

An Exploration of Supervisory Satisfaction as a Mediator Variable in Organisational Citizenship Behaviour

Lee Kim Lian¹

¹ Taylors University, Malaysia

Correspondence: Lee Kim Lian, Taylors University, Malaysia. E-mail: kimlian.lee@taylors.edu.my

Received: July 30, 2014 Accepted: September 21, 2015 Online Published: December 21, 2015

doi:10.5539/ass.v12n1p138

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v12n1p138>

Abstract

This paper seeks to explore the mediating construct of supervisory satisfaction on the relationship between leadership styles and organisational citizenship behaviour in companies across Malaysia. While there have been past research that investigated the relationship between leadership styles and citizenship behaviour, until now, there is very little research investigating the mediating effects of supervisory satisfaction on such relationship especially in the Malaysian context. Data was collected from 280 respondents that represent major industries such as services, manufacturing, mining and construction. SmartPLS was used to test the proposed framework. The results show that the transformational leadership style has significant positive relationship with subordinates' organisational citizenship behaviour. This result found that supervisory satisfaction mediates the relationship between transformational leadership and citizenship behaviour. The conclusion of the research emphasizes the effects of the research for future research and practice.

Keywords: leadership, supervisory satisfaction, organisational citizenship behaviour

1. Introduction and Objective of the Study

The purpose of this research is to determine the transformational leadership styles on subordinates' organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB). Supervisory satisfaction is explored closely as a mediator on OCB. This research rationale is to explore the relationship between these variables and not on specific organisational citizenship problems that Malaysian organisations are facing. Extensive literature has shown that leadership styles has the greatest impact on subordinate's response to work condition, thus, it is an important predictor. Although leadership style and organisational citizenship behaviour has been examined in the past (Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang & Chen, 2005; Ehrhart, 2004; MacKenzie, Podsakoff & Rich, 2001; Schlechter & Engelbrecht, 2006; Boerner, Eisenbeiss, & Griesser, 2007; Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996; Goodwin, Wofford, & Whittington, 2001), there has been little research done in determining the role of supervisory satisfaction as a mediator.

Malaysia is the choice of location for the study due to the shortage of empirical work which explores supervisory satisfaction on the relationship between leadership styles and OCB. This research attempts to add knowledge in the Malaysian context with regards to the literature surrounding organisational behavior.

This study seeks to answer the following research questions:

- What is the direct and indirect effect of leadership styles on subordinates' organisational citizenship behaviour?
- How does supervisory satisfaction mediate the relationship between leadership styles and organisational citizenship behaviour?

2. Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

An examination of the literature was done to outline and elaborate the interactions among the three variables: leadership styles, supervisory satisfaction and OCB.

2.1 Leadership Styles

Past researches have extensively studied transactional leadership as the core component of effective leadership behaviour in organisations. This was prior to the introduction of transformational leadership theory into the literature (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; House, 1977). Transactional leadership is based on exchange relationship

where subordinates agreed with, accepted, or complied with the superior in exchange for rewards, resources or the avoidance of disciplinary action (Podsakoff, Todor & Skov, 1982; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). More recently, much empirical work has focused on transformational leadership, in particular on the extent to which transformational leadership augments the effect of transactional leadership in explaining various outcomes such as leader effectiveness (Hater & Bass, 1988), subordinate satisfaction (Seltzer & Bass, 1990) and subordinate effort (Bass, 1985). These earlier studies are of particular relevant for this research as the existing literature suggests that (1) transactional and transformational leaders elicit different patterns of follower conformity (Kelman, 1958; Howell, 1988; Tichy & Devanna, 1986). This emergent genre of leadership study advocates that transformational leaders can motivate followers to perform beyond the normal call of duty.

2.2 Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)

Bateman and Organ (1983) introduced the construct of OCB by drawing upon Katz and Kahn's (1966) super role behavior. Some examples of OCB are accepting extra duties and responsibilities at the workplace, helping other subordinates with their work, offering to work overtime when the need arises (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 1996; Organ, 1988). The field of organisational behavior and social psychology has focus attention in determining why such individuals engage in OCB (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; McNeely & Meglino, 1994) where most past research on OCB has been focused on organisational performance, effects of OCB on individuals and leadership behavior (Bolino, Turnley, & Bloodgood, 2002; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Pain, & Bachrach, 2000). Numerous predictors of OCBs have been acknowledged which include interpersonal trust or loyalty to the leader (Podsakoff et al., 1990), transformational leadership behaviour (Eisenberger, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986; Greenberg, 1988), job attitudes (Organ, 1988; Shore & Wayne, 1993), organisational justice (Moorman, 1991), cultural influences (Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997), task characteristics (Farh, Podsakoff, & Organ, 1990), civic citizenship and covenantal relationship (van Dyne et al., 1994; Graham, 1988), contextual influences (Netemeyer, Boles, McKee, & McMurrian, 1997) and dispositional influences (Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994; Moorman & Blakely, 1995). The outcomes of OCB studied are satisfaction (Bateman & Organ, 1983), perceptions of fairness (Folger, 1993; Martin & Bies, 1991; Moorman, Niehoff, & Organ, 1993; Tepper & Taylor, 2003), commitment (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986) and perceptions of pay equity (Organ, 1988).

