

THE RATIONAL BEHIND THE NEED FOR ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR AND JOB SATISFACTION

Hila BALLALIS

Carmel College, Israel

Abstract. Organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction are two interdependent factors that determine the effectiveness of an organization's work. Organizational behavior refers to the attitudes and behaviors of individuals in groups or organizations, while job satisfaction is defined as a conglomerate of feelings and beliefs that employees manifest over their profession. This study analyzes the dimensions of these two factors which, by their very nature, constitute a generator of organizational performance.

Keywords: organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction, organizational performance, organization, employees.

RAȚIONALUL DIN SPATELE NEVOII DE COMPORTAMENT ORGANIZAȚIONAL ȘI SATISFACȚIA LA LOCUL DE MUNCĂ

Rezumat. Comportamentul organizațional și satisfacția la locul de muncă reprezintă doi factori interdependenți, care determină eficacitatea activității unei organizații. Comportamentului organizațional se referă la atitudinile și comportamentele indivizilor în grupuri, sau organizații, în timp ce satisfacția la locul de muncă este definită ca un conglomerat de sentimente și convingeri pe care angajații le manifestă față de profesia lor. Studiul de față analizează dimensiunile acestor doi factori care, prin esența lor, constituie un generator de performanțe organizaționale

Cuvinte-cheie: Comportament organizațional, satisfacția la locul de muncă, performanțe organizaționale, organizație, angajați.

Organizational citizenship behavior belongs to a certain class of selected behaviors that enhances the ability to perform a job, by allocating more time to establish efficient planning, scheduling, problem solving tactics etc. It has an important impact on the effectiveness and efficiency of professional teams and organizations and therefore contribute to the organization's general output. Bolino and Turner [3] noted that organizational citizenship behaviors should be managed in order to be maintained, and monitored to ensure their positive effect; and under these circumstances, they will indeed improve and encourage employee's performance in an organization rather than cause damage.

Organ [14] defined organizational citizenship behavior as "the behavior of the individual, acting in his own discretion, which is not directly acknowledged by the official reward system, and the accumulation of these behaviors promotes the efficient and effective function of the organization". He also argued that this definition was too broad—as there are many behaviors that go unrewarded and are not an official part of the employee's job description. Organizational citizenship behavior produces "extra" outputs ("above and beyond" the role) for the organization that are outside the obligatory parameters of one's role. In reference to this, Van Dyne, Cummings and McLean [17], proposed a broad definition of "behaviors outside the role" (Extra Role Behaviors - ERB), which stem from the employee's personal judgment, benefit the organization or

are intended to benefit the organization, and exceed existing role expectations. Therefore, organizational citizenship is functional, and includes pro-social organizational behavior (which involves helping others) stemming from individual, collective, or organizational intention. These helping behaviors are not officially assigned by the organization for which the individual is employed, and do not involve target outcomes, direct compensation, or alternatively, penalties for their lack.

The researcher Organ [14] conceived the *initial principles of organizational citizenship behavior*, that describe employees' willingness to go above and beyond the set requirements of their role:

Pro-social behavior: Employee's behaviors that go beyond the job description (going "the extra mile" or being highly considerate); voluntary behaviors that are not necessarily rewarded by the organization.

Altruism (helping): Benevolence, giving without expectation of reward, the individual's personal concern for the wellbeing of others. Helping those who are burdened for no particular reason, for instance: helping another employee who is absent from work or helping a certain employee catch up to their workload.

Thoughtfulness/ kindness: Courtesy, taking action to prevent problems, conflicts, and confrontations with other employees, in order to prevent them from getting into trouble and interfering with the rights of others.

Civic spirit: Responsible intervention in organizational processes. Staying updated on what is happening in the organization by attending non-mandatory meetings, for instance, which are important for making changes or repairing setbacks.

Conscientiousness: Compliance with organizational rules and regulations, even when no one notices, for example; avoiding extended breaks, or not missing work even when there is good reason to. These are not necessarily personality traits but also the result of a sense of duty.

Sportsmanship: What employees choose not to do. For instance: avoiding complaints that waste valuable time on trivial matters, not focusing on the 'wrong' and the 'negative'. Taking things easy, being patient when it comes to work-related challenges, being positive and good spirited even when it comes to decisions that one objects.

Loyalty to the organization: Defending the organization when it is criticized, speaking proudly of the organization, encouraging others to use the organization's products, and so on.

