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How Leadership Affects Organisational Citizenship Behaviour – a study of independent hotels
Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to examine the factors that managers in independent hotels can influence to improve organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) by examining the relationship between leadership style and OCB through newly developed balanced organisational culture and trust variables. Unlike most studies, which have been on chain hotels, this study investigates these relationships in independent hotels in Iran. Additionally, organisational size was also included in the study.

Design/methodology/approach: Using information from Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Handicrafts and Tourism 160 independent hotels were identified and approached. A survey was assembled using well-known instruments. 392 usable questionnaires, out of 1150 distributed, were collected from employees and analysed using SEM.

Findings: Contrary to previous studies, we found that in this context neither transformational nor transactional leadership affects trust directly but only through balanced organisational culture and only transactional leadership had a direct relationship with OCB. Also, organisational size had a moderating effect on the relationship between trust and OCB.

Originality/value: We add to the theoretical literature dealing with the different behaviour of constructs developed in a Western context in other contexts and suggests that hotel managers in a collectivist culture, like Iran, who want to build OCB can do so by creating organisational culture conditions (Balanced Organisational Culture) that foster trust between managers and their subordinates.

Keywords: OCB, leadership styles, trust, balanced organisational culture, independent hotels, SET
1. Introduction

Increasingly competitive trading conditions in the hospitality industry require hotel managers to identify sources of competitive advantage they can influence directly. The human resource is a major source of competitive advantage in this industry (Nazarian, et al., 2017; Nazarian et al., 2020) so scholars have devoted much attention to the problem of how managers can encourage spontaneous and unsupervised behaviour among employees that increases organisational effectiveness (Organ, 2018; Solnet et al., 2015). There have been no major studies conducted outside the Western and Far Eastern regions, but this need to maximise the effectiveness of the human resource is particularly pressing in countries where the hospitality industry requires development. Additionally, there have been no major studies of independent hotels. These gaps leave an uncertainty about the relationships between factors that ultimately affect organisational effectiveness.

We address this problem from within the functionalist paradigm (Burrell and Morgan, 1979), specifically basing our approach on Blau’s (1964) Social Exchange Theory (SET) which brings together the principle of autonomous actors acting rationally in their own self-interest to analyse the interactions between individuals while simultaneously acknowledging the agency of groups in their self-preservation. What is good for the individual is not necessarily good for the group, and vice versa. Thus, from the viewpoint of an autonomous actor an altruistic act may be destructive while being beneficial from the viewpoint of the group. Similarly, while the existence of culture at either the national or organisational levels is explicable at the level of the individual by a need for uniformity of values and expected behaviour to reduce friction in interactions, many characteristics of national and organisational culture call for altruism on the part of individual members. However, both national and organisational culture tend to
prevail over individual considerations and, therefore, have a demonstrable bearing on organisational effectiveness.

One way of measuring altruistic and organisationally beneficial behaviour of employees is by using the construct of organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) which is behaviour exhibited by organisational members that is not motivated by the expectation of reward and promotes goodwill, co-operation and harmony between co-workers while simultaneously promoting the interests of the organisation (Organ, 2018). It has been shown that the relationship between transformational leadership and some of the elements of OCB (sportsmanship, civic virtue and conscientiousness) are mediated by trust (Moorman et al., 2018). Similarly, transactional leadership is has also been shown to be positively correlated with OCB (Rodrigues, De and Ferreria, 2015). However, leadership, trust and OCB all take place in the context of organisational culture which is implemented by the senior management (Schein, 2017). Thus, this study set out to investigate the relationships between leadership style, organisational culture, trust and OCB in the overall context of Iranian independent hotels.

Additionally, data on organisational size were collected but no data were collected on national culture. Organisational size is a possible moderating factor since studies have shown that smaller hotels may exhibit different organisational characteristics from larger ones (Erkutlu, 2008; Tremblay and Gibson, 2016). Since there is secondary data on national culture that is easily available, and to avoid survey fatigue, no primary data was collected on this construct for this study.

We show that, in this context, OCB is related to both transformational and transactional leadership styles with a direct relationship with transactional leadership and, though trust is not directly related to the transformational leadership style, it is indirectly related to it through
balanced organisational culture. These results contradict previous studies conducted in other parts of the world outside the Middle East (eg. Rodrigues & Ferreria, 2015; Buil et al., 2018).

Thus, we add to the theoretical literature dealing with the different behaviour of constructs developed in a Western context in other contexts and suggests that hotel managers in a collectivist culture, like Iran, who want to build OCB can do so by creating organisational culture conditions that foster trust between managers and their subordinates.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. First, we explain the underlying theory and assumptions of this study and review the literature that is relevant to the constructs used and the relationships between them. Then, we describe the methods by which the data were gathered and analysed. Next, the findings from the data analysis are discussed. Finally, the paper concludes with a statement of its theoretical and practical contribution and its main limitations.

2. Literature review and hypotheses development

2.1 Functionalism and Blau’s social exchange theory

This study is founded upon Social Exchange Theory (SET), to analyse the relationship between leadership and OCB since the hospitality industry is one that mostly depends on individual human interactions. However, we assume that not all social phenomena are reducible to the individual level. Thus, we use Blau’s (1964) version of SET which integrates the rational individualism of other versions of SET with the ability to include collective social phenomena, such as organisational and national culture, as well (Burrell and Morgan, 1979).

As Emerson (1976) points out, Social Exchange Theory (SET) is not so much of a theory as a collection of theories with common themes and an area for debate. Homans (1958) developed a version of the theory based on Skinner’s theory of behaviourism (Emerson, 1976; Ritzer and
Stepinsky, 2014). In this version of SET the behaviour of members of groups of any size can be reduced to the rational choices of individual actors. However, Blau (1964) developed a different version of the theory in which he points out that, though rational choice may explain many of the interactions between individuals, there are also norms and values which are not the product of individual rational choices but are emergent from the phenomenon of human groups.

Burrell and Morgan (1979) place Blau’s theory in the functionalist paradigm which assumes that social groupings act in favour of their own survival or they will fade away. However, they also argue that Blau’s theory is an integration of rational choice theory and theories of group processes since, though the rational choice is not necessarily made at the individual level, the choice is rational at the level of the group in terms of the survival of the group. The constructs of trust and OCB have been developed in the SET paradigm (Cohen et al., 2012; Organ, 1990) and it can be argued that though they are not necessarily based on the rational choice of the individual actors, they favour organisational survival.

