

## Does Organizational Structure Predict Citizenship Behaviours?

**Ajay K Jain**

Management Development Institute, Gurgaon.

The purpose of this article is to investigate how different dimensions of organizational structure predict various forms of organizational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) within the work setting of motorbike organizations in India. Literature survey shows a very little work is done to explore the relationship between organizational structure and OCBs. The data were collected from a sample of 250 male middle level executives from six motorbike manufacturing organizations located in northern part of India. The data was collected through a questionnaire in face to face condition. Results of Stepwise regression analysis show that Centralization, Participation and Job Specificity dimensions of structure were found to be the positive predictors of different dimensions of OCB where as Centralization, Innovation and Job Autonomy were found to be negative predictors of different dimensions of OCB. These results can be used to design the organizations to promote specific forms of OCB that suits to the organizational purpose. The results further strengthen the idea of contextual specific OCBs.

**Keywords:** Organizational Structure, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Motorbike Organizations.

Organizational structure is an important tool of enhancing coordination and cooperation among organizational members. An organizational structure defines how a job or a task is formally divided, grouped, and coordinated. The sociological and psychological literature has provided the conceptualization to the development of the concept of organizational structure. Organizational structure is defined as the enduring characteristics of an organization reflected by the distribution of units and positions within the organization and their systematic relationship to each other. Structure is a contextually linked concept which has no absolute value. Sometime the effective functioning of the organization gets thwarted due to a misfit between the type of structure and environmental demands. From the standpoint of open system theory (Homans, 1950; Katz & Kahn, 1966, 1971; Miller & Rice, 1967) structure develops within an organization to accomplish three basic events, namely energetic input, transformation

and energetic output. The open system model postulate that structure develops because of the need for patterned cooperation among people and coordination among organizational units. A recent work of Siggelkow and Levinthal's (2003) "Temporarily Divide to Conquer: Centralized, Decentralized, and Reintegrated Organizational Approaches to Exploration and Adaptation" examines performance when competitive landscape shifts-a shock in the environment. Davis, Eisenhardt and Bingham (2009) found that 'the amount of structure' was central when the environment yielded a continuing flow of opportunities. Thus it means environment and organization structure interact with each other. The structure helps in achieving dynamic fit between the organizational architecture and the environment (and other contingencies) which yields good performance (Nissen & Burton, 2011). The purpose of structuring and restructuring of an organization is to facilitate the smooth functioning of all organizational

activities so that efficiency and effectiveness can be ensured.

According to Barnard (1938) the task of the manager is to maintain a system of cooperative effort in a formal organization. The formal organization cannot exist unless there are persons who (a) are able to communicate with one another, (b) are willing to contribute to group action, and (c) have a conscious common purpose. The role of the organizational structure is to facilitate the process of communication, coordination, and contributions among organizational members to achieve a common goal. Thus, structure has important implications on employee's behaviour in terms of their level of motivation, performance, job satisfaction, etc. According to Nasurdin, Ramayah, and Beng (2006) structural variables (formalization and centralization) had a positive influence on job stress. The organizational structure also helps in adapting to the outside environment. According to Hunter (2002) a variety of structures and elements ensure a fluid and flexible organization which helps in dealing with shifts in direction or impacts. The research evidence shows that organizational citizenship behaviour is taken as part of employee's performance which helps in improving overall organizational effectiveness. Literature does not provide any conclusive evidence which shows significant relationship between these two constructs. Therefore, the present research is aimed to see the impact of different dimensions of organizational structure on employee's organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) in work context of two wheeler motorbike organizations.

### **Organizational Structure**

Structure includes three key components pertaining to both vertical and horizontal aspects of organizing: designation of formal reporting relationships including number of levels in the hierarchy and span of control of managers and supervisors; grouping of

individuals into departments and of departments into the total organization; design of systems to ensure effective communication, coordination, and integration across departments (Daft, 2005).

There are six key elements that managers need to address when they design organization's structure. These are work specialization (the degree to which tasks in organization are subdivided into separate jobs), departmentalization (the basis by which jobs are grouped together), chain of command (the unbroken line of authority that extends from the top of the organization to the lowest echelon and clarifies who reports to whom), span of control (the number of subordinates a manager can efficiently and effectively direct), centralization (the degree to which decision making is concentrated at a single point in the organization, (Aiken & Hage, 1968; Jansen, Van Den Bosch, & Volberda, 2006), decentralization (decision discretion is pushed down to lower-level employees), and formalization (the degree to which jobs within the organization are standardized, (Pugh et al, 1968; Jansen, et al., 2005). Ownership (public versus private) and Size (large versus small or medium) are two other popularly discussed variables that may come under structural considerations. Researchers (e.g., Lau & Pavett, 1980) have indicated that managers in both the public and private sectors perform the same kind of activities in terms of complexity of job content and same kind of roles in terms job characteristics, whereas others (e.g., Fottler, 1981; Rainey, Backoff, & Levine, 1976) have challenged the notion by stating that the management functions are same in all types of organizations. It may be expected that public and private organizations differ on a number of dimensions, the effective functioning of both type of the organizations may be thought of as depending on the different criteria (Solomon, 1986).

