Predicting the Relationship between Organizational citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Leadership Styles

Author Details: Author Detail: Vijaya Mani Professor-SSN School of Managements' College of Engineering, Old Mahabalipuram Road (OMR) Kalavakkam, Tamil Nadu, INDIA 603110

ABSTRACT

Organizations need employees who are prepared to work beyond their job descriptions. These employees often exert behaviors that go beyond their prescribed job obligations which in turn improve the overall performance of the organization. The Paper seeks primarily to examine relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and leadership styles and also attempts to determine if demographic variables have an impact on the organizational citizenship behavior and leadership styles in one of the leading construction company in Tamil Nadu , India.

The findings revealed that gender has an impact on courtesy and sportsmanship dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior and there is a significant relationship between leadership styles and organizational citizenship behavior displayed by the employees in the organization. The results suggest that transformational leadership and OCB are positively correlated. It was also concluded that there is a significant differences in subordinates' organizational citizenship behaviour when subjected to different leadership styles.

Keywords: Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Job Descriptions, Demographic Variables, Leadership Styles, Job Obligations.

Introduction and Background

As the world moves towards becoming a global place, organization's competitive ability and behaviors improving individual and organizational efficiency have become more valuable (Turnip seed and Murkison, 2000). In order to attain organizational effectiveness, organizations have shifted away from the use of hierarchical structures and individualized jobs, and implemented team-based work structures. This implementation has increased the importance of individual initiative and cooperation (Le Pine, Erez, Johnson; 2002). Therefore, in today's complex business world, one of major concerns of the managers is motivating employees for initiative and cooperation in order to attain effective organizational functioning (Le Pine et al., 2002).Researchers have theorized that the effectiveness of organizations is likely to be enhanced when employees go above and beyond the call of duty to aid fellow workers in order to achieve organizational goals (Organ, 1988) and such behavior has become critical in today's corporate world. Organ (1988) originally defined OCB as ―individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization. The term 'discretionary' as used in this definition suggest that the behavior is not an enforceable requirement of the role or the job prescription that is clearly specified in an employee's employment contract with the organization. The behavior is rather a product of a personal decision by the employee such that its omission is not generally understood as punishable. OCB facilitates the social machinery of the organization, provides the flexibility needed to work through many unexpected contingencies, (Smith, Organ and Near, 1983) and leads to organizational efficiency (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff and Blume, 2009).Pro social ethical behaviors such as helping a co-worker with a job-related problem, obeying organizational rules and regulations, attending meetings that are not mandatory, volunteering to do things in excess of job prescriptions are some of the behaviors that can be associated with OCB (Schnake,1991). Organizational citizenship behavior consists of a wide range of behaviors which have been termed 'dimensions of OCB' and these include altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, courtesy and sportsmanship (Moorman,1993).

All the dimensions of OCB explained previously combined to have a compelling benefit to organizations as this behavior has been described as important for the growth, success, effectiveness and productivity of any organization (Murphy et al., 2002).The study of leadership has been the central part of management and organization behavior literature for several decades (Yukl, 1989). According to Yukl's (1989) study, most leadership research suggests that leadership is an important determinant of organizational effectiveness. Leaders can significantly affect individual, group, and organizational performance (Ilies, Nahrgang, and Morgeson, 2007). Although the conceptual mechanisms linking leaders to performance are different in leadership theories, they are based on the assumption that effective leaders influence individuals and groups so that they are willing to perform beyond the minimum levels required by the organization (Ilies et al., 2007; Podsakoff et al., 1990). Anderson and King (1993) concluded that besides a participative leadership style, a clear vision or mission is most likely to foster innovation. Leaders who enhance followers' confidence and skills to devise innovative responses, to be creative, and to take risks, can also facilitate the changeover processes in organizations. Resulting from this, a paradigm shift occurred in the past decade with the emergence of "new leadership" theories such as transformational and charismatic leadership (Bass, 1997). According to Dvir (2002), transformational leadership (TL) is a process in which leaders and followers help each other to advance a higher level of morale and motivation. Burns (2003) related to the difficulty in differentiation between management and leadership and claimed that the differences are in the characteristics and behaviors. He established two concepts: "transformational leadership" and "transactional leadership". Transformational leadership styles create significant change in the life of people and organizations. It redesigns perceptions and values, changes expectations, and

