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Abstract
The current study was an empirical attempt to examine the role of perceived leadership styles in predicting organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) among a sample of university teachers (N = 494). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (1997) and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (Lee & Allen, 2002) were used to measure the constructs used in present study. Multiple regression analysis revealed that perceived transformational and transactional leadership styles of teachers were significant positive predictors of OCB. Idealized influence (attributes) idealized influence (behaviors), inspirational motivation and, intellectual stimulation sub-constructs of transformational and contingent reward a sub-construct of transactional leadership were also found to be significant positive predictors of OCB. Limitations, suggestions and implications have also been discussed.
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I. Introduction
It is the teacher whom we consider important enough that we leave our future to his hands. He teaches us how to speak, read and write. He struggles for us when we cannot write even our own names. He trains us how to live not only the present moment but prepares us for the next. The doctor gives treatment to the patients and his duty is finished. The engineer constructs the machines and his responsibility is over. Same is the case with other professions, but it is only the teacher who has to perform dual responsibilities. He teaches us how we can have knowledge, how we can learn knowledge and how we can construct knowledge.

Universities are organizations but different from other manufacturing or human service organizations. Like other organizations, universities have chain of command from vice chancellor to the teachers; but unlike other organizations, the authorities of the departments do not possess professional administrative trainings. In such a situation, role of leaders (i.e., head of departments and others) become more critical and interesting for organizational researchers. Therefore, the present study is focused on the individual impacts of perceived leadership styles, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). It is assumed that perceived leadership styles (transformational and transactional) and their constructs will positively predict OCB.
II. Perceived Leadership Styles

Process of influencing followers in order to achieve a common goal in recognized as leadership (Northouse, 2001). It is a relationship between the individuals who want to lead and the individuals who desire to be leaded (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). To conclude, leadership has been defined in the terms of personality, compliance, center of group processes, influence, specific behaviors, persuasion, power relation, differentiated role and all possible combinations of these aspects (Bass, 1997). Leadership styles refer to the manners which are used by the leader to influence others by providing directions to them and motivating them to work (Duta, 2011).

The present study focuses on how employees perceive the leadership style of their leader i.e., their perceived leadership style. Now a days, researchers are turning their attention towards how the employees perceive their leaders rather than solely the impact of leadership styles. For instance, Shums-ur-Rehman, Shareef, Mahmood and Ishaque (2012) studied the impact if perceived leadership style on employee commitment among staff of educational institutes in Pakistan. Mitonga-Monga, Coetzee, and Cilliers (2012) studied the relationship of perceived leadership style and employee participation among a sample of manufacturing organization. Similarly, Mester, Visser, Roodt, and Kellerman (2003) observed the relationship of perceived leadership style with organizational commitment, job involvement, job satisfaction, and OCB. They also studied the effects of leadership styles and found different results as compared to perceived leadership styles. This suggests that perception of employees regarding the leadership style of the manager is of crucial importance.

A. Transformational leadership

Transformational leadership involves the behaviors of leaders that transform their followers and inspire them so that they are able to perform beyond expectations and could go beyond their own self-interests for the sake of organization (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). They bring change among their employees by using one or more components of transformational leadership including idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration and idealized attributes (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Idealized Influence

Idealized influence consists of those acts of the leader which he specifies goals and the importance of a sense of purpose, clarifies ethical and moral side of decisions, encourages his followers to explore new possibilities, and tell them about the significance of trusting others are included in this category (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Inspirational motivation

By inspirational motivation, those qualities of leaders are meant which energize his followers by proposing an optimistic view of the future. Leader with enthusiastically articulates to his followers about what they should actually consider (Antonakis, et al., 2003).

Intellectual stimulation

The leader high on intellectual stimulation encourages his employees to question the accuracy of critical assumptions, to focus on problems from different new
perspectives, to discover innovative ways of completing the assignments and to rethink those notions which have never been questioned (Antonakis, et al., 2003).

