OCB: A NEW WAY TO HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Shravasti Jain[*]
Harinder Singh[**]

ABSTRACT

Organization is made and maintained by employees. Their feelings make it the best and most competitive in the world. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is the behavioral pattern of the employees which makes them closer to the objectives of the organization in relation with their own. This paper covers the aspects of organizational citizenship behavior. It discusses the determinants and consequences of OCB. It highlights how and what creates OCB. The paper concludes with suggestions that can be incorporated to enhance OCB among employees. OCB can support social and psychological environment in the organization so studying this term and its effect on employees' performance.

KEYWORDS: *Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB), Employee Effectiveness, Effects & Consequences.*

_____

Introduction

Organizational citizenship behavior is a term that refers to anything that is done by employees, is positive and constructive and which is beneficial for co-workers and the company. The employees who follow OCB go extra mile for the company and do more than the minimum requisitions. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is beneficial if employees engage into it because it has been shown to increase productivity, efficiency and customer satisfaction and reduce costs and rates of turnover and absenteeism. Currently, OCB is conceptualized as synonymous with the concept of contextual performance, defined as 'performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place' (Organ, 1997, p. 95). While this reflects the flexible nature of workers' roles in the modern workplace, and acknowledges the fact that employees do get recognized and rewarded for engaging in OCB (Van Scotter, Motowidlo & Cross, 2000; Werner, 1994), the colloquial understanding of OCB as going 'the extra mile' or 'above and beyond' to help others at work is an idea that many are familiar with, and these ideas continue to be a popular way of conceptualizing OCB.

Some researchers (e.g. Williams & Anderson, 1991) have also divided OCB into two types including behavior that is directed at individual (OCBI) and organization (OCBO) level. Podsakoff (2000) identified two main categories of individual characteristics including employees attitudes and variables. First, OCB may enhance coworkers and managerial productivity. Second, OCB allows the resources to be used for more productive purposes in the organization. It helps to coordinate activities both within and across work groups. OCB may also make an organization more attractive if employees speak favorably about the organization to outsiders. The relationship of job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior is stronger than satisfaction and in role performance atleast among managerial, non-managerial and unprofessional groups. The attitudinal measures which includes perceived fairness, organizational commitment, leader supportiveness. A relationship between LMX and OCB, to build and tested a path model wherein employee affect (job satisfaction and organizational commitment) mediates between these two variables (Rick D. Hackett, 2004).

[*] Lecturer, S.S Jain Subodh P.G. College (Autonomous),Jaipur, Rajasthan, India.
[**] Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India.

Citizenship Behaviors' Directed Toward Individuals (OCBI)

OCBI refers to the behaviors' that immediately benefit specific individuals within an organisation and, thereby, contribute indirectly to organisational effectiveness (Lee & Allen, 2002; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Podsakoff et al. (2000) labeled this dimension as helping behaviour and defined it as voluntarily helping others with work-related problems.

Review of Literature

The concept of organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) has been studied since 1970.Dennis Organ, who is considered as the father of OCB actually expanded upon Katz's (1964) original work. Organ (1988) defines OCB as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization". This dimension also encompasses positive involvement in the concerns of the organization (Organ et al., 2006). Examples of civic virtue can be seen in daily affairs like attending meetings; staying updated with organizational announcements and defending the organization's policies and practices when they are challenged by an outside source. By reducing the amount of complaints from employees that administrators have to deal with, sportsmanship conserves time and energy. Many measures have been used to assess these OCB dimensions from time to time, the scale developed by (Podsakoff,et al. 1990) is one of the most cited scales in the researches done in western context and it has been found to have satisfactory psychometric properties as demonstrated in past studies (MacKenzie et al., 1999; MacKenzie et al., 1998; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; MacKenzie et al., 1993). Considering that in the Indian context there is dearth of studies which have established the reliability and validity of this measure, the present study aimed at investigating the same on a sample group of professionals of human service organizations functioning in Srinagar, J&K.

