

Profiling Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (An Empirical Study of Public and Private Food Processing Industry)

*Dr. Luxmi **

Abstract

This study was designed to compare Organizational Citizenship Behaviour of the employees in public and Private sector organizations in Food Processing Industry, to see the association between subscales of organizational citizenship behaviour and to compare these dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour vis-à-vis different psycho-demographic factors of the employees. The scope of the study was Public and Private sector organizations belonging to Punjab, Haryana and Chandigarh in Food Processing Industry. The sample comprised of 196 respondents drawn from three public sector organizations, and six private sector organizations. Comparisons made on the basis of hierarchical levels and other psycho-demographic factors make the study comprehensive. The results revealed a very significant but weak positive correlation between three subscales of Organisational Citizenship Behaviours. Almost all other null hypotheses concerning level of Organisational Citizenship Behaviours vis-à-vis failed to be rejected unlike previous similar studies.

Introduction

Barnard (1938) was among the first to explicitly address the need for behaviors that go beyond delineated roles. Katz and Kahn (1978) noted that not only employees must engage in role-prescribed behaviors, they also must be willing to engage in innovative and spontaneous behaviors that go beyond those role prescriptions in order to ensure organizational vitality and effectiveness. Organ (1988) originally coined the term organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and defined them 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." Also, the willingness of participants to go beyond the formal requirements of their positions has been recognized as an essential component of effective organization. Thus, Organizational citizenship behaviours can be said to "lubricate the social machinery of the organization".

Organizational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) are employee work behaviours such as helping others, staying late, or working weekends, performing at levels that exceed enforceable standards, tolerating impositions or inconveniences on the job, and being actively involved in company affairs (Podsakoff et al.,

* Sr. Lecturer, University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh

2000). Citizenship behaviors are often performed by employees to support the interests of the group or organization even though they may not directly lead to individual benefits. Examples of citizenship behaviors may range from helping a co-worker with a job-related problem even when such help is not required to wearing the company logo on a sweatshirt while attending a charity event. What is important is that both these examples describe behaviors which are helpful to the company, yet they are not behaviors considered part of the core elements of the job. Thus, managers often find it difficult to reward good citizenship directly, as well as difficult to punish directly the absence of such citizenship. A good citizen is an employee who offers support to the organization even when no such support is or can be expressly required. Organisational citizenship behaviors are similar to prosocial organizational behavior (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986) and organizational spontaneity (George and Brief, 1992), but some important differences exist. Prosocial organizational behavior (POB) describes a broad spectrum of helping behaviors which include many organisational citizenship behaviors. However, prosocial organizational behavior also includes behaviors which might be helpful to an individual in the organization, but would be dysfunctional to the organization (i.e. an employee might help someone cover up performance problems). Organizational spontaneity (OS) is like organisational citizenship behaviors in that it only includes functional behaviors, but OCBs are not directly recognized by the organizational reward system, while organizational spontaneity could be part of such a reward system.

To date, researchers have proposed a variety of specific dimensions of organizational

citizenship behavior. Organ (1988) provided a multi-dimensional scale of organisational citizenship behaviors. The scale consists of five dimensions that make up the organisational citizenship behaviors construct. The five dimensions are: (1) Altruism, which concerns with helping one employee in completing his or her task under unusual circumstances (2) Conscientiousness, which refers to an employee performing his or her assigned tasks (in-role behaviors) in a manner above what is expected. (3) Sportsmanship refers to stressing the positive aspects of the organization instead of negative. (4) Civic virtue, which involves support for the administrative functions of the organization. (5) Courtesy, which includes proactive gestures that consider consulting with other workers in the organization before acting, giving advance notice, and passing along information.

Other dimensions include obedience, loyalty, advocacy participation, social participation, functional participation (Van Dyne et al., 1994), helping and voice (Van Dyne et al., 1995; Van Dyne and LePine, 1998), as well as organization-focused and interpersonal-focused organizational citizenship behavior (Williams and Anderson, 1991).

