

Organizational Citizenship Behavior in India: A Study

Ms. Arpita Mehta*

Introduction

Organizational citizenship behavior is “individual behavior that is discretionary or flexible, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization, as explained by Organ (1988). By discretionary, it means that the behavior is not an enforceable obligation of the role or function, or the job description, that is, the noticeably specifiable terms of person's employment agreement with the organization; the behavior is rather a concern of individual's personal choice, such that its exclusion is not generally taken as punishable.” It can also be referred as pro-social organizational behavior as mentioned by (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986), extra-role behavior by Wright et al., (1993) and contextual behavior by Organ & Ryan, (1995). Researchers are fascinated towards and involved in OCB mainly because it is assumed to have a positive and affirmative impact on organizational performance.

Review of Literature

- **Background of OCB**

A good number of researches have examined the antecedents of OCB. Researchers have focused on individual factors as well as organizational factors. Individual factors include attitudinal factors (like job satisfaction and organizational commitment), perceptual factors (such as perceived organizational support), and dispositional factors (such as personality traits). Attitudinal factors including job

* Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Poornima University, Jaipur, India.

~ The chapter is based on the paper presented in "National Conference on Emerging Trends and Scope in Digital Banking, Cashless Economy & Innovations in Commerce and Modern Management & International Seminar on Global Economy: Opportunities and Challenges" Organized by Inspira Research Association (IRA), Jaipur & Shri Bhawani Niketan Girls P.G. College, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India. 29-30 September, 2018.

satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived fairness (LePine et al., 2002; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 1996), and job involvement (Diefendorff, 2002) have been found to be strongly related to OCB. For instance, Organ and Ryan (1995) conducted a meta-analysis on the attitudinal and dispositional predictors of OCB and found that job satisfaction showed a stronger relationship with OCB than with in-role performance. Other attitudinal factors such as perceived fairness, organizational commitment, and leader supportiveness correlated with OCB at the same level as job satisfaction. Research also examined the connection between individual perceptual variables and OCB. Factors identified include perceived organizational support (Moorman et al., 1998) usefulness of work-life benefits (Lambert, S. J., 2000), leader member exchange (Settoon et al., 1996). Though the results regarding relationship between OCB and dispositional factors are usually disappointing, research has revealed increasing attention in situational predictors and obtained more promising results.

Bommer et al. (2003) found that the consistency of OCB across coworkers was associated with more OCB by individuals (Bommer et al., 2003). A more recent study found that organizational learning values and learning structures [Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2004) were strongly related to OCB. Overall, current research has identified many new situational factors that have strong relationships with OCB.

On computing, prior research has identified both individual and organizational antecedents of OCB. The findings have been fairly consistent, suggesting that employee attitudes including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived fairness, employee perceptions including perceived organizational support, LMX, usefulness of work-life benefits, abusive supervision, and organizational factors including leader behavior, team identification, and organizational learning values and learning structures are strongly related to OCB. Dispositional factors including conscientiousness, agreeableness and positive affectivity only show a rather weak relation with OCB.

- **Scope of OCB**

Even if there is a lack of consensus on the scope of OCB, Organ (1988) projected five dimensions of OCB, which are most often used in studies worldwide. The dimensions are:

Altruism refers to as helping behaviors aimed at particular persons and will eventually profit the organization. An illustration of altruism is sharing a co-worker's workload.

Courtesy is defined as trying to avoid job-related interpersonal problems or difficulties from taking place. A good example is noticing others about being absent from work in advance.

Conscientiousness means doing things that are beneficial to the organization, and it involves performing one's role or implied duties in the organization even under no surveillance, such as following rules when nobody is watching.

Sportsmanship is taken as tolerating less than model situations on the job without making unreasonable complaints.

Civic virtue simply means responsibly being concerned and alarmed about the well functioning of the company. An exemplar is attending meetings and keeping up with major issues about the company.

