Testing the Role of Charismatic Leadership, Psychological Climate, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Resilience

Wustari Mangundjaya[1,*]

[1]*Faculty of Psychology Universitas Indonesia Depok, Indonesia*
[*]*Corresponding author. Email: wustari@ui.ac.id, wustari@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

Nowadays, in the era of VUCA, one of the characters that need to own by the employees is being resilience. With resilience, people will be able to face uncertainty, complexity, ambiguity, and challenges. As a result, there is a need to identify which variables may develop resilience in people. Meanwhile, in the era of uncertainty, insurance companies face significant challenges and competition, as they are facing a very tight competition both from national (local) and international companies. Consequently, this condition has an impact on the employees, there is a high need for being resilient, as people with high resilience needed in insurance companies. On the other hand, the influence of a leader and its leadership style have an impact on people attitude and behavior were tested and proven. A good leader is expected to drive, motivate, and inspire people to do their best, including supporting them during their tough times. Not only the psychological climate, but sound characteristics of worker are also crucial in developing resiliency. The aimed of the study is to test the model on how the charismatic leadership influence on people resilience through psychological climate and organizational citizenship behavior as mediators. This research conducted at 2 (two) insurance companies. Respondents were 354 employees. Results showed that there is no direct impact of charismatic leadership on resilience, but it has to go through psychological climate or organizational citizenship behavior.

Keywords: charismatic leadership, psychological climate, organizational citizenship behavior, resilience

1. INTRODUCTION

In the era of VUCA (Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity, Ambiguity) organization has to be agile and adapt changes in the environment very fast. Given today disruptive and adverse work environment, scholars and practitioners have increased their interest in workplace resilience [1]. With this fast and complex changes, this will affect the organization, such as whole organization transformation, merger, acquisition, and all kind of organizational intervention programs. As a result, the need of resilience is critical both for employees and leaders [2], as resilient people are prepared to face organizational change better with more ease [3], [4], [5]. Employee resilience is essential as it is also related to their level of job satisfaction, commitment, and happiness [2], [6].

Meanwhile, Insurance companies in Indonesia are also facing a very high competition both from local insurance companies as well as from international companies that operate in Indonesia. Consequently, the need to have resilient workers are needed. Studies about resilience in the workplace at present are flourishing. As a result, a better understanding of the antecedents that will develop the attitude of resilient in a workplace context is critical. In this regard, previous researches showed that many variables would increase resilience, such as leader; the climate of the organization and the characteristics of people [7], [8], [9].

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Resilience

Resilience is defined as protective factors which modify, or alter a person response to environmental threats that inclines to a maladaptive result [10]. Resilience defines as the ability of the individual to stand up from the condition of hopelessness when facing a problem or inconvenient situation [11] and able to make a decision under pressures and change failures to success [12].

Based on that, resilient people are prepared to face organizational change better with more ease [4], [5], [13]. Resilience views as a positive reaction or adaptation in the face of risk or adversity [13]. Further, Masten and Reed [14] directed this definition to the workplace as the positive psychological capacity to to bounce back from adversity, uncertainty, conflict, failure, or even positive change, progress and increased responsibility [15].

2.2. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) defined by Organ [16] as the behavior of an individual which is discretionary, and is not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system. Discretionary means that this behavior is not a requirement, but this is an individual choice [17]. These discretionary will promote the effective functioning of the organization [18]. As a result, OCB behavior categorized as a form of performance behavior, which is different from the traditional performance that is more heavily relies on official assignments and tasks [19]. Organizational citizenship behavior is also an essential phenomenon in the work setting as it is enabled to facilitate interpersonal relationships among employees, as well as to increase organizational performance [20]. Further, Podsakoff et al. [17] stated that there are 4 (four) factors that are enabling the development of OCB, namely: individual characteristics, task characteristic, organizational characteristics, and leadership behavior.

2.3. Psychological Climate

Kahn [21] stated that psychological climate is a perception of how employees perceive their working environment as an environment that has the characteristics of psychological safety and psychological meaningfulness. The way employees perceive this environment represented in 4 (four) dimensions namely supportive management, role clarity, self-expression, and perceived meaningfulness of contribution.

