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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) among the employees in insurance organizations in Kuching, Sarawak. Most of the respondents involved in this study were sales persons. This study determined the most important dimensionalities of OCB shown by most of the insurance sales person in Kuching.

Data were collected from 150 insurance sales person by using stratified random sampling. Finding showed that loyalty, conscientiousness, altruism and civic virtue were the most important dimension of OCB as perceived by the insurance sales persons. Whereas, organizational compliances, self development and functional participant were not seem to be important as perceived by the respondents.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) was first mentioned in the early 1980 as a unique aspect of individual activity at works. It represents “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988). It is also been defined in the literature as a multidimensional concept that includes all positive organizationally relevant behaviors of organizational members including traditional in role behaviors, organizationally pertinent extra-role behaviors, and political behaviors, such as full and responsible organizational participation (Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994).

Today, the organizations face an increasingly competitive and rapidly changing environment characterized by a diverse labour market, advancement in information technologies, globalization, deregulation, continuous customer demand and others. To be successful, a firm must be able to improve performance by reducing cost, creating new products and processes, enhancing quality and productivity, and increasing speed to market (Luthans & Sommers, 2005). In this regards, organizations need to focus on the capabilities of their workforces. Successful organizations have employees who go beyond their formal job responsibilities and freely give their time and energy to success at the assigned job. Such altruism is neither prescribed nor required; yet it contributes to the smooth functioning of the organization. Organizations could not survive or prosper without their members behaving as good citizens by engaging in all sorts of positive behaviors. OCB is held to be vital to the survival of an organization. It can maximize the efficiency and productivity of both the employee and the organization that ultimately contribute to the effective functioning of an organization.

Prominent current organizational researchers such as Brief have supported Organ’s position regarding the importance for effectiveness of those behaviors which he labeled as organizational citizenship behavior (George & Brief, 1992). Although the
current authors know of no studies, which have specifically investigated the nature and extent of the relationship between OCB and organizational effectiveness, it is widely accepted among contemporary organizational behavior theorists, that organizational citizenship behaviors have an accumulative positive effect on organizational functioning (Wagner & Rush, 2000).

1.2 The Concept of OCB

The concept of OCB was the proposed construct coined by Organ during his initial attempt to understand these as-yet-unnamed behaviors as a better representation of “performance” in the "satisfaction-causes-performance" controversy (Organ, 1977). This work has led to various studies examining a variety of predictors of OCB, including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and perceptions of justice (Moorman, 1991), state or trait personality characteristics (George, 1991) and leadership behaviors (Farh, Podsakoff, & Organ, 1990). Attitudinal variables (e.g., satisfaction, fairness, and commitment) showed the strongest relationship with OCB (Organ and Ryan, 1995). But support for personality predictors of OCB has been inconsistent, as studies have failed to replicate findings across samples (Organ, 1994). OCB have also been viewed as "affiliative and promotive" behaviors that demonstrate the actor's desire to maintain a relationship with the target (i.e., coworkers or the organization) and contribute to the target's success (Van Dyne et al., 1995). On the other hand, others have portrayed OCB as socially desirable behaviors.

OCB also represents a set of desirable organizational behaviors, which demonstrate multi-dimensional relationships with positive organizational consequences (Walz and Niehoff, 1996). What has been missing, however, is a conceptually sound framework for understanding why OCB occurs. Historically, each new study suggested, and to an extent found support for, a new antecedent of OCB. But it is evident that a convergence for coherence in the conceptual underpinnings of OCB is literally missing. It is argued here that this lack of convergence in the search for antecedents is not due to any measurement issues; rather OCB has been primarily studied as an impetus for better organizational performance along with other commonly recognized organizational variables. Specifically, the researchers examined OCB in relation to organizational commitment, job satisfaction, or procedural justice to investigate the
employees' contributions to organizational performance. However, none of the researchers identify why employees in the first place engage in OCB in an organizational context.

OCB might be considered as a part of total job performance. Furthermore, for some supervisors, “effective task performance beyond a particular level loses its importance, replaces in importance by the proficient execution of behaviors in the areas of regular attendance, predictability, following the rules, not making waves, avoidance of hassles, cooperation, and generalized tendencies toward compliance” (Organ, 1977).

