Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

S.Suresh and P. Venkatammal
Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar

The prime objective of this study was to predict changes in organizational citizenship behaviour by personality and organizational climate with samples drawn from a public sector organization. This study adopted survey design and the data was collected from 215 executives. Self-report instruments were used to collect the data. Results indicate that the organizational citizenship behaviour of the public sector employees was influenced by their gender, age, marital status, personality factors and organizational climate. Personality and climate factors both had greater strength in predicting citizenship behaviour. Hence, this study concludes that organizations might promote citizenship behaviour by building systems to capture these and raise them.

Keywords: Organizational citizenship behaviour, Personality, Organizational climate

Organizations today, have to continually find new ways to grow in response to constantly changing challenges. In today's dynamic work place, successful organizations need employees who will do more than their role requirements. When employees frequently exert behaviours that exceed their formal role requirements, they improve the overall functioning of the organization. Organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) is referred as set of discretionary workplace behaviours that exceed one's basic job requirements. They are often described as behaviours that go beyond the call of duty. Research of OCB has been extensive since its inception (Bateman & Organ, 1983). Organ (1988) argued that OCB is held to be vital to the survival of an organization. Organ further elaborated that OCB can maximize the efficiency and productivity of both the employee and the organization that ultimately contribute to the effective functioning of an organization.

Numerous Western researchers have empirically investigated OCB and its antecedents. In contrast, only fewer attempts on OCB research in India have been noted (e.g. Moideenkutty, 2000; Chaitanya, & Tripathi, 2001; Bhatnagar & Sandhu, 2005; Pattanayak, Misra, & Niranjana, 2005; Niranjana & Pattanayak, 2005; Singh, 2006; Jain & Sinha, 2006; Moideenkutty, Balu, Kumar, & Nalakath, 2006; Biswas & Varma, 2007). Nonetheless, most of the studies generally utilized Organ's (1988) more generic conceptualization of organizational citizenship, conversely a number of studies have used the two-factor categorization of OCB in accordance to Williams and Anderson (1991).

Although Organ's five-dimension framework has been widely used in prior research (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002; Podskoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000), current research has not agreed upon specific dimensions for OCB. LePine, Erez, & Johnson (2002) conducted a meta-analysis to examine the relationship among these dimensions and addressed this issue. LePine and colleagues (2002) suggested that researchers should consider OCB at the aggregate level and distinguish OCB by the target towards whom such behaviour is directed. Thus, this study used a two-factor model, which consisted of OCB directed at individuals (OCBI) and directed at organization

(OCBO). Self-report OCB of Lee and Allen (2002) was chosen for the present study because it was designed to measure OCBO and OCBI more directly than previous scales did.

In general, organizational citizenship includes a variety of behaviours, such as helping other employees, volunteering for extra work, or representing the organization in a positive light. However, more precisely defining, explaining and predicting organizational citizenship behaviours have proved to be a rather difficult endeavour. For example, a variety of different taxonomies of OCB types have been proposed and used in research (e.g., Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Morrison, 1994; McNeely & Meglino, 1994; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000; Van Dyne, Cummings, & McLean Parks, 1995), with an important distinction made between those types of OCBs whose beneficiary is a single other individual (e.g., helping a new employee get through his or her first day on the job) versus a group of individuals or an impersonal collective (e.g., presenting the organization in a positive light to outsiders).

Furthermore, our understanding of the contextual factors and psychological mechanisms that increase the extend to which employees engage in OCBs or (OCBs antecedents), remains quite insufficient, existing models have had a modest level of success in predicting OCBs (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Thus, the key purpose of the current research is to investigate the usefulness of a different set of potential OCB antecedents – perceived organizational climate and personality factors, in the context of other OCB antecedents which have been previously studied.

