



Impact Factor: 4.081

## A Study of Organizational Citizenship Behavior in relation to Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

Dipti Singh\* & Rohtash Singh\*\*

\* Research Scholar, PhD, Department of Psychology, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Haryana, INDIA

\*\*Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Haryana, INDIA

**Abstract:** *The present study is an attempt to examine organizational citizenship behavior in relation to organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The sample consists of 200 participants taken from government production industry HMT and Indian Railways Workshop by using accidental sampling technique. They were assessed on organizational commitment scale, job satisfaction questionnaire and organizational citizenship questionnaire. The results reveal that organizational commitment and job satisfaction have greater strength in predicting organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational commitment and job satisfaction were found to be correlated positively with organizational citizenship behavior, and plays an important role in enhancing organizational citizenship behavior among employees. Multiple regression analysis revealed that affective commitment and personal aspect of job satisfaction are potent predictors of organizational citizenship behavior.*

**Keywords:** Organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

### Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The term organizational citizenship behavior was coined in the late 1980's and has undergone subtle definitional revisions, but the constructs remains the same at its core. Anything that employees choose to do, spontaneously of their own accord, which often lies outside of their specified contractual obligations refers to organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors is referred as set of discretionary workplace behaviors that exceed one's basic job requirements. They are often described as behaviors that go beyond the call of duty. Organ argued that organizational citizenship behavior is held to be vital to the survival of an organization and it maximizes the efficiency and productivity of both the employee and the organization that ultimately contribute to the effective functioning of an organization. Organizational commitment and job satisfaction contribute to develop organizational citizenship behavior; people high on organizational commitment and job satisfaction are more involved in their job works. It may not always be directly and formally recognized or rewarded by the company. It may be reflected in favorable supervisor and Co-worker ratings or better performance appraisals. Thus, indirectly it can facilitate future reward gain and promote the effective functioning of the organization' (Organ, 1988). The world is looking forward to high performance organizations, which would provide high job satisfaction to their employees and world also cherish excellence and effectiveness. Organizational citizenship behavior has been shown to have a positive impact on employee performance and wellbeing.

It has threefold effect on employees' performance Firstly; workers who engage in organizational citizenship behavior tend to receive better performance ratings by their managers (Podsakoff et al. 2009). The reason could be employees who engage in organizational citizenship behavior are simply liked more and

perceived more favorably ('halo effect') (Organ et al, 2006). The second effect is that a better performance rating is linked to gaining reward's (Podsakoff et al. 2009) such as pay increment, bonuses, promotions or work related benefits. Thirdly, because employees have better performance ratings and receive greater rewards, when the company is downsizing e.g. during an economic recession, there employees will have a lower chance of being made redundant.

Empirical research on organizational citizenship behavior has generated somewhat conflicting results. A few researchers have been successful in identifying four categories of organizational citizenship behavior (Moorman & Blakely, 1995), but the weight of the factor analytic evidence suggests a two-factor structure. Williams (1988) also found a two-dimensional definition of organizational citizenship behavior, 1) benefits to the organization in general, such as volunteering to serve on committees (organizational citizenship behavior organization), and 2) benefits directed at individuals within the organization, such as altruism and interpersonal helping individual. Skarlicki and Latham (1995) examined organizational citizenship behavior in a university setting; their data supported a two-factor structure of organizational citizenship behavior i.e. organizational and interpersonal. DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) reported that one dimension captures all aspects of organizational citizenship behavior and both benefits to the organization (helping the organization) and benefits to the individual (helping individuals) combine into a single, bipolar construct. Since Organ (1988) introduced the concept of organizational citizenship behavior into organizational research, it has tended to be conceptualized in terms of positive contributions to the colleagues and to the organization, which implies an active positive contribution.

### **Job Satisfaction**

Bateman and Organ (1983) found that job satisfaction is the potent predictor of organizational citizenship behavior (Organ, 1997). But job satisfaction is in and of itself a challenging outcome sought by organizational managers. The resulting implications are restricted to suffice that organizational citizenship behavior is likely when workers are satisfied. Many scholars believe job satisfaction is too broad construct for the accurate prediction of organizational citizenship behavior (Deluga, 1995; Penner, Midili & Kegelmeyer, 1997).

