

## Organizational Citizenship behaviour among College Teacher

Trupti Ambalal Chandalia<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr. Minakshi D. Desai<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The present study was aimed to find out the impact of gender, college type and faculty type on the organizational citizenship behaviour among college teachers. Considering this purpose, first effort was made to select college teachers from different working colleges affiliated to Saurashtra University, Rajkot through stratified random sampling method. By using above mentioned method, total 210 female college teachers and 210 male college teachers were selected in sample for the present study. Again in each group of female and male 105 college teachers were selected from Government Colleges and 105 college teachers from self-finance colleges. Again in each of this group of 105 college teachers 35 were selected from arts faculty, 35 were from commerce faculties and 35 were from science faculties in this group. Thus, the whole sample comprised of 420 college teachers with equal number of female and male. The participants were assessed with Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Scale of constructed by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter based on Organ's and Personal Data Sheet. The data were analyzed by using three-way ANOVA. Result demonstrated that gender type no significant impact on organizational citizenship behaviour among college teachers. Government college teacher reported more organizational citizenship behaviour than the Self-finance college teacher and Science college teacher more organizational citizenship behaviour than Arts and Commerce college teacher. The interaction between type of college and type of faculty had significant impact on organizational citizenship behaviour among college teacher.

**Keywords:** *Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, College Teacher*

Today every institute has started to take care of the teacher's physical mental, economic and social factors, because so many findings from the research have resulted in the welfare of the psychological behaviour of the teacher's. Can a teacher give positive share in the success of the institute? Present it is decided in the realm of the caring attitude of the trustees of the caring institute. In present situation, behaviour of active teacher is not like the organizational citizenship behaviour of institute. Even self-efficacy and organizational commitment is negative in many ways. But the head can turn this situation in positivity by the own behaviour. There can be necessary a change in present research is the role of a teacher by concerning the above points of the research. The present research is the role of the thinking

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar, Department Of Psychology, Saurashtra University, Rajkot, Gujarat, India

<sup>2</sup> Professor And Head, Department Of Psychology, Saurashtra University, Rajkot, Gujarat, India

\*Responding Author

Received: December 10, 2018; Revision Received: February 7, 2019; Accepted: February 15, 2019

## Organizational Citizenship behaviour among College Teacher

process of all these factors. Organizational behavior is a field of study that investigates the impact those individual, groups, and structure has on behavior within organizations, for the purpose of applying such knowledge toward improving an organization's effectiveness. Organizational behaviour is the study of human behavior in organizational settings, the interface between human behavior and the organization, and the organization itself. Organizational behaviour can be defined as the understanding, prediction, and management of human behaviour in organizations. Organizational behaviour is the studies of what people think, feel, and do in and around organizations.

Halbesleben and Bellairs (2015) suggest that organizational citizenship behaviours are selected by individuals in alignment with personal goals, and with how they see their future work selves. They use the term "equal finality" when a choice of paths can attain one goal, and "multi finality" for a behaviour type in which imminent and distant goals can both be served by one behaviour. Individuals will learn from how their behaviour is (formally or informally) rewarded (or not), and select continuing behaviours accordingly. In addition, individuals' development of their goals is influenced by these rewards (or lack of them).

Organizations to be successful should have employees who go beyond their formal job responsibilities and freely give off their time and energy to succeed at the task. Such behavior is neither prescribed nor rewarded, yet, it contributes to the smooth functioning of the organization. As managers cannot fore see all contingencies or fully anticipate the activities that they may desire or need employees to perform (Katz & Khan, 1978; Organ 2000), work behavior that goes beyond the reach of organizational measures of job performance holds promise for long-term organizational success (Van Dyne, Cummings& Parks, 2001). This is because they are purported to improve organizational efficiency, effectiveness, and adaptability (Organ, 2000). However, this kind of behavior is lacking or it is less exhibited at work places in most Government Ministries. *Organizational citizenship behavior is defined as the context of performance in any job or task takes place. It is basically being a person who is ready to serve the organization in matters that is outside the scope of his/her job domain. It includes being helpful, caring to ward other employees in the organization - Management Dictionary (MBASkool.com 2011-2018).*

