# It's not all about leadership: The role of emotions in encouraging organizational citizenship behaviours.

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
**Master of Science in Applied Psychology**
at the **University of Canterbury**

**Lauren Grace Sheat**
**Supervised by Joana Kuntz**

**Department of Psychology**
**University of Canterbury**

## Table of Contents

## Acknowledgements

Firstly, monumental thanks are in order to my wonderful supervisor Joana Kuntz. Your patience and unwavering support throughout my dissertation has been incredible and I am so grateful for what I have been able to achieve under your tutelage, not only throughout my dissertation but also throughout my master's journey.

I would also like to thank Chris Burt for the knowledge and skills he has imparted and for his sense of humour in stressful periods. Thank you also to Katharina Näswall for your teaching, I have learnt a great deal from you over the past two years.

To my parents and Winston, I will be forever grateful for the endless love and support you have shown me throughout my masters. I would not have been able to complete it without you.

Thank you to all of my beautiful friends who have assisted me throughout my university career, I treasure all of your support.

To my amazing team at The Warehouse Rangiora, I will never forget the support I have received whilst completing my masters. I will always be grateful for the escape from study and for the wonderful friends who gave me confidence to finish my studies.

A special thank you to Brooke Daniels for encouraging me to undertake my masters, for always believing in me and for being a ray of sunshine when I needed it the most.

Finally, thank you to Jordan for your continuous love, encouragement and reassurance. Thank you for escaping to far corners of the globe with me when I needed a break and for the twilight walks and coffee dates. Here's too many more adventures.

## Abstract

**Purpose:** The purpose of this research is to investigate the relationship between authentic leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour. Positive and negative emotions toward the organization were also included as a moderator of this relationship.

**Design/Methodology/Approach:** A self-report online questionnaire was distributed to Public Servants, a District Health Board and retail employees at a single time point. The study data was analysed using SPSS (version 25). The analyses included exploratory factor analyses for each of the scales, and moderated multiple regression to test the hypotheses.

**Findings:** Authentic leadership is not significantly related to employees performing organizational citizenship behaviours. Positive emotions toward the organization were significantly associated with organizational citizenship behaviours. Positive and negative emotions toward the organization did not significantly moderate the relationship between authentic leadership and organizational citizenship behaviours.

**Originality:** This study is the first to explore the relationship between authentic leadership, emotions toward the organization and organizational citizenship behaviours. How employees feel about the organization seems to be more important in encouraging organizational citizenship behaviours than working with an authentic leader.

**Research Limitations/implications:** Findings from the current study demonstrate the importance of positive emotions in the workplace and highlight the need for further research to be conducted on the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) and emotions.

**Practical/ societal implications:** Encouraging positive emotions in followers could lead to OCBs which are highly beneficial for organizations. By encouraging a positive emotional climate and building a positive emotional relationship between the organization and its employees, organizations can be rewarded with OCBs.

## Introduction

Employees have the ability to make or break an organization through the effort they exert at work, and quality of work they produce. The nature of business is changing, with globalization placing increased demands on both organizations and employees. To meet these increased demands, effective leadership is crucial to motivate individuals to contribute their best work, and to coordinate teams of employees to achieve goals (Kaiser, Hogan, & Craig, 2008).

Various values-based leadership frameworks have been developed over the past several decades, notably authentic leadership, which has been proposed to have positive effects on work behaviours (Erkutlu & Chafra, 2010; Al Sahi AL Zaabi, Ahmad & Hossan, 2016). Authentic leadership describes leaders who are self-aware, and consistently disclose and act in congruence with their personal values and emotions (Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008). The evidence suggests that this leadership style is positively associated with work engagement and performance (Gardner & Schermerhorn, 2004; Walumbwa et al., 2008).

As a consequence of the positive attributes authentic leaders convey to followers, authentic leadership has also been associated with followers performing organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) (Banks, Davis-McCauley, Gardner & Guler, 2016; Tonkin, 2013). OCBs are discretionary behaviours that are not formally rewarded by the organization, yet have been associated with high performance, high customer satisfaction, low levels of turnover (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009) and greater trust in the leader (Wong, Laschinger, & Cummings, 2010). Authentic leadership has the potential to promote positive behaviours, but also to alienate employees if the values espoused by the leader are inconsistent with those held by the followers, or when a candid approach to leading causes discomfort by challenging assumptions (Algera & Lips-Wiersma, 2012). Given the potential for discrepant outcomes of authentic leadership, the first aim of the current study is to test the relationship between authentic leadership and OCBs, and establish whether authentic

leadership and discretionary organizational behaviours are positively associated. Understanding the impact that authentic leadership exerts onto employee behaviours is paramount in ensuring organizations create the best environment possible to encourage OCBs, therefore contributing to their competitive advantage and successful organizational functioning.

Research also suggests that, in addition to leadership, positive emotions toward the organization play an important role in shaping positive behaviours and attitudes at work, including OCBs (Lee & Allen, 2002; Chang, Johnson & Yang, 2007). If employees feel positively toward their organization, behaviours such as OCBs may be elicited. There is strong support for this assumption, with research finding that employee positive emotions make prosocial behaviours such as OCB more likely (Lee & Allen, 2002; Barsade & Gibson, 2007; Ziegler, Schlett, Casel & Diehl, 2012). Research into negative emotions and workplace behaviour is largely focused on negative emotions leading to counterproductive work behaviours (CWB), with little to no mention of OCB. Yet, experiencing negative emotions in the workplace may lead employees to suppress OCBs, rather than perform CWBs. Whilst this may not cause harm to the organization, the suppression of OCBs may result in less than desirable consequences for the organization, such as reduced levels of customer service. The current study will contribute to the literature by examining the often overlooked relationship between negative emotions and OCBs. Hence, the second aim of this study is to examine the relationship between both positive and negative emotions and OCBs.

Despite the vast array of research exploring the association between positive emotions and workplace behaviours (Barsade & Gibson, 2007; Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005) and between authentic leadership and organisational outcomes, no studies to date have explored the interplay of authentic leadership and felt emotions on desirable organisational behaviours. Employees working with an authentic leader who they feel positively about, combined with

feeling good about the organization, may lead to increased performance, attitudes, and the motivation to enact OCBs. Contrastingly, the experience of negative emotions toward the organisation may undermine the positive influence of authentic leadership on OCBs. The third aim of this study is to investigate the distinct moderating role of positive and negative emotions towards the organization on the relationship between authentic leadership and OCBs.

**Authentic leadership**

The concept of authenticity was first advocated by the Greek Stoics as a moral response to a deterioration in religious and civic values (Baumeister, 1987). Greek Stoics were encouraged to "know thyself" and be in control of their life (Kernis & Goldman, 2006). Authenticity has been historically articulated in philosophy as concepts of individual virtues and ethical choices, whereas psychology has ascribed authenticity to individual states, traits and identities (Novicevic, Harvey, Ronald, & Brown-Radford, 2006). Early exploration of the idea of authenticity in a leadership context was pioneered by Argyris (1957), who claimed that authentic leaders are not only aware of the organization's worth, but also their self-worth and the worth of others.

Erickson (1995) suggests that authenticity can be conceptualized as a continuum from inauthentic to fully authentic, and individuals can be anywhere along the continuum. The concept of authenticity was further explored by Harter (2002), who stipulated that thoughts and feelings must be congruent with actions. Harter (2002) defines authenticity as "owning one's personal experiences, thoughts, emotions, needs, wants, preferences and beliefs" (p.382). Luthans & Avolio (2003) transfer the idea of authenticity into organizational psychology, by integrating positive psychology with theories of transformational and full-range leadership.

As suggested by Avolio & Gardner (2005), authentic leadership can incorporate many theories of leadership, such as charismatic, servant and transformational leadership, along with other forms of positive leadership. Four dimensions of authentic leadership have been proposed

by Walumbwa et al. (2008): self-awareness, relational transparency, balanced processing, and an internalized moral perspective. Firstly, self-awareness is a key contributing factor in authentic leadership, defined as "the ability to recognize one's moods, emotions, and drives, as well as their effects on others" (Goleman, 2004, p. 85). Relational transparency involves self-disclosure and development of a mutual relationship, so that subordinates will see the leader's true aspects, both good and bad (Goldman & Kernis, 2002). Openly sharing information, expressing true thoughts and feelings with followers and accountability in relationships with followers are other aspects of relational transparency (Burke & Cooper, 2006; Walumbwa, Wang, Wang, Schaubroeck & Avolio, 2010). The more employees believe that their managers are acting true to themselves and behaving in accordance with their beliefs, the more risk followers are willing to invest by offering further dedication to the manager, a component known as internalized moral perspective (Clapp-Smith, Vogelgesang, & Avey, 2009). Lastly, a dimension known as balanced processing concerns one's ability to ask others to contribute to, question and challenge values in order to make the best decision for the organization.

Authentic leadership is grounded in the belief that if leaders express themselves in a natural and honest way, positive and ethical work outcomes will occur (Banks et al., 2016). Therefore, authentic leadership must be grounded in behaviour and intentions that are moral (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Luthans & Avolio (2003) suggest that authentic leaders are transparent about their behavioural intentions and endeavour to maintain a link between values, behaviours and actions. Authentic leadership draws upon the positive psychological capital that a leader possesses and encourages leaders to make selfless judgements. Luthans & Avolio (2003) see the positive psychological states projected by authentic leaders as initiating the development of authenticity in those around them.

A key aspect of authentic leadership is that authentic leaders are capable of choosing authentic behaviours despite strong pressure from multiple sources, such as external pressures

and rewards for acting inauthentically (Harvey, Martinko, & Gardner, 2006). As a consequence of resisting pressures, authentic behaviour is seen as a reaction to an internal desire to act with integrity, and not to cave into certain standards (Erickson, 1995). Authentic leaders may promote positive behaviour in followers as they set an example of good behaviour without this behaviour being limited to role requirements. Followers are motivated by authentic leaders, as the leader models and transfers a sense of responsibility to contribute positive outcomes to the team and organization (George, 2003). Luthans & Avolio (2003) state that authentic leaders view the best in followers, and as a result identify and nurture desired skills and abilities.

Howell & Avolio (1992) argue that only leaders concerned for the common good should be classified as authentic leaders. Shapira-Lishchnsky & Tsemach (2014) further state that the most critical determinant of authenticity in leadership is the followers' attribution of a leader's intentions. For followers to perceive a leader as authentic, leaders must display exemplary behaviours, that ultimately result in attributions of trust, responsibility and a high degree of integrity (Gardner & Avolio, 1998). Perceptions of authentic leadership, namely modelling exemplary behaviours, are expected to result in followers displaying positive behaviours through role modelling.

