

DRIVING IN-ROLE PERFORMANCE THROUGH CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOURS

Japneet Kaur*, Prabhjot Kaur**

Abstract *In this competitive era organisations strive to enhance the performance of their firm to grow and attain sustainability. Human resources being the intangible valuable assets of a firm contribute a large share in deciding the fate of their employers. Considering significance of employee's behavior in firms' performance, the citizenship behaviours have been gaining considerable importance. Organisational citizenship behaviours are extra-role behaviour where the employees go beyond the formal responsibilities of their job and work for benefiting their firm. This research aims at examining the relationship and impact of citizenship behaviour on in-role performance among the employees of banking industry. One hundred and twenty employees have been chosen as respondents to conduct this survey from public and private sector banks. Results of the study indicate significant relationship of extra-role behaviours and task performance; also citizenship behaviours were seen to predict 63% of variance in the later. The study concludes by mentioning possible research implications.*

Keywords: *Organisational Citizenship Behaviours, In-role Performance, Extra-role Behaviours, Job Performance, Task Performance*

INTRODUCTION

In this era of cut-throat competition, organisations are striving to enhance their performance and attain sustainable competitive advantage. Amongst the many vital resources of an organisation, human resources have been considered as the most valuable asset for the firms. Driving commitment among the employees can help the firms to sustainably grow and attain success. With globalisation and opening up of the economies, competition in the service sector has become more and more intense. Increasing the performance of an organisation is highly dependent upon the enhancement of individual performance of employees. Organisations need employees who can go beyond the formal responsibilities of their job. Such behaviours in which an individual goes extra-mile for their organization are described as the organisational citizenship behaviours (OCBs). Measurement of an individual performance can be done by assessing the citizenship behaviours, the negative or the counter-productive behaviours and the last ones which are termed as task behaviours. The outcome of in-role behaviours constitutes the in-role performance (IRP) or the in-role behaviour performance (IRB performance). It won't be feasible for organizations to survive or prosper without their members behaving as good citizens by engaging in all sorts of positive behaviours (Jahangir, Akbar & Haq, 2004). Willingness of employees to go an extra mile by actually engaging in behaviours that are not within their job description-and also, which do not fall under the broad

heading of task performance describe the citizenship behavior (Colquitt, 2008). Improving the performance of an individual on the job is the need of the hour for all the firms to their maintain market share, moreover firms nowadays are in search of employees who can guard the organisation with good behaviours. Thus, this study focuses on studying the relationship and impact of citizenship behaviours on in-role performance among the employees of banking industry. Also, this paper aims to investigate any differences existing in the levels of extra-role behaviours and in-role performance among private and public sector bank employees.

ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOURS

Organisational Citizenship behaviour term has been introduced by Bateman and Organ in 1983 and the roots of this concept have been drawn from the "willingness to cooperate" given by Barnard in 1938. Organisational citizenship behaviours are similar to those described as the extra-role behaviours by Katz (1964). Dennis Organ defined organisational citizenship behaviours as 'individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognised by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organisation. By discretionary, we mean that the behaviour is not an enforceable requirement of the role or the job description, that is, the clearly specifiable terms of the person's employment contract with the organisation; the

* Doctoral Research Scholar, University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, Punjab, India.
Email: japneet15@gmail.com,

** Doctoral Research Scholar, University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, Punjab, India.
Email: prabhjot.ubs@gmail.com

behaviour is rather a matter of personal choice, such that its omission is not generally understood as punishable' (Organ, 1988, p.4).

Antecedents of OCBs have been considered on various different levels *viz.* Individual, task, employee and organisation wide characteristics (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Job satisfaction has been considered as the most prominent predictor of citizenship behaviours (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Jahangir *et al.*, 2004; Odoch & Nangoli, 2013). Job attitudes like organisational commitment have also been seen to have significant positive relationship with extra-role behaviours (William & Anderson, 1991; Jahangir *et al.*, 2004; Ulndag *et al.*, 2011). Ünal (2013) described that organisational commitment was found to act as a mediator between facets of job satisfaction and organisational citizenship dimensions. Affective commitment fully mediated the relationship of job satisfaction with altruism, whereas, continuance commitment mediated satisfaction and civic virtue sub-dimension of OCB. Ghanbari & Eskandari (2012) revealed positive impact of organisational climate and motivational factors of OCBs.

Hypothesis 1: Significant difference exists in the citizenship levels among employees of public and private sector banks.

IN-ROLE PERFORMANCE (TASK PERFORMANCE)

Job performance is defined as 'the aggregated value to organisation of the discrete behavioural episodes that an individual performs over a standard interval of time (Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997 as cited in Othman, Abdullah, & Ahmad, 2008, p.33). The job performance depends upon task performance which refers to behaviours (task behaviours/in-role behaviours) that are directly linked with completion of the job and are related to the employee's formal role requirements (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Othman *et al.*, 2008). The in-role behaviour performance also known as the IRB performance consists of behaviour that are inclined in meeting the job responsibilities (Behrman & Perreault, 1984; Anderson & Oliver, 1987).