Some other variables associated with the organizational structure could be: Innovation

(a new idea applied to initiating or improving the product, process, or service), Rule Observation, and Job Autonomy (the degree to which the job provides substantial freedom and discretion to the individual in scheduling the work and determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out), Job Specificity (well defined job and task), Vertical Differentiation (refers to the depth in the structure) and horizontal differentiation (refers to the expanse in the structure).

The evidence suggests that somehow these components may be interrelated with each other. There is inverse relationship between centralization and complexity. Decentralization is associated with high complexity. Where as relationship between centralization and formalization is ambiguous. The early researchers found no strong relationship between centralization and formalization. Later research reported a strong negative relationship between two components; that is organization were highly formalized and decentralized. However, high formalization can be found coupled with either a centralized or decentralized structure.

### **Organizational Citizenship Behaviour**

In the past couple of decades, organizational researchers have begun to study aspects of work behaviour that are not directly related to these primary tasks (Organ, 1988). These are called Organizational Citizenship Behaviours (OCBs) which have almost always been studied in isolation from core technical proficiency. The project 'A', a study done on US army in the year 1990 that represents an effort in which the measured performance domain included *both* core technical proficiency and what might be termed citizenship behaviour (i.e. effort and leadership, discipline). This expansion of the performance domain has included some important organizationally relevant measures (willingness and capability to mentor less senior colleagues or to serve on special tasks forces and committees) as well as some rather

mundane activities (e.g., administering the office coffee fund, organizing the happy hour activities) and community activities (e.g., leading an effort to clean up high way or organizing the blood drive) that has no direct relevance to the employing organization.

Over two decades have passed when Organ and his colleagues (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983) first coined the term "OCB". Drawing on Chester Barnard's concept (Barnard, 1938) of the "willingness to cooperate" and Daniel Katz's (Katz, 1964; Katz & Kahn, 1966, 1978) distinction between dependable role performance and "innovative and spontaneous behaviours" Organ (1988, 1990) defined the concept of OCB as individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promote the effective functioning of the organization. Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) stated *that citizenship behaviour are important because they lubricate the social machinery of the organization*. They provide the flexibility, needed to work through many unforeseen contingencies. They enable the participant to cope with the otherwise awesome condition of interdependence on each other. They further state that citizenship behaviour is not easily governed by individual initiative schemes, because such behaviour is often subtly difficult to measure, may contribute more to others' performance than one's own, and may even have the effect of sacrificing some portion of one's immediate individual output.

### **Antecedent of OCB**

Empirical researches have focused on four major categories of antecedents: 1. Individual or Employee Characteristics; 2. Task Characteristics; 3. Organizational Characteristics; and 4. Leadership Behaviours. Based on the above categories, a number of variables have been identified as determinants of organizational citizenship

behaviour including *job attitude* (Bateman & Organ, 1983), *job cognitions* (Organ & Konovsky, 1989), *positive affect* (George, 1991), *positive mood states* (Smith, Organ and Near, 1983), *positive trait, positive state and OCBs* (Luthans and Youssef, 2007), *organizational justice* (Moorman, Niehoff, and Organ, DW, 1993), *collectivism* (Moorman & Blakely, 1995), *organizational support* (Moorman, Blakely & Niehoff, 1998), *interpersonal trust* (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990), *task characteristics* (Farh, Podsakoff & Organ, 1990), *culture, work unit size, stability of membership, complexity of technology, task interdependence, rewards & interpersonal interaction* (Karambayya, 1990), *leader-member exchange* (Hui, Law, & Chen, 1999), *supportive leader behaviour* (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Rich, 2001), and *servant leadership and OCBs* (Lester, Meglino & Korsgaard 2008). Organ and Ryan (1995) adopted a position similar to that taken by Borman & Motowidlo's (1993) in determining the antecedents of OCB and task performance. The major difference is that OCB is largely determined by attitudinal and dispositional factors while task performance is determined by Knowledge, Skill, and Ability (KSAOs) particularly as that interest with precise incentives structures quality of task performance. Mostly the focus of OCB research was more on to explore role of individual level variables on enhancing OCBs. However, there is dearth of research studies done to see the relationship between organizational structure and OCBs. OCBs have been considered worthwhile for the overall growth and the development of organizations. Researchers have demonstrated the positive impact of OCBs on managerial evaluations of performance and judgment regarding pay raises, and promotions etc and organizational performance and success (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, and Bachrach, 2000).

