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Abstract

The concept of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) is comparatively new in the area of behavioural research. However, very quickly it could manage to grab full attention of researchers and now is one of the most studied aspect of organizational behaviour. The concept basically talks about the extra-role behaviour of employees which are helpful to maintain the overall effectiveness of the organization. This is much more critical to the organization because these behaviours can not be managed or manipulated through any actions or sanctions of the organizational processes. A lot of research works have been carried out on OCB since its inception in 1983. These research works deal with identifying measures, designing a construct, evaluating the antecedents and consequences of OCB etc. However, a lot many of those researches directly or indirectly are getting connected to the area of Job Satisfaction of employees. The present paper tries to give a theoretical perspective of the relationship between Job Satisfaction and OCB.
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Introduction

The concept of help is as old as the human civilization itself. This distinct character of human beings is found in almost all organizations. We come across a number of persons who extend all possible help and co-operation to their fellow beings. A good number of research has been carried out on the nature, causes and implications of helping behaviour and co-operation in organizations (Moore et al.1973; Berkowitz and Connor, 1966; Cialdini et al.1973; Konecni,1972; Rawlings,1968; Regan,1971; Barnard,1938). However, in organizations these helping behaviours are mainly characterized under a number of situations. These situations may vary in its range from positive to negative mood. It may be compensatory or prosocial in nature.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB): Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is a concept which refers to the performances those are not included in the prescribed job description or job specification for a given job. These behaviours include any/all of those gestures which are very often taken for granted. Though they lubricate the social machinery of the organization, they do not directly fall within the usual notion of task performance. Examples of such behaviours include helping co-workers with a job related problem, accepting orders without a fuss, tolerating temporary impositions without complaint,
helping to keep the work area cleaned and uncluttered, making timely and constructive statements about the work area/unit, promoting a work climate that is tolerable, conserving and protecting organizational resources etc.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is proposed as a form of job performance which may be more strongly related to job satisfaction than performance measures employed in previous job satisfaction/job performance research. This concept holds more promise for organizational behaviours research than merely its relationship with job satisfaction. Organ (1988) argues that organizational citizenship, in aggregate, promotes the effective functioning of the organization. It is defined as supra-role behaviour, i.e. behaviour that goes beyond formal job descriptions but which is desired by an organization. Examples include punctuality, helping other employees, volunteering for things that are not required in the job, making innovative suggestions to improve department/organization, not wasting time, keeping the work area cleaned and uncluttered, preserving/minimising wastage of organizational resources etc. It also includes behaviour that a person refrains from doing even though he/she has every right to do so. Behaviours, like not finding fault with other employees frequently, expressing resentment, complaining about insignificant/trivial matters are also included in this category. These supra-role behaviours appear to be largely unaffected by organizational reward/punishment system for several reasons (Katz and Kahn, 1966).

Firstly, citizenship behaviours are often very subtle and difficult to measure. It is very difficult to include them in the formal performance appraisal system. While managers may see these behaviours and consider them in subjective ratings of employees performance, the direct linkage between reward and citizenship is likely to be very weak.

Secondly, engaging in citizenship behaviour may actually damage individual job performance. For example, helping a co-worker who has fallen behind may cause the “good citizen” employees to produce less than would otherwise be the case.

Finally, since citizenship behaviours do not find place in the formal role prescriptions, punishment for failing to engage in these behaviour seems unlikely.

Measurement of OCB: Bateman and Organ (1983) popularised the concept of organizational citizenship behaviour to denote those organizationally beneficial behaviours and gestures that can neither be enforced on the basis of formal role obligations nor elicited contractual guarantee of compensation. They are the first researchers who tried to develop a measure (scale) of organizational citizenship behaviour by enumerating a list of employees’ behaviours that managers typically appreciate but are ill-equipped to demand except perhaps to a limited degree. The Bateman and Organ scale provides a means for preliminary investigation into correlates of organizational citizenship behaviour. They tried to establish a causal connection between prior overall satisfaction and subsequent display of a host of citizenship behaviours. In this context, they predict that there is a strong connection between supervision and job satisfaction. Their contention for this prediction was that the immediate supervisor represents the most direct source of variance in events that arouse a felt need to reciprocate or that influence positive affect. Though the sample size (N=77) limits the confidence to some extent, still they found a stronger statistical relation-ship between general job satisfaction and the aggregate measure of organizational citizenship behaviour. They gave the rationale for this strong relationship as organizational citizenship represents actions...
more under volitional control of workers than conventional productivity measures. Prosocial gestures are less likely to be constrained by other situational forces, and they pose very little in the ability requirements.

