Fall 2017

BIS SENIOR RESEARCH PAPER

Kaycee R. Geeding
Murray State University, geedingkaycee@yahoo.com

BIS SENIOR RESEARCH PAPER

Kaycee R. Geeding

DECEMBER 1, 2017

MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY
Commerce and Leadership

What is the relationship between leadership styles, organizational communication and organizational citizenship behavior?

INTRODUCTION

You can not underestimate the power of communication…but communication doesn't always just happen; you must make a conscious effort to make communication a top priority in all you do (Mulroy, 2016) Communication is the strongest instrument a leader or manager can implement or put down if they know how to use it (Raducan, Raducan, 2014). Realistically it can make or break an organization. Having to go to work is sometimes a struggle but wouldn't you love going to a job that you enjoyed each day? The plethora of knowledge and information discussed in this paper will provide an excellence source of knowledge for both leaders and employees. As we work thorough the information you will begin to see the relationship between several contributory aspects of organizations, low they communicate, who is communicating and what it means for those employed by the organization.

The success or failure of a leader depend on the ability to communicate, to work together with subordinates (Raducan, Raducan, 2014). Before constructing this paper, I did not view an organization as a cohesive unit. Yes, everyone has their own part and jobs to perform at different levels, but the success of the organization is really built on a single objective. What is the message? And, how is the organization going to communicate it so that it maximizes results?

This paper challenges its readers to examine themselves and the messages they are sending in the workplace. I found myself looking inward as I wrote this paper and evaluating my own personal communication and leadership styles. It really encourages me to think about the

goals of the organization I work for and the leadership styles within it. Having a leader that always puts employee needs at the top of her priority list makes it easy to go above and beyond the job description. She often communicates face-to-face and is always emailing asking for our insights on various aspects of the job. This gives me a sense of purpose in my work and encourages me to continue doing my very best in my position. Her authenticity in her communication encourages the concept known as organizational citizenship behaviors, or voluntary behaviors that benefit the organization without the promise of a reward in return. We will be digging deeper into the meaning and importance of these behaviors and what it is exactly that influences employees to engage.

This topic is significant to all current and future employees. Leadership styles, organizational communication and their relation to organizational citizenship behaviors is not common knowledge but applicable to a very large population in the workforce. The information in the following pages will prove itself to be rich in information and will be influential to leaders and followers alike.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership Styles

Scholars have long been concerned about the effects of leadership style on an organization. To understand their concerns, it is important to look at various leadership styles and their associations. Leadership is the ability to move a group towards a common goal that would not be met if a leader had not been there (Graham, 1997). Differences in leadership styles could be an organizational variable affecting job satisfaction among other variables in the workplace. Previous research on leadership describes it as a relational concept. It is a social

influence process in which the leader seeks the voluntary participation of subordinates in an effort to reach organizational goals (Olasupo,2011). Olasupo (2011) suggests a pattern that can be identified when examining leaders and their methods of communicating with their subordinates. Various leadership patterns have different implications for employee satisfaction and performance.

Leadership is dynamic, and is built by means of an ongoing process requiring considerable time and organizational resources and culture (Fleishman, Mumford, Zaccaro, Levin, Korotkin, & Hein, 1991; Wiersemama & Bantel, 1992). Previous studies on leadership and organizations affirm leadership's significant role in steering organizational culture and organizational change (Rymer, 2008).

To understand the role of effective leadership within the workplace one should look deeper in the concepts. Arti Appannah and Simon Biggs (2015) focus on a psychological paradigm providing perspective in the workplace, and describes how it encompasses a multi-leveled framework to accommodate employees across organizations. The framework described in the literature is designed for organizations to be better equipped and prepared to accommodate employees. Level 1 focuses on the physical setting of the workplace; level 2 covers values and goals of the organization that may directly affect older workers; and level 3 encompasses assumptions of the current employees in the organization. The paradigm is divided into three levels, but focus should be on the following: level 2 of the paradigm includes various qualities of leadership that are believed to provide a generic framework across organizations. Variables include a supporting uptake of policies, nurturing and supportive leadership style, career planning and development, and leading by example (Appannah, Biggs, 2015). All of these

variables can be studied collectively or individually when making decision in their leadership roles.

Communicative literature suggests that creating constructive working relationships that can sustain workplace initiatives is reliant of communication that is inclusive. It is recommended that staff have access to relevant information and resources where appropriate. In a review of the relation between interpersonal communication behaviors and human-oriented leadership and task oriented leadership it is concluded that human-oriented leadership is mainly communicative, while task-oriented leadership is much less so (Vries, Bakker-Peiper, Oostenvald, 2010,). Task and relations oriented leadership were examined and explained by the literature. Task orientation focuses on the efficient achievement of a goal. Scheduling, monitoring and employee production are all traits of this type of leadership. There is a focus on achievement and not the leader-subordinate relationship. On the other hand, relations-oriented leadership behaviors are helpful, supportive and the objective is to help employees feel comfortable in their job and responsibilities. Relations-oriented leadership behaviors can include expressing encouragement to employees, increased levels of trust, respect and camaraderie between the leader and the employees, and cooperation between employees (Mikkelson, York, Arritola, 2015). This type of communication style has been associated with increased flow of communication among leaders and subordinates. The relational aspects of communication and human-oriented leadership focus on interpersonal variables including, warmth and concern. Whereas in task-oriented leadership there is more emphasis on the content of the information being communicated rather than how the information is being relayed.

Goal-oriented leadership and maintaining healthy interpersonal communication relationships is believed to aide employees in accomplishing tasks at work. When supervisors are

clear in their communication of expectations, objectives and procedures, employees should be better able to perform their job-related tasks. Mikkelson et al (2015) hypothesized: because employees can be more skilled in their work when supervisors communicate effectively, meaning effective communication should be positively related to employee outcomes such as job satisfaction, motivation and organizational commitment (Mikkelson, York, Arritola, 2015). Organizational commitment has a small but consistent relationship to productivity. Specifically, individuals who are satisfied with their job typically have higher quality work performance and job productivity (Mikkelson, York, Arritola, 2015).

Another hypothesis from the provided literature discusses a positive relationship between relations-oriented leadership communication and employee job satisfaction, motivation and organizational commitment (Mikkelson, York, Arritola, 2015). As represented in Table 4, the analysis revealed that relations-oriented leadership was significantly related to job satisfaction, motivation and organizational commitment (Mikkelson, York, Arritola, 2015). It presents predictor variables from a regression analysis that are related to organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 4 claimed that relations -oriented leadership would be positively related to the employee outcomes of job satisfaction, motivation and organizational commitment. Relations-oriented leadership focuses on building strong relationships with employees by treating employees with respect, and has been found to be consistently related to job satisfaction. Thus, it

Table 4. Hierarchical Regression Predicting Organizational Commitment ($N = 276$).

Predictor variables	B	SE B	β	ΔR^2
Step 1				.10**
Length of time in organization	.02	.02	.08	
Length of time with supervisor	.11	.04	.26**	
Step 2				.24**
Length of time in organization	.01	.02	.05	
Length of time with supervisor	.07	.03	.16*	
Task leadership	.00	.11	−.00	
Relations-oriented leadership	36	.11	.30**	
Appropriateness	.08	.08	.05	
Effectiveness	.32	.13	.21*	

Note. Total $R^2 = .35$; adjusted $R^2 = .33$; $F(6, 242) = 20.79$.
$p < .001$. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

is reasonable that Hypothesis 4 was supported given that most employees was to have a good relationship with their supervisor (Mikkelson, York, Arritola, 2015,).

Given that an employee's direct supervisor has the greatest influence on whether a person will leave their job, the use of competent communication and leadership styles becomes even more important. Simply put, leadership is enacted through communication. A leader's ability to accomplish the tasks required and to do so in a way that increases motivation, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment is connected to that leader's level of communication competence and leadership style (Mikkelson, York, Arritola, 2015).

Vries et al. (2010) claims that charismatic leadership has been closely related to human-oriented leadership and transformational leadership, which will be discussed later. A study reviewed in the literature separates leadership style from leadership communication and examines the outcome variables associated with differences in each. The satisfaction of employees and how this compares with the leadership styles of their leaders has been extensively studied in the business and organizational communication fields. Literature discussing relationship management refers to satisfaction as the degree to which parties are satisfied with each other, or a favorable feeling. It is reasonable to assume that transformational leaders breed satisfaction based on their communication characteristics; they genuinely care about the well-being and feelings of their followers. They are open to different opinions and encourage employee involvement in the decision-making process.

Burris et al. (2014) examines the Leadership Member Exchange Theory (LMX) and the outcomes of having different relationships between supervisors and subordinates. High quality LMX relationships and positive workplace outcomes encourage increased job satisfaction, decreased turnover intent, and decreased actual turnover (Burris, Collins, Meyer, 2014). The

authors assumed this theory was the same for all subordinates but found different results from different subordinates. The literature uses the phrase "job embeddedness" when referring to the extent in which workers feel a connection with their job. Job embeddedness relates to different outcomes within the organization including voluntary turnover, actual turnover, attitudes at work as well as performance.

The explanation for the link between positive LMX and organizational outcomes comes from the styles of leadership implemented within the organization. When employees are comfortable that their working style is approved by their supervisors they send less energy working to maintain the supervisor-subordinate relationship and can focus on their task. The literature suggests that the link between LMX and job embeddedness may be affected by gender as well. Perceptions vary from male and female regarding the relationship between work and their superiors. Specifically, female subordinates appear to place more value on communal leader behaviors whereas both genders value agentic leader behaviors (Burrus, Collins, Meyer, 2014). Differential leader-member exchange relationships can create fissures within teams and cause members to perceive the leader and the organization as being unjust (Buunk, Collins, et al., 1995), hamper communication effectiveness, (Hooper & Martin, 2008), and lead to coworkers attributing labels and biases to each other and acting on such assumptions based on the specific level of leader-member exchange each share (Baker, Omilion-Hodges, 2013).