A review of the literature on citizenship indicates that researchers generally maintain that organisational citizenship behaviors stem from two motivational bases: (1) job attitudes and/or (2) disposition/ personality (Organ and Ryan, 1995). The relationship between organisational citizenship behaviors and job attitudes is rooted in social exchange theory—that is, employees engage in organisational citizenship behaviors in order to reciprocate the actions of their organizations. The second rationale holds that organisational citizenship behaviors reflect an individual's

predisposition to be helpful, cooperative, or conscientious. Research on citizenship has almost exclusively concerned antecedents consistent with these theoretical bases. Examples of the antecedents examined by researchers include job attitudes such as job satisfaction (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ and Near, 1983; Williams and Anderson, 1992), organizational commitment (Becker, 1992), perceptions of fairness (Moorman, 1991), job cognitions (Organ and Konovsky, 1989), dispositional factors (e.g., agreeableness, conscientiousness, and equity sensitivity; Konovsky and Organ, 1996), positive affect (George, 1991), concern for others (McNeely and Meglino, 1994), organizational justice (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993), and collectivism (Moorman and Blakely, 1995). Additionally, organisational citizenship behaviour has been found to be related to task characteristics (Farh et al., 1990; Moorman and Sayeed, 1992), and interpersonal trust (Podsakoff et al., 1990).

The common denominator across these studies is the notion that citizenship stems from an individual's desire to help others or the organization because of disposition or a sense of obligation; describing such individuals as "good soldiers" or "good

citizens" reinforces this idea. As early as 1964, Katz recognized the importance of organizational citizenship behavior for organizational effectiveness. Katz (1964) identified three categories of employee behavior essential for organizational effectiveness. According to Katz, individuals must first be induced to enter and remain with an organization; as employees, they must carry out specific role requirements in a dependable fashion; and they must engage in innovative and spontaneous activity that goes beyond role prescriptions.

METHODOLOGY

PRESENT STUDY

The above mentioned and other similar studies made the plot for the present study. The authors attempt to study Organizational Citizenship Behaviors of employees in two strata of culturally diverse organizations. In all, nine organizations belonging to Punjab, Haryana and Chandigarh region were studied comprising of three Public sector organizations and six Private sector organizations in Food Processing Industry.

Description of the organizations is as follows:

Exhibit 1: Targeted Organizations

Public Sector Organisations	Hafed, Panchkula (Haryana)
	Vita, Ambala (Haryana)
	Markfed, Patiala (Punjab)
Private Sector Organisations	LT Overseas Pvt. Ltd., Jind (Haryana)
	Bonn Nutrients Pvt. Ltd., Ludhiana (Punjab)
	Milk Plant, Jind (Haryana)
	Pepsi Food Pvt. Ltd., Patiala (Punjab)
	Alchemist, Kurali (Punjab)
	Nestle, Moga (Punjab)

OBJECTIVES

The paper studies Organizational Citizenship Behaviours in Food Processing Industry (Both Public and Private Sector Organizations). The main objectives of the study are as follows:

- To compare the level of Organizational Citizenship Behaviours of employees in Public and Private Sector of Food Processing Industry.
- To compare Organisational Citizenship Behaviours of employees using psycho-demographic factors i.e. Marital Status, Qualification, and Gender.
- To see the association of Organisational Citizenship Behaviours with psycho-demographic factors i.e. Age, Total Work Experience, and Work Experience in Present Position.
- To compare the level of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors of employees among different hierarchical levels in Food Processing Industry.
- To find the correlation between the three subscales-Organizational Ownership, Professional Commitment, and Sharing and Involvement.

HYPOTHESES

- H1. There is a significant difference in the level of Organizational Ownership, Sharing and Involvement, and Professional Commitment of the employees between the Public and Private Sector Organizations in Food Processing Industry.
- H2. There is a significant difference in the level of Organizational Ownership, Professional Commitment, and Sharing and Involvement at different hierarchical levels.

- H3. There is a significant difference in the level of Professional Commitment, Organisational Ownership, and Sharing and Involvement of the employees possessing different educational levels.
- H4. There is a significant difference in the level of Sharing and Involvement, Organizational Ownership, and Professional Commitment for male and female employees.
- H5. There is a significant difference in the level of Sharing and Involvement, Organizational Ownership, and Professional Commitment for married and single employees.
- H6. There is a significant correlation among Sharing and Involvement, Organisational Ownership and Professional Commitment of employees in Food Processing Industry.
- H7. There is a correlation between Sharing and Involvement, Organizational Ownership & Professional Commitment and the Age of the employees.
- H8. There is a correlation between Sharing and Involvement, Organizational Ownership & Professional Commitment and Total Work Experience of the employees.
- H9. There is a correlation between Professional Commitment, Organisational Ownership, Sharing & Involvement and Work Experience in Present Position.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The study is descriptive and empirical in nature. Three organizations were chosen from Public sector and six from the Private sector of Food Processing Industry using Quota

Sampling. Then a sample of managers, supervisors and workers was chosen from a sample frame of nine companies using Stratified Random Sampling. Managers, Supervisors and Workers were taken in the ratio of 1:2:3, based on availability and feasibility of the study. Out of a total of 196 respondents:

- 80 respondents belong to Public Sector and 116 from Private Sector in the Food

Processing Industry.

