Open Research Online

Benevolent leadership: conceptualization and construct development

Journal Item

For guidance on citations see FAQs.

oro.open.ac.uk

BENEVOLENT LEADERSHIP:

CONCEPTUALIZATION and CONSTRUCT DEVELOPMENT

Abstract

This research examines benevolent leadership and makes three key contributions to organizational research. The first contribution is a theoretical one; the development of a theory-grounded conceptual model of benevolent leadership based on four streams of creating common good in organizations; morality, spirituality, vitality, and community. The second contribution is the development of an instrument (Benevolent Leadership Scale) to measure the construct of benevolent leadership. This scale is composed of four dimensions: ethical sensitivity, spiritual depth, positive engagement, and community responsiveness. The third contribution is of empirical nature; the exploration of potential outcomes of benevolent leadership in organizations; affective commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviour.

INTRODUCTION

This study develops a conceptual model of benevolent leadership based on four streams of common good in organizational research: Morality, spirituality, vitality, and community. This study is based on the assumption that these four areas of research can provide leadership scholars and practitioners a theoretically sound basis and a wealth of knowledge to create common good in organizations. We define benevolent leadership as the process of creating a virtuous cycle of encouraging and initiating positive change in organizations through: a) ethical decision making, b) creating a sense of meaning, c) inspiring hope and fostering courage for positive action, and d) leaving a positive impact for the larger community.

Benevolent leaders are those who create observable benefits, actions, or results for the common good. The term "common good" is used in the sense of shared benefits or positive outcomes for all or most members of a community (Daly and Cobb, 1989; Bryson, and Crosby, 1992). Benevolent leaders exemplify whole-hearted and genuine actions at work that benefit people around them. Therefore, they have an inclination to do good, kind or charitable acts due to a felt obligation to use their developmental and intentional attributes of love and charity.

This paper makes three key contributions to organizational research and literature: First, the major theoretical contribution is the development of a theory-grounded conceptual model of benevolent leadership. Second, the methodological contribution is the development of an instrument (Benevolent Leadership Scale) to measure the construct of benevolent leadership. Third, the empirical contribution is the exploration of potential outcomes of benevolent leadership in organizations; specifically, perceived organizational performance, affective commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviour.

The Quest for Benevolent Leadership

The call to understand the roots, characteristics, and outcomes of benevolent leadership is timely for a number of reasons. First and foremost, there is disenchantment with leadership as articulated by a surge in a crisis of confidence in leadership (Parameshwar, 2005). Specifically, it is manifested in corporate layoffs (Leigh, 1997); psychological disengagement of people from their work (Mitroff and Denton, 1999); economic recession with growing unemployment (Farago and Gallandar, 2002); a sense of betrayal engendered by downsizing and reengineering (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003); and ethical scandals such as Enron, Arthur Andersen and WorldCom (Waddock, 2004). Both the academic and professional management literature is replete with compelling examples of business leaders who abuse power and act selfishly (Maccoby, 2000). This crisis of confidence in leadership is also manifested in the 2008 global financial crisis (Hutton, 2008; Steenland and Dreier, 2008) which is linked to moral and ethical roots such as uncontrolled greed (Greenhalgh, 2008; Steenland, and Dreier, 2008).

In addition to disenchantment with leadership, there is increasing uncertainty and flux in today's workplaces as a result of technology advances, mergers and acquisitions, and increasing globalization (Bolman and Deal, 2008). The waves of change sweeping the business world include digitalization, hyper-competition, heightened volatility, demographic shifts, and the highly turbulent environment (Kotter, 2008). Moreover, increasing complexity and interdependence implies that change is becoming increasingly non-linear and unpredictable (Brejnrod, 2001). The resulting competitive and economic pressures have led to intense cost cutting, massive corporate downsizing, and increasing stress (Neal et al., 1999). In the last decade, four million jobs were cut by Fortune 500 firms, which caused severe emotional damages for affected employees and families (victims), as well as from coworkers and managers

(survivors) who remained in their organizations (Cash and Gray, 2000). Many downsizing, reengineering, and restructuring strategies in the past decades (Kriger and Hanson, 1999) mean that the old psychological contract, which offered job security in return for loyalty, is changing (Fairholm, 1996). Today's leaders are faced with employees whose attitudes are not of trust and engagement; but of scepticism, fear and cynicism (O'Bannon, 2001). As a result of these shifts, the old leadership models based on competition and hierarchy that served us in the past are not well suited to the multifaceted challenges described above. There is a need for a new concept of leadership which is better suited to these unique challenges.

A paradigm shift in leadership theory and practice is being discussed over the past decade (Clegg, Clarke, and Ibarra, 2001). While consensus on the name of this new leadership concept has not been reached, there is a growing recognition that some of the most critical research frontiers in the field of leadership revolve around morality, spirituality, positive change and social responsibility. To date research on leadership has mostly focused on either one of these aspects, e.g., ethical leadership (Kanungo and Mendonca, 1996), spiritual leadership (Fry, 2003), transformational leadership (Bass and Avolio, 1993) and servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1977). The current study notes and addresses the general lack of cumulative work and the lack of synthesis across these domains. We thus contribute to the literature by bringing together these multidimensional approaches toward developing a conceptual model of benevolent leadership.

Articulating the role of leaders as agents of positive change in organizations is of theoretical and practical importance (Mumford et al. 2000; Gerencser et al. 2008). To understand how leaders contribute to the world around them, scholars have borrowed many concepts and theories from other disciplines, such as business ethics (Trevino, 1986), spirituality at work (Ashmos and Duchon, 2000; Mitroff and Denton, 1999), positive organizational

scholarship (Cameron, Dutton and Quinn, 2003), appreciative inquiry (Cooperrider and Whitney, 1998), and corporate social responsibility (Carroll, 1999). All these fields attempt to help leaders better cope with the challenges of the competitive materialist business landscape, but eclectically integrating these various fields into a broader framework of benevolent leadership has not yet occurred. The confluence and synergy of all these fields through a conceptual model of benevolent leadership may be a turning point in the way organizations are led in order to thrive.

Despite the importance placed on these issues by leaders and academics alike, and despite the vast research performed in these fields over the last two decades, a persistent degree of confusion plagues these fields and deters attempts at gaining greater understanding of these issues and their role in leadership. We identify two major weaknesses in these fields of research as they relate to leadership: a) the lack of a leadership model that brings together multiple streams of creating positive change; and b) inadequacy of measurement methods and tools regarding leadership characteristics and behaviours. Although past research in these domains address leadership performance in organizations, they do not go far in illuminating the individual characteristics, attitudes and behaviours of benevolent leaders, which will be a focus of the current study. This study first attempts to ''map the territory'' by classifying emergent streams related to leadership and benevolence in order to contribute to the clarification and synthesis of the field. Then, it develops a conceptual model of benevolent leadership grounded on four streams of creating common good in organizations. Finally, this study proposes an instrument (Benevolent Leadership Scale) to measure the construct of benevolent leadership.

CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT

The concept of benevolent leadership is distinct from other leadership concepts because of its central emphasis on creating observable benefits, actions, or results for the "common good". The term common good gained popularity in the last twenty years; as seen in paradigm-breaking books such as "*For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy toward Community, the Environment, and a Sustainable Future*" (Daly and Cobb, 1989) or "Leadership for the Common Good: Tackling Public Problems in a Shared-power World" (Bryson and Crosby, 1992); as well as in academic journals such as "Journal of Globalization for the Common Good".

Benevolence is defined as a philosophic belief in the potential goodness of humanity and the corresponding belief that humans have an obligation to use their natural instincts and developmental attitudes of love and charity; an inclination to do good, to do kind or charitable acts. This study introduces a conceptual model of benevolent leadership based on four streams of common good in organizational research:

(1) Morality paradigm, which is based on business ethics, leadership values and ethics, and ethical decision making literatures (the focus is on leaders' ethics and values);

(2) Spirituality stream, which is based on spirituality at work and spiritual leadership literatures (the focus is on the inner landscapes and spiritual actions of leaders);

(3) Vitality stream, which is based on positive organizational scholarship and strength-based approaches (the focus is on how leaders create positive change in organizations and the world); and,

(4) Community Stream, which is based on corporate social responsibility and corporate citizenship literatures (the focus is on leaders' contribution to society and community service).

