

**THE EFFECTS OF ORGANIZATION SUPPORT,
ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE, AND ORGANIZATIONAL
POLITICS ON ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR
AMONG NURSES: THE ROLE OF COMMITMENT AND TRUST
AS MODERATORS**

by

LAU TIAM YIT

Research report in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Masters of Business Administration

MARCH 2003

DEDICATION

To

*My dearest wife, Lin Poh and
three princesses, Qian-Hui, Xinhuey and Lihuey*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|-------------------|------------------|
| TITLE | <u>Page</u> i |
| DEDICATION | ii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | iii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | iv |
| LIST OF TABLES | x |
| LIST OF FIGURES | xii |
| ABSTRAK | xiii |
| ABSTRACT | xiv |

Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

| | | |
|-------|---|---|
| 1.1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2 | Objectives of Study | 3 |
| 1.3 | Research Questions | 4 |
| 1.4 | Significance of Study | 4 |
| 1.5 | Scope of Study | 5 |
| 1.6 | Definitions of Terms | 6 |
| 1.6.1 | <i>Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)</i> | 6 |
| 1.6.2 | <i>Organizational Citizenship Behavior- Organizationally Focused (OCBO)</i> | 6 |
| 1.6.3 | <i>Organizational Citizenship Behavior- Interpersonally Focused (OCBI)</i> | 6 |
| 1.6.4 | <i>In-Role Behavior (IRB)</i> | 6 |
| 1.6.5 | <i>Perceived Organizational Support (POS)</i> | 7 |
| 1.6.6 | <i>Organizational Justice (OJ)</i> | 7 |
| 1.6.7 | <i>Perceived Organizational Politics (POP)</i> | 7 |
| 1.6.8 | <i>Organizational Commitment (OC)</i> | 7 |
| 1.6.9 | <i>Trust</i> | 7 |
| 1.7 | Summary and Organization of Chapters | 8 |

Chapter 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

| | | |
|-----|--------------|---|
| 2.1 | Introduction | 9 |
|-----|--------------|---|

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 2.2 | Organizational Citizenship Behavior | 9 |
| 2.2.1 | <i>Organizational Citizenship Behavior- Organizationally Focused (OCBO)</i> | 12 |
| 2.2.2 | <i>Organizational Citizenship Behavior- Interpersonally Focused (OCBI)</i> | 12 |
| 2.2.3 | <i>OCBI And OCBO Differentiation</i> | 13 |
| 2.3 | Theories and Norms Associated with Organizational Citizenship Behavior | 14 |
| 2.3.1 | <i>Social Exchange Theory</i> | 14 |
| 2.3.2 | <i>Equity Theory</i> | 15 |
| 2.3.3 | <i>Norm Of Reciprocation</i> | 15 |
| 2.4 | Antecedents of OCB | 16 |
| 2.4.1 | <i>Perceived Organizational Support (POS)</i> | 17 |
| 2.4.2 | <i>Organizational Justice (OJ)</i> | 19 |
| 2.4.3 | <i>Perceived Organizational Politics (POP)</i> | 22 |
| 2.5 | Moderating Variables | 25 |
| 2.5.1 | <i>Organizational Commitment (OC)</i> | 25 |
| 2.5.2 | <i>Trust</i> | 27 |
| 2.6 | Theoretical Framework | 29 |
| 2.7 | Hypotheses | 30 |
| 2.8 | Summary | 34 |

Chapter 3: METHODOLOGY

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 3.1 | Introduction | 35 |
| 3.2 | Research Site | 35 |
| 3.3 | Sample And Sampling Procedure | 36 |
| 3.4 | Measures | 38 |
| 3.4.1 | <i>Questionnaire for Non-Supervisory Employees</i> | 40 |
| 3.4.2 | <i>Questionnaire for Supervisory Employees</i> | 42 |
| 3.5 | Statistical Analyses | 43 |
| 3.5.1 | <i>Descriptive Statistic</i> | 43 |
| 3.5.2 | <i>Factor Analysis</i> | 43 |
| 3.5.3 | <i>Reliability Testing</i> | 44 |
| 3.5.4 | <i>Correlation Analysis</i> | 44 |
| 3.5.5 | <i>Hypothesis Testing</i> | 45 |
| 3.6 | Summary | 46 |

Chapter 4: RESULTS

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 4.1 | Introduction | 48 |
| 4.2 | Overview of Data Collected | 49 |
| 4.2.1 | <i>Sample Profile</i> | 49 |
| 4.3 | Goodness of Measure | 50 |
| 4.3.1 | <i>Factor Analysis of The Independent Variables</i> | 50 |
| 4.3.2 | <i>Factor Analysis of Moderating Variables</i> | 53 |
| 4.3.3 | <i>Factor Analysis of The Dependent Variables</i> | 55 |
| 4.3.4 | <i>Inter-Correlations Among The Study Variables</i> | 57 |
| 4.4 | Hypotheses Tests | 58 |
| 4.4.1 | <i>Test for Hypothesis H1</i> | 58 |
| 4.4.2 | <i>Test for Hypothesis H2</i> | 60 |
| 4.4.3 | <i>Test for Hypothesis H3</i> | 66 |
| 4.5 | Summary | 70 |

