Published in final edited form as:

Leadersh Q. 2011 April 1; 22(2): 353–366. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.02.010.

Leadership, OCB and Individual Differences: Idiocentrism and Allocentrism as Moderators of the Relationship between Transformational and Transactional Leadership and OCB

Inbal Nahum-Shani and

The Pennsylvania State University

Anit Somech

University of Haifa

Abstract

We propose and test a framework which suggests that the relationships between leadership styles and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB) are contingent upon employee cultural-based individual differences. More specifically, we examine whether followers' idiocentrism and allocentrism moderate the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and followers' OCB. Survey data, collected from a sample of school teachers and their principals from the Israeli kibbutzim and urban sectors, support our hypotheses. We found the relationship between transformational leadership and OCB to be positive to the extent that allocentrism increases, and negative to the extent that idiocentrism increases. We also found the relationship between transactional leadership and OCB to be positive to the extent that idiocentrism increases and negative to the extent that allocentrism increases. Implications of these findings for research and practice are discussed.

Keywords

Leadership style; Organizational Citizenship Behavior; Idiocentrism; Allocentrism

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) were originally defined as individual behaviors that are discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promote the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988, p. 4). Based on this conceptualization, the literature has long emphasized the advantage of transformational over transactional leaders in promoting OCBs (e.g., Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine & Bacharach, 2000; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990). Transformational leaders (Burns, 1978) motivate their subordinates by developing closer relationships with them, inspiring them, offering challenges, and

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Inbal Nahum-Shani, The Methodology Center, The Pennsylvania State University, 204 E. Calder Way, Suite 400, State College, PA 16801. iun2@psu.edu.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

encouraging individual development. The ability of these leaders to motivate their followers to do more than what is initially expected of them is considered the real essence of this leadership style (Vigoda-Gadot, 2006). Transformational leaders *transform* followers' basic values, beliefs and attitudes for the sake of a higher collective purpose, such that they are willing to perform beyond the minimum levels specified by the organization (Bass, 1985; Jung & Avolio, 1999).

On the other hand, it has been suggested that transactional leaders are less likely to promote OCB. Transactional leaders motivate followers primarily through conditional reward-based exchanges. By engaging in negotiation with their followers, these leaders focus on setting goals, clarifying the link between performance and rewards, and providing constructive feedback (Bass, 1985). Thus, it has been suggested that transactional leaders are likely to have little influence on behaviors that cannot be quantitatively measured and accurately rewarded, such as OCBs (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Rich, 2001).

In sum, the literature on leadership styles and OCB seems to draw on three underlying assumptions. First, every leader displays both transformational and transactional behaviors to varying degrees, but still can be characterized in terms of a dominant leadership style (Bass, 1999), which in the aggregate affects followers' behaviors in a certain direction and magnitude. Second, since OCBs are extra-role behaviors, they are likely to be promoted by transformational leaders who can motivate their followers to perform above and beyond their role description (Rafferty & Griffin, 2004). Finally, OCBs are not directly recognized or rewarded by the formal organizational reward system and hence are less subject to the influence of transactional leaders (see Podsakoff et al., 2000).

However, researchers have criticized these assumptions. First it has been suggested (e.g., Dansereau, 1995; Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999) that leadership is a dyadic phenomenon, reflecting a leader-follower relationship. In this sense, characterizing a leader in terms of a dominant leadership style does not capture the diversity of relationships the leader develops with different followers. Second, research findings indicate that employees often view OCB as an aspect of their in-role performance, namely as part of their formal job description (Morrison, 1994). These findings cast doubt on the underlying assumption that transformational leaders are more effective in promoting OCB because they motivate their followers to perform beyond their job requirements. Finally, researchers have recently begun to realize that reward contingencies also play a role in promoting OCB. Research findings indicate that managers take OCB into account when evaluating employee performance, and directly or indirectly reward such behaviors (Allen & Rush, 1998; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1993). Moreover, empirical evidence suggests that employees engage in and sustain OCBs to the extent that they perceive these behaviors as being generally worthwhile (Borman, White, & Dorsey, 1995; Haworth & Levy, 2001).

Overall, these findings highlight the need to reconsider the way by which leadership styles affect OCB and to develop models that (a) recognize the new boundaries of OCB as a construct reflecting behaviors that may be part of the explicit expectations of what constitutes appropriate role behavior and that may be recognized and directly rewarded by the organization, and (b) capture the role of individual differences in leadership-OCB

relations. Accordingly, we propose that OCBs can be enhanced by mechanisms that highlight the contribution of these behaviors to the collective, as well as by mechanisms that tie these behaviors to personal achievement and extrinsic rewards. However, the effectiveness of these mechanisms depends on whether they accord with followers' value orientations. More specifically, we suggest that both transformational and transactional leadership styles may be positively associated with OCBs, depending on followers' levels of idiocentrism and allocentrism.

Individual differences as moderator of the leadership - OCB relations

Referring to the work of Lord and Maher (1991), Gerstner and Day (1994) suggested that a follower's evaluation of a leader is a subjective process which reflects the self and its cultural background (Gerstner & Day, 1994). Since this evaluation process determines the extent to which the leader will be able to influence workers' outcomes in the desired direction, recent cross-cultural leadership research has examined cultural factors that may moderate the effectiveness of transformational and transactional leadership. The underlying premise for this research is that the relationship between leadership styles and followers' perceptions, attitudes and behaviors may be contingent upon the cultural context within which leader-followers relations are nested (Gelfand, Bhawuk, Nishi, & Bechtold, 2004). In this sense, a key cultural moderator that has received considerable attention is the individualism-collectivism dimension suggested by Hofstede (1980). For example, Gerstner and Day (1994) found that in collectivistic cultures the ideal leader is perceived as responsible, intelligent, and trustworthy; in individualistic cultures that leader is perceived as determined, goal-oriented and verbally skilled. More recently Jung and Avolio (1999) examined the moderating effects of individualism and collectivism on the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and followers' performance in a brainstorming task. Collectivists working with a transformational leader were found to generate more ideas than individualists, who generated more ideas with a transactional leader.

In recent years researchers have increasingly shifted the focus to followers' personal characteristics as potential moderators of the relationship between leadership and performance outcomes, suggesting that such an approach may shed new light on normative models of leadership (Yukl, 1999). Walumbwa, Lawler and Avolio (2007: 214) suggest that "without taking into consideration individual differences among followers, research on transactional and transformational leadership, especially across cultures, will likely fall short of fully explaining the linkages between leadership, followers, and performance outcomes."

Whereas individualism and collectivism represent the general attributes of a given culture (Hofstede, 1980), the terms "idiocentrism" and "allocentrism" have been used to measure the individual-level orientations that reflect these cultural values, hence capture within-culture variation in personality attributes (Triandis, 1995). Individuals high on idiocentrism view the self as being separate from others, give priority to personal goals over the goals of the collective, and are concerned with achievement. Individuals high on allocentrism view the self as inseparable from their in-group members. When they do distinguish between their personal and the collective goals, they subordinate the former to the latter (Lam, Chen &

Schaubroeck, 2002: 906). Idiocentrism and allocentrism are considered distinct constructs, and although common societal influences tend to place one of them higher on average in any particular societal culture, individuals often differ from their society's trends (Triandis, 1995: 2002).

In light of the differences in value orientations between allocentric and idiocentric individuals, it has been suggested that the effectiveness of leader behaviors is contingent upon followers' allocentrism and idiocentrism (see Walumbwa et al., 2007). According to Triandis (1995), individual values specify what constitutes normative behaviors and acceptable roles for individuals within specific social contexts. Individual values largely determine how one evaluates other people's actions and behaviors and the way in which he/she is influenced by them. In this sense, Cultural Congruence Theory (House, Wright, & Aditya, 1997: 599) proposes that individuals have implicit theories (stereotypes, beliefs, convictions, and assumptions) about the attributes and behaviors that distinguish effective from ineffective leaders. These theories influence the values individuals place on certain leader behaviors and their reasons for accepting these behaviors and perceiving the leader as influential and legitimate. Although cultural congruence theory suggests that implicit leadership theories (i.e., mental models, or schemas of leadership: Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984) are likely to vary across societal units, it also points to the influence of external cultural forces on individual values, suggesting within societal variation in implicit leadership theories. Accordingly, it has been suggested that leader behaviors consistent with particular values will be viewed as more acceptable and effective, while leader behaviors that violate individual norms are likely to result in followers' dissatisfaction, and hence lower performance.