For the present research study organizational climate "is defined as a set of perceived attributes of an organization and its subsystems as reflected in the way an organization deals with its members, groups and issues" (Pethe, Chaudhari, & Dhar, 2001). Organizational climate is a broad construct comprised of multiple dimensions that captures many of the elements mentioned as antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviours. Organizational climate scales can tap into task characteristics, organizational characteristics, and even leadership characteristics. In a seminal article, Schneider suggested that organizational climate influences individuals' behaviour because they try to "adapt to achieve some kind of homeostatic balance with their psychological environment" (1975). It has been proposed that pro-social organizational climates, those characterized as warm, friendly, supportive, and cooperative, encourage organizational citizenship behaviours (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). Overall, organizational climates, which facilitate norms of reciprocity, should lead to increased incidences of organizational citizenship behaviours.

Personality Factors of all the individual (employee) characteristics (i.e., employee attitudes of fairness, satisfaction, organizational commitment, affective commitment, trust in leader) and dispositional factors (i.e. positive and negative affectivity, personality factors) associated with OCB, personality factors are the most stable and enduring. Organ and Ryan (1995) provided the first comprehensive review of the literature concerning the relationships between personality and OCB concluding only conscientiousness correlated significantly with OCB. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000) viewed, "that of the dispositional variables examined in previous research, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and positive affectivity have the strongest effects". In 2001, an update of Organ and Ryan's meta-analysis found higher correlation for personality variables (including conscientiousness, agreeableness, and extroversion) and organizational citizenship behaviours (Borman, Penner, Allen &

Motowidlo, 2001). Others argue that the relationship between personality factors and OCB is equivocal (King, George, & Hebl, 2005). What is clear is that comparisons are somewhat compromised since personality factors are being studied using a multitude of different OCB dimensions and that further study of these relationships is warranted.

Studies suggest that organizational citizenship is a construct that contributes to organizational effectiveness and performance and other important outcomes for organizations. While majority of studies have focused on the antecedent of OCB has resulted in less then definitive conclusions (Suresh, 2009). It is anticipated that the result of this study will be of theoretical and practical significance. Result of the study will contribute to the research literature on organizational citizenship providing further clarification of the construct for Indian context.

Hypotheses

H1 :Organizational Climate will be positively related to OCB.

H2 : Personality will be significantly related to OCB.

H3 : OCBI will be significantly influenced by personality factors and organizational climate.

H4 :OCBO will be significantly influenced by personality factors and organizational climate.

H5 :Executives differ in their OCB with regard to gender, age and marital status.

Method

Sample:

The employees included for this study were middle and bottom level executives; they are professionally qualified with technical and managerial jobs. Totally 250 questionnaires were distributed to the executives of which only 220 were collected back and 215 were found complete that are taken for final analysis. The sample consisted of 58% male and 42% female.

Tools:

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Questionnaire (Lee & Allen, 2002): The scale consists of 16 statements that include an 8-item subscale for OCBs directed at the organization (OCBO) e.g., "offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization" and an 8-item subscale for OCBs directed at individuals within the organization (OCBI) e.g., "help others who have been absent". Lee and Allen (2002) initially intended their scales be used by subjects to rate their coworkers on how frequently the target person engaged in these behaviours using seven-point Likert-type scale (1= never, 7 = always). Reliabilities were .83 (OCBI) and .88 (OCBO) and a factor analysis clearly affirmed that two-factor model is preferred to the one-factor model confirming an empirical distinction between OCBI and OCBO.

Organizational Climate Scale (Pethe, Chaudhari, & Dhar, 2001): It is a 7 bipolar scale with affirmative and negative poles or ends, which has been developed among Indian executives (Pethe, Chaudhari, & Dhar, 2001). It contains 22 items that belong to the different attributes namely results, rewards and interpersonal relations, organizational processes, clarity of roles and sharing of information and altruistic behaviour. The split half reliability coefficient was 0.87.

