

Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology (2012), 85, 421–432 © 2011 The British Psychological Society Short research note Leader and follower organizational identification: The mediating role of leader behaviour and implications for follower OCB Sebastian C. Schuh^{1*}, Xin-an Zhang², Nikolai W. Egold¹, Matthias M. Graf¹, Diwakar Pandey³ and Rolf van Dick¹ ¹Goethe University, Frankfurt, Germany ²Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China ³Universal College of Medical Sciences, Bhairahawa, Nepal

The transfer model of organizational identification (OI) posits a trickle-down process of OI from leaders to followers. Despite this cumulated evidence, however, two important questions have remained unanswered: first, it is still unclear how leaders affect their employees' OI. Even though van Dick et al. (2007) suggested that transformational leadership (TFL) behaviours such as showing dedication to the cause of the group may play a central role in this process, none of the previous studies have examined the behavioural links that connect leader OI and follower OI. More specifically, while previous research has found a positive relationship between TFL and follower OI (e.g., Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003) as well as between follower OI and followers' group-oriented efforts (e.g., Riketta, 2005), this is, to our best knowledge, the first study that examines the link between leader OI and (group-oriented) leadership behaviour. See the Terms and Conditions (<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions>) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

424 Sebastian C. Schuh et al. (83 supervisors and 437 followers), Walumbwa, Avolio, and Zhu (2008) reported that employees' OI mediated the link between TFL and employee performance.

Transformational leadership L1: $TFL_{ij} = 0j + 1j(F_age_{ij}) + 2j(F_gender_{ij}) + 3j(F_age_{ij}L_age_{ij}) + 4j(F_gender_{ij}L_gender_{ij}) + r_{ij}$
L2: $0j = 00 + 01(L_age_{ij}) + 02(L_gender_{ij}) + 03(L_OI_{ij}) + u_{0j}$
L2: $1j = 10$ $2j = 20$ $3j = 30$ $4j = 40$
Follower age (10) Leader age (01) Follower gender (20) Leader gender (02) F_age x L_age (30) F_gender x L_gender Leader OI (03)
-.25 .19 -.08 .09 .19 .26 -.18 .19 .09 .05 -.07 .21 .25 -.01 -.01 -.79 -.62 .00 .62 .07 .02 .62 .34 .00 .50
.21 .04 .05 .45 .20 .00 .37 .13 .07 CI indirect effect (95%) ~R2 .40 .10 [.083, .085] .41 (40) * * * ~R2

2. Follower OI L1: $F_OI_{ij} = 0j + 1j(F_age_{ij}) + 2j(F_gender_{ij}) + 3j(F_age_{ij}L_age_{ij}) + 4j(F_gender_{ij}L_gender_{ij})$
.14 + 5j(TFL_{ij}) + r_{ij}
L2: $0j = 00 + 01(L_age_{ij}) + 02(L_gender_{ij}) + 03(L_OI_{ij}) + u_{0j}$
L2: $1j = 10$ $2j = 20$ $3j = 30$ $4j = 40$ $5j = 50$
.24 Follower age (10) Leader age (01) Follower gender (20) Leader gender (02) F_age x L_age (30) F_gender x L_gender Leader OI (03) TFL (50) CI indirect effect (95%) .03 -.09 .15 .25 -.03 -.18 .05 .32 .22 .10 .31 .20 .06 .24 .11 .08 .05 .08 -.34 -.53 .00 .23 -.02 .28 (40) (40) * * * [.016, .168] .11 [.075, .386] .28 ~R2

3. Follower OCB L1: $F_OCB_{ij} = 0j + 1j(F_age_{ij}) + 2j(F_gender_{ij}) + 3j(F_age_{ij}L_age_{ij}) + 4j(F_gender_{ij}L_gender_{ij}) + 5j(TFL_{ij}) + 6j(F_OI_{ij}) + r_{ij}$
L2: $0j = 00 + 01(L_age_{ij}) + 02(L_gender_{ij}) + 03(L_OI_{ij}) + u_{0j}$
L2: $1j = 10$ $2j = 20$ $3j = 30$ $4j = 40$ $5j = 50$ $6j = 60$
Follower age (10) Leader age (01) Follower gender (20) Leader gender (02) F_age x L_age (30) F_gender x L_gender Leader OI (03) TFL (50) Follower OI (60) .00 .05 .01 .05 .06 .45 * .00 .00 -.17 .37 * * *

Note. [Corrections added on 14 December 2011 after initial online publication on 7 November 2011: some data were corrupted during typesetting to erroneously include minus signs; the data have been corrected in this version of the article.] OI transfer and leadership behaviour 427 .10 .75 .51 .21 -.05 .14 * * .34 .07

** 20448325, 2012, 2, Downloaded from

<https://bpspsychub.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2011.02044.x> by University Of

Texas–Arlington, Wiley Online Library on [14/09/2023]. Across three studies, van Dick et al. (2007) found support for the proposed link between leader OI and employee OI. Several studies have replicated these findings in a wide range of organizational contexts including pharmaceutical companies, retail organizations, and schools (Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, & Maxham III, 2010; Schuh, Egold, & van Dick, 2011; Wieseke, Ahearne, Lam, & van Dick, 2009). See the Terms and Conditions (<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions>) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

Transformational leadership We used Bass and Avolio's (1995) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X short scale to assess employees' perceptions of TFL. DOI: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.2011.02044.x 422 Sebastian C. Schuh et al. o

Furthermore, our findings suggest that this transfer of OI is not restricted to leader–follower links in western, individualistic societies but also applies to China, characterized by more collectivistic values. OI, organizational identification; TFL, transformational leadership; OCB, organizational citizenship behaviour; L_age, leader age; F_age, follower age; L_gender, leader gender; F_gender, follower gender; ~R², pseudo-R²; CI, confidence interval.* 421 The British Psychological Society www.wileyonlinelibrary.com

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Sebastian C. Schuh, Department of Psychology and Sports Sciences, Goethe University Frankfurt, Kettenhofweg 128, 60054 Frankfurt am Main, Germany (e-mail: sebastian.schuh@stud.uni-frankfurt.de). The hypothesized two-factor measurement model yielded an acceptable level of fit ($\chi^2 = 320.0$, $df = 76$; comparative fit index (CFI) = .91; standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) = .07) and fitted the data significantly better than the one-factor model combining both variables ($\chi^2 = 6.1$; $df = 1$, p