Although, job satisfaction has been found to have a positive relationship with job performance and organizational citizenship behavior, which in turn has a significant influence on employees' absenteeism, turnover and psychological distress (Davis, 1992). Workers with high levels of job satisfaction are more likely to be engaged in organizational citizenship behavior (Brown, 1993). Furthermore, individuals with higher levels of job satisfaction demonstrate decreased propensity to search for another job (Sager, 1994). Penner et al, (1997) reported that, job satisfaction is not only reason for the accurate prediction of organizational citizenship behavior. Job satisfaction is a result of employees' perception of how well their job provides those things that are viewed as important. According to Mitchell and Lasan (1987), it is generally recognized in the organizational behavior area that job

satisfaction is the most important and frequently studied attitude. Kopelman and colleagues (2000) in their model explained that the measures of job satisfaction are significantly associated with discretionary behaviors classed as “Organizational Citizenship” helping loyalty, compliance and so on. (Podsakoff et al, 2000).

Bateman and Organ (1983), reconceptualization of the satisfaction-causes-performance hypothesis, investigated the effect of job satisfaction on employee supra role behaviors, which they termed “citizenship behavior.” They provided some rationale for expecting satisfaction to influence citizenship behavior. First, based on social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Adams, 1965), employees would be expected to reciprocate organizational officials who positively affect the employees' job satisfaction. Employees may be relying to attempt this reciprocation by engaging in extra role citizenship behaviors. Secondly, social psychological research cited by Bateman and Organ (1983) indicates that people tend to engage in pro-social behavior when experiencing a positive mood state. This positive affective state should be reflected in job satisfaction measures, as affect is considered to be one of the attitudinal components of satisfaction. The results of Bateman and Organ's study (1983) on university employees provided evidence of a strong, positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. Smith et al. (1983) constructed a refined measure for organizational citizenship behavior that contained two separate dimensions, altruism and generalized compliance (conscientiousness), and tested job satisfaction as an antecedent of citizenship behavior. The results, based on a sample of bank employees, indicated that job satisfaction, as a measure of mood state, was predictive to altruism but not for conscientiousness. Puffer (1987) investigated organizational citizenship behavior under the rubric of pro-social behavior. Her study on pro-social behavior, noncompliance behavior, and work performance indicated that satisfaction with material rewards was positively correlated with pro-social behavior. The results were based on a sample of commission salespeople. Organ and Konovsky (1989)'s analysis of data from a sample of hospital employees indicated that cognitive measures rather than measures of affect had more predictive power in regard to citizenship behavior. In a similar vein, Moorman (1993) identified support for the relative importance of cognition-based satisfaction over affect-based satisfaction; his investigation included only exempt and non exempt salaried employees, due in part to pending labor negotiations.

The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior been examined by many researchers (Podsakoff et al, 1993) and reported positive relationship but David et al.(2008) reported that jobs satisfaction is not correlated with organizational citizenship behavior.

### **Organizational Commitment**

Along with job satisfaction, organizational commitment is frequently cited antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational commitment is conceptualized as a strong belief in, and acceptance of, an organization's goals and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization (Van Dyne et al., 1995). Commitment maintains behavioral direction when there is little expectation of formal

rewards (Allen & Meyer, 1996), it would seem logical that affective commitment drives those behaviors (i.e. discretionary behaviors) that do not depend primarily on reinforcement or formal rewards.