Five Factor Personality Scale (Goldberg, 1999): Public domain measure from the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP, 2008). It consists of 50 items (10 per scale) and measures Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability and Imagination. Participants rated items in a 5-point Likert scale, from 1 (very inaccurate) to 5 (very accurate). Previously reported internal consistency coefficient alphas for each of 10 item subscales ranged from 0.79 for

Conscientiousness to 0.87 for Extraversion (Goldberg, 1992) High convergent validity has also been demonstrated for this measure with a corrected correlation of r = 0.94 with the NEO-PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

Results and Discussion

Table-1 shows correlation coefficient of organizational climate with two forms of organizational citizenship behaviour. The OCBI is significantly and positively correlated with results, rewards and interpersonal relations; organizational processes, clarity of roles and sharing of information and organizational climate total. The OCBO is significantly and positively correlated with organizational processes, altruistic behaviour and organizational climate total. Hence, the hypothesis 1 is accepted

Organizational climate is a complex phenomenon that appears to be related to employee commitment, employee retention, perceptions of the organization, and employee performance. Studies on the relationship between organizational climate and OCBs are scanty and diverse (Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, & Bommer, 1996; Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 1994). On the other hand, there have been many studies concerning the relationship between organizational climate and OCB (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Organ, 1988; Garg, & Rastogi, 2006; Lin & Hui-Min, 2006). The

results in this study provided support that organizational climate is positively related to OCB.

As an encouraging evidence, Biswas & Varma (2007) found a positive correlation between organizational climate and an employee's OCB among 357 managerial employees in the manufacturing and service sectors in India. Biswas & Varma (2007) found that individual's perception of the positive climate in the organization has a significant positive impact on employee's willingness to engage in OCBs, This perception of positive climate stimulates the employee to exhibit more OCBs. The results of this study concur with Biswas & Varma's findings that a strong relationship exists between the perceived organizational climate and OCBs exhibited by the employees. There could be several reasons for this connection; executives who feel comfortable with their organization may also choose to express a good helping relationship with coworkers and towards organization. While this study provides additional support for past findings on each that organizational climate is positively related to OCB by Biswas & Varma (2007). Present research is an added evidence supports the employee's positive perception of organization is associated with organizational citizenship behaviours.

Table 1. Correlation coefficients between the organizational climate and two forms of OCB

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Results, Rewards and Interpersonal Relations	-						
2. Organizational Processes	0.113*	-					
3. Clarity of Roles and Sharing of Information	0.437**	0.261**	-				
4. Altruistic Behaviour	-0.016	-0.096	0.181**	-			
5. Organizational Climate Total	0.777**	0.600**	0.734**	0.069	-		
6. OCBI	0.470**	0.243**	0.247**	0.038	0.476**	-	
7. OCBO	-0.032	0.200**	0.076	0.236**	0.137**	0.043	-

*p < 0.05.   **p < 0.01.

Table 2. Correlation coefficients between personality factors and two forms of OCB

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Extraversion	-						
2. Agreeableness	0.672**	-					
3. Conscientiousness	0.444**	0.612**	-				
4. Emotional stability	-0.080	-0.296**	-0.097	-			
5. Imagination	0.562**	0.585**	0.693**	0.006	-		
6. OCBI	0.222**	0.350**	0.145**	-0.236**	0.069	-	
7. OCBO	0.488**	0.411**	0.681**	-0.035	0.663**	0.043	-

*$p<0.05$.   **$p<0.01$.

Table 2 shows correlation coefficient of personality factors with two forms of organizational citizenship behaviour. The OCBI is significantly and positively correlated with extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and alternatively negative relationship with emotional stability. The OCBO is significantly and positively correlated with extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and imagination. Hence, the hypothesis 2 is accepted.

This study confirms and clarifies the link between personality and OCB. The data shows that all the personality factors (except neuroticism) are positively related to both dimensions of OCB. It thus provides considerable support for the general hypothesis linking personality factor-OCB relationship.

The correlation of personality factors with OCB shows executives high on extraversion reported that higher degree of helping behaviour directed towards organization (OCBO) as well as towards individuals (OCBI). This means that the sociability and friendliness of extraverts lead to helping behaviour toward others and organization. It is possible that their relationship with colleagues is more due to companionship of executives. Helping to colleagues is tapped by the measures of OCBI and helping to organization is tapped by the measures of OCBO. Extraverts might be more interested in helping a colleague get access to a social club or to make arrangements for a party at home as well as at workplace.

