



# IMPACT OF LEADERSHIP STYLE ON ORGANIZATION CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR IN THE EDUCATION SECTOR

Kkhush Aggarwal

Student

Christ University

## ABSTRACT

Rapid growing economies, increased competition, and rising demand for up-to-date skill sets have raised the concern among organizations to provide their workers with various types of training that meet the needs of employees, keep them engaged, and help boost their efficiency. This study aims at carrying out an analysis to understand if and to what extent; the Leadership Style of an Immediate Supervisor in the education has an impact Organization Citizenship Behavior of a teacher in the city of Hyderabad, India. The study makes use of Cronbach's Alpha for Reliability Test, One Way ANOVA and Regression Analysis for the purpose of determining the extent to which there is an impact of Leadership Style on Organization Citizenship Behavior.

**Key Words-** Leadership Style, Organization Citizenship Behavior, Education Sector, Regression, Reliability, ANOVA

## 1. Introduction

The conduct of organizational citizenship deals with the actions and behaviors not expected by the employees. They are not vital to the job but they support the team and promote even greater functioning and productivity in the company.

This is usually known as a worker "moving beyond and beyond," or "giving their everything." They see their task as greater than just a paycheck, and they try to do everything they can to make their work environment run smoothly; even if it has a limited relation to their current duties.



The leadership Style scenario model used belongs to the School of Behaviour. Kurt Lewin, a psychologist, led a research team in 1939 and in an article in the Journal of Social Psychology described what he called three 'models' of leadership behavior. Kurt Lewin identified three revolutionary forms of behavior. These three styles might also fit into the Leadership Styles module right now. Moreover, if you know the strengths and disadvantages of each strategy, you can adapt them to your circumstances-obviously you can flex your behavior. This is where the Model Three Styles transform into a manual for progressively viable power.

**Authoritarian-** In some cases called the Autocratic style. This is the place heads illuminate the objectives, cutoff times and strategies while settling on choices all alone with little counsel with others.

**Participative-** Also called the Democratic style. This is the place the pioneer communicates their needs and qualities in defining objectives and deciding, yet additionally participates in the gathering's work and acknowledges exhortation and proposals from partners.

**Delegative-** Known as the Laissez-Faire style. The Delegative style implies the pioneer hands over obligation regarding results to the gathering.

The main objectives of the study are to determine if there is any significant difference in Leadership Style based on Demographic Variables, to determine if there is any significant difference in Organization Citizenship Behaviour based on Demographic Variables and to identify and analyze the Impact of different Leadership Styles on Organization Citizenship Behavior.

The research is carried out in the Education sector in Hyderabad. The educational institutions chosen are Gitanjali Devashray and P. Obul Reddy Public School. A sample size of 109 teachers has been selected based on non-probability convenience sampling.

## 2. Literature Review

(Despoja and Stott, 2001) acknowledges that Autocratic leadership can lead to collisions and disputes between Party members involved in decision-making. Sully, (David and House, 2018) agrees that Executives who promote economic values can be seen as autocratic leaders. Executives who use stakeholder principles when making decisions are more likely to be seen as non-autocratic leaders.

(Streams, 2011) investigates that Autocratic leadership in a country where democracy operates can be a bane. A leader's life can be turned around if there is no example of leadership performance.

Civic education increases students ' democratic ability, but they argue there has been little study to date on how and why civic education works. Citizenship habits need to be learned, and students should be educated by the public schools for democratic participation (Martens and Gainous, 2013).

Unless the situation calls for urgent action, particularly on a security issue, autocratic leadership is generally ineffective in the long term (Hernandez (2011). (Tas and Burnie (2015) says If given in the wrong hands autocratic leadership can have a negative impact. Leadership style should depend on subordinates of that type.



Vidal (2007) questions whether Organizations which regularly share information with subordinates may or may not benefit from the appointment of a self-confident leader.

According to Jurek and Scime (2014) Some important factors also correlate with democratic leadership, the length of time in office and, to a lesser degree, the religious convictions of executives and the possibility of being listed as a democracy.

Deluga (1990) acknowledges that Laissez faire is seen as demonstrating the rising degree of leading power. Research subjects replied to an item asking whether the leader mentioned in the scenario was either primarily charismatic, encouraging, displayed intellectual stimulation, individual concern, used contingent reward, man-accord-by-exception, or viewed as a laissez faire leader.

