An exploratory study of Role efficacy as correlate to Organizational Citizenship Behaviour among female nurses in a maternal and childcare facility at Bangalore in India

National Human Resource Conference

On

Organisational Citizenship Behaviour: Driver for Organisational Performance and Effectiveness

March 2012

Siddharth N.

Agarwal R.

For our families

- Authors

Author 1 can be reached at naga@nagasiddharth.com

Author 2 can be reached at rupal.agarwal.90@gmail.com

The authors remember fondly, Late Dr. Udai Pareek, whose generosity is a model of citizenship behaviours for themselves as HRD professionals.

"What are the things you would like your employees to do more of, but really can't make them do, and for which you can't guarantee any definite rewards, other than your appreciation?"

(Smith, Organ and Near 1983, cited in Organ, Podsakoff, MacKenzie 2006, p.16)

Abstract

While many studies on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour exist, role efficacy as an correlate to prganizational citizenship behavior offers potential of research. This study is conducted to explore Role Efficacy as an correlate of Organizational Citizenship Behavior among female nurses in a maternity and child care hospital in the Healthcare Industry located at Bangalore in India. Role Efficacy is the potential effectiveness of an individual occupying a particular position in an organization as perceived by the individual. The sample included 31 nurses and supervisors from an organization that caters exclusively to maternity and childcare. The findings indicate that role efficacy is positively correlated to Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, but not significantly. Correlations of dimensions of role efficacy to Organizational Citizenship Behaviour are also reported.

Acknowledgements

Index

1. Introduction

India's health sector is at the threshold of large scale corporatization and exponential growth in 2012. India has 0.9 beds per 1000 people as against the global average of 3.3, requiring 100,000 additional hospital beds each year, at investment of approximately INR 45,000 to INR 50,000 crore per year for the next 10 years. Moreover, there is a shortfall of 1.4 million doctors and 2.8 million nurses in India. Worthy of note is that healthcare personnel will need to prepare and reorient themselves to more informed and evolved customers. (Gearing up for Healthcare 3.0, McKinsey & Company, 2010). This places both employees and organisations at a stage where employees are looking for roles where they can be effective and organisations desire Organization Citizenship Behaviours (referred to as OCB in this paper) from employees. In this context, it is of interest to the authors to study whether there exists a positive linkage between Role efficacy and OCB among nurses in a maternal and child care facility located at Bangalore in India.

a. *Organizational Citizenship Behavior*

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) are a special type of work behaviors that are defined as individual behavior that promotes the goals of the organization by contributing to its social and psychological environment (Organ, 1997; Rotundo, Sackett, 2002). Some of these behaviors include voluntarily helping peers, taking personal initiatives for the development of the team, volunteering innovation; not wasting time and performing extra duties without complaint. These behaviors are believed to be instrumental for the effective functioning of the organization.(Organ, 1983).

Williams and Anderson (1991) proposed a two-dimensional conceptualization of OCB: OCB-I (Behavior directed towards individuals; comprising altruism and courtesy) and OCB-II (Behavior directed towards organization, comprising the

remaining three dimensions i.e. conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue in Organ's (1988) conceptualization.

Five distinct factors of OCB are: Altruism (e.g. helping Behaviors directed at specific individuals). In a health care organization, such Behaviors can help the medical staff (doctors, nurses, paramedical) in working towards the common organizational goals. Conscientiousness (e.g. going beyond minimally required levels of attendance), Conscientiousness behavior of medical staff viz: doctors, nurses, paramedical staff would make them to avoid casual talks or to spend lengthy time on personal telephone conversation and make them sure to attend patients on time and perform their duties as required. Sportsmanship (e.g. tolerating the inevitable inconveniences of work without complaining). Inculcation of sportsmanship behavior among medical employee enables them to avoid finding faults and avoid blowing problems out of proportion within or outside the medical department and improves the amount of time spent on constructive endeavours in the organization. Courtesy (e.g. informing others to prevent the occurrence of work related problems) Assessing and doing what is best for the patients as well as for the employees will help in strengthening courtesy dimension. Civic Virtue (e.g. participating in and being concerned about the life of the company).

b. Role Efficacy

The performance of a person working in an organisation can be thought of as depending on his competencies and his own potential effectiveness in the role as well as the design of his role that he is expected to perform. Just as personal efficacy is the potential effectiveness of the person, role efficacy is the potential effectiveness of an individual in his/her role as perceived by the individual. (Pareek, U., 1987) Dimensions of role efficacy include (Pareek, 1987)

Dimension 1: Role Making

a. Self-role integration – the degree to which the individual's strengths are allowed to be used by the role

b. Proactivity – possibility of the individual being allowed in his/her role to take initiative in starting something new

c. Creativity – an opportunity to be creative and try out newer and unconventional ways of solving problems is important in a role

d. Confrontation – tendency to confront problems and find relevant solutions contributes to efficacy

Dimension 2: Role Centering

e. Centrality – feeling that the role occupied is central to the Organisation increases role efficacy

f. Influence – the possibility of the role holder influencing others around him/her

g. Personal growth – the role providing the individual with an opportunity to grow and develop

Dimension 3: Role Linking

h. Inter-role linkage – possibility of joint effort to solve problems results in higher role efficacy

i. Helping relationship – possibility of the role holder receiving help when needed increases role efficacy

j. Superordination – when the role holder perceives that what he does is of value to a larger cause or a group

All these dimensions are positively correlated to Role efficacy.

2. Literature review

The study of organizational citizenship behavior has emerged as an extremely popular topic in organizational psychology, human resource management, and organizational behavior. The roots of the construct could be traced back to Barnard (1938), and Katz (1964). Cited by Saradha, H. (2011), Katz has stated that for the effective functioning of the organization, there are three basic types of behavior which are essential. (1) People must be valued and made to remain with the organization (2) They must carry out specific task requirements in consistent and dependable fashion. (3) There must be innovativeness and spontaneous activity that goes beyond the job requirement. Organizational citizenship behavior as envisioned by Organ belongs to the third type of behavior.

Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) as a concept is now almost 25 years old. However, in the current hypercompetitive business environment, where organisations are looking for anything which can help them achieve competitive advantage, OCB may well provide the answer. The origin of this concept can be traced to Organ, D. who published a paper titled 'A Reappraisal and Reinterpretation of the Satisfaction-Causes-Performance Hypothesis' in 1977. The paper looked at the casual and subtle contributions of employees, which cannot be captured by quantitative hard measures of output. The term OCB was first used by Organ in his studies in 1983 with two of his doctoral students, Tom Bateman and C Ann Smith.

According to Kumar, K., Bakhshi, A., (2009), from the time when Katz (1964) introduced the concept of a class of discretionary and spontaneous behaviors that are beyond explicit role requirements, but are essential for organizational effectiveness, there has been augmented research exploring the nature of such behavior. Smith et al. (1983), conceptualized these contributions as 'Organizational Citizenship Behavior' (OCB), later defined by Organ as *'individual behavior that is discretionary, not*

directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization' (Organ, 1988). More recently, however, Organ (1997) refined this definition, conceptualizing *organizational citizenship behavior as any form of performance that supports the social or psychological environment in which the work tasks are embedded.*

This definition is intended to distinguish organizational citizenship behavior from the performance of core tasks. In addition, this definition overcomes the complication that many organizations now strive to reward such behaviors.

   a. *Dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior*

Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000) distinguished 30 different forms of organizational citizenship behavior. Scholars have developed a variety of taxonomies to classify these citizenship behaviors (see Bateman & Organ, 1983; Organ, 1988, 1990; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994; Williams & Anderson, 1991). One of the most prevalent taxonomies was propounded by Organ (1988), who differentiated five facets or factors: altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, civic virtue, and sportsmanship. Subsequently, Organ (1990) also included two additional factors: peacekeeping and cheerleading.

According to several studies, three of these seven factors can be readily distinguished by managers: sportsmanship, civic virtue, and conscientiousness (Bell & Menguc, 2002; Hui, Lee, & Rousseau, 2004; Lam, Hui, & Law, 1999). Sportsmanship describes employees who are willing to tolerate difficulties in the workplace that are intended to improve the organization, abstaining from unnecessary complaints and criticisms. Civic virtue refers the active involvement, interest, and participation in the life of their organization, such as functions, events, and meetings. Conscientiousness,

sometimes referred to as compliance, reflects the genuine acceptance and adherence of workplace rules, regulations, and procedures.

Some of the other factors, such as altruism, courtesy, peacekeeping, and cheerleading, cannot be as readily distinguished (Bachrach, Bendoly, & Podsakoff, 2001; MacKenzie et al., 1991; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994). According to Podsakoff, Ahearne, and MacKenzie (1997), all of these factors might correspond to a broader dimension, which they label as helping.

A different taxonomy was proposed by Williams and Anderson (1991), which differentiated behaviors directed towards individuals, called OCBI, and behaviors directed towards the organization, called OCBO. OCBI, for example, might include altruism (Williams & Anderson, 1991), as well as the other helping behaviors such as courtesy, peacekeeping, and cheerleading. OCBO might entail conscientiousness (Williams & Anderson, 1991), as well as perhaps civic virtue and sportsmanship (e.g., Coleman & Borman, 2000; Hoffman, Blair, Meriac, & Woehr, 2007).

The distinction between OCBI and OCBO can also accommodate many other facets of citizenship behavior that depart marginally from the scheme defined by Organ (1988, 1990). OCBI, for example, could encompass interpersonal facilitation (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996), interpersonal harmony (Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997), and interpersonal helping (Graham, 1989). OCBO could encompass job dedication (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996), voice behavior (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998), individual initiative or taking charge (Morrison & Phelps, 1999), organizational loyalty (Graham, 1991), endorsing, supporting, and defending the objectives of organizations (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997), and promoting the image of a company (Farh, Zhong, & Organ, 2004).

Several studies have highlighted the utility of this distinction, revealing that OCBI and OCBO correspond to a distinct set of antecedents, correlates, and consequences (Graham & Van Dyne, 2006; Halbesleben & Bowler, 2007; Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007; LePine & Van Dyne, 2001; Stamper & Van Dyne, 2001). For example, emotional exhaustion is positively related to OCBI but negatively related to OCBO (Halbesleben & Bowler, 2007). Furthermore, leader-member exchange, which represents the quality of relationships between leaders and employees, is slightly more related to OCBI than OCBO (Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007).

Research on OCB has benefited greatly from Organ's (1988) conceptualization of OCB that consists of five distinct factors: Altruism (e.g. helping behaviours directed at specific individuals), Conscientiousness (e.g. going beyond minimally required levels of attendance), Sportsmanship (e.g. tolerating the inevitable inconveniences of work without complaining), Courtesy (e.g. informing others to prevent the occurrence of work-related problems), and Civic Virtue (e.g. participating in and being concerned about the life of the company). The proposed model by Organ could find support for a three factor model of OCB. In this recent conceptualization, Conscientiousness is removed and Altruism and Courtesy are combined to form a single helping dimension (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994), resulting in three factors (i.e. Helping Behaviour, Civic Virtue, and Sportsmanship). However a recent meta-analysis conducted by Hoffman, Blair, Meriac, and Woehr (2007) suggested that "current operationalizations of OCB are best viewed as indicators of a general OCB factor. and wholistic approach is better than the compartmentalization of the concept. (as cited in Srivastava K., Saldanha D.,2008). For the purpose of this study, the authors chose to go with five dimensions of OCB considering the large number of studies that exist which consider five dimensions rather than three or seven dimensions, thus allowing the present study to be compared with for further research.

b. Differentiation between OCB and other similar concepts

As discussed earlier, Organizational citizenship behavior was first examined by Organ and his colleagues (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Since this time, many related concepts have emerged, such as extra-role behavior (Van Dyne, Cummings, & Parks, 1995), organizational citizenship performance (Borman, 2004), organizational spontaneity (George & Brief, 1992; George & Jones, 1997), prosocial organizational behavior (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; George, 1990, 1991), and voice behavior (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998; Van Dyne, Ang, & Botero, 2003). These terms are related, but often emphasize different features. Widespread interest in OCB primarily stems from the fact that OCB leads to improved organizational effectiveness (Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997). To improve OCB is lowest cost and best way for businesses to reach organizational effectiveness. Chien, M.,(1996)

The more significant, yet, different concepts that need to be differentiated are dealt with in detail by Aykler, J., (2010) and are cited below.