**Authentic leadership and OCBs**

OCBs are defined by Organ (1988) as "individual behaviour 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). Discretionary behaviours are defined by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach (2000) as behaviours that are not an enforceable condition of the role or job description. Podsakoff et al.,(2000) elaborate that OCBs are a matter of personal choice and employees cannot be punished for deciding not to perform these behaviours. OCBs contribute to organizational performance, but also shape the organization's

social and psychological context that dictates task activities and processes (Borman, Penner, Allen, & Motowidlo, 2001).

Two frameworks of classifying OCBs have been promoted in literature, one consisting of 5 dimensions of OCB (e.g. Organ, 1988) and the other of 3 dimensions (e.g. Williams & Anderson, 1991; Lee & Allen, 2002). Organ (1988) describes 5 dimensions of OCB that capture different categories of an individual's workplace behaviour. These dimensions include altruism, courtesy, civic virtue, conscientiousness and sportsmanship. Altruism refers to the helping approach of the employee towards members of the organization. Behaviours include helping co-workers with heavy workloads, and assisting new employees with job tasks (Chahal & Mehta, 2010). The second dimension, conscientiousness, includes obeying rules, being punctual and following timely breaks (Chahal & Mehta, 2010). Thirdly, sportsmanship is identified as the willingness to accept less than perfect circumstances without complaint. Another dimension, civic virtue, is behaviour from employees that shows concern towards the life of the organization. Behaviours that reflect civic virtue include attending voluntary functions, participating in meetings, and organising get-togethers (Chahal & Mehta, 2010). Lastly, courtesy encompasses discretionary behaviours that employees perform which are aimed at preventing work related issues with other employees (Chahal & Mehta, 2010). An example of the courtesy dimension of OCB is advising other employees how to contact an individual who is away from the office (Newland, 2012).

Based on Organ's (1988) 5 dimensions of OCBs, Williams and Anderson (1991) conceptualized a three-dimension model of OCB. The three-dimension model categorizes OCBs based on the direction of the behaviour and includes OCBs directed towards the organization (OCB-O) and OCBs directed towards other employees/individuals (OCB-I). OCB-O consists of Organ (1988)'s conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue dimensions, whilst OCB-I consists of altruism and courtesy (Chahal & Mehta, 2010, Hoffman,

Blair, Meriac & Woehr, 2007). The third dimension of Williams & Anderson's (1991) OCB scale consists of in-role behaviours. In-role behaviours refer to behaviours that are recognized by the formal reward system, part of the job description and support others' efforts to perform (Williams & Anderson, 1991). The in-role behaviour dimension of OCB comprises items that concern the act of supporting others in undertaking activities that are expected as part of their job and are not discretionary.

Organizations have much to gain from OCBs, as they are receiving extra effort and work from the employee. Organ (1988) stated that OCBs can maximise the efficacy and productivity of employees, which will contribute to optimal functioning of the organization (Chahal & Mehta, 2010). Employees performing OCBs provide the flexibility needed to work through many unforeseen contingencies. Formal job descriptions do not encompass the full range of behaviours that are needed for organizations to succeed and achieve their goals, therefore OCBs are paramount to achieve organizational success (Vanyperen, van den Berg, & Willering, 1999). Companies can attract and retain high performing employees, enhance cohesion between individuals and aid in adaptability to change in the workplace by relying on OCBs (Bolino, Turnley, & Bloodgood, 2002; Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997). OCBs are often implicitly encouraged in organizations, through organizational norms and stories of exemplary employee behaviour circulated throughout the workplace (Bolino, Turnley, Gilstrap & Suazo, 2010).

Authentic leaders may encourage OCBs through the prosocial values and behaviours they espouse throughout the workplace. Leading by example is a common behaviour that authentic leaders engage in to demonstrate their commitment to their organization. By openly sharing their positive thoughts and feelings and displaying relational transparency, authentic leaders provide guidance to followers regarding their emotional and physical connection to the workplace (Wang, Sui, Luthans, Wang, & Wu, 2014). Displaying behaviours congruent with

the self-awareness dimension of authentic leadership, including high moral standards and a desire to contribute to the common good, authentic leaders are able to stimulate positive values and behaviours such as OCBs. This is achieved by the authentic leader through role modelling positive behaviours that emanate from the positive ethical foundation of the internalized moralized perspective dimension. Followers then reciprocate these positive and ethical behaviours (Yukl, 2002, Ilies, Morgeson & Nahrgang, 2005). Authentic leaders almost go so far to perform self-sacrificing behaviour, sacrificing their own needs and wants for the greater good of the team (Nichols & Erakovich, 2013). Accordingly, a positive relationship between authentic leadership and OCBs is expected.

*Hypothesis 1.* There will be a positive association between the four authentic leadership dimensions (self-awareness, relational transparency, balanced processing, and an internalized moral perspective) and organizational citizenship behaviours.

**Emotions at work**

Organizations are an emotional place as they are human inventions, serving human purposes and needs, and depend on humans to run efficiently (Armstrong, 2018). Therefore, work is an emotional experience and is a source of many positive and negative emotions, which in turn influence individual, group and organizational performance (Kaplan, Cortina, Ruark, LaPort, & Nicolaides, 2014). Emotions permeate many aspects of employee relations in organizations, from perceptions of authority, to the desire of having a long-term career within a particular organization (Ozcelik, Langton, & Aldrich, 2008).

Beginning in the 20th century, it was commonly hypothesized that if employees were happy, they would be productive (Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986). Despite this assumption, the study of emotions in an organizational setting was not seriously pursued until the publication of Hochschild's book "The Managed Heart" in 1983, which details the commercialization of human feelings (Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000). Hochschild (1983) elaborates that humans have

become used to accepting rules and techniques of emotional labour enforced by their organization, suppressing certain emotions such as anger to best serve commercial purposes. The Managed Heart prompted a revival of researching emotions in the organizational setting. Barsade, Brief & Spataro (2003) later defined emotions as "intense, relatively short lived affective reactions to a specific environmental stimulus" (p.12). Emotions have a clear cause and are more focused and intense as opposed to moods (Frijda & Mesquita, 1994; Barsade, Brief & Spataro, 2003).

The emotional experience is characterized by motivational, physiological, psychological, cognitive, and behavioural components (Ashkanasy, 2003). Emotions serve an adaptive function that allows humans to respond to environmental events that have implications for survival (Plutchik, 1989). In typical workplace situations, emotions act to help formulate intentions for individuals to engage in certain behaviours (Bies, Tripp, & Kramer, 1997). However, contrasting opinions on the role of emotions at work exist. As early as 1955, emotions in organizations were labelled as "extraneous noise that need containing and managing" (Jaques, 1955). Albrow (1992) furthers this opinion by suggesting that emotions interfere with rational and effective decision making. Nevertheless, given that emotions are at the core of human experience and humans spend more time engaged in work than any other activity, they are an important concept to examine (Muchinsky, 2000).

Emotions exert an influence over many aspects of organizational functioning, including how employees behave at work. The association between emotions at work and OCBs has been previously explored in literature (e.g. Spector & Fox, 2002; Barsade & Gibson, 2007). Spector & Fox (2002) state that emotions typically motivate behaviour that enhances positive feelings and mitigates negative feelings. Spector & Fox (2002) further elaborate that emotions are associated with voluntary behaviour, regardless of whether the behaviour occurs immediately as a reflexive reaction or whether it spurs a decision to act later. OCBs in employees can be

encouraged by positive emotions, as people in positive emotional states engage in behaviour that is congruent with their feelings (Spector & Fox, 2002). This assumption is supported by the observation that individuals in positive moods are more likely to help others than those in negative or neutral moods (Lee & Allen, 2002). The connection between emotions and behaviours was further explored by Barsade & Gibson (2007) who state that there is strong support for the assumption that positive emotions make prosocial behaviours such as OCBs more likely, and negative emotions are associated with anti-social behaviours.

Research on the relationship between negative emotions and OCBs is scarce, with most research in this domain focusing on the relationship between negative emotions and counterproductive work behaviours. The theoretical association between OCBs and negative emotions is often overlooked, and as a result of this oversight little empirical evidence for the relationship between negative emotions and OCB exists. Spector & Fox (2002) call for studies that investigate the relationship between OCB and negative emotion to address the lack of literature in the field. Since by definition OCB is a behaviour that is not required by their job description, employees are free to engage in OCB or to withhold the behaviour from the employer (Spector & Fox, 2002). It is entirely plausible that negative emotions toward the organization result in the suppression of OCBs. Based on previous research conducted into emotions and OCBs, the following is hypothesized.

*Hypothesis 2a.* There will be a positive association between positive emotions toward the organization and organizational citizenship behaviours.

*Hypothesis 2b.* There will be a negative association between negative emotions toward the organization and organizational citizenship behaviours.

In addition to investigating the direct effects of authentic leadership, emotions toward the organization and OCBs, the current study will explore whether positive and negative emotions

toward the organization interact with authentic leadership to predict OCBs. Considering OCBs are discretionary behaviours that go beyond the basic performance of job requirements, these behaviours may be contingent on the leader's capacity to stimulate behaviours that serve the common good, coupled with how the employee feels toward the organization. Authentic leadership has been demonstrated to promote OCBs in past literature (e.g. Banks et. al., 2016; Tonkin, 2013), and this positive effect can be enhanced by employees feeling positively towards the organization. Conversely, the positive effect of authentic leadership on OCB may be undermined by employees feeling negatively toward the organization. Although an individual may like their leader, how the individual feels about their organization may also determine the employees' willingness to perform OCB.

Combining previous research in the authentic leadership, emotions and OCB literature, employees viewing their leader as authentic and working in a positive emotional climate with high levels of positive emotions should maximise employee OCBs and result in the most promising results for organizations. Accordingly, the following hypotheses were formulated to explain the relationship between authentic leadership, positive and negative emotions toward the organization and OCBs.

*Hypothesis 3a.* The relationship between follower perceptions of authentic leadership and follower OCBs will be moderated by positive emotions towards the organization. At high levels of positive emotions, the relationship between authentic leadership and OCBs will be significantly stronger than at low levels of positive emotions.

*Hypothesis 3b.* The relationship between follower perceptions of authentic leadership and follower OCBs will be moderated by negative emotions towards the organization. At high levels of negative emotions toward the organization, the relationship between authentic leadership and OCBs will be significantly weaker than at low levels of negative emotions.

