Volunteer leadership: The role of pride and respect in organizational identification and leadership satisfaction
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Abstract
We introduce and test with structural equation modeling an identity-based model of volunteer leadership (Study 1: \(N = 109\) volunteers; Study 2: \(N = 183\) volunteers). Volunteers take pride in the organization, due to leader communication about the effectiveness of the volunteer work and leader prototypicality. Volunteers feel respected by their leaders due to supportive leadership and leader encouragements for expressing ideas within the non-profit organization. These aspects of volunteer leadership relate to identification with the non-profit organization and the satisfaction with the leadership among volunteers, via respectively pride in the non-profit organization and respect from the leadership of the non-profit organization. Implications for leadership and avenues for further research are discussed.
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Many non-profit organizations (e.g. charities, faith-based institutions, political parties, etc.) run on the efforts of volunteers (i.e. unpaid workers). While leadership is essential to coordinate and motivate the efforts of volunteers, non-cooperation (e.g. deviation from organizational guidelines and rules) and non-acceptance of leadership (e.g. agitation against leaders)
are often observed among volunteers working in non-profit organizations (Farmer and Fedor, 2001; Handy, 1988; Pearce, 1993). This raises the question of whether specific types of leadership may foster identification with the organization (a precursor of cooperation with the organization, see Tyler and Blader, 2000) and satisfaction with the leadership (an indicator of acceptance of leadership) among volunteers. This question is still unanswered. In the present research, we examine whether pride in the organization and respect from the leadership of the organization, evoked by specific behaviors and characteristics of leaders active within the non-profit organization, associate with identification with the non-profit organization and satisfaction with the leadership among volunteers. This research contributes to the literature in multiple ways. We answer the call (Fuller, 2011; Pearce, 1980, 1993; Riggio et al., 2004) for research on leadership processes in non-profit organizations and the situation of volunteerism, and we address the need for research on the role of respect in leadership (Clarke, 2011; Van Quaquebeke and Eckloff, 2010). Further, non-profit organizations are neither vital to the lives of its volunteers nor are volunteers obliged to cooperate with the organization and its representatives (Farmer and Fedor, 2001; Pearce, 1993). In this context, where volunteers are generally less receptive to leaders and methods of leadership than paid employees are (Farmer and Fedor, 2001; Pearce, 1993), it is even more important to assess whether and how leaders may constitute a source of pride and respect for volunteers. Third, we develop recommendations for leading volunteers based on the model (Figure 1) tested in this research.
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**Figure 1.** An identity-based model of volunteer leadership. Hypothesized direct (H1a, H2a, H3a, H4a) and indirect (H1b, H2b, H3b, H3c, H4b, H4c) effects and results of Study 2 are depicted. *p < 0.10; **p < 0.05; ***p < 0.01.
A social identity approach to leading volunteers

Volunteers (unpaid workers) are fundamentally different from paid workers (Cnaan and Cascio, 1999; Pearce, 1993). Comparison studies (e.g., Boezeman and Ellemers, 2009; Laczo and Hanisch, 1999; Liao-Troth, 2001; Pearce, 1983, 1993) make clear that volunteers experience their jobs in their own unique way. Hence, it is not self-evident that leadership styles suited for managing paid workers are equally relevant or even effective for coordinating volunteers (cf. Farmer and Fedor, 2001; Pearce, 1993). We argue that volunteer leadership requires an approach that focuses on non-instrumental and non-coercive concerns, because volunteer work is unpaid and not compulsory. Social identity theory (Tajfel and Turner, 1979) provides such an approach (Ellemers et al., 2004) and we build upon the concepts of pride and respect (Blader and Tyler, 2009; Tyler and Blader, 2000). Pride in the organization concerns an evaluation of the standing of one’s organization (Blader and Tyler, 2009; Tyler and Blader, 2000). Respect concerns an evaluation of one’s own personal standing within the organization (Blader and Tyler, 2009; Tyler and Blader, 2000). Tyler and Blader (2000) and Blader and Tyler (2009) argue that pride and respect are key to workers’ identification with the organization and satisfaction during work. This because pride and respect relate to feelings of self-esteem and self-worth (Blader and Tyler, 2009; Smith and Tyler, 1997). We build upon the theoretical framework of Tyler and Blader (2000) and Blader and Tyler (2009) and argue that pride in the organization and respect from the leadership of the organization, evoked by specific behaviors and characteristics of leaders active within the non-profit organization, evoke identification with the non-profit organization and satisfaction with the leadership among volunteers. What behaviors and characteristics of leaders promote pride and respect among volunteers?