Accordingly, Men (2014) suggest transformational leaders communicate well and closely interact with employees to understand and address their higher order needs. Based on this suggestion it would be reasonable to assume this type of leadership is communicating a desirable, inspirational, and attainable vision. Meaning that transformational leaders give followers a sense of purpose within the organization and thus improve their relational

satisfaction among their subordinates. Research on transformational leadership has demonstrated its positive impact on employee attitudes and behaviors such as, trust in leaders, job satisfaction, satisfaction with leaders, leader-follower relationships, organizational commitment, loyalty, task performance, employee perception of organizational reputation, and organizational citizenship (Men, 2014). The literature describes transformational leaders as using this type of information-rich communication to employees. Nurturing employee relationships creates a productive and efficient environment that in turn cultivates external organizational relations and builds quality relationships. Leadership at different levels in an organization determines organizational culture, climate and communication. Different types of leadership, which advocate different styles and communication channels to influence followers, constitute a major component of internal communication systems (Men, 2014).

Furthermore, transformational leadership theory posits that leaders can transform followers in three essential ways: by increasing their awareness of task importance; by focusing them first on team or organizational goals; and by activating their higher order needs (Neufeld, Wan, Fang, 2010). Communication is most effective when it leads to shared understanding. Effective transformational leaders tend to craft their messages carefully, are open to followers' input, communicate candidly, and appeal to followers' aspirations in order to gain followers' trust and commitment. The most effective leaders interact and communicate with their followers frequently (Neufeld, Wan, Fang, 2010).

The findings of the study exhibited a positive link between leadership and communication effectiveness for both transformational leadership behaviors and transactional contingent reward leadership behaviors. The implication of this finding is that managers who are perceived to demonstrate strong leadership behaviors, whether transformational or transactional,

will also be seen as engaging in effective communication behaviors. This finding establishes a link that is often assumed in leadership literature. The high correlations between leadership behavior and communication effectiveness constructs suggest substantial conceptual overlap, in other words, the act of leadership appears to be tied to the act of communication (Neufeld, Wan, Fang, 2010).

It is necessary to note knowledge sharing could be classified as an important communication concept that is supported by the characteristics of the transformational leadership style affecting employee performance. The literature, within the context of an effective communicative leader suggests when employees have ready access to information they are more likely to look for answers internally rather than turning to outside sources. The literature suggests that knowledge sharing is a product of communicating closely with your employees. It would be reasonable to assume that this concept impacts the willingness of employees to share information with one another.

Outside of employee performance it is important to discuss the affects transformational leadership could have on organizational performance as well. Results from a cross-sectional survey are presented by Emmanuel Ogbonna and Lloyd C. Harris (2000). They examined the link between leadership style, organizational culture, and performance across companies in the United Kingdom. Results from previous literature in the fields of organizational culture and leadership finds that the two areas have been independently linked to organizational performance.

Style and behavioral theorists shifted the emphasis away from characteristics of the leader to the behavior and style the leader adopted. The principal conclusion of these studies appears to be that leaders who adopt democratic or participative styles are more successful. In

other words, early studies focused on identifying one best way to lead (Ogbonna, Harris, 2000). Recent studies have contrasted transactional leadership with transformational leadership. Transactional leaders are said to be instrumental and frequently focus on exchange relationship with their subordinates. In contrast, transformational leaders are argued to be visionary and enthusiastic, with an inherent ability to motivate subordinates (Ogbonna, Harris, 2000). The following table presents an analysis of the components used to measure leadership style.

a. Leadership Communication

The purpose of communication in an organization is to effect change and to influence action toward the welfare of the organization. Communication is essential for the internal functioning of enterprises because it integrates the managerial functions (Solaja, Idowu, James, 2016). The style of communicating ideas, information and knowledge in a joint or collective activity is imperative; without effective communication style among the group of individuals, the intensity to attain collective goals will be difficult (Solaja, Idowu, James, 2016).

The literature defines communication styles as the individual way of thinking, temperament, and perception of social reality during interaction or dissemination of information. Communication style is natural and culturally nurtured, therefore, it is individualistic, and it is determined by the way people conduct themselves, perceives and observed others as well as their perspectives on social reality. Consequently, communication style plays a pivotal role in workplace relationships at the vertical and horizontal level of organizational communication (Solaja, Idowu, James, 2016).

Communication is perceived to be easy for leaders. Most people in a supervisory position have the ability to speak. However, the ability to speak is not the same as the ability to communicate. The capacity to construct a message, address it to another, listen for feedback, process it, and continue to communicate in ways that are understood requires a complex set of skills that take time and effort to develop. Effective leadership messages work to create a bond of trust between leader and follower (Baldoni, 2004).

Baldoni (2004) breaks down effective leadership communication into four goals; it informs, involves, ignites, and invites. Inform people of what the issues are and how those issues relate to them and their role in the organization. There is emphasis in *showing* subordinates information so that they know the vision, mission, and values of the organization will help them to succeed. The leader also needs to get people involved; even if that simply means listening. When people sense they are being listened to, they are more likely to buy into the message. Ignite imaginations and get people passionate about their goals and organization. When people hear the enthusiasm, and feel the energy they are more likely to jump on board and lastly, invite people to participate.

A study conducted by Derrick J, Neufeld, Zeying Wan, and Yulin Fang (2008) examined how physical distance influenced leader-follower communication effectiveness and leadership performance. Their findings support statements made from prior literature on leadership communication effectiveness, so it seemed necessary to discuss. Consistent with empirical findings, transformational leadership was associated more strongly with perceived leader performance than transactional contingent reward leadership. Communication effectiveness was also a strong predictor of leader performance, and furthermore acted as a mediator of leadership behavior on performance (Neufeld, Wan, Fang, 2010). Within the framework of leadership

styles, it is suggested that emphasis be placed on the importance of leader communication. Amanda Henderson (2015) explores the significance of leadership communication and how it can be used to build and maintain good working relationships. Having a plan in place helps achieve goals and provides guidance and motivation along the way. When staff better understand what is being proposed they are better positioned to develop an effective plan to implement the necessary changes, however, the complication lies in the method of communication. Research suggest that there is not a clear establishment for communication practices among leaders that sustain motivation and vision. Initially the vision is cultivated and processed and eventually the drive for long-term change gets lost in the process. For longer-term benefits, communication practices need to explore how to maintain staff well-being and relationships (Henderson, 2015).

For leaders, identifying and using appropriate communication styles is a challenge as communication needs to extend up and out on all levels. Specifically, messages from leaders to followers. Leadership messages affirm the organizational vision and mission that inspire and cultivate change in the workplace. It is suggested that overtime, leaders should reinforce what the organization stands for, where it is going, and how it will accomplish goals (Baldoni, 2004).

Communication styles are related to a number of outcome variables and to some, but not all, leadership styles. A meta-analysis referenced by Vries et al. (2010) revealed positive relations between both transformational and charismatic leadership, along with the corresponding communication characteristics, and subordinates job satisfaction, satisfaction with the leader, motivation, leader effectiveness and group performance. There were no significant differences between charismatic and transformational leadership, suggesting the two constructs are interchangeable (Vries, Bakker-Peiper, Oostenvald, 2010).

Positive outcomes for communication effectiveness seem to be common regarding human-oriented leadership; Vries et al. found it to be strongly related to subordinates' job satisfaction, satisfaction with the leader, and leadership effectiveness than task-oriented leadership (Vries, Bakker-Peiper, Oostenvald, 2010). The evidence presents a question of the extent the information affects communication styles. It was suspected that the relations were significant and different variables should be considered when examining communication styles.

Upon further investigation, Bakker-Peiper and de Vries found that communication styles are related to personality suggesting that conclusion on the effectiveness of their leadership could also be drawn from their findings. Communication styles do have incremental validity over personality, the concept may help further our understanding of leadership. They suggest that communication styles have incremental validity over personality in predicting leader outcomes due to the relevance of communication for leadership.

Personality traits are reflected in all behaviors of an individual, whereas communication styles are reflected in a subset of (communication) behaviors (Bakker-Peiper, de Vries, 2013). One of the main reasons why communication styles may add value over personality traits in predicting leader outcomes has to do with the specificity of the communication styles. Most communicative acts are applicable in a leadership setting, and given the importance of communication for leadership we assume that communication styles are conceptually relevant, narrow predictors for several leader outcomes (Bakker-Peiper, de Vries, 2013). Based on the literature it is reasonable to assume that the expressive and precise communication styles of a leader are related to the effectiveness of their communication. The regressions analysis in the literature, reveals strong correlations between the communication styles of a leader and his/her leadership style. The two strongest correlates of human-oriented leadership were leadership

supportiveness and leader's verbal aggressiveness; with aggressiveness having a strong negative correlation (Vries, Bakker-Peiper, Oostenvald, 2010).

Reports of the regression analysis of communication styles and leadership styles supports charismatic leadership being significantly related to five of the six communication style variables including aggressiveness, expressiveness, preciseness, assuredness, supportiveness and argumentativeness. Vries et al. (2010) explains that the two strongest predictors of human-oriented leadership were assuredness and supportiveness. The main communication style predictors were leadership supportiveness, leader's preciseness, and leader's expressiveness. Of the outcome variables reported in Table 4, except for leader's expressiveness, all communication style variables were significantly related to perceived leader performance and satisfaction with the leader (Vries, Bakker-Peiper, Oostenvald, 2010).

