

1999

# Attributional Charismatic Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Correlational Study

Brian Moore

Follow this and additional works at: [https://knowledge.e.southern.edu/senior\\_research](https://knowledge.e.southern.edu/senior_research)



Part of the [Business Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Moore, Brian, "Attributional Charismatic Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Correlational Study" (1999). *Senior Research Projects*. 96.  
[https://knowledge.e.southern.edu/senior\\_research/96](https://knowledge.e.southern.edu/senior_research/96)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Southern Scholars at KnowledgeExchange@Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Senior Research Projects by an authorized administrator of KnowledgeExchange@Southern. For more information, please contact [jspears@southern.edu](mailto:jspears@southern.edu).

**Attributional Charismatic Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors:  
A Correlational Study**

by

Brian Moore

Southern Scholars Research Project

April 9, 1999

# **Attributional Charismatic Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Correlational Study**

## **Purpose of the Study**

This study explores the relationship between charismatic leadership characteristics and organizational citizenship behaviors in subordinates. Accordingly, the research question is as follows:

Do charismatic leadership attributes positively correlate with organizational citizenship behaviors?

## **Introduction and Definition of Terms**

Charisma, in today's world, brings to mind images of fanatical religious leaders and confident executives that control corporate empires. Although the word *charisma* predates Christ, only recently has the term come to be used to describe the charismatic leader in business. The topic of charismatic leadership in organizations has been further developed only within the past three decades (Conger & Kanungo, 1994).

Before proceeding further, I would like to define the terms *charismatic leadership* and *organizational citizenship behaviors* as they will be used throughout this paper.

*Charismatic leadership* will refer to the model developed by Conger and Kanungo (1994). The reason for this choice is addressed in the literature review section which follows. The model proposes that charismatic leadership is mainly an attributional phenomenon based on the subordinate's perception of the leader (Deluga, 1995). This means that the relationship between the follower and the leader is shaped by the ideas the follower has about the leader.

Subordinates interpret certain behaviors as evidence of the leader's charisma. In effect, the power that the charismatic leader has to influence and lead people comes from the perceptions that his/her followers have of him/her.

Conger and Kanungo (1994) developed a survey to measure charismatic leadership. The Conger and Kanungo scale identifies and measures six attributes of charismatic leadership, 1) vision and articulation, 2) sensitivity to the environment, 3) unconventional behavior, 4) personal risk, 5) sensitivity to organizational members' needs, and 6) action orientation away from the *status quo*. Their testing showed that these behaviors strongly correlated with charismatic leadership behavior.

*Organizational citizenship behaviors* (OCBs) is another term that needs to be defined. Organ (1988) defines OCBs as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization" (p. 4). That is, OCBs are not an enforceable requirement of the job. These extra-role behaviors go beyond the normal parameters of the individual's formal job description (in-role behaviors).

Organ (1988) recognized five categories of OCBs. They are as follows: 1) altruism, 2) conscientiousness, 3) sportsmanship, 4) courtesy, and 5) civic virtue (Organ, 1988). These five dimensions are supported by empirical evidence, though at the time Organ wrote his paper in 1988 it was still a rather new concept. Since then others (Podsakoff et al., 1990) have done more research that has strengthened his initial position and developed a survey to measure the categories of OCBs.

## Literature Review

### *The Origin of Charisma and Max Weber*

Charisma is a concept that dates back as far as Greek civilizations. The Greek word *charisma* means “gift.” It was later used by the early Christian church to refer to a gift of grace that was manifested by the ability to heal, to prophesy, or to speak in tongues (Longmans English Larous, 1968). In the study of leadership, charisma refers to the special quality of a leader to inspire others and to gain their allegiance. However, while this leadership quality was recognized it was not until much more recently that it became a subject of scholarly study (Bryman, 1992)

Max Weber (1968) was a key factor responsible for bringing the word *charisma* into the realm of scientific study. In *Economy and Society* (1968) he divided authority into three different bases. The first of which is rule based, authority that arises out of some formal system of organization. The second authority is derived from traditions, an example of which would be the divine right of kings. Finally, the third authority is based on the leader’s charismatic qualities. He asserted that the charismatic leader’s authority did not come from rules, policies, traditions, or positions, but rather from the leader’s exceptional heroism or exemplary character. His work moved the term *charisma* beyond its use to describe evidence of the working of the Holy Spirit in the Christian church and applied it to sociology.