In the **Malaysian context, Ahmad (2006)** has stated that four job attitudes, namely, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, procedural justice and distributive justice have a positive and direct impact on academicians' citizenship behaviors. Furthermore, a study among nurses in a health care institution (Othman, 2002) found that job satisfaction, organizational commitment and ethical climate were correlated to OCB.

Mardani and Heidari (2008), in a study entitled "Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior" concluded that organizational justice and its components are positive and significant relation with organizational citizenship behavior of and its components.

Ahmadi (2009), in their research, as" identify the factors affecting the development of organizational citizenship behavior pattern for the National Iranian Oil Company "states that structural factors, leadership, personality, values and culture are among the factors that influence the development of organizational citizenship behavior.

Determinants of OCB

Those are attitudinal variables (e.g., organizational commitment, perceptions of justice, satisfaction), individual characteristics (e.g., conscientiousness, positive affectivity, agreeableness) and elements within work environment (e.g., leadership, organizational supportiveness and task characteristics). In this study HR practices, employee engagement, and job embeddedness have been taken as determinants of OCB on which sufficient research is needed to be done.

OCB & HR Practices

HR practices are the means through which employee perceptions, attitudes and behaviors are shaped (Wright, McMahan & Mac Williams, 1994). Now employees are considered as a source of competitive advantage on which organizations should give more focus in order to compete in the market with others. Organizations superior performance will depend on the degree that these important and inimitable employees not only adequately perform their required job but exert efforts that are beyond necessities (Lee & Kim, 2010). High performance HR practices will communicate employees about the humanistic values. It will convey that the organization cares about their happiness and is ready to trust them. Therefore organizations by adopting high performance HR practices will be able to achieve competitive advantage through discretionary behaviors those are not included in the job description but lead to organizational effectiveness if performed by the employees. High-performance HR practices are positively related to service-oriented OCBs. Morrison (1996) mentioned that because HR practices set the tone and conditions of employee employer relationship, an organization can foster OCBs through human resource management. HR practices will have positive relationship with OCB.

Job Embeddedness & OCB

Job embeddedness is comparatively a new construct developed. It refers to a broad constellation of forces, from job as well as community context that might influence employee attachment to the organization (Wijayanto & Kismono, 2004). It represents three facets that can be associated with an individual's organization and community. Those are social links, fit and sacrifice. Social links includes the formal or informal connections between a person and institutions and other people. It connects an employee and his family with friends, community and physical environment in which he or she lives. Fit represents an employee's perceived compatibility with the organization and with the environment. Sacrifice involves the perceived cost of material or psychological benefits that the individual has to sacrifice if he leaves the organization or community. Individuals having more embeddedness will tend to perform more OCB like behaviors which are beneficial for the organization (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, & Erez, 2001). When an individual is job embedded or socially enmeshed in an organization, he feels a part of that social network and performs citizenship behaviors (Lee, Mitchell, Sablynski, Burton, &Holtom, 2004). Employee Engagement

Employee Engagement & OCB

Employee engagement refers to the positive psychological conditions that lead employees to invest themselves actively in their role and organization. Schaufeli (2002) defined engagement as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption. Engaged employees have greater attachment to their organization and they will be involved in the behavior that will increase efficiency of their organization. There is a positive relationship between employee engagement and OCB. Engaged employees appears to show more discretionary behaviors to improve the organization as well as fulfill their role more effectively (Bakker, Demerouti & Verbeke, 2004). Highly engaged employees are not only expected to deliver superior performance but also to involve in behavior that goes beyond job requirements.