Task performance can be defined 'as the effectiveness with which job incumbents perform activities that contribute to the organisation's technical core either directly by implementing a part of its technological process, or indirectly by providing it with needed materials or services' (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997, p. 99). Werner (2000) described task performance as being synonymous with in-role performance. Task performance consists of two types; executing technical processes, and maintaining and servicing

technical requirements (Motowidlo *et al.*, 1997 as cited in Othman *et al.*, 2008). The contextual performance (like OCB) and task (in-role) performance were both theoretically and practically important because they were probably determined by different antecedents (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Organ & Ryan, 1995). Contextual performance has been referred to as the interpersonal behaviours or actions that benefit an organization (Othman *et al.*, 2008) and 'that are not directly related to their main task functions but are important because they shape the organisational, social, and psychological context that serves as the critical catalyst for task activities and processes' (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, p. 71). Completion of in-role tasks is often constrained by rules and environmental conditions at work, whereas OCBs are under the volitional control of the individual employee (Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin, & Lord, 2002; Chughtai, 2008). In-role performance is essential component of overall performance, as well as an antecedent to the same. IRP has been studied as a different construct than OCB thus, it becomes imperative to determine and compare its level in terms of banking industry. Guided by the prior research findings, second hypothesis (H₂) has been framed as follows

Hypothesis 2: In-role performance significantly differs among employees of public and private sector banks.

OCB and IRP

OCBs have been found to enhance the overall performance of employees (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994). Employees who often engage in OCB may tend to have higher task performance, as task performance is related to OCB (Zhang, 2011). OCB may be considered as an antecedent for the IRB performance (Piercy, Cravens, Nikala-Lane, & Vorhies, 2006) whereas; IRB performance has been conceptualized as the antecedent of outcome performance (Anderson & Oliver, 1987; Cravens, Ingrain, LaForge, & Young, 1993). Researchers have found that OCB and IRP are distinct constructs (Biswas & Varma, 2012) and OCBs have a direct positive impact on the in-role behaviour performance (IRB performance) of the sales persons (Piercy *et al.*, 2006). IRB performance has also been seen to mediate the relationship between the OCBs and the outcome performance (Piercy *et al.*, 2006). The literature suggests existing linkage between OCB and IRP and, also that the former has a significant impact on the later. Hence, it would be interesting to study the relationship and impact of OCB on IRP among the employees' of banking industry. Suggested by the previous research, it's proposed that OCBs' will have a significant positive relationship with IRP. Interpersonal helping, individual initiative, personal industry and loyal boosterism behaviours are expected to enhance the performance of the employees working in the

banking sector. These citizenship behaviours should aid and encourage employees' in-role performance. The following has been hypothesized:

Hypothesis 3: OCBs' will have a significant positive association with the employees' in-role performance.

Hypothesis 4: Higher levels of interpersonal helping, individual initiative, personal industry and loyal boosterism behaviours will lead to higher levels of In-role behaviour performance.

Hypothesis 5: OCB's have a significant impact on IRP among the employees of banking sector.

METHODS

Sample

The empirical research has been carried out on a sample of 96 employees of the public and private sector banks from Chandigarh, Mohali and Panchkula region with the help of non-probability sampling. The sample consisted of employees from different hierarchical levels with varied job responsibilities, age, gender and years of experience. Four banks from each category, i.e. two private and two public, have been selected on the basis of maximum number of employees based on the RBI (2012) bank statistics. Data have been gathered through in-person survey technique. 120 employees have been contacted to fill the structured instrument prepared for data collection, after screening 96 questionnaires fit for data analysis were retrieved with a response rate of 80%.

Research Measures

Structured questionnaire has been prepared to collect the primary data from bank employees consisting of two parts. Part one included items relating to the constructs under study (OCB and IRP) which were measured on five point Likert scale. Second portion of the instrument aimed at gathering the demographic profile of the sample respondents.

Organisational Citizenship Behaviour: Organisational citizenship behaviours have been measured using the 19 item scale of Moorman and Blakely in 1995. The scale divides the OCB construct into 5 dimensions- interpersonal helping, individual initiative, personal industry and loyal boosterism. Reliability coefficients for the construct have been mentioned in Table 2.

In-Role Performance: The measurement of in-role performance construct has been done with the standardized scale developed by William & Anderson (1991). The reliability of the scale was found to be satisfactory with the Cronbach's alpha 0.732.