Charismatic authority stands out from the other two types identified by Weber; unlike traditional or legal authority which use position or status to exercise authority, charismatic

authority is distinctly personal (Willner, 1984). Charismatic leaders command authority by virtue of their unique attributes and abilities (Bryman, 1992). Weber points out that charismatic leadership is dependent on two factors for success. The first is the leader's ability to perform "miracles," especially in times of crisis. The second is the leader's ability to create a mission that the followers attach themselves to and see benefit in attaining.

### *Charisma in Organizations*

Until the latter part of the 1980s charismatic leadership in the context of businesses and large organizations was largely ignored (Bryman, 1992). The studies conducted by the following researchers provided the base upon which the modern behavioral model for charismatic leadership is built.

House (1977) found that the personal characteristics that contribute to charismatic leadership are: a high level of self-confidence, a tendency to dominate and a need to influence others, and a strong conviction in the integrity of one's own beliefs. His theory further suggests four aspects of the behavior of charismatic leaders: role modeling, image building, communicating high expectations, and arousing relevant motives.

Bass (1985, 1990) discusses a different type of leadership which he calls transformational leadership. He argues that transformational leaders are able to raise follower's propensity to expend greater effort. Building upon House's (1977) work, Bass (1985) sees charisma as a component of transformational leadership. He also suggests that charismatic leadership reduces resistance to change. Although charisma is only part of Bass' transformational leadership, it is by far the largest component of it (Bryman, 1992).

Others (Howell and Frost, 1989; Biggart, 1989; Roberts and Bradely, 1988) have contributed to the study of charismatic leadership. However, the remainder of the literature review on charismatic leadership will focus on the Conger and Kanungo model because it is the only fully-developed model that exists with a survey instrument for measure. Unlike Bass, which highlights transformational leadership, their model focuses specifically on charismatic leadership.

#### *The Behavioral Model for Charismatic Leadership*

Conger and Kanungo (1988a) proposed a process whereby followers attribute charismatic qualities to the leader. They have divided it up into three stages for the purposes of study. In reality these stages are not clear and distinct, but change as the organization faces a constantly evolving environment. Stage one involves evaluating the status quo. It is necessary in this initial stage to sum up the situation before defining the organizational goals. This assessment of the current situation and the evaluation of the needs of the followers leads into the second stage, which involves the formulation of organizational goals. The third stage involves demonstrating how the goals can be achieved, forming a plan of action.

A charismatic leader's ability to see the deficiencies in the present system distinguishes him/her from other types of leaders. The charismatic leader constantly looks for weakness in the status quo, seeking out areas to improve. These weaknesses may be seen as a place from which to begin campaigning against the status quo. This first stage involves three of the six attributes of charismatic leadership. "Environmental sensitivity" involves the leader's perceptions of the skills of the subordinates and the needs of the organization. "Sensitivity to member needs"

encompasses how the leader relates to the needs of the subordinates. Finally, the leader's goal of fundamental change explains why he "does not maintain the status quo."

In the second stage the charismatic leader is able to instill a sense of vision in the followers, "vision and articulation." The leader is able to convey his vision with such power that those goals are adopted by the followers as their own. This strong sense of vision is part of the power behind the organization as it moves forward against the status quo towards goals seen as desirable.

The final stage reveals a leader who is personally committed to achieving his/her goals, so much so that he/she assumes great risk, "personal risk". The charismatic leader puts himself on the line for the sake of the organization. He/she lives out a demonstration of the vision that has been articulated. This personal risk taking instills confidence in the followers of the leader's sincerity. This trust is crucial to the success of the change process. The final category is "unconventional behavior" in which the leader acts unexpectedly and creatively to achieve his/her goals.