**Individualized consideration**

The leader high on individualized consideration focuses on each employee’s needs is concerned for the employee’s concerns. It results in development of intrinsic motivation among the followers. Such a leader spends time in teaching others, considers the individual differences of the employees rather than treating them merely as team members, and encourages others to develop themselves (Antonakis, et al., 2003; Nicholason, 2007).

**Idealized attributes**

Idealized attributes involve those behaviors of leaders which enable others to trust the leader. Leader, with his charisma, build a sense of pride among his followers for being associated with him. He makes personal sacrifices for the benefit of others, and perceived as confident, powerful, and focusing on ethics and high-order ideals (Antonakis, et al., 2003).

**B. Transactional leadership Style**

The leadership style characterized by gaining power through using rewards, promises and praises which may take the form of bargaining, compromising, and trading between the leaders and the followers (Northouse, 2010). Bass and Riggio (2006) stated that transactional leaders fulfill the current needs of employees, resulting in a short term satisfactory effects on the employees. Transactional leadership consists of three factors including contingent reward, management by exception (active) and management by exception (passive).

**Contingent Rewards**

Contingent reward behaviors (i.e., constructive transactions) include those behaviors of the leaders which are aimed at clarifying the roles of the followers along with explaining task requirements to them. The transactional leader performs these behaviors by indulging in a transaction where rewards are offered by the leader for expected results and for fulfillment of the contractual duties (Antonakis, et al., 2003).

**Management-by-Exception Active**

This component of transactional leadership involves the active participation of the leader whose efforts are aimed at ensuring the standards to be met. Such a leader participates actively in monitoring his employees and takes correcting measures in order to achieve desirable results (Antonakis, et al., 2003).

**C. Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

Organizational citizenship behavior is a cluster of discretionary, organization-facilitating behaviors which add to psychological and social context of performance but do not bring reward for the worker under formal reward system (Organ, 1988; Organ, Podsakoff, &MacKenzie, 2006). These behaviors add to the development of the organization but are not included in the formal job description. Organ (1988) first introduced this concept when he revisited the traditional concept of job performance. He noted that along with quantitative aspects of work, job performance was something more than the call of duty. It included some qualitative aspects, which he termed organizational
citizenship behavior, which add to the social and psychological context of the work. An extra-role behavior (ERB), which was initiated by Van-Dyne, Cummings, and Parks (1995), involves discretionary behaviors which are more than the expected roles of the employees.

D. Linking Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

Leadership is a composite of three interacting elements, which are the leader, follower, and situation. The follower and the situation are the elements which are almost stable; it is the leader who has to bring change among these two elements for smooth development of the organization (Duta, 2011). Appropriate leadership style can exert a very significant effect on the followers and can motivate them to increase their inputs for formal, prescribed duties as well as extra-role behaviors. One such positive work-place behavior is OCB which is the result of high-quality relationship between the leader and the follower (Brouer, Duke, Treadway, & Ferris, 2009).

Social exchange theory (Blau, 1965) explains that, when followers build up positive perceptions of their leaders and find them as encouraging and motivating them, in return, they try to give positive response through performing more than their formal duties. Therefore, a strong positive relationship is assumed between transformational leadership style and OCB.

Along with transformational leadership, transactional leadership has also been found associated with increased level of OCB among employees. Transactional leaders improve the behaviors of the followers by offering rewards to them. When rewards are allocated, the leaders not only consider both in-role performance and extra-role behaviors. Therefore, in order to get more rewards the employees perform more extra-role behavior (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). Therefore transformational leadership has been observed as an important predictor of OCB among employees. Moreover, a transactional leader can increase the level of OCB among employees by using the principal of operant conditioning. When rewards are given on increased level of OCB, the employees are more likely to perform OCBs.

On the bases of aforementioned review following hypotheses have been formulated for the current study.

1. Perceived transformational leadership styles will positively predict organizational citizenship behavior.
2. Perceived transformational leadership styles will positively predict organizational citizenship behavior.