Extra Role Behavior, as opposed to in-role behavior, is per definition a behavior that tries to benefit the organization and that "*goes beyond existing role requirements.*" (Organ, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, 2006) Whereas failing to perform the required in-role behavior that serves as basis for continuing job performance (Katz 1964, cited in Van Dyne and Le Pine 1998, p.108), will have financial consequences and bear the risk of losing the job, extra-role behavior is discretionary. If one takes a closer look on the definition of extra-role behavior, one can see the resemblances with OCB as well as the differences. Extra role behavior is: "(1) not specified in advance by role prescriptions, (2) not recognized by formal reward systems and (3) not a source of punitive consequences when not performed by job incumbents." (Van Dyne and Le Pine 1998). there are some similarities between the ERB dimension of "helping" and

some OCB behaviors especially the "altruism" dimension. Nevertheless *the definition of ERB tends to exclude those types of OCB which are not explicitly beyond role requirements, but fit into the definition of OCB as soon as the level of engagement in a certain behavior, such as "compliance", exceeds the minimum standards required by the job description.* (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006) Referring to the challenging forms of ERB, the distinction between OCB and ERB is more obvious: Both the antecedents and the immediate consequences are quite different. (Organ, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, 2006)

As regards prosocial behavior, in his differentiation, Aykler, J., (2010) refers to Brief and Motowidlo, (1986) "providing services or products to consumers in organizationally inconsistent ways", which is the opposite of the behavior mentioned previously, as well as one type of prosocial behavior. "This may sound like a contradiction, but in fact *both behaviors can be prosocial, as they benefit the person to whom it is addressed, with or without respect to the interests of another party (in this case the organization).* To point it out in a clear manner this is, according to Aykler, J., (2010), is the biggest difference between prosocial and organizational citizenship behavior. The first one includes any type of behavior that benefits another person or group within an organizational context, but does not necessarily require respecting the interests of the organization. The latter one, indeed, does not require respecting the interest of the organization per definition, either, but does include the term "*promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization*" (Organ 1988, p.4), and consequently excludes any behavior that will harm the effective and efficient functioning of the organization.

Aykler, (2010), while examining contextual performance says that contextual performance is in its nature very similar to OCB, as it includes not only forms of helping and supporting one's colleagues, but also more impersonal forms of

contribution to the social spirit of the organization in form of job dedication. Nevertheless *OCB seems to be more specified as it includes in its definition that those behaviors are unrewarded and not included in the job-description. The concept of contextual performance, in contrast to OCB, does not make reference to the expectations according to the job description or the prospect of formal rewards.* (Organ, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, 2006) Consequently it remains open whether contextual performance includes all types of dedication to work and helping without questioning whether this behavior is voluntary or required. As a consequence it can be argued that the motives behind contextual performance might vary from being totally selfless and other-oriented to egocentric ones that motivate to behave socially in order to fulfill all the job-requirements in the best possible way.

c. OCB studies and culture

It is well understood that behavior does not occur in vacuum and culture has a very important role to play .Cultural differences are noted in behaviors being identified bad and undesirable, good and desirable. Baron and Miller (2000) found Indian students perceive not helping a stranger in a life threatening situation to be far more harmful of than American students do. Hustedh (2001) suggested that national differences in what behaviors are considered to be harmful behavior are likely to be affected by whether people hold individualistic or collectivistic cultural assumptions, values and norms. In individualistic cultures people tend to perceive themselves as independent selves who pursue their own goals that take priority over group goals. In individualistic cultures personal rights take precedence above duties. In collectivistic cultures, on the other hand, individuals conceptualize themselves as part of a group and the collective duties and interest take precedents above personal interest and rights. (as cited in Srivastava K., Saldanha D.,2008). This is also discussed by Hofstede, (2009).

As discussed earlier, citizenship behavior can be described as directed towards individual (OCBI) and directed towards Organization. OCBI comprises behaviors that are directed at individuals or groups in the organization, while OCBO refers to helping targets of the organization. There have been attempts to research this construct in other international contexts such as in China, Singapore, Taiwan, Australia, Japan and Hong Kong (Hui, Law, & Chen, 1999: Lam, Hui, & Law, 1999; Tang, Furnham, & Davis, 2002;). (as cited in Srivastava K., Saldanha D.,2008)

It is worthwhile to synthesize this concept in Indian scenario for productive organizational environment. Cultural context may affect the forms of citizenship behaviour observed in organizations hence there is a need to synchronize it in the Indian scenario as per Srivastava K., Saldanha D.,(2008). These different conceptualizations of the self and the duties towards the others are likely to affect what people perceive to be altruistic behaviors (Hustedh, 2001).

As per Kumar, K., Bakhshi, A., (2009), almost all the measures used for measuring OCB are developed in western cultural context, especially U.S., and culture does influence the conceptualization of specific behavior that might be considered OCB. Conceptions of what constitutes extra role (or citizenship) behavior vary across cultures. Lam, Hui and Law (1999) found that a five-factor structure of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs)—altruism, conscientiousness, civic virtue, courtesy, and sportsmanship—was replicated in Japan, Australia, and Hong Kong. However, Japanese and Hong Kong employees were more likely to define some categories of OCBs (e.g. courtesy, sportsmanship) as part of 'in role' performance as compared with Australian and U.S. employees.

Culture seems to thus have an implication on OCB and hence supports the need for a study in India.

d. Select literature review of Indian studies on OCB

There have been studies on OCB in India and a select literature review is presented in this section.

Bhatnagar, J., Sandhu, S., (2005), studied 111 managers of the IT sector organizations in India. Results indicated that managers who perceive psychological empowerment in their occupational environment exhibit organisational citizenship behaviour.

Chaitanya, S.K., Tripathi, N., (2001), in a study of 100 scientific officers of a public sector in southern India report Altruism, Sportsmanship and Perception of organization towards OCB significantly predicted Organization commitment.