aspirations of employees. Unlike the transactional leadership, it is not based on "give and take" relationship, but on the leader's personality, traits, and the ability to make the change through vision and goals. Transformational leadership occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that the leaders and the followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. Bass (1985) while agreeing to Burns (1978) added that the transformational leader expands the needs and wants of the follower. According to Conger (1999), transformational leaders exhibit proposed and expound a vision of what their team, organization or nation should become. They offer a clear and believable road map for attaining the vision. They frame their vision and strategy in a manner which give purpose. They give meaning and direction to the lives of the followers. They take great personal risks to achieve what they believe in. They have a high level of self-confidence and inspire confidence in others. They have a stirring personal and communication style. They have an ability to read others reactions very quickly and accurately. In the organizational sciences, non-prescribed organizationally beneficial behaviour and gestures are distinguished.

Transactional leadership is based on an exchange process in which employees obtain rewards from their leaders in return for their performance. Transactional leadership includes contingent reward behavior, contingent punishment behavior, non-contingent reward behavior, and non-contingent punishment behavior, whereas transformational leadership includes clarifying a vision, high performance expectations, and intellectual stimulation (Podsakoff et al., 2000). On the other hand, transformational leaders motivate the followers to perform beyond the minimum level of requirement for the organization by putting high level goals and developing an appropriate work environment (Williams, Pillai, and Schriesheim, 1999). The leader-member exchange theory of leadership, which focuses on the two way relationship between supervisors and subordinates, aims to maximize organization success by establishing positive interactions between the two. olanda B. Truckenbrodt 2000)) suggested that a significant relationship exists between the quality of the supervisor-subordinate relationship and subordinates' commitment and altruistic organizational citizenship behavior. Conclusions arrived from this study might help policy-making management executives and human resource specialists to support initiatives such as employee training and leadership career development, and help positively shape the organization's future.Vijaya Banu, R.Amudha, (2012), explores the variables influencing Organization Citizenship behaviour and its impact on demographic variables. Atousa G Dehkordi investigated the relationships between transformational and transactional leadership styles of physical education departments heads with employee's organizational citizenship behaviors. Correlation analysis revealed that transformational leadership style was correlated with organizational citizenship behaviors and three of its facets viz., conscientiousness, courtesy, and altruism. No correlations were found between transformational leadership style with sportsmanship and civic virtue. Transactional leadership style was not correlated with OCB and its facets, except for civil virtue. Regression analyses revealed that among five facets of transformational leadership style, idealized attributes, inspirational motivation and individualized consideration predicted OCB, significantly. J.S. Gunavathy & Indumathi, G. (2011) analyzed the relationship between the leadership styles and organizational citizenship behavior. No significant relationship was identified between demographic factors and leadership style on the one hand and OCB on the other. Relationship between gender and OCB was statistically significant. The author suggested that for true citizenship behavior to be exhibited, leaders should be able to foster a culture of trust, mutual understanding and transparency.

Research in the area of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has shown a dramatic increase in the last few years. This trend is illustrated by the rapid growth in publications dealing with OCB over recent decades, ranging from 13 occurring in the period from 1983 to 1988, to 122 in the period from 1993 to 1998 (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003).Although research has been extensive in addressing the numerous antecedents of OCB (e.g., job satisfaction, perceptions of fairness, personality factors), less attention has been focused on other important areas related to the construct. One such area is the mechanisms by which certain antecedents influence citizenship performance, as well as the potential for additional dispositional variables to moderate antecedent-OCB relationships (Podsakoff et al., 2001). Initially Smith, Organ, and Near, (1983) identified two dimensions: altruism, representing those forms of OCB that provide help to a specific person; and generalized compliance, or conscientiousness which includes faithful adherence to rules about work procedures and conduct. Later three additional dimensions were introduces- courtesy, or gestures to help prevent problems of work associates; sportsmanship or willingness to forebear minor and temporary personal inconveniences and impositions without fuss, appeal, or protest; and civic virtue, or responsible and conductive involvement in the issues of governance of organizations (Posdakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000), in a meta-analytic study found that researchers have identified almost 30 different forms of citizenship behaviors. However, there exists conceptual overlap between the constructs; therefore, they grouped these behaviors into seven dimensions: helping behavior, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and self-development. Moorman (1991) and Organ (1988) identified five dimensions of OCB as altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue. Later, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) developed a scale that showed evidence for the five-factor model. Schnake and Dumler (2003) also highlighted that the same five OCB dimensions that have been most frequently examined by researchers. The present research was conducted at one of the largest technology, engineering, manufacturing and construction organization in tamil nadu India, with a record of over 70 years. Its cutting edge capabilities cover every discipline of construction – civil, mechanical, and electrical and instrumentation engineering and services extend to large industrial and infrastructure projects from concept to commissioning.The objective of this study was to examine the effects of leadership styles on employees' organizational citizenship

behaviour. The reason for choosing OCB as a research area is its positive relationship with organizational performance, i.e by identifying the relation and impact of OCB on leadership styles, the organizational performance can be enhanced.

