

ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR- AN OVERVIEW

Ms.T.Subha,
Research Scholar, RVS IMSR &
Assistant Professor, Department of MBA & MIB,
VLBJCAS, Coimbatore, India.

Abstract

In the current high competitive environment, where organizations are looking for those which can help them in achieving competitive advantage, OCB may help them. OCB is important for effective functioning of an organization because its ultimate goal is to make all the employees work towards achieving the organization goals rather than accomplishing their duties. It is defined as individual behaviour that is discretionary. Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) is a term that encompasses anything positive and constructive that employees do, of their own volition, which supports co-workers and benefits the company. Typically, employees who frequently engage in OCB may not always be the top performers (though they could be, as task performance is related to OCB), but they are the ones who are known to 'go the extra mile' or 'go above and beyond' the minimum efforts required to do a merely satisfactory job. For now, the study indicates that OCB promises to emerge as a significant and novel management paradigm having multifarious outcomes and implications in individual context of employees' vis-à-vis organisational functioning.

Keywords: *Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Organisational Loyalty, Job Satisfaction, Emotional Intelligence, Sportsmanship.*

INTRODUCTION

Chester Barnard was the first one to introduce importance of an employee's "willingness to cooperate" in the literature of organizational behavior (Organ, 1990). Barnard proposed that "the willingness of persons to contribute efforts to the cooperative system is indispensable" (Organ in Staw and Cummings, 1990, p. 44). In 1938, Chester Barnard analyzed the nature of the organization as what he called a "cooperative system." He raised very important questions for organizations like: Why do organizations exist? What sustains their existence? What creates the need for authority? Prior to this strong emphasis was placed on formal structure and controls in an organization. Barnard (1938) provides organizational theory based on structural concepts of: the individual and bounded rationality, cooperation, formal organization, and informal organization. Dynamic concepts include: free will, communication, a consent theory of authority, the decision process, dynamic equilibrium, and the inducement contributions balance, and leadership and executive responsibility.

The term OCB was first coined by Bateman and Organ (1983), as 'innovative and spontaneous activity that goes beyond role prescriptions', and distinction between dependable role performances. Terminologies like "willingness to cooperate" (Barnard, 1938), "organizational loyalty" (Hirschman, 1970; Hage, 1980), "organizational commitment" (Mowday, Porter, and Steers, 1982), and "extra-role behaviors", (Van Dyne, Cummings, and McLean Parks., 1995), such as "organizational citizenship behavior" (Organ, 1988), "contextual performance" (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993), and "prosocial organizational behavior" (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986) are used to conceptualize the cooperative behavior. Some of the authors have gone ahead and differentiated these terms from actual OCB behavior.

CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS

OCB consists of employee behavior that has an overall positive impact on the functioning of the organization; this behavior is beyond legal or employment contract. Despite significant growth in the development of OCB there are debates regarding theoretical foundation of OCB, contents, causes, and possible effects of OCB (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach, 2000). OCB focus on explaining the helping behavior or going "out of the way" behavior of employees at workplace. There is no consensus over any precise definition of OCB. The most popular definitions in the literature are: "Individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization" (Organ, 1988, p. 4). "Functional, extra-role, pro-social organizational behavior, directed at individuals, groups, and/or an organization" (Schnake, 1991, p. 736).

In summary, these definitions illustrate OCB as an individual's discretionary behavior, which is not mandatory or enforced by the organization. This behavior is not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and it in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization. Organ (1988) also called OCB as "good behavior syndrome". Extra role behavior is believed to influence performance evaluations (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Fetter, 1991) and employee participation programmes (Graham and Verma, 1991). Further, extra role behavior is a factor in job involvement, organization commitment, and self-esteem (Schanke, 1991). Borman and Motowidlo (1993, 1997) proposed another construct called 'contextual performance' related to OCB that contribute to the effectiveness of the organization by shaping the organizational, social, and psychological context. It is different from the "task performance" which refers to the employee effectiveness in a particular task which contributes to the organization's technical competence and by "contextual performance" authors suggested

