

A Study of Factors Affecting Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) Amongst Academicians of Surat City Colleges

Vaidehi Desai

Research Scholar, Department of Business & Industrial Management, VNSGU, Surat vaidehijimi.desai@gmail.com

Dr. Jaydip Chaudhari

Professor, Department of Business & Industrial Management, VNSGU, Surat jaydipchaudhari@gmail.com

Abstract:

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is a novel paradigm in organizational studies which originally coined by T.S. Bateman and D.W. Organ conceptualized OCB (1983). The phrase "organizational citizenship behaviour" (OCB) refers to all the helpful and productive employee acts and behaviors that don't fall within their official job descriptions. Thus in line with this, the present study tries to find out the factors that drive the OCB of teachers who are working different colleges of Surat city. Descriptive research design has been used and necessary secondary data drawn from websites, journals and books. Primary data collected using survey method through structured questionnaire. Total 100 teachers are asked to respond on their citizenship behaviour who is working in various colleges of Surat city. To achieve the aforesaid objectives, the present employed exploratory factor analysis to identify the prominent factors and further thereby analyzed the association of those extracted factors with demographic profile of the teachers. The study is useful to management of various colleges in the form of employee citizenship performance and thereby positive contribution in the development of institute. Further the study may be useful to academicians and researcher to carry out further research study by taking the base of the constructs used in this study.

Key Words: Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Academicians, altruism

INTRODUCTION:

Early in the 1980s, the term "organisational citizenship" was developed to characterise how academicians behaved inside various firms' social structures. Bateman & Organ developed the idea in the 1980s, and it was subsequently enhanced and refined by a number of academics, including Podsakoff & Mackenzie (1993), LePine et al (2002), Jahangir, Akbar & Haq (2004), Khalid & Ali (2005). Since then, it has grown into an important area of research as the value of independent and collaborative work over rigid, traditional hierarchies has increased (LePine et al., 2002). OCB is defined by Organ as "contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance" (Organ, 1997)

Different Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

The phrase "organizational citizenship behaviour" (OCB) refers to all the helpful and productive employee acts and behaviors that don't fall within their official job descriptions. Anything an employee does voluntarily to help their co-workers and advance the business as a whole qualifies. Academicians are not obligated to participate in OCB as part of their contractual obligations or as a need for them to do their work.

Dennis Organ initially outlined organizational citizenship behaviour as "an individual action which is not recognized by a formal incentive system... but which, when joined with the same behaviour in a group, results in effectiveness" in 1988.

Dennis Organ was the one who first classified organization citizenship conduct into five categories. Each of them will be discussed in the section that follows. Additionally, the aspects of organizational compliance (Hannam & Jimmieson, 2002) and resource protection (Marokczy & Xin, 2004) are also identified; however they are only partially researched. The following are discussed as the commonly accepted dimensions:-

Altruism

In the workplace, altruism manifests itself when one person lends a hand to another without expecting anything in return. An easy way to demonstrate altruistic behaviour at work is to volunteer to help. For example Providing assistance to coworkers with a high workload, sharing resources, pointing out errors and omissions, and teaching them how to use new technology when it is not required are all examples of aiding coworkers (George & Jones, 1997). Workplace altruism can increase effectiveness, productivity, and morale among academicians.

Courtesy

Courtesy refers to the assist others and prevent interpersonal problems. For example consulting others before taking any actions that could have an effect on them (Organ, 1990). Simple instance of courtesy at work is Leaving the copier or printer machine in a right condition for different members of the office to use it after own work completed on the printing machine. (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006) Courtesy consists of behaviors, which consciousness at the prevention of issues and taking the essential step so as to lessen the consequences in the future. In different words, courtesy approach a member encourages different academicians while they are demoralized and feel discouraged professionally It will help to control the crisis management costs and training cost as well as less supervision.

Sportsmanship

Simply put, sportsmanship refers to a worker's capacity to accept defeat with dignity. It's about having the ability to handle unfavourable shocks or events that don't go as planned and not act negatively in those circumstances. For instance an employee who is temporarily taking the responsibilities of a team member who shattered his leg and will be on sickleaves for a few weeks is an illustration of excellent sportsmanship in the workplace. This employee's workload has increased significantly, but that person isn't complaining to coworkers since that one understands that it's only a temporary circumstance and that person is doing what's best for the team.

Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness is described as conduct that exhibits a certain degree of restraint and self-discipline and goes above and beyond the minimal standards. It is some role behaviours that academicians exhibit above and above what is anticipated (Chuin&Ramayah, 2009, Jung & Hong, 2008, Jahangir, Akbar &Haq, 2004, Hannam&Jimmieson, 2002 and Podsakoff, Mackenzie & Fetter, 1993). In a professional situation, this entails that workers do more than just arrive on time and meet deadlines; for instance, they could prepare ahead before a vacation so that their coworkers won't be overburdened with work. Having the self-discipline to wake up in the morning and complete the task, even when there is no boss around you. Additionally, it is a habit of exceeding expectations for punctuality, housekeeping, resource conservation, and other associated internal maintenance issues.

Civic Virtue

How well someone represents the company they work for is a measure of civic virtue. It concerns the way a worker assists their employer while they are not acting in an official position. According to Emmerik, Jawahar, and Stone (2005), Khalid, Ali, and (2005), as well as Jahangir, Akbar, and (2003), civic virtue is defined as the willingness of academicians to actively participate in the organization's activities. Academicians can also show civic virtue by participating in company-sponsored activities like fundraisers or teaming up with coworkers to run a (semi)marathon for charity. A sort of organisational citizenship activity called civic virtue fosters a sense of belonging and camaraderie among its members. Higher job happiness and improved job performance are the results of this.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

(Schlechter, 2005) The influence of Transformational Leadership, Emotional Intelligence, Trust, Meaning and Intention to Quit on Organisational Citizenship Behaviour. The results in essence show that effective leaders who are emotionally intelligent and make use of the transformational leadership style can positively influence

trust and meaning among followers. This, in turn, will motivate followers to display organisational citizenship behaviour and reduce their intention to quit. These are believed to positively influence organisational effectiveness and performance.

(Bukhari, 2008) Key Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) in the Banking Sector of Pakistan. This research offer strong indications, that the selected antecedents have deep impact on OCB in the Banking Sector of Pakistan. OCB has a vital importance to an organization; because if personnel are not willing to work and their work directions are not parallel to the organizational objectives then the organization cannot achieve the operational efficiency. As without OCB there won't be much concern present among the employees about the promotion and benefit of the organization.

(Yong, 2011) Exploring the Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in Knowledge-based Virtual Communities. The results regarding the regression analysis suggest that community members who are emotionally attached to the community are more likely to engage in virtual community citizenship behaviours, which is consistent with the previous studies. Additionally, affective commitment has proved to be the key driving force of community members' loyalty toward the virtual community, it is therefore important to find ways to strengthen the emotional ties between the community members and the community.

(Zahra Alizadeh, 2012) Antecedents and Consequences of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB). Organizational citizenship is discretionary behaviour that is not part of an employee's formal job requirements, but that nevertheless promotes the effective functioning of the organization. Successful organizations need employees who will do more than their usual job duties and provide performance that is beyond expectations. In short, in order to reach that goal, fill full employees' job satisfaction, understand they motivation and create suitable work environments are most important thing in management reality.

(Lily Chernyak-Hai, 2012) Organizational citizenship behaviours: Socio-psychological antecedents and consequences. Perceptions of justice and job motivation are positively associated with OCB. Perceptions of organizational politics are negatively associated with perceptions of justice, which are positively linked to OCB, leader member exchange is positively associated with clarity of information regarding organizational change, which is positively associated with OCB. In turn OCB is positively linked to openness to organizational change and personal traits of agreeableness and extroversion are positively associated with several OCB dimensions and aggregate OCB. (Grego-Planer, 2019) The Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviours in the Public and Private Sectors. In general, there are similar frequencies of Organizational Citizenship Behaviours in the public and private sectors. In public institutions, however, OCBs in the interpersonal dimension are more frequent, while in private institutions they occur more commonly in the organizational dimension. Most positively correlated with OCBs is the active dimension of organizational commitment.

(Habeb, 2019) A proposed instrument for assessing organizational citizenship behaviour in BFSI companies in India. Although all the participants, in general, perform well beyond minimally required role and task requirements, tolerate expected inconvenience, prevent work-related problems for co-workers, support organizational functions, and voluntary help co-workers in work-related problems, private company employees have shown greater OCB than public company workers. (Meor Rashidan Abdullah, 2019) The Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: A Conceptual Framework. A proposition was put forward to test the relationship. Apart from that, the current paper also provides a conceptual framework for the purpose of providing an opportunity to scholars and practitioners in exploring the framework in order to further explain the relationship between individual and organizational factor in regard to citizenship behaviour.

