

## Investigating the effect of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Employees' Empowerment

<sup>1</sup>Zahra Houshmand Neghabi and <sup>2</sup>Sudabeh Morshedian Rafiee (Ph.D.)

<sup>1</sup>Faculty member, Department of Commercial Management, Islamshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University (IAU), Iran. E-mail addresses: [ikiu2011@gmail.com](mailto:ikiu2011@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>Assist. Prof. & Faculty Member, Department of Commercial Management, Islamshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University (IAU), Iran

**Abstract:** The Features of today's organizations is dynamic, complexity, ambiguity and tradition aversion. In order to overcome complex, dynamic and uncertain situations, the only way that managers are facing is to empower the organization and employees. Hence, having a capable and efficient manpower that are foundations of scientific wealth and assets, are considered critical to the organizations. The aim of this study is to evaluate the impact of organizational citizenship behavior on employees' empowerment. Research hypotheses examine the impact of organizational citizenship behavior on each dimension of empowerment. The findings show that there is a meaningful relation between OCB and empowerment. On the other hand in order to achieving the strategic goals of organizations, it is necessary to consider the effective factor of attitudinal and behavioral variables of employees and planning in line with the dimensions of empowerment has strong effect in organizational citizenship behaviors.

[Zahra Houshmand Neghabi and Sudabeh Morshedian Rafiee. **Investigating the effect of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Employees' Empowerment** . *Life Sci J* 2012;9(3): 1302-1306]. (ISSN: 1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 186

**Key word:** Organization citizenship behavior, empowerment, employees' behavior, IRAN

### 1- Introduction

In a competitive environment in which organizations must be faster, leaner, provide better service quality, be more efficient, and more profitable, an empowered and proactive service worker is thought to be essential (Bowen and Lawler, 1995).

Under these conditions companies have to design and shape their organization structure, management understanding, company competences and outputs according to new competition conditions in order to compete. The conditions such as customers demand, environmental pressure, quality standards etc. and their partnership, have caused tendency to transform similar characteristic make-up of the companies under the same market conditions (Ataman, 2003)

Rather than using traditional hierarchical structures with clear lines of authority and distinct jobs, many organizations have gone to more autonomous team-oriented organizational environments (LePine et al., 2002).

More than a decade ago, Conger and Kanungo (1988) noted that the practice of empowering subordinates is a

principal component of managerial and organizational. Most of these researchers and many others argue that empowerment need to be supported and nurtured by some prerequisites like incentives, skill and knowledge, and communication and flow of information within an organization climate conducive to employees empowerment in order to attain employees effective performance and job satisfaction( Bitner et al., 1990; Randolph, 1995; Yip, 2000).

Most literature on employees' empowerment provides only conceptual or anecdotal evidence. Therefore, there is a need for more systematic and empirical efforts in investigating the role of empowerment among service employees. Specifically, there is a need for further research to investigate the conditions that affect the empowerment among service employees. One of these conditions is identifying the organization citizenship behavior in organization.

The term "OCB" was first introduced by Bateman and Organ (1983). Organ (1988, p. 4) originally described OCB as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization". Organ further described OCB as behavior that contributes indirectly to the organization through the maintenance of the organization's social system.

Much of the scholarly interest in OCBs stems from the widespread belief that OCBs improve the efficiency and effectiveness of organizations (Organ et al., 2006). OCBs include both behaviors that are directed toward specific persons (e.g. interpersonal helping), as well as more impersonal forms of conscientiousness and workplace involvement that contribute to organizational effectiveness (e.g. sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and self-development; Organ et al., 2006).

According to Katz and Kahn (1966), innovative and spontaneous behaviors do not necessarily directly contribute to the genotypic function of an organization, but are "vital to organizational survival and effectiveness" and include cooperating with fellow members, protecting the organization (or subsystem), suggesting organizational improvements, self-training for additional organizational responsibility, and creating a favorable climate for the organization in the external environment.

The main goal of this study is to evaluate the impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational empowerment.

## 2- Literature review

### 2-1- Organization Citizenship Behavior

According to the scholarly researchers Organization Citizenship Behavior is defined as employees's behaviors that go beyond the role requirements, that are not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that facilitate organizational functioning (Organ, 1988).

In the last decade, the researchers have been persuaded by Organ's definition that identified the organizational citizenship as a behavior "that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization" (Organ, 1988, P4). This theoretical framework confuses the phenomenal definition through its effects and description and it causes the consolidation of a mainstream focusing only on the OCB's positive effects.

According to Podsakoff et al. (2000), several different forms of OCB have been characterized by a significant theoretical overlap. A big part of these concepts focuses on helping behavior that can be defined as "voluntarily helping others with, or preventing the occurrence of, work-related problems". It is argued by researchers that helping behavior includes concepts such as helping and cooperating with others (Borman and Motowidlo, 1997), interpersonal helping (Graham, 1991), helping co-workers (George and Brief, 1992), altruism (Organ, 1988), interpersonal helping (Graham, 1991) and

sportsmanship (Organ, 1988). Although less frequently, other researchers focalize on concepts such as promoting (George and Brief, 1992; Moorman and Blakely, 1995) and defending the organization (Borman and Motowidlo, 1997).

