

Distributive justice, affective commitment, leader-member exchange (LMX), and job characteristics model (JCM) as predictors of organizational citizenship behaviours (OCB): evidence from Indian banking sector

Sudhir Chandra Das*

Department of Commerce, Banaras Hindu University, India

ABSTRACT:

The study is undertaken to investigate the predictors of organizational citizenship behaviours among Indian banking employees. The study adopted the eastern scale of Farh et al (1997) consisting of seven items categorized into two parts namely protecting company resources (3 items) and Interpersonal harmony (4 items). The western 24-item OCB scale developed by Podsakoff et al (1990) consists of five subscales, namely: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue which have been adopted in the study. The scholar used the scale of Niehoff and Moorman (1993), Allen and Meyer (1990), Liden and Maslyn (1998), and Hackman and Oldham (1975, 1976, 1980) for measuring distributive justice, affective commitment, leader-member exchange, and job characteristics model, respectively. The study validates the OCB scale mixing both eastern and western counterparts for the Indian banking sector setting. Four select predictors have been found to have a significant association with OCB dimensions. Hierarchical Regression Analysis reveals that affective commitment is the solid predictor of OCB select dimensions. It has been established that all the predictors do not create significant variations on different dimensions of OCB. Level of leader-member exchange, fairness in distribution and JCM enhancement through HRD interventions will create banking organizations that are more vibrant, resilient, and highly effective.

Keywords: Distributive justice, Affective commitment, Leader-member exchange, Job characteristics model, Organizational citizenship behaviour, Antecedents, Banking employees.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY: Researchers have found many more predictors of OCB including leader characteristics and the quality of an employee's relationship with his leader (Podsakoff et. al, 1996, Kaya, 2015; Kwak and Kim, 2015; Lu, 2014; Luo and Liu, 2013), procedural justice (Moorman, 1991; Aquino, 1995, Altuntas & Baykal, 2010; Duffy and Lilly, 2013; Lee and Peccei, 2011), personality (Organ, 1990; Penner et al., 1997, Guay et al. 2013, Arshadi & Danesh, 2013), motivational theories job satisfaction (Bateman and Organ 1983; Hemakumara, 2020; Ingrams, 2020; Magdalena, 2014; Shafazawana, et al., 2016; Soelton, et al., 2020), perceptions of fairness (Folger, 1993; Tepper and Taylor, 2003) and commitment (O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986, Staufenbiel and Konig (2010), Fu, 2013; Magdalena, 2014; Magdalena, 2014; Ruhana, 2020; Shafazawana, et al.,

2016). The present study experimented with four predictors namely distributive justice, affective commitment, LMX and JCM of OCB in the Indian banking industry. (Adams JS, 1965).

Numerous Western researchers have empirically investigated OCB and its predictors across industries, sectors, and academic disciplines. (Adil M, 2020). In contrast, only a few attempts at OCB research with regard to antecedents in India have been noted in manufacturing (e.g. Vijayabanu et al 2014; Dash and Pradhan 2014; Valliappan and Revathi 2015; Kar and Tewari 1999; Subramani et al 2015; Moideenkutty, 2000; Niranjana and Pattanayak, 2005; Singh, 2006; Jain and Sinha, 2006; Biswas and Varma, 2007; Gondlekar and Kamat, 2016) and service sector (e.g., Shaheen et al 2016; Gupta and Singh 2013; Mohanty J. 2013, Moideenkutty et al 2006; Mohanty and Rath 2012, Suresh and Venkatammal 2010; Narayana et al 2013; Bhatnagar and Sandhu, 2005; Pradhan et al 2016; Ajgaonkar et al (2012) and Qureshi 2015) (Ajgaonkar M, 2012). Most studies focused on psychological capital, job satisfaction, organizational justice, personality, HR practices and organizational culture and climate as predictors of OCB

Received: 25-Aug-2023, Manuscript No: ijemhhr-23-111386;

Editor assigned: 28-Aug-2023, Pre QC No. ijemhhr-23-11138 (PQ);

Reviewed: 11-Sep-2023, QC No. ijemhhr-23-111386;

Revised: 16-Sep-2023, Manuscript No. ijemhhr-23-111386R);

Published: 23-Sep-2023, DOI: 10.4172/1522-4821.1000595

*Correspondence regarding this article should be directed to: scdas@bhu.ac.in

(Allen N.J,1990). As far as the Banking sector is concerned very negligible studies have been traced (e.g., Karthiga, V. 2016; Prathiba, Srividya and Balakrishnan 2017; Garg and Samta 2013) (Altuntas S,2010).

THEORETICAL BASE AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT:

A. DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE AND OCB: Wang et al, (2010) described that distributive justice justifies treatment based on ethical and objective criteria among individual workers (Aquino K, 1995). Empirical research supports the relationship between overall fairness and organizational citizenship behaviour (Greenberg, 1993; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993; Williams, Pitre and Zainuba, 2002). Using equity theory, Organ (1990) suggested a theoretical basis for the relationship between distributive justice and organizational citizenship behaviour (Arshadi N, 2013). According to equity theory (Adams, 1965), the perception of the unfair distribution of work rewards relative to work inputs creates tension within an individual, and the individual is motivated to resolve the tension (Baghersalimi S, 2011). Spector and Che (2014) found that distributive justice is positively correlated with organizational citizenship behaviour (Bateman T.S, 1983). Several other pieces of research also found the strength of the relationship between distributive justice and OCB like Samad (2006); Kumar et al (2009); Mortazavi, (2000); Walumbwa, Hartnell and Oke, (2010); Iqbal, Aziz, and Tasawar, (2012); Spector and Che, (2014); Sohn and Shin, (2015) (Bhatnagar J, 2005).

HYPOTHESIS-1: Distributive justice would be the positive antecedent of organizational citizenship behaviour (Biswas S, 2007).

B.AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT AND OCB: Previous research in Western settings indicates that affective commitment is the key factor in predicting OCB (Morrison, 1994; Shore & Wayne, 1993; Wiener, 1982) (Bolon D.S, 1997). In a Meta-analysis of attitudinal and dispositional factors of OCB, Organ and Ryan (1995) reported that affective commitment had a significant average correlation with altruism and generalised compliance (Campbell D. T, 1959). This also appears to be true in some non-western settings (Cardona P, 2004). Chen and Francesco (2003) found that affective commitment related significantly to OCB in China while Kuehn and Al-Busaidi (2002) also found a similar correlation in Oman (Chaurasia S, 2015). Other researchers also identified it as an antecedent of organizational citizenship behaviour (Schappe 1998; Wasko & Faraj, 2005; Rahman and Karim, 2022; Subramaniam, 2022) (Chen C.C, 2009).

HYPOTHESIS II: Affective commitment is probably the predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour (Chen Z.X, 2003).

C. LMX AND OCB: Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) is a unique leadership approach by focuses on the special relationship that leaders create with each of their subordinates (Septiadi et al. 2017; Shanty et al. 2019; Setyawan 2018; Suherman, 2018; Suryana et al. 2019; Triyanthi Subudi, 2018). Liden and Graen (1980) proved that members in high-quality LMX relationships will receive more support, job discretionary and trust from the leader, and will exhibit higher OCB (Chiu S.F, 2005). Similarly, Hui, Law and Hackett (2004) also suggested that the LMX is significantly positively related to OCB. LMX is a better predictor of OCB (Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996, Podsakoff et al., 2000; Hackett et al., 2003; Lo et al., 2006; Chaurasia & Sukhla, 2015). Deluga (1994) found a positive relationship between employee OCB and the quality of LMX (Churchill G, 1979). Seminal research shows that subordinates reporting high-quality LMX not only assume greater job responsibilities but also express contributing to other units (Liden & Graen, 1980) (Coakes S. J, 2005).

