

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR: A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

Surya. S

M.Phil Student, School of Management Studies, DePaul Institute of Science and Technology (DIST), Angamaly, Ernakulum, Kerala.

Prof.Unny C.J

Director, School of Management Studies, DIST, Angamaly, Ernakulum, Kerala.

ABSTRACT

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 organization. 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. Organ (1988) defines Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) as individual behaviour 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. Organizational citizenship behaviour is an effective tool for accomplishing the organizational goals rather than fulfilling duties. Organizational citizenship behaviour has been linked to overall organizational effectiveness, thus these types of employee behaviours have important consequences in the workplace. Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) has garnered much academic attention since its conception. It is perceived to be something intangible; OCB is not always formally recognised or rewarded, and concepts like 'helpfulness' or 'friendliness' are also difficult to quantify. Yet OCB has been shown to have a considerable positive impact at the organisational level. This Paper reviews the overview of trends in research on OCB, Definitions, Similar Concepts, Origin of OCB, various dimensions and antecedents of OCB.

Keywords: *Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Concepts, Dimensions and Antecedents.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Organizations to be successful should have employee's who go beyond their formal job responsibilities and freely give off their time and energy to succeed at the task. Such behaviour is neither prescribed nor rewarded, yet, it contributes to the smooth functioning of the organization. Organ as cited in Thanswor, Van, Ulrich, Narottam and Ann (2000) termed these extra efforts as Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) defined them to include activities that target other individuals in the workplace (such as helping co-workers or communicating changes that affect others) and the organization itself (such as actively participating in group meetings or representing the organization positively to outsiders).

Organizational citizenship behaviour is not specified by any contractor not even expected by an average employee, this behaviour is organizationally desirable because this behaviour assists resource transformation', adaptability and innovation in order to increase the organization efficiency (Turnipseed and Murkison, 1996). An individual's behaviour influences the way one approaches and reacts to important life situations. People's abilities to adjust to unattainable goals are associated with good quality of life. Though individuals' performance in job is related to their abilities, their success in job is determined by their personality and extra-role behaviour. In order to have a cutting edge , organizations should have employees who are ready to help their peers with work, work beyond duties mentioned in job descriptions, orient new employees, do not waste their time at work, speak positively about the organization to the outsiders, comply with organizational rules and regulations even though, nobody is watching them. These employees will be engaged in organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) and will be ready to stand through the thick and thin of the organizations (Dash, 2013).

2. ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

2.1 DEFINITION, CONCEPTS AND ORIGIN OF THE CONSTRUCT

Dennis Organ is generally considered the father of OCB. Organ expanded upon Katz's (1964) original work. Organ (1988) defines OCB as "individual behaviour 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" (p-160). The pioneering researchers of OCB emphasized that OCB should be viewed as extra-role and organizationally functional and separate from in-role job performance (Bateman and Organ, 1983, Smith, Organ and Near, 1983). This, according to Graham (1991) created the difficulty of determining what in-role is and what extra-role is. To remove this difficulty, Graham (1991), proposed a second approach based on research of civic citizenship in philosophy, political science, and social history arguing that organizational citizenship can be conceptualized as a global concept that includes all positive organizationally relevant behaviours of employees. This conceptualization of organizational citizenship, thus, encompasses the traditional in-role job performance behaviours, organizationally functional extra-role behaviours, and political behaviours, such as full and responsible organizational participation (Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). According to Turnipseed and Rassuli (2005), OCB elements which enhance performance include: elements which add social capital, helping or altruistic elements, elements resulting with time savings or problem solving, and other elements which provide socio-emotional support by boosting morale or developing a nurturing culture. Somech and Bogler (2002) have accredited that OCB is a personality trait, a social response to supervisors' and peers' behaviour, as well as a possible reaction of the individual to the behaviour of his or her superiors or to other motivation-based mechanisms in the workplace.

OCB has often been compared to contextual performance. Contextual is defined as non-task related work behaviours and activities that contribute to the social and psychological aspects of the organization (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993). OCB has also been compared to Prosocial organizational behaviour (POB). POB is defined as behaviour within an organization that is aimed at improving the welfare of another person (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986). Extra Role Behaviour (ERB), as cited in Organ, Podsakoff and Mackenzie (2006) is another construct similar to OCB. ERB is defined as behaviour that attempts to benefit the organization and that goes beyond existing role expectations.