### **Structure and OCB**

The research done to see the impact of organizational structure on employee performance and satisfaction does not provide any conclusive evidence for example, everyone do not prefer the freedom and flexibility of organic structures and some people are most productive and satisfied when tasks are standardized and ambiguity is minimized- that is, in mechanistic structures. So the findings show that individual differences play an important role in determining the impact of organizational design on employee behaviour (Porter & Lawler III, 1965; James & Jones, 1976; Snizek & Bullard, 1983; Turban & Keon, 1994). Tannenbaum and Massarik (1950) and Worthy (1950) have pointed out how important the allocation of power is in an organization, and have suggested that one implication of a decentralized power structure is higher morale. Weber (1947) suggested that bureaucratic structure helps in realizing the control over human behaviour. Others studies have also supported the link between control and structure (Baulmer, 1971; Blau & Scott, 1962; Ouchi, 1977). In this research, I would like to explore how structure influence citizenship behaviour. The research evidence suggests that OCB is a context-related phenomenon (Somech and Zahavy, 2004). These results should encouraged researchers and practitioners to focus more attention on the organizational context and its characteristics as related to OCB. In this context, *DeGroot and Brownlee* (2006) investigated how the variable of *organizational structure* is related to OCB and *organizational* effectiveness within an *organizational* setting at the department level. The findings suggested that the relationship between structure, measured on an organic-mechanistic scale, and departmental effectiveness is partly driven by OCB. *Min-Huei Chien* (2004) did a research to explain how to improve OCB and how to develop a plan to obtain continual OCB through a formal

system and an informal environmental setting in the work place. OCBs describe actions in which employees are willing to go above and beyond their prescribed role requirements. Results indicated that positive work climate, organization resources, employee's personality, *organizational* culture, and so on are all related to OCB. The author suggest that improving OCB is the lowest cost and best way for businesses to reach *organizational* effectiveness in which formal system and procedure can play an important role. Wong, Tjosyold and Liu (2009) suggested that a shared *organizational* vision shapes goal interdependence among departments that, in turn, affected the OCB of 101 cross-functional teams. The analysis suggested combining independent and competitive goals, and this combined measure negatively predicted team OCB. These results suggest that a shared *organizational* vision and cooperative goals among departments are important foundations for cross-functional teams to contribute to the effective working of organizations through *citizenship behaviour*. However whatever research done to link organizational structure and OCBs does not provide any conclusive evidence in this direction. Therefore the present research is conducted within exploratory framework to explore the impact of organizational structure on OCBs. Framed as a research question, "What is the strength of association between different dimensions of organizational structure as the predictor of different dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviours (OCBs)."

### Method

#### Participants

The sample consisted of 250 male middle level executives from four motorbike manufacturing organizations from the private sector based in various cities of North India. Employees selected ranged from 25 to 45 years of age, were all male, had spent at least

one year in the same organization, and the majority were married and had a graduate degree or diploma level education in engineering. The sample does not consist of female participants due to their limited representation in these organizations.

#### Measures:

The measures used in this study were either borrowed from the original source, or modified versions of the original measures. Modification included changes in the sentence constructions, wordings, scaling, response categories and selective use of items and ideas. Modifications and fresh additions were by and large prompted by the experience of the author in the production organizational setting, and which was further reinforced by the data and experiences gathered during the course of pilot studies in connection with the work. Even before starting the pilot study, interview were taken from 25 executives in connection with the main variable (OCB) to verify the concept in real work setting. The description of measures is as follows-

*Form 1: Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.* This form was consisting of ninety-seven items purported to measure the concept of OCB. Apart from the newly constructed ones, the items used in the questionnaire was based on work of Bateman & Organ (1983), Smith, Organ and Near (1983), Organ (1988), Van Dyne, Graham and Dienesch (1994), Moorman and Blakely (1995), Chattopadhyay (1999).

*Form 2: Organizational Structure.* This questionnaire was consisted of thirty-six items. The questionnaire was based on the writings of Hage and Aiken (1967), Hall (1962), Oldham and Hackman (1981), Kerr and Jermier (1978), Dewar, Whetten, and Bojk (1980).

#### Results of Factor Analysis

Responses on both the major variables were subjected to exploratory factor analysis.

The exploratory factor analysis is administered to see the validity and reliability of the questionnaires in the present work context. The questionnaires used in this study are mostly developed outside India. A different cultural context compare to the culture of origin of the questionnaires may influence the validity of the questionnaire. Hence before administering stepwise multiple regression analysis to see the predictability of structural dimensions, both the questionnaires were subjected to factor analysis.