work behaviors beyond the boundaries of task performance. Their classification of contextual performance includes persisting with enthusiasm and extra effort as necessary to complete task successfully, volunteering to carry out task activities that are not formally perceived, helping and cooperating with others, following organizational rules and procedures, and endorsing, supporting, and defending organizational objectives. Van-Scotter and Motowidlo (1996) proposed that contextual performance should be separated into the two narrower constructs of “interpersonal facilitation” and “job dedication,” which are similar to Organ’s interpersonally directed and organizationally-directed factors respectively. However, Organ (1997) suggested that Borman and Motowidlo's (1993) construct of "contextual behaviors" has provided a more acceptable definition of OCB. Contextual behaviors support the must function and does not support the technical core itself (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993). This definition is not clouded by notions of discretion, rewards, or intent of the actor. This definition only assumes that the behaviors should support “the organizational, social, and psychological environment” rather than the “technical core.” There is no specific motive presumed on the part of employee, nor are there any other contingent antecedents. A certain degree of subjectivity persists between what is and is not included in the technical core. Summarizing all the definitions of OCB the distinction between the in-role/extra-role for desired discretionary work behaviors remains ambiguous. Most of the definition of OCB consistently includes prosocial behaviors (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986), punctuality, helping others, innovating, and volunteering (Organ, 1988), as well as the lack of undesirable actions such as complaining, arguing, and finding fault with others (Organ, 1990). OCB is job-related, but not tied to the formal reward system, and it functions to advance the effective operation of the organization.

TYPES OF CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

Despite the growing interest in citizenship-like behaviors, a review of the literature reveals a lack of consensus about the dimensionality of this construct. Podsakoff et al., (2000) identified 30 potentially different forms of citizenship behavior. The OCB behavior in the literature has been broadly classified under seven themes.

- **Helping Behavior:** Helping behavior has been identified as the most important and critical form of citizenship behavior by invariably everyone who has worked in this area. This includes voluntarily helping others with and preventing the occurrence of work-related problems. Assistance to new employees or providing colleagues with advice. There is no study according to my knowledge where helping behavior has not been considered either in theoretical and empirical explanation. Conceptually, helping behavior involves voluntarily helping others at workplace. The first part of this definition (helping others with work-related problems) includes Organ’s altruism, peacemaking, and cheerleading dimensions (Organ, 1988, 1990); Graham’s interpersonal helping (Graham, 1989); OCB-I (Williams and Anderson, 1991); interpersonal facilitation (Van Scotter and Motowidlo, 1996); and the helping others constructs from George and Brief (1992) and George and Jones (1997). The second part of the definition captures Organ’s (1988, 1990) notion of courtesy, which involves helping others by taking steps to prevent the occurrence of problems for coworkers, exhibiting polite, and soft behavior towards colleagues. Empirical research (MacKenzie et al., 1993; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Rich, 1999; Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff, Ahearne, and MacKenzie, 1997) has generally confirmed the fact that all of these various forms of helping behavior load on a single factor.
- **Sportsmanship:** Sportsmanship is another dimension of citizenship behavior that has received relatively less attention from the researchers. Organ (1990, p. 96) has defined sportsmanship as “a willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining.” Employees performing in this zone often avoid complaining about work life or trivial matters or tend to express a positive attitude even when others do not follow their own particular way of working. Podsakoff et al (2000) found the label of this construct too broad for its narrow definition. Researchers further stated that “good sports” are people who do not complain when they are inconvenienced by others, they maintain a positive attitude even when things do not go the way they want, are not offended when others do not follow their suggestions, are willing to sacrifice their personal interest for the good of the work group, and do not take the rejection of their ideas personally.
- **Organizational loyalty:** Organizational loyalty consists of loyal boosterism and organizational loyalty (Graham, 1989, 1991), spreading goodwill and protecting the organization (George and Brief, 1992; George and Jones, 1997), and the endorsing, supporting, and defending organizational objectives construct (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993, 1997). Essentially, organizational loyalty entails promoting the organization to outsiders, protecting and defending it against external threats, and remaining committed to it even under unfavorable conditions.
- **Generalized Compliance:** Organizational compliance has been widely used to measure OCB. Different terms have been used to study generalized compliance. The different terms used so far are: generalized compliance (Smith et al., 1983); organizational obedience (Graham, 1991); OCB-O (Williams and Anderson, 1991); following organizational rules and procedures (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993); and job dedication construct (Van Scotter and Motowidlo, 1996). This dimension appears to capture a person’s internalization and acceptance of the organization’s rules, Regulations, and procedures, which results in a conscientious adherence to them, even when no one observes or monitors compliance. Employees’ behavior exceeds any enforceable minimum standards; workers willingly go far beyond stated expectations. This behavior is regarded as a form of citizenship behavior is that even though everyone is expected to obey company regulations, rules, and procedures at all times, many employees simply do not.
- **Individual Initiative:** Another dimension that several researchers have identified as a form of citizenship behavior is called individual initiative. This form of OCB involves engaging in task-related behaviors at a level that is beyond minimally required as a part of job. Individual initiative is attached to OCB on the grounds that change or innovation initiation is far beyond the actions minimally required on the day-to-day level. Behaviors referred to in this dimension include making innovative suggestions to improve a department or organization and implementing an externally imposed change. Such behaviors include voluntary acts of creativity and innovation designed to improve one’s task or the