We contend that the interplay between these four streams can provide a more comprehensive understanding of benevolent leadership and synthesizing them will lead to leadership theory that has stronger and broader explanatory power than each of these four streams alone. Such integration is useful in several ways. First, it is a step toward a holistic theory generation on leadership for the common good. The emphasis on common good is critical here; as benevolent leadership focuses on creating positive changes or engaging in actions that benefit all. Second, the conceptual framework serves both normative and pragmatic functions. These four streams provide useful standards and practical guidelines for leaders to create positive change in organizations. Third, the resulting model underlines the importance of taking all four dimensions into account while theorizing or researching on organizational phenomena.

Four Streams of Common Good in Organizational Research

We performed a multidisciplinary literature review to identify alternative theories and streams of research on how leaders encourage and initiate positive change in organizations. This review was assisted by a computerized search using keywords such as ethics, values, virtues, spirituality, and positive change. By inductively examining the substance and intellectual heritage of these theories, we found that most of them could be grouped into four basic streams. Each of these four streams has a rich and long-standing intellectual tradition, although various disciplines use different terminologies. We will refer to them as morality, spirituality, vitality, and community streams. Figure 1 outlines the essence of these four streams in terms of their related literatures, ideal leadership profiles, main gaps and problems, and leader behaviours.

Insert Figure 1 about here

The benevolent leadership model that we are proposing is built on three critical assumptions. First, these four streams are related to creating common good in organizations. They can be used to encourage and initiate positive change in organizations. Second, these four streams are distinct, in the sense that the goals they seek are not interchangeable, even though they are highly interactive with each other. Third, these four streams provide a holistic set of assumptions and research findings on creating common good in organizations. Although one may articulate the existence of additional streams related to creating positive change in organizations, we propose that these four streams together make up a meaningful whole and they craft a big picture of creating common good in organizations. Accordingly, these four streams, when taken together, can provide us the cornerstones of a conceptual model of leadership.

This study contributes to the leadership literature by calling for an integration of these four streams. More specifically, benevolent leadership model sits at the crossroads of four important research streams in organizational behaviour. First, in the morality stream, we build from the literatures of values in management and ethical decision making that purport ethical principles are critical elements in explaining how leaders act ethically (Brown and Treviño, 2006; Kanungo and Mendonca, 1996). Second, in the spirituality stream, we draw on spirituality at work research (Ashmos and Duchon, 2000; Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, 2003) and spiritual leadership research (Fry, 2003) that portrays leaders as searching for a sense of meaning (Mitroff and Denton, 1999), deeper self-awareness (Kriger and Seng, 2005, Dent, Higgins, and Wharff, 2005), transcendence (Parameshwar, 2005), and wisdom (Kessler and Bailey, 2007), to explore how leaders incorporate spirituality in their actions at work. Third, in the vitality stream, we build on strength based approaches; such as positive psychology (Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), positive organizational behaviour (Luthans, 2002), positive

organizational scholarship (Cameron, Dutton, and Quinn, 2003), and appreciative inquiry (Cooperrider and Whitney, 1998) in order to develop theoretical understandings of how leaders cultivate human strengths and lead to positive change in work organizations. Fourth, in the community stream, we draw on research on corporate social responsibility (Carroll, 1999; Garriga and Melé, 2004), corporate citizenship (Matten and Crane, 2005), and organizational citizenship behaviour (Dyne, Graham, Dienesch, 1994) to inquire how leaders fulfil their social responsibilities and contribute to their communities.

These four streams are useful bodies of research to explore how leaders create positive change in organizations and the world around them. It is useful to picture these streams as four overlapping circles sharing common conceptual space yet possessing distinctive intellectual properties. Each of them has arisen in response to the specific changes in the contexts in which organizations and leaders recently operate. These streams are closely intertwined; such that some of the research in these streams could be collapsed together. Yet, there are enough differences to keep them separate as they are conceptually distinct from each other.

Proposal for a Benevolent Leadership Model

This study develops a conceptual model of benevolent leadership by building on four streams of organizational research that are centered on main aspects of leadership responsibility toward creating common good: (1) ethical sensitivity, (2) spiritual depth, (3) positive engagement, and (4) community responsiveness. Benevolent leadership model underlines the importance of taking all four dimensions into account while theorizing or researching on positive change in organizations. Most of the research to-date has focused on only one of these

leadership responsibilities; while benevolent leadership model is built on synthesizing and taking into the account all these four dimensions.

Construct Development

Our objective is to build a multidimensional theory-based measure of benevolent leadership (the Benevolent Leadership Scale (BLS) and to provide preliminary evidence for its construct validity. We operationalize the benevolent leadership construct using the Benevolent Leadership Scale (BLS) composed of four subscales. *Ethical sensitivity* refers to the leader's process of moral reflection and consideration of what is right and wrong conduct at work. *Spiritual depth* refers to the leader's search for a sense of meaning and purpose at work. *Positive engagement* refers to creating positive change in the organization through inspiring hope and courage. Finally, *community responsiveness* refers to the leader's role in solving social problems and enabling social innovation to contribute to society.

In developing and validating an instrument to capture the four characteristics of benevolent leadership, a process recommended by DeVellis (1991) and Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing and Peterson (2008) is used. In keeping with this process, first new and conceptually consistent theoretical definitions of the construct were developed. We used both deductive and inductive approaches for item generation to assess how leaders demonstrate benevolent leadership. Initial content specifications were developed based on (a) an extensive review of the literature on four streams of research that constitute four anchors of benevolent leadership, (b) pilot interviews conducted with three managers on what constitutes benevolent leadership and benevolent leader behaviour, (c) a series of academic discussions and meetings with field experts focusing on construct clarity, validity, and item validation.

After reviewing about 300 articles and books on four streams of research in organizational sciences centered on creating common good, we conducted pilot interviews with ten managers in Canada. Theoretical sampling was used to identify individuals who have significant experience and idealism in creating positive change in their organizations. To assess the adequacy of the categories above, we asked these managers to describe a person they regarded as a benevolent leader (e.g., what made him or her benevolent leader?). Their responses were then content analyzed. The emergent categories closely matched those just described (resulting in % 90 similar themes in content analysis), providing initial evidence of the multidimensionality of the benevolent leadership construct. Based on this comprehensive literature review, pilot interviews, and content analysis, the four subscales mentioned above were deemed appropriate as constituting the benevolent leadership construct.

Next, a pool of 20-25 items were generated for each dimension based on four streams of research incorporating structured item development strategies (DeVellis, 1991, Walumbwa et al. 2008). We theoretically derived 90 sample items in total, which were later refined to 40 items that best captured the proposed content areas and were considered the least ambiguous and most behavioral. Items have been written for clarity and congruence to the theoretical descriptions and prior work in four streams of research. The revised items were then tested for face validity by three subject matter experts. We made sure that the items in each of the four subscales: a) captured both benevolent leadership attitudes and behaviors; b) were theoretically consistent with identified and proposed leader behaviors in each stream of research; c) avoided measuring multiple attitudes or behaviors in one item to reduce ambiguity and error. These items were then subjected to a subsequent content validity assessment by the researchers using procedures recommended by Schriesheim et al. (1993). Finally, construct coherence was checked through a

consistency test of whether the core construct of benevolent leadership demonstrated greater resilience than its four foundational subscales (Suddaby, 2010). The final items that were retained for further analysis are listed in Table 4.

