

# African Research Review

---

An International *Multidisciplinary Journal, Ethiopia*

Vol. 7 (2), Serial No. 29, April, 2013:161-174

ISSN 1994-9057 (Print)

ISSN 2070--0083 (Online)

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/afrrv.7i2.10>

---

## **Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour among Employees of Public and Private Organisations**

**Chowwen, Catherine** - Department of Psychology, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria

E-mail: [chowwenc@yahoo.com](mailto:chowwenc@yahoo.com); [chowwenco@gmail.com](mailto:chowwenco@gmail.com)

&

**Ogunsakin Austin** - Department of Psychology, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria

### **Abstract**

*The focus of this study is to investigate the influence of organizational climate and leader-member exchange on organisational citizenship behaviour. Three hundred workers from both public and private organisations took part in the study. Multiple regressions and t-test for independent group were used to test the predicted hypotheses. Findings showed that Leader-member relationship significantly influenced employees' exhibition of organisational citizenship behaviour and organisational climate. Findings have implication for creation of positive work-climate and*

*expression of discretionary behaviour for group and organisational development.*

**Key words:** Leader-member exchange, organisational climate, organisational citizenship behaviour, public and private organisation.

### **Introduction**

There appears to be a substantial body of theory and research that has emphasized the importance of organizational citizenship behaviour (Cohen, 2003). Organizations are created for the attainment of goals and no organization in today's competitive world can perform at its peak levels unless employee are committed to the objectives and work as effective team members to achieve organisational goals. Current organizations are faced with various challenges and opportunities due to constant changing world of business. These changes include technological advances and fluctuating economic trends in the global market. The implication of these constant changes is that organizations are expected to compete and survive in the dynamic business world by utilising human and other resources for the achievement of set goals. Organizations have a pervasive influence on employees' lives since most individuals spend the major part of their lives as members of one organization or the other. Ultimately, the way these organizations are set up and managed influences the work done, how effectively employees perform on our jobs, and how committed they become. This implies that every organisation is unique and has its own climate which plays a critical role in influencing individual behaviour and attitudes (Ohly and Fritz, 2010) and attempts have been made to explore these relationships (e.g.; Daly, 2002; Schnake, 1986).

Organizational climate has generally been defined as an individual's perception of his work environment, and individual perceptions is often argued to affect individual behaviour (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). Research indicates that the work climate could promote or deter work-based outcomes (Ohly and Fritz 2010) and a good organisational climate is associated with employee satisfaction, employee performance, organisational commitment and a decrease in intent to leave (Donoghue 2010). It facilitates good working relationships between the organisation's management and employees (Pyman et al. 2010). It is possible to infer from the above that a positive organisational climate and employees' satisfaction in such an environment will promote employees' discretionary behaviours. This premise

is strengthened with the evidence from studies that suggests that a worker's satisfaction does influence his job behaviour (e.g. Wright, Cropanzano, & Bonett, 2007). A large number of studies have consistently demonstrated relationships between unit or organizational climate and individual outcomes such as performance, satisfaction, commitment, involvement and accidents (Ostroff et al, 2003).

These highlighted relationships and linkages revealed in literature suggest that employees with a positive frame of mind will demonstrate organisational citizenship behaviour. For instance, a growing body of research into organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) suggests that employees demonstrate greater role performance when they experience a strong connection to their organisation, have a sense of ownership over to its continued success, are loyal to their role and work colleagues and, have found a sense of meaning and purpose in their daily work (Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). Similar results have been found for intact work teams (Ehrhart & Naumann, 2004). Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is defined as "individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization". Although this kind of behaviour makes organizational successful and effective but such behaviour is not adequately rewarded and recognized by the top management (Organ, 1988). Shore, Barkdale & Shore (1995) and Chen, Hui & Sego (1998) explained that employees who show full willingness to be involved in the goals of the organization reflect true citizenship behaviour.