Antecedents and Correlates of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Some studies have shown that personality traits, such as agreeableness, are related to these behaviors (see Borman, Penner, Allen, & Motowidlo, 2001&Konovsky& Organ, 1996& Organ & Ryan, 1995). Second, research has shown how characteristics of the tasks, such as autonomy, might correspond to organizational citizenship behavior (e.g., Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006&Podsakoff, Mac Kenzie, & Bommer, 1996). Third, the behavior of leaders and managers also affects the prevalence of these acts (Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999&Podsakoff, Mac Kenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). Fourth, employee attitudes towards the job and organization (Bateman & Organ, 1983&Konovsky& Pugh, 1994& Organ & Ryan, 1995), as well as perceived justice and fairness (Moorman, 1991&Niehoff& Moorman, 1993) also affect the incidence of organizational citizenship behavior. Perhaps the most comprehensive summary of these findings have emerged from meta-analyses. That is, several authors have undertaken meta-analysis to explore the antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior (see, for example, Dalal, 2005& Hackett, Farh, Song, & Lapierre, 2003&Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007& Judge, Thoreson, Bono, & Patton, 2001 & LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002& Organ & Ryan, 1995).

Unsurprisingly, when employees perceive the procedures of their organization as fair and just, they are more inclined to engage in organizational citizenship behavior. Interestingly, if leaders empower employees to develop their skills and expertise, this relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior is especially pronounced. In contrast, if leaders empower employees to reach decisions independently, this relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior diminishes (van Dijke, De Cremer, Mayer, & Van Quaquebeke, 2012). To clarify, according to both the group value model (Lind & Tyler, 1988) and the relational model of authority (Tyler & Lind, 1992), people are very attuned to signals or information that indicates whether or not they are valued in the organization (see also Tyler & Smith, 1999). If employees are inspired to develop their capabilities, they become more attuned to information about their performance. Consequently, they might be more receptive to signals about their status as well. Procedural injustice may be especially likely to curb organizational citizenship behavior in these individuals.

Consequences of OCB

- **Employee Retention:** Employee retention has the attention of top-level managers in today's organizations because the personal and organizational costs of leaving a job are very high (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, &Erez, 2001). It is a business management term which refers to the efforts made by employers to retain employees in their workforce. Little number of studies

(Meyer, Ristow, & Lie, 2007; Podsakoff& Mackenzie, 1997) revealed that OCB dimensions like altruism and sportsmanship improve organizational capacity to attract and retain best employees. Retention has a direct and casual relationship with employee's needs and motivation. Employees with altruism behavior help each other in the organization which leads to healthy interpersonal relationship among employees. This results in a healthy work environment and positive work climate. Employees with this type of working environment rarely wish to leave the organization. Sportsmanship and courtesy also creates a positive working environment where employees rarely complain about the inconveniencies faced by them and reduce work related conflicts of other employees. All these extra role behaviours of employees make the workplace the best place to work for and help in employee retention.

- **Job Satisfaction:** Job satisfaction measures how happy employees are with their job and working environment. In this direction a couple of findings (Chughtai& Zafar, 2006; Khalid & Ali, 2005) found that dimensions of OCB like altruism and conscientiousness may improve satisfaction of employees working in the organization. When experienced employees exhibit altruism in their behavior to help the less experienced employees about efficient ways of performing the job, it will enhance the performance of less experienced employees where as employees with conscientious behavior require less supervision and allow the manager to delegate more responsibility to them (Meyer et al., 1997; Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1997). Due to altruism and courtesy positive interpersonal relationship will be developed among employees and they will remain satisfied in the organization.

- **Absenteeism:** Absenteeism refers to the habitual non-presence in the job. Van Scooter and colleagues (1994,1996) stated OCB shows an employee's eagerness to be actively involved in the organization and to interact with other members. But absenteeism which refers withdrawing from work tasks of the organization and withdrawing from the social environment (Viswesvaran, 2002). Both the characteristics of behavior indicate to have negative relation between the two constructs. Employees having high propensity in OCB dimensions like conscientiousness and civic virtue are quite interested for the development and existence of the organization and avoid unnecessary absence which might be harmful for the organization. Therefore, a negative relationship between OCB and absenteeism is expected.

- **Work-family Conflict:** Work–family conflict can be defined as a form of inter role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect (Bolino & Turnley, 2005). It is a kind of role conflict in which work-role demands interferes with family-role demands (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). (Bragger, Srednicki, Kutcher, Indovino, & Rosner 2005. When an individual helps others in the organization or stays for long hours he generally gives less time to his family which leads to work family conflict. Bolino and Turnley (2005) found out that OCB sometimes leads to negative consequences like work family conflict. Pezij (2010) also found positive relation between OCB and work-family conflict and the relationship was moderated by cooperative norms. Hence OCB is likely to be positively correlated with work family conflict.

