

Despotic and Transformational Leadership in Collectivistic Culture: Evidence from Asian Tech Firms

Zahra Batool

Researcher, McMaster University, Canada
Email: batoolz@mcmaster.ca

Irfan Saleem

Assistant Professor, Sohar University, Oman
Email: isaleem@su.edu.om

Faisal Mustafa

Professor/ Provost, University of Central Punjab Lahore, Pakistan
Email: faisal.mustafa@ucp.edu.pk

Abstract

This study aims to test that how employees' creativity and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) are affected by two contrasting leadership styles in technology firms in a collectivistic culture. A quantitative approach and a dyadic design are used in this study. Data were collected from technology firms and the hypotheses were tested using various statistical techniques. The results regarding the role of positive and negative leadership styles for employees' OCB and creativity were found as expected. However, when a boundary condition (i.e. culture as moderator) was set, the direct relationships between the two leadership styles and OCB were either strengthened or weakened. This research may not be generalizable across cultures. Therefore, future studies may explore the moderating role of individual and collective cultures, while incorporating more exogenous variables (e.g. transnational, servant, and inclusive leadership styles) and endogenous (e.g. individual job satisfaction and turnover intentions) variables. Similarly, one could test our theory by testing the interactive effect of two leadership styles. The study has contextual implications for local firms. So international investors, like Chinese firms need to understand the collective culture of tech firms in Pakistan. First, this study fills an empirical gap by collecting data from technology firms in the South Asian context. Second, this research identifies the need to understand the role of national culture in order to increase leaders' success in a collectivistic culture.

Keywords: Despotic leadership, Transformational leadership, Collectivistic culture, Organisational citizenship behaviour, Creativity.

I. Introduction

Globally firms' executives are worried about promoting innovation and creativity, at the workplace in order to achieve every challenging organizational goal (Chen, Sharma, Zhan & Liu, 2019). Nevertheless, the misunderstanding ignorance about the organisational culture under the influence of the certain national logic causes poor

leader-member exchange (Lemoine, Hartnell, & Leroy, 2019). Moreover, executives successful in one firm under influence on one national logic may not achieve the same results in another firm (Mao, Chiu, Owens, Brown & Liao, 2019). Resultantly leaders and managers may face undesirable employee behaviours triggering low organizational outcomes (efficiently and effectiveness). The theorists have also claimed that quality and type of exchange between leader and members results in different desirable and undesirable behaviours of the employee depending on the style of a leader (Cheung & Wu, 2012).

Therefore, the question whether culture plays a key role in the degree of leaders' effectiveness has also concerned South Asian management scholars and organizational psychologists (Aguilera, Judge & Terjesen, 2018; Farooq et al., 2017; Naseer et al., 2016). Accordingly, our research question is: How a leader can interact with local culture to promote creativity and organizational citizenship behaviour among subordinates at the workplace?

Previous studies have acknowledged that successful leadership requires an understanding of the local society's norms, values, beliefs, quality of exchange between leaders and members, and ideology-in short, its culture or national logic (Aguilera, Judge & Terjesen, 2018; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Hofstede, 2011). Following this line of reasoning, to successfully retain creative employees, unite the workforce as a team and sustain employees' motivation to achieve the firm's goals, supervisors need a deep understanding of subordinates' behaviour in the cultural context (Kremer, Villamor, & Aguinis, 2019). Recent studies have shown that the value systems, norms, and ideology of a particular national culture greatly affect organizational settings (Farooq et al., 2017; Hartnell, Ou, Kinicki, Choi, & Karam, 2019). In addition, research on leadership across cultures has explicated the need for different types of leadership in different societal settings, but most such research has been conducted in western cultural contexts (Nguyen et al., 2017). Therefore, research is required in non-western societies, in which collectivistic cultures may affect the relationship between leadership styles and individual or organizational outcomes (Hofstede, 2011; Naseer et al., 2016; Saleem, Khalid & Nadeem, 2019).

The paper is focused on a very intriguing and interesting topic about contrasting leadership styles including despotic and transformational in relationship with collectivistic culture under one umbrella. Recently, much attention has been given to the dark side of leadership in the west (Landay, et al., 2019; Mao et al., 2019), yet there is a dearth of academic literature on the particular topic in the context of developing countries usually have an individualistic culture. Thus, scholars and petitioners would be enthusiastic about this study on the leadership styles and behaviours in the context of collectivistic culture. Specifically, we focus on how Despotic and Transformational leadership styles influence creativity and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) in a collectivistic culture. The topic certainly contributes to international teaching for business students, scholars, and practitioners. Moreover, this paper offers novel insights that can really improve the level of research on the dark side of leadership in a collectivistic culture. Along the same lines, you suggest that we fill the empirical gap by collecting the data from technology firms, which are of future attraction for investment for most of the foreign investors from China, Dubai, and Saudi Arabia.

Normally, it is claimed that in a collectivistic culture, particularly in India and Pakistan, leaders follow transactional and laissez-faire leadership style (Chaudhry & Javed, 2012; Verma, et al., 2015). Nevertheless, limited studies have been conducted on comparison of despotic and transformational leadership. So, this is one of our unique empirical contributions.

Another contribution of this study is to theorise and test the influence of contrasting leadership styles, that is despotic and transformational leadership on creativity and organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) in collectivistic cultures at one point of time to address recent calls for further investigation and theory testing (Atwater & Carmeli, 2009; Chen et al., 2019; Landay, Harms & Credé, 2019).