organization's performance, persisting with extra enthusiasm and effort to accomplish one's job, volunteering to take on extra responsibilities, and encouraging others in the organization to do the same. All of these behaviors share the idea that the employee is going "above and beyond" the call of duty. This dimension is comparable to Organ's conscientiousness construct (Organ, 1988), Graham's and Moorman and Blakely's personal industry and individual initiative constructs (Graham, 1989; Moorman and Blakely, 1995), George's making constructive suggestions construct (George and Brief, 1992; George and Jones, 1997), Borman and Motowidlo's persisting with enthusiasm and volunteering to carry out task activities constructs (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993, 1997)

- **Civic Virtue:** The next dimension is derived from Graham's discussion of the responsibilities that employees have as "citizens" of an organization (Graham, 1991). Civic virtue represents a macro-level interest in, or commitment to, the organization as a whole. This is shown by a willingness to participate actively in its governance (e.g., attend meetings, engage in policy debates, express one's opinion about what strategy the organization ought to follow, etc.). To monitor the organization's environment for threats and opportunities (e.g., keep up with changes in the industry that might affect the organization), and to look out for organization best interests (e.g., reporting fire hazards or suspicious activities, locking doors, etc.), even at great personal cost. This dimension has been referred to as civic virtue by Organ (1988, 1990b), organizational participation by Graham (1989), and protecting the organization by George and Brief (1992).
- **Self development:** The final dimension is self development. Based on the work of Katz (1964) and, George and Brief (1992) identified developing oneself as a key dimension of citizenship behavior. Self-development includes voluntary behaviors employees engage in to improve their knowledge, skills, competencies, and abilities. According to George and Brief (1992) this include seeking out advantage of advanced training courses, keeping abreast with latest developments in one's area, learning new skills, and sharpening the competencies to add valuable contributions to an organization. Though, self-development has not received any empirical confirmation in the citizenship behavior literature. However, it does appear to be a discretionary form of employee behavior that is conceptually distinct from the other citizenship behavior dimensions, and might be expected to improve organizational effectiveness through somewhat different mechanisms than the other forms of citizenship behavior.

ANTECEDENTS OF ORGANIZATION CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

The antecedents to organization citizenship behavior are categorized broadly into individual factors and organizational factors and they are discussed below:

INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

- **Age:** Age is very critical variable in any study pertaining to organization behavior. The notion that younger and older employees view work and self in fundamentally different ways is not new. Wagner and Rush (2000) pointed out that early years (20-34) are the years of establishment and settling down; later years (35- 55) are strong sense of self and location vis-à-vis life and work. The authors further argued that younger employees coordinate their needs with organizational needs more flexibly; by contrast, older employees tend to be more rigid in adjusting their needs with the organization. Therefore, younger and older workers may differ in their orientations toward self, others, and work. These differences may lead to different salient motives for OCB among younger and older employees.
- **Gender:** Authors noted that empathetic concern and perspective taking should influence both helping behavior and courtesy, and both of these traits are associated with females (Davis, 1983). Conversely, Kidder and McLean Parks (1993) argued that males are more likely to engage in conscientious behavior than females, because this type of behavior suggests an exchange orientation or an emphasis on quid pro quo, frequently associated with a male preference for equity over equality. Men are described as exhibiting aggression, competitiveness, assertiveness, individualism, task-orientation, and a focus on material success. Women are considered to exhibit nurturance, kindness, loquaciousness, warmth, an emotion-orientation, and a concern for the quality of life (Archer and Lloyd, 1985; Gefen and Straub, 1997; Tannen, 1994). Thus, females are expected to show OCB towards colleagues and Supervisor.
- **Tenure:** The meta review by Podsakoff (2000) and various other studies could not provide any conclusive evidence for the relationship between tenure and OCB. Similarly, Pettit, Donohue, and Cieri (2004) found no relationship between tenure and OCB. Thau, Bennett, Stahlberg, and Werner (2004) found that the (zero-order) effect of tenure on OCB is negative. Authors further reasoned that a long employment history in one organization reflects successful past exchanges (Buskens, Raub, and Snijders, 2003). There are limited studies (Podsakoff et al., 2000, p. 527) which have controlled for this relationship except in the work of Van Dyne and LePine, maybe because tenure has been judged to be unimportant for OCB (Organ and Ryan, 1995, p. 789).
- **Ability, Experience, and Knowledge:** In the literature of OCB the results have been mixed when it comes to the relationship between employee's abilities, experience, training and knowledge. Experience in multiple correlations was significantly related to OCB (Murphy et al., 2002). Most of the studies could not produce anything in conclusive terms. In the classic meta review by Podsakoff and Colleagues (2000), it was found out that none of employee characteristics including ability, experience, training, knowledge, and need for independence share any consistent strong relationship with any of the citizenship behaviors.
- **Career Orientation:** Career orientation is a more stable, longer-term and deeper definition of work identity than just occupying the job or being part of the organization (DeLong, 1982). It is a person's subjective career self-identity about work and life and his/her role within it (Derr and Laurent, 1989). It focuses both on what one wants or thinks is important and what he/she feels and believes he/she can do best (Schein, 1971; Schein, 1978; Van Maanen and Schein, 1977). Internal career orientations comprise a person's motives, values, and talents. Therefore, reasonable to postulate that those with different internal career orientations will correspondingly engage in different organizational citizenship

behavior (Chompookum and Derr, 2004). Employees with getting ahead or getting high career orientations may engage in less OCB because they highly value advancement and exciting work, respectively (Delong, 1982). They tend to focus on their in-role jobs in order to meet their psychological needs (e.g. getting exciting work) rather than investing resources in displaying OCB.