Similar to previous studies (Konovsky & Organ, 1996; Neuman & Kickul, 1998), employees who indicated that they were agreeable also reported that they helped co-workers and organization. Executives in the present study who were high agreeableness showed they enjoyed interacting with others and actively participated in company events. Agreeable persons are described by adjectives such as friendly, cooperative, selfless and altruistic (McCrae & John, 1992). They are considered to have a giving nature and supportive so these qualities of agreeable persons come into play in the circumstances of citizenship behaviours

In the present study, executives who were conscientious reported that they engaged in citizenship behaviours by pitching in to help their co-workers also for the whole organization. As expected, and in line with the findings in the available research (e.g., Organ & Ryan, 1995; Neuman & Kickul, 1998), conscientiousness was positively related to OCB. This means that, being more concerned with task accomplishment, career advancement and interpersonal relationships, conscientious people exhibit more helping behaviours directed toward organization and individuals. Most studies examining personality in relation to OCB rarely use

independent measures of OCB, and even the handful of studies that do so have found little support for this relationship (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2000). As demonstrated in the present study, personality is likely to have parallel relationships with OCBO and OCBI. Future research may benefit from distinguishing between individually and organizationally directed citizenship behaviours when examining this construct's association with personality.

Although the literature on dispositional causes of citizenship behaviours suggests a negative association between neuroticism and OCB (Organ & Konovsky, 1989), empirical support for such a relationship is not conclusive (Organ and Ryan, 1995). The hypothesized negative relationship between OCBO and neuroticism was not supported in this study. However, neuroticism was negatively related to OCBI. Executives who were anxious and easily frustrated were least likely to respond to the needs of co-workers. Even though Organ and Ryan (1995) did not find a relationship between openness and citizenship behaviours, results of this study demonstrate that executives who were open to experience (imagination) showed higher degree of helping directed towards organization (OCBO) then those of individuals (OCBI) and did not overlook the shortcomings

of co-workers.

To determine the amount of variance explained by personality, all of the personality factors were entered on the first step. Jointly, these variables accounted for 17% of the variance in OCBI. However, only the coefficient associated with agreeableness was significant. The four organizational climate dimensions (results, rewards and interpersonal relations, organizational processes, clarity of roles and sharing of information and altruistic behaviour) were entered on the second step. Jointly, these variables explained an additional variance 15% of the variance beyond that accounted for by personality (R^2 increment = 0.15, p< 0.01). The coefficients associated with results, rewards and interpersonal relations and organizational processes were significant. Hence, the hypothesis 3 is partly accepted and partly rejected.

Consequently, agreeableness was significantly influencing the organizational citizenship behaviours directed toward individuals. Results, rewards and interpersonal relations and organizational processes were also significant predictors as well. Personality factors were predictive of citizenship behaviours was not unanticipated. These results are supportive of findings in a meta-analytic review by Podsakoff, MacKenzie,

Table 3. Summary of variance in OCBI explained by personality and organizational climate

Step Independent Variables	â	t	R	R^2change	Total R^2
1 Personality Factors			0.41	0.17**	0.17**
Extroversion	0.11	1.90			
Agreeableness	0.33	5.51**			
Conscientiousness	0.09	1.50			
Emotional Stability	- 0.12	-2.51			
Imagination	- 0.24	-3.36			
2 Organizational Climate			0.38	0.15**	0.32**
Results, rewards & interpersonal relations	0.45	9.51**			
Organizational processes	0.20	4.55**			
Clarity of roles and sharing of information	- 0.01	-0.35			
Altruistic behaviour	0.06	1.49			

** p< 0.01

Paine, & Bachrach (2000) which found agreeableness and conscientiousness consistently related to organizational citizenship behaviours termed altruism and generalized compliance. A consecutive study by King, George and Hebl (2005) also found significant interactions between conscientiousness, agreeableness, extroversion and emotional stability in predicting helping behaviours.

