

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR DIRECTED TOWARD INDIVIDUALS: DETERMINING THE INFLUENCES OF PERSONAL FACTORS AMONG THE EMPLOYEES OF IRANIAN ISLAMIC AZAD UNIVERSITIES

Atefeh Hosseini

Research Scholar, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam, India
Email: atefeh371@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward individual (OCB-I) refers prosocial behaviours that directed toward specific people or groups within the organization. behaviors like organizational citizenship behaviors contribute to organizational effectiveness because they help to obtain the psychological, organizational and social context that helps employees to perform their jobs. Organization citizenship behavior lubricates the social machinery of the organization, increasing productivity, efficiency and reducing friction among employees. Earlier research indicated no evidences were reported on this aspect especially in Iranian population. We explored the influence of the personal factor in the (OCB-I). The present study intends to compare (OCB_I) within groups of personal factors in the employees of Iranian Islamic Azad University. (OCB_I) was measured by using the questionnaire of Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1991), where 266 employees of Islamic Azad University Iran were participated in the study. Personal factor was also collected from the employees. Result revealed that conscientiousness was significantly different within groups of age group and organization unit; courtesy within groups of age and civic virtue was different within groups of income and education of the employees. Furthermore, there was high (OCB-I) among the Iranian employees of Islamic Azad university.

Keywords: Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Personal factor, Islamic Azad University

INTRODUCTION

Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) are workplace activities that exceed an employee's formal job requirements and contribute to the effective functioning of the organization (Dávila de León, Finkelstein, 2011).

Organ (1988) conceptualized OCB into five dimensions, namely, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, civic virtue, and altruism. In explanation of these variables conscientiousness is extra-role only in the sense that it involves engaging in task-related behaviours at a level that is so far beyond minimally required or generally expected levels that it takes on a voluntary flavor. Organ has defined sportsmanship as a willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining.

Courtesy, involves helping others by taking steps to prevent the creation of problems for coworkers. Civic virtue represents a macro-level interest in, or commitment to, the organization as a whole; Altruism defined as helping others with work-related problems (Organ, 1988).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Akinbode (2010) indicated that age, gender, tenure, management level organization as well as organizational type (demographic variables) did not valid predictors of OCB among workgroups investigated. Nevertheless, results still revealed that female were about 1.24 times more likely to demonstrate OCB compare to their men counterpart. Result showed that OCB increases with age as depicted by the rising Odds ratios associated with ages. Age group of 31-40 years old reported the highest probably of OCB.

Kim (2009) gained an important insight from his study is that pay-for-performance programmes encourage employees to demonstrate OCB, not because of financial outcomes, but because of perceptions of personal value alignment with the organization. There was a possibility that incentive systems can increase OCB among workers. He hypothesized that group-based pay plans can increase employees' OCB. By highlighting collective performance, group-based pay defines and constructs the group as a distinctive identity to members. .

Okediji, Esin, Sanni, Umoh, (2009) founded that the gender of the employee plays no role on organizational citizen behavior. Broucek (2003) tested the demographic factors of age and sex as predictors of OCB. The result indicates that age of employee was a demographic predictor of OCB. But sex did not show as predictor of OCB.

The proposition is that younger and older worker may view work and self in fundamentally different ways is not new. Wagner and Rush (2000) demonstrate that (20-34) early years are the years of establishment and settling down; (35-55) later years are strong sense of self and location vis-a-vis work and life. The authors argued that older employees tend to be more rigid in adjusting their needs with the organization; by contrast, younger employees coordinate their needs with organizational needs more flexibly. Therefore, older and younger workers may differ in their orientations toward self, others, and work. These differences of older and younger workers may lead to different salient motives for OCB among younger and older employees (Nadim, Muzahid Akbar, 2004).

