

Assess the maturity level of organizational citizenship behavior among employees of engineering and technical company in Isfahan Province, Iran

Hadi Teimouri, Ph.D (Corresponding author)

Assistant Professor of Management Department, University of Isfahan, Iran

Address: The University of Isfahan / HezarJerib.st / Isfahan /Iran, Postal Code: 81746-73441

Hadi_Teimouri@yahoo.com

Nazanin Sheykh Abou Masoudi Graduated in Industrial Management, Management

Department, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran

Nazanin.masoudi@gmail.com

Doi:10.5296/ijhrs.v5i2.7187 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v5i2.7187>

Abstract

In order to ensure organizational efficiency, organizations need employees' cooperation, benevolence, self-sacrifice and, at times, extra effort. Thus voluntary work by employees is important for organizations. In this sense, organizational citizenship behaviors are attached more and more importance and are frequently used in studies to understand or interpret organizational behavior.

The major aim of this paper is to assess the maturity level of organizational citizenship behavior among employees of engineering and technical company in Isfahan province, Iran. The mentioned aim will be studied by supposing some factors such as social behavior, philanthropy, sense of duty and sportsmanship as component of organizational citizenship behavior. This survey is of applied type in terms of purpose and is descriptive-field in terms of methodology. Historical study was used to collect data related to theoretical principles of research like books and scientific magazines and researcher self made questionnaire (with acceptable reliability of 94%) was applied for data collection and its analysis. The results of this research indicate that level of social behavior, philanthropy, sense of duty and sportsmanship components among employees of engineering and technical company is higher than the average level.

Keywords: Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Maturity, Iran

1. Introduction

Rather than using traditional hierarchical structures with clear lines of authority and distinct jobs, many organizations have gone to more autonomous team-oriented organizational environments (LePine et al., 2002). This shift has increased the importance of individual initiative and cooperation (Ilgen and Pulakos, 1999). Because of this change, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), or behavior characterized by individuals voluntarily making prosocial contributions to the organization that are above and beyond their job duties, has received increasingly more attention from both scholars and managers (Allen et al., 2004; Bolino and Turnley, 2005; Bolino et al., 2004; Coleman and Borman, 2000; LePine et al., 2000; Paine and Organ, 2000; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Vey and Campbell, 2004).

Since OCB first appeared in the organizational behavior and management literature (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983), it has been the subject of considerable research. Much of this research has focused on antecedents of OCB such as job satisfaction, interpersonal trust, organizational commitment and employee mood (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Becker, 1992; George, 1991; Konovsky and Organ, 1996; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993; Moorman and Blakely, 1995; Organ and Konovsky, 1989; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Smith et al., 1983; Williams and Anderson, 1992; Williams and Wong, 1999) and consequences of OCBs such as performance, customer service and satisfaction, sales revenue and financial efficiency (Koys, 2001; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff et al., 1997; Walz and Niehoff, 2000, 1996).

Because of OCB's association with such important outcomes, research indicates that OCB is beneficial to organizations (Bolino and Turnley, 2003) and is critical to organizational functioning (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Organ, 1988). OCB is also viewed as desirable because such behavior is thought to increase available resources and decrease the need for more formal and costly mechanisms of control (Organ, 1988).

Based on the existing research, it appears that organizations and managers should be interested in encouraging employee citizenship behaviors. One possible way in which organizations could encourage OCBs is to explicitly measure and reward such behaviors through the performance appraisal process and reward systems such as compensation and employee recognition programs. In fact, some researchers have begun to address the possibility of including OCBs in formal performance appraisal and reward systems (Bolino and Turnley, 2003; Denisi and Griffin, 2005; Paine and Organ, 2000; Vey and Campbell, 2004) and some organizations have already started to explicitly recognize OCBs (Levering and Moskowitz, 2003).

Research has shown that OCBs influence managers' decisions regarding training, promotions, rewards (Allen and Rush, 1988) and perceptions of how much an employee's performance contributes to the financial performance of an organization.

Whether through formal or informal means, when managers evaluate the performance of employees, they apparently factor citizenship behaviors into their assessments (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Therefore, in most performance appraisal systems, OCB dimensions are being

evaluated, although not formally or consistently. As a result, OCBs may contribute to the unreliability or inaccuracy of employee performance appraisals (Bolino et al., 2004). From a measurement perspective, one could argue that it is important to formally capture these OCBs since they are associated with organizational functioning and managers consider them in evaluating direct reports regardless of whether they are formally explicated on the appraisal instrument.

However, if this is done, it is possible that unanticipated negative outcomes may occur. Therefore, the goal of this paper is to examine the possible consequences of formally evaluating and rewarding OCBs.

2. Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB)

OCB is defined as “discretionary behaviors on the part of an employee that directly promote the effective functioning of an organization, independent of an employee’s objective productivity” (MacKenzie et al., 1998, p. 89). The body of literature on OCB has used a variety of terms for describing the preferable employees’ mentality, such as extra role behavior (Van Dyne and Cummings, 1990), organizational spontaneity (George and Brief, 1992), and support for collective interests over individual interests (Graham, 1991), before these concepts converged upon and accumulated in OCB studies. Despite the relatively inconsistent conceptualizations and the following applications, most of the conceptualizations had a commonality whereby the concept of

OCB was crystallized. That is, most of these concepts denoted the fact that the organizational effectiveness is expected when employees are proactive and benevolent to the organization (Van Dyne et al., 1994).

There have been five distinct elements constituting the concept of OCB (Bell and Menguc, 2002; Organ, 1988). Altruism is the discretionary behaviors motivating employees to help other employees’ work related problems whereas courtesy is also discretionary behaviors not to create work-related problems with others. Conscientiousness indicates the discretionary extra-role behaviors that exceed the requirements of the task, job, and work ethics (MacKenzie et al., 1993). Sportsmanship of employees is to tolerate circumstances unexpected or less preferable without complaining. Lastly, civic virtue is the behavior to participate organizational practices with the concern of the life of the company (Podsakoff et al., 1990).

3. Research hypotheses

The following hypotheses that are proportional to components of organizational citizenship behavior have been studied in the present survey:

- 1- Maturity level of social behavior component among employees of engineering and technical company in Isfahan Province is higher than the average level.
- 2- Maturity level of philanthropy component among employees of engineering and technical company in Isfahan Province is higher than the average level.

- 3- Maturity level of sense of duty component among employees of engineering and technical company in Isfahan Province is higher than the average level.
- 4- Maturity level of sportsmanship component among employees of engineering and technical company in Isfahan Province is higher than the average level.

4. Research methodology

This survey was conducted using descriptive-field methodology. Issues related to theoretical principles were collected through historical study like books and scientific journals and researcher self-made questionnaire was used to collect and analyze data (with acceptable reliability equal to 94%).

Statistical population of the survey included experts and managers at various levels in the engineering and technical company in which random sampling method (accessible) was applied. First a pilot study was conducted by distributing questionnaires among members of the statistical population and volume of the statistical sample was determined after estimating the primary variance (65 persons).

Data exploited from questionnaires was processed and summarized through SPSS software. Descriptive statistics methods (frequency, mean) were used to analyze data and inferential statistics methods were applied to explain the collected data and confirm or reject hypotheses.

5. Data analysis

5.1 Studying demographic characteristics of the statistical population under study

Characteristics of the statistical population under study are studied in this section in terms of gender.

Table 1- statistical population under study in terms of employees' gender

Gender	Frequency	Frequency percentage
Female	20	30.8
Male	45	69.2
Total	65	100.0

According to results of the above table, 30.8% of the statistical populations under study are female and 69.2% are male.

Table 2- statistical population under study in terms of organizational post

Organizational post	Frequency	Frequency percentage
Technician	33	50.8
Expert	21	32.3
Operational management	5	7.7
Middle management	6	9.2
Senior management	0	0
Total	65	100

According to results of the above table, 50.8% of the statistical populations under study are technician, 32.3% are expert, 7.7% are operational manager and 9.2% are middle manager.

5.2. Studying descriptive statistics related to questions supporting research hypotheses

5.2.1 Studying descriptive statistics related to questions supporting research hypothesis one:

Descriptive statistics related to questions supporting research hypothesis one are studied in this section separately.

Table 3- descriptive statistics related to questions supporting research hypothesis one

Question	Average	Standard deviation
Paying attention to one's work beyond the standard level and contracts	4.36	0.69
Paying attention to contracts and meetings that are not compulsive but seem to be important	3.95	0.83
Paying attention to actions that are not essential but have a positive impact on the organizational status and image	3.83	0.85
Paying attention to the impact of your behavior on others	4.26	0.77

According to results of the above table, the highest level of social behavior dominance is related to the component of paying attention to one's work beyond the standard level and contracts with an average equal to 4.36% and the lowest level of social behavior dominance is related to the component of paying attention to actions that are not essential but have a positive impact on the organizational status and image with an average equal to 3.83 among employees of the engineering and technical company.

5.2.2 Studying descriptive statistics related to questions supporting research hypothesis two:

Descriptive statistics related to questions supporting research hypothesis two are studied in this section separately.