Bhargava, S., Rupashree, B., (2009) in their study identify core self-evaluations, family support, supervisor support and job characteristics as the antecedents of work-to-family enrichment and family satisfaction, job satisfaction, affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as its outcomes. The participants (n=245) were employees from four organizations in India from manufacturing and information technology sectors. The results show that job characteristics and supervisor support were the predictors of work-to-family enrichment and core self-evaluations, family support and supervision support emerged as the predictors of family-to-work enrichment. On outcome, work-to-family enrichment are the predicator of job satisfaction, affective commitment and OCB and family-to-work enrichment as the predictor of family satisfaction, job satisfaction, affective commitment and OCB.

Singh, A. K., Singh, A.P., (2009) in a study conducted on 188 front level managers to examine the role of personality in organizational citizenship behavior, along with demographical data schedule Indian adaptation of Neo Five-Factor Inventory and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale were used for data collection. The results

of coefficient of correlation indicate that Conscientiousness and extraversion dimensions of personality were found to be significantly positively correlated with all the five dimensions of OCB. Agreeableness dimension of personality was significantly positively correlated with all the five dimensions of OCB except civic virtue. Neuroticism dimension of personality was significantly negatively correlated with sportsmanship, courtesy and altruism dimensions of OCB. The results of hierarchal regression support the results of correlational analysis.

Singh, U., Srivastava, K.B.L., (2009) investigated the relationship between certain individual level determinants of interpersonal trust and its impact on organizational citizenship behavior. The participants (N=303) were top, middle and lower level executives from manufacturing and services sectors. The results indicated that interaction frequency, consistency, and competence are significant predictors of interpersonal trust. Interpersonal trust is positively associated with organizational citizenship behavior, and it also partially mediated the relationship between individual level factors and organizational citizenship behavior. The results imply that the development of trust at the interpersonal level may be used as a strategy to motivate the employees to engage in extra role behaviors to ensure improved individual and organizational performance.

Krishnan, V.R., Arora, P., (2008), using a sample of 93 superior-subordinate dyads from various organizations in India, this study looked at the relationships between leader's organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), transformational leadership, and follower's OCB. It also looked at leader's public self-consciousness and self-monitoring as antecedents to leader OCB, and leader's social skills and even-temperedness as antecedents to follower OCB. Results show that public self-consciousness is positively related to leader OCB, leader OCB is positively related to

transformational leadership, and transformational leadership, social skills, and even-temperedness are positively related to follower OCB.

Sardha, H., Harold, A. P., (2011) in their study proposed to examine the relationship between Employee Engagement and OCB. The sample consisted of 235 IT professionals from both Indian and MNC IT companies operating in India. The IT professionals were from companies where Employee Engagement activities were prevalent. Employee Engagement was measured by using the questionnaire developed by Dilys Robinson (2004) and Organizational citizenship Behavior was measured by using the questionnaire developed by Podsakoff (2000).The results of the study indicated that moderate level of engagement and OCB experienced by employees and low significant relationship was found between engagement and OCB. Current career intention, job satisfaction, pay & benefits, management, equal opportunities, and organization citizenship behavior had a significant influence on employee engagement.

Gunavathy, J.S., Indumati, G., (2011) in their study aimed at understanding the relationship between various demographic variables and leadership that an employee experiences from his supervisor and Organization Citizenship Behavior. The study was conducted among the 90 employees of a Civil Engineering company in Chennai. The leadership scale used was the adapted version of the Leadership tool developed by Frank MJ LaFasto and Carl E. Larson(1996). The findings indicated that there is no significant relationship between factors like age, years of experience, designation, leadership style and OCB. Relationship between Gender and OCB was statistically significant.

Sharma, J.P., Bajpai, N., Holani, U., (2011) in their study aimed at understanding the difference in the degree of Organization Citizenship Behavior present in the

employees of public and private sector organisations. The sample consisted of 200 employees including both managerial and non-managerial staff from the public sector and private sector organizations. The results showed that employees in public sector organization have greater degree of OCB in comparison to private sector organizations and also the job satisfaction increases or decreases based on increase or decrease in OCB. Organizational citizenship behavior was being proven as the catalyst for enhancing job satisfaction level of employees

A study in India in the healthcare sector presents an opportunity to research OCB. OCB studies have been conducted among nurses in Malaysia. Harif, A. R., (2005) in his study undertaken to examine the factors that influence organizational citizenship behavior in an organization, these factors included procedural justice, distributive justice, job satisfaction and commitment as the theoretical model proposed that job satisfaction has an effect on OCB through affective commitment. In terms of commitment, this study utilized the specific type of commitment, i.e. affective commitment. The sample consisted of 383 nurses who were working in Private hospitals in Indonesia. The findings indicated that there are significant relationships between both procedural justice and distributive justice and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction has a significant impact for developing affective commitment. The results also supported that affective commitment is a significant predictor of organizational citizenship behavior.

e. *Selected literature review on Role efficacy*

Role theory was first identified in the 1930s, but it was not until years later (Katz & Kahn, 1978) that role theory became more widely recognized and readily used in organizational research (Harris, 2004). This is supported by Biddle (1986) asserting that, "Role theory is a science concerned with the study of behaviors that are characteristic of persons within contexts and with various processes that presumably

produce, explain, or are affected by those behaviors". Role theory explains roles as individuals having social positions and hence having expectations for the behaviors of themselves and others. In addition, the theory suggests that the sender's role will affect the role of a receiver, which will later affect the role of the sender, and so on (Harris, 2004).

Saxena, D., (2009) referred to the following studies on role efficacy

> Surti, Sen (1982-1983) indicated that persons with role efficacy experience less role stress and also they effectively cope up with the behaviours. Sen's study on role efficacy over the period of years has found out that Role efficacy has high positive correlation with internal locus of control. The individuals with higher role efficacy, showed growth orientation, attitudinal commitment, positive and approach behaviour. They also tend to feel more satisfied with life, with their jobs and organizational role in general.

> Sayeed (1992a) in his study on role efficacy found out that there is a strong linkage between appropriate power position structure and role efficacy. Also that a conducive work environment influences role efficacy of organisational members and productivity of organisations and finally that personal attributes like Age, Gender and Marital Status and job demographics like experience and job type have impact on Role Efficacy.