HYPOTHESIS III: Leader-member exchange would be a positive predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour (Cohen J, 1983).

D. JCM AND OCB: Literature evident relatively few studies on the relationship between job characteristics and OCB (Chiu and Chen, 2005) (Dash S, 2014). Specifically, this relationship has been examined in the substitutes for leadership literature (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Bommer, 1996; Podsakoff, Niehoff, MacKenzie, and Williams, 1993; Farh, Podsakoff, and Organ, 1990). Several other studies indicated that job characteristics significantly contributed to the prediction of OCB (Cardona, Lawrence, and Bentler 2004; Podsakoff and colleagues 1996; Organ and colleagues 2006; Podsakoff, Niehoff, MacKenzie, and Williams, 1993; Chen and Chiu 2009; Todd and Kent 2006; Singh et al 2021; Adil et al 2020) (Deluga R.J, 1994).

HYPOTHESIS IV: Job characteristics have a significant positive influence on organizational citizenship behaviour (Duffy J. A, 2013)

RESEARCH PURPOSE:

- To validate the dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behaviours;
- To measure the strength of association between select antecedents and dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviours; and
- To investigate the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviours among Indian banking employees (D Van Dyne L, 1994).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

- Whether the combination of eastern and western measures of OCB validate in the Indian cultural context?

- What are the prominent factors (antecedents) that affect organizational citizenship behaviour?
- Whether dimensions of OCB associated positively with select antecedents?

RESEARCH DESIGN

PARTICIPANTS AND PROCEDURES: The population was a managerial non-managerial employee in the public and private sector banks situated in Varanasi district, India (Farh J, 1997). The researcher contacted individually in 94 branches of 10 public sector banks and 17 branches of 10 private banks provided them with a description of the research project and delivered the set of printed questionnaires to the branch manager or to employees (Farh J, 1990). A total of 350 employees (respondents) located in Varanasi bank branches were randomly selected for participation in the study (Folger R, 1993). The “drop-off” and “pick-up” methods were employed and arrangements were made for the questionnaires to be collected from banks 1 week from the date of “drop-off” (Fu, C, 1983).

RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF THE INSTRUMENT/DIMENSIONS: Specific scales for measuring Distributive justice (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993); Affective commitment (Allen and Meyer, 1990); Leader-Member exchange (Liden and Maslyn, 1998) and Job Characteristics Model (Hackman and Oldham, 1975, 1976, and 1980) have been used (Fu Y K, 2013). The study has used select measures of Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990) based on Organ (1988); Farh, Earley and Lin (1997) for assessing organizational citizenship behaviour (Garg A, 2013).

VALIDATING THE INSTRUMENTS OF PREDICTOR VARIABLES: Cronbach’s Alpha value was calculated and its acceptance (Gondlekar S, 2016). Limit has been determined as per the reliability condition suggested by prior studies (e.g., Hair et al., 1998; Creswell, 2003; Nunnally, 1978; Hair et al., 2010; Griffiee, 2012; and Reid 1990). On the other hand, this study followed Hair et al. (2006); Fornell and Larcker (1981) and Campbell and Fiske (1959) to check the construct validity of the scale by conducting the convergent and discriminant validity. (Table 1) (Graham J W, 1989).

According to Cronbach (1961), a Likert scale model should be accessed via Cronbach’s alpha to determine the reliability of the survey. (Greenberg J, 1993). The present study is composed of 54 statements with a Likert scale ranging from (1) to seven (7) following “strongly agree to strongly disagree” respectively aiming to determine whether select antecedents (distributive justice, affective commitment, leader-member exchange relationship and job characteristics model) have any impact on OCB (Griffiee D, 2012). From affective commitment two items and from the job characteristics model one item has been deleted from the

scale (Guay R P, 2013). Cronbach’s alpha values ranged from 0.746 to 0.933, thereby surpassing the minimum threshold of 0.7 recommended (Creswell, 2003). The results show that the researcher’s scales are highly reliable. (Table 2) (Gupta V, 2013).

The study used four factors as predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour which is subject to validity analysis (Hackett R D, 2003). Discriminant validity assesses the extent to which the construct does not correlate with other measures that are different from it (Hair, Babin, Money and Samouel, 2003: 174) (Hackman J R, 1975). In other words, it is a type of validity representing a measure’s uniqueness or uniqueness (Salkind, 2012: 127) (Hackman J R, 1976). Correlation analysis was done on the four factors and the result is presented (Hackman J R, 1980). All the factors are not perfectly correlated where their correlation coefficients range between 0 or 1. Hence, it can be concluded that discriminant validity has been established. (Table 3) (Hair J F Jr, 1998).

Convergent validity was carried out through a ‘within factor’ factor analysis in order to obtain a more in-depth judgment of the dimensionality of the construct under study (Hair J, 2003). In this study, convergent validity was weighted by its average variance extracted through exploratory factor analysis (Hema kumara M G, 2020). Five select factors displayed uni-dimensionality with distributive justice; KMO was 0.88 explaining 75.89 per cent of the variation (Hui C, 2004). Affective commitment shows KMO of 0.71 explaining 79 percent of the variation, whereas leader-member exchange relationship KMO projects 0.74 explaining 57.7 percent of the variation (Ingrams A, 2020). The KMO measure of sampling adequacy is 0.74 for job characteristics, explaining 57.76 percent variations. Thus, the analysis provided evidence of convergent validity (Iqbal H K, 2012).

VALIDATING OCB SCALES IN INDIAN CULTURAL CONTEXT: The objective laid down at the beginning of the study is to develop a concise measure of organizational citizenship behaviour for the banking industry based on Eastern and Western scales (Jain A K, 2006). Research studies have revealed several scales to measure Organizational citizenship behaviour, though they vary in a number of dimensions (Kar D P, 1999). The OCB scale was developed by Smith, Organ, and Near (1983), Organ and Bateman (1983); Organ (1988); Graham (1989); Moorman and Blakely (1995); George and Jones (1997); Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994); Van dyne, Graham and Dienesch (1994); Buenetello et al, (2007), Yaghoubi, et al, (2011); Baghersalimi et al, (2011); and Lambert and Hogan (2013). The study adopts the eastern scale of OCB given by Farh et al (1997) and the Western scale includes 24 item OCB scale developed by Podsakoff et al (1990) using recommendations postulated by Schwab (1980) and Churchill (1979). (Karthiga V, 2016).

Table 1.
Reliability Statistics.

S.NO	Name of the Factor	Initial No. of Items	Item Deleted	Established No. of Items	Cronbach 's Alpha	Mean	Variance
1	Distributive justice	5	0	5	0.933	23.6	73.454
2	Affective commitment	5	2	3	0.867	14.58	22.994
3	LMX	3	0	3	0.823	13.81	19.848
4	JCM	5	1	4	0.746	22.98	11.968

Table 2.
Inter-correlation of Major Predictors.