III. Method

A. Sample

Convenient sampling technique was used to draw samples of university teachers (N = 494) from different university of Punjab and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa provinces of Pakistan. The inclusion criteria of the sample one was those full time university teachers in public sector universities, who were having minimum job experience of two years. Sample was consisted of 260 male and 234 female university teachers. The age of the sample was ranged between of 23 to 62 (M = 36.38, SD = 9.01) years.
B. Instruments

All the constructs of the present study were measured through self-report instruments which included the following:

C. Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X, Bass & Avolio, 1997)

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X, Short) developed by Bass and Avolio (1997) was used in current study to assess the perceived leadership styles university teachers. MLQ is a self-report measure that measures the perception regarding leadership behavior in each of the factors in the Full Range Theory of Leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1997). Response format is Likert type that varies from strongly disagree for 1 to strongly agree for 5.

Transformational leadership style encompasses five sub constructs i.e. idealized influence (attributed) idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, individual stimulation, and individualized consideration respectively. Transactional leadership style incorporates three sub constructs namely contingent reward, management-by-exception-active, and management-by-exception-passive. Reliability scores for the MLQ subscales ranged from .63 to .92.

D. Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (Lee & Allen, 2002)

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale developed by Lee and Allen (2002), is fixed on 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (Never) to 5 (Always). Farh, Zhong, and Organ (2004) summed the 16 items of the OCB scale to form a composite score for the OCB construct and reported coefficient alpha for the composite OCB scale that was found to be .89.

IV. Procedure

Participants were contacted in their universities by the researcher on behalf of Department of Psychology, University of Peshawar. After seeking informed consent and their permission, they were briefed about the objectives, purpose and rationale of the present study, then they were given the questionnaires and written instructions about responding on each item. Furthermore, their queries regarding how to respond items of various scales were also cordially entertained and they were requested to respond on each item of all scales. The filled questionnaires from the teachers were gathered back by the researcher himself or on his behalf by the helper.

V. Results

Keeping in view the assumptions of the proposed study Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were computed for scales and subscale to determine the internal consistency of the scales. Pearson correlation illustrated pattern of relationship among the variables. Multiple regression analyses accounted for hypotheses testing.

Table 1 presents the bivariate zero-order correlations between the constructs operationalized for the present study. Transformational and transactional leaderships yield significant positive correlations with OCB. Table 2 suggests that 7% of the variance in OCB can be designated to transformational (TRF) and transactional leadership (TRS) styles ($R^2 = .07$) and overall the model was significant ($F (2, 492) = 10.10, p < .001$) and among the predictors, TRF ($\beta = .12, t = 1.51, p < .05$) and TRS ($\beta = .19, t = 2.54, p < .001$) were found to be significant positive predictors of OCB.
Table 1: Correlation Matrix for Leadership Styles and Their Sub-scales (N = 494)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80*</td>
<td>.84*</td>
<td>.85*</td>
<td>.83*</td>
<td>.87*</td>
<td>.82*</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.85*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.83*</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1 = transformational leadership; 2 = transactional leadership; 3 = idealized influence (attributes); 4 = idealized influence (behaviors); 5 = inspirational motivation; 6 = intellectual stimulation; 7 = individualized consideration; 8 = contingent reward; 9 = management-by-exception active; 10 = OCB. *p < .001.

Table 2: Regression Analysis of Leadership Styles Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behavior (N = 494)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>OCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictor Variable</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional leadership</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table 3 imply that 8.4% of the variance in OCB can be designated to TRF constructs (R² = .084). Overall the model is significant {F (5, 489) = 15.99, p < .001} and among the predictors, IA (β = .13, t = 2.49, p < .05), IB (β = .12, t = 2.44, p < .05), IM (β = .14, t = 2.66, p < .01), and IS (β = .10, t = 1.96, p < .05) were found to be significant positive predictors of OCB.