The first subscale, *ethical sensitivity*, contained 10 items that capture leader's morally grounded principles and ethical rules at work; such as "*When I make a managerial decision at work, I reflect on the ethical consequences of my decision*", and "*I challenge my colleagues when they depart from ethical values at work.*"

The second subscale, *spiritual depth*, contained 10 items that capture leader's search for meaning and self-reflection, as well as incorporation of spirituality at work; such as "*I feel vitally alive and passionate when I bring my soul into work*" and "*I believe that we are all interconnected and part of a meaningful whole*".

The third subscale, *positive engagement*, contained 10 items that capture leader's passion for initiating and encouraging positive change in the organization; such as "*I try to provide hope and courage for people around me to take positive action*" and "*I have a fundamental belief in our abilities to produce desired results or positive outcomes in this organization.*"

The fourth subscale, *community responsiveness*, contained 10 items that capture leader's sensitivity and idealism in leaving a social legacy and contribution to community; such as "*I go beyond my job definition to contribute to my community and to the world*" and "*I am actively involved in social responsibility projects for community benefit*". Responses were made on a 5-point scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Benevolent leadership scale is an additive index made up of these four subscales. An additive index implies these four dimensions are complementary to each other and they together

add up to form the construct of benevolent leadership. The psychometric properties of the

proposed scale are assessed using standard methods which are presented in the next section.

METHOD

Sample

The data for this study is gathered by a survey using judgment sampling. Eligible

participants were acting managers who work in business and non-profit organizations in Canada

and manage at least one person. First, a pilot survey was conducted with 15 managers. Based on

the feedback from the respondents, the survey items were revised to eliminate redundancies and

unclear formulations. The revised survey was sent out for data collection. Our target was to

reach at least 150 managers to be able to test the psychometric properties of the Benevolent

Leadership Scale in keeping with Hinkin (1995) who, based on a review of 277 measures in 75

articles, recommended a minimum sample size of 150 observations to obtain accurate solutions

for new scale development procedures and exploratory factor analysis.

As this is an exploratory study judgment sampling was deemed adequate. Although the

use of non-probability sampling limits generalizability, judgment sampling provided flexibility,

convenience, and insight in choosing the respondents. We sought diversity in terms of

demographics, background, and attitudes towards benevolence; that is, we tried to obtain data

from respondents with diverse tendencies toward benevolence, rather than trying to reach only

seemingly 'benevolent leaders'. We also tried to seek diversity in terms of sectors, departments,

positions, job experience and location. To ensure diversity in terms of sectors, we sent messages

requesting participation to various professional associations in Canada; such as the Canadian

Club, Canada's Telecommunications Hall of Fame and McGill Alumni. To ensure diversity in

terms of location, we recruited volunteers in each city who agreed to contribute to this study by sending out the surveys to managers and professional associations in their cities. We located one volunteer each in Ottawa, Toronto, Calgary and Vancouver.

Participants were reached and recruited by using the following venues: a) Professional associations; b) Professional e-mail groups, social networking sites (i.e. Facebook), professional networking sites (i.e. LinkedIn); c) Managers who act as volunteers and city representatives for this study by sending out surveys to managers in their cities; and, d) Personal/professional contacts and references. Participants were informed that their participation in this study was completely voluntary. There was no compensation for participating in this research. The answers of respondents were kept strictly confidential and released only as summaries or quotes in which no individual's answers could be identified. Participants could choose to skip any questions that they did not wish to answer or that would make them uncomfortable.

Most of the surveys were completed online with an e-mail message sent to the respondents containing a link to the survey web page. Respondents entered their answers directly online. Paper-and-pencil surveys were also used for participants who could not access the Internet or do not prefer completing electronic surveys. Responses from online surveys and paper-and-pencil surveys were analyzed to check for response bias and none were found. Incidence of non-response was low. The survey was sent out to 450 managers throughout Canada. Responses were obtained from 175 managers, yielding a response rate of 38.8 percent.

Data Analysis

Standard descriptive information was computed on all variables including the frequency, mean and standard deviation. In addition, the psychometric properties of the newly created

benevolent leadership scale (BLS) were assessed using various procedures. First, internal consistency (reliability) of each of the four subscales and the full BLS was assessed by cronbach alpha. Then, the dimensionality and factor analytic structure of BLS was tested through exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. When the factor structure can be determined a priori from theory, as proposed in this research, using both confirmatory factor analysis and exploratory factor analysis is preferable (Kirkman and Shapiro, 2001).

According to Law, Wong, and Mobley (1998), the dimensions of a latent model should be correlated to justify the summing of component dimensions into a single overall representation of those dimensions. Moreover, Walumbwa et al. (2008) suggest that there must be evidence of discriminant validity for the component dimensions, as each of the dimensions must make a unique contribution to the latent construct. An exploratory factor analysis and a second-order confirmatory factor analysis (loading items on the four dimensions and the four dimensions on a single benevolent factor) were performed. We assessed the convergent and discriminant validity of the benevolent leadership items and the contribution of the four dimensions to the overall construct of benevolent leadership.

RESULTS

Table 1 provides the means, standard deviations, and range of the key demographic information for the respondents. The sample represented a diverse range of ages, from 19 to 66. The mean age of the respondents is 36.01. The majority (66.7%) of the respondents were relatively young managers who were in their 20s or 30s. The remaining respondents were equally divided between the ages of 40s and 50+. More than half of the respondents had an undergraduate degree. About one-third held graduate degrees in total; 40 had masters and 15 had

Ph.D. degrees. The sample included 71 females and 86 males. The gender and education demographics seem comparable with the population of managers in Canada. For example, a Statistics Canada report on diversity of managers in Canada (Marshall, 1996) states that 63% of managers are male and 28% are university educated.

Insert Table 1 about here
----

90 respondents were married, while 50 respondents were single. 39.1 % has no children, 2.4 % has 4 or more children and the remaining have between 1-3 children. The sample encompasses a diverse set of respondents in terms of professional experience; including both who are very early and who are well advanced in their careers. The mean of number of years in current organization is 5.05 years with a standard deviation of 5.44. The average number of professional experience is 7.73 years with a standard deviation of 7.40. The sample was drawn from 12 cities across Canada. The respondents were about equally split between Quebec, Ontario and rest of Canada.

Respondents worked in a wide variety of functions and departments, (e.g., Finance, Marketing, HR, Production and Operations, R&D, and Information Systems) and business sectors (e.g. media, telecommunications, manufacturing, banking, pharmaceuticals, and biotechnology). In total, 59% of the respondents were working for business organizations; whereas 41% of them were working for not-for-profit organizations, including universities or schools, hospitals, NGOs, governmental, religious, and environmental organizations.

Examining the Psychometric Properties of the Benevolent Leadership Scale

Summary information on the four sub-scales, Ethical Sensitivity, Spiritual Depth, Positive Engagement, and Community Responsiveness, as well as the full Benevolent

Leadership Scale is provided in Table 2. The Cronbach's α values of the sub-scales range from

0.848 to 0.922, which exceed the recommended threshold of 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978), thus provide

evidence of internal consistency and reliability. The Cronbach's α score for the full scale,

consisting of all 40 items, is 0.945; which demonstrates high internal consistency and reliability.

Insert Table 2 about here

An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was performed on Benevolent Leadership Scale

items using principal-components to ascertain that the items loaded onto common latent factors.

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) was 0.883; above the

recommended value of 0.6 which indicates that the variables are measuring a common factor.

Bartlett's test of Sphericity 3781.801; df = 780; p = .000, confirms the sample intercorrelation

matrix did not come from a population in which the intercorrelation matrix is an identity matrix.

Finally, the communalities were all above 0.490 confirming that each item shared common

variance with other items and not much meaning of the items is lost in the factor analysis.

In total, eight factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 emerged explaining 65.613

percent of the total variance in the data (Table 3). Both orthogonal (e.g. varimax, quartimax, and

equamax), and oblique (e.g. oblimin) rotations were attempted although the oblique rotation

seems theoretically more appropriate since the items constituting the Benevolent Leadership

Scale are expected to be correlated. Indeed, the oblimin rotation provided the best results as

shown in Table 4.