Consistent with this notion, research findings have generally indicated that transformational leaders are more effective among allocentric followers, while transactional leaders are more effective among idiocentric followers. Walumbwa and Lawler (2003) found that transformational leadership explained a greater proportion of the variance in organizational commitment, satisfaction, and withdrawal behaviors in employees high in allocentrism. More recently, Walumbwa and colleagues (2007) found that allocentric employees reacted more positively when they viewed their managers as being more transformational, while idiocentric employees reacted more positively when they rated their managers as displaying a more transactional contingent-reward leadership. Here we aim to extend the previous work mentioned above, by examining the extent to which allocentrism and idiocentrism moderate the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership behaviors and employee OCB.

Since allocentric followers are more concerned with group maintenance and solidarity than with personal rewards (Triandis, 2006; Walumbwa et al., 2007), their motivation to perform OCB is likely to be bolstered by mechanisms that highlight the contribution of these behaviors to the enhancement of the work context and the effectiveness of the work-group or the organization. In this sense, transformational leaders who motivate their followers to transcend their self-interest for the better realization of the collective's vision and goals (Bass, 1985) are consistent with the value orientation of allocentric values, hence are likely to promote OCB among these followers. Mechanisms that tie OCBs to personal achievement

and extrinsic rewards (Bass, 1985) may be inconsistent with the value orientation of allocentric followers, hence may be associated with reduced motivation to perform OCB.

On the other hand, idiocentric followers value the achievement of individualized goals and place less emphasis on the importance of their roles within the work-group or the organization (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 2006; Walumbwa et al., 2007). Hence, their motivation to perform OCB is likely to be enhanced by mechanisms that tie these behaviors to psychological or material rewards. In this sense, transactional leaders, who emphasize reward-based exchanges between the leader and his/her followers and encourage individual competition, autonomy, and personal achievement (Bass, 1985; Jung & Avolio, 1999), seem to be in line with the value orientation of idiocentric followers and increase their motivation to perform OCB. Mechanisms that tie OCBs to the good of the group or the collective interests may be inconsistent with the value orientation of idiocentric followers, hence reduce their motivation to perform OCB. Accordingly, we posit the following:

Hypothesis 1: Followers' allocentrism moderates the relationship between transformational leadership and OCB, such that transformational leadership is positively related to OCB to the extent that followers are more allocentric.

Hypothesis 2: Followers' idiocentrism moderates the relationship between transformational leadership and OCB, such that transformational leadership is negatively related to OCB to the extent that followers are more idiocentric.

Hypothesis 3: Followers' idiocentrism moderates the relationship between transactional leadership and OCB, such that transactional leadership is positively related to OCB to the extent that followers are more idiocentric.

Hypothesis 4: Followers' allocentrism moderates the relationship between transactional leadership and OCB, such that transactional leadership is negatively related to OCB to the extent that followers are more allocentric.

Method

Participants and procedure

Our research was conducted among two sub-cultures in Israeli society, represented by the kibbutz and the urban sectors. The existence of the kibbutz and the urban sectors within Israeli society creates an interesting context for examining individual differences in value orientation (Cohen, 2007; Erez & Somech, 1996; Triandis, 2006). On the one hand, the kibbutz and the urban sectors differ in their emphasis on collectivism and individualism. The kibbutz is a communal settlement based on a socialistic ideology and collectivistic values, which despite recent changes in its economic and institutional structures remains collectivistic, in contrast to the urban sector in Israel (for more details see Cohen, 2007; Erez & Somech, 1996; Kurman 2001; Somech, 2006). This collectivistic orientation is especially apparent in the kibbutz educational system, where community development has always been a key educational goal (Somech, 2006). The urban sector is individualistically oriented. Individuals live their life independently, mostly in family units and the educational system is typically "Western", stressing individual development per se (see Somech, 2006). Yet, although the kibbutz and the urban sectors are often used to compare collectivistic and

individualistic cultures (Cohen, 2007; Erez & Somech, 1996; Somech, 2006), both belong to the same society, with values, norms and beliefs spilling over from one sub-culture to the other. Such characteristics suggest an increased variation in value orientation among individuals in Israeli society (Triandis, 2002).

Accordingly, in this study teachers working in ten state elementary schools in northern Israel were surveyed. Six schools were urban and four were from kibbutzim. Data were collected on site at each school and all teachers present on the data collection days were invited to participate. Respondents were assured anonymity of responses. Participants responded to a survey assessing idiocentrism and allocentrism, as well as their perceptions of their school principal's transformational and transactional leadership behaviors. Out of a target sample of 200 employees, 150 returned effective questionnaires (93% females, 7% males; 53% from the urban sector, 47% from the kibbutzim). On average 15 ($SD = 5$) participants responded from each organization. Participants' age was on average 41.32 years ($SD=9.89$). Their tenure at school was on average 9.48 years ($SD=6.5$), and tenure in teaching was on average 16 years ($SD=7.6$). The majority of participants (62.1%) had a Bachelor's degree, 21.3% had a "professional" degree, and 12.4% had a Master's degree. Except for gender differences (in the urban sample 97% were females and 3% were males while in the kibbutz sample 90% were female and 10% were males), there were no significant differences in demographic characteristics between the two sectors (kibbutz and urban).

Teachers' OCB was evaluated by their school principals (70% females and 30% males). Principals' average age was 44 years ($SD=5.7$) and their average tenure at school was 14 years ($SD=7.5$), with no significant differences between the kibbutz and the urban principals.

Variables and Measures

Idiocentrism and allocentrism were measured based on Triandis, McCusker, and Hui's (1990) attitudes scale: idiocentrism was measured by ten items referring to selfreliance, reflecting a sense of competition, freedom to act by free will, and striving not to be a burden on others (e.g., "One should live one's life independently of others as much as possible"). Cronbach's alpha was .75. Allocentrism was measured by five items referring to interdependence, namely a sense of commitment, moral conduct, and exchange between the individual and his or her in-group (e.g., "I like to live close to my good friends"). Items were rated on a seven-point Likert-type scale from 1 – strongly agree, to 7 – strongly disagree. The Cronbach's alpha estimate for this measure was moderate ($\alpha=.65$).

Transformational and Transactional leadership styles—We used a Hebrew version of the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ) Form 5X short (Bass & Avolio, 2000), adjusted to the school context. More specifically, teachers were asked to evaluate the degree to which a particular behavior was typical of their school principal. Items for both the transformational and the transactional dimensions were rated on a five-point Likert-type scale from 1 – never, to 5 – always (internal consistency for each dimension is reported in Table 1). Transformational leadership style was measured by 20 items reflecting four dimensions (Idealized Influence, Individual Consideration, Intellectual Stimulation and

Inspirational Motivation). There is some controversy in the literature regarding the multidimensionality of transformational items from the MLQ. While in certain cases, evidence is provided for multiple transformational leadership factors (e.g., Avolio, Bass & Jung, 1999), other studies (e.g., Carless, 1998) found little evidence to support distinct factors and suggested that overall or single constructs of transformational leadership are more appropriate. Accordingly, a series of confirmatory factor analyses were conducted on the transformational leadership items to determine the appropriateness of proceeding with four separate measures. The results (available from the authors) suggested better fit for a four-factor model of transformational leadership, compared with a single-factor model or a three-factor model in which Idealized Influence and Inspirational Motivation were combined into a single factor reflecting Charismatic-Inspirational Leadership (see Avolio et al., 1999). Moreover, in their study of leadership and individual differences, Walumbwa and his colleagues (Walumbwa et al., 2007) noted that it is possible that different facets of transformational leadership may interact differently with individual differences to produce different results. Accordingly, they recommended that future research investigate whether the effect of transformational leadership varies with regard to different individual facets of transformational leadership.