Nair, S.K., referred to the following studies on role efficacy

> Gupta, et.al., (1988) showed that Role Efficacy was found to be related to the quality of work life measured by influence, amenities at the work place, nature of job and supervisory behaviour.

Franks, et, al., (1972) in his study suggested that Role-taking and power are seen as distinct strategies by which persons achieve control of other.

Pandey, A. (1995),this study focused on examining the relationship between Role Efficacy and Role Stress among the Rail Engine Drivers of Indian Railways. The sample consisted of 62 Rail Engine Drivers. The study revealed role efficacy and role stress to be negatively related. The respondents were found to be suffering from the feeling of role overload, resource inadequacy and personal inadequacy. Advancement in experience was found to enhance probability of stress as also to have differential impact on drivers.

Upadhyay, A. S., conducted a study on Role of Personality Type (Introversion-Extraversion) For the Enhancement of Role Efficacy among technical Grade Employees. The study was conducted on 170 technical grade participants from various departments of railways such as electric, signals, telecom and mechanical has been selected as sample.

Role identity and Volunteerism OCB share important attributes. Both involve long-term, planned, and discretionary acts that occur in an organizational context and benefit non intimate others. Penner (2002) suggested that the factors that initiate and sustain volunteerism could also be used to understand the dispositional factors that underlie OCB. One's self-concept comprises of an array of social role identities. The more others identify one with a particular role, the role is more internalized and incorporated into the self-concept. Finkelstein, Penner, and Brannick (2005), in a study of hospice volunteers, found significant associations between role identity and amount of time spent volunteering and length of volunteer service. Applying the integrated perspective to workplace behavior, Finkelstein and Penner (2004) quantified that role identity helped predict OCB. Motives concerned with the desire to help coworkers and/or the organization proved to be better predictors of OCB than

did those concerned with the desire for impression management. A citizen role identity also correlated with citizenship behavior. Authors (Finkelstein and Penner, 2004) found a strong positive association between identity and both OCBI and OCBO in a sample of public employees. Just as long-term volunteers develop a volunteer identity, continued OCB was associated with an "organizational citizen" self-concept. Together, the studies suggested that similar mechanisms are involved in sustaining both volunteerism and OCB. (as cited in Srivastava K., Saldanha D.,2008)

f. *Human Resources Development for organizational effectiveness through people*

 (cited from Benjamin, A., 2012) Today's business landscape is changing rapidly due to factors such as: globalization, responsiveness to customers, increasing revenue and decreasing costs, building organizational capability, change, and transformation, implementing technology, attracting and developing Human Capital, and ensuring fundamental and long-lasting change (Ulrich, 1997). Human Resource Development (HRD) is not just about employee training and development. It consists of all activities relating to training, career and organisation development. It is the conscious and deliberate organizational and/or individual undertakings aimed at enhancing the skills, knowledge, ability and other attributes of an employee for effectiveness in current job demands and anticipated future challenges. It is making a continuous, long-term investment in ensuring a high-quality workforce capable of accomplishing the organisation's mission now and in the

future. Harrison and Kessels (2004, p.4) define HRD as an oganizational process comprising "the skillful planning and facilitation of a variety of formal and informal learning and knowledge processes and experiences, primarily but not exclusively in the workplace, in order that organisational progress and individual potential can be enhanced through the competence, adaptability, collaboration and knowledge-

creating activity of all who work for the organisation." Swanson (1995) sees HRD as a process aimed at performance improvement by developing and unleashing human expertise through organisation development and personnel training and development. Rao (1985) elaborately define HRD as "a process by which the employees of an organisation are helped, in a continuous, planned way, to: acquire or sharpen capabilities required to perform various functions associated with their present or expected future roles; develop their general capabilities as individuals and discover and exploit their own inner potential for their own and/or organisational development purposes; develop an organisational culture in which the supervisor-subordinate relationships, teamwork, and collaboration among sub-units are strong and contribute to the professional well being, motivation and pride of employees."

Human Resource Development (HRD) was also defined as "a set of systematic and planned activities designed by an organization to provide its members with the opportunities to learn necessary skills to meet current and future job demands" (Werner and DeSimone, 2006 p.5). Werner and DeSimone described HRD as a function of HRM. But Rao (1995) opined that the scope of HRD is extended, at one side, to developing competencies of human resource by enhancing knowledge, building skill, changing attitude and teaching values, and at other side, creation of conditions through public policy, programs and other interventions to help people to apply these competencies for their own and others' benefits and making things happen. Stressing the ultimate goal of HRD in any country Bacchus (1992) posits that it is 'to improve the quality of life of all it's people and not merely concerned with providing necessary skills to individuals. The concept of HRD deals with many facets of development of individuals including their physical, intellectual, emotional, political, and spiritual aspects. In essence, HRD is tantamount to building competence, commitment and culture (Rao, 1990). In the era of intense competition, rapidly changing technology, uncertainty, high customer expectations and demand, organisations cannot affort to trivialise the capability development of their

employees. As stated by Dag Hammarskjöld, "fundamentally man is the key to all problems, not money. Funds are valuable only when used by trained, experienced, and devoted men and women. Such people, on the other hand, can work miracles even with small resources and draw wealth out of a barren land (UN 1995, p.3). Since HR is the major source of sustainable competitive advantage it should be strategically developed to meet current and future challenges. The effectiveness of organisations in developing their workforce largely depends on the prevailing developmental climate within the organisations.

Developing Role Efficacy has been referred to as one of the interventions of Human Resources Development. (Acharya, V., Siddharth, N., 2007). HRD is a continuous and dynamic process in organizations. Dynamic people can build dynamic organizations. Hyde, A.M., Pethe, S., (2005)

The authors explore whether Role efficacy has a positive significant effect as an correlate to OCB and arrive at the hypothesis for this study being

H1: There is a significant positive relationship between Role Efficacy and Organizational citizenship Behavior

3. **Gaps in Literature and Need of the study**

Service based organizations, such as Healthcare, require individuals with high role efficacy. As per Todd, (2003), OCB can be affected by instilling in employees a perception of expertise in their job tasks, employees with higher role efficacy, show growth orientation, attitudinal commitment, positive and approach behaviour. They also tend to feel more satisfied with life, with their jobs and organizational role in general (Surti and Sen, 1982-1983). Research suggests that several studies on OCB have highlighted the relationship between OCB and Role Clarity, Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity. Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity are negatively related to Role Efficacy and also to Organizational Citizenship Behavior. However, in globally published literature, there is no research to find out the relationship that exists between Role Efficacy and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the Healthcare Industry in India. The authors attempt to study whether Role Efficacy is an correlate to and has a positive significant relationship with Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

4. **Methodology**

This study was exploratory and was conducted among the employees of an organization in the field of healthcare, that catered exclusively to maternity and child care. The organization was situated at Bangalore in India. Data was obtained through primary research. The technique adopted for the purpose of the research was convenience sampling technique. A total of 31 female nursing staff participated in the process which included both the nurses as well as the supervisors.