2.3 Supervisory Satisfaction

Supervisory satisfaction is a collection of feelings or affective reactions of the organisational members which are associated with their immediate manager supervision. The aspect of supervising style is simply the amount of supervision and direction given to the subordinates. These being: how closely their job activities are structured, monitored, and directed. Justification for the need to investigate supervisory satisfaction is exemplified in the seemingly observed relationship between the levels of job dissatisfaction, absenteeism, grievance expression, tardiness, low morale and high turnover. Dissatisfaction with supervision is an antecedent of intention to leave the workplace. Unsatisfied workers will leave their jobs more than their satisfied colleagues (Gangadhraiah, Nardev, & Reddy, 1990; Martin, 1990; Padilla-Vellez, 1993).

3. Hypothesized Relationship

3.1 Transformational Leadership Styles and OCB

Many studies have shown that transformational leadership can affect followers' OCB (Geyer & Steyrer, 1998; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Lowe, Kroeck & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Podsakoff et al., 1990). Graham (1988) has suggested that the most important effect of transformational leadership behaviour is the ability to promote extra-role behaviours that exceed the requirements of in-role expectations. Podsakoff et al. (1990) support Graham's view and argues further that "the most important effects of transformational leaders should be on extra-role performance, rather than in-role performance" (p. 109).

Such leadership is proposed to "lift ordinary people to extraordinary heights" (Boal & Bryson, 1988, p. 11) and to cause followers to "do more than they are expected to do" (Yukl 1989, p. 272) and "perform beyond the level of expectations" (Bass, 1985, p. 32), and House, Landis & Umberson (1988, p. 100) claim that these leaders motivate their subordinates to "perform above and beyond the call of duty". In sum, this suggests that transformational leadership may have an important effect on extra-role or OCB that is of a discretionary nature which are not part of the employee's formal role requirements.

The positive relationships between transformational leadership and OCB have been empirically proven by past researchers demonstrating that transformational leadership is unambiguously linked to followers' higher levels of OCB across different settings (Geyer & Steyrer, 1998; Goodwin et al., 2001; Graham, 1988; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; MacKenzie et al., 2001; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Podsakoff et al.,

2000; Wang et al., 2005; Whittington, 1997). For example, Podsakoff et al. (1990) and Podsakoff et al. (1996b) reported a positive relationship between transformational leader behaviour (such as articulating a vision, role modelling, intellectually stimulating employees and communicating high performance expectations) and subordinates' OCB. Thus, there is a strong conceptual support that transformational leaders motivate their followers to exhibit extra-role behaviours.

Hypothesis 1: Transformational leadership style is positively correlated with OCB.

3.2 Transformational Leadership Styles and Supervisory Satisfaction

Among the determinants of job satisfaction, leadership is viewed as an important predictor and plays a central role. Leadership is mostly directed towards people and social interaction, as well as to the process of influencing people so that they will achieve the goals of the organisation (Skansi, 2000). The link between transformational leadership and work-related attitudes and behaviours such as job satisfaction, is well established (Avolio, Bass, Walumbwa, & Zhu, 2004).

Under the circumstances when job satisfaction is examined using Bass's (1985) leadership model, it is suggested that managers who display more transformational leadership characteristics might intrinsically foster higher job satisfaction. In a similar fashion, the transformational leader is able to motivate his or her followers to take on more responsibility by granting them work autonomy. As such, work tasks provide employees with an increased level of accomplishment and satisfaction. Additionally, the transformational leader's ability in grooming the individual personal development of followers projects a sense of belonging among subordinates as they observe that someone is concerned for their needs. Hence, the transformational leader-employee interactions may be more balanced since the manager and satisfied employees both jointly and effectively work toward achieving the organisation's common goals.

Essentially, both empirical and meta-analytic studies suggest that followers working with transformational leaders are more involved, satisfied, empowered, motivated and committed to their organizations, and demonstrate fewer withdrawal behaviours (Barling, Weber & Kelloway, 1996; Bono & Judge, 2003; Walumbwa & Lawler, 2003; Walumbwa, Wang, Lawler, & Shi, 2004). Such leaders enhance followers' confidence, effectiveness and motivation by giving them personal attention and by learning their needs and aspirations (Walumbwa & Kuchinke, 1999). Thus, based on the foregoing discussion, the following hypothesis is put forward:

Hypothesis 2: Transformational leadership and subordinates' supervisory satisfaction will be positively correlated

3.3 Supervisory Satisfaction and OCB

Although, it is believed that satisfied employees will perform better, this claim has remained relatively unsupported as reported in the past (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955; Vroom, 1964; Iaaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982).