- **Role Overload:** Role overload is defined as the degree to which role expectations exceed the amount of time and resources offered for their accomplishment (Bolino&Turnley, 2005). It refers to a situation in which employees experience that there are too many responsibilities or activities expected of them within the time available for them, their ability and in relation to other constraints (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970). When an employee do certain things which are beyond his job roles, he has to give extra time for his work neglecting his family, staying late in office or working in off days etc. Therefore the individual faces the problem of role overload.

- **Organizational Politics:** Some organizations are perceived as especially political. That is, employees feel they need to outperform, and even undermine, their colleagues to be promoted and valued. The perception of organizational politics reinforces the belief that rewards and recognition may be unfair, dependent on arbitrary considerations rather than contributions at work. Individuals, therefore, do not feel they can readily shape their environment, diminishing their sense of control and evoking negative emotions. These changes undermine job satisfaction. When people are dissatisfied with their job, they are not as willing to sacrifice their personal interests to help the organization, diminishing organizational citizenship behavior.

- **Remuneration:** Another determinants of discretionary behaviors might be levels of pay. That is, many organizations offer pay that exceeds the levels of remuneration that are expected in the

market. Three motivations underpin this competitive pay (see Akerlof & Yellen, 1986& Gerhart & Milkovich, 1990). First, many managers assume that employees will devote more effort into their work-striving to ensure their job is secure-if paid handsomely as well as refrain from leaving prematurely (e.g., Salop, 1979& Shapiro & Stiglitz, 1984). Second, managers often assume that competitive wages will attract the most effective or proficient employees (Akerlof & Yellen, 1986). These managers assume that proficient employees are able to choose which organization to which they will apply-and thus choose only companies that offer the best conditions. Third, managers assume that competitive pay might encourage discretionary effort (Akerlof, 1982)-optional activities that enhance the organization.

- **Employee withdrawal:** Organizational citizenship behavior tends to be negatively related both to intentions to leave the organization and to actual departures (e.g., Chen, 2005&Mossholder, Settoon, & Henagan, 2005). Conceivably, the abstention from organizational citizenship behavior might reflect a form of withdrawal, which tends to predict turnover (Chen, 2005& Chen, Hui, & Sego, 1998) and may be related to absenteeism as well.

- **Corporate Citizenship:** As Evans, Davis, and Frink (2011) demonstrated, when individuals feel their organization is an exemplary corporate citizen--sensitive to social, legal, ethical, and environmental issues--they are more likely to engage in organizational citizenship behavior. For example, in one study, participants answered a series of questions that assess whether their organization is responsible. In particular, they indicated the degree to which their organization is ethically responsible (e.g., "Fairness toward coworkers and business partners is an integral part of the employee evaluation process"), legally responsible (e.g., "The managers of the organization try to comply with the law"), economically responsible (e.g., "We have been successful at maximizing our profits"), and sensitive to the rights of employees (e.g. "Flexible company policies enable employees to better coordinate work and personal life").

- **Motives:** Many motives may underpin organizational citizenship behaviors. Presumably, when colleagues are very supportive, almost everyone feels compelled to be helpful in return. When colleagues are unsupportive, and therefore the setting does not compel individuals to engage in specific behaviors, the actions of individuals are more likely to be governed by their traits (cf., Tett& Burnett, 2003). Only people who like to help or impress other individuals will engage in organizational citizenship behaviors. Furthermore, if the organization was not generally perceived as supportive, individuals seldom voiced suggestions, regardless of whether they experienced organizational concern. In contrast, if the organization was generally perceived as supportive, individuals often voiced suggestions, but only if they also experienced elevated levels of organizational concern. Arguably, individuals will voice their suggestions--a behaviour that is riskier than helping--only when they both feel the organization is supportive and feel concerned about this organization.

