

Influence of Organizational Structure on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Seemi Azam & Rashmi Kumar

This study attempts to probe organizational structure as an antecedent of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, OCB. Centralization, Formalization and Task Routineness were taken as the factors of organizational structure. The main objective of this paper is to determine the influence of organizational structure on OCB. For this purpose, a sample of 295 employees belonging to three different types of organizations across public and private sectors was taken to give their responses on organizational structure and OCB scales. It was hypothesized that all the three structure variables taken would be negatively associated to OCB dimensions. However, results only partially supported the hypotheses.

Seemi Azam is Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, K. N. Government Post Graduate Degree College, Gyanpur, Bhadohi. E-mail: seemi_7@yahoo.com. **Rashmi Kumar** is Professor and Head, Department of Psychology, University of Allahabad, Allahabad

Introduction

Organizational citizenship behavior has been the focus of organizational behavior researchers (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000) since the past few decades. It has been the most extensively studied topic in organizational behavior research (Chahal & Mehta, 2011; Lievson & Anseel, 2004) owing to its importance and its implications on the organizations. These researchers also proposed that OCB could positively influence individual and organizational performance. By looking at such arguments, we come to know how important OCB is in the context of organization and its importance is poised to increase only in the future.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors or OCB is commonly described as those behaviors which are not a part of an individual's job profile. Neither do their presence guarantee rewards nor their absence ensure punishment. However, overall they help to improve the overall performance of the organization.

The concept of OCB is not a new one. Hint of this concept can be found in

the early works of Barnard (1938), who said that employees should be willing to contribute efforts to cooperative systems for achieving organizational goals. Scholars hold different views with respect to the dimensionality of OCB. However, one of the most popularly quoted set of dimensions is the one given by Organ (1988) who identified five dimensions belonging to OCB: Altruism, Courtesy, Civic Virtue, Conscientiousness and Sportsmanship.

The notion of organizational structure focuses on the differentiation of positions, formulations of rules and procedures and prescriptions of authority. It is the way jobs are divided, grouped and coordinated in an organization. Structure is a complex medium of control, which is continuously produced and recreated in interactions and yet, shapes that interaction. According to Hage and Aiken (1967), two important features of organizational structure are formalization and centralization. Hage and Aiken (1967) defined organizational formalization as the level to which an organization precisely spells out rules and procedures related to jobs in different situations. This aspect is also known as job codification. Rule observation refers to the extent to which an organization rigidly adheres to the rules and procedures. In other words, this construct measures how far employees are supervised in ensuring that they are not committing any offense against the company's rules and regulations (Hage & Aiken, 1967).

Centralization deals with the amount of power distributed among employees of various positions. This variable is mea-

sured in terms of hierarchy of authority and participation in decision making. According to Hage and Aiken (1967), hierarchy of authority examines whether or not employees rely upon their supervisors in decision making while participation in decision making identifies the level of employees' involvement in decisions on resource allocation and policy formation. Tata and Prasad (2004) categorized centralization into macro-level and micro-level whereby the former deals with employees' participation in decision making regarding policies and procedures at the organizational level and the latter is concerned with employees' involvement in decision making regarding their own tasks.

Adler and Borys (1996), on the other hand, conceptualized formalization into coercive and enabling. This is because they asserted that attitudinal and behavioral outcomes among employees are attributed to the type of formalization enforced in the organization. Hence, a conceptual understanding of this construct among top management is deemed crucial. Adler and Borys (1996) viewed that formalization can be effective depending upon the selection process, congruency of organizational goals, and type of industry in which an organization operates.

Bodewes (2002) provided three definitions of organizational formalization but he proposed that formalization is most accurately defined as "the extent to which documented standards are used to control social actors' behavior and outputs". Bodewes (2002) highlighted that most

researchers overlook the comprehensive definition of formalization by not including the aspect of rule observation or segregating it into two dimensions.

Organizational structure can also be understood in terms of prevailing routines of the organization i.e. the ways, manner and means through which the organizational processes take place. Although not emphasized in the existing OCB literature, it appears that task characteristics are important determinants of citizenship behavior and deserve more attention in future research (Podsakoff et al, 2006).

Organizational Structure & OCB: the Relationship

The type of structure determines power distribution which then plays an important role in determining the behavior of individuals. The outcomes of organizational structure, namely formalization and centralization, have been examined in a number of studies. Better task performance is hardly achievable in organizations with highly formalized rules and centralized decision making (Organ et al., 2006). It is generally expected that as an organization becomes more structured and complex, it moves towards greater rigidity and inflexibility and hence, gives fewer chances to its employees to engage in extra role behaviors.