In a Norwegian labor force, structural equation modeling supported the hypothesis that perceived laissez-faire leadership would be positively related to experiencing position uncertainty at three consecutive measurement points (Skogstada et al. (2014).

Kumar (2014) says the five types of OCBs have been correlated with organizational performance, including Altruism, Courtesy, Conscientiousness, Sportsmanship and Civic Virtue. Procedural justice has been argued to be fostered by speech during a decision-making process and control over the Walker result (1975) or through adherence to equal process standards such as fairness, lack of bias, reliability, equality, accuracy and ethicality. Taylor (2013) urges us to see Positive result produced by OCB. According to him, organizational functioning is critical. OCB is not unique to the job duties of an employee but rather it reflects the wider organizational climate in which core success occurs.

Kataria, Garg and Rastogi (2013) studies that Value-based companies should implement high-performance HR practices in their HR infrastructure to maintain high rates of employee engagement, since the psychological engagement process drives OCB through which an organization achieves productivity.

for most businesses, corporate citizenship is a strategic imperative and many executives agree that citizenship stresses are likely to increase in Whadcock (2009). Ehrhart (2004) found that workers in working groups who view their members as showing concern not only for the company but also for the employees and external stakeholders displayed higher levels of OCBs.

OCB is a set of Discretionary actions which are not acknowledged implicitly or indirectly by the scheme of structured incentives and which, in the aggregate, facilitate the successful functioning of the Organ (1988).

Rurkkhum and Bartlett (2012) find OCB Civic Virtue Relationship and leadership style component. No evidence for the potential moderating impact of HRD activities between employee engagement and OCB has been found.

Ozyilmaz, Erdogan and Karaeminogullari(2018), reports that Employee trust in the company as an environmental boundary condition that could impact employee satisfaction, turnover intentions, job success and OCBs ' role in self-efficacy.



## 2.1 Statement of the Problem

Citizenship activity of the company is of paramount importance to any organization of education. It's not just about keeping the institute's staff but also about reflecting on the result and efficiency if the service is provided.

It is vital for any educational organization to be in the teaching staff considerably aware of the citizenship behavior as they can help improve performance and productivity, thus ensuring a more efficient and effective workforce in the organization.

This research would help educational institutes better understand the impact of Leadership Style on Citizenship Behavior of organizations.

## 2.2 Research Objectives

The objectives of the study are: -

- To determine if there is any significant difference in Leadership Style based on Demographic Variables.
- To determine if there is any significant difference in Organization Citizenship Behaviour based on Demographic Variables.
- Identifying and Analyzing the Impact of different Leadership Styles on Organization Citizenship Behavior.

## 3. Research methodology

A questionnaire was developed based on detailed literature reviews to attain the study's objectives. The questionnaire was divided into three sections by three pages in length. Part I consists of questions that request demographic information (such as age, existing tenure experience and total work experience). Part II incorporates questions aimed at collecting information on the Citizenship Actions of the company. Part III was intended to gain knowledge of the supervisor's leadership style according to the employee. Most of the questions in the questionnaire allowed the respondents to give a score on a Likert scale of five points.

### 3.1 Data Specification

Leadership Style was measured using the five-item scale of Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, and Lynch (1997) (for the measurement scale, refer to Eisenberger et al., 1997).

Organization Citizenship Behavior was measured using the 5-item scale of Williams and Anderson (1991) (for the measurement scale, refer to Williams & Anderson, 1991).



## Basic Tests in Econometrics

Independent Variable- Leadership Style

Dependent Variable— Organization Citizenship Behavior

### a. Hypotheses- One-Way ANOVA

**H0-** There is no Significant Difference in Leadership Style based on Demographic Variables.

**H1:** There is a Significant Difference in Leadership Style based on Demographic Variables.

**H0-** There is no Significant Difference in Organization Citizenship Behavior based on Demographic Variables.

**H1:** There is a Significant Difference in Organization Citizenship Behavior based on Demographic Variables.

### b. Hypotheses- Regression

**H0-** There is no significant impact of the Leadership Style on the Organization Citizenship Behavior in the education sector.

**H1:** There is significant impact of the Leadership Style on the Organization Citizenship Behavior in the education sector.