Insert Table 3 about here

Insert Table 4 about here

The factor analysis retrieves the two dimensions Spiritual Depth and Community Responsiveness as originally proposed. The two other scales, Ethical Sensitivity and Positive Engagement, were each split into 3 dimensions.

The first factor, labeled **Community Responsiveness,** has 8 items from the original Community Responsiveness subscale. It explains 32.636 % of the total variance. The second factor is labeled as **Spiritual Depth** and it has 10 items; all of which are from the original Spiritual Depth subscale. The second factor explains 9.603 % of the total variance.

The third factor, **Procedural Ethics,** explains 5.375 % of the total variance and includes five items from the original Ethical Sensitivity subscale. The fourth factor, **Positive Engagement,** has 6 items from the original Positive Engagement scale and explains 4.625 % of the total variance. The fifth factor, **Moral Responsibility,** contains three items. The highest loading item is *"challenging colleagues when they depart from ethical values"*. Factor 5 explains 4.411 % of the total variance.   Two items were loaded on the sixth factor: "*being hopeful about what we can accomplish in this organization*" and "*having fundamental belief in our abilities to produce positive results in organization*". This factor is labeled as **Positive Expectation** and explains 3.482 % of the total variance. The seventh factor explains 2.787 % of the total variance and also contains two items: "*striving to communicate a clear and positive vision of the future*" and "*encouraging team members to have bold dreams in this organization*". It is named as **Positive Vision**. The last explains 2.694 % of the total variance and has three items: "*my work is guided by high ethical standards*", *"I stand up for what is right"* and "*I take*

responsibility for mistakes". Therefore, this factor is labeled as ***Integrity***. All these three items are originally from the Ethical Sensitivity subscale.

Validity of the Benevolent Leadership Scale (BLS) was further explored by a confirmatory factor analysis in keeping with Van Prooijen and Van Der Kloot (2001) and Shi, Kunnathur and Ragu-Nathan (2005). Four factors instead of eight were used in confirmatory factor analysis; because the scree plot indicated a significant declineafter four factors. Specifically, a structural equation model using EQS was conducted to test the relationships between the four subscales of Benevolent Leadership and the composite BLS. Maximum likelihood confirmatory factor analysis was used for the estimation, as it makes possible to assess the goodness of fit of a factor structure to a set of data. The four subscales were set as latent variables. This analysis revealed an adequate overall fit ($\chi^2 = 1171.118$, df = 690, p $\leq$.01). The ratio of chi-square to the degrees of freedom is 1.69; which is below the maximum recommended value of 2.00. This ratio suggests that the four-factor model does fit the data relatively well.

The overall fit of the CFA model to the data was assessed with various indices; the goodness-of-fit index (GFI) = 79, the Bentler-Bonett (1980) normed-fit index (NFI) = .85, comparative fit index (CFI) = .92, and non-normed fit index (NNFI) = .91. These values indicate that the hypothesized factor structure fits the data moderately well. The model was further evaluated by the measure of fit - root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) where values less than 0.06 indicate a good fit and values ranging from 0.06 to 0.08 indicate acceptable fit (Hu and Bentler, 1999). Therefore, this model has a relatively good fit with RMSEA = .063.

The four-factor model above is superior to the *one-factor* model (GFI = .67, NFI = .77, CFI=.82, and NNFI = .79. RMSEA = .082). The chi-square difference between these two models was significant ($\Delta\chi^2$ =5225.938, Δdf = 2, p $\leq$.01).

The convergent validity was supported in all four subscales. The lowest parameter estimate (λ) among the items was .69; and all the estimates were significant at the 0.05 level. Composite reliability scores (γ) for each subscale varied between 0.8 and 0.85; which were higher than the recommended value of 0.6 (Kaptein, 2008). The variances extracted were also higher than the recommended value of 0.5 (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). These results support convergent validity. Furthermore, the factor correlations (phi coefficients) ranged from .48 to .69. For all the items, the variance-extracted estimates were larger than 0.5 and they were also larger than the square of the phi matrix, supporting discriminant validity (Kaptein, 2008).

Establishing Predictive Validity of Benevolent Leadership Construct

In this study, we assessed the predictive validity of benevolent leadership construct by relating it to three selected organizationally relevant outcomes: Perceived organizational performance, affective commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviour. We have chosen these outcomes because of four reasons: a) These outcomes are theoretically relevant to the construct of benevolent leadership; b) These outcomes generally have well established and reliable measures in organizational studies; c) These outcomes are perceived to be practically relevant and critical outcomes for organizations; d) These outcomes have been heavily researched and found to be positively associated with leadership in extant literature. In other words, they have prominence and track record in empirical leadership studies.

Our first proposition is that benevolent leadership is positively associated with perceived organizational performance. There is considerable empirical evidence that virtuous and benevolent actions at work lead to tendencies to repeat or replicate these actions and this contagion effect leads to mutually reinforcing cycles and positive spirals in human systems (Cameron, Bright, and Caza, 2004; Seligman, 2002; Fredrickson, 2001). When employees

observe benevolent leadership behaviours at work, they become more inclined towards replicating these behaviours, such as spending extra effort to help colleagues or contribute to the common good. In turn, these positive spirals lead to collective flourishing, thriving, productivity, and better organizational performance (Cameron, Bright, and Caza, 2004). Therefore, we propose

Hypothesis 1: Benevolent leadership is positively associated with perceived organizational performance.

Organizational performance is measured by asking respondents to rate key dimensions using the following question: How would you compare the organization's performance over the past three years to that of other organizations that do the same kind of work? Responses are made on a 5-point scale: 1 (much worse), 2 (worse), 3 (equal), and 4 (better), and 5 (much better). The following key dimensions of organizational performance are rated 1) financial performance indicators, i.e. profitability, 2) managerial effectiveness in this organization, 3) ability to attract and retain essential employees, 4) satisfaction of customers or clients, 5) relations between management and other employees, 6) relations among employees in general, 7) employee morale, 8) employee productivity, 9) business ethics, 10) spirituality at work, 11) positive organizational change, 12) corporate social responsibility, 13) innovation, 14) long term organizational health. These dimensions were selected on the basis of prior research investigating perceived organizational performance (Delaney and Huselid, 1996; Youndt, Snell, Dean, and Lepak, 1996; Cameron, Bright, Caza, 2004). Furthermore, additional dimensions and areas of performance were added based on the criteria of being theoretically relevant and being associated with benevolent leadership.

The second hypothesis states that benevolent leadership is positively associated with affective commitment. Affective commitment is defined as the employee's positive emotional attachment to the organization (Meyer and Allen, 1991); and it is one of the components of the three-component model of commitment (Affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment). In the case of affective commitment, an employee strongly identifies with the goals of the organization and desires to remain a part of the organization. Working with benevolent leaders who contribute to their co-workers, organizations, and the world around them can elicit a desire in employees to be more committed to their organizations. The perception of being valued and cared about by their managers may encourage employees' positive identification and membership with the organization, which in turn strengthens their affective commitment to the organization (Meyer and Allen, 1991). Therefore, we hypothesize that employees receiving favorable treatment will be more sensitive and affectively committed to the organization they are working for.

Hypothesis 2: Benevolent Leadership will be positively associated with affective commitment.

Affective commitment is measured using eight items from the Affective Commitment Scale (Meyer and Allen, 1991). Two example items are 'I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization' and 'I do not feel like a part of the family at my organization' (reverse coded).