The questionnaire method was adopted to collect the data. Two questionnaires were administered, one to the nursing staff and other one was responded to by the supervisors.

- Role Efficacy Scale developed by Pareek, Udai (2002) was responded to by the nurses

- Organizational citizenship Behavior items were responded to by the supervisors. Of these items, those related to dimensions of Courtesy, Sportsmanship and Civic behaviour were adapted from as cited in Aykler, (2011) and those on Helping (referred to as Altruism in this study) and Conscientiousness were adapted from MacKenzie, Podsakoff, Fetter, (1993). Minor changes of her for his/her and nursing/nurses were made. For each of the employees, this was responded to by their immediate supervisors. This is in line with directions for future research from other studies where it is indicated that for the assessment of OCB future research should aim at gaining independent assessments (Bentein et al. 2002; Chen & Francesco 2003) such as the use of either supervisor rating or direct observation of OCB. Kumar, K., Bakhshi, A., (2009)

According to Bhakshi., A., et.al., (2011), demographic variables show no significant impact on the Organizational citizenship behavior. Alotaibi (2001) also found that none of the demographic variables such as age and gender correlated with OCB. Schappe's (1998) also found no significant correlation between age, gender and OCB.

In this study, variables of experience and age we collected from the respondents.

5. Results of the study

Descriptive statistics

The table below indicates the descriptive statistics for the five dimensions of OCB and the total of these five dimensions is indicated as OCB

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of dimensions of OCB and OCB

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Courtesy	31	10	20	16.00	2.556
Altruism	31	8	15	11.26	1.843
Sportsmanship	31	19	44	25.97	5.003
Civic	31	8	15	10.65	2.244
Conscientiousness	31	9	15	11.87	1.607
OCB	31	54	100	75.74	9.338
Valid N (listwise)	31				

The table below indicates the descriptive statistics for the ten dimensions of Role Efficacy, the total of the ten dimensions and the Role Efficacy Index computed as per Pareek, U, (2002).

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of dimensions of Role efficacy, totals of dimensions and Role Efficacy Index

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Centrality	31	2	4	2.90	.870
Integration	31	0	4	3.45	1.207
Proactivity	31	-2	4	1.94	1.315
Creativity	31	0	4	3.10	.870
Rlink	31	1	4	3.42	1.025
Hlprel	31	-2	4	2.45	1.710
Superordination	31	0	4	2.48	1.458
Influence	31	1	4	2.45	.810
Growth	31	1	4	3.32	.871
Confrontation	31	1	4	3.55	.675
Total	31	16	38	29.06	5.202
REI	31	60	97	81.77	8.701
Valid N (listwise)	31				

Table 3. Inter dimension correlations

		Courtesy	Altruism	Sportsmanship	Civic	Conscientiousness	OCB
						Correlations	
Centrality	Pearson Correlation	0.015	0.162	-0.169	-0.155	-0.057	-0.102
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.468	0.193	0.181	0.203	0.381	0.293
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31
Integration	Pearson Correlation	-.313*	-0.069	0.102	0.098	0.117	-0.001
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.043	0.356	0.293	0.3	0.265	0.498
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31
Proactivity	Pearson Correlation	-0.02	0.145	-0.127	0.15	0.296	0.042
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.458	0.219	0.248	0.21	0.053	0.411
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31
Creativity	Pearson Correlation	0.105	0.129	-0.045	0.069	0.128	0.069
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.287	0.244	0.405	0.355	0.246	0.356
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31
Rlink	Pearson Correlation	0	0.064	-0.205	0.096	-0.067	-0.086
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.5	0.366	0.134	0.304	0.36	0.323
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31
Hlprel	Pearson Correlation	0.252	-0.006	0.197	-0.044	-0.112	0.143
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.086	0.486	0.145	0.408	0.275	0.221
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31
Superordination	Pearson Correlation	0	0.25	-0.062	0.156	0.084	0.068
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.5	0.088	0.371	0.201	0.326	0.358
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31
Influence	Pearson Correlation	0.225	0.299	0.275	.366*	.328*	.413*
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.111	0.051	0.067	0.021	0.036	0.011
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31
Growth	Pearson Correlation	0.225	0.154	-0.135	0.231	0.197	0.109
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.112	0.204	0.234	0.106	0.144	0.28
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31
Confrontation	Pearson Correlation	0.039	0.07	-.370*	-0.197	0.006	-0.22
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.418	0.354	0.02	0.144	0.487	0.117
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31
Total	Pearson Correlation	0.103	0.231	-0.065	0.165	0.172	0.108
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.291	0.105	0.364	0.188	0.177	0.281
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31
REI	Pearson Correlation	0.099	0.232	-0.07	0.156	0.169	0.102
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.298	0.104	0.354	0.201	0.181	0.292
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31
Age	Pearson Correlation	-.342*	-0.181	0.049	0.087	0.046	-0.075
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.03	0.164	0.397	0.322	0.403	0.345
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31
Experience	Pearson Correlation	0.015	-0.02	0.015	.308*	0.111	0.101
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.469	0.457	0.469	0.046	0.275	0.294
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31
Courtesy	Pearson Correlation	1	0.276	0.149	.418**	.390*	.575**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		0.066	0.213	0.01	0.015	0
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31
Altruism	Pearson Correlation		1	0.037	.369*	.315*	.436**
	Sig. (1-tailed)			0.422	0.02	0.042	0.007
	N			31	31	31	31
Sportsmanship	Pearson Correlation			1	.530**	.443**	.787**
	Sig. (1-tailed)				0.001	0.006	0
	N				31	31	31
Civic	Pearson Correlation				1	.772**	.845**
	Sig. (1-tailed)					0	0
	N					31	31
Conscientiousness	Pearson Correlation					1	.764**
	Sig. (1-tailed)						0
	N					31	31
OCB	Pearson Correlation						1
	Sig. (1-tailed)						
	N						31

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

6. Discussion of results

The correlation between Role Efficacy Index (REI) and overall OCB is positive, but not significant when tested using a one-tailed test. Hypothesis H1 stands rejected.