The factor analysis results are based on principal factoring with iterations and oblique rotations using the SPSS-X statistical analysis package program. The criterion of factor loadings equal to greater than .30 with no cross-loadings on other factors and Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient equal to or greater than .70 (Nunally, 1978) was used for the purpose of identifying the valid and reliable scales. The brief description of factors extracted by factor analysis is as follows.

*Form 1: Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.* OCB questionnaire yielded eleven significant factors upon factor analysis. They were called: *Emotional Support* (ES,  $\alpha = .88$ ), that is measured through items like, "I make myself available to my coworkers to discuss any personal or professional problems they may be facing"; *Concern for Organizational Resources* (COR,  $\alpha = .83$ ), that is measured through items like, "I conduct personal business on company"; *Conservation of Time* (CT,  $\alpha = .70$ ), that is measured through items like, "I do not spend time in extra conversation"; *Organizational Pride* (OP,  $\alpha = .76$ ), that is measured through items like, "I show pride when representing the organization in public" *Work Mindedness* (WM,  $\alpha = .71$ ), that is measured through items like, "I produce highest quality of work, regardless of circumstances"; *Civic Virtue* (CV,  $\alpha = .84$ ), that is measured through items like, "I utilize some creative means to complete

my job effectively"; *Social and Functional Participation* (SFP,  $\alpha = .75$ ), that is measured through items like, "I keep well informed where opinion might benefit the organization"; *Altruism* (ALT,  $\alpha = .70$ ), that is measured through items like, "I go out of my way to help co-workers with work related problem"; *Sportsman Spirit* (SPO,  $\alpha = .79$ ), that is measured through items like, "I always find fault with what the organization is doing"; *Individual Initiative* (INI), that is measured through items like, "I encourage others to try new and more effective ways of doing their jobs"; and *Generalized Compliance* (GC,  $\alpha = .70$ ), that is measured through items like, "I give advance notice if unable to come". The reliability for all eleven dimensions has shown acceptable reliability. The literature showed seven dimensions of OCB (Podsakoff et. 2000). But the reasons of getting 11-dimensions may be related to cultural variations in the construct of OCB. However, the factor structure very much resembles to the work done by Bateman and Organ (1983), Smith, Organ and Near (1983), Organ (1988), Van Dyne, Graham and Dienesch (1994), Moorman and Blakely (1995), and Chattopadhyay (1999).

*Form 2: Organizational structure:* Similarly, factor analysis yielded 7 significant factors which named as follows; *Formalization* (FLN,  $\alpha = .83$ ), which is measured through the items, like "A "rules and procedures" manual exists and is readily available within this organization;" *Centralization* (CTN,  $\alpha = .80$ ), which is measured through items like, "A person who wants to make his own decision would be quickly discouraged;" *Participation* (PTN,  $\alpha = .86$ ), which is measured through items like, "How frequently do you usually participate in the decision on the adoption of new programs;" *Innovation* (INN,  $\alpha = .89$ ), which is measured through items like, "Most jobs around here have something-new happening everyday;" *Rule Observation* (ROB,  $\alpha = .76$ ), which is measured through the items like "People here

feel they are constantly being watched to see that they obey all the rules;" *Job Autonomy* (JAUT,  $\alpha = .74$ ), which is measured through "How things are done here is left up to persons doing the work;" and *Job Specificity* (JSPEC,  $\alpha = .79$ ), which is being measured through the items like "Going through proper channels is constantly stressed". These factors were found to be valid and reliable on a sample of 250 executive from motorbike organizations located in India.

### Results

The conceptual scheme of the present study includes two major construct, namely organizational structure and organizational citizenship behaviour. It was conjectured that structure will have significant impact on OCBs. The results of Stepwise Multiple regression analysis are presented in Table 1. The table of zero order correlation (which is not given here) has shown that seven dimensions of structure and eleven dimensions of OCB are

significantly correlated. The table indicates that all the measures have acceptable levels of reliability.

The results of Multiple Regression Analysis (MRA) from Table 1 with the dimensions of OCB called *Emotional Support*, *Concern for Organizational Resources*, *Conservation of Time*, *Organizational Pride*, *Social and Functional Participation*, *Work Mindedness*, *Altruism*, *Sportsman Spirit*, *Individual Initiative* and *Generalized Compliance* as the criterion and the seven dimensions of organizational structure as predictor showed that overall regression was significant. Organizational structure has explained maximum amount of variances in the concern for organizational resources and organizational pride. Overall results showed that Centralization, on the one hand was found positive predictor of Emotional Support, Organizational Pride, Work Mindedness, and Altruism dimensions of OCB.