2.2 DIMENSIONS OF OCB

Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, and Bacharach (2000) distinguished 30 different forms of organizational citizenship behaviour. Scholars have developed a variety of taxonomies to classify these citizenship behaviours (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Organ, 1988, 1990; Smith, Organ, and Near, 1983; Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch, 1994; Williams and Anderson, 1991). One of the most prevalent taxonomies was propounded by Organ (1988), who differentiated five facets or factors: altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, civic virtue, and sportsmanship. Subsequently, Organ (1990) also included two additional factors: peacekeeping and cheerleading. Sportsmanship describes employees who are willing to tolerate difficulties in the workplace that are intended to improve the organization, abstaining from unnecessary complaints and criticisms. Civic virtue refers the active involvement, interest, and participation in the life of their organization, such as functions, events, and meetings. Conscientiousness is referred to as compliance, reflects the genuine acceptance and adherence of workplace rules, regulations, and procedures. Altruism refers to helping behaviour of the employees in the organization. In this, employees help their co-workers and also they are able to orient the new ones with their job. Courtesy dimension of OCB includes discretionary behaviour of individuals that is aimed at preventing work related problem with others, Assessing and doing what is best for the employees will strengthen courtesy dimensions.

2.3 ANTECEDENTS AND CORRELATES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR.

Most of the research in this domain has focused on the antecedents or determinants of organizational citizenship behaviour. Some studies have shown that personality traits, such as agreeableness, are related to these behaviours (Borman, Penner, Allen and Motowidlo, 2001; Konovsky and Organ, 1996; Organ and Ryan, 1995). Research has also shown how characteristics of the tasks, such as autonomy, might correspond to organizational citizenship behaviour (e.g., Piccolo and Colquitt, 2006; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, and Bommer, 1996). The behaviour of leaders

and managers is another factor which affects the prevalence of these acts (Pillai, Schriesheim, and Williams, 1999). Employee attitudes towards the job and organization (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Konovsky and Pugh, 1994; Organ and Ryan, 1995), as well as perceived justice and fairness (Moorman, 1991) also affects the incidence of organizational citizenship behaviour.

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 behaviour (Dalal, 2005; Hackett, Farh, Song, and Lapierre, 2003; Ilies, Nahrgang and Morgeson, 2007; Judge, Thoreson, Bono, and Patton, 2001; LePine, Erez, and Johnson, 2002; Organ and Ryan, 1995).

CONCLUSION

Citizenship behaviours come in many distinct shapes and forms. Traditionally thought of as the worker who 'goes above and beyond' the minimum requirements, it can also be the employee who takes the initiative and always offers to lend a hand; the knowledgeable, helpful and cooperative towards others. All of these types of OCB should be actively encouraged employees support the organisation through enhancing each other's performance and wellbeing, and this is reflected in reduced costs and increased profitability at the organisational level.

REFERENCES

1. Bateman, T. S, D. W, Organ and Smith Near (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between Affect and Employee Citizenship. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587-595. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/255908?uid=2&uid=4&sid=21104108489331>.
2. Borman, W. C and S. J, Motowidlo (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt, W. C. Borman, and Associates (Eds), *Personnel Selection in Organizations*, 71–98. Retrieved from <http://www.deltatoptalent.com/hogan/white%20papers/Using-Theory.pdf>.
3. Brief, A. P and S. J, Motowidlo, (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviours. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(7), 10-725. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net/. Prosocial_ Organizational_ Behaviours. Organization.
4. Dalal, S (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1241-1255. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/2005-14549-015>.
5. Dash, S (2013), Determinants and consequences of organizational citizenship behaviour: A theoretical framework for Indian manufacturing organisations. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*.3 (1), 17-21, 2319-8028, retrieved from www.ijbmi.org volume 3 Issue 01.
6. Dyne, L. V, J. W, Graham, and R. M, Dienesch. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviour: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 765-802. Retrieved from <http://soonang.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/1998-AMJ-Van-Dyne.pdf>.
7. Graham, J (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behaviour. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4(4), 249-270. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/2F01385031#page-1>.
8. Hackett, R.D, J. L Farh, J. L, Song, and L.M, Lapierre, (2003). LMX and organizational citizenship behaviour: Examining links within and across Western and Chinese samples. In G. B. Graen (Ed.), *dealing with diversity*, 219-264. Greenwich, CT: Information Age. Retrieved from <http://www.psych-it.com.au/Psychlopedia/article.asp?id=272>
9. Ilies, R, J. D, Nahrgang, and F. P, Morgeson (2007). Leader-member exchange and citizenship behaviours: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 269-277. Retrieved from https://www.msu.edu/~morgeson/ilies_nahrgang_morgeson_2007.pdf.

