the use of different leadership styles. The mismatch might precipitate an unending and potentially disruptive vicious cycle that many organizational leaders want to avoid and therefore, they might want to address their styles and the attendant consequences more rigorously.

Methodology

The transactional and transformational leadership styles are taken into consideration. The influential methods incorporated by the leader on their subordinates are classified as persuasion, consultation, communication and anxiety. The samples for the study are managers from 250 firms in Chennai city. The firms are found involving in the businesses of manufacturing, retailing and servicing. The structured questionnaires are distributed to the samples using simple random sampling technique. The questionnaires received are then put into analysis using chi square and regression.

Analysis and discussion

H₀₁- The association between the leadership styles and influential modes of OCB is insignificant.

Table – 1: Chi-Square Analysis

S.No	Influential modes	x^2	Sig. value	Hypothesis
Transactional leadership				
1	Persuasion	26.14	0.06	Accepted
2	Consultation	18.36	0.05*	Rejected
3	Communication	19.47	0.00**	Rejected
4	Anxiety	28.69	0.00**	Rejected
S.No	Influential modes	x^2	Sig. value	Hypothesis
Transformational leadership				
1	Persuasion	47.08	0.02*	Rejected
2	Consultation	09.55	0.03*	Rejected
3	Communication	16.38	0.05*	Rejected
4	Anxiety	94.61	0.01**	Rejected

Source: Primary data * Significant at 5%. ** Significant at 1%

The above table depicts the chi-square analysis between leadership styles and the influential modes. It is clear from the table that the hypothesis is accepted transactional leadership style and persuasion and rejected for the rest of all the variables. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected for those variables and conferred that the association between the leadership styles and influential modes exist significantly.

H₀₂- There is no significant impact posed by the leadership styles on influential modes of OCB

The hypothesis is broken down into sub hypotheses for each of the leadership styles;

H_{02a}- There is no significant impact posed by the transactional leadership style on influential modes of OCB

Table 3: Multiple Regression Analysis

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t	Prob.
L	2.36	3.11	-1.12	0.02
P	4.12	6.32	-0.21	0.04
Con	3.25	5.21	-8.51	0.05
Com	0.01	6.11	-2.12	0.04
A	3.58	4.21	1.02	0.07
R ²	0.36		Durbin-Watson	1.61
Adjusted R ²	0.40			
F	0.89			

Source: Primary data

The table above shows the regression analysis between transactional leadership style and influential modes of OCB. The analysis shows ($R^2 = 0.36$), which states that leadership styles contributed for influential modes of OCB. The F-statistic is significant indicating that the hypothesized relationship between the variables is validated. The value of Durbin-Watson is 1.61 indicating that the model is not suffering from auto correlation problem. The calculated F value is significant and hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and concluded that there is a significant impact posed by the transactional leadership style on influential modes of OCB.

H_{02b}- There is no significant impact posed by the transformational leadership style on influential modes of OCB

Table 4: Multiple Regression Analysis

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t	Prob.
L	0.65	3.21	1.51	0.05
P	3.21	6.26	2.11	0.04
Con	7.14	5.14	1.89	0.08
Com	5.12	8.17	1.36	0.52
A	0.22	2.56	1.07	0.00
R ²	0.39		Durbin-Watson	1.78
Adjusted R ²	0.46			
F	12.54			

Source: Primary data

The table above shows the regression analysis between transformational leadership style and influential modes of OCB. The analysis shows ($R^2 = 0.39$), which states that leadership style contributed for influential modes of OCB. The F-statistic is significant indicating that the hypothesized relationship between the variables is validated. The value of Durbin-Watson is 1.78 indicating that the model is not suffering from auto correlation problem. The calculated F value is significant and hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and concluded that there is a significant impact posed by the transformational leadership style on influential modes of OCB.

Conclusion

The role of leadership is very important in the organization. Leaders need to understand attitudes and behavior of existing employees in the organization in order to improve work spirit so that positive impact for the organization. Leadership is needed to respond to the challenges of change that occur as a result of advancements in various areas of human life, not least the change in the needs of the individual, the individual who wants to actualize himself, which affects the form of service and respect for the individual. Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) on the other hand is an important trait that should be in practice in all work environments. OCB occurs within the minds of individuals to display positive attitude at work, taking additional strides to take extra jobs, respecting the policies stated by the organization and having tolerance to work related stress. The study acknowledges the impact of leadership styles on the organizational citizenship behavior. Further, it offers empirical confirmation that transformational leadership is positively associated to OCB directly and indirectly.

