



## LEADERSHIP STYLE AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

**Shahid Iqbal**

(M.A, NET), Research Scholar, University Department of Psychology, Lalit Narayan Mithila University, Darbhanga

**Prof. Anis Ahmed**

Supervisor, University Department of Psychology, L.N. Mithila University, Darbhanga

**ABSTRACT** For an organization to remain successful, having the right leader is crucial. The best employers know how they can participate with their employees in order to achieve the organization's objectives. There are a lot of different leadership styles; among which are the autocratic, administrative, free economy, charismatic, democratic, cooperative, situational, functional, transformational, transactional, and relationship-oriented styles. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is the criterion variable of the study. In today's world of competitive work environment OCB taking an important phenomenon at workplace, it is that behaviour of employees at work that is related to their extra work related activities for which employees not get any financial reward by the management. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) as "discretionary and voluntary Behaviour being followed by formal reward system." A modest attempt has been made to make survey of past studies related to leadership style and organizational citizenship behaviour.

**KEYWORDS :** Ground breaking Administration, Citizenship Conduct, Indian Banking Sector, Organizational Trust, Styles of Leadership

### INTRODUCTION

The "Great Man" theory of leadership states that historically, a civilization's leader has an effect on the organization's success (Shaukat et al., 2012). Leadership is one of the most extensively discussed topics of research around the world (Kuchler, 2008); and all groups and teams need a leader (Jones, George, & Hill, 2002). A lot of definitions have been presented in the field of leadership and leadership styles (De Simone, 2006). Traditionally, leadership has been defined in recent years as individual skills that are applied directly to the organizations (Nivala & Hujala, 2002). Cole (2002) has defined leadership as a dynamic process by which, during a specific period of time, and in a specific organizational field, one individual affects the group in order to achieve the overall objective. Locke and Crawford (2004) argue that leadership plays a crucial role in a company's ultimate success or failure. Laue (2004) knows that leadership starts with an individual that has a vision and then takes the required actions in order to achieve the goal. This leader also must treat others as their equals while pursuing these changes. Gill (2006) sees leadership to help stimulate, motivate, and encourage the followers so that the company may achieve satisfactory results for the organization. De Simone (2006) has defined leadership as using a non-coercive influence to direct and coordinate a group's activities towards a certain objective. Jong and Hartog (2007) have defined leadership as the process of influencing people in order to achieve desirable results.

According to the literature, the most important leadership styles that had a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction were transformational leadership, transactional leadership and relationship-oriented leadership, respectively. Almost in all studies, transformational, transactional and relationship-oriented leadership styles had significant positive effects job satisfaction and no study was found in which the mentioned styles have no effect on job satisfaction. On the other hand, based on empirical studies transformational leaders are more comprehensive, more effective and more successful in comparison with transactional leaders (Nivala & Hujala, 2002; Awamleh et al, 2008; Bushra, 2011; Cetin, et al, 2012; Belias, 2013). Accordingly, a manager can choose one of these different leadership styles for different situations. It simply depends on the culture of the organization and the maturity of the employees. Today, employees are highly educated and jobs are mostly specialized; therefore, the employees have more power than they have ever had before.

### Styles of Leadership

We, as a whole, realize that initiative assumes a significant part in each circle of person's life, for example, at school, at home and furthermore at working environment, where pioneer is an individual which influences the productivity of the representatives and development of the association too. The term apparent initiative style is a view of the representatives about the pioneer and his way of behaving with their subordinates. The majority of the worker's way of behaving and productivity are impacted by the pioneer, since he is the individual who coordinates their representatives towards the achievement of the

objectives. Initiative is a complicated cycle including various in a general sense various kinds of acts (Saaty, 1990). A successful pioneer is one who rouse their subordinates, gives headings and backing towards the achievement of the objective. As per Stogdills (1950) authority might be considered as the most common way of impacting the exercises of a coordinated gathering in mission of laying out objectives and in accomplishing objectives.