Methodology

Previous studies conducted by the organization revealed that the organization was not satisfied with the employee's level of citizenship behavior that has an influence on employee's contribution to the organization. There is a need to ascertain whether leadership style of the superior is one of the factors that has an impact on the level of commitment and the employee contribution. The management is looking into avenues for developing a cohesive workforce in order to increase organizational growth. The problem area is to ascertain if there is any relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and leadership styles of the superior

The scope of the study is confined to middle management level employees of an Engineering and Construction Company in Tamil Nadu having more than 3 years of experience in the organization. The study is confined to analyzing only two styles of leadership viz., transactional and transformational styles. It hs also made an attempt to analyze the impact of demographic characteristics on organizational citizenship behavior and to ascertain the impact of demographic characteristics on leadership styles.

The current research is a cross-sectional study and the sample consisted of 150 employees from the construction company with out discrimination or bias. The census method of sampling was adopted as the sampling technique.Primary data was collected from the respondents by means of 2 questionnaires, one to test the perception of employees towards OCB and another to test their perception towards leadership styles. A total of 150 questionnaires were circulated among the employees of whom 136 responded. The response rate was 90.6%. In our survey, responses were rated on the Likerts -scale format, with answer ranging from 1 to 5 (1 = never and 5 = always). The respondents were assured of confidentiality to guarantee the fairness of responses. To avoid any oversight due to a non-serious attitude, we tried to utilize the time off of employees to fill the questionnaires. Also the respondents were provided with full explanation of the questionnaire.

Descriptive statistics are used to explore the data collected and to summarize and describe those data using percentages and frequencies. Statistical tools like One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), Factor Analysis and Correlation were used to analyze the data. After the collection of data, scores were developed for OCB constructs by averaging the responses to items comprising each dimension. Reliability test was conducted to ascertain the reliability of the questionnaire. The Cronbach's Alpha value of .811(>.5), shows that the instrument is reliable

Table 1 Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.811	.792	36

Demographic Analysis

Following Tables haves tabulated the demographics data on the basis of age, gender , Qualification, and Work Experience of the respondents with their description range, frequency and percentage.

Table 2 – Demographic Analysis

Demographic Variables	**Description Range**	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**	
AGE	Less than 25	18	13.2	
	25-35	89	65.4	
	35-45	26	19.1	
	45-55	2	1.5	
	55 and above	1	.7	
Gender	Male	96	70.6	
	Female	40	29.4	
Qualification	Undergraduate	73	53.7	
	Post graduate	31	22.8	
	Others	32	23.5	
Work Experience	Less than 5 years	43	31.6	
	5-10 years	73	53.7	

	10-15 years	13	9.6	
	15-20 years	3	2.2	
	20-25 years	2	1.5	
	more than 25 years	2	1.5	

Demographic analysis of the data reveals that 65% of the respondents belong to the age group of 25 to 35 years. The education qualification categorization shows that 54% of the respondents have UG qualification. The data also reveals that the ratio of male respondents is higher than females and 54% of the respondents have work experience of 5-10 years.

Percentage Analysis on Dimensions of OCB

Table 3 Altruism Dimension

	I adjust my work schedule to accommodate other employees' request for time off	I help other employees who are absent	I am willing to take time off to train/orient new employees
Strongly disagree	0.7		
Disagree	7.4	7.4	3.7
Neutral	14	16.2	12.5
Agree	66.2	58.8	62.5
Strongly Agree	11.8	17.6	21.3

Table 4 Courtesy Dimension

	Willingly give my time to help my co-workers when they have work related problems	Showing genuine concern and courtesy even during trying situations	I try to avoid creating problems for co-workers.	I consider the impact of my actions on coworkers	I am always ready to lend a helping hand to those around me.
Strongly disagree				0.7	1.5
Disagree	4.4	5.9	8.8	8.8	10.3
Neutral	11.8	20.6	6.6	12.5	13.2
Agree	56.6	60.3	52.9	60.3	52.9
Strongly agree	27.2	13.2	31.6	17.6	22.1