According to Organ (1988), organizational citizenship behaviour is defined as work-related s that are discretionary, not related to the formal organizational reward system, and, in aggregate, promote the effective functioning of the organization. In addition, organizational citizenship behaviour extends beyond the performance indicators required by an organization in a formal job description. Moreover, reflects those actions performed by employees that surpass the minimum role requirements expected by the organization and promote the welfare of co-workers, work groups, and/or the organization (Lovell, Kahn, Anton, Davidson, Dowling, et al., 1999). Research into organizational citizenship behaviour began in the early 1980s (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983), and since its inception, a distinction has been made between two dimensions of employee: (1) general compliance (doing what a good employee should do), and (2) altruism (helping specific others). Later, the concept underwent a number of transformations. For instance, in a review of the research, Organ (1988) identified five distinct dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour: Altruism (helping specific others); civic virtue (keeping up with important matters within the organization); conscientiousness (compliance with norms); courtesy (consulting others before taking action); and sportsmanship (not complaining about trivial matters). However, Organ (1997) further classified the organizational citizenship behaviour dimensions into three parts: helping, courtesy, and conscientiousness. According to Williams and Anderson (1991), who

## Organizational Citizenship behaviour among College Teacher

divided organizational citizenship behaviour into two types: (1) s directed at specific individuals in the organization, such as courtesy and altruism (OCBI); and (2) s concerned with benefiting the organization as a whole, such as conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue (OCBO). Citizenship s directed toward individuals (OCBI) OCBI refers to the s that immediately benefits specific individuals within an organization and, thereby, contributes indirectly to organizational effectiveness (Lee & Allen, 2002; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Organizational citizenship behaviour is not specified by any contract or not even expected by an average employee, this behavior is organizationally desirable because this behavior assist resource transformation', adaptability and innovation in order to increase the organization efficiency (Turnipseed & Murkison, 1996). Organizational citizenship behaviour is the actions that are not nominated or demanded by the formal job responsibilities (Farh, Zhong & Organ, 2004).

Today organizations are facing the fierce competition due to the flow of intense awareness and knowledge. Organizational commitment is significantly associated with the organizational citizenship behavior as its construct (Gautam, Dick, Wagner, Upadhyay & Davis, 2004). According to Wilson & Western (2000) Training and development plans of individuals can be supportive for the organizational objectives if there is a clear sense of direction. The teachers who are empowered participate in decision making that affect the learning and teaching. If there is empowered work environments then it assist in improving the quality of work life, teacher leadership and professionalism. Teachers show more commitment when they perceive their work is meaningful (Dee, Henkin & Duemer, 2002).

A good educational system of a developing country is considered as the backbone and teachers are the central part of the educational system. The capability and quality of the teachers determines the success of any educational system (Joolideh & Yeshodhara, 2008). Previous studies reveal that the faculty members of educational institutes who are highly committed continue their involvement with their current institutions and they also put high level of efforts and show high performance for their institutions (Chughtai & Zafar, 2006).

### **Dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour:-**

- A. Altruism refers to helping behavior of the employees in the organization .In this employees help their coworkers and also they are able to orient the new ones with their job.
- B. Conscientiousness The second dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour relates to conscientiousness. The elements leading to conscientiousness behavior include obeying rules, following timely breaks, punctuality etc. Conscientiousness behavior of executives would make them to avoid casual talks or to abide by the rules of the organization, reporting to duties on time, complying with the orders of the superiors.
- C. Sportsmanship it is willingness to tolerate less than ideal circumstances without complaining and refraining from activities such as complaining and petty grievances. Inculcation of sportsmanship behavior among executives in banking sector enables them to avoid finding faults and finding problems of the employees in the organization. It seeks to identify the grievances of the employees in the organization.
- D. Civic Virtue It is the behavior on the part of individuals indicating that they responsibly participate and rationally show concern about the life in the organization .In other words, engaging the employees in meetings, participation in social activities i.e get together, attending voluntary functions, etc.

## Organizational Citizenship behaviour among College Teacher

- E. Courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour includes discretionary behavior of individuals that is aimed at preventing work related problem with others, Assessing and doing what is best for the employees in strengthening courtesy dimensions.

The present investigation was carried out to examine the impact of gender, college type and faculty type on organizational citizenship behaviour among college teacher.

### METHOD

#### *Sample*

Considering this purpose, first effort was made to select college teachers from different working colleges affiliated to Saurashtra University, Rajkot through stratified random sampling method. By using above mentioned method, total 210 female college teachers and 210 male college teachers were selected in sample for the present study. Again in each group of female and male 105 college teachers were selected from Government Colleges and 105 college teachers from self-finance colleges. Again in each of this group of 105 college teachers 35 were selected from arts faculty, 35 were from commerce faculties and were from 35 science faculties in this group. Thus, the whole sample comprised of 420 college teachers with equal number of female and male.