Though Beteman and Organ’s study is a novel and pioneering one, it offered little insight into the dimensional structure of organizational citizenship behaviour. The factor analysis of the measure proved almost uninterpretable. The entire factor loading of the 30 items exclusively explained one general factor. Several other factors had no distinctive meaning common to their respective group of items.

Smith et al. (1983) developed a more streamlined measure of organizational citizenship behaviour through semi-structured interview conducted with the supervisory personnel in two manufacturing organizations. The interviewers asked the supervisors to describe actions of subordinates that they appreciated and regarded as helpful but could scarcely demand on the basis of supervisory authority or remuneration. They tried to measure 16 such items pre-tested with a group of 67 managerial and professional people enrolled in an evening MBA programme. They could find two clear factors from the analysis. They are altruism (ALT) which comprises factors like, helping a specific person (either the supervisor or a co-worker or any client) and generalised compliance comprising factors, like conscientiousness in attendance, use of work time properly and adherence to various rules.

The study of Smith et al. (1983) was comparatively broader in its scope as it attempted to assess the extent to which certain environmental forces and individual difference variables could independently predict citizenship behaviours. The result obtained from the study shows that factors, like job satisfaction and leader supportive behaviour are instrumental in fostering citizenship behaviour. Urban/ rural background and education also proved to be significant as antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviour. However, the citizenship behaviour measure used in this study is rather simplistic and the dimensionality of citizenship behaviour is not definite. The study did not address longitudinal relationships. The causal models used to interpret the findings of this study may be viewed as somewhat arbitrary regardless of the goodness of fit. Nevertheless, the study results show enough consistency with previous social-psychological studies of prosocial behaviour. Interestingly, the results suggest that citizenship behaviour in the work setting is worthy of study in its own rights.

From the review of the existing literature, it is clear that a good number of theoretical work and empirical tests have been done to explain the construct, causes and effects of organizational citizenship behaviour (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Smith et al.1983; Organ, 1977, 1988; Organ and Konovsky, 1989; Podsakoff et al.1990; Moorman, 1991). Also presently research on organizational citizenship behaviour is progressing at rapid pace. A number of models have been suggested linking organizational citizenship behaviour with job attitudes, like job satisfaction (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Smith et al.1983; Williams and Anderson, 1991), Organizational commitment (Becker, 1960), and perceptions of fairness (Moorman, 1991). It has also been related to leadership style (Farh et al.1990), inter-personal trust (Podsakoff et al.1990) and leader member exchange relationship (Wayne and Green, 1993).
However, there have been questions regarding the nature of the construct and the ways in which the concept has been operationalised (Schnake, 1991). For example, two differing operationalisations of organizational citizenship behaviour have surfaced in the recent years. The first one is the traditional view forwarded by Organ (1988) which describes organizational citizenship behaviour in a social exchange framework. In this framework organizational citizenship behaviour includes those behaviours which aid the maintenance of the pleasant and helpful relationships between organizational members. The second view, suggested by Graham (1986, 1989), is grounded by the definition and dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour in political science theory. In this framework, organizational citizenship behaviour becomes more controversial. Organizational citizenship behaviour in one person's eye may not be organizational citizenship behaviour for others. These two frameworks also do have the measurement construct in two different ways. The first construct is developed by Organ and his colleagues in Indiana University and the second one is developed by Graham.

Bateman and Organ (1983) for the first time attempted to measure organizational citizenship behaviour in a longitudinal study designed to test if measures of job satisfaction are causally related to organizational citizenship behaviour. However, the scale developed by them could tap only one factor which explained the majority of variance and they termed it as organizational citizenship behaviour. As it seems highly illogical (all behaviours under organizational citizenship behaviour can be described under one factor), Smith et al. (1983) refined the 30-item scale to 16-item scale and could explain the result in a more descriptive and multidimensional model. They labelled these behaviours under two heads namely altruism (behaviours which are directly and intentionally aimed at helping a specific person in face to face situations) and generalized compliance (behaviours which pertain to a more impersonal form of conscientiousness that does not provide immediate aid to any specific person but are indirectly helpful to others involved in the system). This factor is labelled as conscientiousness by Organ.