Organizational citizenship behavior is closely related to job satisfaction. The higher the job satisfaction the more positive are employees' citizenship behaviors. Job satisfaction is defined as a conglomerate of feelings and beliefs employees have toward their profession. Employees' level of satisfaction can range from extreme satisfaction to extreme dissatisfaction. Beyond the attitudes employees develop toward the work itself,

there are some additional aspects that influence satisfaction such as attitudes toward the type of work employees perform, their colleagues, superiors, subordinates, and more.

Four factors that may influence job satisfaction:

- *Personality*. An individual's personality is an influential factor in terms of the feelings and thoughts one has towards their work, and whether one has a positive or negative general approach to their job.
- *Values*. Values influence satisfaction as they reflect a person's beliefs and influence their behavior. There is a distinction between intrinsic values (in a professional context – the approach to the nature of the work itself) and extrinsic values (outside of a professional context – the outcome and rewards related to the work). Those who have strong intrinsic values are usually more satisfied with a job that is interesting and meaningful, and conversely, those with strong extrinsic values are usually satisfied with a well-compensated job.
- *Working conditions*. An important aspect of job satisfaction is related to the tasks a person performs (interesting or boring), the people with which they work, and their working relationships, along with the physical and organizational conditions in which they work, in terms of their rights and obligations.
- *Social influence*. The influence individuals or groups have on the disposition and behavior of the individual. Colleagues have a highly significant effect on job satisfaction.

According to Bateman [1], there are five parameters by which we define job satisfaction:

1. The work itself refers to the tasks performed by the employee, the provision of learning opportunities and cultivation of a sense of accountability.
2. Wages. Fair wages and forms of compensation.
3. Promotional opportunities - opportunities for advancement in the workplace - a component of the organization's investment in the employee.
4. Supervisors. The degree to which supervisors are considerate and concerned with the needs of their employees.
5. Colleagues - The level of support and care among colleagues.

Several theories were formulated in order to understand the main factors that influence job satisfaction:

The Equity Theory. This theory deals with the interrelationship between employee input (investment in the work), e.g. effort, prior experience, training, knowledge, etc., and employee's output (earnings as a result of work), e.g. wages, status, friends, and more. According to this theory, the employee will be satisfied when their compensation corresponds with their investment. A state of imbalance (lack or excess) between

employee compensation and investment will cause the employee to express dissatisfaction.

Hygiene Theory of Job Satisfaction. According to this theory, every employee has two types of needs and demands: *motivational needs* that refer to the work itself and the challenges it poses, such as interest in the work, responsibility, and independence, all of which relate to needs that influence motivation among employees; and *hygienic needs* – that refer to the physical and psychological conditions in the work environment such as cleanliness, comfortable location, management, salary, job permanence, and a sense of security in the workplace, all of which satisfy hygienic needs.

Herzberg [8] explained the theoretical links between motivational and hygienic needs and job satisfaction in the following way: when motivational needs are satisfied - the employee is satisfied and vice versa, when these needs are not satisfied, the employee is not satisfied. When hygienic needs are satisfied - the employee is satisfied and vice versa, when these needs are not satisfied, the employee is not satisfied.

It is possible for the employee to be simultaneously satisfied and unsatisfied, if their motivational needs are met while the hygienic conditions are inadequate. According to Herzberg [ibidem], satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not opposite but two separate dimensions: one ranges from satisfaction to dissatisfaction and the other ranges from dissatisfaction to lack of dissatisfaction. According to this theory, hygienic factors related to the work environment affect dissatisfaction. Motivational factors related to the work itself affect satisfaction. As noted above, these are two distinct spectrums: one is a spectrum of intrinsic factors (satisfaction) and the other a spectrum of extrinsic factors (dissatisfaction). This theory has been supported by co-relational research only. Some of the criticism it has received stems from the research methodology, with the claim that individuals attribute success (satisfaction) to themselves and failure to external factors.