## Method

**Participants**

The current study examined employee perceptions of authentic leadership with regard to their direct or immediate supervisor. Perceptions of authentic leadership from the executive management or CEO level were not examined, as most employees will not have daily contact with these individuals. Participants in this study were full- and part-time workers across several industries in New Zealand, namely five District Councils, one retail organisation, and one District Health Board. Council A consists of 296 employees, with a total of 95 responses recorded, resulting in a response rate of 32%. Council B has 158 employees, however only the senior management team completed the questionnaire. This resulted in 14 employees being invited to participate, with 10 responses recorded, a response rate of 71%. Only the 3 Human Resource employees from Council C participated in the study, producing a response rate of 100%. At Council D, the questionnaire was posted on the staff intranet, with 17 responses from 261 employees, a 6% response rate. Lastly, Council E also posted the questionnaire on the staff intranet, with 10 responses recorded from an employee count of 403, a .024% response rate.

The District Health Board invited to participate in the study posted the questionnaire on their staff intranet and returned 40 responses. 1000 employees are employed at the District Health Board, equating to a response rate of .04%. Employees from a branch of a large retailer were also invited to participate, with 110 responses recorded from 267 employees, a response rate of 41%.

A total of 268 participants returned useable responses from the seven sources of participants, resulting in a total response rate of 9.6%, comprised of 76.2 % females, 23.4% males and .4% Gender Diverse. Response rates for online surveys within organizations yield a response rate of approximately 30% (Nulty, 2008; Baruch & Holtom, 2008). However, Sheehan (2001) states that the response rate for emails is much lower when compared to

surveys distributed on paper (Sheehan, 2001). Despite the small response rate, a good sample size was still achieved as a result of the large sample that was contacted. Power statistics were computed for both OCBI (.990) and OCBO (.999), indicating that the current study has high statistical power (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009).

To preserve anonymity in responding, age, gender and tenure were the only demographic variables collected. The mean age of participants was 36.65, with a mean tenure of 5.8 years, ranging from 6 weeks to 40 years. For the purposes of this study, ethnicity data was not collected nor analysed.

**Procedure**

A self-report, cross-sectional design was used for the study. Responses were collected at one-time point over a 6 week period. Links to the online Qualtrics questionnaire were emailed to the researcher's contact within each organization (e.g. HR manager), with the questionnaire remaining open for 3 weeks as at the date of email. This email was forwarded to employees within the organization by the established contact, inviting them to participate in the questionnaire, regarding their perceptions of leadership and the behaviours they perform at work. Appendix A details the email that participants were sent inviting their participation. If the invitation was accepted, participants clicked on a link which redirected them to the questionnaire on Qualtrics, an online survey platform. To reduce the effects of common method variance, scales were separated onto different pages (Spector, 2006).

Included in the online questionnaire was an information and consent form (Appendix B) which participants must agree to before they could continue to the questionnaire. The information and consent provided further information about the study to participants, including the purpose of the study and how their data would be treated and protected. Participants were also informed that the research had been approved by the University of Canterbury Human

Ethics committee. Employees completed the questionnaire on company time at their place of work, with the questionnaire being endorsed by participating organizations.

Participation in the questionnaire was voluntary and employee participation was incentivised by providing a draw of 5x $200 supermarket vouchers for employees to enter once the questionnaire had been completed. To protect participant identities, employee information for the prize draw was collected on a separate webpage to the online questionnaire. This personal information was used only for the distribution of prizes and was destroyed at the completion of the study.

**Measures**

Variables were measured on a 5 point Likert scale. A full list of the measures used in the current research can be viewed in Appendices C, D and E. At the end of each measure, an open ended question was included in the questionnaire for participants to elaborate on their responses.

**Authentic Leadership**

To measure employee perceptions of authentic leadership, items were adapted from the Authentic Leadership Inventory (ALI) (Neider & Schriesheim, 2011). This scale included 15 items in total and measured the four aspects of authentic leadership, balanced processing, relational transparency, internalized moral perspective and self-awareness. Participants were presented with these questions and were asked to indicate on a 5 point Likert scale with *1= strongly agree, 2= agree, 3= neither agree nor disagree, 4= disagree and 5= strongly disagree*. The ALI has been shown to have good internal consistency with reported coefficient alphas of .79 for Self-Awareness, .80 for Relational Transparency and .85 for both Internalized Moral Perspective and Balanced Processing (Neider & Schriesheim, 2011). An example question from the ALI is *"my leader clearly states what he/she means"*.

**Organizational Citizenship Behaviours**

To measure OCBs that are directed at both the individual and the organization, items were adapted from the Williams and Anderson (1991) OCB scale. This scale measures three aspects of OCB: OCBs directed towards the individual, OCBs directed towards the organization, and employee in role behaviours. For the purposes of this study, two dimensions of OCB were included, OCBs toward the individual (OCB-I) and OCBs toward the organization (OCB-O). Examining these two dimensions of OCB resulted in 13 questions being included in the questionnaire. The dimension of OCB-I included 7 questions, an example of which is "helps others who have been absent". Participants were asked to respond to each question on a Likert scale with *1= strongly agree, 2= agree, 3= neither agree nor disagree, 4= disagree and 5= strongly disagree*. Coefficient alpha values for OCB-I ranged from .61 to .88 (Williams & Anderson, 1991; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998; Morrison & Phelps, 1999). The OCB-O dimension included 6 questions, with coefficient alphas ranging from .70 to .75 (Williams & Anderson, 1991; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998; Morrison & Phelps, 1999). An example question from the OCB-O dimension is "fulfils responsibilities specified in job description".

**Emotions**

Employee emotions toward the organization were measured with items adapted from the Positive and Negative Affect Scale (PANAS) (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Included in the scale are 20 emotions, both positive and negative, that describe how employees feel whilst at work. Participants were asked to respond to each question on a Likert scale with *1=Very slightly or not at all, 2=A Little, 3=Moderately, 4=Quite a bit and 5=Extremely.* Coefficient alpha values for the PANAS scale are all acceptably high and range between .86 and .90 for positive affect and .84 to .87 for negative affect (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). An example of a positive and negative emotion measured in the scale are *excited* and *ashamed.*

**Data Analysis**

All data was statistically analysed using IBM SPSS (version 25). Before analysis, all data from the seven Qualtrics questionnaires was merged into one dataset, with an extra column added stating which organization the data originated from. Participating organizations were assigned a number ranging from 1-7, which allowed individual organizations to be identified for the purpose of statistical analysis.

<center>**Results**</center>

Prior to testing hypotheses, exploratory factor analyses were conducted to determine the underlying factor structure of each scale. Principal axis factoring with direct oblimin rotation using Kaizer Normalization was used to establish the dimensionality of the OCB scale, ALI, and the PANAS scale. Firstly, the factor structure of the scale used to measure OCBs in the current study was examined. Examination of the OCB scale revealed three factors with eigenvalues above 1. It was observed that all 13 items in the OCB scale reached the recommended value of factor loadings above .4 (Costello & Osborne, 2005), with the lowest factor loading being .43 on item 12. Costello & Osborne (2005) state that factors with less than three items may be weak or unstable. All three factors retained in the OCB scale consist of three or more items, further supporting the factor structure. As a result of these adequate factor loadings, no items were excluded from this analysis on the basis of eigenvalue, as all items displayed adequate measurement properties. Appendix F displays the initial factor analysis of the Williams & Anderson (1991) OCB scale.

A two factor structure was expected, one factor for OCB-I and one factor for OCB-O. However, the factor analysis of the OCB-I and OCB-O dimensions extracted a three factor solution. OCB-O loaded on one factor, as expected. Surprisingly, OCB-I loaded on two factors. A content analysis of the items suggests that one of which pertains to social support (items 8, 9, 10) and the other factor to support provided to colleagues in work related tasks (items 11,

12, 13). The decision was made to exclude the items that measure social support at work, as questions targeting social support do not examine contributions to the organization and supporting colleagues' work tasks. Therefore, items 8, 9 and 10 were excluded from further analysis. Items 11, 12 and 13 were retained as they measured positive contributions towards others' work, consistent with Williams & Anderson's (1991) in-role behaviours. A sample item is "I go out of my way to assist new employees". A principal axis factoring factor analysis was then repeated to confirm the final structure of the OCB scale, with this solution displayed in Appendix G.

An exploratory factor analysis was then conducted to test the underlying factor structure of the Authentic Leadership Inventory. The results of this analysis are displayed in Appendix H. A two factor solution was obtained, with items 6, 10 and 14 loading onto a separate factor. However, these two factors correlate highly at .68, therefore a decision was made to combine the factors into a composite variable.

Factor analyses were conducted for both negative and positive emotions to test the underlying factor structure of these dimensions. The initial factor structure for negative emotions is displayed in Appendix K. Upon examination of the negative emotions factor structure, items in the negative emotions scale loaded on two factors, yet the second factor was represented by two items ("Upset" and "Irritable"), which were removed from further analysis. The final factor structure for the negative emotion items in the PANAS scale is displayed in Appendix L. The items on the negative emotions factor have factor loadings above the suggested value of .4 and were therefore retained (Costello & Osborne, 2005).

The underlying factor structure of positive emotion items on the PANAS scale was then analysed. Results of this analysis are shown in Appendix M. Factor analysis of the positive emotion variable revealed one factor, as expected, with all factor loadings above .4. All items from the factor analysis on positive emotions were retained for further analyses.

Bivariate Pearson correlations, Cronbach alpha values and descriptive statistics were calculated to test the linear relationship amongst variables. The values for each scale are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1
*Summary of Descriptive Statistics, Correlation Matrix and Internal Consistency values*

| Variable | M | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 AL Overall | 3.67 | .77 | (.94) | | | | |
| 2 Positive Emotions | 3.46 | .81 | .39** | (.93) | | | |
| 3 Negative Emotions | 1.46 | .56 | -.22** | -.23** | (.91) | | |
| 4 OCB Individual | 4.50 | .47 | .16* | .28** | -.06 | (.68) | |
| 5 OCB Organization | 4.26 | .49 | .17** | .35** | -.06 | .85** | (.86) |

*Note. ** Significant at p=0.01, *Significant at p=0.05. Cronbach alpha values (α) are displayed on the diagonal.*

Correlational analyses revealed significant associations between positive emotions toward the organization and OCB-I and OCB-O (r=.28, *p=.01;* r=.35 *p=.01*, respectively*).* Significant positive correlations were also observed between authentic leadership and OCB-O and OCB-I (r=.17, *p=.01* r=.16 *p=.05*, respectively). No significant correlations were found between negative emotions toward the organization and OCB-O (r=-.06 *p=.05*) or OCB-I (r=-.06, *p=.05*).