(Niveditha M, 2020) The impact of organizational structure and leadership effectiveness on organizational citizenship behaviour - a comparative study in Indian health and education sectors. the findings of the research revealed a positive relationship between the variables considered in the research which is a good sign that there is a need to improve leadership effectiveness and organizational structure of Indian health and educational

organizations. However, an extensive research is warranted with additional variables, extensive sample size and different sectors to arrive at better consensus. (Geus, 2020) Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in the Public Sector: A Systematic Literature Review and Future Research Agenda. Some characteristics, such as interrelationships with core organizational constructs such as organizational commitment, are quite often studied. In addition, some public sector-specific linkages have been addressed, such as with PSM. However, there are gaps in areas that are needed to take the field forward; notably in contextualization with many public policy and public service areas, and diversification and strengthening of research designs.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

The present study tries to find out the factors that drive the OCB of teachers who are working different colleges of Surat city. Descriptive research design has been used and necessary secondary data drawn from websites, journals and books. Primary data collected using survey method through structured questionnaire. Total 100 teachers are asked to respond on their citizenship behaviour who is working in various colleges of Surat city. To achieve the aforesaid objectives, the present employed exploratory factor analysis to identify the prominent factors and further thereby analyzed the association of those extracted factors with demographic profile of the teachers. The study is useful to management of various colleges in the form of employee citizenship performance and thereby positive contribution in the development of institute. Further the study may be useful to academicians and researcher to carry out further research study by taking the base of the constructs used in this study.

EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS:

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.966	25

The table number 1 represents the reliability statistics for 25 items to be studied. Total 25 variables are taken for carrying out factor analysis. Before moving to factor analysis, we are testing for reliability of instrument so the Cronbach's Alpha model is applied. There are other methods available for reliability testing like split-half, Guttman, Parallel and Strict Parallel. We will interpret Cronbach's Alpha in first column, which is based on the number of items in the survey and the ratio of the average inter-item covariance to the average item variance. Ideally it ranges from 0 to 1 and near to 1 (Approximately greater than 0.7 or 0.8) Alpha value indicates items are reliable for the further analysis. Here in our case, Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.966 which is higher than the standard value 0.7. So the researcher is free to carry out factor analysis with the help of surveyed instrument.

KMO and Bartlett's Test:

H₀: Samples are not adequate to perform factor analysis

H₁: Samples are adequate to perform factor analysis

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.930
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2375.122
	df	300
	Sig.	.000

The above table 2 demonstrates the result of KMO (Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin) and Bartlett’s Test. The KMO measures the sampling adequacy for carrying out the factor analysis. KMO can be calculated for individual and multiple variables. These values for individual variables are produced on the diagonal of the anti-image correlation matrix.

These make the anti-image correlation matrix an extremely important part of the output. The value should be minimum 0.5 and preferably higher than that. For this data KMO value is 0.930 which is much higher than the standard value. This is indeed good news for researcher to carry out factor analysis.

Bartlett’s test of Sphericity tests the null hypothesis that the original correlation matrix is an identity matrix. For factor analysis, we observe the needs of some relationship between variables and if overall matrix were found to be identity then all correlation coefficients would be zero. Therefore we always want this test to be statistically significant. A significant of Bartlett’s test of Sphericity indicates the correlation matrix is not an identity matrix that means there is some relationship between variables we hope to include in the factor analysis. For our study, Bartlett’s test significance value is 0.000 which is less than 0.05. So we interpret that the value is significant and correlation matrix is not an identity matrix. So the factor analysis is appropriate and further analysis can be done.

Table 3: Variance Explained						
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	14.026	56.103	56.103	5.304	21.214	21.214
2	2.012	8.048	64.150	4.909	19.638	40.852
3	1.613	6.452	70.603	4.307	17.229	58.081
4	1.122	4.488	75.091	4.252	17.010	75.091
5	.909	3.636	78.726			
6	.587	2.347	81.073			
7	.539	2.156	83.230			
8	.498	1.994	85.224			
9	.442	1.767	86.990			
10	.388	1.552	88.542			
11	.374	1.495	90.037			
12	.312	1.248	91.285			
13	.300	1.199	92.484			
14	.265	1.061	93.545			
15	.243	.973	94.518			
16	.226	.905	95.423			
17	.187	.747	96.169			
18	.181	.724	96.894			

19	.164	.658	97.551			
20	.142	.568	98.120			
21	.118	.471	98.591			
22	.110	.441	99.032			
23	.101	.403	99.436			
24	.072	.288	99.724			
25	.069	.276	100.000			

The table number 3 shows the result of total variance explained by all extracted factors by using Principal Component Analysis (PCA). The first step towards factor extraction is to determine the linear component within the data set by calculating the eigenvalue of the matrix. To determine the importance of a particular factor we look at the magnitude of the associated eigenvalue. We can apply criteria to determine which factor to remain which to discard from the study. By default SPSS uses Kaiser’s criterion for keeping factors with eigenvalue greater than 1. Above table shows two broad categories of column consists initial eigenvalue and rotated sums of square loadings.