The psychological climate is important, as it will drive and motivate employees to work harder for the organization. [22], [23], [24], [25]. In other words, organizations that focus on satisfying employees psychological needs, and encourage employees, in turn, will enable to motivate employees to exhibit desirable behaviors at the workplace [26]. Therefore, employee expressions in psychological climate and the factors that are responsible for these behaviors are of considerable importance to researchers and practitioners.

2.4. Charismatic Leadership

Charismatic leadership is the ability of a leader to formulate and articulate an inspirational vision, by behaviors and actions. They also have the expertise in expressing an image of a better future [27]. Further, charismatic leadership [28] consist of five dimensions of leadership behavior, namely: a) strategic vision; b) sensitivity to the environment; c) sensitivity to member need; d) personal risk; and e) unconventional behavior. These dimensions are assumed to have positive impacts on subordinate reaction as the leader tends to motivate and inspire others to develop themselves.

2.5. Charismatic Leadership, Psychological Climate, OCB and Resilience

Charismatic leadership enables them to make their followers feel better about their work and their performance during organizational change [28], [28]. Charismatic leaders also provide warmth and trust in the relationship to their followers [7]. As a result, they were enabled to make them feel more self-confidence and resilient. As a result, in stressful situations, followers will thus count on encouragement support from their charismatic leader, which will make them resilience. Charismatic leadership stimulating and idealizing the vision for the future [30]. Based on this discussion, the proposed hypothesis as follows:
H1: Charismatic leadership positively impacts resilience.
Conger and Kanungo [27] stated that charismatic leadership was able to formulate and articulate an inspirational vision and foster the impression that their mission is extraordinary. Charismatic leaders can are also described as articular a vision and a sense of purpose, showing determination and communication high-performance expectations [31]. Meanwhile, Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) based on discretionary behavior [18]. Empirical studies showed that there was a significant and positive relationship between charismatic leadership and OCB [32], [33]. Furthermore, empirical studies showed that there a positive relationship between charismatic leadership and the OCB of the followers have confirmed [34]. Sosik [34] found that followers are willing to engage in OCB because of their favorable perceptions of the leader, based on their trust, loyalty, and obedience to the leader.
Further, Podsakoff et al. [17] stated that one of the essential factors that are enabling the development of OCB is leadership behavior. Other research also found that there was a significant positive relation between charismatic leadership and OCB [35]. Based on this discussion, the second hypothesis as follows:
H2: Charismatic leadership positively impacts organizational citizenship behavior.
Researches also showed that there are many factors which affecting employees to perform well, such as psychological environment or psychological climate.
Meanwhile, a leader who has charisma was more acceptable to their followers during organizational change as they feel better about their work and enable them to perform. They are also allowed in transforming values, beliefs, and attitudes [29], which then lead to developing positive psychological climate. Based on this discussion, the third hypothesis as follows:
H3: Charismatic leadership positively impacts the psychological climate.
According to Litwin and Stringer [36], the organization is a developing psychological climate, which in turn will either positively or negatively affects particular motivational patterns of employees. In addition to this, mastery or task-involving climate is shown correlated positively with resilience and perceived competence [9].

Based on this discussion, the fourth hypothesis as follows:
H4: Psychological climate positively impacts resilience.

Research about the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and resilience is still limited. A study conducted by Ryan [37] showed that there was a positive and significant relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and work values such as hard work and independence. Resilience encompasses two elements, the first element is the experience of adversity, and the second is a positive adaptation [13].

Fisher et al. [38] stated that difficulty at work may come in the form of high-intensity circumstances, as well as crisis, or may come in the form of lower-intensity as in the types of work stress. Organ et al. [8] stated that characteristic of the individual loyalty to the organization (OCB) categorized as one of the essential variables in developing a right attitude toward the organization, including the perspective of resilience. People with high OCB enabled in adapting to the organization environment, especially during organizational change, with all the crisis and works stress. Based on this discussion, the fifth hypothesis as follows:
H5: Organizational citizenship behavior positively impacts resilience.

