Volume - 5, Issue- 3, March 2017 IC Value : 56.46 e-ISSN : 2347 - 9671| p- ISSN : 2349 - 0187
EPRA International Journal of Economic and Business Review SJIF Impact Factor(2016) : 6.484
ISI Impact Factor (2013): 1.259 (UAE)

Research Paper


www.eprawisdom.com

# ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR: A STRATEGY FOR ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS - AN EMPIRICAL STUDY

**Dr. S. Anand Reddy**[1] — [1]*Dept. of HRM, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur-522 510, A.P, India*

**Dr. V. Tulasi Das**[2] — [2]*Dept. of Human Resource Management, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur-522 510, A.P, India*

## ABSTRACT

*In competitive world, every manager and leader, in fact every organization wants an employee who is not only technically strong, not only those who do hard work, but also who display good traits, positive competitive nature, collaborate with team members to reach the organizational goals. If a manager has an employee who possess qualities like helping the other persons, commitment to work, working without thinking of personal gains and strict timings, standing up as the face of the organization etc. then the manager will have to invest less time on the employee and will have less stress. Though the mentioned qualities are not paid for, they will have high impact on the performance. This type of behavior is termed as organization citizenship behavior. Organizations are encouraging their employees to engage in Organizational citizenship behavior .The present study is an attempt to find out if the employees have organizational citizenship Behavior. All together nine hundred and twenty seven participated in the study.*

**KEY WORDS**: *Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Organizational Effectiveness, Organizational Performance.*

## INTRODUCTION

The world is looking forward to high performance organizations, which would provide high job satisfaction to their employees as organizations attribute their success to their employees and would also cherish excellence and effectiveness. Without hardworking and creative employees, most organizations would not be where they are today. It is quite probable that many of these employees are not merely completing their assigned tasks; they are rising above and beyond their job description to benefit the organization as a whole. This extra-role performance has been termed organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). OCB is a relatively new concept in performance analysis but it represents a very old human conduct of voluntary action and mutual aid with no request for pay or formal rewards in return. The concept was first introduced in the mid1980s by Dennis Organ. Dyne (1995) proposed the broader construct of "extra-role behavior" (ERB), defined as "behavior which benefits the organization and/or is intended to benefit the organization, which is discretionary and which goes beyond existing role expectations". Thus organizational citizenship is functional, extra-role, pro-social organizational behaviors directed at individual, groups and / or an organization. Katz and Kahn (1978) pointed out that organizational citizenship is important in organizations. Organizational citizenship can be extremely valuable to organizations and can contribute to performance and competitive advantage (Nemeth and Staw 1989). A few

studies have shown that OCB are positively related to indicators of individual, unit, and organizational performance (Werner, 1994; Podsakoff&MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff, Ahearne, &MacKenzie, 1997).Like most behaviors, OCB are probably multi-determined. That is, there is no one single cause of OCB.

As defined by Organ (1988), OCB reflects a "good soldier syndrome" which is so necessary for the prosperity and good functioning of every organization. Organizational citizenship is discretionary behavior that is not part of an employee's formal job requirements, but that nevertheless promotes the effective functioning of the organization. OCB has been defined as participating in activities or actions that are not formally a part of the job description, but that benefit the organization as a whole (Borman, 2004). Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) describe actions in which employees are willing to go above and beyond their prescribed role requirements. Results indicate that positive work climate, organization resources, employee's personality, organizational culture and so on are all related to OCB.

In the organizational setting, citizenship behaviors generally describe an extra struggle shown by employees on behalf of other colleagues or for the organization as a whole. Organizational citizenship behavior is not all the time formally acknowledged or rewarded by the organization and concepts like cooperation or friendliness are also not easy to measure (Podsakoff et al., 2000). The typical examples of OCB include showing positive attitude, offering to help a novice become familiar with his/her job at the office, helping coworker who may be under stressed due to deadlines, and organizational-related works such as working for colleagues and over time without expectation of reward. Similarly think of employees who are supportive with their boss/superiors and colleagues, willing to make sacrifices.