Yahaya (2012) reported that commitment is a biggest contributor to the organizational citizenship behavior. He found positive relationship between courtesy and civic virtue, dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment. Studies have been shown that organizational commitment has the potential to predict various organizational outcomes, e.g. lower absenteeism rate and increased organizational citizenship behavior (Meyer et al 2002; Sinha & Jain, 2004). Moreover, committed employees who are highly motivated to contribute their time and energy to the pursuit of organizational goals are increasingly acknowledged as the primary asset available to an organization (Puffer, 1998). Shore and Wayne (1993) explained that continuance commitment is negatively related to organizational citizenship behavior. Ayesha Noor (2009) revealed that organizational commitment impacts positively in enhancing the organizational citizenship behavior among teachers. Feather et al (2004) reported that their contractual teachers tend to have more organizational citizenship behaviors as compare to the permanent teachers. Some Asian studies have revealed a positive relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. Chen and Francesco (2003) revealed a significant positive effect of organizational commitment on altruism and general compliance. Chughtai (2008) confirmed the positive relationship between organizational commitment and the composite measure of organizational citizenship behavior. Van Dyne and Ang (1998) demonstrated the positive effects of organizational commitment on the helping measure by using the Singaporean sample. Similar results have been reported by the researches that used sample from western Asian countries: Israel (Cohen, 2006), Oman (Kuehn and Al- Busaidi , 2002) and India (Kwantes , 2003).

Notwithstanding the fact that it was not limited to Asian research, the meta-analysis by Organ and Ryan (1995) on the effects of organizational commitment revealed that affective organizational commitment had a positive effect on altruism, dimension of organizational citizenship behavior. Kim (2006) on the basis of a survey conducted in 6 countries concluded that there are significant and direct relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

The present study is designed to examine the relationship of organizational citizenship behavior with job satisfaction and organizational commitment and to ascertain the contribution of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in organizational citizenship behavior.

## **Methodology**

### ***Objectives***

- To examine the relationship of organizational citizenship behavior with Job satisfaction and organizational commitment respectively.

- To find out the substantial contribution of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in organizational citizenship behavior.

### ***Hypotheses***

- Job satisfaction is likely to correlate positively with organizational citizenship behavior.
- There exist positive relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.
- Job satisfaction and Organizational commitment will contribute substantially to explain the variance in organizational citizenship behavior.

### ***Sample***

The present study was conducted on a sample of 200 employees working in Govt. industry HMT, Pinjore, Haryana and Indian Railways Workshop, Kalka, Haryana. Only those participants were included in this study who had given their consent to participate in the study. The Age range of the sample participants was between 20-60 years. The mean age of the participants was 42. The participants were having good health and free from any chronic adamant.

### **Measures**

**Organizational Commitment Scale:** This scale was developed by Allen & Meyer (1990) and consisted of 24 items. The response options were strongly agree to strongly disagree at seven points scale. The scale measures three dimensions of organizational commitment i.e.–affective commitment, normative commitment and continuance commitment and each dimension consists of eight items. As far as psychometric properties of the scale is concerned, the test retest reliability coefficient for the scale is .81 and validity of the scale is .75.

**Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale:** This scale was developed by Bakhshi and Kumar, (2009) and it includes 30 items which measures five dimensions i.e. conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship, helping co-workers or altruism, and civic virtue. The scale consists of both positive and negative items. The response varies from strongly disagree to strongly agree on five point likert scale. The test reliability of each domain ranges from .71 to .91.

**Job Satisfaction Scale:** This scale was developed by B.C. Muthaiyya, (1978) and it includes 34 items related to three dimensions i.e. job aspect, personal aspect and inter personal aspect. Out of these 34 items, 17 covering job aspect, 10 personal aspect and 7, interpersonal aspect. It is pertinent to mention that higher the score on the scale reflect higher dissatisfaction and vice-versa. The answer categories for each of the items were agree (A), not sure (NS), disagree (D). The Split-half technique of reliability (odd-even items) was used for the 34 item to estimate the reliability coefficient for the scale and obtained the reliability coefficient 0.81. The obtained validity index of the items in the preliminary job satisfaction questionnaire ranged from 0 to .76.

### ***Administration and scoring of the tests***

The participants were contacted personally through human resource managers of respective organizations. After getting the willingness of the participants, they were administered the study tests. They were assured that the obtained information will be kept confidential and will be used for research purpose only. The scoring of the tests



was done as per prescribed in respective manuals. Organizational citizenship behavior scale consists of 3 subscales. The responses of the subjects were assessed on five point scale and they vary from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The score of 0, 1,2,3,4 was assigned to strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree, respectively and vice-versa for negative items. Organizational commitment scale was scored for three dimensions as well as for total score. The score varies from 1 to 56 for its dimensions and from 1 to 168 for total scale.

