

Exploring Individual Difference in Organizational Citizenship Behaviour In The Academic Context

Anita Pradhan

Research Scholar, KSoM, KIIT, Bhubaneswar, India
anita21@ksom.ac.in

Sasmita Mishra

Associate Professor, KSoM, KIIT, Bhubaneswar, India
sasmita.mishra@ksom.ac.in

DOI: 10.23862/kiit-parikalpana/2019/v15/i1-2/190173

ABSTRACT

The literature on the individual difference in the display of organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB), with respect to age, gender, total work experience, organizational tenure has not been conclusive. While studies on different culture and organizational context have come up with different findings, there is a paucity of such research in academic organisations. With this backdrop, this study aims at studying the impact of demographic variables such as gender, age, work experience organizational tenure, and job category in an Indian university context. The findings revealed that male and female employees don't differ significantly in the display of citizenship behaviour; there was also no significant difference in the display of OCB among teaching and non-teaching category; the different age groups were found to differ in the conscientiousness dimension of OCB. The findings further revealed total work experience and organizational tenure to be better antecedents of OCB. The paper has theoretical and practical implications in the demographic difference in display of OCB in academic organizations.

Key words: organizational citizenship behaviour, demographics, Education sector, Academic organization, India

Introduction

An organization can be described in terms of the demographic composition of age, sex, race, tenure and educational background (Pfeffer, 1983). These demographic compositions form the basis of self-categorisation and influence the perception and behaviour of employees (Turner, 1987: 54). Hence, studying demographic differences in different organisational behaviour

context have been of interest for researchers. Recently, there is growing curiosity on studying demographic difference in extra-role performance or organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) in the modern work setting (Dwivedi, Kaushik & Luxmi, 2015; Mitonga-Monga, Flotman & Cilliers, 2017).

Many previous studies have examined the demographic difference in relation

to its display of Citizenship Behaviours in various sectors and different cultural contexts (Wangeri, Tumuti, & Otanga, 2014; Mohammad, Quoquab, Habib, & Zakaria, 2010; Mitonga-Monga, Flotman, & Cilliers, 2017). While Agyemang (2013) found no significant relationship between organizational tenure and OCB among bankers in Ghana, Mohammad, Quoquab, Habib & Zakaria (2010) found age and tenure to be related among the academic staffs of high learning institutions in Malaysia.

Studies on demographic difference in OCB has been studied in different cultural context. To mention few, Cohen & Avrahami (2006) had studied 241 certified nurses and their superiors in the hospital sector in Israel to understand the demographic effects on OCB. The findings of the study revealed tenure to have consistent relationship with OCB dimensions. Less experienced employees displayed more of sportsmanship behaviour than their long tenured counterparts. Similarly, Dwivedi, Kaushik & Luxmi (2015) found different level of OCB among different age groups but no difference among different experience groups. It is also noteworthy that cultural values and norms such as individualism and collectivism have a substantial impact on OCB (Moorman & Blackley, 1995). Hence, there appears to be the need for more investigation on demographic variables in different cultural context.

In recent decades, OCB studies in the academic industry have gained attention. Precisely because, these are no more a hub for only imparting

education but are engaged with multifaceted activities on research and development programmes to gain the competitive advantage so as to attract more customers and funds from external agencies. The work of employees is no more limited to only teaching but is more complex and varied. To fulfil the organizational objectives, all employees own the responsibility towards adding value to the organization through the display of voluntary extra-role behaviours apart from the prescribed job roles. However, despite the felt need for OCB research in academics context in India (Garg & Rastogi, 2006), the research is not much crowded in this domain yet.

Scant literature on OCB in the context of academic organization highlights how nature of OCB in this organization is different from other organizations (Elstad, Christophersen, and Turmo, 2011; Erturk, 2007; Oplatka, 2009). While Erturk, (2007) describes the academic job to be a complicated activity that demands more reasoning and less of OCB, other researchers have realized the significance of OCB in academics (Wangeri, Tumuti & Otanga, 2014; Magdalena, 2014; Singh & Kolekar, 2015; Kagaari & Munene, 2007). Notwithstanding the differences in opinions, some studies conducted in the academic organization have revealed interesting facts on OCB. While summing up the quantitative studies on OCB in the school context, Oplatka (2009) mentions that OCB is displayed in schools towards three aspects: students, the team and the organization. Further he states that teachers can

model altruistic behaviour for students, the future citizens of the country. Hence, the importance of OCB is more in the academic organization than in other professions.

Another seemingly more pertinent motivation comes from the fact that academic institutions are operated by the staff of different demographics and understanding on demographic differences in the display of OCB can be well harnessed for increasing the voluntary behaviour thus increasing organizational efficiency. These differences further can be utilized in the identification and selection of staffs for displaying such extra role activities so as to maximize organizational performance in the academic organization under study.

With the backdrop of inconclusive findings on group composition and OCB; the differential impact of cultural values on OCB; juxtaposed with the paucity of literature in Indian academic context, the study aims at studying the impact of age, gender, work experience, and organisational tenure, as well as job category on OCB of university staff members. The following section enumerates the pertinent literature on the OCB construct and measurement, gender difference in OCB, age difference in OCB, impact of work experience and organisational tenure on OCB and difference in job categories and its disposition towards OCB.

Review of Literature

Dimensions of OCB concept

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour has its origins from the Bernard's (1938)

concept of the 'willingness to cooperate' and Katz's (1966) taxonomy of dependable role performance and innovative and spontaneous behaviours (cited by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000). A list of behaviours that captures the essence of OCB includes individual's interest in others' work, giving suggestions for improvement, caring for the organizational property, punctuality, confirming to the organizational norms, refraining from complaining about insignificant matters, etc. However, there is always a debate on the dimensionality of OCB.