A leader who has charisma was more accepted to their followers during organizational change, crisis, and conflicts, as they enable to provide warmth, comfort, and assurance. They are also allowed in transforming followers values, beliefs, and attitudes [29], which then lead to developing positive psychological climate. As a result, a charismatic leader enables to create a psychological climate.

The psychological climate will establish a task-involving climate which has correlated positively with resilience [9]. Further, the psychological climate becomes the vital variable in developing a right attitude toward the organization, including the perspective of resilience [8]. Based on this proposition, the six hypotheses as follows:
H6: Charismatic leadership positively impacts resilience through psychological climate.

A leader who has charisma will have a positive impact on the employee's characteristics. This statement was supported by the study Babcock-Roberson & Strickland [35], who found that there was a significant positive relation between charismatic leadership and OCB. Meanwhile, a leader with charisma will positively impact peoples' organizational citizenship behavior and finally affects their resilience. Following this discussion, the researcher proposes the following hypothesis:
H7: Charismatic leadership positively impacts resilience through organizational citizenship behavior.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Respondents

The respondents for this study were employees who worked at 2 (two) state-owned insurance companies. The two organizations have undertaken some regulatory changes, e.g.: changing in the organizational structure; such as policies, system, and procedures. Respondents consisting of 354 respondents were chosen using non-probability sampling, with convenience sampling from the required criteria.

The criteria of the respondents were as follows: permanent employees; at least senior high school graduates, minimum working period in the organization was 2 (two) years and had aware of organizational changes. The respondents profileas follows: the majority were male (61.69%), bachelor degree (62.54%), age ranging from 44 to 56 years old (46.48%), had been working in the organization more than 20 years (42.53%) and staff members (41.40%).

3.2. Data Collection

Data was collected using the survey method, with 4 (four) Likert Style Questionnaires, namely: 1) Charismatic Leadership Questionnaire (the C–K Scale) based on their charismatic leadership theory [28], [29], [39] consist of five dimensions of leadership behavior, namely: a). Strategic vision; b) Sensitivity to the environment; c) Sensitivity to members need; d) Personal risk; and e) Unconventional behavior. The C-K scale had a Cronbach Alpha score of 0.979. 2). Psychological Climate Inventory, consists of a) Management support; b) Role Clarity; c) Self Expression; d) Contribution, e) Recognition; and f) Challenges [21]. The score of Cronbach Alpha was 0.92. 3) OCB (Organizational Citizenship Behavior) questionnaire based on Mangundjaya [40] and Farh, Early & Lin [41]. The Seven Dimensions of OCB as follows: a) Identification with the company; b) Altruism toward colleagues; c) Conscientiousness; d) Self-training; e) Interpersonal harmony; f) Protecting and Saving Company resources; and g) Keeping the workplace clean. The score of Cronbach Alpha was 0.90. 4) Resilience was measured using Modified Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC) by Dong et al. (2013), which consists of 4 (four) dimensions and 32 items, with the Cronbach Alpha score of 0.977.

Questionnaires are translated into Bahasa Indonesia consisted of a) Flexibility, b) Social and family support, c) Spiritual supports, and d) Goal orientation. Which modified to 6 points Likert scale by Mangundjaya [42]. All the questionnaires score of Cronbach Alpha were above 0.9, which is reliable according to Anastasi and Urbina [43] and all items were valid as internal validity score were above 0.2 [44].

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Data Analysis and Results

Data were analyzed using descriptive analysis and SEM (Structural Equation Modeling), and it enables us to determine which dimensions that have the most significant impact on the variables. Table 1 shows that all variables are correlated, with the highest score is in the correlation between OCB and Resilience.