Job satisfaction scale was also scored for three dimensions as well as for total score. The rating of responses for job satisfaction was done on three-point scale i.e. yes, no and not sure. The scoring of the scale was done with the help of scoring keys. A score of 0, 1 and 2 was assigned as per agreement of responses with the scoring key. The total score for the scale ranges between 0-68.

## Results and Discussion

The perusal of Table-1 reveals that job aspect measure of job satisfaction correlates negatively with conscientiousness ( $r = -.15, P < .05$ ), sportsmanship ( $r = -.17, P < .05$ ), organizational citizenship behavior total ( $r = -.18, P < .05$ ). Personal aspect correlates negatively with conscientiousness ( $r = -.18, P < .05$ ), courtesy ( $r = -.19, P < .05$ ), sportsmanship ( $r = -.15, P < .05$ ), helping -co-workers ( $r = -.15, P < .05$ ), civic virtue ( $r = -.15, P < .05$ ) and organizational citizenship behavior total ( $r = -.18, P < .05$ ). Inter personal aspect correlates negatively with conscientiousness ( $r = -.21, P < .05$ ) as well as total scores of organizational citizenship behavior ( $r = -.17, P < .05$ ). As the higher score on job satisfaction scale indicates the higher dissatisfaction and vice-versa. Thus, the relationship between job aspect and the measures of organizational citizenship behavior suggest that individuals high on conscientiousness, sportsmanship are more satisfied with their job aspect. The significant relationship between personal aspect and the measures of organizational citizenship behavior shows that participants high on organizational citizenship behavior measures are more satisfied with personal aspect of job satisfaction. They were satisfied with feeling of adequacy, security and belief in the programs. The negative relationship between overall job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior ( $r = -.24, P < .01$ ) suggests that participants having the job satisfaction tend to have higher organizational citizenship behavior. The results of the study are in tune with the studies of Arif and Chohan (2012), Swaminathan and Jawahar (2013) and Mohamd (2016) and support the hypothesis No.1.

**Table - 1. Correlation Coefficient of organizational citizenship behavior with job satisfaction and organizational commitment measures.**

Variable	JA	PA	INA	JST	AC	NC	CC	OCT
CNS	-.15*	-.18*	-.21**	-.21**	.29**	.18*	.11	.25**
CRT	-.06	-.19**	-.09	-.13	.31**	.10	.13	.23**
SPT	-.17*	-.18*	-.14	-.20**	.22**	-.11	-.05	.02
HCW	-.1	-.19**	-.07	-.15*	.29**	.19**	.13	.26**
CV	-.13	-.21**	-.06	-.17*	.30**	.11	.11	.21**
OCBT	-.18*	-.25**	-.17*	-.24**	.38**	.18	.11	.25**

\*and\*\*significant at .05 and .01 probability levels, respectively.

Note: CNS=Conscientiousness, CRT=Courtesy, SPT= Sportsmanship, HCW=Helping-co-workers, CV=Civic Virtue, OCBT= Organizational citizenship behavior total, JA= Job Aspect, PA= Personal Aspect, INA= Interpersonal Aspect, JST= Job satisfaction Total, AC= Affective Commitment, NC=Normative Commitment, CC= Continuous Commitment, OCT= Organizational Commitment Total.

Affective commitment is found to have positive and significant relationship with conscientiousness ( $r = .29, P < .01$ ), courtesy ( $r = .31, P < .01$ ), sportsmanship ( $r = .22, P < .01$ ), helping co worker ( $r = .29, P < .01$ ), civic virtue ( $r = .30, P < .01$ ) and overall organizational citizenship behavior ( $r = -.38, P < .01$ ).