References

1. Amason A, Sapienza R (1997) The effects of top management size and interaction norms on cognitive and affective conflict. *J. Manag.* 23: 495-516.
2. Amburgey T, Rao H (1996) Organizational ecology: Past, present and future directions.
3. *Acad. Manag. J.* 39: 1265-1286. Beedle W (1992) Small firm equity cost: Evidence from Australia. *J. Small Bus. Manag.* 30: 57-66.
4. Dr. D.Paul Dhinakaran, "Exports and Imports Stagnation in India During Covid-19- A Review" *GIS Business (ISSN: 1430-3663 Vol-15-Issue-4-April-2020)*.
5. Bourantas D, Papadakis V (1996) Greek management. *Int. Studies Manag. Org.* 26: 13-33.
6. Byers T, Slack T (2001) Strategic decision-making in small business within the leisure industry. *J. Leisure Res.* 33: 121-136.
7. Carpenter M, Fredrickson J (2001) Top management teams, global strategy posture and moderating role of uncertainty. *Acad.*
8. *Manag. J.* 44: 533-546. Carroll E, Hannan M (2000) *The Demography of Corporations and Industries*. Princeton University Press. *Long Range Plann.* 33: 608.
9. Chen MJ, Hambrick DC (1995) Speed, stealth and selective attack: How small firms differ from large firms in competitive behavior.
10. *Acad. Manag. J.* 38: 453-482. Dean T, Brown R, Bamford C (1998) Differences in large and small firm responses to environmental context: Strategic implications from a comparative analysis of business formations *Strat. Manag. J.* 19: 709-728.
11. Eckard E (1994) Plant level scale economies and industrial concentration. *Quart. Rev. Econ. Finance* 34: 173-182.
12. Ekvall G, Ryhammar L (1998) Leadership style, social climate and organizational outcomes: A study of Swedish University College. *Creativity Innov.*
13. *Manag. J.* 7: 126-130. Goleman D (2000) Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Bus. Rev.* 78: 78-90.
14. Haleblan J, Finkelstein S (1993) Top management team size, CEO dominance and firm performance.
15. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 9: 193-206. Hannan M, Freeman J (1977) The population ecology of organizations. *Am. J. Sociol.* 82: 929-964.
16. Hart S, Banbury C (1994) How strategy-making processes can make a difference. *Strat. Manag. J.* 15: 251-269.
17. Ingress O (1995) Viewpoint: A leader's inner security might be a crucial factor for choice of leadership style. *J. Eur. Indust. Training* 19: 19-20.
18. Kahai S, Sosik J (1997) Effects of leadership style and followers' cultural orientation on performance in group and individual task conditions. *Pers. Psychol.* 50: 121-147.
19. Lowe K, Kroeck K, Sivasubramaniam N (1996) Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of MLQ literature, *Leadership Quart.* 7: 385-426..

20. Majeed, N., Ramaya, T., Mustamil, N., Nazri, M. and Jamshed, S. (2017), "Transformational Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Modeling Emotional Intelligence as Mediator", *Management and Marketing. Challenges for the Knowledge Society*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 571-590. DOI: 10.1515/mmcks-2017-0034
21. Matlay H (1999) Employee relations in small firms. A micro-business perspective. *Employee Relat.* 21: 28-29.
22. Moen O (1999) The relationship between firm size, competitive advantages and export performance revisited. *Int. Small Bus. J.* 18: 53- 72.
23. Oakley J (2000) Gender-based Barriers to Senior Management Positions: Understanding the Scarcity of Female CEOs. *J. Bus. Ethics* 27: 321-334.
24. Ogbonna E, Harris L (2000) Leadership style, organizational culture and performance: Empirical evidence from U.K. companies. *Int. J. Human Resourc. Manag.* 11: 766-788.
25. Orser B, Hogarth-Scott S, Riding A (2000) Performance, firm size, and management problem solving. *J. Small Bus. Manag.* 38: 42- 58.
26. Park D (1996) Gender role, decision style and leadership style. *Women Manag. Rev.* 11: 13- 17.
27. Pedraja L, Rodríguez E (2004) Efectos del estilo de liderazgo sobre la eficacia de las organizaciones públicas. *Rev. Fac. Ing. Univ. de Tarapacá, Chile.* 12: 63-73.
28. Pedraja L, Rodríguez E (2005) Leadership styles in public organizations. *Proc. Int. Buss. Assoc., Vancouver, Canada.* Pelled L, Eisenhardt K, Xin K (1999) Exploring the black box: An analysis of work group diversity, conflict, and performance. *Admin.. Sci. Quart.* 44: 1-28.
29. Pérez M (1997) La interrelación de las unidades estratégicas de negocio como instrumento moderador de la eficacia en las organizaciones: Una aplicación empírica en el sector de la construcción en España. Tesis. Universidad Complutense de Madrid. Madrid, Spain. 299 pp.
30. Rodríguez E (2005) La toma de decisiones estratégicas en las instituciones universitarias: Un estudio empírico en universidades de Chile y España. Editorial Consejo de Rectores de Chile. Andros. Andros, Santiago de Chile. 199 pp.
31. Rahman S (2001) Total quality management practices and business outcome: Evidence from small and medium enterprises in Western Australia. *Total Qual. Manag.* 12: 201- 210.
32. Shamir B, House R, Arthur M (1993) The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organiz. Sci.* 4: 577-594.
33. Simonds T, Pelled L, Smith K (1999) Making use of difference: Diversity, debate and decision comprehensiveness in top management teams. *Acad. Manag. J.* 42: 662-673.
34. Vroom V (2000) Leadership and decision-making process. *Organiz. Dynam.* 28: 82-94. Waldman D, Ramírez G, House R, Puranam P (2001) Does leadership matter, CEO leadership attributes and profitability under conditions of perceived environmental uncertainty. *Acad. Manag. J.* 44: 134-143.
35. Wang ZM, Satow T (1994) Leadership Styles and Organizational Effectiveness in ChineseJapanese Joint Ventures. *J Manag. Psychol.* 9: 31-36.
36. Wolff J, Pett T (2000) Internationalization of small firms: An examination of export competitive patterns, firm size, and export performance. *J Small Bus. Manag.* 38: 34-47.