In view of the fact that organizational citizenship behaviour has been given a prime place in organizational setting, the problem is how to promote this behaviour especially in government establishments. An employee going the extra mile is a survival requirement in the era of competitive business climate. Discretionary behaviour is assumed to be prevalent in the private sector because of the inherent differences in terms of climate, policies and practices. However, in the public sector, especially government ministries and parastatals, problems of nonchalant attitude and reluctance in taking initiatives are prevalent. Employees may simply treat work scheduled for the duration of the working hours without any burning desire to accomplish any more than necessary. Most "public servants" consciously and strongly hold on to the belief that government work does not require more commitment than considered necessary. In addition, poor supervision and failure on the

part of managers and supervisor to create a committed workforce that is ready to ensure standard performance and productivity further aggravate the problems highlighted. Consequently, service recipients are often not satisfied. These are some of the challenges most state and federal governments have to overcome if meaningful progress is to be made. This is particularly important in the democratic dispensation where governance is meant to be for the people and by the people, as a result, employees' contribution from every department is important. A reorientation that would involve perceived collective ownership and control at the different levels of government may enhance citizenship behaviour and increase commitment.

It seems supervisors and other categories of leaders may sometimes be overwhelmed by negative attitude of employees and be confused on the strategies to achieve optimum citizenship behaviour. For example, Nwachukwu (1999) said "one of the most important problems confronting Nigeria and which will in many years to come is how to improve the productivity of employees, both in public and private sector". While some organizations have folded up, some others are experiencing high employee turnover and this may partly be due to failure of leaders to provide the necessary platform and develop a relationship that would promote citizenship behaviour of employees.

The basic principle of leader-member exchange (LMX) is that leaders develop different types of exchange relationships with their followers and that the quality of these relationships affects important leader and member attitudes and behaviours (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Liden et al., 1997; Sparrowe & Liden, 1997). Leader member exchange focuses on the relationship and interaction (a dyadic exchange) between the supervisor and subordinate, as opposed to the traits, behaviour, situational styles of leaders, or any other variables. To survive the challenges of the highly competitive and ever-changing global market, corporations need to understand LMX and how it contributes to the survival and profitability of business operations and employees' attitude and behaviour. Carson and Carson (2002) suggested that employees who experienced high LMX reciprocate with a greater expenditure of time and effort, higher commitment, and higher levels of performance. They also reported that supervisors offer high-LMX (in-group) employees special benefits such as a higher degree of trust, respect, mutual obligation and interaction, participation, support, and rewards, which are not offered to low-LMX (out-group) employees. In exchange, the members seek

out extra-role situations in form of providing citizenship behaviour to the supervisors who, in turn, give more reciprocal support and opportunities.

The focus of this study is to investigate the influence of organizational climate and leader-member exchange on organisational citizenship behaviour.

### **Objective of study:**

The main purpose of this study is to determine the influence of perceived organizational climate and leader-member exchange on organizational citizenship behaviour

1. To determine the independent and joint influence of perceived organizational and leader member exchange on organizational citizenship behaviour.
2. To ascertain the significant difference in the level of organizational citizenship behaviour of employees in the public and private sectors.

### **Hypotheses**

1. Perceived organizational climate and leader member exchange will independently and jointly predict organizational citizenship behaviour.
2. Employees in private organization will exhibit more organizational commitment and OCB significantly higher than employees in the public organization.

### **Methodology**

#### **Participants**

Three hundred workers took part in this study, a hundred and fifty from three public organisations and one hundred and fifty from three private organisations. Of these, 170 were males (56.7%) and 130 (43.3%) were females. The average mean was 35.85 (SD=7.22) years ranging from 24 to 54 years. The average tenure of the participants with their organizations was 7.20 (SD 5.33), ranging from 1-30 years. They also varied in their level of educational qualification, 31 (10.35%) of the participants has OND, 74 (24.7%) HND, BSC 121 (40.3%), 74 (24.7%) had postgraduate qualification. The married among the subjects were 173 (57.7%) while those who were single were 127 (42.3%).

## **Instrument**

The researcher used the questionnaire method of data collection. Four standardized scales were used; they were perceived organizational climate, leader member exchange, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship scale.