MATERIALS AND METHOD

The study is based on a survey using standard questionnaires which were distributed to six various sections in five constituents (located at different places) of the Islamic Azad University in the one district of Iran. The questionnaires were distributed based on the number of employees in every section of Islamic Azad University.

organizational Citizenship behavior Questionnaire 24 items of Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1991) was used to measure organizational Citizenship behavior directed toward individual(OCB-I). The items included in this scale were based on the definitions of the five dimensions of OCB described by Organ (1988), namely, (1) conscientiousness; (2) courtesy; (3) altruism; (4) sportsmanship; (5) civic virtue. Each item in the scale is a belief statement of supervisor about the subordinate individual organizational Citizenship behavior with which he/she may agree or disagree. Beside each statement is a response scale which ranges from completely disagree (1) to completely agree (5). Scores of

1 and 2 indicate the extent to which an individual disagrees. Score of 3 indicate no opinion. Scores of 4 and 5 indicate the extent to which an individual agrees. For each item the supervisor should circle the number that represents the extent of agreement or disagreement with that statement. According to Podsakoff and coworkers, the calculated reliability coefficients of the questionnaire using Cronbach's alpha method are, for conscientiousness, courtesy, altruism, sportsmanship and civic virtue, 0.83, 0.87, 0.81, 0.87 and 0.77, respectively.

Descriptive statistics (frequencies for categorical variables), and mean & standard deviation (for continuous variables) employed to describe general characteristics of data. One way ANOVA and independent means used to test significant differences within groups of personal correlates on mean scores of organization citizenship behaviour. In post hoc comparisons, the Tukey HSD method employed to identify significant groups of those variables.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

- To examine the differences of organization citizenship behaviour directed toward individuals (OCB-I) within different groups of personal factors of employee of Azad universities;
- What is the level of (OCB-I) among the employees?

RESEARCH QUESTION

1. Are there differences in influencing organizational citizenship behaviour directed toward individuals (OCB-I) within groups of personal factors of Iranian Azad universities?
 - a) Are there differences in influencing conscientiousness within groups of personal factors of Iranian Azad universities?
 - b) Are there differences in influencing courtesy within groups of personal factors of Iranian Azad universities?
 - c) Are there differences in influencing altruism within groups of personal factors of Iranian Azad universities?
 - d) Are there differences in influencing sportsmanship participation within groups of personal factors of Iranian Azad universities?
 - e) Are there differences in influencing civic virtue within groups of personal factors of Iranian Azad universities?
2. To assess the level of (OCB-I) among employees at Azad university

RESULTS

Personal factor

Table 1 it provides the personal details about the respondents such as Age, gender, work experience, organizational unit, income and educational status.

Table 1. Personal factor of the Respondent

	Variables	frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative percent
Gender	Male	179	67.3	67.3	67.3
	Female	87	32.7	32.7	100.0
	Total	266	100.0	100.0	
Age group	below 30 years	82	30.8	31.2	31.2
	31-40 years	105	39.5	39.9	71.1
	41-50 years	61	22.9	23.2	94.3
	above 51 years	15	5.6	5.7	100.0
	Total	263	98.9	100.0	
	Missing	3	1.1		
Marital status	Single	57	21.4	21.8	21.8
	Married	205	77.1	78.2	100.0
	Total	262	98.5	100.0	
	Missing	4	1.5		
Organizational experience	below 5 years	58	21.8	22.2	22.2
	5.1-10 years	96	36.1	36.8	59.0
	10.1-15 years	41	15.4	15.7	74.7
	15.1-20 years	43	16.2	16.5	91.2
	above 20.1 years	23	8.6	8.8	100.0
	Total	261	98.1	100.0	
Organizational unit	Educational	90	33.8	33.8	33.8
	Student welfare	33	12.4	12.4	46.2
	Administrative	90	33.8	33.8	71.1
	Overdevelop	14	5.3	5.3	76.4
	Cultural	20	7.5	7.5	83.9
	Research	43	16.2	16.2	100.0
	Total	266	100.0	100.0	
Income	below 400000 Toman	91	34.2	34.2	34.2
	401000-800000 Toman	159	59.8	59.8	94.0
	above 801000 Toman	16	6	6	100.0
	Total	266	100.0	100.0	
Education qualification	diploma and below diploma	76	28.6	28.6	28.6
	Up diploma and bachelor	148	55.6	55.6	84.2
	Masters and PhD	42	15.8	15.8	100.0
Total Number of Respondents		266	100.0	100.0	