The positive relationship between the measures indicate that participants having emotional attachment with their organizations tend to have higher organizational citizenship behavior. Pertaining to previous research (Meyer et al., 2002; Morisson, 1994), Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) presumed that organizational citizenship behavior had the highest correlation with affective commitment. This study also obtained the similar results and confirm the findings of some earlier studies of Rifai (2005), Feather and Rauter (2004), Podsakoff et al; (2000). The results of the present study also support the findings of earlier study of Mohamed and Anisa (2012).

Normative commitment is found to have positive and significant correlation with

Conscientiousness ( $r = .18, P < .05$ ), helping co-workers ( $r = .19, P < .01$ ). The positive and significant relationship between the measures suggests that participants high on conscientiousness and helping co-worker are having tendency to have the obligation to remain in the organization as moral duty. The results are in the direction of some earlier studies i.e. Meyer and Allen, Mohammad and Anisa (2012).

Organizational commitment total score is found to have positive and significant relationship with conscientiousness ( $r = .25, P < .01$ ), courtesy ( $r = .23, P < .01$ ), helping co worker ( $r = .26, P < .01$ ), civic virtue ( $r = .21, P < .01$ ) and overall organizational citizenship behavior scores ( $r = .25, P < .01$ ). The positive and significant relationship between the measures suggests that participants high on conscientiousness, courtesy, helping co-workers and civic virtue are having the obligation to remain in the organization as moral duty, emotional fulfillment and continuity for financial and non financial benefits. Studies are also reported that organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior has positive relationship i.e. Liu (2009), Morin et al. (2011), Chen and Kao (2012), Hasani (2013). Hence, support the hypothesis No.2.

Further, to meet out the objectives of the study multiple regression analyses was used. It was applied with parameters; p of F-to-enter = .05, p of F-to remove = .01, and minimum tolerance = .001. The probability of F-to-enter is a test additional predictive value of a variable taking into account for other variables already entered. Table 2 shows results of stepwise multiple regression analyses, dependent measure organizational citizenship behavior for the sample of Industrial employees. Results reveal that affective commitment and personal aspect emerged as potent predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. Affective Commitment being the most potent predictor of

organizational citizenship behavior, it entered in the equation at step one. The R for this variable equals to .38 and R<sup>2</sup> .145, F being 33.48, it is significant at .00 probability. It indicates that affective commitment is a very strong predictor of organizational citizenship behavior among employees which also supports the results of the previous researches that commitment is the predictive of organizational citizenship behavior because it significantly impacts on organizational citizenship behavior (Liu 2009; Islam, Ahmed, Ahmed, Mohammad. 2012).

**Table -2. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis**  
**Dependent variable- Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

S.No	Variables	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	df (N-1=199)	F	Sign.
1.	Affective Commitment	.38	.15	.14	1/198	33.48	.00
2.	Personal Aspect	.42	.17	.17	2/197	20.77	.00

Personal aspect is an another potent predictor of organizational citizenship behavior which was entered at step two multiple R increased to .42 and R<sup>2</sup> .18, with the entry of personal aspect in the equation after affective commitment. The F ratio being 20.77 is significant at .001 probability level. It indicates that personal aspect is also a potent predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. Thus, the linear combinations of affective commitment and personal aspect jointly account 17 % (R<sup>2</sup> =.17) variance in organizational citizenship behavior. Thus the hypothesis 3 is supported. The results of the previous studies of Ozturk (2010) and Mohammad, Habib, Alias (2011) support the present finding. Results reveal that job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior has positive positive relationship. It shows that as the job satisfaction among employees increases the organizational citizenship behavior also increases. The obtained findings is in tune with some earlier studies (Swaminathan and Jawahar, 2013; Mohamd, 2016).

**Conclusion:** It can be concluded that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are helpful to inculcate organizational citizenship behavior of an organization.

**Acknowledgement:** Authors are grateful to all participants who gave their precious time from their busy schedule and helped us in the execution of the research study.

**REFERENCES:-**

[1] Allen, N.J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurements and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.

[2] Adams, J. A. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowicz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press. pp. 267-299.

[3] Arif, A. & Chohan, A. (2012). How Job Satisfaction influencing the organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB): A Study On Employee Working in Banking Sector of Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Company Research in Business*, 4, 74-88.