Findings of present study suggest that individually directed helping behaviours are a function of one's personality as well as the organizational climate. While this may be predominant conclusion there are some interesting effects attributed to organizational climate which deserve mentioning. Openness in the communication process, relationships between the other members in the organization appears to have important influence on OCBI. So while it may be that agreeable employees tend to engage in helping behaviours toward fellow employees, Individuals who are high on agreeableness tend to be friendly, cooperative, courteous, flexible, tolerant, and trusting (Thoms, Moore, & Scott, 1996) and are more likely to facilitate pro-social behaviour toward fellow group members. These behaviours are also a result of effective communication within the organization. Certainly one could see how breakdowns in communication could lead to feelings of isolation and thereby thwart the occurrence of helping behaviours. This is an important finding because there are ways to facilitate effective communication patterns within organizations. Once more is known about the different consequences attributed to OCBI, it may be that improvements to areas of communication could be used to facilitate these desired outcomes.

To determine the amount of variance explained by personality, all of the personality factors were entered on the first step. Jointly, these variables accounted for 16% of the variance in OCBO. However, only the coefficient associated with conscientiousness and imagination was significant.

The four organizational climate dimensions (results, rewards and interpersonal relations, organizational processes, clarity of roles and sharing of information and altruistic behaviour) were entered on the second step. Jointly, these variables explained an additional variance 22% of the variance beyond that accounted for by personality (R^2 increment = 0.22, p< 0.01). The coefficients associated with organizational processes and altruistic behaviour were significant. Hence, the hypothesis 4 is partly accepted and partly rejected.

Table 4. Summary of variance in OCBO explained by personality and organizational climate

Step Independent Variables	$\hat{a}$	t	R	R^2change	Total R^2
1 Personality Factors			0.40	0.16**	0.16**
Extroversion	0.14	3.21			
Agreeableness	-0.01	-0.30			
Conscientiousness	0.31	8.78**			
Emotional Stability	0.01	0.32			
Imagination	0.30	5.74**			
2 Organizational Climate			0.46	0.22**	0.38**
Results, rewards & interpersonal relations	-0.05	-0.97			
Organizational processes	0.33	4.90**			
Clarity of roles and sharing of information	- 0.00	-0.14			
Altruistic behaviour	0.35	5.40**			

** p< 0.01

The results of the study also indicated that conscientiousness and imagination (i.e. openness to experience) was the significant personality predictor of OCBO. Conscientiousness is predictive of OCBO because following norms and rules and planning and organizing nature of executives provides a basic ground work for serving to the organization. Imagination is predictive of OCBO because this personality trait allows for greater openness to the possibilities of the organization's future state and less judgments of its past mistakes. In addition the organizational climate dimensions organizational processes and altruistic behaviour was the significant predictor OCBO. These results support previous literature which suggests organizational climate dimensions and personality factors contribute to organizational citizenship behaviours (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000).

Unlike the results for individually directed organizational citizenship behaviours in which agreeableness was the only significant dimension influenced OCBI, there is much greater variance in which factors are of greatest influence to OCBO. Organizational characteristics have been empirically linked to organizational citizenship behaviours, was evidenced by a meta-analysis Podsskoff MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach (2000) which shows the linkage of organizational characteristics to five categories of organizational citizenship behaviours: altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue.

Table 5. OCB of the executives with reference to their demographic variables

Variables	Mean	SD	't' value
Male	30.69	5.38	3.172 *
Female	29.15	3.88	
Below 40	26.56	3.12	10.235 *
Above 40	31.46	4.75	
Married	31.23	4.76	9.320 *
Unmarried	26.45	3.17	

*p<0.05

Table-5 shows "t" values of OCBO with respect to demographic variables. This study showed that gender significantly predicted OCBO that is female executives were less likely to exhibit OCBO. Results of this research provide support for the proposition that OCBO behaviours are more likely to expected of men (Kidder & Parks, 2001). The results of two recent studies had provided support for this idea Ehrhart & Godfrey, 2003; Heilman & Chen, 2005.

