THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Organisational Citizenship Behaviour: Its Significance and the Emerging Trends

Samuel Njoroge Kihara
Masters Student, Karatina University, School of Business, Nyeri, Kenya Murang'a, Kenya
David M. Gichuhi
Senior Lecturer, Karatina University, School of Business, Nyeri, Kenya

Abstract:
Organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) refers to anything that employees choose to do, spontaneously and of their own accord, which often lies outside of their specified contractual obligations. Main dimensions of OCB include altruism, courtesy, civic virtue, conscientiousness and sportsmanship.Benefits of OCB includes enhancing organization's performance, competitiveness, effectiveness, promotes growth, organization's continuity, insulates against redundancy, maximizes efficiency and productivity, pay increments, promotions and promotes best practices in the organization. Modern trends in OCB include; increased academic research, one of ingredients of organizational effectiveness and a good corporate behavior.It propels organization's efficiency and productivity as well as motivating employees. In conclusion OCB has been observed that it has positive effects on organizational performance, competitiveness and continuity. The study recommends that employee` should be given knowledge on importance of OCB and modern managers should be proactive and strategic on how to motivate and reward employees to exhibit OCB.

Keywords: Organization citizenship behaviour, organizational performance, New Trends in OCB

1. Introduction

1.1. The Background of the Term Organizational Citizenship Behavior
The idea concerning organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) can be traced back in 1938 from the work of Chester Bernard. It was revisited in mid-sixties by Kartz (1964) but much focus on the term OCB was given in late eighties when various authors started paying closer attention on the term. One of prominent authors to do this was Organ who in 1988 combined various words to come up with the term organizational citizenship behavior (Tanaka, 2013). He subsequently with his colleagues examined the vast amount of work that had been done on OCB in recent years and defined the term as anindividual behavior that discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ,Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 2006). Since then the term has evolved through researches and literature review and many concepts and meaning have been attached to the term.

1.2. Defining the Concept: Organizational Citizenship Behavior
Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has garnered much academic attention since its conception. It is perceived to be something intangible; OCB is not always formally recognized or rewarded, and concepts like 'helpfulness' or 'friendliness' are also difficult to quantify (Zhang, 2011).OCB refers to anything that employees choose to do, spontaneously and of their own accord, which often lies outside of their specified contractual obligations (Khurana, Singh & Khandelwal, 2014).
The original concept of OCB was defined by Organ (1988) as an individual behavior which is randomly at will or discretionary, indirectly or not recognized by the official proper reward system that helps or effectively increase the performance of the organization. An individual's behavior is discretionary, meaning he may choose to do it or not. OCB is a willingness of an employee to work beyond their job scope which will indirectly increase the organization performance. They indicated that Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as a set of discretionary workplace behaviors that exceed one's basic job requirements. They are often described as behaviors that go beyond the call of duty. Organ (1997) as cited in Romle, Talib and Shahuri (2016) asserts that Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is thework behavior that has positive impacts towards the performance of the organization. OCB can easily be understood as various forms of cooperation and helpfulness to others that support the organizational social andpsychological context. According to Zhang (2011) OCB can be seen as performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place.

2. Theoretical Approach to OCB
Various authors have come up with different theoretical approaches to OCB.

2.1. Social Exchange Theory
Social exchange theory is one of theoretical explanation for OCB.The concept of organizational citizenship Behavior draws its origin from the Social Exchange Theory that describes the conditions under which people feel obligated to reciprocate when they feel that they have benefited from some other persons or some entity's action.According to Newland (2012) social exchange theory specifies that an employee engages in OCB because the organization has given them a good job and treats themfairly. These individuals feel obligated to give back to the organization that has given them so much.

The extent that employees engage in behaviors with the intention of helping other individuals, the theory of social exchange as indicated by Blau (1964) and cited by Harper(2015) may come to bear. This theory posits that "giving and receiving material or intangible resources is at least partially predicatedon the expectation of return". Therefore, the target of the beneficial act may feel an obligation to repay in some way. If a person takes extra steps to help another individual, that other individuals may take extra steps to reciprocate (Uehara, 1990). Thus, employees who exhibit higher levelsof OCB directed toward the organization should receive higher performance evaluations by supervisors than those who exhibit OCB directed toward other individuals, and employees who exhibit higher levels of OCB directed toward other individuals should receive higher performance evaluations by peers than those who exhibit OCB directed toward the organization (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, Blume, 2009)

Homans, the initiator of the social exchange theory, expressed that this theory was developed to understand the social behavior of humans in economic undertakings. Social exchange theory proponents hold that all human relationships are formed by the use of a subjective cost-benefit analysis and the comparison of alternatives. For example, when a person perceives the costs of a relationship as outweighing the perceived benefits, then the theory predicts that the person will choose to leave the relationship (Gabriel, 2015).