To examine differences between male and female participants in OCB, perceptions of authentic leadership, and emotions toward the organization, independent samples *t*-tests were conducted. Results of this analysis are displayed in Table M1 (Appendix M). The independent samples *t*-test shows that mean levels of OCB-O for males (*M*=4.04 SD=.46,) and females (M=4.33, SD=.48) differ significantly (t=-4.12, p=.00). Statistically significant differences also exist in OCBI between males (M=4.40, SD=.44) and females (M=4.54, SD=.46), (t=-2.14), *p*=.03. On average, females tend to perform higher levels of OCBs than males. Gender will be used as a control variable in subsequent analyses.

A One-way ANOVA was conducted to examine significant differences in levels of Authentic Leadership, Positive and Negative Emotions, OCB-I and OCB-O, across the

organisations surveyed. The results of this analysis are displayed in Table N1 (Appendix N). As displayed in Table N1, no significant differences between organizations were observed. Therefore, no further analysis concerning organizational differences was conducted.

**Hypotheses testing**

To test the study's hypotheses, moderated multiple regression analyses were conducted for each of the OCB dimensions. Firstly, index variables were created for each dimension of the OCBI and OCBO scales, the authentic leadership scale, and the PANAS scale. Index variables were created by calculating the mean of each item in each dimension. Index variables were centered for the predictor variables, to mitigate multicollinearity. The technique of grand mean centering was used to centre the index variables, as suggested by Hofmann and Gavin (1998). Interaction terms were also created to test the moderating relationship between authentic leadership, emotions toward the organization, and OCB. To create the interaction terms, variables of interest were multiplied together and labelled under a new variable. An assessment of multicollinearity revealed low VIF and tolerance levels in all variables, with all VIF values in accordance with Bowerman & O'Connell's (1990) recommendations of a VIF value under 3. VIF values for all variables are displayed in Table 11. The results of the regression analyses are shown in Table 2.

*Table 2. Results of moderation analysis testing authentic leadership positive and negative emotions towards the organization and interaction effects, controlling for age. Unstandardized coefficients and standard errors (SE).*

| Variable | OCBO | | | | OCBI | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | SE | *p* | VIF | B | SE | *p* | VIF |
| Constant | 4.14 | 0.9 | 0.0 | | 3.97 | .11 | 0.0 | |
| Age | .00 | .00 | .11 | | .00 | .00 | .04 | |
| AL | .03 | .05 | .48 | 1.3 | .05 | .06 | .39 | 1.3 |
| Positive_Emotion | **.22**** | .05 | **.00** | 1.3 | **.22**** | .06 | **.00** | 1.3 |
| Negative_Emotion | .04 | .06 | .44 | 1.1 | .04 | .07 | .58 | 1.1 |
| ALxPositiveEmotion | .07 | .05 | .20 | 1.2 | .09 | .06 | .18 | 1.2 |
| ALxNegativeEmotion | .05 | .07 | .48 | 1.2 | .03 | .09 | .69 | 1.2 |
| $R^2$ | | | | .15 | | | | .12 |
| F for change in $R^2$ | | | | 6.4 | | | | 5.0 |
| Sig F Change | | | | 0.0 | | | | 0.0 |

Note. N=268 ** indicates significance at *p=.01*.

Authentic Leadership and OCBs were not significantly associated, inconsistent with previous research suggesting that authentic leadership leads to higher OCBs in followers. The regression table shows authentic leadership is not significantly associated with either OCB-O (B=.03 *p=.48*) or OCBI (B=.05 *p=.39*). Therefore hypothesis 1 which predicted Authentic Leadership and OCBs would be positively associated is not supported. Hypothesis 2a which predicted that positive emotions towards the organization would be positively associated with OCB is supported for both OCB-O (B=.22, *p=.00*) and OCB-I (B=.22 *p=.00*) Negative emotions towards the organization were not significantly associated with OCBO (B=.04 *p=.44*) or OCBI (B=.04, *p=.58*). , therefore hypothesis 2b is not supported.

Positive emotions toward the organization did not significantly moderate the relationship between authentic leadership and OCB (see Table 2). Therefore, hypothesis 3a which predicted that positive emotions toward the organization would enhance the relationship between authentic leadership and OCBs is not supported. Negative emotions toward the organization did not significantly moderate the relationship between authentic leadership and OCB-I (see Table 2). Consequently, hypothesis 3b which predicted that negative emotions

toward the organization would moderate the relationship between authentic leadership and OCBs is not supported.

## Discussion

In an attempt to address the ethical crisis that 21st century organizations are facing, reflected on cases of corporate malfeasance and scandal, authentic leadership has been brought to the forefront of leadership research (Gardiner, 2011; Cooper, Scandura & Schriesheim, 2005). In addition, the role of emotions in organizations has been investigated for the positive organizational outcomes they encourage, fuelling optimal organizational functioning and reverberating throughout interactions with both customers and other employees (Fredrickson, 2000). To contribute to this literature, the current study sought to investigate if positive and negative emotions towards the organization, along with perceptions of authentic leadership, influenced organizational citizenship behaviours (OCBs). In addition, the study explored whether emotions toward the organization moderated the relationship between authentic leadership and OCBs. To examine these relationships, a self-report questionnaire was administered to seven organizations across local government, health, and retail organizations. Findings indicated that while the association between authentic leadership and OCBs was not significant, there was a positive relationship between employees feeling positively toward the organization and performing OCBs. Overall, the results from the current study indicate that, despite a positive correlation between authentic leadership and OCBs, this association was not significant when the effect of emotions toward the organisation was accounted for. This finding is inconsistent with previous research in the authentic leadership literature which shows significant positive associations between the two variables (e.g. Banks et al., 2016; Ribeiro, Duarte & Filipe, 2018). Further, it runs counter to the premise that authentic leaders will influence prosocial behaviours through displaying positive and ethical behaviours (Howell &

Avolio, 1992; May et al., 2003). The non-significant relationship between authentic leadership and OCBs in the current study suggests that an employee's decision to perform OCBs may be contingent on more than the leadership style of their immediate manager. How an employee feels toward their organization and the positive organizational climate in which the employee works may influence the employees' decision to perform these behaviours. The significant association between positive emotions toward the organization and an employee's decision to perform OCBs is consistent with previous research in emotions literature (Barsade & Gibson (2007)

Negative emotions toward the organization were not found to have a significant association with OCBs. These results are consistent with Ziegler et al.,(2012), who found that negative emotions do not contribute to predicting OCB behaviour beyond positive emotions. Positive and negative emotions towards the organization did not act as a moderator of the relationship between authentic leadership and OCBs.

**Limitations**

Several limitations of the current study exist, which must be taken into account when interpreting the findings. Firstly, the results of the current study showed that authentic leadership loaded on two factors as opposed to the expected four factors, one for each dimension of authentic leadership. The decision was made to combine the two factors of authentic leadership into a single composite variable. Merging the dimensions did not allow for the relationship between individual authentic leadership dimensions, emotions toward the organization, and OCBs to be examined. Although the relationship between authentic leadership and OCB was not significant in the current study, examining authentic leadership dimensions individually would have provided more insight into whether specific behaviours performed by authentic leaders prompt OCBs. It may be that certain dimensions of authentic

leadership contribute more significantly to OCBs than others, however this fine-grained analysis could not be conducted in the current study.

Measuring emotions retrospectively may be another limitation of the current study as emotions are variable and transient. As a result of their transient nature, emotions may be difficult to recall and accurately describe long after they have occurred (Fisher, 2002). The current study asked participants to describe their emotions toward their organization in the last 30 days. As with any emotions research, participant responses may have been contaminated by how the individual was feeling at the time of responding, or their mood in general (Brief, Butcher & Roberson, 1995; Kraiger, Billings & Isen, 1989). Future studies may be able to overcome the limitation of retrospective emotions recording by using electronic real time responding. Individuals' emotions could be measured once or multiple times per day through an electronic medium, such as a mobile phone application. Participants could download an application that sends an alert once per working day, at a different time each day, during the participants hours of work. The participant then rates their emotions toward their organization for the current day. Using this method, a pattern of emotions over time could be discerned. This would offer both researchers and organizations valuable insight into how their employees are feeling at different times of the day, over a period of time. Inputting this data into a mobile phone would be a quick and convenient process for employees, with the ease of use potentially leading to a higher response rate than traditional self-report questionnaires. Using this method, participants would be able to provide real time feedback about their emotions whilst at work, thus eliminating the potential for retrospective response bias. Kaplan, Dalal & Luchman (2013) suggest that measuring emotions in real time may also address the issue of self-report data in emotions research. A similar method of emotions reporting was utilized by Fisher (1997), who asked participants to wear a device that buzzed once per day, with participants completing a paper version of the Job Emotions Scale.

Another limitation of the current study is the method of data collection, a self-report questionnaire and all the data collected at one time point (cross-sectional). Self-report data provides the opportunity for participants to provide socially desirable responses. Research results may become confounded by socially desirable responding, alongside the possibility for false relationships to be created or true relationships between variables to be obscured (van de Mortel, 2008). Despite the limitations associated with self-report data, self-report is the only viable method to record emotions toward the organization, as this information cannot be inferred by a third party. Podsakoff et al (2003) state that self-report is a highly useful tool to glean an understanding into individuals' feelings and perspectives. As participants in the current study reported on their own emotions and their desire to perform OCB, self-report was deemed as an appropriate method to use.

Common method variance may also be a limitation of the current study. The current study was only conducted at one time point, with Lindell & Whitney (2001) describing that if the same rater responds to items in a single questionnaire at the same time point, the results may susceptible to the effects of common method variance. Common method variance refers to variance that may be attributed to the measurement method rather than to the constructs the measures are assumed to represent (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Measurement error due to common method variance may threaten the validity of the conclusions between the variables of interest in the study (Bagozzi, Yi & Phillips, 1991; Podsakoff et al., 2003). To mitigate the effects of common method variance in the current study, variables were separated onto different pages in the questionnaire, a technique suggested by Podsakoff et al. (2003).

Future studies may utilize multiple time points to further separate constructs of interest and to create temporal separation (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Measuring emotions toward the organization in a time-lagged study may reduce common method variance and build a stronger picture of how emotions toward the organization influence OCBs. A pattern of emotions

toward the organization over time will also be gleaned with a time lagged study. Future technological advances such as gamification and methods of measuring body movements may also provide other methods to measure emotions and offer a solution to the limitations associated with self-report data (Rubio et al., 2017).

**Implications for Future Research and Practice**

The current study aimed to explore the associations between authentic leadership, emotions toward the organization and OCBs, including the moderating role of emotions on the relationship between authentic leadership and OCBs. The unique influence of authentic leadership and emotions toward the organization on OCBs had not been previously been examined, which provides important contributions to research. Results of the current study have practical implications for organizations to encourage employees to perform discretionary behaviours at work. Findings are also of use to emotions and leadership researchers in furthering the knowledge of how these factors impact workplace behaviour.