A meta-analytic review by Petty and his colleagues (1984) indicated that job satisfaction and performance have a positive relationship. These conclusions were supported by Judge, Thoresen, Bono & Patton (2001), who found that earlier studies sometimes were too restrictive in their conceptualizations of both job satisfaction and performance. Concerning the direction of the satisfaction-performance relationship, it was proposed that positive emotions such as a feeling of satisfaction would bring about higher performance, especially when performance is being associated with the outcome of the participant's extra role behaviour. Therefore, the next hypothesis is formulated as:

Hypothesis 3: Subordinates' organisational citizenship behaviour will be increased as supervisory satisfaction increases.

3.4 Supervisory Satisfaction as Mediator

Job satisfaction is seen in some studies as a mediator to the effect of various antecedents on career commitment (Rhodes & Doering, 1983; Malik, Waheed, & Ur-Rehman Malik, 2010; Steers & Mowday, 1981; Oliver & Brief, 1977; Farrel & Rusbult, 1981; Yousef, 2002a,b; Chen, Myrtle, Lin, & Fahey, 2011; Malik et al., 2010; Cheung, Wa, Chan, & Wong, 2009). Farrell and Rusbult (1981) commented that job satisfaction is an intervening variable to be a function of rewards and costs associated with a specific job where job commitment is an outcome from job satisfaction, investments and alternatives. Other studies have also found that job satisfaction does not mediate the effects of other antecedents on commitment; rather these antecedents influence career commitment directly (Goulet & Singh, 2002).

The argument could be made that supervisory satisfaction as a mediating variable occurs because supervisory satisfaction represents a situational factor that is within a leader's sphere of influence. When supervisory satisfaction increases, the leader becomes more instrumental. Conversely, as supervisory satisfaction decreases, the leader becomes less instrumental. Thus, one could argue that the link between leadership and OCB would be stronger when supervisory satisfaction is high and weaker when supervisory satisfaction is low. On top of that, the transformational leader is said to be able to increase supervisory satisfaction and supervisory satisfaction has been found to be positively related to extra-role performance (Churchill, Ford, Hartley, & Walker, 1985; Jaworski & Kohli, 1991). Based on this rationale, the following is expected.

Hypothesis 4: Supervisory satisfaction mediates the relationship between transformational leadership style and organisational citizenship behaviour.

4. Methodology and Research Design

4.1 Sampling Design

The sample selection for this research includes executives, managers and professionals in companies that deal with services, manufacturing, mining and construction. These companies are mainly located in the Klang Valley, Malaysia. Companies that met the criteria above were carefully chosen from the Federation of Manufacturers, Malaysia, Service Directory, Construction Industry Development Board Directory, and Malaysian Trade and Commerce Directory published in 2008.

4.2 Research Instruments

4.2.1 Leadership Styles

Six dimensions of the Transformational Leadership Behaviour Inventory (TLI: Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Morrison & Fetter, 1990) were used to measure the 14 items of leadership style. A 7-item scale was used to assess the transactional leadership from Leader Reward and Punishment Behaviour Questionnaire (LRPQ: Podsakoff, Todor, Grover, & Huber, 1984; Podsakoff, Todor, & Skov, 1982). To measure subordinates' perception of the superior leadership styles the instrument uses a 7-point Likert scale.

4.2.2 Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)

The research uses Smith, Organ and Near's (1983) 7-item scale to measure OCB. In particular the scale measures the dimension of OCB connected to altruism. This instrument uses 7-point Likert scale with ranges from 1 as strongly disagree to 7 as strongly agree as incumbent rated.

4.2.3 Supervisory Satisfaction

This study will focus on one facet of job satisfaction called satisfaction with supervision developed by Hackman and Oldman (1980). The satisfaction consists of three items assessing satisfaction with supervision, method of supervision and quality of supervision. The internal consistency reliability for this scale as reported by Warren (1998) is 0.93

4.3 Data Analysis Procedure

The SmartPLS was the primary statistical technique used and correlational analysis is the other statistical analysis employed.

5. Research Results

Compared to the covariance-based structural equation modelling technique, PLS provides a better explanation of variables relationships and it can accommodate a minimal sample size and sample distribution (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Chin, 1998). The PLS analysis was conducted using the SmartPLS 2.0 software (Ringle, Wende & Will, 2005).