The third hypothesis states that benevolent leadership is positively associated with organizational citizenship behaviour. Organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) is defined as voluntary behaviors performed by the workforce, not explicitly evaluated nor rewarded by the company (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter, 1990). It is also defined as discretionary behaviour which goes beyond existing role expectations and benefits or is intended to benefit the

organization (Organ, 1988). According to this definition, OCB refers to organizationally beneficial behaviors that can not be enforced on the basis of formal role obligations. OCB consists of informal contributions that participants can choose to perform or withhold without regard to considerations of sanctions or formal incentives (Organ, 1990). Podsakoff et al. (2000) identified five dimensions of OCB: (a) Altruism, or helping behaviour involves voluntarily helping others with an organizationally relevant task or problem; (b) Conscientiousness, namely, going well beyond minimally required levels of punctuality, housekeeping, conserving resources, and attending at work above the norm; (c) Sportsmanship, which reflects the employee's willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences of work without complaining, such as not wasting time complaining about trivialities; (d) Courtesy, namely, behaviors aimed at preventing work-related problems with others, and (e) Civic virtue, which reflects responsive, constructive involvement in the organization, such as keeping abreast of changes at work.

A considerable amount of work in organizations is accomplished through interactions among employees as they help each other in their roles. Employees working with benevolent leaders and getting help from them will be more likely to offer extra help to their coworkers or spend extra effort to contribute to the common good (Lilius et al., 2008). Therefore,

Hypothesis 3: Benevolent Leadership will be positively associated with organizational citizenship behavior.

Organizational citizenship behavior is measured using the OCB scale proposed and validated by Netemeyer, Boles, Mckee, and McMurrian (1997) composed of four dimensions: (a) sportsmanship (three items), (b) civic virtue (three items), (c) conscientiousness (three items), and (d) altruism (three items).

Therefore, a positive relationship has been hypothesized between the four benevelont leadership dimensions proposed by this research a) Ethical Sensitivity, b) Spiritual Depth, c) Positive Engagement, and d) Community Responsiveness and the three seemingly related organizational outcomes: a) Perceived Organizational Performance, b) Affective Commitment, and c) Organizational Citizenship Behavior. We used Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to investigate the proposed relationships. The SEM analysis tested all the constructs (latent variables of the four subscales of Benevolent Leadership) and the outcome variables.

SEM is appropriate in this research because it is defined as a representation of a network of hypothesized causal relationships (Millsap and Hartog, 1988). The modeling is characterized by an - estimation of multiple and interrelated dependence relationships, and by - the ability to represent unobserved concepts in these relationships (Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black, 1998). Therefore, SEM not only investigates individual hypotheses and relationships, but also provides an overall assessment of the fit of a hypothesized model to the data, which is the intent in this research.

SEM is an increasingly popular quantitative data analysis technique for estimating and testing hypothesized models describing (linear) relationships among a set of variables (Hoyle, 1995; Kline, 2005). SEM has two main strengths. The first strength is that SEM specifies models that provide both the estimates of relations among latent constructs and their manifest indicators (the measurement model) and the estimates of the relations among constructs (the structural model). By these means, researchers can assess the psychometric properties of measures and estimate relations among constructs (Bollen, 1989). The second strength is the availability of measures of global fit that can provide a summary evaluation of even complex models that involve a large

number of linear equations. We conducted two alternative Structural Equation Models to test the relationships among the study variables.

Structural Equation Model 1

The first structural equation model tested the relationships between the composite Benevolent Leadership Scale and the three organizational outcomes: Perceived Organizational Performance, Affective Commitment, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

Our hypothesized model fit the data moderately well ($\chi2$ = 4375.118, df = 2624, p $\leq$.01; root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .080; Bentler-Bonett Non-Normed Fit Index = .801; Bentler-Bonett Normed Fit Index = .721; Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = .809). The ratio of chi-square to the degrees of freedom in this model was 1.66; which is below the recommended maximum value of 2.00. This suggests a moderately good fit. Second, we assessed the overall fit of the model to the data. The goodness-of-fit (GFI) index was .690, the normed-fit index (NFI) was .721, comparative fit index (CFI) was .809) and non-normed fit index (NNFI) was .801, all indicating that the hypothesized factor structure partially fits the data. Third, we evaluated and specified the model by examining the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). This model has a RMSEA of .080; indicating an acceptable fit (MacCallum, Browne, and Sugawara, 1996; Hu and Bentler, 1999).

Examination of the standardized parameter estimates indicate that the hypothesized relationships were significant and in the predicted directions. Path parameter estimates measure the degree of effect produced by one variable on the arrow-pointed variable. First, Benevolent Leadership had a significant positive direct effect (.47, p < .05) on Perceived Organizational Performance. Benevolent Leadership contributed 12.8 % of the variance in Perceived Organizational Performance. This confirms Hypothesis 1. Second, Benevolent Leadership

significantly predicted (.508, p < .05) Affective Commitment. Benevolent Leadership

contributed 13.7 % of the variance in Affective Commitment. This confirms Hypothesis 2.

Third, Benevolent Leadership had a significant positive direct effect (.432, p < .05) on

Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Benevolent Leadership contributed 22.1 % of the variance

in Organizational Citizenship Behavior. This confirms Hypothesis 3.

Structural Equation Model 2

The second structural equation model tested the relationships among the four subscales of

Benevolent Leadership and the three organizational outcomes: Perceived Organizational

Performance, Affective Commitment, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. This model

represents the relationships among these outcome variables as spurious correlations resulting

from their joint dependence on the four dimensions of Benevolent Leadership. In this model,

observed bivariate correlations are treated as statistical artifacts that disappear when joint effects

of benevolent leadership dimensions are controlled.

Our hypothesized model fit the data well ($\chi2$ = 3903.894, df = 2609, p $\leq$.01; root mean

square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .064; Bentler-Bonett Non-Normed Fit Index = .894;

Bentler-Bonett Normed Fit Index = .836; Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = .918). The ratio of chi-

square to the degrees of freedom in this model was 1.49; which is below the recommended

maximum value of 2.00. This suggests a good fit. Second, we assessed the overall fit of the

model to the data. For this model, the goodness-of-fit (GFI) index was .809, the Bentler-Bonett

normed-fit index (NFI) was .836, comparative fit index (CFI) was .918) and Bentler-Bonett non-

normed fit index (NNFI) was .894. These index values indicate that the hypothesized factor

structure fits the data moderately well. Third, we evaluated and specified the model by

examining the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). This model has a RMSEA of 0.064; indicating a relatively good fit.

Overall, the second structural equation model provided better fit than the first one. In this model, the examination of the standardized parameter estimates indicate the nuanced relationships among various benevolent leadership dimensions and different organizational outcomes. Here are the significant parameter estimates: First, Community Responsiveness had a significant positive direct effect (.28, p < .05) on Perceived Organizational Performance. Benevolent Leadership contributed 14.9 % of the variance in Perceived Organizational Performance. Second, Community Responsiveness (.447, p < .05) and Positive Engagement (.308, p < .05) significantly predicted Affective Commitment. These two variables contributed 18.7 % of the variance in Affective Commitment. Third, Community Responsiveness (.277, p < .05) and Positive Engagement (.221, p < .05) had a significant positive direct effect on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. These two variables contributed 24.8 % of the variance in Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

DISCUSSION

In developing a model of benevolent leadership, this study brings together multidisciplinary perspectives. We make three key contributions to organizational research and literature. First, the major theoretical contribution is the development of a conceptual model of benevolent leadership based on four streams of common good in organizations: Morality, spirituality, vitality, and community. Second, the methodological contribution is the development of a theory-based instrument (Benevolent Leadership Scale) to measure the construct of benevolent leadership. The validity and reliability of the measurement instrument was confirmed by various methods including coefficient alpha, exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses.

Third, the empirical contribution is the exploration of potential outcomes of benevolent leadership in organizations; namely, perceived organizational performance, affective commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. Significant positive relationships were obtained between benevolent leadership tendencies and the three organizational outcomes. Predictive validity of the benevolent leadership scale was confirmed from structural equation modeling using the organizational outcomes of perceived organizational performance, affective commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. Results indicated positive and significant relationships between benevolent tendencies of leaders and their affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

Implications for research:

From a research perspective, the main contribution of this study is that it brings together four streams of organizational research that had previously not been connected to develop a conceptual model of benevolent leadership. This model provides an opportunity for integrating diverse fields of organizational research centered on creating common good: business ethics, spirituality at work, positive organizational scholarship, and corporate social responsibility. This paper proposes the utility of benevolent leadership as a unifying construct to provide direction for further research across these fields.