- **Personality:** Personality variables have been linked to a number of organizational variables and OCB is no exception (Organ and Lingl, 1995; Organ and Ryan, 1995). Researchers have suggested that especially five basic traits/factors account for most of the variance in personality (Barrick and Mount, 1991; Costa and McCrae, 1992; Mischel, 1990). Research has suggested that negative affectivity, conscientiousness, and agreeableness have all been found to predispose people to orientations that make them more likely to engage in OCB (Organ and Ryan, 1995). OCB does not seem to depend on personality traits such as extraversion, introversion, or openness to change.
- **Ethics:** There is neither any universally accepted definition of ethics nor a standard measure that allows an individual or event to be uniformly judged as ethical or unethical. It was found that creativity (Social/Advocacy Participation dimension) is an extra-role behavior, and a productive trait of both more and less ethical workers, suggesting that truly creative individuals are spontaneous with their talent. Loyalty behavior of good organizational representation, requires conscious effort, and is not behaviors attributed to the less ethical. Cooperation predicted productivity only among the least ethical group.
- **Materialistic Attitude:** Ward and Wackman (1971, p. 422) define the concept as “an orientation which views material goods and money as being important for personal happiness and social progress”. While, Belk (1984) and Richins and Dawson (1992) view materialism as a treat and value, respectively. Moschis and Churchill (1978) approach materialism as the sum of attitudes. Torlak and Koc (2007) found that materialistic attitude is negatively correlated with all dimensions of OCB. Findings indicated that materialistic attitude is one of the antecedents that have negative impacts on OCB. All the dimensions of OCB except sportsmanship and overall OCB have correlated with materialism at middle levels.
- **Ethnicity:** Ethnicity has seldom been investigated as a variable in research on OCB. Chattopadhyay (1999) suggests that organization-based self-esteem will be greater for minority employees working in white-dominated groups than for whites working in minority dominated groups. Koberg, Boss, Goodman, Boss, and Monsen (2005) recently did consider OCB and ethnicity; however it was done at hospital setting. Thus, it cannot be implied in organization setting without a risk. Koberg (2005) hypothesized that OCB will be greater for women than for men, and will not differ between non-Anglo and Anglo-Americans.
- **Marital Status:** The research examining the association between marital status and OCB is limited. Moreover, there are no study establishing the direct linkage between marital status and OCB. Though, marital status has been found to indirectly influence the participation in OCB. Marital status brings changes in career orientation of employee. Further, career orientation influence OCB (Chompookum and Derr, 2004).

ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS

- **Morale:** Early research efforts on employee characteristics (Bateman and Organ, 1983; O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986; Smith et al., 1983) focused on two main causes of OCB. The first of these is a general affective “morale” factor, which Organ and Ryan (1995) view as underlying employee satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceptions of fairness, and perceptions of leader supportiveness. These variables have been the most frequently investigated antecedents of OCB, and all of them have significant relationships with citizenship behaviors.
- **Trust:** Trust and OCB has been studied in the light of social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Clark and Mills, 1979; Rousseau and Parks, 1993). It implies an informal contract between an employee and an organization, and in this contract, the employee’s manager largely represents the organization to the employee (Konovsky and Pugh, 1994). When employees have much trust in their social exchange relationship, they are more likely to define many types of their OCB as part of their job requirements, because employees’ obligations within social exchange relationships are not well defined and are open-ended (Konovsky and Pugh, 1994; Morrison, 1996). This, in turn, will increase the possibility of performing OCB.
- **Perceived Job Mobility:** Perceived job mobility influence OCB (Hui et al., 1999). Thau et al (2004) explained cooperative employee behaviors within the context of the evaluations (attractiveness of alternative employment opportunities) and restrictions (perceived ease of finding alternative employment) connected to alternative exchange partners, which authors believed to be important elements in exchange relationships (Molm, 2003; Thibaut and Kelley, 1969). Author stated that OCB is influenced by attractive employment alternative and the ease with which employee can move from the current organization. This happens as employees who perceive an easy access to attractive alternatives can much more easily balance their exchange ratio in a social exchange grounded on voluntarily contributions than in an economic exchange which is easier to sanction. Thau et al., (2004) hypothesized that the interactive effect of the two variables would be less for task performance but more for the extra role behavior. Thau et al., (2004) extended this concept to attractiveness of alternative employment and perceived ease of finding alternative employment. Findings suggested that both variables interact and produce a moderately strong effect on OCB. Results support the expectation that employees who evaluate alternatives as attractive perform less OCB.
- **Organization Structure:** The relationships between organizational characteristics and OCB were somewhat mixed. In a meta review it was found that neither organizational formalization, organizational inflexibility, advisory/staff support, nor spatial distance were consistently related to citizenship behaviors (Podsakoff et al., 2000). At the organizational level, formalization, inflexibility, perceived organizational support, and organizational constraints have been shown to

influence OCB. In a reanalysis of an earlier study, Organ et al. (2006) found that inflexibility had a weak direct relationship with altruism while formalization had none. Following Weber (1978), bureaucratic rules have been viewed as both a source of dehumanization through formalization of task specialization and employee protection from arbitrary managerial rule.

