

## **Employee Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Nepal**

**Prakash Shrestha, Ph.D.**

*Faculty of Management, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal.*

**ABSTRACT:** *This paper aims to examine the relationship between employee commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. For the study purpose, the survey instruments were randomly administered to the employees' five Nepalese companies for a questionnaire survey. A total of 400 questionnaires administered, only 340 valid questionnaires (with a response rate of 85%) were returned and used. The results showed that affective and normative commitment had positive relations to both factors of organizational citizenship behavior such as altruism and compliance. The effect of employee commitment found in the present analysis in terms of organizational citizenship behavior was appealing. These findings imply for the practitioners in initiating human resources strategies to enhance affective commitment and normative commitment. Organizations can use the concept of organizational citizenship behavior and employee commitment as the tools for increasing organizational effectiveness.*

**KEYWORDS** - *Altruism, Citizenship behavior, Compliance, Employee commitment, Relations.*

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Employees are strategic resources for successful organizations. Their positive perception and behavior matter a lot in workplaces. Commitment is one of the key behavioral factors that has a positive effect on the citizenship behavior of employees at work. Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) refers to individual helping behaviors and gestures that are organizationally beneficial but are not formally rewarded (Organ, 2000). It involves discretionary behavior that helps co-workers, supervisors and the organization. Assisting newcomers into the organization, not abusing the rights of co-workers, not taking extra breaks, attending elective company meetings and enduring minor impositions that occur when working with others are examples of OCB that help in coping with various organizational uncertainties (Gautam, 2003).

Organ, Podsakoff, and MacKenzie (2006) stated OCB as "an individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that ultimately promotes the effective functioning of the organization. It is voluntarily aiding others with job-related problems. It is also called 'extra-role behaviour that has great significance at workplaces and for organizations (Tanaka, 2013).

Multidimensional delineations have identified OCB facets such as conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy, and altruism (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990; Van Dyne, Cummings & Parks, 1995; Podsakoff, Ahearne & Mackenzie, 1997).

Organ et al. (2006) mentioned OCB in terms of seven dimensions such as (a) helping: it is acting to help a specific individual, such as co-workers, superior, or customers, (b) compliance: it is contributing the work-team, unit, department, or organization, (c) sportsmanship: it is choosing not to protest unfairness or show dissatisfaction to manager and the organization, (d) civic virtue: it is readiness to participate responsibly and usefully in the political and governing processes of the organization, (e) organizational loyalty: it is showing pride in one's organization to people who are not members of that organization, (f) self-development: it is taking autonomous steps to expand skills and knowledge pertaining to one's own work, and (g) individual initiative: it involves almost all behaviors that go beyond what is necessary to resolve or avoid problems.

Some other researchers such as Williams and Anderson (1991), and Organ and Ryan (2000) divided OCB into two types. The first one is the behavior that is directed mainly at individuals in the organization (*Organizational Citizenship Behavior-Individual: OCBI*) and next one is the behavior that is concerned more with helping the organization as a whole (*Organizational Citizenship Behaviour-Organization: OCBO*). Courtesy and altruism are viewed as mainly benefiting co-workers whereas conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and civic virtue are directed at the organization (Organ & Ryan, 2000). This paper focuses on two major factors of OCB such as altruism and compliance. Altruism represents that OCB which provides aid to specific persons, e.g., direct team members, and (b) compliance pertains to more impersonal contributions to the organization as a whole (Organ & Ryan, 2000; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983).

Employee commitment is commonly known as organizational commitment. It has been identified for many years as a central construct in understanding the relationship between the employee and the employer

(Meyer & Allen, 2001; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch & Topolnytsky, 2002, Shrestha, 2016). This commitment indicates its significance in binding the individual both to the organization and to courses of action, which are relevant to the target of the commitment (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Many researchers identified the relationships between components of employee commitment and a range of discretionary and extra-role behaviors (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001) including attendance (Somers & Burnbaum, 1998), performance (Cropanzano, James & Konovsky, 1993) and organizational citizenship behavior (Organ & Ryan, 2000).

As used in this paper, the term employee commitment is a psychological state that categorizes the employee's relationship with the organization. It is understood as a commitment to the entire organization. There are three components of commitment, each of which ties the employees to their organization but the nature of the 'psychological-bonding' is different (Gautam, 2003). The first one is the affective commitment (AC). It ties people through their emotional attachment, involvement, and identification with the organization. The 'affectively' committed employee stays because they want to. Next is continuance commitment (CC). It depends on an employee's awareness of the costs of leaving the organization – people stay because of the cost of losses associated with leaving the organization. The third one is normative commitment (NC). It rests on employees' obligatory feelings towards co-workers or management – people stay because they feel an obligation to do so (Meyer & Allen, 2001). Each component might have different antecedents and, while all lead to a reduced intention to leave the organization, result in different outcomes for employees' discretionary extra-role behavior (Gautam, Van Dick & Wagner, 2001).