## 4. Results and Discussions

The first analysis to be conducted was a reliability analysis that was carried out for both the independent and dependent variables. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability for Autocratic Leadership, Democratic Leadership, Laissez Faire Leadership and Organization Citizenship Behavior were 0.929, 0.943, 0.925, 0.974 respectively. These values are greater than 0.7 and can hence be concluded that the data is reliable and can be used for further data analysis.

| Variable                           | Cronbach's Alpha |
|------------------------------------|------------------|
| Autocratic Leadership              | .929             |
| Democratic Leadership              | .943             |
| Laissez Faire Leadership           | .925             |
| Organization Citizenship Behaviour | .974             |

The next test conducted were Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tests that were used to assess the acceptance or rejection of hypotheses that were formed at the beginning of this study based on the objectives of the study. There was a total of 12 ANOVA tests that were conducted using Demographic Variables like gender, current tenure and total work experience as a factor based on the independent and dependent variables.

The first ANOVA test was conducted between elements of Autocratic Leadership and the gender of an



employee in the organization. This test concluded that there is no impact of gender on Autocratic Leadership as the Significance level was 0.517.

#### ANOVA

|    |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F    | Sig. |
|----|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| AL | Between Groups | 7.257          | 1   | 7.257       | .422 | .517 |
|    | Within Groups  | 1841.073       | 107 | 17.206      |      |      |
|    | Total          | 1848.330       | 108 |             |      |      |

The second ANOVA test was conducted between elements of Autocratic Leadership and the current tenure of an employee in the organization. This test concluded that there is an impact of current tenure on Autocratic Leadership as the Significance level was 0.049.

The third ANOVA test was conducted between elements of Autocratic Leadership and the total work experience of an employee in the education sector. This test concluded that there is no impact of the total work experience of an employee in the education sector on Autocratic Leadership as the Significance level was 0.528.

The fourth ANOVA test was conducted between elements of Democratic Leadership and the gender of an employee in the organization. This test concluded that there is no impact of gender on Democratic Leadership as the Significance level was 0.603.

#### ANOVA

|    |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F    | Sig. |
|----|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| DL | Between Groups | 4.479          | 1   | 4.479       | .272 | .603 |
|    | Within Groups  | 1761.852       | 107 | 16.466      |      |      |
|    | Total          | 1766.330       | 108 |             |      |      |

The fifth ANOVA test was conducted between elements of Democratic Leadership and the current tenure of an employee in the organization. This test concluded that there is an impact of current tenure on Democratic Leadership as the Significance level was 0.017.

The sixth ANOVA test was conducted between elements of Democratic Leadership and the total work experience of an employee in the education sector. This test concluded that there is no impact of the total work experience of an employee in the education sector on Democratic Leadership as the Significance level was 0.657.

The seventh ANOVA test was conducted between elements of Laissez Faire Leadership and the gender of an employee in the organization. This test concluded that there is no impact of gender on Laissez Faire Leadership as the Significance level was 0.807.



**ANOVA**

|                    | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F    | Sig. |
|--------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| LFL Between Groups | .850           | 1   | .850        | .060 | .807 |
| Within Groups      | 1517.865       | 107 | 14.186      |      |      |
| Total              | 1518.716       | 108 |             |      |      |

The eight ANOVA test was conducted between elements of Laissez Faire Leadership and the current tenure of an employee in the organization. This test concluded that there is no impact of current tenure on Laissez Faire Leadership as the Significance level was 0.381.

The ninth ANOVA test was conducted between elements of Laissez Faire Leadership and the total work experience of an employee in the education sector of an employee in the organization. This test concluded that there is an impact of the total work experience in the education sector on Laissez Faire Leadership as the Significance level was 0.025.

The tenth ANOVA test was conducted between elements of Organization Citizenship Behavior and the gender of an employee in the organization. This test concluded that there is an impact of gender on Organization Citizenship Behavior as the Significance level was 0.005.

**OCB**

|                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Between Groups | 1916.301       | 1   | 1916.301    | 8.198 | .005 |
| Within Groups  | 25012.616      | 107 | 233.763     |       |      |
| Total          | 26928.917      | 108 |             |       |      |

The eleventh ANOVA test was conducted between elements of Organization Citizenship Behavior and the current tenure of an employee in the organization. This test concluded that there is an impact of current tenure on Organization Citizenship Behavior as the Significance level was 0.036.