- Employee Position and Social Structure:** Formal organizational structure refers to the defined positions and roles through reporting relationships, and formal role prescriptions. Informal organization refers to the positions and roles constituted by spontaneous social relationships, voluntary behaviors, and scripts for informal interactions among organizational members (Nelson, 2001; Nohria and Gualti, 1994; Tichy, 1981). According to the perspective of social networks of workplace relationships (Nelson, 2001; Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1938), employees hold informal positions defined by the patterns of direct and indirect relationships connecting them to other people at workplace (Brass and Burckhardt, 1993). The network positions are the channels through which expectations for informal role scripts are communicated and verified (Baker and Faulkner, 1991; Barley, 1990; Graen, 1976). Therefore, the OCB behavior is displayed as a part of role enactment due to reciprocal causal link between informal structure and behavior. For example, an employee positioned prominently in a network may perform OCB because being placed in such a social network raises normative expectations (Fiske, 1991; Pearce, Jone, and Gergersen, 1991).
- Group Cohesion:** Group cohesiveness refers to group members' affinity for one another and their desire to remain part of the group. Group cohesiveness explains OCB among employees. In cohesive work groups, employees are likely to be more sensitive to others and are more willing to aid and assist them (Schachter, Ellertson, McBride, and Gregory, 1951). Some researchers (e.g., Organ, 1990) have suggested that OCB may reflect members' efforts to maintain social exchange relationships within the group than economic exchange relationship. It is argued that cohesive groups exhibit more constructive and frequent social exchanges than non-cohesive groups. Employees in work groups with high liking and cooperation for each other develop trust about reciprocation of good behavior. Highly cohesive groups generate a sense of social identity that can enhance members' desires to help one another. Further, positive mood states may stimulate altruistic behavior toward others (Isen and Baron, 1991).
- Job Satisfaction:** Job satisfaction is an attitudinal construct traditionally conceptualized in terms of beliefs (cognitions) and feelings (affect) regarding one's job in general (Locke, 1976) or specific facets of one's job (Smith, Kendall, and Hulin, 1969). Employee job satisfaction is defined as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the valuation of his/her work (Locke, 1976). There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and OCB (Paillé, 2011). Research suggests that individuals with higher job satisfaction have a greater inclination to engage in extra-role behavior because they tend to experience positive mood states more frequently (Brown and Peterson, 1985). The principal explanation for the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB comes from social exchange theory (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Organ et al., 2006) and psychological contract theory (Robinson and Morrison, 1995). Both the theories are grounded upon the reciprocity rule. Employees who are satisfied with their jobs reciprocate through OCB (Bateman and Organ, 1983). On the other hand employees experiencing job dissatisfaction may withdraw their OCB (Fassina et al., 2008). The mood factor provides another explanation as to why individuals engage in OCB to repay the organization (Schanke, 1991; Witt, 1991).
- Organization Justice:** Fairness or justice perceptions refer to whether or not employees feel organizational decisions are made equitably and with the necessary employee input (usually called procedural justice) and whether or not employees perceive that they are fairly rewarded given their level of training, tenure, responsibility or workload (called distributive justice). Perceptions of fairness are positively related to OCB (Moorman, 1991; Diefendorff et al., 2002; Kidwell et al., 1997; Organ, 1988, 1990; Somech and Bogler, 2002; Spector and Fox, 2002). Organ (1990) suggested that fairness perceptions play a central role in promoting OCBs. Organ (1988, 1990) proposed an explanation that employees perform OCBs to reciprocate the fair treatment offered by the organizations. Organ and Konovsky (1989) proposed that employee perceptions of fairness in the workplace leads to emergence of OCBs, as fair treatment create a sense of reciprocation among employees in the form of display OCB.
- Organization Commitment:** Organizational commitment means "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in an organization" (Mowday, Steers, and Porter, 1979, p. 226). Studies have found linkage between organizational commitment with several OCB facets (Liden, Wayne, Kraimer, and Sparrowe, 2003; Shore and Wayne, 1993; Van Dyne and Ang, 1998; Bateman and Organ, 1983; O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986; Organ, 1990; Puffer, 1987; Smith, Organ, and Near, 1983). Organizational commitment is positively related to OCB (Diefendorff et al., 2002; Kidwell et al., 1997; Organ, 1988, 1990; Somech and Bogler, 2002; Somech and Drach-Zahavy, 2000; Spector and Fox, 2002). According to Schappe (1998), hierarchical regression analyses indicated that when job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions were considered concurrently, only organizational commitment accounted for a unique amount of variance in OCB. Meyer, Stanley, Hersecovith, and Topolnytsky (2000) found that among three dimensions of commitment, affective commitment has the strongest positive correlation with OCB, followed by normative commitment, but continuance commitment is unrelated to OCB. However, Williams and Anderson (1991) found that organizational commitment was not related to either form of OCB, and Tansky (1993) found no significant positive relationships between organizational commitment and five OCB dimensions. Organizational commitment is a likely determinant of OCB. O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) found that identification was a significant predictor of self-reports of generalized compliance behaviors and that identification and internalization were significant predictors of self-reports of extra-role compliance behaviors.