2.2. Group Engagement Model
Proponents of the model posits that employees with strong social identities with their organizations become intrinsically motivated to facilitate the success of such organizations (Blader & Tyler, 2009), and one way of ensuring the success of the organization is to engage in extra-role behavior on behalf of the organization.

According to Ashforth and Mael (1989) as cited in the works of Khaola and Sebotsa (2015) employees help the organization because they integrate their self-concept with the organization, and hence consider the success of the organization as their success; in other words, to them meeting the goals of the organization is tantamount to meeting their own goals.

2.3. Social Identification Approach
The social identification approach points to purpose-driven discretionary behaviors rather than exchange-based relationships as "any organizational benefit may simply be the unintended consequence of behaviors intended to help people" (McNeely & Meglino, 1994). The social identity approach goes beyond the attribution of individual properties to outcomes and rather to an understanding of the dynamics of contexts and their effects on individuals (Ellemers et al., 2004). In this light, when Chen and Carey (2009) state that OCB is a complex social phenomenon [which] arises in part from one's interdependence, a sensitivity to one's relationships with others and a concern with in-group membership, and cooperation to achieve social goals, a process of social identification echoes behind such behaviors. Such behaviors suggest that the reason individuals are willing to circumscribe their personal will to, and to make pronounced extra-role efforts is due to the desire to belong and remain a member of a valued in-group (Ras, 2012; Seyle and Swann, 2007). Shamir and Lapidot (2003) argue that teams have greater legitimacy than individuals to represent collective values and identities suggesting that the goal of such behaviors then may both be an expression of identification reflecting the salience of in-group identity as well as the fulfillment of in-group behavioral expectations.

3. Dimensions of OCB
Organizational citizenship behavior is a multidimensional construct and as such different scholars have come up with different OCB dimensions. For example, several researchers (Graham, 1986; Morrison, 1994; Smith, Organ and Near, 1983, Organ, 1988) as cited by Gabriel (2015) posit that there are five dimensions: Altruism, Conscientiousness, Civic virtue, Courtesy and Sportsmanship; whereas Podsakoff et al., (2007) developed seven dimensions: (1) Helping behavior, (2) Sportsmanship, (3) Organizational Loyalty, (4) Organizational compliance, (5) Individual initiative, (6) Civic Virtue, and (7) Self-Development. Williams and Anderson, (1991) simply divided organizational citizenship Behaviorsinto OCB-I-behaviors directed at individual members of the organizationand OCB-O-behaviors directed at the organization

3.1. Altruism (Helping Behavior)
Altruism means being helpful. According to Jahangir,Akbar and Haq (2004) altruism is helping behavior directed at specificindividuals. When individuals have specificproblems, need assistance, or seek help, altruistic people go the extra mile in assisting them. Dekas et al (2013) say that this is voluntarily helping colleagues with work-related problems or issues or working to prevent incidents resulting in work-related problems. Khurana, Singh and Khandelwal (2014) in a study done on Axis bank employees established that altruism is selflessness of an employee towards the organization.Employees of Axis bank who fell in the range of 26 to 36 years showed more altruistic behavior and were ready to help others when required than other employees.

Altruism triggers positive behaviors among employees, as recipients of these behaviors usually feel obligated to reciprocate the good deeds, thereby perpetuating the cycle of goodwill to the advantage of the organization. For instance, Organ, Podsakoff and Mackenzie (2006) opined that the compilation of employees helping behaviors will eventually be advantageous for the organization. Also, Batson, Van Lange, Ahmad and Lishner (2007) suggested that altruism results in increased collaboration and a deeper sense of "we-ness" or collectivism, a condition necessary for the optimal functioning of the organization. To further corroborate this claim, Farzianpour, Foroushani, Kamjoo and Hosseini (2011) asserted that organizational services will reach the highest quality when corporate employees consider each other as the customers of the organization and help each other in the organizational tasks with great interest and willingness.