S.No	Variables	Mean	S.D	1	2	3	4
1	Distributive Justice	4.7217	1.7141	1			
2	Affective Commitment	4.8629	1.5983	-.200**	1		
3	Leader-member exchange	4.6048	1.48503	.335**	-.321**	1	
4	Job characteristics model	5.745	0.86487	.277**	0.019	0.045	1

N=350, a Two-tailed test, **p<0.01

Table 3.
Convergent Validity of Select Predictors.

S.No	Name of Factors	Name of variable	Extraction	KMO	No. of Items	Eigenvalues	Variation
1	Distributive Justice	Fair & justified	0.748	0.882	5	3.943	78.855
		Fair pay	0.801				
		Fair workload	0.827				
		Fair reward	0.832				
		Fair responsibilities	0.734				
2	Affective Commitment	Belongingness	0.778	0.708	3	2.371	79.05
		Emotional attachment	0.854				
		Part of the family	0.74				
3	Leader-Member Exchange	Manager defends	0.591	0.664	3	2.231	74.372
		Manager helps	0.821				
		Honest Mistake	0.819				
4	Job Characteristic Model	Skill variety	0.358	0.741	4	2.31	57.756
		Task identity	0.687				
		Task significance	0.591				
		Autonomy	0.674				
		Formal performance e	0.58				
		Job description	0.733				
		Customer expectations	0.765				
		Helping customer	0.468				

FACTOR ANALYSIS IN OCB: The study identified thirty useful items out of thirty-one which were composed of six-factor solutions through Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), explaining 62.59% of the total variance (Kaya A,2015). Six items loaded in the first factor (named harmony and resources) project an Eigenvalue of 6.131 and the total variance explained is 15.437% (Kemery E R, 1996). Variables under the second factor are comprised of six items whose Eigenvalue is 4.747 and total variance explained is 12.866%, (named as conscientiousness) (Kuehn K N,2002). Six items are loaded on factor-3 (named civic virtue) with an Eigenvalue of 3.457 and the total variance explained rate

is 11.652% (Kumar K, 2009). Factor-4 retained the original (05) items of courtesy having Eigenvalues of 1.880 and the total variance explained is 10.681%. Factor-5 (named altruism) loaded four items with Eigenvalues of 1.292 which explained 7.246% of the variance (Kwak W,2015).Factor-6 composed of three items (named sportsmanship), explained 4.795% of the variance with Eigenvalues of 1.262. (L Cummings, 2014). Out of the six factors extracted, four factors project internal consistency of more than 0.7, but the last two factors (5 and 6) show Cronbach's alpha less than 0.7 and retained as their average variance explained is more than 0.5. (Lambert E G, 2013).

CONSTRUCT VALIDITY: Convergent validity was carried out through a ‘within factor’ factor analysis in order to obtain a more in-depth judgment of the dimensionality of the construct under study. (Table 4). (Lee J, 2011).

All the six factors displayed one-dimensionality with Harmony & Resources (Factor-1), KMO was 0.90 explaining 75.89 per cent of the variation (Liden R C, 1998). Conscientiousness (Factor-2), KMO was 0.83 explaining 56.91 per cent of the variation (Liden R C, 1980). Civic Virtue (Factor-3), KMO was 0.84 explaining 51.43 per cent of the variation. Courtesy (factor-4), KMO was 0.83 explaining 57.18 per cent of the variation (Lo M.C, 2006). Altruism (Factor-5), KMO was 0.72 explaining 53.71 per cent of the variation(Lu X,2014). finally Sportsmanship (Factor-6), KMO was 0.51 with average variance explained is 47.61 percent (Luo H,2013). Thus, the analysis provided evidence of convergent validity. (Table 5). (Magdalena S.M,2014).

DISCRIMINANT VALIDITY: It is the precondition for discriminant validity that constructs must be distinctive which means the coefficient of correlation is neither an absolute value (Meyer J P, 1993). It can be seen all the factors are not perfectly correlated where their correlation coefficients range between 0 or 1 thus discriminant validity has been established (Mohanty J, 2012).

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

CORRELATION ANALYSIS (PREDICTOR VARIABLES VS.OCB): The bivariate correlation analysis was conducted on distributive justice, affective commitment, leader-member exchange relationship and job characteristics model as well as on the OCB dimensions of harmony and resources, conscientiousness, civic virtue, courtesy, altruism

and sportsmanship and role- prescribed customer service behaviour (Mohanty J,2013). The values of Pearson’s *r* range from .50 to -.031. This suggests that most variables have a low to medium correlation (Moideenkutty U, 2000). According to Cohen and Holliday (1982) in Bryman and Cramer, 1997), a correlation coefficient between .40 to .69 is modest and those below 19 are considered very low (Moideenkutty U, 2006). Based on that guideline, most correlations in this study should be considered modest (Moorman R.H, 1995).

Results of correlation analysis found a negative relationship between distributive justice and harmony and resources ($r = -.157, p < .01$) (Moorman R H, 1991).. But rest of the cases positive correlation has been observed. Affective commitment positively correlated with harmony and resources, courtesy, and altruism ($r = .44, r = .14, r = .17$ respectively; $p < .01$), whereas in the case of sportsmanship, it is negatively correlated ($r = -.17, p < .01$) (Morrison E W, 1994). Positive correlation was also obtained between leader-member exchange and conscientiousness ($r = .198$) and sportsmanship ($r = .155$); all significant at $p < .01$, whereas harmony and resources ($r = -.13$), civic virtue ($r = -.15$), and altruism ($r = -.16$) are negatively correlated and to be significant at 1% level (Mortazavi Sh, 2000). Results of correlation analysis also show that the job characteristics model is positively correlated with conscientiousness behaviour ($r = .11, p < .05$), civic virtue ($r = .29, p < .01$), courtesy ($r = .24, p < .01$), altruism ($r = .17, p < .01$) and sportsmanship ($r = .24, p < .01$). (Table 6). (Narayana S, 2013).

IMPACT ANALYSIS: Hierarchical regression analysis (Cohen and Cohen, 1983) was used to evaluate the relationships among the four predictor variables i.e., distributive justice, affective commitment, leader-member exchange, and job characteristics model and the seven

Table 4.
Convergent Validity of OCB Scale.

S.No	Factor name	KMO	Variance Explained
1	Harmony and Resources	0.9	75.89
2	Conscientiousness	0.83	56.91
3	Civic Virtue	0.84	51.43
4	Courtesy	0.83	57.18
5	Altruism	0.72	53.71
6	Sportsmanship	0.51	47.61

Table 5.
Correlation among the Constructs of OCB.

Variables	HR	Conts.	CV	Crts.	A	S
Harmony & Resources (HR)	1					
Conscientiousness (Conts.)	-0.022	1				
Civic Virtue (D)	0.02	.475**	1			
Courtesy (Crts.)	0.063	.170**	.340**	1		
Altruism (A)	0.068	0.054	.162**	.503**	1	
Sportsmanship (S)	.141**	.386**	.383**	.206**	.158**	1

Note: ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 6.
Correlation Matrix (Predictor Variables and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour).