A 35-item scale developed by Glick (1985) measured perceived organizational climate. This 35-item scale was measured on a 6 point likert type response format ranging from “strongly disagree to very strongly agree”. The scoring format will be the higher the score, the more favourable the perception of organizational climate and score 1 depicts unfavourable climate. The author reported a coefficient alpha of 0.72 for the scale. However, for this study, item 23 was dropped because it was weak and the reliability estimate for the retained 34 items was 0.91.

A 12-item scale developed by Liden and Maslyn (1998) measured leader member exchange. The scale was measured on a 7-point likert-type response format ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The authors reported an alpha of .92 for the total LMX. High score indicates high quality of relationship between the subordinate and his/her supervisor. However for this present study item 9 was dropped, because it was weak. The reliability coefficient for this present study was .93.

A 24-item scale developed by Allen and Meyer (1990) measured organizational commitment. The scales was on a 5-point likert type response format ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The scale has three dimensional construct; namely affective commitment, (1-8) with coefficient alpha of 74.87, continuance commitment, (9-16) with alpha of 73.81 and normative commitment, (17-24) with alpha of 67.78. The scoring format is such that the higher the score, the higher the commitment. For the present study, items 9, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, was dropped, because they are weak, the reliability coefficient for this study is .91

A 13-item scale developed by Posdsakoff, et al (1990) was used to measure organizational citizenship behaviour the scale was measured with a 5-point likert-type scale, which ranges from extremely disagree (1) to extremely agree (5). High scores indicate high organizational citizenship behaviour. The split half reliability is .69.

### Procedure for data collection

The researcher visited each of the organizations and got permission from the appropriate quarters. The use of carefully designed questionnaire was the means of data collection. To facilitate the process of data collection, the researcher engaged the services of some employees within each organization to help in the administration of the questionnaire. Participants were randomly selected; the purpose of this study was to ensure that all sections in each organization were fully represented. 350 questionnaires were given out, 310 was recovered. However, only data on 300 respondents were used for the analysis. Others were either unfilled or incompletely filled.

### Statistical analysis

Zero order correlation for all the variables was calculated. Multiple regressions and t-test for independent group were used to test hypotheses respectively.

### Results

Table 4.1: a summary table of multiple regression showing the independent and joint influence of perceived organizational climate and L.M.X on organizational citizenship behaviour in public organisations

| Mode | Variable                         | R   | R <sup>2</sup> | B    | T    | F      | P    |
|------|----------------------------------|-----|----------------|------|------|--------|------|
| 1    |                                  |     |                |      |      |        |      |
| 1    | Perceived organizational climate | .36 | .13            | -.03 | -.44 | .22.78 | <.05 |
|      | L.M.X                            |     |                | .37  | 6.6  |        |      |

Table 4.1 reveals the independent and joint influence of perceiving organizational climate and L.M.X on OCB was partially supported. An observation of the above table reveals that L.M.X independently predicted OCB with  $\beta$  value of .37  $p < .05$ . Perceived organizational climate was not significant ( $\beta = -.03$  *pns*). the joint influence was significant ( $R^2 = .13$ ,  $F(2, 299) = 22.78$ ,  $p < .05$ ). this means that about 13% of the variance observed

in OCB could be explained by the joint influence of perceived organizational climate and LMX for employees in the public sector.

**Table 4.2 the summary table of multiple regression showing the influence of LMX and perceiving organizational climate on OCB in private organisations**

| Model | Variable                         | R   | R <sup>2</sup> | B   | T    | F     | P    |
|-------|----------------------------------|-----|----------------|-----|------|-------|------|
| 1     | L.M.X                            | .36 | .13            | .36 | 6.75 | 45.49 | <.05 |
|       | Perceived Organizational climate |     |                | .07 | 1.32 |       | Ns   |

Table 4.2 reveals the independent and joint influence of perceiving organizational climate and L.M.X on OCB was partially supported. An observation of the above table reveals that L.M.X independently predicted OCB with  $\beta$  value of .36  $p < .05$ . Perceived organizational climate was not significant ( $\beta = -.03$  *pns*). the joint influence was significant ( $R^2 = .13$ ,  $F(2, 299) = 22.78$ ,  $p < .05$ ). this means that about 13% of the variance observed in OCB could be explained by the joint influence of perceived organizational climate and LMX for employees in the private sector.