The proposition that younger and older individuals may view work and self in fundamentally different ways is not new. Wagner and Rush (2000) pointed out that early years (20-34) are the years of establishment and settling down; later years (35-55) are strong sense of self and location in comparison with life and work. This may be the reason that younger executives have to coordinate their needs with organizational needs that take time and not easy; by contrast, older executives tend to be more adjusted to needs of their organization. Therefore, younger and older executives may differ in their orientations toward organization. These differences may lead to different salient motives for OCB among younger and older executives. It was found that married executives are higher in helping behaviour toward organization than unmarried executives. This may be the reason that married executives may feel more contented in their life that's make the married executives to give attention to organization rather than individual.

Implications and Recommendations

The present study demonstrated strong relationship between organizational processes and OCB. Organizational processes include openness in the communication process and relationships between the members in the organization. A work environment with multiple responsibilities, independent and administrative nature necessitates effective communication in an organization. Effective communication is essential for overcoming the

inertia that might overtake such a bureaucracy and for communicating changing roles and responsibilities so executives can prioritize to avoid burnout. Effective communication is finding the balance between too much and too little information in big organizations with multiple units information sharing is even more critical. Therefore, it is recommended that top administrators of organization be supposed to establish an atmosphere for effective communication and good relationships between the members in the organization for the improvement of organizational citizenship behaviours. So possibly, by initiating some mechanism to capture and reward these behaviours, organizations could promote fairness and equity while collecting the organizational elements of these behaviours.

References

Allen, T. D. (2006). Rewarding good citizens: The relationship between citizenship behaviour, gender, and organizational rewards. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *36*, 120-143.

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*, 587- 595

Bhatnagar, J. & Sandhu, S. (2005). Psychological Empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in IT Managers: A Talent Retention Tool, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, *40*, 449-469

Biswas, S., & Varma, A. (2007). Psychological climate and individual performance in India: Test of a mediated model. *Employee Relations, 29*, 664-676.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt, W.C. Borman, & Associates (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71- 98). San Francisco, CA: Jossey – Bass.

Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T. D., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2001). Personality predictors of citizenship performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*, 52- 69.

Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviours. *Academy of Management Review*, *11,* 710-725.

Chaitanya, S. K. & Tripathi, N. (2001). Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 37*, 217-230.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised* NEO *personality inventory and the five factor inventory professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. (1982). *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of organizational life*. Reading, MA: Addison- Wesley.

Ehrhart, M. G. & Godfrey, E. G. (2003). *The role of schemas in gender and organizational citizenship research.* Paper presented at the 18th Annual Conference for the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.

Finkelstein, M. A., & Penner, L. A. (2004). Predicting organizational citizenship behaviour: Integrating the functional and role identity approaches. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, *32,* 383-398.

Garg, P., & Rastogi, R. (2006). Climate profile and OCBs of teachers in public and private schools of India. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, *20*, 529-541.

Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the big-five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, *4*, 26-42.

Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain personality inventory measuring the lower–level facets of several five-factor models. In I, Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality Psychology in Europe, Vol.7* (pp. 7-28). Tilburg. The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.

Heilman, M. E. & Chen, J. J. (2005). Same behaviour, different consequences: Reaction to men's and women's altruistic citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*, 431-441.

International Personality Item Pool. (2008). A Scientific Collaboratory for the Development

of Advanced Measures of Personality Traits and Other Individual Differences (http://ipip.ori.org/). Internet Web Site, 2/1/2008.

Jain, A. K., & Sinha, A. K. (2006). Self-Management and Job performance: In-Role Behaviour and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *Psychological studies, 51*, 19-29.

Kidder, D. & McLean Parks, J. (2001). The good soldier: Who is (s)he? *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 22, 939-959.