Better task performance is hardly achievable in organizations with highly formalized rules and centralized decision making.

The negative influence of formalization and centralization on OCB has been reported in most empirical investigations. A study conducted by Nasurdin (2006) examined the influence of organizational structure (formalization and centralization) on job stress among salespersons in the stock broking industry of Malaysia. It was found that formalization had a positive influence on job stress because job that is bounded by inflexible rules and procedures allowed lesser autonomy and freedom for the incumbents on how to perform their tasks. This will most likely lead to job stress. It is evident that stress has negative influence on overall organizational effectiveness of which OCB is considered an indicator. Johari and Yahya (2009) proposed that organizational structure namely centralization and formalization has direct effect on employee task performance and organizational citizenship behavior.

Jain (2011) conducted a study in motorbike organizations of India in order to investigate how different dimensions of organization structure predict various forms of OCB in the particular work setting. Data was collected from a sample of 250 executives. Results of stepwise regression analysis revealed that among other dimensions, Centralization was found to be a negative predictor of OCB.

Formalized rules and procedures and centralized decision making also hinder employees from 'thinking outside the box' in performing tasks. Hence, employees do not put extra effort or take any initiative to improve the way their jobs are performed. In other words, highly

formalized and centralized organization discourages employees from exerting more in achieving organizational goals (Organ et al., 2006). This is a clear hint that OCB may be negatively correlated with formalization and centralization.

Parker, Wall, and Cordery (2001) recommended that future job design studies should incorporate the influence of job characteristics on contextual performance (i.e., OCB). The degree to which the work done by employees in the organization is repetitive or monotonous, in other words, lack variety, also may have substantial influences on extra-role behavior. It may be the case that some of the task variables (e.g., intrinsically satisfying tasks or task routinization) influence OCBs through job attitudes (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Bommer (1996) reported that task characteristics had strong relationships with OCB dimensions of altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, and civic virtue; task routinization was negatively correlated to OCBs. Podsakoff, Niehoff, MacKenzie, and Williams (1993) too, reported negative correlations between task routinization and both altruism and conscientiousness.

Routine tasks generally reflect a high degree of repetitiveness in the job and therefore fail to generate enthusiasm in employees (Iverson & Maguire, 2000). Todd and Kent (2006) investigated how a selection of task variables impacts OCB. In the study 337 employees from a manufacturer of sporting goods products completed the survey. They con-

cluded that task related variables of routine or methodologically invariant tasks and intrinsically satisfying tasks have consistently demonstrated substantial influences upon OCB in the form of altruism.

Job characteristics, one of which is skill variety are the ‘system factors’ affecting the psychological condition of employee in performing job.

Job Characteristics Theory of Motivation by Hackman and Oldham specifically explain that job characteristics, one of which is skill variety are the ‘system factors’ affecting the psychological condition of employee in performing job. This state then determines the level of task performance and OCB exhibited by employees. Therefore, it can justly be expected that organizational structure dimensions of centralization, formalization and task routineness may have a negative impact on positive extra-role behavior like OCB.

After careful review of the above literature, certain gaps in the existing knowledge were noticed, leading to questions in the minds of the researchers. Firstly, many western researchers have empirically investigated OCB and its antecedents. On the contrary, fewer attempts to research upon OCB have been made in India (for e.g; Chaitanya & Tripathi, 2001; Bhatnagar and Sandhu, 2005).

Most research on OCB has focused on individual antecedents and

organisational determinants had been under researched. It is appropriate to understand them as individual behaviours. But, some of these behaviours may be further understood by an investigation of how they are embedded in different contexts, such as the work group, the department or the organization (George and Battenhausen, 1990). Hence, this study focuses on organizational level characteristics, organizational structure in particular.

The main objective of this research is to study the relationship between Organizational Structure dimensions of Centralization, Formalization and Task Routineness and OCB and to see how organizational structure factors influence OCB dimensions.