Table 1 Mean and standard deviation among variable

No.	Variable	Mean	SD	Res.	Psy Cl.	OCB	Ch. Led.
1	Res.	5.20	0.39	1			
2	Psy Cl.	4.83	0.44	0.50**	1		
3	OCB	4.80	0.39	0.70**	-	1	
4	Ch. Led.	4.43	0.86	0.16**	0.65**	0.25**	1

** Pearson Sig. two tailed, significant at $p<0.01$.
Ch.Led. = Charismatic Leadership;
OCB = Organizational Citizenship Behavior;
Psy Cl. = Psychological Climate;
Res = Resilience;

Table 2 Results of SEM analysis

Path Analysis	Standardized	t-value	Significant t-values >1.96
Charismatic Leadership and Resilience	–0.31	–4.45	Not significant
Charismatic Leadership and OCB	0.26	4.62	Significant
Charismatic Leadership and Psychological Climate	0.66	9.82	Significant
Psychological Climate and Resilience	0.52	6.26	Significant
OCB and resilience	0.79	8.95	Significant
Charismatic Leadership on Resilience through Psychological climate	0.34	-	Significant
Charismatic leadership on Resilience	0.19	-	Significant

Path Analysis	Standardized	t-value	Significant t-values >1.96
through OCB.			

Chi-square = 636.12; df = 196; p value = 0.00; RMSEA = 0.080

The outcomes of the study shows that charismatic leadership has significantly and positively impacted on resilience indirectly. The impact has to go through psychological climate and OCB as mediators. The results also revealed that the score of the effects of charismatic leadership on resilience through psychological climate is higher than the impact of charismatic leadership on resilience through OCB. Although the effects of OCB on resilience is higher than the impact of psychological climate on resilience. Moreover, results also shows that the impact of charismatic leadership on psychological climate is higher than the effect of charismatic leadership on OCB. In this regard, the most substantial effect of charismatic leadership was on developing psychological climate on the organization.

The results show that charismatic leadership did not have a significant impact on resilience (t-value -4.45<1.96); thus, hypothesis 1 (one) not supported. Result s also showed that charismatic leadership had a significant and positive impact on organizational citizenship behavior of the employee (t-value 4.62>1.96), or hypothesis 2 (two) was supported. Charismatic leadership had a significant positive impact on the psychological climate (t-value 9.02 >1.96). Thus, hypothesis 3 (three) supported, meaning that with good charismatic leadership, employees showed higher psychological climate. The psychological climate had a positive and significant impact on resilience (t-value 6.26>1.96), so hypothesis 4 (four) supported. The higher the perception of the employee on their psychological climate, the stronger their resilience. Further, the results show that organizational citizenship behavior had a positive and significant impact on resilience (t-value 8.95>1.96). Which means that the higher organizational citizenship behavior of the employee will have an effect on the stronger people resilience, and hypothesis 5 (five) was supported.

Charismatic leadership also had a significant and positive impact on resilience through psychological climate and organizational citizenship behavior. Thus hypothesis 6 (six) and 7 (seven) is supported. Moreover, the results also show that the relationship between charismatic leadership on resilience through psychological climate is higher compares to the relationship between charismatic leadership on resilience through organizational citizenship behavior. To conclude, charismatic leadership could not directly and significantly impact resilience without mediators (psychological climate or organizational citizenship behavior), and psychological climate as a stronger mediator between the two.

Results in Figure 1 below show that personal risk has the highest score, which means that the dimension of own risk (PRi ChL) is very significant in charismatic leadership. In Psychological Climate variable, it shows that recognition (Recg Clim) had the most reliable score, which means that attention plays a critical role in developing psychological climate. The results also show that goal orientation (GO) is the one that had the highest score in resilience dimension, which means that goal orientation is the most represents resilience. It also shows that altruism toward colleagues (ATC) had the highest score in organizational citizenship behavior variable, which means that a sense of altruism is the most represents dimension for organizational citizenship behavior.

The results also revealed that the score of the effects of charismatic leadership on resilience through psychological climate is higher than the impact of charismatic leadership on resilience through OCB. Although the effects of OCB on resilience is higher than the impact of psychological climate on resilience. Moreover, results also shows that the impact of charismatic leadership on psychological climate is higher than the effect of charismatic leadership on OCB. In this regard, the most substantial effect of charismatic leadership was on developing psychological climate on the organization.