The Facet Model of Job Satisfaction [78]. This theory applies to the components of different work-related factors, and the investigation of employee's satisfaction from every angle. According to this theory, job satisfaction is a sum of all related parameters. This model is highly significant as it allows executives to understand every facet of the job's impact on the employees. In this model, each parameter has a certain weight, depending on the role and the employee. The different aspects include: *utilization of ability* - to what extent can the employee apply their range of skills and abilities in the role; *achievement* - the employee's sense of accomplishment in their work; *activity* - how busy and involved is the employee with the work; *promotion* - opportunities for advancement; *company policy* – the policy suits the employee; *compensation* – the payment the employee receives for his work; *creativity* – the extent to which the employee generates new ideas; *moral values* – the way these compare to the moral values of the employee; recognition - the employee's work recognition; responsibility – the degree of responsibility the employee has in terms of decision-making and taking action;

security – the degree to which the workplace provides stability and security; *social service* - contribution to society; *social status* –the way the role is perceived by the community; *superior's human relations* - the manager/director's interpersonal conduct; *superior's technical abilities* - the superior's technical skills in relationship to their work; *diversity* – the role diversity and entailment; *working conditions* - physical conditions, location, comfort, and so on. Employees rate each of these components, and the final sum in relationship to the components significance to the role and indicate overall job satisfaction.

Alongside the importance of OCB and job satisfaction as key organizational behavior components, several demographic variables were found to moderate the relationships between these concepts.

First, professional and workplace seniority was found to influence the levels of both OCB and job satisfaction. Seniority affects wages and professional value; it represents experience, persistence, and the ability to adapt. Professional seniority usually lends itself to roles that involve more responsibility and have more hierarchical value, roles that involve a greater degree of organizational responsibility compared to those lower in hierarchy. In light of this, one would expect to find professional seniority as negatively correlated to withdrawal behavior (which is opposite to organizational citizenship behavior in several ways), i.e. significant seniority will be associated with decreased absences, for instance. This correlation may be reversed, however, in unionized workplaces where workers with seniority enjoy job security and professional union protection, and therefore suffer less consequences for absences than employees who are at the start of their careers. Therefore, it can be assumed that there is a positive correlation, rather than a negative one, between seniority and withdrawal behavior.

Literature on the subject shows contradictory findings on the relationship between seniority in the workplace and withdrawal behavior. Some researchers found a negative correlation between these factors. Becker's *side-bet theory* [2], however, claims that the more one has contributed to the organization the more difficult it will be for them to leave. A positive correlation was found between employee seniority and organizational commitment, such that the more seniority an employee has in the organization, the greater their organizational commitment will be. Other studies did not find a significant correlation between employee seniority and job satisfaction [5], [7].

A possible reason for the lack of consistency in previous findings is that some investigated role seniority, some workplace seniority, and some professional seniority. Seniority may affect employees differently depending on their profession, age, and the nature of their role. In addition, employees' age was also found to correlate with job satisfaction, such that the older the worker the higher their level of satisfaction. There are several different opinions regarding the correlation between organizational commitment and employees' age. Some researchers [8] claim there is a positive correlation between

these components, as the older the employee the less alternatives there are for employment. Other researchers found a negative correlation between these variables [90], such that the older the employee, the less organizational commitment they exhibit.

Moreover, Meyer and Allen [11] found a positive correlation between an employee's age, workplace seniority, and organizational commitment. Their claim is that the older the employee and the more seniority they have in the organization, the greater their organizational commitment will be.

The findings of job satisfaction-OCB relationship vary across various research studies. But in several independent studies across different contexts found a significant relationship between job satisfaction and OCB. Werner [18] asserts that only satisfied employees seem more likely to display positive behaviors that can effectively contribute to the overall functioning of the organization. Job satisfaction has the most robust attitudinal relationship with OCB. Employees will tend to display organizational citizenship behaviors more probably when they feel satisfied with their jobs, against support or benefit (e.g., positive work experiences) provided by their organization or colleagues.

Bateman and Organ [1] examined the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB and found a correlation between employee satisfaction and supervisory OCB. In another study Schnake et al. analyzed the effect of perceived equity, leadership and job satisfaction on OCB and found that leadership and perceived equity is strongly related to OCB and hence predictor of OCB, while job satisfaction is only found related with two dimensions of OCB.