OCB enhances the social environment in the organization, lowering rates of absenteeism and turnover intentions, increases employee well-being, along with the productivity (Podsakoff et al., 2000). In the view of (Podsakoff et al., 2000) leadership behaviors have been discovered to play an important role in promoting organizational citizenship behavior. The suggested positive link and association between servant-leadership and OCB is also supported by (Smith et al. 1983).

## OBJECTIVES

1. To examine the perceptions of employees on Citizenship Behavior in the organization,
2. To identify the awareness according to the level of employees and departments on OCB
3. To put forth certain suggestions based on findings that have been arrived.

## METHODOLOGY

A survey was conducted in a specific manufacturing unit to identify the OCB of that unit. A structured questionnaire was prepared and distributed to all the employees in the organization. Suzy Fox and Paul E Spector (2011) were considered for this study. The questionnaire consists of 17 items with a five point rating scale. The adopted questionnaire was customized by limiting the number of questions to 15 with Yes and No answers to make it very simple to the manufacturing people. Out of 400 questionnaires that were distributed, we received 230 responses which are complete. Since we wanted the data to be genuine, we asked the participants not to reveal their personal identity in any form except for department and designation. Even designation we have classified in to two categories as juniors and seniors to make it more confidential. Above managers are considered to be seniors and below manager are considered to be juniors. Out of 230 around 30 are seniors and rest of them are juniors. The data is collected from four departments: Research and Development, Engineering and WH, Production and quality. 15 are from R&D department, 42 are from Engineering and WH, 99 are from production and the rest of them are from quality departments.

## DATA ANALYSIS

**Cross Tabulation:** A cross tabulation is a joint frequency distribution of cases based on two or more categorical variables. It Displays a distribution of cases by their values on two or more variables is known as contingency table analysis and is one of the more commonly used analytic methods in the social sciences The joint frequency distribution can be analyzed with the *chisquare* statistic to determine whether the variables are statistically independent or if they are associated. The chi-square test of statistical significance, first developed by Karl Pearson, assumes that both variables are measured at the nominal level. To be sure, chi-square may also be used with tables containing variables measured at a higher level; however, the statistic is calculated *as if* the variables were measured only at the nominal level. This means that any information regarding the order of, or distances between, categories is ignored.

| Table 1: Sample Analysis of Employee Designation and Departments | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Designation | | Total |
| | | | Seniors | Juniors | |
| Dept | R&D | Count | 3 | 12 | 15 |
| | | Expected Count | 2.3 | 12.6 | 15.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **20.0%** | **80.0%** | **100.0%** |
| | ENG | Count | 11 | 31 | 42 |
| | | Expected Count | 6.6 | 35.2 | 42.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **26.2%** | **73.8%** | **100.0%** |
| | PD | Count | 9 | 90 | 99 |
| | | Expected Count | 15.5 | 83.1 | 99.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **9.1%** | **90.9%** | **100.0%** |
| | Quality | Count | 13 | 60 | 73 |
| | | Expected Count | 11.4 | 61.3 | 73.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **17.8%** | **82.2%** | **100.0%** |
| Total | | Count | 36 | 193 | 230 |
| | | Expected Count | 36.0 | 193.0 | 230.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **15.7%** | **83.9%** | **100.0%** |

From the above table we understand that there are 83.9 % of the employees who belong to the junior level and 15.7% of the employees only belong to senior level. In Research and Development department there are 80 % of the employees are from junior level and only 20% of them from senior level. In engineering department there are 73.8% of the employees are from junior level and 26.2% of the employees are from senior level. In Production department there are 90.9% of the employees from junior level and only 9.1% of them are from senior level. And in quality department there are 82.2% of juniors have participated in the survey and 17.8% of them have participated in the survey. Out of all seniors participation is more from engineering department and juniors sample is more from Production department.