This study assumed that culture reflects a national setting and cannot be easily changed at the organizational level. For instance, collectivistic culture is a feature of South Asian nations, and individualistic culture a feature of western societies (Aguilera, Judge & Terjesen, 2018; Hofstede, 2011). This research paper is expected to contribute both empirically and conceptually. First, this study fills an empirical gap by collecting data from technology firms in the South Asian context. Second, this research identifies the need to understand the role of national culture inherent in firms in order to increase leaders' success in collectivistic cultures. This may indirectly ensure the firm and employee level outcomes.

II. Literature Review

Culture is relevant not only at the national level (Hofstede, 2011), but also at the organizational level (Tipu et al., 2012). Organisational Behaviour (OB) scholars interested in studying the role of culture in diverse leadership styles (Hambrick and Lovelace, 2018; Landay, Harms, & Credé, 2019; Lemoine et al., 2019; Jung et al., 2009; Mao et al., 2019) have suggested the following topics for further research. How workforce effectiveness is influenced by culture? Can a leaders' cultural misunderstanding destroy a team's efficacy, either directly or indirectly? Researchers are currently investigating how and why cultures influence the direct relationships between leadership styles and employee behaviours (Lemoine et al., 2019; Mao et al., 2019). Research is needed on how cultures set the boundary conditions for the relationship between leadership styles and employee outcomes.

According to the Leader Member Exchange-LMX theory, leaders establish distinct relationships with each follower using a system of exchanges (Cheung and Wu, 2012). LMX theory states that a stable relationship is established between leaders and followers, and benefits or consequences are exchanged when this relationship matures (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). Leaders may choose to go beyond formal contact, indicating a high level of LMX, or may choose only professional contact, indicating a low level of LMX. The degree of LMX may also depend on other factors: some leaders and employees may be good at work-related tasks, others at negotiating or social interaction, and still others may be good at both. In the cases of the despotic and transformational leadership styles, scholars believe that a low-quality exchange can be expected between despotic leader-members and a high-quality between transformational leader-members (De Hoogh and Den Hartog, 2008).

Leadership has been a hot research topic for many decades (Avolio et al., 1999; Edelman and van-Knippenberg, 2018), and although scholars have identified various personal leadership styles, including transformational, transactional, despotic, autocratic and laissez-faire, inclusive leaders, servant leadership, and ethical leadership (Chen et al., 2019; Eva et al., 2019; Grijalva, et al., in press) but the present study addresses only two, that is despotic and transformational.

Transformational leadership is recognized as the most effective at helping individuals, teams and organizations perform beyond the status quo, which in turn enhances employees' ability to adapt and innovate in changing work environments to accomplish the goals (Chen et al., 2019; Sadiq, 2018). Currently, many high-technology firms operate worldwide, competing fiercely. To gain competitive advantage, they must strive to improve constantly by embracing innovation (Gong et al., 2009; Kremer, Villamor & Aguinis, 2019). Customising the transformational leadership style to local cultures can help accomplish this (Hartnell et al., 2019), and such customization has been found to help employees take ownership of their successes and failures as a group and be more motivated to accomplish the firm's key objectives without expecting any immediate additional remuneration (Kremer, Villamor & Aguinis, 2019; Wang et al., 2005).

Despotic leaders work toward their own self-interests (De Hoogh and Den Hartog, 2008; Landay, Harms & Credé, 2019) and develop relationships based on these self-interests (Schilling, 2009). In addition, they tend to be vengeful and may exhibit unscrupulous behaviour that furthers personal gain and self-aggrandizement (Einarsen et al., 2007). This leadership style usually features a high power distance between leaders and subordinates (Naseer et al., 2016; Shao, Nijstad & Täuber, 2019; Wong et al., 2014). In nations that have collectivistic cultures, including India and Pakistan (Wong, et al., 2014), instead of using either transformational or transactional leadership, many leaders continue to use the despotic leadership style, which is not only inherent in these cultures but also has been perpetuated due to the bureaucratic legacy of the British colonies like Pakistan and India (Shao, Nijstad & Täuber, 2019; Naseer et al., 2016). For these reasons, this study compares the transformational leadership style with the despotic style instead of the transactional.

A. Hypotheses Development

Integrating organizational culture into leadership style has been shown to boost employees' creativity and OCB (Amabile, 1983; Atwater & Carmeli, 2009; Hartnell et al., 2019; Zhou and George, 2001). In Pakistan collectivistic culture usually prevails in firms (Hofstede, 2011; Naseer et al., 2016; Saleem et al., 2019). Thus, employees' creativity can be enhanced through colleagues and team leaders (Kremer, Villamor & Aguinis, 2019; Tipu et al., 2012). Firm's innovation is contingent upon workforce creativity (Zhou and George, 2001), which in technology-driven firms is an acknowledged factor in gaining competitive advantage and addressing the constantly changing business environment (Jung et al., 2003; Shao et al., 2019; Tierney et al., 1999). The literature also substantiates that transformational leadership is highly correlated with creativity (Choi, 2006; Chughtai, 2014; Gong et al., 2009; Khan, Rehman & Fatima, 2009; Tierney et al., 1999), and transformational leaders have been found to motivate creative designers in software (Avolio et al., 1999) and the telecom sector of Pakistan (Khan, Rehman & Fatima, 2009). Nevertheless, certain obstacles, including negative leadership behaviours and attitudes, may thwart innovation and creativity at the

workplace (Chughtai, 2014; De Hoogh and Den Hartog, 2008), and despotic leadership may even alienate creative employees (Chughtai, 2014; Landay, Harms, & Credé, 2019; Oldham and Cummings, 1996).