Table 4- descriptive statistics related to questions supporting research hypothesis two

Question	Average	Standard deviation
Avoiding not to create problems for others	4.44	0.88
Helping those colleagues who cannot be present at work	4.18	0.74
Helping others do difficult tasks	4.13	0.91
Helping new employees towards their progress and success	4.24	0.88
Readiness to help those who need your assistance	4.29	0.76

According to results of the above table, the highest level of philanthropy dominance among employees of the engineering and technical company is related to the component of avoiding notto create problems for others with an average equal to 4.44% and the lowest level of dominance is related to the component of helping others do difficult tasks with an average equal to 4.13%.

5.2.3 Studying descriptive statistics related to questions supporting research hypothesis three:

Descriptive statistics related to questions supporting research hypothesis three are studied in this section separately.

Table 5- descriptive statistics related to questions supporting research hypothesis three

Question	Average	Standard deviation
Avoiding excessive rests at work	3.98	1.25
Be faithful to rules and regulations of the organization even when no one controls your work	4.32	0.81
Coordination of one's work with changes of the organization	4.03	0.82
Trying to avoid to infringe on others' rights	4.32	0.64
Studying the news and announcements of the organization and be faithful to them	4.23	0.70
Believing in doing honest work against receiving salary	4.53	0.84

According to results of the above table, the highest level of sense of duty dominance among employees of the engineering and technical company is related to the component of believing in doing honest work against receiving salary with an average equal to 4.53% and the lowest level of dominance is related to the component of avoiding excessive rests at work with an average equal to 3.98%.

5.2.4. Studying descriptive statistics related to questions supporting research hypothesis four:

Descriptive statistics related to questions supporting research hypothesis four are studied in this section separately.

Table 6- descriptive statistics related to questions supporting research hypothesis four

Question	Average	Standard deviation
Intention to exaggerate small problems	2.33	1.25
More emphasis and attention to the shortages and problems than positive aspects of affairs	3.46	0.90
Looking for the existing deficiencies in the organization	4.01	0.94
Level of attempt to regulate the created chaos in the organization through one's behavior	3.92	0.88
Tolerance level of the existing working problems and distinctions in work environment due to the organization	3.69	1.04
Level of support from the organization in conversations and events outside of the organization	4.38	0.74

According to results of the above table, the highest level of sense of duty dominance among employees of the engineering and technical company is related to the component of level of support from the organization in conversations and events outside of the organization with an average equal to 4.38% and the lowest level of dominance is related to the component of intention to exaggerate small problems with an average equal to 2.33%.

6. Testing research hypotheses

Results related to testing research hypotheses are studied in this section separately.

6.1 Testing research hypothesis one

Results related to testing research hypothesis one are studied in this section.

Hypothesis one: Maturity level of social behavior component among employees of engineering and technical company is higher than the average level.

Table 7- testing research hypothesis one

Hypothesis	Test statistic	Degree of freedom	Significance level
Dominance level of social behavior component	17.08	64	0.000

According to results of the above table since the calculated test statistic is significant at significance level less than 5% dominance level of social behavior component among employees of engineering and technical company is higher than the average level and this hypothesis is confirmed.

6.2. Testing research hypothesis two

Results related to testing research hypothesis two are studied in this section.

Hypothesis two: Maturity level of philanthropy component among employees of engineering and technical company is higher than the average level.

Table 8- testing research hypothesis two

Hypothesis	Test statistic	Degree of freedom	Significance level
Dominance level of philanthropy component	19.39	64	0.000

According to results of the above table since the calculated test statistic is significant at significance level less than 5% dominance level of philanthropy component among employees of engineering and technical company is higher than the average level and this hypothesis is confirmed.

6.3. Testing research hypothesis three

Results related to testing research hypothesis three are studied in this section.

Hypothesis three: Maturity level of sense of duty component among employees of engineering and technical company is higher than the average level.

Table 9- testing research hypothesis three

Hypothesis	Test statistic	Degree of freedom	Significance level
Dominance level of sense of duty component	18.51	64	0.000

According to results of the above table since the calculated test statistic is significant at significance level less than 5% dominance level of sense of duty component among employees of engineering and technical company is higher than the average level and this hypothesis is confirmed.

6.4. Testing research hypothesis four

Results related to testing research hypothesis four are studied in this section.

Hypothesis four: Maturity level of sportsmanship component among employees of engineering and technical company is higher than the average level.

Table 10- testing research hypothesis four

Hypothesis	Test statistic	Degree of freedom	Significance level
Dominance level of sportsmanship component	8.45	64	0.000

According to results of the above table since the calculated test statistic is significant at significance level less than 5% dominance level of sportsmanship component among employees of engineering and technical company is higher than the average level and this hypothesis is confirmed.

7. Conclusion

The results of this research indicate that level of social behavior, philanthropy, sense of duty and sportsmanship components among employees of engineering and technical company is higher than the average level.