**Future Research**

Negative emotions were not significantly associated with OCBs in the current study. As mentioned above, the potential exists for employees to channel their negative emotions into retribution behaviours, such as CWBs. Employees feeling negatively toward the organization may not contribute to OCB, but may be redirected into other behaviours and cognitions, such as CWB. Negative emotion has previously been associated with CWB (e.g. Spector & Fox, 2002), therefore it is plausible that the lack of significant relationship between negative emotions and OCBs in the current study is explained by these emotions being redirected into CWB. Individuals who have been made to feel negatively by the organization or others may engage in retaliation behaviours in order to make themselves feel better (Spector & Fox, 2002). This argument is furthered by Spector & Fox (2002) who state that situations which induce feelings of negative emotion within an employee will increase the probability that the employee

will engage in CWB, either through directly attacking the agent of the situation (e.g. through intimidation) or through indirect coping mechanisms (e.g. avoiding work). Retribution behaviours have previously been shown to pose serious consequences for organizations with costs of CWB estimated at $50billion USD per year (Coffin, 2003; Mount, Illies & Johnson, 2006). Further research in the area of negative emotions towards the organization and OCB/CWB is needed to test whether positive and negative emotions contribute exclusively and respectively to OCBs and CWBs.

Previous research into the association between authentic leadership and OCB may have revealed significant results as authentic leadership is typically measured in relation to senior leaders (e.g. CEO) and not in relation to the direct or line manager. It is possible that the more distal the leader, the more employees' feelings toward the leader will mirror feelings toward the organization. Conversely, how an employee views their immediate manager may be distinct from their feelings toward the organisation, and result in unique workplace behaviours. These findings suggest the need for future research to investigate associations between authentic leadership and outcomes of interest including OCB, considering leadership level.

Future research could investigate differences across organizational levels in emotions towards the organization and OCBs. The current study only investigated emotions toward the organization at the individual level and did not explore employee emotions at team or group level. To date, most of the research about the role of emotions and affect in organizations has been conducted at the individual level (Gamero, Gonza´lez-Roma, & Peiro, 2008). Studying emotions toward the organization amongst different levels of the organization could yield unique results. Although emotional climate is often conceptualized at the organizational level (Ashkanasy & Humphrey, 2011), it is unlikely that a shared culture permeates the organization as a whole, especially when the organization is large with many divisions and layers (Anderson & West, 1998; Dansereau & Alutto, 1990). Team and group contexts may also create their own

distinct emotional climate, different to the climate of the rest of the organization. Investigating the relationship between group emotions toward the organization and OCBs is another area researchers could explore.

Several academics have highlighted that group members can share affect (e.g. George, 1990; Bartel & Saavedra (2000). George (1990) proposed the concept of a group affective tone, referring to "consistent affective reactions within a group" (p.77). Emotional contagion, a phenomenon in which employees mimic, synchronize and converge their behaviour and emotions with those of others (Hatfield, Cacioppo & Rapson, 1994) explains how affect is spread across organizational levels (Dasborough, Ashkanasy, Tee, & Tse, 2009). Affective climate and group affective tone have been shown to exert influence on team processes and outcomes such as positive prosocial behaviour (George, 1990) and team performance (Barsade, Ward, Turner, Sonnenfeld, 2000; Kelly & Barsade, 2001). Groups may form collective opinions of the organization and act as a team to exert or withhold OCB from their employer. In this regard, performing OCBs may be a team or organization level phenomenon and not one limited to individual employees. This assumption would benefit from multilevel investigation as it has far reaching consequences for organizations.

Future research in the area of OCB should consider the different dimensions of OCBs that are often combined into a single scale or scale dimension. In the current study it was found that items on the OCB-I scale that may have measured two different dimensions, namely interpersonal work factors such as assisting colleagues at work, and more general social support helping that is not specifically directed at individuals. However, these very different behaviours and actions are often classified under the same umbrella term and may lead to issues with construct validity. Williams & Anderson (1991) acknowledge the issue that in previous studies, dimensions of OCB are often unintentionally blended together which leads to issues in classifying types of behaviour. Additionally, the current study highlighted an issue within the

OCB-I scale, noting that this dimension measured two aspects of OCB, work related tasks and generalised social support. In future, researchers should be more discerning in classifying the items that constitute OCB-I, as the behaviours measured within the scale pertain to both task-related supportive behaviours, and to social support.

**Implications for Practice**

Positive emotions toward the organization were identified in the current study as being associated with employees displaying OCB. Previously, OCB research has been directed toward the type of leader the employee works with or under, suggesting that it is the leadership style that drives the employee's decision to perform positive behaviours (e.g. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990; Lian & Tui, 2012). The current study has revealed that emotions toward the organization may be more of an influencing factor when employees decide whether to perform or withhold OCBs.

Dimensions of authentic leadership address moral behaviour, displaying true feelings to others and using open and honest communication with followers (Walumbwa et al., 2008). However, no mention is made of authentic leaders encouraging positive emotions toward organizations. In fact, no contemporary leadership frameworks include the leader's ability to foster positive emotions towards the organization in followers, with the key dimensions of leadership styles making little to no reference of the organization and only to the leader or their followers. Modern leadership styles should include the leader's ability to foster a positive emotional climate and encouraging positive emotions toward the organization. An emotional climate refers to the collective mood of organizational members, their cognitions and attitudes towards leaders, peers and the organization (Schein, 2004). A positive emotional climate is associated with increased organizational performance, revenue growth and outcome growth, therefore contributing highly to organizational success (Ozcelik, Langton, & Aldrich, 2008). In a positive organizational climate, leaders consider the emotional needs and personal growth

of followers, whilst encouraging the sharing of positive emotions (Ozcelik, Langton, & Aldrich, 2008). Encouraging a positive emotional climate is paramount to motivating employees to repeatedly demonstrate helping behaviours such as OCBs (Vacharkulksemsuk, Sekerka, & Fredrickson, 2011). DeConinck (2011) argues that by encouraging a positive and ethical work climate, employees' level of organizational identification and belonging will increase. More research into group emotional climates and the decision to perform OCBs will allow for further interventions to be designed to improve the emotional climate within teams, in order to contribute to desirable organizational outcomes.

With so much of life spent at work with others, it comes as no surprise that encouraging positive emotions in employees and building a positive emotional climate in a workplace is crucial to motivate employees to display positive behaviours. These findings are corroborated by Ashkanasy & Daus (2002), who suggest that positive emotions influence the way employees feel toward their workplace and the tasks they perform. Vacharkulksemsuk, Serkerka & Fredrickson (2011) affirm that positive emotions contribute to an expansion of positive self-concept, social inclusion in a team environment and increased organizational identification. Considering these findings, managers and organizations would be wise to foster a positive emotional climate and build positive emotional resources in employees, to ensure that employees feel positively at work and contribute their best.

Many strategies to encourage a positive emotional climate have been put forward by researchers. Ashkanasy & Daus (2002) suggest using positive role modelling and a rewards and compensation system to create a positive emotional climate. Also advised by Ashkanasy & Daus (2002) is the idea that leaders must create and communicate an emotionally healthy vision for the organization. These findings are echoed by Barsade & O'Neill (2016) who encourage the use of management tactics, special outings, celebrations and rewards to build a positive emotional climate in the workplace. Barsade & O'Neill (2016) also argue that to

encourage a positive emotional climate in a workplace, an organizations mission statements must be congruent with the actions displayed in the organization in everyday life. Organizations must consider the image they portray to employees and must work hard to ensure positive emotions are aroused in employees whilst at work, in order to maximise the amount or frequency of OCBs elicited.

Small gestures of kindness and support can compound into an emotional climate characterized by caring and compassion (Barsade & O'Neill, 2016). Harnessing what employees already feel is a starting point, as some employees may already experience positive emotions toward their workplace. Research into emotional contagion has gleaned that individuals model feelings off others (Barsade, 2002). Leaders consciously modelling desired emotions in the workplace shapes the emotional climate of the organization. Establishing the emotions that organizations want to display, ensuring leaders model these behaviours to employees and rewarding others to do the same may create a positive emotional climate, encourage employees to feel positively toward the organization, and consequently display more OCBs (Barsade & O'Neill, 2016).

**Conclusion**

The role of emotions toward the organization as a moderator of authentic leadership and OCBs was examined in the current study. This study is the first study to examine the role of emotions toward the organization in OCBs, therefore making original contributions to both research and practice. The importance of positive emotions in the workplace was highlighted in the current study, with positive emotions towards the organization associated with employees performing OCBs. Emotions toward the organization play more of a role in employees' decision to perform OCBs than the leadership style of their direct manager. This finding has significant implications for the way that organizations approach eliciting OCBs from employees to

contribute to successful organizational functioning. Future studies should consider examining differences across organizational levels in emotions toward the organization and OCBs, including within groups and teams. Results from the current study suggest that organizations should foster a positive emotional climate to encourage positive and prosocial behaviour from employees. Several strategies to foster a positive emotional climate within the workplace are recommended.

## References

Al Sahi AL Zaabi, M. S., Ahmad, K. Z., & Hossan, C. (2016). Authentic leadership, work engagement and organizational citizenship behaviors in petroleum company. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 65*(6), 811-830.

Albrow, M. (1992). Do organizations have feelings? . *Organization Studies, 13*(3), 313-329.

Algera, P., & Lips-Wiersma, M. (2012, February ). Radical Authentic Leadership: Co-creating the conditions under which all members of the organization can be authentic. *The Leadership Quarterly , 23*(1), 118-131 .

Anderson, N. R., & West, M. A. (1998). Measuring climate for work group innovation: development and validation of the team climate inventory. . *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 19*(3), 235-258.

Argyris, C. (1957). *Personality and organization; the conflict between system and the individual.* Oxford , England: Harpers .

Armstrong, D. (2018). Emotions in organizations: disturbance or intelligence? In C. Huffington, D. Armstrong, W. Halton, L. Hoyle, & J. Pooley, *Working Below the Surface* (pp. 11-27 ). London: Karnac Books.

Ashkanasy, N. M. (2003). Emotions in organizations: A multi-level perspective. *Multi-level issues in organizational behavior*.

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Daus, C. S. (2002). Emotion in the workplace: The new challenge for managers. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 16*(1), 76-86.

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Humphrey, R. H. (2011). Current emotion research in organizational behavior. *Emotion Review, 3*(2), 214-224.

Avolio, B., & Gardner, W. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership . *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(3).

Bagozzi, R. P., Yi, Y., & Phillips, L. W. (1991, 36). Assessing construct validity in organizational research., . *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*, 421–458.