The constructs used to measure organisational culture and leadership, Competing Values Framework (CVF) (Cameron and Quinn, 2011) and full-range leadership theory (Avolio & Bass, 2004), fall within the functionalist paradigm. CVF includes a construct that is used in this study to measure organisational culture. This theory is not concerned with individual choices but describes characteristics of the organisation including the balance between four culture types. We use the degree to which there is an even balance between these culture types as the measure of organisational culture in this study. The choice between the culture types does not take place at the individual level and therefore cannot be related to rational choice theory. However, at the organisational level an inappropriate choice of the mixture of organisational culture types could lead to the demise of the organisation. Our measure of
leadership is also based on a functionalist concept of leadership, Avolio and Bass’s (2004) full-range leadership theory, which measures the leadership style in the organisation on the transactional and transformational dimensions.

Thus, this study investigates the relationships between factors that act at the individual level and at the organisational level for the well-being of the organisation.

2.2 Transformational and transactional leadership

Leadership style theories are mostly concerned with the degree to which leaders exhibit a specific characteristic, for example authentic leadership, servant leadership or autocratic leadership. Full Range Leadership Theory, however, is based on the principle that all leaders exhibit the transformational or transactional style to some extent and, its exponents argue, is concerned with characteristics that are found in leaders in all places and at all times (Bass, 1985). The version of the theory as used in this study was developed by Bass (1985) which assumes that, rather than there being one continuous scale from transactional to transformational, there are instead two scales, the transactional scale and the transformational scale, and there could be any amount of either in a particular instance.

The transformational leadership style has been proven to inspire subordinates (Dai et al., 2013; Buil, et al., 2019) and is generally considered to be more influential than the transactional leadership style (Lee et al., 2010). It is characterised by mutual loyalty and respect between leaders and subordinates (Bass, 1985) and it positively influences levels of satisfaction of subordinates with leaders (Jung & Avolio, 2000; Yang, 2016) Therefore, it is considered to be one of the most effective leadership styles for the hospitality industry (Chen and Wu, 2017; Patiar and Mia, 2009). Studies have shown that the effects of transformational leadership are not culturally variable (Den Hartog et al., 2013).
On the other hand, the transactional leadership style encourages the precise exchange of information between leaders and subordinates regarding the level of performance expected of subordinates and how they will be rewarded (Kelloway et al., 2012). Therefore, transactional leadership is considered to promote fairness and equality producing a strong leader-subordinate relationship that generates trust and commitment (Walumbwa et al., 2008; Rothfelder et al., 2012; Yahaya and Ebrahim, 2016). The transactional leadership style is expected to provide positive outcomes in stable environments (Patiar and Mia, 2009). However, this leadership style has been criticised for not encouraging the creative abilities of subordinates in the hospitality context (Dai et al., 2013); hence, its effectiveness has been thought to be limited in the context of the hospitality industry (Nazarian et al., 2019; Patiar and Mia, 2009).

The main objective of both styles is to facilitate effective outcomes from the relationship between leader and subordinates. Thus, studies have suggested neither leadership style should be overlooked and it is more advantageous to use both styles simultaneously to obtain optimum results (Dai et al., 2013; Nazarian et al., 2019). In this study, along with transformational leadership, we test their relationships with trust, organisational culture and OCB.

2.3 Balanced organisational culture

Organisational leadership takes place in the context of a specific organisational culture. In the Competing Values Framework (CVF) model of organisational culture (Cameron and Quinn, 2011), there are two dimensions by which organisational culture is measured: internal versus external focus and stability versus flexibility. This gives four organisational culture types: clan (internal focus and flexibility) which emphasises human resources and cohesion, adhocracy (external focus and flexibility) which emphasises adaptability and resource acquisition, market (external focus and stability) which emphasises productivity and goal orientation and hierarchy
(internal focus and stability) which emphasises bureaucracy and control (Quinn, 1988). Each of these organisational culture types has its own different set of values for leadership and effectiveness and its own model of organising: clan has a human relations model, adhocracy an open systems model, market a rational goal model and hierarchy an internal process model (Quinn, 1988).

Having all four culture types substantially represented in the overall organisational culture mix enables an organisation to take advantage of different approaches, in the different functional departments and to draw upon a diversity of viewpoints among managers (Quinn, 1988; Nazarian et al., 2017). Such a mixture has been termed a balanced organisational culture by scholars who have identified it as a possible source of competitive advantage not only in a stable operating environment (Gregory et al., 2009) but, more importantly, it gives an organisation resilience in rapidly changing or highly competitive conditions (Gregory et al., 2009; Hartnell et al., 2011; Nazarian et al., 2017). We have adopted balanced organisational culture for this study because, as suggested by Hartnell et al. (2011), a mix of the CVF organisational culture types where all four are represented is likely to bring about a perception among employees that managers are open to different points of view which are fairly considered on their merits. This helps to create a context conducive to positive organisational characteristics, such as trust and OCB that, in turn, lead to effectiveness.

Since transformational leaders are visionary (Rodrigues et al., 2015) and are change agents (Avolio & Bass, 2004) they often welcome changes in the business environment (Buil et al., 2019) and customer preferences, adapting to them to optimize commercial opportunities (Wu, 2013). The transformational leadership style can be related to each of the four culture types of CVF; for example, clan culture attempts to develop a sense of belongingness between the employees and the organisation through close ties, which can be achieved via the leader
empowering subordinates (Cameron and Quinn, 2011). It follows that transformational leadership is consistent with balanced organisational culture (Quinn, 1988). If we assume that leadership style can be a conscious choice for managers, in this study we link the individual and organisational levels. Thus, we propose:

**H1. The transformational leadership style has a positive influence on balanced organisational culture.**

Setting targets, allocating resources to achieve them and evaluating performance based on the set targets along with managing by exception are characteristics of transactional leadership (Nazarian et al., 2019, 2020) and balanced organisational culture influences performance (Gregory et al., 2009; Nazarian et al., 2017). As with the transformational leadership style, relationships can be seen between different CVF culture types and the transactional leadership style. For example, Cameron and Quinn (2011) say the main purpose of a market is to conduct transactions that ultimately generate profits, implying a market culture where employees are evaluated by their contribution towards generating those profits. It follows that transactional leadership is also consistent with balanced organisational culture. Thus, we propose:

**H4. The transactional leadership style has a positive influence on balanced organisational culture.**

2.4 Trust

Trust is the willingness to depend on another party where both parties have the confidence in the motives of each other (Moorman et al., 2018). According to Chathoth et al. (2011), in an organisation, trust is a combination of integrity, commitment and mutual dependence among members. Their findings confirm that these factors are universal and can be seen in both
individualist cultures and in collectivist cultures though there are differences in how each factor is perceived and valued in the two types of culture.

Mutual trust improves many organisational factors (Yang, 2016). When the leader trusts the subordinates, they can be empowered resulting in higher loyalty from them (Hon and Lu Lin, 2010; Liu et al., 2014). When subordinates trust their leaders, they enthusiastically extend their support and commitment to the benefit of the organisation (Bass, 1985). An increased level of organisational trust leads to improved employee satisfaction in the hotel industry (Chathoth et al., 2011; Moorman et al., 2018) and trust has been shown to have a direct effect on knowledge sharing within teams (Lee et al., 2010). Both employee satisfaction (Rothfelder et al., 2012; Karatepe and Karadas, 2015) and knowledge sharing (Yang, 2007) are beneficial for the organisation and are positively related to effectiveness.