With reference to the five dimensions of OCB by Organ (1988), altruism and courtesy are more individual oriented (OCBI), and conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and civic virtue are much more oriented towards the organization (OCBO). In a detailed and methodical analysis of the OCB literature and other associated constructs, Podsakoff et al. (2000) classified OCB into seven dimensions, adding two new dimensions to those given by organ (1988) that is individual initiative and self development. The added two dimensions are not as normally and frequently used by current research for two reasons. First, these two dimensions are not conceptually distinguishable from rest of the dimensions of OCB. For case in point, individual inventiveness involves getting engaged in task-related behaviors at a level that is ahead of what is necessary, and it includes behaviors such as voluntary acts of creativity and innovation and persistence with extra eagerness to achieve one's job. It is quite similar to the conscientiousness dimension of OCB. Self development takes account of performance based on voluntary behaviors employees engage in to improve and enhance their knowledge, skills and abilities, which is similar to the civic virtue dimension of OCB.

Van Dyne and her colleagues (1994) developed a new chief and interesting framework involving OCB dimensions. Van Dyne and colleagues empirically recognized five dimensions of OCB: obedience, social participation, functional participation, loyalty and advocacy participation. Her framework has some common characteristics with that of Organ's OCB dimensions. For instance, obedience having its focus on subsequent rules and procedures and meeting deadlines over laps with Organ's conscientiousness dimension. Functional participation involves taking additional work assignments and volunteering for special duties, and advocacy involves making suggestions and maintaining high standards of work, both of which share some similarity with the civic virtue dimension. Van Dyne's framework is not as widely used as Organ's five OCB dimensions (Podsakoff et al., 1997).

Although Organ's five-dimension structure has been widely used in prior research (LePine et al., 2002; Podsakoff et al., 2000) current research has not reached consensus in regards to which specific dimensions should be included when examining OCB. To address this issue, LePine et al. (2002) conducted a meta-analysis to examine the relationship among these dimensions. The results thus

produced indicated that these dimensions were highly correlated with the exception of sportsmanship, and the dimensions did not differentially relate to the several predictors of OCB including satisfaction, commitment, fairness, leader support, and conscientiousness. Based on these results, LePine et al. (2002) suggested that researchers should consider OCB at the aggregate level, and distinguish OCB by the target towards which such behavior is directed. Thus, this study used a two-factor model which consisted of OCB directed at organization (OCBO) and OCB directed at individuals (OCBI).

- **Consequences of OCB**

Outcomes of OCB mainly fall into two categories; individual-level outcomes and the firm-level outcomes. In terms of individual-level outcomes, researchers have found that OCB has an impact on both employee objective and subjective performance evaluations (MacKenzie et al., 1991; MacKenzie et al., 1993; MacKenzie et al., 2001; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). For instance, MacKenzie and colleagues (1991) looked at sales productivity as well as subjective overall performance evaluation. They found that manager's evaluations were determined as much by OCB as they were by objective measures of performance. After common method variance was controlled for, OCB accounted for a significant proportion of a sales manager's evaluation of employee performance. Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994) looked at both in-role and extra-role behaviors and found that both explained unique variance in performance evaluations. Taken together, these findings suggest that OCB has a strong impact on both objective and subjective performance evaluations.

Organ (1988) suggested that OCB, in aggregation, should improve firm-level performance and effectiveness. Researchers have found strong support for his contention (Podsakoff et al., 1997; MacKenzie et al., 1996). For instance, Podsakoff and colleagues (1997) found strong effects for OCB on the quantity and quality of unit performance. They also found that OCB made an important contribution to the overall firm-level objective measure of performance. Thus, studies consistently find that OCB has a positive impact on firm performance and firm effectiveness.

Research Methodology

- **Participants**

This section will provide a description of the sample; the measures applied; and the data analysis conducted. A sample size of 56 respondents was taken to write the paper. The technique used to collect data was Random sampling. The questionnaire was sent to 80 Executives but only 56 responded, the response rate was 70 %. The respondents came from different walks of life. Out of total 56 respondents 20 were female and 36 were male. The detail information of distribution of demographic variables is listed in Table below:

Age	No. of Respondents
21–25	34
26–30	21
31–35	1
Education	
Graduate	19
Post Graduate	35
above post graduate	2
Job Hierarchy	
Junior Level	20
Middle Level	31
Senior Level	5
Monthly salary	
Up to 25,000	24
25,000 – 40,000	20
40,000 – 55,000	6
55,000 – 70,000	5
above 70000	1
not for profit	1
Experience	
0–5	54
10–15	4

Many demographical Traits were included in the research so that a true picture can be presented about OCB. There a huge difference between the ratio of male and female gender in the sample. The respondents are quite young with 34 falling between 21–25 years and 21 falling among 26–30 so, we can say that approx. whole sample is between 21–30 years of age. On Education front, the sample is faring well with 35 respondents holding Post Graduate Degree and 19 with Graduate Degree with them. There are 2 respondents with above Post Graduation Degree as well. Not a single respondent was there with just Diploma. Hence, the respondents were quite educated to become part of this kind of research. Another demographic trait used was the Job Hierarchy in the organization .31 of the respondents were in middle Level and 20 in junior level followed by 5 people in Senior Level. So, majority of respondents were from Middle level. about the compensation, 24 respondents were drawing salary below Rs.25, 000 p.m., as the salary slabs were increasing, the respondents number decreased with 20 people drawing salary between 25,000–40,000, it decreased to a level of 1 respondent drawing salary above Rs 70,000 p.m. Majority of respondents taken were from private organizations followed by Public organization and only 1 from Not for Profit institution.

- **Measure**

OCB was measured on five– point Likert Scale taken from Podsakoff et al. (1990). Scale consisted of 24 items representing 5 types citizenship behavior.

Personal attributes in the study include Gender, age, organizational tenure, job Hierarchy, and educational level. Primary Collection of data was done to analyze the Problem. ANOVA and independent Sample t-test was used for testing the difference in OCB between groups.

- **Research Hypothesis**

H₁ There is a difference in level of Conscientiousness between married and Unmarried Employees.

H₂ There is a difference in level of Courtesy between Employees with Different Education Levels.

H₃ There is a difference in level of OCB between Employees with different Income Levels.

H₄ There is a difference in level of OCB between Employees with different Experience Level in same Organization.

Because the Age Level, Gender, Education Level, Job Hierarchy, Salary, Tenure in the Organization is different between respondents, the difference may lead to difference in OCB level of individuals.

- **The Results**

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare Conscientiousness in Unmarried and Married Employees. There was a significant difference in the scores of Unmarried and Married Employees. These results suggest that Conscientiousness is higher in Married Employees as compared to Unmarried once. Especially our results show that Conscientiousness increases in Married Employees (Table 1).

(Table 2) The Sig. value here is .014. This value is less than .05. Because of this, we can conclude that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean Courtesy Level for all of our groups (graduate, post graduate and above post graduate). We have found statistical significance between conditions but we don't know where the significant differences are. So we deployed a post hoc test Tukey HSD (Table 3).

Looking at the Sig. column, we can see that most of the values are greater than .05. However, there are two values that are 0.033. These values correspond with the comparison between the graduate and above post graduate employees. For this reason, we can conclude that the graduate and above post graduate employees are significantly different in terms of Courtesy. Courtesy in above Post Graduate Level Employees was found more than that of Just Graduate Employees. However, the other condition comparisons are not significantly different from one another. This means that the post graduate and graduate employees are not significantly different. It also means that the post graduate and above post graduate employees are not significantly different.

Table 1: Conscientiousness: Marital Status Wise

Variable	Unmarried	Married	F	Sig.
Conscientiousness	46	10	.388	0.009

Table 2: Courtesy: Education Wise**ANOVA**

	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Sig.
Graduate	19	18.31	2.16	4.631	.014
Post Graduate	35	19.68	2.21		
Above Post Graduate	02	22.50	0.70		
Total	56	19.32	2.32		

Table 3: Post HOC Test Tukey HSD Dependent Variable: Courtesy

(I) Education		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
Graduate	Post Graduate	-1.36	0.62	.080
	Above Post Graduate	-4.18	1.62	.033
Post Graduate	Graduate	1.36	0.62	.080
	Above Post Graduate	-2.81	1.58	.188
Above Post Graduate	Graduate	4.18	1.62	.033
	Post Graduate	2.81	1.58	.188