Banks, G., Davis-McCauley, K., Gardner, W., & Guler, C. (2016, August). A meta-analytic review of authentic and transformational leadership: A test for redundancy . *The Leadership Quarterly, 27*(4), 634–652.

Barsade, S. G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 47*(4), 644-675.

Barsade, S. G., & Gibson, D. E. (2007). Why does affect matter in organizations? *The Academy of Management Perspectives, 21*(1), 36-59.

Barsade, S. G., Ward, A. J., Turner, J. D., & Sonnenfeld, J. A. (2000, 802–836.). To your heart's content: A model of affective diversity in top management teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 45*, 802–836.

Barsade, S., & O'Neill, O. (2016, January-February). Manage Your Emotional Culture. *Harvard Business Review*, 58–66.

Barsade, S., Brief, A. P., & Spataro, S. E. (2003). The affective revolution in organizational behavior: The emergence of a paradigm. In J. Greenberg, *Organizational behavior: A management challenge.* (pp. 3-50). Mahwah, NJ, United States of America: Lawrence Eribaum.

Bartel, C., & Saavedra, R. (2000). The collective construction of work group moods. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 45*, 197-231.

Baruch, Y., & Holtom, B. C. (2008). Survey response rate levels and trends in organizational research. *Human Relations, 61*(8), 1139-1160.

Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 181-217.

Baumeister, R. (1987). How the self became a problem: A psychological review of historical research. *Psychological Review, 52*(1), 163-176.

Bies, R. J., Tripp, T. M., & Kramer, R. M. (1997). At the breaking point: cognitive and social dynamics of revenge in organizations. In R. A. Giacalone, & J. Greenberg, *Antisocial behavior in organizations* (pp. 18-36). Thousand Oaks, CA, United States of America: SAGE.

Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Bloodgood, J. M. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 27*.

Bolino, M., Turnley, W., Gilstrap, B., & Suazo, M. (2010). Citizenship under pressure: What's a ''good soldier'' to do? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31*, 835–855.

Borman, W., Penner, L., Allen, T., & Motowidlo, S. (2001, March-June). Personality Predictors of Citizenship Performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment , 9*(1/2).

Bowerman, B. L., & O'Connell, R. T. (1990). *Linear statistical models: An applied approach* (2nd ed.). Belmount, CA, United States of America: Duxbury.

Brief, A. P., Butcher, A. H., & Roberson, L. (1995, April). Cookies, disposition, and job attitudes: The effects of positive mood-inducing events and negative affectivity on job satisfaction in a field experiment. . *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes , 62*(1), 55-62 .

Burke, R. J., & Cooper, C. (2006). The new world of work and organizations: implications for human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review, 16*(2), 83-85.

Burke, R. J., & Cooper, C. L. (2006). *The human resources revolution.* Oxford, United Kingdom: Elsevier.

Chahal, H., & Mehta, S. (2010). Antecedents and consequences of organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB): A conceptual framework in reference to health care sector. *Journal of Services Research, 10*(2), 25.

Chang, C. H., Johnson, R. E., & Yang, L. (2007). Emotional strain and organizational citizenship behaviours: A meta-analysis and review. . *Work & Stress, 21*(4), 312-332.

Chang, S., van Witteloostuijn, A., & Eden, L. (2010, February-March). Common Method Variance in International Business Research. *Journal of International Business Studies, 41*(2), 178-184.

Clapp-Smith, R., Vogelgesang, G., & Avey, J. (2009, February). Authentic Leadership and Positive Psychological Capital, The Mediating Role of Trust at the Group Level of Analysis. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 15*(3), 227-240.

Coffin, B. (2003). Breaking the silence on white collar crime. . *Risk Management, 50*(8).

Cooper, C.D, Scandura, T., & Schriesheim, C. (2005 ). Looking forward but learning from our past: Potential challenges to developing authentic leadership theory and authentic leaders . *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 475-493.

Costello, A., & Osborne, J. (2005, July). Best Practices in Exploratory Factor Analysis: Four Recommendations for Getting the Most From Your Analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation., 10*(7).

Dansereau, F., & Alutto, J. A. (1990). Level-of-analysis issues in climate and culture research. *Organizational Climate and Culture, 193*(236), 333-349.

Dasborough, M., Ashkanasy, N., Tee, E., & Tse, H. (2009). What goes around comes around: How meso-level negative emotional contagion can ultimately determine organizational attitudes toward leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*, 571–585.

DeConinck, J. (2011, June). The effects of ethical climate on organizational identification, supervisory trust, and turnover among salespeople. *Journal of Business Research, 64*(6), 617-624.

Erickson, R. J. (1995). Our society, our selves: Becoming authentic in an inauthentic world. *Advanced Development, 6*, 27-39.

Erkutlu, H., & Chafra, J. (2010). Effects of trust and psychological contract violation on authentic leadership and organizational deviance . *Management Research Review, 36*(9), 828-848.

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods, 41*, 1149-1160. .

Fisher, C. (1997). *Emotions at work: What do people feel and how should we measure it?* Bond University Australia, School of Business Discussion Papers. Robina, Gold Coast: Bond University.

Fisher, C. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of real-time affective reactions at work. *Motivation and Emotion, 26*(1), 3–30.

Fisher, C. D., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2000). The emerging role of emotions in work life: An introduction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(2), 123-129.

Fredrickson, B. (2000). Why Positive Emotions Matter in Organizations: Lessons From the Broaden-and-Build Model. *The Psychologist Manager Journal, 4*(2), 131-142.

Frijda, N. H., & Mesquita, B. (1994). The social roles and functions of emotions. In S. Kitayama, & H. Markus, *Emotion and culture: Empirical studies of mutual influence* (pp. 51-87). Washington D.C, United States of America: American Psychological Association.

Gamero, N., Gonza´lez-Roma, V., & Peiro, J. (2008). The influence of intra-team conflict on work teams' affective climate: A longitudinal study. . *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 81*(1), 47-69.

Gardiner, R. (2011). A Critique of the Discourse of Authentic Leadership. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2*(15), 99-104.

Gardner, W. L., & Avolio, B. J. (1998). The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 23*, 32-58.

Gardner, W., & Schermerhorn, J. (2004, August ). Unleashing Individual Potential:: Performance Gains Through Positive Organizational Behavior and Authentic Leadership . *Organizational Dynamics, 33*(3), 270-281.

George, D. &. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference* (4 ed.). Boston, United States of America: Allyn & Bacon.

George, J. (1990). Personality, affect, and behavior in groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 107-116.

Goldman, B., & Kernis, M. (2002). The role of authenticity in healthy psychological functioning and subjective wellbeing. *Annals of the American Psychotherapy Association , 5*, 18-20.

Goleman, D. (2004). What makes a leader? . *Harvard Business Review, 82*(1), 82-91.

Harter, S. (2002). Authenticity . In C. Snyder, & S. Lopez, *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 382-394). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, Martinko, & Gardner. (2006). Promoting Authentic Behavior in Organizations: An Attributional Perspective. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 12*(3), 1-11.

Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Rapson, R. L. (1994). *Emotional Contagion.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Hochschild, A. (1983). *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hoffman, B. J., Blair, C. A., Meriac, J. P., & Woehr, D. J. (2007). Expanding the criterion domain? A quantitative review of the OCB literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(2), 555.

Hofmann, D. A., & Gavin, M. B. (1998). Centering decisions in hierarchical linear models: Implications for research in organizations. *Journal of Management, 24*(5), 623-641.

Howell, J.M, & Avolio, B. (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation? . *The Executive, 6*, 43-52.

Ilies, R., Morgeson, F. P., & Nahrgang, J. D. (2005). Authentic leadership and eudaemonic well being: Understanding leader– follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 373–394.

Jaques, E. (1955). Social systems as a defence against persecutory and depressive anxiety. In M. Klein, P. Heimann, & E. Money-Kyrle, *New Directions in Psychoanalysis* (pp. 478–498). London: Tavistock Publications.

Kaiser, R., Hogan, R., & Craig, S. (2008). Leadership and the fate of organizations. *The American Psychologist , 63*(2), 96-110.

Kaplan, S., Cortina, J., Ruark, G., LaPort, K., & Nicolaides, V. (2014). The role of organizational leaders in employee emotion management: A theoretical model. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*, 563-580.

Kaplan, S., Dalal, R., & Luchman, J. (2013). Measurement of Emotions . In R. R. Sinclair, M. Wang, & L. E. Tetrick, *Research methods in occupational health psychology: Measurement, design, and data analysis.* New York, New York, United States of America: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Kelly, J. R., & Barsade, S. G. (2001). Mood and emotion in small groups and work teams. . *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86*, 99–130.

Kernis, M. H., & Goldman, B. M. (2006). A multicomponent conceptualization of authenticity: Theory and research. In M. Zanna, *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 38, pp. 283–357). San Diego: Academic Press.

Kraiger, K., Billings, R. S., & Isen, A. M. (1989). The influence of positive affective states on task perceptions and satisfaction. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 44*(1), 12-25.

Lee, K., & Allen, N. (2002). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Workplace Deviance: The Role of Affect and Cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 131–142.

Lian, L. K., & Tui, L. G. (2012). Leadership styles and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating effect of subordinates' competence and downward influence tactics. *Journal of Applied Business and Economics, 13*(2), 59-96.

Lindell, M. K., & Whitney, D. J. (2001). Accounting for common method variance in cross-sectional research designs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(1), 114.

Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. (2003). Authentic Leadership: A Positive Developmental Approach. In K. Cameron, J. Dutton, & R. Quinn, *Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 241-261). San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler.

Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin, 131*(6), 803-855.

May, D. R., Chan, A. Y., Hodges, T. D., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Developing the moral component of authentic leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, 32*, 247-260.

Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extrarole efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal, 42*(4), 403-419.

Mount, M., Ilies, R., & Johnson, E. (2006). Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology, 59*(3), 591–622.

Muchinsky, P. (2000). Emotions in the workplace: the neglect of organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior , 21*, 801-805.

Neider, L. L., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2011). The authentic leadership inventory (ALI): Development and empirical tests. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*(6), 1146-1164.

Newland, S. (2012). Organizational Citizenship Behavior- Individual or Organizational Citizenship Behavior Organization: Does the Underlying Motive Matter? Bowling Green, Kentucky, United States of America .

Nichols, T., & Erakovich, R. (2013). Authentic leadership and implicit theory: a normative form of leadership? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 34*(2), 182-195.

Novicevic, M. M., Harvey, M. G., Ronald, M., & Brown-Radford, J. A. (2006). Authentic leadership: A historical perspective. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 13*(1), 64-76.

