

## **ANTECEDENTS & CONSEQUENCES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR – AN OVERVIEW**

**Dr Elizabeth George\***

---

### **Abstract**

Organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) is the behaviour that an employee voluntarily engages in, that promotes the effectiveness of the organization but is not explicitly rewarded by the organization. This paper follows the method of extensive literature survey to examine the dimensions of OCB construct and explore the antecedents and consequences of organizational citizenship behaviour. This also look into various tools used to measure OCB. This can enable the organizations to understand the role of OCB in increasing the organisational effectiveness keeping in mind the negative consequences and positive consequences of OCB and resulting in better performance of business organizations

**Keywords: Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) Antecedents Consequences Measures**

---

**\*Associate Professor, Department of Management Studies, Adi Shankara Institute of Engineering and Technology, Kalady, Kerala, India.**

## **1. Introduction**

In today's tumultuous and erratic business world, traditional HR Practices do not suffice to retain the employees and improve the performance. An innovative organizational environment is required to create a competitive edge in an organization and this emphasizes the importance of extra-role behaviour. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) is considered as an extra- role behaviour. Even though Organizational Citizenship Behaviour has proved to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the organisation, as it is a discretionary behaviour, it is not recognized by any formal reward system. According to Schnake (1991), Organizational Citizenship Behaviour are not affected by organizational influences for three reasons. OCB are not very obvious and so it is difficult to be rated or evaluated. Another reason is that some kind of OCB may keep away people from their own routine work and further since OCB is not obligatory as per the requirement of the job, organization cannot punish employees for not performing them.

## **2. Dimensions of OCB Construct**

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) has received a great attention from researchers on organisational behaviour in the last few decades. The concept of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) was introduced by Chester Barnard (1938) as 'the willingness of individuals in organizations to cooperate'. Later, several researchers gave different dimensional perspective of OCB construct. Some researchers developed on the existing construct. Organ (1988) identified five dimensions of OCB. They include Altruism, Civic Virtue, Conscientiousness Courtesy and Sportsmanship.

Altruism is the behaviour of employees that is intended to assist others in the work place settings, like peers, superiors, customers etc. without expecting anything back from them. Conscientiousness is the painstaking devotion to rules and regulations of the organization. Here the employee goes beyond the minimum required work behaviour like working on holidays, working extra hours etc. Civic Virtue is the pro-active behaviour which shows more involvement in management related matters of the organisation, attending important meeting held by management and upholding the status of the organisation. Courtesy is conveying information to

others before something unpleasant happens. Sportsmanship is any behaviour showing tolerance of less than ideal circumstances without any complaint.

Organ(1990) further expanded the model by adding peacekeeping and cheerleading. Peace keeping is to act as mediator at times of disagreement and Cheerleading is praising and encouraging others. Graham (1991) categorized OCB into three components. They are Organizational Obedience, Organizational Loyalty and Organizational Participation. Organizational obedience is the acceptance of the rational rules and regulations governing organizational structure, job descriptions, and personnel policies. Organizational loyalty is identification with and faithfulness to the organization's leaders and the organization as a whole. Organizational participation is showing interest in organizational affairs guided by ideal standards of virtue and responsible involvement in organizational governance. Williams and Anderson (1991) opined that OCB directed toward individual (OCBI) is distinct from OCB directed toward organization (OCBO). Altruism and courtesy are behaviours that fit to OCBI whereas, conscientiousness sportsmanship and civic virtue fit in to OCBO.

Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994) presented three dimensions for OCB: Obedience, loyalty and participation. Obedience involves respect for structures and processes of the organization; Loyalty means protecting community and putting in additional effort for the attainment of common good; Participation involves contributing to the process of community self-governance. Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996) offered two dimensions of contextual performance ie. Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication (based on the behavior of employees). Interpersonal facilitation is similar to Organ's (1988) altruism and Courtesy. Job dedication is similar to Organ's (1988) sportsmanship, civic virtue, and consciousness dimensions. After an extensive survey of literature on OCB Podsakoff et al (2000) put forward seven common dimensions of citizenship behaviours. They were, helping behavior, Sportsmanship, Organizational loyalty, Organizational compliance, Individual initiative, Civic virtue and Self- development.