Organ and Ryan [15] investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB and noted that there is a modest relationship of job satisfactions with that of Altruism. They also found that civic virtue, courtesy, sportsmanship is sufficient predictor of satisfaction however civic virtue is less related to satisfaction than other OCB measure. On the other hand Konovsky and Organ, [9] analyzed dispositional factors and their relationship as to predict OCB. They reported a sufficient variance by Conscientiousness in at least three dimensions of OCB Civic virtue, Altruism and Compliance. This finding put forward a petty concrete statement that dispositional factors, especially conscientiousness, are strongly related to three dimensions of OCB. Moorman et al. [13] also highlighted the effects of organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and procedural justice on OCB and explained that both job satisfaction and organizational commitment would not be related to OCB when the procedural justice-OCB relationship is controlled. Thus, they concluded that there is an insignificant relationship found between job satisfaction and OCB, when relationship of procedural justice to OCB is controlled. Moorman examined the effects of job satisfaction on OCB and found that when perception of fairness is controlled, there is no relationship found between job satisfaction. According to him perception of fairness influences employee

decision to act as OCB. Job satisfaction only predicts OCB to the extent that it reflects fairness. Podsakoff et al. [16] while observing the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB among human resource professional reported a significant correlation between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship and participation behaviors.

Reviews of the relevant literature [2], [9] reveal that work motivation among public sector employees and managers is very different from that of their private sector counterparts. However, most research on the subject devotes limited attention to the relative importance of the causes of these differences. For example, compared to factors such as age or gender, the importance of the sector that an employee works in. In particular, the hierarchical level at which an employee works cannot be neglected. In comparing public sector and private sector employee motivation, strong interaction effects have been found between work motivation and management level. In addition, most of the research fails to control for relevant explanatory variables, often because of very small sample sizes. Sometimes, when samples of private sector and public sector employees contain too many differences in gender, age, education, job content, or hierarchical level, differences in work motivation can be explained simply by these demographic or organizational factors.

Employees in the public sector often make a choice to deliver a worthwhile service to society. They are motivated by a strong desire to serve the public interest, by a sense of service to the community that is not found among their private sector counterparts and by an urge to promote the public interest. Public sector employees show a stronger service ethic than private sector employees. Public service motivation comprises elements such as the opportunity to have an impact on public affairs, commitment to serving the public interest, and an interest in achieving social justice .

This choice of the “good cause” is certainly not the only choice that public sector employees make. Most workers constantly make choices between work and family. Some opt for a more balanced life with less work–family conflict, whereas others show high degrees of work commitment and organizational citizenship behavior, devoting extra time and effort. Can some of the observed differences between public sector and private sector employees be explained by such a positive choice, adding to a further understanding of the differences in work motivation between public sector and private sector employees? The research has consistently found that private sector employees and managers value economic rewards more highly than do public sector employees and managers. Direct economic benefits are less important for public sector employees than for those in the private sector. Pay is a much greater motivator for private sector employees, supervisors, and managers than it is for their public sector counterparts. Unlike private sector managers, public sector managers are not strongly motivated by pay expectancy. Based on an analysis of 34 empirical studies, Boyne [4] found support for only 3 out of 13 hypotheses about the differences between public sector and private

sector management. This study was not a real meta-analysis, however, because it gave equal weight to all studies included and may have overlooked other significant differences. Although we acknowledge that this might lead to a slightly skewed picture, the fact that one of three positive results indicated less materialism in public managers largely corroborates previous assumptions.

There is a broad consensus that public sector employees are more intrinsically motivated. Leete [10] found that nonprofit organizations rely disproportionately on intrinsically motivated employees. This also seems to be the case in the public sector. Most studies have concluded that public sector workers are less extrinsically and hence more intrinsically motivated. Public sector employees are more motivated by job content, self-development, recognition, autonomy, interesting work, and the chance to learn new things.

When it comes to the motivational impact of a supportive working environment, the literature on differences between the public and private sectors is silent. Although there is a large body of studies dealing with the link between motivation and job security, the findings often are conflicting. The general picture is that, all else being equal, public sector employees are strongly motivated by security and stability. Job security refers to workers' ability to retain a desirable job; job stability refers to the duration of the match between a worker and a job. Most studies, however, deal with job security, not job stability. Job stability is a concept that is closer to job content or working style than job security, which has more to do with external economic conditions. Being motivated by a supportive working environment reflects feelings of safety in one's role, which is a broader concept than stability. It also encompasses the need to work in a friendly, harmonious, respectful atmosphere. There is some evidence that federal government executives consider their coworkers, colleagues, and bosses significantly more important than do business executives, and public employees seem to respond more favorably to a people-oriented leadership style than do private employees.