Transactional Leadership was measured by 4 items reflecting Contingent Reward. We also measured Active Management by Exceptions (4 items), choosing not to include the measure Passive Management by Exceptions as it bears some resemblance to laissez-faire leadership which represents the absence of any leadership (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). One consistent problem raised regarding the contingent reward dimension was whether contingent reward leadership should be viewed as a separate construct or as part of the components of transformational leadership (see Avolio et al., 1999). Accordingly, confirmatory factor analyses were conducted in order to assess whether the contingent reward dimension should be viewed as another facet of transformational leadership. We tested a model including a second order factor which explains the first order transformational leadership factors (Idealized Influence, Individual Consideration, Intellectual Stimulation and Inspirational Motivation), as well as two separate factors representing contingent reward and active management by exception (allowing the second order transformational leadership construct and the contingent reward and management by exception constructs to correlate). This model (NFI=0.81, GFI= 0.83, RMSEA=0.06) was tested against an alternative model in which contingent reward was added to the second order transformational leadership construct (NFI=0.78, GFI= 0.81, RMSEA=0.07). The fit statistics of the former model suggested a more satisfactory fit to the data relative to the latter, indicating that treating contingent reward as a distinct construct may be more appropriate than treating this construct as another dimension of transformational leadership. Note that it has been suggested that RMSEA less than 0.05 is indicative of a “close fit,” and that values up to 0.08 represent reasonable errors of approximation. Still, concerning GFI and NFI, .90 or higher reflect acceptable levels of fit (Marsh, Hau & Wen, 2004). Although this may indicate that the first model can be improved, it is important to keep in mind that “it is difficult to designate a specific cutoff value for each fit index because it does not work equally well with various types of fit indices, sample sizes, estimators, or distributions” (Hu & Bentler, 1998: 449). Moreover, in light of research indicating that these fit indices are significantly

lower for sample sizes (see Marsh & Balla, 1994), the values reported in the current study may be a result of our relatively small sample size.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior—Principals' evaluation of employees' organizational citizenship behavior was measured by Podsakoff et al.'s (1990) OCB scale. This 24-item scale refers to five types of organizational citizenship behavior. Altruism, namely an employee's discretionary behaviors of helping other employees with an organizationally relevant task or problem (5 items, e.g., "This employee helps others who have heavy workloads"); Conscientiousness, namely an employee's discretionary behaviors that far surpass the minimum role requirements of the organization, in the areas of attendance, obeying rules and regulations, taking breaks, and the like (5 items, e.g., "This employee obeys company rules and regulations even when no one is watching"); Sportsmanship, namely an employee's willingness to tolerate less than ideal circumstances without complaining, (5 items, e.g., "This employee wastes a lot of time complaining about trivial matters"); Courtesy, namely an employee's discretionary behavior aimed at preventing work-related problems with others (5 items, e.g., "This employee does not abuse the rights of others"); and Civic Virtue, namely behaviors indicating that the employee responsibly participates in, is involved in, or is concerned about the life of the company (4 items, e.g., "This employee attends functions that are not required, but help the organization's image"). Items were rated on a seven-point Likert-type scale from 1 – strongly agree, to 7 – strongly disagree. Internal consistency for each dimension is reported in Table 1.

Analysis

In the current study, we found significant results only with respect to two dimensions of OCB, altruism and sportsmanship. Accordingly, Table 3 (for altruism) and Table 4 (for sportsmanship) present the results for these two dimensions solely (the results with respect to the other 3 dimensions are available from the authors).

Since participants were nested in 10 organizations, we accounted for between-organization variance. That is, we tested our hypotheses at the individual level of analysis, while considering possible correlation among individuals from the same organization – in other words possible variance in OCB that could be attributed to organizational membership (Singer, 1998). The estimated between-organization variance in altruism was $\sigma_{\alpha}^2=0.39$ ($P<.05$), that is, around 36% of the total variance in altruism ($\sigma^2 = 1.08$). The estimated between-organization variance in sportsmanship was $\sigma_{\alpha}^2=0.27$ ($p<.05$), that is, around 16% of the total variance in sportsmanship ($\sigma^2 = 1.66$). This magnitude indicated that between-organization variance had to be taken into account when we assessed our model. Since some schools were urban and others from the kibbutzim, and as our aim was to assess the moderating role of individual differences over and above the effect of any societal culture, our models were adjusted to account for possible differences between the sectors (by including an indicator coded 0 for urban schools and 1 for kibbutz schools as a control variable in all of the estimated models).

To test the moderating effect of allocentrism and idiocentrism in the relationship between leader behaviors and each dimension of OCB, we ran a series of two-way and three-way interaction models. Independent variables (leadership dimensions) and moderators (allocentrism and idiocentrism) were mean-centered (Aiken & West, 1991). For each dimension of OCB we first tested a full model including all possible three-way and two-way interactions between each one of the leadership dimensions and allocentrism and idiocentrism (resulting in two two-way interactions, and one three-way interaction for each leadership dimension). We then ran two additional models (reduced models) including only those significant ($p < .05$) and marginally significant ($p < .10$) effects.

Based on these models, Hypothesis 1 can be supported if the two-way interaction between transformational leadership (for example, the dimension idealized influence) and allocentrism is positive and significantly different from zero (indicating that the effect of transformational leadership is more positive to the extent that allocentrism increases). Hypothesis 2 can be supported if the interaction between transformational leadership and idiocentrism is negative and significantly different from zero (indicating that the effect of transformational leadership is more negative to the extent that idiocentrism increases). Although testing for a three-way interaction between transformational leadership, allocentrism and idiocentrism is not an integral part of Hypotheses 1 and 2, it is still important. The test of this three-way interaction indicates whether the moderating effect of allocentrism (in the relationship between transformational leadership and OCB), varies as a function of the level of idiocentrism, and whether the moderating effect of idiocentrism (in the relationship between transformational leadership and OCB) varies as a function of the level of allocentrism.

Similarly, Hypothesis 3 can be supported if the two-way interaction between transactional leadership (for example, the dimension contingent reward) and idiocentrism is positive and significantly different from zero (indicating that the effect of transactional leadership becomes more positive to the extent that idiocentrism increases). Hypothesis 4 can be supported if the two-way interaction between transactional leadership and allocentrism is negative and significantly different from zero (indicating that the effect of transactional leadership becomes more negative to the extent that allocentrism increases). Testing for a three-way interaction between transactional leadership, allocentrism and idiocentrism indicates whether the moderating effect of idiocentrism (in the relationship between transactional leadership and OCB) varies as a function of the level of allocentrism, and whether the moderating effect of allocentrism (in the relationship between transactional leadership and OCB) varies as a function of the level of idiocentrism.

It is also important to estimate the sign and the significance of the simple slopes (effects) of transformational/transactional leadership, which are simply the regression of OCB on transformational/transactional leadership at specific points on the regression surface defined by the moderators allocentrism and idiocentrism (see Cohen, Cohen, West & Aiken, 2003). In the current study, the simple slopes of transformational/transactional leadership were estimated based on the estimated coefficients obtained in the final models (Tables 2 and 3), across low (one SD below the mean) and high (one SD above the mean) values of

allocentrism and idiocentrism (see Aiken & West, 1991 for more information concerning simple slopes estimation).