- [4] Ayesha Noor (2009). *Examining OCB as the Outcome of organization commitment: A study of university teachers of Pakistan*. Proceeding 2nd CBRC.
- [5] Bakhshi, A., & Kumar, K. (2009). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale*. Prasad Psychological Corporation: Agra.
- [6] Baron, J. (1998). *Judgment Misguided: Intuition and error in public decision-making*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- [7] Bateman, T.S., & Organ, D.W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employees "citizenship". *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587-595.
- [8] Blau (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- [9] Brown, R. (1993). Antecedents and consequences of salesperson job satisfaction: Meta analysis and assessment of causal effects. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30, 63-77.
- [10] Chen, Z.X., & Francesco, A.M. (2003). "The relationship between three components of commitment and employees performance in China". *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 62 (3), 90-510.
- [11] Chughtai, A.A. (2008). "Impact of job involvement on in-role job performance and organizational citizenship behaviour". *Behavioural and Applied Management*, 9(2), 169-182.
- [12] Cohen, A. (2006). The relationship between multiple commitments and organizational citizenship behavior in Arab and Jewish culture. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 69(1), 105-118.
- [13] David A.; Foote & Thomas Li-Ping Tang (2008). *Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour : Does team commitment make a differences in relation to direct team? Management Decision*. 46(6), 933-947.
- [14] Davis, R.V.(1992). Person-environment fit and job satisfaction. In C.J. Cranny & P.C. Smith & E.F. Stone(Eds.), *Job Satisfaction*, 69-73.NY:Lexington Books.
- [15] Deluga, R. J. (1995). The relation between trust in the supervisor and subordinate organizational citizenship behaviour. *Military Psychology*, 7, 1-16.
- [16] DiPaola, M.F. & Tschannen-Moran, M.(2001). Organizational citizenship behaviour in schools and its relationship to school climate. *Journal of School Leadership*, 11, 424-447.
- [17] El Din Mohamed, W.S. (2016). Investigating the Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Beni Suef Cement Company Employees. *Arabian Journal Business Management, Review* 6, 259. doi: 10.4172/2223-5833.1000259
- [18] Farh, Earley, P.C., & Lin, S. (1997). Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 421-444
- [19] Farooqui (2012). Organizational citizenship behaviours as a consequence of Mrganizational climate. *Asian Journal of Business Management* 4(3), 294-302
- [20] Feather, N.T., & Rauter, K.A. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviours in relation to job status, job insecurity, organizational commitment and identification, job satisfaction and work values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 81-94.
- [21] Hasani,K., Boroujerdi, S.S. & Sheikhesmaeli,S.(2013). "The Effect of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Organizational Commitment." *Gold Bus Perspect*, 1, 452-470.
- [22] Ibrahim, A.M. (2013).Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) at government owned Corporation Companies.*Journal of Public Administration and Governance*. 3(3)35-42.
- [23] Islam T, Ahmed Z, Ahmed I, Mohammad SK (2012).Key Factors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the Banking Sector of Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management*. 6, 3296-3302.
- [24] Kim,S. (2006). Public Service motivation and organizational citizenship behaviour in Korea. *International Journal of Manpower*, 27(8), 714-722.