5.1 Measurement Reliability and Validation

The construct reliability, convergent validity, discriminant validity, and nomological validity test were applied to all constructs. The psychometric properties of all latent constructs are presented in Table 1. As seen in Table 1, the standardized loadings (λ) of each reflective measurement item on its corresponding latent construct was greater than the threshold levels of 0.50, were all significant at $p < 0.01$, and therefore convergent validity was achieved (Hair et al., 2010). The Cronbach's alpha values (α) and composite reliability (ρ) for all latent constructs were above 0.70, supporting adequate reliability of the multi-item scales (Bagozzi & Youjae, 1988). All average variance extracted (AVE) were greater than 0.50 threshold level, supporting convergent validity of the latent constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Chin, 1998; Hair, Black, Babin, & Andeson, 2010).

Table 1. Psychometric properties of the measures

Constructs	Items	λ	t-value	α	P	AVE
Transformational leadership	TFL1	0.80	38.21	0.93	0.94	0.55
	TFL2	0.69	20.72			
	TFL3	0.65	19.98			
	TFL4	0.70	22.95			
	TFL5	0.80	43.24			
	TFL6	0.81	37.74			
	TFL7	0.70	22.18			
	TFL8	0.79	37.26			
	TFL9	0.80	37.05			
	TFL10	0.77	27.70			
	TFL11	0.62	16.89			
	TFL12	0.64	16.92			
	TFL13	0.78	32.22			
	TFL14	0.76	25.95			
Supervisory satisfaction	SS1	0.94	129.72	0.94	0.96	0.91
	SS2	0.95	135.00			
	SS3	0.95	140.15			
Organizational citizenship behaviour	OCB1	0.81	35.63	0.91	0.94	0.68
	OCB2	0.82	34.20			
	OCB3	0.78	28.79			
	OCB4	0.84	39.69			
	OCB5	0.85	45.59			
	OCB6	0.82	38.47			
	OCB7	0.75	22.45			

As seen in Table 2, the discriminant validity was supported as the AVE for each construct was greater than the squared correlation with other constructs (Fornell and Larcker, 1981, Malhotra, 2010). The nomological validity was assessed using the measure of explained variance. The R^2 value of supervisory satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviours were 0.63 and 0.55 respectively, which were large effect sizes (~26%; Cohen, 1988). The goodness-of-fit (GOF), which was calculated as the geometric mean of average R^2 (0.59) and average communality (0.65) was 0.62, and suggested satisfactory fit to the model (Tenenhaus et al., 2005).

Table 2. Correlation and discriminant validity

	1	2	3
Transformational leadership	0.74		
Supervisory satisfaction	0.69*	0.95	
Organizational citizenship behaviour	0.64*	0.73*	0.82
Mean	4.57	3.38	4.67

Note: Diagonal values represent square root of average variance extracted. *p < 0.01

5.2 Structural Model

Blindfold approach was carried out to evaluate the predictive validity of the structural model. The means of the cross-validated (CV) communality (H^2) and redundancy (F^2) indicate that the quality of structural model is well above the recommended standard of 0.30 (Tenenhaus et al., 2005). In fact, the average CV-communality (H^2) was 0.65 and average CV-redundancy (F^2) was 0.49. The average variance accounted (AVA) for the model was 0.35, which was greater than the cut-off value of 0.10 (Falk & Miller, 1992). These results suggest that the model exhibits adequate explanatory power.

Table 3 presents the estimated path coefficients, t-values, and variance explained (R^2) of each endogenous construct. The results confirm the research hypotheses. As can be seen from Table 3, transformational leadership has a significant positive effect on supervisory satisfaction ($\beta = 0.79$, $t = 30.33$, $p < 0.01$). This provides support for H3. Similarly, supervisory satisfaction was found to have a positive effect on organizational citizenship behaviour ($\beta = 0.61$, $t = 8.54$, $p < 0.01$). However, the direct effect of transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behaviour was not significant ($\beta = 0.15$, $t = 1.84$, $p = 0.07$).

Table 3. Structural model

	β	t	R^2
Transformational leadership → Supervisory satisfaction	0.79	30.33*	0.63
Transformational leadership → Organizational citizenship behaviour	0.15	1.84	
Supervisory satisfaction → Organizational citizenship behaviour	0.61	8.54*	0.55

Note: * $p < 0.01$

5.3 Mediation Analysis

A mediation analysis was carried out to examine the mediating role of supervisory satisfaction in the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour using Preacher and Hayes (2008) procedure. The latent variable scores obtained using SmartPLS was analysed using SPSS routine developed by Preacher and Hayes (2008) for generating the 95 percentile confidence intervals. Table 4 presents the results of the mediation analysis. As can be seen from the results, the total effect of transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behaviour is 0.64. However, the direct effect of transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behaviour is not significant ($\beta = 0.15$, $t = 1.84$, $p = 0.07$) and the total indirect effect is 0.49. These findings suggest full mediation of supervisory satisfaction in the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour.