Nulty, D. (2008). The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: what can be done? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33* (3), 301-314.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Issues in organization and management series. Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome.* Lexington, England, : Lexington Books.

Ozcelik, H., Langton, N., & Aldrich, H. (2008). Doing well and doing good: The relationship between leadership practices that facilitate a positive emotional climate and organizational performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 23*(2), 186-203.

Plutchik, R. (1989). Measuring emotions and their derivatives. In Plutchik, R, & H. Kellerman, *Emotion: theory, research, and experience: the measurement of emotions* (Vol. 4, pp. 1-35). San Diego, United States of America: Academic Press.

Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: a meta-analysis. . *Journal of Applied Psychology , 94*, 122–141.

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestion for future research. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 133-151.

Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*.

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. *1*(2), 107-142.

Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N. (2003, October ). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879–903.

Ribeiro, N., Duarte, A., & Filipe, R. (2018). How authentic leadership promotes individual performance: mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior and creativity. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management , Just Accepted* .

Rubio, V., Aguado, D., Delgado-Gómez, D., Oliva Márquez, M., & Cernada, R. (2017). Can Big Data analysis be useful for assessing personality? A new approach to personality judgments based on movement recognition. *14th Conference on Psychological Assessment* (p. 41). Lisbon: European Conference on Psychological Assessment.

Schein, E. (2004). *Organizational Culture and Leadership.* (3rd edition ed.). San Francisco, CA, United States of America: Jossey-Bass.

Shapira-Lishchinsky, O., & Tsemach, S. (2014). Psychological Empowerment as a Mediator Between Teachers' Perceptions of Authentic Leadership and Their Withdrawal and Citizenship Behaviors. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 50*(4), 675–712.

Sheehan, K. B. (2001). E-mail survey response rates: A review. . *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 6*(2).

Snape, E., & Redman, T. (2010, November). HRM Practices, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, and Performance: A Multi-Level Analysis. *Journal of Management Studies , 47*(7), 1219-1247.

Spector, P. E. (2006). Method variance in organizational research: Truth or urban legend? . *Organizational Research Methods, 9*, 221-232.

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review, 12*(2), 269-292.

Staw, B. M., Bell, N. E., & Clausen, J. A. (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A lifetime longitudinal test. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 56-77.

Tonkin, T. (2013). Authentic Versus Transformational Leadership: Assessing their effectiveness on organizational citizenship behavior of followers. *International Journal of Business and Public Administration, 10*(1), 40-61.

Vacharkulksemsuk, T., Sekerka, L. E., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2011). Establishing a positive emotional climate to create 21st-century organizational change. In N. Ashkanasy, C. Wilderom, & M. Peterson, *The handbook of organizational culture and climate* (pp. 101-118). Thousand Oaks, CA, United States of America: SAGE.

van de Mortel, T. (2008). Faking it: social desirability response bias in self-report research. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing, 25*(4), 40-48.

Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*(1), 108-119.

Van Katwyk, P. T., Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Using the Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale (JAWS) to investigate affective responses to work stressors. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*(2), 219.

Vanyperen, N. W., van den Berg, A. E., & Willering, M. (1999). Towards a better understanding of the link between participation in decision-making and organizational citizenship behaviour: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72*, 377-392.

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. . *Journal of Management, 34*(1), 89-126.

Walumbwa, F., Wang, P., Wang, H., Schaubroeck, J., & Avolio, B. (2010). Psychological processes linking authentic leadership to follower behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21*, 901–914.

Wang, H., Sui, Y., Luthans, F., Wang, D., & Wu, Y. (2014). Impact of authentic leadership on performance: Role of followers' positive psychological capital and relational processes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35*(1), 5-21.

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: the PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(6), 1063.

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17*(3), 601-617.

Wong, C., Laschinger, H., & Cummings, G. (2010). Authentic leadership and nurses' voice behavior and perceptions of care quality. *Journal of Nursing Management, 18*(8), 889-900.

Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations (5th ed.).* Upper Saddle River, NJ, United States of America: Prentice-Hall.

Ziegler, R., Schlett, C., Casel, K., & Diehl, M. (2012). The Role of Job Satisfaction, Job Ambivalence, and Emotions at Work in Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Personnel Psychology , 11*(4), 176–190.

**Appendices**

**Appendix A**

Recruitment Email

Leadership and discretionary behaviours at work

Have you considered the benefits of helping employees perform above and beyond their job description?

Email: Hello,

I am an MSc student at the University of Canterbury, currently exploring ways in which leadership can promote discretionary work behaviours (e.g. helping and advocacy). I'd be very keen to talk with (Insert organization name here) to invite your employees to participate in this project.

To get in touch, please use any of the contact details below. However, if you would like to know a bit more information, please read below.

Lauren Sheat
Email: lauren.sheat@pg.canterbury.ac.nz
Phone: 0278409759

Why bother?

•Behaviours performed above and beyond an employee's job description have positive benefits for relationships at work and organizational functioning. Leaders have a key role in promoting these behaviours.

•You can demonstrate to your employees that you have a commitment to furthering leadership and positive workplace behaviours, which is great for growing staff engagement and recruitment.

•We are not just interested in the views of organisations that currently engage in developing leadership in relation to discretionary workplace behaviours, we want to hear from a range of organisations in different industries.

•You will receive a report at the end of the project to better understand leadership and discretionary workplace behaviours in your organization.

How long will it take?
• The survey is relatively short, and will only take around 15 minutes to complete.

What do I have to do?
• We will be asking you to distribute a questionnaire link to your staff. We'll make it easier for you by providing you with a good draft invite, which you can adjust to your organization's requirements.

### What are the prizes?

• We understand staff may want to see some incentive for participating. Employees who participate have the option to go into a draw for one of 5 $200 supermarket vouchers. As we are targeting around 700 staff, the chance for your staff receiving one of these is reasonable.

### Who reads the results?

• This research is designed to bring practical benefits to organizations, including how to prompt extra role behaviours from employees. The findings from this research may be published in human resource management and psychology journals to help advance research in leadership and workplace behaviour.

### How is my privacy protected?

•Answers given in the questionnaire are anonymous and cannot be linked to an individual employee. Information will be stored on password protected computers at the University of Canterbury and will be destroyed after 5 years in accordance with University guidelines.

**Appendix B- Information and Consent**

Information and Consent

My name is Lauren Sheat and I am a Master of Science student at the University of Canterbury. I am investigating perceptions of leadership and workplace behaviour.

If you decide to participate in this research, you will be required to complete an online questionnaire. **The questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes of your time to complete**.

**Participation is voluntary** and you have the right to withdraw at any stage by exiting the browser window. Your responses will remain completely **anonymous** and you will not be identifiable as a participant.

**If you complete the questionnaire, you are eligible to enter a prize draw to win one of five $200 supermarket vouchers**. Once you have completed the questionnaire, you will be directed to a separate link to provide contact details. This page is in no way linked to the questionnaire responses.

The results of this study may be published in an academic journal, however any data gathered during this research will be kept completely confidential. Individuals and specific organizations will not be identified. Any information provided back to the organization will only be in the form of a generalised report and will not contain any identifiable information. Reports for participants will be distributed through participating organizations. Data collected will be stored on password protected computers at the University of Canterbury and will not be accessible to anyone but myself, my senior supervisor Dr Joana Kuntz, and my secondary supervisor Professor Katharina Näswall. Any emails collected for the prize draw will be collected on a separate page and will be in no way associated with responses.

Should participation in this study cause you any distress, please do not hesitate to contact the following.

Lifeline: 0800 543 354- For phone counselling and support
Samaritans: 0800 726 666- For counselling regarding job stress or overwork
Depression Helpline: 0800 111 757- For specific depression counselling

This research is being conducted as a requirement for a Master in Science degree in Applied Psychology by Lauren Sheat under the direct supervisor of Dr Joana Kuntz, who can be contacted at joana.kuntz@canterbury.ac.nz. She will be happy to discuss any concerns you may have about participating in this research.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the University of Canterbury Human Ethics Committee, and participants should address any complaints to The Chair, Human Ethics Committee, University of Canterbury, Private Bag 4800, Christchurch (human-ethics@canterbury.ac.nz).
Your consent will be assumed if you continue to the questionnaire.

**Appendix C- OCB Scale**

Source: Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviours. *Journal of Management, 17*(3), 601–617.

This scale was used to measure organizational citizenship behaviours that are directed towards the individual and organization.

Responses are obtained using a 5-point Likert-type scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*. The measure can be used for peer, supervisor, or self-reports.

## Scale Items

1. Adequately completes assigned duties.
2. Fulfills responsibilities specified in job description.
3. Performs tasks that are expected of him/her.
4. Meets formal performance requirements of the job.
5. Engages in activities that will directly affect his/her performance evaluation.
6. Neglects aspects of the job he/she is obligated to perform. (R)
7. Fails to perform essential duties. (R)
8. Helps others who have been absent.
9. Helps others who have heavy work loads.
10. Assists supervisor with his/her work (when not asked).
11. Takes time to listen to co-workers' problems and worries.
12. Goes out of way to help new employees.
13. Takes a personal interest in other employees.
14. Passes along information to co-workers.
15. Attendance at work is above the norm.
16. Gives advance notice when unable to come to work.
17. Takes undeserved work breaks. (R)
18. Great deal of time spent with personal phone conversations. (R)
19. Complains about insignificant things at work. (R)
20. Conserves and protects organizational property.
21. Adheres to informal rules devised to maintain order.

**Appendix D- Authentic Leadership Inventory**

Source  Neider, L. L., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2011). The authentic leadership inventory (ALI): Development and empirical tests. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*(6), 1146-1164. This scale was used to measure employee perceptions of authentic leadership.

The scale encompasses all four aspects of authentic leadership, self-awareness, internalised moral perspective, balanced processing and relational transparency.

Scale items:

1. My leader solicits feedback for improving his/her dealings with others. (S)

2. My leader clearly states what he/she means. (R)

3. My leader shows consistency between his/her beliefs and actions. (M)

4. My leader asks for ideas that challenge his/her core beliefs. (B)

5. My leader describes accurately the way that others view his/her abilities. (S)

6. My leader admits mistakes when they occur. (R)

7. My leader uses his/her core beliefs to make decisions. (M)

8. My leader carefully listens to alternative perspectives before reaching a conclusion. (B)

9. My leader shows that he/she understands his/her strengths and weaknesses. (S)

10. My leader openly shares information with others. (R)

11. My leader resists pressures on him/her to do things contrary to his/her beliefs. (M)

12. My leader objectively analyses relevant data before making a decision. (B)

13. My leader is clearly aware of the impact he/she has on others. (S)

14. My leader expresses his/her ideas and thoughts clearly to others. (R)

15. My leader is guided in his/her actions by internal moral standards. (M)

16. My leader encourages others to voice opposing points of view. (B)

Note. Response choices are: (1) Disagree strongly; (2) Disagree; (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree; (4) Agree; and (5) Agree strongly. Abbreviations used are: (S) = Self-Awareness, (R) = Relational Transparency, (M) = Internalized Moral Perspective, and (B) = Balanced Processing. Instructions given respondents in organizations usually include the definitional statement, "Please note that the term 'leader' means your immediate or direct supervisor."