Many previous studies have researched the construct on either one type of OCB or multiple types of OCB understood through different dimensions. Smith, Organ, & Near (1983) summarized OCB as a two-factor model which included altruism and generalized compliance. Organ (1988) proposed a five-factor OCB model consisting of helping behaviour, organisational compliance, courtesy, civic virtue, and sportsmanship. Following these five dimension conceptualisation of Organ (1988), Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter (1990) had developed a scale to measure OCB. Williams and Anderson (1991) made an attempt to understand OCB from two perspectives: OCB (I) directed towards specific individuals and emphasizes interpersonal aspects and OCB (O) directed towards organization as a whole and focuses on general compliance behaviours. While OCB-O includes behaviours that benefit the organization as a whole, OCB-I indicates behaviours

that benefit the co-workers and peers, thus indirectly benefiting the organization. The former category is similar to Organ's (1988) civic virtue, sportsmanship, and conscientiousness, whereas the latter category fits into altruism and courtesy dimensions. On the other hand, Dyne, Graham & Dienesch (1994) also presents five factors (obedience, loyalty, social participation, advocacy participation, and functional participation) scale. Moon, Dyne & Wrobel (2005) offer a circumplex of four dimensions, including, helping, innovation, sportsmanship, and compliance. Similarly, the dimensions OCB conceptualised by Moorman and Blakely's (1995) include interpersonal helping, individual initiative, personal industry, and loyal boosterism.

In the Indian context, Pattanayak, Mishra, and Niranjana (2003) have conceptualised a three dimensional OCB scale. The first dimension, sharing and involvement refer to behaviours involving interaction with others to resolve organisational issues in creative ways. The second dimension, Organisational Ownership includes behaviours that are intended at optimum utilisation of resources and dedication towards work and organisation. Thirdly, Professional commitment refers to meeting deadlines and promoting the organisation. In spite of the various ways in which OCB has been conceptualized over the years by different researchers, Organ's (1988) conceptualisation of five dimensional OCB construct has been

used by many researchers across the world in different contexts.

Our measurement of OCB was influenced by that of Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter (1990) and Pattanayak, Mishra, and Niranjana (2003). While former's measurement was based on Organ's OCB dimensions, that of Pattanayak, Mishra, and Niranjana's (2003) was based on Indian version of OCB concept in manufacturing set up. Our compiled scale yielded four dimensions after exploratory factor analysis, which were slightly related to Organ's OCB dimensions. The dimensions included: *Organizational Ambassador* (represent the organization positively to outsiders), *Work Involvement* (emotional & strong participation in organizational activities), *Civic Virtue* (feeling of being part of the organization as a whole), and *Conscientiousness* (adhering to rules and regulations of organization).

Gender and OCB

Whether male and female employees differ in the display of OCB has been a question of interest for the OCB researchers. While few have not found any relationship between gender and display of OCB (Dirican & Erdil, 2016; Dwivedi, Kaushik, & Luxmi, 2015), others (Mahnaz et. al., 2014; Bahrami, Montazeralfaraj, Hashemi, & Dehghani, 2013; Cameron & Nadler, 2013) have found that male and female significantly differ in this aspect of work-related behaviour.

As gender is a cultural construct, the gender schema associated with each

gender makes them differ in the dimensions of OCB. Heilman and Chen (2005) found out that female students were high on altruism dimension whereas male students were high on civic virtues and initiative. There also has been the difference in the display of OCB dimensions in gender stereotypical jobs. Those jobs such as child psychologists and dietitian are female stereotyped jobs whereas the job of engineer and electrician are male stereotyped. It has been found that people performing male stereotyped jobs displayed more civic virtue, sportsmanship and initiative dimension than people performing female stereotyped jobs (Ehrhart, Godfrey, & Morales, 2005; Farrell & Finkelstein, 2007).

There has been also evidence from different industries and culture on gender difference in the display of OCB. It has been found out that female teachers demonstrated high OCB than male counterparts while displaying OCB in Kenyan Context (Wangeri, Tumuti, & Otanga, 2014). Whereas, in US IT firms OCB was stronger for males than for females (Mahnaz et. al, 2013). And Cameron & Nadler (2013) reported higher performance of females in OCB as it is feminine behaviour. On the other hand, Beham, (2011) found lower OCB performance of female employees in Spanish context owing to twin demand of family and work responsibility. In the Indian context, Dwivedi, Kaushik and Luxmi (2015) did not find any difference between male and female in the display of OCB.

Although several researchers found OCB to be displayed more by females and the behaviour is female stereotyped (Farrell & Finkelstein, 2007; Heilman & Chen, 2005, p. 431), no consensus has been achieved on this and researchers have voiced need for studies on gender difference in OCB in different context (Karakowsky, Mann & McBey, 2010). Moreover, there exist several gender differences in roles and organisational behaviour in the academic industry. Kathryn (1988) describes the subtle differences in a synthesis of articles published in "Educational Administration Quarterly". She mentions that the role of female teachers in four distinct aspects in academics such as teaching, teacher training, academic administration, and perception towards students seems to be gender stereotyped. Women are less found in higher echelons of decision making, teacher training, although they seem to be showing more positive attitude towards students and are equally competent in handling classes. She also found gender differences in organisational behaviour such as job satisfaction, leadership style and job involvement.

Given the gender stereotype that exists in academics, it can be hypothesized that male faculties would be high on OCB dimensions that requires representing organisation from outside as males generally occupy higher positions in the organisation and are more vocal and women would be high on the dimension that requires helping

behaviour and work involvement. Moreover, The social perceptions regarding work, for men and women are strongly influenced by cultural factors (Simeon, Nicholson & Wong, 2001) confirming to cultural dimension, proposed by Hofstede (1980) distinguishing between masculinity-femininity cultures thus describing gender roles within a country. According to social role theory, men should be more assertive and female should be more compassionate at the workplace (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Hence, males would display more male stereotyped OCB such as civic virtue (Ehrhart, Godfrey & Morales, 2005). With such evidences of gender difference in roles and organisational behaviour in academic organisations, and the study context being high on masculinity index, we would like to hypothesize that male and female would differ in the display of different dimensions of OCB.