- 29 are managers, 76 are supervisors and 91 are workers.
- 171 are males and 25 are females.
- 164 are married and 32 are unmarried.
- 90 have professional qualifications and 106 have no professional qualifications.

The other demographics are mentioned in Exhibit 2.

Exhibit 2: Descriptive Statistics

Parameters	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age in Years	196	22	68	39.52	11.560
Work Experience in Years	196	1	42	16.35	11.629

MEASURES

Primary data was collected through preliminary interviews and questionnaires ultimately. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour questionnaire (Lynn Van Dyne, 1995) adapted by Biswjeet Pattanyak, Rajnish Kumar Mishra and Phalgu Niranjana, 2003 is used to undertake the study. The only difference between this instrument and the other one is that, Dyne's instrument of OCB needs to be administered to three persons, the person himself, his/her peer and superior. But the technique adopted in this instrument design and its administration is one of projection of one's own needs while evaluating others. That is, whenever the respondents are answering the items as 'my colleagues', they are reflecting their needs in their responses (Morgan and Murray, 1938). The scale is multidimensional, suggesting three subscales i.e.; Organizational Ownership (14 items), Professional Commitment (10 items) and Sharing and Involvement (8 items). The

cronbach alpha coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.87.

DATA ANALYSIS

Preliminary Analysis: Data were examined for outliers and possible errors prior analysis, and none were detected. The data also were screened for possible violations to assumptions of normality and linearity. No violations were found.

Results of Independent Sample t-test (Comparison vis-à-vis Public & Private Sector Organizations (Table-1):

In all the cases, we cannot assume equal variances for Public and Private sector employees samples as p- value of the F-test in the case of Organizational Ownership comes out to be less than 0.05(p equals 0.006). But the results of Independent Sample t-test suggested no difference in the level of Professional Commitment and Sharing and Involvement for the employees of Public and

Table 1: Independent Sample t-test

Variables		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Organizational Ownership	Equal variances assumed	7.841	0.006	-0.031	194	0.975
	EVNA			-0.029	135.925	0.977
Professional Commitment	Equal variances assumed	0.203	0.653	-0.341	194	0.733
	EVNA			-0.344	175.077	0.731
Sharing and Involvement	Equal variances assumed	0.027	0.870	-0.912	194	0.363
	EVNA			-0.893	157.170	0.373

Table 2: Hierarchy-wise comparison

Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Organizational Ownership	Between Groups	68.998	2	34.499	3.006	0.052
	Within Groups	2214.676	193	11.475		
	Total	2283.673	195			
Professional Commitment	Between Groups	121.690	2	60.845	3.095	0.048
	Within Groups	3794.126	193	19.659		
	Total	3915.816	195			
Sharing and Involvement	Between Groups	12.942	2	6.471	.702	0.497
	Within Groups	1778.339	193	9.214		
	Total	1791.281	195			

Private sector organizations, getting p-value more than 0.05 (p equals .653 and .870 respectively). Therefore in the 1st null hypothesis i.e. there is no significant difference in the level of Professional Commitment and Sharing and Involvement for the employees of Public and Private sector organizations in Food Processing Industry are not rejected or

may be accepted.

Results of ANOVA (Hierarchy-wise comparison) (Table-2):

The results suggested no difference in the level of Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement among different hierarchical levels (managers, supervisors and workers), getting p-value more than 0.05 (p equals .052

and .497 respectively). Therefore in the second null hypotheses, that there is no significant difference in the level of Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement at different hierarchical levels, are not rejected. But in case of Professional Commitment p-value is less than 0.05 (p equals .048). So further Post Hoc Test (Scheffe, Table-3) was applied, but no value of Professional Commitment has been found to be less than 0.05. Hence the second null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the level of

Professional Commitment at different hierarchical levels is not rejected or may be accepted.