Volunteer leadership and pride

Organizational competence and the successes of the organization enhance the standing of the organization (Ellemers et al., 2011; Fuller et al., 2006). Non-profit organizations invest time and effort in serving the common good, providing relief to specific groups (e.g., the poor), and improving social conditions within society. The value of the non-profit organization thus lies in the contribution of the organization to society and people’s lives. The effectiveness of the volunteer work is an indicator of the value of the organization for individual volunteers (cf. Pearce, 1993), because it reflects the ability of the non-profit organization to contribute to society and people’s lives. Hence, we argue that communication about the effectiveness of the volunteer work by leaders fosters pride in the organization and identification with the organization among volunteers. This reasoning is consistent with research. That is, leaders who make clear that the activities of the volunteers contribute significantly to the organization and its accomplishments are inspiring and encouraging for volunteers (Pearce, 1993). Furthermore, non-effectiveness of the volunteer work devalues the membership of the organization for individual volunteers and motivates volunteers to distance themselves from the organization and to quit the voluntary job (Galindo-Kuhn and Guzley, 2001; Pearce, 1993). We predict:

Hypothesis 1: Among volunteers, leader communication about the effectiveness of the volunteer work correlates directly and positively with pride in the organization (H1a) and indirectly and positively with identification with the non-profit organization through pride (H1b).
Organization prototypical leaders reflect the identity of the organization (Hogg, 2001; Van Knippenberg, 2011). Hence, organization prototypical leaders are effective in exercising leadership within the organization (Hogg, 2001; Van Knippenberg, 2011). Morality is central to the identity of the non-profit organization (cf. Handy, 1988; Pearce, 1993; Riggio et al., 2004) and perceived organizational morality relates to pride in the organization among workers (Ellemers et al., 2011). Non-profit organizations are moral organizations, because they for ideological reasons and non-material aims contribute to society and the lives of people. Leaders who embody the moral values of the organization (e.g. altruism, selflessness), who demonstrate high standards of moral and ethical conduct, and who show extraordinary dedication to the mission of the organization, are inspiring and encouraging for volunteers (Pearce, 1993). Organization prototypical leaders (i.e. leaders who embody the moral non-profit organization) therefore constitute a reason for volunteers to take pride in the organization and to identify with the organization. We predict:

Hypothesis 2: Among volunteers, perceived leader prototypicality correlates directly and positively with pride in the organization (H2a) and indirectly and positively with identification with the non-profit organization through pride (H2b).

We will now turn to the role of respect in volunteer leadership. Leaders are the representatives of the non-profit organization. Hence, it is relevant to research whether respect from the leadership of the organization fosters identification with the organization among volunteers. Furthermore, effective volunteer leadership is contingent upon the relationship that volunteers have with their leaders within the organization (Pearce, 1993). We will therefore research whether satisfaction with the leadership is an outcome of leader conveyed respect.

