Organizational Citizenship Behavior (Ocb) The   Behavioral Indicators of a Good Soldier

Prof. A Narasimha Rao, Om Prakash
Dept. of Commerce & Management, Andhra University
Research Scholar, Dept. of Commerce & Management, Andhra University

Abstract: *This paper is a brief outline about various behavioral indicators of a self-motivated soldier or an employee who takes pride in serving the nation or the organization beyond his normal call of duty without expecting any reciprocating rewards in return and this construct is called as **"Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)".** The citizenship behavior imbibes to them because of various contextual variables also called as antecedents such as **individual's personality traits** (e.g. **conscientiousness** and **extroversion** i.e. who enjoys leading the team from the front in various whole-ship evolutions of the organization), **attitudinal** or **perceptual variables** (e.g. **job satisfaction** i.e. jubilation on rectifying a critical defect after spending a sleepless night, **organizational commitment** and **justice perceptions**),**leadership style** (e.g., **transformational** & **transactional**), **Leader–member exchange(LMX)** relationship and **job characteristics** (e.g. **Task feedback** and **task interdependence**) etc. OCB lubricates the social system of the organization. A good soldier should exhibit certain military bearings such as **Altruism**; where a superior takes pride in grooming a recruit to a combatworthy soldier by sparing his personal valuable time & resources; **Conscientiousness**, wherein the employee develops an empathetic attachment to his men & machines in keeping them eveready; **Sportsmanship**, means keeping the flag high even during difficult times without complaining for the hardships ; **Courtesy**, means being subtle in all his decisions & actions so that his team members should not face any hitches, **Civic Virtue** are the indicators through which he sets an impression on outsiders about the good image of the organization by displaying a good military discipline and conduct. These citizenship behaviors contribute to organizational functioning by affecting the individual who does the citizenship behavior, the group in which these behaviors are exhibited and ultimately the organization by in increasing its effectiveness. Therefore, organizations should foster an organizational culture and environment to encourage and motivate their employees for inculcating & exhibiting citizenship behavior.*

Key words: *Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB); Individual differences; Attitudinal & perceptual variables; contextual factors; Leadership style, Altruism, Conscientiousness, Leader-member exchange(LMX).*

I.   Introduction:

The Indian Navy propels on the wheels of concrete organizational structure, organizational climate, physical resources and most importantly the officers & sailors. The team of officers & sailors acts as blood in the organization and always strives to pump purified oxygen towards combat readiness of the organization in terms of performing its prescribed in-roles as mentioned in their charter of duties and ensures that organizational objectives are achieved in time and every time with greatest perfection.

In recent hostile scenario, the armed forces have to be ready to encounter threats at all times. Thus, achieving these high-end goals without the support and cooperation of their team of officers & sailors is not an easy task, therefore, the Indian Navy always look towards them for an extra role behavior, which is not part of their in-role job requirements. However, this can not be demanded at all times. So, this has to be a volunteer gestures by them, which will again depend upon their dispositional and attitudinal behavior.

Therefore, among many management theorist Chester Bernard's (1938) concept of 'willingness to cooperate' has a very indispensible role in the functioning of the organization which was later on confirmed by Katz & Kahn (1966, 1978) saying that " any organization in which cooperation was limited to formally prescribed behavior would utterly break down"(Organ, 1990). The one construct which captures such work behavior is the concept of 'Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB): The concept of OCB was first introduced as 'A Good Soldier Syndrome', (Bateman & Organ, 1983); (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983), something that was considered necessary for the prosperity and effective functioning of organizations. Organisational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) are discretionary behaviours that are neither mandated nor compensated by the organisation. 'Good soldiers' are those who are not concerned about getting rewards or any other tangible benefits from the organization. They

include those behaviours that contribute to maintain an organisation's social system based on social exchange theory relying on long term socio-emotional benefits and not on short term economical benefits (Blau, 1964); (Cropanzano et al., 2001);(Houser, 1988), and which indirectly benefit the work group or organisation as a whole (Smith et al., 1983). Theoretically, citizenship behaviours are thought to improve an organisation's functioning by "lubricating" its social machinery (Smith et al., 1983) and contribute to the development of social capital in organisations (Bolino, Turnley, & Bloodgood, 2002). Drawing on Chester Barnard's concept (1938) of the "willingness to cooperate," Organ (1988) originally defined organizational citizenship behavior 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" (p. 4). By discretionary it is meant that it is not enforceable role requirement or job description, rather it is depending upon incumbent's personal choice and if are omitted are not punishable (Organ, 1997)**,** also it is not directly or explicitly rewarded by the formal reward system, but over a period of time it can influence the performance appraisal, but such returns are not contractually guaranteed (Organ, 1997)**.**

Research has found that the average level of employees' organisational citizenship behaviours is positively associated with organisational performance (Koys, 2001)(Walz & Niehoff, 2000) and work group performance (P. M. Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997). Employees have various motives for engaging in OCBs. For example, some individuals might be predisposed (empathetic concern) towards helping others.