Results of Karl Pearson's Correlation (Correlation between Psycho-demographic variables and Sub-scales of OCB) (Table 4).

Results of Karl Pearson's Correlation (Correlation of OCB with Age)

The results of Karl Pearson's Correlation

Table 3: Post Hoc Test

Multiple Comparisons					
(J) level	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Middle	0.504	0.739	0.793	-1.32	2.33
Lower	-0.778	0.722	0.561	-2.56	1.00
Top	-0.504	0.739	0.793	-2.33	1.32
Lower	-1.282	0.526	0.054	-2.58	0.02
Top	0.778	0.722	0.561	-1.00	2.56
Middle	1.282	0.526	0.054	-0.02	2.58
Middle	-0.519	0.968	0.866	-2.91	1.87
Lower	1.167	0.945	0.468	-1.16	3.50
Top	0.519	0.968	0.866	-1.87	2.91
Lower	1.686	0.689	0.052	-0.01	3.39
Top	-1.167	0.945	0.468	-3.50	1.16
Middle	-1.686	0.689	0.052	-3.39	0.01
Middle	-0.593	0.663	0.671	-2.23	1.04
Lower	-0.767	0.647	0.497	-2.36	0.83
Top	0.593	0.663	0.671	-1.04	2.23
Lower	-0.174	0.472	0.934	-1.34	0.99
Top	0.767	0.647	0.497	-0.83	2.36
Middle	0.174	0.472	0.934	-0.99	1.34

(Table 4) suggested that there is no correlation between the Age of the employees and Organizational Ownership ($r = .007, p = .923$), and Sharing and Involvement ($r = .010, p = .885$). Therefore the seventh null hypotheses that there is no significant correlation between Age and Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement are not rejected or may be accepted. But a significant correlation is found between the Age and the Professional Commitment ($r = .172, p = .016$). Hence the hypothesis that there is no correlation between Age and Professional Commitment is rejected.

Results of Karl Pearson's Correlation (Correlation of OCB with Total Work Experience) (Table 4) suggests that there is no correlation between the Total Work Experience of the employees and the level of Organizational Ownership ($r = .002, p = .978$) and Sharing and Involvement ($r = -.032, p = .657$). Therefore the eighth null hypotheses that there is no significant correlation between Organisational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement and Total Work Experience, are not rejected or may be accepted. But a significant correlation between Total Work Experience of the employees and the level Professional Commitment ($r = .087, p = .224$) is found. Therefore the eighth null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Professional Commitment and Total Work Experience is rejected.

Results of Karl Pearson's Correlation (Correlation of OCB with Work Experience on present position) (Table 4) suggests that there is no correlation between the Work Experience in Present Position and the level of Organizational Ownership ($r = .020, p = .780$)

and Sharing and Involvement ($r = -.034, p = .637$). Therefore the ninth null hypotheses that there is no significant correlation between Organisational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement and Work Experience in Present Position, are not rejected or may be accepted. But a significant correlation between Work Experience in Present Position and the level Professional Commitment ($r = .050, p = .486$) is found. Therefore the ninth null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Professional Commitment and Work Experience in Present Position is rejected.

Results of Karl Pearson's Correlation (Correlation between Sub-scales of OCB) (Table 4) suggests that there is a very significant weak correlation ($p < 0.05$) between Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement ($r = 0.182, p = 0.010$). A still positive correlation is found between Professional Commitment and Sharing and Involvement ($r = 0.220, p = 0.002$) significant at 5 % level of significance. But no significant correlation is found between Organizational Ownership and Professional Commitment. Therefore in the sixth null hypotheses that there is significant correlation between Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement and between Sharing and Involvement and Professional Commitment subscales are not rejected or may be accepted. But third part of sixth null hypothesis that there is significant correlation between Professional Commitment and Organizational Ownership subscale is rejected.