However, there are a few correlations that the authors discuss since these have interesting implications.

Integration and Courtesy are significantly negatively correlated. This could be due to the nature of the role being perceived as primarily being of a technical nature and of an individual contributor, rather than one that is linked to the organization.

Confrontation and sportsmanship are significantly negatively correlated. This could possibly be attributed to the fact that the supervisors who provided feedback could have viewed confrontation of issues as non-sportsmanship behaviours.

Influence is significantly positively correlated to Civic behaviours. This could possibly imply that those who perceive their roles as allowing them to influence, tend to exhibit civic behaviours since those behaviours could stand a chance of achieving change through influence.

Influence is also significantly positively correlated to Conscientiousness. This could possibly imply that those who perceive their roles as allowing them to influence, tend to exhibit behaviours of Conscientiousness (which could be through their co-workers observing them).

Among the demographic variables collected, Courtesy was significantly negatively co-related with age. This is possibly due to India's culture being high in Power-Distance as discussed by Hofstede (2009). Also, Civic virtue behaviours were significantly positively co-related to experience.

7. Implications of the study

According to Schyns, the supervisor often has the discretion to offer valuable job assignments to employees; these provide a potential for enactive attainment, or actual success experiences. Pellegrini and Scandura (2006) and Schyns et al. (2005) tested this possibility directly. They found that leaders are more likely to provide beneficial delegation opportunities to workers with whom they have a high quality Leader Member Exchange (LMX) relationship. This may also provide effective learning opportunities for workers (Walumbwa et al., 2009). For a second source of influence (cf., Bandura, 1986), a boss may demonstrate or model effective performance for the subordinate, thereby providing vicarious experience. In this regard, Schyns (2004) maintains that high LMX leaders often model effective conduct for their workers. Consistent with this, Kramer (1995) found that supervisors interact more with their subordinates when they are in a high quality LMX relationship and less when the relationship is of lower quality, thereby providing more opportunities for modeling (see also Bauer & Green, 1996, and Murphy & Ensher, 1999). A third means by which LMX can increase self-efficacy is through verbal persuasion that boosts worker self-confidence. Schyns' (2004) model includes verbal persuasion as a relevant mechanism (Murphy and Ensher,1999, limit themselves to enactive mastery and vicarious experience). A fourth means by which LMX could potentially increase self-efficacy is through the use of affective arousal. For example, a supervisor might "fire up" an employee for future challenges. Bandura (1986) suggests that the benefits of affective arousal tend to be modest when compared to enactive mastery and vicarious experiences.

With a few dimensions of Role Efficacy indicating that they have a significant positive co-relation with a few dimensions of OCB in this study, it becomes worthwhile to consider whether supervisors can be trained to increase the role efficacy of subordinates and thus also have an additional positive impact on the organization through OCB of subordinates.

8. Limitations of the Study

The current study has the following limitations. First, the data for research was collected from one organisation in Bangalore and hence, the findings cannot be generalized to the Healthcare Industry in India. Second, the research employed convenience sampling to accomplish research objectives. For further research, simple random sampling is recommended to be used in order to increase the generalizability of the findings of the research. Third, the research focussed only on female nurses in the organisation.

9. Suggestions for future research

The authors suggest that future research in this sector is carried out to study gender variations, generalizability across India and also explore any variations if a scale developed for OCB in India is used.

10. Bibliography

Acharya, V.U., Siddharth,N., (2007), A Business HR intervention using the concept of Organizational roles Experience sharing and exploratory findings, *Kaustubham*, TISS

Ahmadi.A.A.S., Ahmadi, F., Tavreh, N.,(Mar2011), The relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and Burnout in public organization in west Azarbayejan province, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, Vol. 2 Issue 11, p147-156, 10p, 1 Diagram, 2 Charts

Allameh, S.,M., Amiri, S., Asadi, A. ,(Sep2011), A Survey of Relationship between Organizational Commitments and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Case study: Regional Water Organization of Mazandaran Province, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business,*Vol. 3 Issue 5, p360-368, 9p, 4 Charts

Aykler, J., (2010), The influence of personality factors on organizational citizenship behavior, BADWW Institute for change management and management development

Bakshi.A.,Sharma.A.D.,(2011), Organizational Commitment as predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, *European Journal of Business and Management,* Vol 3, No.4

Benjamin, A., (2012), Human Resource Development Climate as a predictor of Citizenship behavior and voluntary turnover intentions in the banking sector, *International business research*, Vol.5, No. 1

Bhargava, Shivganesh and Rupashree B, (2009), Antecedents and consequences of work-family enrichment among Indian mangers. *Psychological Studies (September 2009)54: 213-225.*

Bhatnagar, J., Sandhu, S., (2005), Psychological Empowerment and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) in 'IT' Managers: A Talent Retention Tool, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations,* Vol. 40, No. 4 (Apr., 2005), pp. 449-469

Biswas, M., Mar2010 *Vilakshan: The XIMB Journal of Management*, Vol. 7 Issue 1, p77-102, 26p, 1 Diagram, 5 Charts

Chahal, H., Mehta, S.,(Apr2011), Antecedents And Consequences Of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (Ocb): A Conceptual Framework In Reference To Health Care Sector., *Journal of Services Research*, Vol. 11 Issue 1, p25-44, 20p

Chaitanya, S.K., Tripathi, N., (2001), Dimensions of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations,* Vol. 37, No. 2 (Oct., 2001), pp. 217-230

Chien, M., A study to improve Organization Citizenship behaviours, The Overseas Chinese Institute of Technology

Chin.S.T.S.**,** Anantharaman**,** R**.** N**.** David, Y. K. T**.,**(2011), Emotional Intelligence and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour of Manufacturing Sector Employees: An Analysis. *Management (18544223)*, Vol. 6 Issue 2, p107-125, 19p, 7 Charts

Gunavathy, J. S., Indumathi, G.,(2011) ,Leadership and Organization Citizenship Behaviour-A Study among Employees of a Civil Engineering Company, *BVIMR Management Edge*, Vol. 4 Issue 1, p66-81, 16p

Harif.A.R.*,*(May-Aug2005),A Test Of The Relationships Among Perceptions Of Justice, Job Satisfaction, Affective Commitment And Organizational Citizenship Behavior.*, Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, Vol. 7 Issue 2, p131-154, 24p

Hofstede, G. (2009, June). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*. ©International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology.