Note: N=266

(OCB-I) Within Groups of Personal Factors

a. Conscientiousness within groups of personal factors. Independent-samples t-test indicated that no significant difference in mean scores for female (M=18.873, SD=.427) and male (M=19.726, SD=3.676; $t(264) = 1.725, p = .086 > .05$). Also there is no significant difference in mean scores for single (M=19.157, SD=4.321) and married (M=19.570, SD=3.646; $t(260) = -.725, p = .469 > .05$). Further, the analysis of one-way ANOVA revealed that no statistically significant differences were found in conscientiousness mean scores for work experience ($F(4, 256) = .186, p = .945 > .05$), educational status ($F(2, 263) = .078, p = .925 > .05$) and income ($F(2, 363) = .750, p > .474$).

Table 2. Means, standard deviations and post- hoc comparisons for age on conscientiousness

Age group	Mean	SD	Tukey HSD	Column-A	Column-B	MD (A-B)
below 30 years	18.524	4.249		below 30 years	31-40 years	-1.637**
31-40 years	20.161	3.682			41-50 years	-.737
41-50 years	19.262	3.306			above 51 years	-1.475
above 51 years	20.000	3.229		31-40 years	below 30 years	1.637**
Total	19.433	3.810			41-50 years	.899
					above 51 years	.161
				41-50 years	below 30 years	.737
					31-40 years	-.899
					above 51 years	-.737
				above 51 years	below 30 years	1.475
					31-40 years	-.161
					41-50 years	.737

Note: ** $P < .05$ Tukey's HSD (Honestly Significant Difference); MD= Mean difference

Besides, there was a statistically significant difference in conscientiousness mean scores for four age groups ($F(3, 259) = 3.056, p = .029; p < .05$). As presented in Table 2 above, post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for group 31-40 years old (M=20.161, SD=3.682) was significantly different from this below 30years (M=18.524, SD=4.249; $p < .05$).

Table 3. Means, standard deviations and post- hoc comparisons for organizational unit on conscientiousness.

organizational unit	Mean	SD	Tukey HSD	Column-A	Column-B	MD (A-B)
administrative	19.433	3.824		administrative	student welfare	-.172
student welfare	19.6061	3.656			educational	1.084
educational	18.348	3.947			cultural	-.116
cultural	19.550	3.068			overdevelop	-2.709
overdevelop	22.142	2.905			research	-.682
research	20.116	3.730		student welfare	administrative	.172
Total	19.447	3.795			educational	1.257

Table 3. Means, standard deviations and post- hoc comparisons for organizational unit on conscientiousness (Contd....)

organizational unit	Mean	SD	Tukey HSD	Column-A	Column-B	MD (A-B)
					cultural	.056
					overdevelop	-2.536
					research	-.510
				educational	administrative	-1.084
					student welfare	-1.257
					cultural	-1.201
					overdevelop	-3.794*
					research	-1.767
				cultural	administrative	.116
					student welfare	-.056
					educational	1.201
					overdevelop	-2.592
					research	-.566
				overdevelop	administrative	2.709
					student welfare	2.536
					educational	3.794*
					cultural	2.592
					research	2.026
				research	administrative	.682
					student welfare	.510
					educational	1.767
					cultural	.566
					overdevelop	-2.026

Note: *P<.01 **P<.05 Tukey's HSD (Honestly Significant Difference); MD= Mean difference