The charismatic leader is distinguishable from other types of leaders by the actions exhibited in the three stages of the leadership process. Conger and Kanungo also mention characteristics that seem to be agreed upon by those who have studied charismatic leadership including: (1) high self-confidence and self-determination, (2) a high degree of mental involvement in the mission and the leadership role, and (3) a high need for power (1994). They also see the charismatic leader as a champion of radical reform rather than that evolutionary reform.

The idea of the charismatic leader has evolved from its earlier roots in sociology and political science to its role in business. The recent research into the charismatic leader has uncovered a very interesting phenomenon that has not been completely explained. There is still much to be learned about the charismatic leader.

### *Organizational Citizenship Behaviors*

Organizational citizenship behaviors is another recent development in the study of corporate behavior. Organ (1988) claims that OCB play a very integral part in the effective function of a company. Without which the organization would be bogged down with rules and job descriptions. In the aggregate, OCBs make for a more effective organization (Organ, 1988). They help by improving effectiveness in organizations, making more human and other capital available for the production process. Another way to look at it would be streamlining. OCBs help to remove some of the kinks in the system, improving the overall effectiveness of the system.

The following paragraphs further explain the definitive qualities of OCBs beginning with altruism. Altruism can be defined as “discretionary behaviors that have the effect of helping a specific other person with an organizationally relevant task or problem” (Organ, 1988, p. 8). Basically it is helping another person. Examples would include a co-worker who takes the time to show a new secretary how to better use the office computer system or the experienced operator who lends a hand to a worker struggling with a piece of equipment. However, altruism does not always have to be aimed at someone within the company. It can be equally effective when an employee helps someone outside of the company, be it a supplier, client, or customer.

The clerk who goes out of the way to help answer a customer's question is as good of an example of altruism as is one who helps a fellow employee.

Conscientiousness concerns the aspect of doing more than is required, going the extra mile. Unlike altruism it is not directed at a person, rather it is an action towards something or an intangible. An example would be coming in to work in inclement weather conditions or when sick. It could include following the company guidelines and not abusing expense accounts. These actions benefit the company as a whole rather than a particular individual.

Sportsmanship includes workers' attitudes toward inconvenient circumstances. Certain disruptions in the workplace are unavoidable: things break down or renovations take place. During times like these sportsmanship helps employees keep the griping and disgruntled comments to a minimum. Cheerfully accepting the circumstances allows them to remain more productive (Organ, 1988).

Courtesy refers to the actions employees take to avoid workplace problems. By being considerate of the people around them workers can take steps toward reducing certain crisis situations. Just by informing a supervisor that they are going to be running late one day next week, an employee can help streamline the work environment, giving the supervisor time to find someone to fill in during his/her absence. This type of forethought can solve future problems before they become a problem.

Graham is responsible for adding civic virtue to the list of OCB characteristics. It includes the political aspects of organizational life, which includes getting involved in optional committees. By keeping up with the "issues of the day" and expressing ideas about those issues,

employees contribute to the governance of the organization. He claims that an employee does the company a service when he/she serves in the political system. OCB actions are discretionary and may go so far as representing the company on personal time.

### **The Link Between Charismatic Leadership and OCBs**

OCBs are important to a business because they free it from the responsibility of having to try to anticipate every conceivable role that the employee should play in his or her job, an impossible task (Deluga, 1995). Even though OCBs are not recognized by the formal reward system, they are very important to the efficient function of a business (Organ, 1988). OCBs allow the business to pay more attention to its goals and waste less resources on the organization and coordination of its workforce.

Conger and Kanungo (1988b), in their attributional model of charismatic leadership, proposed that the charismatic leader is often present in crisis situations. They see the charismatic leader as embracing revolutionary rather than evolutionary changes. It then follows that charismatic leaders would best serve their purpose in a dynamic, changing environment. Little research had been done on the effectiveness of charismatic leadership in a stable environment (Bryman, 1992).