Volunteer leadership and respect

Volunteers are not formally affiliated with their respective organizations (Pearce, 1993) and they work for organizations that primarily direct attention to the mission of the organization (e.g. helping the poor). Therefore, we argue that volunteers feel respected by their leaders, when their leaders are supportive during volunteer work and encourage them to express their ideas regarding the organization and its mission. Such leadership behaviors are forms of positive attention and acknowledgement for volunteers. This reasoning is consistent with research and field observations. Volunteers value the support they receive from their respective organizations and organizational support is an indicator of the work satisfaction of volunteers (Galindo-Kuhn and Guzley, 2001). Researchers (Boezeman and Ellemers, 2007) found that general perceptions of organizational support correlate with respect and organizational commitment among volunteers. Furthermore, workers feel respected by their leaders, when their leaders show interest in their opinions and suggestions and encourage them in expressing their criticism and ideas (Van Quaquebeke and Eckloff, 2010). Garner and Garner (2011) observed that volunteers are more inclined to stay a volunteer when they perceive that the organization is open to their ideas about the volunteer work. We predict:

Hypothesis 3: Among volunteers, perceived leader support correlates directly and positively with respect from the leader (H3a), and indirectly and positively with identification with the organization (H3b) and satisfaction with the leadership (H3c) through respect.
Hypothesis 4: Among volunteers, perceived leader encouragement for expressing ideas correlates directly and positively with respect from the leader (H4a), and indirectly and positively with identification with the organization (H4b) and satisfaction with the leadership (H4c) through respect.

We first explored (Study 1) whether specific leadership behaviors relate to pride and respect and the criterion variables (Hypotheses 1 and 3). Study 1 encouraged us to test the full model (Figure 1) in an additional Sample of volunteers (Study 2).

**Study 1: Method**

**Participants and procedure.** Participants were 113 volunteers working for various types of non-profit organizations (e.g. charities, the church, animal shelters, etc.). They were recruited via advertisements and social network recruitment. 109 questionnaires were complete and usable for analysis in EQS 6.1 (Bentler and Wu, 2004). Of these 109 respondents, 80.7% were women and 56% held a paid job besides working as a volunteer. The mean age of the respondents was 31.2 years \( (SD = 11.5) \) and the tenure of the respondents was 3.35 \( (SD = 4.12) \) years. The questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter. We guaranteed the anonymity of the participants and the confidential treatment of the data via this letter. The respondents were given 3 small boxes of tea in exchange for their completed questionnaire. The data were analyzed with EQS 6.1 (Bentler and Wu, 2004).

**Measures.** Scales were taken from existing instruments \( (1 = \text{totally disagree}, 7 = \text{totally agree}) \). We slightly adjusted the wording of the items (e.g. changed ‘organization’ to ‘the management’) to tap the volunteers’ perceptions of the leadership. The scales for measuring the leader communication about the effectiveness of the volunteer work (3 items, \( \alpha = .94 \), e.g.: ‘The management of my volunteer organization communicates that my volunteer work really benefits the target group of the organization’) and the leader support during volunteer work (3 items, \( \alpha = .93 \), e.g.: ‘The management of my volunteer organization advises and assists me in my volunteer work’) were derived from the measurement instruments developed by Boezeman and Ellemers (2007). The scales for measuring pride in the organization (3 items, \( \alpha = .75 \), e.g.: ‘I am proud of being a member of my volunteer organization’) and respect from the leadership of the organization (3 items, \( \alpha = .86 \), e.g.: ‘The management of my volunteer organization respects me’) were derived from the instruments developed by Tyler and Blader (2002). Furthermore, we used the scale of Mael and Ashforth (1992) to measure identification with the organization (3 items, \( \alpha = .70 \), e.g.: ‘When I talk about my volunteer organization, I usually say ‘we’ rather than ‘they’’). The scale developed by Bass (1985) was used to assess the satisfaction with the leadership (2 items, \( \alpha = .89 \), e.g.: ‘The management of my volunteer organization works with me in a satisfactory way’). We measured (2 items, \( \alpha = .96 \), e.g.: ‘I get along well with the management of the volunteer organization’) the affect for the leadership (Brown and Keeping, 2005) to check for common method variance and to rule out differential mood as an alternative explanation for the observed effects (Brown and Keeping, 2005; Podsakoff et al., 2003). Structural equation modeling (SEM) cannot handle too many indicators per latent construct (e.g. Yang et al., 2010). Hence, we used shortened scales, because scale shortening is an acceptable method to resolve this issue in SEM (Yang et al., 2010).
Results