On the basis of review of literature, the following hypotheses were formulated:

- Organizational Structure dimensions of Centralization, Formalization and Task Routineness would be significantly negatively related to OCB such that higher the degree of perception of these structure dimensions in the organisation by the employees, lower will be their level of OCB
- Organizational Structure dimensions of Centralization, Formalization and Task Routineness would significantly predict OCB such that, higher level of perception of structure dimensions of the organization by the employees will lead to lower level of their OCB

Sample

A total of 300 respondents participated in the study. Out of the 300, data of 5 respondents was incomplete, hence not used. The percentage of males and females in the sample was 62.4% and 37.6% respectively. Whereas, the ratio of various levels of management i.e. higher, middle and lower level was 12.5%, 55.6% and 31.9% respectively. The mean age of the respondents in the sample was 40 (SD=9.8), the mean tenure was 11 years (SD=9.06), whereas the mean annual emolument was Rs. 10.5 lakh (SD=8.15). The data was collected across six different organizations with equal representation from public and private sector and three different types of organizations-schools, banks and construction companies.

Organisational Structure

Here, organizational structure is defined in terms of centralization of power and authority, formalization of rules and regulations and variability in tasks i.e. task routineness. Centralization dealt with the amount of power distributed among employees of various positions. Formalization referred to the extent to which organization is perceived to be governed by too many rules or the degrees to which rules are perceived to be rigid or flexible. Task Routineness referred to the degree to which jobs require repetitive and regular course of procedures to be performed. There are three subscales developed by Aiken and Hage (1967) related to three broad dimensions which were used in this study.

The total number items in the full scale were 20 out of which 8 items were reverse coded (1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 18, 19, 20). The Cronbach alpha co-efficient was found to be .66 for these scales. Respondents were asked to give their responses in a 4-point rating scale where 1 referred to 'definitely false' and 4 referred to 'definitely true'. A higher score on these scales depicted higher levels of centralization, formalization and task routineness.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

OCB was understood in this study as individual behavior that is discretionary, not a part of individual's job profile; neither directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system; nor is its absence punishable; and that overall contributes positively to the effective functioning of the organization. In order to measure this construct, a self developed scale was used. The scale had a total of 23 items measuring 4 factors or dimensions of OCB. These were:

Helping: Behavior aimed at helping co-workers in their tasks and customers or clients in their transaction in the organization; helping self in terms of taking training and conserving and protecting the resources of the organization.

Initiating: Behavior aimed at taking initiatives in order to support workers and customers or clients. It also involves initiating in problem solving at organizational level and going the extra mile in performing one's task.

Defending: Behavior aimed at defending the organization by putting up a front in difficult times and situations and creating or maintaining a good image of the organization.

Refraining (from acts harmful to the organisation): Behavior aimed at refraining from activities which may directly or indirectly bring harm to the organization.

The Cronbach alpha was found to be .836 for the full scale. Five items were reverse coded (19, 20, 21, 22, 23). Responses were to be given on a 5-point scale (1-rarely, 2-seldom, 3-sometimes, 4-often, 5-almost always). A high score on each of the dimensions indicate high Helping, Initiating, Defending and Refraining behavior; while a low score indicates vice-versa.

Results & Discussion

Unexpectedly, Formalization was found to have an overall positive correlation with OCB dimensions; whereas, Helping and Refraining had overall positive relationship with OCB. In the private sector also, Formalization was found to have a positive relationship with OCB.

Unexpectedly, Formalization was found to have an overall positive correlation with OCB dimensions; whereas, Helping and Refraining had overall positive relationship with OCB.

Table 1 Correlations between OCB & dimensions of Organizational Structure across Sectors of Organizations

OCB Dimensions		Organizational Structure	
Public Sector	Centralization	Formalization	Task routineness
Helping	.569**	.058	.355**
Initiating	-.002	.584**	-.248**
Defending	-.098	.539**	-.300**
Refraining	.309**	.103	.105
OCB Dimensions		Organizational Structure	
Private Sector	Centralization	Formalization	Task Routineness
Helping	.597**	-.381**	.367**
Initiating	-.460**	.653**	-.609**
Defending	-.430**	.175*	-.104
Refraining	-.595**	.205*	-.511**

***pd" .001; **pd" .01; *pd" .05

Table 2 Correlations between OCB & Dimensions of Organizational Structure across Types of Organizations

