

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR; MEASUREMENT AND VALIDATION IN THE CONTEXT OF SRI LANKAN UNIVERSITIES

¹F.H.Abdul Rauf and ²Shamala Kumar

¹*Department of Management, Faculty of Management and Commerce, South Eastern University, Oluvil, Sri Lanka*

²*Department of Agricultural Economics & Business Management, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Peradeniya, Peradeniya, Sri Lanka*

Keywords: *Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Dimensions, Measurement, Validation*

Introduction

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is “performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place” (Organ, 1997, p. 95). Researchers have used a variety of scales to measure OCB (Organ *et al.*, 2006), which are derived from work populations dissimilar to the Sri Lankan State University contexts. However, OCBs depend on the context (Organ, 1988) and may vary according to contextual elements (Farh *et al.* 2002). Therefore, Rauf and Kumar (2011) identified the dimensions of OCB for a sample of academic staff of the University in Sri Lanka using an inductive approach. Content analysis revealed 08 dimensions of OCB, which were classified into the broader categories of OCBO (OCB directed toward organizations) and OCBI (OCB directed individuals), and supports past research of OCB (William & Anderson’s, 1991). The present study attempts to develop a new instrument to measure OCB using above dimension and validate it.

Methodology

Three to six items were developed to measure each 08 OCB dimensions from Rauf and Kumar (2011). All items were originally developed in English and translated into Sinhala and Tamil via the back-translation technique (Brislin, 1980). A sample consisting of 300 academic staff from various faculties of three Universities were administered the final set of 38 items. With 38 indicators, the sample size to parameter ratio was almost better than the recommended (Bentler & Chou, 1988). Items reflecting undesirable behaviors were worded in the reverse which may function as filtering questions to avoid response set bias (Van Dyne *et al.*, (1994).

Self report responses to the 38 item OCB scale were factor analyzed. The initial assessment produced a chi-square of 2580.80 with 523 degree of freedom ($p < .01$). The loadings indicated that we could improve by dropping some items. For example, the items or Keep up with new proposals for educational developments, Keep up with the University procedures and standards and Comply with the code of ethics in performing academic and examination works were regarded as in role by most staff. Following and obeying newly proposed development, adhering to the policies and standards, being fair, honest, just and moral in performing academic and examination works were seems to be perceived as expected part of the job by most of the staff. Therefore, it did not better capture the spirit of OCB. The other dropped item was go to the University on holidays for special works, although this item qualify for OCB the loading does not support to be a strong variable. Staff do not like to spend leisure time, and willing to take rest and invest the time for other social obligations during leave and time off may be the reason for having a very less loading by respondents. The other dropped item was take the credit due by others, blame others and fighting for improper personal gain, adhering to the intellectual property rights, offering others deserving recognition, avoiding of getting involving unwarranted behaviors were seems to be felt as implied and important behaviors for the academic community by the respondents. The other dropped item was Misuse the University

properties and equipments, the pattern of responses for this item seems to be perceived that the conservation of University resources were felt necessary by the respondents due to the limited fund allocation by the government for state Universities in Sri Lanka.

Items which had significant and substantial loadings on their designated factors were retained. As a result the two factor model, measured by 32 items, resulted in a chi-square of 1997.63 with 494 degree of freedom ($p < .01$) and the overall fit of the two factor model to the data was good. The consistency of the items and the magnitude of the loadings for factor 1 and 2 provide strong empirical support for the substantive categories of OCBO and OCBI. The Cronbach alphas for the two dimensions were .96 for OCBI and .97 for OCBO. This evidence, taken together, suggested that the two dimension OCB scales has sound psychometric properties and can be used in further analysis. These findings are consistent with prior research of dimensionality of OCB.

Following the recommendation of DeVellis (1991) for new scale development, Cronbach's alpha was also calculated on the cross validation data in order to assess the internal consistency reliability of the scale for a different set of respondents from a different state University which indicates the scales are reliable. Harman's one factor test was conducted to assess the common method bias. The results indicate that common method variance is not likely to be a serious threat to validity. Furthermore, the correlations among factors vary from 0.32 to 0.90, shows that the strong affect of common method bias is very unlikely.