Results

The correlation matrix of the measures of interest is presented in Table 1 for the Kibutz and the Urban sectors. Followers are seen to evaluate their leaders' transformational behaviors higher (mean response was 3.79–4.13 for the Kibbutzim and 3.92–4.26 for the Urban sector) than their transactional behaviors (mean response was 1.67–1.83 for the Kibbutzim and 2.23–2.26 for the Urban sector). These findings are consistent with those of many other leadership studies (e.g., Judge & Bono, 2000; Kane & Tremble, 2000).

Table 1 also shows no significant differences in allocentrism ($t = .01$, *ns*) and idiocentrism ($t = .04$, *ns*) between the Kibbutz and the urban sectors. Still, Figure 1 presents the distribution of allocentrism and idiocentrism across the schools from the two sectors ($N=150$). Clearly, and as expected, there is greater variation in allocentrism and idiocentrism among the schools from the Kibbutzim. As we will discuss later, this may reflect an ongoing trend in the Israeli society, towards increased social and cultural influence of the urban sector on the Israeli Kibbutzim (Seginer & Schlesinger, 1998).

Interestingly, Table 1 also indicates that the kibbutz sample rated their leaders as significantly less transactional in terms of both contingent reward ($t = -.59$, $p < .0001$) and active management by exception ($t = -.40$, $p < .01$) than did the urban sample. Moreover, the correlation matrix indicates that for the urban sector, the transformational dimension idealized influence and intellectual stimulation were found to be positively related to OCB ($r = .25$, $p < .05$ for the courtesy dimension). No significant relationships were found between the transactional dimensions and OCB. For the Kibbutz sector, significant relationships were found between the transformational dimensions individualized consideration ($r = .25$, $p < .05$ for sportsmanship) and inspirational motivation and OCB ($r = .30 - .40$ for the five dimensions of OCB), as well as between the transactional dimension contingent reward and three OCB dimensions ($r = .28$, $p < .05$ for altruism and sportsmanship, and $r = .26$, $p < .05$ for contentiousness). As we next demonstrate, these findings may be explained by within-sector variation in followers' idiocentrism and allocentrism.

In the current study, significant results were found only with respect to two dimensions of OCB, altruism (Table 2) and sportsmanship (Table 3). Tables 2 and 3 present the regression estimates for the control (Model 1), main effect (Model 2), interaction (Model 3) reduced interaction (Model 4) and the final model (Model 5).

The control model, which contains the control variables age and gender as well as the sector indicator, is seen to explain 9% of the total variance in altruism and 21% of the variance in sportsmanship. The main effect model (2), which contained the four transformational dimensions and the two transactional dimensions, as well as the value orientation variables idiocentrism and allocentrism, explained 18% of the total variance in altruism and 25% of the total variance in sportsmanship. With respect to altruism, this model evinced a significant and positive relationship between the transformational leadership dimension

inspirational motivation ($b = .46, p < .05$) and altruism. The other leadership dimensions, as well as idiocentrism and allocentrism, were insignificantly related to altruism. With respect to sportsmanship, the leadership dimensions, as well as idiocentrism and allocentrism, were found to be insignificantly related to sportsmanship.

The full interaction models (3), which contained the two- and the three-way interactions of each leadership dimension with idiocentrism and allocentrism, explained 30% of the total variance in altruism and sportsmanship. With respect to altruism, we found four significant two-way interactions and one significant three way-interaction. As hypothesized (Hypothesis 1), the interaction of idealized influence and allocentrism was positive and significantly different from zero ($b = 1.06, p < .01$), indicating that the relationship between idealized influence and altruism becomes more positive to the extent that allocentrism increases. Additionally, as hypothesized (Hypothesis 2), the interaction of idealized influence and idiocentrism was negative and significantly different from zero ($b = -.93, p < .01$), indicating that the relationship between idealized influence and altruism becomes more negative to the extent that idiocentrism increases. Moreover, as hypothesized (Hypothesis 3), the interaction of contingent reward with idiocentrism was positive and significantly different from zero ($b = .36, p < .05$), indicating that the relationship between contingent reward and altruism becomes more positive to the extent that idiocentrism increases. Additionally, as hypothesized (Hypothesis 4) the interaction of contingent reward with allocentrism was negative and marginally significant ($b = -.30, p < .10$), indicating that the relationships between contingent reward and altruism becomes more negative to the extent that allocentrism increases. The three way-interactions of contingent reward/idealized influence, allocentrism and idiocentrism was not significantly different from zero, indicating that the moderating effect of allocentrism does not vary as a function of idiocentrism and the moderating effect of idiocentrism does not vary as a function of allocentrism.

Although Model 3 for altruism also shows a significant negative three-way interaction between the transformational dimension inspirational motivation, allocentrism and idiocentrism ($b = -.69, p < .05$), this interaction was found to be insignificant ($b = -.16, ns$) in the reduced interaction model, in which insignificant main effects and second order interactions were removed (Model 4). Hence, this interaction was excluded from the final model (Model 5), which contained the four significant interactions found in Model 3, their lower order components, as well as the control variables and the significant positive main effect of inspirational motivation ($b = .45, p < .01$). In this reduced model, which explained 27% of the total variance in altruism, the four two-way interactions discussed above remained significant (the marginally significant interaction of contingent reward and allocentrism became significantly different from zero in Models 4 and 5) and in the same direction as in Model 3.

Similar results were obtained with respect to sportsmanship, with only a few exceptions. First, in addition to the four significant or marginally significant interactions of contingent reward/idealized influence with allocentrism/idiocentrism, Model 3 also shows a significant negative interaction between the transactional leadership dimension management by exception and allocentrism ($b = -.45, p < .05$). However, this interaction turned insignificant in the reduced interaction model (Model 4) and hence was excluded from the final model

(Model 5). Second, in the final model, the interaction of idealized influence with allocentrism was only marginally significant ($b = .47, p < .10$), while the other three two-way interactions were significant. Finally, in Model 3 we found inspirational motivation to be insignificantly related to sportsmanship ($b = .37, ns$). The final model (Model 5) for sportsmanship accounted for 29% of the total variance of this OCB dimension.

Figures 2 and 3 present the simple slopes of Idealized Influence (Figure 2) and Contingent reward on the OCB dimension altruism. Since these simple slopes vary as a function of both the level of allocentrism and idiocentrism, we present the simple slopes for all possible low/high combinations of allocentrism and idiocentrism. Similar results were obtained for the OCB dimension of sportsmanship, and hence the simple slopes are presented only with respect to altruism. The results presented in Figure 2 further support Hypothesis 1, indicating the effect of idealized influence on altruism becomes more positive to the extent that allocentrism increases. Under low levels of idiocentrism, high levels of allocentrism yield a positive and statistically significant simple slope of idealized influence on altruism ($b = .67, p < .05$). In line with Hypothesis 2, the results in Figure 2 indicate that the effect of idealized influence on altruism becomes more negative to the extent that idiocentrism increases. Under low and moderate levels of allocentrism, high levels of idiocentrism yield a negative and statistically significant simple slope of idealized influence on altruism ($b = -.49, p < .05$; $b = -.94, p < .01$, for moderate and high levels of allocentrism respectively).

Supporting Hypothesis 3, the results presented in Figure 3 indicate that the effect of contingent reward on altruism becomes more positive to the extent that idiocentrism increases. Notice that under low and moderate levels of allocentrism, high levels of idiocentrism yield a positive and statistically significant simple slope of contingent reward on altruism ($b = .44, P < .01$; $b = .75, p < .001$). In line with Hypothesis 4, the results indicate that the effect of contingent rewards on altruism becomes more negative to the extent that allocentrism increases. Under low levels of idiocentrism, high levels of allocentrism yield a negative and marginally significant simple slope of contingent reward on altruism ($b = -.24, p < .01$).

Like Walumbwa et al. (2007), we ran an additional analysis, which for brevity we do not describe here, to examine whether these findings were consistent across individuals from collectivist (kibbutz) and individualist (urban) societal cultures. More specifically, we tested a series of three-way interactions between leadership dimensions, allocentrism/idiocentrism and the sector indicator. Since none proved significant, we can conclude that idiocentrism and allocentrism condition the effects of transformational and transactional leadership behaviors on OCB regardless of the societal culture characterizing the sector.