Hyde, A.M., Pethe, S., (2005), Impact of HRD Climate on Empowerment and Organization Citizenship Behavior, the IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior, July 2005

Ibrahim.A. B.,(2010) a correlation study of leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior in a public sector organization, *Journal of Global Business & Economics*, Vol. 1 Issue 1, p62-78, 17p, 6 Charts

Khalid, S.A., et.al., (June 2009) ,Organizational Citizenship Behavior Factor Structure among Employees in Hotel Industry, International Journal of Psychological studies, Vol. 1, No. 1,

Krishnan, V.R., Arora, P., (2008), Determinants of Transformational Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Asia-Pacific Business Review, Vol. IV, No. 1, Jan-Mar 2008

Kumar, K., Bakhshi, A.,(July-Dec 2009), Organizational Citizenship Behavior in India: Development of a Scale, International Journal of Organisational Behaviour, Vol. 14, No. 1,: 14-25.

Lathalavanya, B., Thenmozhi, R., (Mar2011),Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Evaluating Organizational Efficiency and Success through Knowledge sharing, *Journal of Contemporary Management Research*, Vol. 5 Issue 1, p24-29, 6p, 1 Diagram, 3 Charts

MacKenzie, Scott B., Podsakoff. P. M.,Fetter, R.,*(Jan93)*, The Impact of Organizational
Citizenship Behavior on Evaluations of Salesperson Performance *Journal of Marketing*, , Vol. 57 Issue 1, p70-80, 11p, 3 Charts

Mohammad, J., Habib, Farzana Q.B., Adnan, M, (2010), Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Higher Education Institution., Alias, Bin. *Global Business & Management Research*, Vol. 2 Issue 1, p13-32, 20p, 1 Diagram, 11 Charts

Najari, Reza; Ahmadi, Freyedon; Habibitabar, Zainab.,(Jun2011), Study of relationship between personality and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in public organizations in Iran., *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, Vol. 3 Issue 2, p472-483, 12p, 5 Diagrams, 4 Charts

Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., (2006): Organizational Citizenship Behavior. It's nature, antecedents and consequences. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Pandey, A., (Oct., 1995), "Role Efficacy and Role Stress Relationship : Some Experience with workers". *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations* , (Vol. 31, No. 2) pp. 193-210

Pareek, Udai (2002). Training instruments in HRD and OD. Tata McGraw-Hill Publications

Peng, Jei-Chen; Chiu, Su-Fen.*,* (Nov/Dec2010),An Integrative Model Linking Feedback Environment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior, *Journal of Social Psychology*, , Vol. 150 Issue 6, p582-607, 26p, 2 Diagrams, 3 Charts; DOI: 10.1080/00224540903365455

Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B., (1997), Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82, 262-270.

S.K.Nair, S. a. (n.d.). A study of Role Stress and Role Efficacy among Indian women Executives. *Intrenational Journal of Arts and Science* , 2-5.

Salvati, A., Batmani, F., Ahmadi, F., Faraji, B.,(Jul2011), The role of personality in development of organizational citizenship behavior*, Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, Vol. 3 Issue 3, p225-234, 10p, 5 Diagrams, 4 Charts

Saradha, H., Patrick, H. A.,(Nov2011)*,* Employee Engagement In Relation To Organizational Citizenship Behavior In Information Technology Organization *Journal of Marketing & Management*, Vol. 2 Issue 2, p74-90, 17p, 6 Charts
Saxena, D. (First Edition 2009). *Actualizing Managerial Roles Through Corporate Leadership: Exploring Indian Corporates.* New Delhi: University Science Press.

Sharma, J. P., Bajpai, N., Holani, U., (Jan2011), Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Public and Private Sector and Its Impact on Job Satisfaction: A Comparative Study in Indian Perspective. *International Journal of Business & Management*, Vol. 6 Issue 1, p67-75, 9p, 1 Diagram, 7 Charts

Singh, A. K. and Singh.A.P. (July 2009),(Banaras Hindu Unversity, Varanasi). Does personality predict organisational citizenship behaviour among managerial personnel. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, Vol. 35, No. 291-298.Psychology* 55

 Singh, S.K., Organ, D.W., Podsakoff, P.M., et.al, (June, 2007), Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences, IIMB Management Review, Volume 19, Number 2

Singh, Upasana and Srivastava.K.B.L., (IIT, Kharagpur, India), *(September 2009),* Interpersonal trust and organizational citizenship behavior. *Psychological Studies 54: 65-76.*
Srivastava K., Saldanha D., (2008), Organizational citizenship behavior. Ind Psychiatry J 2008; 17:1-3

Sutton, Martha J., (2005). "Organizational citizenship behavior: A career development strategy" *Theses and Dissertations.* Paper 880.

http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/880,   http://www.psych-it.com.au/Psychlopedia/article.asp?id=272

Walumbwa. F. O, Cropanzano.R ,Goldman. B. M., (Autumn2011), How Leader–Member Exchange Influences Effective Work Behaviors: Social Exchange and Internal–External Efficacy Perspectives*, Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 64 Issue 3, P739-770, 32p, 1 Diagram, 3 Charts; Doi: 10.1111/J.1744-6570.2011.01224.Xb

Wei, Y., Yani, Z., (2010), Analysis on the influence of supervisory role on staffs' organizational citizenship behaviors in service enterprises, Shandong Univ. of Finance, Jinan, China, Information and Financial Engineering (ICIFE), 2nd IEEE International Conference