3.2. Courtesy
The dimension of courtesy represents behaviors that show consideration and respect for others. It emphasizes mutual respect and avoidance of inconvenience to others that may result from one's actions or inactions. This dimension of OCB fosters harmonious and peaceful working relationships and improved productivity among co-workers. This is because courteous employees simplify work processes for others by removing and not constituting stumbling blocks in the work processes. Among other things, they also warn co-workers of potential problems on the job (Olowookere, 2014).
Courtesy refers to the gestures that help others to prevent interpersonal problems from occurring, such as giving prior notice of the work schedule to someone who is in need, consulting others before taking any actions thatwould affect them (Organ,1990). Courtesy or gestures are demonstrated in the interest of preventing creations of problems for co-workers (Organ, 1997). Courtesy includes behaviors which focus on the deterrence of problems and taking the necessary and timely steps in order to lessen the effects of the problem in the future. In simple words, courtesy means the encouragement given by a member to other member/s of the organization when they are demoralized and feel discouraged about their professional development.

3.3. Conscientiousness
Doing more than just the minimum; attention to detail (prevent orminimize error). According to Khurana, Singh and Khandelwal (2014) conscientiousness is a personality dimension that can be defined as the magnitude of adherence to the rules and norms of an organizational setting. Conscientiousness helps in making the environment of the organization better and calm.Conscientiousness means the thorough adherence to organizational rules and procedures even when no one is watching. According to Neihoff & Yen (2004), more conscientious employees will stay informed with up-to-date knowledge about products or services offered.

3.4. Civic Virtue
Showing interest and involvement (e.g. keeping up to date) with the organization; defend organizational policies and practices. This is taking actions that indicate macro-level interest in the organization as a whole. These actions reflect a person recognizing that he is part of a larger whole and accepting the responsibilities that such membership brings with (Dekas et al, 2013).
The dimension of civic virtue is characterized by employees' concern and keen interest in the affairs of the organization. This involves behaviors that promote the interest of the organization and portray the employees as its ambassadors. Such behaviors include voluntarily attending organizational functions, defending and promoting the image of the organization and others (Olowookere, 2014)

3.5. Sportsmanship
Tolerating less-than-ideal conditions; accepting ofchanges and performsrequests without complaints (Zhang, 2011). These dimensions were considered to be the main characteristics to determine an employee's citizenship and commitment toward his organization (Romle, Talib& Shahuri, 2016). According to Olowookere (2014) Sportsmanship is the dimension that emphasizes employee positive attitude and tolerance for the inevitable inconveniences associated with work without complaining. For instance, some employees have to do some sacrifices such as working overtime or skipping their free time to do a certain assignment in a situation where they are constrained of resources or lack support.
According toPodsakoff, Ahearne&MacKenzie (1997) sportsmanship is also expected to be positively related to work group performance. The more willing employees are to be "good sports" and go along with necessary changes in their work environment, the less time and energy a manager wastes in getting their cooperation. Thus, sportsmanship allows managers to devote a greater proportion of their time to productive activities like planning, scheduling, problem solving, and organizational analysis. In addition, a lack of sportsmanship is likely to have detrimental effects on group cohesiveness and make the atmosphere in the workplace less attractive to co- workers. This might be expected to reduce the organization's or work group's ability to attract or retain the most productive workers

3.6. Self-Development
Self-development includes voluntary behavior employees engage in to improve their knowledge, skills and abilities (Gabriel, 2015). Self-development "encompasses the discretionary measures people take to broaden their work-relevant skills and knowledge, including voluntary enrollment in company-sponsored training courses as well as informal study" (Organ et al., 2006). Many scholars have omitted this dimension of OCB as it is regarded as more complicated and difficult dimension than the other dimensions
Self-development is effective in improving employees' task performance and organizational effectiveness, and, the rewards of these benefits are not often connected to those employees. A significantly more complicated aspect of self-development is that it is not always used to improve employees' job skills in their current organization (Gabriel, 2015; Organ et al, 2006)

3.7. Organizational Loyalty

It implies employee's faithfulness and belongingness towards the organization. This makes employees work beyond expectations (Srivastava & Gope, 2016). It consists of loyal boosterism and organizational loyalty(Graham, 1989, 1991), spreading goodwill and protecting the organizationand the endorsing, supporting, and defending organizational objectives construct (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997). Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach, (2000) opined that organizational loyalty entails:

- ➢ Promoting the organization to outsiders
- ➢ Protecting and defending it against external threats, and
- ➢ Remaining committed to it even under adverse conditions

3.8. Organizational Compliance

This dimension has been called generalizedcompliance by Smith et al. (1983); organizational obedience by Graham (1991); OCB-O by Williams and Anderson (1991); and following organizational rules and procedures by Borman and Motowidlo (1993); and contains some aspects of Van Scotter and Motowidlo's job dedication construct (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996). This dimension appears to capture a person's internalization and acceptance of the organization's rules, regulations, and procedures, which results in a scrupulous adherence to them, even when no one observes or monitors compliance. The reason that this behavior is regarded as a form of citizenshipbehavior is that even though everyone is expected to obey company regulations,rules, and procedures at all times, many employees simply do not. Therefore, an employee who religiously obeys all rules and regulations, even when no one is watching, is regarded as an especially "good citizen."