The results show that charismatic leadership did not have a significant impact on resilience (t-value -4.45<1.96); thus, hypothesis 1 (one) not supported. Results also showed that charismatic leadership had a significant and positive impact on organizational citizenship behavior of the employee (t-value 4.62>1.96), or hypothesis 2 (two) was supported. Charismatic leadership had a significant positive impact on the psychological climate (t-value 9.02 >1.96). Thus, hypothesis 3 (three) supported, meaning that with good charismatic leadership, employees showed higher psychological climate. The psychological climate had a positive and significant impact on resilience (t-value 6.26>1.96), so hypothesis 4 (four) supported. The higher the perception of the employee on their psychological climate, the stronger their resilience. Further, the results show that organizational citizenship behavior had a positive and significant impact on resilience (t-value 8.95>1.96). Which means that the higher organizational citizenship behavior of the employee will have an effect on the stronger people resilience, and hypothesis 5 (five) was supported.

Charismatic leadership also had a significant and positive impact on resilience through psychological climate and organizational citizenship behavior. Thus hypothesis 6 (six) and 7 (seven) is supported. Moreover, the results also show that the relationship between charismatic leadership on resilience through psychological climate is higher compares to the relationship between charismatic leadership on resilience through organizational citizenship behavior. To conclude, charismatic leadership could not directly and significantly impact resilience without mediators (psychological climate or organizational citizenship behavior), and psychological climate as a stronger mediator between the two.

4.2. Discussion

This research was to test a model of charismatic leadership impact on resilience through psychological climate and OCB. Results showed as follows: Hypothesis 1 (one) was not supported, in which charismatic leadership did not have a significant impact on resilience. This finding has not endorsed the assumption behind the previous outcomes that found charismatic leadership provides warmth and trust to their followers, which makes them feel resilient. It assumed that there was another mechanism that influences the relationship between these two variables.

The results ot the study also show that there was a positive and significant impact of charismatic leadership on organizational citizenship behavior. This finding supported the previous conclusion of Babcock-Roberson & Strickland [35], which found a significant impact. Thus, a leader who has charisma can create values, belief and attitudes of their subordinates. This condition then will develop a sense of loyalty and willingness to contribute to the organization beyond their routine jobs. Charismatic leader was also enabled to develop a psychological climate in the working context. A positive working framework which consists of a feeling of meaningful, and supported with their warmth, trustful, and sensitivity, enable to develop his/her employee organizational citizenship behavior. This finding supported the statement of Conger and Konungo [29] that stated charismatic leader is more acceptable to their followers. In this regard, people do not mind to work hard if they know that they feel psychologically safe, and their leader appreciates their contributions. Results supported Vitali et al. [9], who found that task-involving climate has correlated positively and significantly with resilience. The result also showed that psychological climate had positively and significantly impact on resilience. Which means that the psychological climate will function as a motivator and supporter for employees, and consequently will develop resiliency.

To conclude, charismatic leadership had a positive and significant impact on resilience through psychological climate and organizational citizenship behavior. The result showed that putting the own risk to support followers, the charismatic leader enables to create a psychological climate and organizational citizenship behavior, which at

last developing resilience. In this regard, although the leader got charisma and accepted by people [28]. However, in order to improve the resilience of the member of the organization, they should first develop their loyalty and safety environment. The findings also showed that psychological climate and organizational citizenship behavior were proven as the full mediators between the relationship of charismatic leadership and resilience.

There are some limitations of this research as follows: First, this study was conducted in insurance companies, which cannot be generalized for every type of organization. In this regard, future research in different kind of organizations is recommended. Second, this research was conducted using a questionnaire, which is a self-report study and is fragile for social desirability and common method biases [45]. This study only uses two variables as mediators between charismatic leadership and resilience, which might not be the accurate mediator variables. Future research is recommended using other variables as mediators.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The topic of resilience is in response to challenging circumstances. Even though resilience is recognized as an essential issue in the workplace, however, the rates of work-related stress and depression have remained broadly flat for more than ten years. In response to the research gaps, the researcher undertakes a comprehensive review of the empirical research conducted on resilience in the workplace. In addition to that, the researcher expects to provide a contribution by synthesizing an emerging of the antecedents of resilience in the workplace and by pinpointing literature that has introduced organizational citizenship behavior and psychological climate as mediators. The findings inform researchers and management from insurance organizations to understand the correlation between charismatic leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, psychological climate, and resilience. These relationships tell the implementation of charismatic leadership to furnish organizational citizenship behavior, psychological climate, and employee's resilience. With this study, the researcher hopes that the organization, especially insurance organizations in away in developing employee's resilience by implementing charismatic leadership intervention strategies supporting with improving organizational citizenship behavior and psychological climate.