Consequences of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

In most instances, citizenship behavior is positively related to the wellbeing of individuals and the functioning of organizations. Nevertheless, some exceptions have been unearthed in specific settings. For example, organizational citizenship behavior can be associated with role overload and conflicts between work and family (Bolino & Turnley, 2005). Furthermore, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994), in a study of insurance agencies, showed that helping behaviors of agents were inversely related to the performance of that agency.

Performance Evaluations and Reward Allocations

Research does indeed indicate that individuals who often engage in organizational citizenship behavior do indeed receive more positive performance evaluations (e.g., Allen & Rush, 1998& Werner, 1994). In addition, these individuals are more inclined to receive additional rewards as a consequence of these associations (Allen & Rush, 1998& Johnson, Erez, Kiker, & Motowidlo, 2002). Several mechanisms could relate organizational citizenship behavior to improved evaluations from managers (Allen & Rush, 1998& Lefkowitz, 2000 & Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Hui, 1993& Shore, Barksdale, & Shore, 1995). First, organizational citizenship behavior, because they are seldom mandatory or prescribed but discretionary and optional, imply the individual must be motivated. This perceived motivation of these individuals could translate to more positive performance appraisals (Shore, Barksdale, & Shore, 1995). Second, organizational citizenship behavior will often facilitate the job of managers, and managers might reciprocate by appraising individuals who engage in these acts more positively. Third, when employees engage in

organizational citizenship behavior, they are more inclined to be liked by other individuals, including managers, which often translates to more positive evaluations (Lefkowitz, 2000). The relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and management evaluations is more pronounced when both these acts and assessments are rated by the same individual, such as a supervisor (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1993). Several biases could amplify this relationship when the same person assesses both the incidence of organizational citizenship behavior and the performance of individuals, such as the need to be consistent or lenient (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003):

- **Workplace Effectiveness:** In general, organizational citizenship behavior is indeed related to measures of workplace effectiveness (Dunlop & Lee, 2004 & Koys, 2001 & Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994 & Walz & Niehoff, 2000). That is, these behaviors coincide with reductions in costs but improvements in efficiency, profitability, and production quantity. Several mechanisms might underpin the associations between organizational citizenship behavior and workplace effectiveness (see Borman & Motowidlo, 1993& Organ, 1988&Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997). First, when experienced employees exhibit organizational citizenship behavior, they might impart their knowledge and skills to novice employees-whose productivity might thus improve exponentially. Second, some facets of exhibit organizational citizenship behavior, particularly civic virtue and voice behavior, might facilitate the identification of insightful and innovative solutions to improve the organization. Third, organizational citizenship behaviors might promote positive emotions and feelings, including morale and cohesion.

- **Customer Satisfaction:** Yen and Niehoff (2004) delineated several mechanisms that could underpin this association between organizational citizenship behaviors and customer satisfaction. Altruism, for example, might facilitate cooperation amongst employees and thus more effective coordination, ultimately improving the service to customers. Conscientiousness and courtesy ensures that employees are cognizant of recent developments, which can also facilitate customer satisfaction. Finally, civic virtue or voice behavior uncovers ideas and insights that could improve the interface between employees and customers as well as optimize products and services.

- **Turnover in the Unit:** In units, workgroups, departments, or organizations characterized by elevated levels of organizational citizenship behaviors, turnover of employees tends to diminish (Richardson & Vandenberg, 2005 & Sun, Aryee, & Law, 2007). Presumably, organizational citizenship behaviors correspond to cooperation among employees. Indeed, such behaviors are positively related to team cohesion (George & Bettenhausen, 1990& Kidwell, Mossholder, & Bennett, 1997), and these measures of cohesion are inversely related to turnover.