Table 5 Civic Virtue Dimension

	I offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization	I attend functions that are not mandatory, but aid in improving the company's image.	I attend training/information sessions that I am encouraged to, but not required to attend
Strongly Disagree	0.7		0.7
Disagree	7.4	13.2	19.9
Neutral	10.3	23.5	30.1
Agree	56.6	51.5	39
Strongly Agree	25	11.8	10.3

Table 6 Conscientiousness Dimension

	My attendance at work is above the norm	I obey company rules and regulations even when no one is watching.	I don't take unnecessary time off work	I do not take lunch/tea breaks extending the stipulated time
Strongly disagree			0.7	0.7
Disagree	6.6	8.1	6.6	10.3
Neutral	14	5.9	19.1	17.6
Agree	47.8	43.4	51.5	50
Strongly agree	31.6	42.6	22.1	21.3

Table 7 Sportsmanship Dimension

	I always find fault with what the organization does	I tend to make mountains out of molehills	I consume a lot of time complaining about trivial matters
Strongly disagree	25.7	14.7	18.4
Disagree	36.8	26.5	34.6
Neutral	23.5	36	28.7
Agree	13.2	18.4	14
Strongly Agree	0.7	4.4	4.4

With respect to the various dimensions of OCB, It has been inferred from the survey that (66.2%, of the respondents display altruistic citizenship behavior,60% display courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behavior,. only a small percentage of respondents (25%,) display the civic virtue dimension of organizational citizenship behavior, (51.5%,) display conscientiousness dimension of organizational citizenship behavior. 36.8%, display Sportsmanship dimension of organizational citizenship behavior.

FACTOR ANALYSIS

Table 8 KMO BARLETT'S TEST 1

KMO and Bartlett's Test – OCB

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.815
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	841.757
	Df	153
	Sig.	.000

As the value of KMO is .815 (>0.5), indicating the sampling adequacy, the number of samples is adequate for doing factor analysis. The Bartlett's Test indicates the strength of the relationship between variables. The observed level of significance of 0.000 indicates that the strength of the relationship among variables is strong. Hence the data is suitable for factor analysis.

Table 9 KMO BARTLETT'S TEST 2

KMO and Bartlett's Test – Leadership Styles

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.932
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1409.197
	df	153
	Sig.	.000

As the value of KMO is .932 (>0.5), indicating the sampling adequacy, the number of samples is adequate for doing factor analysis. The Bartlett's Test indicates the strength of the relationship between variables. The observed level of significance of 0.000 indicates that the strength of the relationship among variables is strong. Hence the data is suitable for factor analysis

The factor extraction matrix explains that from 18 variables 5 factors were extracted explaining the 63% of variance.

Table 10 Total Variance Explained – OCB

Component	Initial Eigen values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	5.518	30.657	30.657	5.518	30.657	30.657	3.787	21.037	21.037
2	1.948	10.821	41.478	1.948	10.821	41.478	2.579	14.326	35.362
3	1.534	8.523	50.001	1.534	8.523	50.001	2.190	12.165	47.527
4	1.206	6.701	56.701	1.206	6.701	56.701	1.551	8.616	56.143
5	1.137	6.316	63.018	1.137	6.316	63.018	1.237	6.875	63.018
6	.866	4.811	67.829						
7	.794	4.410	72.239						
8	.731	4.059	76.298						
9	.637	3.540	79.838						
10	.567	3.148	82.986						
11	.538	2.988	85.974						
12	.467	2.592	88.566						
13	.436	2.424	90.990						
14	.411	2.281	93.271						
15	.393	2.182	95.453						
16	.337	1.874	97.327						
17	.259	1.439	98.766						
18	.222	1.234	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 11 Rotated Component Matrix[a] - OCB

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged into 6 iterations

Component	Initial Eigen values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	8.843	49.130	49.130	8.843	49.130	49.130	5.233	29.073	29.073
2	1.277	7.095	56.225	1.277	7.095	56.225	4.036	22.421	56.225
3	.866	4.859	61.084						
4	.974	5.411	67.422						
5	.787	4.371	71.794						
6	.650	3.614	75.407						
7	.637	3.538	78.946						
8	.529	2.941	81.887						
9	.502	2.790	84.677						
10	.463	2.570	87.246						
11	.382	2.122	89.368						
12	.361	2.007	91.375						
13	.339	1.882	93.258						
14	.287	1.596	94.853						
15	.271	1.503	96.357						
16	.254	1.412	97.769						
17	.228	1.268	99.037						
18	.173	.963	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

The factor extraction matrix explains that from 18 variables 2 factors were extracted explaining the 56% of variance.