Research has also found that people who are characterised as conscientious (working more than minimum job requirement such as staying beyond working hours, sacrificing authorized leave for the benefit of organization etc.) (Konovsky & Organ, 1996) and with positive affect (emotionally attached to the organization) (George, 1991) engage in more citizenship behaviours. It has also been acknowledged that individuals may engage in OCBs to enhance their image in the organisation (Bolino, 1999).

Finally, based on social exchange theory, research has found that employees who are treated well by their organisations and whose contributions are valued and recognized (perceived organizational support; POS) reciprocate by engaging in OCBs. For example, organisational support , favourable job condition, autonomy in performing their tasks and organisational fairness have been found to be related with employees' OCBs and to the organization in terms of affective commitment, heightened performance, and lessened withdrawal behavior (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993)(Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) (Jain & Cooper, 2012)(Jain & Cooper, 2011)(Jain, 2016)

Antecedents / Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB): The antecedents / predictors are the reasons, causes or contextual variables which influence to encourage / motivate employees for citizenship behaviors. Much of the early work in OCB research has identified **individual differences** (e.g., **conscientiousness and extroversion** i,e who enjoys in working in groups & team, who builds their image by getting gratification, recognition, & fame while leading the team from the front in various whole ship evolutions of the organization), **attitudinal or perceptual variables** (e.g**., job satisfaction** i,e jubilation on rectifying a long pending defect after toiling the midnight oil is awesome, **organizational commitment** which could be normative & affective, and **justice perceptions** i,e fairness in managerial decisions pertaining to nominations, rewards & performance appraisals etc.), **leadership-related factors** (e.g., **Transformational behaviors**; a leader who works with subordinates and understand their difficulties, strength & weaknesses , creates a vision mutually agreed upon by all team members, serves to enhance the josh, motivation, morale and their performance by imbibing a sense of collective identity & ownership to their work & organization by becoming a role model for his subordinates & whereas **Transactional behaviors**; also known as managerial leadership where leaders focuses on established procedures, SOPs, rules, regulation, supervision etc. and accomplish the task through their subordinates by method of reward & punishment without changing the organizational structure & procedures, and relationship based leadership style i,e **LMX; Leader–member exchange** relationship is a two way dyadic relationship between leader and subordinates based on mutual trust, faith and respect which goes beyond the scope of employment. The quality of LMX influences subordinates behavior and organizational effectiveness; and **job characteristics** (e.g., **task feedback and task interdependence**) as significant predictors or antecedents of employee OCBs (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006).

Dimensions / Indicators of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB):   Since,Organ's(1988) conceptualization of OCB, over 30 different forms or dimensions have been identified (P. M. Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). According to Podsakoff et al. (1990), OCB is consisted of five broad dimensions namely, **Altruism**, which is discretionary behavior directed at helping others or co-workers by sharing work load or resources (such as orienting new incumbents to imbibe the Naval traditions, regulations, policies and mentoring them to learn the technical system as quickly as possible so that they can handle them independently by sparing their valuable personal/leisure time & resources); **Conscientiousness**,   which is behavior going beyond minimum requirements of the organization such as staying beyond normal working

hours, not taking authorized leave, developing an empathetic attachment to the technical system they handle and keeping them combat ready at all times by following the Naval tradition of **'Service before self'**; **Sportsmanship**, that indicates willingness of an employee to tolerate less than ideal circumstances without excessive complaining such as facing various difficulties during long military deployments even after leaving their family behind, keeping their weapon & sensors combat worthy even with scarce resources, ready to report back to unit if any requirement arises during leave or short leave , not complaining for any discomfort as salary cut during difficult times of an organization ; **Courtesy**, which is behavior that is aimed at considering the impact of own actions on others, such as turning up on time for scheduled meeting so that others are not kept waiting, keeping informed to unit about their whereabouts during leave period, **Civic Virtue** , which indicates employee's participation in the public affairs of the organization such as displaying good military conduct in terms of good turnout and behavior at civil settings, volunteer participation in external events such as participating in Swachh bharat abhiyan, tree plantation drive, educating illiterates, helping people during any natural calamities etc. which enhances organization's image.