3.9. Individual Initiative

This form of OCB is extra-role only in the sense that it involves engaging in task-related behaviors at a level that is so far beyond minimally required or generally expected levels that it takes on a voluntary flavor. Such behaviors include voluntary acts of creativity and innovation designed to improve one's task or the organization's performance, persisting with extra enthusiasm and effort to accomplish one's job, volunteering to take on extra responsibilities, and encouraging others in the organization to do the same. All of these behaviors share the idea that the employee is going "above and beyond" the call of duty. This dimension is similar to Organ's conscientiousness construct (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000)

4. Importance of Organizational Citizenship Behavior to the Organization

4.1. Organizational Performance

From the past researches, it was proven thatOrganizational Citizenship Behavior and its dimensions have a direct relationship withindividual and organizational performance.In the words of Olowookere (2014) organizational citizenship behaviors have been implicated in organizational performance. These positive behaviors and attitudes have great consequences for organizations and then their individual employees. Organizational Citizenship Behavior represents the characters of a committed and loyal employee towards his employer.Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997) argued that OCB helps new employees become productive more quickly, and helps to spread 'best practices' in organizations, thus enhancing the performance of those who learn these best practices. Moving to higher levels of analysis, research has demonstrated relationships between OCB and unit performance in terms of customer service quality and sales performance, as well as performance quality and quantity (Gabriel, 2015).

Organizational citizenship behaviors are usually performed by employees to support the interests of the organization even though they may not directly lead to employee benefits (Barroso, Armario & Ruiz, 2004). Employees exhibit OCBs in various situations. Employees exhibit OCBs when;

- • They help fellow workers who have difficulty in performing their work.
- • Endurance and perseverance in performing jobs; avoiding things that tarnish the image of the organization;
- • Pending extra time to achieve objectives;
- • Performing job beyond requirements; and
- • Showof extra concern about success of the organizations (Ranjbar, Zamani & Amiri, 2014).

OCB has potential to enhance organizational performance through lubricating the social machinery of the organization, reducing friction, and increasing efficiency (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff & Blume, 2009).Organizational citizenship behavior may also contribute to organizational success by enhancing co-worker and managerial productivity, promoting better use of scarce resources, improving coordination, strengthening the organization's ability to attract and retain better employees, reducing variability of performance, and enabling better adaptation to environmental changes (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009).William and Anderson (1991) intheir empirical study suggested that OCB can be categorized into two, which are Organizational Citizenship Behavior-Organization (OCB-O) and Organizational Citizenship Behavior-Individual (OCB-I).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior-Organization (OCB-O) behavioris said to be benefitting the organization as a whole, whereas, Organizational Citizenship Behavior-Individual (OCB-I) behavior is said to directlybenefitting certain individuals and indirectly contributing to the organization as well. OCB-O includes the dimensions of sportsmanship and civic virtues, which directly linked with overall organizational performance, whereas, OCB-I covers the dimensions of altruism,conscientiousness and courtesy, which are directly linked with individual's jobsatisfaction and performance (Romle, Talib & Shahuri, 2016).

Organ elaborated that organizational citizenship behavior can maximize the efficiency and productivity of both the employee and the organization that ultimately contribute to the effective functioning of an organization (Jahangir,Akbar & Haq, 2004). OCB has been

shown to have a positive impact on employee performanceand wellbeingand this in turn has noticeable flow-on effects on the organization (Zhang, 2011).

The effects on employee performance are threefold.Workers who engage in OCB tend to receive better performance ratings by their managers (Podsakoff et al., 2009). This could be because employees who engage in OCB are simply liked more and perceived more favorably (this has become known as the 'halo effect'), or it may be due to more work-related reasons such as the manager's belief that OCB plays a significant role in the organization's overall success, or perception of OCB as a form of employee commitment due to its voluntary nature (Organ et al., 2006). A better performance rating is linked to gaining rewards(Podsakoff et al., 2009) – such as pay increments, bonuses, promotions or work-related benefits. When the company is downsizing e.g. during an economic recession, these employees will have a lower chance of being made redundant (Organ et al, 2006)

According to Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bacharach (2000), organizational citizenship behaviors improve organizational effectiveness by: increasing co-worker or managerial productivity; releasing resources so that they can be used for more productive purposes; coordinating activities within and across work groups; reducing the need to devote scarce resources to purely maintenance functions; strengthening the organizations' ability to attract and retain the best employees; increasing the stability of the organization's performance; and enabling the organization to adapt more effectively to environmental changes.