In order to test the construct validity of all the measures in the final model, we ran a confirmatory factor analysis which included the transformational dimension of idealized influence, the transactional dimensions of contingent reward, allocentrism and idiocentrism, and the two OCB dimensions of altruism and sportsmanship. Since we found significant between-school variation in the two OCB dimensions, we ran a CFA using MPLUS software (Muthén & Muthén, 2004), specifying the schools as a clustering variable (to take into consideration the dependency between observations). The fit indices obtained based on

this six factor model (CFI=.90, TLI=.88, RMSEA=.08, SRMR=.07) were somewhat lower/higher relative to the rules of thumb (above .95 for CFI and TLI; below .05 for RMSEA and SRMR) recommended by Muthén and Muthén (2004). Nevertheless, considering our relatively small sample size, these values may indicate an adequate fit (see Marsh & Balla, 1994). Moreover, recent research suggest that these rule of thumbs are too restrictive when applied in cases where there are multiple factors (e.g., 5–10), each measured with a reasonable number of items (e.g., at least 5–10/per scale) (Marsh et al., 2004), which is the case in the current study.

Discussion

The results of this study supported our hypotheses, indicating that the relationships of transformational and transactional leadership with OCB are contingent upon followers' levels of idiocentrism and allocentrism. In greater detail, transformational leadership was associated with higher OCB to the extent that followers were more allocentric, and with lower OCB to the extent that followers were more idiocentric. Transactional leadership was associated with higher OCB to the extent that followers were more idiocentric, and with lower OCB to the extent that followers were more allocentric.

These findings support the underlying assumption that employees with different personal characteristics may hold different needs and interests regarding their organization, such that different leadership styles are expected to accord with their interests and thus enhance their tendency to perform OCB. These findings are also in line with cultural congruence theory (House et al., 1997), suggesting that leader behaviors consistent with followers' values and beliefs will be viewed as more acceptable and effective than behaviors representing conflicting values. According to this perspective, any violation of individual norms by the leader may result in follower dissatisfaction, and hence, result in reduced motivation and performance.

Our findings indicate that conceptualizing OCB in terms of extra-role non-rewarded behaviors may lead to limited understanding of the mechanisms by which these behaviors can be promoted. Here we adopted a broader conceptualization of OCBs, holding that these behaviors might well lie within the explicit expectations of what constitutes appropriate role behavior and can be recognized and directly rewarded by the organization (Organ, 1997). Accordingly, we suggested that OCB can be enhanced by mechanisms that stress the contribution of these behaviors to the collective, as well as by mechanisms that tie these behaviors to personal achievement, as long as these are consistent with the followers' value orientations. In this respect we found both transformational and transactional behaviors effective in promoting OCB, to the extent that these leader behaviors are in line with followers' idiocentrism and allocentrism.

Unlike previous research (e.g., Walumbwa et al., 2007) in which transformational leadership dimensions were combined while exploring whether leadership effectiveness is contingent upon allocentrism and idiocentrism, in the current study we examined the effect of each transformational leadership dimension separately. As noted by Walumbwa et al. (2007), since transformational leadership can be viewed as a multi-faceted construct, different facets

of transformational leadership may interact differently with individual differences to produce different results (Walumbwa et al., 2007). In line with this notion, our results indicated that only the idealized influence dimension of transformational leadership was contingent on followers' idiocentrism and allocentrism, while inspirational motivation positively predicted OCB regardless of individual differences. No results were found regarding the dimensions of individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation. These results are not surprising, considering that idealized influence is deemed the most prototypic and often the single most important dimension of transformational leadership (Judge & Bono, 2000). The development of a shared vision is an integral component of idealized influence (Jung & Avolio, 2000). It helps followers to look at the desired future, while inspiring acceptance through the alignment of personal values and interests to the group's collective interests (Avolio & Bass, 2002; Jung & Avolio, 2000). This focus on goals, missions and responsibilities that are collective in nature, are aligned with allocentric followers' needs and expectations of a leader who can transcend their self-interests and motivate them to engage in behaviors that promote the good of the group (Triandis, 1995). However, it seems to conflict with idiocentric followers' focus on self-interests and the fulfillment of personal goals (Triandis, 1995).

In this sense, a question arises as to why inspirational motivation was found to be positively related to OCB, regardless of individual differences. Although idealized influence and inspirational motivation are often combined to form charismatic-inspirational leadership, these two dimensions differ (Stone, Russell & Patterson, 2004). Inspirational motivation refers to inspiring and challenging followers while displaying enthusiasm and optimism (Avolio & Bass, 2002). There is less emphasis on the nature of the vision, and more on leaders' ability to inspire followers to see the attractive future state. Such inspiration may be appealing to both idiocentric and allocentric followers, increasing their motivation to engage in OCB regardless of their individual values.

Regarding transactional leadership, our findings extend those of Walumbwa et al. (2007) by showing that the relationship between contingent reward and OCB is not only intensified to the extent that idiocentrism increases, but also attenuated to the extent that allocentrism increases. These findings are consistent with the idea that reward contingencies, which represent the exchange-based nature of transactional leadership, accord with idiocentric values but conflict with allocentric needs and expectations. However, no results were found with regard to management by exception, probably because this dimension does not reflect reward contingencies but the degree to which the leader takes corrective action on the basis of results of leader–follower exchanges (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Accordingly, this dimension may not be related to OCB regardless of followers' value orientation.

Finally, in the current study we found significant results only with respect to two dimensions of OCB, namely altruism and sportsmanship. The results concerning altruism are not surprising, taking into account that this dimension has been identified as the primary example of OCB and is one of the commonly studied dimensions of this construct (Ehrhart, 2004). With respect to sportsmanship, the willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions related to one's work is considered an important OCB dimension in the school context (Heck, Bedeian & Day, 2005). This dimension may be

especially important among Israeli teachers (Somech & Ron, 2007). Moreover sportsmanship is considered culturally specific (i.e., emic) (see Lam, Hui & Law, 1999), such that cultural values may play a key role in employees' motivation to perform these behaviors. Although we found no significant results with respect to the other three dimensions of OCB (i.e., conscientiousness, civic virtue, and courtesy), the fact that significant findings were obtained with respect to one dimension representing OCBs that benefit individuals (i.e., altruism) and one dimension representing OCBs that benefit the organization (i.e., sportsmanship) (Williams & Anderson, 1991), may point to the generalization of our findings across various operationalizations of OCBs.

Nevertheless, since the current study failed to show results for the other three dimensions of OCB, as well as for the transformational dimensions intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration and for the transactional leadership dimension of management by exceptions, we encourage further exploration of other possible psychological-level individual differences that may condition the relationship between transformational and transactional behaviors and OCB.

Limitations and directions for future research

Several limitations of the study warrant further attention in future research. First, in the current study we drew a sample of elementary school teachers. Since this specific context could limit the generalizability of the results, future research should extend these findings by including a broader sampling of organizations across different industries. For example, it is possible that teaching reflects an allocentric occupation, namely one that requires paying a lot of attention to the views and needs of others (Triandis & Singelis, 1998:40), such that self-selection within a culture may result in a relatively more allocentric population. Accordingly, testing our hypotheses in the context of different occupations, some more idiocentric in nature (i.e., allowing one to make own decisions while ignoring the needs and views of others, Triandis & Singelis, 1998:40) is likely to provide better understanding of the moderating role of allocentrism and idiocentrism.