- [25] Kuehn, K.W., & Al-Busaidi, Y. (2002). Citizenship behaviour in a non-Western context: an examination of the role of satisfaction, commitment and job characteristics on self-reported OC. *International Journal of Commerce & Management*, 12(2), 107-125.
- [26] Kwantes, C.T. (2003). Organizational citizenship and withdrawal behaviours in the USA and India: does commitment make a difference? *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 3(1), 5-26.
- [27] Kopelman, R.E., Brief A. P. and Guzzo, R.A. (1990). 'The Role of Climate and Culture in Productivity', in B. Scheider (ed.), *Organizational Climate and Culture*, p. 282-318. San Fransisco: Jossey Bass.
- [28] Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace. Toward a general model. *Human Resources Management Review*, 11(2), 291-326.
- [29] Meyer, J.P., Stanley, D.J. Herscovitch, L., & Topolnysky, L. (2002). Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization : A Meta Analysis of Antecedents, Correlates and Consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 61, 20-52.
- [30] Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: the importance of the employees' perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(6), 1543-1567.
- [31] Mitchell, T.R. & Lason, J.R. (1987). People in organization. 3rd Ed. New York : McGraw-Hill.
- [32] Mohamed, M.S. and Anisa, H. (2012). Relationship Between Organizational Commitment and organizational Citizenship Behavior. *The IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(3), 7-23.
- [33] Mohammad J, Habib FQ, Alias MA (2011). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Empirical Study at Higher Learning Institution. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, 16, 149-165.
- [34] Moorman, R. H. (1993). The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Relations*, 46, 759-776.
- [35] Morin, A. J. S., Vandenberghe, C., Boudrias, J. S., Madore, I., Morizot, J., & Tremblay, M. (2011). Affective commitment and citizenship behaviors across multiple foci. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(8), 716-738. doi:10.1108/02683941111181798.
- [36] Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism-Collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 127-142.
- [37] Muthaiyya, J. C. & I. Gnana Kannan (1973). Developmental Personnel, NICD., Hyderabad.
- [38] Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior : The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, M.A. Lexington books.
- [39] Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 157-164.
- [40] Organ, D.W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 776-801.
- [41] Organ, D.W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behaviour: It's construct clean up time. *Human performance*, 10(2), 85-97.
- [42] Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P.M. & Mackenzie, S.P. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: It's nature, antecedents, and consequences*. London : Sage publications.
- [43] Ozturk, F. (2010). Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Knowledge Workers: The Role of Characteristics, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment. Graduate Thesis, Master-degree Program in Business Administration, Ankara, Turkey: The Graduate School Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University.
- [44] Penner, L.A., Middli, A.R. & Kegelmeyer, J. (1997). Beyond job attitudes : a personality and social psychology perspective on the causes of organizational citizenship behaviour. *Human Performance*, 10 (2), 111-131.
- [45] Puffer, J. (1998). *The human equation*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

- [46] Puffer, S.M.(1987). Prosocial behavior, noncompliant behavior and work performance among commission salespeople. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 615-621.
- [47] Podsakoff, P.M.; Mackenzie, S.B., & Bommer, W.H.(1996). A meta analysis of the relationship between Kerrand Jermier's substitutes for leadership and employee job attitudes, role perception and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* , 81, 380-399
- [48] Podsakoff, P; Mackenzie, S., Paine, J. B. and Bachrach, D.G. (2000). Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestion for Future Research, *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
- [49] Podsakoff, N.P, Blume, B.D., Whitinig, S.W., & Podsakoff, P.M. (2009). Individual and organization level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviour : A meta Analysis. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 94(1), 122-141.
- [50] Rifai, H.A. (2005). A test of the relationships among perceptions of justice, job satisfaction, affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, 7, 131-154.
- [51] Sager, J.K.(1994). A structural model depicting salespeople's job stress. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22,74-84.
- [52] Skarlicki, D. & Latham, G. (1995). Organizational citizenship behaviour and performance in university setting. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 12, 175-181.
- [53] Smith , A. C., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653-663.
- [54] Sinha, A.K. & Jain, A.K. (2004). Emotional Intelligence: Imperative for the Organizationally Relevant Outcomes. *Psychological Studies*, 49, 81-96.
- [55] Swaminathan, S. & Jawahar P (2013). Job Satisfaction as a Predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Empirical Study. *Global Journal of Business Research*, 7, 71-80.
- [56] Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L.L., Parks, J.M.(1995). Extra role behaviours: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 765-802.
- [57] Van Dyne, L. & LePine, J.A.(1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academic. Management Journal*, 41, 108-119.
- [58] Williams, L.(1988). *Effective and non effective components of job satisfaction and organizational commitment as determinants of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviours*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington , IN.
- [59] Yahaya A, Yahaya, N., Malip, H, Ramli J. Malin (2012). The relationship between the occupational stress, OC and JS with OCB. *Archives Des Sciences*, 65(3), 10.