Discussion and Conclusion

William and Anderson's (1991) conceptualization of OCBO and OCBI incorporates most other OCB related constructs into it (Podsakoff, *et al.*, (2009). For example, OCBI captures not only Organ's (1990) altruism, courtesy, peacekeeping, and cheerleading dimensions but also Graham's (1989) interpersonal helping. Van Scotter and Motowidlo's (1996) interpersonal facilitation, and Farh, Earley, and Lin's (1997) helping coworkers and interpersonal harmony constructs. In a similar way, OCBO captures not only Organ's (1990) compliance, civic virtue, and sportsmanship dimensions but also Graham's (1991) organizational loyalty; Borman and Motowidlo's (1993, 1997) endorsing, supporting, and defending organizational objectives; Van Scotter and Motowidlo's (1996) job dedication; LePine and Van Dyne's (1998) voice behavior; Morrison and Phelps's (1999) taking charge (or individual initiative); and Farh, Zhong, and Organ's (2004) promoting the company's image constructs. As a result of this, and the fact that Organ (1997, pp.94-95) himself seems to be favorably disposed to William and Anderson's (1991) approach, the two factor solutions (OCBO and OCBI) has strong consistent support in the context of academicians as well. In summary, the results of the factor analysis generally support the two substantive categories of OCB derived from the narrower context of 8 dimensions found in the first study. The data indicate, however, that the respondents in this study had a lesser complex conceptualization of OCB than we originally anticipated, with responses indicating significant distinction among OCBO and OCBI. Originally 8 dimensions were found based on the first study. However, the factor analysis did not support its initial categorization. But still confirm with its broader categorization of two dimension which are consistent with those proposed by Williams and Anderson (1991), who believe that it is important to distinguish OCB with respect to the target of the behavior. Research suggests that OCBs are context dependent (Organ, 1988). Hence, OCBs in academic institutions, such as Universities, varies from most of the organizations in most aspects. In their research, Skarlicki and Latham (1995) examined OCBs in a University setting and their data supported a two factor structure (organizational-OCBO and interpersonal-OCBI). In their study, DiPaola and Tschannen (2001) found that two dimensions covered all aspects of organizational citizenship in Universities. More recently the study by Erturk (2007) also revealed a consistent support to two factor solutions (OCBO and OCBI) in the context of academicians. Therefore, the two factor

solution (OCBO and OCBI) has strong consistent support in the context of Sri Lankan Universities as well.

References

- Bentler, P.M. & Chou, C. (1988), "Practical issues in structural modeling", in Long, J.S. (Ed.), *Common problems/proper solutions: Avoiding error in quantitative research*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA, pp. 161-92.
- Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N.Schmitt, W.C.Borman, & Associates (Eds), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71-98). San Francisco Jossey-Bass.
- Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human performance*, Vol.10, pp. 99-109.
- Brislin, R.W. (1980), "Translation and content analysis of oral and written materials", in Triandis, H.C. and Berry, J.W. (Eds), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Methodology*, Vol. 2, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, MA.
- DeVellis, R.F. (1991), *Scale development: Theory and applications*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- DiPaola, M.F. & Tschannen Moran, M. (2001), "Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relationship to school climate", *Journal of School Leadership*, Vol.11, pp.424-47.
- Erturk, A. (2007), "Increasing organizational citizenship behaviors of Turkish academicians", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol.22, No.3, pp.257-270.
- Farh, J.L., Zhong, C.B., & Organ, D.W. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior in the People's Republic of China, *Organizational Science*. Vol.15, No.2, pp. 241-253.
- Farh, J. L., C. B. Zhong, & D. W. Organ. (2002). An inductive analysis of the construct domain of organizational citizenship behavior in the PRC. A. S. Tsui, C. M. Lau, eds. *The management of enterprises in the People's Republic of China*. Kluwer Academic Press, Boston, MA, pp.445-470.
- Farh, J.L., Earley, P.C., & Lin, S.C. (1997), Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 42, pp.421-444.
- Graham, J.W. (1989). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, operationalization, and validation. Unpublished working paper, Loyola University of Chicago.
- Graham, J.W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol.4, pp. 249-270.
- LePine, J.A., & Van Dyne, L. (1998). Predicting voice behavior in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.83, pp. 853-868.
- Morrison, E.W., & Phelps, C.C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extra role efforts to initiate workplace change, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 42, pp.403-419.
- Organ, D.W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct cleanup time. *Human Performance*, Vol.10, pp.85-97.
- Organ, D.W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol.12, pp.43-72). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The good soldier syndrome*, Lexington Books, Lexington, MA.
- Organ, D.W., Podsakoff, P.M. & MacKenzie, S.B. (2006), *Organizational citizenship behavior, Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Podsakoff, N.P., Blume, B.D., Whiting, S.W., & Podsakoff, P.M., (2009), Individual and organizational level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta analysis, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.94, No.1, pp 122-141.

- Rauf.F.H.A. & Kumar.S (2011),Dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior(OCB): Are they emic,etic or both?,Proceeings of the 1st International conference on the social sciences and the humanities,ICSSH.
- Skarlicki,D. & Latham,G.,(1995), "Organizational citizenship behavior and performance in a university setting", Canadian journal of administrative sciences, Vol.12,pp.175-81.
- Van Dyne.L.,Graham.J.W.&Dienesch.R.M.,(1994),Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation, Academy of management journal, Vol.37, No.4, pp 765-802.
- Van Scotter, J.R., & Motowidlo, S.J.(1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance.Journal of applied psychology, Vol. 81, 525-531.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E.(1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors.*Journal of management*, Vol.17: 601-617.