**Table 4.3: A summary table of t-test result showing difference in the employees of public and private sector on OCB.**

| Variable | Organizational type | N   | Means | SD   | Df  | T | P    |
|----------|---------------------|-----|-------|------|-----|---|------|
| OCB      | Public              | 150 | 31.27 | 4.31 | 298 |   | .824 |
|          | Private             | 150 | 31.64 | 3.49 |     |   |      |

As shown in the table above, there was no difference between employees in private organizations and those in public organization on organisational citizenship behaviour.  $t = (298) = -.824$ ,  $p = n.s$ .



## **Discussion and conclusions**

Perceived organizational climate and leader-member exchange independently and jointly predicted organizational citizenship behaviour. That is leader/member exchange relationship and organisational climate increased the expression of citizenship behaviour. Most importantly, leader-member exchange significantly contributed to expression of citizenship behaviour. It has been argued that one of the most important initial aspects of the exchange relationship is subordinates' performance based on supervisors' requests (Elkins & Keller, 2003). The basic principle of leader-member exchange (LMX) is that leaders develop different types of exchange relationships with their followers and that the quality of these relationships affects important leader and member attitudes and behaviours (Gerstner & Day, 1997) Subordinates' reactions to those requests can influence perceptions of trustworthiness and loyalty (House & Aditya, 1997). This finding is consistent with those of previous studies. For example, Carson and Carson (2002) suggested that employees who experienced high LMX reciprocate with a greater expenditure of time and effort, higher commitment, and higher levels of performance. They also reported that supervisors offer high-LMX (in-group) employees special benefits such as a higher degree of trust, respect, mutual obligation and interaction, participation, support, and rewards, which are not offered to low-LMX (out-group) employees. In exchange, the members seek out extra-role situations in form of providing citizenship behaviour to the supervisors who, in turn, give more reciprocal support and opportunities. Also, in a study conducted by Donoghue (2010), he found out that a good organisational climate part of which may be evident in supervisor/ subordinate relationship is associated with employee satisfaction, employee performance, organisational commitment and a decrease in intent to leave. Pyman et al. (2010) also asserted that a good organisational climate facilitates good working relationships between the organisation's management and employees and may enhance citizenship behaviours from employee.

It is interesting to note that leader/member exchange was significant in influencing expression of citizenship behaviour of employees in both public and private organisations. This is particularly important and emphasises the salient role of exchange relationship in facilitating the exhibition of discretionary behaviour irrespective of the type of organisation. This is of relevance in the public sector where discretionary behaviour is rife, since most

often government work is seen as ‘nobody’s work’, and employees’ salaries will be paid at the end of the month whether goals are achieved or not. The findings have implication for management in both private and public organisations as it emphasised that if employees are treated fairly in a social exchange relationships, they are motivated to give more of themselves cognitively, affectively, and behaviourally in support of their supervisors and the organizations they represent.

There was no difference between employees in public and private organisations in citizenship behaviour. This is at variance with studies which have reported significant difference between the two groups on related employee behaviour such as motivation and commitment. For example, the study of Boyne (2002) which focused on employees in the managerial jobs, found differences in employee’s motivation or values. It was concluded that public managers are indeed less materialistic and also expresses a greater desire to serve the public interest. Their organizational commitment however, tended to be lower than what was found in the private sector. Boyne (2002), suggests that the low level of the commitment in the public sector may be due to more flexible personnel practices in that sector. In conclusion the study has demonstrated that although significant result was not obtained in respect of public and private organisations, findings revealed that perceived organizational climate and leader-member exchange influenced organizational citizenship behaviour for employees in both groups.

### **Implications and recommendation**

The findings of this study are particularly important for government, organizational behaviour-researcher and practitioners because they have several important and potential implications for practice. Focus should be on building a positive relationship between subordinates and supervisors and providing a conducive work climate that would promote the expression of initiative and imaginative abilities, selflessness, cooperation, and other discretionary behaviours that promotes both group and organisational development.