As shown in Table 3, post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for overdevelop unit (M=22.142, SD=2.905) was significantly different from educational unit (M=18.348, SD=3.947; p<.01).

b. Courtesy within groups of personal factors. From an independent-samples t-test it was observed that there was no significant difference in courtesy scores for female (M=19.333, SD=3.075) and male (M=19.608, SD=3.410; t (264) = .638, p = .383> .05) moreover Result of t-test indicated that no significant difference in mean scores was observed for single (M=19.210, SD=3.188) and married (M=19.643, SD=3.340; t (260) = -.875, p = .731 > .05). However, the analysis of one-way ANOVA indicated that no statistically significant differences were found in courtesy mean scores for work experience (F (4, 256) =.133, p=.970>.05, organizational unit (F (5, 260) =.934, p=.459>.05, educational status (F (2, 263) =1.077 p=.342<.05 and income (F (2, 363) =1.643 p=.195).

Table 4. Means, standard deviations and post- hoc comparisons for age on courtesy.

Age group	Mean	SD	Tukey HSD	Column-A	Column-B	MD (A-B)
below 30 years	18.426	3.718		below 30 years	31-40 years	-1.858*
31-40 years	20.285	2.983			41-50 years	-1.409**
41-50 years	19.836	3.093			above 51 years	-.506
above 51 years	18.933	2.250		31-40 years	below 30 years	1.858*
Total	19.524	3.304			41-50 years	.449
					above 51 years	1.352
				41-50 years	below 30 years	1.409**
					31-40 years	-.449
					above 51 years	.902
				above 51 years	below 30 years	.506
					31-40 years	-1.352
					41-50 years	-.902

Note: **P<.05 Tukey's HSD (Honestly Significant Difference); MD= Mean difference

As presented in Table 4 above, post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for group 41-50 years old (M=19.836, SD=3.093) was significantly different from this below 30 years old (M=18.426, SD=3.718; p<.05). For group 31-40 years old (M=20.285, SD=2.983) was significantly different from this below 30years (M=18.426, SD=3.718; p<.05).

c. Altruism within groups of personal factors.From analysis it was observed that there was no significant difference in emotionality scores for female (M=11.057, SD=2.594) and male (M=11.441, SD=2.633; t (264) = 1.121, p = .263> .05). Other analysis revealed that there was no significant difference in altruism scores for single (M=11.438, SD=2.398) and married (M=11.302, SD=2.700; t (260) =.345, p=.731>.05). Besides, a one-way between-groups analysis of variance was also conducted to examine mean scores in altruism within of groups of age, work experience, organizational unit, educational status and income. The analysis disclosed that there was no statistically significant difference in altruism scores for age groups (F (3, 259). = 1.420, p = .237>.05), work experience (F (4, 256) = .106, p=.980>.05), organizational unit (F (5, 260) = 1.554, p=.174>.05), educational status (F (2, 263) = .152, p=.859>.05) and income (F (2, 263) = 1.895 p=.274>.05).

d. Sportsmanship within groups of personal factors. In light of this, an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the sportsmanship mean scores for gender. From analysis it was observed that there was no significant difference in sportsmanship scores for female (M=29.632, SD=5.478) and male (M=28.782, SD=5.020; t (264) = -1.234, p = .905 > .05). An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the sportsmanship mean scores for marital status. The analysis revealed that there was no significant difference in sportsmanship scores for single (M=39.596, SD=6.726) and married (M=28.741, SD=5.156; t (260) =1.891, p=.554>.05). Besides, a one-way between-groups analysis of variance was also conducted to examine mean scores in sportsmanship within of groups of age, work experience, organizational unit, educational status and income. The analysis disclosed that there was no statistically significant difference in sportsmanship scores for age groups (F (3,

259). = 1.093, p = .353>.05), work experience (F (4, 256) = .802, p=.525>.05), organizational unit (F (5, 260) = 2.357, p=.041>.05), educational status (F (2, 263) = .354, p=.702>.05) and income (F (2, 263) = 1.250, p=.288>.05).

e. Civic virtue within groups of personal factors. In this regard, an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the civic virtue mean scores for gender. From analysis it was observed that there was no significant difference in civic virtue scores for female (M=18.229, SD=2.991) and male (M=18.754, SD=3.205; t (264) =1.279, p = .202> .05). An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the civic virtue mean scores for marital status. The analysis revealed that there was no significant difference in civic virtue scores for single (M=18.421, SD=2.963) and married (M=18.678, SD=3.198; t (260) =-.545, p=.586>.05).