4.2. Organizational Competitiveness and Effectiveness

According to Allameh and Alinajimi (2012) Organizational citizenship behavior plays a role in increasing the effectiveness and durability of the organization. Organ (1988) elaborated that organizationalcitizenship behavior can maximize the efficiencyand productivity of both the employee and theorganization that ultimately contribute to theeffective functioning of an organization. It is thecontention of Bergun (2005) that OCB maximizesthe efficiency and productivity of bothsubordinates and the organization. At subordinatelevel, Podsakoff et al. (1997) explain that OCBhelps new employees become productive fasterand helps to spread 'best practices' inorganizations.

At organizationallevel,organizational research has shown that OCB issignificantly related to customer service qualityand sales performance as well as performancequality and quantity. Though, the consequences ofOCB are not limited to the organizationperformance. The organizational outcomes of OCBextend to customer satisfaction, employeeturnover, organization performance andorganization effectiveness (Podsakoff et al., 2000), service quality (Bienstock etal., 2003), worker wellbeing (Hodson 2001),absenteeism and withdrawal behavior (Khalid & Ali, 2005).

4.3. The Organizational Growth and Organizational Continuity

Organ (1988) as cited by Srivastava and Gope (2016) argued that OCB isheld to be vital to the survival of an organization. In order to have acutting edge, organizations should haveemployees who are ready to help their peers withwork, work beyond duties mentioned in jobdescriptions, orient new employees, do not waste their time at work, speak positively about theorganization to the outsiders, comply withorganizational rules and regulations even though,nobody is watching them. These employees willbe engaged in organizational citizenshipbehavior (OCB) and are willing to standthrough the thick and thin of the organizations (Srivastava&Gape, 2016).

Organizations could not survive or prosper without their members behaving as good citizens by engaging in all sorts of positive behaviors (Jahangir,Akbar &Has, 2004).According toChelagat, Chepkwony and Kemboi (2015)Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is an important factor that can contribute to the survivalof an organization. In their study oneffects of OCB and employee performance in banking sector, Nairobi County, Kenya, they established that Altruism which is one of the dimensions of OCB enables employees to go beyond the job requirements resulting to accomplishment of difficult task. Also, through altruism, employees are able to share their knowledge and expertise with other employees as well as support those with problems at work. These are ingredients of organization's continuity.

5. The New Trends in OCB

5.1. Trends in Academic Research

One of the emerging trends is that OCB has continued to be viewed with importance as a research topic in realms of organizational psychology and organizational behavior. In a search conducted using academic database by ProQuest of academic papers with a phrase on OCB between 1983 to January 2013, it was established that that there was a positive upward increase from about 2 annually to about 100 annually; a total of 588 journal were analyzed (Tanaka, 2013). In recent years, organizational citizenship behavior has become of great interest to organizations; accordingly, it has been found out that many Industrial/Organizational psychologists have researched on OCB. The research on OCB has increased dramatically over the years (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000).

In fact, current analyses revealed that 66% of the research on OCB related topics hasoccurred since the year 2000 (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). It isexpected that this trend of increased research on OCB will continue.

5.2. Trend in Organizational Effectiveness

There have been many studies offering a wide range of dimensions to understand OCB, however, we see a trend of agreement on the matter that OCBs help improve organizational effectiveness (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2009) and enhance favorable psychological climate for employees and organizations (Mena, 2015). OCB is presumed as one of the emerging management concepts

that are being emphasized for the organizational effectiveness (Ahmed, Rasheed & Jehanzeb, 2012). OCB is important for organizations as Research has demonstrated OCB to be strongly correlated with indicators of employee effectiveness andorganizational success (Yen & Niehoff, 2004; Newland, 2012).As OCB has such a profound impact on individual and organizational functioning, organizations are interested inpredicting OCB, stimulating OCB and rewarding OCB (Newland, 2012).