#### *Tools*

The following tools were used in the present study.

##### **Personal Data Sheet:**

Certain personal information about respondents included in the sample of research is useful and important for research. Here also, for collecting such important information, personal data sheet was prepared. With the help of this personal data sheet, the information about gender, type of college, type of faculty, monthly income, monthly income of family, length of service in this college, marital status, time of college, college environment, family type etc. were collected.

##### **Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Scale (OCBS):**

Organizational citizenship behaviour scale constructed by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990) based on Organ's (1988) five dimensional taxonomy, was used to collect information on this matter. In this scale, there are 24 statements. It is a five point Likert type scale with the options like: 'strongly disagree', 'moderately disagree', 'neutral', 'agree' and 'strongly agree'. The scale has both negative and positive statements. Responses to the items are based on a five-point Likert scale. For item no. 1, 3, 5, 6, 8 to 15, 17, 18 and 20 to 24; scoring has to be done in the order of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively and for item no. 2, 4, 7, 16 and 19 scoring has to be done in reverse 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 order. In this scale, minimum 24 and maximum score of 120 can be obtained. High scores indicate high organizational citizenship behaviour and low scores indicate low organizational citizenship behaviour. For each dimensions a score obtained (the mean of the items in the scale) and the overall mean considered as overall score for general organizational citizenship behaviour. Organizational citizenship behaviour scale has reliability of 0.82 in Podsakoff et. al. (1990). The validity of Gujarati version was checked through the administration of both English and Gujarati version of the scale to 50 college teachers having good command over both English and Gujarati languages. The correlation between both the scores was calculated and the correlation coefficient of which was satisfactory ( $r = 0.92$ ).

## Organizational Citizenship behaviour among College Teacher

### **Procedure:**

Above mentioned devices were administered to all the selected government and self-finance college teacher having different colleges. Scoring was carried out as per the manual. To test the framed hypotheses related to organizational citizenship behaviour with reference to gender, type of college and type of faculty F-test was used.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The purpose of the present study was to investigate whether government and self-finance college having different type of faculty differ in the organizational citizenship behaviour. To examine the framed hypotheses F-test was applied and the obtained results are presented in the following table-1, 2, 3 and 4.

**Table – 1, Summary of ANOVA on organizational citizenship behaviour with reference to gender, college type and faculty type (N=420)**

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Sum of Squares	'F'
Gender (A)	64.82	1	64.82	0.75 <sup>NS</sup>
College Type (B)	1890.19	1	1890.19	21.95**
Faculty Type (C)	796.73	2	398.36	4.63*
A X B	233.26	1	233.26	2.71 <sup>NS</sup>
A X C	164.33	2	82.16	0.95 <sup>NS</sup>
B X C	1268.24	2	634.12	7.36**
A X B X C	121.58	2	60.79	0.71 <sup>NS</sup>
Within Groups	35133.03	408	86.11	
Total	39672.18	419		

**Table - 2 Difference among mean scores of organizational citizenship behaviour with reference to gender, college type and faculty type (N=420)**

Sr. No.	Variables	Categories	N	Mean	Mean Difference
1	Gender (A)	A1 = Female	210	95.71	0.79
		A2 = Male	210	96.50	
2	College Type (B)	B1 = Government	210	98.23	4.24
		B2 = Self-Finance	210	93.99	
3	Faculty Type (C)	C1 = Arts	140	95.53	C1vsC2 = 0.74
		C2 = Commerce	140	94.79	C1vsC3 = 2.48
		C3 = Science	140	98.01	C2vsC3 = 3.22

### **Organizational citizenship behaviour with reference to gender:**

It was assumed that gender of college teacher might affect the level of organizational citizenship behaviour. Therefore considering the gender type college teachers were categorized under two groups viz., female (A1) and male (A2) college teachers.

When F-test was applied to check the impact of gender type on organizational citizenship behaviour among college teachers the F-Value ( Table - 1) was found to be 0.75 which is insignificant.

Table - 2 reveals that the mean scores of organizational citizenship behaviour of female and male college teachers are 95.71 and 96.50 respectively and the difference between two is

## Organizational Citizenship behaviour among College Teacher

0.79. This difference is very negligible. Hence, it was concluded that there was not any significant impact of gender type of college teachers on their organizational citizenship behaviour. Lorna Valencia Pastor (2012), Sandeep R. Singh and Vasundhrara Padmanabhan (2017), study support result of the present study.