Tools for Analysis

Data have been analyzed using various appropriate statistical analytical tools. Firstly, the descriptive measures of mean (median in this case) and standard deviation have been used to describe the data characteristics. Secondly, distribution of the data has been checked using different normality tests. Thirdly, Test of significant difference has been applied to determine the difference in two data sets. Further, the bi-variate correlations have been calculated to examine the relationship between OCB and IRP and lastly, linear regressions have been used to study the impact of OCB on IRP.

RESULTS and FINDINGS

Normality Test

Distributional shape of both the variables was found to violate the assumptions for normal distribution. Based on the results listed in Table 1, it has been observed that OCB and IRP variables don't follow the normal distribution. Hence, the further analyses have been conducted using the non-parametric tests.

Table 1: Normality Test

	Kolmogorov-Smirnova			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
IRP	.171	96	.000	.917	96	.000
OCB	.118	96	.004	.942	96	.003

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

The median and standard deviations for the data have been listed in Table 2. It depicts that the level of OCB and IRP among employees of both sectors is high (above the scale mean). Mann-Whitney U test results revealed that there exists no significant difference among employees of private and public sector banks on basis of OCB and IRP, $U = 984.6, p = .249$ and $U = 1067.0, p = .590$ respectively. This finding reveals that the perception of two constructs among employees does not vary on basis of the public and private sector regulations.

OCB, its Dimensions and its Relationship With In-Role Performance

Spearman's rho correlations were obtained to determine the relationship among the selected variables. As the results in

Table 2: Means, Standard Deviations, Alpha Reliabilities and Inter-Correlations Among Variables

	Median	SD	1	2	4	5	6	7
Organisational citizenship behaviour	4.43	.328	(.886)					
In-role performance	4.43	.365	.854*	(.732)				
Interpersonal helping	4.44	.325	.826*	.672*	(.671)			
Individual initiative	4.40	.384	.856*	.760*	.628*	(.785)		
Personal industry	4.29	.440	.891*	.776*	.726*	.755*	(.646)	
Loyal boosterism	4.55	.395	.764*	.614*	.564*	.454*	.561*	(.858)

Note: $N = 96$; SD = standard deviation; Reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) of each scale have been mentioned on the diagonal (in parentheses).
* $p < .001$, $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 3: Regression Estimates

	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	Remarks
	B	Standard error	B	
OCB In-role performance	.882	.070	.793	H5 accepted

Note: $N = 96$; OCB = Organisational citizenship behaviour; B, unstandardized regression coefficients; significance at $p < .001$ level.

Table 2 suggest that OCB has a strong association with the in-role performance, they share a statistically significant positive correlation, $r(96) = .854$, $p < .001$. Significant positive relationships were also found among the dimensions of OCB and in-role performance. Interpersonal helping was found to have a strong positive association ($r(96) = .672$, $p < .001$), individual initiative correlated strongly with IRP ($r(96) = .760$, $p < .001$), personal industry shared a strong association ($r(96) = .776$, $p < .001$) and similarly, loyal boosterism ($r(96) = .614$, $p < .001$) was also found to have a significant positive correlation. Considering the results of Spearman's rank correlation, the third and fourth hypotheses have been accepted.

Table 3 represents the results of regression analysis done to predict the impact of independent variable (OCB) on the dependent variable IRP. Results of regression indicated that OCB explains 63% of variance ($R^2 = .629$) and was found highly significant, $F(1,94) = 159.185$, $p < .001$. Results of regression analysis are in favour of the fifth hypothesis of this study, hence it has been accepted.

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

Aim of this study was to determine the relationship and impact of citizenship behaviours on in-role performance among employees of public and private sector banks. The analysis revealed significant relationship between the two variables and has been further discussed in the following paragraphs.

The first hypothesis of the study, aiming to analyze the difference in levels of organisational citizenship behaviours

among private and public sector bank employees has been rejected, due to the statistically non-significant results of Mann-Whitney U test. The results suggested that there is no significant difference in the levels of OCB among the public and private sector bank employees. This finding reflects on the exposure of public and private sector banks to different cultures' and practices, as they operate in a similar dynamic environment, but still the level of OCB has been found similar irrespective of the sector.

Similar results have been seen in relation to the levels of in-role performance among the different sector bank employees. The Mann-Whitney U test revealing insignificant results indicated that the employees of public and private banks perceive their in-role performance to be of approximately the same level with no statistically significant difference being sited. Considering these results the second hypothesis has also been rejected.

Considering the relationship of OCB and IRP, the third and fourth hypotheses have been supported by the results, as the findings indicate a highly significant relationship ($r(96) = .854$, $p < .001$) between the two, these findings have been supported by studies Biswas and Varma (2012), Zhang (2011) and Piercy *et al.* (2006). Along with this, the four dimensions of OCB (interpersonal helping, individual initiative, personal industry and loyal boosterism) also associated in a significantly positive way with in-role performance. These results are in line with the findings of Piercy *et al.* (2006). Also, the presumption of IRP being impacted by OCB in a significant manner ($R^2 = .629$) has been supported. Hence, the results favour the fifth hypothesis and similar findings have been reported in the study of Piercy *et al.* (2006) which are in support of this research work.

