

A Study on Organizational citizenship behavior of Teaching Staff of Higher Educational Institution in Assam

Papari Nayak¹ and Dr. Mukulesh Barua²

¹Research Scholar, Assam Science and Technology University, Assam

Email: papari.nayak@gmail.com

²Director, Assam Institute of Management & Professor, ONGC Chair

Email: mukuleshbarua@gmail.com

Abstract

The study attempts to identify the factors or dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The present paper also explores the relationship between the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior and overall citizenship behavior of teaching staff of higher educational institution in lower Assam. The findings establish that the dimensions of citizenship behavior had a positive relationship with OCB.

Keywords: Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), teaching Staff, lower Assam

1 Introduction

Organizational citizenship behavior has been mainly conceptualized as extra role behavior within an organization. It is defined as “individual’s behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and it promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988). Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is commonly referred as ‘Go the extra mile’ or ‘go above and beyond’ the job requirement and it encompasses voluntary positive behavior of employees of an organization.

Podsakoff, *et.al.*, (2009) noted that the widespread interest in organizational citizenship has been predicated on the assumption that citizenship behaviors enhance organizational effectiveness. Citizenship behaviors may improve organizational performance by reducing the need to devote scarce resources to purely maintenance functions and helping to coordinate the activities of work groups. This behavior also enhanced team spirit, morale, and cohesiveness and the organization’s ability to attract and retain the best people by reducing the amount of time and energy spent on team maintenance functions (Podsakoff, *et.al.*, 2009).

2 Review of Literature

2.1 Dimensions of Organizational citizenship behavior

Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000) have done extensive review of literature and reveal almost 30 potential dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). Smith, Organ and Near, (1983) proposed two dimensions of OCB: altruism and general compliance, which was renamed by Organ (1988) as conscientiousness. Later in 1988 Organ improved the work of Bateman and Organ (1983) and Smith, *et.al.*, (1983) and identified five dimensions. These are altruism, conscientiousness, civic virtue, courtesy, and sportsmanship and these have been widely used by the scholars like Mackenzie *et.al.*, (1993), Walz and Niehoff (2000), Chaitanya and Tripathi (2001). Again, Williams and Anderson (1991) identified two board categories of OCB ‘(a) OCBO-behaviors that benefited the organization and (b) OCBI-behaviors that immediately benefitted specific individuals. Dyne, L. V. *et.al.*, (1994) developed three categories of OCB i.e., obedience, loyalty, and participation. Later, Farh *et.al.*, (2004) studied the forms of OCB in the Chinese context and identified ten major dimensions of OCB consisting of Self-training, Taking initiative, Social welfare participation, Keeping workplace clean, Group activity participation, Voice, Promoting company image, Helping coworkers, Protecting and saving company resources, Interpersonal

harmony. However, among the different forms of citizenship behavior identified by researchers, conceptual overlap is found between the identified constructs. Therefore, Podsakoff *et.al*, arranged these forms into seven general dimensions. These are Helping Behavior, Sportsmanship, Organizational Loyalty, Organizational Compliance, Individual Initiative, Civic Virtue, and Self Development.

3 Objectives

The research study is undertaken to attain the following objectives

1. To explore the different factors or dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior of teaching staff.
2. To study the relationship between identified dimensions of citizenship behavior and overall citizenship behavior among teaching staff of higher education institution.

4 Methods

4.1 Sample

The sample consisted of 120 teaching staff of provincialized colleges of lower Assam. A total of 105 usable questionnaires were returned (87.5 per cent response rate). The final sample consisted of 72 per cent male and 24 per cent female respondents.

4.2 Scale development:

Organizational citizenship behavior was measured using a scale based on the instruments adopted from Organ *et.al*, (1983), Podsakoff, *et.al*, (1990) and Van Dyne, *et.al*, (1994). The instrument was pre-tested on the teaching staff of colleges. After pre-testing, items were excluded that are not applicable and hence 15 items were selected for further evaluation. Each item was presented in the form of a statement with a five-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

4.3 Statistical tools: The data were analyzed by using Factor analysis and Correlation analyses. Statistical Package for Social Sciences was used to analyze and interpret the data.

4.4 Item-total correlation

Total item correlation serves as a criterion for initial assessment and purification of items. According to Cristobal *et al.* (2007) the cutoff value for item-total correlation is 0.30. Hence three items were excluded from the analysis to fulfill the criterion.