OCB Dimensions		Organizational Structure	
Education	Centralization	Formalization	Task Routineness
Helping	.080	.273**	-.248*
Initiating	.185	.417**	-.219*
Defending	.213*	.302**	-.178
Refraining	.235*	.105	.064
OCB Dimensions		Organizational Structure	
Banking	Centralization	Formalization	Task Routineness
Helping	.614**	-.457**	.477**
Initiating	-.718**	.753**	-.674**
Defending	-.728**	.673**	-.443**
Refraining	-.126	.184	-.409**
OCB Dimensions		Organizational Structure	
Construction	Centralization	Formalization	Task Routineness
Helping	.091	-.037	.060
Initiating	.427**	.640**	-.088
Defending	-.253*	.088	.153
Refraining	-.086	-.236*	-.064

Note: Same as in Table 1

Among types of organizations, Formalization and Centralization had an overall positive correlation, whereas, Task routineness had a negative correlation with OCB. In banks also, Formalization had a positive relationship with OCB,

where as Centralization and Task routineness had a negative relationship with it. In construction companies, mixed results were found.

Overall, Formalization and in many instances Centralization too, had a positive relationship with OCB dimensions which is contrary to the hypothesis. This was particularly true for schools setting. Task routineness had mostly an inverse relationship with OCB which is in line with the hypothesis formulated. It means that higher the Formalization and Centralization perceived by the employees,

higher will be their tendency to engage in OCB; whereas higher the level of Task routineness perceived by the employees, lower will be their OCB. These correlations were carried out to test the hypothesis “Organizational Structure dimensions of Centralization, Formalization and Task Routineness would be significantly negatively related to OCB such that higher the degree of perception of these structure dimensions in the organization by the employees, lower will be their level of OCB”. Hence it may be stated that it has been only partially proved.

Table 3 Dimensions of Organizational Structure as Predictors of OCB across Sectors of Organization

OCB Dimensions		Dimensions of Organizational Structure			
Public Sector	Centralization	Formalization	Task Routineness	Adj. R2	F
Helping	.548***	.198**	.087	.341	26.344***
Initiating	.166	.571***	-.097	.344	26.700***
Defending	.072	.497***	-.121	.282	20.254***
Refraining	.394***	.133	-.093	.108	6.923***
OCB Dimensions		Dimensions of Organizational Structure			
Private Sector	Centralization	Formalization	Task Routineness	Adj. R2	F
Helping	.580***	-.241**	-.112	.384	31.363***
Initiating	-.141	.452***	-.272***	.516	52.842***
Defending	.564***	.156	.318**	.220	14.760***
Refraining	-.454***	-.129	-.314***	.392	32.340***

***pd” .001; **pd” .01; *pd” .05

Organizational structure dimensions explained 34% to 10 % of variance in OCB dimensions in Public sector organizations. Remarkably, Centralization and Formalization was found to predict and contribute to OCB positively. On the other hand, Task Routineness as expected was found to have a negative relationship with OCB.

In Private sector, 51% to 22% variance in (Initiating and Defending respectively) OCB was explained by Organisational Structure dimensions.

In Private sector, 51% to 22% variance in (Initiating and Defending respec-

tively) OCB was explained by Formalization and Task routineness- Organizational Structure dimensions. All were found to have a mixed relationship the three dimensions - Centralization,

Table 4 Dimensions of Organizational Structure as Predictors of OCB across Types Of Organization

OCB Dimensions	Dimensions of Organizational Structure			Adj. R2	F
Schools	Centralization	Formalization	Task Routineness		
Helping	.089	.183	-.218*	.084	4.044**
Initiating	.136	.332**	-.159	.174	7.999***
Defending	.209	.190	-.180	.107	4.988**
Refraining	.216	.050	.019	.028	1.966
Banks	Centralization	Formalization	Task Routineness	Adj. R2	F
Helping	.605***	.096	.119	.365	19.197***
Initiating	-.246*	.411***	-.219*	.622	53.004***
Defending	-.615***	.355**	.233*	.570	42.995***
Refraining	.306	-.013	-.632***	.198	8.510***
Construction	Centralization	Formalization	Task Routineness	Adj. R2	F
Helping	.118	-.062	.055	-.015	.521
Initiating	.235**	.588***	.102	.451	27.589***
Defending	-.252*	.038	.138	.052	2.791*
Refraining	-.006	-.274*	-.142	.045	2.509

Note: Same as in Table 3

Coming to schools, structure explained 17% to 2% variance in OCB. Centralization and Formalization had a positive, though non-significant correlation with all OCB dimensions; whereas, Task routineness is negatively related to OCB factors. Though organizational structure predicted OCB significantly, the separate dimensions of structure did not significantly contribute to variance in OCB

In banks, 62% to 19% variance in OCB dimensions was explained by organizational structure dimensions. Formalization had comparatively more posi-

tive relationship with OCB than the other two dimensions of structure.