Besides, a one-way between-groups analysis of variance was also conducted to examine mean scores in civic virtue within of groups of age, work experience, organizational unit, educational status and income. The analysis disclosed that there was no statistically significant difference in civic virtue scores for age groups (F (3, 259) = 2.319, p = .076>.05), work experience (F (4, 256) = .884, p=.474>.05) and organizational unit (F (5, 260) = 1.634, p=.151>.05).

Table 5. Means, standard deviations and post- hoc comparisons for educational status on civic virtue.

educational status	Mean	SD	Tukey HSD	Column -A	Column -B	MD (A-B)
D/B.B	17.828	3.283		D/B.B	U.D/B	-.806
U.D/B	18.635	2.999			M/ PhD	-1.932*
M/ PhD	19.761	3.050		U.D/B	D/B.B	.806
total	18.582	3.141			M/ PhD	-1.126
				M/ PhD	D/B.B	1.932*
					U.D/B	1.126

Note: *P<.01 **P<.05 Tukey's HSD (Honestly Significant Difference); MD= Mean difference

In the Table 5 above, post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for M/ PhD holders (M=19.761, SD=3.050) was significantly different from the D/B.B holders (M=17.828, SD=3.283; p<.01).

Table 6. Means, standard deviations and post- hoc comparisons for income on civic virtue

income	Mean	SD	Tukey HSD	Column-A	Column -B	MD (A-B)
below 400000 Toman	17.637	3.277		below 400000	401000-800000	-1.29345*
401000-800000 Toman	18.930	2.931			above 801000	-2.86264*
above 801000 Toman	20.500	2.943		401000-800000	below 400000	1.29345*
Total	18.582	3.141			above 801000	-1.56918

Table 6. Means, standard deviations and post- hoc comparisons for income on civic virtue

income	Mean	SD	Tukey HSD	Column-A	Column-B	MD (A-B)
				above 801000	below 400000	2.86264*
					401000-800000	1.56918

Note: * P < .01; **p<.05 Tukey's HSD (Honestly Significant Difference); MD= Mean difference

As shown in Table 6 above, post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for above 801000 (M=20.500, SD=2.943) was significantly different from the below 400000 Toman (M=17.637, SD=3.277; p<.01) . For 401000-800000 (M=18.930, SD=2.931) was significantly different from the below 400000 Toman (M=17.637, SD=3.277; p<.01).

Table 7. Level of (OCB-I) of the Employees of the Islamic Azad University

	frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative percent
low	124	46.6	46.6	46.6
high	142	53.4	53.4	100.0
total	266	100.0	100.0	

Table 7 indicates level of (OCB-I) of the employees 53.4 percent of the respondents were having high (OCB-I), 46.6 percent of respondents were having low (OCB-I). Hence, employees with high level of emotional intelligence are dominated in the work force of Islamic Azad University. Some studies have showed that those with collectivistic values or norms were more likely to perform OCB and engage in cooperative behaviors (Moorman, Blakey, 1995).