Measurement analysis and correlations. Confirmatory factor analysis showed that the items clustered as intended. The 6-factor measurement model fitted the data well $\chi^2 (104, N = 109) = 144$, $p < 0.01$, NNFI = 0.96, CFI = 0.97, RMSEA = 0.06. Subsequently, we tested alternative measurement models against the hypothesized measurement factor model. In terms of omnibus fit indexes and chi-square differences tests, the hypothesized measurement model fit the data best as compared to the alternative measurement models. This further supported the validity of the hypothesized factor measurement model. Finally, we checked for method variance effects (Podsakoff et al., 2003). We found no indication for spurious relationships among model variables. The 1-factor measurement model did not indicate that a single factor accounted for the covariation among all items. This provided preliminary evidence against bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). When we introduced to the measurement model a factor (cf. Podsakoff et al., 2003) representing common method variance (i.e. affect for the volunteer coordinator, see Brown and Keeping, 2005), the factor loadings and overall covariances of the latent variables under examination remained significant. Partial correlation analyses corroborated that the correlations among constructs remained significant when controlling for the method factor. Thus, we concluded that relationships among the variables under examination were meaningful. We calculated correlations (Table 1) and continued our analysis with SEM.

Structural analysis. We tested the hypothesized structural model with SEM in EQS 6.1 (Bentler and Wu, 2004). The model fit the data well $\chi^2 (113, N = 109) = 197$, $p < 0.001$, NNFI = 0.92, CFI = 0.93, RMSEA = 0.08, AIC = 29. To address the possibility that the causal order of the variables in our model might be reversed, which we wanted to rule out because we assessed the variables at one point in time, we subsequently tested the hypothesized structural model against an alternative reversed order structural model. The lower value of the AIC-statistic for non-nested model comparison indicated that our hypothesized structural model provides a more appropriate representation of the data (AIC = 29) than the alternative model (AIC = 26). In non-nested model comparison, the model with the lowest value of AIC best represents the data (Bentler, 2004). Furthermore, we compared the hypothesized structural model against an alternative structural model that included a direct path from pride to satisfaction with the leadership, because it might be the case that leader induced pride is a precursor of satisfaction with the leadership. In terms of the chi-square differences test, this alternative structural model did not show superior fit compared to the hypothesized structural model ($\Delta \chi^2 = 1, p = ns$) and was rejected. In the alternative structural model, pride was also not significantly related to leadership satisfaction. Thus, we examined the structural relationships among the latent variables in the hypothesized structural model.2