*The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 4: Overall OCB: By Monthly Income**ANOVA**

	N	Mean	S. D	F	Sig.
Up to 25,000	24	17.62	1.43	2.353	.066
25,000 – 40,000	20	17.16	1.50		
40,000 – 55,000	6	16.30	1.68		
55,000 – 70,000	5	16.32	.83		
above 70000	1	19.80			
Total	56	17.23	1.51		

Table 5: Experience with Same Organization**Independent Samples Test**

	Experience with Current Organization b/w 0–5 Yrs	Experience with Current Organization b/w 5–10 Yrs	F	P	Sig.
OCB	53	3	.388	.536	0.009

*Only significant results were added in the analysis

(Table 4) By analyzing the OCB level based on monthly salary of Employees we found that Sig value is above .05. We can conclude that there is no statistically significant difference between the Groups. We can conclude that the differences between group Means are likely due to chance and not likely due to the manipulation.

By analyzing the OCB level based on Experience with same organization of Employees we found that Sig value is above .05. We can conclude that there is no statistically significant difference between the Groups. We can conclude that the differences between group Means are likely due to chance and not likely due to the manipulation (Table 5).

Discussion and Conclusion

Conscientiousness in married respondent was found higher than unmarried once. Also with time it keeps on increasing. Employees after getting married learn to be more dedicated and disciplined. It does have impact on their way of working in the organization. Self management increases because they have responsibility of family and that reduces constant need of supervision on them. They will perform their duty religiously even when nobody is watching them. On the other hand, Unmarried people are more relaxed and careless in their approach. They, at certain point try to run from hard work and try to take short cuts, often breaking the organization's rules and regulations and hence scoring low on Conscientiousness. The findings of this research are against the popular notion that married Employees by virtues of being married will devote most of the leisure time to family and hence will not contribute to extra – role Behavior. Unmarried Employees have more time and energy to perform extra–role activities. Russell and Rush (1987) Trainings should be imparted to make employees dedicated and motivated.

Courtesy, which is trying to avoid job–related interpersonal problems or difficulties from taking place, was measured on the basis of Education level of the Employees. No significant difference was found between graduate and post graduate employees. Also no significant difference was found between post graduate and above post graduate employees. There was significant difference between level of courtesy between Graduate and above post Graduate Employees. Our findings are in sync with previous researches done by (Gregerson, H.B., 1993; Smith et al., 1983). Graduate employees who are quite young, are less concerned about impact of their actions on others and also how their job do have impact on other's work .On the other hand Highly Educated employees who hold a degrees above post Graduation have experienced how the organizations functions and how to conduct themselves so as to create minimum interpersonal problems. This study proves that Education level do have an impact on Courtesy of Employees. Employees should be given ample of opportunities to learn and grow. Programs for higher education should be launched to increase the Courtesy Level of Employees in organization.

Income which is considered important part of any Job and crucial to every Employee was also taken to find its impact on overall OCB. Against the much popular Belief ,Monthly Income had no significant impact on OCB level of Employees .There were insignificant variations between OCB levels of employees who are drawing high

salary and who are drawing low salary. The open communication and culture gives freedom to every individual in organization and hence the Citizenship behavior develops in Employees at even lower income levels. Employees who are just joining the organization have high Expectations and aspirations from the new job and they try to give their best even though the Income may not be that great. With rise in Income, the trust and attachment is maintained leading to continuous OCB. These results are contradictory to the results of (Lambert, S. J. (2000) insisting that work benefit Packages increases the probability of employees helping others at work place, or will participate in discussion or gives suggestions and attend meetings.

We are of the view that employees with higher Experience in same organization would perform more OCB and our research here also supports the logic that they are more attached both psychologically and emotionally with the organization. Their organizational Experience makes them quite familiar with organization and its environment and they know where and how to contribute. On the other hand Employees with Less Experience in the organization will lose lot of their energy in performing in – role activities to institute job security. The research findings regarding this variable are mixed. O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) as well as Morrison (1993) found that Employees with longer tenure performed more extra–role activities, while Smith et al. (1983) did not find a relationship between the two variables.