Table 3: Multiple Regression Analysis of Transformational Leadership Constructs Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behavior (N = 494)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>OCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictor Variable</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized influence (attributes)</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized influence (behaviors)</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational motivation</td>
<td>.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized consideration</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 4 imply that 9.4% of the variance in OCB can be designated to TRS constructs (R² = .094) and overall the model elucidates significant results {F (3, 491) = 12.58, p < .001} and among the predictors, CR (β = .16, t = 2.81, p < .01) was found to be significant positive predictor of OCB.
Table 4: Multiple Regression Analysis of Transactional Leadership Constructs Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Affective Commitment and Job Involvement (N = 494)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>∆R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contingent reward</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-exception-active</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

VI. Discussion

In order to accomplish the psychometric strength of the instruments, descriptive statistics and reliability coefficients (see Table 1) were determined for all scales. Results revealed that overall various scales of the study manifested an adequate index of alpha reliability that is greater than .70 (Nunnally, & Bernstein, 1994), except three sub-scales namely; idealized influence (attributes), intellectual stimulation and management-by-exception active. The alpha reliabilities of these sub-scales ranged between .61 to .63 (see Table 1). Keeping in view that increase in alpha value is partially subjected to number of items a scale held, these reliabilities were also considered to be acceptable as recommended by George and Mallery, (2003).

Our findings suggest that perceived transformational leadership style (TRF) and its constructs directly predicted OCB in the expected directions (see Table 2&3), except the individualized consideration which found to be non significant predictor of OCB. In organizational work settings, the most important entities are recognized as leaders who are most probable to employ a direct influence on the behavior, attitude, and performance of their subordinates. Thus their followers are being encouraged and motivated to work for goals by keeping aside their short-term self-interest (Ivancevich, Konopaske, & Matteson, 2008). This positive association between both leader and followers stimulates OCB and other work related progressive behaviors in employees.

There has always been a need of strong motivation and determination to evolve a positive behavior among employees and transformational leaders are among those influential individuals who are meant to assure poise between employees’ perception and their OCB. Dvir, Eden, Avolio, and Shamir (2002) has also described TRF as a process of mutual benefit and help between leaders and followers to enhance a higher level of motivation and morale. It is therefore, the positive relationship between TRF and OCB is plausibly understandable and justified.

In Pakistani public sector, university teachers are more likely to demonstrate OCBs voluntarily, when they perceive that the person sitting on chair of head is visionary and goal oriented. University faculty members themselves are highly qualified and academic elite living in an academic environment so they can only be swayed in the presence of chairperson who must possess some extraordinary leadership qualities. TRF has been widely recognized in transformation of subordinates’ behavior through charismatic attitude and visionary guidance. TRF in an organization like university is seemingly, among one of the most suitable style to raise the performance of faculty members and generation of OCBs among them. There is empirical evidence that TRF belongs to promote OCB among employees for example Organ, Podsakoff, and
MacKenzie (2006) examined that OCB among employees was affected by transformational leaders’ behavior.

Current study also examined the effect of the four core behavioral components of TRF identified by the Avolio and Bass (2002), and those are generally recognized as the pillars of TRF. They include idealized influence (attributed and behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

When TRF exercises individualized influence their followers imitate them by identifying with their aspirations. Leaders pay considerable attention on followers’ needs and also concentrate on their risks and yield consistent conduct with underlying values, ethics, and principles beyond their own interests and needs. As a result leader is retaliated with respect, admiration, and trust by the followers and this entire scenario becomes encouraging for them to promote OCB. Mutual trust plays a major role in creating an environment in which followers identify and recognize OCB. Current findings can be empirically supported by Kucukbayrak (2010) who investigated positive relationship between trust on TRF and OCB. Moreover, findings of Asgari, Silong, Ahmad, and Samah (2008) explored significant mediated effect of trust in relationship between TRF and OCB.

Transformational leaders behave through inspirational motivation in ways that motivate their subordinates by providing those challenges and meaning in order to engage in common goals and activities. They also display optimism and enthusiasm, encourages employees to envisage striking future states and thus they succeed in arousing individual and team spirit and expectedly the individual’s perception of treatment and worth received by leader might lead him to adopt OCBs. Employees’ perception of value and fairness and his participation in decision making may exert extensive effect on his behavior. A positive relationship between TRF and OCB in findings of present research can reasonably be supported by Kaur (2011) who explained that a positive perception of an employee leads to citizenship behaviors.