The effects of volunteer leadership

We predicted that the leader communication about the effectiveness of the volunteer work relates directly and positively to feelings of pride in the non-profit organization (Hypothesis 1a). Furthermore, we predicted that the perceived leader support during volunteer work relates directly and positively to respect (Hypothesis 3a). These hypotheses were supported by the SEM analysis. We found that the communicated effectiveness of the volunteer work relates directly and positively to pride in the non-profit organization
### Table 1. Correlations between averaged constructs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample 1 (N = 109)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Management Communicated</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.65***</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td>0.31***</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Management Support</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.55***</td>
<td>0.53***</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td>0.65***</td>
<td>0.75***</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pride in the non-profit organization</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.55***</td>
<td>0.53***</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td>0.65***</td>
<td>0.75***</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Respect from Management</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.55***</td>
<td>0.53***</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td>0.65***</td>
<td>0.75***</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Identification with the Organization</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>0.42***</td>
<td>0.30***</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.65***</td>
<td>0.75***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Satisfaction with the Leadership</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.61***</td>
<td>0.75***</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.62***</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.75***</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Years of volunteering for the organization</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample 2 (N = 183)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Coordinators’ Prototypicality</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.60***</td>
<td>0.68***</td>
<td>0.68***</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td>0.50***</td>
<td>0.75***</td>
<td>0.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Coordinator Communicated</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinator Support</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.60***</td>
<td>0.68***</td>
<td>0.68***</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td>0.50***</td>
<td>0.75***</td>
<td>0.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinator Encouragement for Expressing Ideas</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.55***</td>
<td>0.55***</td>
<td>0.55***</td>
<td>(0.94)</td>
<td>0.50***</td>
<td>0.75***</td>
<td>0.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pride in the Non-profit Organization</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.39***</td>
<td>0.37***</td>
<td>0.36***</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Respect from Coordinator</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.53***</td>
<td>0.80***</td>
<td>0.76***</td>
<td>0.57***</td>
<td>0.57***</td>
<td>0.57***</td>
<td>0.57***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Identification with the Organization</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>0.40***</td>
<td>0.46***</td>
<td>0.46***</td>
<td>0.46***</td>
<td>0.46***</td>
<td>0.46***</td>
<td>0.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Satisfaction with the Leadership</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.61***</td>
<td>0.68***</td>
<td>0.68***</td>
<td>0.68***</td>
<td>0.68***</td>
<td>0.68***</td>
<td>0.68***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Years of Volunteering for the organization</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

N = 108 due to missing values.

N = 180 due to missing values. Alpha coefficients are displayed in parentheses.

*p < 0.10; **p < 0.05; ***p < 0.10.
Further, we found that the perceived leader support during volunteer work ($\beta = 0.71, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.50$) relates directly and positively to respect from the leadership. Further, we predicted (Hypotheses 1b, 3b) that volunteer leadership enhances volunteers’ identification with the non-profit organization via pride and respect. The Hypotheses were supported by the SEM analysis. The results showed that the leader communication about the effectiveness of the volunteer work ($\beta = 0.11, p < 0.05$) relates indirectly to identification with the non-profit organization, via pride. Furthermore, we found that the perceived leader support ($\beta = 0.23, p < 0.01$) relates to identification with the non-profit organization, via respect. Finally, as predicted (Hypothesis 3c) we found that the perceived leader support ($\beta = 0.56, p < 0.001$) relates indirectly to the satisfaction with the leadership, via respect.

Study 1 offered preliminary evidence that distinct aspects of volunteer leadership relate to pride and respect. Furthermore, Study 1 showed that pride and respect mediate the effects of volunteer leadership on the outcome variables (i.e. identification with the organization, satisfaction with the leadership). We verify these findings and extend our analysis in Study 2.

**Study 2**

**Method**

**Participants.** Participants were 234 board member volunteers serving in local departments of a left-wing oriented political party. The mission of the political party is to improve social conditions in society. 183 questionnaires ($N = 183, 67.8\%$ men) were complete and usable for analysis in EQS 6.1 (Bentler and Wu, 2004). The mean age of the respondents was 49 years ($SD = 12.6$), their mean number of years of volunteering for the organization was 8.56 ($SD = 8.4$), 94.5% of the respondents held a paid job besides volunteering, and 49.7% of the respondents had an additional volunteer job at another organization.

**Procedure.** The participants were contacted via their organization. All 553 board member volunteers received a survey with an accompanying letter. The accompanying letter was used to ask the volunteers to participate in the research, to convey that the results would be used for scientific purposes and to improve the volunteer policy of the organization, and to guarantee anonymity and confidential treatment of data. The respondents sent their completed questionnaire directly to the researchers. We used EQS 6.1 (Bentler and Wu, 2004) to analyze the data.