**ANOVA****OCB**

|                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Between Groups | 2088.778       | 3   | 696.259     | 2.943 | .036 |
| Within Groups  | 24840.139      | 105 | 236.573     |       |      |
| Total          | 26928.917      | 108 |             |       |      |

The twelfth ANOVA test was conducted between elements of Organization Citizenship Behavior and the total work experience of an employee in the education sector. This test concluded that there is no impact of the total work experience of an employee in the education sector on Organization Citizenship Behavior as the Significance level was 0.147.

**ANOVA****OCB**

|                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Between Groups | 1334.040       | 3   | 444.680     | 1.824 | .147 |
| Within Groups  | 25594.877      | 105 | 243.761     |       |      |
| Total          | 26928.917      | 108 |             |       |      |

From the regression analysis, there are 3 Model Summaries to show the Impact of Leadership Style on Organization Citizenship Behavior in the education sector.

The first of regression analysis for the Impact of Autocratic Leadership on Organization Citizenship Behavior that is being studied an R square value of 0.036 is generated (3.6%). From this, it is known that there is only about Four percent chance that similar results will be found if this study is conducted at other times.

**Model Summary**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .672 <sup>a</sup> | .452     | .524              | 7.57824                    |

a. Predictors: (Constant), AL

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

| Model        | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig.              |
|--------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| 1 Regression | 961.997        | 1   | 961.997     | 3.964 | .049 <sup>b</sup> |
| Residual     | 25966.921      | 107 | 242.682     |       |                   |
| Total        | 26928.917      | 108 |             |       |                   |



a. Dependent Variable: OCB

b. Predictors: (Constant), AL

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

| Model |            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|       |            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1     | (Constant) | 50.124                      | 3.320      |                           | 15.100 | .000 |
|       | AL         | .721                        | .362       | .189                      | 1.991  | .049 |

a. Dependent Variable: OCB

The second regression analysis for the Impact of Democratic Leadership on Organization Citizenship Behavior that is being studied an R square value of 0.008 is generated (0.8%). This goes to show that there is almost no chance that similar results will be found if this study is conducted at other times.

**Model Summary**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .902 <sup>a</sup> | .813     | .892              | 5.79710                    |

a. Predictors: (Constant), DL

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F    | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 227.243        | 1   | 227.243     | .911 | .342 <sup>b</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 26701.674      | 107 | 249.548     |      |                   |
|       | Total      | 26928.917      | 108 |             |      |                   |

a. Dependent Variable: OCB

b. Predictors: (Constant), DL

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

| Model |            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|       |            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1     | (Constant) | 52.507                      | 3.988      |                           | 13.166 | .000 |
|       | DL         | .359                        | .376       | .092                      | .954   | .342 |

a. Dependent Variable: OCB



The third regression analysis for the Impact of Laissez Faire Leadership on Organization Citizenship Behavior that is being studied an R square value of 0.047 is generated (4.7%). From this, it is known that there is only about 5% chance that similar results will be found if this study is conducted at other times.

#### Model Summary

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .838 <sup>a</sup> | .703     | .852              | 8.49005                    |

a. Predictors: (Constant), LFL

#### ANOVA<sup>a</sup>

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 1255.155       | 1   | 1255.155    | 5.231 | .024 <sup>b</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 25673.762      | 107 | 239.942     |       |                   |
|       | Total      | 26928.917      | 108 |             |       |                   |

a. Dependent Variable: OCB

b. Predictors: (Constant), LFL

#### Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

| Model |            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|       |            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1     | (Constant) | 48.046                      | 3.792      |                           | 12.670 | .000 |
|       | LFL        | .909                        | .397       | .216                      | 2.287  | .024 |

a. Dependent Variable: OCB

## 5. Conclusion

From the study, it can be concluded that efforts of displaying and practicing the right Leadership Style by the supervisor in the education sector has a positive relationship with the employees Organization Citizenship Behavior and hence has an impact on it. Employees do feel a sense of OCB and pride in working for an organization that cares for its employees and provides them with Democratic Leadership from the supervisor while incorporating their opinions in decision making and creating a work environment which encourages them to take responsibility of the work they do.