By extraction, SPSS has identified 4 factor/components whose eigenvalue is greater than 1. Next column represents variance in % term for each factor and their cumulative values. So our result indicates that 1st factor explains 21.214% of variance in dependent variable. 2nd factor explains 19.638% and so on. Together all 4 factors explains 75.091% of variance on dependent variables. So the organizational citizenship behaviour has been explained by 75.091% through 4 major factors which we will discuss in next step.

Table 4: Rotated Component Matrix				
	Component			
	Individual Traits	Organizational Justice	Organizational Commitment	Perceived Leadership Behaviour
OCB_23	.868			
OCB_24	.835			
OCB_25	.828			
OCB_22	.773			
OCB_17		.836		
OCB_18		.831		
OCB_20		.801		
OCB_19		.692		
OCB_7			.847	
OCB_6			.796	
OCB_9			.685	

OCB_8			.632	
OCB_10			.552	
OCB_14				.808
OCB_12				.775
OCB_13				.649
OCB_15				.617
OCB_11				.568

Factor analysis first carried out without rotation that gives us only component matrix. This matrix contains the loadings of each variable onto each factor. By default SPSS displays all the loadings and in this research we have requested for loadings less than 0.5 to be suppressed.

This matrix was not found to be appropriate or important for the interpretation. Further Varimax rotation has been applied to simplify the loadings and gave somewhat clear picture about the factor/component.

Factor 1: Individual Traits

Factor 2: Organizational Justice

Factor 3: Organizational Commitment

Factor 4: Perceived Leadership Behaviour

Differences among demographic variables regarding OCB factors:

H0: there is no significant difference in mean rank of age categories regarding OCB Factors extracted

H1: there is significant difference in mean rank of age categories regarding OCB Factors extracted

Age and OCB Factors Extracted:

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of Individual Traits is the same across categories of Age.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.645	Retain the null hypothesis.
2	The distribution of Organizational Justice is the same across categories of Age.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.471	Retain the null hypothesis.
3	The distribution of Organizational Commitment is the same across categories of Age.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.131	Retain the null hypothesis.
4	The distribution of Perceived Leadership Behaviour is the same across categories of Age.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.145	Retain the null hypothesis.

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

The above results indicate the output for Kruskal Wallis test as age categories being more than two independent factors and all four OCB factors. Looking to the significance value all are greater than 0.05 which mean we fail to reject the null hypothesis and interpret that there is no significant difference among age categories regarding organizational citizenship behaviour.

Gender and OCB Factors Extracted:

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of Individual Traits is the same across categories of Gender.	Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney U Test	.704	Retain the null hypothesis.
2	The distribution of Organizational Justice is the same across categories of Gender.	Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney U Test	.772	Retain the null hypothesis.
3	The distribution of Organizational Commitment is the same across categories of Gender.	Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney U Test	.910	Retain the null hypothesis.
4	The distribution of Perceived Leadership Behaviour is the same across categories of Gender.	Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney U Test	.624	Retain the null hypothesis.

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

The above results indicate the output for Kruskal Wallis test as age categories being more than two independent factors and all four OCB factors. Looking to the significance value all are greater than 0.05 which mean we fail to reject the null hypothesis and interpret that there is no significant difference among age categories regarding organizational citizenship behaviour.

Designation and OCB Factors Extracted:

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of Individual Traits is the same across categories of Designation.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.689	Retain the null hypothesis.
2	The distribution of Organizational Justice is the same across categories of Designation.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.576	Retain the null hypothesis.
3	The distribution of Organizational Commitment is the same across categories of Designation.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.856	Retain the null hypothesis.
4	The distribution of Perceived Leadership Behaviour is the same across categories of Designation.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.213	Retain the null hypothesis.

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

The above results indicate the output for Kruskal Wallis test as designation categories being more than two independent factors and all four OCB factors. Looking to the significance value all are greater than 0.05 which mean we fail to reject the null hypothesis and interpret that there is no significant difference among designation categories regarding organizational citizenship behaviour.

Nature of Appointment and OCB Factors Extracted:

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of Individual Traits is the same across categories of NA.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.915	Retain the null hypothesis.
2	The distribution of Organizational Justice is the same across categories of NA.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.562	Retain the null hypothesis.
3	The distribution of Organizational Commitment is the same across categories of NA.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.933	Retain the null hypothesis.
4	The distribution of Perceived Leadership Behaviour is the same across categories of NA.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.377	Retain the null hypothesis.