10. Judge.T.A, C. J, Thoreson, J. E, Bono, and G. K, Patton, (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 376-407. Retrieved from www.timothy-judge.com/JS-JP%20published.pdf.
11. Katz, D (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behaviour. *Behavioural Science*, 9(1). Retrieved from <http://thejournalofbusiness.org/index.php/site/article/view/File/221/220>.
12. Konovsky, M.A and D.W, Organ. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 17, 253-266. Retrieved from <http://www.psych-it.com.au/Psychlopedia/article.asp?id=272>.
13. Konovsky, M.A, and S. D, Pugh, (1994). Citizenship behaviour and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 656-669. Retrieved from mjl.aom.org/content/37/3/656.short.
14. LePine, J.A, A, Erez, and D. E, Johnson, (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behaviour: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 52-65. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11916216>
15. Moorman, R.H (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviours: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855. Retrieved from <http://rkoopmann.com/academic-papers/poj-ocb.pdf>
16. Organ, D. W (1988). Organizational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington books.p-160. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/258426?uid=2&uid=4&sid=21104108502261>
17. Organ, D.W (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behaviour. In B. M. Staw and L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behaviour* (12), 43-72. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press. Retrieved from books.google.co.in/books?isbn=0070153191.
18. Organ, D.W and K, Ryan (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 775-802. Retrieved from books.google.co.in/books?ISBN=1400829143.
19. Organ, D. W, P.M, Podsakoff, and S. P, Mackenzie (2006). Organizational citizenship behaviour: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences. London: Sage publication. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/2603295/_Stimulating_Organizational_Citizenship_Behavior_OCB_Research_for_Theory_Development_Exploration_of_Leadership_Paradigms_.
20. Piccolo, R.F, and J. A, Colquitt (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviours: The mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 327-340. Retrieved from www.profjrayfigueiredo.com.br/LID_AC_06.Pdf.
21. Pillai, R, and E. S, Williams (1999). Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: A two-sample study. *Journal of Management*, 25, 897-933. Retrieved from books.google.co.in/books?ISBN=131797574X.
22. Podsakoff, P.M, S. B, MacKenzie and W. H, Bommer (1996). A 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, 380-399. Retrieved from warrington.ufl.edu/departments/mkt/docs/cv_PhilPodsakoff.pdf.
23. Podsakoff, P.M, S. B, Mackenzie, J, B Paine, and D, G Bachrach, (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviours: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26, 513-563. Retrieved from <http://www.uk.sagepub.com/chasten/Chasten%20Web%20readings%20chapters%201-12/Chapter%207%20-%202520Boerner%20et%20al.pdf>.
24. Somech, A and Bogler, R (2002). Antecedents and Consequences of teacher organization and professional commitment. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Sage publications, p-555. Retrieved from [http://www.edu.haifa.ac.il/personal/asomech/Publications.Files/somech_bogler\(2002\).pdf](http://www.edu.haifa.ac.il/personal/asomech/Publications.Files/somech_bogler(2002).pdf).
25. Thanswor, G, Rolf Van, D, Ulrich, W, Narottam, U and Ann, J. D (2000). The effect of organizational commitment and organizational identity strength to citizenship behaviour. Impact of fire department and



- details of employee performance. *Journal of Business and Management*, 10(3), 2278-4871, 30-36. Retrieved from <http://www.ijmbs.com/31/neeta.pdf>.
26. Turnipseed, D and G, Murkison (1996). Organization citizenship behaviour: An examination of the influence of the workplace. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 17, 42-47. Retrieved from <http://www.fareastjournals.com/files/FEJPBV4N2P2.Pdf>.
27. Turnipseed, D. L and A, Rassuli, (2005). Performance perceptions of organizational citizenship behaviours at work: A bi-level study among managers and employees. *British journal of management* (16), 231-244. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net/...Performance_Perceptions_of_Organizations.
28. Williams, L, J and S. E, Anderson (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviours. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601-617. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net/...Organizational_Citizenship_Behavior...Predictor.