H1: Male and female would differ significantly on different dimensions of OCB.

Age difference in OCB

Aging brings changes to biological, psychological and social function of an individual thus impacting his/her personal, social and organizational life. There has been number of conceptualization of age groups. Sterns and Doverspike (1989) have conceptualized age as chronological age (refers to one's calendar age); Functional age (indicates workers performance reflecting cognitive abilities and physical health); Psycho social age (refers self perception and social perception of age);

Organizational age (indicates years of experience in service, career stage from organization perspective). Similarly, Levinson's (1978) theory centered around the idea that adult development is made up of a number of stages (eras) and transitional periods: Early Adult Transition (17-22); Early Adulthood (22-45); Midlife Transition (40-45); Middle Adulthood (40-65) and Late Adult Transition (60-65). In OCB literature the age classification has been conceived differently by different scholars. While Muijnck and Zwinkels (2002) focused on older people in the organization on the threshold of 40 or 45 years, OECD (2005) identified workers aged between 50-55 years as old. However, our study is based on Levinson's classification.

Notwithstanding the differences in age classification, all researchers believed transition across such age-graded roles may be significant in understanding the motivational basis for altruistic behaviour in the work setting (Wagner & Rush, 2000). Similarly, employees experience different stages in their careers which influence their perceptions and their behaviours, as explained by career stage model (Super, 1957). For instance, during the trial stage of one's career, employees are at the initial stage of their career, thus are less satisfied, less involved and less committed reducing their likelihood of displaying OCB, contrary to their establishment or maintenance stage. In the same line, Doering, Rhodes and Schuster (1983) posit that older employees have higher need of affiliation and that could make a difference in their display of OCB.

In many previous research studies, age was found to have inconclusive findings with respect to work behaviours. Singh & Singh (2010) explained older employees to be more cooperative compared to their younger counterparts with a more positive psychological sense of community and less competitively oriented thus displaying more OCB behaviours. Wagner & Rush (2000) found that the orientations of younger and older employees towards self, others and work are different and thus they possess different motives for showing altruistic behaviours. In a study on Monash University Alumni members, Pettit, Donohoe & Cieri (2004) found that older employees in the maintenance stage of their career were likely to show more OCB than their younger counterparts who were in the exploring stage of their career. The reasons authors attributed here is that older employees have moral obligations of helping others out of benevolence than the younger employees who have a transactional focus and is based on the norm of reciprocity.

Similarly, Mitonga-Monga, Flotman and Cilliers (2017) in a study on the railway employees in Congo found age and tenure linked to display of Citizenship behaviours. Studies in academic organisations reveal that people of different age group differ in their display of OCB (Singh & Kolekar, 2015). In a study by Wangeri, Tumuti and Otanga (2014), older employees recorded high OCB-O and younger teachers displayed high OCB-I. On the contrary, many studies did not find age to have any influence while displaying citizenship

behaviours (Bahrami, Montazeralfaraj, Hashemi & Dehghani, 2013). Confirming to previous studies in different cultural and work context (Kuehn & Al-Busaidi, 2002), where older Omanis (employees over 40 years) were found to enhance the OCB scores.

In line with the majority of studies that found older people display more OCB than younger employees, this study also assumes that in academics context, older employees would be more guided by benevolence and altruistic attitude towards the team and the organization and hence would show more OCB.

H2: Older employees would display more OCB than young employees.

Tenure influencing OCB

It is expected that employees with more tenure would perform more OCB due to their psychological involvement and a stronger identification with the organization, while less tenured employees will invest more in performing in-role activities to secure their job. However, a meta-analytic study by Organ and Ryan (1995) did not find any relationship between tenure and altruism and organizational compliance dimension of OCB. A couple of recent studies (Bahrami, Montazeralfaraj, Hashemi, & Dehghani, 2013; Dwivedi, Kaushik & Luxmi, 2015; Pettit, Donohoe & Cieri, 2002) also conform to the findings of Organ and Ryan. On the other hand, Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, (1994) found that organisational longevity develops the covenantal relationship between employee and organisation and this relationship, in

turn, enhances OCB. In the same line, Mohammad, Quoquab Habib and Zakaria (2010) revealed tenure has a significant bearing on OCB. The study among railway employees in Congo found that longer an employee works, the more they demonstrate the act of citizenship behaviour (Mitonga-Monga, Flotman & Cilliers, 2017)).

While such contradictory findings require more investigations on this relationship, the nature of academic context supports this notion too. Job in academics involves interaction with multiple stakeholders and in the initial period, the focus is more on job performance, gaining familiarity with student and work procedure. As the organizational longevity enhances, the employee may develop confidence and competence in performing their job which in turn can enhance positive feeling towards their job (Organ & Greene, 1974) and build strong bonding with the organization (Rousseau, 1989). And such a positive emotional state would enhance pro-social gesture (Clark & Isen, 1982). As a result, the employee would show interest in displaying extra role behaviour and engage himself/herself in activities related to promoting the organization. Hence, we hypothesized as follows:

H3: Tenure in the organization would enhance the display of different dimensions of OCB.

Work experience influencing OCB

Academic is a knowledge-intensive industry where the increase in years of experience results in enhanced

knowledge, skill, and ability. Experience is also a significant determinant of the organizational position. Previous studies reveal that knowledge, skill, and the ability of employees contribute to display of OCB (Organ & Ryan, 1995) and organizational position provides avenues to display certain dimensions of OCB (Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). It is likely that work experience would enhance the OCB of employees in the academic context. However, a few recent studies provide contradictory pieces of evidence. While Cohen and Avrahami (2006) found that more experienced employees exhibited a low level of sportsmanship than their less experienced employees, Wangeri, Tumuti & Otanga (2014) found OCB enhanced with the years of work experience.