Table 4. Mediation analysis results

Independent variable	Criterion variable	Total effect	Specific indirect effect Supervisory satisfaction (95% CI)
Transformational leadership	Organizational citizenship behaviour	0.64	0.49* (0.36-0.60)

Note: * $p < 0.05$. Standardized beta coefficients are presented with biased corrected 95% confidence intervals.

5.4 Discussion

Hypothesis H1 predicts that transformational leadership style is positively correlated with organisational citizenship behaviour (Table 2: $r = 0.64$, $p < 0.01$). This result is quite similar to past studied (Schlechter & Engelbrecht, 2006; Ferres, Travaglione & Connell, 2002; Mackenzie, Podsakoff & Rich, 2001) that unambiguously indicate that there is a positive relationship between transformational leadership and OCB. The relationships between leadership and OCB have been empirically studied with the conclusion that transformational leadership was consistently linked to followers' higher level of OCB (Goodwin, Wofford, & Whittington, 2001; Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, & Chen, 2005; Mackenzie, Podsakoff, & Rich, 2001). Hence,

there is strong conceptual support for the notion that transformational leaders motivate their followers to exhibit extra-role behaviours.

Hypothesis H2 predicts the relationship between transformational leadership and subordinates' supervisory satisfaction will be positively correlated (Table 2: $r = 0.69$, $p < 0.01$) lend support to Hypothesis H2. This result reinforces the general speculation that transformational leadership produces desirable work-related attitudes and behaviours in the subordinates such as job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004; Avolio, Bass, Walumbwa, & Zhu, 2004). Transformational leaders are also known for their ability to recognise, understand and attempt to address each follower's needs on a one-on-one basis (Bass, 1998) and continue to raise those needs to higher levels of inspiration (Avolio, 1999). Subordinates who perceive they receive the leader's special attention are more likely to exhibit greater satisfaction with supervision (Bartram & Casimir, 2007; Berson & Linton, 2005; Emery & Barker, 2007).

Hypothesis H3 posits that subordinates' organisational citizenship behaviour will be increased as supervisory satisfaction increases (Table 2: $r = 0.73$, $p < 0.01$) lend support for Hypothesis H3. Thus, the result seems to agree with the conventional reasoning that supervisory satisfaction provides the opportunity of a person to perform effectively and efficiently. Other research findings (Judge et al., 2001), have also demonstrated a positive relationship between supervisory satisfaction and performance. There is clearly more empirical evidence to suggest the simple conclusion that the supervisory satisfaction ensures better performance (including extra-role) as one is more certain about what is expected to be accomplished. Hopefully, the increase in supervisory satisfaction will lead to an increase in organisational commitment and task performance and ultimately, increase the employees' OCB level (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Ahearne, 1998; MacKenzie, et al., 2001; Tubre & Collins, 2000).

Hypothesis H4 states that supervisory satisfaction mediates the relationship between transformational leadership style and organisational citizenship behaviour as shown in Table 4. The result asserts that transformational leadership has a significant and direct relationship with subordinates' OCB and that this relationship is mediated by supervisory satisfaction. In relation to the direction of effect, it would appear that supervisory satisfaction serves to increase the strength of the relationship between transformational leadership and OCB. This can be explained from the fact that transformational leadership will generally increase the supervisory satisfaction and this will lead to an increased in OCB (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Rich, 2001). Transformational leaders by their attempt to provide followers with a clearer perspective on their work may actually increase employees' supervisory satisfaction. The present result seems to acknowledge the contention made by several researchers that leadership style effectiveness is very much dependent on the supervisory satisfaction (Yousef, 2002a,b; Jaworski & Kohli, 1991).

6. Conclusion

This research sought to determine how a superior is able to attain a better understanding of the appropriate leadership styles when faced with supervisory satisfaction. As predicted the superior is inclined to adopt a transformational leadership style as compared to a transactional leadership style when greater subordinate OCB is pursued. It is well suggested that the superior must adopt the appropriate leadership style to ensure that subordinates surpass their call of duties. The supervisory satisfaction as a mediating effect was purposely researched so as to investigate how the variable is able to strengthen or weaken the relationship between leadership styles and OCB. OCB is intended as an outcome variable in this research so as to solicit subordinate superior effort in the organisation. The presence of such a correlation shows the significance of leadership style in promoting subordinates' OCB in organisation. Such behaviour should have great practical significance and thus should be promoted in organisation. The research also supports the contention that subordinates' supervisory satisfaction has a direct and indirect effect on the outcome, serving to increase the strength of transformational leadership on OCB. This result seems to support a widely held assertion that the effectiveness of leadership depends very much on the situation (Fiedler, 1967; House & Dessler, 1974; Weed, Mitchell, & Moffitt, 1976). In short, this research provides the theoretical grounding for exploring a greater variety of outcomes vis-à-vis managers' leadership styles and their effect via supervisory satisfaction. The present research could assist to foster further research efforts to apply the findings of organisational research to industrial settings.