Alternative Frameworks and Related Concepts

One of the most recent accounts to characterize discretionary behaviors of work was developed by Confirmatory factor analysis confirmed these nine factors, which taken together comprise 27 items. Consistent with this model, Griffin, Neal, and Parker (2007), showed that factors measured at the individual level, such as role clarity, predicted individual level performance. Team support predicted team level performance. Finally, organizational characteristics, such as organizational commitment, predicted organizational performance:

- **Discretionary Effort:** Lloyd (2008) differentiated the concept of discretionary effort from organizational citizenship behavior. According to Lloyd (2008), discretionary effort refers to the extent to which individuals devote intense and persistent exertion into their work. This definition evolved from an article, constructed by Yankelovich and Immerwahr (1984), in which the concept was defined as voluntary effort, exceeding the requirements of a job. Lloyd (2008) undertook a study that verified her proposition that discretionary effort is distinct from organizational citizenship behavior. She developed a measure of discretionary effort, which comprised seven items such as "When I work, I really exert myself to the fullest, beyond that what is expected" and "I persist in overcoming obstacles to complete an important task". The level of alpha reliability was .86 and .87 in two distinct samples.

- **Job Crafting:** Job crafting represents the extent to which employees change features of their job, at least partly to satisfy their personal needs or preferences (for a seminal article, see Wrzensniewski & Dutton, 2001). These changes are not always intended to enhance the organization and, thus, may diverge from citizenship behaviors. To illustrate, Lyons (2008) examined the characteristics and correlates of job crafting. Sales representatives were interviewed. First, these participants were asked to describe a time, within the last year, in which

they adjusted or modified one of their work activities. Only changes that were not encouraged by managers or training programs were sought. These individuals were also asked to specify the effort that was dedicated to this task, the time that was needed to adjust the activity, and the significance of this modification. Independent judges then rated the extent to which the change demanded considerable time or effort and was perceived as important and interesting. Furthermore, participants completed a series of scales to assess their cognitive ability, self esteem, perceived control over their work, and willingness to change.

Limitations

There are three main issues to be cautious of when promoting OCB in your workplace:

- **Discrimination:** Be especially wary of implicit gendered expectations – research has shown that men are rewarded for OCB more than women (Heilman & Chen, 2005), as women are expected to engage in certain types of citizenship behaviors' (such as being altruistic and courteous) more than men.

- **Organisational Justice:** In addition to the gender bias, if some supervisors reward OCB more than others, perceived unfairness may increase among certain clusters of employees. This will not only lead to a decrease in OCB among those not rewarded for it but may have other side effects related to perceived injustice, such as an increase in counterproductive behaviour (e.g. theft, absenteeism) (Marcus & Schuler, 2004).

- **Habituation:** If OCB is rewarded regularly, you may find that OCB levels will rise across the organisation over time. What was once considered OCB (e.g. working overtime) may become an internalized organisational norm, & is no longer spontaneous and voluntary but expected of workers. Research into this phenomenon, termed citizenship pressure, is relatively recent, and though contested, it may impact negatively on employee stress levels (Bolino, Turnley, & Suazo, 2010).

Conclusion

One of the crucial elements of OCB is the fact that although it is often recognized and rewarded by managerial staff, employees do not necessarily make the connection between performing OCB and reward gain (especially OCB-I or altruism and courtesy-related behaviors'), and do not expect rewards (Organ, 1997). Given that OCB has such a significant impact on the productivity and efficiency of the organisation, and workers do not expect to be reimbursed for their efforts, OCB should be considered an efficient way of improving organisational profitability and reducing costs through, for example, lowering rates of absenteeism and turnover. At the same time it increases employee performance and wellbeing, as cooperative workers are more productive, and OCB enhances the social environment in the workplace. Costs will be involved if managers actively seek out and reward workers for engaging in OCB, but these will have long-term benefits for the organisation (consult pages 4-5 for a detailed list of these benefits). There may also be potential costs if supervisors require training, or a meeting that takes a few hours out of their schedule, to enhance their awareness of OCB. Evaluating OCB also involves costs in administering and analyzing the results of an office- or department-wide survey. Evaluations should take place before and after interventions have been introduced, to assess whether there has been a positive impact on the levels of OCB in the workplace.