| Chi-Square Tests | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | **237.238[a]** | **8** | **.000** |
| Likelihood Ratio | 20.074 | 8 | .010 |
| N of Valid Cases | 230 | | |
| a. 8 cells (53.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .00. | | | |

From the study we can understand that there is a significant difference between designation and department as the Chi square value is .000

| Table 2: Department suggestions for improvement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Offered suggestions for improving the work environment. | | |
| | | | YES | NO | Total |
| Dept | R&D | Count | 4 | 11 | 15 |
| | | Expected Count | 4.4 | 10.5 | 15.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **26.7%** | **73.3%** | **100.0%** |
| | ENG | Count | 15 | 27 | 42 |
| | | Expected Count | 12.4 | 29.4 | 42.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **35.7%** | **64.3%** | **100.0%** |
| | PD | Count | 33 | 66 | 99 |
| | | Expected Count | 29.3 | 69.3 | 99.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **33.3%** | **66.7%** | **100.0%** |
| | Quality | Count | 16 | 57 | 73 |
| | | Expected Count | 21.6 | 51.1 | 73.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **21.9%** | **78.1%** | **100.0%** |
| Total | | Count | 68 | 161 | 230 |
| | | Expected Count | 68.0 | 161.0 | 230.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **29.6%** | **70.4%** | **100.0%** |

Only 29.6 % of the participants say that they offered suggestion for improving the work environment where are a huge number of participants 70.4% of them say that they don't give suggestions? It is observed that from Engineering department participants give suggestions more than others production standing the next line. This is an indication that workers participation needs to be more in order to develop OCB

| Chi-Square Tests | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | **233.553[a]** | **8** | **.000** |
| Likelihood Ratio | 16.500 | 8 | .036 |
| N of Valid Cases | 230 | | |
| a. 8 cells (53.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .00. | | | |

As the chi Square value is less than .000 we can say that there is significant difference with this question with respect to different departments.

| Table 3: Departments on volunteering for Extra work | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Volunteered for extra work assignments | | |
| | | | YES | NO | Total |
| Dept | R&D | Count | 4 | 11 | 15 |
| | | Expected Count | 5.9 | 9.1 | 15.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **26.7%** | **73.3%** | **100.0%** |
| | ENG | Count | 18 | 24 | 42 |
| | | Expected Count | 16.4 | 25.4 | 42.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **42.9%** | **57.1%** | **100.0%** |
| | PD | Count | 47 | 52 | 99 |
| | | Expected Count | 38.7 | 59.8 | 99.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **47.5%** | **52.5%** | **100.0%** |
| | Quality | Count | 21 | 52 | 73 |
| | | Expected Count | 28.6 | 44.1 | 73.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **28.8%** | **71.2%** | **100.0%** |
| Total | | Count | 90 | 139 | 230 |
| | | Expected Count | 90.0 | 139.0 | 230.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **39.6%** | **60.4%** | **100.0%** |

With respect to the item participants volunteering for extra work assignments, around 40% of them say YES while around 60% are not ready to take up extra work assignments. In the production department highest percentage is marked for taking up extra work and in R&D the employees are least interested to take extra work.

| Chi-Square Tests | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | **237.427[a]** | **8** | **.000** |
| Likelihood Ratio | 20.407 | 8 | .009 |
| N of Valid Cases | 230 | | |
| a. 7 cells (46.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .00. | | | |

As the value of chi Square is .000 we can say that there is a significant difference between the departments to this question.