Factor Analysis was done to the 18 variables found by literature review and interviews to reduce them to 5 factors (Conscientiousness Courtesy, Sportsmanship, Civic Virtue, and Altruism). These variances under each factor have high correlation with the given factors and low correlation with other factors. This explains the congruent and discriminate validity of the instrument.

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
I don't take unnecessary time off	.750				
I try to avoid creating problems for co-workers	.708				
I do not take extended tea / lunch breaks	.706				
I consider the impact of my actions on my co-workers	.700				
I obey company rules even when no one is watching	.655	.427			
I am always ready to lend a helping hand	.630	.456			
My attendance at work is above the norm	.597				
I help other employees when they are absent	.473	.314			
Iam willing to train new employees		.768			
I willingly give my time to help my co-workers when they have work related problems		.687			
I offer ideas to improve the organization		.658			
I show genuine concern towards employees even during the most trying times		.621			.472
I consume most of my time complaining about trivial matters			.842		
I am always finding fault with whatever the organization does			.831		
I tend to make mountains out of molehills		.319	.734		
I attend training and information sessions that I am encouraged to but not required to attend				.794	
I attend functions that are not mandatory but boost the company's image				.765	
I adjust my work schedule to accommodate other employees request for time off					.801

Table 12 Rotated Component Matrix[a] – Leadership Styles

	Component	
	1	2
He/ She gives personal attention to others who seem rejected	.788	
Others are proud to be associated with him/her	.768	
He/ She gets others to rethink ideas that were never questioned before	.765	.305
He/ She provides recognition/rewards when others reach their goals	.742	
He/ She calls attention to what others get for what they accomplish	.731	.418
He/ She helps others find meaning in their work.	.670	.476
He/ She tell others the standards they have to know to carry out their work.	.645	.476
My leader lets others know his/her perception of their performance	.519	.473
As long as things are working he/ she does not try to change anything	.508	
He /She tells others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work.		.779
Others have complete faith in him/her	.417	.616
He/ She helps others develop themselves		.614
He/ She provides others with new ways/perspectives of looking at puzzling things	.395	.614
He/ She expresses with a few simple words what we could and should do.		.600
He/ She provides appealing images about what we can do.	.422	
He /She is satisfied when others meet upon agreed standards		.334
My leader makes others to feel good around him/her		.509
He /She enables others to think about old problems in new ways	.514	

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
Rotation converged in 10 iterations

Factor Analysis was done to the 18 variables found by literature review and interviews to reduce them to 2 factors (Transformational and Transactional Leadership). The variance under each factor has been identified and has been named as Transactional and Transformational styles of leadership. These variances under each factor have high correlation with the given factors and low correlation with other factors. This explains the congruent and discriminant validity of the instrument.

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Table 13 Correlations

		Transformational	Transactional
Conscientiousness	Pearson Correlation	-.187*	-.086
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.030	.318
	N	136	136
Courtesy	Pearson Correlation	-.041	.067
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.637	.436
	N	136	136
Sportsmanship	Pearson Correlation	-.136	-.091
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.115	.291
	N	136	136
Civic Virtue	Pearson Correlation	.007	-.066
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.931	.442
	N	136	136
Altruism	Pearson Correlation	-.045	-.056
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.601	.521
	N	136	136

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Conscientiousness and Transactional Leadership are significant at 95% confidence level but the correlation is low (-.187). This indicates that there is inverse relationship between conscientiousness dimension and transactional leadership style. There is no correlation between conscientiousness and transformational leadership style as the significance value (0.318) is greater than 0.05.There is no correlation between altruism and transactional and transformational styles of leadership as the sig values are (0.601 and 0.521) are greater than 0.05There is no correlation between the courtesy, sportsmanship and civic virtue dimensions and the leadership styles as all their sig values are greater than 0.05. Thus the correlation analysis states that the two leadership styles as indicated by the two factors do not seem to have much impact on the dimensions of OCB displayed by the employees.