1.3 Problem Statement

Customer is becoming demanding while the business environment is getting more competitive and has more to offer to attract their customers. Organizations today is facing an increasingly competitive and rapidly changing environment characterized by a diverse labour market, advancement in information technologies, globalization, deregulation, continuous customer demand and others. To be successful, a firm must be able to improve performance by reducing cost, creating new products and processes, enhancing quality and productivity, and increasing speed to market (Luthans & Sommers, 2005). In this regards, organizations need to focus on the capabilities of their workforces. Successful organizations have employees who go beyond their formal job responsibilities and freely give their time and energy to success at the assigned job. Employees who go the extra mile by performing spontaneous behaviors that go beyond their role prescriptions are especially valued by the management. This phenomenon is critical for organizational effectiveness because managers cannot foreseen all contingencies or fully anticipate the activities that they may desire or need employees to perform (Katz & Kahn 1978, Organ 1988).

Most organizations in Kuching were not aware of the importance of OCB. They hardly understand the theory of OCB and it’s implication in their organization. OCB is held to be vital to the survival of an organization. It can maximize the efficiency and productivity of both the employee and the organization that ultimately contribute to the effective functioning of an organization. Enhancing an organization’s competitive ability is increasingly critical and behaviors, which may improve
individual and organizational efficiency, become more valuable. Work behavior that goes beyond the reach of organizational measures of job performance holds promise for long term organizational success (Van Dyne, Graham & Dieneresch 1994) because these types of action are purported to improve organizational efficiency, effectiveness and adaptability (Organ 1988).

1.4 Research Objective

The objective of this research is to understand the nature construct of OCB. Rapid growth of research on OCB has resulted in some conceptual confusion about the nature of construct, and made it difficult for all but the most avid readers to keep up with development in this domain (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000). The research is mainly to determine which dimension of OCB that strongly appear and practice by the employees in insurance company in Kuching. This research also tries to determine the dimensionalities of OCB. It is vital to the survival of an organization to have employee that act like “The Good Samaritan” especially for servicing company i.e. insurance company.

1.5 Research Questions

Which are the dimensionalities of OCB that are seen and viewed as important among employees in insurance industry in Kuching, Sarawak.

1.6 Scope of The Study

This research reveals the various definition of OCB, antecedent, and dimensionalities. More specifically, explores the conceptual similarities and differences by various researcher, discovered the dimensionalities of OCB among executives working in insurance company in Kuching context.
1.7 Organization of Chapters

Chapter 2 of this study will mention about the literature of OCB by various researcher. OCB definition, its dimensions and antecedents, theoretical framework and hypotheses will be included.

Chapter 3 will discuss about the methodology use in this research. Sample of respondents, instrument for interview, and procedure for gathering data on interview will included in first section. Second section will explain about the method use for data analysis.

Climax of this research is included in chapter 4. Findings are shown in tables followed by explanations.

Discussion of finding is discussed in chapter 5. Implication of the research is discussed in this chapter. Strength and potential limitation of the research is included. Furthermore this chapter also introduced directions for future research. Final of this chapter is the conclusion of overall research.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Although the rapid growth in theory and research undoubtedly has been gratifying to those interested in organizational citizenship behavior, it also has produced some unfortunate consequences. For example, Van dyne et al (1995) have noted that much of the empirical research on OCB, and related concept of prosocial organizational behavior and organizational spontaneity, has focused more on what Schwab (1980) called substantive validity, rather than in construct validity. That is, the literature has focused more on understanding the relationships between organizational citizenship and other constructs, rather than carefully defining the nature of citizenship behavior itself.

Despite the growing interest in citizenship-like behaviors, a review of the literature in this area reveals the definition, antecedents and dimensionality of OCB in this chapter.

2.2 Definition of OCB

Participants willing to exert effort beyond the formal obligations dictated by their positions have long been recognized as an essential component of effective organizational performance. For example, more than a half century ago, Barnard (1938) stated that the willingness of individuals to contribute cooperative efforts to the organization was indispensable to effective attainment of organizational goals. Barnard further elaborated that efforts must be exerted not only to perform the functions that contribute to the goals of the organization but also to maintain the organization itself. Individuals can be differ in their willingness to contribute to the “cooperative system”, and these individual differences in behavior cannot be explained by individual differences in ability. Maintaining the organization could be interpreted to up-lift the organization by exercising discretionary ownership. Katz and Kahn’s (1966) extended this argument further. They claimed that in any organization, the system would break down were it not for the “countless acts of cooperation.”
exhibited by the employees. They further noted that the incentives that motivate such spontaneous, informal contributions are different from those that motivate task proficiency. These insights prompted much of the subsequent research in the area. Several positive work behavior constructs such as pro-social organizational behavior, organizational spontaneity, extra-role behavior have subsequently been mooted, but the most attended one is OCB and contextual performance that prompted numerous empirical researches.