We propose that with the increasing years of experience, professionals in academic institutes would have a higher sense of autonomy, responsibility, and accountability towards their job. Studies reveal that jobs with aforesaid characteristics, enhances OCB (Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994) whereas jobs which are closely supervised and lack autonomy stand as a hindrance to display of OCB (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). Moreover, senior employees are expected to be more engaged in institutional brand building and mentoring the junior colleagues which may create an implicit demand for display of OCB. Hence, our fourth hypothesis is as follows:

H4: Individual's overall work experience would enhance the display of different dimensions of OCB.

Job Category and OCB

In academic organizations there are broadly two categories of jobs: teaching and non-teaching. Traditionally, teaching staff or faculties were engaged in teaching and research whereas, non-teaching staffs were performing all other functions. As the nature of higher education system taking a different shape with contingency funding opportunities, policy uncertainties, fluctuating market and enormous load on teaching and support, the role of non-teaching staff is also changing and a group of new professionals or roles are evolving in the organization (Gornall, 1999). In modern higher education work setting, both teaching and non-teaching staff spend a great deal of time in student counseling, supporting in field visits, industry interaction etc. Hence, the nature of extra role behaviour may not be completely different for these two groups.

OCB research in the academic setting has either researched academic staff (ex. Paramasivam, 2015) or non-teaching staff (ex. Ucho & Atime, 2013). Any such study including both categories of staff or comparison of these staffs has not come to our notice. However, inferences can be drawn from previous studies that social status is one of the strongest predictors of citizenship behaviour (Milbrath & Goel, 1977; Verba & Nie, 1972). As reported by (Legge, 1995), academic and non-academic staff distinctions also often create classification in social status. Such perceived social status may have a differential impact on the citizenship behaviour displayed by teaching and non-teaching staff. Similarly, job

characteristics can have a substantial impact on OCB (Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). Teacher's job is mostly performed in isolated classrooms and is different from other non-teaching jobs that require frequent interaction with colleagues (Lortie, 1976). In terms of loyalty, it is opined that teaching staff are more loyal to their profession and their loyalty transcends institutional/national boundary whereas non-teaching staff are mostly loyal to their organizations and also are often confused about their loyalty focus (Coaldrake & Stedman, 1999). At the same time, Coaldrake and Stedman (1999) observe that the teaching and non-teaching roles have been blurred in the current academic set up. However, we propose distinction between teaching and non-teaching staff in display of OCB on the following premises: that teaching staffs constitute the core of the academic institutions; that in Indian context they are expected to be role models for students (in display of altruistic behavior); and that their nature of loyalty differs from the non-teaching staff.

H5: Teaching and Non-teaching staff would differ in the display of different dimensions of OCB.

The Study Context

The proliferation of private universities, emphasis on professional education, and employability and growing competition, call for higher accountability and value addition in part of employees. Under such assumptions, there is an implicit expectation from employees on effective delivery of *in role* as well as *extra role* behaviour to further organisational effectiveness. Thus, the

researcher has focused on this particular organization due to its multi-faceted features and work-culture. The University is spread across 25 sq. km Academic Township with 23 world class campuses imparting professional training of international standards. The University is unique among its peer institutions located in and around the region, possessing exceptional breadth and depth of excellence.

Method

Sample

This is a case study of one of the reputed private universities of the eastern region of India. This has around 50,000 students, 15,000 academic and non-academic staff. A convenience sampling method was used to draw 356 samples from both academic and non-academic employees. The academic employees comprised Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors, while the non-academic employees included Executive & Administrative staffs. No contractual staffs and Adjunct faculties were taken as samples. The OCB displayed by University staffs not only included OCB towards students but also towards organization and fellow employees as a whole. Since the employees under study were equally responsible for exhibiting citizenship behaviours towards various stakeholders of the University, the sample was taken as a single unit. The sample comprised of 63 percent males and 37 percent females. About 53 percent of employees were in age group of 23-35 years, followed by 44 percent in the age group of 36-58 years, and only 3 percent

comprised of older employees with more than 58 years of age. Their total work experience ranged from less than one year to 41 years (table 1). The tenure in the current organization ranged from less than 1 year to more than 20 years. The samples comprised of both academic - 73 percent and non-academic employees constituted of 27 percent.

Data collection

A total of 450 questionnaires were distributed in various departments of the University across academic and non-academic employees of the University. A total of 356 responses were returned resulting in a response rate of 79 percent. After removing the outliers identified through box plot, the final response reached 323 which were used for further analysis. This sample size was adequate as the item to response ratio was 1:7 which fall within the specification of Rummel (1970) and Schwab (1980). However, the size was little lower as per the specification given by Gill et al., (2010) as the margin error crossed 5% (5.39%). Further, we justify the sample size as we had taken a 7 point rating scale where Cochran's (1977) formula results in even less sample size (see Bartlett, Kotrlik & Higgins, 2001). Moreover, Bartlett, Kotrlik & Higgins (2001) mentions, that an alpha level of .10 can be used in Cochran's formula if the objective is to find out the statistical phenomena of difference.

Measures

A structured questionnaire was constructed incorporating demographic

variables such as age, gender, total years of work experience, organizational tenure in current organization and designation along with a scale measuring OCB. While gender measured the biological sex of individuals on a dichotomous scale, age, tenure and work experience were captured in exact years on a continuous scale. Later on the age groups were formed based on the basis of Levinson et.al (1978) conceptualization to make statistical analysis. According to career stage model (Super, 1957), classification of tenure and work experience was made. Teaching and Non-teaching category was measured on a dichotomous scale.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour scale: Initially 41 items were pooled from the scales of Pattanayak, Mishra, and Niranjana (2003) and Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter (1990). After normality check, few items were deleted. Again during exploratory factor analysis, few items with insignificant loading were deleted. Finally, 18 items loaded significantly on four dimensions. Based on the common theme derived from the items, the dimensions were named as *Organizational Ambassador*, *Work Involvement*, *Civic Virtue*, and *Conscientiousness*.