**Measures.** Seven-point scales were used in the research ($1 = totally disagree, 7 = totally agree$) and we asked the volunteers about their coordinator in the organization. The items developed in Study 1 (in the item-wording we changed ‘management’ to ‘coordinator’) were used for measuring the leader communication about the effectiveness of the volunteer work (3 items, $\alpha = 0.96$), the leader support during volunteer work (3 items, $\alpha = 0.93$), pride in the organization (4 items, $\alpha = 0.91$), respect from the leadership (4 items, $\alpha = 0.97$), identification with the organization (3 items, $\alpha = 0.73$), the satisfaction with the leadership (2 items, $\alpha = 0.88$), and affection for the leader (2 items, $\alpha = 0.94$). An extra item was used in the measurement of pride (i.e. ‘I feel proud when I tell people that I belong to <organization>’) and respect (i.e. ‘My coordinator values my contribution as a volunteer’). The perceived leader prototypicality (4 items, $\alpha = 0.90$, e.g.: ‘My coordinator represents what we stand for as
was measured with items adapted from the Leader Ingroup-Prototypicality scale developed by Platow and Van Knippenberg (2001). Reworded items from the Socialized Charismatic Leadership Construct (House, 1998) were used in measuring the leader encouragement for expressing ideas (2 items, $\alpha = 0.94$, e.g.: 'My coordinator challenges me to re-examine some of my basic assumptions about society').

**Results**

*Measurement analysis and correlations.* Confirmatory factor analysis showed that the items clustered as predicted. The 8-factor measurement model fitted the data well $\chi^2 (247, N = 183) = 441$, $p < 0.001$, NNFI = 0.95, CFI = 0.96, RMSEA = 0.07. Subsequently, we tested alternative measurement models against the hypothesized measurement factor model. The hypothesized measurement model fitted the data best in terms of omnibus fit indexes and chi-square difference tests. This further supported the validity of the hypothesized factor measurement model. When checking for method variance effects (Podsakoff et al., 2003), we found no indications for spurious relationships among model variables. The 1-factor measurement model did not indicate that a single factor accounted for the covariation among the items. Furthermore, factor loadings and overall covariances of the latent variables under examination remained significant, when we introduced to the measurement model a factor (cf. Podsakoff et al., 2003) representing common method variance (affect for the leader, see Brown and Keeping, 2005). Partial correlation analyses corroborated that correlations among constructs remained significant when controlling for the method factor. We concluded that relationships among the variables under examination were meaningful and hence we continued our analyses with SEM.

*Structural analysis.* We tested the hypothesized structural model (Figure 1) with SEM. The model fitted the data well $\chi^2 (262, N = 183) = 569$, $p < 0.001$, NNFI = 0.93, CFI = 0.94, RMSEA = 0.08, AIC = 45. We then tested the hypothesized structural model against the alternative structural models previously identified. The AIC-statistic for non-nested model comparison (Bentler, 2004) indicated that our hypothesized structural model provided a more appropriate representation of the data (AIC = 45) than the alternative reversed causal order model (AIC = 230) (Bentler, 2004). Likewise, the hypothesized structural model better represented the data than the alternative structural model that included the extra path from pride to satisfaction with the leadership ($\Delta \chi^2 = 0, p = ns$). Thus, we accepted the hypothesized structural model (Figure 1) for analysis and we examined the structural relationships among the latent variables.

**The effects of volunteer leadership**

We predicted that the leader communication about the effectiveness of the volunteer work (Hypothesis 1a) and the perceived leader prototypicality (Hypothesis 2a) relate to pride in the organization among volunteers. These Hypotheses were supported by the SEM-analysis. The communicated effectiveness of the volunteer work ($\beta = 0.21$, $p < 0.05$) and the perceived leader prototypicality ($\beta = 0.29$, $p < 0.01$) associated directly and positively with pride in the organization. These aspects of volunteer leadership jointly accounted for 20.6% of the variance in organizational pride.
We predicted that the perceived leader support (Hypothesis 3a) and the perceived leader encouragement for expressing ideas (Hypothesis 4a) correlate with respect. These Hypotheses were supported by the SEM-analysis. The perceived leader support ($\beta = 0.72$, $p < 0.001$) and the perceived coordinator encouragement for expressing ideas ($\beta = 0.12$, $p < 0.10$) related directly and positively to respect. The aspects of volunteer leadership jointly accounted for 64.6% of the variance in respect.