Since transformational leadership has the effect of infusing the organisation with one common vision, it might be expected that subordinates might become mutually reliant and supportive (Buil, et al., 2019). The transactional leadership style is associated with characteristics such as dependability and consistency that build trust (Dai et al., 2013). Thus, we propose that:

\[ H2. \text{The transformational leadership style has a positive influence on trust.} \]

\[ H5. \text{The transactional leadership style has a positive influence on trust.} \]

Organisational culture has been shown to have a positive effect on trust (House et al., 2004). According to Cameron Quinn (2011) a more balanced organisational culture can be expected to produce greater employee satisfaction (Gregory et al., 2009) and in turn participation where participation has been shown to have a positive relationship with trust (Moorman et al., 2018). There have been a limited number of studies showing a relationship between organisational culture and trust (Alizadeh and Panahi, 2013) and none so far of the relationship between
balanced organisational culture and trust. Thus, there is a gap in our knowledge about this and, therefore, we propose to test if:

H7. Balanced organisational culture has a positive influence on trust.

2.5 Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB)

Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) is the individual and discretionary acts that are not limited to the job role specifications that collectively result in the wellbeing of the organisation (Ravichandran et al., 2007; Organ, 2018) and scholars have increasingly come to recognise its importance in the hospitality sector (Liang, 2012). Ravichandran et al. (2007) examine the theoretical basis of OCB as applied in tourism and hospitality research and find that one of the main theories underpinning these studies is Blau’s version of SET. Blau connects the individual rationale for OCB to trust in the organisation through the principle that it is in the interests of the employee to have a stable relationship with their employer and this comes about as trust is built (Blau, 1964; Ravichandran et al., 2007).

Numerous studies conducted around the world have shown that the transformational leadership style is positively associated with OCB (Rodrigues & Ferreria, 2015; Buil et al., 2018). Also, trust has been shown to mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and OCB (Dai et al., 2013). There is a positive association between OCB and outcomes such as satisfaction (Nadiri and Tanova, 2010), organisational commitment (Khan et al., 2015) and service orientation (Tang and Tang, 2012), which benefit the organisation. Such factors are related with transformational leadership style (Buil et al., 2018; Erkutlu, 2008) making it apparent that the transformational leadership style influences OCB (Dai et al., 2013; Piccolo et al., 2018). Most of these studies were conducted in Western countries (Yoon et al., 2016); however, in different cultural contexts OCB can take different forms (Wang and Wong, 2011) and our study contributes to this literature.
Thus, we propose to confirm that:

**H3.** The transformational leadership style has a positive influence on OCB.

Although there are studies that suggest there is no relationship between transactional leadership and OCB (Dai *et al.*, 2013), the transactional leadership style has been found to be positively correlated with OCB (Walumbwa *et al.*, 2008). Studies have also shown there is an association between factors such as perceptions of equitable pay and fairness (Cropanzano *et al.*, 2018) with OCB. As these factors are considered important in transactional leadership (Rothfelder *et al.*, 2012), these studies confirm there is a relationship between transactional leadership and OCB. Thus, we propose to confirm that:

**H6.** The transactional leadership style has a positive influence OCB.

According to CVF, organisations that have a significant amount of all four culture types in the mix of their organisational culture are more resilient in a changing environment (Hartnell *et al.*, 2011; Nazarian *et al.*, 2017). They exhibit customer orientation, identifying the needs that are not yet fulfilled in the market (Lukas *et al.*, 2013) and respond with innovative solutions. The ability to be responsive towards market demand is at the core of balanced organisational culture, which cannot be achieved without trust between the leader and the subordinates where the leader provides direction for the innovation and the subordinates support it. Thus, we propose that:

**H8.** Balanced organisational culture is positively related with OCB

These theoretical positions see trust as an antecedent or concomitant of OCB and studies have shown that trust positively influences OCB (Moorman *et al.*, 2018) and it has also been shown that trust positively stimulates OCB through the intermediation of factors such as organisational commitment (Dai *et al.*, 2013; Hon and Lu Lin, 2010). Thus, we propose that:
H9. Trust is positively related with OCB.

2.6 Organisational size

It might be expected that the organisational culture would be transmitted more easily in smaller organisations leading to members thinking in a similar way. According to Social Information Theory, in smaller groups the patterns of interaction between members tend to be more similar than in in larger groups (Ohana, 2014). It might be expected, therefore, that this similarity would make it easier for group members to build trust and mutually supportive relationships between them, so trust and OCB may support each other more in smaller organisations. Gray et al. (2003) found that smaller organisations are more supportive than larger ones, and this suggests a greater degree of clan culture which is an essential component of balanced organisational culture. Additionally, supportiveness is consistent with OCB. Thus, we propose that:

H10. Organisational size acts as a moderator in the relationship between trust and OCB.

<<< Please Insert Figure 1 Here>>>>

3. Methods

3.1 Data collection

The formulated hypotheses were tested using a sample of hotel employees and managers from Iran. Based on the recommendation by international researchers (Hult et al., 2008), we used translation-back-translation, in a non-mechanical way. Two bilingual experts proficient in English and Farsi discussed each question and the alternatives. In addition, 5 academics reviewed the items for content validity and 3 academics assessed them for face validity.
This data was collected between August 2018, and March 2019. The participants were selected using convenience sampling (McDaniel and Gates, 2006) due to convenient accessibility to the relevant information from the Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Handicrafts and Tourism (2019). The initial sample of 160 hotels comprised all the officially registered independent hotels in the 6 major tourist cities of Tehran, Isfahan, Yazd, Mashhad, Kish and Shiraz (Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Handicrafts and Tourism, 2019) out of which 52 agreed to participate. This sample amounted to 33% of the target population which was large enough to be representative and allowed the researchers to generalise from the sample statistics to the population under study (Hair et al., 2006; Malhotra and Birks, 2000; Salant and Dillman, 1994). 1150 questionnaires were sent to employee and manager participants from which 392 usable questionnaires were returned and analysed.

The instrument consisted of questions about managers’ and employees’ perceptions of the impact of leadership style, balanced organisation culture and trust on OCB. The data were collected by online and the face-to-face methods, and, to increase the sample size and make sure that the sample included the most knowledgeable informants, non-probability ‘snowballing’ was used as a distribution method by asking initial informants to suggest others who could offer further insights (Goodman, 1961). To keep the non-response rate to a minimum, participants were given a statement of the aim of the research and participants were guaranteed that their information would be treated with the utmost confidentiality (Sekaran, 2003).