Organizational Ambassador implies talking about the organization in a positive way, preferably in front of potential customers. *Work Involvement* is the psychological and emotional extent to which the employees participate in his or her work, profession, and company. This

dimension was similar to the personal industry dimension of Moorman and Blakely (1995). *Civic Virtue* represents an employee's feeling of being part of organizational whole in the same way a citizen feels a part of his/her country. Finally, *Conscientiousness* represents a personality trait of being careful or vigilant. It implies a desire to do a task well and to take obligations to others seriously through adherence to rules and regulations.

The Cronbach alpha reliability for four dimensions of OCB ranged from 0.44 to 0.68. Though the Cronbach Alpha of individual factors was low, the total scale reliability was 0.72 which implied a reliable scale for measuring OCB. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy appeared at 0.82 which was above Kaiser's recommendation of 0.50. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity showed that the correlation between questions is sufficiently large for factor analysis (table 2).

Results

To analyse the data, Descriptive statistics, ANOVA tests and Pearson's correlation were performed using SPSS 24.0. The ANOVA test results on gender difference in OCB revealed that there is no significant difference among males and females in the display of different dimensions of OCB (table 3). Closer inspection of mean scores reveals that male ($M=25.05$) were little higher than females ($M=24.49$) in the dimension of Civic Virtue. In the case of age it was observed that different age groups differed on conscientiousness dimension of OCB ($F=5.87$; $df=2/320$;

$P < .01$). Mean scores of the three groups reveal that conscientiousness increases with increase in age. Similar mean scores were also observed in the case of Civic virtue dimension. Further, the correlation analysis confirmed that there is an increase in the display of Civic virtue with an increase in age.

Work experience and Tenure were found to be better antecedents of OCB in ANOVA test results. It was found that people from different experience level differed on Civic virtue ($F = 3.77$; $df = 2/320$; $P < .05$) and conscientiousness ($F = 3.03$; $df = 2/320$; $p < .05$) dimensions. Mean scores revealed that display of OCB in both the dimensions is low during initial years of career and increases in the second phase. However, work experience and all the dimensions of OCB do not correlate with each other implying there is no continuous incremental change in OCB with the increase in age. Hence, it would be safe to interpret that younger people are different from middle-aged and older people in the above dimensions of OCB. In case of tenure in the organisation, it was observed that all the three groups differed on organisational ambassador ($F = 2.76$; $df = 2/320$; $p < .07$) and civic virtue dimension ($F = 5.22$; $df = 2/320$; $p < .01$). Closer inspection of mean scores reveals that with organisational longevity, display of both the dimension of OCB enhances. However, the most tenured employees showed the best performance in organisational ambassador dimension (table 3). However, the correlation analysis revealed that organisational tenure was

related to 3 dimensions of OCB: organisational ambassador, civic virtue and conscientiousness. So far as teaching and non-teaching staff display of OCB was concerned, despite perceived differences in roles among them in academic institutes; we did not find any difference in the display of OCB. The ANOVA results were insignificant for all the dimensions of OCB (table 3).

Discussion and Conclusion

The study investigated the impact of demographic variables on organizational citizenship behaviour. The purpose of this research was to analyze the effect of age, gender, total work experience and tenure of employees in a private university in exhibiting OCB. The findings reflected that both males and females are equal in their perception regarding the display of various dimensions of OCB. This finding is consistent with a few of the previous findings where gender is shown to have no significant relationship (Akinbode, 2011; Dwivedi, Kaushik & Luxmi, 2015; Dirican & Erdil, 2016). However, the result is contradictory to few of the other findings where gender has a significant relationship in displaying OCB (Bahrami, Montazeralfaraj, Hashemi & Dehghani, 2013; Jenaabadi, Okati, & Sarhadi, 2013; Mahnaz et. al, 2014; Cameron & Nadler, 2013). Although the above studies attribute different reasons for the gender difference in OCB, our findings can be attributed to the humanitarian focus of the university and absence of gender stereotypes within the

organization. Irrespective of gender, each employee of this organizations are expected to display humanitarian values and the congenial organizational climate provides equal scope to male and female to display extra role behavior. Contradictory to our initial assumption, wealsodid not find anygenderdifference in OCB dimensions. This implies that there is no differential social expectation from females to behave differently than males and enough flexibility exists to enable women to accommodate their multiple role demand and be equally involved in thework.

The ANOVA test revealed that age groups differ in Conscientiousness dimension. Similar findings were noted in few of the studies where age was seen to be an important predictor of OCB (Gyekye & Haybatollahi, 2015; Mahnaz et. al, 2014; Kuehn & Al-Busaidi, 2002). With increasing age employees tend to mature in terms of intelligence and cognitive abilities (Caspi & Roberts, 1990) which makes them understand the intricacies of work discipline and display OCB behaviour directed towards organization as a whole thus promoting organizational effectiveness. However, the f inding goes against the previous f inding that age has no effect on OCB (Bahrami, Montazeralfaraj, Hashemi & Dehghani, 2013).

In line with the previous f indings (Mitonga-Monga ,Flotman & Cilliers, 2017), the present study found employees with the different level of work experience differed in civic virtue and conscientious dimension of OCB.

This is contradictory to the previous f indings (Bahrami, Montazeralfaraj, Hashemi , & Dehghani ,2013; Dwivedi ,Kaushik & Luxmi, 2015). However, respondent's tenure in the current organization showed significant impact on two dimensions of OCB-organizational Ambassador and Conscientiousness. This may be due to the employee's stronger identif ication with the organization, psychological involvement and organizational culture of theorganization. This is contradictory to previous findings where tenure in the current organization had no significant relationship in displaying OCB (Dwivedi ,Kaushik & Luxmi, 2015).