Table 4 Multiple regression of leadership outcomes on leader's communication styles (LCS) and leadership styles (LS) ($N = 269$)

	Perceived leader performance			Satisfaction with the leader			Subordinate's team commitment		
	LCS β's	LS β's	All β's	LCS β's	LS β's	All β's	LCS β's	LS β's	All β's
Leader's verbal aggressiveness	−.18**		−.09	−.26**		−.15**	−.01		.11
Leader's expressiveness	−.01		−.04	.06		.02	−.05		−.09
Leader's preciseness	.32**		.23**	.20**		.12**	.05		−.02
Leader's assuredness	.26**		.09	.20**		.06	.24**		.08
Leader's supportiveness	.27**		−.08	.36**		−.04	.47**		.10
Leader's argumentativeness	.06		.00	.07*		.02	.08		.01
Charismatic leadership		.42**	.32**		.36**	.27**		.41**	.37**
Human-oriented leadership		.37**	.34**		.55**	.45**		.32**	.37**
Task-oriented leadership		.09*	.05		.00	−.01		−.01	−.06
Multiple R	.75**	.77**	.80**	.80**	.83**	.85**	.62**	.67**	.68**

$* p < .05; ** p < .01$

Among the six variables, leadership supportiveness seems to be the most important variable regarding communication styles. Supportiveness had a positive relationship with all of the other styles and outcomes. Supportive communication of a leader enhances knowledge donating behaviors to the leader and knowledge collecting behaviors from the leader (Vries,

Bakker-Peiper, Oostenvald, 2010). Having a leader that communicates with certainty keeps subordinates focused and aimed toward a goal with purpose. Though the evidence is strong, the literature suggests additional research into various communication styles of leaders and sharing this information with new employees or trainees so there is a clear understanding of what behaviors lead to positive results.

Alan C. Mikkelson, Joy A. York, and Joshua Arritola examined leadership communication competence and leadership style and used the information to predict employee outcomes including satisfaction, motivation, and organizational commitment. Regression analysis revealed that effective communication and relations-oriented or human-oriented leadership were the best predictors of satisfaction, motivation and organizational commitment. Another leadership communication style that can be comparable to relations-oriented or human-oriented leadership is transformational leadership. Transformational leaders consider the individual needs of their subordinates and encourage them to prioritize the collective over the individual interests as a way to achieve the organizational targets and the wellbeing of the group (Bass et al., 1996, Bass et al.,2003). This type of communication influences subordinates to make efforts in favor of the organization, as a way to return the treatment received by their leaders (Boerner, Eisenbeiss, & Griesser, 2007). They (employees) start to identify with the organizational targets and share a collective identity that encourages the production of behaviors focused in promoting the common good, which characterize organizational citizenship behaviors (Rodrigues, Ferreira, 2015).

They [leaders] are also encouraged to share knowledge with their employees. The behaviors that facilitate these types of communication are characterized by a willingness to listen to others. A tolerance of their ideas, and discussions that are fair and reasonable in exploring the

strengths and limitations of the change process (Henderson, 2015). This type of leadership

creates a work environment that is healthy in problem solving, respect, trust and inclusiveness.

The effects of strong leadership communication are demonstrated in literature provided

by Captain C.P. Krishan Nair as he describes how poor communication in the early days of the

development of The Leela Group, a successful luxury hotel company, nearly ended the

organization before it began. Nair claims that leadership communication is what made the

company what it is today despite the setbacks in the beginning. The leader's communication is

what inspires a company and its culture to stand out above the rest (Nair, 2013). Emphasizing the

power of communication, Nair paints the picture of early challenges in his career that he

attributes to poor communication among leaders. His desire to enter an industry of luxury

hospitality was not common in India; attributing the success of the Leela Group to three

principles of leadership communication: direction, dignity, and defining moments. It is

reasonable to apply this concept to other organizations on a smaller scale in a more direct form

of communication with immediate supervisors as a result of a trickle-down effect. Nair's model

of leadership emphasizes never losing sight of the larger organizational purpose (Nair, 2013).

Leaders have the responsibility of using communication to imitate the personality of the

company and integrate its own culture; making the organization unique and personal to each

employee. How a leader communicates with subordinates sets the tone for organizational culture

among other variables in the workplace as previously discussed. Nair (2013) breaks down the

process of the communication strategy he found most effective in his organization. First elevate

business over busyness; the leader evaluates the direction of the organization and gives its

employees their corporate identity. For employees caught in the day-to-day operations, the

leader's communication aligns them with the higher purpose of the business. Then, emphasize

relationships over transactions. His findings suggest the leader's communication upholds dignity and key values as well as cultural aspects of the organization that the leader embodies and emphasizes to the team. Lastly, enabling moments of truth over truisms. It is recommended that the leader enable and continuously celebrate defining moments of truth, or victories, in the day-to-day interactions with employees. (Nair,2013).

Amanda Henderson (2015) explores the significance of leadership communication and how it can be used to build and maintain good working relationships. Having a plan in place helps achieve goals and provides guidance and motivation along the way. When staff better understand what is being proposed they are better positioned to develop an effective plan to implement the necessary changes. However, the literature suggest that the complication lies in the method of communication or *how* the message is being sent. According to Henderson (2015) There is not a clear establishment for communication practices among leaders to sustain motivation and vision. Suggesting that initially the vision may be clear but the drive for long-term change gets lost in the process. It is recommended for leaders to explore longer-term benefit that maintain positive relationships in the workplace (Henderson, 2015).

Researchers Reinout E. de Vries, Angelique Bakker-Peiper and Wyneke Oostenveld (2010) conducted a study using surveys with the purpose of investigating relations between leaders' communication styles including, human-oriented leadership, task-oriented leadership, and leadership outcomes (Vries, Bakker-Pieper, Oostenveld, 2010). The communication styles were strongly and differentially related to knowledge sharing behaviors, perceived leader performance, satisfaction with the leader, and subordinate's team commitment. Multiple regression analyses showed that leadership styles mediated the relations between the communication styles and leadership outcomes (Vries, Bakker-Peiper, Oostenvald, 2010). The

literature also notes that there has been much research that reference communication as being central to leadership, however, few have attempted to operationalize the communication styles leaders use in their daily transactions with subordinates nor have they studied the relation of communication styles with general leadership styles and outcome variables (Vries, Bakker-Peiper, Oostenvald, 2010).

Though there are more than two main communication style dimensions, Vries et al (2010) focuses on the interpersonal aspect including friendliness and dominance. The literature explains how different style characteristics are more productive in different situations. An example included in the text: a dominant communication style may be more productive in a home setting while the same communication style may not work in a doctor-patient setting. The studies seem to indicate that satisfaction is often more associated with a friendly communication style, while a dominant communication style may be associated with performance, but only in some instances (Vries, Bakker-Peiper, Oostenvald, 2010).

Organizational Communication

The first half of the 19th century presented organizational communication as communication skills, managerial effectiveness, superior-subordinate relationships (Richetto, 1977). Organizational communication under the name of 'organizational communication' emerged as a potentially autonomous discipline in the 1950s (Redding and Tompkins, 1988) but the research was mainly conducted by scholars from diverse fields and traditionally took a pragmatic approach to the concepts. In this period, the academic field of organizational communication can trace most of its conceptual roots to four sources: traditional rhetorical theory, mass communication, human relations and, management/organization theory (Yusuf Yuksel, 2013). Since then, the field of organizational communication has made a shift to a more

interpretive approach where scholars are discussing meaning, interpretation and power within organizations (Putnam and Krone, 2006). Scholars have sense realized that the field is not meant to be debated but rather compared and contrasted from different perspectives within the field (Yusuf Yuksel, 2013).

Before one can understand the field of organizational communication it is beneficial to know the foundation of communication. Shannon and Weaver's theory, discusses the basic information we know about communication today; communication is the transmission of information or sending and receiving messages (Craig, 1999). This theory posits messages being independent of the sender and receiver. Within this context, the studies mainly focused on information flow, message content, communication skills, message channel, message fidelity to understand communication problems, the nature of superior-subordinate relationships, and effectiveness of communication (Thayer, 1986). Naturally, communication problems occur and different sources of "noise" can crowd or distort the message between sender and receiver. Information overload, coordination problems and poor communication skills are all examples of ways a message can be interrupted within an organization. Dawson (2004) proposes clarity of message and open communication as practical solutions for poor communication within the organization (Dawson, 2004). Making structural shifts in organizations that will allow more communication among organizational members from different positions may also be necessary changes to implement to gain communication effectiveness (McPhee and Poole, 2001). Deetz, (1994) defines, "Messages are active part of the production of meaning, perceptions, and feelings" (Deetz, 1994). In other words, communication is viewed as a process through which shared meanings are produced and reproduced (Putnam, 1983). This perspective can be perceived as a meaning-centered view whereby meaning is not universal and fixed, but

negotiated and situated (Deetz, 2001). Understanding this concept helps organizations to understand that poor communication should be expected, and for that reason focusing on different perspectives may be necessary in order to be prepared for message distortion.

Yuksel (2013), categorizes the perspectives of organizational communication into three main categories: functionalist, interpretive and critical. The functionalist perspective is more of a mechanical view of organizational communication. Functionalistic perspective defines communication as mainly information exchange and treats communication as a variable that can be manipulated to produce certain effects, such as effectiveness, coordination or collaboration (Yuksel, 2013). It places emphasis on law-like statements and variables such as predictability, and generalizations to create a knowledge base of the concept (Yuksel, 2013).

The interpretive perspective is becoming more common for scholars in referencing organizational communication. As opposed to dealing with prediction and control, this perspective is concerned with the processes and experiences through which people construct organizational reality and meaning (Geertz, 1973; Smircich, 1983). It is believed that this type of perspective will provide a richer understanding of communications within organizational.

The critical perspective focuses on an organizations dominant structure and other forms of organizational, control. For critical theorists, "organizations are a struggle site in which conflicting preferences and interpretations between the members of dominant and marginalized groups is inevitable" (Alvesson, 1993). Consistent with their focus on a more democratic and participatory organizational life, critical scholars strive to contribute to the establishment of a democratic workplace where informed, authentic participation, and freedom from various coercive acts are possible (Yuksel, 2013).

Schuler (1976) describes organizational communication as a system with purposes, operational procedures and structure. Four various types of organizational communications are discussed: 1) informative, 2) regulatory, 3) status quo, and 4) integrative. The types are defined in the literature as follows:

Regulative communication emphasizes conformity to plans, orders, and controls which are task related. Regulative communication is frequently implemented through policy statements, rules, and procedures. Innovative communication enables the organization to adapt to its changing environment. Problem-solving activities and interpretation of the environment are crucial functions of innovative communication. Individuals in boundary positions of the organization are expected to engage in innovative communication more than non-boundary individuals. Integrative communication is concerned with the maintenance of the organization. Communication which is integrative discusses the needs and feelings of the individuals in the organization. It, as opposed to the other types of communication, is most closely related to employee satisfaction. The final type of communication network is the informative-instructive. This type of communication network is more task oriented than the other three types. It includes concern for correct information, adaptability, and morale in facilitating the goal-attainment task-completion process (Schuler et al. 1976).