Variables	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Distributive Justice	4.7217	1.7141	1									
Affective Commitment	4.8629	1.5983	-.200**	1								
Leader-Member exchange	4.6048	1.485	.335**	-.321**	1							
Job Characteristics Model	5.745	0.86487	.277**	0.019	0.045	1						
Harmony & Resources	5.7019	1.3113	-.157**	.444**	-.127*	0.012	1					
Conscientiousness	5.7752	0.91075	.363**	-0.074	.198**	.112*	-0.02	1				
Civic virtue	5.8429	0.74283	.189**	-0.031	-.151**	.296**	0.02	0.475	1			
Courtesy	6.3303	0.70018	0.061	.139**	-.112*	.248**	0.063	.170**	.340**	1		
Altruism	6.3521	0.60628	-0.03	.167**	-.161**	.178**	0.068	0.054	.162**	.503**	1	
Sportsmanship	5.1714	1.0675	.247**	-.170**	.155**	.245**	-.141**	.386**	.383**	.206**	.158**	1

Note: N=350, *p<0.05, **p<0.01

categories of citizenship behaviour namely harmony and resources, conscientiousness, civic virtue, courtesy, altruism, and sportsmanship. (Niehoff B P, 1993). Prior to conducting a hierarchical multiple regression, the relevant assumptions of this statistical analysis were tested (Niranjana P, 2005). An examination of correlations revealed that no independent variables were highly correlated collinearity statistics (i.e., Tolerance and VIF) were all within acceptable limits (Nunnally J, 1978). The assumption of multicollinearity was deemed to have been met (Coakes, 2005; Hair et al., 1998). (O Reilly C.A, 1986).

Three basic principles underlie the hierarchical order of predictor variable entry (Cohen and Cohen, 1983; Petrocelli, 2003) are presumed causal priority/direction of causal flow, the hierarchical relevance of each predictor to the criterion, and interactions among predictor variables (Organ D W,1990). Based on the literature review and proposed theoretical relationships as stated in the hypotheses, predictors were entered into the analysis in the following order: distributive justice, affective commitment leader-member exchange and job characteristic model (Organ, D W, 1989). The procedure used for analysis was the same for each of the seven dependent variables. The ΔR^2 and its corresponding change in F (ΔF) and r values are the statistics of greatest interest in these hierarchical regression results (Organ D W, 1995). If the addition of an independent variable caused a statistically significant increase in the R^2 , in addition of that variable to the model was found to have significantly improved (Organ D W,1988). The model's ability to predict the dependent variable. As suggested by Thompson and Borello (1985), β coefficients reported for predictor variables are those computed for the step in which the variable was first entered (Organ D.W, 2005).

EFFECTS OF SELECT ANTECEDENTS ON HARMONY AND RESOURCES (OCB): It was proposed that four select independent variables are the positive antecedents of harmony and resources (Organ D.W,1988). Prior to the hierarchical regression analyses, the

independent variables were examined for collinearity (Luo H,2013). Results of the variance inflation factor (all less than 2.0) suggest that the estimated β 's are well established in the following regression models (Penner L.A,1997). The results of step one indicated that the variance accounted for (R^2) with the first predictor (distributive justice) equalled .025 (adjusted R^2 =.022), which was significantly different from zero $F(1,348) = 8.76, p < .01$ (Petrocelli J.V, 2003). Next, affective commitment scores were entered into the regression equation (Podsakioff P.M, 1996). The change in variance accounted for (ΔR^2) was equal to .177, which was statistically significant increase in variance accounted for over the step one model $\Delta F(1, 347) = 77.16, p < .001$ (Podsakoff P. M, 1994). In steps three and four, the leader-member exchange (LMX) and job characteristics model were entered into the regression equation. The change in variance accounted for (ΔR^2) was equal to .001 in both cases which was a statistically insignificant increase in variance accounted above the variability contributed by the previous predictor variables entered in step two (Podsakoff P M,1996a). Hence, the findings partially supported the Hypothesis. (Table 7). (Podsakoff P. M, 1996b).

EFFECTS OF SELECT PREDICTORS ON CONSCIENTIOUSNESS: The results of the hypothesis which tested the predicting conscientiousness from distributive justice, affective commitment, leader-member exchange and job characteristic model are reported in. (Podsakoff P. M, 1990). In block 1, distributive justice accounted for 13.2% of the variance in Conscientiousness, $F(1, 348) = 52.774, p < .001$ contributing significantly (Podsakoff P.M, 2000). However, the inclusion of affective commitment in block 2, resulted insignificant change in variance (Podsakoff P.M, 1993). In the 3rd block, the inclusion of LMX resulted in 13.9% variation (change of 0.7%) and insignificant variance has been observed (Pradhan R. K, 2016). Finally, the inclusion of JCM in the regression on conscientiousness yielded no significant variance. Overall, the findings partially supported the Hypothesis. (Table 8). (Prathiba S, 2017).

Table 7.
Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Harmony and Resources.

BLOCK	Predictor Variables	F	R	B	R2	ΔR2	Adjusted R2	ΔF
1	Distributive Justice	8.761**	0.16	-.16**	0.025	0.025	0.022	8.761**
2	Affective commitment	43.92***	0.45	.430***	0.202	0.177	0.197	77.165***
3	LMX	29.454***	0.45	0.042	0.203	0.001	0.197	0.433
4	JCM	22.115***	0.45	0.027	0.204	0.001	0.195	0.281

*P <.05, **p <.01, ***p<.001.

Table 8.
Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Conscientiousness.

BLOCK	Predictor Variables	F	R	B	R2	ΔR2	Adjusted	ΔF
1	Distributive Justice	52.774***	0.363	-.363***	0.132	0.132	0.129	52.774***
2	Affective commitment	26.312***	0.363	-.001	.132	0.000	.127	.000
3	LMX	18.585***	0.373	0.093	0.139	0.007	0.131	2.852
4	JCM	13.925***	0.373	0.016	0.139	0.000	0.129	0.091

*P <.05, **p <.01, ***p<.001.

EFFECTS OF SELECT ANTECEDENTS ON CIVIC VIRTUE: Hypothesis proposed that four predictor variables have influences on civic virtue and the results of the regression analysis have been presented in (Qureshi H, 2015). The hierarchical regression revealed that at stage one, distributive justice contributed significantly to the regression model, $F(1, 348):12.86, p<.001$, and accounted for 3.6% of the variation in civic virtue (Rahman M H A, 2022). Introducing affective commitment, no additional variation in civic virtue has been explored (Reid J, 1990). Adding LMX to the regression model explained an additional 1% of the variation in civic virtue and this change in R^2 was found to be insignificant (Ruhana I, 2020). Finally, the addition of JCM to the regression model explained an additional 6.6% of the variation in civic virtue and this change in R^2 was found significant $F(1, 345) = 25.82, p<.001$. Together the four independent variables accounted for 11.2% of the variance in civic virtue. Overall, the findings partially supported the Hypothesis. (Table 9) (Salkind N,2012).

PREDICTING COURTESY (OCB) FROM SELECT ANTECEDENTS: This part test hypothesis which predicts courtesy behaviour by four independent variables was evaluated in separate hierarchical regression analyses (Schappe P,1998). Initially, distributive justice was introduced in regression analyses which accounted for negligible variation in the courtesy behaviour of banking employees (Schwab D. P, 1980).But the inclusion of affective commitment resulted in a 2.8% variation in courtesy behaviour ($F2, 347= 4.922, p<.01$) (Septiadi S A, 2017). The inclusion of a third variable (LMX) creates a 3.8% variation in courtesy (adding 1% variance) and found insignificant change (Settoon R P, 1996). Finally, the addition of JCM to the regression model explained an additional 5.1% of the variation in courtesy and this change of R^2 was found significant ($F 1, 345: 19.31, p<.001$) (Setyawan S, 2018).