Early research on OCBs focused on its possible connection with job satisfaction (Bateman and Organ, 1983). These studies found a link between job satisfaction and OCBs. However, more recent research in the area of OCBs has begun to look elsewhere to further the understanding of the antecedents of OCBs, which are not completely understood (Organ and Lingl, 1995; Schappe, 1998). In fact, when Schappe (1998) studied OCBs in conjunction with

job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions simultaneously, he did not find the link between OCBs and job satisfaction that had showed up in previous studies. The point is that research has not completely identified the predictors of OCBs, which are “paramount for organizational success” (Deluga, 1995).

The purpose of this study is to explore a possible link between attributional charismatic leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors. If the link exists it would further our understanding of the antecedents of OCBs.

### **Research Method**

#### *Data Analysis Plan*

The purpose of the surveys is to provide an instrument to empirically test for a link between the six attributes of charismatic leadership and the five qualities of organizational citizenship behaviors.

The exact responses from the 24-item OCBs survey and the 25-item leadership survey were entered into SPSS. The only exceptions were the questions that were reversed scored (see Appendix II), these were manually reversed and then entered in the same manner as the other numbers.

- I. Variables were created for the each of the six leadership attributes and the five OCB categories by grouping together those items on the surveys that measured the same variable.

- II. A correlation matrix was created correlating the six attributes of charismatic leadership with the five categories of OCBs. A two-tailed test was conducted to determine a 95% confidence interval (see Appendix I).

### *Coding*

The questions from the surveys were assigned codes as they were entered into the computer spreadsheet and grouped according to survey: the leadership survey was coded Q1L, Q2L, . . . , Q25L; and the organizational citizenship behaviors survey was coded Q1OCB, Q2OCB, . . . , Q24OCB.

Codes were also created for the eleven study variables. The six charismatic leadership variables were coded as follows: environmental sensitivity (ES), personal risk (PR), sensitivity to member needs (SM), does not maintain the status quo (SQ), unconventional behavior (UB), and vision and articulation (VA). The five categories of organizational behavior were coded as follows: altruism (ALT), conscientiousness (CON), courtesy (CRT), civic virtue (CV), and sportsmanship (SPT).

Due to the small sample size, I felt confident that reviewing my own work would be sufficient to ensure accuracy. Accordingly, the information was double checked once it had been entered into the computer to eliminate errors.

### *Enlisting the Respondent's Participation*

The following steps were taken to enlist the respondent's participation:

1. I spoke with the student association president to see if he would be willing to participate in the study as he had to fill out 11 surveys.

2. Introductory letters were sent out to the participants via email. The letter described the project and explained why I was conducting the study.
3. The surveys were sent out with a cover letter, once again explaining the survey and its purpose. I also guaranteed anonymity to the respondents by using a code number at the top of the sheet rather than a name.
4. Using the codes, non-respondents were identified and contacted by email and telephone to encourage response.
5. Self-addressed stamped envelopes were included with the surveys to facilitate returning the completed questionnaires.

### *Ethical Considerations*

The respondents were assured that confidentiality would be maintained in the study. For that purpose, a coding system was used. Because of the small sample size, and the fact that only one leader was involved, the surveys filled out by the leader could only come from one source. Therefore, he was informed of this fact. As no names were used, his responses would not be able to be identified with any one particular member of the group that he rated.

Because of the potentially sensitive nature of the questionnaires, only the researcher had access to the code list and the surveys. The code list will be destroyed at the end of the research project.

### *Calendar of Events*

Week of October 18, 1998	Letters were e-mailed to the survey group explaining the study and why I was conducting it.
--------------------------	---

October 26, 1998	Surveys were delivered to persons living in the school dormitories. The others were sent via US Mail.
Week of November 2, 1998	Most of the surveys from officers were returned.
Week of November 8, 1998	Non-respondents were contacted and encouraged to return the survey.
November 16, 1998	Surveys from SA president were returned.
Week of November 16, 1998	Data from surveys was entered into SPSS
Week of November 29, 1998	Correlation analysis of data was conducted.
Week of December 13, 1998	Completed research paper.