While there is the discussion on the evolving nature of academic institutes and the job roles inside it, ourstudy tried to f ind out the distinction between academic and non-academic staff in the display of OCB. Despite perceptual differences in the nature of the job of both the categories of employees, we did not find any distinction in their display of OCB. This might be attributed to the open organizational climate (Halpin & Croft, 1962) that enhanced OCB (Garg & Rastogi, 2006). The organisation might have anopen climate that fostered mutual trust and facilitated OCB in both academic and non-academic staff. Another attribution can be made on the indicators of OCB. Oplatka (2009) mentions three kinds of OCBs performed in the school context and our indicators were based on duties directed at the organization. We had not taken any specif ic team or student-related

duties as indicators in the OCB scale. Hence, we could not find any distinction in the display of OCB by both the category of staff. Above all, if we go by the Gornall's (1999) reporting, higher education environment is changing where the class system boundary is gradually wiped out. Hence, there might not be any differential expectation on extra-role performance from both the categories of staff.

This study has thrown an intriguing fact that people irrespective of their age, gender, tenure and work experience displayed a similar amount of OCB in terms of work involvement and organizational ambassador. As people become more experienced and their tenure in the organization increased their civic virtue dimension of OCB enhanced. They became more protective of the organization. Hence, it can be concluded that, firstly, the display of civic virtue behaviour might be influenced by his/her level of understanding of the organization, sense of belongingness in the organization as he/she stays longer in the organization; secondly, the organization might have an employee-friendly and excellence driven culture that placed each one irrespective of age, gender, work experience and tenure in the same plane to be involved in work and become goodwill ambassador of the organization.

Future/ Managerial Implications

By incorporating demographic characteristics and OCB in an

educational setting, this research reflects the OCB exhibited by the employees of different segments. The research findings enrich human resource management literature and are significant for promoting organizational performance through the exhibition of citizenship behaviours. Management can try to understand employee's individual OCB type and provide ample opportunity and a conducive environment which will encourage employees to exhibit OCB. Additionally, management can create inclusive organisational climate, and foster inclusive leadership and HR practices (Panicker, Agrawal, & Khandelwal, 2018) to foster OCB among different demographic groups. Previous studies report individual difference in the display of OCB (for example OCB-I and OCB-O) and in educational context OCB can be conceptualised differently (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Njagi, 2018). Hence, future research can focus on developing an OCB measure for academics with a broader conceptualisation. And instead of implementing HR practice to foster OCB in general, a flexible approach can be adopted for fostering OCB befitting different demographic groups. For example, for few with family responsibilities at home may not spend more time in committee activities and adhere to organisation time schedule always, but they can fair well on OCB dimension of altruism and sportsmanship (Organ, 1988) or handling student assignment (Optalka, 2009). Another gray area in OCB literature is measuring

OCB intention. There could be instances when OCB intentions are not converted to OCB behavior owing to certain social perception or constraints. Finally, we acknowledge certain limitations of the study. First, the study was conducted in a particular university context. Hence, the generalizability of the findings is low. Second, in an academic environment, it was difficult to collect the response from immediate superior about the OCB of employees. Hence, the measurement was based on the single self-report which might have accounted for social desirability and common method bias. Notwithstanding the above limitations, the study provides significant findings that can be used in the similar university context.

References

- Agyemang, C.B. (2013). Perceived Organizational Climate and Organizational tenure on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Empirical Study among Ghanaian Banks. *European journal of Business and Management*, 5 (26), 132-142
- Akinbode, G.A. (2011). Demographic and Dispositional Characteristics as predictors of OCB. *IFE Psychologia*, 19(1), 379-403.
- Bahrami, M.A., Montazeralfaraj, R., Hashemi Gazar, S., & Dehghani Tafti, A. (2013). Demographic Determinants of organisational Citizenship Behaviour among Hospital Employees. *Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal*, 5(4), 171-178.
- Beham, B. (2011). Work-family conflict and organisational citizenship behaviour: empirical evidence from Spanish employees. *Community, Work & Family*, 14 (1), 63-80.
- Bartlett, J. E., Kotrlik, J. W., & Higgins, C. C. (2001). Organizational Research: Determining Appropriate Sample Size in Survey Research. *Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal*, 19 (1), 43-49.
- Cameron, S.M. & Nadler, J.T. (2013). Gender roles and organizational citizenship behaviours: effects on managerial evaluations. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 28(7), 380 – 399.
- Caspi, A., & Roberts, B. (1990). Personality continuity and change across the life course. In L.A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality theory and research* (pp.549-575). New York: Guilford.
- Clark, M. S., & Isen, A. M. (1982). Toward understanding the relationship between feeling states and social behaviour. In A. H. Hastorf & A. M. Isen (Eds.), *Cognitive social psychology*. New York: Elsevier North Holland, 73-108.
- Coaldrake, P. & Stedman, L. (1999). Academic Work in the Twenty-first Century: Changing roles and policies, 99H Occasional Paper Series (September 1999), Higher Education Division, Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, Commonwealth of Australia
- Cochran, W. G. (1977). Sampling techniques (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Cohen, A., & Avrahami, A. (2006). The relationship between Individualism, Collectivism, the perception of justice, Demographic characteristics and OCB. *Service Industries Journal* 26(8),889-901.
- DiPaola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relationship to school climate. *Journal of School Leadership*, 11, 424-447
- Dirican, A.H., & Erdil, O. (2016). An Exploration of Academic Staff's Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Counterproductive Work Behaviour in Relation to Demographic Characteristics. 12th International Strategic Management Conference, ISMC. 28-30 October 2016. Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences 235 .pp.351 – 360.
- Doering, M., Rhodes, S.R., & Schuster, M. (1983). *The aging worker*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Dwivedi, S., Kaushik, S., & Luxmi . (2015). Organisational citizenship behaviours and demographic variables of employees in Indian business process outsourcing (BPO) sector. *The IUP Journal of organisational Behaviour*, 14(1), 39-57.
- Dyne, L.V., Graham, J.W., & Dienesch, R.M. (1994). Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Construct Redefinition, Measurement, and Validation. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4). 4765-802
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109(3), 573-598.
- Ehrhart, M. G., Godfrey, E., & Morales, S. (2005). *The role of schemas in gender and OCB research*. Poster presented at the 20th Annual Conference for the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.
- Elstad, E., Christophersen, K.A., & Turmo, A. (2011). Social Exchange Theory as an explanation of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour among teachers. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*. 14(4), 405-421.
- Erturk, A. (2007). Increasing Organisational Citizenship Behaviours of Turkish academicians: Mediating role of trust in supervisor on the relationship between organisational justice and citizenship behaviours. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 22(3), 257-270.
- Farrell, S. K., & Finkelstein, L. M. (2007). Organizational citizenship behaviour and gender: Expectations and attributions for performance. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 9(1), 81-96.
- Garg, P., & Rastogi, R. (2006). Climate Profile and OCBs of teachers in public and private schools of India. *International Journal of Educational Management*. 20 (7). 529-541.
- Gill, J., Johnson, P. & Clark, M. (2010). *Research Methods for Managers*, London: SAGE Publications.
- Gornall, L. (1999). New professionals: Change and occupational roles in higher education. *Perspectives: Policy & Practice in Higher Education*, 3(2), 44-49.