In OCB, an individual’s behavior is discretionary (Organ, 1988). This behavior is not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and it in the aggregate that promotes the effective functioning of the organization. Katz's (1964) paid attention to the notion of employees’ extra-role behaviors. Katz noted that employees willingly contribute extra efforts for the attainment of the organizational outcomes. Organ in developing his OCB construct relied on both the notions of Barnard (1938) and Katz (1964). Despite the proliferation of research in this area, debate continues over the precise definition or operationalisation of OCB. This is partly because most of the OCB research has focused on understanding the relationships between OCB and other constructs, rather than carefully defining the nature of the construct itself.

Notwithstanding, a distinguishing feature is that supervisors cannot demand or force their subordinates to perform OCB. Similarly, the employees do not or cannot expect any kind of formal rewards for these discretionary behaviors. However, as Organ (1997) has noted, the supervisors do regularly take into account and reward OCB exhibited by the subordinates both directly and indirectly (e.g. preferential treatment, performance ratings, promotions, etc). Another important assertion, is that these behaviors are often internally motivated, arising from within and sustained by an individual's intrinsic need for a sense of achievement, competence, belonging or affiliation. Organ (1988) argued that OCB is distinct from related constructs (such as “organizational commitment”) developed by organizational researchers. While OCB may be empirically related to organizational commitment (Cohen & Vigoda, 2000), it is important to emphasize that OCB refers to a particular class of employee behaviors, while constructs such as organizational commitment is essentially attitude-based (as originally operationalized in the organizational commitment questionnaire of Mowday et al., 1979) which is typically measured by seeking employees’ responses to such
scale item statements as "I find that my values and the organization's are very similar". The unique contribution of Organ was to identify a class of employee work behaviors (organizational citizenship behaviors) whose relationship with job satisfaction, among other variables, might be meaningfully examined in the search for a practically significant workplace behaviors related to employee job attitudes.

Van Dyne et al. (1995), proposed the broader construct of "extra-role behavior" (ERB), defined as "behavior which benefits the organization and/or is intended to benefit the organization, which is discretionary and which goes beyond existing role expectations". Organ (1997) suggested that this definition did not provide much clarity, noting that one's "job role" is dependent on the expectations of and communication from the role sender. The "sent role" could thus be less than or greater than the actual job requirements. This role theory definition thus places OCB or ERB in the realm of phenomenology, unobservable and completely subjective in nature. Distinctions between antecedents and behaviors become blurred, completely dependent on the "eyes of the beholder." This definition also presumes that the actor's intentions are "to benefit the organization." Once again, the behavior should be defined independent of its presumed antecedents.

Another definition of OCB proposed by Borman (1993) and Motowidlo (1997) called 'contextual performance' which was related to OCB that contribute to the effectiveness of the organization by shaping the organizational, social, and psychological context that serves as the catalyst for task activities and processes. As opposed to "task performance" (i.e. the effectiveness with which job incumbents perform activities that contribute to the organization's technical core) by "contextual performance" these authors referred to those behaviors that employees engage in many work behaviors that fall outside the rubric of task performance. Their taxonomy of contextual performance includes persisting with enthusiasm and extra effort as necessary to complete own task activities successfully, volunteering to carry out task activities that are not formally part of own job, helping and cooperating with others, following organizational rules and procedures, and endorsing, supporting, and defending organizational objectives. Van-Scotter and Motowidlo (1996) suggested that contextual performance should be separated into the two narrower constructs of
“interpersonal facilitation” and “job dedication,” which are similar to Organ’s interpersonally directed and organizationally-directed factors respectively.

However, Organ (1997) suggested that Borman and Motowidlo's (1993) construct of "contextual behaviors" has provided a more tenable definition of OCB. Contextual behaviors do not support the technical core itself so much as they support the broader organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core must function (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). This definition is not clouded by any notions of discretion, rewards, or intent of the actor. This definition only assumes that the behaviors should support “the organizational, social, and psychological environment” rather than the “technical core.” There is no specific motive presumed of the actor, nor are there any other antecedents inferred. A certain degree of subjectivity will remain surrounding the fuzzy line between what is and is not included in the technical core. This ambiguity is likely to persist. As an endnote on the various definitions of OCB the distinction between the in-role/extra-role for desired discretionary work behaviors is problematic. Therefore, the solution is to define OCB along the lines of contextual performance. This accomplished, the two constructs become virtually identical.