#### *Sample and Data Collection*

The sample consisted of the officers of the Student Association of Southern Adventist University. The group was made up of 11 individuals. Of these individuals eight were elected by the student body to their positions, four were appointed positions by the president. Six of the group members were female and the remaining five were males. Eight surveys were returned yielding a response rate of 73%. Four of the respondents were females, and four were males.

#### *Measures*

Subordinates completed the Conger-Kanungo charismatic leadership scale (C-K; Conger and Kanungo, 1994).

Charismatic leadership. The C-K scale utilizes a 25-question survey that has been shown to be reliable. The reliabilities for the Conger-Kanungo scale varied from 0.88 to 0.91 across samples. For the total sample of (N = 488) the reliability index was 0.88. The item-total

correlations for the 25 items of the C-K scale ranged from 0.25 to 0.66, with an average correlation of 0.44 (Conger and Kanungo, 1993).

The C-K scale's 25 questions are divided over the six divisions of charismatic leadership in the following manner: (1) vision and articulation, six items, (2) environmental sensitivity, seven items, (3) unconventional behavior, three items, (4) personal risk, four items, (5) sensitivity to member needs, three items, and (6) does not maintain status quo, two items that are reverse scored. In answering the questions, a scale of one to seven was used ranging from very characteristic to very uncharacteristic, respectively.

The leader completed an organizational citizenship behaviors questionnaire containing 24 items (Podsakoff, et al., 1990).

Organizational citizenship behaviors. The psychometric properties of the scale were demonstrated by Podsakoff et al. (1990). The alpha reliabilites ranged from .70 to .85. With a Tucker-Lewis goodness-of-fit index of .94, confirmatory factor analysis showed evidence for a five-factor model.

The OCBs scale's 24 questions were divided over the five divisions of OCBs in the following manner: (1) altruism, five items, (2) conscientiousness, five items, (3) civic virtue, four items, (4) courtesy, five items, and (5) sportsmanship, five items. The questionnaire utilized a scale of one to seven ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, respectively.

### **Limitations**

The sample surveyed is limited in its ability to be generalized to larger populations. The sample was chosen out of convenience. It is also limited in its selectivity in that many of the

respondents were elected to their positions; they have been considered leaders by their peers and do not represent a random selection of students at Southern Adventist University. The size of the sample also limits the ability of the results to be generalized, as there were only 8 respondents.

The response rate of 73% essentially meets the accepted normal rate of 75%. Additionally, a reliability test was conducted. Cranbach's alpha was calculated and all but three of the study variables passed, indicating that there was reliability within the study itself. The results of the reliability test are located in Table 2 of Appendix I.

## **Results**

The results of the correlation are displayed in Table 1 of Appendix I. From the information presented there it is clear that, ignoring negative correlations, only two correlations were found at the .05 significance level. The two significant correlations were between sensitivity to member needs (SM) and conscientiousness (CON) and civic virtue (CV). SM and CON correlated with  $r = .7338$  and  $P = .038$ . SM and CV correlated with  $r = .7952$  and  $P = .018$ .

The means and standard deviations for the category variables are reported in Table 2 of Appendix I along with the alphas (Cranbach's alpha). There were three variables that failed to yield an acceptable alpha value: courtesy with .409, sportsmanship with .524, and does not maintain status quo with .415. Excepting these three, the alphas ranged from .732 (environmental sensitivity) to .967 (civic virtue).

## **Discussion**

The findings of the study did not support the idea that there is a significant, positive correlation between charismatic leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors. This was contrary to the expected findings.

A strength of the study was that the group surveyed works closely together. As such, the respondents were able to knowledgeably rate the leader or supervisor.

As mentioned previously in the limitations section the small sample size severely limits the study's generalizability. Future research would need to include a larger sample that uses a wider cross section of respondents.

The implications of this study seem to indicate that charismatic leadership does not serve as a predictor of OCBs. This leaves us with the question of why charismatic leadership should be encouraged in organizations that exhibit stable operating environments (an assumption in this study at Southern Adventist University). One may conclude that charismatic leadership may have a stronger impact on OCBs in situations involving crisis and change. It must be noted that much of the previous research in the area has focused on why charismatic leadership should be encouraged in a stable environment (Deluga, 1995).