Many scholars analyze the helping behavior in combination with other concepts that can be considered as specific forms of OCBs: individual initiative (Moorman and Blakely, 1995), civic virtue (Organ, 1988), organizational compliance (Smith et al., 1983), and self-development (Moorman and Blakely, 1995). The focal point of the paper is to analyze behavior involving helping others with work-related problems as a form of citizenship behavior that is recognized by most researchers. Concepts such as organizational loyalty, individual initiative, or organizational compliance are not investigated.

The several attributes on OCBs consequences can be grouped into two issues: the effects on managerial evaluations of employees and the effects on organizational performance (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

### Types of organizational citizenship behavior

Graham believes that citizenship behavior shows itself in three different types; include organizational obedience, organizational loyalty and organizational participation that each of them will be briefly described in this article.

**Organization obedience:** This term describes the behaviors that their necessity and desirability are identified and accepted in reasonable and disciplinary structure. Organizational obedience indicators are behaviors such as respect for organizational rules, doing tasks and responsibilities completely with regard to organizational resources.

**Organization loyalty:** This loyalty to the organization is different from loyalty to him/her, other individuals and institutional sectors. Moreover, it expresses dedication of employees in the organization and support and defends the interests of the organization.

**Organization participation:** This word was mean with the active participation of employees in Corporate governance (Meetings, to share their ideas with others and knowledge of current issues).

### 2-2- Empowerment

According to Bowen and Lawler (1992), empowerment has been described as a means to enable employees to make decisions, and Pastor (1996), as a personal phenomenon where individuals take responsibility for their own actions. The first definition relates to how

management facilitates and implements the empowerment culture, while the second emphasizes the importance of the individual in the truly successful application of empowerment. The term personal empowerment was used in relation to business consultants and it was viewed as a strong self-analytical tool which allows them to understand and address their personal biases, differences of opinions, and experiences with clients in order to be successful in change efforts (Wing, 1996).

Bandora defined empowerment as a creating power of compliance in confronting conditions and counts for it four main factors (Yaha, 2004):

- 1- Emotional support for people that are involved in stressful issues.
- 2- Encouraging and giving feedback to them
- 3- Introduction of successful and effective people
- 4- Gain experience through successful completion of an activity

As Long argued in 1996 the end goal is to develop the performance and potential of the individual as well as that of the organization (Long, 1996). Empowerment could be considered in terms of social exchange theory as a process of enabling (Conger and Kanungo, 1988). Psychological empowerment represents intrinsic motivation and consists of a set of four cognitions (Thomas and Velthouse, 1990): meaningfulness, impact, competence (synonymous with Conger and Kanungo's (1988) concept of self-efficacy), and choice (later renamed by Spreitzer (1995) as self-determination).

### 3- Methodology

*Table 1; Presence or absence of sense of competence among employees*

	Category	Frequency of view	View proportion	View proportion	Test proportion	Level of significant
Sense of competence	Group 1	4 $\geq$	5	0.1	0.6	0.000
	Group 2	4 $<$	84	0.9		
	Total		89	1		

As it is considered in table 1 in order to assess competency feeling among employees, 10% of respondents is lower than 4 and 90% of them are more than 4, the level of significant of is 0.000 and because the rate of significant level of type one error is lower than 0.05 so this hypothesis is confirmed.

#### 4-2- Ranking empowerment dimensions

In order to examine the dimensions empowerment importance, and as the responds are according to likert scale, so the Friedman nonparametric ANOVA is used.

The method of this research is descriptive. The main objective of this study is to describe systematically aspects of empowerment and its relationship with organizational citizenship behavior. So the kind of this research is correlation type. Also in order to evaluate the presence or absence of each dimensions of Empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior we used two tailed test in DAMSAN RAYANE Company.

Statistical population of this research is DAMSAN RAYANE Company employees. In this research the empowerment Dimension are dependent variables and organization citizenship behavior is independent variable. In this research there is need two questionnaires for gathering information that reliability test is used with SPSS software. According to the results that were obtained by SPSS chronbach Alpha for empowerment questionnaire is 0.93 and for OCB is 0.86.

### 4- Data analysis

#### 4-1- Assessing existence or nonexistence of empowerment dimension

In order to determine empowerment dimension among employees two tailed nonparametric test is used. In this test for each factor the frequency of responds with quantity of lower than 4 (no opinion, disagree, absolutely disagree and high absolutely disagree) in contrast with frequency of responds with quantity of lower than 4 (agree, absolutely agree and high absolutely agree) is compared. Furthermore the hypothesis will be confirmed or rejected with comparing the people number proportion of two groups with quantity of 0.6 (i.e. the respond of 60% of people is more than 4). For instance the table 1 is about existence or nonexistence of competence feeling in employees.