The study revealed that there is a significant difference in the employee conscientiousness based on age and organization unit. In other words, age group of below 30 years old has significantly lower conscientiousness than 31-40 years old. In addition, it is also found that there is significant difference in conscientiousness between different organization units. Further, it is found that there was difference in age for courtesy of the employees. In other explanation, age group of below 30 years old has significantly lower courtesy than groups of 31-40 years old and 41-50 years. Furthermore, it is found that civic virtue was significantly different within groups of income and education. In other words, M/ PhD holders have significantly higher civic virtue than U.D/B holders. In addition, for income group of above 801000 have significantly high civic virtue than 401000-800000 and below 400000 Toman income groups; also 401000-800000 have significantly high civic virtue than below 400000 Toman group. These findings are similar to the various empirical studies like Akinbode (2010) ; Kim, (2009); Okediji et al., (2009); Broucek, (2003); Wagner and Rush, (2000); Nadim and Muzahid Akbar, (2004).

Further, it is found that there was no significant difference in altruism and sportsmanship with groups of the personal factor.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The overall results are consistent with the four hypotheses. The results from Table 4, 5 and Table 6 showed that personal factor had suitable impact on different dimensions of citizenship behavior directed toward individual. The result of present study shows age have influence in conscientiousness and courtesy dimensions; organization unit have influence in conscientiousness; income have influence in civic virtue; and education status have influence in civic virtue of Iranian employees of Islamic Azad university. These results have supported implicit in the prior research. Findings in this direction one consequence of the current global economic crisis is downsizing at many organizations. The reduced workforce means that employers rely on remaining employees to assume extra duties. The employees themselves also may benefit from the performance of OCB, as citizenship activities can improve work environment (de León and Finkelstein, 2011; Dovidio et al., 2006). Thus employers should benefit from attending to dispositional variables in the selection process, hiring collectivist oriented workers.

LIMITATION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study was limited and only focused on the subscales of (OCB-I) within groups of personal factors among employees of Islamic Azad universities one district in Iran. No research on this subject has, to date, been conducted in an Iranian work context. Further research is suggested to collect data over a wider range like the employees of the other districts university in Iran or all governmental universities or the employees of the private sector to make sure if the findings of this study can be generalized. A further research can also be conducted on the effect of personal factor on organization, which is found to be effective on productivity and job performance.

REFERENCE

1. Akinbode, G. A. (2010). Personality characteristics as predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). Unpublished Master Thesis, Dept of Psychology, Lagos: Unilag.
2. Broucek, W .G. (2003). "An Examination of Organizational Citizenship Behavior in an Academic Setting from the Perspective of the Five Factor Model". Journal of International Business & Economics Research, Vol. 2, No. 1, 63-69.
3. Davila de Leon, M.C., Finkelstein, M.A., (2011). "Individualism/ collectivism and organizational citizenship behavior". Journal of Psicothema. Vol. 23, No.3, 401-406.
4. Dovidio, J.F., Piliavin, J.A., Schroeder, D.A., & Penner, L.A. (2006). The social psychology of prosocial behavior. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
5. Dyne, L.V., Vandewalle, D., Kostova, T., Latham, M.E., & Cummings, L.L. (2000). "Collectivism, propensity to trust and self-esteem as predictors of organizational citizenship in a non-work setting". Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol.21, No. 3, 3-23.
6. Jahangir, N., Muzahid Akbar, M. (2004). "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: its Nature and Antecedents" .Journal of Brac University, vol. 1, no. 2, 75-85.
7. Kim, H. (2009)."The roles of tacit knowledge and OCB in the relationship between group-based pay and firm performance". Journal of Technology Human Resource Management, Vol. 19, no. 2, 120-139

8. Moorman, R.H., Blakely, G.L. (1995).” Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior”. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 16, no. 1, 127-142.
9. Okediji, A. A., Esin, P.A., Sanni, K. B., Umoh, O. O. (2009). “The influence of personality characteristics and gender on organizational citizenship behavior”. *Journal of Social Sciences* Vol.8, No. 2, 69-76.
10. Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA. Lexington Books.
11. Wagner, S., M. Rush. (2000).” Altruistic organizational citizenship behavior: context, disposition and age”. *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 140, No. 2, 379-391.