OUTCOMES OF ORGANIZATION CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

- **Customer Satisfaction:** Customer Satisfaction is one of the empirically tested outcomes of the OCB. Research suggests that customer's evaluation of an organization's service depends upon competence, attitudes, expertise, and skills of the customer-contact employee. This was also supported by socialization theory and service climate development (Schneider and Bowen, 1999). The behavior of employees with customers significantly influences the future relationship with the customer (Paulin, Ferguson, and Payaud, 2000). As a result review suggests the significance of developing internal relationships, not only among employees but also between the employee and the company create and enhance successful relationships with the customer (Kelley and Hoffman, 1997). The extra-role (OCB) activities are critical factors influencing service quality and customer satisfaction (Bitner et al., 1994, Yoon and Suh, 2003).
- **Employment Turnover and Turnover Intention:** Turnover refers to permanent removal, voluntarily or involuntarily, of an employee from the organization (Koslowsky, Sagie, Krausz, and Singer, 1997). OCB may lead to low turnover (Moorman, 1991; Organ and Konovsky, 1989; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Smith et al., 1983). Khalid and Ali (2005) found that civic virtue and sportsmanship affect turnover intention significantly and negatively, only conscientiousness significantly influenced self-reported absenteeism. Despite over 1500 studies reported in the turnover literature (Shaw, John, Jenkins, and Nina, 1998) previous research on this dysfunctional behavior has focused on job affect, cognitive process, and demographic factors as antecedents but has not paid attention to the role of behavioral antecedents such as OCB.
- **Worker Well Being:** Understanding CWA as a form of OCB is an important from the workers' point of view. High levels of CWA enhance worker well-being by making work more meaningful, providing sociability, and psychological support in an uncertain and anonymous world (George and Bettenhausen, 1990). Further it contributes to empowerment and employability by building employee skills, enhancing self-efficacy, and strengthening social networks. Contrary to this coworker with conflicting relations can lead to high levels of job dissatisfaction, withdrawal of cooperation, and high labor turnover (Hodson, 2001). v. **Withdrawal Behavior:** Withdrawal refers to a set of behaviors employees use in attempts to remove themselves from their jobs or avoid work tasks (Koslowsky et al., 1997).
- **Organization Performance and Effectiveness:** A key tenet of Organ's original definition of OCB (Organ, 1988) is that, when aggregated over time and people, such behavior enhances organizational effectiveness. This assumption remained untested in initial years. Its acceptance was based more on its conceptual plausibility than direct empirical evidence (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993; Organ and Konovsky, 1989; Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994). Various explanation were extended to reason as to how and why OCB results in organization effectiveness (George and Bettenhausen, 1990; Karambayya, 1990; MacKenzie et al., 1991, 1993; Organ, 1988, 1990; Podsakoff et al., 1997; Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994, 1997). For instance OCB may contribute to organizational success by enhancing coworker and managerial productivity, freeing up resources so they can be used for more productive purposes, reducing the need to devote scarce resources to purely maintenance functions, helping to coordinate activities both within and across work groups, strengthening the organization's ability to attract and retain the best employees, increasing the stability of the organization's performance, and enabling the organization to adapt more effectively to environmental changes.