Second, the current sample was homogeneous in terms of gender (93% were females). While this percentage is typical in the context of elementary school teachers (see Jacobs, Morrison & Swinyard, 2000; Marshall & Dorward, 2000; Trumper, 2003), this under-representation of males may have introduced bias into our findings. For example, women are more likely to exhibit altruism since this dimension is typically associated with the female gender role (see Kidder, 2002). Women may also tend to be more allocentric, while men tend to be more idiocentric (Triandis et al., 1995). Despite the gender homogeneity, the variation in allocentrism, idiocentrism and altruism in the current study was large enough to detect significant moderating effects of the two value orientation dimensions. Accordingly, it is possible that a more heterogeneous sample may provide further support for our findings, allowing detection of significant results with respect to other dimensions of OCB, beside altruism and sportsmanship.

Forth, in the current study we found no significant differences in allocentrism and idiocentrism between the Urban and the Kibbutz sectors. Still, we found greater variation in allocentrism and idiocentrism among the schools from the Kibbutzim, relative to the urban

schools. Such variation within the schools from the Kibbutzim reflects the structural changes characterizing this sector in recent years, where financial difficulties have led many of the Israeli Kibbutzim to privatization. However, since the Israeli Kibbutzim still believe in and represent a collectivist ideology (Cohen, 2007), the privatization process may have led to increased variation in value orientation within the Kibbutz sector. These findings are in line with the aim of the current study, to demonstrate how within-sector rather than between-sector variation moderates the relationship between leadership and OCB. Sampling schools from both the Urban and the Kibbutz sectors enabled greater within-societal variation in allocentrism and idiocentrism, allowing better examination of the moderating effects of these value orientation dimensions.

Fifth, considering the difficulty of detecting interactions between continuous variables in field research using moderated multiple regression (MMR) (see O'Connor, 2006), it is possible that deviations from multivariate normality may have introduced bias into our results. As noted by Fisiaro and Tisak (1994:34) "if moderator effects are present... the associated probabilities for determining statistical significance or constructing confidence intervals may be misleading." Still, as noted by Shieh (2009:521) despite these problems, "moderated multiple regression has remained as one of the important research methods that are applicable to a wide range of fields. From the methodological viewpoint, the lack of a full range of accessible and accurate statistical methods is a severe dilemma and major setback to the advance of moderation research."

Finally, in the current study OCB was measured by managers' ratings of employees who responded to the survey. Becker and Randall (1994) note that the very act of participating in a survey reflects OCB: it is voluntary, not rewarded directly or explicitly, and potentially promotes organizational effectiveness. Accordingly, our sample might have mostly captured such higher level OCB-performing employees. Still, treating the return of a questionnaire as an OCB measurement cannot facilitate examination of the relationship between employees' self-reported independent variables and OCB. Furthermore, research findings indicate that managers are able to effectively assess OCB (Becker & Randall, 1994). Accordingly, manager reports remain a valid measure.

Practical implications

From a practical point of view, our results may also provide some insights into how transformational and transactional behaviors can be applied to motivate diverse work groups. We found that transformational and transactional leader behaviors were each positively or negatively related to OCB, depending on followers' degree of idiocentrism or allocentrism. This suggests that the same type of leadership may be partly effective and partly harmful, depending on the individual's value orientation. Being aware of followers' idiocentrism and allocentrism may therefore help managers to identify individual or group contexts where transformational or transactional behaviors may better or worsen employees' motivation to perform OCB, and accordingly to adjust their leadership style to their followers' individual values. Such sensitivity to individual differences may be particularly relevant in light of the rapid globalization of the world economy and the cultural diversification of the workforce (Jackson & Joshi, 2004; Jung & Avolio, 1999). These trends

widen culture-based individual differences within work-groups and organizations, highlighting the need to understand, address, and meet followers' diverse needs and expectations.

Our findings suggest that allocentrism and idiocentrism reflect powerful individual differences, which may exert meaningful influences on followers' behaviors regardless of societal boundaries. This implies that any attempt to understand followers' behaviors simply on the basis of their societal cultural affiliation may be over-simplistic, failing to represent particular individuals within these cultures (Lam et al., 2002). This notion is in line with extensive research evidence demonstrating the role of within-societal cultural differences in various management and applied psychology domains, including: change management; conflict management; decision-making; leadership and OCB (see Kirkman, Lowe & Gibson, 2006 for review). Accordingly, it is important that managers learn to see beyond the norms and stereotypes imputed to any societal culture, and adjust their leadership behaviors to their followers' needs on the basis of individual as well as societal differences.

Finally, examining transformational and transactional leadership behaviors simultaneously responds to a call in the OB literature, directed to researchers and practitioners alike, to “move from a traditional, schismogenic, either/or approach to a both/and approach, thus making it possible for us to see management behavior in genuinely new ways” (Quinn, 1988, p. 85). This approach offers a basis for ongoing conceptual and practical development, suggesting that effective managers are those who are able to move back and forth between different styles of behaviors (Lewis, Welsh, Dehler, & Green, 2002). Acknowledging that managers can effectively influence their subordinates in many ways may serve as the basis for management training programs intended to expand the range of leadership behaviors applied by managers and improve their ability to perform those behaviors in a way that matches their followers' needs and expectations.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Guy Shani and John Dziak for their helpful comments and suggestions.

References

- Aiken, L.S.; West, S.G. *Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage; 1991. .
- Allen TD, Rush MC. The effects of organizational citizenship behavior on performance judgments: A field study and a laboratory experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1998; 83:247–260. [PubMed: 9577234]
- Avolio, B.J.; Bass, B.M. *Developing Potential across a Full Range of Leadership Cases on Transactional and Transformational Leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2002.
- Avolio BJ, Bass BM, Jung DI. Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 1999; 72:441–462.
- Bass, B.M. *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press; 1985.
- Bass BM. Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. 1999; 8:9–32.
- Bass, B.M.; Avolio, B.J. *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual Leader Form, Rater, and Scoring Key for MLQ (Form 5x-Short)*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden; 2000. .

- Becker TE, Randall DM. Validation of a measure of organizational citizenship behavior against an objective behavioral criterion. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 1994; 54:160–167.
- Borman WC, White LA, Dorsey DW. Effects of ratee task performance and interpersonal factors on supervisor and peer performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1995; 80:168–177.
- Burns, JM. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row; 1978.
- Carless SA. Assessing the discriminant validity of transformational leader behaviour as measured by the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 1998; 71:353–358.
- Cohen A. One nation, many cultures: A cross-cultural study of the relationship between personal cultural values and commitment in the workplace to in-role performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Cross-Cultural Research*. 2007; 41:273–300.
- Cohen, J.; Cohen, P.; West, SG.; Aiken, LS. *Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analyses for the Behavioral Sciences*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum; 2003.
- Dansereau F. A dyadic approach to leadership: Creating and nurturing this approach under fire. *Leadership Quarterly*. 1995; 6:479–490.
- Erez M, Somech A. Is group productivity loss the rule or the exception? Effects of culture and group-based motivation. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1996; 39:1513–1537.
- Ehrhart MG. Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*. 2004; 57:61–94.
- Fisicaro SA, Tisak J. A theoretical note on the stochastics of moderated multiple regression. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 1994; 54:32–41.
- Gelfand, MJ.; Bhawuk, DPS.; Nishi, LH.; Bechtold, D. Individualism and collectivism: Multilevel perspectives and implications for leadership. In: House, RJ.; Hanges, PJ.; Javidan, M.; Dorfman, PW.; Gupta, V., editors. *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Cultures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2004. p. 437–512.
- Gerstner CR, Day DV. Cross-cultural comparison of leadership prototypes. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 1994; 5:121–134.
- Haworth CL, Levy PE. The importance of instrumentality beliefs in the prediction of organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 2001; 59:64–75.
- Heck AK, Bedeian AG, Day DV. Mountains out of molehills? Tests of the mediating effects of self-Esteem in predicting workplace complaining. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 2005; 35:2262–2289.
- Hofstede G. Motivation, leadership, and organizations: Do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*. 1980; 8:42–63.
- House, RJ.; Wright, NS.; Aditya, RN. Cross-cultural research on organizational leadership: A critical analysis and a proposed theory. In: Earley, PC.; Erez, M., editors. *New Perspectives on International Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. San Francisco, CA: Lexington Press; 1997. p. 535–625.
- Howell JM, Hall-Merenda KE. The ties that bind: Leader-member exchange, transformational and transactional leadership, and distance on predicting follower performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1999; 84:680–694.
- Hu LT, Bentler PM. Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to underparameterized model misspecification. *Psychological Methods*. 1998; 3:424–453.
- James S, Jacobs JS, Morrison TG, Swinyard WR. Reading aloud to students: A national probability study of classroom reading practices of elementary school teachers. *Reading Psychology*. 2000; 21:171–193.
- Jackson SE, Joshi A. Diversity in social context: A multi-attribute, multilevel analysis of team diversity and sales performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 2004; 25:675–702.
- Judge TA, Bono JE. Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2000; 85:751–765. [PubMed: 11055147]
- Judge TA, Piccolo RF. Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2004; 89:755–768. [PubMed: 15506858]
- Jung DJ, Avolio BJ. Effects of leadership style and followers' cultural orientation on performance in group and individual task conditions. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1999; 42:208–218.