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

The above results indicate the output for Kruskal Wallis test as nature of appointment categories being more than two independent factors and all four OCB factors. Looking to the significance value all are greater than 0.05 which mean we fail to reject the null hypothesis and interpret that there is no significant difference among nature of appointment categories regarding organizational citizenship behaviour.

Institute Type and OCB Factors Extracted:

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of Individual Traits is the same across categories of Inst_Type.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.060	Retain the null hypothesis.
2	The distribution of Organizational Justice is the same across categories of Inst_Type.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.001	Reject the null hypothesis.
3	The distribution of Organizational Commitment is the same across categories of Inst_Type.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.003	Reject the null hypothesis.
4	The distribution of Perceived Leadership Behaviour is the same across categories of Inst_Type.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.007	Reject the null hypothesis.

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

The above results indicate the output for Kruskal Wallis test as institute type categories being more than two independent factors and all four OCB factors. Looking to the significance value three factors' viz. organizational justice, organizational commitment and perceived leadership behaviour less than 0.05 which mean we reject the null hypothesis and interpret that there is significant difference among institute type categories regarding organizational citizenship behaviour.

Experience and OCB Factors Extracted:

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of Individual Traits is the same across categories of Experience.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.741	Retain the null hypothesis.
2	The distribution of Organizational Justice is the same across categories of Experience.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.344	Retain the null hypothesis.
3	The distribution of Organizational Commitment is the same across categories of Experience.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.188	Retain the null hypothesis.
4	The distribution of Perceived Leadership Behaviour is the same across categories of Experience.	Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.268	Retain the null hypothesis.

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

The above results indicate the output for Kruskal Wallis test as experience categories being more than two independent factors and all four OCB factors. Looking to the significance value all are greater than 0.05 which mean we fail to reject the null hypothesis and interpret that there is no significant difference among experience categories regarding organizational citizenship behaviour.

CONCLUSION:

The study concludes that organizational citizenship behaviour of academicians is good in terms all dimensions studied in the research. However, most prominent factors or dimension which are affecting the OCB of academicians across the south Gujarat VNSGU colleges are

1. Individual Traits
2. Organizational Justice
3. Organizational Commitment
4. Perceived Leader Behaviour

Further study concludes from the testing proceeds that there are statistical significant differences observed among various profile variables of the academicians and OCB dimensions extracted in this study. Only institute type found to have significant differences in terms of OCB dimension otherwise rests of all other factors such as gender, experience, nature of appointment, designation etc have no significant differences.

In conclusion, the organizational citizenship behavior of academicians can have a profound impact on educational institutions. When teachers willingly contribute their time, effort, and expertise to support their colleagues and students, it can lead to a more positive institute culture, improved student outcomes, and increased job satisfaction. However, it is essential for colleges and leaders to recognize, encourage, and support OCB in a way that balances the benefits while preventing burnout.

REFERENCES:

1. Schlechter, A. F. (2005). The influence of Transformational Leadership, Emotional Intelligence, Trust, Meaning and Intention to Quit on Organisational Citizenship Behaviour. Dissertation presented at the University of Stellenbosch , -.

2. Bukhari, Z. u. (2008). Key Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) in the Banking Sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management* , 3 (12), 106-115.
3. Yong, L. (2011). Exploring the Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Knowledge-based Virtual Communities. *Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University* , 1-47.
4. Zahra Alizadeh, M. E. (2012). Antecedents and Consequences of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB). *INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY RESEARCH IN BUSINESS* , 3 (9), 494-505.
5. Lily Chernyak-Hai, A. T. (2012). Organizational citizenship behaviors: Socio-psychological antecedents and consequences. *Review of International Social Psychology* , 25 (3), 53-92.
6. Grego-Planer, D. (2019). The Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in the Public and Private Sectors. *Faculty of Economic Sciences and Management, Nicolaus Copernicus University* , 11, 1-20.
7. Habeeb, S. (2019). A proposed instrument for assessing organizational citizenship behavior in BFSI companies in India. *Cogent Business and Management* , 6, 1-20.
8. Meor Rashydan Abdullah, S. M. (2019). The Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Advanced Research in Social and Behavioural Sciences* , 15 (1), 1-14.
9. Nauman Majeed, e. a. (2017). Transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: Modeling emotional intelligence as mediator. *Management & Marketing. Challenges for the Knowledge Society* , 12 (4), 571-590.
10. Niveditha M, S. S. (2020). The impact of organizational structure and leadership effectiveness on organizational citizenship behavior - a comparative study in Indian health and education sectors. *Journal of Critical Science* , 7 (13), 167-172.
11. Geus, C. J. (2020). Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the Public Sector: A Systematic Literature Review and Future Research Agenda. *Public Administration Review* , 259-270.