An initiative style is a variation of shifting strategies utilized by pioneers to give direction and impact cooperation of subordinates in a predefined course to be explored. Initiative is a connection between at least two individuals from a gathering that frequently elaborate an organizing or rebuilding of the circumstance and the insights and assumptions for individuals (Sauer, 2011). Leadership is a process of motivating others to work together collaboratively to accomplish great things. As you progress in your career and develop leadership skills, you'll likely use different techniques and methods to achieve your organization's objectives while engaging employees who report to you. These different approaches of providing direction, executing plans, and motivating people are known as **leadership styles**.

### A Snapshot of Past Studies

Every research contributes a drop to the vast ocean of knowledge, it is therefore the sum total of a multitude of researches conducted by different researchers over an immense period of time. Not only does research contribute to knowledge per se, but also by clarifying and raising new issues, it provokes further research. Therefore, it is essential to be familiar with the development, which has taken place in the domain of research on the related topic.

**McCrae, R. R., and John, O. P. 1992**, expressed that the five-factor model (FFM) of character is a various leveled association of character qualities regarding five essential aspects: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience. Research utilizing both regular language modifiers and hypothetically based character polls support the exhaustiveness of the model and its relevance across onlookers and societies. Of these, the review referenced the significance of thoroughness which is maybe the most pivotal element. This study sums up the historical backdrop of the model and its supporting proof; examines originations of the idea of the variables and blueprints a plan for hypothesizing about the **Judge et al., 2002**, extra meta-logical work has additionally upheld the overall end that character qualities matter with regards to administration. A subjective and quantitative survey of the connection among character and initiative zeroed in on the five variable model of character. The purported Big Five character model was one more development that started resurgent interest in character research in I/O brain science. The examinations depended on 222 relationships from 73 free examples and shown a by and large numerous connection of .48 between the Big Five character elements and authority. Results from the individual meta-investigations on the particular quality elements showed that extraversion was the most predictable relate of initiative

across settings and significant rules (rise and adequacy). Principles, receptiveness, and neuroticism (switched) all exhibited non-no associations with administration.

**Judge and Piccolo, 2004**, an ensuing meta-examination on groundbreaking and value-based initiative had the option to address both of these issues. Across 626 connections from 87 sources, it was shown that groundbreaking authority had a general legitimacy (adjusted for factual relics) of .44, though CR showed a typical rectified legitimacy of .39, LZ administration associated by and large -.37 with results, and the MBE parts were conflictingly connected with the measures. Regardless, the normal legitimacy for groundbreaking authority was significantly lower than that found in the meta-examination, potentially mirroring the utilization of more thorough exploration plans as the hypothesis acquired more extensive acknowledgment throughout the long term. For sure, arbitrator examinations analyzing the impact of utilizing free information sources showed significant uniqueness in impacts while contrasting same-source and different source evaluations. In trial of the expansion impact, groundbreaking administration was displayed to have generally huge steady impacts over what was anticipated by the conditional and LF authority parts, as well concerning the parts of adherent inspiration and fulfillment with the pioneer, pioneer adequacy, however not for pioneer work execution.

**Singh, N., and Krishnan, V.R. 2005**, set that a significant component that adds to effective hierarchical change is initiative. The review investigated groundbreaking authority the greater part of which have been drawn from Singh and Bhandarker's (1988) model. Results showed that the widespread element of groundbreaking initiative comprises 44% of the reactions, while culture-explicit aspects comprise the rest. The review overcomes any barrier between the reasonable contentions and experimental discoveries, by showing that however there is a part of comprehensiveness in the Indian climate, yet the greater part of the ways of behaving of groundbreaking pioneers are adjusted with "Special Indian" aspects. The review pushed on the point that whatever is the authoritative culture, the inescapable public culture or cultural culture can't be circumvent or overlooked.

**Arvey, Zhang, Avolio, and Krueger, 2007**, the experimental proof backings an "and/both" as opposed to "either/or" viewpoint with respect to the significance of both nature and support in the improvement of pioneers. Utilizing an example of friendly (n = 178) and indistinguishable (n = 214) female twins, it was assessed that 32% of the fluctuation in influential position inhabitance was related with heritability or nature. Moreover, another 10-15% of the difference was inferable straightforwardly to work and educational encounters, and the leftover half "is at this point unseen" (p. 704).