The research on work and organizational commitment offers mixed results. Early research by Buchanan [5] reinforced the belief that public sector managers have a lower level of organizational commitment than business executives. Similar findings have been reported by Rainey. In a comparison of 474 Australian public sector employees and 944 private sector employees, Zeffane found higher commitment among the latter. Moon [12] found that public sector managers have a lower level of organizational commitment than do private sector managers, especially in terms of their willingness to expend extra effort. Goulet and Frank [7] report the lowest organizational commitment among public sector employees and managers in a sample consisting of for-profit, nonprofit, and public sector employees and managers.

Some other studies, however, have reported a higher level of commitment among public sector managers or no difference. Farid, for example, compared the organizational

commitment of 54 and 43 middle managers from public sector and private sector organizations, respectively, and found no significant differences. Most studies report inconclusive or inconsistent findings [6].

In a critical review of the empirical literature—and in an effort to “debunk negative stereotypes”—Baldwin concludes that private sector and public sector employees are equally motivated. However, Baldwin’s summary table makes clear that most of the cited studies deal with public sector managers, not street-level public sector employees. Baldwin’s conclusion of equal motivation, then, may be relevant only for managers and not for other employees.

Different organizational or national cultures can explain many differences. Nevertheless, the fact that public sector managers have weaker organizational commitment than their private sector counterparts is one of the three hypotheses supported by Boyne’s [4] overview of 34 empirical studies. Balfour and Wechsler found different correlations between public sector employment and several dimensions of commitment. The only consistent finding is a negative correlation between public sector employment and the willingness to expend extra effort. This dimension, “willingness to exert considerable effort,” is one of the three factors associated with commitment.

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that individuals are drawn to careers in public service primarily by a unique set of altruistic motives such as wanting to serve the public interest, effect social change, and shape the policies that affect society. This perspective views public service as a distinct profession or calling to which certain types of people are morally compelled. This implies that job seekers do not necessarily view private sector and public sector jobs as competing options; an individual who is drawn to a career in public service would choose a public sector job even if the economic rewards were not competitive with comparable jobs in the private sector.

Bibliography

1. Bateman T. S. and Organ D. W. Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee “citizenship.” *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 1983, p. 587–595.
2. Becker H. S. Notes on the Concept of Commitment. In: *American Journal of Sociology*, 1960, 66, p. 32-40.
3. Bolino M. C., Turner W. H. Going the Extra Mile: Cultivating and Managing Employee Citizenship Behavior. In: *Academy of Management Executive*, 2003, 17, 3, p. 60-70.
4. Boyne G. A. Public and Private Management: What’s the Difference? *Journal of Management Studies* 39(1), 2002, p. 97–122.
5. Buchman B. Building Organizational Commitment: The Socialization of Managers in Work Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 19(4), 1974, p. 509–32.

6. Farid M. I. Job Characteristics, Leadership, and Organizational Commitment as Perceived by Managers in the Egyptian Public and Private Sectors. *Academy of Strategic and Organizational Leadership Journal* 1(1), 1997, p. 20–31.
7. Goulet L. R. and Frank M. L. Organizational Commitment across Three Sectors: Public, Non-Profit, and For-Profit. *Public Personnel Management* 31(2), 2002, p. 201–210.
8. Herzberg F. *Work and the Nature of Man*. Cleveland, OH: World Publishers, 1966.
9. Konovsky M. A. and Organ D. W. Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 17, 1996, p. 253–266.
10. Leete L. Wage Equity and Employee Motivation in Nonprofit and For-Profit Organizations. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 43(4), 2000, p. 423–446.
11. Meyer J. P., Allen N. J. *Commitment in the Work Place*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1997.
12. Moon M. Jae. Organizational Commitment Revisited in New Public Management: Motivation, Organizational Culture, and Managerial Level. *Public Performance and Management Review* 24(2), 2000, p. 177–194.
13. Moorman R. H. Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 1991, p. 845–855.
14. Organ D. W. *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome* (1st ed.). Lexington, Massachusetts and Toronto: D.C. Heath and Company, 1988.
15. Organ D. W. and Ryan K. A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior, *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 1995, p.775–802.
16. Podsakoff P. M. et al. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research. In: *Journal of Management*, 2000, 26 (3), 513-563.
17. Van Dyne L., Cummings L. L., McLean P. J. Extra-Role Behaviors: In Pursuit of Construct and Definitional Clarity (A Bridge Over Muddied Waters). In: L. L. Cummings and B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1995, pp. 215-285.
18. Werner J. M. Dimensions that make a difference: Examining the impact of in-role and extra-role behaviors on supervisory ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 1994, 98–107.