Chapter 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 5.1 | Introduction | 72 |
| 5.2 | Recapitulation | 72 |
| 5.3 | Discussion | 73 |
| 5.3.1 | <i>The Impact of Organizational Variables on OCB</i> | 73 |
| 5.3.2 | <i>The Impact of Organizational Commitment As A Moderating Variable Between The Relationship of Organizational Variables and OCB</i> | 74 |
| 5.3.3 | <i>The Impact of Trust As A Moderating Variable Between The Relationship of Organizational Variables and OCB</i> | 76 |
| 5.4 | Implications | 77 |
| 5.5 | Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research | 79 |
| 5.6 | Conclusion | 80 |

| | | |
|---------------------|--|-----|
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | | 81 |
| APPENDICES | | |
| Appendix A | Letters and Questionnaires | 89 |
| A1 | Letters to Hospitals to Seek Support (example) | 89 |
| A2 | Cover Letter and Questionnaire for Non Supervisory Employees | 90 |
| A3 | Cover Letter and Questionnaire for Supervisory Employees | 96 |
| Appendix B | Reliability Statistics | 99 |
| B1 | Perceived Organizational Support Scale | 99 |
| B2 | Perceived Organizational Politics – Go Along to Get Ahead (POP1) Scale | 99 |
| B3 | Perceived Organizational Politics – Pay, Promotion and Policies (POP2) Scale | 102 |
| B4 | Distributive Justice Scale | 100 |
| B5 | Procedural Justice Scale | 100 |
| B6 | Organizational Commitment Scale | 100 |
| B7 | Trust Scale | 101 |
| B8 | In-Role Behavior Scale | 101 |
| B9 | Organizational Citizenship Behavior- Interpersonally Focused (OCBI) Scale | 101 |
| B10 | Organizational Citizenship Behavior- Organizationally Focused (OCBO) Scale | 102 |
| Appendix C | Descriptive Statistics | 103 |
| C1 | Standard Deviation, Mean, Minimum and Maximum for Perceived Organizational Support | 103 |
| C2 | Standard Deviation, Mean, Minimum and Maximum for Perceived Organizational Politics -Go Along to Get Ahead (POP1) | 103 |
| C3 | Standard Deviation, Mean, Minimum and Maximum for Perceived Organizational Politics -Pay and Promotion Policies (POP2) | 103 |
| C4 | Standard Deviation, Mean, Minimum and | |

| | | |
|------------|---|-----|
| | Maximum for Distributive Justice | 103 |
| C5 | Standard Deviation, Mean, Minimum and Maximum for Procedural Justice | 104 |
| C6 | Standard Deviation, Mean, Minimum and Maximum for Organizational Commitment | 104 |
| C7 | Standard Deviation, Mean, Minimum and Maximum for Trust | 104 |
| C8 | Standard Deviation, Mean, Minimum and Maximum for In-Role Behavior | 105 |
| C9 | Standard Deviation, Mean, Minimum and Maximum for Organizational Citizenship Behavior-Interpersonally Focused (OCBI) | 105 |
| C10 | Standard Deviation, Mean, Minimum and Maximum for Organizational Citizenship Behavior-Organizationally Focused (OCBO) | 105 |
| Appendix D | Regression Results | 106 |
| D1 | Regression Results Between Personal Variables (control), Organizational Variables and OCBI | 106 |
| D2 | Regression Results Between Personal Variables (control), Organizational Variables and OCBO | 107 |
| D3 | Regression Results Between Personal Variables (control), Organizational Variables, and OCBI Using OC as Moderator | 108 |
| D4 | Regression Results Between Personal Variables (control), Organizational Variables, and OCBO Using OC as Moderator | 110 |
| D5 | Regression Results Between Personal Variables (control), Organizational Variables, and OCBI Using Trust as Moderator | 112 |
| D6 | Regression Results Between Personal Variables (control), Organizational Variables, and OCBO Using Trust as Moderator | 114 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | | <u>Page</u> |
|------------|--|-------------|
| Table 2.1 | Summary of Hypotheses | 33 |
| Table 3.1 | Profile of the Six Private Hospitals | 36 |
| Table 3.2 | Questionnaire Layout For Non-Supervisory Nurses | 39 |
| Table 3.3 | Questionnaire Layout For Supervisors | 40 |
| Table 4.1 | Distribution of Questionnaire by Hospital | 48 |
| Table 4.2 | Demographic Profile of Respondents | 49 |
| Table 4.3 | Rotated Factors, Item Loadings, Reliabilities, Means and Standard Deviation of Independent Variables | 52 |
| Table 4.4 | Rotated Factors, Item Loadings, Reliabilities Means and Standard Deviation of Moderating Variables | 54 |
| Table 4.5 | Rotated Factors, Item Loadings, Reliabilities, Means and Standard Deviation of Dependent Variables | 56 |
| Table 4.6 | Inter-correlations Among the Independent Variables, Moderating Variables and Dependent Variables | 57 |
| Table 4.7 | Summary of Hierarchical Regression for OCBI and OCBO with Personal Variable (Control) and Organizational Variables as Predictors | 59 |
| Table 4.8 | Summary of Hierarchical Regression Results Using Organizational Commitment (OC) as a Moderator In the Relationship between Personal Variables (control), Organizational Variables and OCBI | 61 |
| Table 4.9 | Summary of Hierarchical Regression Results Using Organizational Commitment (OC) as a Moderator In the Relationship between Personal variable (control), Organizational Variables and OCBO | 64 |
| Table 4.10 | Summary of Hierarchical Regression Results Using Trust in Supervisor (TS) as a Moderator In the Relationship between Personal variable (control), Organizational Variables and OCBI | 67 |

| | | |
|------------|---|----|
| Table 4.11 | Summary of Hierarchical Regression Results Using Trust in Supervisor (TS) as a Moderator In the Relationship between Personal Variable (control), Organizational Variables and OCBO | 68 |
| Table 4.12 | Summary Of Hypothesis Results | 71 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | | <u>Page</u> |
|------------|--|-------------|
| Figure 2.1 | Research Framework | 30 |
| Figure 4.1 | Moderating Effect of OC on The Relationship Between POS and OCBI | 62 |
| Figure 4.2 | Moderating Effect of OC on The Relationship Between POP1-Go Along to Get Ahead and OCBI | 63 |
| Figure 4.3 | Moderating Effect of OC on The Relationship Between PJ and OCBO | 65 |
| Figure 4.4 | Moderating Effect of TS on The Relationship Between POS and OCBO | 69 |