**Appendix E- Positive and Negative Affect Scale (PANAS)**

Source: Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: the PANAS scales. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *54*(6), 1063.

## The PANAS

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent [INSERT APPROPRIATE TIME INSTRUCTIONS HERE]. Use the following scale to record your answers.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| very slightly or not at all | a little | moderately | quite a bit | extremely |

| | |
|---|---|
| _____ interested | _____ irritable |
| _____ distressed | _____ alert |
| _____ excited | _____ ashamed |
| _____ upset | _____ inspired |
| _____ strong | _____ nervous |
| _____ guilty | _____ determined |
| _____ scared | _____ attentive |
| _____ hostile | _____ jittery |
| _____ enthusiastic | _____ active |
| _____ proud | _____ afraid |

We have used PANAS with the following time instructions:

| | |
|---|---|
| Moment | (you feel this way right now, that is, at the present moment) |
| Today | (you have felt this way today) |
| Past few days | (you have felt this way during the past few days) |
| Week | (you have felt this way during the past week) |
| Past few weeks | (you have felt this way during the past few weeks) |
| Year | (you have felt this way during the past year) |
| General | (you generally feel this way, that is, how you feel on the average) |

**Appendix F-OCB Factor Analysis**

*Table F1. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Williams & Anderson OCB Scale using Principal Axis Factoring with Direct Oblimin Rotation with Kaizer Normalization.*

| Item | Factor 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I complete my duties to a good standard | **.563** | .030 | -.101 |
| 2. I perform all tasks that are written in my job description | **.677** | -.023 | -.006 |
| 3. I perform tasks that are expected of me | **.860** | -.064 | .082 |
| 4. I meet formal performance targets of the job | **.651** | .117 | -.025 |
| 5. I do things at work that directly affect my performance evaluation | **.438** | .131 | -.008 |
| 6. I perform all aspects of the job I am supposed to | **.807** | -.060 | -.028 |
| 7. I perform all my main duties as expected of me | **.874** | -.060 | .007 |
| 8. I help others who have been away from work | .116 | .044 | **-.579** |
| 9. I help others who have heavy work loads | -.011 | -.047 | **-.772** |
| 10. I help my immediate supervisor with their work when not asked | -.020 | .015 | **-.619** |
| 11. I take time to listen to co-workers problems and worries | -.016 | **.606** | -.002 |
| 12. I go out of my way to help new employees | .022 | **.433** | -.269 |
| 13. I take a personal interest in other employees | .041 | **.770** | .057 |

**Appendix G-Final OCB Factor Analysis**

*Table G1. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Williams & Anderson OCB Scale (excluding items 8, 9, 10) using Principal Axis Factoring with Direct Oblimin Rotation with Kaizer Normalization.*

| Item | Factor | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | 1 | 2 |
| 1. I complete my duties to a good standard | **.592** | .078 |
| 2. I perform all tasks that are written in my job description | **.683** | -.023 |
| 3. I perform tasks that are expected of me | **.839** | -.107 |
| 4. I meet formal performance targets of the job | **.653** | .123 |
| 5. I do things at work that directly affect my performance evaluation | **.434** | .149 |
| 6. I perform all aspects of the job I am supposed to | **.820** | -.056 |
| 7. I perform all my main duties as expected of me | **.875** | -.072 |
| 8. I help others who have been away from work | -.043 | **.614** |
| 9. I help others who have heavy work loads | -.092 | **.532** |
| 10. I help my immediate supervisor with their work when not asked | -.007 | **.754** |

**Appendix H-Factor Analysis of ALI**

*Table H1. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Authentic Leadership Inventory using Principal Axis Factoring with Direct Oblimin Rotation and Kaizer Normalization*

| Item | Factor 1 | 2 |
|---|---|---|
| 1. My supervisor asks for feedback to improve his/her relationships with others | **.475** | .091 |
| 2. My supervisor says what he/she means | **.599** | .227 |
| 3. My supervisor shows consistency between his/her beliefs and actions | **.658** | .159 |
| 4. My supervisor asks for ideas that challenge his/her views | **.694** | .129 |
| 5. My supervisor admits mistakes when they occur | **.780** | .038 |
| 6. My supervisor uses his/her core beliefs to make decisions | -.044 | **.689** |
| 7. My supervisor carefully listens to different opinions before making a decision | **.927** | -.123 |
| 8. My supervisor shows that he/she understands his/her strengths and weaknesses | **.759** | .039 |
| 9. My supervisor openly shares information with others | **.578** | .176 |
| 10. My supervisor resists pressures on him/her to do things that are against his/her beliefs | .103 | **.512** |
| 11. My supervisor takes into account relevant information before making a decision | **.792** | -.104 |
| 12. My supervisor is clearly aware of the impact he/she has on others | **.840** | -.068 |
| 13. My supervisor expresses his/her ideas and thoughts clearly to others | **.763** | .013 |
| 14. My supervisor is guided by his/her moral standards | .115 | **.655** |
| 15. My supervisor encourages others to voice opposing points of view | **.796** | -.046 |

**Appendix I-Final Factor Analysis of ALI**

*Table I1. Final Factor Analysis of the Authentic Leadership Inventory using Principal Axis Factoring with Direct Oblimin Rotation and Kaizer Normalization*

| Item | Factor 1 |
|---|---|
| 1. My supervisor asks for feedback to improve his/her relationships with others | .592 |
| 2. My supervisor says what he/she means | .791 |
| 3. My supervisor shows consistency between his/her beliefs and actions | .799 |
| 4. My supervisor asks for ideas that challenge his/her views | .813 |
| 5. My supervisor admits mistakes when they occur | .823 |
| 7. My supervisor carefully listens to different opinions before making a decision | .850 |
| 8. My supervisor shows that he/she understands his/her strengths and weaknesses | .806 |
| 9. My supervisor openly shares information with others | .736 |
| 11. My supervisor takes into account relevant information before making a decision | .746 |
| 12. My supervisor is clearly aware of the impact he/she has on others | .811 |
| 13. My supervisor expresses his/her ideas and thoughts clearly to others | .799 |
| 15. My supervisor encourages others to voice opposing points of view | .780 |

**Appendix J-Factor Analysis Negative Emotions**

*Table J1. Initial Factor analysis for negative emotions using principal axis factoring with direct oblimin rotation and Kaiser Normalization*

| Item | Factor 1 | Factor 2 |
|------|----------|----------|
| How do you normally feel at work? - 2. Distressed | **.586** | .246 |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 4. Upset | **.641** | **.445** |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 6. Guilty | **.581** | .056 |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 7. Scared | **.778** | -.289 |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 8. Hostile | **.540** | .036 |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 13. Ashamed | **.617** | .033 |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 15. Nervous | **.716** | -.135 |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 18. Jittery | **.690** | -.100 |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 20. Afraid | **.837** | .374 |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 11. Irritable | **.491** | **.413** |

**Appendix K-Final Factor Analysis Negative Emotions**

*Table K1. Final Factor analysis for negative emotions using principal axis factoring using principal axis factoring with direct oblimin rotation and Kaiser Normalization.*

| Item | Factor 1 |
|---|---|
| How do you normally feel at work? - 2. Distressed. | **.586** |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 6. Guilty | **.581** |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 7. Scared | **.778** |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 8. Hostile | **.540** |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 13. Ashamed | **.617** |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 15. Nervous | **.716** |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 18. Jittery | **.690** |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 20. Afraid | **.837** |

**Appendix L-Factor Analysis Positive Emotions**

*Table L1. Factor analysis for positive emotions using principal axis factoring with direct oblimin rotation with Kaiser Normalization*

| Item | Factor 1 |
|---|---|
| How do you normally feel at work? - 1. Interested | **.777** |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 3. Excited | **.727** |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 9. Enthusiastic. | **.801** |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 10. Proud | **.851** |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 12. Alert | **.606** |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 16. Determined | **.794** |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 14. Inspired | **.795** |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 17. Attentive | **.698** |
| How do you normally feel at work? - 19. Active | **.601** |

**Appendix M-*t* test and Descriptive Statistics**

*Table M1. Results of t-test and Descriptive Statistics for OCB, Authentic Leader and Emotions toward Organization*

|  | Sex | | | | 95% CI for Mean Difference | | |
|  | Male | | Female | | | | |
|  | M | SD | M | SD | | t | df |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------|-----|-----|
| AL Overall | 3.64 | .772 | 3.68 | .770 | -.261,.183 | -.348 | 258 |
| Positive Emo | 3.45 | .826 | 3.46 | .806 | -.241,.224 | -.075 | 258 |
| Negative Emo | 1.48 | .520 | 1.46 | .570 | -.151,.180 | -.175 | 254 |
| OCB-O | 4.04 | .466 | 4.33 | .487 | -.428,-.151 | -4.121 | 259 |
| OCB-I | 4.40 | .447 | 4.54 | .464 | -.275,-.011 | -2.137 | 258 |

**Appendix N-One Way ANOVA**

Table N1. *One way ANOVA of Authentic Leadership, OCB-I, OCB-O and Positive and Negative Emotions towards the organization.*

*ANOVA*

| Variable | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OCB_I | Between Groups | 1.226 | 6 | .204 | .916 | .484 |
| | Within Groups | 57.298 | 257 | .223 | | |
| | Total | 58.524 | 263 | | | |
| OCB_O | Between Groups | 2.419 | 6 | .403 | 1.679 | .127 |
| | Within Groups | 61.979 | 258 | .240 | | |
| | Total | 64.398 | 264 | | | |
| Negative_Emotions | Between Groups | 5.887 | 6 | .981 | 2.134 | .050 |
| | Within Groups | 116.789 | 254 | .460 | | |
| | Total | 122.676 | 260 | | | |
| Positive_Emotions | Between Groups | 7.091 | 6 | 1.182 | 1.635 | .138 |
| | Within Groups | 182.117 | 252 | .723 | | |
| | Total | 189.208 | 258 | | | |
| AL | Between Groups | 3.320 | 6 | .553 | .941 | .466 |
| | Within Groups | 150.603 | 256 | .588 | | |
| | Total | 153.923 | 262 | | | |

*Note. a=0.05*