In this analysis we seek to prove the following hypotheses:

*Table2; test result*

	125.772
Degrees of freedom	4
Level of significant	0.000

The chi-square test statistic in order to prove the following proposition is 125.772 with degrees of freedom equal to 4 and the level of significant is 0. Because the significant level rate is lower than type 1

$O$  is rejected empowerment dimensions have different importance (see table 3).

Table 3; average rank of empowerment dimensions

Empowerment dimensions	Average rank
Sense of competence	3.94
Independence	2.35
Sense of being effective	2.47
Sense of meaningfulness jobs	3.84
Trust between coworkers	2.4

#### 4-3- The main study hypothesis

The main hypothesis of this research is the impact of OCB on empowerment. In order to investigate the

Table 5; Test results

	Sum of square	d.f	Average of square	F	Significant level
Regression	7413.52	1	7413.52	40.144	0.000
Residual	16066.368	87	184.671		
Total	23479.888	88			

The F statistic is 40.144 and the rate of significant level is 0.000. Because in level of 0.05 the rate of significant level is lower than rate of type 1 error, so it is improved that there is a meaningful relation between OCB and empowerment with 95% certainly.

## 5- Conclusion

The main objective of this study was to investigate the perceived impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational empowerment. The results that were obtained in this study approved a significant relationship between citizenship behavior and the empowerment. According to importance role of human resources in achieving the strategic goals of organizations, it is necessary to consider the effective factor of attitudinal and behavioral variables of employees. Planning in line with the dimensions of empowerment has obvious effect in organizational citizenship behaviors.

Achieving to empowerment is not only individual or group effort, rather another macro factors such as

relation between and empowerment as a dependent variable and organizational citizenship behavior as independent variable we used correlation coefficient.

Table 4; correlation coefficient hypothesis test

Adjustment coefficient	determined coefficient	R
0.308	0.316	0.562

As it is considered from Table 4, the correlation coefficient is 0.562 and it shows that OCB and empowerment have strong relationship with each other. Then we investigate that is there a meaningful relation between these variables? In fact we investigate the following hypothesis:

structure, policies, values, reward systems and organizational culture must all together encourage and strengthen individual and group behavior in this regard.

According to this study, the following guidelines are recommended to establish empowerment:

- 1- Increase the range of employees' participation in decision making through the development of skills and abilities of employees.
- 2- Holding enough and adequate classes and workshops in context of organizational citizenship behavior among employees in order to reinforce the spirit of sportsmanship among employees.
- 3- Using OCB factors to evaluate employees' performance.
- 4- Developing and improving connection and information channels in company in order to share knowledge.
- 5- Using brochures, posters and photographs in context of reinforcing organizational citizenship behavior and its factors.
- 6- Interaction between units with other similar units in company in order to share information.
- 7- Make vision, goals and mission of organization clear for employees with organization leaders.

**Reference**

- Ataman, G. (2003). Örgüt Tasarımında Yeni Tekniklerin Yayılım dinamikleri. *Öneri*, 5(19), 13-19.
- Bateman, T.S. and Organ, D.W. (1983), "Job satisfaction and the good soldier: the relationship between affect and employee 'citizenship'", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 26, pp. 587-95.
- Borman, W.C. and Motowildo, S.J. (1997), "Task performance and contextual performance: the meaning for personnel selection research", *Human Performance*, Vol. 10, pp. 99-109.
- Bowen, D. E. and E. E. Lawler (1995). Organizing for Service: Empowerment or Production Line? In: W.J. Glynn & J.G. Barnes (Eds.), *Understanding services management*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 269-294.
- Bowen, D. E. & E. E. Lawler (1992). The Empowerment of Service Workers: What, Why, How and When?. *Sloan Management review*, 33 (3): 31-39.
- Conger, J. A. and R. N. Kanungo (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13: 471-482.
- George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. 1992. Feeling good-doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112: 310-329.
- Graham, J. W. 1991. An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4: 249-270
- Organ, D.W. (1988), *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*, Lexington Books, Lexington, MA.
- Katz, D. and Kahn, R. (1966), *The Social Psychology of Organizations*, Wiley, New York, NY.
- Lepine, J.A., Erez, A. and Johnson, D.E. (2002), "The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: a critical review and meta-analysis", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87 No. 1, pp. 52-65.
- Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. 1995. Individualism-Collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16: 127-142.
- Organ, D.W., Podsakoff, P.M. and MacKenzie, S.B. (2006), *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S., Moorman, R.H. and Fetter, R. (1990), "Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on trust, satisfaction, and organisational citizenship behavior", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 107-42.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B. and Bachrach, D.G. (2000), "Organizational citizenship behaviors: a critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 513-63.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. 1983. Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68: 655-663.
- Spreitzer, G.M. (1995), "Psychological empowerment in the workplace: dimensions, measurement, and validation", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 38, pp. 1442-65.
- Thomas, K.W. and Velthouse, B.A. (1990), "Cognitive elements of empowerment: an 'interpretive' model of intrinsic task motivation", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 15, pp. 666-81.
- Yahya D, (2004). "Significant conditions in employees empowerment": the case of Jordanian four star hotel, *Jameat-al-yermok*, 332- 367

9/23/2012