- Jung DJ, Avolio BJ. Opening the black box: An experimental investigation of the mediating effects of trust and value congruence on transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 2000; 21:949–964.
- Kane TD, Tremble TR. Transformational leadership effects at different levels of the army. *Military Psychology*. 2000; 12:137–160.
- Kidder DL. The influence of gender on the performance of organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*. 2002; 28:629–648.
- Kirkman BL, Lowe KB, Gibson CB. A quarter century of culture's consequences: A review of empirical research incorporating Hofstede's cultural values framework. *Journal of International Business Studies*. 2006; 37:285–320.
- Kurman J. Is self-enhancement related to modesty or to Individualism-Collectivism? A test with four Israeli groups. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*. 2001; 4:225–237.
- Lam SSK, Chen X, Schaubroeck J. Participation decision making and employee performance in different cultures: The moderating effects of allocentrism/idiocentrism and efficacy. *Academy of Management Journal*. 2002; 45:905–914.
- Lam SSK, Hui C, Law KS. Organizational citizenship behavior: Comparing perspectives of supervisors and subordinates across four international samples. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1999; 84:594–601.
- Lewis MW, Welsh MA, Dehler GE, Green SG. Product development tensions: Exploring contrasting styles of product management. *The Academy of Management Journal*. 2002; 45:546–564.
- Lord, RG.; Maher, KJ. *Leadership and Information Processing: Linking Perceptions and Performance*. Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman; 1991.
- Lord RG, Foti RJ, De Vader CL. A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. 1984; 34:343–378.
- MacKenzie SB, Podsakoff PM, Fetter R. Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 1991; 50:123–150.
- MacKenzie SB, Podsakoff PM, Fetter R. The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of sales performance. *Journal of Marketing*. 1993; 57:70–80.
- MacKenzie SB, Podsakoff PM, Rich GA. Transformational and transactional leadership and salesperson performance. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*. 2001; 2:115–134.
- Markus HR, Kitayama S. Culture and self: Implications for cognition, emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review*. 1991; 98:224–253.
- Marsh HW, Balla JR. Goodness-of-fit indices in confirmatory factor analysis: The effect of sample size and model complexity. *Quality & Quantity*. 1994; 28:185–217.
- Marsh HW, Hau K, Wen Z. In search of golden rules: Comment on Hypothesis-testing approaches to setting cutoff values for fit indexes and Dangers in Overgeneralizing Hu and Bentler's (1999) findings. *Structural Equation modeling*. 2004; 11:320–341.
- Marshall JA, Dorward JT. Inquiry experiences as a lecture supplement for preservice elementary teachers and general education students. *American Journal of Physics*. 2000; 68:S27–S36.
- Morrison WE. Role definition and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of employees' perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1994; 37:1543–1567.
- Muthén, LK.; Muthén, BO. *Mplus: The comprehensive modeling program for applied researchers*. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén; 2004.
- O'Connor BP. Programs for problems created by continuous variable distributions in moderated multiple regression. *Organizational Research Methods*. 2006; 9:554–567.
- Organ, DW. *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books; 1988.
- Organ DW. Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*. 1997; 10:85–97.

- Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Moorman RH, Fetter R. Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 1990; 1:107–142.
- Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Paine BJ, Bacharach DJ. Organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*. 2000; 6:513–563.
- Quinn, RB. *Beyond Rational Management: Mastering the Paradoxes and Competing Demands of High Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 1988.
- Rafferty AE, Griffin MA. Dimensions of transformational leadership: Conceptual and empirical extensions. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 2004; 15:329–354.
- Shieh G. Detection of interactions between a dichotomous moderator and a continuous predictor in moderated multiple regression with heterogeneous error variance. *Behavioral Research Methods*. 2009; 41:61–74.
- Singer JD. Using SAS proc mixed to fit multilevel models and individual growth models. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*. 1998; 24:323–355.
- Seginer R, Schlesinger R. Adolescents future orientation in time and place: the case of the Israeli Kibbutz. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*. 1998; 22:151–167.
- Somech A. The effects of leadership style and team process on performance and innovation in functionally heterogeneous teams. *Journal of Management*. 2006; 32:1–26.
- Somech A, Ron I. Promoting organizational citizenship behavior in schools: The impact of individual and organizational characteristics. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. 2007; 43:38–66.
- Stone AG, Russell RF, Patterson K. Transformational versus servant leadership – a difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*. 2004; 4:349–361.
- Triandis, HC. *Individualism and Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press; 1995.
- Triandis, HC. Motivation to work in cross-cultural perspective. In: Brett, JM.; Drasgow, F., editors. *The Psychology of Work: Theoretically Based Empirical Research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum; 2002. p. 101–117.
- Triandis HC. Cultural aspects of globalization. *Journal of International Management*. 2006; 12:208–217.
- Triandis HC, Chan DKS, Bhawuk DPS, Iwao S, Sinha JPB. Multimethod probes of allocentrism and idiocentrism. *International Journal of Psychology*. 1995; 30:461–480.
- Triandis HC, McCusker C, Hui CH. Multimethod probes of Individualism and Collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1990; 59:1006–1020.
- Triandis HC, Singelis TM. Training to recognize individual differences in collectivism and individualism within culture. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 1998; 22:35–47.
- Trumper R. The need for change in elementary school teacher training--a cross-college age study of future teachers' conceptions of basic astronomy concepts. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 2003; 19:309–323.
- Vigoda-Gadot E. Leadership styles, organizational policies, and employees' performance: An empirical examination of two competing models. *Personnel Review*. 2006; 36:651–683.
- Walumbwa FO, Lawler JJ. Building effective organizations: Transformational leadership, collectivist orientation, work-related attitudes, and withdrawal behaviors in three emerging economies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 2003; 14:1083–1101.
- Walumbwa FO, Lawler JJ, Avolio BJ. Leadership, individual differences, and workrelated attitudes: A cross-culture investigation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*. 2007; 56:212–230.
- Williams LJ, Anderson SE. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*. 1991; 17:601–617.
- Yukl G. An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 1999; 10:285–305.

Figure 1.
Distribution of allocentrism and idiocentrism across schools (N=150)

Figure 2.
Effect of Idealized Influence on Altruism as a Function of Followers' Level of Idiocentrism and Allocentrism.

Figure 3.
Effect of Contingent Reward on Altruism as a Function of Followers' Level of Idiocentrism and Allocentrism.

Table 1

Correlations among all measures at the individual level ($n=141$) for the Urban ($N=71$ above the diagonal) and the Kibbutz ($N=70$ below the diagonal) sectors.