OCB involves employees' personal decisions and interests (Lee and Allen, 2002) and is essential to effective organizational functioning (Lee and Allen, 2002). Leaders can enhance employees' OCB using positive support and constructive leadership styles (Eva et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2005). Transformational leadership has been found to enhance organizational efficiencies and to contribute to accomplishing firms' goals (Chen, Sharma, Zhan, & Liu, 2019; Jiao et al., 2011; Khan, Rehman & Fatima, 2009;). Enhancing OCB needs less focus on a formal reward system, but organizations can provide work environments that facilitate employees to enhance psychological and social affiliation with the firm (Wang, 2005). Given this, we may hypothesize a positive relationship between transformational leadership and employees' OCB. Accordingly, we hypothesize the following.

H1: Transformational leadership enhances creativity and OCB among subordinates.

In contrast, despotic leaders give a few rights to their subordinates and usually, employees rely on the force of personal determination (De Hoogh and Den Hartog, 2008; Grijalva et al., in press). Thus, this style may eventually lower employees' performance by lowering their OCB toward the organization (Landay, et al., 2019; Naseer et al., 2016). As, we are suggesting that negative leaders' behaviour, in our case despotic leadership, diminishes creativity among subordinates. But the opposite could be possible (Chughtai, 2014). For example, the former CEOs of big western firms, such as Apple and Oracle were known to exhibit narcissistic behaviour. However, these firms are known for radical creativity. But based on the collective culture in colonized nations like India and Pakistan, where only low-level disruptions are possible, we are thus assuming contrary to what is possible in western culture (Grijalva, et al., in press). Accordingly, we hypothesize the following.

H2: Despotic leadership diminishes creativity and OCB among subordinates.

Recent calls for further research have urged OB scholars to explore the role of culture (Farooq et al., 2017; Hartnell et al., 2019; Hambrick and Lovelace, 2018; Sadiq, 2018). Various researchers have defined culture in various ways, but Hofstede, who has conducted established work in the domain of culture, states that a particular group of people is distinguished from others by collective programming of the mind, which is conceptualized as a culture (Hofstede, 2011). Five dimensions of culture have been identified: low versus high Power Distance (PD), low versus high Uncertainty Avoidance (UA), individualism versus collectivism, masculine versus feminist and long-term versus short-term time orientation (Hofstede, 2011). In addition, a society's overall behaviour can be collectivistic or individualistic, the latter of which values self-rule, individual rights, independence and unconventional, maverick approaches (Hofstede, 2011). However, according to Hofstede, Pakistani culture is typically collectivistic, scoring low on individualism, moderate on masculinity and a long-term orientation, high on uncertainty avoidance and extremely low on individualism (Saleem, et al., 2019; Tipu et al., 2012).

Organizational culture may force leaders to customize their styles (Hanges and Dickson, 2004), and collaborative organizational environments that acknowledge and value employees' skills may further motivate them (Wang, 2005), particularly in a collectivistic culture in which uncertainty avoidance and power distance may produce despotic leaders (Naseer et al., 2016). Therefore, the effect of transformational or despotic styles can differ in magnitude depending on the degree to which the culture in the firm is collectivistic. As previously mentioned, studies have shown a positive relationship between LMX and employee's creativity, supporting the assumption that LMX enables individuals to be more creative and to act deliberately in making risk-based decisions (De Hoogh and Den Hartog, 2008; Gilson & Madjar, 2011). For instance, when a leader transforms employees' roles by granting them autonomy, including the freedom to take the initiative to meet the firm's goals (Kremer et al., 2019), they are engaged, thus organizational goals and sustainable success is more likely to be achieved (Amabile, 1983; Mao et al., 2019). In contrast, it can be argued that despotic leaders dampen their followers' intrinsic commitment and motivation and, eventually, their creativity. Therefore, positive or negative exchanges are due to the collectivistic culture and its positive or negative effects. Extending these arguments, we may say that collectivism moderates despotic leaders' effects on employee creativity due to negative LMX (Gong et al., 2009; Hartnell et al., 2019; Naseer et al., 2016). Accordingly, the following are the hypotheses regarding moderation.

- H3: Collectivistic cultures enhance the positive association between transformational leadership and OCB and creativity.
- H4: Collectivistic cultures enhance the negative association between despotic leadership and OCB and creativity.

III. Methodology

The present study's respondents were subordinates and supervisors of various technology-based entrepreneurial firms-namely, software creators located in and near Lahore, Pakistan. There are about 664 registered software-producing businesses. These firms include Arbisoft, Conrad Labs, Mindstorm Studios, NetSol Technologies and Techlogix as the major players (Abdullah et al., 2018). The main reasons for collecting data from the IT-based entrepreneurial firms are the growth of this sector in Pakistan and the fact that dynamic leadership is pivotal among such firms and businesses usually have a flatter structure because they are smaller.

Separate questionnaires were developed and administered to supervisors and their subordinates at 80 organizations. A contact person was identified at each organization and asked to hand-deliver the survey packets to the supervisor of every team, including business analysts, software developers, and testers. Each organization's survey packet contained six envelopes, one that contained the questionnaire for the leader and the remaining five envelopes contained the questionnaire for the subordinates. This also aimed to enhance the response rate and prevent any bias by one subordinate toward the leader from influencing another subordinate. Each of the subordinates' envelopes was assigned a unique identification number from 1–350, and each of the leaders' envelopes was assigned a unique number from 1–6 and an additional identification number that was used to match dyads of supervisors with their employees. A cover letter explained the significance of the study and assured participants of confidentiality. To increase the response rate, postage-paid return envelopes were provided. The supervisor participants

were asked to provide demographic data and measures of employee creativity and OCB and the subordinates to provide measurements of both leadership style and culture, each of which was defined for them.

Of the 1,390 subordinates' questionnaires were distributed, 463 were completed and returned, for a response rate of 33.34%, and of the 401 supervisor questionnaires, 171 were returned, for a response rate of 42%.