### **Conclusion**

The results of this study did not indicate that the presence of charismatic leadership qualities was a predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors. Future research could focus on discovering other benefits that might be associated with charismatic leadership functioning in an environment where the organization is not seeking to undergo radical change.

If evidence can be found to support the benefits of charismatic leadership in a stable environment, then companies can take that into account as they consider training managers to exhibit charismatic leadership qualities in the workplace.

## Appendix I

Table 1

Correlation Matrix for Charismatic Leadership and OCB

		ES	PR	SM	SQ	UB	VA
ALT	r	0.4508	0.0939	0.7538	-0.8355	0.0875	0.1931
	P	0.2620	0.8250	0.0380	0.0100	0.8370	0.6470
CON	r	0.2714	0.3922	0.4148	-0.3452	0.0052	0.0782
	P	0.5160	0.3370	0.3070	0.4020	0.9900	0.8540
CRT	r	0.1586	0.5685	0.6223	-0.1601	0.0607	0.2066
	P	0.7080	0.1410	0.0990	0.7050	0.8860	0.6240
CV	r	0.3331	0.1537	0.7052	-0.7407	-0.0781	0.0934
	P	0.4200	0.7160	0.0130	0.0360	0.8540	0.8260
SPT	r	-0.3263	-0.1576	0.1260	-0.1291	-0.5594	-0.6093
	P	0.4300	0.7090	0.7660	0.7610	0.1490	0.1090

Shaded background indicates significant, non-negative findings.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables			
Symbol	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cranbach's Alpha
ALT	5.70	0.535	0.8908
CON	5.55	0.520	0.7728
CRT	5.25	0.786	0.4090
CV	5.53	0.258	0.9665
SPT	5.65	0.966	0.5236
ES	5.07	0.360	0.7319
PR	4.59	0.656	0.8965
SM	5.79	0.144	0.8095
SQ	2.56	0.265	0.4148
UB	3.75	0.573	0.8056
VA	4.83	0.258	0.9545

Non-shaded cells represent OCB findings  
Shaded cells represent charismatic leadership findings.

## Appendix II

### OCBs Scale

#### Construct Measured and Item #

#### Item

#### Conscientiousness (CON)

3	Gives an honest day's work for an honest day's pay
18	Compared to other co-workers, his or her daily work attendance is above average.
21	Does not take extra breaks
22	Obeys rules and regulations even when no one is watching
24	Is one of the most conscientious employees of the organization.

#### Sportsmanship (SPT)

2	Is the classic "squeaky wheel" that always needs greasing. (R)
4	Consumes a great deal of time complaining about co-workers. (R)
7	Tends to make "mountains out of molehills." (R)
16	Always focuses on what is wrong, rather than the positive. (R)
19	He or she always finds fault with what the organization is doing. (R)

#### Civic Virtue (CV)

6	Keeps abreast of changes in the organization.
9	Attends meetings that are not mandatory, but considered important.
11	Attends functions that are not required, but help the institution's image.
12	Reads and keeps up with the organization's announcements, memos, et cetera.

Courtesy (CRT)

- 5 Tries to avoid creating problems with co-workers.  
8 Considers the impact of his or her actions on co-workers.  
14 Does not abuse the rights of others.  
17 Takes steps to try to prevent problems with other workers.  
20 Is mindful of how his or her behavior affects other people's jobs.

Altruism (ALT)

- 1 Helps others who have heavy work loads.  
10 Is always ready to lend a helping hand to those around him or her.  
13 Helps others who have been absent.  
15 Willingly helps others who have work-related problems.  
23 Helps orient new people even though it is not required.

(R) indicates question is reverse scored.