**Table 1. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis with the Dimensions of Organizational Structure as Predicting the Dimension of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour**

N o	Predictor Variables	Criterion Variables	$\beta$	t	p (exact)	Adj. R <sup>2</sup>	Overall F
1	Centralization	<i>Emotional support</i>	.25	3.87	.0001	.04	$F_{(2, 247)} = 8.21$ , $p \leq .0004$
2	Participation		.13	2.06	.0039	.05	
1	Innovation	<i>Concern for organizational resources</i>	-.18	-2.82	.0052	.05	$F_{(3, 246)} = 9.32$ , $p \leq .0000$
2	Centralization,		-.18	-3.00	.0029	.08	
3	Job Autonomy		-.14	-2.29	.0225	.09	
1	Job Autonomy	<i>Conservation of Time</i>	-.13	-2.03	.0426	.01	$F_{(1, 248)} = 4.15$ , $p \leq .0426$
1	Participation	<i>Organizational pride</i>	.25	3.99	.0001	.04	$F_{(4, 245)} = 6.89$ , $p \leq .0000$
2	Job Specificity		.16	2.63	.0088	.06	
3	Job Autonomy		-.13	-2.09	.0376	.08	
4	Centralization		.13	1.99	.0470	.09	
1	Job Specificity	<i>Work mindedness</i>	.22	3.56	.0004	.05	$F_{(2, 247)} = 9.63$ , $p \leq .0000$
2	Centralization		.12	2.02	.0435	.06	
1	Centralization	<i>Social and functional participation</i>	.17	2.75	.0063	.03	$F_{(1, 248)} = 7.59$ , $p \leq .0000$
1	Centralization		<i>Altruism</i>	.26	4.25	.0000	
1	Centralization	<i>Sportsman Spirit</i>	-.24		.0001	.05	$F_{(2, 247)} = 10.27$ , $p \leq .0000$
2	Job Autonomy		-.15		.0181	.07	
1	Job Specificity	<i>Individual initiatives</i>	.17	2.79	.0056	.03	$F_{(1, 248)} = 7.82$ , $p \leq .0000$
1	Job Autonomy	<i>Generalized Compliance</i>	-.16	-2.53	.0120	.02	$F_{(2, 247)} = 5.63$ , $p \leq .0040$
2	Job Specificity		.15	2.36	.0190	.04	

On the other hand, Centralization was also found to be a negative predictor for Concern for Organizational Resources and Sportsman Spirit dimensions of OCB. Participation was found to be the positive predictor of Emotional Support, Organizational Pride, and Social and Functional Participation dimensions of OCB. Job Autonomy was found to be a negative predictor of Concern for Organizational Resources, Conservation of Time, Organizational Pride, Sportsman Spirit, and Generalized Compliance dimensions of OCB. Innovation predicted Concern for Organizational Resources negatively. Job Specificity was found to be the positive predictor of Organizational Pride, Work Mindedness, Individual Initiative, and Generalized Compliances.

### Discussion

The present study is aimed to explore the relationship between organizational structure and OCBs. The relationship between structure and OCB is not explored in the past. Consequently not much knowledge is available regarding the impact of structure on OCB. OCB is conceptualized as a composite of behaviours that are not required by the formalized organizational design but are now considered by many behavioural science scholars as relevant for increased effectiveness or at least better functioning of the human resource constituting the relevant group. Therefore it is interesting to see the role of organizational structure in enhancing the OCBs.

The dimensions of Organizational Structure, namely Centralization and Participation were found to be the positive predictors of the dimension of OCB called *Emotional Support*. The reason may be that Centralized structure provides less freedom to work and take decisions independently. Employees may feel boredom and monotony at work place. They may feel alienated, isolated, and self estranged. In this condition, it is more likely that they may provide more

emotional support to others to create a better human relation system in the organization. This may help them to get connected with other and which bring a sense of empowerment. The other component of organizational structure Participation directly contributes to Emotional Support for other employees. The participation provides the greater opportunities for more interaction with other employees which may further motivates employees to provide emotional support to their colleagues. It may mean Centralization and Participation acts in two ways, first Centralization motivates to remove negative emotion by helping others emotionally, second Participation motivates positively by creating a sense of joy. These results can be theoretically explained by using Negative State Relief Model and Empathic Joy Model which is being discussed in prosocial behaviour area (Cialdini, Baumann, & Kenrick, 1981; Smith, Keating, & Stotland, 1989). VanYperen, Berg and Willering (1999) have observed the positive impact of participation in decision making on exhibiting OCBs in which perceived supervisory supports mediated the relationship between two.