Results of one way ANOVA (Education-wise comparison) (table-5) suggested no difference in the level of Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement

Table 4: Correlations

		Age in Years	Work Experience in Years	Experience in years	Organisational Ownership	Sharing & Involvement	Professional Commitment
Age in Years	Pearson Correlation	1	.920(**)	.772(**)	.007	.010	.172(*)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.923	.885	.016
	N	196	196	196	196	196	195
Total Work Experience	Pearson Correlation	.920(**)	1	.857(**)	.002	-.032	.087
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.978	.657	.224
	N	196	196	196	196	196	195
Experience in Present Position	Pearson Correlation	.772(**)	.857(**)	1	.020	-.034	.050
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.780	.637	.486
	N	196	196	196	196	196	195
Organisational Ownership	Pearson Correlation	.007	.002	.020	1	.182(*)	-.050
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.923	.978	.780		.010	.484
	N	196	196	196	196	196	195
Sharing & Involvement	Pearson Correlation	.010	-.032	-.034	.182(*)	1	.220(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.885	.657	.637	.010		.002
	N	196	196	196	196	196	195
Professional Commitment	Pearson Correlation	.172(*)	.087	.050	-.050	.220(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.016	.224	.486	.484	.002	
	N	195	195	195	195	195	195

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 5: Education-wise comparison

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Organisational Ownership	Between Groups	14.031	1	14.031	1.198	.275
	Within Groups	2272.556	194	11.714		
	Total	2286.587	195			
Sharing & Involvement	Between Groups	1.894	1	1.894	.205	.651
	Within Groups	1789.386	194	9.224		
	Total	1791.281	195			
Professional Commitment	Between Groups	128.532	1	128.532	6.574	.011
	Within Groups	3773.314	193	19.551		
	Total	3901.846	194			

among different educational levels, getting p-value more than .05 (p equals .275 and .651). Therefore the third null hypotheses that there is no significant difference in the level of Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement among different educational levels are not rejected or may be accepted but in case of professional commitment p-value (.011) is less than .05. Hence the third null hypothesis that there is no difference in the level of Professional Commitment and different educational levels is rejected.

Results of Independent Sample t-test (Comparison vis-à-vis Marital Status) (Table 6) shows that in all the cases we can not assume equal variances as p-value of the F test in the cases of Organisational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement comes out to be less than 0.05 (p equals .030 and .025). The result in table 5 suggested no significant difference in the level of Professional Commitment for married and single employees, getting p-value more than 0.05 (p equals .470). Therefore the fifth null hypotheses that there is no significant difference between the level of Organisational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement for married and single employees are rejected and in case of level of Professional Commitment for married and single employees are not rejected or may be accepted.

Results of Independent Sample t-test (Comparison vis-à-vis Gender) (Table 7) indicates that we can assume equal variances in all the cases as p-value of the F test (p equals .343, .320 and .430 respectively) comes out to be more than 0.05. Therefore the fourth null hypotheses that there is no significant difference in the level of Organisational Ownership, Sharing and Involvement, and

Professional Commitment for Male and Female are not rejected or may be accepted.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

- No significant difference was found in the level of Organizational Ownership, Professional Commitment and Sharing and Involvement of employees in Public and Private sector Organizations in Food Processing Industry.
- No significant difference was found in the level of Organizational Ownership, Professional Commitment and Sharing and Involvement of employees at different hierarchical positions (managers, supervisors and workers).
- No significant difference was found in the level of Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement for the employees possessing different educational levels. But a significant difference was found in the level of Professional Commitment of employees possessing different educational levels.
- No significant difference was found in the level of Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement, and Professional Commitment for male and female employees.
- No significant difference was found in the level of Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement for married and single employees. But a significant difference was found in the level of Professional Commitment for married and single employees.
- A very significant weak correlation is found between Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement and between Professional

Table-6: Independent Sample t-test

Variables		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Organisational Citizenship Behaviour	Equal variances assumed	.020	.887	.472	194	.638
	Equal variances not assumed			.403	38.932	.689
Organisational Ownership	Equal variances assumed	4.767	.030	1.217	194	.225
	Equal variances not assumed			1.466	54.572	.148
Sharing Involvement	Equal variances assumed	5.074	.025	.727	194	.468
	Equal variances not assumed			.564	36.808	.576
Professional Commitment	Equal variances assumed	.524	.470	-.680	194	.497
	Equal variances not assumed			-.739	47.843	.464

Table-7: Independent Sample t-test

Variables		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Organisational Citizenship Behaviour	Equal variances assumed	.689	.408	.797	194	.427
	Equal variances not assumed			-.974	37.263	.336
Organisational Ownership	Equal variances assumed	.902	.343	1.054	194	.293
	Equal variances not assumed			1.141	33.305	.262
Sharing Involvement	Equal variances assumed	.993	.320	-.110	194	.913
	Equal variances not assumed			-.139	38.747	.890
Professional Commitment	Equal variances assumed	.626	.430	-1.993	194	.048
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.279	34.907	.029

Commitment and Sharing and Involvement. But no significant correlation is found between Organizational Ownership and Professional Commitment.

