

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour as a Potential Source of Social Power

Ajay K. Jain

This paper explores the strength of association between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) and social power by using OCB as an antecedent and the several bases of social power as criterion variables. Data were collected by administering questionnaires to male middle level executives (N = 250) from motor cycle manufacturing organizations based in India. Based on a stepwise multiple regression analysis, OCB was found to be positively associated with Referent, Expert, and Intra-Work Reward forms of social power. Conversely, OCB had a negative effect on Coercive and Legitimate Power. The implications of the results are discussed in relation to the potential benefits of increasing emphasis on OCB by supervisors as part of their managerial style in order to improve his personal effectiveness.

Ajay K. Jain is Associate Professor, Department of Human Behaviour & Organizational Development, Management Development Institute, Gurgaon 122 001. E-mail: akjain@mdi.ac.in

Organisational Citizenship Behaviour

Traditionally the concept of social power has been linked with different forms of influencing strategies between superiors and subordinates including situations engendering reason, coalition formation, bargaining, assertiveness, greater authority and sanction (e.g. Brauer & Bourhis 2006, Van Dijke & Poppe 2006). Although power has been viewed as an independent variable with outcomes such as domination, as well as a dependent variable as is the case with dependency (Hardy & Clegg 1996), no single prevailing source of social power has emerged from the literature, suggesting that there are perhaps several ways of influencing co-worker actions in relation to obedience and conformity. In general agency, impression management and ingratiation are suggested as potential ways of positively influencing power and politics in organisations (Van Dijke & Poppe 2006). In the absence of prior studies in this area, this paper explores the strength of association between OCB and social power by using Organisational Citizenship

Behaviour (OCB) as an antecedent and the several bases of social power as criterion variables.

Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) has received increasing attention by both scholars and practitioners (Howard 1993, Organ & Ryan 1995, Motowidlo, Borman & Schmit 1997, LiPine, Hanson, Borman & Motowidlo 2000) as it is thought to contribute indirectly to organisational development through the maintenance of its social systems (Organ 1997). The concept of OCB was first introduced as “A Good Soldier Syndrome” (Bateman & Organ 1983, Smith, Organ & Near 1983), something that was considered necessary for the prosperity and effective functioning of the organisation. Organ (1988: 4) defines the concept of OCB 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.” OCB has also been conceptualised as a core element of employee performance (Rotundo & Sackett 2002) which is influenced by individual attitudinal and dispositional variables rather than directly by an employee’s knowledge, skills and abilities (Organ & Ryan 1995, Konovsky & Organ 1996). According to Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, & Bachrach (2000) OCB is a multidimensional construct. Whilst examining the different types of citizenship behaviour that have been identified in the literature, they categorised them into the following behaviours: helping, sportsmanship, organisational loyalty, organisational

compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue and self-development. In addition to selected items from the literature, the present study introduces additional measures in order to encompass the South Asian context. Some recent studies demonstrate the positive impact of OCB on organizationally relevant variables like personal effectiveness and general health (e.g. Jain 2009, Jain & Sinha 2008)

Social Power

The relationship of social power and citizenship behaviour can be identified from Nietzsche’s (1968) seminal work on altruistic motive, where the author proposed human beings as egoistic creatures. Nietzsche (1968) has suggested that humans can not be truly altruistic and that the gestures of gift-giving, claims of love, praise, or indeed negative acts such as mendaciousness and physical violence all stem from the same motive – that is to exert will, or in other words, power over others.

Power has typically been seen as the ability to get someone to do something they normally would not do or even to get them to do something against their will (Dijke & Poppe 2006). In an organisational setting the concept can be broadly referred to generally as the influence to change the actions of others in some intended fashion (Mowday 1978). Most studies on the concept of power have been conducted in relation to observing obedience, conformity, authority etc, whereby the aim of exercising power would be to reduce any variability in behaviour, or in other

words produce the 'J' curve of human conformity characteristic of organisationally determined acts. Allport (1934) suggested that most people conform to social rules, but some people deviate from the norm. Small deviations are most common; larger deviations are atypical. These earlier views however presented a rather one-dimensional and negative viewpoint of power. The present study challenges this perception and aims to identify ways in which social power can be beneficial for organisations by conceptualising it within an OCB framework.

Most people conform to social rules, but some people deviate from the norm.