In a more recent body of research Jiang et al. (2015) discusses organizational communication transparency, defining it as a process that builds trust and credibility which has the potential to drive employee engagement. Transparency is only meaningful when it provides information relevant to the employees about their organizations' actions and decisions, and organizations invite their employees to participate in identifying, acquiring, and distributing

information (Cotterrell, 2000). It is suspected that transparency is the foundation for building employee engagement however more research is needed to support this assumption.

Solaja et al (2016) discusses communication styles that work effectively within organizations in a way that activities can be efficiently assigned, performed and supervised (Solaja, Idowu, James, 2016). It is noted in the research that the type of communication style that proves effective can vary by organization and culture. (Solaja et al., 2016) states, "Good communication styles and personality traits promote high level of organizational commitment, job satisfaction in the work setting, knowledge creation, and acceptance of work responsibility as well as positive subordinate behavior which often result in increased productivity."

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Popescu et al. (2014) identifies the origins of the organizational citizenship behavior as a concept. As defined by Popescu et al. (2014), organizational citizenship behaviros are discretionary, not directly recognized by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Deaconu, Popescu, Popescu, 2014). The concept has since been redefined and its coverage increases significantly, organizational citizenship behavior being considered a sum of "…contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of social and psychological context that supports task performance (Deanconu, Popescu, Popescu, 2014). One of the most recent definitions consider organizational citizenship behavior as being an "…extension of effort and creativity beyond the formal contract of employment" (Deaconu, Popescu, Popescu, 2014).

Dr. Lori A. Brown and Dr. Michael E. Roloff investigate the communicative role in perceived organizational support, via psychologial contracts, or informal obligations of employee

to employer, in fulfilling exchange relationships in employees contributing extra role time organizational citizenship behaviors (ERT-OCB). Findings showed that both organizational support and psychological contract fulfillment buffered the positive relationship between extra role time-organizational citizenship behaviors and burnout. Reasonably, employees with high goals and expectations are likely candidates to contribute to ERT-OCB (Brown, Roloff, 2015). It is easy to see where this type of leader-subordinate relationship could be fragile.

Other descriptions of organizational citizenship behavior are defined by scholars as a discretionary behavior that transcends formal role requirements (Organ, 1995). The concept itself is also considered to be a relatively new employee related outcome, however concepts can be traced back for decades (Bhal, 2005). Breif et al, (1986) described OCB as the work behavior of the subordinates, which is beyond the boundries of the traditional measure of job performance but has long-term implication for organizational success (Breif, Motowildo, 1986), extra role behavior (Van Dyne & Cummings, 1990), and organizational spontaneity (George & Breif, 1992).

In their review of the organizational citizenship literature, Podsakoff et al. (2000) noted that almost 30 forms of citizenship behaviors have been identified. This particular study focused on four categories: altruism, courtesy, cheerleading, and civic virtue. Based on the data collected, Podsakoff et a; (2000) concludes that there is a signifigant path coefficeint from organizational citizenship to cohesion.Though these results are based on evidence from a study on multilevel marketing organizations, it is reasonable to assume that this model could be applied across organizations. The results point to important positive effects of leader socialization and communication activities on cooperation and group cohesion. The more socialization communication activities recruits report of their leaders, the more organizational citizenship

behaviors sponsors report of their recruits. It is reasonable to conclude that the more that leaders invest time in communicating regularly with subordinates they help produce better organizational citizens. Moreover, sponsor socialization communication likely contributes to more cohesive units in an organization, an effect that occurs both directly and through organizational citizenship behaviors (Sparks, Schenk, 2006).

Though scholars have charcterized thirty different forms of organizational citizenship behaviors, for the purposes of this topic, the focus will be on a narrowed spectrum of fewer dimensions. Roderigues et al. (2015) identifies five dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviors. The first being creative suggestions to the system. This is in reference to the behaviors of suggesting new ideas issued to benefit the organization. Protection to the system is another form of behaviors that is associated with producing actions aimed at protecting the organizations property. The creation of a climate favorable to the organization in the external environment is another dimensions that may be related to the behaviors of disseminating the advantages and merits of the organization beyond the work environment. Self-training is a dimension that combines behaviors focused on seeing courses and events that can contribute to improve performance at work. Lastly, cooperation with colleagues- comprises behaviors of helping fellow workers at benefiting the organization (Rodrigues, Ferreira, 2015).

As previously mentioned,organizational citizenship has many dimensions that build an informal concept. The behaviors go beyond the policies and procedures of an organization and have the potential to directly contribute to organizational performance. Organizations constructed of employees with high levels of organizational citizenship behaviors tend to have a competitive advantage. The literature takes the factors of the correlation between organizational citizenship behavior and performance and expands into the link between those behaviors and the

age of the organization. The data demonstrated positive links between organizational citizenship behavior and altruism, consciousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue and positive turnover rates. The positive correlation between organizational citizenship behavior and its components suggest that if at least one component level grows, this will determine organizational citizenship behavior level increase for organizations that have a positive turnover development and vice versa (Deaconu, Popescu, Popescu, 2014).

Colin R. Baker and Leah M. Omilion-Hodges examine organizational citizenship behaviors on a different level as they study the affects of differing quality relationships between leaders and subordinates. As referenced earlier, this concept is referred to as leader-member exchange theory or (LMX). Their research examines employee perceptions of LMX and investigates how these perceptions relate to coworker exchange relationships (CWX) and organizational citizenship behavior (Baker, Omilion-Hodges, 2013).

One should not underestimate the impact of a social work life, that is not directly related to advancement of the individual or the organization, and its affects on the organizational citizenship behavior. Baker et al (2013) suggests that as workgroup members engage in social comparisons and begin to develop relationships with similar others, they may be more willing to engage in organizational citisenship behaviors (Baker, Omilion-Hodges, 2013).

A specific form of OCB, individual initiative, involves "task-related behaviors at a level so far beyond minimally required or generally expected levels that it takes on a voluntary flavor" (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000, p.524). Validated measures of individual initiave organizational citizenship behaviors have an "in-role flavor" to them (Organ, 1988). Behaviors classifed as in-role include checking email from home, working on things at home, staying late or weekend duties.

There is, however, a negative side to organizational citizenship behaviors that include lower task performance, decreased job satisfaction and prescence of organizational politics (Bolino, Klotz, Turnley, & Harvey, 2013). In general the implications for the organization are positive, however, problems arise when organizations become dependent on OCB. Despite the evidence, employers are continuing overwork their employees. The possible negative implications, or the dark side, of OCB's for employees have been less studied and usually focus opon career implications (Bergeron, Shipp, Rosen, & Furst, 2013). Studies are often framed around organizational outcomes. Coyle-Shapio and Shore (2008) advised that research should focus on the positive effects of a well-functioning employee-employer relationship on employee health. The research conducted by Dr. A. Brown and Dr. Michael E. Roloff (2015) is aimed at expanding the literature on employee-organization communication and relationships, citizenship behavior, and employee well-being. The literature suggests a link between the amount of extra role time and worker burnout and seeks to confirm that employees who perform extra role time organizational citizenship behavior will be more likely to expect higher levels of informal social exchange. Lastly, the research was intended to used to find a buffer between OCB and burnout through organizational fullfillment of social exchange obligations. Brown (2015) suspects that "giving it their all" may not be the only factor in burnout related to ERT-OCB. A gradual disilusionment may occur when this well-intentioned extra contribution is not reciprocated by the organization through social fulmillment (Brown, Roloff, 2015). Perceived organizational support is developed when, on the basis of the organization's personification, employees view their favorable or unfavorable treatment as an indication that the organization favors or disfavors them or find their efforts important to organizational goals (Allen, 1995). Perceived organizational

support can serve as a communicator variable to help employees interpret their organizational value (Brown, Roloff, 2015).

According to the results of the study the relationship between extra role time citizenship behaviors and burnout was fragile. Burnout does appear to be a job attitude that can be influenced by the communication of the organization (Brown, Roloff, 2015). The study contributes to the literature on organizational citizenship behavior by extending the study of personal effects of OCB on employees to include burnout. Focusing on the amount of time dedicated to individul initiative OCB demonstrated to be a key tool in the association between citizenship behavior and employee well-being (Brown, Roloff, 2015). The literature suggests a study that examines the changes that occur over time between ERT-OCB and its relationship to burnout.

Extra role time organizational citizenship behavior may have deleterious effects on employees. Working long hours is a predictor of ill-health and other ailments (Akerstedt et al., 2002; Halbesleben, 20019; Harrington, 1994; Sparks, Cooper, Fried, & Shirom, 1997). Overall, the well-being of employees is adversly affected, increased personal costs, stress, overload and work-family conflict are a few of the negative implications that can trickle down from organizational citizenship behaviors.

Leadership Styles and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Both individual and group organizational citizenship behaviors (GOCBs) are thought to be strongly related to leadership (Euwemaet al (2007). As previously discussed, transactional and transformational styles have shown to be associated with various organizational outcomes, including satisfaction at work, commitment to work and productivity (Wang, Oh, et. Al, 2011).

Alexandra Rodrigues and Maria Ferreira (2015) investigate the impact of transactional and transformational leadership styles on organizational citizenship behaviors(Rodrigues, Ferreira, 2015). The literature suggests that studying the relationship between leadership styles and motivated individuals because the styles have been responsible for effectively complying w ith long and short term goals.