**Bakker and Demerouti, 2008**, explained that engaged employees experience more optimistic and pleasant emotions, and they have joy in their work thus they can easily adopt proactive behaviour (OCB). Similarly, engaged employees experience good physical and psychological health so they can use optimum level of their abilities and mental resources to exercise ERBs (IWB). Additionally, they are supposed to be good in transferring their abilities and knowledge to other colleagues as well (KSB). There are evidences in which WE contribute to (ERBs) OCB, KSB, and IWB (c.f. Hakanen, Perhoniemi, & Toppinen Tanner, 2008). This engagement ERBs (OCB, KSB, IWB) relation has been tested on a sample of 245 firefighters and found positive by Rich, LePine, and Crawford (2010). On the basis of previous research and in light of JDR Model following hypothesis can be proposed:-

- Work Engagement positively relates to Organizational Citizenship Behaviour of the employees.
- Work Engagement positively relates to knowledge sharing behaviour of the employees.
- Work Engagement positively relates to Innovative Work Behaviour of the employees.

**Kuldeep, K. et al., 2009**, investigated the linkages among character and association citizenship conduct (OCB) utilizing a field test. Huge Five character model was utilized to investigate the connection among character and OCB. Four of the 'enormous five' factors aside from Neuroticism were emphatically related with OCB. The outcomes demonstrated that Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness were legitimate indicators for OCB. Be that as it may, Openness to encounter showed no huge relationship with in general proportion of OCB. Accordingly, the discoveries demonstrated that extraversion and

pleasantness are the significant character attributes to foresee OCB. The outcomes proposed that the five-factor model fills in as an educational structure in looking at the dispositional wellsprings of authoritative citizenship conduct.

**Suresh, S., and Venkatammal, P. 2010**, anticipated the progressions in authoritative citizenship conduct by character and hierarchical environment. Finding of the review uncovered that OCBI was essentially and emphatically associated with remunerations and relational relations; hierarchical cycles, lucidity of jobs and sharing of data and authoritative environment altogether. OCBI was fundamentally and emphatically connected with extraversion, appropriateness, reliability, and then again pessimistic relationship with profound precariousness. OCBO altogether emphatically related with authoritative cycles, philanthropic way of behaving and hierarchical environment all out. The aftereffects of the concentrate additionally showed that scruples and creative mind were the huge character indicators of OCBO. This study showed that orientation essentially anticipated OCBO that is female chiefs were less inclined to display OCBO. Results demonstrated that the authoritative citizenship conduct of the public area representatives was impacted by their orientation, age, conjugal status, character factors and hierarchical environment. Character and environment factors both had more noteworthy strength in anticipating citizenship conduct.

**Avey (2011)** found that the employees psychological capital have significant positive effects on organisational citizenship Behaviour. He conducted a meta-analytic study which includes 51 independent samples (N= 12,567 employees) that met the inclusion criteria. The results indicated that there are significant positive relationships of psychological capital with job satisfaction, organisational commitment, psychological well-being and employee Behaviours i.e. citizenship Behaviours.

**Cole et al.(2013)** investigated the effect of psychological capital and resistance to change on organisational citizenship Behaviour. The data was collected from a sample of 97 employees from a government organisation that provides life-cycle career management support. The participants were assessed on Psychological Capital Questionnaire-24, Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Scale and Resistance to Change Scale to obtain data for Psychological capital, organisational citizenship Behaviour and resistance to change, respectively. The data were analyzed for correlation analysis. Results reveal that the facets of psychological capital have positive and significant relationship with organizational citizenship Behaviour. The negative correlations between resistance to change and psychological capital, and between resistance to change and organisational citizenship Behaviour, suggested that employees who reported high levels of resistance to change tend to report low levels of psychological capital and organisational citizenship Behaviour. Hierarchical regression analysis observed that resistance to change moderated the relationship between psychological capital and organisational citizenship Behaviour.