REFERENCES

[1] G.S. van der Vegt, G.S., P. Essens, M. Wahlström, & G. George, "Managing risk and resilience," 2015.

[2] M. D. Larson, & F. Luthans, "Potential added value of psychological capital in predicting work attitudes," Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 75-92, 2006.

[3] F. Dong, C. Nelson, S. Shah-Haque, A. Khan, & E. Ablah, "A modified CD-RISC including previously unaccounted for resilience variable," Kansas Journal of Medicine, 2013.

[4] F. Luthans, C.M. Youssef-Morgan, & B. Avolio, "Psychological capital and beyond," 2015. New York: Oxford University Press.

[5] S.R. Maddi, & D.M. Khoshaba, DM, "Resilience at work: How to succeed no matter what life throws at you," 2005. Amacom Books.

[6] C.M. Youssef, & F. Luthans, "Positive organizational behavior in the workplace: The impact of hope, optimism, and resilience," Journal of Management, vol. 33, pp. 774-800, 2007.

[7] S. Boerner, E. Dutschke, & S. Wied, "Charismatic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: Examining the role of stressors and strain," Human Resource Development International, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 507-521, 2008.

[8] D.W. Organ, P.M. Podsakoff, & S.B. Mackenzie, Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedenst, and consequences," 2006. United Kingdom: Sage Publications, Inc..

[9] F. Vitali, et al., "Motivational climate, resilience and burn out it youth sport". Sport Science for Health, vol. 11, issue 1, pp. 103-108, 2015.

[10] A. Crawford, et al., "Teaching and learning strategies for the thinking classroom," 2005. New York: The International Debate Education Association.

[11] A. Siebert, "The resilience advantage master change, thrive under pressure, and bounce back from set backs," 2005. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

[12] K. Reivich, & A. Shatte, "The resilience factor: 7 essential skills for overcoming life's inevitable obstacles," 2002. Broadway Books.

[13] A.S. Masten, "Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development," American Psychologist, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 227-238, 2001.

[14] A.S. Masten, & M.J. Reed, "Resilience in development". In C.R. Snyder, & S.J. Lopez,

(Eds.) 2002. Handbook of Positive Psychology, pp. 117-131. New York: Oxford University Press.

[15] F. Luthans, "The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior," Journal of Organizational Behavior, vol. 23, pp. 695-706, 2002.

[16] D.W. Organ, "Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome," 1988. Lexington: Lexington Books.

[17] P.M. Podsakoff, S.B. MacKenzie, J.B. Paine, & D.G. Bachrach, "Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research," Journal of Management, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 51- 63, 2000.

[18] J. L. Farh, C.B. Zhong, & D.W. Organ, "Organizational citizenship behavior in the People's Republic of China," Organization Science, vol. 15, pp. 241-253, 2004.

[19] D. Karolidis, & Δ. Καρολίδης, "Organizational citizenship behavior in the Greek public sector," 2016.

[20] R.K. Pradhan, L.K. Jena, & P. Bhattacharya, "Impact of psychological capital on organizational citizenship behavior: Moderating role of emotional intelligence," Cogent Business & Management, vol. 3, no. 1, pp.119-174, 2016.

[21] S. Brown, & T. Leigh, "A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort and performance," Journal of Applied Psychology, vol. 81, no. 4, pp. 358-368, 1996.

[22] A. Bakker, S. Albrecht, & M. Leiter, "Key questions regarding work engagement," European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, no. 20, pp. 4-28, 2011. doi:10.1080/1359432X.2010.485352.

[23] A. Cohen, & D. Keren, "Does climate matter? An examination of the relationship between organizational climate and OCB among Israeli teachers," The Service Industries Journal, vol. 30, pp. 247-263, 2010. doi:10.1080/02642060802120158.