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini bertujuan meninjau perhubungan di antara tiga pembolehubah organisasi (sokongan organisasi yang ditanggap, keadilan organisasi dan politik organisasi yang ditanggap) sebagai anteseden kepada dua bentuk gelagat kewarganegaraan (OCBI- gelagat kewarganegaraan yang berfokuskan individu dan OCBO- gelagat kewarganegaraan yang berfokuskan organisasi). Komitmen organisasi and kepercayaan (trust) juga ditinjau sama ada variabel ini menyederhana (moderate) perhubungan di antara variabel organisasi dengan OCB. Sampal kajian ini terdiri daripada 276 jururawat di enam buah hospital swasta yang beroperasi di Pulau Pinang. Hasil regresi menunjukkan bahawa sokongan organisasi dan keadilan prosedur mempunyai perhubungan yang positif dengan OCBO manakala politik- “mengikuti arus” mempunyai perhubungan yang negatif dengan OCBO. Keadilan prosedur mempunyai perhubungan yang positif dengan OCBI manakala keadilan distributif mempunyai perhubungan negatif dengan OCBI. Komitmen organisasi pula berfungsi sebagai moderator dalam perhubungan di antara (i) sokongan organisasi dan OCBI, (ii) politik-“mengikut arus” dan OCBI, dan (iii) keadilan prosedur dan OCBO. Kepercayaan pula bertindak sebagai moderator dalam perhubungan di antara sokongan organisasi dan OCBO. Hasil kajian mencadangkan bahawa pengurus seharusnya bersikap adil dalam pembuatan keputusan dan memberi sokongan yang memadai bagi meningkatkan berlakunya OCBO dan OCBI. Mengujudkan kepercayaan di kalangan pekerja, memilih dan mengekalkan pekerja yang komited adalah penting bagi memupuk gelagat kewarganegaraan mereka.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to investigate the relationship of three organizational variables (perceived organizational support, organizational justice and perceived organizational politics) as antecedents to two forms of OCB (OCBI-interpersonally focused and OCBO-organizational focused). Additionally, organizational commitment and trust were examined as moderators in the relationship between organizational variables and OCB. The sample in this study consisted of 276 nurses attached to six private hospitals operating on the island of Penang. The regression results showed that perceived organizational support and procedural justice had a positive influence on OCBO whereas politics-go along to get ahead had a negative impact on OCBO. Additionally, procedural justice had a positive relationship with OCBI whilst distributive justice was negatively related to OCBI. Organizational commitment had a moderating effect on the relationship between (i) perceived organizational support and OCBI, (ii) politics-go along to get ahead and OCBI, and (iii) procedural justice and OCBO, whereas, trust moderated the relationship between perceived organizational support and OCBO. The implications of this study suggest that managers need to be fair in their decision-making process and provide adequate supports to employees in order to enhance OCBI and OCBO. Building trust with employees, selecting and retaining committed employees are important in promoting the display of citizenship behavior among employees.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

There is no duty more indispensable than that of returning kindness. All men distrust one forgetful of a benefit.

– Cicero

1.1 Introduction

In today's competitive business climate, the ability to provide distinctive products and services has become the key value proposition for an organization. In order to succeed, an organization requires strong human capital to deliver its strategic business plan. Furthermore, as organizations move into the 21st century's Internet and connectivity era, doing business globally and remotely from headquarter is becoming the norm. Employees and supervisors would have lesser face-to-face interactions as compared to the past. Employees are expected to go the extra mile to delight and retain customers, even though without being instructed or monitored by supervisors. The ability of employees to be self-initiated and to provide value-added services to customers by performing beyond their normal job scope is a key differentiator in a competitive global business environment. Hence, understanding of "going the extra mile" or extra-role behaviors in promoting organizational effectiveness has attracted great recognition by researchers (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994).

Healthcare industry, no different from other service industry, has grown rapidly parallel with the higher living standard in the new global economy. As cited in Davis and Ward (1995), in 1992, American paid 14% of the gross national product (GNP), or 14 cents out of every dollar of national income for health care. The competitive

environment also caused many healthcare institutions to adopt patient-focused care strategy to stay ahead of the competition (Lum et al., 1998). This patient-focused strategy required front-line employees to be able to perform the tasks and react to patients' needs spontaneously. Most of the time, they are required to go beyond the call of duty. Such organizational citizenship behavior is important for the organization to stay ahead of competition.

The concept of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) represents individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate, promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988a). Employees who demonstrate extra role work behavior will deliver beyond formal contractual roles. Extra role work behavior is vital because organizations cannot forecast through stated job descriptions the entire spectrum of subordinate behaviors needed for achieving goals (Organ, 1988a). OCB also improves organizational efficiency and effectiveness by contributing to resource transformations, innovativeness and adaptability (Organ, 1988a). Past researches have indicated that OCB was positively related to both the quality and quantity of organizational performance (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

There were many conceptualizations of OCB put forth in the literature. Smith et al. (1983) delineated OCB into two dimensions, i.e., altruism and generalized compliance. Organ (1988a), however, categorized OCB into 5 dimensions, i.e., altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness and civic virtue.