5.3. OCB and Spirituality
OCB is considered as a good practice and there is growing trend by many organization to term it as one of the good corporate behavior(Ahmadi, Nami & Barvarz, 2014). OCB is a learned behavior and most of the times does not pay attention to the material aspect of voluntary behavior. Spirituality has been effective in development and promotion of such practices. OCB has recently been affected by a powerfulforce that, if properly managed, supported and guided, it leads to the deepest capacity for collaboration, notonly in professional fields, but it has to be a perfect human incidence (Ahmadi, Nami & Barvarz, 2014).

5.4. Service Industry
Inservice industry like banks and where clients'loyalty is most important, OCB has become extremelynecessaryfor service delivery.OCB can assistorganizations to developperformance and increasecompetitive periphery as it encouragesemployees to perform beyond the formal job requirement. Organizational citizenship behavior can assistthe organizationto be successful in current environment and accelerate noveltyand creativeapproachesfor organizations**.** Most of the organizations arerequiring from their employees to work for longer hours (Bond, Galinsky &Swanberg, 1997; Reich, 2001)

5.5. Motivating Employees
Many organizations are trying to motivate their employees so that they can display OCB to enhance organization's productivity and effectiveness. Zhang (2011) comes up with the following three new ways;

5.5.1. Office Social Environment
Modern organizations are creating a working environment that promotes or is conducive to employees demonstrating OCB. Certain types of group norms such as everyone should only do the minimum amount of work required; everyone should mind his/her own business; no one should talk to the supervisor- can stifle worker initiative and spontaneity, and this will decrease incidents of OCB. Group norms may be difficult to break but organizations have devised ways to make workers more social – such as encouraging staff to attend office functions or having more office functions, or office-wide birthday lunches. In some organizations managers are taking the necessary steps to stimulate their employees' interest to engage in OCB such as by getting them involved in the organizational activities and functions (Khalid&Alias, 2006).

5.5.2. Supervisor Awareness
Some organizations are Training or educating management about OCB to make them more aware of employee displays of OCB. They may choose to include OCB in their performance appraisalsor devise their own casual/informal reward system to encourage OCB. As such Employees with lower level ofOCBshould be trained to make them understand the relevance of OCB for themselves, co-workers, superiors and organization. Managers may also identify employees with high or low level of OCB as a way of predicting the likelihood of their employees' levels of turnover intention and absenteeism (Khalid&Alias, 2006).

5.5.3. Hiring Practices
Though the impact of personality on OCB is small, an outgoing, attentive, enthusiastic employee with a positive outlook and 'can do' attitude will be more inclined to engage in OCB. As such many organizations are using psychometric testing as a part of their interview/hiring process, in an attempt to look out for traits related to OCB, and have these staff in future motivate others to perform OCB (Zhang, 2011)

6. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations
Though OCB is term that can be traced to late 1930s it has been observed that it is a term that is gaining much attention especially from organizational behavior theorist. Different scholars have come up with different dimensions and definitions of the term OCB. However, majority of these scholars concur that OCB is a set of discretionary workplace behaviors that exceed one's basic job requirements or call of duty. These behaviors have been known to increase both the individual employee and organizational performance. Have also boost organizational competitiveness and effectiveness in the market as well as promoting growth and continuity of the organization. As a result, modern performance based organizational managers are exploring new trends in the concept of OCB to improve the organization performance and to make organization effective in both the local and global market. An organization with employees exhibiting OCB characteristic is therefore expected to have an edge over others in the market in term its productivity, general performance and meeting customers' needs

In conclusion, it can be said that OCB has a lot of significance in an organization as it has positive influence on organizational performance, competitiveness and continuity. However, for this to happen managers need to conform to the new trends in the market in regard to OCB. The study recommendsthatthere is need to equip modern knowledge worker with information on importance of OCB on promoting organizational performance and effectiveness and ensuring an organization is competitive. There is need for more research on how OCB can enhance employee's productivity and relevance to avoid a situation where employees are laid off due to

redundancy. Organizations should sensitize and encouragethe employees through motivation and reward system to practice OCB as strategy to make them have an edge over other employees and a step toward being managers and captains of their industry.