The dimensions of Organizational Structure, namely Innovation, Centralization and Job Autonomy were found to be the negative predictors of the dimension of OCB called *Concern for Organizational Resources*. The reason may be that Innovation is concerned with job enrichment, intrinsic motivation and sense of contribution. Employees have opportunity to go beyond the prescribed job profile and which require investment of organizational resources. Therefore, they get relatively less time to think about saving organizational resources. Most of time they remain concerned with accomplishment of their task in hand innovatively. Same is true for Job Autonomy, when employees has greater flexibility to perform their job than they may feel less concerned towards saving organizational



resources for citizenship purpose. The reason may be that they do not consider it as necessary part of their in-role behaviour. It may be possible that Innovation and Job Autonomy may create a sense of confusion and role ambiguity about their in role behaviour and which discourages their concern for organizational resource. When there is a high degree of Centralization, employees have to consult with their superiors for every decision. Thus, they have less decision making power in organization. Then they just do in-role behaviour to maintain their organizational membership. It means that Innovation and Job Autonomy on the one hand and Centralization on other hand reduces employee's concern for saving organizational resources.

The dimensions of Organizational Structure, namely Job Autonomy was found to be the negative predictor of the dimension of OCB called *Conservation of Time*. When there will be greater Job Autonomy employees would be less clear about their role expectation. Job autonomy may create an atmosphere where people feel free to argue, debate and discuss things in detail which may reduce the focus on conserving the time. There would be relatively higher role ambiguity. In this situation, they will devote more time in non-productive arguments which left no time to get indulge into conservation of time related citizenship behaviour.

The dimensions of Organizational Structure, namely Participation, Job Specificity, and Centralization were found to be the positive predictors where as Job Autonomy was found to be the negative predictor of the dimension of OCB called *Organizational Pride*. The reason may be that Job Autonomy is concerned with more freedom at the job. More freedom may lead to a sense of role ambiguity and role conflict. Freedom may also lead to non productive debates at work place. That may create negative affective state and negative feelings towards organization as whole. Where as

Participation, Job Specificity, and Centralization predicted Organizational Pride positively. The reason may be that Participation is concerned with sharing of decision-making with employees in formulation of organizational plans, rules and regulations. That makes them to feel positive affect for their organization. The participation in decision-making makes employee more responsible, committed and empowered. They develop a sense of ownership which makes them to participate at social and functional level for the development of the organization. VanYperen, Berg and Willering (1999) have observed similar results. Job Specificity and Centralization gives clarity to their organizational roles due to which they feel less confusion and conflict. That creates positive mood state and feeling of organizational pride. Hence, Participation, Centralization and Job Specificity may create a sense of pride for the organization.

The dimensions of Organizational Structure, namely Job Specificity and Centralization were found to be the positive predictors of the dimension of OCB called Work Mindedness. The reason may be that Job Specificity and Centralization provides greater clarity about the job and the task to be done. It motivates them to accomplish the work effectively and put an extra effort to perform their prescribed role behaviour.

The dimension of Organizational Structure, namely Centralization was found to be the positive predictor of the dimension of OCB called Altruism. There may be two reasons for such findings. First, Centralization is concern with concentration of power in the hands of few for making decisions. In this situation employee may feel greater dissatisfaction and unhappiness which will create a negative mental state. Helping other employees would help in releasing their negative mood state. This rationale is supported by the Cialdini and Colleagues (1982).

The dimensions of Organizational Structure, namely Centralization and Job Autonomy was found to be the negative predictors of the dimension of OCB called Sportsman Spirit. The reason may be that Centralization may create negative mental state due to the feeling of low empowerment where as Job Autonomy may produce role ambiguity and role conflict that will also add in negative mental state. The negative mental state may produce negative affective state towards whole organization. Employee would be prone for complaining behaviour then accepting the nuisances at work place. The dimensions of Organizational Structure, namely Job Specificity was found to be the positive predictor of the dimension of OCB called Individual Initiative. The reason may be that clarity about one's job profile will help to take initiatives for the welfare of the organization. Role specificity will make them to take extra initiatives for enhancing overall organizational performance.

The dimensions of Organizational Structure, namely Job Autonomy was found to be the negative predictor where as Job Specificity was found to be positive predictor of the dimension of OCB called Generalized Compliance. The reasons may be that Job Specificity may increase understanding about one's work place in terms of rules, regulations and organizational procedures and which may enhance the generalized compliance. Where as Job Autonomy may reduce Generalized Compliance citizenship behaviour because of lack of clarity about the role and responsibilities.

Thus, it can be concluded that Centralization, Participation and Job Specificity were found to be the positive predictors of different dimensions of OCB where as Centralization, Innovation and Job Autonomy were found to be negative predictors of different dimensions of OCB.