A. Measurement of Constructs

In Pakistan, English is an official language of business communication and is well understood by workers other than blue collar ones. Therefore, the questionnaire instructions were in English. Except for those regarding transformational leadership and culture, all responses were recorded on a five-point Likert scale containing options that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

The culture was measured using eight items adapted from Singelis et al. (1995) and recently tested by Pakistani scholars (Farooq et al., 2017). Responses were recorded on a five-point Likert scale containing options ranging from 'Definitely No' to 'Definitely Yes'. The scale is classical well tested in Pakistani organizational setting recently. Therefore, we used the same for our study.

Transformational leadership was measured using eight items adapted from Nguyen et al. (2017) and originally developed by Avolio et al. (1999). Responses were recorded on a five-point Likert scale containing the following responses: 1 (not at all); 2, 3 and 4 (sometimes); and 5 (frequently, if not always). This scale is valid and reliable and is used even in meta-analytical studies. So, we have adopted this scale without any modification.

Despotic leadership was measured using six items adapted from the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (Hanges and Dickson, 2004) and De Hoogh and Den Hartog (2008) and tested by a Pakistani scholar (Naseer et al., 2016). The scales for transformational and despotic leadership were found to be reliable, as they were well tested in the local organizational setting of studies cited earlier.

Employee's OCB at the individual level was measured using eight items adapted from Lee and Allen (2002). Employee creativity was measured using four items adapted from Tierney et al. (1999) and tested by various studies (see e.g. Oldham and Cumming, 1996; Zhou and George, 2001). All these scales are reliable and adopted by local scholars published in top tier journals like *Leadership Quarterly* and *Academy of management* (Naseer et al., 2016; Farooq et al. 2017)

The study collected demographic data, including age and gender, from all respondents and tested a few control variables, as guided by previous studies (Mao et al., 2019; Shao et al., 2019). To capture the level of bonding between leader and follower and the LMX level, two types of tenure were used: for supervisors, tenure with the organization and for employees, tenure with the supervisor. To control for the effect on employees' creativity, data on education level were collected (Hartnell et al., 2019; Kremer, Villamor & Aguinis, 2019).

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics, Reliability and Correlations

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Transformational Leadership	3.99	0.53	1.00				
2. Despotic Leadership	2.12	0.78	-.142	1.00			
3. Culture	3.20	0.67	.221**	-.320**	1.00		
4. OCB	3.11	0.79	.057	-.381**	.329**	1.00	
5. Creativity	3.83	0.63	.602**	-.099	.086	-.020	1.00

Note: Gender (Male = 1, Female = 0). Age of employee/leader (1 = below 20 years; 2 = 21–30 years; 3 = 31–40 years; 4 = 41–50 years; 5 = 51 and older). Employee/leader tenure with organisation (1 = 0–2 years; 2 = 3–5 years; 3 = 5–10 years; 4 = more than 10 years). Education of leader/employee (1 = Secondary School; 2 = High School; 3 = Bachelor's Degree; 4 = Master's Degree; 5 = Other/Technical Degree. **p < 0.01; *p < 0.05.

Table 1 contains the standard deviation, mean, correlation and reliability estimates among all study variables. Transformational leadership was significantly and positively correlated with culture ($r = 0.221$, $p < .01$), OCB ($r = 0.057$) and creativity ($r = 0.602$, $p < .01$). Similarly, despotic leadership was significantly and negatively correlated with culture ($r = -0.320$, $p < .01$), OCB ($r = -0.381$, $p < .01$) and creativity ($r = -.086$). Hence, the correlation analysis of the results warranted further analysis.

IV. Data Analysis and Findings

Descriptive, regression and moderation analyses were conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25 and SPSS Analysis of a Moment Structures (AMOS) version 21. All normality assumptions were tested before the required analysis was conducted.

The descriptive analysis found that 88% of subordinates were male and 12% were female. Their mean age was 42.8 years ($SD = 6.230$), and their mean tenure with their supervisor was 2.12 years ($SD = 0.88$), with 22% of them having ≤ 2 years of tenure with their supervisor, 55% having 3–5 years, 12% having 5–10 years and 11% having > 10 years. The subordinates had a mean of 2.6 years of education ($SD = 1.2$), with 23% having completed secondary school, 29% have completed high school, 25% having a bachelor's degree, 17% having a master's degree and 6% having completed technical education. Of the supervisors, 96% were male and 4% were female. Their mean age was 48.72 years ($SD = 5.69$), and their mean tenure with their organization was 2.7 years ($SD = 0.958$), with 15% having ≤ 2 years of tenure with the organization, 20% having 3–5 years, 45% having 5–10 years and 20% having more than 10 years. In terms of education, approximately 17% of supervisors had completed secondary school, 25% had completed high school, 19% had a bachelor's degree, 18% had a master's degree and 21% had completed technical education.

A. Measurement Model

AMOS version 21 was used to perform confirmatory factor analysis by putting all constructs together to analyze the validity of the measures with respect to the research context. To analyse and assess the model's adequacy, the TLI (Tucker-Lewis coefficient), GFI (goodness-of-fit index), RMSEA (Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation), CMIN/DF (degrees of freedom) and CFI (Comparative Fit Index) model-fit indices were reported (Byrne, 2010; MacCallum et. al., 1996. pg. 130–149). The initial CFI model, which contained all five-factor items representing the model-fit statistics, reported scores lower than the acceptable range, including TLI = 0.891, RMSEA = 0.075, CFI = 0.900, CMIN/DF = 2.258 and GFI = 0.796. Treatment enabled achievement of model-fit indices

at the required level (Steiger, 1998, pg. 411–419). Two items with low factor loading were deleted: one from transformational leadership and one from OCB. This significantly improved the model-fit indices to an acceptable range in the second testing: RMSEA = 0.056, TLI = 0.938, CFI = .943, GFI = .827 and CMIN/DF = 1.715. The third time the measurement model was run, more acceptable results were obtained: RMSEA = 0.053, TLI = 0.945, CFI = 0.950, GFI = 0.835 and CMIN/DF = 1.629. Finally, in order to achieve model-fit, the fourth time the model was run, the model-fit indices fell into the acceptable range, with RMSEA = 0.051, TLI = 0.950, CFI = 0.955, GFI = 0.839 and CMIN/DF = 1.576.