| Table 4: Departments view on Good about the Organization | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Said good things about your employer in front of others. | | |
| | | | YES | NO | Total |
| Dept | R&D | Count | 15 | 0 | 15 |
| | | Expected Count | 13.0 | 1.9 | 15.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **100.0%** | **0.0%** | **100.0%** |
| | ENG | Count | 36 | 6 | 42 |
| | | Expected Count | 36.5 | 5.3 | 42.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **85.7%** | **14.3%** | **100.0%** |
| | PD | Count | 83 | 16 | 99 |
| | | Expected Count | 86.1 | 12.5 | 99.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **83.8%** | **16.2%** | **100.0%** |
| | Quality | Count | 66 | 7 | 73 |
| | | Expected Count | 63.5 | 9.2 | 73.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **90.4%** | **9.6%** | **100.0%** |
| Total | | Count | 200 | 29 | 230 |
| | | Expected Count | 200.0 | 29.0 | 230.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **87.4%** | **12.6%** | **100.0%** |

87.4% of the participants say that they say positive about the company in the presence of the others and only 12.6% of the people do not talk positive about the company in the presence of the others. Research and Development team claims that they are cent percentage in speaking positive about the company and Engineering stands least with 85.7%.

| Chi-Square Tests | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | **234.012[a]** | **8** | **.000** |
| Likelihood Ratio | 18.723 | 8 | .016 |
| N of Valid Cases | 230 | | |
| a. 8 cells (53.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .00. | | | |

There is a significant difference between the departments and the question of speaking positive about the company.

| Table 5: Dept. on sacrificing the breaks | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Gave up meal and other breaks to complete work. | | |
| | | | YES | NO | Total |
| Dept | R&D | Count | 15 | 0 | 15 |
| | | Expected Count | 14.5 | .4 | 15.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **100.0%** | **0.0%** | **100.0%** |
| | ENG | Count | 41 | 1 | 42 |
| | | Expected Count | 40.7 | 1.1 | 42.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **97.6%** | **2.4%** | **100.0%** |
| | PD | Count | 96 | 3 | 99 |
| | | Expected Count | 96.0 | 2.6 | 99.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **97.0%** | **3.0%** | **100.0%** |
| | Quality | Count | 71 | 2 | 73 |
| | | Expected Count | 70.8 | 1.9 | 73.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **97.3%** | **2.7%** | **100.0%** |
| Total | | Count | 223 | 6 | 230 |
| | | Expected Count | 223.0 | 6.0 | 230.0 |
| | | % within V2 | **97.4%** | **2.6%** | **100.0%** |

There is huge number of people who say that they give up breaks to complete the work. And R&D stands tall with 100% with respect to giving up their breaks for the work.

| Chi-Square Tests | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | **230.484[a]** | **8** | **.000** |
| Likelihood Ratio | 13.744 | 8 | .089 |
| N of Valid Cases | 230 | | |
| a. 11 cells (73.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .00. | | | |

There is significant difference between the departments and giving up breaks for the work

| Table 6: Employee Experiences and Suggestion for Improvement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Offered suggestions for improving the work environment. | | |
| | | | YES | NO | Total |
| Design | Seniors | Count | 8 | 28 | 36 |
| | | Expected Count | 10.6 | 25.2 | 36.0 |
| | | % within V3 | **22.2%** | **77.8%** | **100.0%** |
| | Juniors | Count | 60 | 133 | 193 |
| | | Expected Count | 57.1 | 135.1 | 193.0 |
| | | % within V3 | **31.1%** | **68.9%** | **100.0%** |
| Total | | Count | 68 | 161 | 230 |
| | | Expected Count | 68.0 | 161.0 | 230.0 |
| | | % within V3 | **29.6%** | **70.4%** | **100.0%** |

It can be observed from the above table that 70% of the employees are not interested in giving suggestions for improving the work area. Surprisingly juniors are more interested in giving suggestions than the seniors.

| Chi-Square Tests | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Value** | **df** | **Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)** |
| Pearson Chi-Square | **231.147[a]** | **4** | **.000** |
| Likelihood Ratio | 14.068 | 4 | .007 |
| N of Valid Cases | 230 | | |
| a. 5 cells (55.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .00. | | | |

There is a significant difference between the designations to the question if the employees give suggestions for improving the work area.