7. References

i. Ahmadi, S., Nami, Y., & Barvarz, R. (2014). The Relationship between spirituality in the workplace and organizational citizenship behavior. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 114, 262-264.

ii. Ahmed, N., Rasheed, A., & Jehanzeb, K. (2012). An exploration of predictors of organizational citizenship behavior and its significant link to employee engagement. International Journal of business, humanities and technology, 2(4), 99-106.

iii. Allameh, S. M., & Alinajimi, S. (2012). The Effect of Self-concept and Organizational Identity on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (A Case Study in Social Security Organization of Isfahan city). International Journal of Human Resource Studies, 2(1), 175.

iv. Bambale, A. J. (2011). Understanding Significant Relationships between Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Marketing Function. Faculty of Commerce and Management Studies.

v. Barroso, C., Armario, E.M. & Ruiz, D.M. (2004). The influence of employee citizenship behaviour on customer loyalty, international Journal of service industry management, vol 15(1), 27-54

vi. Batson, C. D., Van Lange, P. A., Ahmad, N., & Lishner, D. A. (2007). Altruism and helping behavior. The SAGE Handbook of Social Psychology: Concise Student Edition, 241.

vii. Bergun, N. (2005). The Relationship between Social Power and Organisational Citizenship. Behaviour: The Mediation Role of Procedural Justice, Organisational Commitment and Job Satisfaction in a context of private commercial bank in Bangladesh. Journal of Psychology, 72, 456-584.

viii. Bienstock, C. C., DeMoranville, C. W., & Smith, R. K. (2003). Organizational citizenship behavior and service quality. Journal of services marketing, 17(4), 357-378.

ix. Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elementsof contextual performance. In N. Schmitt, W. C. Borman, & Associates (Eds.), Personnel selection in organizations:71–98. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

x. Bladder, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2009). Testing and extending the group engagement model: linkages between social identity, procedural just, economic outcomes, and extra role behaviour. Journal of Applied Psychology, 94 (2), 445-464.

xi. Bond, J. T., Galinsky, E. &Swanberg, J. E. (1997). The 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce. New York: Families and Work Institute.

xii. Borman, W. C., &Motowidlo, S. J. 1997. Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. Human Performance, 10: 99–109.

xiii. Chelagat, L. J., Chepkwony, P. K., & Kemboi, A. (2015). Effect of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Employee Performance in Banking Sector, Nairobi County, Kenya. International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology, 5(4).

xiv. Chen, X. S., & Carey, T. P. (2009). Assessing citizenship behavior in educational contexts: The role of personality, motivation, and culture. Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 27(2) 125-137

xv. Dekas, K.H., Bauer, T.N., Welle, B., Kurkoski, J. & Sullivian, S. (2013). Organisational citizenship behavior; Version 2.0: a review and qualitative investigation of OCBs for knowledge workers at Google and beyond. The Academy management perspectives, 27 (3), 219-237

xvi. Ellemers, N., de Gilder, D., & Haslam, S. A. (2004). Motivating individuals and groups work; A social identity perspective on leadership and group performance. Academy of Management Review, 29(3) 459-478

xvii. Farzianpour, F.,Foroushani, A.R., Kamjoo, H. & Hosseni, S.S. (2011). Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) among managers of Teaching Hospitals. American journal of Economics and Business Administration, Volume 3, issue 3, 534-542

xviii. Gabriel, J. M. O. (2015). Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) and Corporate Resilience in the Domestic Aviation Sector in Nigeria(Doctoral dissertation, RIVERS STATE UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY).

xix. Graham, J. W. (1986). Organisational citizenship informed by political theory: Conceptual analysis of mood. Annual meeting of the academy management, Chicago.

xx. Graham, J. W. (1989). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, operationalization, and validation.Unpublished working paper, Loyola University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.

xxi. Graham, J. W. 1991. An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 4: 249–270

xxii. Harper, P. J. (2015). Exploring forms of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB): antecedents and outcomes. Journal of Management and Marketing Research, 18, 1.

xxiii. Hodson, R. (2001). Dignity at work. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

xxiv. Jahangir, N., Akbar, M. M., & Haq, M. (2004). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents. BRAC University Journal, 75-85.

xxv. Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. Systems Research and Behavioral Science, 9(2), 131-146.

xxvi. Khalid, S. A., & Alias, H. (2006). The importance of organizational citizenship behaviour among hotel employees. Journal Intelek, 4(1), 43-56.

xxvii.   Khaola, P. P., & Sebotsa, T. (2015). Person-organisation fit, Organisational commitment and organisational citizenship Behaviour, Danish Journal of management and Business sciences, July 2015, 67-74.   Khan, S.K., Feng, C.H., Zhen, C.W, Leong, L.H., Yee, T.Y & Zhi, Y.W. (2015). The Factors affecting Organization Citizenship Behavior: A Study in the Fitness Industry, International Journal of Recent Advances in Organizational Behaviour and Decision Sciences (IJRAO2B) An Online International Research Journal (ISSN: 2311-3197) 2015 Vol: 1 Issue 2 p 374.