Intellectual stimulation refers to the acts of the TRF, which inspire the follower to use their logic and problem solving abilities, and enable them to explore the solution of their problems creatively. The leaders high on intellectual stimulation encourages their employees to question the accuracy of critical assumptions, to focus on problems from different new perspectives, to discover innovative ways of completing the assignments and to rethink those notions which have never been questioned. There is no mockery or criticism of individual members’ mistakes rather their new ideas and innovative solutions to problematic issues are implored and continuously considered in the process of problem addressing and solution finding in an organization. Current findings can be discerned within this context that a sense of job involvement and self worth is likely to be developed among employees as a result of intellectual stimulation and they are inclined to change their behavior positively towards both leader and organization and expected to demonstrate OCB. Although there is scant literature available on direct relationship between the core constructs of TRF and OCB but there is empirical confirmation for current results for example Kucukbayrak (2010) explored intellectual stimulation as significant positive predictor of OCB among 148 participants obtained from public banks in Turkey.
Present findings elucidated non significant results regarding individualized consideration as positive predictor of OCB. A transformational leader usually use individualized consideration behavior to pay attention to each individual’s need for accomplishment and advancement by acting as a mentor or coach. An explanation to of current results might be that in universities faculty members are mostly belonged to diverse individual and social back ground. Their individual differences are not most of the time possible to be addressed adequately by the respective heads in terms of needs and desires to initiate OCB among them. Another promising reason might be the construct of TRS which in aggregate is perceived more meaningfully as compared to the its components individually. The findings of Emery & Barker (2007) provide evidence that specific behaviors of TRF did not reflect leader’s behavior perfectly. Present results are also consistent with Kucukbayrak (2010) who found that individualized support, a TRF construct similar to individualized consideration, was no significant predictor of OCB in public sector bank employees.

Current findings, as far as the relationship between TRF and OCB is concerned, found to be consistent not only with indigenous studies of Saeed and Ahmad (2012) who observed positive relationship between constructs of perceived TRF and OCB in university administrative staff, Khan, Ghouri, and Awang (2013) who confirmed positive relationship between TRF and OCB among IT solution finders and Farooqui (2012) who studied in a sample of lecturers of Pakistani universities that leadership was a strong predictor of employees’ OCB, but also with various western studies exhibiting the same relationship pattern (e.g. Asgari, et al., 2008; Lian&Tui, 2012; Organ, Podsakoff, &MacKenzie, 2006; Rabcock-Roberson & Strickland, 2010).

Present findings also revealed that perceived transactional leadership (TRS) and contingency rewards predicted OCB in positive direction, whereas active-management-by-exception (MBE-A) was found to be the non significant predictor of OCB (see Table 2 & 4).

Leadership is has been recognized one of the important factor in the influencing behavior of employees and molding them to contribute in success and effectiveness of groups and organizations. Cherry (2007) described transactional leadership (TRS) as those who set goals and targets to ensure success by clear communication of tasks and activities, and achieve targets in collaboration with subordinates and motivating them through aligning resources. They basically emphasize on relationship based on “give and take” and use conventional punishment and reward to ensure compliance from employees and inspire them to manifest OCB. These leaders use incentive or rewards to achieve desired results when employees did not meet their expectations. Employees cultivate the perception that their behavior is contingent to rewards and thus produce more OCB. Study of Riaz and Haider (2010) has also documented evidence that TRS rewards positively and give recognition to the employee for his good performance and contribution in success.

OCBs are theoretically described as multifaceted constructs pertain to all positive behaviors related to an organization that are specifically not recognized and rewarded by a formal system. They are not formally required roles of job description, rather they are subject to individuals’ own choices and generally perceived non punitive if not exhibited (Organ, 1988), but as a matter of fact this is not true in real sense. At individual level
employee is in urge of getting some benefit or reward from leadership as a result of his OCB. Plethora of research has witnessed that the role of OCB are positively associated with variety of effectiveness measures of organization e.g. profitability, productivity, and efficiency (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, &Blume, 2009), basic trauma life support (Nasiripour, 2011) job satisfaction and commitment (Sharma, Bajpai, &Holani, 2011) job performance, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Ahmad, 2010).