### **3. Antecedents**

Podsakoff et al. (2000) reviewed 200 published studies and provided an insight into the antecedents and consequences of OCB. They researched four broad categories to find out the antecedents of OCB. Individual characteristics, task characteristics, organizational characteristics and leadership behavior. Their study revealed that individual characteristics satisfaction, organizational commitment, and trust in leader have positive correlations with OCB whereas role ambiguity and role conflict generally have negative effects. Among task characteristics, task feedback, intrinsically satisfying task, and task routinization is positively related to OCB. In the organizational characteristics category, cohesive group affected OCB positively but there is a negative relation between OCB and reward outside the leader's control. And among leadership behaviors; transformational leadership, contingent reward behavior, leader role clarification and supportive leader behaviors positively affects OCB, while, non-contingent punishment behavior negatively affects OCB. Here some of the key antecedent like psychological factors, personal factors, leadership, attitude HRD climate etc. are discussed.

#### **3.1 Psychological Factors**

Fok, Hartmandy, Patti, and Razek (2000), found that organizational citizenship behavior displayed by employees varied from person to person and that those who were more compassionate were also more likely to engage in OCB. Turnipseed, (2002) also purported that individual values, or ethics play a prominent role in determining the extent to which an employee will engage in OCB.

#### **3.2 Personality Factors**

In a meta-analysis by Organ & Ryan, 1995 on OCB and personality factors they examined the relationship between OCB and four personality factors: conscientiousness, agreeableness, positive affectivity and negative affectivity. Other studies like Hogan et al. (1998), Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1994) etc. also found that conscientiousness dimension of Big Five Personality Model is a strong predictor of extra role performances of employees.

### **3.3 Attitude**

Job satisfaction and organizational commitment are positive attitudes in work place. Studies suggest that job satisfaction predict OCB. Organ & Konovsky (1989) suggest that job satisfaction is the strongest measure that correlates to OCB. According to Blau (1964), those employees who are motivated from intrinsic and extrinsic satisfiers, reciprocate and even go beyond what their jobs demand. Even negative attitude at times become an antecedent to OCB. Bolino et al., (2004) posited that when employees dislike their routine job they may focus on other tasks and special assignments to avoid their normal in role duties. Qamar (2012) conducted a study among ninety six bank employees in Lahore to identify the relationship of job satisfaction and organizational commitment with organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB). The study revealed that job satisfaction had positive moderate relation with OCB whereas organizational commitment has significant strong relation with OCB

### **3.4 Leadership**

Leadership has a major role in encouraging citizenship behaviour of employees. Leaders empower the employees and kindle the citizenship behaviour in them. Transformational leaders who establish vision, provide as an appropriate role model, provide individualized support and set high performance goals, play a major role in promoting Organizational citizenship behaviours from employees (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter, 1990). In the light of path goal theory and Leader Member Exchange (LMX) theory many researchers purported that supportive leader behaviour influence OCB (Schnake et al., 1993; Podsakoff et al., 1990) when the employees feel that the leader will be there for support and help they will be obliged to take up more responsibility.

### **3.5 Job Embeddedness**

Job embeddedness 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). Studies have revealed that the employees with high job embeddedness shows more OCB like behaviour. Wijayanto and Kismono (2004) observed the relationship between job embeddedness and Organizational citizenship behaviour in five private hospitals in Jogjakarta and found positive correlation between job embeddedness and OCB. In another study, role of job

embeddedness on organizational citizenship, Job performance, Volitional absences and voluntary turnover were examined. Job embeddedness was divided into two sub dimensions, on-the-job and off-the-job embeddedness and it was found that out of two, on-the-job embeddedness was significantly predicted organizational citizenship (Lee et al,(2004)

### **3.6 Employee Engagement**

Engaged employees tend to show more discretionary behaviour in organization.. In a study on antecedents and consequences of employee engagement Sak (2006) identified a positive relation between employee engagement and OCB. In another study among employees in four Thai organizations in Thailand, Bartlett &Rurkkhum (2012) observed the relationship between employee engagement and organizational citizenship behaviour and found that there is a positive relationship between employee engagement and all components of OCB.

### **3.7 HRD Climate**

A study on HRD Climate and Citizenship behaviour among employees in commercial banks in South Western Nigeria showed a positive relationship between HRDC and OCB (Akinyemi, 2012)

## **4. Consequences**

Studies on the consequences of OCB are comparatively less. Some of the studies prove that OCB can have both positive and negative impact on organization and employees themselves. OCB can have a strong positive impact on absenteeism, turnover and stress. At the same time there can be negative consequences also like role overload, stress and work life conflict

### **4,1Reduced Absenteeism and Turnover intentions**

Various studies emphasised that high level of OCB leads to reduced absenteeism (Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Meyer, 1997) and reduced Turnover intentions. Uludağ, Khan and Güden (2011) investigated the effects of organizational citizenship behaviour on turnover intention of Frontline employees working in five-star hotels in North Cyprus. The result of the study revealed that organizational citizenship behaviour was negatively associated with turnover intentions. Further some studies like Meyer, Ristow, & Lie (2007); Podsakoff&Mackenzie(1997)stated that OCB

dimensions like altruism and sportsmanship enable the organization to attract and retain the best employees.