ANOVA (Gender and OCB)

H_o : There is no significant difference between gender and organizational citizenship behavior

H_1 : There is significant difference between gender and organizational citizenship behavior

Table 14 ANOVA (Gender and OCB)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Conscientiousness	Between Groups	2.401	1	2.401	2.426	.122
	Within Groups	132.599	134	.990		
	Total	135.000	135			
Courtesy	Between Groups	3.069	1	3.069	3.117	.080
	Within Groups	131.931	134	.985		
	Total	135.000	135			
Sportsmanship	Between Groups	3.528	1	3.528	3.596	.060
	Within Groups	131.472	134	.981		
	Total	135.000	135			
Civic Virtue	Between Groups	2.586	1	2.586	2.617	.108
	Within Groups	132.414	134	.988		
	Total	135.000	135			
Altruism	Between Groups	2.457	1	2.457	2.484	.117
	Within Groups	132.543	134	.989		
	Total	135.000	135			

It can be inferred that only the dimensions of Courtesy and Sportsmanship have a significant difference with gender as their significance value is 0.080 and 0.060 (<0.1) respectively. All the other dimensions do not have any significant difference with gender. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected.

ANOVA (Age and OCB)

H_0 : There is no significant difference between age and dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior

H_1 : There is significant difference between age and dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior

Table 15 ANOVA (Age and OCB)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Conscientiousness	Between Groups	2.034	4	.509	.501	.735
	Within Groups	132.966	131	1.015		
	Total	135.000	135			
Altruism	Between Groups	2.303	4	.576	.568	.686
	Within Groups	132.697	131	1.013		
	Total	135.000	135			
Sportsmanship	Between Groups	4.925	4	1.231	1.240	.297
	Within Groups	130.075	131	.993		
	Total	135.000	135			
Civic Virtue	Between Groups	1.267	4	.317	.310	.871
	Within Groups	133.733	131	1.021		
	Total	135.000	135			
Courtesy	Between Groups	4.415	4	1.104	1.107	.356
	Within Groups	130.585	131	.997		
	Total	135.000	135			

It can be inferred that all the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior does not have a significant difference with age. Therefore the null hypothesis is not rejected.

ANOVA (Experience and OCB)

H_0 : There is no significant difference between experience and dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior
H_1 : There is significant difference between experience and dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior

Table 16 ANOVA(Experience and OCB)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Conscientiousness	Between Groups	6.435	5	1.287	1.301	.267
	Within Groups	128.565	130	.989		
	Total	135.000	135			
Altruism	Between Groups	6.250	5	1.250	1.262	.284
	Within Groups	128.750	130	.990		
	Total	135.000	135			
Sportsmanship	Between Groups	3.243	5	.649	.640	.670
	Within Groups	131.757	130	1.014		
	Total	135.000	135			
Civic Virtue	Between Groups	1.263	5	.253	.246	.941
	Within Groups	133.737	130	1.029		
	Total	135.000	135			
Courtesy	Between Groups	5.732	5	1.146	1.153	.336
	Within Groups	129.268	130	.994		
	Total	135.000	135			

It can be inferred that all the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior does not have a significant difference with experience. Therefore the null hypothesis is not rejected.

ANOVA (Gender and Leadership Styles)

H_0 : There is no significant difference between gender and styles of leadership
H_1 : There is significant difference between gender and styles of leadership

Table 17 ANOVA(Gender and Leadership Style)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.*
Transformational	Between Groups	7.426	1	7.426	7.800	.006
	Within Groups	127.574	134	.952		
	Total	135.000	135			
Transactional	Between Groups	.722	1	.722	.721	.397
	Within Groups	134.278	134	1.002		
	Total	135.000	135			

It can be inferred that transformational leadership has a significant difference with gender as the sig value is <.1(0.006).Therefore null hypothesis is rejected.It is also inferred that transactional leadership does not have any significant difference with gender (.397).Thus the null hypothesis is not rejected.

ANOVA (Experience and Leadership Styles)

H_0 : There is no significant difference between experience and styles of leadership

H_1 : There is significant difference between experience and styles of leadership

Table 18 ANOVA (Experience and Leadership Style)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.*
Transformational	Between Groups	2.705	5	.541	.532	.752
	Within Groups	132.295	130	1.018		
	Total	135.000	135			
Transactional	Between Groups	9.227	5	1.845	1.907	.097
	Within Groups	125.773	130	.967		
	Total	135.000	135			

It can be inferred that transformational leadership has no significant difference with experience as the sig value is (0.752).Therefore null hypothesis is not rejected. It can be inferred that transactional leadership has a significant difference with experience (.097). Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected.