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is one example of discretionary behavior. It is taken to be a positive outcome of a committed workforce, characterized by voluntary extra-role contributions of employees that are not recognized by the formal organizational reward system (Organ & Ryan, 1999). This paper focuses on the relationship between OCB and employee commitment as a form of discretionary extra-role behavior. Connections between employee commitment and OCB at the individual level may result because positive attitudes about the job or the organization tend to predispose people toward extra-role behavior (Koberg, Boss, Bursten & Goodman, 2003). Also, high levels of commitment can create equity pressures that motivate individuals to provide non-required helping behaviors as repayment for the fulfilment and belongingness they draw from their work (Moorman & Blakely, 2006). One research shows that affective commitment is among the affective work reactions that have been offered most often as antecedents to affiliate/promotive extra-role (Meyer & Allen, 2001). Studies have also found employee commitment to be associated with several OCB facets (Chen, Hui & Sego, 1998). For example, when defined as a psychological identification with the organization and its values, employee commitment has also displayed links with OCB. DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) found positive relationships between affective commitment and several OCB dimensions. Therefore, in this paper OCB is taken as the positive outcome of committed employees. Thus, the present paper is directed to replicate two factorial citizenship behavior (in terms of *altruism and compliance*) and to find their linkage to the three-component organizational commitment (in terms of affective, continuance and normative commitment) in selected organizations of Nepal.

## **II. RESEARCH HYPOTHESES**

Based on the literature review and above discussions, the following hypotheses have been developed and tested:

- H1: Affective, continuance and normative commitment have a positive and significant relationship with altruism.
- H2: Affective, continuance and normative commitment have a positive and significant relationship with compliance.

## **III. RESEARCH METHODS**

A field-study research design was followed for the study. Participants and data collection instruments tools used for the study are discussed below:

### **Participants**

For the study purpose, the survey instruments were randomly administered to the employees' five leading Nepalese companies (namely Nepal Bank Limited, Rastriya Banijya Bank Limited, Agriculture Development Bank Limited, Nepal Telecom, and Nepal Television) for questionnaire survey. These companies were selected by purposive sampling technique to make a heterogeneous sample. A total of 400 questionnaires administered, only 340 valid questionnaires (with a response rate of 85%) were returned and used. The profile of the respondents is presented in the following table (1):

Table 1: Profile of the Respondents (N =340)

Demographic Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	214	63
	Female	126	37
Marital Status	Married	185	54
	Single	155	46
Job Level	Supervisory levels	149	44
	Subordinate level	191	56
Education Level	Master and above	168	49
	Graduate level	172	51

### Data Collection Instruments

Present study uses primary data that was collected through a questionnaire survey. The questionnaires consisting of six items in each employee commitment component (affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment) developed by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) were used to examine three-component employee commitment. Two-factors of OCB such as altruism and compliance were measured with the scales developed by Smith et al. (1983). Data were generated using a six-point Likert-type scale anchored by “strongly disagree” = ‘1’ to “strongly agree” = ‘6’.

## IV. EMPIRICAL RESULTS AND FINDINGS

The following sections present empirical results and findings that were obtained from the survey.

### Descriptive Statistics

The basic descriptive statistics of the variables are presented in table (2) that includes scale means and standard deviations. This section also presents Pearson correlations and internal consistencies (Cronbach alpha) for each scale.

Table 2: Scale Means, Standard Deviations, Pearson Correlations, and Cronbach Alpha

Scales	M	SD	Cronbach Alpha	Altruism	Compliance
Altruism	5.23	0.73	0.85		
Compliance	5.78	0.64	0.82	0.34**	
Affective Commitment	5.35	0.78	0.86	0.39**	0.24**
Continuance Commitment	3.68	0.79	0.87	-0.09	-0.14
Normative Commitment	4.86	0.97	0.93	0.35*	0.24**
Note: ** $p < 0.01$ . * $p < 0.05$					

The results show that the Cronbach's alpha of altruism, compliance, affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment are 0.85, 0.82, 0.86, 0.87 and 0.93 respectively. Hence, the reliabilities of the instruments seem sufficient in terms of Cronbach's alpha. The data set shows high reliability. The descriptive statistics show that employee commitment and OCB (in terms of altruism and compliance) are stable and high in the Nepalese context. Pearson correlation coefficients show that both OCB scales (altruism and compliance) are inter-correlated and show significant positive relationships with affective and normative commitment scales but fail to show any significant relationship with continuance commitment.

### Employee Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

In this section, we use a regression model to analyze the impact of employee commitment on organizational citizenship behavior. The following Table (3) and table (4) present the results of the regression analysis.

**Table 3: Regression Result of Employee Commitment and OCB (Altruism)**

Model I	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
(Constant)	19.69	1.441	14.37	0.00
Affective Commitment	0.19*	0.113	3.34	0.02*
Continuance Commitment	-0.07	0.127	3.56	0.21
Normative Commitment	0.31*	0.062	6.56	0.01**
<b>R<sup>2</sup> = 0.349, Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = 0.339, F-Value = 35.6</b>				
<b>Note: **p&lt;0.01. *p&lt;0.05</b>				

Table (3) shows the regression analysis results of OCB (in terms of altruism) based on employee commitment dimensions. In model I, both affective commitment and normative commitment have a significantly positive impact on altruism. But continuance commitment has no significant impact on it. Hence, H1 is partially accepted.