Several classifications of sources of power have been proposed by various social scientists (e.g., French & Raven 1959, Mudler 1971, Brauer & Bourhis 2006). French & Raven's (1959) conceptualisation of social power within five distinct power bases which include coercive power (manager can mediate punishment), legitimate power (manager has the authority to prescribe behaviour), reward power (manager can mediate rewards), referent power (identification with and attraction to the manager), and expert power (manager possesses unique or rare knowledge or skills), is one of the frameworks most widely used by researchers to study the concept. A wider review of the literature suggests other bases of power including information power (Sengupta 1995) and connection power (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson

2002). Among the above power categories, *coercive power*, *reward power*, *legitimate power* and perhaps *connection power* can be thought to result from the position one holds in an organisation. Where as, *referent power*, *information power* and *expert power* can be considered as a possession of the personal qualities (Kumar & Sankaran 2007). Another classification of differing political styles between "institutional" and "personal power" managers (McClelland & Burnham 1976) may also be relevant to power consideration of OCB. Although both kinds of managers seem to use power effectively, the use of power by institutional managers however is directed toward collective organizational goals. Institutional power managers also have a strong sense of justice and a willingness to sacrifice self interest for the 'good of the organization'. Personal power managers on the other hand often seek and employ power to enhance their own personal status. While they may inspire loyalty and commitment it is to themselves and not the organization where their interests lie (Cobb 1986).

Positive Forms of Social Power

Job satisfaction is often studied as a mediator variable in relation to OCB (e.g. Bateman & Organ 1983). Some studies highlight a positive relationship between job satisfaction and expert and referent power, and a negative correlation with coercive power (Busch 1980). Carson, Carson, & Roe (1993) suggest that expert and referent power are more strongly correlated with satisfaction with a supervisor than they are with job sat-

The use of reward power by the leader increases group productivity, whereas the use of coercive power decreases productivity.

isfaction. Researchers have also looked at the relationship between various bases of power and individual performance (Student 1968, Ivancevich & Donnelly 1970, Speckman 1979), with suggestions that expert power, and to a lesser extent referent power, are seen as positive correlates with individual performance. Conversely, these studies also indicate that subordinates consider coercive power to be a weak reason for improving performance. It is important to note here that OCB is conceptualised as a part of performance considered under the motivational control of the individual that is termed 'contextual performance' (Griffin, Neal & Neale 2000). As far as the relationship of social power with organisational performance is concerned, Sheley & Shaw (1979) found that the use of reward power by the leader increases group productivity, whereas the use of coercive power decreases productivity. OCB has also been highlighted as a predictor of work group performance and organisational performance (e.g., Koys 2001, Walz & Niehoff 2000, Podsakoff, Ahearne & MacKenzie 1997); it is plausible therefore that OCB may positively predict reward power. In regard to the relationship of social power with employee turnover, Student (1968) reports that an employee's withdrawal intentions are negatively related with their supervisor's referent power. The re-

lationship of the bases of social power with outcome variables demonstrate that reward and referent power, and to some extent expert power are more important power bases for organisational functioning than coercive, legitimate and information power.

The Conceptual Framework

The present research investigates how OCBs could predict the use of positive forms of social power rather than negative forms. Based on findings from the literature, referent and expert power are considered personal bases of power and reward power are considered positional bases of power. Furthermore, six power bases are categorized into positive and negative forms of social power. The positive forms consist of reward, referent and expert power, whereas negative forms of social power comprise coercive, legitimate and information power.

Definitions of social power imply the potential for a dependency based relationship (Brauer & Bourhis 2006). Moreover, if we assume that power is the function of dependency then we may also assume that power would be related to citizenship behaviour as it is suggested that OCB is directed towards other colleagues as much as it is towards an organisation. It is also more likely that the act of citizenship may

The act of citizenship may increase an individual's capacity to influence others.

increase an individual's capacity to influence others. It has been proposed that citizenship behaviours are thought to improve an organization's functioning by "lubricating" its social machinery (Smith, Organ & Near 1983) and contributes indirectly to the organization through maintenance of its social systems (Organ 1997). We can therefore hypothesise that OCB will have a positive impact on those forms of social power which are based on positive reinforcement, personal ability and skills such as reward power, expert power and referent power.