ANOVA (Age and Leadership Style)

H_0:There is no significant difference between age and styles of leadership

H_1 : There is significant difference between age and styles of leadership

Table 19 ANOVA (Age and Leadership Styles)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.*
Transformational	Between Groups	2.201	4	.550	.543	.705
	Within Groups	132.799	131	1.014		
	Total	135.000	135			
Transactional	Between Groups	2.889	4	.722	.716	.582
	Within Groups	132.111	131	1.008		
	Total	135.000	135			

It can be inferred that transformational leadership and transactional leadership has no significant difference with age as the sig value is 0.705 and .582 respectively. Therefore null hypothesis is not rejected.

Conclusion

The project aimed at analyzing the relationship between two leadership styles, transformational and transactional and OCB displayed by the employees. A census study was conducted among the population of 150 employees who belonged to the executive cadre at the selected organization.. Primary data was collected through 2 questionnaires. One to test perceptions of OCB and the other to test the perception of leadership styles among employees. The findings revealed that gender has an impact on courtesy and sportsmanship dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior and there is a significant relationship between leadership styles and organizational citizenship behavior displayed by the employees in the organization. The results suggest that transformational leadership and OCB are positively correlated. It was also concluded that there is a significant differences in subordinates' organizational citizenship behaviour when subjected to different leadership styles. Future research can be pursued to identify other factors viz., leader-member exchange, nature of the work, work environment that may have an impact on the organizational citizenship behavior.It is felt by the researchers that there is an ample room for research in this field but the lack of resources poses a serious limitation. Also it is believed that the sample size is not enough to represent the whole industry and there is slight possibility that the future research in the same industry may yield some different results. It was found during the survey that maximum employees had no concept of OCB, the researchers made their honest efforts to make every respondent understand the questionnaire so that the research is productive. The study suggested that Training and information sessions organized by the company should be tailored to the needs of the employees of the various departments. This will encourage them to participate in these activities willingly thereby portraying the organization as one whole entity in the eyes of the public. Organizing knowledge transfer sessions will enhance their knowledge as well as enable them to contribute more to the organization. Employees also feel that more opportunities to train new co-workers should be provided in order to enable them to build a better relationship which is also a dimension of organizational citizenship behavior.

REFERENCES

1. Allen, T., & Rush, M.2001. "The influence of Rate Gender on Ratings of Organizational Citizenship Behavior', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 2001, 31, 12, pp. 2561-2587.

2.Atousa G.2012, The Relationships between managers' leadership styles of physical education of Islamic Azad Universities (Sixth District) with employees organizational citizenship behaviors International Conference on Management, Behavioral Sciences and Economics Issues.

.3. Bachrach, D., Jex, S. 2000. "Organizational Citizenship and Mood: An Experimental Test of Perceived Job Breadth, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 2000, 30. 3,* pp. 641-663.

4. Baker, B. 2005. "The Good, the Bad and the Ugly: The Mediating Role of Attribution Style in the Relationship between Personality and Performance. North Carolina State University.

5. Borman, W., Penner, L., Allen, T., & Motowidlo, S. 2001. "Personality predictors of citizenship Performance. International journal of selection and assessment." Borman, W.C. 2004. The Concept of Organizational Citizenship. Personnel Decisions Research Institutes, Inc., Tampa, Florida, and University of South Florida.

6 Brennan, A., & Skarlick, D. 2004. "Personality and Perceived Justice as Predictors of Survivors' Reactions Following Downsizing1.*Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 2004,34, *6*, pp. 1306-1328.

7. Coole, D.R. 2003. "The Effects of Citizenship Performance, Task Performance, and Rating Format on Performance Judgments, University of South Florida.

8. Deckop, J., Mangal, R & Circa, C. 1999. Getting more that you pay for: organizational citizenship behavior and pay for performance plan, Academy of Management Journal. Vol 42 ,No, 4. 420-428.

9. Dennis W. Organ , Philip M. Podsakoff, Scott B. MacKenzie, (2006) **"**Organizational Citizenship Behaviour its nature and consequences

10. Dick, R., Grojean, M., Christ, O & Wieseke, J. 2006. Identity and the Extra Mile: Relationships between Organizational Identification and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. British Journal of Management, Vol. 17, 283–301 (2006)

11. Fleenor, J. 2006. Review of the book by *Center for Creative Leadership Greensboro, North Carolina.* Personnel psychology vol. 59, No. 2—summer, 2006 457–500

12 Gautam, T., Dick, R,. Wagner, U., Upadhyay, N.,and Davis, A.2005. "Organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment in Nepal. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology* 2005 8: 305–314

13 Gunavathy & Indumathi, (2011) Leadership Styles and Organizational Citizenship behavior – A study among employees of a Civil Engineering Company BVIMR

14. Jacqueline, A-M., Shapiro, C., Kessler I & Purcell, J. 2004. "Exploring organizationally directed citizenship behaviour: reciprocity or 'it's my job'? J*ournal of management studies*41:1.