- No significant correlation was found between Organization Ownership and

Sharing and Involvement and Age of the employees. But a significant correlation was found between Age and Professional Commitment of employees.

- No significant correlation was found between Organizational Ownership and

Sharing and Involvement and Total Work Experience of the employees. But a significant correlation was found between Total Work Experience and Professional Commitment of employees.

- No significant correlation was found between Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement and Work Experience in Present Position of the employees. But a significant correlation was found between Work Experience in Present Position and level of Professional Commitment of employees.

REFERENCES

Barnard C. (1938), "The Functions of the Executive", Harvard University Press: Cambridge.

Etzioni, A. (1964), "Modern organizations," Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Farh, J., Podsakoff, P.M., and Organ, D.W. (1990), "Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction", *Journal of Management*, 16, pp 705-722.

George, J.M. and Brief, A.P. (1992) "Feeling good-doing good: a conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship", *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, pp. 310-329.

Hall, R.H. (1991), *Organization: Structures, processes, and outcomes*, 5th edition, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Karambayya, R. (1990), "Good organizational citizens do make a difference", *Proceedings of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada*, Whistler, British Columbia: The Administrative Sciences of Canada, pp. 110-

119.

Katz, D and Kahn, R.L. (1978), *The Social Psychology of Organization*, 2nd edition, Wiley: New York.

Katz, D. (1964), "The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*", 9: pp.131-133.

Katz, D. and Kahn, R. (1966), *The social psychology of organizations*, New York: Wiley.

Konovsky, M.A. and Organ, D.W. (1996) "Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17, pp. 253-266.

LePine, J.A. and Van Dyne, L. (1998), "Predicting voice behavior in work groups", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, pp. 853-868.

MacKenzie, S., Podsakoff, P., and Fetter, R. (1991), "Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, pp.123-150.

McNeely, B.L. and Meglino, B.M. (1994), "The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial organizational behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, pp. 836-844.

Moorman, R. (1991), "Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship", 76, pp. 845-855.

Moorman, R.H. and Blakely, G.L. (1995), "Individualism- collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organization citizenship behavior", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, pp.127-142.

Moorman, R.H. and Sayeed, L. (1992), "Can using computers promote organizational citizenship? A study relating computer usage, task characteristics, and OCB", Unpublished manuscript, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV.

Moorman, R.H., Niehoff, B.P. and Organ, D.W. (1993), "Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behaviors: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice", *Journal of Employee Responsibilities and Rights*, 6, pp. 209-225.

Niehoff, B.P. and Moorman, R.H. (1993), "Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior", *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, pp 527-556.

Organ, D.W. and Konovsky, M. (1989), "Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, pp. 157-164.

Organ, D.W. and Ryan, K. (1995), "A meta analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior", *Personnel Psychology*, 48, pp. 775-802.

Podsakoff, P.M. and MacKenzie, S.B. (1997), "Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: a review and suggestions for future research", *Human Performance*, 10, pp. 133-151.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman R.H., and Fetter, R. (1990) "Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on

followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors", *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, pp. 107-142.

Quinn, R.E. and Rohrbaugh, J. (1983), "A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: Towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis", *Management Science*, 29(3), pp. 363-377.

Schnake, M. and Dumler, M.P. (1997), "Organizational citizenship behavior: the impact of rewards and reward practices", *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 9, pp.216-229.

Steers, R.M. (1977), *Organizational effectiveness: A behavioral view*, Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear.

Van Dyne, L., Graham, J., and Dienesch (1994), "Organizational citizenship behavior: construct redefinition, operationalization, and validation", *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, pp. 765-802.

Williams, L.J. and Anderson, S.E. (1992), "An alternative approach to method effects using latent variable models: Applications in organizational behavior research", Paper presented at the Academy of Management Meetings, Las Vegas, NV.

Yuchtman, E. and Seashore, S.E. (1967), "A system resource approach to organizational effectiveness", *American Sociological Review*, 32, pp. 891-903.

Zammuto, R.F. (1982), "Assessing organizational effectiveness: Systems, change, adaptation, and strategy", Albany: State University of New York Press.