## Leadership Scale

### Construct measured and Item #

### Item

#### Environmental Sensitivity (ES)

2	Readily recognizes barriers/forces within the organization that may block or hinder achievement of his/her goals.
4	Entrepreneurial: seizes new opportunities in order to achieve goals.
8	Readily recognizes constraints in the physical environment (technological limitations, lack of resources, etc) that may stand in the way of achieving organizational objectives.
11	Readily recognizes constraints in the organization's social and cultural environment (cultural norms, lack of grass-roots support, et cetera) that may stand in the way of achieving organizational objectives.
19	Recognizes the abilities and skills of other members in the organization.
23	Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical social conditions) that may facilitate achievement or organizational objectives.
24	Recognizes the limitations of other members in the organization.

#### Personal Risk (PR)

7	In pursuing organizational objectives engages in activities involving considerable self-sacrifice.
12	Takes on high personal risks for the sake of the organization.
20	Often incurs high personal cost for the good of the organization.
25	In pursuing organizational objectives, engages in activities involving considerable personal risk.

Sensitivity to Member Needs (SM)

- 1 Influences others by developing mutual liking and respect.
- 5 Shows sensitivity for the needs and feelings for the other members in the organization.
- 16 Often expresses personal concern for the needs and feelings for other members of the organization.

Does Not Maintain the Status quo (SQ)

- 9 Advocates following non-risky, well-established courses of action to achieve organizational goals. **(R)**
- 17 Tries to maintain the status quo or the normal way of doing things. **(R)**

Unconventional Behavior

- 3 Engages in unconventional behavior.
- 6 Uses non-traditional means to achieve organizational goals.
- 18 Often exhibits very unique behavior that surprises other members of the organization.

Vision and Articulation

- 10 Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals.
- 13 Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing.
- 14 Consistently generates new ideas for the future of the organization.
- 15 Exciting public speaker.
- 21 Appears to be a skillful performer when presenting to a group.
- 22 Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for the future.

**(R)** indicates the question is reverse scored.

## ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIORS QUESTIONNAIRE

Serial No. \_\_\_\_\_

This 24-item questionnaire is part of a leadership research project. The results will be used in my senior research for Southern Scholars.

### Instructions

Circle the appropriate response next to the item that most accurately indicates your impressions of the student association officer identified by the name above.

			<i>Strongly Disagree</i>						<i>Strongly Agree</i>
1.	Helps others who have heavy work loads.		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	Is the classic "squeaky wheel" that always needs greasing.		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	Gives an honest day's work for an honest day's pay.		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	Consumes a great deal of time complaining about trivial matters.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
5.	Tries to avoid creating problems with co-workers.		2	3	4	5	6	7	
6.	Keeps abreast of changes in the organization.		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	Tends to make "mountains out of molehills."		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	Considers the impact of his or her actions on co-workers.		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	Attends meetings that are not mandatory, but considered important.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

10.	Is always ready to lend a helping hand to those around him or her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			<i>Strongly Disagree</i>				<i>Strongly Agree</i>	
11.	Attends functions that are not required, but help the institution's image.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	Reads and keeps up with the organization's announcements, memos, et cetera.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	Helps others who have been absent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	Does not abuse the rights of others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15.	Willingly helps others who have work-related problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16.	Always focuses on what is wrong, rather than the positive side.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17.	Takes steps to try to prevent problems with other workers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18.	Compared to other co-workers, his or her daily work attendance is above average.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19.	He or she always finds fault with what the organization is doing:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20.	Is mindful of how his or her behavior affects other people's jobs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21.	Does not take extra breaks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22.	Obeys rules and regulations even when no one is watching.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

- |     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 23. | Helps orient new people even though it is not required.         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 24. | Is one of the most conscientious employees of the organization. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

## LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

Serial No. \_\_\_\_\_

Dear Respondent,

This questionnaire is part of a leadership research project. The results will be used in my senior research project for Southern Scholars.

### Instructions

Indicate the extent to which each of the following items is characteristic of the current student association president at SAU by circling the appropriate category next to the item.