Another promising OCB construct was to consider the beneficiaries of these behaviors (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Williams and Anderson (1991) classified OCB into

behaviors that were interpersonally-focused, that were, directly and intentionally aimed at assisting others (OCBI); and organizationally-focused that function as a more impersonal form of citizenship directed at accomplishing organizational goals (OCBO).

Williams and Anderson (1991) and others (Kemery et al., 1996; Moorman et al., 1998) provided preliminary evidence for the differential effects of the intrinsic and extrinsic components of job satisfaction on OCBI and OCBO respectively. Williams and Anderson (1991) provided evidence that in-role behavior (IRB), OCBI and OCBO were relatively distinct types of performance. Similarly, Kaufman et al. (2001) showed that perceived organizational support was more strongly related to OCBO than to OCBI. There were limited studies on the relationship between antecedent factors like perceived organizational politics, and organizational justice on the two forms of OCB (OCBO and OCBI), particularly, within a non-western cultural set-up. This study will therefore, attempt to close the above-mentioned gap.

1.2 Objectives Of Study

The two purposes of this study are to examine:

1. The relationship between three organizational variables, i.e., perceived organizational support (POS), organizational justice (OJ) and perceived organizational politics (POP), and organizational citizenship behavior (OCBO and OCBI), and;
2. The role of trust and organizational commitment (OC) as moderators in the relationship between three organizational variables (POS, OJ and POP) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCBO and OCBI).

1.3 Research Questions

Based on the objectives formulated in subsection 1.2, this study will help to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between organizational variables (POS, OJ and POP) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCBO and OCBI)?
2. Do trust and OC moderate the relationship between the organizational variables (POS, OJ and POP) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCBO and OCBI)?

1.4 Significance of Study

Previous researches had focused mainly on OCB in general, covering five components such as altruism, compliance, conscientiousness, civic virtue, sportsmanship and courtesy (for instance Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Moorman, 1993; Schappe, 1998; Smith et al., 1983; Van Dyne et al., 2000). Most of the studies on OCB were undertaken in Western countries particularly the United States, covering the banking industry (Smith et al., 1983), health industry (Organ & Konovsky, 1989), steel industry (Moorman, 1991), and the public sector (Tang & Ibrahim, 1998).

Therefore, this study hopes to provide at least two key significant contributions as follows:

1. Although numerous studies had been done on OCB (for instance Bateman & Organ, 1983; Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Moorman, 1991; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Schappe, 1998; Smith et al., 1983; Van Dyne et al., 2000), very few had differentiated the OCB construct into OCB that was directed at individuals and OCB that was directed at the organization (for instance, Kaufman et al., 2001; Kemery et al., 1996; Moorman et al., 1998; Williams & Anderson, 1991).

2. Most of OCB studies were undertaken in the western culture. In Malaysia, studies on OCB have been very few. For instance, Mohd Nasurdin (2001) examined the relationships between procedural justice, perceived organizational support, organizational commitment and OCB among hotel employees. Another study by Tan (2001) looked at the relationship between trust, perceived organizational support, perceived supervisory support and OCB among employees in private companies. Yusoff (2002) studied the effects of job satisfaction, and leadership supportiveness on altruistic behavior among university staffs. However, all these studies were focused on the generic OCB construct covering several dimensions. Hence, this study hopes to contribute to the OCB literature particularly in relation to the Malaysian context.

1.5 Scope of Study

The subjects of this study comprised of nurses working in six privately owned Hospitals operating in the Penang Island. The subjects were selected from various ranks and specializations.

The antecedents in this study were organizational variables, namely perceived organizational support (POS), organizational justice (OJ) and organizational politics (POP). The moderators were trust and organizational commitment (OC). The dependent variable was organizational citizenship behavior (OCBI and OCBO).

Analysis was done based on dyad responses (that is, nurse and nurse's supervisor). The nurses rated POS, POP, OJ, OC and trust scales, whereas the respective nurse's immediate supervisor rated the nurse's OCBO, OCBI and in-role behavior. Data was

collected via questionnaires, and statistical tools were used to analyze and test the hypotheses.

1.6 Definitions of Terms

The ensuing sections present both the conceptual and operational definitions with regard to the terms employed in the present study.

1.6.1 *Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)*

OCB refers to an individual's contributions in the workplace that go beyond role requirements and contractually rewarded job achievements (Organ & Ryan, 1995).

1.6.2 *Organizational Citizenship Behavior-Organizationally Focused (OCBO)*

OCBO refers to OCB behaviors that are organizationally-focused, that function as a more impersonal form of citizenship directed at accomplishing organizational goals (Williams & Anderson, 1991).

1.6.3 *Organizational Citizenship Behavior-Interpersonally-Focused (OCBI)*

OCBI refers to OCB behaviors that are interpersonally-focused and directly and intentionally aimed at assisting others (Williams & Anderson, 1991).

1.6.4 *In-Role Behavior (IRB)*

Williams and Anderson (1991) defined IRB as behaviors such as working a full 8-hour day, or completing all required assignments. Such behaviors are part of the formal job requirements and are recognized by the organization's formal reward system.

1.6.5 *Perceived Organizational Support (POS)*

POS is defined as the global beliefs held by an employee that the organization values his/her contributions and cares about his/her well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

1.6.6 *Organizational Justice (OJ)*

OJ is the term used to describe the role of fairness as it directly relates to the workplace (Moorman, 1991). Specifically, OJ is concerned with the ways in which employees determine if they have been treated fairly in their jobs and outcomes received are fair.

1.6.7 *Perceived Organizational Politics (POP)*

POP is defined as social influence attempts directed to those who can provide rewards that will help promote or protect the self interests of the actor (Cropanzano & Kacmar, 1995).

1.6.8 *Organizational Commitment (OC)*

OC is defined as the relative strengths of an individual's identification with and involvement in an organization (Mowday, Porter, & Steer, 1979).