Non-response bias “involves the assumption that people who are more interested in the subject of a questionnaire respond more readily and that non-response bias occurs on items in which the subject’s answer is related to his interest in the questionnaire” (Armstrong and Overton, 1977, p.2). On a recommendation by Lambert and Harrington (1990) non-response bias was calculated by using the Mann-Whitney U-test on early and late participants, as well as on non-respondents compared with the entire sample (for both online and hard copy) for the means of all research variables, by taking the first 50 observations to be the early participants and the last 50 observations to be the late participants. We found no difference between online and hard copy data collection method. The results show that the significance values in the research
variables are not less than 0.5 probability value, which is insignificant. Therefore, the result
suggests that there was no statistically significant difference between early and late
questionnaire submission and non-response bias was not a concern.

A summary of the demographic characteristics is shown in Table 1. It indicates that of 389
usable responses, the majority of the participants were female (53.2%), the largest age groups
were 45-54 (35.7%) and 35-44 (32%), a high proportion had postgraduate education (53.5%),
middle managers comprised 45.8% and senior managers 30.8% of the sample and most
participants were working for large companies (61.2%).

<<<Please Insert Table 1 Here>>>

3.2 Measures

The survey scales were derived from previous recognised studies which had been proven to be
psychometrically sound (Churchill, 1979). The item measurements were scored using seven-
point Likert scales (1 ‘strongly disagree’ to 7 ‘strongly agree’), to deliver acceptable properties.
There is an initial section containing 5 items concerning the demographic and background
information about the participant. The next section contains 28 items concerned with leadership
style (transformational and transactional) that were taken directly from Avolio and Bass (2004)
MLQ (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) 5X instrument. The following section contains
24 items concerned with balanced organisational culture which is a modified version of
Cameron and Quinn’s (2011) instrument. The next section contains 4 items concerned with
organisational trust that were adopted from Schoorman and Ballinger (2006). The final section
contains 10 items concerned with OCB and these were adopted from Wang and Wong (2011).
Table 2 contains the items that were employed to conduct this research investigation.

<<<Please Insert Table 2>>>
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4. Data analysis and findings

As recommended by previous studies (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988; Hair et al., 2006), we employed the two-stage approach in structural equation modelling (SEM) to examine the coefficients pattern of the nine hypotheses. In the first stage, the measurement model was used by employing AMOS 21 to recognize the causal relationships between observed variables and latent variables. FIA3, IC3, BOA6, BOM6, OCB5, OCB8 were excluded due to multiple loadings on two factors. Furthermore, BOC1, BOA5, BOA3, OCB6 were dropped due to multiple loadings on two factors as well as low reliability. In addition, FIB1, BOC2, BOA4, OCB9 were deleted due to cross-loadings on extra factors, and IS4 was removed for cross-loadings on extra factors and low reliability. The dropping of items did not impact the measurement of anticipated constructs, as each construct had minimum three items to carry out the relevant measurement. The remaining items were examined for internal consistency reliability by employing the coefficient alpha and the results illustrates the measures were acceptable (0.873 to 0.960) (Churchill, 1979; Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007).

Harman’s one-factor was used to examine the common method bias and a common latent factor employing a chi-square difference among the original and fully constrained model (Malhotra et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 2003). Also, the results suggested by the two models were statistically different and share a variance. Furthermore, we followed Podsakoff et al.’s (2003) four categorization sources of common method variance. Then, the results of the model were examined without any consideration of method biases.

In this stage, discriminant validity was examined by the average variance extracted (AVE) for each construct which ranged from 0.615 to 0.892, which confirms a distinctive underlying concept and the good rule of thumb was extracted of 0.5 or higher shows adequate convergent
validity. Convergent validity was evaluated with the values of standard errors and CFA loadings. The construct loadings and all items were noteworthy (t-value/CR>1.96). In addition, the homogeneity of the study constructs was assessed by convergent validity.

The next stage was using regression path, which described the causal relationships among the observed variables (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988). To assess model fit, we used incremental fit indices to solve the possible problem of an un-reliable standard error and Chi square statistic due to ML application. RMSEA (root mean squared approximation of error) 0.064<0.08 shows acceptable fit (Hair et al., 2006). CFI (comparative fit index) 0.916>0.90, TLI (Tucker-Lewis index) (0.910), and IFI (incremental fit index) (0.916) illustrate acceptable fit (Hair et al., 2006). The results shown in Table 3 indicate there is no problem with validity that might interfere with testing our hypotheses.

<<Please Insert Table 3 Here>>

4.1 Hypotheses testing

We inspected the proposed research conceptual framework using SEM (Figure 1) which reflects the expected linear, causal associations among the constructs that were confirmed from the previous studies. Hypothesis 1 suggests that transformational leadership is positively related to balanced culture (γ=0.338, t=6.156). The regression weight for transformational leadership in predicting trust (H2) and OCB (H3) are significantly different from 0 at the 0.001 significance level (γ=0.082, t=1.134, p 0.257; γ=0.050, t=0.494, p 0.621, respectively); thus, hypotheses 2 and 3 were not supported. The result shows support for hypothesis 4 (transactional leadership -> balanced culture γ=0.158, t=2.858). In contrast, the regression path unexpectedly showed a negative relationship between transactional leadership and trust (H5: γ=0.062, t=1.019, p 0.308). The results show that transactional leadership has a positive impact on OCB (H6: γ=0.434, t=2.427). In addition, the significant relationships between balanced culture and
trust (H7: $\gamma=0.142$, $t=4.280$) and balanced culture and OCB (H8: $\gamma=0.843$, $t=1.838 \ p 0.066$) were significant. Surprisingly, the results show insignificant relationships between trust and organisational citizenship behaviour (H9: $\gamma=0.300$, $t=3.441$). Table 4 demonstrates the regression coefficient that measures the interaction effect of company size between trust and balanced culture (H10). In other words, the impact of the independent variable on its dependent variable depends on the size of the moderator variable. Table 4 shows the results of this analysis and Figure 2 shows the consequences of the hypotheses testing for the proposed Research Model.

<<Please Insert Table 4 Here>>

<<Please Insert Figure 2 Here>>

5. Discussion

This study set out to explore the relationship between leadership style and OCB in the context of Iranian independent hotels. This exploration was carried out by examining the relationship between these two factors and other antecedents of OCB: balanced organisational culture, trust and organisational size. The results of this research were surprising for three reasons. First, transformational leadership did not have a direct relationship with OCB although, as expected, transactional leadership did. Second, neither transformational nor transactional leadership had a relationship with trust. This was unexpected since previous studies have found such a relationship. Third, there was no direct relationship between balanced organisation culture and OCB. However, there were other results that were more consistent with expectation. Both transformational and transactional leadership had a relationship with balanced organisational culture, which confirms that leaders do affect the organisational culture. Transformational
leadership had an indirect relationship with OCB through balanced organisational culture and trust. Finally, size did have an effect on the relationship between trust and OCB.