#### **4.2 Performance**

Different researchers suggest different reason for improved performance due to OCB. Podsakoff et al., (1997) opined that OCBs may boost organizational performance as the employee with high citizenship behaviour promotes group cohesiveness and coordinate the activities of the groups whereas Allen and Rush (1998) claimed that high level of OCB among employees enhance organizational performance as these employees enable to make available various resources which can be used more productively.

#### **4.3 Role Overload**

Organ and Ryan (1995) suggested that employees with high level of OCB may result in role overload. According to a study conducted by Peziz (2010) it was found that employees who show OCB get overloaded with work as they take up too much of work and may spent too much time in the organization. Eatough and colleagues (2011) in a meta-analysis of 42 existing studies indicated that they found a positive direct relationship between role overload and OCB.

#### **4.4 Work-life Conflict**

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) defined work-family conflicts as a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible, such that participation in one role makes it difficult to participate in the other. So when an employee spend more time on his/her job and completely immerse himself/herself in work, naturally he/she will have only less time to spend with the family. Peziz (2010) found positive relation between OCB and work-life conflict which means that employees showing OCB will face the consequences of work-life conflict.

#### **4.5 Stress**

Organ and Ryan (1995), in their meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour claimed that an employee with high OCB could contribute to high stress level. But Jain & Cooper (2012), investigated the effect of

organisational stress on organisational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) in a sample of 402 operators working in a business process outsourcing (BPO) in northern India and the results of multiple regression analysis showed that stress had significant negative impact on OCBs.

## **5. Measuring OCB**

Podsakoff et al. (1990) developed a scale to measure OCB on a five point scale. The measure of OCB involves 24 items under five dimensions, namely conscientiousness (five items), sportsmanship (five items), civic virtue (four items), courtesy (five items), and altruism (five items). The total score Of OCB can be calculated by taking the average of these dimensions. The psychometric properties of this scale were investigated by Podsakoff et al. (1990). They reported an internal consistency for each dimension which ranged from 0.70 for civic virtue to 0.85 for altruism.

A 24-item questionnaire was developed by Moorman (1993) to measure OCB, using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Examples of items include “I help others who have heavy workloads” and “I attend functions that are not required, but help the organizational image” etc. The internal reliability for altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue was 0.81, 0.87, 0.87, 0.83, and 0.77 respectively. Here OCB is obtained by averaging the scores of the five OCB dimensions.

Van Dyne et al. (1994) developed a 34 items scale based on three factors obedience, loyalty and participation on a five point scale. Obedience denotes behaviour that focus on dutiful performance of the job. For eg. “Always on time at work, regardless of circumstances”; loyalty denotes allegiance to the organization and promotion of its interests. For eg. “Volunteering for special assignments” and participation, extra participatory contributions to the organization. For eg. “Performing additional work activities”. They have demonstrated that these scales have good internal consistency and test retest reliability but this has some problem with construct validity as these three factors were not anticipated in author’s original conceptualization

## 6. Conclusions

The present study through light to various possibilities where further research can be done. This covers various dimensions of OCB construct. There are several studies on antecedents of OCB, but the studies on consequences are comparatively rare. Further there are no much studies on the negative consequences of OCB. OCB was always looked from a positive view point. Here both antecedents, consequences(positive and negative) of OCB are discussed So when managers encourage OCB to retain the employees and increase productivity they should also keep in mind the negative consequences and take measures accordingly.

## Reference.

1. Akinyemi Benjamin, “Influence of Affective commitment on Organizational Citizenship Behavior and intention to quit among commercial bank employees in a Nigeria”,*Journal of management and sustainability* Vol 2 No. 2.2012.
2. Allen, T. D., & Rush, M. C., “The effects of citizenship behaviour on performance judgments: A field study and a laboratory experiment.” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol83, pp247–260, 1998.
3. Bartlett, R.K., & Rurkkhum, S. ,“The relationship between employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior in Thailand”,*Human Resource Development International*, 15 (2), 157-174,2012.
4. Blau, P. 1964. Exchange and power in social life. New York: Wiley.
5. Chughtai, A., & Zafar, S.,“Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Commitment among Pakistani university teachers”, *Applied HRM Research*, Vol.11, pp.39-64, 2006.
6. Eatough EM, Chang CH, Miloslavic SA, Johnson RE, “Relationships of role stressors with organizational citizenship behavior: a meta-analysis”. *J Appl Psychol*.Vol.96(3),pp.619-32, 2011.
7. Fok, L. Y., Hartmandy, S. J., Patti, A. L., &Razek, J. R., “The relationship between equity sensitivity, growth need strength, organizational citizenship behaviour, and perceived outcomes in the quality environment: A study of accounting professionals”,*Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality*, Vol.15(1), pp.99–120, 2000.