A number of studies have been done to develop a more refined construct of organizational citizenship behaviour measurement taking the Smith et al. model as the base (Williams et al. 1986; Konovsky, 1986; Organ and Konovsky, 1989; Williams and Anderson, 1991). Organ (1988) has recently proposed a five factor model of organizational citizenship behaviour. This expanded model consists of the two Smith et al. dimensions, i.e. altruism and conscientiousness and three new dimensions called courtesy, sportsmanship and civic virtue.

Podsakoff et al. (1990) have developed an instrument designed to capture the five factors suggested by Organ (1988). This measure has been used in two studies (Podsakoff et al. 1990; Moorman, 1991). In both the studies confirmatory factor analysis supports for the psychometric properties of the scale and reports that the scale taps five organizational citizenship behaviour factors.
Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: It is believed that organizational citizenship behaviour is highly influenced by job satisfaction. There are two distinct conceptual bases for this thought. Firstly, Social Exchange Theory (Adams, 1965; Balu, 1964) predicts that, given certain conditions, people seek to reciprocate those who benefit them. To the extent that a person’s satisfaction results from the efforts of organizational officials and such efforts are interpreted as volitional and non-manipulative in intent, the person will seek to reciprocate those efforts. The person may not have the ability or opportunity to reciprocate with greater work output or creative solutions to work-related problems. Citizenship behaviours are more likely to be under the person’s control and thus, more likely to be a salient mode of reciprocation.

A second basis for predicting this relationship is derived from a series of social psychological experiments (Rosenhan et al. 1974; Clark and Isen, 1982). This strongly supports the contention that prosocial gestures are most likely to occur when a person experiences a generalized mood state characterized by positive affect. To the extent that job satisfaction (as conventionally measured) reflects this positive affective state, it is likely that more satisfied persons display more of the prosocial/citizenship behaviour. As Rosenhan et al. (1974) phrased it, positive affect tends to generalize whatever caused it to other stimuli (notably persons) in the temporal and social context.

In the citizenship behaviour research it is convincingly argued that job satisfaction measures reliably correlate with measures of organizational citizenship behaviour (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Smith et al. 1983). Millar and Tesser (1986) have established that when both the evaluation and the behaviour are driven by the same component—whether it be affective or cognitive; the correlation between attitude and behaviour would be greater. In this context, Organ and Konovsky (1989) tried to answer some fundamental questions of job satisfaction-organizational citizenship behaviour correlation. They attempted to find which attitudinal component predominates in job satisfaction measures and which component drives organizational citizenship behaviour. It was further attempted by them to answer a crucial question, like what difference does it make whether organizational citizenship behaviour is cognitively or affectively driven. Organ and Konovsky (1986) summarised the findings from a vast amount of data as organizational citizenship behaviour has a deliberate, controlled character somewhat akin to conscious decision making rather than expressive emotional behaviour.

However, the limitation of the study is that the interpretation has proceeded with overtones of causality not strictly admissible from the cross-sectional nature of the data. Those who consistently render higher levels of organizational citizenship behaviour may elicit informal responses from their supervisors, co-workers or clients that express appreciation or provide informal rewards. This, in turn, may enhance subjective appraisals of the work situation and generalise judgements about such specific outcomes as pay. Also, those who freely offer themselves in terms of organizational citizenship behaviour, for whatever dimly perceived reasons, may experience a need to justify such inputs thereby cognitively augmenting outcomes from the exchange with the organization. So, it needs additional evidence from
other types of research design to permit confident attributions of cause and effect. Also as the predictor variables in the study of Organ and Konovsky could not explain more than 50 per cent of variance of organizational citizenship behaviour, it seems that some important variables are missing in the study.

The legacy of the work with job satisfaction and citizenship has not yielded unqualified support for the causal power of all types of job satisfaction. Research on job satisfaction measures and the causes of organizational citizenship behaviour suggest that the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour may be more complex than realized (Moorman, 1993). In this context, two issues in the measurement of this relationship are pertinent to be analysed. They are

a) the attitudinal basis underlying job satisfaction measures,

b) the relative effect of pure indicators of affect and cognition on job satisfaction.