The unexpected results of there being no relationship between either leadership style and trust may be due to the manner in which national culture affects the relationship between manager and employee in a Middle Eastern country like Iran. Of the nine dimensions of national culture in the GLOBE Survey (House et al., 2004), the one that could be the most significant for this study is *In-Group Collectivism* which measures the degree of loyalty and cohesiveness that individuals experience within their particular in-group which is usually based on the family. This is distinct from the dimension of *Institutional Collectivism* which measures the degree to which actions for the benefit of society at large are rewarded. Countries in the Middle East region, including Iran, score high on In-Group Collectivism and low on Institutional Collectivism. This might explain why transformational management only has an effect on OCB through organisational culture; that is, it may be that it is only when there is a culture where employees regard each other as members of their own in-group that this leadership style is able to build trust. Although, we were most interested in the degree to which the organisational culture types are balanced, we could only achieve this by collecting data on all of the four types. As might be expected Clan culture, which is where the members of the organisation feel as though they belong to a family, shows a strong positive impact on the relationship between the leadership style and trust.

Organisational size was found to have a moderating effect in the relationship between trust and OCB. Cameron and Quinn (2011) show that smaller organisations have a stronger element of clan culture in their organisational culture mix than larger ones and for Clan culture to be created there must be trust between leaders and followers. They argue that smaller organisations need coherence and trust to succeed and as they grow this sense of coherence and
trust is replaced by formal rules and procedures. Thus, our findings tend to confirm Cameron and Quinn’s argument.

6. Conclusion

This study was designed to investigate if the relationships between certain antecedents of OCB were the same in a sample of managers of Iranian independent hotels as would be expected in a Western or East Asian context. It shows there are, indeed, discrepancies between the results from data gathered in this context and data gathered in previous studies in different contexts suggesting that further studies are needed to further understanding of how these factors work together.

6.1 Theoretical implications

This study was designed using the assumptions of Blau’s version of the functionalist paradigm which holds that individuals act rational in their own self-interest and that organisations also act in ways that maximise their chances of survival. Trust and OCB are concerned with the choices that individuals make about their personal behaviour whereas leadership style and balanced organisation culture are concerned with the overall behaviour of the larger group. This study demonstrates that data on individual behaviour and organisational characteristics are compatible with each other and can be used within the same conceptual framework to illuminate practical problems.

Our results suggest that the relationship between managers and employees may be affected by the In-Group Collectivism dimension of the GLOBE Survey model of national culture, which forms the basis of the Clan culture type of the CVF model of organisational culture (Cameron and Quinn, 2011), and is essential for the effectiveness of the transformational leadership style in the Middle East region, therefore, also the Southern Asia region which has a similar score on this dimension (House et al., 2004).
6.2 Practical implications

The findings of this study point towards some advice for managers of independent hotels in the Middle East and Southern Asian regions. First, it shows that transactional leadership is at least as important in this context as transformational leadership since it has a direct effect on OCB. From this, it follows that managers should be careful to be transparent and fair with their subordinates, especially in terms of extrinsic rewards. Additionally, since both leadership styles affect trust and OCB through organisational culture, it suggests that managers need to build an organisational culture that fosters trust perhaps both by following rules objectively and by building a sense of belonging and ownership of the organisation. Since In-Group Collectivism (House et al., 2004) has been shown to be important in this region, managers may consider promoting the Clan CVF culture type (Cameron and Quinn, 2011) which would be consistent with a view of the organisation as resembling a family where everyone is valued for who they are while, at the same time, preserving hierarchies.

6.3 Suggestions for further research

It would be useful for practitioners if future research could provide insight into how Clan culture can be promoted in the hospitality industry in this region. Given the theoretical and practical implications, future research might build on this study by examining the specific details of how managers of independent hotels can use extrinsic rewards to motivate staff, perhaps by using Vroom’s Expectancy Theory (Vroom, 1964). Additionally, this study suggests that future research might examine how a sense of belonging and ownership among organisational members might be fostered perhaps using Leader-Member eXchange (LMX) theory (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995).
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Table 1: Respondents’ Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>Under-25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief-Executive</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior-Management</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Management</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior-Management</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Main Constructs, Definitions, Measurement Items, Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities and Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Final Factor Loading (CFA)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational-Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributed-Idealized-Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributed-Idealized-Influence1</td>
<td>FIA1</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>1.263</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributed-Idealized-Influence2</td>
<td>FIA2</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>1.245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributed-Idealized-Influence3</td>
<td>FIA3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Removed/multiple-loadings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributed-Idealized-Influence4</td>
<td>FIA4</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour-Idealized-Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour-Idealized-Influence1</td>
<td>FIB1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Removed/cross-loadings</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour-Idealized-Influence2</td>
<td>FIB2</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>1.371</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour-Idealized-Influence3</td>
<td>FIB3</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>1.288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour-Idealized-Influence4</td>
<td>FIB4</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational-Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational-Motivation1</td>
<td>FIM1</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>1.177</td>
<td>0.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational-Motivation2</td>
<td>FIM2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Removed/low-reliability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational-Motivation3</td>
<td>FIM3</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>1.339</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational-Motivation4</td>
<td>FIM4</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual-Stimulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual-Stimulation1</td>
<td>IS1</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>1.226</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual-Stimulation2</td>
<td>IS2</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual-Stimulation3</td>
<td>IS3</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual-Stimulation4</td>
<td>IS4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Removed/cross-loadings-low-reliability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual-Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual-Consideration1</td>
<td>IC1</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>0.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual-Consideration2</td>
<td>IC2</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>1.265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual-Consideration3</td>
<td>IC3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Removed/multiple-loadings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Individual-Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>IC4</th>
<th>Comm</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>RFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contingent-Reward</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transactional-Leadership

By Amolvo and Bass (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>SR1</th>
<th>Comm</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>RFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contingent-Reward1</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent-Reward2</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent-Reward3</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent-Reward4</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Management-by-Exception (Active)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>SM1</th>
<th>Comm</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>RFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception (Active)1</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception (Active)2</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception (Active)3</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception (Active)4</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Balanced-Organisational-Culture