	Reliability	M (SD) Urban	M (SD) Kibbutz	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Age		39.90 (7.26)	42.49 (11.36)	----	.58	.22	-.08	-.08	-.39	-.26	-.18	-.17	-.03	-.11	-.18	-.19	-.05	-.14
2. Gender (Female=1)		.98 (.12)	.88 (.32)	.10	----	-.17	-.28	-.02	.09	-.02	-.14	.14	.22	-.11	-.11	-.11	-.07	-.14
3. Allocentrism	.65	3.75 (.79)	3.76 (.62)	.28	-.02	----	.07	-.07	-.20	-.15	-.08	-.14	-.23	-.20	-.20	-.19	-.26	-.14
4. Idiocentrism	.77	3.76 (.84)	3.80 (.73)	.06	-.18	-.16	----	.10	.15	-.13	.03	.03	-.12	-.07	-.04	-.32	-.04	-.08
5. Management by Exceptions (Active)	.68	2.23 (.88)	1.83 (.60)	.04	-.11	-.10	-.02	----	.33	.16	-.10	.16	.12	-.15	-.15	-.12	-.15	-.20
6. Contingent Reward	.87	2.26 (1.09)	1.67 (.79)	.24	.10	.11	.02	.35	----	.27	.19	.34	.24	.05	.09	.17	.04	-.02
7. Idealized Influence	.92	4.01 (.59)	3.79 (.68)	.15	.19	-.30	-.23	.16	.34	----	.57	.54	.53	.18	.19	.25	.04	.08
8. Individualized Consideration	.70	4.32 (.62)	4.13 (.73)	.11	.16	-.09	-.14	-.01	.22	.57	----	.49	.54	.07	.09	.02	.14	.08
9. Intellectual Stimulation	.71	3.92 (.62)	3.76 (.70)	.11	.17	-.16	-.08	.23	.43	.73	.56	----	.64	.12	.10	.25	.10	.13
10. Inspirational Motivation	.70	4.26 (.71)	4.07 (.80)	.23	.18	-.22	-.19	.12	.28	.55	.53	.63	----	.15	.07	.17	.11	.10
11. Altruism	.93	5.70 (1.04)	5.53 (1.34)	.18	.28	-.01	-.22	.15	.28	.03	.11	.13	.32	----	.72	.57	.82	.83
12. Sportsmanship	.91	5.67 (1.29)	6.08 (1.05)	.01	.28	.02	-.13	.23	.28	.19	.25	.20	.33	.62	----	.57	.76	.65
13. Courtesy	.76	5.74 (.88)	5.65 (1.07)	.21	.23	-.09	-.14	.23	.14	.19	.08	.15	.31	.69	.67	----	.46	.52
14. Civic Virtue	.89	5.58 (1.26)	5.70 (1.06)	.16	.09	.04	-.19	.13	.23	.04	.03	.07	.30	.75	.57	.60	----	.82
15. Contentiousness	.80	5.55 (.98)	5.70 (1.06)	.16	.13	.06	-.20	.15	.26	.12	.13	.22	.40	.66	.43	.45	0.85	----

$p < .05$ for .24 $r < .31$; $p < .01$ for .31 $r < .40$; $p < .001$ for $r > .40$

Results for the moderating effect of Allocentrism and Idiocentrism in the relationship between leadership and Altruism

Table 2

Model:	(1) Control	(2) Main effect	(3) Full Interaction		(4): Reduced Interaction		(4): Final	
Predictor	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE
Age	.01	.01	.02	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01
Gender	1.54**	.61	1.34*	.59	1.10	.60	1.25*	.57
Kibbutz (=1)	.001	.23	.11	.29	.22	.38	.27	.26
Idiocentrism			-.20	.13	-.27	.15	-.32*	.13
Allocentrism			-.06	.16	-.11	.19	-.04	.15
Contingent Reward (CR)			.22	.12	.34*	.13	.27*	.11
Management by Exception (Active) (MEA)			-.13	.14	-.10	.16		
Idealized Influence (II)			.13	.25	.09	.26	-.14	.21
Inspirational Motivation (IM)			.46*	.19	.47*	.19	.43**	.16
Individualized Consideration (IC)			-.08	.19	-.003	.21		
Intellectual Stimulation (IS)			-.18	.24	-.26	.24		
Allocentrism* Idiocentrism					-.50	.27		
CR* Allocentrism					-.30	.17	-.36*	.15
CR* Idiocentrism					.36*	.17	.27*	.13
CR* Allocentrism* Idiocentrism					.15	.21		
II* Allocentrism					1.06**	.41	.62*	.31
II* Idiocentrism					-.93**	.35	-.74**	.25
II* Allocentrism* Idiocentrism					.22	.53		
IM* Allocentrism					.16	.41	-.21	.24
IM* Idiocentrism					.65	.25	.30	.18
IM* Allocentrism* Idiocentrism					-.69*	.49	-.16	.23
MEA * Allocentrism					-.22	.23		
MEA * Idiocentrism					.30	.18		
MEA * Allocentrism * Idiocentrism					.004	.25		

Model:	(1) Control		(2) Main effect		(3) Full Interaction		(4): Reduced Interaction		(4): Final	
	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE
Predictor										
IC* Allocentrism					-.66	.44				
IC* Idiocentrism					.02	.21				
IC* Allocentrism* Idiocentrism					.02	.30				
IS* Allocentrism					.02	.41				
IS* Idiocentrism					.23	.37				
IS* Allocentrism* Idiocentrism					.33	.47				
R-Square	.09		.18		.30		.28		.27	

† P<.01;
* p<.05;
** P<.01;
*** P<.001

Results for the moderating effect of Allocentrism and Idiocentrism in the relationship between leadership and Sportsmanship

Table 3

Model:	(1) Control	(2) Main effect	(3) Full Interaction		(4): Reduced Interaction		(5): Final	
Predictor	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE
Age	-.01	.01	-.01	.01	-.003	.01	-.004	.01
Gender	1.05*	.52	.79*	.53	.89+	.52	.92+	.52
Kibbutz (=I)	.63*	.30	.75*	.33	.89	.35	.91**	.33
Idiocentrism			-.02	.13	-.003	.15	-.09	.12
Allocentrism			.05	.16	-.11	.20	.09	.16
Contingent Reward (CR)			.21	.11	.43**	.14	.30*	.11
Management by Exception (Active) (MEA)			-.07	.14	-.03	.16	-.07	.14
Idealized Influence (II)			.20	.24	-.11	.28	.12	.18
Inspirational Motivation (IM)			.27	.18	.37	.20		
Individualized Consideration (IC)			.11	.21	.14	.23		
Intellectual Stimulation (IS)			-.27	.23	-.23	.24		
Allocentrism* Idiocentrism					-.49	.35		
CR* Allocentrism					-.34+	.20	-.37*	.17
CR* Idiocentrism					.42*	.18	.28*	.14
CR* Allocentrism* Idiocentrism					.20	.27		
II* Allocentrism					1.01**	.44	.47+	.26
II* Idiocentrism					-.63+	.37	-.57*	.24
II* Allocentrism* Idiocentrism					.53	.56		
IM* Allocentrism					-.02	.46		
IM* Idiocentrism					.33	.26		
IM* Allocentrism* Idiocentrism					-.29	.52		
MEA * Allocentrism					-.45*	.23	-.01	.18
MEA * Idiocentrism					.17	.18		
MEA * Allocentrism* Idiocentrism					.13	.28		
IC* Allocentrism					-.33	.46		

Model:	(1) Control		(2) Main effect		(3) Full Interaction		(4): Reduced Interaction		(5): Final	
	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE
Predictor										
IC* Idiocentrism					-.03	.27				
IC* Allocentrism* Idiocentrism					-.22	.49				
IS* Allocentrism					-.04	.38				
IS* Idiocentrism					-.28	.36				
IS* Allocentrism* Idiocentrism					.01	.46				
R-Square	.21		.25		.30		.29		.29	

† P<.01;
* p<0.05;
** P<.01;
*** P<.001