Organ (1988, 1990) has suggested that job satisfaction measures may differ to the extent to which they tap more of an affective satisfaction or a cognitive satisfaction. Affective satisfaction is the satisfaction that is based on overall positive emotional appraisal of the job. This satisfaction focuses on whether the job evokes a good mood and positive feelings. Affectively oriented measures of job satisfaction would include questions about a respondent’s feelings about the job or his mood while working. Positive feelings or a positive mood would then indicate high job satisfaction.

On the other hand, cognitive satisfaction is the satisfaction that is based on a more logical and rational evaluation of the job conditions. Cognitive satisfaction is an appraisal based on comparisons which do not rely on emotional judgements but, instead, are evaluations of conditions, opportunities or outcomes. Job satisfaction scale which reflects job cognition include questions about the nature of job, the working conditions and the opportunities to satisfy important needs. The questions seek information for appraisals of the job, not descriptions of their feelings.

Organ and Near (1985) first suggested that measures of job satisfaction probably are based on an employee’s cognition about his/her job and not his/her affective responses. They noted that most satisfaction measures ask respondents to compare facets of their job to some referent (a cognitive process) and did not really ask for judgements about feelings and emotions. However, empirical tests of this proposition by Brief and Roberson (1987) and Williams (1988) found that while most measures of job satisfaction are cognitively based, some measures are found to be based to some degree of affective influences. For example, Brief and Roberson tested the relative effect of cognition and affect on three satisfaction measures and found that both cognitive and affective influences are present. These three satisfaction measures are

i) the job description index (JDI) (Smith et al. 1969),

ii) the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), and

iii) the Faces Scale (Kunin, 1955, Dunham and Herman, 1975).
Canonical correlation and regressions analysis showed that of the three satisfaction measures, MSQ is the most cognitive in its orientation while the Faces Scale is the most affective oriented. JDI is found to be predominantly cognitive, but some affective influence is also present.

The partitioning of the above job satisfaction scales based on cognition or affect is not surprising given the nature of the scales. For example, the MSQ is found to be mostly cognitive in its orientation, consists of a list of job conditions which the respondent is asked to appraise. The job conditions include the working condition, pay, quality of supervision and the degree of autonomy and importance in the job. No mention is made about the types of feelings associated with the work or the degree to which the work evokes positive or negative emotions. On the other hand, the Faces Scale, found to be mostly affective; asks for no detailed appraisals. The respondent simply reports which facial expression best approximates his/her own while working. The faces range from very happy to very sad and clearly reflect an emotional response to work.

Williams (1988) has also tested the relative cognitive and affective influence on job satisfaction measures. In this study, he tested the Facet Free job satisfaction scale (Quinn and Staines, 1979), the job diagnostic survey (JDS) satisfaction scale (Hackman and Oldham, 1975) and the Brayfield and Rothe (1951) satisfaction scale. By examining the shared variance among these satisfaction measures and factors represented by affect and cognition, he was able to separate the variance in each measure into cognitive and affective components. His results indicate that 27 per cent of the variance in the Facet Free scale and 18 per cent of the variance in JDS could be explained by cognition, while only 10 per cent of the variance in the Facet Frees and 12 per cent in the JDS could be explained by cognition. Conversely, 22 per cent of the variance in the Brayfield and Rothe scale could be explained by affect and only 16 per cent by cognition.

Organ (1988) summarizing the researches on organizational citizenship behaviour concluded that the researches do lend reasonable support to the hypothesis that organizational citizenship behaviour and job satisfaction are bound together in a robust relationship. Though a number of studies support that cognition would predict organizational citizenship behaviour in a better way than affect, still the effect of affect on organizational citizenship behaviour can never be ignored. Further the evidence related to mood and helping behaviours also support the proposition that affective components influence behaviours in an organization (Brown, 1985). It may also be argued that if cognition and affect are relatively independent (Andrews and Witey, 1976; Organ and Near, 1985; Brief and Roberson, 1987), cognition (perceived equity) may be more strongly related to certain type of organizational citizenship behaviour such as generalized compliance while affect (job satisfaction) may be more strongly related to dimensions like altruism. The studies on mood state (Berkowitz, 1972; Clark and Isen, 1982; Isen et al. 1976) support this conclusion.