By Cameron and Quinn (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>BOC1</th>
<th>Comm</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>RFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Clan1</td>
<td>Removed/multiple-loadings-low-reliability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Clan2</td>
<td>Removed/cross-loadings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Clan3</td>
<td>Removed/multiple-loadings-low-reliability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Clan4</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Clan5</td>
<td>BOC5</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Clan6</td>
<td>BOC6</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adhocracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>BOA1</th>
<th>Comm</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>RFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Adhoc1</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Adhoc2</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Adhoc3</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Adhoc4</td>
<td>Removed/cross-loadings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Adhoc5</td>
<td>Removed/multiple-loadings-low-reliability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Adhoc6</td>
<td>Removed/multiple-loadings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>BOM1</th>
<th>Comm</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>RFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Market1</td>
<td>BOM1</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Market2</td>
<td>BOM2</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Market3</td>
<td>BOM3</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Market4</td>
<td>BOM4</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Market5</td>
<td>BOM5</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Market6</td>
<td>BOM6</td>
<td>Removed/multiple-loadings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Hierar1 | BOH1 | .875 | 5.61 | 1.339 |
| Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Hierar2 | BOH2 | .849 | 5.64 | 1.302 |
| Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Hierar3 | BOH3 | .908 | 5.67 | 1.242 |
| Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Hierar4 | BOH4 | .901 | 5.67 | 1.286 |
| Balanced-Organisational-Culture-Hierar5 | BOH5 | Removed/low-reliability |

| Trust 1 | TR1 | .833 | 5.41 | 1.381 |
| Trust 2 | TR2 | .907 | 5.46 | 1.406 |
| Trust 3 | TR3 | .923 | 5.37 | 1.515 |
| Trust 4 | TR4 | .927 | 5.39 | 1.514 |

| Organizational-citizenship-behaviours1 | OCB1 | .839 | 5.70 | 1.421 |
| Organizational-citizenship-behaviours2 | OCB2 | .835 | 5.70 | 1.370 |
| Organizational-citizenship-behaviours3 | OCB3 | Removed/low-reliability |
| Organizational-citizenship-behaviours4 | OCB4 | .852 | 5.65 | 1.459 |
| Organizational-citizenship-behaviours5 | OCB5 | Removed/multiple-loadings |
| Organizational-citizenship-behaviours6 | OCB6 | Removed/multiple-loadings-low-reliability |
| Organizational-citizenship-behaviours7 | OCB7 | .856 | 5.65 | 1.360 |
| Organizational-citizenship-behaviours8 | OCB8 | Removed/multiple-loadings |
| Organizational-citizenship-behaviours9 | OCB9 | Removed/cross-loadings |
Table 3: Discriminant Validity, AVE & CR

|                      | CR   | AVE | MSV | MaxR(H) | BOH  | TR   | OCB  | FIB  | FIM  | FIC  | SC   | FIS  | BOC  | BOA  | BOM  | SM   | FIA  |
|----------------------|------|-----|-----|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Hierarchy-(BOH)      | 0.960| 0.856| 0.182| 0.970   | 0.925|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Trust-(TR)           | 0.941| 0.801| 0.144| 0.962   | 0.205| 0.895|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Organizational-Citizenship-Behaviours-(OCB) | 0.932| 0.820| 0.223| 0.941   | 0.402| 0.379| 0.906|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Behaviour-Idealized-Influence-(FIB) | 0.914| 0.781| 0.384| 0.918   | 0.375| 0.086| 0.349| 0.884|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Inspirational-Motivation-(FIM) | 0.902| 0.755| 0.108| 0.921   | 0.085| 0.110| 0.006| 0.141| 0.869|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Individual-Consideration-(FIC) | 0.939| 0.836| 0.353| 0.959   | 0.416| 0.076| 0.431| 0.528| 0.204| 0.914|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Contingent-Reward-(SC) | 0.921| 0.744| 0.383| 0.925   | 0.285| 0.023| 0.347| 0.619| 0.161| 0.372| 0.863|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Intellectual-Stimulation-(FIS) | 0.925| 0.806| 0.123| 0.947   | 0.094| 0.074| 0.350| 0.209| 0.170| 0.215| 0.178| 0.898|      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Clan-(BOC)           | 0.932| 0.822| 0.115| 0.938   | 0.323| 0.231| 0.339| 0.297| 0.294| 0.188| 0.102| 0.906|      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Adhocracy-(BOA)      | 0.879| 0.709| 0.138| 0.904   | 0.266| 0.178| 0.273| 0.322| 0.024| 0.318| 0.252| 0.061| 0.328| 0.842|      |      |      |      |
| Market-(BOM)         | 0.914| 0.730| 0.108| 0.945   | 0.013| 0.096| 0.134| 0.100| 0.328| 0.036| 0.082| 0.028| -0.034| 0.025| 0.854|      |      |      |      |
| Management-by-Exception-(SM) | 0.944| 0.808| 0.319| 0.949   | 0.427| 0.099| 0.381| 0.484| 0.165| 0.565| 0.445| 0.070| 0.223| 0.309| 0.057| 0.899|      |      |
| Attributed-Idealized-Influence-(FIA) | 0.941| 0.842| 0.384| 0.957   | 0.288| 0.086| 0.472| 0.620| 0.172| 0.594| 0.519| 0.137| 0.328| 0.371| 0.005| 0.490| 0.918|      |
### Table 4: Hypothesis Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Standardised-Regression-Paths</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Balanced-Culture</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>6.156</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>Not-Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Balanced-Cultural-Organisational-Culture</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>2.858</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>2.427</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>4.280</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>Balanced-Organisational-Culture</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>1.838</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>Organisational-Citizenship-Behaviour</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>3.441</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>Organisational-Citizenship-Behaviour</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>200.348</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moderation-effect (size)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DF</th>
<th>CMIN</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.88</td>
<td>200.348</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

Notes: Path = Relationship between IDV on DV; $\beta$ = Standardised-regression-coefficient; S.E. = Standard-error; $p$ = Level of significance.
Figure 1: Research Model
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Figure 2: Validated Model
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- Balanced Organisational Culture
- Trust
- Organisational Citizenship Behaviour

Paths and Path Coefficients:
- Transformational Leadership to Balanced Organisational Culture: 0.682 (p < 0.05)
- Transactional Leadership to Balanced Organisational Culture: -0.029 (p < 0.05)
- Balanced Organisational Culture to Trust: 1.43 (p < 0.05)
- Trust to Organisational Citizenship Behaviour: 0.30 (p < 0.05)
- Organisational Citizenship Behaviour to Trust: 0.43 (p < 0.05)
The sample drawn from the population should be representative so that it allowed the researcher to make inferences or generalisation from the sample statistics to the population understudied. The sample survey gives an opportunity to gain the essential information from a relatively few respondents to explain the characteristics of the entire population.

The sample of 33% compared to the target population (160) was drawn from the population which should be representative so that it allowed the researchers to make inferences or generalisation from the sample statistics to the population under study.
We would like to thank both reviewers for their valuable comments. We have considered all comments very carefully and made some major changes to our paper. Those parts that include major changes we have highlighted them in yellow but we have also made so many small changes that we could not highlight in yellow.

Correct the formatting of the references to the style of the journal. Thanks for your comments. We have made changes and used the Emerald Harvard ref system.