15. Joireman, J., Daniels, D., Falvy, J., & Kamdar, D. 2006.Organizational citizenship behavior as function of empathy consideration of future consequences, and employee time horizon: an initial exploration using an in-

basket simulation of OCBs. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, , 36, 9, pp.
2266–2292.

16. King, E., George, J., and Hebl, M. 2005. Linking Personality to Helping Behaviors at Work: An Interactional Perspective Journal of Personality 73:3, June 2005 *r* Blackwell Publishing.

17 Konovsky, M., & Organ, D. 1996. "Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behaviour,. Journal of organizational behaviour,, VOL. 17,253-266.

18. Koys, D. 2001. "The effects of employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and
Turnover on organizational effectiveness: a unit-level, longitudinal study. Personnel psychology, s4.

19.Ladd, D., & Henry, R. 2000. "Helping Coworkers and Helping the Organization: The Role of Support
Perceptions, Exchange Ideology, and Conscientiousness. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *30*, 10,
pp. 2028-2049.

20 Lepine, J., Colquitt, J., & Eriz, A. 2000. "Adaptability to changing task contexts: effects of general
cognitive ability, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. Personnel psychology.

21.Liz Dickinson (2009), An Examination of the Factors Affecting Organizational
Citizenship Behaviour, Departmental Honors Thesis, The University of
Tennessee at Chattanooga

21. Lowery, C., & Krilowicz, T. 1996. Effects of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Evidence from
Production Supervisors.International journal of selection and assessment.

22 Moorman, R., Blakely, G., & Neihoff, B. 1995. Does received organizational support mediate the

relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior. Academy of

Management Journal. Vol. 41. No. 3, 351-371.

23. Pare, G., & Tremblay, M. 2000. The Measurement and Antecedents of Turnover Intentions among IT Professionals, Scientific series.

24 Poncheri, R. 2006. The Impact of Work Context on the Prediction of Job Performance. North Carolina State University.

25. Pond, S., Nacoste, R., Mohr, M., & Rodriguez, C. 1997. "The Measurement of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Are We Assuming Too Much? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 1997, *27*, 17, pp. 1527-1 544.

26. Redman, T., & Snap, E. 2005. "I to we: the role of consciousness transformation in compassion and altruism. *Journal of Management Studies* 42:2 March 2005 0022-2380

27. Roberts, et al. 2005. The structure of Conscientiousness: an empirical investigation based on seven
major personality questionnaires, Personal psychology, 58,103-139.

28. Sanson, C., Wiebe, D., & Morgan, C. 1992. "Self-Regulating Interest: The Moderating Role of
Hardiness and Conscientiousness. *Sanson. C., Wiebe, D., & Morgan, C. 1999.* Self-Regulating
Interest: The Moderating Role of Hardiness and Conscientiousness. *Journal of Personality* 67:4,
August 1999.

29. Todd, S. A causal model depicting the influence of selected task and employee variables on
Organizational citizenship behavior.

30. Turnipseed, D.,& Rassuli, A. 2005. Performance Perceptions of Organizational Citizenship
Behaviours at Work: a Bi-Level , Study among Managers and Employees. British Journal of
Management, Vol. 16, 231–244

31. Vieten,C., Amorok, T., and Schlitz,M. 2005. I to we: the role of consciousness transformation in
compassion and altruism [*Zygon*, vol. 41, no. 4 (December 2006).]

32 Wu, Z. 2001." Altruism and the Family Firm: Some Theory. University of calgary.

33. Yen, H., & Neihoff, B. 2004. Organizational citizenship behavior and organizational effectiveness:
Finding relationship in Taiwanese banks. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 2004, 34, 8, pp.
1617-1637.

34 Yorges, S. 1999. The Impact of Group Formation and Perceptions of Fairness on Organizational
Citizenship Behaviors, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 1999, 29, 7, pp. 1444-1 47
.

35. Zirgham ullah Bukhari, Umair Ali, Khurram Shahzad & Sajid Bashir, Determinants of
Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Pakistan, International Review of Business Research Papers
Vol.5 N0. 2 March 2009 Pp. 132-150.