Altogether, the four independent variables accounted for 8.9% of the variance in the courtesy behaviour of bank employees. Overall, the findings partially supported the Hypothesis. (Table 10). (Shafazawana M T, 2016).

PREDICTING ALTRUISM (OCB) FROM SELECT INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: Hypothesis proposed that Distributive justice, Affective commitment, Leader-member exchange and Job characteristics model would be positive antecedents of altruism (organizational citizenship behaviour) (Shaheen M, 2016). The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at block one, distributive justice not contributed significantly to the regression model and accounted for 0.1% of the variation in employees' altruism behaviour (Shanty, D, 2019).Introducing affective commitment variables explained an additional 2.7% of the variation in altruism and this change in R^2 was significant ($F1,347=9.639, p<.01$) (Shore L. M, 1993).Adding LMX to the regression model explained an additional 1.4% of the variation in altruism and this change of R^2 was significant ($F1,346=5.181, p<.05$) (Singh V, 2006).Finally, the addition of variables of job characteristics to the regression model explained an additional 3.1% of the variation in altruism behaviour and this change in R^2 was also significant ($F 1,345= 11.70, p<.01$) (Smith C. A, 1983). Together the four independent variables accounted for 7.4% of the variance in altruism (Soelton M, 2020). Overall, the findings partially supported the Hypothesis. (Table 11) (Sohn Y. W, 2015).

PREDICTING SPORTSMANSHIP BEHAVIOUR (OCB) FROM SELECT INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: The study hypothesised that four select independent variables would be a positive predictor of sportsmanship (Spector P E, 2014). Accordingly, hierarchical regression analysis was conducted and their results are shown in (Staufenbiel T, 2010). In block one, composite variables of distributive

Table 9.
Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Civic Virtue.

BLOCK	Predictor Variables	F	R	B	R2	ΔR2	Adjusted R2	ΔF
1	Distributive Justice	12.862***	0.189	.189***	0.036	0.036	0.033	12.862***
2	Affective commitment	6.422**	0.189	0.008	0.036	0	0.03	0.019
3	LMX	5.505**	0.213	0.11	0.046	0.01	0.037	3.575
4	JCM	10.865***	0.335	.269***	0.112	0.066	0.102	25.802***

*P<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.

Table 10.
Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Courtesy.

BLOCK	Predictor Variables	F	R	B	R2	ΔR2	Adjusted R2	ΔF
1	Distributive Justice	1.281	0.061	0.061	0.004	0.004	0.001	1.281
2	Affective commitment	4.922**	0.166	.158**	0.028	0.024	0.022	8.534**
3	LMX	4.561**	0.195	-0.113	0.038	0.01	0.03	3.761
4	JCM	8.428***	0.298	.236***	0.089	0.051	0.078	19.307***

*P<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Table 11.
Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Altruism.

BLOCK	Predictor Variables	F	R	B	R2	ΔR2	Adjusted R2	ΔF
1	Distributive Justice	0.315	0.03	-0.03	0.001	0.001	-0	0.315
2	Affective commitment	4.981**	0.167	.168**	0.028	0.027	0.022	9.639**
3	LMX	5.087**	0.206	-.132*	0.042	0.014	0.034	5.181*
4	JCM	6.859***	0.271	.185**	0.074	0.031	0.063	11.703**

*P<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

justice accounted for 6.1% of the variance in sportsmanship and contributed significantly ($F_{1, 348}=22.599, p<.001$) (Subramani A K, 2015). But the inclusion of affective commitment resulted in a 7.6% variation in OCB (Suherman U. D, 2018). (adding 1.5%) and was found to be significant ($F_{1, 347}=6.65, p<.05$) (Suresh S, 2010). The inclusion of a third antecedent (i.e., LMX) yielded 7.8% variation (change of .2%) on sportsmanship yielded no significant variation (Suryana A, 2019). But the introduction of the fourth variable (Tepper B J, 2003). (JCM) resulted in a significant variance of 11.6% ($F_{1, 345}=14.858, p<.001$) (Thompson B, 1985). Overall, the findings partially supported the Hypothesis. (Table 12). (Todd S. Y, 2006).

ANTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR FROM SELECT INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: Hypothesis proposed that Distributive justice (Triyanthi M, 2018). Affective commitment, Leader-member exchange and Job characteristic model are positive predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour (Valliappan, 2015). In the first model, distributive justice significantly predicted organizational citizenship behaviours (Vijayabanu C K, 2014). ($F_{1, 348}=12.78, p<.001$) (Walumbwa F O, 2010). The addition of affective commitment to the equation in the second step enhanced the model's ability to predict OCB ($\Delta F_{1, 347}=17.59, p<.001$), and an increase in explained variation ($\Delta R^2=.047$) (Wang X, 2010). The addition of LMX, a minor improvement in the model, but the change

in variation was found insignificant (Wasko M, 2005). When JCM was added to the equation in the fourth step, the model was found significant with an $F_{4, 349}=14.28, p<.001$, and $R^2(.14)$ revealed that the combination of four variables was accounted for 14% of the variation in OCB. Besides, the R^2 change (.06) showed that JCM significantly contributed to the prediction of OCB and the standard coefficient $\beta=.25, p<.001$ showed that jobs with high core job characteristics resulted in engagement in OCB. (Table 13) (Wiener Y, 1982).

CONCLUSIVE REMARKS:

DIMENSIONALITY AND VALIDITY: The study has used Western measures of Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990) based on Organ (1988) and eastern counterparts of Farh, Earley and Lin (1997) for assessing the dimensionality of organizational citizenship behaviour. Through appropriate diagnostic statistics (Reliability, construct validity and common method variance) the scholar identified six factors with 31-item scales in the Indian context. Therefore, the scale developed in the study was found to be perfect for Indian banking organizations and it is suggested that bankers/policy-makers can use this scale for any further studies regarding the development of OCB (Williams S, 2002).

RELATIONSHIP: Based on scales for measuring Distributive justice (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993); Affective commitment (Allen and Meyer, 1990); Leader-Member

Table 12.
Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Sportsmanship.

BLOCK	Predictor Variables	F	R	B	R2	ΔR2	Adjusted R2	ΔF
1	Distributive Justice	22.599***	0.247	.247***	0.061	0.061	0.058	22.599***
2	Affective commitment	14.278***	0.276	-.125**	0.076	0.015	0.071	6.655*
3	LMX	9.755***	0.279	0.049	0.078	0.002	0.07	0.731
4	JCM	11.324***	0.341	.204***	0.116	0.038	0.106	14.858***

*P <.05, **p <.01, ***p<.001

Table 13.
Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.

BLOCK	Predictor Variables	F	R	B	R2	ΔR2	Adjusted	ΔF
1	Distributive Justice	12.788***	0.188	.188***	0.035	0.035	0.033	12.788***
2	Affective commitment	15.498***	0.286	.220***	0.082	0.047	0.077	12.598***
3	LMX	10.470***	0.288	0.039	0.083	0.001	0.075	0.462
4	JCM	14.280***	0.377	.253***	0.142	0.059	0.132	23.652***

*P <.05, **p <.01, ***p<.001.