1.6.9 *Trust*

Trust is defined as the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995).

1.7 Summary and Organization of Chapters

Organ and his colleagues (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983) first coined the term “organizational citizenship behavior” (OCB) in 1983. Since then, numerous studies on the antecedents of OCB had been conducted. However, the variables examined in previous studies were fragmented and their findings were divided. Previous studies in OCB were mainly conducted in western countries, particularly in the United States, while very few researches in this area had been undertaken in Malaysia. To the author’s knowledge, no study had investigated the effects of organizational politics, organizational justice, organizational support, trust and organizational commitment on OCBI and OCBO. Therefore, the aim of this study was to investigate how organizational variables, employees’ commitment and trust might influence two types of organizational citizenship behavior (OCBI & OCBO).

The remaining chapters in this study are organized as follows: Chapter 2 presents an overview of literature on organizational citizenship behavior, perceived organizational support, perceived organizational politics, organizational justice, trust and organizational commitment leading to the formulation of the theoretical framework and hypotheses. Chapter 3 describes the research methodology of the study while Chapter 4 presents the results of the statistical analyses. Finally, Chapter 5 will include discussions on the findings, limitations, implications of this study, as well as suggestions for future research, and conclusion.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This study focused on the relationships between employees' perception of three organizational variables (POS, OJ, POP) on organizational citizenship behavior (OCBI and OCBO). Organizational commitment and trust were also examined to understand whether they serve to moderate the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. Thus, the literature review will cover organizational citizenship behavior and its related antecedents, as well as literature on organizational commitment and trust. Theories pertinent in the discussion of OCB such as social exchange theory and equity theory will be covered in this chapter. Towards the end of this chapter, the theoretical framework and hypotheses will be presented.

2.2 Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organ (1988a) described OCB as individual behavior that was discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promoted the efficient and effective functioning of the organization. The subordinate spontaneously went beyond the formally prescribed job requirements (in-role behavior) and performs non-mandatory (extra role) behaviors without expectation of receiving explicit recognition or compensation. In other words, organizational citizenship behavior encompassed actions that lie outside one's primary job responsibilities, but contributed to organizational effectiveness by supporting both organizational and social contexts at the workplace (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Organ & Ryan, 1995).

Organizational citizenship behavior plays a key role in enhancing organizational productivity because organizations cannot forecast the entire spectrum of subordinate behaviors that are needed for achieving goals through stated job descriptions. Given the importance of organizational citizenship behavior, it is necessary to understand this construct and to identify the types of discretionary behaviors employees choose to exhibit under various conditions.

Although there had been many conceptualizations of organizational citizenship behavior put forth in the literature (for instance, Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Organ, 1988a, 1990), many of them relate to the multi-dimensional delineations of organizational citizenship behavior such as conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy, and altruism. However, these constructs did not distinguished between the targets of citizenship behavior. Smith et al. (1983), and Organ and Konosvky (1989) conceptualized OCB into a two-dimensional construct, and labeled them as altruism and generalized compliance. Williams and Anderson (1991) argued that the altruism and compliance terms in this construct implied restrictive assumptions about external rewards that were inconsistent with present conceptualizations of OCB (i.e. altruism was viewed as behavior that occurs without any external rewards, whereas compliance was viewed as behavior that occurred because of expected rewards or the avoidance of punishment).

Williams and Anderson (1991) were the first to examine the organizational citizenship behavior construct by considering the beneficiaries of these behaviors. Specifically, they classified organizational citizenship behavior into two-dimensional behaviors. First extra-role behaviors that were interpersonally-focused and directly and intentionally aimed at assisting others (i.e., OCBI, which included behaviors such as

orienting new employees and assisting a fellow employee with a heavy work load). Second, extra-role behaviors that were more organizationally-focused, and function as a more impersonal form of citizenship directed at accomplishing organizational goals (i.e., OCBO, which included behaviors such as giving advance notice when unable to come to work, adhering to informal rules devised to maintain order) (Williams & Anderson, 1991).

Several research works had investigated organizational citizenship behavior per Williams and Anderson's two-dimensional construct. For instance, Bolon (1997) investigated the relationship between two attitudinal variables namely job satisfaction and organizational commitment on two forms of organizational citizenship behavior (OCBI and OCBO) among 202 hospital employees in southeastern United States. Randall et al. (1999) investigated the effect of organizational politics and organizational support on organizational citizenship behavior (OCBI and OCBO) involving 128 subjects from three different manufacturing organizations in the United States. Vigoda (2000) later examined the influence of job congruence as well as perceived organizational politics on organizational citizenship behavior (OCBI and OCBO) amongst 411 municipalities' employees in northern Israel. Subsequently, Kaufman et al. (2001) examined the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior (OCBI and OCBO) involving 472 manufacturing and restaurant employees in two separate studies in the United States.

Prior researchers had examined various antecedent factors associated with employees' organizational citizenship behavior. For instance, organizational citizenship behavior had been linked with job satisfaction (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983; Williams & Anderson, 1991), organizational justice (Moorman, 1991), organizational

commitment (Schappe, 1998), trust and loyalty to the leader (Deluga, 1994; Tan & Tan, 2000), organizational politics (Randall et al., 1999; Vigoda, 2001), and perceptions of supervisor fairness (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Organ & Konovsky, 1989).