Organ (1997) also has suggested similar view regarding the use of OCB for the future researchers. A recent review of the literature by Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000) identified a major weakness of this stream of research on OCB. The authors argued that the literature has focused more on understanding the relationship between OCB and other constructs, rather than carefully defining the nature (dimensions) of citizenship behavior itself. Podsakoff et al. (2000) warned that unless more attention is paid to the conceptualization of OCB and its measures, there were dangers of developing a stream of literature that may prove of little worth to the field in the long run. Thus, the conceptualization of OCB could be manifested in a better way by discussing the dimensions of OCB.

2.3 Antecedents of OCB

A wide range of employee, task, organizational and leader characteristics are consistently found to predict different types of OCB across a range of occupations.
(Podsakoff et al., 2000). The search for a host of reliable predictors of OCB has been increasing during the last two decades, during this time span the researchers tried to figure out various enabling factors of OCB, with varying degrees of predictive merit which is personality (Organ, 1990), procedural justice (Moorman, 1991), leader characteristics (Deluga, 1995), motivational theories (Kemery, Bedeian, & Zacur, 1996), and interview style (Skarlicki & Latham, 1995).

Job satisfaction has been the best predictor for antecedent of OCB since it was first research conducted (Smith, et al, 1983 & Bateman and Organ, 1983). Even after two decades of research, job satisfaction is still the leading predictor of OCB (Organ, 1997). Descriptively, job satisfaction is in and of itself a challenging outcomes sought by organizational manager. This resulting implication is restricted to suffice that OCB is likely when worker are satisfied. Job satisfaction has positive relationship with job performance and OCB and has significant influence on employees' absenteeism, turnover, and psychological distress (Davis, 1992). Workers with high levels of job satisfaction are more likely to engage in OCB (Brown, 1993). Along with job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment is frequently cited antecedents of OCB. Affective 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).

Role perception includes perceptions such as role conflict and role ambiguity, both of which have been found to be significantly negatively related to OCB. Oppositely, role clarity and role facilitation are positively related (Podsakoff et al., 2000). However, since both role ambiguity and role conflict are known to affect employee satisfaction, and satisfaction is related to OCB, it is likely that at least a portion of the relationship between ambiguity, conflict and OCB is mediated by satisfaction.

Leadership appears to have a strong influence on an employee's willingness to engage in OCB. However, rather than being associated with a particular leadership style, research finds that it is the quality of an employee's relationship with his or her leader that counts (Podsakoff et al., 2000). The quality of the relationship between a subordinate and a leader is often called leader member exchange (LMX). Another leadership variable positively related to OCB is the leaders' contingent rewards
behaviors, such as expressing satisfaction or appreciation for good performance (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Leadership behaviors may also influence OCB indirectly via employee perceptions of fairness or justice in the workplace.

Fairness or justice perceptions refer to whether or not employees feel organizational decisions are made equitably and with the necessary employee input (usually called *procedural justice*) and whether or not employees perceive that they are fairly rewarded given their level of training, tenure, responsibility or workload (called *distributive justice*). Result of various researches over perceptions of fairness is positively related to OCB (Moorman, 1991).

Personality variables including positive or negative affectivity, conscientiousness and agreeableness have all been found to predispose people to orientations that make them more likely to engage in OCB (Organ & Ryan, 1995). OCB does not seem to depend on personality traits such as extraversion, introversion, or openness to change. The fact that OCB is conceptualized as a set of behaviors primarily influenced by perceptions of the workplace (rather than by enduring personal traits) might be why measures of personality have not been widely applied in studies of OCB. Nonetheless, personality may be an important measure in order to control for its influence on behavior or to investigate any moderating effects it may have.

Individual's motives may relate to his or her organizational citizenship behaviors (Organ, 1990). This interest has renewed and it is proposed to five sources of motivation measured which is intrinsic process, instrumental, self-concept-external, self-concept-internal, and goal internalization. (Leonard, Beauvais & School, 1999). However, as individual progress upward in an organization, motivational theories tend to be less applicable as antecedent (Barbuto, Wilhite & Wheeter, 2001).

The proposition that younger and older worker may view work and self in fundamentally different ways is not new. Younger employees coordinate their needs with organizational needs more flexibly; by contrast, older employees tend to be more rigid in adjusting their needs with the organization (Wagner & Rush, 2000). Therefore, younger and older workers may differ in their orientations toward self, others, and
work. These differences may lead to different salient motives for OCB among younger and older employees.