Exchange (Liden and Maslyn, 1998) and Job Characteristics Model (Hackman and Oldham, 1975, 1976, and 1980), a significant positive correlation with specific dimensions of OCB have been found using the Pearson coefficient of correlation.

PREDICTORS: For tracing the predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour, seven (07) hypotheses have been tested. The research found that all of the predictors do not create significant variation in OCB dimensions and hence hypotheses were partially supported. Prior researchers also found that all of the dimensions were not influenced by specific predictors. Out of four predictors, affective commitment was found to be a strong predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour. Conscientiousness behaviour of bank employees uncovered a least affected variable by predictors except for distributive justice.

IMPLICATIONS FOR HRD PURPOSE: Bank authorities must emphasize this approach when distributing resources so that the issue of unequal or unfair distribution of resources can be eliminated. Fostering effective commitment across organizational levels could help to develop and unleash the entrepreneurial potentials of employees thereby enabling them to contribute maximally to the long-term growth, development, and sustainability of organizations. Management should invest time, effort, and commitment to elevate their employees' OCB level through fostering quality dyadic relationships since OCB has been identified as a low-cost vehicle for promoting and developing HR and overall organizational effectiveness.

REFERENCES

Adams JS. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). Academic Press.

Adil, M., Haroon, M., Zakar, M., Shah, M. J., Tahir, M. (2020). 'The Effects of Job Characteristics on Employee's

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Among Banking Sector Employees in Peshawar City'. *Inter Nat J Manage Entre Preneurship Res.*1(3), pp. 132–139.

Ajgaonkar M., Baul U., Phadke, S.M. (2012). Relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Job Characteristics Model of Motivation: An Empirical Study. *NMIMS Management Rev.* V (17),51-72.

Allen, N.J., Meyer, J.P., (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization, *J Occup Psycho* 63(1):1-8.

Altuntas, S., Baykal, U., (2010). Relationship between nurses' organizational trust levels and their organizational citizenship behaviours', *J Nurs Scholarsh* 42(2):186-94.

Aquino, K., (1995). Relationships among pay inequity, perceptions of procedural justice, and organizational citizenship. *Emp Respons Rights J.*8:21-33.

Arshadi, N., Danesh, F., (2013). Designing and testing a model of precedents and outcomes of emotional labour in an industrial organization in Iran'. *Pro Soc Behav Sci.*84:1529-33

Baghersalimi, S., Reza, H., Keldbari, R., Alipour, R. H. (2011). Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Employees social capital: A Case Study Rasht Hospitals. *Aust J. Basic Appl Sci.* 5(8), 1185-1193.

Bateman, T.S., Organ, D.W., (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between effect and employee citizenship. *Acad Manage J.* 26(4), 587-595.10.5465/255908.

Bhatnagar, J., Sandhu, S., (2005). Psychological empowerment and organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) in managers: A talent retention tool. *Indian J Ind Relat* 449-469.

Biswas, S., Varma, A., (2007). Psychological climate and individual performance in India: test of a mediated model. *Emp Relat.*

Bolon, D.S., (1997). 'Organizational citizenship behavior among hospital employees: A multidimensional analysis involving job satisfaction and organizational commitment'. *J Healthc Manag.*42(2).221-241.

- Campbell, D. T., Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and Discriminant Validation by the Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix, *Psychol Bull.* 56(2),81-105.
- Cardona, P., Lawrence, B.S., Bentler, P.M., (2004). The influence of social and work exchange relationships on organizational citizenship behaviour. *Group Organ Manag.*29(2), 219-247.
- Chaurasia, S., Shukla, A. (2015). The Influence of Leader-Member Exchange Relations on Employee Engagement and Work Role Performance. *Int J Organ Theory Behav.* 16(4), 466-493.
- Chen, C.C., Chiu, S.F., (2009). The mediating role of job involvement in the relationship between job characteristics and organizational citizenship behaviour. *J Soc Psychol.* 149(4), 474-494.
- Chen, Z.X., Francesco, A.M., (2003). Relationship between the three components of commitment and employee performance in China, *J Vocat Behav.* 62(3), 490-510.
- Chiu, S.F., Chen, H.L., (2005). Relationship between job characteristics and organizational citizenship behaviour: The mediational role of job satisfaction. *Soc Behav Person Internat J.* 33(6), 523- 540.
- Churchill, G. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *J Mark Res.* 16(1), 64–73.
- Coakes, S. J. (2005). SPSS: Analysis without Anguish: Version 12.0 for Windows, John Wiley & Son Australia, Ltd.
- Cohen J., Cohen P (1983). Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioural Sciences, 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Elrbaum. constructs. *J Mark Res.* 16(1), 64–73.
- Dash, S., Pradhan, R.K. (2014). ‘Determinants & Consequences of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: A Theoretical Framework for Indian Manufacturing Organisations’. *Internat J Business Manag Invent.* 3(1), 17-27.
- Deluga, R.J.,(1994). Supervisor trust building, leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behaviour. *J Occup Psychol.* 67(4), 315-326.
- Duffy, J. A., Lilly, J. (2013). Do Individual Needs Moderate the Relationships between Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Organizational Trust and Perceived Organizational Support. *J Behav App Manag.* 14(3). 185-197.
- D Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviour: Construct re-definition, operationalization, and validation. *Acad Manage J.* 37(4), 765-802.
- Farh, J., Earley, P. C., Lin, S. (1997). Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behaviour in Chinese society. *Adm Sci Q.*42 (3), 421-444.
- Farh, J., Podsakoff, P. M., Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *J Manage.* 16(4), 705-721.
- Folger, R. (1993). Reactions to mistreatment at work. *Soc Psych Inorganizat Ads Theory Res.* 161(183), 591-610.
- Fornell, C., Larcker, D. (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *J Mark Res.* 18(1), 39–50.
- Fu, Y. K. (2013). High-performance human resource practices moderate flight attendants’ organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Social Behavior and Personality.* *Int J.* 41(7), 1195- 1208.
- Garg, A., Samta, S. (2013). Analyzing the impact of psychological empowerment on organizational citizenship behaviour in public banking sector. *Internat J Mar Fin Serv Manag Res.*2(7), 80-94.
- Gondlekar, S., Kamat, M.S. (2016). Does Positive Work Climate predict Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *ELK. Asia Pac J Hum.* 2(2),1-15.
- Graham, J. W. (1989). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, operationalization, and validation.
- Greenberg, J. (1993). Stealing in the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. *Organ Behav Hum Decis Process.* 54, 81-103.
- Griffiee, D. (2012). *An introduction to second language research methods: design and data*’. California: TESL-EJ Publications.
- Guay, R. P., Oh, I. S., Choi, D., Mitchell, M. S., Mount, M. K., Shin, K. 2013. The Interactive Effect of Conscientiousness and Agreeableness on Job Performance Dimensions in South Korea. *Internat J Select Asses.* 21(2), 233-238.
- Gupta, V., Singh, S., (2013). An empirical study of the dimensionality of organizational justice and its relationship with organizational citizenship behaviour in the Indian context. *Int . Hum Resour.* 24(6), 1277-1299.
- Hackett, R.D., Farh, J.L., Song, L.J.,Lapierre, L.M., (2003). LMX and organizational citizenship behavior: Examining the links within and across Western and Chinese samples. *Diver.* 1, 219-231.
- Hackman, J. R., Oldham, G. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *J Appl Psychol.* 60(2), 159-170.
- Hackman, J.R., Oldham, G.R., (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizat Behav Human Performance.* 16(2), 250-279.
- Hackman, J.R., Oldham, G.R., (1980). *Work Redesign*’, Addison Wesley. *Reading, MA.*
- Hair, J. F. Jr., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis.* (5th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hair, J., Babin, B., Money, A., Samouel, P. (2003). *Essentials of business research methods.* Indianapolis: Wiley.
- Hema kumara, M. G. (2020). The impact of job satisfaction on organizational citizenship behavior: A review of the literature. *Internat J Busi Soc Sci.* 11(12), 49-51.
- Hui C, Lee C, Rousseau D M (2004). Employment relationships in China: Do workers relate to the organization or to people. *Organ Sci.* 15(2), 232– 240.
- Ingrams, A. (2020). Organizational citizenship behaviour in the public and private sectors: A multilevel test of public service motivation and traditional antecedents. *Rev Public Pers Adm.* 40(2), 222-244.