Generally there are few editorial errors - but some remain - please check carefully. Thanks for your comments we have made some major changes to the paper and managed to correct those editorial errors.

**Reviewer 1**

This is most important early-stage work that needs replication and extension. Thank you for your diligence. Please consider incorporating the LMX literature in your future work as it may inform both your inquiry and findings.

Thanks for your comments. We have considered your comments very carefully and strongly agree with you that in future researches we should consider the LMX more seriously when the nature of study is based on individual analysis.

P4:58-59: Please establish the basis for the claim the OCBs are not motivated by expectations of "rewards". You appear to claim that OCBs are not elements of a transactional leadership response...

Thanks for your comments, we have made some changes in to the test.

Text added:

It has been shown that the relationship between transformational leadership and some of the elements of OCB (sportsmanship, civic virtue and conscientiousness) are mediated by trust (Moorman et al., 2018). Similarly, transactional leadership is has also been shown to be positively correlated with OCB (Rodrigues and Ferreria, 2015). However, leadership, trust and OCB all take place in the context of organisational culture which is implemented by the senior management (Schein, 2017).

P4:29-34: Can we assume that employees and managers in these Iranian hotels reflect local cultures?

We can make this assumption since, first, there has been very little immigration into Iran in recent decades and, second, when the questionnaires were distributed to hotel managers they came with instructions that they were only to be completed by Iranians.

P6:37-40: Please justify the claim that culture is not a result of individual level choices (leader or member) and therefore cannot be related to rational choice theory.

Thanks for your comments, we have considered your points carefully and made some changes.

Text modified:

We address this problem from within the functionalist paradigm (Burrell and Morgan, 1979), specifically basing our approach on
Blau’s (1964) Social Exchange Theory (SET) which brings together the principle of autonomous actors acting rationally in their own self-interest to analyse the interactions between individuals while simultaneously acknowledging the agency of groups in their self-preservation. What is good for the individual is not necessarily good for the group, and vice versa. Thus, from the viewpoint of an autonomous actor an altruistic act may be destructive while being beneficial from the viewpoint of the group. Similarly, while the existence of culture at either the national or organisational levels is explicable at the level of the individual by a need for uniformity of values and expected behaviour to reduce friction in interactions, many characteristics of national and organisational culture call for altruism on the part of individual members. Both national and organisational culture tend to prevail over individual considerations and, therefore, have a demonstrable bearing on organisational effectiveness.

**P6:46-51:** While transactional approaches may include specificity, this is by no means a requirement. Please justify or modify your narrative.

**Text modified by removing the word ‘specific’ which is unnecessary.**

**P8:5-6:** Please flesh out the claim that transactional approaches do not allow subordinate creativity. Such creativity may in fact be an element of the exchange.

**Thanks for your comments, as objective researchers we sometimes need to mention some points that are in literature which we may not necessarily agree with it. In this case, we are simply reporting what has been found in a previous study and published in very well established journal in Hospitality. Having said that we have some minor changes.**

**Text added to clarify context:**

However, this leadership style has been criticised for not encouraging the creative abilities of subordinates in the hospitality context (Dai et al., 2013)

**P9:17-22:** Please share Hartnell et al.’s (2011) suggestion and justification with your readers. This is not a clear claim from your narrative.

**Thanks for your comments, we have made some changes.**

**Text added:**

We have adopted balanced organisational culture for this study because, as suggested by Hartnell et al. (2011), a mix of the CVF organisational culture types where all four are represented is likely to bring about a perception among employees that managers...
are open to different points of view which are fairly considered on their merits. This helps to create a context conducive to positive organisational characteristics, such as trust and OCB that, in turn, lead to effectiveness.

P9:23ff: Trust is positively associated with LMX....

Thanks for the point

It is possible to look at organisations as being formed by individuals – the classic SET approach that is also followed in LMX - or as forming the individual members, as seen from a cultural approach. This is how Blau’s approach is being used here; that is, it is being used because it transcends this dichotomy. It would, therefore, be contradictory to introduce LMX here since it is concerned with the relationships between individual leaders and subordinates and does not tell us about the organisation as a whole, though it might be recommended as an approach for further research.

P15:17ff: Please discuss:
- the potential impact of your approach to sampling.
- the fact that 52/160 hotels agreed to participate. Are the hotels within and beyond your frame identical in terms of meaningful characteristics?
- how confidentiality was conveyed and provided? Would the respondents expect adherence to such?

We really appreciate your points here which made use to do some major changes and made the paper much better and stronger.

Text modified:

This data was collected between August 2018, and March 2019. The participants were selected using convenience sampling (McDaniel and Gates, 2006) due to convenient accessibility to the relevant information from the Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Handicrafts and Tourism (2019).

The initial sample of 160 hotels comprised all the officially registered independent hotels in the 6 major tourist cities of Tehran, Isfahan, Yazd, Mashhad, Kish and Shiraz (Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Handicrafts and Tourism, 2019) out of which 52 agreed to participate. This sample amounted to 33% of the target population which was large enough to be representative and allowed the researchers to generalise from the sample statistics to the population under study (Hair et al., 2006; Malhotra and Birks, 2000; Salant and Dillman, 1994). 1150 questionnaires were sent to employee and manager participants from which 392 usable questionnaires were returned and analysed.

The instrument consisted of questions about managers’ and employees’ perceptions of the
impact of leadership style, balanced organisation culture and trust on OCB. The data were collected by online and the face-to-face methods, and, to increase the sample size and make sure that the sample included the most knowledgeable informants, non-probability ‘snowballing’ was used as a distribution method by asking initial informants to suggest others who could offer further insights (Goodman, 1961). To keep the non-response rate to a minimum, participants were given a statement of the aim of the research and participants were guaranteed that their information would be treated with the utmost confidentiality (Sekaran, 2003).

P16:29-32: This addresses early and late responders, not non-respondents. How did the non-respondents differ, if at all, from the respondents?

Many thanks for your comments and Appreciate your concerns. We considered your points very carefully and made some major changes

Text added:

Non-response bias “involves the assumption that people who are more interested in the subject of a questionnaire respond more readily and that non-response bias occurs on items in which the subject's answer is related to his interest in the questionnaire” (Armstrong and Overton, 1977, p.2). On a recommendation by Lambert and Harrington (1990) non-response bias was calculated by using the Mann-Whitney U-test on early and late participants, as well as on non-respondents compared with the entire sample (for both online and hard copy) for the means of all research variables, by taking the first 50 observations to be the early participants and the last 50 observations to be the late participants. We found no difference between online and hard copy data collection method. The results show that the significance values in the research variables are not less than 0.5 probability value, which is insignificant. Therefore, the result suggests that there was no statistically significant difference between early and late questionnaire submission and non-response bias was not a concern.

P15:34-44: How does your sample compare to the target population to which you wish to generalize?