Leaders largely demand OCB from followers because of its recognized affectivity and they influence on employees through social exchange behavior to enhance the citizenship behavior among them. The study of Bass and Riggio (2006) strengthen our argument that transactional leaders intend to enhance OCB through the concept social exchange (e.g., subsidies for campaign contributions and financial rewards). Moreover, another judicious explanation to current research findings might be that OCBs are also vital in determining reward allocation decisions and managerial evaluations, therefore; these are also used to influence TRS in gaining advantage in decision making processes of transactional leaders. Such decisions are important, sometimes, in job promotion for instance in universities annual confidential reports (ACR) endorsed by heads are considered and given weight age for promotion of a university teacher. So a positive relationship of TRS and contingent reward with OCB is discernible. Podsakoff, et al., (2009) in a meta-analytic study on OCB found that OCBs were positively associated with reward allocation and ratings of employees. Current results are in same fashion with few studies of near past e.g., Rubin, Bommer, and Bachrach, (2010) and Walumbwa, Wu, and, Orwa (2008) who also found a significant relationship of TRS and contingent reward with OCB.

Whereas, in the case of MBE-A, transactional leaders not only use corrective methods but also keenly monitors the work performed and to ensure the work has been done up to accepted standards to influence behavior of employees. A strict monitoring may cause some negative consequences on employee e.g. stress, work-family conflicts, turnover intention etc. These negative consequences may originate negative relationship between MBE-P and OCB. As Bolino and Turnley (2005) investigated that consequence of OCB, include stress, increased levels of role overload, and work–family conflicts. Findings of present study regarding TRS in prediction of OCB and in line with considerable indigenous and western research for example Khan, et al., (2013) confirmed positive relationship between TRS and OCB among IT solution finders of small and medium scale IT firms running in Pakistan, Zabihi and Hashemzehi (2012) in an Iranian study explored TRS and contingent rewards as significant positive predictors and MBE-P as non significant predictor of OCB, Asgari et al., (2008) and found same relationship pattern among full time public sector employees in Malaysia. Kim (2009) also found TRS and contingent rewards as significant positive and MBE-as non significant predictors of OCB in a sample 359 athletic head coaches.

VII. Conclusions

Conclusions elucidated that both transformational and transactional leadership styles were significant predictors of OCB, whereas individualized consideration a construct of TRF and management-by-exception-active a dimension of TRS were found to be non significant predictors of OCB among public sector university teachers of Pakistan.
VIII. Limitations and Suggestions
Present study was confined to examine the perceived leadership styles of university teachers, whereas multisource data of heads and teachers could be of vital importance to validate the teachers’ perception and generalize the findings. Current study did not explore the OCB at its sub construct level which is recommended to be examined in further studies. In current study convenient sampling technique was used so the results should be viewed with caution and purposive or random sampling procedure in future research to have more clear picture.

IX. Implications
Importance of leadership has been a well established fact and current findings also endorsed that university heads with both transformational and transactional leaders have key role in leading OCBs among faculty members. Moreover many other positive attitudes e.g. teachers ’satisfaction (Bogler, 2001), organizational commitment, increasing satisfaction with compensation (Mosadegh Rad &Yarmohammadian, 2006) are associated with transformational academic institutional heads. Cognitive learning, perceptions of heads credibility, affective learning, and communication satisfaction are associated with transactional leadership, so the results of this study suggest that public sector university departmental heads need to use sheer leadership style to enhance effectiveness in universities.

References


Kim, H. (2009). Transformational and transactional leadership of athletic directors and their impact on organizational outcomes perceived by head coaches at NCAA Division II intercollegiate institutions. (Unpublished PhD dissertation). The Ohio State University. USA.