### ***Organizational citizenship behaviour with reference to college type:-***

It was assumed that college type of working college teachers might affect the level of organizational citizenship behaviour. Therefore considering the college type college teachers were categorized into two group viz., college teachers having working government college (B1) and self-finance college (B2) and those two groups were compared on organizational citizenship behaviour.

As college type was one of the factors included in factorial design 2x2x3 ANOVA carried out and the F-Value (Table - 1) was found to be 21.95 which is significant at 0.01 level. Thus, the result revealed significant impact of college type on organizational citizenship behaviour among college teachers.

Table - 2 reveals that the mean scores of organizational citizenship behaviour of college teachers having working government and self-finance are 98.23 and 93.99 respectively and the difference between the two is 4.24. Means reveal that a government college teacher has greater organizational citizenship behaviour than self-finance college teachers. Hence, it was concluded that college type of college teachers had significant impact on organizational citizenship behaviour. Crewson (1997), Vigoda and Golembiewski, 2001, Sharma J. P., Bajpai N., and Holani U. (2011), Feather and Rauter (2004), Goulet and Frank (2002), Honingh and Oort (2009) studies support result of the present study.

Public sector employees are more motivated by job content, self-development, recognition, autonomy, interesting work, and the chance to learn new things Houston, (David J. 2000). Contradict result of the present study. Organizational citizenship behavior score is high for public sector organization as compared to private sector organization. Public sector employees show a stronger service ethic than private sector employees (Perry, James L. 2000). Public service motivation comprises elements such as the opportunity to have an impact on public affairs, commitment to serving the public interest, and an interest in achieving social justice (Wright, Bradley E. 2001 and Perry, James L., and Lois R. Wise. 1990).

The probable reason for this difference could be that explained in terms of different level of competitiveness in both the organizations. It seems that within organization competitiveness is very high in self-finance sector organization. This may be a probable reason which hinders teachers of the self-finance sectors to exhibit less organizational citizenship behaviors as compared to government sector organization. Government teachers in government organizations are seen as motivated by a conked for the community and a desire to serve the government interest, and are more likely to be characterized by an ethic that prioritizes intrinsic rewards over extrinsic rewards. He also added that government-sector employees rate a feeling of accomplishment and performing work helpful to society and to others as more important job characteristics than do self-finance-sector employees. Organizational citizenship behaviour is critical in enhancing government organizations' productivity. At the point of taking part in citizenship practices, government officials; likewise their partners in the self-finance sector, can look for approaches to upgrade organizational performance. In

## Organizational Citizenship behaviour among College Teacher

doing so, they would provide better public service and build a better organizational atmosphere.

### ***Organizational citizenship behaviour with reference to faculty type:-***

It was assumed that faculty type of college teachers might affect the level of organizational citizenship behaviour as faculty type has decisive impact on behaviour of college teachers. Therefore considering the college type college teachers were categorized into two groups' viz., (C1) Arts, (C2) Commerce and (C3) Science faculty type group of college teachers.

When F-test was applied to check the impact of faculty type on organizational citizenship behaviour among college teachers the F-Value (Table - 1) was found to be 4.63 which is significant 0.05 level.

Table – 2 reveals that the mean scores of organizational citizenship behaviour of Arts, Commerce and Science faculty group are 95.53, 94.79 and 98.01 respectively and the differences among these scores are C1vsC2 = 0.74, C1vsC3 = 2.48 and C2vsC3 = 3.22. These differences are means reveal that a Science college teacher has greater organizational citizenship behaviour than Arts and commerce college teachers and an Arts college teacher has greater organizational citizenship behaviour than Commerce college teachers. Hence, it was concluded that faculty type of college teachers had significant impact on organizational citizenship behaviour.

For further interpretation of this result LSD was applied to find out the significance of differences among mean scores of organizational citizenship behaviour of faculty type all the three groups. Result re mentioned in Table – 3.

***Table – 3, Summary of LSD test for organizational citizenship behaviour with reference to faculty type***

Groups	Arts (C1) (95.53)	Commerce (C2) (94.79)	Science (C3) (98.01)
Arts (C1)	-	0.74 <sup>NS</sup>	2.48*
Commerce (C2)	-	-	3.22*
Science (C3)	-	-	-

\*P < 0.05, NS = Not Significant

So far as the impact of faculty type on organizational citizenship behaviour is concerned out of possible three comparisons two mean differences were found significant at 0.05 level by computing LSD test. The most striking results were obtained for the group of college teachers with Science college working. This group of college teachers significantly differed with group of college teachers with Arts and Commerce colleges working. These differences are means reveal that a Science college teacher has greater organizational citizenship behaviour than Arts college teachers and an Arts college teacher has greater organizational citizenship behaviour than Commerce college teachers.