Table 2: Convergent and Discriminant Validity

Variable	CR	AVE	MSV	ASV
1. Transformational Leadership	0.89	0.56	0.15	0.04
2. Despotic Leadership	0.93	0.71	0.18	0.08
3. Culture-Collectivism	0.91	0.56	0.16	0.08
4. Employee Creativity	0.90	0.69	0.15	0.04
5. OCB	0.91	0.59	0.18	0.09

Note: MSV = maximum shared variance; CR = composite reliability; AVE = average variance extracted; ASV = average shared variance. Threshold of Convergent Validity: AVE > .50; Discriminant Validity: AVE > MSV; Convergent Reliability \geq .70.

Discriminant and convergent validity were computed for all scales using the procedures recommended by Hair et al. (1998). A Harman single-factor test reported that 27% of the variance was shared among all the items when loaded on a single factor, which was within the acceptable range (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

B. Regression Analysis

To test the first two hypotheses regarding the direct relationship between leadership styles and OCB and creativity, a simple regression was run using SPSS. The results were in line with expectations about the classic role of positive and negative leadership styles in relation to employee OCB and creativity. As Table 3 shows, software-business leaders who adopted transformational leadership styles had a significant positive effect on employees' OCB ($r = .179$; $p < 0.01$) and creativity ($r = .615$; $p < 0.01$). In contrast, despotic leaders played no role in creativity, and employees of despotic leaders were not proud to be citizens of their firms ($r = -0.299$; $p < 0.01$). In addition, this analysis found that some demographics were significant, including an inverse, statistically significant relationship between employee age and creativity ($r = -0.235$; $p < 0.01$), indicating that younger employees were more creative, and a direct relationship between employee age and OCB ($r = 0.274$; $p < 0.01$). The reason for this might be that older employees are not willing to adapt to change. The leaders' demographics were equally interesting. The relationship between age and creativity was positive and statistically significant ($r = 0.261$; $p < 0.01$), indicating that older leaders were more creative.

However, the relationship between age and OCB was inverse ($r = -0.283$; $p < 0.01$), a potentially alarming result indicating that older leaders demonstrated less OCB toward their firms. This may be because leaders have been associated with firms for many years due to their identification with the organizational culture and receiving pressure from employees. Another significant leaders' demographic was gender in relation to creativity. Because most participating leaders were male, further study is warranted regarding why only male leaders increased employees' creativity.

Table 3: Regression Analysis – Leadership Styles, OCB and Creativity

	OCB (β)	OCB (β)	Creativity (β)	Creativity (β)
Age – Employee	.219	.274*	-.156	-.235**
Gender – Employee	.083	.060	.067	-.001
Age – Leader	-.219	-.283*	.205	.261**
Gender – Leader	-.082	-.075	.050	.140*
Tenure – Employee	-.001	.020	.010	.016
Tenure – Leader	-.097	-.101	-.091	-.069
Education – Employee	-.030	-.067	.180*	.115
Education – Leader	.085	.120	-.147	-.059
Transformational Leadership (TL)	-	.179**	-	.615**
Despotic Leadership (DL)	-	-.299**	-	.023
SE	.549	.51	.62	.49
F – Test	.981	4.33	1.31	14.73
R ²	.035	.169	.046	.408

Note: Dependent variables = Creativity and OCB; whereas OCB = Organisational Citizenship Behaviour; TL = Transformational Leadership; CL = Collective Leadership; **p < 0.01; *p < 0.05.

C. Moderation Analysis

This analysis addressed the moderating role of culture. The sample was divided into datasets based on collectivism, with respondents who scored ≥ 3 being considered highly collectivistic and those who scored < 3 being less collectivistic. The leaders' results regarding cultural understanding were interesting: when the boundary condition (culture as moderator) was set, the direct relationship between the two leadership styles was either strengthened or weakened, supporting our hypothesis regarding the moderating role of collectivistic culture. As Table 4A shows, collectivistic culture significantly negatively affects employees' creativity ($r = -1.25$; $p < 0.01$), and transformational leadership has no effect on employees' creativity.

However, the interaction between transformational leadership and collectivistic culture had a significant positive effect on subordinates' creativity ($r = .301$; $p < 0.01$), meaning that a firm's collectivistic culture helped transformational leaders enhance the creativity of technology workers. It can be assumed that strong transformational leaders have the capacity to make the best of collectivistic culture to increase workplace creativity. Thus, H3 was partially supported. Future studies may explore the moderating role of culture by adding outcome variables, possibly including turnover intentions and job satisfaction.

Table 4A: Firms' High Collectivistic Culture - Transformational Leader

Step 1	Creativity				OCB			
	Step 2		Step 1		Step 2			
	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE
Constant	.900	.255	4.87	1.14	2.32	.268	3.40	1.17
TL	.731	.063	-.226	.284	.232**	.066	-.224	.293
CL			-1.25**	.350			-.260	.362
CL x TL			.301**	.086			.123	.089
Adjusted R ²		.372		.401		.047		.123
ΔR ²		.375		.034		.052		.083

Note: Dependent variables = Creativity and OCB; whereas OCB = Organisational Citizenship Behaviour; TL = Transformational Leadership; CL = Collective Leadership; **p < 0.01; *p < 0.05.