7. Managerial Implications

From the present research there are numerous managerial implications. Such as, in terms of a practical standpoint, the research findings recommend that given a choice of leadership styles, a superior should show greater importance in adopting a transformational leadership style so as to achieve greater OCB. By adopting the transformational leadership style the harmful influencing network created is changed by shifting the

superior-subordinate power difference. As such, it is important to foster organisational cultures that are transformationally-oriented through the encouragement of job and organisational design, human capital decisions and training and development. The behaviour of the transformational leader is fostered by training through mentoring and recognising the ever-changing development needs of the employees. Rather than promoting the win-lose relationship which are inherently damaging the intellectual stimulation of the transformational leadership style found in the integrative problem-solving relationship should be promoted. Subordinates can learn to adopt the transformational leadership style through the learning of scenarios such as role play and even videotapes of actual cases in organisation. With the appropriate feedback, work productivity will increase. Likewise, organisations that are facing rapid environmental change will profit at all levels from the flexibility adopted by transformational leadership. With the help of supervisory satisfaction as mediator the variable is able to uncover how leadership styles provide indirect effects on its outcome. As such, the transformational leader deals with supervisory satisfaction so as to induce higher OCB levels.

8. Contribution and Direction for Future Research

This research contributes to the existing literature of leadership and OCB research in several ways. Firstly, the model offers a base for incorporating a large and diverse body of research. By appealing to the managerial leadership, the model is able to provide the theoretical grounding for research to distinguish the effectiveness of different leadership styles and OCB. In line with past research study (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000; Mackenzie, Podsakoff, & Rich, 2001; Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, & Chen, 2005; Walumbwa, Wu, & Orwa, 2008), this research concurs that subordinates tendency to adopt a transformational leadership style as compared to a transactional leader in engaging OCB is more interesting and encouraging. In future, research should attempt to include other endogenous variables such as motivation, compliance and performance of subordinate that are more indicative of organisational outcomes.

References

- Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., Walumbwa, F. O., & Zhu, W. (2004). *MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (3rd ed.). Redwood, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Youjae, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16, 74-94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02723327>
- Baird, L. S., & Hamner, W. C. (1979). Individual versus systems rewards: Who's dissatisfied, why; and what is their likely response? *Academy of Management Journal*, 22, 783-792. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/255814>
- Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, E. K. (1996). Effects of transformational leadership training and attitudinal and fiscal outcomes. A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 827-832. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.6.827>
- Bartram, T., & Casimir, G. (2007). The relationship between leadership and follower in-role performance and satisfaction with the leaders: The mediating effects of empowerment and trust in the leader. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 28(1), 4-19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437730710718218>
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations*. Free Press, New York.
- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.207>
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587-595. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/255908>
- Berson, Y., & Linton, J. D. (2005). An examination of the relationships between leadership style, quality and employee satisfaction in R&D versus administrative environments. *R&D Management*, 35, 51-60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9310.2005.00371.x>
- Boal, K. B., & Bryson, J. M. (1988). Charismatic leadership. In: A Phenomenological and structural approach. In J. G. Hunt, B. R. Baliga, H. P. Dachler, & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Emerging leadership vista* (pp. 11-28). Lexington, New York.

- Boerner, S., Eisenbesiss, S. A., & Griesser, D. (2007). Follower behaviour and organisational performance: The impact of transformational leaders. *Journal of Leadership and Organisational Studies*, 13(3), 15-26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/10717919070130030201>
- Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Bloodgood, J. M. (2002). Citizenship behaviour and the creation of social capital in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 27, 505-523.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 554-571. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/30040649>
- Brayfield, A. H., & Crockett, W. H. (1955). Employee attitudes and employee performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 396-424. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0045899>
- Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organisational behaviours. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 710-725.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper and Row, New York, NY.
- Chen, D. R., Myrtle, R., Liu, C., & Fahey, D. (2011). Job and career influences on the career commitment of health care executives: The mediating effect of job satisfaction. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, 25(6), 693-710. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14777261111178565>
- Cheung, M. F. Y., Wu, W. P., Chan, A. K. K., & Wong, M. M. L. (2009). Supervisor-subordinate guanxi and employee work outcomes: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(1), 77-89. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9830-0>
- Chin, W. W. (1998). The partial least squares approach for structural equation modeling. In G. A. Marcoulides (Ed.), *Modern methods for business research* (pp. 295-236). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Churchill, G. A. Jr., Ford, N. M., Hartley, S. W., & Walker, O. C. Jr. (1985). The determinants of salesperson performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 22, 103-118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3151357>
- Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit level organisational citizenship behaviour. *Personnel psychology*, 57, 61-94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.tb02484.x>
- Eisenberger, R. R., Hutchison, H. S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500-507. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- Emery, C. R., & Barker, K. J. (2007). The Effect of Transactional and Transformational Leadership Styles on the Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction of Customer Contact personnel. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication and Conflict*, 11(1), 77-90.
- Falk, R. F., & Miller, N. B. (1992). *A primer for soft modeling*. Akron, OH: University of Akron Press.
- Farh, J., Earley, C. P., & Lin, S. (1997). Impetus for action: a cultural analysis of justice and OCB in Chinese society. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 421-444. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2393733>
- Farh, J., Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. (1990). Accounting for OCB: leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, 16, 705-721. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014920639001600404>
- Farrell, D., & Rusbult, C. E. (1981). Exchange variables as predictors of job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover: The impact of rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 27, 79-95. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(81\)90016-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(81)90016-7)
- Ferres, N., Travaglione, T., & Connell, J. (2002). Trust: A precursor to the potential mediating effect of transformational leadership. *International Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 5, 242-263.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Folger, G. (1993). Justice, motivation, and performance beyond role requirements. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6(3), 239-248. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01419447>
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3151312>
- Gangadbraiah, H. M., Nardev, G., & Reddy, M. V. (1990) Nurses job satisfaction in mental health and neuro-science setting. *The Nursing Journal of India*, 81, 299-302.