xxviii.   Khurana, R., Singh, V. K., & Khandelwal, S. (2014). Key Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior: A study of Axis bank. The International Journal of Business &Management, 2(5), 256.

xxix.   McNeely, B. L., & Meglino, B. M. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial organizational behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79(6), 836-844.

xxx.   Mena, L. (2015). Organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior: Trends and relationship, the Intercontinental   journal of Human Resource Research Review, 3(9), 22.

xxxi.   Morrison, E.W. (1994).Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: the importance of the employees' perspective, Academy of Management Journal, 37,1543-67.

xxxii.   Newland, S. J. (2012). Organizational Citizenship Behavior-Individual or Organizational Citizenship Behavior-Organization: Does the Underlying Motive Matter? MastersTheses &Specialist Projects Paper 1159

xxxiii. Olowookere, E. I. (2014). Organisational Citizenship Behaviours (OCB): A Key to Industrial Development in Nigeria. Organizational   Citizenship Behaviours (OCB): A Key to Industrial Development in Nigeria, 1-13.

xxxiv.   Organ, D.W., Podsakoff, P.M &Mackenzie, S. B (2006). Organizational citizenship behaviour: Its nature, antecedents and consequences. Thousand oaks, CL: sage publications.

xxxv.   Organ, D. W. (1988).Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books

xxxvi.   Organ, D.W (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. Research in organizational behavior, 12(1), 43-72

xxxvii. Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. Human performance, 10(2), 85-97.

xxxviii. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D.G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviours: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. Journal of Management, 26, 513-563.

xxxix.   Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance.Journal of Applied psychology1997, Vol. 82, No. 2, 262-270

xl.   Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, J. A., & LePine, M. A. (2007). Differential challenge stressor-hindrance stressor relationships with job attitudes, turnover intentions, turnover, and withdrawal behavior: a meta-analysis. Journal of applied psychology, 92(2),438.

xli.   Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P.M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individualandorganizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 94(1), 122

xlii.   Ranjbar, M., Zamani, H., & Amiri, N. (2014). The Study on Relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Productivity. International Conference on Arts, Economics and Management (ICAEM'14) March 22-23, 2014 Dubai (UAE)

xliii.   Ras, N. L. (2012). What we do here is who we are": Teacher discretionary behavior as social identification. Discretionary behavior and performance in educational organizations: The missing link in educational leadership and management, 197-222.

xliv.   Reich, R. B. (2001). The Future of Success. Working and Living in the New Economy, trad. It. L'infelicità del successo.

xlv.   Romle, A. R., Talib, N. F. M., & Shahuri, N. S. S. (2016). The relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and high performance organization from the perspective of the students in the higher education institution in Malaysia. Journal of Scientific Research and Development 3 (5): 37-42

xlvi.   Seyle, D. C., & Swann, W. B. (2007). Being oneself in the workplace: Self-verification and identity in organizational contexts. In C. A. Bartel, S. Blader & A. Wrzesniewski (Eds.), Identity and the Modern Organization (pp. 177- 200). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence   Erlbaum.

xlvii.   Shamir, B., & Lapidot, Y. (2003). Trust in organizational superiors: Systemic and collective considerations. Organization Studies, 24(3), 463-491.

xlviii. Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., &Near, J. P., (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: its nature and antecedents. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68,653-663

xlix.   Srivastava, S. K., & Gope, A. K. (2016). The antecedents and consequences of organization citizenship behavior (OCB): a conceptual inquiry. Management Insight, 11(2).

l.   Tambe, S. &Shanker, M. (2014). A study of organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) and its dimensions: a literature review. InternationalResearch Journal of Business and Management, VoI 169

li.   Tanaka, K. I. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior in contemporary workplace in Japan. Japan Labor Review, 10(3), 5-18.

lii.   Uehara, Edwina. (1990). "Dual Exchange Theory, Social Networks and Informal SocialSupport." American Journal of Sociology 96:521-57.

liii.   Van Scotter, J. R., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. Journal of applied psychology, 81(5), 525.

liv.   Williams, L.J. and Anderson, S.E., (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment aspredictors of organizational citizenship and in role behaviors. Journal ofManagement, 17(3), 601-617.

lv.   Yao, J., & Fan, L. (2015). The Performance of Knowledge Workers Based on Behavioral Perspective. Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies, 3(01), 21.

lvi.   Yen, H. R., & Niehoff, B. P. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational effectiveness: Examining relationships in   Taiwanese banks. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34(8), 1617-1637.

lvii. Zhang, D. (2011). Organisational citizenship behaviour, white paper 2, 2