### ***Organizational citizenship behaviour with reference to interaction of gander type, college type and faculty type:***

The main advantage of using ANOVA technique is that it not only provides the information of main effects but also provides information about the interactive effects of independent variables taken into consideration. In real life situation various factors have complex behaviour with each other while exerting influence on some other factor, so the present

## Organizational Citizenship behaviour among College Teacher

researcher decided to go for identifying such interactive effect between gender, college type and faculty type on organizational citizenship behaviour among college teachers.

The AXB, AXC and AXBXC interaction are found to be statistically insignificant as the F-values are 2.71, 0.95 and 0.71 respectively, and BXC interaction are found to be statistically 0.01 level significant as the F – value are 7.36 respectively. The significant interactive effect of independent variables like a gender and college type, gender and faculty type and gender, college type and faculty type faculty on organizational citizenship behaviour of college teachers. And independent variable college type and faculty type of college teachers had significant impact on organizational citizenship behaviour.

For further interpretation of this result LSD test was applied to find out the significance of differences among mean scores of organizational citizenship behaviour of college type and faculty type all the groups. Result re mentioned in Table -4.5.

**Table – 4, Summary of LSD test for organizational citizenship behaviour with reference to college type and faculty type**

Variable Group (Mean)	B1C1 (98.84)	B1C2 (96.77)	B1C3 (98.07)	B2C1 (91.21)	B2C2 (92.80)	B2C3 (97.94)
B1C1 (98.84)	-	2.07 <sup>NS</sup>	0.77 <sup>NS</sup>	7.63**	6.04**	0.90 <sup>NS</sup>
B1C2 (96.77)	-	-	1.30 <sup>NS</sup>	5.56**	3.97**	1.17 <sup>NS</sup>
B1C3 (98.07)	-	-	-	6.86**	5.27**	0.13 <sup>NS</sup>
B2C1 (91.21)	-	-	-	-	1.59 <sup>NS</sup>	6.73**
B2C2 (92.80)	-	-	-	-	-	5.14**
B2C3 (97.94)	-	-	-	-	-	-

\*\*P < 0.01, NS = Not Significant

So far as the impact of college type and faculty type on organizational citizenship behaviour is concerned, results of Post hoc LSD test revealed that out of possible fifteen comparisons eight mean differences were found significant at 0.01 level. Hence, it was concluded that college type with faculty type of college teachers had significant impact on organizational citizenship behaviour. The most striking results were obtained for the group of college teachers working with Self-finance Arts colleges. These groups significantly demonstrated higher level of organizational citizenship behaviour than groups of college teachers working with self-finance Commerce and Self-finance Science colleges. Moreover, college teachers having working self-finance Commerce college teachers also significantly derived more organizational citizenship behaviour than college teachers having self-finance Science college teachers.

Teacher plays an important role in effective functioning of educational organization and also in the transmission of wisdom, knowledge and experience of one generation to another. In fact, the role of teacher in society is significant, widespread and valuable. However, teaching in universities is a highly complex and challenging task as compared to teaching in schools and colleges because of low formalization of teaching content and method in universities. To successfully impart knowledge, skill and ability to students, university teacher's job cannot be fully prescribed in job description (Herman & Ornstein, 2008; Dipola & Hoy, 2005). Keeping this in mind, it has been argued that the success of higher educational institutions cannot depend entirely on formally designed job descriptions, it depends more on teachers who are ready to exert considerable effort beyond formal job requirements, that is, to engage

## Organizational Citizenship behaviour among College Teacher

in organizational citizenship behaviour (Somech and Drach-Zahavy, 2000). Moreover, teacher's organizational citizenship behaviour should be of high importance to the universities which receive high amount of public funding. And at the university level this is expected to increase the overall efficiency of the organization in terms of student's satisfaction and performance. Therefore, the present study is as such a humble attempt to gauge the level of organizational citizenship behaviour in the context of higher education.

### CONCLUSION

On the basis of above findings it can be concluded that gender type no effect on organizational citizenship behaviour among college teachers, Government college teachers were exhibiting high organizational citizenship behaviour then self-finance college teachers. Moreover, faculty group college teacher highest level of organizational citizenship behaviour then Arts and Commerce college teacher. And type of college and type of faculty group significantly impact on organizational citizenship behaviour among college teacher.