[24] B.S. O'Neill, & L.A. Arendt, "Psychological climate and work attitudes: The importance of telling the right story," Journal of Leadership &

Organizational Studies, vol. 14, pp. 353-370, 2008. doi:10.1177/154805180831555.

[25] A.M. Suliman, & M.H. Abdullah, 'Towards a high performance workplace: Managing corporate climate and conflict," Management Decision, vol. 43, pp. 720-733, 2005. doi:10.1108/ 00251740510597734.

[26] Z. Zhang, D. Wan, & M. Jia, "Do high-performance human resource practices help corporate entrepreneurship? The mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior," Journal of High Technology Management Research, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 128-138, 2008.

[27] J. Conger, & R. Kanungo, "Charismatic leadership in organizations: Perceived behavioral attributes and their measurement," Journal of Organizational Behavior, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 439-452, 1994.

[28] J. Conger, J, & R. Kanungo, 1998. "Charismatic leadership in organizations," 1998. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

[29] J. Conger, R. Kanungo, S. Menon, & P. Mathur, "Measuring charisma: Dimensionality and validity of the Conger- Kanungo scale of charismatic leadership," Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 290-301, 1997.

[30] J.L. Pierce, & J.W. Newstrom, "Leaders and the leadership process: Readings," Self-Assessments and Applications, 6th edition, 2011. New York: McGraw-Hill.

[31] D.A. Waldman, G.G. Ramirez, R.J. House, & P. Puranam, "Does leadership matter? CEO leadership attributes and profitability under conditions of perceived environmental uncertainty," Academy of Management Journal, vol. 44, pp.134-143, 2001.

[32] C.N. Den Hartog, A.E. Keegan, & A.H.B. De Hoogh, "Research reports: The interactive effects of belongingness and charisma on helping and compliance," Journal of Applied Psychology, vol. 92, no. 4, pp.13-19, 2007.

[33] D. de Cremer, & D. van Knippenberg, "How do leaders promote cooperation? The effects of charisma and procedural fairness," Journal of Applied Psychology, vol. 87, no. 5, pp. 58-66, 2002.

[34] J.J. Sosik, "The role of personal values in the charismatic leadership of corporate managers: A model and preliminary field study," The leadership quarterly, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 221-244, 2005.

[35] M. Babcock-Roberson, & O. Strickland, "The relationship between charismatic leadership, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behaviors," The Journal of Psychology, vol. 144, no. 3, pp. 313-326, 2010.

[36] G.H. Litwin, & R.A. Stringer, "Motivation and organizational climate," 1968.

[37] J.J. Ryan, "Work values and organizational citizenship behaviors: Values that work for employees and organizations," Journal of Business Psychology, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 123-132, 2002.

[38] D.M. Fisher, J.M. Ragsdale, & E.C. Fisher, 2018. 'The importance of definitional and temporal issues in the study of resilience," Applied Psychology: An International Review, 2018. doi:10.1111/apps.12162.

[39] R.N. Kanungo, "Leadership in organizations: Looking ahead to the 21st century," Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne, vol. 39, no. 1-2, p.71, 1998.

[40] W.L.H. Mangundjaya, "Persepsi dukungan organisasi versus kepuasan kerja dan perannya terhadap perilaku kewarganegraan organisasi," Jurnal Psikologi Sosial, pp. 175-182, 2012.

[41] J.L. Farh, P.C. Earley, & S.C. Lin, "Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society," Administrative Science Quarterly, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 421-444, 1997.

[42] W.H. Mangundjaya, "The role of communication, trust and justice in commitment to change," In ICEHM Conference Proceedings, Batam, 2014.

[43] A. Anastasi, & S. Urbina, Psychological testing, 7th ed., 1997. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

[44] L. Aiken, & G. Groth-Marnat, Psychological testing and assessment, 12th ed., 2006. Boston: Pearson Education.

[45] P.M. Podsakoff, S.B. Mac Kenzie, J-Y. Lee, & N.P. Podsakoff, "Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies," Journal of Applied Psychology, vol. 88, no. 5, pp. 879-903, 2003.