Second, measurement issues are of primary importance. The development of an accurate, reliable and credible scale measuring benevolent leadership is an essential step to studying the construct. In further research, Benevolent Leadership construct will be operationalized with diverse samples and cultural contexts to enhance the generalizability as well as further confirm the discriminant, convergent, and predictive validity of the Benevolent Leadership Scale. Including the Benevolent Leadership Scale in future studies of positive organizational

scholarship, leadership, business ethics, and spirituality at work can provide scholars an inventory for measuring various benevolent tendencies of leaders.

 Implications for practice:

The crisis of confidence in leadership in organizations has become a matter of intense concern in the corporate world. The new challenges call for a new level of courageous, principled, and integrative leadership and in response we propose benevolent leadership which balances ethical, spiritual, transformational, and social concerns at the same time.   As organizations are attempting to address ethical, spiritual, transformational, and social challenges; benevolent leadership model can provide leaders with a fresh perspective on addressing and solving these complex problems.

LIMITATIONS and FUTURE WORK

This exploratory study has several limitations. First, although the participants were selected from different organizations across Canada, the results may not be generalizable to different contexts and different samples since the sample was not drawn probabilistically. Benevolent leadership dynamics and behaviors may operate differently for diverse people and in different organizational settings.

Second, a variety of psychometric, experimental and ethnographic methods can be developed for further exploration and measurement of benevolent leadership in organizations. Interview-based methodologies can offer rich descriptions of how benevolent leaders create positive change in organizations. Longitudinal studies could delineate the processes through which benevolent leaders reflect on themselves, make decisions, take positive actions, improve organizational effectiveness, and influence people around them.

Third, there are alternative leadership styles that managers can adopt to achieve positive results, such as ethical leadership, spiritual leadership, transformational leadership, and servant leadership. Future research is needed to address how different leadership styles and roles interrelate and complement one another to create common good in organizations.

Fourth, the antecedents of benevolent leadership also provide research opportunities. For example, such variables as emotional intelligence, flexibility, and openness to experience, or such situational variables as education, organizational culture, and exposure to benevolent leaders, all may serve as antecedents.

Fifth, clear assessment and measurement of the organizational outcomes of benevolent leadership is a crucial agenda for further research. Benevolent leadership may be positively associated with other positive outcomes such as job satisfaction, vitality, innovative work behaviors, and perceptions of organizational effectiveness. The extent that benevolent leaders foster positive organizational outcomes is a promising line of empirical inquiry.

Finally, there may be additional dimensions or paradigms that can be considered for benevolent leadership. However, this study suggests that these four dimensions make up a meaningful whole and a comprehensive toolkit for leaders interested in creating positive change.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the concept of benevolent leadership can be used as a construct that bridges diverse approaches to creating common good in organizational contexts. The vitality and utility of benevolent leadership model is based on the insight and the big picture the model provides leaders in their decisions and actions at work. Without such integration on a substantial level of nuanced thinking and balanced action, leaders may be confronted with the threats of

facing analysis paralysis and making partial decisions. This study purports that the usage of four critical heart-sets of benevolent leadership will be a critical success factor in leading positive change and creating common good in organizations in the 21st century.

As organizations devote vast resources to create common good, the need for a better understanding of benevolent leadership continues to grow. Although not a final statement on the topic, this study adds to the growing body of evidence that doing good contributes to doing well in organizations. By understanding how leaders enable positive change in organizations, we can discover new pathways towards creating "common good" for our communities. As such, this article contributes to the positive organizational scholarship literature that helps to uncover dynamics towards positive change in human systems.

REFERENCES

Ashmos, D.P. and Duchon, D.: 2000, 'Spirituality at work: A conceptualization and measure', *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 9, 134–145.

Bagozzi, R. P. & Yi, Y.: 1988, 'On the evaluation of structural equation models', *Journal of Academy of Marketing Research,* 14, 396-402.

Bass, B.M., and Avolio, B.J.: 1993, 'Transformational leadership: A response to critiques', In M. M. Chemmers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions,* 49-88. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Bentler, P. M.: 1992, 'On the fit of models to covariances and methodology to the Bulletin', *Psychological Bulletin* 112, 400-404.

Bentler, P. M., & Weeks, D. G.: 1980, 'Linear structural equations with latent variables', *Psychometrika* 45, 289–308.

Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G.: 1980, 'Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures', *Psychological Bulletin* 88, 588-606.

Bollen, K. A.: 1989, '*Structural Equations with Latent Variables',* New York: Wiley.

Bolman, L. G. and Deal, T. E.: 2008, '*Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership',* Jossey-Bass Business and Management Series, 4th Edition.

Brejnrod, P. H.: 2001, '*The Discovery of the New World',* Denmark: Kroghs Forlag A/S.

Brown, M. E. and Trevino, L. K.: 2006, 'Ethical leadership: A review and future directions', *The Leadership Quarterly* 17, 595-616.

Bryson, J. M., and Crosby, B. C.: 1992, '*Leadership for the common good: Tackling public problems in a shared power world',* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E., and Quinn, R. E. (Eds.): 2003, '*Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a new Discipline',* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Cameron, K. S., Bright, D and Caza, A.: 2004, 'Exploring the Relationships between Organizational Virtuousness and Performance', *American Behavioral Scientist* 47, 766.

Carroll, A.: 1999, 'Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct'. *Business and Society* 38(3), 268-295.

Carroll, A.B.: 2001, 'Ethical challenges for business in the new millennium: Corporate social responsibility and models of management morality', In Richardson, J.E. (Ed.), *Business Ethics*, Guilford, CT: Dushkin/McGraw-Hill, 198-203.

Cash, K., & Gray, G.: 2000, 'A framework for accommodating religion and spirituality in the workplace', *Academy of Management Executive* 14(3), 124-134.

Clegg, S., Clarke, T. and Ibarra, E.: 2001, 'Millennium Management, Changing Paradigms and Organizational Studies', *Human Relations* 54(1), 31-36.

Cooperrider, D. L., and Whitney, D.: 1998, '*Appreciative Inquiry: A Constructive Approach to Organization Development and Social Change',* Lakeshore Publishing, Cleveland, OH.

Corkery, M. and Hagerty, J. R.: 2008, '*Continuing vicious cycle of pain in housing and finance ensnares market',* Wall Street Journal, July 14, 2008.

Daly, H. E. and Cobb, J. B.: 1989, '*For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy toward Community, the Environment, and a Sustainable Future',* Boston: Beacon Press.

Delaney, J.T. and Huselid M.A.: 1996, 'The Impact of Human Resource Management Practices on Perceptions of Organizational Performance', *Academy of Management Journal* 39, 949–969.

Dent, E. B., Higgins, M. E.,Wharff, D. M.: 2005, 'Spirituality and Leadership: An Empirical Review of Definitions, Distinctions, and Embedded Assumptions', *The Leadership Quarterly* 16 (5).

DeVellis, R. F.: 1991, '*Scale development: Theory and applications',* Newbury Park: Sage.

Dyne, L. V., Graham, J. W., Dienesch, R, M.: 1994, 'Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Construct Redefinition, Measurement, and Validation', *The Academy of Management Journal* 37(4), 765-802.

Fairholm, G. W.: 1996, 'Spiritual leadership: fulfilling whole-self needs at work', *Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 17(5), 11-17.

Farago, A. and Gallandar, B.: 2002, '*How to survive the recession and the recovery',* Insomniac Press, Toronto, ON.

Fredrickson, B.L.: 2001, 'The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions', *American Psychologist* 56, 218–226.

Fry, L.W.: 2003, 'Toward a theory of spiritual leadership', *The Leadership Quarterly* 14(6), 693–727.

Garriga, E. and Melé, D.: 2004, 'Corporate Social Responsibility Theories: Mapping the Territory', *Journal of Business Ethics* 53 (1-2), 51–71.