8. Graham, J.W., “An essay on organizational citizenship behavior”, *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 249-70, 1991.
9. Greenhaus, J. H., &Beutell, N. J., “Sources of conflict between work and family roles”,*Academy of Management Review*,Vol 10, pp.76-88, 1985.
10. Hogan, J., Rybicki, S., Motowidlo, S. J., &Borman, W. C. (1998), “Relations between contextual performance, personality, and occupational advancement”,*Human Performance*, 11, 189-207.
11. Jain A.K&, Cooper C.L, “Stress and organisational citizenship behaviours in Indian business process outsourcing organisations” ,*IIMB Management Review*, Volume 24, Issue 3,pp.155–163, 2012.
12. Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., Sablinski, C. J., Burton, J. P., &Holtom, B. C. (2004), “ The effects of job embeddedness on organizational citizenship, job performance, volitional absences, and voluntary turnover”. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol47, pp.711–722, 2004.
13. Meyer, J. P., “ Organizational commitment”, in Cooper, C.L. and Robertson, I.T. (Eds), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 12, pp.175-228, 1997.
14. Meyer, D., Ristow, P.L., & Lie, M. (2007). Particle size and nutrient distribution in fresh dairy manure. *Applied Engineering in Agriculture*. Vol. 20, pp. 349–354, 2007.
15. Moorman, R.H., “The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior”, *Human Relations*, Vol. 46 No. 6, pp. 759-76, 1993.
16. Organ, D. W., &Konovsky, M., “Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior”,*Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.74, pp. 157-64,1989.
17. Organ, D. W., *Organizational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1988.
18. Organ, D. W., “The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behaviour” In B. M.Staw& L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*(Vol. 12, pp. 43–72). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1990.
19. Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K., A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour. *Personnel Psychology*, Vol.48, pp.775–802, 1995.

20. Pezij, A. M., When helping others is harmful to yourself: Moderating effects of motives on the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and negative outcomes. Master thesis Work and Organizational Psychology, University of Twente, Netherlands, 2010.
21. Podsakoff, P.M., Niehoff, B.P., Moorman, R.H. and Fetter, R., “Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers’ trust in leader, satisfaction and organizational citizen behaviors”, *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 1, pp. 107-142, 1990.
22. 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, 262–270.
23. Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B. and Bachrach, D.G., “Organizational citizenship behaviors: a critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research”, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 513-63, 2000.
24. Qamar, N., “Job satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)”, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, Vol.4(7), pp103-122, 2012.
25. Saks, A. M., “Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement”, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 21, pp. 600-619, 2006.
26. Schnake, M. E. (1991), “Organizational citizenship: A review, proposed model, and research agenda”, *Human Relations*, Vol.44, pp.735-759, 1991.
27. Schnake, M., Dumler, M. P., & Cochran, D. S. (1993), “The relationship between “traditional” leadership, “super” leadership, and organizational citizenship behaviour”, *Group and Organization Management*, Vol.18, pp. 352– 365, 1993.
28. Turnipseed, D. L. (2002), “Are good soldiers good? Exploring the link between organization citizenship behaviour and personal ethics”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol.55, pp.1–15, 2002.
29. Uludağ O, Khan S, and Güden N, (2011), “The Effects of Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Turnover Intentions”, *FIU Review* Vol. 29 No. 2 Page: 1, Florida International University, 2011
30. Van Dyne, L., Graham, J.W., & Dienesch, R.M., “Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, operationalization, and validation”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.37, pp.765-802, 1994.

31. Van Scotter, J.R., & Motowidlo, S.J., “Evidence of two factors of contextual performance: Job dedication and interpersonal facilitation”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.81, pp. 525-531, 1996.
32. Williams, L.J., & Anderson, S.E., “Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and inrole behaviors”, *Journal of management*, Vol.17, pp. 601-617., 1991
33. Wijayanto, B. R., & Kismono, G., “The Effect of Job Embeddedness on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour”, *Gajah Mada International Journal of Business*, Vol. 6, pp. 335 – 354, 2004.