CONCLUSION

OCB has been an area of interest of researchers for more than twenty-five years. Different scholars have discussed several dimensions of OCB. In addition to there being different dimensions of OCB, there are also different motives for performing OCB. There is significant research on individual and organizational OCB too. Several scales are also developed from time to time to measure various dimensions of OCB. This paper touches upon the five dimensions of OCB given by Organ and makes a fleeting reference to other dimensions discussed by various scholars.

REFERENCES

1. Aryee, S., Budhwar, P.S. & Chen, Z.X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3), 267-285.
2. Aukler. (2010). The Influence of Personality Factor on Organisational Citizenship Behaviour, unpublished report available at [www.poczynek.org/.../2010%20Judith%20Ayckler%20-%20Organizational...ý](http://www.poczynek.org/.../2010%20Judith%20Ayckler%20-%20Organizational...) (retrieved on March, 22, 2013), pp. 1-67.
3. Bagheri1, G., Matin, H. Z., & Amighi, F. (2011). The Relationship between Empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior of the Pedagogical Organization Employees. *Iranian Journal of Management Studies*, 4(2), 53-62.
4. Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587-595.
5. Bolino, M.C., & Turnley, W.H. (2003). Going the extra mile: cultivating and managing employee citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Executive*, 17(3), 60-71. Bolino, M.C., & Turnley, W.H. (2005). The personal costs of citizenship behavior: the relationship between individual initiative and role overload, job stress, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4), 740-748.
6. Borman, W. C., Buck, D. E., Hanson, M. A., Motowidlo, S. J., Stark, S., & Drasgow, F. (2001). An examination of the comparative reliability, validity, and accuracy of performance ratings made using computerized adaptive rating scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 965-973.
7. Castro, C. B., Armario, E. M. & Ruiz, D. M. (2004). The influence of employee organizational citizenship behaviour on customer loyalty. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 15, 1, 27-53.

8. Chen, X. P., Hui, C., & Seago, D. J. (1998). The role of organizational citizenship behavior in turnover: Conceptualization and preliminary tests of key hypotheses. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 922–931. Chen, Z. X., Tsui, A. S., & Zhong, L. (2008). Reactions to psychological contract breach: a dual perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29, 527–548.
9. Costa, P. T. & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Normal personality assessment in clinical practice: The NEO personality inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, 4, 1, 5-13.
10. Deluga, R.J. (1998) "Leader-member exchange quality and effectiveness ratings: The role of subordinate-supervisor conscientiousness similarity", *Group and Organization Management*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 189-216.
11. Farh, Jiing-Lih;Chen-Bo, Zhong; Organ, Dennis W. 2004. Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the People's Republic of China. *Organization Science*, Vol.14, No.2, March-April 2004. Pp 241-253
12. Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4, 249-270.
13. Kidder, D. L., & McLean Parks, J. (1993). The good soldier: Who is (s)he? In D. P.Moore (Ed.), *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*, 363–367.
14. Lee, K., & Allen, N.J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: the role of affect and cognition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 131- 142
15. McCrae, R.R., & Costa, P.T. (1987) Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 81-90.
16. MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behaviour on evaluations of sales performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 57:70–80.
17. Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
18. Organ, D. W. (1990b). The subtle significance of job satisfaction. *Clinical Laboratory Management Review*, 4:94–98.
19. Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48: 775–802.
20. Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behaviour: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10: 85–98.
21. Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*. Sage Publication: Thousands Oaks.
22. Podsakoff, N.P., Whiting, S.W., Podsakoff, P.M., & Blume, B.D. (2009). Individual and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 122-141.
23. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, K. (1990). Transformational leader behaviours and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviours. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1: 107– 142.
24. Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behaviour and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(2): 262-70.
25. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviours: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26: 513–563
26. Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behaviour: Its nature and antecedents. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68: 653– 663.
27. Walz, S.M., Niehoff, B.P., (1996). Organizational citizenship behaviors and their effects on organizational effectiveness in limited - menu restaurants. *Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings*, 307-311.
28. Williams, L., & Anderson, S. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of Organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601-617.