- Gyekye, S. A. & Haybatollahi, M. (2015). Organizational citizenship behaviour: An empirical investigation of the impact of age and job satisfaction on Ghanaian industrial workers. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 23 (2), 285-301.
- Halpin, W.A., & Croft, D.B. (1962), *The Organizational Climate of Schools*, Washington University Press, St. Louis, MO.
- Heilman, M. E., & Chen, J. J. (2005). Same behaviour, different consequences: Reactions to women's altruistic citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 431-441
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Jenaabadi, H. Okati, E. & Sarhadi, A. (2013). organisational Citizenship Behaviour, Job Satisfaction, and Commitment to school: Is there any significant difference between male and female teachers?. *World Journal of Education*, 3 (3), 75-81
- Kagaari, J.R.K., & Munene, J.C. (2007). Engineering lecturers' competencies and organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) at Kyambogo University. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 31(9), 706-726.
- Karakowsky, L., Mann, S., & McBey, K. (2010). Feeling (and acting) like a fish out of water-Numerical minority status, gendered work and citizenship behaviour in mixed gender work teams. *Team Performance Management*, 16(7/8), 413-433.
- Kathryn, J.B. (1988). *The gender difference hypothesis: A synthesis of research in the Educational Administration Quarterly*. Dissertation submitted to graduate college of Texas, A & M University
- Kuehn, K.W. & Al-Busaidi, Y. (2002). Citizenship Behaviour in a non-western context: An examination of the role of satisfaction, commitment and job characteristics on self-reported OCB. *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 12 (2), 107-125.
- Legge, K. (1995). HRM: Rhetoric, reality, and hidden agendas. In J. Storey (ed) (1995) *Human Resource Management: a critical text*. London: Routledge.
- Levinson, D.J., Darrow, C.N., Klein, E.B., Levinson, M.H. & McKee, B. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life*. Random House Digital Inc. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Li, S. (2013). *The culture heritage on OCB – A life case study between China & Sweden*. Master's thesis in Management. Stockholm School of Economics.
- Lortie, D. (1976). *School Teacher*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Magdalena, S.M. (2014). The effects of organizational citizenship behaviour in the academic environment. *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 127. pp. 738 – 742.
- Mahnaz, M. A., Mehdi, M., Jafar, K. M., Rahmati, M., & Abolghasem. (2014). The Effect of demographic characteristics on organisational Citizenship Behaviour in the selected Teaching Hospitals in Tehran.

- Indian Journal of Scientific Research*. 7(1). 068-077.
- Milbrath, L. W., & Goel, M. L. (1977). *Political participation: How and why do people get involved in politics*. (2nd Ed.). Lanham, MD: University.
- Mitonga-Monga, J., Flotman, A., & Cilliers, F.V.N. (2017). Organisational citizenship behaviour among railway employees in a developing country: Effects of education and tenure. *Southern African Business Review* 21,385-406
- Mohammad, J., Quoquab Habib, F., & Zakaria, S. (2010). Organizational citizenship behavior and commitment: do age and tenure make any difference?. *Business Management Quarterly Review*, 1(3), 28-49.
- Moon, H., Dyne L.V., & Wrobel, K. (2005). The circumplex model and the future of organizational citizenship research. In: Turnipseed D (ed.) *A Handbook on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: A Review of 'Good Soldier' Activity in Organizations*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, 1-22.
- Moorman, R.H., & Blakely, G.L. (1995). Individualism-Collectivism as an Individual Difference Predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 16(2). 127-142.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. 1993. Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organisational citizenship behaviour. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527-556.
- Njagi, S.R. (2018). School climate and organizational citizenship behaviour. *International Journal of Education*, 6(1/2), 13-28
- Oplatka I. (2009). Organizational citizenship Behaviour in teaching The consequences for teachers, pupils, and the school. *International Journal of Educational Management*. 23(5), 375-389.
- Organ, D. W., & Greene, C. N. (1974). Role ambiguity, locus of control, and work satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(1), 101-102.
- Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- Organ, D.W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *Personnel Psychology*. 48 (4), 775-802.
- Panicker, A., Agrawal, R. K. & Khandelwal, U. (2018). Inclusive workplace and organizational citizenship behavior: Study of a higher education institution, India. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*. 37(6), 530-550
- Paramasivam, G. M. (2015). Role of self-efficacy and family supportive organizational perceptions in teachers' organizational citizenship behaviour: A study on engineering college teachers in India. *Asian Education and Development Studies*, 4 (4), 394-408.
- Pattanayak, B., Misra, R.K., & Niranjana, P. (2003). Organizational Citizenship