We predicted (Hypotheses 1b, 2b, 3b, and 4b) that the aspects of volunteer leadership foster identification with the non-profit organization via pride and respect. The leader communication about the effectiveness of volunteer work ($\beta = 0.13$, $p < 0.05$) and the perceived leader prototypicality ($\beta = 0.19$, $p < 0.01$) correlated with identification with the organization, via pride. The perceived leader support ($\beta = 0.25$, $p < 0.001$) and the perceived leader encouragement for expressing ideas ($\beta = 0.04$, $p < 0.10$) correlated with identification with the non-profit organization, via respect. The hypotheses were supported by the SEM analysis.

Finally, we predicted (Hypotheses 3c and 4c) that the perceived leader support during volunteer work and the leader encouragement for expressing ideas relate to the satisfaction with the leadership. The perceived leader support ($\beta = 0.61$, $p < 0.001$) and the leader encouragement for expressing ideas ($\beta = 0.10$, $p < 0.10$) correlated with the satisfaction with the leadership, via respect. The SEM analysis showed support for Hypotheses 3c and 4c.

**Discussion**

We focused on leadership processes and outcomes in the situation of volunteerism in the non-profit organization. We found empirical support for our model of volunteer leadership (Figure 1) for different types of volunteers working in a range of volunteer organizations. Our findings help in understanding leadership in non-profit organizations and offer recommendations for leading volunteers.

**Theoretical contributions**

Very few studies to date (e.g. Fuller, 2011; Pearce, 1980, 1993) focus on leadership in the context of volunteer work. Volunteers are less receptive to leaders and methods of leadership than paid employees are (Pearce, 1993; Farmer and Fedor, 2001) and it is not self-evident that leadership styles suited for managing paid workers are equally relevant or effective for coordinating volunteers (cf. Farmer and Fedor, 2001; Pearce, 1993). This is why we examined leadership processes in the situation of volunteer work in the non-profit organization. Our social-identity analysis of volunteer leadership is new to the literature. Our model and findings demonstrate that psychological connections between the individual and the group or organization are of value to understand volunteer leadership (Figure 1). The present work also extends existing insights into the role of respect in leadership (Clarke, 2011; Van Quaquebeke and Eckloff, 2010). Our findings reveal that respect plays a key role in volunteer leadership, and reveal specific leadership behaviors that convey respect to volunteers. This complements the literature on respect in leadership. Finally, the cooperation with the organization and work satisfaction of volunteer workers are still poorly understood (Farmer and Fedor, 2001; Pearce, 1993; Wilson, 2012). We found that pride and respect
relate to organizational identification (a precursor of cooperation with the organization, see Tyler and Blader, 2000) and satisfaction with the leadership (an indicator of acceptance of leadership) among volunteers. Thus, another contribution of the current work is that it shows that pride and respect are relevant for understanding the cooperation with the organization and work satisfaction of volunteers.

Implications for non-profit organizations
Organizational identification and satisfaction with the leadership are key to the cooperative intentions and work motivation of volunteer workers. Hence, non-profit organizations are advised to stimulate specific displays of leadership in their leaders. In volunteer leadership it is important for leaders to communicate about the effectiveness of the volunteer work (e.g. tell how the organization improves people’s lives), to support volunteers during volunteer work (e.g. help volunteers to overcome task-related problems during volunteer work), and to encourage volunteers to express their ideas within the organization. By doing this, leaders instill pride and respect among volunteers, and pride and respect are precursors of organizational identification and satisfaction with the leadership among volunteers. Leaders are also advised to behave as prototypical members of the organization (e.g. behave selfless within the non-profit organization) as this evokes pride and organizational identification among volunteers. Leaders who go against the identity and central values of the non-profit organization usually have a short career within the non-profit organization.