Euwemaet a; (2007) uses the term directive leadership. Usually it is defined as task-oriented behavior, with a strong tendency to control discussions, dominate interactions, and personally direct task completion (Euwemaet al, 2007). Directive leadership seems to be negatively related to organizational behavior in groups.When managers are controlling strongly, initiative by employees is easily seen as inappropriate, risky behavior, or even insubordination (Paine & Organ, 2000). Euwemaet al (2007) also mentions, the behavior of directive leader behavior puts the team members in a dependent role, facilitating them to wait for the manager before acting, showing less initiative and fewer extra activities.

As mentioned by Euwemaet al (2007), Podsakoff and colleagues (2000) report consistent positive relations between supportive leadership and different aspects of organizational citisenship behavior.

Communication scholars have summarized transactional leadership and how it focuses on the exchange of information between leaders and subordinates. Goals are clarified and shares the benefits and possibilites for reward if these goals for acheivement of these awards (Bass et al., 1996; Bass et al., 2003). The relationship is built on mutual agreements and can be responsible for long-term trust development. For instance, the transformational leadership style has been proven effective and is suggested to promote interactive, caring, visionary, inspirational, and empowering communication (Men, 2014). Transformational leadership is defined as a leadership

style that motivates followers by appealing to their higher order needs and inducing them to transcend self-interest for the sake of the group or the organization. This form of leadership involves creating an emotional attachment between leaders and followers (Men, 2014).

A large body of research supports a link between communication and job satisfaction (Gibbs, Rosenfield, 1994). The study concludes relationships were found between workers' job satisfaction and their self-reported demonstrations of organizational citizenship behaviors. If a worker is satisfied with his or her work, promotions, co-workers, pay, and supervision, and is generally satisfied with his or her job in general, it appears logical that he or she probably is less likely to be moody, complain, find fault, and exhibit annoyance with others at the workplace(Gobbs, Rosenfield, 1994). It is reasonable to assume that job satisfaction positively affects OCB except for the negative relationship between satisfaction with co-workers and the OCB variable conscientiousness. It is important to note, employees who are satisfied with all aspects of their jobs with the exception of their co-workers may demonstrate conscientious behaviors because these behaviors are not directed toward individuals (Gibbs, Rosenfield, 1994).

Organizational Communication and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

In the workplace, organizations and employees typically form exchange relationships where employees exchange time dedicated to the organizational and job-related tasks for formal organizational rewards such as salary and benefits. These benefits demonstrate their value to the organization. Not all workplace relationships adhere to such formal exchange. When workplace relations are such, that time is committed to work is not all reciprocated with formal rewards, employees may look to less direct organizational communication to confirm, in more informal exchange, that they and their contributions are valued (Broen, Roloff, 2015). One way this may occur is when employees go the extra mile for their organization. Contributing to the

organization time and effort above and beyond the call of duty. This effort is typically considered discretionary and less likely to be rewarded in the context of the organizations formal reward structure. These extra contributions are considered organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Oraan, 1988). It is important to note that although OCB's can be extra-role, or outside the job description, most citizenship behaviors are not strictly extra-role but rather discretionary amounts of "in-role" behavior. That is, they are types of behaviors in the realm for which employees are compensated to perform, but contributed at levels not specifically required or expected (Brown, Roloff, 2015).

In another study, Osman Yildirim (2014) examines the relationship between organizational communication and organizational citizenship behavior. Among the organizational communication dimensions, only the dimensions involving communication with managers correlated with the altruism and civic virtue dimensions of OCB. Previous research has deconstructed OCB into five factors: altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, civic virtue, and sportsmanship.The researchers proposed a correlation between perceived fairness, organizational commitment and leader supportiveness with organizational citizenship behavior. Organ and Ryan (1995) conducted a meta-analysis of 28 studies and found a modest correlation between job satisfaction and OCB.

Table 2. The Correlation between organizational communication and organizational citizenship behavior

Organizational Citizenship Behavior	Communication with coworkers		Communication with managers		Organizational communication policy	
	r	p	r	p	r	p
Altruism	0,22	0,02*	0,12	0,18	0,12	0,21
Conscientiousness	0,15	0,09	0,06	0,49	0,18	0,06
Courtesy	0,10	0,27	0,06	0,51	0,20	0,83
Civic Virtue	0,11	0,23	0,09	0,32	0,28	0,00**
Sportsmanship	0,13	0,15	0,02	0,84	0,08	0,42

*$p<0,05$ **$p<0,01$

In this research, it is noted that there is a correlation between the organizational communication and the organizational citizenship behavior of employees. Effective communication is not only necessary to build up proper channels between managers and employees, but also necessary to contribute to the overall performance of the organization. According to the findings, organizational communication has to be considered as an important issue to foster employees's organizational citizenship behavior (Yildirim, 2014).

John S. Sparks and Joseph E. Schenk draw upon the social identiy theory in examing the communication of multilevel marketing organizations during the socialization of new members and cooperation affects organizational citizenship behaviors. The idea is for a sponsor to take a new member of the sales team and socialize them, getting them accustomed to the norms and behaviors of the organization. The theoretical model illustrated in the literature draws on the social identiy theory, which seeks to explain how and why people learn to identify with the organizations or groups in which they claim membership (Ashforth and Mael, 1989; Tajfel and Turner, 1985). The efforts to socialize new recruits positively affect their feelings of cohesion (Sparks, Schnek, 2006).

Cohesion should also increase the recruits' organizational citizenship behavior (Sparks, Schenk, 2006). In this context, members build cohesion through individual acts of organizational citizenship. Evidence for this relationship comes from Kidwell, Mossholder, and Bennett (1997), who report positive correlations between organizational citizenship behaviors and group cohesiveness among work groups in traditional heirarchical organizations. Overall it appears that leader-subordinate communication indirectly affects OCB. It is reasonable to assume this is the same conclusion for employees at all stages of their employment not just new recruits. Thus,

hypothesis 3: recruits' organizational citizenship behaviors will be positively associated with their feelings of unit cohesion.

Leadership Styles and Organizational Communication

Communication scholars have been working to understand the various approaches and perspectives to communicating inside the framework of the workplace and how the variables affect organizational outcomes. The research suggests the following recommendations for leaders to consider in regards to effective organizational communication 1) Managers must employ good leadership communication style when disseminating information that will positively affect productivity. 2) Leaders must allow employees to participate in decision making within the organization in order to allow creativity, sense of belongingness, and responsibility that will bring about innovation and development in the organization. 3) Managers must adopt open communication style which will enable the workers to express and communicate their intentions and suggestions regarding how to enhance productivity in the organization (Solaja, Idowu, James, 2016). A study by Vries et al. (2009) found that team members were more likely to be willing to share knowledge with team members who were more agreeable and extraverted in their leadership style.

Communication competence and leadership styles are two perspectives through which we can examine supervisor behavior and its impact on employee and organizational outcomes (Mikkelson, York, Arritola, 2015). Understanding these behaviors could help supervisors be more effective in their communication with employees, which could not only increase employee outcomes but could benefit the organization with increased productivity and reduced turnover. Research has identified that leadership is dependent, in part on the communication competence

of the leader (Mikkelson, York, Arritola, 2015). Suggesting that communication is the primary way leaders achieve their goals and benefit the organization (Vries, Bakker-Pieper, 2010).

ANALYSIS

As was shown in the literature review, leadership styles and organizational communication are a vital part of breeding organizational citizenship behaviors in the workplace. Understanding leadership styles is a key component in the success of an organization. Leadership is the ability to move a group towards a common goal that would not be met if a leader had not been there (Graham, 1997). Without an effective leader, organizational communications would be poor resulting in reduced levels of organizational citizenship behaviors.

First, we will discuss the basic functions of various leadership styles and examine their relationship with organizational communication and the implications their relationship has on organizational citizenship behaviors.

Leadership is a relational concept and presents different variables within the workplace. Variables such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment and employee performance are all factors to consider when examining the effectiveness of the leader. The goal of an effective leader sounds very similar to the definition of leadership I previously referenced; the goal is to seek the ongoing, voluntary participation of subordinates in an effort to reach organizational goals (Olasupo, 2011).

Simply having a leader is not enough to be effective. However, having the right leader is everything. Based on the personal experiences of (Nair, 2013) leaders set the tone for the workplace and ultimately will determine the level of satisfaction in workers. After the right leader is in place, quality relationships will likely ensue. High quality relationships between leaders and subordinates has positive implications for the workplace. The explanation for the link between positive leader-member exchange and organizational outcomes comes from the styles of leadership implemented within the organization. When employees are comfortable that their working style is approved by their supervisors they spend less energy working to maintain the supervisor-subordinate relationship and can focus on their task (Burris, Collins, Meyer, 2014).

There is a modest trend between successful leaders that breed satisfied employees and organizational citizenship behaviors. Naturally, a satisfied employee will be more likely to go above the call of duty and perform outside of the formally rewarded tasks. As discussed in the literature review, Organ and Ryan (1995) proposed a correlation between perceived fairness, organizational commitment and leader supportiveness with organizational citizenship behavior. Notice the term perception. This is relevant to the perspective approach on organizational communication that will be discussed later. Organ and Ryan (1995) conducted a meta-analysis of 28 studies and found a modest correlation between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior; suggesting leadership styles that produce job satisfaction are indirectly linked to organizational citizenship behaviors.

Leadership communication is a crucial aspect of leadership style. It is directly responsible setting the tone in the workplace. Leaders also have the responsibility of using communication to imitate the personality of the company and integrate its own culture; making the organization unique and personal to each employee (Nair, 2013). Since leaders are responsible for imitating

the personality of the company it is obvious that leadership and communication styles reflect the organization's communicative tone that will trickle down to the workplace. If a leader is negative and unmotivated the employees will follow suit. The message and how it is communicated from leaders to subordinates in the workplace plays a vital role in either positively or negatively affecting organizational citizenship behaviors. An unmotivated leader will not motivate employees to go the extra mile because they are sending the message to be disinterested and undedicated to the workforce. Leadership communication is essential for the internal functioning of enterprises because it integrates the managerial functions (Solaja, Idowu, James, 2016). Meaning, leadership communication is different than your basic face-to-face communication style because it includes the incorporation of managerial duties. Based on the literature it is reasonable to assume that the expressive and precise communication styles of a leader are related to the effectiveness of their communication. I currently work under a first-year teacher that is very reserved, quiet, and for the lack of a better term, socially awkward. Her method of communication, or not communicating at all, is not effective for me as a subordinate. I often am in the dark on her lesson plans, other than words/jargon on paper and I am left to decipher things on my own. She has an inability to make a decision and when asked a question it is usually reciprocated with non-verbal cues of confusion that tend to make me uncomfortable. Put simply, this is her personality. I am not saying her personality traits are wrong however, I do believe they contribute to the lack of effectiveness in her communication.