OCB within the Social Network Framework

Bolino, Turnley and Bloodgood (2002) argue that OCB helps to create and develop social capital in organizations. OCB may therefore enhance one's personal and organizational effectiveness by contributing to the creation of structural, relational and cognitive forms of social capital (Nahapiet & Ghosal 1998). Here the structural dimension of social capital refers to the overall pattern of relationships found in organizations; the relational dimension of social capital concerns the nature of connections between individuals in organizations, and the cognitive dimension concerns the extent to which employees within a social network share a common perspective or understanding (Nahapiet & Ghoshal 1998). Hence OCB may help in creating an informal network of relationships by going beyond the task requirements and expectations of the job. Indirectly these informal networks

could also help in the successful accomplishment of one's role and responsibilities within an organizational context.

OCB & Social Exchange

Although there is a plethora of research on OCB, progression has been slow in terms of development of the concept and new insight. Organ's social exchange interpretation of OCB (1988) seems to have spurred debate by suggesting that supervisor fairness leads to employee citizenship as a result of the development of a social exchange relationship between employees and their supervisors. When supervisors treat employees fairly, social exchange and the norms of reciprocity dictate that employees reciprocate. Organ (1988) proposes that OCB may be one likely avenue for employee reciprocation.

Compared to economic exchange relationships, which are more short term in nature, social exchange relationships tend to involve the exchange of socio-emotional benefits (Blau 1964, Organ 1988, Cropanzano, Rupp, Mohler & Schminke 2001). They are associated with close emotional attachment, informal, personal and more transparent obligations. When individuals form social exchange relationships with their working organizations, they tend to demonstrate improved job performance, enhanced OCB and weaker turnover intentions (e.g. Wayne, Shore & Liden 1997, Hendrix, Robbins, Miller & Summers 1998).

As evidence indicates that not all forms of social power are equally rel-

evant for the effective functioning of the organisation, with some forms of power identified as rather more significant for positive outcomes. We assume that OCB could positively predict these more desirable forms of social power through the possibility that individuals who possess high levels of citizenship behaviour may strengthen their social networks and exchange relationships within the organization. This in turn could lead to these members consciously or unconsciously gaining more informal social power (Pfeffer 1992). For example, they may frequently be approached by others for assistance with personal or professional problems and during the process of helping others or working more favourably with the organisation, their co-workers and supervisors might appreciate and trust them even more (Krackhardt & Hanson 1993). As a result, involvement in OCB may therefore be perceived as a positive influence on the overall reputation of these citizens within the organisation. Fiol, O'Connor, & Aguinis (2001) suggest that over a period of time, individuals develop consistent perceptions regarding the power of others and that the power of reputation leads to predictable behaviours within specific contexts. In a similar fashion, OCB may also be conceptualised as a possible base of social power by increasing the reputation of good citizens, as other organisational members identify with and feel attracted to them for fulfilment of their needs. Managerial reputation contributes significantly to subordinate perceptions of legitimate, referent, and expert power (Gioia & Sims 1983). Moreover, French & Raven (1959) developed the notion of

referent power to characterise the influence that one person has over another based on attraction and identification. It may be argued that individuals with a stronger reputation possess greater referent power due to other individuals' attraction to them and desire to identify with them. Similarly, others may recognise good citizens as the source of referent, reward and expert power while taking help in personal or professional problems.

Thus social networks and social exchange may increase the involvement in OCB towards other employees and the organization generally, which may in turn help in creating further bases for more desirable forms of social power. Based on this analysis, we hypothesise that:

Hypothesis 1: OCB will have a positive impact on positive forms of social power, i.e., Referent, Expert, and Reward Power.

Hypothesis 2: OCB will have a negative impact on negative forms of social power i.e., Legitimate, Coercive and Information Power.

Method

Participants & Procedure: The sample consisted of 250 middle-level male executives from four private sector motorcycle manufacturing plants located in North India. The manufacturing sector in India is dominated by male workers, thus the absence of female employees from this research. The

participants were chosen randomly from departments within each organisation. All employees were in the 25-45 years age group, had spent at least one year in the same organisation, and almost all of them were married and had a graduate degree or diploma in engineering.

Potential participants were provided the background information prior to being asked to participate in the study. All questionnaires were in English, but were adapted to suit the Indian cultural context through exploratory factor analysis on newly developed items and other measures borrowed from the literature. As the data were collected by administering questionnaires mainly during office hours and with the consent of employer and employee representatives, the response rate was above 80%. Reasons such as busy schedules were given by those who could not respond to the questionnaire.