- Behaviour: A conceptual framework and scaled development. *Indian Journal of Industrial relations*. 39 (2), 194-204.
- Pettit, T., Donohue, R., & Cieri, H.D. (2004). Career stage, Organizational Commitment, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. Working paper series. Department of Management. Monash University. Working paper 58/04.
- Pfeffer, J. (1983). Organizational Demography. *Research in Organizational Behaviour*. 5. 299-357.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviours and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviours. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B. & Bachrach, D.G. (2000). organisational citizenship behaviours: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestion for future research. *Journal of Management*. 26 (3), 513-563.
- Rousseau, D.M. (1989). Psychological and Implied Contracts in Organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*. 2 (2), 121-139.
- Rummel, R.J. (1970). *Applied Factor Analysis*, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Schwab, D.P. (1980), "Construct validity in organization behaviour", in Staw, B.M. and Cummings, L.L. (Eds), *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, Vol. 2, JAI, Greenwich, CT, pp. 3-43.
- Simeon, R., Nicholson, J.D., & Wong, Y.Y. (2001). Comparisons of Asian and US Workplace Gender Roles. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*. 8(2), 47-59
- Singh, A.K., & Singh, A.P. (2010). Career Stage and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour among Indian Managers. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*. 36 (2). 268 -275.
- Singh, N., & Kolekar, B.D. (2015). Measurement of attributes of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in Academicians. *International Journal of Management*. Volume 6.(3). 24-33.
- Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W., & Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 68. 653-663
- Sterns H.L. & Doverspike D., (1989). Aging and the retraining and learning process in organizations. In (eds) Goldstein I. & Katznel R. *Training and development in work organizations* (pp. 229-332). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Super, D.E. (1957). *The Psychology of Careers*. New York: Harper.
- Turner, J. C. (1987). *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-categorization Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ucho, A & Atime, E. T. (2013). Distributive Justice, Age, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour among Non-teaching Staff of Benue State University. *International Journal of Psychology and Behavioural Sciences*. 3(4), 77-85

- Verba, S., & Nie, N. H. (1972). *Participation in America: Social equality and political democracy*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Wagner, S.L. & Rush, M.C. (2000) Altruistic Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Context, and Age. *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 140(3),379-391.
- Wang'eri, T., Tumuti, S., & Otanga H. (2014). Relationship between demographic variables, organisational commitment, and job satisfaction and organisational Citizenship behaviour among primary school teachers, Coast province, Kenya. *International Journal of Contemporary Applied Sciences*. 1(2),
- Williams, & Anderson, S. (1991). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as predictors of Organizational Citizenship and in-role behaviours. *Journal of Management*. 17, 601-617.

Table 1. Sample Profile

Demographic Variables	Frequency	%
<i>Age</i>		
23-35years	171	53
36-58 years	143	44
59-70 years	9	3
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	202	63
Female	120	37
<i>Professional Category</i>		
Academic Staff	236	73
Non-Academic Staff	87	27
<i>Total Work Experience</i>		
0-5 years	91	28
5.1-20years	198	61
20.1-41 years	34	11
<i>Tenure in the current organisation</i>		
0-3 years	114	35
3.1-15 years	196	19
15.1-23 years	13	4

Table 2. Exploratory factor analysis of OCB scale

Sl. No.	Items	1	2	3	4
Organisational ambassador					
A39	I actively promote organisation products or services to outsiders.	.70			
A34	I tell outsiders that this is a good place to work.	.79			
A33	I read and keep up with the organisation announcements, memos and so on.	.67			
Work involvement/personal industry					
A17R	I take long and extra breaks.		.73		
A21R	I waste organisational resources while working.		.64		
A20R	I do not meet all deadlines set by the organisation		.67		
A37R	I avoid taking extra duties and responsibilities at work.		.65		
Civic Virtues/Loyal boosterism					
A6	I defend the organisation when others criticize it.			.67	
A7	I represent the organisation favorably to outsiders.			.41	
A19	I am part of committees where participation would reflect favourably on the organisation.			.58	
A30	I take steps to prevent problems with other colleagues.			.67	
Conscientiousness					
A14	I produce as much as I am capable of producing at all times.				.64
A16	I do not abuse the right of others.				.72
A10	I do not spend a great deal of time in conversation with family and friends during work hours.				.65
Cumulative Percentage		15.26	29.40	41.45	51.62
Eigen values		3.30	1.63	1.23	1.06
KMO Bartlett's Test of Sphericity		.79	683.81***		
Cronbach alpha		.68	.64	.58	.44
Total scale reliability		.72			

Table-3: ANOVA

	OCB-1		OCB-2		OCB-3		OCB-4	
Demographic Variables	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Age								
23-35 years	18.58	2.59	23.38	4.96	24.63	2.83	17.83	2.96
36-58 years	18.90	2.62	23.16	5.04	25.05	2.92	18.77	2.30
59-70 years	18.67	3.08	25.00	3.16	26.00	3.16	19.55	2.12
Gender								
Female	18.63	2.70	23.47	4.62	24.49	3.12	18.19	3.10
Male	18.78	2.57	23.25	5.16	25.05	2.72	18.35	2.45
Total Work Experience								
0-5 years	18.37	2.82	22.79	5.35	24.22	2.94	17.71	3.12
5.1-20 years	18.90	2.54	23.61	4.88	25.02	2.87	18.55	2.47
20.1-41 years	18.71	2.42	23.12	4.23	25.62	2.56	18.44	2.64
Tenure in the current organisation								
0-3 years	18.31	3.05	23.11	5.10	24.18	3.30	18.03	2.97
3.1-15 years	18.91	2.34	23.38	4.93	25.17	2.61	18.40	2.56
15.1-23 years	19.62	1.80	24.46	4.10	25.85	1.63	19.15	2.26
Teaching/Non-teaching staff								
Teaching	18.83	2.76	23.57	4.83	24.93	3.05	18.32	2.79
Non-teaching	18.46	2.15	22.67	5.24	24.66	2.39	18.24	2.48