The response categories are numbered **6 to 1** to represent the categories in the following way:

6 = Very Characteristic  
5 = Characteristic  
4 = Slightly Characteristic

3 = Slightly Uncharacteristic  
2 = Uncharacteristic  
1 = Very Uncharacteristic

- |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Influences others by developing mutual liking and respect.  | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. | Readily recognizes barriers/forces within the organization that may block or hinder achievement of his/her goals. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. | Engages in unconventional behavior in order to achieve organizational goals.                                      | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. | Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities in order to achieve goals.  | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. | Shows sensitivity for the needs and feelings for the other members in the organization.                           | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

6.	Uses non-traditional means to achieve organizational goals.	6	5	4	3	2	1
7.	In pursuing organizational objectives engages in activities involving considerable self-sacrifice.	6	5	4	3	2	1
8.	Readily recognizes constraints in the physical environment (technological limitations, lack of resources, etc) that may stand in the way of achieving organizational objectives.	6	5	4	3	2	1
9.	Advocates following non-risky, well-established courses of action to achieve organizational goals.	6	5	4	3	2	1
10.	Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals.	6	5	4	3	2	1
11.	Readily recognizes constraints in the organization's social and cultural environment (cultural norms, lack of grass-roots support, et cetera) that may stand in the way of achieving organizational objectives.	6	5	4	3	2	1
12.	Takes high personal risks for the sake of the organization.	6	5	4	3	2	1
13.	Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing.	6	5	4	3	2	1
14.	Consistently generates new ideas for the future of the organizational.	6	5	4	3	2	1
15.	Exciting public speaker.	6	5	4	3	2	1
16.	Often expresses personal concern for	6	5	4	3	2	1

	the needs and feelings for other members of the organization.						
17.	Tries to maintain the status quo or the normal way of doing things.	6	5	4	3	2	1
18.	Often exhibits very unique behavior that surprises other members of the organization.	6	5	4	3	2	1
19.	Recognizes the abilities and skills of other members in the organization.	6	5	4	3	2	1
20.	Often incurs high personal cost for the good of the organization.	6	5	4	3	2	1
21.	Appears to be a skillful performer when presenting to a group.	6	5	4	3	2	1
22.	Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for the future.	6	5	4	3	2	1
23.	Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical social conditions) that may facilitate achievement or organizational objectives.	6	5	4	3	2	1
24.	Recognizes the limitations of other members in the organization.	6	5	4	3	2	1
25.	In pursuing organizational objectives, engages in activities involving considerable personal risk.	6	5	4	3	2	1

## References

- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18:19-31.
- 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.
- Biggart, N. W. (1989). *Charismatic Capitalism: direct Selling Organizations in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and Leadership in Organization*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988a). Behavioral dimensions of charismatic leadership. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.) *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness* (pp. 78-97). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988b). Conclusion: patterns and trends in studying charismatic leadership. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.) *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness* (pp. 78-97). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1994). Charismatic leadership in organizations: perceived behavioral attributes and their measurement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15, 439-452.
- Deluga, R. J. (1995). The relationship between attributional charismatic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25, 1652-1669.
- 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, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

- Howell, J. M., & Frost, P. (1989). A laboratory study of charismatic leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *43*, 243-269.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance *Journal of Marketing*, *1*, 70-81.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). The good soldier syndrome. In *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome* (pp. 1-14). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W., & Lingl, A. (1995a). Personality, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. *The journal of social psychology*, *135*, 339-351.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995b). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, *48*, 775-803.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, *1*, 107-142.
- Roberts, N. C., & Bradley, R. T. (1988). Limits of charisma. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.) *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schappe, S. P. (1998). The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Psychology*, *132*, 277-291.
- Schnake, M., Cochran, D., & Dumler, M. (1995). Encouraging organizational citizenship: The effects of job satisfaction, perceived equity and leadership. *Journal of managerial issues*, *7*, 209-222.
- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*, 108-120.
- Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and Society* (1925), 3 vol, eds G. Roth & C. Wittich. New York: Bedminster.
- Willner, A. R. (1984). *The Spellbinders: Charismatic Political Leadership*. New Haven: Yale University Press.