In construction companies, organizational structure dimensions explained 45% to 1% variance in Initiating and Helping respectively. It may be said that structure dimensions predict only Initiating and Defending. OCB had a mixed relationship with OCB and that Refraining had a negative correlation with all structure variables.

Overall, it can be said that except for in construction companies, structure dimensions predict all dimensions of

Except for in Construction companies, structure dimensions predict all dimensions of OCB significantly.

OCB significantly. Structure dimensions best predict Initiative. Centralization and Formalization, particularly Formalization was found to have a positive relationship with OCB in many organizations whereas, Task routineness was seen as having a clearly negative relationship with some of the dimensions. Lastly, Refraining clearly showed negative relationship with structure dimensions on many occasions. Thus we can say that the hypothesis “Organizational Structure dimensions of Centralization, Formalization and Task Routineness would significantly predict OCB such that, higher level of perception of structure dimensions the organization by the employees will lead to lower level of their OCB” was partially proved.

The organizational structure dimensions studied here were Centralization, Formalization and Task routineness. Out of these three dimensions, Task routineness was found to relate negatively on almost all occasions across all organizational settings under study. This was consistent with previous researches (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Bommer (1996). Centralization too, barring some instances, seemed to share a negative relationship with OCB dimensions (Tables 1, 2).

A look at the regression analysis tables shows that all OCB dimensions

are predicted highly significantly by the structure dimensions (Table 3). A study by Williams (1993) confirmed that negative correlation existed between Task routineness and OCB dimensions. Routine or methodologically invariant tasks have consistently demonstrated substantial influences upon OCB, according to Todd and Kent (2006) also. Like routine tasks, which generally reflect a high degree of repetitiveness in the job and fail to generate enthusiasm among employees (Iverson & Macguire, 2000); centralized decision making too hinder employee ‘thinking outside the box’ while performing tasks. The decisions are made by superiors and the employees are only expected to follow the beaten track in centralized systems. Hence, employees do not put extra effort or take any initiative to improve the way things are done in the organization. Organ et al (2006) also supported that highly centralized organizations discourage employees from exerting more efforts in achieving goals. Task routinization was found to relate negatively to OCB (Krishnan et al, 2010). Alternatively, Drago and Garvey (1998) demonstrated that job variety positively related to helping behavior (OCB).

The results of regression analysis also confirm these findings. Structure variables were able to predict almost all OCB dimensions across all organizations, except for construction companies. The Initiating dimension of OCB was predicted by organizational structure with highest variance in it (62% to 17%) (Tables 3, 4).

Two exceptions were noticed. Surprisingly, Formalization was found to have a positive association with OCB dimension and also predict them in a positive manner on most occasions. This means that higher Formalization perceived by employees leads to their increased level of Citizenship Behavior. This finding is opposite to what earlier researchers found, i.e., formalization of procedures leads to dip in the tendency to engage in OCB. Perhaps somewhere it proved the theory of bureaucracy by Weber (1946) which says that formal organizations, which are bureaucratically organized, have higher level of performance owing to the task specifications and clear division of organizational structure which results in higher performance among employees. Another distinguishing finding here was that organizational structure variables did not predict OCB dimensions in the context of construction companies. These two findings were against the expectations of the researchers and need further probing.

Hence, it can be said that the hypotheses “Organizational Structure dimensions of Centralization, Formalization and Task Routineness would be significantly and negatively related to OCB such that higher the degree of perception of these structure dimensions in the organization by the employees, lower will be their level of OCB” and “Organizational Structure dimensions of Centralization, Formalization and Task routineness would significantly predict OCB such that, higher level of perception of structure dimensions of the organization by the employees will lead to

lower level of their OCB” were partially supported. Overall, these findings also seem to relate to quiet an extent, the theory of performance by Cardy and Dobbins in Williams (2002), and as explained by Adler and Borys (1996), which says that the ‘system factors’ or organizational factors, if enabling and positive, may result in high performance in the workplace, seen in the form of OCB over here.