2.2.1 Organizational Citizenship Behavior- Organizationally Focused (OCBO)

As cited in Williams and Anderson's (1991) study, prior studies had labeled OCBO dimension as generalized compliance (for instance, Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Smith et al., 1983). This dimension appeared to capture a person's internalization and acceptance of the organization's rules, regulations, and procedures, which resulted in a scrupulous adherence to them, even when no one observed or monitored compliance. Therefore, an employee who religiously obeyed all rules and regulations, even when no one was watching, was regarded as an especially "good citizen" (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Examples of such behavior included giving advance notice when unable to come to work and adhering to informal rules devised to maintain order (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Williams and Anderson (1991) later defined OCBO as citizenship behavior that were aimed at benefiting the organization in general.

2.2.2 Organizational Citizenship Behavior-Interpersonally Focused (OCBI)

As cited in Williams and Anderson's (1991) study, prior studies had labeled OCBI dimension as altruism (Konovsky & Organ, 1989; Smith et al., 1983), which captured behaviors that were directly and intentionally aimed at helping a specific person in a face-to-face situation (for example, orienting new people, and assisting someone with a heavy workload). Williams and Anderson (1991) later defined OCBI as behaviors that immediately benefited specific individuals and indirectly through this means contributed to the organization (for example, helps others who have been absent, and

took a personal interest in other employees). Other related definition that captured the essence of OCBI was interpersonal helping behaviors (Moorman & Blakely, 1995) which focuses on helping co-workers in their jobs when such help was needed, and helping co-workers which included all voluntary forms of assistance that organizational members provided each other to facilitate the accomplishment of tasks and attainment of goals. Conceptually, these behaviors involved voluntarily helping others (Podsakoff et al., 2000). As cited in Podsakoff et al. (2000), empirical studies undertaken by scholars (for instance, MacKenzie et al., 1993; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Rich, 1999; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994) had generally confirmed the fact that all of these various forms of helping behavior loaded on a single factor.

2.2.3 OCBI and OCBO Differentiation

The behavioral outcomes of OCBO and OCBI were aimed at two distinct beneficiaries. Furthermore, earlier work suggested that these two forms of OCB activities could have different antecedents (for example, Bolon et al., 1997; Kaufman et al., 2001; Kemery et al., 1996; Moorman et al., 1998; Williams & Anderson, 1991).

Organ and Konovsky (1989) indicated that pay cognition (that is, how good was the pay relative to specified referents) was a significant predictor of both OCBI and OCBO. In a separate study, Vigoda (2000) found that organizational politics was negatively related to both OCBO and OCBI.

However, Williams and Anderson (1991) in their examination of 127 part time MBA students discovered that extrinsic job cognition was able to predict OCBO. In contrast, the intrinsic component of job cognition variable predicted OCBI. In another study on 115 line-level employees in a moderate-sized manufacturing organization

and 257 restaurant employees, Kaufman et al. (2001) found that perceived organizational support was more strongly related to OCBO than OCBI.

Given the above information, it was important to identify factors that helped to answer why people decided to allocate discretionary effort toward different beneficiaries.

2.3 Theories And Norms Associated With Organizational Citizenship Behavior

2.3.1 *Social Exchange Theory*

Thibaut and Kelley (1959) as cited in Deluga (1994) argued that social exchange theory was grounded in an economic model of human behavior whereby interactional processes between individuals were motivated by a desire to maximize rewards and minimize losses. Later, Blau (1964) differentiated social exchange from economic exchange. According to Blau (1964), social exchange referred to relationships that entailed unspecified future obligations.

Yukl (1994) as cited in Deluga (1994) indicated that the most fundamental form of social interaction was an exchange of benefits or favors, which could include not only material benefits but also psychological benefits such as expression of approval, respect, esteem and affection. For example, at the workplace, the organization provides a subordinate with support and monetary rewards while in exchange, the subordinate contributes personal devotion and expertise. When the organization treats its employees fairly, social exchange and norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960) will dictate that employees reciprocate. Organ (1988a) suggested that organizational citizenship behavior was one of the likely avenues for employee reciprocation.

2.3.2 Equity Theory

Messick and Cook (1983) as cited in Deluga (1994) quoted that equity theory maintained that subordinates and supervisors were most satisfied when the ratio between the benefits received and the contributions made was similar as compared to the perceived ratio of their co-workers. Thus, Adams (1965) as cited in Deluga (1994) indicated that the fundamental premise of equity theory was perceived fairness. When unfairness was perceived to exist, equity theory predicted that subordinates would respond to eliminate inequities by reducing contributions and/or expecting additional rewards. Organ (1998a) suggested that reducing organizational citizenship behavior was one way of eliminating inequities.

2.3.3 Norm of Reciprocation

Cicero as cited in Gouldner (1960) said that, there was no duty more indispensable than that of returning a kindness, and all men distrusted one forgetful of a benefit. Similarly, Simmel (1950, p. 387) as cited in Gouldner (1960) remarked that, " Social equilibrium and cohesion could not exist without the reciprocity of service and return service; all contacts among men rest on the schema of giving and returning the equivalence." Men have been insisting on the importance of reciprocity for a long time. Norm of reciprocity was defined as certain actions and obligations as repayments for benefits received (Gouldner, 1960). Reciprocity entailed a mutual dependence and was realized in the equivalent arrangement of reciprocal services. The norm of reciprocity also had "division of labor" element, which stated that reciprocation would be made in terms of goods and services that were of value to the object of the reciprocation and was within the capability of the donor (Gouldner, 1960).

2.4 Antecedents of OCB

Podsakoff et al. (2000) in summarizing previous empirical studies on organizational citizenship behavior (for example, Bateman & Organ, 1983; Organ, 1988; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff & McKenzie, 1995) identified four major categories of antecedent namely individual (or employee) characteristics (inclusive of employees' attitudes and values), task characteristics, organizational characteristics, and leadership behaviors. The organizational citizenship behavior construct examined was of the multidimensional nature.