Consequences of OCB: As mentioned in the definition of OCB, it contributes to organizational functioning by affecting the individual who does the citizenship behavior, the group in which these behaviors are exhibited and ultimately the organization as a whole. **At the individual level**, these consequences include performance evaluation decisions, managers' reward allocation decisions, and employee withdrawal related criteria (i.e., turnover intentions, turnover, withdrawal behavior and absenteeism), whereas **at the organizational level** they include a variety of objective effectiveness measures (e.g., combat readiness at all time, productivity, efficiency, costs, and profitability) (N P Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009)**.** The effects of OCB are even dysfunctional such as increased levels of role overload, stress, and work–family conflicts (Bolino & Turnley, 2005)**.** Also, Penner and colleagues' (Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder, 2005) review chapter explicates positive consequences of performing pro-social behavior on individual well-being, psychological health, physical health, social behavior, and fitness (Spitzmuller, Van Dyne, & Ilies, 2008).

II.   Conclusion:
With the above discussions about OCBs, it has been understood that for an organization to excel at all fronts, it has to foster a culture of citizenship behavior among its employees by adhering to the recommended antecedents or conducive organizational climate & culture to achieve heightened organizational effectiveness.

References
[1].   Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job Satisfaction and the Good Soldier: The Relationship Between Affect and Employee "Citizenship". Academy of Management Journal, 26(4), 587–595. http://doi.org/10.2307/255908
[2].   Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and Power in Social Life. Exchange and Power in Social Life. http://doi.org/10.2307/2091154
[3].   Bolino, M. C. (1999). Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors? Academy of Management Review, 24(1), 82–98. http://doi.org/10.2307/259038
[4].   Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2005). The Personal Costs of Citizenship Behavior: The Relationship Between Individual Initiative and Role Overload, Job Stress, and Work-Family Conflict. Journal of Applied Psychology, 90(4), 740–8. http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.740
[5].   Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Bloodgood, J. M. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. Academy of Management Review, 27(4), 505–522. http://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2002.7566023
[6].   Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., Mohler, C. J., & Schminke, M. (2001). Three roads to organizational justice. Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 20, 1–113. http://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-7301(01)20001-2
[7].   George, J. M. (1991). State or trait: Effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(2), 299–307. http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.2.299
[8].   Houser, H. F. (1988). Reviews the book "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome," by Dennis W. Organ. Personnel Psychology (Vol. 41).
[9].   Jain, A. K. (2016). Volunteerism, affective commitment and citizenship behavior. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 31(3), 657–671. http://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-02-2014-0042
[10].   Jain, A. K., & Cooper, C. L. (2011). Social power as a means of increasing personal and organizational effectiveness: The mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior. Journal of Management & Organization, 17(3), 412–432.
[11].   Jain, A. K., & Cooper, C. L. (2012). Stress and organisational citizenship behaviours in Indian business process outsourcing organisations. IIMB Management Review, 24(3), 155–163. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.iimb.2012.06.004
[12].   Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17(3), 253–265. http://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199605)17:3<253::AID-JOB747>3.0.CO;2-Q
[13].   KOYS, D. J. (2001). The effects of employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover on organizational effectiveness: a unit-level, longitudinal study. Personnel Psychology, 54(1), 101–114. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2001.tb00087.x
[14].   Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. Academy of Management Journal, 36(3), 527–556. http://doi.org/10.2307/256591
[15].   Organ, D. W. (1990). Motivational Basis of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Research in Organizational Behavior, 12(1), 43–72.
[16].   Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: It's Construct Clean-Up Time. Human Performance. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_2
[17].   Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and

consequences. Human Resource Management, 32, 350.

[18].   Penner, L. a, Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. a, & Schroeder, D. a. (2005). Prosocial behavior: Multilevel perspectives. Annual Review of Psychology, 56, 365–92. http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070141

[19].   Podsakoff, N. P., Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Maynes, T. D., & Spoelma, T. M. (2014). Consequences of unit-level organizational citizenship behaviors: A review and recommendations for future research. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35(SUPPL.1). http://doi.org/10.1002/job.1911

[20].   Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psycholychol, 94(1), 122–141. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0013079

[21].   Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. The Journal of Applied Psychology, 82(2), 262–70. http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.2.262

[22].   Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and future research, 26(3), 513–563.

[23].   Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(4), 698–714. http://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.87.4.698

[24].   Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences. Journal of Applied Psychology 68, 32(1), 145–147. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00043_9.x

[25].   Spitzmuller, M., Van Dyne, L., & Ilies, R. (2008). Organizational citizenship behavior: A review and extension of its nomological network. The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Behavior: Volume I Micro Approaches, 106–123. http://doi.org/10.4135/9781849200448

[26].   Van Scotter, J. R., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81(5), 525–531. http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.5.525

[27].   Walz, S. M., & Niehoff, B. P. (2000). Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Their Relationship to Organizational Effectiveness. Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 24(3), 301–319. http://doi.org/10.1177/109634800002400301