4.5 Reliability test:

Cronbach's alpha is a widely accepted measure to check the internal consistency of the scale. The Cronbach's alpha score was found to be 0.828 suggesting high internal consistency.

5. Exploratory Factor Analysis

5.1 KMO and Bartlett's Test

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) and Bartlett's test of Sphericity are applied to verify the adequacy or appropriateness of the data for factor analysis.

Table 1: Table Label KMO and Bartlett's Test

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.725
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	521.380
	Df	66
	Sig.	.000

According to Kaiser (1974) the acceptance KMO value should be greater than .5. The KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy for 12 items is 0.725 and the significance value of Bartlett's test of Sphericity is less than 0.5 indicating thereby that the samples taken are appropriate to proceed with the factor analysis.

5.2 Communalities

On the basis of communalities value items were removed one by one iteratively, starting from the smallest value till the value of communalities for all the remaining items was greater than 0.5. In the process 3 items were removed.

5.3 Total Variance Explained

To identify the dimensions/factors of scale, EFA has been conducted by using Principal Component Method with Varimax Rotation. Factors with Eigen value more than 1 were extracted as a result of which three factors were extracted. The Eigen value of the factor 1 is 3.721, factor 2 is 1.672 and factor 3 is 1.075. Results of before rotation and after rotation is displayed (refer to Table 2) along with their cumulative percentages.

Table 2. Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.721	41.340	41.340	3.721	41.340	41.340	2.644	29.381	29.381
2	1.672	18.579	59.919	1.672	18.579	59.919	1.957	21.742	51.123
3	1.075	11.947	71.867	1.075	11.947	71.867	1.867	20.743	71.867
4	.797	8.851	80.718						
5	.632	7.024	87.742						
6	.454	5.047	92.789						
7	.316	3.506	96.295						
8	.227	2.523	98.818						
9	.106	1.182	100.000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

Before rotation, Factor 1 accounted for 41.340 per cent variance, Factor 2 accounted for 18.579 per cent variance and Factor 3 accounted for 11.947 per cent variance. After rotation, it can be observed that Factor 1 accounted for 29.381 per cent variance, Factor 2 accounted for 21.742 per cent variance and Factor 3 accounted for 20.743 per cent variance. Cumulative percentages for the factors 1, 2 and 3 after the rotation are 29.381, 51.123 and 71.867 respectively. It indicates that the three factors extracted from the total 9 items have a cumulative percentage up to 71.867 per cent of the total variance.

5.4 Rotated Component Matrix

The rotated component matrix displayed the factor loading of the three components (factors). While analyzing, factor loadings of less than 0.5 was suppressed and thus, three factors were extracted from the 9 items.

Table 3. Rotated Component Matrix

	Component		
	1	2	3
I volunteer for things that are not required in our institute.	.888		
I do work beyond what is required	.883		
I am willing to assist new colleagues to adjust to the work environment.	.720		
I assist my supervisor with his or her work	.635		
I frequently make creative suggestions to coworkers		.847	
I encourage others to speak up at meetings		.814	
I volunteer for overtime work when needed		.615	
Helps others who have heavy work loads			.896
I help my colleagues who have been absent from work			.893
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.			
a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.			

Factor 1 is the most important factor which explains 29.38 per cent of the variation. Factor 1 is loading with statements such as “volunteer for things that are not required in our institute, “do work beyond what is required”, “assist supervisor with his or her work” and “willing to assist new colleagues to adjust to the work environment”. The items in this segment are found to represent that employees’ discretionary behavior that goes to the extent of helping their peers and organization and thus this factor has been named as altruistic leadership.

Factor 2 explains 21.74 per cent of the variation loading with statements such as “frequently make creative suggestions to coworkers”, “encourage others to speak up at meetings” and “volunteer for overtime work when needed”. The second factor that has emerged represents participation and thus, this factor has been named as participation.

Factor 3 explains 20.74 per cent of the variation loading with statements such as “help colleagues who have been absent from work” and “helps others who have heavy work-loads”. The third factor consisted of items highlighting employees’ altruistic behavior. Thus this factor has been named as Altruism.

6. Assessing Reliability

In this study, all the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior were having alpha value more than 0.7 which indicates high reliability of the instrument. The overall reliability of the scale is 0.811.