Mel Schnake (1991) in his proposal for further research on organizational citizenship behaviour has suggested that future research should untangle the relationship between job satisfaction, perceived equity and organizational citizenship behaviour. This may require replacing measures of job satisfaction with some new measures which tap only affect. In this context, it may not be illogical to tap affect component of job satisfaction only. Though the
study of Bateman and Organ (1983) provide correlation evidence that job satisfaction and citizenship behaviour are strongly related, the causal directionality between these two could not be identified.

However, Smith et al. (1983) provide evidence for causal directionality between these two. They divide citizenship into two dimensions, namely altruism (helping behaviours directed towards specific persons) and generalized compliance (being a good citizen and doing what is right). Smith et al. found significant direct effects of job satisfaction on altruism but not on generalized compliance. Thus, it appears that job satisfaction may increase citizenship behaviour if directed towards helping specific persons only. These behaviours may emerge only in response to a situation where a specific individual has faced a problem or has asked for help. As Fisher (1980) has pointed out that narrowly defined attitude measures are more predictive of narrowly defined performance measures than of global measures of performance. Perhaps this is true of citizenship behaviour as well. Various dimensions of job satisfaction may be causally related to some types of citizenship behaviours but not others.

A few more empirical research results of the recent times have also confirmed the relationship between Job Satisfaction and citizenship behaviours. Shokrkon and Naami (2009) found that there is a significant effect of job satisfaction on organizational citizenship behavior. The findings of Shokrkon and Naami (2009) is also supported by Badawy et al. (2016) where they have concluded that there is a significant relationship between job satisfactions on organizational citizenship behavior. In a study carried out by Serpian et al (2016) it has been convincingly argued that the effect of Organizational Culture and Job Satisfaction variables on Organizational Citizenship Behavior is highly significant.

According to Brunetto et al (2012), satisfaction in job has a positive impact on an individual in an organization which is strongly related to the emotional feeling of a worker in the work place. The job satisfaction in many ways makes an employee feel whether the job is pleasant or unpleasant to be done (Brunetto et al 2012). It is observed that a good feeling in the job and the workplace will give employees an opportunity for fostering longer and lasting Organizational Citizenship Behavior. It has been a general observation that those workers who have been satisfied in their job will usually exhibit positive feeling about their organization and may also be willing to help others and do more than it is usually expected from them. The probable reason for this behaviour could be because they would like to reciprocate their positive experiences from their previous experience.

In some of the recent studies Swaminathan and Jawahar (2013), have proved that there is a positive relationship between Job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors especially help-oriented ones (i.e. civic virtue, conscientiousness, altruism and courtesy). In the studies carried out by Jena and Goswami (2013), it has been reported that satisfied workers have positive OCB. They also found significant positive correlations between dimensions of job satisfaction and OCB.

**Conclusion:** Job satisfaction include reaction or attitude of cognitive, affective, and evaluative parameters of a job. It is an emotional or psychological condition or state which is perceived by the job holder that is how much happiness or positive emotions are derived from the job.
or work experienced by them in their respective job or workplace. The same or similar job can have different meanings and implications to different people at different context and time frame (Handoko 2012). Employees frequently and constantly interact with their co-workers and superiors, adhere and comply to the rules and policies of the organization, work in groups and teams to achieve the standard of performance and very often live in and with working conditions that are not the most ideal. However, all these complex factors and elements influence the satisfaction of job in some way or the other. This means that the researchers need to take extra care for assessment or evaluation of employee job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. It can be safely concluded that job satisfaction or dissatisfaction is highly subjective and is an individual phenomenon. A number of critical issues need to be properly addressed before collecting the data through the questionnaire with regard to the accuracy and legitimacy of the responses. While it is a fact that no employee provides misleading answer intentionally, there is always a possibility that many uncontrollable situational factors can affect the quality of data collected. This may also possibly happen either because of the improper understanding of the questions by the respondents and the extent to which employees want to really frank in answering. Hence, the capturing of accurate and authentic information from the respondents on job satisfaction is very critical in the studies.
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