Measures: A questionnaire survey was used to obtain data on the variables included in the study. Apart from the newly constructed items, OCB was measured by using existing items from the work of Bateman & Organ (1983), Smith, Organ & Near (1983), Organ (1988), Van Dyne, Graham & Dienesch (1994), Moorman & Blakely (1995), and Chattopadhyay (1999); social power was measured with Singh-Sengupta's (1995) 40-item scale. All questionnaire survey items were rated on a 5-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 (true to almost no extent) to 5 (true to a very great extent).

Results of Factor Analysis

Responses on both the variables were subjected to exploratory factor analysis to identify the validity and reliability of the questionnaires in the present Indian work context. Before administering stepwise multiple regression analysis to test the predictability of OCB in predicting the bases of social power, all questionnaires were subjected to exploratory factor analysis.

The factor analysis results are based on principal factoring with iterations and oblique rotations using the SPSS-X statistical analysis package program. The criterion of factor loadings equal to greater than .30 with no cross-loadings on other factors and Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient equal to or greater than .70 (Nunally 1978) was used for the purpose of identifying valid and reliable scales. The brief description of factors extracted by factor analysis is as follows.

Form 1: Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The OCB questionnaire yielded eleven significant factors upon factor analysis. The first factor, *Emotional Support* (ES, $\alpha = .88$), is measured through items like, "I make myself available to my co-workers to discuss any personal or professional problems they may be facing". The second factor, *Concern for Organizational Resources* (COR, $\alpha = .83$), is measured through items like, "I conduct personal business on company". The third factor, *Conservation of Time* (CT, $\alpha = .70$), is measured through items like, "I do not spend time in extra con-

versation". The fourth factor, *Organizational Pride* (OP, $\alpha = .76$), is measured through items like, "I show pride when representing the organization in public". The fifth factor, *Work Mindedness* (WM, $\alpha = .71$), is measured through items like, "I produce highest quality of work, regardless of circumstances". The sixth factor, *Civic Virtue* (CV, $\alpha = .71$), is measured through items like, "I utilize some creative means to complete my job effectively". The seventh factor, *Social and Functional Participation* (SFP, $\alpha = .84$), is measured through items like, "I keep well informed where opinion might benefit the organization". The eighth factor, *Altruism* (ALT, $\alpha = .75$), is measured through items like, "I go out of my way to help co-workers with work related problem". The ninth factor, *Sportsman Spirit* (SPO, $\alpha = .70$), is measured through items like, "I always find fault with what the organization is doing". The tenth factor, *Individual Initiative* (INI, $\alpha = .79$), is measured through items like, "I encourage others to try new and more effective ways of doing their jobs". The eleventh factor, *Generalized Compliance* (GC, $\alpha = .70$), is measured through items like, "I give advance notice if unable to come". Although the literature highlights seven dimensions of OCB (Podsakoff et al. 2000), the reasons for achieving 11-dimensions may be related to cultural variations in the construct of OCB within the present study. However, the factor structure very much resembles the work done by Bateman and Organ (1983), Smith, Organ and Near (1983), Organ (1988), Van Dyne, Graham and Dienesch (1994), Moorman and Blakely (1995) and Chattopadhyay (1999).

Form 2: Social Power. This scale yielded seven significant factors upon factor analysis. The first factor, *Work Reward Power* (IWRP, $\alpha = .83$), is measured through items like, "I praise them verbally for their good performance". The second factor, *Coercive Power* (CP, $\alpha = .89$), is measured through items like, "I write adverse confidential reports of those who work unsatisfactorily". The third factor, *Information Power* (IP, $\alpha = .89$), is measured through items like, "I know the internal politics of the head office". The fourth factor, *Extra-Work Reward Power* (EWRP, $\alpha = .81$), is measured through items like, "I get extra work from them by providing light refreshment once in a while". The fifth factor, *Legitimate Power* (LP, $\alpha = .77$), is measured through items like, "I make them recognize my authority". The sixth factor, *Referent Power* (RP, $\alpha = .89$), is measured through items like, "My non-managerial staff knows that I like them". The seventh factor, *Expert Power* (EP, $\alpha = .86$), is measured through items like, "I prove my knowledge and skills as and when required". Singh-Sengupta's (1995) study originally identified a six factor structure to social power. However, seven factors were identified in the present study due to two factors relating to reward power - namely, Intra-Work Reward Power and Extra-Work Reward Power. The intra-work reward power is more intrinsic in nature where as extra-work reward power is more extrinsic. Only 1 item was dropped because of factor loading below .30.