Limitations and future directions. This research relied on correlational data based on self-reports. This implies that there is a possibility of common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003) and that it is difficult to draw firm conclusions about the direction of causality among model variables. Although this is an obvious limitation, we checked in different ways whether this might have influenced the conclusions drawn from these data. We found no evidence that the results obtained simply reflect common method variance, which suggests that the observed effects reflect meaningful relations between the hypothesized constructs. In addition to the statistical examination of the possibility of common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003), we note that the current interpretation of our data not only reflects the causal relationships proposed in the theoretical framework that we used (Blader and Tyler, 2009; Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Tyler and Blader, 2000), but also is consistent with results from prior correlational and experimental research (e.g. Blader and Tyler, 2009; Simon and Stürmer, 2003; Tyler and Blader, 2000) in this area. Furthermore, when testing the possibility that the causal relations between the model variables might be different from what we predicted, we consistently found alternative structural models to account less well for the data than the hypothesized directional models. Another limitation of this research modeling lower level variables is the potential threat of reduced power of the statistical tests due to non-independence of data collected among workers some of whom are potentially nested within the same work groups (Bliese and Hanges, 2004). However, despite this reduction in statistical power, we found relationships among model variables to be significant as predicted, suggesting that reduced power did not lead to Type II errors in this research. Thus, despite its limitations, we think this research offers an interesting and important first step into examining and addressing leadership in the context of volunteer work in non-profit organizations. Nevertheless, the robustness of our findings should be cross-validated in future research that uses additional methodologies and examines a broader range of volunteers working in different organizations.
The present data also generate several possibilities for further research. In view of our observation that current theories and models regarding leadership have mainly addressed the situation of paid employees working in profit organizations, we propose that future research might elaborate on how different leadership styles and behaviors may affect the motivation and actual productivity of volunteer workers. Future research might compare our model of social-identity based leadership to other forms of leadership (e.g. explore the theoretical notions on transformational/charismatic leadership, Riggio et al., 2004; ‘martyred leadership’, Pearce, 1993) and include additional indicators to assess volunteer motivation, such as degree of cooperation or the willingness to recruit new volunteers for the organization (see also Fuller, 2011). A final point worth noting is that participants in the present research were able to identify coordinators and respond to the behaviors they displayed. However, this is not always the case in non-profit organizations. Thus, a further challenge for future research on leadership in non-profit organizations is to explore how pride and respect can be induced through leadership under conditions in which specific leader-subordinate dyads are ill-defined or even non-existent.

For now, we have shown that social identity based leadership is of importance in volunteer leadership. We think this research holds a clear promise with regard to further theory development and research on leadership in the context of volunteerism, and does justice to the notion that volunteers deserve to feel proud and respected for the contributions they make to society and its members.
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**Notes**

1. Respect is a multifaceted concept (e.g. Clarke, 2011; Dillon, 2007, 2010; Van Quaquebeke et al., 2007) and different types of respect have been examined in the literature. In the present research, we build on the work of Tyler and Blader (2000, 2002) and focus on what they refer to as ‘autonomous respect’, that is, the subjective evaluation that one is a valued member of the organization.
2. We also tested alternative structural models that included a direct path from the aspects of volunteer leadership to the criterion variables. The alternative structural model that contained a significant direct effect path, showed that the added direct effect did not reduce to non-significant the indirect effects via pride and respect, as expected.
3. As in Study 1, we additionally tested alternative structural models that included a direct path from the aspects of volunteer leadership to the criterion variables. The results reconfirmed that where direct effects were observed, the addition of the direct effect did not reduce to non-significant the indirect effects via pride and respect, as expected.
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