- Geyer, L., & Steyrer, J. M. (1998). Transformational leadership and objective performance in banks. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 47, 97-420. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/026999498377917>
- Goodwin, V. L., Wofford, J. C., & Whittington, J. L. (2001). A theoretical and empirical extension to the transformational leadership construct. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 22, 759-774. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.111>
- Goulet, L. R., & Singh, P. (2002). Career Commitment: A Reexamination and an Extension. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 73-91. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1844>
- Graham, J. W. (1988). Transformational leadership: Fostering follower autonomy, not automatic followership.
- Greenberg, J. (1988). Cultivating an image of justice: looking fair on the job. *Academy of Management Executive*, 2, 155-157. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AME.1988.4275532>
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work Redesign*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- Hair, J. F., Black, B., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective* (7th ed.). Pearson Education, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Hater, J. J., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 695-702. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.73.4.695>
- House, J. S., Landis, K. R., & Umberson, D. (1988). Social relationships and health. *Science*, 241, 540-545. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.3399889>
- House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt, & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The Cutting Edge* (pp. 189-207). Carbondale: Southern Illinois: University Press.
- Howell, J. M. (1988). Two faces of charisma: Socialized and personalized leadership in organizations. In J. A. Conger, & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership* (pp. 213-236). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 891-902. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.6.891>
- Iaffaldano, M. T., & Muchinsky, P. M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, 251-273. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.97.2.251>
- Jaworski, B. J., & Kohli, A. K. (1991). Supervisory feedback: Alternative types and their impact on salespeople's performance and satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28, 190-201. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3172807>
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 376-407. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.3.376>
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The Social Psychology of Organisations*. New York: Wiley.
- Kelman, H. C. (1958). Compliance, identification and internalization: Three processes of opinion change. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2, 51-60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/002200275800200106>
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 385-425. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(96\)90027-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90027-2)
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Ahearne, M. (1998). Some possible antecedents and Consequences of In-Role and Extra-Role Performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 62, 87-98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1251745>
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Rich, G. R. (2001). Transformational and transactional leadership and salesperson performance. *Academy of Marketing Science Journal*, 29(2), 115-135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/03079459994506>
- Malhotra, N. K. (2010). *Marketing research: An applied orientation* (6th ed.). Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/S1548-6435\(2010\)6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/S1548-6435(2010)6)
- Martin, B. J. (1990). A successful approach to absenteeism. *Nursing Management*, 21, 45-48. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00006247-199008000-00019>
- Martin, C. L., & Bies, R. J. (1991). Just laid off, but still a good citizen? Only if the process is fair. *Annual*