Table 1: Intercorrelations, Means, Number of Items (parenthesis), Standard Deviations, Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients (across the diagonal for the respective variables or factor analytically derived dimensions) pertaining to the main variables of the study

Vari.	M (Items)	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1	ES	16.15(4)	2.56	.88																
2	COR	21.14(5)	2.97	.32	.83															
3	CT	7.79(2)	1.75	.36	.20	.70														
4	OP	19.85(5)	3.11	.50	.33	.25	.76													
5	WM	11.85(3)	1.92	.41	.27	.21	.42	.71												
6	CV	27.2(7)	2.5	.60	.30	.30	.56	.41	.71											
7	SFP	22.8(6)	3.7	.56	.21	.13	.50	.40	.56	.84										
8	ALT	14.88(4)	.16	.38	.02	.20	.37	.22	.38	.43	.75									
9	SPO	15.42(4)	2.94	.14	.47	.03	.21	.09	.15	.19	-.03	.70								
10	INI	19.24(5)	2.77	.55	.19	.25	.48	.30	.46	.50	.51	.15	.79							
11	GC	16.57(4)	2.43	.40	.38	.47	.40	.43	.35	.30	.17	.25	.30	.70						
12	IWRP	15.79(5)	2.39	.52	.24	.23	.37	.30	.44	.44	.28	.20	.35	.29	.83					
13	CP	21.6(9)	6.89	-.05	-.19	-.13	-.07	-.07	-.15	.00	.05	-.20	-.08	-.18	-.11	.89				
14	IP	19.12(7)	6.46	.13	-.07	.00	.09	-.05	.04	.11	.12	-.06	.06	-.13	.14	.26	.89			
15	EWRP	13.99(4)	3.13	.22	-.06	.03	.13	.12	.19	.27	.23	.04	.24	.04	.54	-.02	.26	.81		
16	LP	17.4(5)	3.45	.14	-.10	.05	.12	.16	.12	.11	.13	-.16	.15	-.01	.31	.06	.17	.35	.77	
17	RP	23.43(6)	3.61	.47	.19	.21	.40	.31	.48	.38	.28	.12	.36	.31	.54	-.24	.15	.34	.32	.89
18	EP	11.88(3)	2.1	.49	.16	.07	.38	.31	.39	.43	.34	.10	.39	.16	.48	-.03	.19	.25	.36	.50

Note : Correlation Value Significance .13<.5; .17<.1, N = 25

ES= Emotional Support, COR = Concern for Organisational Resources, CT = Conservation of Time, OP = Organisational Pride, WM = Work Mindedness, CV = Civic Virtue, SFP = Social and Functional Participation, ALT = Altruism, SPO = Sportsman Spirit, INI = Individual Initiative, GC = Generalised Compliance, IWRP = Intra Work Reward Power, CP = Coercive Power, IP = Information Power, EWRP = Extra Work Reward Power, LP = Legitimate Power, RP = Referent Power, EP = Expert Power

Results

The results based on correlation and regression analysis demonstrate a significant relationship between OCB and social power. The descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation and correlations) pertaining to all the main variables in this study appear in Table 1. The results of descriptive statistics show that

OCB and social power were significantly correlated and OCB had a significant relationship.

The stepwise multiple regression was performed to see the impact of different forms of OCB on bases of social power. This analysis is done to see how OCB dimensions predict positive forms of social power.

Table 2: Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis with Dimensions of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) Predicting the Dimensions of Social Power

No. Predictor Variables (Dimensions of OCB)	Criterion Variables	b	t	p (exact)	Adj. R ²
1 Emotional Support	Intra-Work Reward Power	.34	5.75	.001	.35
2 Civic Virtue	Coercive Power	-.15	-2.37	.02	.02
3 Sportsman Spirit	Legitimate Power	-.19	-3.30	.001	.12
4 Civic Virtue	Referent Power	.30	5.19	.001	.34
5 Emotional Support	Expert Power	.36	5.76	.001	.36

Table 2 shows that OCB is an important construct for predicting Intra-Work Reward Power, Referent Power, and Expert Power positively. OCB had explained around 35 per cent of the variance in positive forms of social power. The results are consistent with the hypothesis (1) that OCB will predict positive forms of social power positively. Conversely, confirming hypothesis (2), OCB also had a negative impact on coercive and legitimate powers which were considered as negative forms of social power.

Discussion

The present study proposes the construct of OCB as an alternative base for

positive forms of social power. The regression results are consistent with our hypotheses. Referent, Expert, and Reward (intra-work) power were positively predicted by different dimensions of OCB. However, Legitimate and Coercive Power were negatively predicted by OCB, and Information Power did not show a significant relationship with any dimension of OCB.