Table 4. Reliability

Factors	Reliability
Altruistic Leadership	.826
Participation	.719
Altruism	.816

7. Relationship between Dimensions of Citizenship Behavior and Citizenship Behavior

In order to determine the relationship between dimensions of Citizenship Behavior i.e., altruistic leadership, participation, altruism and overall organizational citizenship behavior, a bivariate correlation analysis was conducted. The results of correlation analyses indicated that Altruistic Leadership ($r = 0.752$, $p < .05$), Participation ($r = 0.523$, $p < .05$), Altruism ($r = 0.395$, $p < .05$), were positively and significantly correlated with organizational citizenship behavior at 1% level of significance.

8. Discussion

This study investigated the dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior measure through exploratory factor analysis. In this study, three factors were extracted which can be termed as altruistic leadership, participation and altruism. Chang and Chelladurai, (2003) and Feather and Rauter, (2004) stated that factorial structure of OCB may vary across organization settings. Dash and Chaudhuri (2015) conducted a study in Indian banks and identified the dimensions of OCB such as conscientiousness, sportsmanship, encouragement and helping co-workers. Tayyab (2005) explored the various dimensions of OCB on public sector employees such as generalized compliance, conscientiousness, helping coworkers and interpersonal harmony.

In this study, Correlation analysis also conducted to test the relationship between dimensions of citizenship behavior and overall citizenship behavior and found that the three factors of citizenship behavior i.e. Altruistic Leadership, Participation and Altruism had a positive relationship with OCB.

References:

- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W., "Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship.", *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 26, no. 4, (1983), pp. 587-595.
- Chang, K., & Chelladurai, P., "Comparison of part-time workers and full-time workers: Commitment and citizenship behaviors in Korean sport organizations", *Journal of Sport Management*, vol. 17, no. 4, (2003), pp. 394-416.
- Chaitanya, S. K. and Tripathi, N., "Dimensions of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour", *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, vol. 37, no. 2, (2001), pp. 217-230
- Cristobal, E., Flavián, C., & Guinalú, M., "Perceived e-service quality (PeSQ): Measurement validation and effects on consumer satisfaction and web site loyalty", *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, vol. 17, no. 3, (2007), pp. 317-340.
- Dyne, L. V., Graham, J. W. and Dienesch, R. M., "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Construct Redefinition, Measurement, and Validation", *The Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 37, (1994), pp. 765-802.
- Dash and Chaudhuri, "Exploring Factorial Structure of OCB in Large Indian Banks: An Empirical Study of Delhi NCR", *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, vol. 17, no. 9, (2015), pp. 96-104
- Farh, J. L., Zhong, C. B., & Organ, D. W., "Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the People's Republic of China", *Organizational Science*, vol. 15, (2004), pp. 241-253.
- Feather, N.T., & Rauter, K.A., "Organizational citizenship behaviors in relation to job status, job insecurity, organizational commitment and identification, job satisfaction and work values", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 77, (2004), pp. 81-94.
- Graham, J., "An essay on organizational citizenship behavior", *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, vol. 4, (1991), pp. 249-70.
- Kaiser, H.F., "An index of factorial simplicity", *Psychometrika*, vol. 39, (1974), pp. 31-36.

- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R., “The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of sales performance”, *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 57, (1993) pp. 70-80.
- Nunnally, J. C., “Psychometric theory” (2nd ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill, (1978)
- Organ, D. W., “Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Solider Syndrome”, Lexington, KY: Lexington Books, (1988)
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M. and Mackenzie, S. B., “Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents and Consequences”, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, (2006)
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W. and Podsakoff, P. M. and Blume, B. D., “Individual- and Organizational-Level Consequences of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Meta-Analysis”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 94, (2009), pp. 122–141
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G., “Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestion for future research”, *Journal of Management*, vol. 26, (2000), pp. 513-563
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R., Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on trust, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 1, (1990), pp. 107-142.
- Smith, A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P., “Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 68, (1983), pp. 653-663.
- Walz, S.M., & Niehoff, B.P., “Organizational citizenship behaviors: their relationship to organizational effectiveness”, *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, vol. 24, no. 3, (2000), pp. 301-99.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E., “Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors”, *Journal of Management*, vol. 17, (1991), pp. 601-617.
- Tayyab, “Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Validating Factorial structure and invariance among employees”, *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, vol. 31, no. 1-2, (2005), pp. 49-64.