## REFERENCES

- Avey, J., Reichard, R., Luthans, F., & Mhatre, K. (2011). Analysis of the impact of positive psychological capital on employee attitudes, behaviours, and performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 22(10), 127–152. doi:10.1002/hrdq.20070
- Axtell, C. M., & Parker, S. K. (2003). Promoting role breadth self-efficacy through involvement, work redesign and training. *Human Relations*, 56, 113–131. doi:10.1177/0018726703056001452
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37, 122–147. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.37.2.122
- Bernerth, J. B., & Aguinis, H. (2016). A critical review and best-practice recommendations for control variable usage. *Personnel Psychology*, 69, 229–283. doi:10.1111/peps.12103
- Brenner, B., Lyons, H. and Fassinger, R. (2010). Can Heterosexism Harm Organizations? Predicting the Perceived Organizational Citizenship Behaviors of Gay and Lesbian Employees. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 58(4), pp.321-335.
- Deepa, E., Palaniswamy, R., & Kuppusamy, S. (2014). Effect of performance appraisal system in organizational commitment, job satisfaction and productivity. *Journal of Contemporary Management Research*, 8(1), 72-82. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1718121048?accountid=38885>
- Luque, M., Washburn, N., Waldman, D. and House, R. (2008). Unrequited Profit: How Stakeholder and Economic Values Relate to Subordinates' Perceptions of Leadership and Firm Performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53(4), pp.626-654.
- Deluga, R. (1990). The Effects of Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez Faire Leadership Characteristics on Subordinate Influencing Behavior. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 11(2), pp.191-203.
- Ertürk, A., Yilmaz, C., & Ceylan, A. (2004). Promoting organizational citizenship behaviors:



Relative effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and perceived managerial fairness. *METU Studies in Development*, 31(2), 189-210. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/89228756?accountid=38885>

Hernandez, James S, M.D., M.S. (2011). Am I demoralizing my staff?-10 questions to ask. *Physician Executive*, 37(3), 60-3. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/893655677?accountid=38885>

Hoel, H., Glasø, L., Hetland, J., Cooper, C. and Einarsen, S. (2009). Leadership Styles as Predictors of Self-reported and Observed Workplace Bullying. *British Journal of Management*, 67(5), pp.996-1004.

Jurek, S. and Scime, A. (2013). Achieving Democratic Leadership: A Data-Mined Prescription. *Social Science Quarterly*, 95(1), pp.97-110.

Krishna, V. (2008). Exploring organizational commitment from an organizational perspective: Organizational learning as a determinant of affective commitment in indian software firms (Order No. 3297162). Available from ProQuest Central; *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global*. (304641378). Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/304641378?accountid=38885>

Kumar, Y. L. N. (2014). Importance of organizational citizenship behaviors in enhancing customer service indicators: A review. *IUP Journal of Management Research*, 13(1), 17-28. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1511117693?accountid=38885>

Martens, A. and Gainous, J. (2012). Civic Education and Democratic Capacity: How Do Teachers Teach and What Works?. *Social Science Quarterly*, 94(4), pp.956-976.

Vidal, J. and Möller, M. (2007). When Should Leaders Share Information with Their Subordinates?. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 16(2), pp.251-283.

Shin, Y. (2013). The relationship between leadership styles, organizational commitment, and organizational outcome in oklahoma's volunteer fire departments (Order No. 1542236). Available from *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global*. (1426247310). Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1426247310?accountid=38885>



Solanki, K. and Singh, A. (2017). MULTIPLE ACTIVE SPATIAL MODULATION IN MIMO SYSTEMS. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 5(9), pp.391-393.

Sørensen, E. and Torfing, J. (2018). The democratizing impact of governance networks: From pluralization, via democratic anchorage, to interactive political leadership. *Public Administration*, 96(2), pp.302-317.

Suthinee Rurkkhuma, Kenneth R. Bartlett. (2016). Does trust matter more in virtual teams? A meta-analysis of trust and team effectiveness considering virtuality and documentation as moderators. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101, 1151–1177. doi:10.1037/apl0000113

Taylor, J. (2013). Goal Setting in the Australian Public Service: Effects on Psychological Empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Public Administration Review*, 73(3), pp.453-464.

Wahyu Ariani, D. (2013). The Relationship between Employee Engagement, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and Counterproductive Work Behavior. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 4(2).