Implications & Recommendations

This study demonstrated the influence of organizational structure factors on OCB. Task routineness negatively predicted OCB. This means that employee perception of their job as highly routine reduced their tendency to engage in OCB. Also, organizational structure dimension of Formalization positively predicted OCB. This implies that, higher degree of Formalization, leads the employees to engage in OCB. Therefore, in order to promote OCB, it may be recommended that the management of the organization should get the jobs designed in a manner such that Task routineness is reduced and job variety is enhanced. Also, Formalization may be reviewed as a tool for enhancement of productivity if used with discretion.

It may be recommended that the management of the organization should get the jobs designed in a manner such that Task routineness is reduced and job variety is enhanced.

References

- Adler, P. S. & Borys, B. (1996), "Two Types of Bureaucracy: Enabling and Coercive. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(1): 61-89.
- Barnard, C. I. (1938), *The Functions of the Executive*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bhatnagar, J. & Sandhu, S. (2005), "Psychological Empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in IT Managers: A Talent Retention Tool", *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 40: 449-69;
- Chahal, H & Mehta, S. (2011), "Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Conceptual Framework in Reference to Health Care Sector", *Journal of Services Research*, 10: 25-44.
- Chaitanya, S. K. & Tripathi, N. (2001), "Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 37: 217-30
- Drago, R. & Garvey, G. T. (1998), "Incentives for Helping on the Job: Theory and Evidence", *Journal of Labor Economics*, 16: 1-25.
- George, J. M. & Bettenhausen, K. (1990), "Understanding Pro-social Behavior, Sales Performance, and Turnover: A Group-level Analysis in a Service Context", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75: 698-709.
- Hackman, J. R. & Oldham, G. R. (1980), *Work Redesign*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA
- Hage, J. & Aiken, M. (1967), "Relationship of Centralization to Other Structural Properties", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 12: 17-92
- Iverson, R. D. & Maguire, C. (2000), "The Relationship between Job and Life Satisfaction: Evidence from a Remote Mining Community", *Human Relations*, 53(6): 807-39.
- Jain, A. K. (2011). "Does Organizational Structure Predict Citizenship Behaviors"? *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 37(2): 341-53.
- Johari, J. & Yahya, K. K. (2009), "Linking Organizational Structure, Job Characteristics, and Job Performance Construct: A Proposed Framework", *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(3): 145 - 52.
- Krishnan, R., Omar, R., Ismail, I., Alias, M., Hamid, R., Ghani, M. & Kanchimalay, K. (2010), "Job Satisfaction as a Potential Mediator between Motivational Job characteristics and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Evidence from Malaysia", *Journal Of Information Technology & Economic Development*, 1(1): 86-110.
- Lievens, F. & Anseel, F. (2004), "Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Invariance of an Organizational Citizenship behavior Measure across Samples in a Dutch-Speaking Context", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77: 299-306.
- Nasurdin, M. A., Ramayah, T. & Yeoh, C. B. (2006), "Organizational Structure and Organizational Climate as Potential Predictors of Job Stress: Evidence from Malaysia", *International Journal of Commerce & Management*, 16(2): 116-29.
- Organ, D. W. (1988), *Organizational Citizenship behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M. & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006), *Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Parker, S. K., Wall, T. D. & Cordery, J. L. (2001), "Future Work Design Research and Practice: Towards an Elaborated Model of Work Design", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74: 413-40.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Niehoff, B. P., MacKenzie, S. B. & Williams, M. L. (1993), "Do Substitutes for Leadership Really Substitute for Leadership? An Empirical Examination of

- Kerr and Jermier's Situational Leadership Model", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54: 1-44.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B. & Bommer, W. H. (1996a), "A Meta-analysis of the Relationships between Kerr and Jermier's Substitutes for Leadership and Employee Job Attitudes, Role Perceptions, and Performance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81: 380-99
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie S. B., Paine, J. B. & Bachrach, D. G. (2000), "Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research", *Journal of Management*, 26: 513-63.
- Tata, J. & Prasad, S. (2004), "Team Self-management, Organizational Structure, and Judgments of Team Effectiveness", *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 16(2): 248-65.
- Todd, S.Y. & Kent, A. (2006), "Direct and Indirect Effect of Task Characteristics on Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *North American Journal of Psychology*, 8(2):253-68.
- Weber M. (1946), *From Max Weber, Gerth H. Mills C. W. Trans.*. New York: Oxford
- Williams, R. S. (2002). *Managing Employee Performance: Design and Implementation in Organizations*, London: Thompson Learning.
- Wynand E.J. Bodewes (2002), "Formalization and Innovation Revisited", *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 5 (4):214-23