Table 4B: Firm's High Collectivistic Culture - Despotic Leader

Step 1	Creativity				OCB			
	Step 2		Step 1		Step 2		Step 1	
	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE
Constant	4.007	.125	3.16	.617	3.71	.102	2.45	.490
DL	-.087	.055	.234	.271	-.215**	.045	0.79	.215
CL			.252	.183			.353*	.146
CL x DL			-.097	.085			-.076	.067
Adjusted R ²		.006		.006		0.88		.137
ΔR ²		.011		.009		.092		.057

Note: Dependent variables = Creativity and OCB, OCB Organisational Citizenship Behaviour; DL = Despotic Leadership; CL = Collective Leadership; **p < 0.01; *p < 0.05.

Table 4C: Firms Low on Collectivistic Culture - Transformational Leader

Step 1	Creativity				OCB			
	Step 2		Step 1		Step 2		Step 1	
	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE
Constant	.214	.316	-3.91	1.14	1.77	.290	-1.24	1.02
TL	.806**	.129	2.50**	.476	.396**	.119	1.37**	.425
CL			1.42**	.383			1.12**	.342
CL x TL			-.583**	.157			-.366*	.140
Adjusted R ²		.145		.189		.043		.143
ΔR ²		.149		.051		.048		.107

Note: Dependent variables = Creativity and OCB; whereas OCB = Organisational Citizenship Behaviour; TL = Transformational Leadership; CL = Collective Leadership; **p < 0.01; *p < 0.05.

Similarly, as Tables (3 and 4B) show, collectivistic culture played a moderating role by weakening the effect of despotic leadership on OCB, as demonstrated by the fact that the formerly statistically significant negative relationship between despotic leadership and OCB ($r = -.299$; $p < 0.01$) became statistically insignificant when moderated by collectivistic culture. Despotic leadership played no role in reducing employee creativity.

Table 4D: Firms Low on Collectivistic Culture - Despotic Leader

Step 1	Creativity				OCB			
	Step 1		Step 2		Step 2		Step 1	
	Coeff	SE	Coeff	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE
Constant	2.70	.357	4.06	1.68	4.16	.296	3.81	1.35
DL	-.169	.112	-.641	.515	-.448**	.093	-.514	.416
CL			-.512	.572			.003	.462
CL x DL			.179	.178			.063	.144
Adjusted R ²		.006		.005		0.91		.139
ΔR ²		.010		.008		.095		.055

Note: Dependent variables = Creativity and OCB, OCB = Organisational Citizenship Behaviour; DL = Despotic Leadership; CL = Collective Leadership; **p < 0.01; *p < 0.05.

The results in Tables (3 and 4A) may be kept in mind while reviewing the surprising results shown in Table 4C. The expected result was that collectivistic culture moderates the relationship between transformational leadership and creativity. However, when firms were classified by the degree of collectivistic culture, the results showed that it negatively moderated between transformational leadership and creativity ($r = -.583$; $p < 0.01$). Similar results were found regarding transformational leadership and OCB ($r = -$

.366; $p < 0.01$). There could be various reasons for this, including organizational politics, the hiring of incompetent employees and negative emotions within firms (Naseer et al., 2016). However, as Table 4D shows, in firms that ranked low on collectivistic culture and also had despotic leadership, the effect of despotic leadership on OCB was weakened, meaning that H4 was not supported regarding the moderating role of collectivistic culture between despotic leadership and creativity and OCB.

V. Discussion

The present study makes important contributions to understanding the role of collectivistic culture in relationship with transformational and despotic leadership styles which indirectly play a key role to promote creativity among employees. The study's purpose was to examine the non-linear moderating effects of culture on the two diametrically opposed leadership styles for the purpose of predicting the OCB and creativity of technology firms' employees. In these firms, the transformational leadership style promoted employees' creativity, a finding consistent with local (Abdullah et al., 2018; Khilji, et al., 2015) and international studies (Gong et al., 2009; Grijalva et al., 2019; Mao et al., 2019). The results regarding the role of despotic leadership in creativity were inconclusive, but it was found to negatively affect employees' OCB, a result consistent with recent studies like Landay, Harms and Credé (2019) and Naseer et al. (2016), who found that it is usual for employees to lose confidence in their firms' leadership in special conditions (Saleem, Khalid & Nadeem, 2019; Shao, Nijstad, & Täuber, 2019).

The study also examined the effect of collectivistic culture on workplace LMX, establishing that when collectivistic culture interacts with transformational and despotic leadership styles, the direct relationships between these two diametrically opposed leadership styles and OCB were either strengthened or weakened, supporting the hypothesis regarding the moderating role of collectivistic culture. The thesis was thus partially consistent with those of cross-cultural studies (Hartnell, et al., 2019). Overall, the present study found an effective role of collectivistic culture, and future research may examine all four dimensions of the culture variable using various national cultures and assuming within-group cultural differences (Hartnell, et al., 2019; Sadiq, 2018; Tipu et al., 2012). Other future avenues could be to explore emerging leadership styles like servant leadership (Lemoine, Hartnell, & Leroy, 2019), inclusive leadership (Eva et al., 2019), innovation leadership (Kremer, Villamor, & Aguinis, 2019) and leadership humility (Mao et al., 2019) and leader's narcissism in emerging market's firm (Saleem et al., 2019) in relation with organization's system and organizational outcomes. Organizational level can unit of analysis could be another venture for forthcoming scholarships in the area of leadership and culture (see e.g. Chen et al., 2019)