The results are exploratory in nature. It is difficult to make any generalized

conclusions from these results. These results can make a huge contribution to the management literature. The reason may be that those organizations which create a culture of job autonomy and innovation then employees' do not require going beyond an extra mile to help people and their organization. However, Centralization and Job Specificity dimensions with Participation dimension of organizational structure motivates employee to get indulge into citizenship behaviour to accomplish their task behaviour. It has been observed that structural inertia makes employees to create a personal network of relationship to successfully finish their in-role behaviour. OCB will help in creating a personal network and doing their job satisfactorily. Sometime OCB becomes an important requirement to do one's job rather than just a matter of one's choice or desire. It is not enough to say that OCBs are mostly determined by one's attitude and dispositions. Also situational determinant in terms of centralized structure, well defined job, and participated work atmosphere would make employee to enhance their citizenship behaviour. It means that citizenship behaviour may become a need of one's role profile if s/he wants to maintain its membership with the organization. Although, the present dominating structure may look distracting on the way to be a good citizen to the company. The results can further be understood in terms of OCBs towards other employees and OCBs towards the company. These results looks very clear to me when I see that employee oriented citizenship behaviour like emotional support, altruism etc is positively determined by Centralization but it reduces organization oriented citizenship behaviour like organizational pride, sportsman spirit. It may be possible that centralized structure and job specificity along with participated work atmosphere make employees to get connected with other employees through citizenship behaviour but may not make them to feel so for their organization. So OCBs are

complex part of employees' behaviour where they can apply their choice to different dimensions of OCBs. The situation may force them to go for some specific forms of OCBs.

### Implications and Suggestions

The results clearly establish relationship between organizational structure and OCBs. However, one needs to understand the complexity of different forms of structure and OCBs. It appears to me that some individual oriented OCBs are determined by Centralization, Participation and Job Specificity dimensions of organizational structure where as organizationally oriented OCBs are reduced by Innovation, Job Autonomy and Centralization dimensions of organization structure. OCBs might be beneficial for "cost-reduction" point of view, because it would be more economical to increase effective functioning of the organization through training of OCBs. Overall, OCBs are helpful in increasing the cooperation, sharing, teamwork, and better harmony among employees and lubricates social machinery of the organizations. In future, one may study various forms of organizational structure like functional, divisional, matrix etc may be in a specific industrial sector and can see the impact on different forms of OCBs. There is a dearth of research in this area. One may study OCB from different points of view. It may be conceptualized also as heaving ramifications for role burden, wastage of time, sacrificing role behaviour etc. some structure may create a high pressure or stress to accomplish one's job through OCBs while other forms of structure may facilitate OCBs. The idea needs further testing.

### References

- Baumler, J. (1971). Defined criteria of performance in organizational control, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 340-540.
- Blau, A.P. & Scott, R. (1962). *Formal organization*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co.
- Barnard, C. (1938). *The functions of executive*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Bateman, T.S., & Organ, D.W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 299-322.
- 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*: 71-98, San Francisco, C.A.: Jossey-Bass
- Chattopadhyay, P. (1999). Beyond Direct and Symmetrical Effects: The Influence of Demographic Dissimilarity on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *Academy of Management of Journal*, 42, 273-287.
- Chien, M.H., (2004). An Investigation of the Relationship of Organizational Structure, Employee's Personality and Organizational Citizenship Behaviours. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 5, 428-232
- Cialdini, R.B., Kenrick, D.T., & Bauman, D.J. (1982). Effects of mood on Pro-social behaviour in children and adults. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Development of Pro-Social Behaviour*. New York: Academic Press:
- Daft R.L., (2005) *Organization theory and design* 8<sup>th</sup> ed Thomson South Western.
- Davis, J.P., Eisenhardt, K.M., & Bingham, C.B. (2009). Optimal structure, market dynamics, and the strategy of simple rules. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54, 413-452.
- DeGroot, T., & Brownlee, A.L., (2006). Effect of department structure on the organizational citizenship behaviour-department effectiveness relationship. *Journal of Business Research*, 59, 1116-1129.
- Dewar, R.D., Whetten, D.A., & Bojk, D. (1980). An examination of the reliability and validity of the Aiken & Hage scale of centralization, formalization and task routineness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 120-128.
- Fahr, J., Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behaviour: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, 16, 705-722.