Several variables on employee characteristics such as job satisfaction (for example, Bateman & Organ, 1983; Organ, 1988b; Williams & Anderson, 1991), organizational commitment (for instance, Schappe, 1998; Williams & Anderson, 1991), interpersonal trust (for example, Deluga, 1994; Tan & Tan, 2000), and employee mood (Williams & Wong, 1999) had been investigated as antecedents of OCB.

Similarly, organizational variables such as organizational justice or employee perceptions of fairness (for example, Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Moorman, 1991; Moorman, Niehoff, & Organ, 1993; Moorman et al., 1998; Organ & Moorman, 1993; Tang et al., 1996), organizational politics (for instance, Randall et al., 1999; Van Dyne et al., 1994; Vigoda, 2000), and perceived organizational support (for example, Bishop et al, 2000; Kaufman et al., 2001) were also being examined as antecedents of OCB. Most of these studies were conducted within the Western context, particularly in the United States.

As cited in Podsakoff et al. (2000), past research on task variables had identified task feedback, task routinization, and intrinsically satisfying tasks as having significant relationship with the various dimensions of OCB.

Past studies on leadership behavior had found transformational leadership behaviors and supportive leader behavior to be significantly and positively related to OCB (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

This study, however, would only focus on the organizational variables (POS, OJ and POP) as antecedents of OCB (OCBO & OCBI). Furthermore, this study would also examine whether organizational commitment and trust moderate the relationship between these predictor variables and the two forms of organizational citizenship behavior.

2.4.1 *Perceived Organizational Support (POS)*

Eisenberger et al. (1986) defined perceived organizational support (POS) as the global beliefs held by an employee, concerning the extent to which the organization values his/her contributions and cares about his/her well-being.

POS was influenced by the organization's treatment of the employees and can thus, influenced employees' interpretation of organizational motives. The influencing process took place through social exchange that people used in making attributions, namely, the frequency, extremity, and perceived sincerity of statements of praise and approval given to employees by organization representatives (Blau, 1964). According to Eisenberger et al. (1986), social exchange theory predicted POS would raise an employee's expectancy that the organization would reward greater effort toward

meeting organizational goals (that is, effort-outcome expectancy). To the extent that perceptions of support would provide needed praise and approval, the employee would then incorporate organizational citizenship into his/her self-identity and subsequently develop an emotional bond (affective attachment) to the organization. Eisenberger et al. (1986) added that affective attachment would enhance employees' participation by: (a) increasing the tendency to interpret the organization's gains and losses as one's own, (b) creating positive evaluation biases in judging the organization's actions and characteristics, and (c) increasing the internalization of organization's values and norms.

Employees try to seek a balance in their exchange relationships with organizations by demonstrating attitudes and behaviors that commensurate with the amount of commitment they feel their employer has for them (Wayne et al., 1997). Being an effective organizational citizen was one way that an employee might reciprocate the support he/she feels was being provided by the organization (Graham, 1991). Thus, making suggestions for improvement, helping co-workers, and other types of organizational citizenship behavior incurred obligations that the other party (that is, either the employee or the employer) would later reciprocate. In so doing, the repayment of these obligations reinforces giving and strengthened the mutually beneficial exchange between the employee and the organization (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

Randall et al. (1999) in their study on a sample of 128 workers from two private manufacturing plants and one public organization in the United States discovered that perceived organizational support was positively related to OCBO and OCBI. Additionally, Kaufman et al. (2001) in their investigation on 257 employees from

several restaurants and manufacturing factory in the United States noted that perceived organizational support was more closely related to employee behaviors that were specifically directed toward the organization (OCBO) than those directed toward assisting other co-workers (OCBI).

Other past researches conducted in the United States also supported the positive relationship between perceived organization support and OCB (Bishop et al., 2000). Specifically, perceived organizational support was more positively related to OCBO than to OCBI (Kaufman et al, 2001)

2.4.2 *Organizational Justice (OJ)*

Moorman (1991) defined organizational justice (OJ) as the term used to describe the role of fairness as it directly relates to the workplace. Specifically, OJ is concerned with the ways in which employees determine if they have been treated fairly in their jobs and in which those determinations influence other work-related variables.

Two sources of organizational justice are frequently cited, namely distributive justice (DJ) and procedural justice (PJ). Distributive justice describes the fairness of outcomes an employee receives, whereas, procedural justice describes the fairness of the procedures used to determine those outcomes (Folger & Greenberg, 1985). A recent review by Greenberg (1990) identified two components of procedural justice. The first component is fair formal procedures. Examples of such procedures are those designed to increase employees' voice in decision or to decrease bias and error in decisions. The second component of procedural justice is interactional justice, which refers to the fairness of the treatment an employee receive in the enactment of formal procedures or in the explanation of those procedures. In many cases, the manner in

which an employee is treated while a procedure is being carried out can influence its perceived fairness. Therefore, fair formal procedures, fair interpersonal treatment, or both may influence procedural justice judgment.

Organ (1988b) suggested two reasons why fairness could predict organizational citizenship behavior. First, based on equity theory, Organ (1988a) suggested that organizational citizenship behavior could be considered an input for one's equity ratio and that raising or lowering one's level of organizational citizenship behavior could be a response to inequity. Organ (1998b) went further by pointing out that changing organizational citizenship behavior could be a strategy of choice because organizational citizenship behavior is discretionary and lies outside one's formal role requirements. Therefore, changing one's display of organizational citizenship behavior in response to inequity would be a safer option than trying to change one's in-role behavior since this form of behavior was directly under one's personal control.