References

- Allen, T.D., Fecteau, J.D. and Fecteau, C.F. (2004), "Structured interviewing for OCB: construct validity, faking, and the effects of question type", *Human Performance*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 1-24.
- Allen, T.D. and Rush, M.C. (1988), "The effects of organizational citizenship behavior on

performance judgments: a field study and a laboratory experiment”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 83, pp. 247-60.

-Bateman, T.S. and Organ, D.W. (1983), “Job satisfaction and the good soldier: the relationship between affect and employee ‘citizenship’”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 26, pp. 587-95.

-Becker, T.E. (1992), “Foci and bases of commitment: are they distinctions worth making?”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 35, pp. 232-44.

-Bell, S.J. and Menguc, B. (2002), “The employee-organization relationship, organizational citizenship behaviors, and superior service quality”, *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 78 No. 2, pp. 131-46.

-Bolino, M.C. and Turnley, W.H. (2003), “Going the extra mile: cultivating and managing employee citizenship behavior”, *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 60-71.

-Bolino, M.C., Turnley, W.H. and Niehoff, B.P. (2004), “The other side of the story: reexamining prevailing assumptions about organizational citizenship behavior”, *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 229-46.

-Coleman, V.I. and Borman, W.C. (2000), “Investigating the underlying structure of the citizenship performance domain”, *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 25-44.

-Denisi, A.S. and Griffin, R.W. (2005), *Human Resource Management*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, MA.

-Ilgen, D.R. and Pulakos, E.D. (1999), *The Changing Nature of Performance: Implications for Staffing, Motivation, and Development*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

-George, J.M. (1991), “State or trait: effects of positive mood on prosocial behavior at work”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 76, pp. 299-307.

-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*, Vol. 112, pp. 310-29.

-Graham, J.W. (1991), “An essay on organizational citizenship behavior”, *The Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 249-70.

-Koys, D.J. (2001), “The effects of employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover on organizational effectiveness: a unit-level, longitudinal study”, *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 54 No. 1, pp. 101-14.

-LePine, J.A., Erez, A. and Johnson, D.E. (2002), “The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: a critical review and meta-analysis”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87 No. 1, pp. 52-65.

- Levering, R. and Moskowitz, M. (2003), "100 best companies to work for", *Fortune*, Vol. 147 No. 1, pp. 127-30, 134, 136, 138, 140, 143, 150, 152.
- MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M. and Ahearne, M. (1998), "Some possible antecedents and consequences of in-role and extra-role salesperson performance", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 62 No. 3, pp. 69-86.
- MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M. and Fetter, R. (1993), "The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 70-8.
- Moorman, R.H. and Blakely, G.L. (1995), "Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 16, pp. 127-42.
- 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*, Vol. 36, pp. 527-56.
- Organ, D.W. (1988), *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*, Lexington Books, Lexington, MA.
- Organ, D.W. and Konovsky, M. (1989), "Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 74, pp. 157-64.
- Paine, J.B. and Organ, D.W. (2000), "The cultural matrix of organizational citizenship behavior: some preliminary conceptual and empirical observations", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 45-59.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Ahearne, M. and MacKenzie, S.B. (1997), "Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 82, pp. 262-70.
- Podsakoff, P.M. and MacKenzie, S.B. (1994), "Organizational citizenship behavior and sales unit effectiveness", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 31, pp. 351-63.
- 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*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 107-42.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B. and Bachrach, D.G. (2000), "Organizational citizenship behaviors: a critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26, pp. 513-63.
- Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W. and Near, J.P. (1983), "Organizational citizenship behavior: its nature and antecedents", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 68, pp. 655-63.
- Van Dyne, L. and Cummings, L.L. (1990), "Extra-role behaviors: in pursuit of construct and definitional clarity", paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, San Francisco, CA.

- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J.W. and Dienesch, R.M. (1994), "Organizational citizenship behavior: construct redefinition, measurement, and validation", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 765-802.
- Vey, M.A. and Campbell, J.P. (2004), "In-role or extra-role organizational citizenship behavior: which are we measuring?", *Human Performance*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 119-35.
- Walz, S.M. and Niehoff, B.P. (2000), "Organizational citizenship behaviors: their relationship to organizational effectiveness", *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 301-99.
- Walz, S.M. and Niehoff, B.P. (1996), "Organizational citizenship behaviors and their effect on organizational effectiveness in limited-menu restaurants", *Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings, 56th Annual Meeting, Cincinnati, OH*, pp. 307-11.
- Williams, L.J. and Anderson, S.E. (1991), "Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behavior", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 17, pp. 601-17.
- Williams, L.J. and Wong, T.S. (1999), "Mood and organizational citizenship behavior: the effects of positive affect on employee organizational citizenship behavior intentions", *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, Vol. 133, pp. 656-68.