Thanks for your comments following your previous comments on meaningful characteristics we have modified the section and mentioned it in the previous section (P15:17ff) and because we did not want to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 44 of 48</th>
<th>International Journal of Culture, Tourism, and Hospitality Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repeat ourselves we did not add the sentence here again</strong></td>
<td><strong>Thanks for your comments and made some changes to our text</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **40-57: Many items were dropped for a variety of reasons. It would be useful for the readers to know what the retained and dropped items measured as well as the specific reasons for why they were dropped. Did the dropping of items impact the measurement of desired constructs? Are you still measuring what you purport to be measuring?** | **Text added:**
| FIA3, IC3, BOA6, BOM6, OCB5, OCB8 were excluded due to multiple loadings on two factors. Furthermore, BOC1, BOA5, BOC3, OCB6 were dropped due to multiple loadings on two factors as well as low reliability. In addition, FIB1, BOC2, BOA4, OCB9 were deleted due to cross-loadings on extra factors, and IS4 was removed for cross-loadings on extra factors and low reliability. The dropping of items did not impact the measurement of anticipated constructs, as each construct had minimum three items to carry out the relevant measurement.** |
| **3ff: Please increase your explicit use of invoked theories in explaining your findings. That is, how do the theories that you used to inform your inquiry square up with your results?** | **Thanks for your comments, we have made some small changes in differences place to make sure theories are clearer. Invoked theories are used to their fullest appropriate extent.** |
| **Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes. The combined theoretical approach and the sample frame both independently lead to this conclusion** | **Thanks for your comments** |
| **Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: The understanding of the literature is well established with the caveat that the body of work on Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) within and beyond hospitality has been ignored. LMX is a prominent SET approach to leadership with potential for transformational elements and should be considered. At this point, at minimum in the discussion and explanation of findings.** | **Thanks for your comments**
| **We have addressed these comments in the previous section in details** |
| **Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: The methodology is** | **Thanks for your comments**
| **We have made appropriate changes** |
Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Yes.

Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper? The research raises interesting and important questions for the hospitality and tourism academies, but it is too early to speak of significant practical or societal impact.

Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal’s readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: It is well written, although a description of scale items rather than just using alphanumeric codes would be helpful.

6.3 Suggestions for further Research

Given the theoretical and practical implications, future research might build on this study by examining the specific details of how managers of independent hotels can use extrinsic rewards to motivate staff, perhaps by using Vroom’s Expectancy Theory (Vroom, 1964). Additionally, this study suggests that future research might examine how a sense of belonging and ownership among organisational members might be fostered perhaps using Leader-Member eXchange (LMX) theory (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995).

Reviewer 2

Need to revise as comments. Author need to more detail on methodology part and make sure all method are suitable. We would like take this opportunity and thanks the reviewer for their valuable comments. We have considered all comments very carefully and made some major and minor changes to our paper

Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: This paper contain significant information to the knowledge and theory but need some revise. Thanks for your comments

Introduction acceptable. Thanks for your comments and we have made some minor changes here
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem statement - should be clear statement to show OCB problem among independent hotel.</th>
<th>Text in opening paragraph altered: The human resource is a major source of competitive advantage in this industry (Nazarian, et al., 2017; Nazarian et al., 2020) so scholars have devoted much attention to the problem of how managers can encourage spontaneous and unsupervised behaviour among employees that increases organisational effectiveness (Organ, 2018; Solnet et al., 2015).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Acceptable</td>
<td>Thanks for your comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology:</td>
<td>Many thanks for your concerns. As we used the validated item measurements from the previous scholars, based on the suggestion by Hair et al. 2014, there is no need to pre-test the questionnaire. However, after translation-back-translation, 5 academics reviewed the items for content validity and 3 academics assessed for face validity. This study is a confirmatory study using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to test various hypothesis that measures the relationship between the observed variables and their underlying construct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This paper didn’t mention about pre-test of questionnaire validation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Need to revise is it snowballing technique suitable because of to larger unit of analysis.</td>
<td>Many thanks for your suggestion, the data were collected by online and the face-to-face methods, and, to increase the sample size and make sure that the sample included the most knowledgeable informants, non-probability ‘snowballing’ technique was used as a distribution method by asking initial informants to suggest others who could offer further insights (Goodman, 1961). To keep the non-response rate to a minimum, the survey was supplemented by the aim of the research and participants were guaranteed that their information would be treated with the utmost confidentiality (Sekaran, 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Need to reconfirm and check either this study exploratory or confirmatory and justify clearly.</td>
<td>Much appreciated your concerns. This study is based on explanatory study as we are following positivism approach. Based on your valuable suggestion, the word of exploratory was removed from conclusion and practical implications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This was designed as an exploratory study to investigate if the relationships between certain antecedents of OCB were the same in a sample of managers of Iranian independent hotels as would be expected in a Western or East Asian context.

Despite being an exploratory study, our findings point towards some advice for managers of independent hotels in the Middle East and Southern Asian regions.

The findings of this study point towards some advice for managers of independent hotels in the Middle East and Southern Asian regions.

Many thanks for your concerns. As we used the validated item measurements from the previous scholars, based on the suggestion by Hair et al. 2014, there is no need to employ EFA.

In addition, based on suggestion by Anderson and Gerbing (1982), this study followed two stages to analysis the SEM data. The first stage tests the measurement properties of the underlying latent variables in the model using confirmatory factor analysis for each construct.

The measurement model explains the causal relations among the observed indicators (variables) and respective latent constructs (variables) (Anderson and Gerbing, 1982; Chau, 1997) to the unidimensionality assumption. Unidimensionality is assessed by the overall fit of the confirmatory model (Garver and Mentzer, 1999). Unidimensionality refers to a set of indicators that has only one underlying construct (Hair et al., 1998). Confirmatory factor analysis examines another important property, the unidimensionality of scale originally and is developed by exploratory factor analysis (Steenkamp and van Trijp, 1991). A confirmatory measurement model was used during this stage to classify the strong association between observed variables and respective constructs (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988) to ensure that the standardised factor loading values are greater than 0.6 or above. Confirmatory factor analysis was computed in
order to examine whether each subset of items is internally consistent (Parasuraman et al., 1998).

The validity and reliability of the construct is significant for further theory testing. CFA allows the computation of an additional estimation of a construct’s reliability, namely composite reliability (Gerbing and Anderson, 1988, Hair et al., 1998).

At the second stage, a structural model was used to test the development of a measurement, which confirms the relationships between a construct and its indicators and examination of the structural model to demonstrate the causal connection among latent constructs (Anderson and Gerbing, 1982). The constructs may all be measured by latent variables, by observed variables or by a combination of the two.

Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: - Need to add in more industrial implication and future studies.

Thanks for your email
We have made some changes into managerial implication and future studies

Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal’s readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: acceptable.

Thanks for your comments