- George, J.M., (1991). State or trait: effects of positive mood on pro-social Behaviour at Work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 299-307.
- Hage, J. & Aiken, M. (1967). Relationship of centralization to other structural properties. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 12, 73-92
- Hall, R.H. (1962). Intraorganizational structural variation: Application of the bureaucratic model. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 7, 295-308.
- Homans, G.C. (1950). *The human group*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World,
- Hui, C., Law, K.S. & Chen, Z.X. (1999). A structural Equation model of the effects of negative affectivity, Leader member exchange, and perceived job mobility on In-role and Extra-role performance: A chinese case, *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 77, 3-21.
- Hunter, J., (2002). Improving organizational performance through the use of effective elements of organizational structure, *Leadership in Health Services*, 15, 12–21
- James, L.R., & Jones, A.P. (1976). Organizational structure: A review of structural dimensions and their conceptual relationships with individual attitude and behaviour. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 74-113.
- Jansen, J.J.P., Van den Bosch, F.A..J., & Volberda, H.W. (2005). Managing potential and absorptive capacity: How do organizational antecedents matter? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 999-1015.
- Jansen, J.J.P., Van den Bosch, F.A..J., & Volberda, H.W. (2005). Exploratory innovation, exploitative innovation, and performance: Effects of organizational antecedents and environmental moderators, *Management Science*, 52, 1661-1674.
- Karambaya, R. (1990). Context for organizational citizenship behaviour: Do high performing and satisfying units have better citizens". York University Paper.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. (1978). *The social psychology of organization*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behaviour. *Behavioural Sciences*, 9, 131-146.
- Kerr, S. & Jermier, J.M. (1978). 'Substitute for leadership: their meaning and measurement', *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 22, 375-403.
- Lester SW, Meglino BM, Korsgaard MA(2008) The role of other orientation in organizational citizenship behaviour, *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 29, 829-844.
- Luthans F, Youssef CM. (2007) Emerging Positive Organizational Behaviour. *Journal of Management*, 33, 321-334.
- MacKenzie, SB, Podsakoff, PM, & Rich, GA (2001) Transformational and transactional leadership and salesperson performance. *Academy of Marketing Science Journal*, 29, 115-134.
- Miller, E.J., & Rice, A.K. (1967). *Systems of organizations: The control of task and sentient boundaries*. London: Tavistock
- Moorman, R.H. & Blakely, G.L. (1995) Individualism-Collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour, *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 16, 127-142.
- Moorman, RH, Niehoff, BP, and Organ, DW (1993) Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behaviour: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6, 209-225.
- Moorman, R.H., Blakely, G.L., & Niehoff, B.P. (1998) Does organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour? *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 351-357.
- Nasurdin, A. M., Ramayah, T., & Beng, Y.C., (2006) "Organizational structure and organizational climate as potential predictors of job stress: Evidence from Malaysia", *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 16, 116–129
- Nissen, M.E., & Burton, R.M. (2011). Designing organizations for dynamic fit: System Maneuverability, and opportunity loss. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics-Part A: Systems and Humans* in press.
- Oldham, G.R. & Hackman, J.R. (1981). Relationship between organizational

- structure and employee reactions: Comparing alternative frameworks. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 66-83.
- Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome*, Lexington, MA Lexington.
- Organ, D.W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). 'Cognitive and 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.
- Ouchi, W. (1977). The relationship between organizational structure and organizational control, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 95-112.
- Posdakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., Paine, B. & Bachrach, D. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviour: 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., Moorman, R.H., Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviours and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviours. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142.
- Porter, L.W., & Lawler, III, E.E. (1965). Properties of organization structure in relation to job attitude and job behaviour, *Psychological Bulletin*, July 1965: pp 23-51.
- Siggelkow, N., & Levinthal, D.A. (2003). Temporarily divide to conquer: Centralized, decentralized, and reintegrated organizational approaches to exploration and adaptation. *Organization Science*, 14, 650-669.
- Smith, K.D., Keating, J.P., & Stotland, E. (1989). Altruism reconsidered: The effect of denying feedback on a victim's status to empathetic business. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 641-650.
- Smith C.A., Organ, D.W. & Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behaviour: Its nature and antecedents, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 655-663.
- Snizek, W. & Bullard, J.H. (1983). Perception of bureaucracy and changing job satisfaction: A longitudinal analysis. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 275-287.
- Solomon, E.E. (1986). Private and public sector managers: An empirical investigation of job characteristics and organizational climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 247-259.
- Somech, A., & Zahavy, A.D., (2004). Exploring organizational citizenship behaviour from an organizational perspective: The relationship between organizational learning and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 281-298.
- Tannenbaum, R., & Massarik, F. (1950). Participation by Subordinates in the Managerial Decision-Making Process, *The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 16, 408-418.
- Turban, D.B. & Keon, T.L. (1994). Organizational attractiveness: An integrationist perspective, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 184-193.
- Van, D.L, Graham J.W., & Dienesch, R.M. (1994) Organizational citizenship behaviour: Construct Redefinition Measurement and Validation, *Academy of Management Journal* 37, 765-802.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. (A.M. Henderson & T. Parsons, Trans). New York: The Free Press.
- Wong, A., Tjosyold, D., & Liu, C. (2009). Cross-Functional Team *Organizational Citizenship Behaviour* in China: Shared Vision and Goal Interdependence among Departments. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*; 39, 2879-2909.
- Worthy, J.C.,(1950). Organization structure and employee morale. *American Sociological Review*, 169-179.

Received: November 24, 2010

Revision received: March 12, 2011

Accepted: May 05, 2011

**Ajay K Jain**, PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Human Behaviour and Organization Development, Management Development Institute, Gurgaon-122 007, India