The present study is not without limitations. We used a cross-sectional design to collect data. Future research may include a longitudinal study with multiple points of measurement to validate the present study's findings in dissimilar cultural settings, including in individualistic cultures based on national logic (Aguilera, Judge, & Terjesen, 2018; Hartnell et al., 2019; Mao et al., 2019) and incorporating innovation as process (Jung, Chow, & Wu, 2003) and or innovation leadership itself (Kremer, Villamor, & Aguinis, 2019). For this purpose, an experimental design may be used to analyze the data and test the generalisability of our theoretical model. The present study collected data using convenience sampling, so the future researcher may test our theory using other

techniques of data collection like probabilistic, random sampling whenever possible. Lastly, we found that contemporary scholars suggest two types of creativity i.e. radical and incremental creativity (Gilson & Madjar, 2011). This differentiation is very much visible in technological firms (e.g. apple, and Oracle) in the West but the same may not be true in emerging economies. Therefore, we did not focus on these different type of concept of creativity which is one of our limitations and could be a future research direction for the scholars.

VI. Conclusion

This study contributes insights regarding transformational and despotic leadership styles and their significant indirect effects on employees' creativity. In addition, although previous studies in organizational behaviour and industrial psychology used culture as an independent variable or mediator (Sadiq, 2018; Hartnell et al., 2019), they did not anticipate the importance of different leadership styles in the same culture (see e.g. Peterson et al., 2009; Schilling, 2009; Swiercz and Lydon, 2002). Therefore, studying the moderating role of collectivistic culture makes the present study unique. The present research work suggests that technology firms in a collectivistic culture that have higher levels of uncertainty avoidance can benefit from leader-development programs by giving them awareness about the organizational culture of Asian firms. Another application of our empirical test could be to avoid the malign effects of despotic leadership on employee behaviour, which firms may do by having their boards of directors review their human-resources strategies and by including followers' feedback when evaluating supervisors' performances.

References

- Abdullah, M. I., Sarfraz, M. and Kazmi, S. M. H. (2018). Traits of leadership for efficacious communication of project management in the software industry of Pakistan. *Khazar Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences*, 21(1), 5-22.
- Aguilera, R. V., Judge, W. Q., & Terjesen, S. A. (2018). Corporate governance deviance. *Academy of Management Review*, 43(1), 87-109.
- Amabile, T. M. (1983). The social psychology of creativity: A componential conceptualization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(2), 357-376.
- Atwater, L., & Carmeli, A. (2009). Leader-member exchange, feelings of energy, and involvement in creative work. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(3), 264–275.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M. and Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using Multifactor Leadership. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 72(4), 441-462.
- Byrne, B. M. (2001), *Structural Equation Modelling with AMOS: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.
- Chen, J. X., Sharma, P., Zhan, W., & Liu, L. (2019). Demystifying the impact of CEO transformational leadership on firm performance: Interactive roles of exploratory innovation and environmental uncertainty. *Journal of Business Research*, 96, 85-96.
- Cheung, M.F. and Wu, W.P. (2012). Leader-member exchange and employee work outcomes in Chinese firms: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 18(1), 65-81.

- Choi, J. (2006). A motivational theory of charismatic leadership: Envisioning, empathy, and empowerment. *Journal of Leadership & Organisational Studies*, 13(1), 24-43.
- Chaudhry, A. Q., & Javed, H. (2012). Impact of transactional and laissez-faire leadership style on motivation. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(7), 258-264.
- Chughtai, A. A. (2014). Can ethical leaders enhance their followers' creativity? *Leadership*, 12(2), 230-249.
- De Hoogh, A. H. and Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness, and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(3), 297-311.
- Edelman, P. and van Knippenberg, D. (2018). Emotional intelligence, management of subordinate's emotions and leadership effectiveness. *Leadership & Organisation Development Journal*, 39(5), 592-607.
- Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S. and Skogstad, A. (2007), "Destructive leadership behavior: A definition and conceptual model", *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 207-216.
- Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research: The leadership quarterly yearly review for 2019. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30(1), 111-132.
- Farooq, O., Rupp, D. E. and Farooq, M. (2017). The multiple pathways through which internal and external corporate social responsibility influence organizational identification and multifocal outcomes: The moderating role of cultural and social orientations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(3), 954-985.
- Gilson, L. L., & Madjar, N. (2011). Radical and incremental creativity: Antecedents and processes. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 5, 21-28.
- Gong, Y., Huang, J.C. and Farh, J.L. (2009). Employee learning orientation, transformational leadership, and employee creativity: The mediating role of employee creative self-efficacy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(4), 765-778.
- Graen, G. B. and Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level, multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- Grijalva, E., Maynes, T. D., Badura, K. L., & Whiting, S. W. W. (in press). Examining the "I" in team: A longitudinal investigation of the influence of team narcissism composition on team outcomes in the NBA. *Academy of Management Journal*, <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2017.0218>
- Hambrick, D. C., and Lovelace, J. B. (2018). The role of executive symbolism in advancing new strategic themes in organizations: A social influence perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 43(1), 110-131.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E. and Tatham, R. L. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (5(3), 207-219). Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Hanges, P. J. and Dickson, M. W. (2004). The development and validation of the GLOBE culture and leadership scales.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W. and Gupta, V. (Eds.), *Culture, Leadership and Organisations, The GLOBE Study of*, 62, 122-151.

- Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y., Kinicki, A. J., Choi, D., & Karam, E. P. (2019). A meta-analytic test of organizational culture's association with elements of an organization's system and its relative predictive validity on organizational outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/apl0000380>
- Hofstede, G. (2011), "Dimensionalising cultures: The Hofstede model in context", *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), pp. 8-26.
- Jiao, C., Richards, D.A., and Zhang, K. (2011), "Leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour: OCB-specific meanings as mediators", *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(1), pp. 11-25.
- Jung, D.I., Chow, C, and Wu, A. (2003), "The role of transformational leadership in enhancing organizational innovation: Hypotheses and some preliminary findings", *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(4), pp. 525-544.
- Jung, D., Yammarino, F.J. and Lee, J.K. (2009), "Moderating role of subordinates' attitudes on transformational leadership and effectiveness: A multi-cultural and multi-level perspective", *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(4), pp. 586-603.
- Khilji, S.E., Keilson, B., Shakir, F.Y. and Shrestha, B.K. (2015), "Self, follower, organization and the context: A cross-cultural view of authentic leadership", *South Asian Journal of Global Business Research*, 4(1), pp. 2-26.
- Khan, R., Rehman, A., & Fatima, A. (2009). Transformational leadership and organizational innovation: Moderated by organizational size. *African Journal of Business Management*, 3(11), 678-684.
- Kremer, H., Villamor, I., & Aguinis, H. (2019). Innovation leadership: Best-practice recommendations for promoting employee creativity, voice, and knowledge sharing. *Business Horizons*, 62(1), 65-74.
- Landay, K., Harms, P. D., & Credé, M. (2019). Shall we serve the dark lords? A meta-analytic review of psychopathy and leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(1), 183-192.
- Lee, K. and Allen, N.J. (2002), "Organisational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of effect and cognitions", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 131-138.
- Lemoine, G. J., Hartnell, C. A., & Leroy, H. (2019). Taking Stock of Moral Approaches to Leadership: An Integrative Review of Ethical, Authentic, and Servant Leadership. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(1), 148-187.
- MacCallum, R.C., Browne, M.W., and Sugawara, H.M. (1996), "Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modelling", *Psychological Methods*, 1(1), 130-149.
- Mao, J., Chiu, C. Y., Owens, B. P., Brown, J. A., & Liao, J. (2019). Growing followers: Exploring the effects of leader humility on follower self-expansion, self-efficacy, and performance. *Journal of Management Studies*. 56(2), 343-371.
- Naseer, S., Raja, U., Syed, F., Donia, M.B. and Darr, W. (2016), "Perils of being close to a bad leader in a bad environment: Exploring the combined effects of despotic leadership, member exchange and perceived organisational politics on behaviours", *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(1), 14-33.
- Nguyen, T.T., Mia, L., Winata, L. and Chong, V.K. (2017), "Effect of transformational-leadership style and management control system on managerial performance", *Journal of Business Research*, 70(1), 202-213.
- Oldham, G.R. and Cummings, A. (1996), "Employee creativity: Personal and contextual factors at work", *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(3), 607-634.

- Peterson, S.J., Walumbwa, F.O., Byron, K. and Myrowitz, J. (2009), “CEO positive psychological traits, transformational leadership, and firm performance in high-technology start-up and established firms”, *Journal of Management*, 35(2), 348-368.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, J.-Y. and Podsakoff, N.P. (2003), “Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.
- Sadiq, A. (2018), “A study of the impact of national culture on transformational leadership practices in the Maldives”, *AU Journal of Management*, 9(2), 1-11.
- Saleem I., Khalid F. & Nadeem M. (2019), Family Business Governance: What's wrong? What's right? What's next?, *Emerald Emerging Markets Case Studies*, 9(1), 1-23.
- Schilling, J. (2009), “From ineffectiveness to destruction: A qualitative study on the meaning of negative leadership”, *Leadership*, 5(1), 102-128.
- Shao, Y., Nijstad, B. A., & Täuber, S. (2019). Creativity under workload pressure and integrative complexity: The double-edged sword of paradoxical leadership. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2019.01.008>
- Singelis, T.M., Triandis, H.C., Bhawuk, D.P., and Gelfand, M.J. (1995), “Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement”, *Cross-cultural Research*, 29(3), 240-275.
- Steiger, J.H. (1998), “A note on multiple sample extensions of the RMSEA fit index”, *Structural Equation Modelling*, 5(1), 411-419.
- Swiercz, P.M. and Lydon, S.R. (2002), “Entrepreneurial leadership in high-tech firms: A field study”, *Leadership & Organisation Development Journal*, 23(7), 380-389.
- Tierney, P., Farmer, S.M. and Graen, G.B. (1999), “An examination of leadership and employee creativity: The relevance of traits and relationships”, *Personnel Psychology*, 52(3), 591-620.
- Tipu, S.A.A., Ryan, J.C. and Fantazy, K.A. (2012), “Transformational leadership in Pakistan: An examination of the relationship of transformational leadership to organizational culture and innovation propensity”, *Journal of Management & Organisation*, 18(4), 461-480.
- Verma, N., Bhat, A. B., Rangnekar, S., & Barua, M. K. (2015). Association between leadership style and decision-making style in Indian organizations. *Journal of Management Development*, 34(3), 246-269.
- Wang, H., Law, K.S., Hackett, R.D., Wang, D. and Chen, Z.X. (2005), “Leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers’ performance and organizational citizenship behavior”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3), 420-432.
- Wong, D., Kessler, E., Khilji, S.E. and Gopalakrishnan, S. (2014), “Cross-cultural comparison of cultural mythologies and leadership patterns”, *South Asian Journal of Global Business Research*, 3(1), 79-101.
- Yang, J., Gu, J., & Liu, H. (2019). Servant leadership and employee creativity: The roles of psychological empowerment and work-family conflict. *Current Psychology*, 1(1), 1-11.
- Zhou, J. and George, J.M. (2001), “When job dissatisfaction leads to creativity: Encouraging the expression of voice”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(4), 682-696.