Gerencser, M., Van Lee, R., Napolitano, F., & Kelly, C.: 2008, '*Megacommunities: How leaders of government, business and non-profits can tackle today's global challenges together*', New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Giacalone, R. A., and Jurkiewicz, C. L.: 2003, '*Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance*', Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Greenhalgh, H.: 2008, '*Poor ethical standards causing financial crisis*', Financial Times, October 13, 2008.

Greenleaf, R.K.: 1977, '*Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*', Paulist Press, New York, NY.

Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L. & Black, W.C.: 1998, '*Multivariate Data Analysis*', 5th Ed., New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Hinkin, T.: 1995, 'A Review of Scale Development Practices in the Study of Organizations', *Journal of Management* 21(5), 967 - 988.

Hoyle, R. H. (Ed.): 1995, '*Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications*', Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M.: 1999, 'Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives', *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 6, 1-55.

Hutton, W.: 2008, '*Without real leadership, we face disaster*', The Observer. Sunday October 12.

Kanungo, R. N. and Mendonca M.: 1996, '*Ethical Dimensions of Leadership*', Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Kaptein, P.: 2008, 'Developing a measure of unethical behavior in the workplace: A stakeholder perspective', *Journal of Management* 34; 978-1008.

Kessler, E. H., and Bailey, J. R.: 2007, *'Handbook of organizational and managerial wisdom',* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kirkman, B.L. and Shapiro, D. L.: 2001, 'The Impact of cultural values on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in self-managing work teams: the mediating role of employee resistance', *Academy of Management Journal* 44(3), 557–569.

Kline, R. B.: 2005, *'Principles and practice of structural equation modeling',* New York: Guilford.

Kotter, J. P.: 2008, '*A Sense of Urgency',* Harvard Business School Press.

Kriger, M. and Seng, Y.: 2005, 'Leadership with inner meaning: A contingency theory of leadership based on the worldviews of five religions', *The Leadership Quarterly* 16, 771-806.

Kriger, M., and Hanson, B.: 1999, 'A value-based paradigm for creating truly healthy organizations', *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 12(4), 302–317.

Law, K.S., Wong, C.S. and Mobley, W.H.: 1998, 'Toward a taxonomy of multidimensional constructs', *Academy of Management Review* 23 (4), 741-755.

Leigh, P.: 1997, 'The new spirit at work', *Training and Development* 51(3), 26-41.

Lilius, J. M., Worline, M. C., Maitlis, S., Kanov, J., Dutton, J. E., & Frost, P.: 2008, 'The contours and consequences of compassion at work', *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 29, 193-218.

Luthans, F.: 2002, 'The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior', *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 23, 695-706.

MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M.: 1996, 'Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling', *Psychological Methods* 1, 130-149.

Maccoby, M.: 2000, 'Narcissistic leaders: The incredible pros, the inevitable cons', *Harvard Business Review* 78 (1), 69-77.

Marsh, H. W., Balla, J. R., & McDonald, R. P.: 1988, 'Goodness-of-fit indexes in confirmatory factor analysis: The effect of sample size', *Psychological Bulletin* 103, 391-410.

Marshall, K.: 1996, '*The Diversity of Managers',* Perspectives. Statistics Canada. Winter 1996; 24-30.

Matten, D. and Crane, A.: 2005, 'Corporate Citizenship: Toward an extended theoretical conceptualization', *Academy of Management Review* 30 (1), 166-179.

Meyer, J. P., and Allen, N. J.: 1991, 'A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment', *Human Resource Management Review*,1, 61-89.

Millsap, R.E. & Hartog, D.N.: 1988, 'Alpha, beta and gamma change in evaluation research: a structural equation approach', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 73, 574-584.

Mitroff, I.I. and Denton, E. A.: 1999, 'A study of spirituality in the workplace', *Sloan Management Review,* 83–92.

Mumford, M.D., Zaccaro, S.J., Harding, F.D., and Jacobs, A.: 2000, 'Leadership skills for a changing world: solving complex social problems', *Leadership Quarterly* 11(1), 11-35.

Neal, J.A., Lichtenstein, B.M.B. and Banner, D.: 1999, 'Spiritual perspectives on individual, organizational and societal transformation', *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 12 (3), 175-185.

Netemeyer, R.G., Boles, J.S., Mckee, D.O. and McMurrian, R.: 1997, 'An investigation into the antecedents of organizational citizenships behaviours in a personal selling context', *Journal of Marketing* 61, 85-98.

Nunnally, J.C.: 1978, *'Psychometric Theory'*, McGraw-Hill: NY.

O'Bannon, G.: 2001, 'Managing Our Future: The Generation X Factor', *Public Personnel Management* 30.

Organ, D. W.: 1988, *'Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome'*, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Organ, D. W.: 1990, 'The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior', In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* 12: 43–72. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Parameshwar, S.: 2005, 'Spiritual leadership through ego-transcendence: Exceptional responses to challenging circumstances', *The Leadership Quarterly* 16, 689-722.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R.: 1990, 'Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior', *The Leadership Quarterly* 1, 107-142.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., Bachrach, D. G.: 2000, 'Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research', *Journal of Management* 26, (3), 513–563.

Sanders, J. E., Hopkins, W. E., and Geroy, G.D.: 2003, 'From transactional to transcendental: Toward an integrated theory of leadership', *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* 9(4), 21-31.

Schriesheim, C. A., Powers, K. J., Scandura, T. A., Gardiner, C. C., & Lankau, M. J.: 1993, 'Improving construct measurement in management research: Comments and a quantitative approach for assessing the theoretical content adequacy of paper-and-pencil survey-type instruments', *Journal of Management* 19, 384-417.

Seligman, M.E.P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M.: 2000, 'Positive psychology: An introduction', *American Psychologist* 35, 5–14

Seligman, M. E. P.: 2002, 'Positive psychology, positive prevention, and positive therapy', In C. R. Synder and S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 3-9). New York: Oxford University Press.

Shi, Z., Kunnathur, A.S. and Ragu-Nathan, T.S.: 2005, 'Is Outsourcing Management Competence Dimensions: Instrument Development and Relationship Exploration', *Information and Management* 42, 901-919.

Steenland, S. and Dreier, S.: 2008, *It's a Moral Meltdown, Too,* Newsletter of Center for American Progress, October 7, 2008.

Suddaby, R. R.: 2010, Construct Clarity in Theories of Management and Organization, *Academy of Management Review* 35(3).

Treviño, L. K.: 1986, Ethical Decision Making in Organizations: A Person-Situation Interactionist Model, *The Academy of Management Review* 11(3), 601-617.

Van Prooijen, J.-W. and Van Der Kloot, W.A.: 2001, Confirmatory Analysis of Exploratively

    Obtained Factor Structures. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* (61:5), 777-

    792.

Waddock, S. A.: 2004, Parallel Universes: Companies, Academics, and the Progress of

    Corporate Citizenship, *Business and Society Review* 109 (1); 5-30.

Walumbwa, F., Avolio, B., Gardner, W., Wernsing, T., and Peterson, S.: 2008, Authentic

    leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure, *Journal of*

    Management 34(1), 89-126.

Youndt, M., Snell, S., Dean, J., and Lepak, D.: 1996, Human resource management,

    manufacturing strategy, and firm performance, *Academy of Management Journal* 39,

    836-866.