Another facet of my proposed research question was the importance of organizational communication and its influence, if any, on organizational communication. Like leadership communication, clear, and open organizational communication are essential in preventing message distortion in the workplace. Distortion can take on many forms including but not limited

to, differences in personalities spelling errors, inappropriate methods, language barriers and perceptions all playing a role in distorting a message. I discovered a few different perspectives regarding organizational communication that could potentially influence which leadership style would be most effective in carrying out the message of the organization into the workplace. Critical, functional and, interpretive perspectives on organizational communication were discussed in the literature and all could be traced back to various characteristics of different leadership styles.

The functionalistic perspective on organizational communication is mainly information exchange and treats communication as a variable that can be manipulated to produce certain effects, such as effectiveness, coordination or collaboration (Yuksel, 2013). It places emphasis on law-like statements and variables such as predictability, and generalizations to create a knowledge base of the concept (Yuksel, 2013). If an organization chose this perspective when they communicate in the workplace it would be reasonable to believe task-oriented leadership would be most influential in transmitting the message from sender and receiver.

As opposed to dealing with prediction and control, this perspective takes a more relaxed approach and is concerned with the processes and experiences through which people construct organizational reality and meaning (Geertz, 1973; Smircich, 1983). It is believed that this type of perspective will provide a richer understanding of communications within the organization. Based on the characteristics of this perspective, relations-oriented leadership styles would be more effective in communicating the message of the organization. For instance, I am confident that the organizational communication in my workplace is much more effective than my perception of the organization based on my observations of other employee who seem very satisfied with their work relationship. A few negative experiences during the early days of my

employment have shaped my reality in the workplace. With this in mind, it is easy to imagine how the outcomes could be different based on individual perspectives. My perspective of the workplace is probably very different than a seasoned teacher. The relations-oriented leadership style genuinely cares about the well-being and feelings of their followers. They are open to different opinions and encourage employee involvement in the decision-making process. An employee under the direction of a relations-oriented leader will process information and compose "their reality" differently than that of different style.

The critical perspective on organizational communication would benefit from a relations-oriented leadership style. Consistent with their focus on a more democratic and participatory organizational life, critical scholars strive to contribute to the establishment of a democratic workplace where informed, authentic participation, and freedom from various coercive acts are possible (Yuksel, 2013). Transformational leadership, which can be used interchangeably with relation-oriented leadership, is described as a leadership style that motivates followers by appealing to their higher order needs and inducing them to transcend self-interest for the sake of the group or the organization. There is a great deal of encouragement that pushes employees to reach higher and set personal goals. Thusly, this form of leadership communication involves creating an emotional attachment between leaders and followers (Men, 2014) and would have positive implications on an organization that chose to implement the critical communicative perspective.

Of the five factors pertaining to organizational citizenship behavior altruism and civic virtue were the only factors that had a relationship among the organizational communication dimensions; only including the organizational dimensions that involved communication with managers correlated with the altruism and civic virtue. Leadership style is an organizational

variable that affects job satisfaction. There is a positive relationship between relations-oriented leadership communication and employee job satisfaction (Mikkelson, York, Arritola, 2015).

Surprisingly I found that both transactional and transformational or relations and task-oriented leadership were found to be positively related to long-term building of trust and job satisfaction because the relationship is built on mutual agreements. Naturally, a worker will be more likely to enjoy their job and approve of their manager if they embody the characteristics of a relations-oriented leadership style. As previously discussed in the literature review, transactional and transformational styles have shown to be associated with various organizational outcomes, including satisfaction at work, commitment to work and productivity (Wang, Oh, et. Al, 2011). I found this to be interesting because much of the literature sheds light on the positive aspects of transformational leadership and its characteristics of inclusiveness, empowerment and emphasis on the individual and not productivity. I had expected to find a positive relationship between transformation leadership style and little to no relationship between transactions leadership and job satisfaction. This just demonstrates that the preferred leadership style varies from organization to organization. As mentioned in the literature review, positive relationships were found between workers' job satisfaction and their self-reported demonstrations of organizational citizenship behaviors (Gibbs, Rosenfield, 1994).

Exchange relationships are often formed in the workplace. That is where employees exchange time dedicated to the organizational and job-related tasks for formal organizational rewards such as salary and benefits. Not all organizational adhere to formal reward exchanges or they may go above and beyond this type of exchange. With this type of exchange relationship not all work is reciprocated as formal reward. Instead, employee look to the less direct organizational communication to confirm, in more informal exchange, that they and their

contributions are valued (Broen, Roloff, 2015). Organizational citizenship behaviors are typically considered to be discretionary and are less likely to be rewarded formally. As an instructional assistant I devote much of my personal time planning activities for the students in my classroom. My informal reward is seeing my students enjoy an activity or learn a new concept because of me going above and beyond the lesson plan. By doing this I am informally transmitting messages to my students that I care about what they are learning and how they are learning the material. If I only prepared activities during my scheduled hours at work I feel like my students would notice the lack of effort by becoming disinterested or disrespectful. On a similar but much larger scale; when an organization has built up the proper communication channels between leaders and subordinates it contributes to the overall success of the organization. Effective communication is not only necessary to build up proper channels between managers and employees, but also necessary to contribute to the overall performance of the organization and helps to set the tone of communication within the organization.

Socialization of new hires was also another important aspect of organizational communication as this positively affects their feelings of cohesion (Sparks, Schnek, 2006). Cohesion should also increase the recruits' organizational citizenship behavior (Sparks, Schenk, 2006). In my recent hiring into the public-school system our leader did not make an effort to socialize me or my team into the culture of the workplace. I felt and still feel awkward and out of place in my new position. My class is frequently left out of school events, and we are rarely visited by faculty or school personnel. Being a new program under the umbrella of the school system I expected much more enthusiasm and effort from our leaders, instead we are treated as if we are the exception to the otherwise inclusive, relaxed culture of the school. I still do not know the names of all my coworkers and I am rarely spoken to at lunch or in the hallways. As a result,

I have not participated in any organizational citizenship behaviors as I feel my time would not be rewarded. The principal of the school communicates with the school in a way that sets a tone for the entire school. The effects of the principal's leadership style are affecting organizational communication in the school body and is decreasing the motivation for organizational citizenship behavior among staff members.

Leadership Style

Organizational
Citizenship
Behavior
(OCB)

Organizational
Communication

Based on the patterns I have discovered from my personal experience, I feel like the opposite outcome would be a reasonable assumption. I feel that leadership style also has the potential to positively affect organizational communication resulting in an increase of organizational citizenship behavior.

All in all, effective leadership styles are discretionary based on the tone set by the organization through communicative measures. As a result, effective communication, and the nurturing relationship between the organization and employees, increased levels of organizational citizenship behaviors are likely to ensue. It is important to note that I did not find that one leadership style was more effective than the other; it seemed to be circumstantial. Thusly, different styles of leadership and organizational communication yield very different results regarding organizational citizenship behaviors.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The information in this paper would prove itself useful on many levels of an organization. For me as an employee simply doing the research and organizing the information has opened my eyes to how the components of leadership style and organizational communications plays a pivotal role in the nurturing of organizational citizenship behaviors. This information would be especially helpful to new business, and emerging organizations that are trying to gain their footing. Keeping these component in mind, I believe will help sustain the workplace.

Communicative literature suggests that creating constructive working relationships that can sustain workplace initiatives is reliant of communication that is inclusive. But how does an organization determine whether a person is inclusive in their communication? I would suggest implementing a personality test during the interview and assessment phases of employment. This would eliminate the guessing game that human resources are playing when hiring a person in a position of leadership. A personality test is a very useful tool in learning your strength and weaknesses and would help employees discover where they would best fit in an organization. For example, in a large organization it is easy to get lost in the mixture of new hires and paperwork, picture my large church as organization, we actually implement an entire four-session class that involves a personality test, and a face-to-face meeting about the values and beliefs of the church to help members discover personal traits they did not know before the test. This is a very valuable tool for members to find out where their talents and abilities have the most potential within the church! The idea of personality test implementation is exciting to me because I have seen it produce tangible results in an organization.

All of the benefits mentioned above come together to work for a higher purpose. The more communicative styles of leadership are more effective, a majority of the time than the operational styles that focus on productivity. Ultimately, it appears that communicative styles breed positive relationships between the variable previously mentioned; job satisfaction, organizational commitment and, employee performance. Mikkelson et al. (2015) supports this statement in his review of relations and task oriented leadership. Relations-oriented leadership behaviors are helpful, supportive and the objective is to help employees feel comfortable in their job and responsibilities. Relations-oriented leadership behaviors can include expressing encouragement to employees, increased levels of trust, respect and camaraderie between the leader and the employees, and cooperation between employees (Mikkelson, York, Arritola, 2015). This type of open, relational, comfortable leadership style is not just related to communication variables; it is positively related to an increase in communication as well. Perhaps it is the interpersonal variables lie warmth and concern for the well-being of the person, not just productivity, that personalize the communication between leader and subordinate that are responsible for this increase. Informing subordinates of information so they know the vision, mission, and values of the organization will help them to succeed.

My next suggestion would be applicable to present and future leaders. Based on the evidence presented throughout this paper relational-leadership possess certain qualities that strengthen workplace relationships. First, I would see to hear, and then to be heard. The leader also needs to get people involved; even if that simply means listening intuitively. Messages are distorted so easily. They are a very valuable puzzle that both senders and receivers must work delicately to decipher. When people sense they are being listened to, they are more likely to buy into the message. Ignite imaginations and get people passionate about their goals and

organization. When people hear the enthusiasm, and feel the energy they are more likely to jump

on board and lastly, invite people to participate. As discussed in the literature review, the

relations-oriented leadership style is indicative of these characteristics.