### REFERENCE

- C. A. Smith, D. W. Organ, & J. P. Near (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653-663.
- Chughtai, A. A., & Zafar, S. (2006). Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Commitment Among Pakistani University Teachers. *Applied H.R.M. Research*, 11(1), 39-64.
- Crewson, P. E. (1997). Public-service motivation: Building empirical evidence of incidence. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 7(4), 499.
- Dee, J.R., Henkin, A.B. & Duemer, I. (2002). Structural antecedents and psychological correlates of teacher empowerment, *Journal of educational Administration*, 41(3), 257-277.
- Dipaola, M.F. & Hoy, W.K. (2005). Organizational citizenship behavior of faculty and achievement of high school students. *The High School Journal*, Feb/Mac, 35-44.
- Farh J.L., Zhong C.B., & Organ D.W. (2004). "Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in the People's Republic of China." *Organization Science*, 15 (2).
- Farh.J.L., Zhong.C.B., & Organ.D.W.(2004). Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the People's Republic of China., *Organization Science*, 15(2), .241-253.
- Feather, N. T. & Rauter, K. A. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviours in relation to job status, job insecurity, organizational commitment and identification, job satisfaction and work values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 81-94.
- Gautam, T., Van Dick, R., Wagner, U., Upadhyay, N., and Davis, A.J. (2005) 'Organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment in Nepal', *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 8: 305-314
- Goulet, L.R. & Frank, M.L. (2002). Organizational commitment across three sectors: public, non-profit, and for profit. *Public Personnel Management*. 31(2), 201-210.
- Halbesleben, J. and Bellairs, T. (2015). What Are the Motives for Employees to Exhibit Citizenship Behavior? Oxford Handbooks Online.
- Herman S & Ornstein S. (2008). Professor delight: Cultivating organizational citizenship behaviour, *Journal of Management Education*, 32(5): 563-574.
- Honingh, M. e. and Oort, F. J. (2009). Beroepsonderwijs tussen Publiek en Privaat. (Vocational education caught between the EERA: Reconsidering the Tension between Bureaucracy and Professionalism in Publicly and Privately funded Schools in the Dutch VET Sector. 2 Public and Private sector) Dissertation. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.

## Organizational Citizenship behaviour among College Teacher

- Joolideh, F. and Yeshodhara, K. (2008). Organizational Commitment among high school teachers in India and Iran. *Edutracks*, 7(10), 38-429.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. 1966, 1978. The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley.
- Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 131–142.
- Lovell, S. E., Kahn, A. S., Anton, J., Davidson, A., Dowling, E., Post, D., & Mason, C. (1999). Does gender affect the link between organizational citizenship behavior and performance evaluation? *Sex Role*, 41(5/6), 469–478.
- Organ, A. (2000). *Organizational Behavior*, 3rd ed. New York: MacGraw Hill.
- Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington: MA: Lexington Books.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. 1990. Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1: 107–142.
- Sharma, J.P., Bajpai, N. and Holani, U. (2011). "OCB in Public and Private Sector and its Impact on Job Satisfaction: A Comparative study in Indian Perspective. *International Journal of Business and Management*." Vol 6(1) pp. 67-75.
- T. S. Bateman & D. W. Organ (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587- 595.
- Turnipseed D, Murkison G (1996). Organizational Citizenship behavior: An Examination of the Influence of the Work Place. *Lead. Organiz. Dev. J.*, 17(2):42-47.
- Turnipseed.D & Murkison.G.(1996). Organization citizenship behaviour: an examination of the influence of the workplace. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 17(2),42–47.
- Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & Parks, J. M. (1995). Extra – role behaviours: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (A bridge over muddied waters). In L.L. Cummings & B.M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, (Vol. 17, pp. 215-285). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Vigoda – Gadot, Eran, and Pobert T. Golembiewski, (2001). Organizational Behavior and the spirit of new managerialism: A theoretical framework. *American Review of Public Administration* 31:273-95.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601–617.
- Wilson.J.P., & Western.S. (2000). Performance appraisal: an obstacle to training and development?. *Journal of European Industrial Training* 24(7), 384-390.

### **Acknowledgements**

The authors profoundly appreciate all the people who have successfully contributed in ensuring this paper is in place. Their contributions are acknowledged however their names cannot be able to be mentioned.

### **Conflict of Interest**

The authors colorfully declare this paper to bear not conflict of interests

**How to cite this article:** Chandalia, T.A, & Desai, M.D (2019). Organizational Citizenship behaviour among College Teacher. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 7(1), 287-296. DIP:18.01.033/20190701, DOI:10.25215/0701.033