**Table 7: Employee Designation and Volunteering for Extra Work**

| | | | Volunteered for extra work assignments | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **YES** | **NO** | **Total** |
| Design | Seniors | Count | 13 | 23 | 36 |
| | | Expected Count | 14.1 | 21.8 | 36.0 |
| | | % within V3 | **36.1%** | **63.9%** | **100.0%** |
| | Juniors | Count | 77 | 116 | 193 |
| | | Expected Count | 75.5 | 116.6 | 193.0 |
| | | % within V3 | **39.9%** | **60.1%** | **100.0%** |
| Total | | Count | 90 | 139 | 230 |
| | | Expected Count | 90.0 | 139.0 | 230.0 |
| | | % within V3 | **39.6%** | **60.4%** | **100.0%** |

It is observed that 39.6% of the participants say that they volunteer for extra work assignments. The ratio of the juniors is higher than the seniors.

| Chi-Square Tests | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Value** | **df** | **Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)** |
| Pearson Chi-Square | **230.183[a]** | **4** | **.000** |
| Likelihood Ratio | 13.056 | 4 | .011 |
| N of Valid Cases | 230 | | |
| a. 5 cells (55.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .00. | | | |

There is a significant difference between designation and volunteering for extra work.

| Table 8: Employee Designation and saying good about organization | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Said good things about your employer in front of others. | | |
| | | | YES | NO | Total |
| Design | Seniors | Count | 34 | 2 | 36 |
| | | Expected Count | 31.3 | 4.5 | 36.0 |
| | | % within V3 | **94.4%** | **5.6%** | **100.0%** |
| | Juniors | Count | 166 | 27 | 193 |
| | | Expected Count | 167.8 | 24.3 | 193.0 |
| | | % within V3 | **86.0%** | **14.0%** | **100.0%** |
| Total | | Count | 200 | 29 | 230 |
| | | Expected Count | 200.0 | 29.0 | 230.0 |
| | | % within V3 | **87.4%** | **12.6%** | **100.0%** |

87.4 % of the participants say that they speak well about the company in front of the others. 94.4% of the seniors vouch for it, whereas juniors are only86%.

| Chi-Square Tests | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | **231.960[a]** | **4** | **.000** |
| Likelihood Ratio | 15.195 | 4 | .004 |
| N of Valid Cases | 230 | | |
| a. 6 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .00. | | | |

There is a significant difference between the designation and speaking good about the company in the presence of the others.

| Table 9: Employee Designation and sacrificing the breaks | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Gave up meal and other breaks to complete work. | | |
| | | | YES | NO | Total |
| Design | Seniors | Count | 34 | 2 | 36 |
| | | Expected Count | 34.9 | .9 | 36.0 |
| | | % within V3 | **94.4%** | **5.6%** | **100.0%** |
| | Juniors | Count | 189 | 4 | 193 |
| | | Expected Count | 187.1 | 5.0 | 193.0 |
| | | % within V3 | **97.9%** | **2.1%** | **100.0%** |
| Total | | Count | 223 | 6 | 230 |
| | | Expected Count | 223.0 | 6.0 | 230.0 |
| | | % within V3 | **97.4%** | **2.6%** | **100.0%** |

97.4% of the participants claim that they give up the meals or breaks to complete the tasks. 97.9% of the juniors say that they stand up to this whereas only 94.4% of the seniors say YES to it.

| Chi-Square Tests | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Value** | **df** | **Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)** |
| Pearson Chi-Square | **231.449[a]** | **4** | **.000** |
| Likelihood Ratio | 14.041 | 4 | .007 |
| N of Valid Cases | 230 | | |
| a. 6 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .00. | | | |

There is a significant difference between designation and giving up breaks or meals for the work to be completed.

## FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS

1. It was observed that only around 30% of the participants are giving suggestions for the improvement in the work area. This could be may be due to existing systems to be very stringent and proper or the ideas may not be well received. Encouraging the employees to give suggestions and trying to discuss and incorporate the suggestions would help the employees to be part of the growth of the organization.
2. Less than 40% of the participants claim that they volunteered to take extra work assignments. It may not be sure that every day people are given extra assignments but the desire to take up the extra work is a positive culture and positive growth. This shows that the employees want to do only the works assigned to them. They do not want to take up extra work. In case of extra work only these 40% of the people would suffer. Encouraging more percentage in this area would definitely reduce the burden on the percentage of accepted and more positive work behavior can be inculcated.
3. However quite a good number of employees are very positive about the organizations. And also most of the people give up the breaks to complete the work. Either it could emerge from the pressure or out of interest. However, it was clear indication in R&D department that they commit to complete the work by sacrificing their breaks. This is a positive sign of OCB.
4. It was observed that quality department is faring average with most of the things. If the quality department can possess OCB then they can transfer to the other departments.
5. It was also observed that juniors are faring well in most of the cases compare to the seniors. This may be due to the enthusiasm of the new ones. If the fresh blood is encouraged then there will be a strong OCB in the company.
6. There is a significant difference between designation and qualification. Each item is unique to level and department. Therefore it is better to focus separately in terms of developing OCB among the juniors and seniors based on the departments.

## ORGANIZATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

By doing this kind of survey the organizations can be benefited.

1. Can identify the OCB level of their employees and develop strategies accordingly.
2. Understand which levels of employees have more OCB or less OCB and focus on identifying to develop further.
3. Understand which departments have OCB and which do not have and try to check what is making them to have less OCB
4. By assessing each item, it can be identified where the problem exactly exists and can take focused action on only those.
5. More number of employees with High OCB will help the organizations to be more effective.

## CONCLUSION

Organizational Citizenship Behavior is an important emerging concept in the recent past. For the success of the organization more than the structured rules and regulations which most of the time limit the work and the skill of the employee, a choice company and work will enable the employees to un earthen their inherited skill. As OCB are not paid for rather voluntary behaviors, these behaviors need to be inculcated among the employees with free will. Once these type of behaviors are developed among the employees, the effectiveness of the organization will be very high. It is identified by various researches that good Organizational Citizenship Behavior will lead to Organizational Effectiveness.

## SCOPE FOR FURTHER STUDY

The study is conducted only in one unit to understand the OCB level of the employees. The same can be extended to various units and then compare between the different units of the organization and also different companies. The study can also be further explored with each item of the questionnaire to understand in which item the employees have less OCB. Thus further we can compare with one item in the one unit with the other unit.

## REFERENCES


1. *Borman, W.C. (2004). The concept of organizational citizenship. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 13, 238-241. Doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.70*
2. *Katz ,D&Kahn,R.L.(1978). The social psychology of organizations, 2nd ed .Wiley :New York*
3. *Nemeth, C. J., &Staw, B. M. (1989). The tradeoffs of social control and innovation in small groups and organizations. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (22, pp. 175–210). New York: Academic Press*
4. *Organ, D.W. (1988).Organizational Citizenship Behavior:The good soldier syndrome. Lexington, MA:Lexington Books*
5. *Podsakoff, P. M. and MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Sales Unit Effectiveness. Journal of Marketing Research, 31(3): 351-363.*
6. *Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., &MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82, 262–270.*
7. *Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie. S.B., Paine, J.B., &Bachrach, D.G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. Journal of Management, 26 (3),513-563*
8. *Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W. and Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68(4), 653-662.*
9. *Van dyne L., Cummings L. L. & McLean – Parks J. M. (1995). Extra role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). Cummings L.L. & B. M. Staw (Eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior (vol – 17 pp. 215–285).*
10. *Werner, JM. (1994). Dimensions that make a difference: examining the impact of in role and extra role behaviors on supervisory ratings. Journal of Applies Psychology 79*