Task-oriented, or goal-oriented leadership is described exactly like it sounds. It is a style

that focuses on the task and goals of the organization with little concern for the interpersonal

variables. Based on the research, I found that the best route for leaders seem to be a combination

of the two styles. Goal-oriented leadership paired with healthy interpersonal communication

relationships is believed to aide employees in accomplishing tasks at work. When supervisors are

clear in their communication of expectations, objectives and procedures, and goals, employees

should be better able to perform their job-related tasks (Mikkelson et al (2015). The research

supported the claim that because employees can be more skilled in their work when supervisors

clearly communicate goals, communication should be positively related to employee outcomes

such as job satisfaction, motivation and organizational commitment (Mikkelson, York, Arritola,

2015). Higher management have the responsibility if building their teams. I would recommend,

based on the findings of Mikkelson et al (2015) that upper management consider combining task

and a relations-oriented leader when possible. Though, relations-orientation seems to be favored

I did not find that one was necessarily better than the other, perhaps this opens and opportunity

for more research contributing to the literature comparing and contrasting these fields of interest.

It is important to note that during my research I discovered a few terms related to the

relational styles of leadership that I feel could be used interchangeably. Vries et al. (2010) claims

that charismatic leadership has been closely related to human-oriented leadership and

transformational leadership, all which place emphasis on the importance of genuine interpersonal

interactions. Transformational or relations-oriented leaders breed satisfaction based on their

communication characteristics; they genuinely care about the well-being and feelings of their followers. They are open to different opinions and encourage employee involvement in the decision-making process leaving employees inspired and feeling like their goals are attainable. Perhaps a way an organization can improve in this area would be to abide by an open-door policy where subordinates feel welcome to bring a conversation to their managers. This will allow for preemptive measures to be taken when the need arises. In a sense, I can see where this welcomed flow of communication would make employees feel empowered and like they have a voice in the workplace. Encouraging close communication on all levels of the organization is likely to improve organizational citizenship behavior benefiting the organization. Accordingly, Men (2014) suggest transformational leaders communicate well and closely interact with employees to understand and address their higher order needs suggesting that transformational leaders give employees a voice in the organization.

I reviewed the specifics of leader-member exchange in my review of the literature. This theory opens discussion for differential leader-member relationships. This is the negative side to close relations within an organization. As discussed in the literature review, differential leader-member exchange relationships can create division within teams and cause members to perceive the leader and the organization as being unjust (Buunk, Collins, et al., 1995), hamper communication effectiveness, (Hooper & Martin, 2008), and lead to coworkers attributing labels and biases to each other and acting on such assumptions based on the specific level of leader-member exchange each share (Baker, Omilion-Hodges, 2013). In other words, there is the risk of having the opposite effect on employee productivity if work relationships become unjustified. In my opinion, this is an understudied facet of organizational communication. I recommend that

managers and leaders in the workplace do more research in this content area in order to improve their communication in the workplace.

Even more important than leadership styles is leadership communication. The most effective leaders interact and communicate with their followers frequently (Neufeld, Wan, Fang, 2010). There is an abundance of research on leadership styles. Most of which focus on strong leadership behaviors, whether transformational or transactional which are linked to strong communication behaviors. I found that the term "knowledge sharing" was used frequently in discussing strong communication behaviors. This type of leadership creates a work environment that is healthy in problem solving, respect, trust and inclusiveness (Henderson, 2015). This is the product of close communications with subordinates. When employees have ready access to information they are more likely to look for answers internally rather than turning to outside sources. This could simply mean sending out regular reports or emails informing employees of "what's happening" in the organization. Leaders should be the first to share information rather than hearing information from fellow workers; this opens the door for message distortion.

It is important to note that "knowledge sharing" could possibly be classified as a characteristic of relations-oriented leadership. Showing subordinates information so that they know the vision, mission, and values of the organization will help them to succeed. When people sense they are being listened to, they are more likely to buy into the message. Ignite imaginations when leading by example and get people passionate about their goals and organization. Passionate people yield positive results. When people hear the enthusiasm, and feel the energy they are more likely to jump on board and lastly, invite people to participate. As discussed in the literature review, the relations-oriented leadership style is indicative of these characteristics. Relations-oriented leadership style behaviors are helpful, supportive and the objective is to help

employees feel comfortable in their job and responsibilities. Relations-oriented leadership behaviors can include expressing encouragement to employees, increased levels of trust, respect and camaraderie between the leader and the employees, and cooperation between employees (Mikkelson, York, Arritola, 2015).

Communication styles can be summed up as an individual's perception, or way of thinking that can be influenced by a number of factors. Communication style is natural and culturally nurtured, therefore, it is individualistic, and it is determined by the way people conduct themselves, perceives and observed others as well as their perspectives on social reality (Solaja, Idowu, James, 2016). Communication and speaking are two very different things. Communication encapsulates speaking, listening, messages, senders, receivers, noise, processing information, and the ability to provide feedback on the information you have received. This requires a complex set of skills that take time and effort to develop (Baldoni, 2004).

Because communication is influenced by a number of factors including personal experiences and, culture I found the approach of Baldoni (2004) unique. As discussed in the literature review, Baldoni (2004) bypasses individual communication styles and breaks down effective leadership communication into four goals; it informs, involves, ignites, and invites. Inform people of what the issues are and how those issues relate to them and their role in the organization. I interpreted this as a "personalized" style -if you will- to the entire umbrella of communication styles. Meaning, if a leader inform, involves, ignites, and invites then their communication lends itself to be effective. I recommend that leaders get creative and personalize their approach. Granted there are styles that encompass these characteristics more than others but Baldoni's comments allowed me to look at communication styles from a different perspective. Rather, than debating styles, he encouraged his audience to look at the goals of communication

and compare and contrast effectiveness on the achievement of communicative goals. As a leader consider your audience and adapt your methods if necessary.

The research also identified gaps in maintaining effective leader communication. There is not a clear establishment for communication practices among leaders that sustain motivation and vision. Initially the vision is cultivated and processed and eventually the drive for long-term change gets lost in the process. For longer-term benefits, communication practices need to explore how to maintain staff well-being and relationships (Henderson, 2015). Identifying the appropriate communication style can be challenging for leaders. There was a positive relationship between the communication characteristics of relations-oriented and/or transformational leadership. This positive relationship communication characteristics was a common conclusion among communicative scholars. This positive relationship corresponds with job satisfaction, leader satisfaction and job performance (Vries, Bakker-Peiper, Oostenvald, 2010). More research needs to be conducted on maintain effective leadership or how to kindle the fire.

Like Baldoni's approach to viewing leadership communication by comparing and contrasting, Yuksel (2013) examines organizational communication with an interpretive approach. Rather than debating the styles he compares and contrasts the field from various perspectives. There are many theories presented by communicative scholars that are relative to organizational communication, however, I chose to focus on the components of Shannon and Weaver's Theory. The foundation of this theory is focusing on the message being independent of the sender and receiver. Message clarity and open communication are recommended methods for improving poor organizational communication. Leaders should make themselves as the first point of contact and once again, consider your audience. Remember that just because you, the

sender, may understand your message the receiver can interpret your message completely different than it was intended. The message is independent. Face-to-face interactions with subordinates eliminate questionable tone and allow you to see the nonverbal ques that are essential when working to understand a message clearly.

CONCLUSION

As you can see, organizational citizenship behaviors are both directly and indirectly affected by leadership styles and organizational citizenship behavior. Both positive and negative implications can be a result of leadership styles and organizational communication. Communication is not necessarily about getting it right the first time, though that would be helpful, but rather it is about learning your audience and adapting and improving upon your skills. Organizations have the responsibility of choosing the route that best suits the organization.

Organizational citizenship behaviors are a product of employee satisfaction. Employees feel satisfied when they feel like they are working toward a higher purpose. They become even more satisfied when they know their voice is heard from the their level all the way to the top of the organization. When an employee can speak to their manager and be confident that their comments and concerns are being heard then, as the literature showed, they are much more likely to perform well. Good performance, with the right leader in place, should be rewarded either formally or informally. This is where organizational citizenship behaviors come into the picture. Their choosing to go the extra mile for their company means they are doing more than what their job description entails. To be successful in their position sometimes it is necessary for them to go beyond the call of duty but can become burnout very quickly. Leaders must be very careful to nurture that relationship and give credit where credit is due to help fuel their fire.

Different leadership styles may work better for some organizations than others and that is

okay. It is important to remember that there is not a cookie-cutter style that works across organizations. Based on my research both relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership styles breed satisfied employees. For instance, a transactional, or task-oriented approach to communication may be more appropriate for an inmate guard dealing with criminals than a doctor working with patients. Neither is right nor wrong, one just fits better. This is an extreme example, but it accurately depicts the point. Naturally, the guard has been instructed by the organization to keep things calm and orderly or short and to the point; their focus is on supervision, reward, and punishment. On the other hand, is the doctor. If a doctor was focused on reward and punishment he would likely get very different results. Instead they listen intently, seeking first to hear what there is patient is saying, they work hard to understand the message and then they construct an appropriate response.

If the career roles I mentioned before switched their styles of leadership around, could you imagine the result? Organizations can sometimes operate backward. Without effective leaders in place the organization will fail. My question then would be how did these leaders come to think this method would work and yield results of organizational productivity, job satisfaction and ultimately organizational citizenship behavior? That is when I would step back and look at the whole picture. Who/what is telling them their methods are effective and what goals are they trying to achieve? The answer you already know, the organization, upper management. When something is wrong at the top of the organization it will trickle into leadership and eventually to employees. How the organization choses to communicate its goals to the leaders of the organization is imperative. It means everything for the success of its employees. If an organization has a vision and mission, which it will, that should be very clearly communicated and understood by the body of the organization.