Limitation of Study: One major limitation of this study is the use of self report measure to obtain information for the study, while this is allows for ease of information generation, it limits the inclusion of other salient factors that could have enhance the understanding of employees’ citizenship

behaviour. It is suggested that future studies combine or adopt qualitative approach in order to achieve this purpose.

## **References**

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1–18.
- Allinson, C. W., Armstrong, S. J., & Hayes, J. (2001). The effects of cognitive style on leader-member exchange: A study of manager-subordinate dyads, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 74, 201-220.
- Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behaviour*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Borman, C. W. (2004). The Concept of Organizational Citizenship. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, Vol. 13(6), pp. 238-241
- Boyne, G. A. (2002). Public and private managerial: What's the difference? *Journal of Management studies*, 39, 97-122
- Carson, K., & Carson, P. P. (2002). LMX reflections: An interview with George Graen, *The Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship* 7, 91-98.
- Chen, X. P, Hui, C., & Sego, D. J. (1998). The role of organizational citizenship behaviour in Turnover: Conceptualization and Preliminary Tests of Key Hypothesis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83; 6, PP.922-931.
- Cohen, A. (2003). *Multiple commitments in the workplace: An integrative approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
- Daly, J. L. (2002). Implications of organizational climate and ethical leadership on reengineering municipal government. *Public Administration Quarterly* , 26, 198-217.
- Ehrhart, M. G. M., & Naumann, S. E. S. (2004). Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in work groups: A group norms approach. *Journal of applied psychology*, 89(6), 960-974.

- Elkins, T., & Keller, R. T. (2003). Leadership in research and development organizations: A literature review and conceptual framework. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(4-5), 587-606.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 827-844.
- Glick, W. H. (1985). Conceptualizing and measuring organizational and psychological climate: pitfall in multilevel research. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 601-616.
- House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23, 409-473.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behaviour and Social exchange. *Academy of management journal*, 37, 656-669
- Liden, R.C., Sparrowe, R.T., & Wayne, S.J. (1997). Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. In G. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resources management* (Vol.15, pp.47-119). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Liden, R. C., & Maslyn, J. M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management*, 24(1), 43- 72.
- Maslyn, J. M., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001). Leader-member exchange and its dimension: Effects of self-effort and other's effort on relationship quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(4), 697-708.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace*. Sage Publication.
- Neuman, A. G., & Kickul, R. J. (1998). Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Achievement Orientation and Personality. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 13(2), pp. 263-279
- Ohly, S. & Fritz, C. (2010). Work characteristics, challenge appraisal, creativity, and proactive behavior: A multi-level study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.

- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome*, Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- Ostroff, C., Kinicki, A. J., & Tamkins, M. M. (2003). Organizational culture and climate. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology. Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 12 (pp. 565–593).
- Podasoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Moorman, R.H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviours and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviour, *Leadership Quarterly*, 107-142.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviour: A critical review of theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research, *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-516.
- Pyman, A., Holland, P., Teicher, J., & Cooper, B., (2010). Industrial relations climate, employee's voice and managerial attitudes to unions: an Australian study, *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48, 2, pp. 460 – 480.
- Rubin, A. B. (2004). An Understructured Conception of Dignity at Work, *Contemporary Sociology*, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 8-10
- Ryan, J. J. (2002). "Work Values and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Values That Work for Employees and Organizations", *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 17: No.1, pp. 123-132.
- Schnake, M. E. (1983). An empirical assessment of the effects of affective response in the measurement of organizational climate. *Personnel Psychology*, 36, 791-807.
- Shore, L.F., Barkdale, K., & Shore, T. (1995). Managerial perceptions of employee commitment to the organization. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 6, 593-1615.
- Sparrowe, R. T., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Process and structure in leader member exchange. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 522–552.

- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J., & Dienesch, R. (1994). Organisational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 765-802.
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 82-111.
- Wright, T. A., Cropanzano, R., & Bonett, D. G. (2007). The moderating role of employee positive well-being on the relation between job satisfaction and job performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12 (2), 93-104.