Second, according to Organ (1998b), employees often overlaid the economic exchange in their organization with social exchanges. If employees defined their relationship with their employers as economic exchanges, distributive justice would have little if any, effect on organizational citizenship behavior. Reciprocation in an economic exchange would be limited to in-role behavior because employees would see little cause to go beyond the specific tenets of the employment contract. However, if employees defined their relationship with their employers as social exchanges, reciprocation would likely entail behaviors that exist outside of any specific contractual promise. An employee would provide organizational citizenship behavior because doing so would be consistent with the positive quality of the employment relationship. Therefore, under social exchange, an employee might believe that

organizational citizenship behavior was an appropriate response to distributive justice even though such behavior was not directly rewarded.

Recent works in the area of organizational justice (OJ) have suggested that employee perceptions of fairness influenced organizational citizenship behavior (Farh, Podsakoff & Organ, 1990; Moorman, 1991). Alotaibi (2001) in his study on 297 Kuwait's civil workers discovered that distributive justice and procedural justice accounted for unique variances in organizational citizenship behavior.

However, most researches in the field of organizational justice noted that the effect of procedural justice on organizational citizenship behavior was independent of distributive justice. For example, Moorman (1991) in his work on 270 samples from two medium-sized companies discovered that when two types of justice were measured separately, procedural justice (specifically the interactional justice component) predicted citizenship behavior, whereas distributive justice did not. William et al. (2002) in their study on 114 respondents from various industries in the United States discovered that only interactional justice significantly influenced employee's intention to perform organizational citizenship behavior. Similarly, Konovsky and Pugh (1994) in their study on 475 hospital employees in the United States discovered that procedural justice was a significant predictor for trust and organizational citizenship behavior. Distributive justice on the other hand, failed to predict trust and citizenship behavior. Additionally, the findings made by Folger and Konovsky (1989) in their work on 217 employees from a manufacturing plant in the United States revealed that procedural justice in pay decisions was related to job attitudes, including organizational commitment and trust in management, whereas distributive justice was related to pay satisfaction only. These findings suggested that

procedural justice might influence organizational citizenship behavior independent of any influence employee has on perceptions of distributive justice.

Tang et al. (1996) in their study of 200 respondents from a Veterans Administration Medical Center in southeastern United States found that both distributive and procedural justice were significantly related to organizational commitment.

2.4.3 *Perceived Organizational Politics (POP)*

Over the past two decades, a number of scholars had attempted to provide a suitable definition of what constitutes political behavior in organizations. However, there was no widely shared definition of organizational politics (Kacmar, Bozeman, Carlson, & Anthony, 1999). Cropanzano and Kacmar (1995) defined organizational politics as social influence attempts directed to those who can provide rewards that will help promote or protect the self-interests of the actor. This seemed to be the understanding of politics possessed by working people. When individuals were asked to describe political behaviors, they tend to list actions that were manipulative and self-serving (Ferris & Kacmar, 1992).

Kacmar and Ferris (1991) suggested three factors that explain POP: *general politic behavior*, which included the behaviors of individuals who acted in a self-serving manner to obtain valued outcomes; *go along to get ahead*, which consisted of lack of action by individuals in order to secure valued outcomes; and *pay and promotion policies*, which involved the organization behaving politically through the policies it enacted.

Political behavior in organization was highly covert, symbolic, and subject to differences in perception (Kacmar & Ferris, 1991). Thus, the same behavior might be interpreted as either political or non-political by different observers, depending on each observer's prior experience and frame of reference.

According to Ferris et al. (1989), perceived organizational politics was influenced by organizational, job/work and personal factors, which, in turn, influence individual and organizational outcomes such as withdrawal, job anxiety, job involvement and job satisfaction.

According to Frost (1987), employees might withdraw from the organization as a means of avoiding political activities. Those who had external mobility might leave the organization. Those with limited job mobility and alternatives might choose psychological turnover. Job anxiety and job satisfaction might be influenced by perceptions of politics for those who elected to stay in political work environments, but could not ignore the political activity around them. As such, employees would attempt to contribute as little effort to the organization as was reasonably possible. Thus, politics should lead to lower performance and reduced organizational citizenship behavior (Randall et al., 1999).

Nye and Witt (1993) as cited in Kacmar and Carlson (1997) found that perceived organizational politics and perceived organizational support were strongly and inversely related. These results suggested some conceptual overlap between the two constructs. However, Kacmar and Carlson (1997) argued that there were distinctions between these two constructs. They further elaborated that, if the respondents focused on the same referent group when completing perceived organizational support and

perceived organizational politics scale, the conceptual overlap could be great. Nevertheless, if the top management rather than departmental colleague and immediate supervisor was the target of perceived organizational support rating, there could be virtually no conceptual overlap.

Randall et al. (1999) in their work on 128 employees from two private manufacturing plants and one public organization in the United States discovered that perceived organizational support was positively related to OCBO and OCBI, whereas perceived organizational politics was negatively related to OCBI and OCBO. However, when perceived organizational support and perceived organizational politics were entered simultaneously into the regression equation, only perceived organizational politics was negatively related to OCBO ($p < .05$). According to Randall et al. (1999), this phenomenon was due to the high correlation between these two constructs. Randall et al. (1999) suggested that it was useful to separate perceived organizational support and perceived organizational politics because they had different frames of reference.

Vigoda (2000) in his work on 303 samples from two local municipalities in Israel discovered that perceived organizational politics was negatively related to OCBO, and OCBI. He explained that high levels of organizational politics usually reflected an unfair organizational environment in which those who held more political power determined criteria of resource allocation and distribution. The resource allocation was generally done with only minor concern for objective standards, fair priorities, and actual needs of the rest of the organization members (Vigoda, 2000). Thus, organizational politics would have a negative effect on organizational citizenship behavior.