Communication penetrates everything in the workplace and quite possibly the single most important aspect for running a successful organization. Organizational citizenship behaviors are a product of good communicators. Good communicators may possess various leadership styles that prove effective depending on the organization. The organization is the hub from which information flows. How that information is collected and distributed is critical to the health and sustainability of the workplace.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akerstedt, T., Knutsson, A., Westerholm, P., Theorell, T., Alfredsson, L., & Kecklund, G.

    (2002). Sleep disturbances, work stress, and work hours: A cross sectional study. *Journal*

    of Psychosomatic Research, 53, 741-748. doi:10.1016/s0022-3999(02)00333-1

Allen, M. W. (1995). Communication concepts related to perceived organizational

    support. *Western Journal of Communication, 59*(4), 326-346.

    doi:10.1080/10570319509374525

Appannah, Arti, and Simon Biggs. "Age-Friendly Organisations: The Role of Organisational

    Culture and the Participation of Older Workers." *Journal of Social Work Practice*, vol.

    29, no. 1, Feb. 2015, pp. 37–51., doi:10.1080/02650533.2014.993943.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social Identity Theory and the Organization. *The Academy of*

    Management Review, 14(1), 20. doi:10.2307/258189

Baker, C. R., & Omilion-Hodges, L. M. (2013). The Effect of Leader-Member Exchange

    Differentiation Within Work Units on Coworker Exchange and Organizational

    Citizenship Bahaviors. *Communication Research Reports, 30*(4), 313-322.

    doi:10.1080/08824096.2013.837387

Bakker-Pieper, Angelique, and Reinout E. De Vries. "The Incremental Validity of

    Communication Styles Over Personality Traits for Leader Outcomes." *Human*

    Performance, vol. 26, no. 1, 2013, pp. 1–19., doi:10.1080/08959285.2012.736900.

Bass, B.M., Avolio, B. J., & Atwater, L. (1996). The transformational and transactional

   leadership of men and women. *Applied psychology: An International Review*, 45(1), 5-

   34. Doi:10.111/j.1464-0597.1996.tb00847.x

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by

   assessing transformational and transactional leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology,

   88(2), 207-218.

Bergeron, D. M., Shipp, A. J., Rosen, B., & Furst, S. A. (2011). Organizational Citizenship

   Behavior and Career Outcomes. *Journal of Management, 39*(4), 958-984.

   doi:10.1177/0149206311407508

Boerner, S., Eisenbeiss, S.A., & Greisser, D. (2007). Follower behavior and organizational

   performance: The impact of transformational leaders. *Journal of Leadership &*

   Organizational Studies, 13(3), 15-26. doi:10.1177/10717919070130030201

Bolino, M. C., Klotz, A. C., Turnley, W. H., & Harvey, J. (2013). Exploring the dark side of

   organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*, 542-559.

   doi:10.01002/job.1847

Brown, L. A., & Roloff, M. E. (2015). Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Organizational

   Communication, and Burnout: The Buffering Role of Perceived Organizational Support

   and Psychological Contracts. *Communication Quarterly, 63*(4), 384-404.

   doi:10.1080/01463373.2015.1058287

Buunk, B. P., Collins, R. L., Taylor, S. E., Van Ypren, N. W., & Dakof, G. A. (1990). The affective consequences of social comparison: Either direction has its ups and downs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 51, 333-338.

Cicei, C. C. (2012). Examining the association between job affects and organizational citizenship behavior on a sample of Romanian communication and marketing specialists. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 33*, 568-572. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.01.185

Collins, Brain J, et al. "Gender differences in the impact of leadership styles on subordinate embeddedness and job satisfaction." *The Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 25, 2014, pp. 660–671., www.elsevier.com?locate/leaqua. Accessed 21 Sept. 2017.

Cotterrell, R. (2000). Transparency, mass media, ideology and community. *Cultural Values*, *3*, 414-426.

Coyle-Shapiro, J. A., & Shore, L. M. (2007). The employee-organization relationship: Where do we go from here? *Human Resource Management Review, 17*, 166-179. doi:10/1016/j.hrmr.2007.03.008

Euwema, M. C., Wendt, H., & Emmerik, H. V. (2007). Leadership styles and group organizational citizenship behavior across cultures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,28*(8), 1035-1057. doi:10.1002/job.496

Gibbs, V. L., Rosenfeld, L., & Javidi, M. (1994). On-the-job relationships among self-reported oral communication apprehension, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Communication Research Reports, 11*(2), 209-220. doi:10.1080/08824099409359959.

Graham, J. (1997). Outdoor leadership: Technique, common sense and self confidence. Seattle,

    WA: The Mountaineers

Henderson, Amanda. "Leadership and communication: what are the imperatives?" *Journal of*

    Nursing Management, vol. 23, 2015, pp. 693–694.

Hooper, D. T., & Marin, R. (2008). Beyond personal leader-member exchange (LMX) quality:

    The effects of perceived LMX variability on employee reactions. *Leadership Quarterly*,

    19, 20-30.

Jiang, H., & Men, R. L. (2016). Creating an Engaged Workforce. *Communication*

    Research,44(2), 225-243. doi:10.1177/0093650215613137

Katz, Sara. "Leadership Through Communication." *American Water Works Association*, vol. 95,

    no. 1, Jan. 2003, pp. 22–23.

Kidwell, R. (1997). Cohesiveness and organizational citizenship behavior: A multilevel analysis

    using work groups and individuals. *Journal of Management, 23*(6), 775-793.

    doi:10.1016/s0149-2063(97)90029-5

Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship Behavior and Social Exchange. *Academy of*

    Management Journal, 37(3), 656-669. doi:10.2307/256704

McCroskey, J. C. (1970). Measures of communication-bound anxiety. *Speech*

    Monographs, 37(4), 269-277. doi:10.1080/03637757009375677

Men, Linjuan Rita. "Strategic Internal Communication." *Management Communication*

    Quarterly, vol. 28, no. 2, 2014, pp. 264–284., doi:10.1177/0893318914524536.

Mikkelson, Alan C., et al. "Communication Competence, Leadership Behaviors, and Employee

    Outcomes in Supervisor-Employee Relationships." *Business and Professional*

    Communication Quarterly, vol. 78, no. 3, 2015, pp. 336–354.,

    doi:10.1177/2329490615588542.

Nair, Captain C. P. Krishnan. "Leadership Communication to Beat the Odds." *Leader to Leader*,

    vol. 2013, no. 70, 2013, pp. 12–17., doi:10.1002/ltl.20095. Accessed 26 Sept. 2017.

Neufeld, Derrick J., et al. "Remote Leadership, Communication Effectiveness and Leader

    Performance." *Group Decision and Negotiation*, vol. 19, no. 3, May 2008, pp. 227–246.,

    doi:10.1007/s10726-008-9142-x.

Ogbonna, Emmanuel, and Lloyd C Harris. "Leadership Style, organizational culture and

    performance: empirical evidence from UK companies." *The International Journal of*

    Human Resource Management, vol. 11, no. 4, Aug. 2000, pp. 766–788.,

    www.tandf.co.uk/journals.

Olasupo, Mo. "Relationship between organizational culture, leadership style and job satisfaction

    in a Nigerian Manufacturing Organization." *IFE Psychological*, vol. 19, no. 1, 2011,

    doi:10.4314/ifep.v19i1.64595.

Omilion-Hodges, L. M. & Baker, C. R. (2012, November). *Reconceptualizing and*

    recontextualizing the leader-member relationship.

Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A Meta-Analytic Review of Attitudinal And Dispositional

    Predictors Of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*(4), 775-

    802. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x

Paine, J. B., & Organ, D. W. (2000). The cultural matrix of organizational citizenship behavior: Some preliminary conceptual and empirical observations. Human Resource Management Review, 10, 45–59.

Podsakoff, P. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: a critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management, 26*(3), 513-563. doi:10.1016/s0149-2063(00)00047-7

Popescu, Alexandra Michaela, et al. "Organization's age and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), performance criteria at SMEs level. Case study-Bucharest-Ilfov development region ." *Procedia Economics and Finance*, vol. 22, 2015, pp. 645–654. *Science Direct*, www.sceincedirect.com.

Raducan, Radu, and Ramona Raducan. "Communication Styles of Leadership Tools." *Social and Behavioral Science*, vol. 149, 2014, pp. 813–818., doi:10.1016/j_sbspro.2014.1.326.

Rodrigues, Alexandra De Oliveira, and Maria Cristina Ferreira. "The Impact of Transactional and Transformational Leadership Style on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors." *Psico-USF*, vol. 20, no. 3, 2015, pp. 493–504., doi:10.1590/1413-82712015200311.

Schuler, R. S., & Blank, L. F. (1976). Relationships among types of communication, organizational level, and employee satisfaction and performance. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, EM-23*(3), 124-129. doi:10.1109/tem.1976.6447173

Solaja, Mayowa, et al. "Exploring the relationship between leadership communication style, personality trait and organizational productivity." *Serbian Journal of Management*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2016, pp. 99–117., doi:10.5937/sjm11-8480.

Sparks, J. R., & Schenk, J. A. (2006). Socialization Communication, Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, and Sales in a Multilevel Marketing Organization. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 26*(2), 161-180. doi:10.2753/pss0885-3134260204

Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Goh, A. P. S., & Bruursema, K. (2003). *Counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: Are they opposites?*

Vries, Reinout E. De, et al. "Leadership = Communication? The Relations of Leaders' Communication Styles with Leadership Styles, Knowledge Sharing and Leadership Outcomes." *Journal of Business and Psychology*, vol. 25, no. 3, Apr. 2009, pp. 367–380., doi:10.1007/s10869-009-9140-2. Accessed 28 Sept. 2017.

Wang, G., Oh, I., Courtright, S.H., & Amy E., Colbert, A. E. (2011). Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research. *Group & Organization Management*, 36(2) 223-270 doi: 10.1177/1059601111401017

Yildirim, O. (2014). The Impact of Organizational Communication on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Research Findings. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 150*, 1095-1100. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.124