Managerial Implication

Since, to be a success in this competitive world, both individual and organization have to be different in working as well as thinking. Keeping in mind the results of the study, organization can provide needed support to those categories of individual who are hesitant in showing extra–role behavior. The higher the level of OCB shown by individual, the higher will be idea generation capabilities and Entrepreneurial plans, because employees will feel free to share his own ideas and also try to do something beneficial for the organization. Role of higher education is emphasized by the results. So, organizations are advised to start promoting enrolments into managerial and other programs to foster OCB level in future.

Limitations and Scope for Future Work

The study does have significant implications but the same is subject to limitations. The overall sample size was only 56 with majority of people from private sector with only 11 from public sector. Therefore the finding of the research is subject to change with increase in sample size. The respondents were generally from service industry and therefore the findings cannot be generalized to all Indian organizations from every sector. The data was collected through questionnaire survey and therefore the responses were not free from personal bias. The significant differences were pointed out and discussed based upon preliminary scores but only implementation of the suggestions by the organizations will actually determine the effectiveness.

In addition to address the above mentioned limitations, the future research can incorporate samples from different nature of industries. A cross industrial as well as a cross national study on OCB can be performed to mark out the differences across. Moreover few independent variables can be incorporated (for e.g. leadership, motivation, decision making) to predict OCB. That will add new dimensions to the research.

References

- ✘ Bommer, W. H., Miles, E. W., & Grover, S. L. (2003). Does one good turn deserve another? Coworker influences on employee citizenship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(2), 181–196.
- ✘ Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of management Review*, 11(4), 710–725.
- ✘ Diefendorff, J. M., Brown, D. J., Kamin, A. M., & Lord, R. G. (2002). Examining the roles of job involvement and work centrality in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(1), 93–108.
- ✘ Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(1), 61–94.
- ✘ Gerban S., Van der Vegt & Janssen, O. (2003). Joint impact of interdependence and group diversity on innovation. *Journal of Management*, 29(5), 729–751.
- ✘ Gregerson, H.B.(1993), Multiple commitments at work and extra–role behavior during three stages of organizational tenure, *Journal of Business Research*, 26(1) , 31–47.
- ✘ Lambert, S. J. (2000). Added benefits: The link between work–life benefits and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(5), 801–815.
- ✘ LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: a critical review and meta–analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 52.
- ✘ MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Ahearne, M. (1996). Unpublished data analysis. Indiana University School of Business: Bloomington, Indiana.
- ✘ MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance. *The Journal of Marketing*, 70–80.
- ✘ MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Rich, G. A. (2001). Transformational and transactional leadership and salesperson performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 29(2), 115–134.
- ✘ Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior?. *Academy of Management journal*, 41(3), 351–357.
- ✘ Morrison, E. W. (1993). Toward an understanding of employee role definitions and their implications for organizational citizenship behavior. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 1993, No. 1, pp. 248–252). Academy of Management.
- ✘ Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 79(4), 475.

- ✘ O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of applied psychology*, 71(3), 492.
- ✘ Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com.
- ✘ Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel psychology*, 48(4), 775–802.
- ✘ Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of applied psychology*, 82(2), 262.
- ✘ Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Meta-analysis of the relationships between Kerr and Jermier's substitutes for leadership and employee job attitudes, role perceptions, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 380.
- ✘ 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 behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 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.
- ✘ Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 351–363.
- ✘ Russell, J. E., & Rush, M. C. (1987). The effects of sex and marital/parental status on performance evaluations and attributions. *Sex Roles*, 17(3–4), 221–236.
- ✘ Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of applied psychology*, 81(3), 219.
- ✘ Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of applied psychology*, 68(4), 653.
- ✘ Somech, A., & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2004). Exploring organizational citizenship behaviour from an organizational perspective: The relationship between organizational learning and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(3), 281–298.
- ✘ Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of management Journal*, 37(4), 765–802.
- ✘ Wright, P. M., George, J. M., Farnsworth, S. R., & McMahan, G. C. (1993). Productivity and extra-role behavior: The effects of goals and incentives on spontaneous helping. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 374–381.