King, E. B., George, J. M., & Hebl, M. R. (2005). Linking personality to helping behaviours at work: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Personality*, 73, 585-607.

Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and citizenship determinants of organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour 17*, 253-266.

Kotter, J. P., & Heskett, J. L. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance.* New York: The Free press.

Lee, K., & Allen, N.J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behaviour and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 131-142.

LePine, J.A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D.E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behaviour: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied psychology, 87*, 52-65.

Lin, Hui-Min, (2006). *Research on relationships of organizational culture to organizational performance- An empirical study of tourist hotels in Kaohsiung.* Unpublished Master Dissertation, Nan Hua University.

McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 175-215.

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

Moideenkutty, U. (2000). Equity Sensitivity, Organisational Justice, and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour: A Relational Study, *Management and Change, 6*, 279-294.

Moideenkutty, U., Blau, G., Kumar, R., & Nalakath, A. (2006). Comparing correlates of organizational citizenship versus in-role behaviour of sales representatives in India. *International Journal of Commerce and Management. 16*(1), 15–28.

Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behaviour: The importance of the employees perspective. *Academy of Management Journa*l, 37, 1543-1567.

Neuman, G. A., & Kickul, J. R. (1998). Organizational citizenship behaviours: achievement orientation and personality. *Journal of Business and psychology, 13,* 263-279.

Niranjana, P. & Pattanayak, B. (2005). Influences of learned optimism and organizational ethos on organizational citizenship behaviour: A study on Indian corporations. *International Journal of Human Resources Development & Management, 5, 85-98.*

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive Versus Affective Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 157-164.

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

Pattanayak, B., Misra, R. K. and Niranjana, P. (2005). Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Inventory: A Conceptual and Validation Analysis, 2005 *Annual: Vol.2*, Consulting Pfeiffer, Jossey-Bass, USA.

Pethe S., Chaudhari, S. and Dhar, U. (2001). *Manual on Organizational Climate Scale*, Agra: National Psychological Corporation.

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviours and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research, 31*, 351-363.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G., (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviours: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and

suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management, 26*, 513-563.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). A meta analysis of the relationship between Kerr and Jermier's substitutes for leadership and employee job attitudes, role perceptions, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*, 380-399.

Sawner, T. E. (2000). An empirical investigation of the relationship between organizational culture and organization performance in a large public sector organization. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60,* 4511B, (UMI No. 9955794).

Schneider, B. (1975). Organizational climates: An essay. *Personnel Psychology, 28*, 447-479.

Singh, S. (2006). Emotional Intelligence among Junior Leaders: Relationship with Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *In* Singh, P., Bhatanagar, J. and Bhandarker, A. (Eds.), *Future of work: Mastering challenge*. New Delhi: Excel Books: 253-270.

Spector, P.E., & Fox, S. (2010). Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour: Are They Opposite Forms of Active Behaviour? *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 59*, 21–39, doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2009.00414.x

Suresh (2009). *Organizational citizenship behaviour of executives*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Annamalai University, Tamilnadu

Thoms, P., Moore, K. S., & Scott, K. S. (1996). The relationship between self-efficacy for participating in self-managed work groups and the Big Five personality dimensions. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 17*, 349–362.

Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & Parks, J. M. (1995). Extra – role behaviours: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (A bridge over muddied waters). In L.L. Cummings & B.M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behaviour,* (Vol. 17, pp. 215-285). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Wagner, S. L., & Rush, M. C. (2000). Altruistic organizational citizenship behaviour: context, disposition and age. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 140*, 379.

Williams, L. J. & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviours. *Journal of Management, 17*, 601-617.

Xie, J. L., & Johns, G. (1995). Job scope and stress: Can job scope be too high? *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*, 1288-1309.

S. Suresh, PhD, Lecturer, Department of Psychology Annamalai University, Annamalainagar – 608 002

P. Venkatammal, PhD, Professor and Head, Department of Psychology Annamalai University, Annamalainagar – 608 002