This research facilitates further clarification of the role of OCB as an antecedent variable in enhancing the use of positive forms of social power and reducing negative forms of social power. Our results suggest that Emotional Support has emerged as the salient positive

predictor of Intra-Work Reward Power and Expert Power. This may be due to the possibility that when supervisors provide emotional support to subordinates who are facing personal or professional problems, then the situation may give rise to the development of a positive base for increasing their Intra-Work Reward Power and Expert Power. Emotional support for other employees also helps in enhancing one's power base to reward others for their expertise in a given area of work.

Our results suggest that the Civic Virtue dimension of OCB has a positive impact on Referent Power. However, it also has a negative impact on Coercive Power. It may be that supervisor Referent Power is based on possession of socially desirable personal traits. Therefore, when people think positively and perform well for their organisation by doing tasks beyond their normal duties then it is likely that they will be appreciated and admired by others for their virtues. Additionally, it may be considered quite logical to think that Civic Virtue will also reduce the use of Coercive Power since Coercive Power is based on the domination over others by the fear of punishment, while OCB is based on volunteerism, good will and positive attitude towards the organisation and its members. OCB could be a factor in discouraging the use of authoritarian leadership and may encourage the use of more democratic management styles. OCB could also make employees more willing and proactive in accepting the rules and regulations of the organisation, and create a positive social context of

work in which employees are able to contribute with more ease and comfort.

OCB within this context could be categorised as a tool for empowering others. The Sportsman Spirit dimension of OCB was identified by this research as a negative predictor of Legitimate Power. It may be that a Sportsman Spirit can motivate employees to tolerate nuisance or within the work place including the acceptance of others' strength and weaknesses. As we are unlikely to find a completely ideal organisation, we can possibly be more satisfied at work when we begin to accept all kinds of nuisances. An environment where there is high acceptance may discourage the use of individual positional power. On the other hand some professionals who are regularly involved in dealing with others who are experiencing stress, strain or burnout may personally, socially or organizationally be more effective when they enjoy a minimum amount of social power. Otherwise they may be at the risk of a health hazard over a period of time due to feelings of powerlessness in a social system.

The present work has some limitations that require consideration. Apart from the cross-sectional design of the study which makes it impossible to ascertain causal relationships, the use of self-reported measures of OCB and social power may cause desirability bias on the part of respondents. Moreover, the cultural context of this study may also limit the generalisation of our findings, particularly as the research did not include female participants in the sample.

Notwithstanding the need for a more global perspective in organisational psychology (Gelfand, Leslie & Fehr 2008), in conducting a study of power, particularly within a specific cultural context, we must highlight the potential influence of cultural dimensions such as power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism and masculinity on self report measures (Hofstede & McCrae 2004). We suggest that additional methods are adopted in future with a focus on a wider cultural context. Future research in the area should also endeavour to compare OCB with other influencing strategies such as impression management and ingratiation for a more comprehensive examination of the OCB-power hypothesis. The relevance of the concept of social power may also be studied on other variables of organisational interests like general health, reputational effectiveness and job satisfaction within the same framework. Fundamentally, 'reputation' should be tested as a mediator variable between OCB and social power as it is possible that OCB may have a greater influence on social power through other such mediators.

The concept of power is generally perceived negatively by organisational members, with individuals who endeavour to develop power in organisations considered to be "politicians and/or manipulators". This study advances the research in both the areas of OCB and social power by viewing the concept through a more positivistic approach to influence within organisations. In our approach with OCB, we have focussed on individuals who are committed and

hard working citizens but do not possess power (perceived as powerless by others). The fact that these people contribute wholeheartedly to the system and as a result enjoy Referent, Expert and Intra-Work Reward Power, suggests that OCB may be considered a potential source of social power

Summary

Based on our analysis it appears individuals who possess high levels of OCB are more likely to be a part of an informal structure, and have their own social network within organisations. Their colleagues may perceive them as key members of the organisation, due to their persistent belief in strengthening and empowering others. It could be argued from an idealistic perspective that power should be used to empower others for developing organisational excellence. Within the current employment climate, where organisations are facing global challenges and competition, the key is to retain good organisational citizens who are likely to put their organisation "first" and who make sacrifices of their personal interests for the sake of wider organisational interests. OCBs may well help to develop managers who have the institutional power to implement transformational cultural change and impart justice and equity in organizations. As this research highlights the positive aspects of organisational behaviour and in particular OCB in creating a healthier workplace, we suggest that it would be advantageous for organisations to gain a further understanding of the main dimensions of OCB.