- Iqbal, H. K., Aziz, U., Tasawar, A. (2012). Impact of Organizational Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Empirical Evidence from Pakistan. *World Appl Sci J.* 19(9), 1348-1354.
- Jain, A.K., Sinha, A.K., (2006). Self-management and job performance: In-role behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Psychol Stud Univer Calicut.* 51(1), p.19.
- Kar, D. P., Tewari, H. R. (1999). Organizational culture and organizational citizenship behavior. *Indian J Ind Relat.* 34(4), 421-433.
- Karthiga, V. (2016). A study to improve organizational citizenship behaviours in private sector banks through organizational effectiveness. *Internat J Adv Res Inn Ideas Edu.* 3 (2), 325-328.
- Kaya, A. (2015). The Relationship between Spiritual Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviours: A Research on School Principals Behaviors. *Edu Sci Theor Pract.* 15(3), 597-606.
- Kemery, E.R., Bedeian, A.G., Zacur, S.R., (1996). Expectancy-Based Job Cognitions and Job Affect as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *J Appl Soc Psychol.* 26(7), 635-651.
- Kuehn, K. N., 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. *Int J Commer Bus Manag.* 12(2), pp.107-125.
- Kumar, K., Bakshi, A., Rani, E. (2009). Linking the 'big five' personality domains to organizational citizenship behaviour. *Int J Psychol Stud.* 2(1), 73-81.
- Kwak, W., Kim, H. 2015. Servant leadership and customer service quality at Korean hotels: Multilevel organizational citizenship behaviour as a mediator. *Soc Behav Per Internat J.* 43(8), 1287- 1298.
- L. Cummings 2014(Eds.), *Research in Organisation Behaviour* (pp. 23-34), Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L. (2013). The association of distributive and procedural justice with organizational citizenship behaviour. *Prison J.* 93(3), 313- 334.
- Lee, J., Peccei, R. (2011). Discriminant validity and interaction between perceived organizational support and perceptions of organizational politics: A temporal analysis. *J Occup Psychol.* 84(4), 686- 702.
- Liden, R. C., Maslyn, J. M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *J Manage.* 24, 43-72.
- Liden, R.C., Graen, G., (1980). Generalizability of the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership. *Acad Manage J.* 23(3),451-465.
- Lo, M.C., Ramayah, T., Kueh, J.S.H. (2006). An investigation of leader-member exchange effects on organizational citizenship behaviour in Malaysia. *Int J Bus Manag.* 12(1), 5-23.
- Lu, X., (2014). Ethical leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour: The mediating roles of cognitive and affective trust. *Soc Behav Pers Internat J.* 42(3), 379-389.
- Luo, H., Liu, S. (2013). Effect of situational Leadership and employee readiness match on organizational citizenship behaviour in China. *Soc Behav Pers Internat J.* 42 (10), 1725-1732.
- Magdalena, S.M., (2014). The effects of organizational citizenship behaviour in the academic environment. *Proc Soc Behav Sci.* 127, 738-742.
- Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J., Smith, C.A., (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *J Appl Psychol.* 78(4), 538-550.
- Mohanty, J., Rath, B. P. (2012). Influence of organizational culture on organizational citizenship behaviour: a three-sector study. *Glob J Manag Bus Res.* 6 (1), 65-76.
- Mohanty, J., (2013). Are government-owned organizations deliberately demonized? the organizational citizenship behaviour indicators. *Adv Manag App Eco.* 3(4), 177-180.
- Moideenkutty, U., (2000). Correlates and outcomes of organizational citizenship behavior directed toward the organization, the supervisor, and co-workers: A social exchange perspective', Temple University.
- Moideenkutty, U., Gary, B., Kumar, R., Nalakath (2006). Comparing correlates of Organizational citizenship behaviour of Sales representatives in India . *Int J Commer Bus Manag.* 16(1), 15-28.
- Moorman , R.H. G. L., Blakely, G.L. (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour, *J Organ Behav.* 16, 127-142.
- Moorman, R.H., (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviours: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship?. *J Appl Psychol.* (76)6, 845-852.
- Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role Definitions and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Importance of the Employee's Perspective. *Aca Mant J.* 37(6), 1543-1567.
- Mortazavi Sh et al. (2000). The relationship between culture with human resource management and organizational behaviours. Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix. *Psych Bullet.* 56(2),81-105.
- Narayana S., Narayana, P. N., Kannan, M. (2013). Perceived Organisational Climate Correlates Organisational Citizenship Behaviour: A Study among the Software Professionals. *Amer Internat J Res Human, Arts Soc Sci.* 3(2), 209-216.
- Niehoff, B.P., Moorman, R.H., (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Acad Manage J.* 36(3), 527-556.
- Niranjana, P., Pattanayak, B., (2005). Influence of learned optimism and organisational ethos on organisational citizenship behaviour: A study on Indian corporations. *Internat J Human Res Dev Manag.* 5(1), 85-98.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd edition). New York: McGraw Hill.
- O'Reilly, C.A., Chatman, J., (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behaviour. *J Appl Psychol.* 71(3), 492-500.
- Organ, D. W. (1990). *The Motivational Basis of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.*