2.4 Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses

McClelland (1961) argued that OCB can be best understood when OCB is viewed as motive based behaviours which all people have some degree of achievements, affiliation, and power motives. The achievement motive pushes people to perform in terms of a standard of excellence, seeking the accomplishment of a task, challenge, or competition. The affiliation motive pushes people toward establishing, maintaining, and restoring relationships with others. The power motive pushes people toward status and situations in which they can control the work or actions of others. Organ and his colleagues (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983) describe OCB as having two basic dimensions which is altruism and generalized compliance.

Katz (1964) identified the OCB dimension from three sources. One of the sources is the taxonomy offered, presumably on a priori grounds, in the original articles by Kartz (1964). The taxonomy is cooperative activities with fellow members, actions protective of the system or subsystem, creative ideas for improvement, self training for increased individual responsibility, and gestures that nurture a benign view of the organization by its external stakeholders and constituents. A second source (Smith et al 1983) comprise interviews with lower-level managers, who were asked to describe actions that they like their subordinated to perform but that they could not require, and for which they could not promise any specific, definite reward (other that gratitude). Initial versions of OCB measures based on those interviews yielded two major factors: altruism, and compliance. Organ (1988) suggests that additional distinguishable dimension of OCB might include courtesy, sportsmanship and civic virtue. The third source on the nature and makeup of OCB follows from classic Greek philosophy on the concept of citizenship, as in Graham (1991) and Van Dyne et al. (1994). This perspective suggests “loyalty” and “boosterism” as significant forms of OCB, but also argues for the importance of principled dissent from organization practices and challenges to the status quo.
OCB has tended to be conceptualized in term of positive contributions to the colleagues and to the organization, which implies an active positive contribution after it been introduced into organizational research by Organ (1988). There are two type of citizenship behaviours exist in the OCB measure: (1) active positive contributions or commissions (e.g., helping others) and (2) avoiding engaging in behaviours that are harmful to others or to one’s organization (e.g., not abusing others’ rights). This latter behaviour that is based on the moral rule “Do no Harm” or more specifically “Do no harm through action” (Baron 1998). Organ and his colleagues (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983) describes OCB as having two basic dimensions which altruism and generalized compliance. Organ (1988) highlights five specific categories of discretionary behaviour i.e. Altruism, Conscientiousness, Sportmanship, Courtesy and Civic Virtue. Figure 1 illustrated the eight dimension of OCB as enumerated by Organ (1988), Van Scotter & Motowidlo, (1996), (Graham, 1989, 1991), Van Dyne et al. (1994), (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997), and George and Brief (1992).

Figure 2.1: Dimensions of OCB
2.4.1 Altruism

Altruism is helping behaviour directed at specific individuals. When individuals have specific problems, need assistance, or seek help, altruistic people go the extra mile in assisting them. Altruism as defined by Smith, Organ and Near (1983) captures behaviour that is directly and intentionally aimed at helping a specific person face-to-face situation, this behaviour has been identified as an important form of citizenship behaviour by virtually everyone who has worked in this area (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997; George & Jones, 1997; Graham, 1989; Organ, 1988, 1990a, 1990b; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Conceptually, altruism involves voluntarily helping others with, or preventing the occurrence of, work-related problems. Definition and concept of altruism is the same as peacemaking and cheerleading dimension (Organ, 1988, 1990b); Graham’s interpersonal helping (Graham, 1989); Williams and Anderson’s OCB-I (Williams & Anderson, 1991); Van Scotter and Motowidlo’s interpersonal facilitation (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1983); and helping others construct from George and Brief (1992) and George and Jones (1997).

Hypothesis 1: Altruism is an important form of OCB.

2.4.2 Sportsmanship

Sportsmanship is a form of citizenship behaviour that has received much less attention in the literature. Organ (1990b) has defined sportsmanship as “a willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining.” However, his definition seems somewhat narrower than the label of this construct would imply. For example, in our opinion “good sports” are people who not only do not complain when they are inconvenienced by others, but also maintain a positive attitude even when things do not go their way, are not offended when others do not follow their suggestions, are willing to sacrifice their personal interest for the good of the work group, and do not take the rejection of their ideas personally. Empirical research (Mackenzie et al., 1993; 1999) that has included this construct in the context of other forms of citizenship behaviour has shown it to be distinct from them, and to have somewhat different antecedents (Podsakoff et al., 1996b; Podsakoff et al., 1990)