- Meeting of the Academy of Management*, 6(3), 227-238.
- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B., & Taylor, M. S. (1996). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 738-748. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1556364>
- McNeely, B. L., & Meglino, B. M. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial organisational behaviour: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(6), 836-844. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.6.836>
- Moorman, R. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviours: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-855. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.6.845>
- Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 16, 127-142. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.4030160204>
- Moorman, R. H., Niehoff, B. P., & Organ, D. W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behaviour: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6, 209-225. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01419445>
- Mowday, R., Porter, L., & Steers, R. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover*. New York: Academic Press.
- Netemeyer, R., Boles, J., McKee, D., & McMurrian, R. (1997). An investigation into the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviours in a personal selling context. *Journal of Marketing*, 61, 85-98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1251791>
- O'Reilly, C., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organisational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 492-499. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.492>
- Oliver, R. L., & Brief, A. P. (1977). Determinants and consequences of role conflict and ambiguity among retail sales managers. *Journal of Retailing*, 53(4), 47-58.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organisational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Padilla-Velez, D. (1993). *Job satisfaction of vocational teachers in Puerto Rico*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus.
- Petty, M. M., McGee, G. W., & Cavender, J. W. (1984). A meta-analysis of the relationships between individual job satisfaction and individual performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 9, 712-721.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). A meta-analysis of the relationships between Kerr and Jermier's substitutes for leadership and employee job attitudes, role perceptions and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 380-399. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.380>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviours and their effects on followers trust in leader satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviours. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(90\)90009-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7)
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Pain, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organisational citizenship behaviours: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-565. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600307>
- Podsakoff, P. M., Todor, W. D., & Skov, R. (1982). Effects of leader contingent and non contingent reward and punishment behaviours on subordinate performance and satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 22, 810-821. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256100>
- Podsakoff, P. M., Todor, W. D., Grover, R. A., & Huber, V. L. (1984). Situational moderators of leader reward and punishment behaviours: Fact or fiction? *Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 34(1), 1-63. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(84\)90036-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(84)90036-9)
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behaviour Research Methods*, 40, 879-891. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/BRM.40.3.879>

- Rhodes, S. R., & Doering, M. (1983). An integrated model of career motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 631-639.
- Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., & Will, A. (2005). *SmartPLS 2.0 (M3) beta*. Hamburg. Retrieved from <http://www.smartpls.de>.
- Schlechter, A. F., & Engelbrecht, A. S. (2006). The relationship between transformational leadership, meaning and organisational citizenship behaviour. *Management Dynamics*, 15(4), 2-16.
- Seltzer, J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational leadership: Beyond initiation and consideration. *Journal of Management*, 16(4), 693-703. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014920639001600403>
- Shore, L. M., & Wagne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and employee behaviour: Comparison of affective commitment and continuance commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(5), 774-780. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.5.774>
- Skansi, D. (2000). Relation of managerial efficiency and leadership styles – empirical study in Hrvatska elektroprivreda. *Management*, 5(2), 51-67.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 655-663. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653>
- Steers, R. M., & Mowday, R. T. (1981). Employee Turnover and post-decision accommodation processes. In L. L. Cummings, & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*. JAI Press: Greenwich, CT.
- Tenenhaus, M., Vincenzo E. V., YvesMarie, C., & Carlo L. (2005). *PLS path modeling. Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 48(1), 159- 205. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2004.03.005>
- Tepper, B. J., & Taylor, E. C. (2003). Relationships among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviours. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(1), 97-105. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/30040679>
- Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1986). *The transformational leader*. New York: Wiley.
- Tubre, T. C., & Collins, J. M. (2000). Jackson and Schuler (1985) revisited: A meta-analysis of the relationships between role ambiguity, role conflict and job performance. *Journal of Management*, 26, 155-169. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600104>
- Van Dyne, L. V., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviour; Construct redefinition, measurement and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 765-802. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256600>
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Walumbwa, F. O., & Lawler, J. J. (2003). Building effective organizations: transformational leadership, collectivist orientation, work-related attitudes, and withdrawal behaviors in three emerging economies. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(7), 1083-1101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0958519032000114219>
- Walumbwa, F. O., Wang, P., Lawler, J. J., & Shi, K. (2004). The role of collective efficacy in the relations between transformational leadership and work outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 515-530. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/0963179042596441>
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.03.004>
- Walumbwa, O. R., & Kuchinke, K. P. (1999). *HRD faculty as leaders: The application of the full range leadership theory to graduate level HRD instruction*. Paper presented at the Academy of Human Resource Development Conference, Fairfax, VA.
- Wang, H., Law, K. S., Hackett, R. D., Wang, D., & Chen, Z. H. (2005). Leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and organisational citizenship behaviour. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3), 420-432. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2005.17407908>
- Warren, W. A. (1998). *The effects of leader-member exchange on supervisor's downward influence attempts*. Unpublished MBA, California State University, Long Beach.
- Weed, S. E., Mitchell, R. R., & Moffitt, W. (1976). Leadership style, subordinate personality, and task type as

- predictors of performance and satisfaction with supervision. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61, 58-67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.61.1.58>
- Whittington, J. L. (1997). *An Integrative Model of Transformational Leadership and Follower Behavior*. Dissertation, University of Texas at Arlington.
- Yousef, D. A. (2002a). Job satisfaction as a mediator of the relationship between role stressors and organizational commitment. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17(4), 250-266. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940210428074>
- Yousef, D. A. (2002b). Job satisfaction as a mediator of the relationship between job stressors and affective, continuance, and normative commitment: A path analytical approach. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 9(2), 99-112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1014954703735>
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Yearly Review of Management*, 15, 251-289. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014920638901500207>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).