- Organ, D.W., Konovsky, M., (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behaviour. *J Appl Psychol.* 74(1), 157-165.
- Organ, D.W., Ryan, K., (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour. *Pers Psych.* 48(4), 775-802.
- Organ, D.W., M. Konovsky. (1988). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behaviour. *J Appl Psychol.* 74, 157-164
- Organ, D.W., Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., (2005). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences. Sage Publications.
- Organ, D.W.(1988).Organizational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier organizational citizenship behaviour. *J Appl Psychol.* 74, 157-164.
- Penner, L.A., Midili, A.R., Kegelmeyer, J., (1997). Beyond job attitudes: A personality and social psychology perspective on the causes of organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Perf.* 10(2), 111-131.
- Petrocelli, J.V., (2003). Hierarchical multiple regression in counseling research: Common problems and possible remedies. *Meas Eval Couns Dev.* 36(1), 9-22.
- Podsakioff, P.M., Mackenzie, S.B., Bommer, W.H. (1996). Transformational Leader Behaviours and Substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust and organizational citizenship behaviours. *J Manage.* 22(2), 259-298.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *J Mark Res.* 31(3),351-363.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Bommer, W. H. (1996a). Meta-analysis of the relationships between Kerr and Jermier's substitutes for leadership and employee job attitudes, role perceptions, and performance. *J Appl Psychol.*81(4), 380-399.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Bommer, W. H. (1996b). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviour. *J Manage.* 22(2), 259-298.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadersh Q.* 1, 107-142.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B., Bachrach, D.G. (2000). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *J Manage.* 26(3), 513-563.
- 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. *Organ Behav Hum Decis Proc.* 54(1). 1-44
- Pradhan, R. K., Jena, L. K., Bhattachaerya. (2016). Impact of psychological capital on organizational citizenship behavior: Moderating role of emotional intelligence. *Cogent Busin & Manag.*
- Prathiba, S., Balakrishnan, L., (2017). Organizational Citizenship Behaviour of Gen Y's at Workplace with Special Reference to Private Sector Banks in Chennai. *J Manag Res.* 9(1), 66-72.
- Qureshi, H. (2015). A study of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) and its Antecedents in an Indian Police Agency.
- Rahman, M. H. A., Karim, D. N. (2022). Organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: the mediating role of work engagement. *Heliyon*, 8(5), 9450-60.
- Reid, J. (1990). The dirty laundry of ESL survey research. *Tesol Quart.* 24(2), 323-338.
- Ruhana, I., Utami, H.N., Afrianty, T., Astuti, E.S., (2020). November. 'Different Tests on 4 Types of Hospitals Related to QWL, Self Efficacy, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). *Ann Internat Conf Busi Pub Admin* . (pp. 147-151).
- Salkind, N. 2012. *Exploring research* (8th ed). New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- Schappe, P. (1998). The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behavior. *J Psych.* 132(3), 277-290.
- Schwab, D. P. (1980). Construct Validity in Organisation Behaviour', In B. M. Staw & L.Septiadi, S. A., Sintaasih, D. K., Wibawa, I. M. A. (2017). Effect of work involvement on performance by mediating Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *E-Journal of Economics and Business, Udayana University*, 6(8), 3103-3132.
- Settoon, R.P., Bennett, N., Liden, R.C., (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *J Appl Psychol.*8(3), 219-228.
- Setyawan, S. (2018). The influence of self-efficacy and empowerment on employee performance by mediating Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *J Econ Bus.* 12(24)
- Shafazawana, M. T., Ying, C. Y., Zuliawati, M. S., Kavitha, S. (2016). Managing job attitudes: The roles of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on organizational citizenship behaviors. *Procedia Econ.* 35, 604- 611.
- Shaheen, M., Gupta, R., Kumar, Y. L.N (2016). Exploring Dimensions of Teachers' OCB from Stakeholder's Perspective: A Study in India. *Qualit Rep.* 21(6), 1095-1117.
- Shanty, D., Mayangsari, S. (2019). Analysis of the Influence of Compensation, Motivation, Work Environment on Employee Performance with Organizational Citizenship Behavior as Intervening Variables. *J Inf Tax Acc Pub Fin.* 12(2), 103-120.
- Shore, L. M., Wayne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and employee behaviour: Comparison of affective commitment and continuance commitment with perceived organizational support. *J Appl Psychol.* 78(5), 774-780.
- Singh, V., Vinnicombe, S., Kumra, S., (2006). Women in formal corporate networks: an organisational citizenship perspective. *Women Manag Rev.* 21(6), 458-482.

- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *J Appl Psychol.* 68, 653–663.
- Soelton, M., Visano, N. A., Noermijati, N., Ramli, Y., Syah, T. Y. R., Sari, Y. J. (2020). The implication of job satisfaction that influence workers to practice organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in the work place. *Arc Busin Rev.* 8(5).
- Sohn, Y. W., Shin, J. (2015). Effects of employees' social comparison behaviors on distributive justice perception and job satisfaction. *Soc Behav Per Internat J.* 43(7). 1071-1083.
- Spector, P. E., Che, X. X. (2014). Re-examining Citizenship: How the Control of Measurement Artefacts Affects Observed Relationships of Organizational Citizen...Behavior and Organizational Variables. *Human Perf.* 27(2), 165-182.
- Staufenbiel, T., König, C. J. (2010). A model for the effects of job insecurity on performance, turnover intention, and absenteeism. *J Occup Psychol.* 83(1), 101-117.
- Subramani, A. K., Jain, N. A., Gaur, M., Vinodh, N. (2015). Impact of organizational climate on organizational citizenship behaviour with respect to automotive industries at ambattur industrial estate, Chennai. *I J A B E R,* 13 (8). 6391- 6408.
- Suherman, U. D. (2018). The Effect of Implementing Islamic Values and Organizational Citizenship Behavior on the Performance of Marketing Employees of Islamic Commercial Banks in West Java. *Economica. J Islam Econ.* 9(1), 51-81.
- Suresh, S., Venkatammal, P. (2010). Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *J Ind Aca App Psy.* 36 (2), 276- 286.
- Suryana, A., Zein, D., Sumartias, S., Gemiharto, I. (2019). Influence of communication strategy marketing, organizational culture, innovative and Organizational individual characteristics Citizenship Behavior on the performance of small and medium enterprises. *J Commun.* 3(2), 185-201.
- Tepper, B. J., Taylor, E. C. (2003). Relationships among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Acad Manage J.* 46(1), 97-105.
- Thompson B., Borrello GM (1985). The importance of structure coefficients in regression research. *Edu Psycho Meas.* 45: 203–09.
- Todd, S. Y., Kent, A. (2006). Direct and indirect effects of task characteristics on organisational citizenship behaviour. *N Am J Psycho.* 8(2), 253-268.
- Triyanthi, M., Subudi, M. (2018). The Influence of Organizational Communication, Leadership Transformational and Organizational Justice Against Organizational Citizenship Behavior As well as Its Impact on Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *J Univ Econ Bus.* 7, 837-868.
- Valliappan., Revathi. (2015). Organizational citizenship behavior of employees at butterfly gandhimathi appliances limited. *Int J Econ Res.* 12(2), 379-385.
- Vijayabanu, C., K. Govindarajan, and R. Renganathan (2014). Organizational citizenship behavior and job involvement of Indian private sector employees using visual PLS–SEM model. *Manag J Contemp Manag Iss.* 19(2),185-196.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., Oke, A. (2010). Servant Leadership, Procedural Justice Climate, Service Climate, Employee Attitudes, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Cross-Level Investigation. *J Appl Psychol.* 95(3), 517-529.
- Wang, X., Liao, J., Xia, D., Chang, T. (2010). The Impact of Organizational Justice on Work Performance Mediating Effects of Organizational Commitment and Leader-member Exchange. *Internat J of Man power.* 31(6), 660-677.
- Wasko, M., Faraj, S. (2005). Why should I share? Examining knowledge contribution in electronic networks of practice. *MIS Q.* 29(1),1-23.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Acad Manage Rev.* 7(3), 418-428.
- Williams, S., Pitre, R., Zainuba, M. (2002). Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Intentions: Fair Rewards Versus Fair Treatment. *J Soc Psychol.* 142(1), 33–44.