**Lather and kaur (2015)** examined psychological capital in two types of organisations: public and private schools. This study explained how psychological capital effects organisational commitment and organisational citizenship Behaviour in public and private schools. The sample includes 150 employees, 75 each from two types of schools. The result obtained from Pearson correlation and stepwise multiple regressions and it showed that all the dimensions of psychological capital were significantly different in the both the kind of schools. Regression analyses showed that psychological capital as a whole can predict organisational commitment and organisational citizenship Behaviour in both kinds of schools. Results also revealed that psychological capital is a significant positive organisational Behaviour variable, as it is capable of performance improvement and is open to development.

**Gupta, Shaheen and Reddy (2017)** conducted a study to examine impact of Psychological Capital on organizational citizenship Behaviour. The sample for the study consists of 293 participants working in diverse service sector industries in India. The data were processed through Structural Equation Modeling. Results show that Psychological Capital and organisational citizenship Behaviour has positive and significant relationship but this relationship is mediated by work engagement.

#### Concluding Remarks

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is the criterion variable of the study. In today's world of competitive work environment OCB taking an important phenomenon at workplace, it is that Behaviour of employees at work that is related to their extra work related activities for which employees not get any financial reward by the management, but this Behaviour is not present in all employees because there are many factors such of workplace climate, leadership styles, the trust of management or company to the employees and also other personality dimensions of employees which have an influence on their citizenship Behaviour. Various researches show that organization or management plays an important role in increasing citizenship Behaviour of employees. In 1983 Bateman and Organ introduced the term "Citizenship" as Behaviour that lubricate the social machinery of the organization and labeled employees who engage in such Behaviours as "good citizens."

According to Malik & Naeem, (2016), defined Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) as "discretionary and voluntary Behaviour being followed by formal reward system." OCB comprises extra role Behaviour that is not within role but nevertheless of great importance for efficient processes in organization (Oguz, 2010).

## REFERENCES

1. Arnold, K. A., Connelly, C. E., Walsh, M. M., & Martin Ginis, K. A. (2015), Leadership styles, emotion regulation, and burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20(4), 481.
2. Day, D. V. (2000), Leadership development: A review in context. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11, 581-613.
3. Den Hartog, D. N., & Dickson, M. W. (2012), Leadership and culture. In D. V. Day & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed., pp. 393-436), Los Angeles: Sage.
4. Gibson, F. W., Fiedler, F. E., & Barrett, K. M. (1993), Stress, babble, and the utilization of the leader's intellectual abilities. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4, 189-208.
5. Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., & Ilies, R. (2004), The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 36-51.
6. Koohang, A., Paliszkievicz, J., & Goluchowski, J. (2017), The impact of leadership on trust, knowledge management, and organizational performance: A research model. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 117(3), 521-537.
7. Koenig, A. M., Eagly, A. H., Mitchell, A. A., & Risitkari, T. (2011), Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-analysis of three research paradigms. *Psychological Bulletin*, 137, 616-642.
8. Koohang, A., Paliszkievicz, J., & Goluchowski, J. (2017), The impact of leadership on trust, knowledge management, and organizational performance: A research model. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 117(3), 521-537.
9. Koppes, L. L., & Pickren, W. (2007), Industrial and organizational psychology: An evolving science and practice. In L. L. Koppes (Ed.), *Historical perspectives in industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 3-35), Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
10. Locke, E. A. (2003), Foundations for a theory of leadership. In S. E. Murphy & R. E. Riggio (Eds.), *The future of leadership development* (pp. 29-46), Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
11. Lord, R. G., & Dinh, J. E. (2012), Aggregation processes and levels of analysis as organizing structures for leadership theory. In D. V. Day & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed., pp. 29-65), Los Angeles: Sage.
12. Mussolino, D., & Calabrò, A. (2014), Paternalistic leadership in family firms: Types and implications for intergenerational succession. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 5(2), 197-210.
13. Nahrgang, J. D., Morgeson, F. P., & Ilies, R. (2009), The development of leader-member exchanges: Exploring how personality and performance influence leader and member relationships over time. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 108, 256-266.