FIGURE 1: BRIDGING FOUR STREAMS OF COMMON GOOD				
	MORALITY STREAM	**SPIRITUALITY STREAM**	**VITALITY STREAM**	**COMMUNITY STREAM**
Anchor/ Integrative characteristic	ETHICAL SENSITIVITY	SPIRITUAL DEPTH	POSITIVE ENGAGEMENT	COMMUNITY RESPONSIVENESS
Related literatures, models, movements, approaches	Values in management Business ethics Virtuousness Management by values/virtues	Management, spirituality and religion, Reflection, inspiration, Integral philosophy Spirituality at work	Appreciative Inquiry Positive organizational scholarship Positive psychology	Corporate social responsibility Organizational citizenship behavior Business as an Agent of World Benefit
Essential concepts	Morality, integrity, virtues, trust, honesty	Awareness, calling, reflection, wisdom, transcendence	Positive deviance, thriving, vitality, hope	Sustainability, corporate citizenship, contribution
Ideal profile/	Virtuousness	Consciousness	Hope	Stewardship

leadership strength	Morality Accountability	Compassion Inspiration	Passion for change Strategic vision	Service Social responsibility
Main problems/gaps/ necessity	ATROPHY: Corporate scandals, bad apples, corruption, unethical practices, indifference, cynicism, egoism, erosion of values	APATHY: Excessive materialism, positivism, loss of meaning, stress, isolation, fear, barren workplaces	LETHARGY: Bureaucracy, static, entropy, resistance to change, reductionism, compartmentalization, loss of perspective	ENTROPY Environmental problems, inequity, social problems, harm to society
Motto	Walk the talk Do what you want to be done unto you	Be self-aware Create meaning	Initiate and catalyze change See the big picture	Serve community Contribute to society

TABLE 1:   DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Selected variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min.	Max.
Age	156	36.01	10.06	19	66
Tenure in current organization (number of years of experience)	140	5.05	5.44	0	33
Tenure in current profession (number of years of experience)	141	7.73	7.40	1	46
Number of children	133	1.08	1.15	0	6
Number of people working in the organization	138	1108	2407	2	380.000
Number of subordinates (who report to the respondent)	131	11.41	25.83	1	446

TABLE 2:   DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE SCALES

Scales	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha)	Min.	Max.
Ethical Sensitivity	175	4.22	.486	.848	2.10	5.00
Spiritual Depth	175	3.78	.733	.922	1.30	5.00
Positive Engagement	174	4.09	.457	.869	2.40	5.00
Community Responsiveness	174	3.99	.595	.907	1.40	5.00
Benevolent Leadership Score	175	4.02	.464	.945	2.25	5.00

TABLE 3: TOTAL VARIANCE EXPLAINED

(BENEVOLENT LEADERSHIP SCALE)

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total
1	13.054	32.636	32.636	13.054	32.636	32.636	8.087
2	3.841	9.603	42.239	3.841	9.603	42.239	8.227
3	2.150	5.375	47.614	2.150	5.375	47.614	5.605
4	1.850	4.625	52.239	1.850	4.625	52.239	5.897
5	1.764	4.411	56.649	1.764	4.411	56.649	3.084
6	1.393	3.482	60.131	1.393	3.482	60.131	3.603
7	1.115	2.787	62.919	1.115	2.787	62.919	3.200
8	1.078	2.694	65.613	1.078	2.694	65.613	3.933

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

TABLE 4: PATTERN MATRIX OF OBLIMIN ROTATED FACTOR LOADINGS FROM THE FACTOR ANALYSIS OF

BENEVOLENT LEADERSHIP SCALE ITEMS

Items	BLS Dimension	Factor 1: Community Responsiveness	Factor 2: Spiritual Depth	Factor 3: Procedural Ethics	Factor 4: Positive Engagement	Factor 5: Moral Responsibility	Factor 6: Positive Expectation	Factor 7: Positive Vision	Factor 8: Integrity
Feel and act like a responsible leader	CR	**.777**	-.381	.306	.458	.429	-.222	.091	.207
Go beyond job definition to contribute	CR	**.739**	-.454	.261	.416	.326	-.234	.037	.384
Willing to devote time & energy to community	CR	**.821**	-.394	.238	.321	.041	-.120	.194	.184
Involved in social responsibility projects	CR	**.791**	-.409	.246	.342	.029	-.098	.110	.284
Evaluate consequences of my managerial decisions for all stakeholders	CR	**.751**	-.299	.315	.309	.281	-.354	.303	.152
Give my time and money to charitable causes	CR	**.826**	-.289	.261	.302	-.054	-.213	.217	.314
Work I do makes a difference in people's lives	CR	**.632**	-.243	.357	.163	.472	-.486	.274	.221
In my work, I strive to help other people	CR	**.537**	-.177	.522	.413	.352	-.570	.209	.108

Spend time on self-reflection or prayer at work	SD	.379	**-.721**	.201	-.070	-.035	-.167	.141	.238
Try to find a deeper sense of meaning at work	SD	.397	**-.720**	.388	.300	.150	-.162	.148	.261
Incorporate spirituality into work done	SD	.352	**-.866**	.341	.163	.105	-.100	.091	.164
Believe that we are all interconnected & part of a meaningful whole	SD	.394	**-.744**	.325	.220	.132	-.170	.200	.263
Feel vitally alive when I bring soul into work	SD	.233	**-.767**	.184	.274	.298	-.171	.137	.163
Spirituality makes me helpful & compassionate	SD	.325	**-.758**	.097	.090	.294	-.131	.149	.348
Spirituality makes me a gentler person	SD	.325	**-.785**	.100	.141	.163	-.175	.194	.268
Try to nurture spiritual growth of colleagues	SD	.319	**-.858**	.272	.079	.177	.012	.150	.134
When faced with an important decision, spirituality plays important role	SD	.414	**-.823**	.244	.084	.271	.108	.170	.146
Searching for something that makes my life feel significant and satisfying	SD	.369	**-.529**	.196	.328	.373	.146	.317	.290
Reflect on ethical consequences of decision	ES	.352	-.282	**.763**	.209	.235	.008	.160	.208
Take a moral stand	ES	.341	-.285	**.679**	.411	.068	-.034	.004	.492
Take ethical rules seriously	ES	.181	-.232	**.761**	.103	.193	-.185	.136	.203

Behaviors congruent w/ethical values & beliefs	ES	.211	-.237	**.734**	.188	.046	-.265	.263	.272
Keep promises & commitments	ES	.254	-.141	**.583**	.343	-.186	-.144	.298	.558
Role model of integrity and honesty	ES	.362	-.332	.427	**.489**	-.061	-.247	.424	.471
Even when others get discouraged, find a way to solve the problem	PE	.338	-.011	.265	**.637**	-.117	-.270	.430	.161
Passionate about bringing in positive change	PE	.383	-.188	.208	**.818**	.209	-.330	.261	.133
Provide hope & courage to take positive action	PE	.381	-.229	.215	**.776**	.249	-.245	.282	.142
Work with colleagues to create shared common vision for positive change	PE	.359	-.240	.206	**.591**	.329	-.450	.455	.147
If I want to change stg. positively at work, I take an action & initiate change	PE	.350	-.215	.258	**.560**	.427	-.257	.158	.307
Open-minded about new ideas to create change & innovation in org.	PE	.333	-.072	.309	**.712**	-.118	-.228	.240	.439
Challenge colleagues when they depart from ethical values	ES	.153	-.264	.380	.241	**.643**	-.172	.314	.242
Care for my community drives my leadership	CR	.503	-.411	.487	.330	**.541**	-.223	-.017	-.017

Care about the legacy for future generations	CR	.525	-.326	.352	.406	**.535**	-.150	.107	.372
Hopeful about what we can accomplish	PE	.396	-.263	.214	.485	.062	**-.788**	.267	.199
Belief in abilities to produce positive results	PE	.329	-.281	.259	.358	.177	**-.845**	.272	.121
Strive to communicate a clear & positive vision	PE	.217	-.270	.227	.375	-.031	.084	**.712**	.271
Encourage team members to have bold dreams	PE	.183	-.156	.175	.205	.167	-.296	**.807**	.108
Work guided by high ethical standards	ES	.293	-.390	.343	.292	.436	-.442	.098	**.459**
Stand up for what is right	ES	.300	-.344	.253	.136	.232	.025	.111	**.798**
Take responsibility for mistakes	ES	.308	-.134	.438	.271	-.066	-.250	.350	**.624**

N=175; Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.