The findings of this study have several implications. In order to enhance the performance of their sub-ordinates, the managers should make an endeavor to inculcate and encourage extra-role behaviours among employees along with focusing on different aspects of jobs.

The implications of this present research finding are both theoretical and practical implications. Previous studies in relation with OCB have tried to differentiate it from the in-role behaviour construct, but the present study has provided evidence that OCB has a strong relationship, as well as, it predicts IRP in the service sector where performance of employee is considered as the decisive factor of his/her growth. The current study highlights the need of enhancing positive work behaviours in employees which will aid in increasing the performance of employees, thus inculcate spirit of growth and healthy competition. This study also provided insights on the existing difference between the two constructs. Extra-role behaviours have often been confused with the in-role behaviour related performance of employees. This study indicated on the underlying difference in the two and has been also successful in establishing relationship among the variables.

As, no piece of research is perfect, limitations are the part and parcel of research works. In similar manner, this study also has certain limitations. First, the sample taken for research was small and may not be representative of the target population. Secondly, the questionnaires used were in form of self-report measures which could have added to the response bias of the participants. To improve this study in future, a large and representative sample could be used, along with that a cross-sectional study can also be planned to survey various different samples. To increase the generalizability of the findings, similar research can be planned in other parts of India and on different sectors *viz.* Manufacturing, hospitality, insurance etc. In conclusion, the results from this research study exhibit predictive ability of organisational citizenship behaviours on the in-role performance of employees in the banking sector.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, E., & Oliver, R. L. (1987). Perspectives on behavior- Based versus outcome-based salesforce control systems. *Journal of Marketing*, 51, 76-88.
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587-595.
- Biswas, S., & Varma, A. (2012). Linkages between antecedents of in-role performance and intentions to quit: An investigation in India. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(5), 987-1005.
- Behrman, D. N., & Perreault, W. D. (1984). A role stress model of the performance and satisfaction of industrial salespersons. *Journal of Marketing*, 48,9-21.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance, In N. Schmitt, W. C. Borman, & Associates (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp.71-98), San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 99-109.
- Chughtai, A. A. (2008). Impact of job involvement on in-role job performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Institute of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 169-183.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2008). Job performance, Organizational behavior: Improving performance and commitment in the workplace (1st ed.), 34-63. Tata McGraw Hill.
- Cravens, D. W., Ingrain, T. N., LaForge, R. W., & Young, C. E. (1993). Behavior-based and outcome-based salesforce control systems. *Journal of Marketing*, 57, 47-59.
- Diefendorff, J., Brown, D., Kamin, A., & Lord, B. (2002). Examining the roles of job involvement and work centrality in predicting organizational citizenship behaviours and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 23, 93-108.
- Ghanbari, S., & Eskandari, A. (2012). Organizational Climate, Job Motivation and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *International Journal of Management Perspective*, 1(3), 1-14.
- Jahangir, N., Akbar, M. M., & Haq, M. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *BRAC University Journal*, 1(2), 75-85.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9, 131-133.
- Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism - collectivism as an individual difference: Predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 127-142.
- Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 10, 71-83.
- Odoch, H., & Nangoli, S. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction. *Unique Journal of Business Management Research*, 1(4), 49-54.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: LexingtonBooks.

- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 775-800.
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Othman, A. K., Abdullah, H. S., & Ahmad, J. (2008). Emotional intelligence, emotional labour and work effectiveness in service organisations: A proposed model. *VISION-The Journal of Business Perspective*, 12(1), 31-42.
- Piercy, N. F., Cravens, D. W., Lane, N., & Vorhies, D. W. (2006). Driving organizational citizenship behaviors and salesperson the role of management control and perceived organizational support. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34(2), 244-262.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness? *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31, 351-363.
- Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., Paine, B., & Bachrach, D. (2000). Organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
- Ulndag, O., Khan, S., & Guden, N. (2011). The effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior on turnover intention. *Hospitality Review*, 29(2), 1-12.
- Ünal, O. F. (2013). Relationship between the facets of job satisfaction and the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior: Mediating role of organizational commitment. *The Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 18(1), 243-269.
- Werner, J. M. (2000). Implications of OCB and contextual performance for human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10(1), 3-24.
- 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, 601-617.
- Zhang, D. (2011). Organizational citizenship behavior, White paper, PSYCH761[4629332]. Retrieved from <https://cdn.auckland.ac.nz/assets/psych/about/our-people/documents/Deww%20Zhang%20-%20Organisational%20Citizenship%20Behaviour%20-%20White%20Paper.pdf>