Suggestions

"The extent to which employees exhibit OCB is a function of ability, motivation and opportunity." (Organ et al., 2006, p. 93). The employees can be helped to develop organizational citizenship behaviour through motivating employees for example, or promoting better relationships between supervisors and staff, and among staff in general. The following are some other tips to encourage OCB in your workplace.

- **Office Social Environment:** A working environment that promotes or is conducive to employees demonstrating OCB. Certain types of group norms (e.g. everyone should only do the minimum amount of work required, everyone should mind his/her own business, no one should talk to the supervisor) can stifle worker initiative and spontaneity, and this will decrease incidents of OCB. Group norms may be difficult to break but other things can be done to make workers more social – such as encouraging staff to attend office functions or having more office functions, or office-wide birthday lunches.

- **Supervisor Awareness:** Training or educating management about OCB will make them more aware of employee displays of OCB. They may choose to include OCB in their performance appraisals, or devise their own casual/informal reward system to encourage OCB.

- **Hiring Practices:** Though the impact of personality on OCB is small, an outgoing, attentive, enthusiastic employee with a positive outlook and 'can do' attitude will be more inclined to engage in OCB. If psychometric testing is a part of your interview/hiring process, consider looking out for traits related to OCB, and have these staff motivate others to perform OCB.

References

- Ajay K. Jain , Cary L. Cooper(2012): Stress and organizational citizenship behaviors in Indian business process outsourcing organizations,IIMB Review 24,pp155-163.
- Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., Gilstrap, J. B., &Suazo, M. M. (2010). Citizenship under pressure: What's a "good soldier" to do? Journal of OrganisationalBehaviour, 31, 835-855. doi: 10.1002/job.635
- Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T. D., &Motowidlo, S. J. (2001). Personality predictors of citizenship performance. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9(1/2), 52-69.
- Chang, Chi-Cheng, Tsai, Meng-Chen, Tsai, Meng-Shan(2011): The Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Organizational Commitments of Organizational Members Influences the Effects of Organizational Learning, International journal of trade,Economics and trade vol2,no1.
- Cheng Ling Tai, Che-Ming Chang Jhao-Yu Hong, Li-Chun Chen(2012):: Alternative models for the relationship among leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, and performance study of new product development teams in Taiwan, Elseiver.
- Dishankamdar,DainelJ.McAllister(2006): "All in a day work" How follower individual differences and justice perceptions predict organizational citizenship behavior role definitions and behavior,Journal of applied psychology Vol91,No 4,pp841-855.
- Dr. Jai Prakash Sharma(2011): Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Public and Private Sector and Its Impact on Job
- Ebru Oguz(2010): The relationship between the leadership styles of the school administrators and the organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers,Elseiver,1188-1193.
- Elena Belogolovsky, AnitSomech (2010): Teachers' organizational citizenship behavior: Examining the boundary between inrole behavior and extra-role behavior from the perspective of teachers, principals and parents, Elsevier 26 (2010) 914-923
- Geroge A.Neuman ,Jill R.Kickul(1998): the effects of personality variables as antecedents in predicting Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) ,Journal of Business and psychology,vol1.
- Guven Ozdem(2012):The relationship between the organizational behavior and organizational and professional commitments of secondary school teachers,Journal of Global Strategic Management.
- Habib Ebrahimpour, Adel Zahed, Ali Khaleghkhah Mohammad BagerSepehri(2011): A survey relation between organizational culture and organizational citizenship behavior,1920-1925.
- Hardeep Chahal and Shivani Mehta (Oct 2010-March 2011): Antecedents and consequences of organizational citizenship behavior :a conceptual framework in reference to Health Care sector,
- Heilman, M. E., & Chen, J. J. (2005). Same behaviour, different consequences: Reactions to men's and women's altruistic citizenship behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 90(3), 431-441. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.431
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. Personnel Psychology, 48, 775-802.
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., &MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences. USA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Van Scotter, J. R., Motowidlo, S. J., & Cross, T. C. (2000). Effects of task performance and contextual performance on systemic rewards. Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(4), 526-535. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.85
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organisational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. Journal of Management, 17, 601-617.

❏❏❏