References

- Allport, F.H. (1934), "The j-curve Hypothesis of Conforming Behaviour," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 5: 141-83.
- Bateman, T.S. & Organ D.W. (1983), "Job Satisfaction and the Good Soldier: The Relationship between Affect and Employee 'Citizenship'", *Academy of Management Journal*, 37: 299-322.
- Blau, P. (1964), *Exchange and Power in Social Life*, New York: Wiley.
- Bolino, M.C., Turnley W.H. & Bloodgood J.M. (2002), "Citizenship Behaviour and the Creation of Social Capital in Organizations", *Academy of Management Review*, 27 (4): 505-22.
- Brauer, M. & Bourhis, R. Y. (2006), "Social Power", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36: 601-16.
- Busch, P. (1980), "The Sales' Managers' Bases of Social Power and Influence upon the Sales Force", *Journal of Marketing*, 44: 91-101.
- Camman, C., Fichman M., Jenkins D. & Klesh J. (1979), The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire, unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Carson, P.P., Carson K.D. & Roe C.W. (1993), "Social Power Bases: A Meta-analytic Examination of Inter-relationships and Outcomes", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23: 1150-69.
- Chattopadhyay, P. (1999), "Beyond Direct and Symmetrical Effects: The Influence of Demographic Dissimilarity on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour", *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(3): 273-87.
- Cobb, A.T., (1986), "Political Diagnosis: Applications in Organizational Development", *The Academy of Management Review*, 11(3): 482-96.
- Cropanzano, R., Rupp D.E., Mohler C.J. & Schminke M. (2001), "Three Roads to Organizational Justice", In J. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, 20, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Fiol, C. M., O'Connor E. J. & Aguinis H. (2001), "All for One and One for All. The Development and Transfer of Power across Organizational Levels", *Academy of Management Review*, 26: 224-42.
- French, J.R.P., Jr. & Raven B.H. (1959), "The Bases of Social Power", In D. Cartwright (Ed.) *Studies in social power*, Ann Arbor, MI: Institute of Social Research.
- Gabarro, J.J. & Athos J. (1976), *Interpersonal relation and communication*, Prentice Hall, New York.
- Gelfand, M. J., Leslie L. M. & Fehr R. (2008), "To Prosper, Organizational Psychology Should Adopt a Global Perspective", *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 29: 493-517.
- Gioia, D.A., & Sims H.P. (1983), "Perceptions of Managerial Power as a Consequence of Managerial Behaviour and Reputation", *Journal of Management*, 9: 7-26.
- Griffin, M., Neal A., & Neale M. (2000), "The Contribution of Task Performance and Contextual Performance to Effectiveness: Investigating the Role of Situational Constraints". *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 49(3): 517-33.
- Hardy, C. & Clegg S.R (1996), "Some Dare Call It Power", In S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W.R. Nord, (eds.), *Handbook of Organization Studies*, Sage Publications.
- Hendrix, W.H., Robbins T., Miller J. & Summers T.P. (1998), "Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice on Factors Predictive of Turnover", *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality*, 13(4): 611-632.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard K.H., & Johnson, S. (2002), *Management of Organizational Behaviour*:

- Leading Human Resources, Prentice-Hall, New Delhi.
- Hofstede, G. & McCrae R. R. (2004), "Personality and Culture Revisited: Linking Traits and Dimensions of Culture", *Cross-Cultural Research*, 38(1): 52-88.
- Howard, N. (1993), "The Role of Emotions in Multi Organizational Decision Making", *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 44(6): 613-23.
- Ivancevich, J. & Donnelly J. (1970), "Leader Influence and Performance", *Personnel Psychology*, 23: 539-49.
- Jain, A.K. (2009), "Organizational Citizenship Behavior As a Predictor of Personal Effectiveness and General Health", *Academy of Taiwan Business Management Review*, 5 (3): 51-61.
- Jain, A.K. & Sinha, A.K. (2008), "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Imperatives for Organizationally Relevant Outcomes", *The Chanakya, Journal of Rourkela Institute of Management Studies*, 8 (2).
- Konovsky, M.A & Organ D.W. (1996), "Dispositional and Contextual Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour," *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 17: 253-66.
- Koys, D. J. (2001), "The Effects of Employee Satisfaction, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, and Turnover on Organizational Effectiveness: A Unit-level, Longitudinal Study." *Personnel Psychology*, 54: 101-14.
- Krackhardt, D. & Hanson J.R. (1993), "Informal Networks: The Company Behind the Chart", *Harvard Business Review*, July-Aug.
- Kumar, M.R., & Sankaran S. (2007), "Indian Culture and the Culture for TQM: a Comparison". *The TQM Magazine*, 19 (2): 176-88.
- LiPine, J.A., Hanson M.A., Borman W.C. & Motowidlo S.J. (2000), "Contextual Performance and Team-work: Implication for Staffing", In G. Ferris and K.M. Rowland, (Eds), *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, 19: 53-90.
- Moorman, R.H. & Blakely G.L. (1995), "Individualism-Collectivism as an Individual Difference Predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour", *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 16: 127-42.
- 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.
- Mowday, R.T. (1978), "The Exercise of Upward Influence in Organizations", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23: 137-56.
- Mudler, M. (1971), "Power Equalization through Participation", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16: 31-38.
- Nahapiet, J. & Ghoshal S. (1998), "Social Capital, Intellectual Capital, and the Organizational Advantage", *Academy of Management Review*, 23: 242-66.
- Nietzsche, F. (1883-1888), *The Will to Power*, Translated by W.Kaufman and R.T. Hollingdale and edited, with Commentary, by W.Kaufman (1968), New York, Vintage Books.
- Organ, D.W. & Ryan K. (1995), A Meta-analytic Review of Attitudinal and Dispositional Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, *Personnel Psychology*, 48: 775-802.
- Organ, D.W. (1988), *Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: The Good Soldier Syndrome*, Lexington, MA Lexington.
- Organ, D.W. (1997), "Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Its Construct Clean Up Time", *Human Performance*, 10: 85-98.
- Pebody, R.L. (1962), "Perception of Organizational Authority: A Comparative Analysis". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 6: 463-82.

- Pfeffer, J. (1992), *Managing with Power: Politics and Influence in Organizations*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Ahearne M. & MacKenzie S.B. (1997), "Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and the Quantity and Quality of Work Group Performance," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82: 262-70.
- Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie S., Paine B. & Bachrach D. (2000), Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research," *Journal of Management*, 26(3): 513-63.
- Rotundo, M. & Sackett P.R. (2002), "The Relative Importance of Task, Citizenship and Counterproductive Performance to Global Ratings of Job Performance: A Policy Capturing Approach," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1): 66-80.
- Sheley, K. & Shaw M.E. (1979), "Social Power: To Use or Not to Use?," *Bulletin of Psychonomic Society*, 13: 257-60.
- Sinha, A.K. (1992), Measures of Some Organizational Variables, unpublished manuscript, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur.
- Singh-Sengupta, S. (1995), "Measure of Bases of Power," In J. B. P. Sinha, *The Cultural Context of Leadership and Power*, Sage Publications, New Delhi.
- Smith, C.A., Organ D.W., & Near J.P. (1983), "Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Its Nature and Antecedents," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68: 655-63.
- Speckman, R.E. (1979), "Influence and Information: An Exploratory Investigation of the Boundary Role Person's Basis of Power", *Academy of Management Journal*, 22: 104-17.
- Spreitzer, Gretchen M. & Mishra Anil K. (1999), "Giving Up Control without Losing Control: Trust and Its Substitutes' Effects on Managers' Involving Employees in Decision Making", *Group and Organization Management*, 24(2): 155-87.
- Student, K.R. (1968), "Supervisory Influence and Group Performance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 52: 188-94.
- Sutton, R.I., & Ford L.H. (1982), "Problem Solving Adequacy in Hospital Subunits", *Human Relations*, 35: 675-701.
- Van Dijke, M. & Poppe M. (2006), "Striving for Personal Power as a Basis for Social Power Dynamics", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36: 537-56.
- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J.W. & Dienesch R.M. (1994), "Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Construct Redefinition, Measurement, and Validation", *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4): 765-802.
- Walz, S. M., & Niehoff B.P. (2000), "Organizational Citizenship Behaviours: Their Relationship to Organizational Effectiveness", *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research* 24: 301-19.
- Wayne, S.J., Shore L.M. & Liden R.C. (1997), "Perceived Organizational Support and Leader Member Exchange: A Social Exchange Perspective", *Academy of Management Journal*, 40: 82-111.