**Table 4: Regression Result of Employee Commitment and OCB (Compliance)**

Model II	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
(Constant)	12.02	1.158	10.305	0.00
Affective Commitment	0.15*	0.091	-0.598	0.03*
Continuance Commitment	-0.14*	0.102	0.217	0.14
Normative Commitment	0.21*	0.05	7.646	0.00**
<b>R<sup>2</sup> = 0.457, Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = 0.449, F-Value = 53.39</b>				
<b>Note: **p&lt;0.01. *p&lt;0.05</b>				

Table (4) shows the regression analysis results of OCB (in terms of compliance) based on employee commitment dimensions. In model II, both affective commitment and normative commitment have a significantly positive impact on compliance. But continuance commitment has no significant impact on it. Hence, H2 is partially accepted.

## V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This paper proposes organizational citizenship behavior as a positive outcome of employee commitment. It also assumes there are positive relationships between OCB dimensions (particularly, altruism and compliance) and employee commitment dimensions (particularly, affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment). Even though the concepts of organizational citizenship behavior and employee commitment (i.e. organizational commitment) were developed in Western culture, but these concepts are found equally applicable in a very different socio-cultural context of Nepal. The results of present study show both affective and normative commitment have positive relations to two key elements of organizational citizenship behavior (i.e. altruism and compliance). However, continuance commitment shows a negative relation to altruism and compliance.

Both affective commitment and normative commitment show a relatively stronger linkage to altruism than to compliance. Hence, the conclusion can be made that attitudinally and normatively committed people to engage in certain types of citizenship behaviors whereas people having continuance commitment show less interest in OCB. The finding supports the theoretical assumption of Smith et al. (1983) about the distinctiveness between helping behavior to other employees (altruism) and following organizational norms or rules (compliance) of OCB. This findings seem to be consistent with the findings of Gautam (2003) concluded that affective commitment and normative commitment were found positively and continuance commitment negatively connected or unrelated to OCB.

As one of the key dimensions of employee commitment, an affective commitment binds employees with their organization. With this commitment, they like or love their organization and they put more efforts on behalf of the organization. Affectively committed employees always display sustaining behavior with other coworkers voluntarily because this commitment is grounded in their desire or willingness rather than on an exchange-based relationship with their organization. This result seems to be consistent with the findings of Gautam (2003) and Chen, Hui & Sego (2004). Likewise, another key dimension of employee commitment, normative commitment is a psychological condition where employees find themselves obliged to continue their membership in organization because of some kind of social, cultural, or contextual norms. In his study, Gautam (2003) concluded that employees can be expected to perform some extra-role behavior to fulfill their obligation or to show their gratefulness towards their respective leaders or peers. So, it can be concluded that normatively committed employees show strong altruism behavior. They are grateful towards the organization and therefore also engage in compliance behavior to some extent.

As a key dimension of employee commitment, continuance commitment ties employees with their organization because of their living cost awareness. People who hold continuance commitment are more interested in their benefits rather than supporting peers because of the exchange-based relationship with their organization. They want to get more from their organization by maintaining their position in the organization. They may also be skeptical of following company rules and norms. It is, therefore, continuance commitment can be linked negatively to compliance. This result also seems to be consistent with the findings of Gautam (2003) and Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994). Hence, the effect of employee commitment to the organization found in the present analysis in terms of organizational citizenship behavior is appealing. These findings imply for the practitioners in initiating human resource strategies to enhance affective commitment and normative commitment. Organizations can use the concept of employee commitment and organizational citizenship behavior as important tools for increasing organizational effectiveness.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Chen, X. P., Hui, C., & Sego, D. J. (1998). The role of organizational citizenship behavior in turnover: Conceptualization and preliminary tests of key hypotheses. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(1), 922–931.
- [2]. Cropanzano, R., James, K., & Konovsky, M. A. (1993). Dispositional affectivity as a predictor of work attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 595-606.
- [3]. DiPaola, M., Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relationship to school climate. *Journal of School Leadership*, 11(5), 424-447.
- [4]. Gautam, T. (2003). *Organizational commitment in Nepal*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis submitted to Faculty of Management, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- [5]. Gautam, T., Van Dick, R., & Wagner, U. (2001). Organizational commitment in Nepalese setting. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 4 (1), 239-248.
- [6]. Koberg, C., Boss, R., Bursten, R., & Goodman, E. (2003). Getting more than you bargained for: Empirical evidence of organizational citizenship behavior from the health care industry? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Chicago.
- [7]. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N.J. (2001). *Commitment in work place: Theory, research and application*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- [8]. Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11(1), 299-326.
- [9]. Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(1), 538-551.
- [10]. Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnysky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20-52.
- [11]. Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (2006). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(2), 127-142.
- [12]. Organ, A. (2000). *Organizational Behavior*, 3rd ed. New York: MacGraw Hill.
- [13]. Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (2000). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personal Psychology*, 48(1), 775-802.
- [14]. Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. USA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- [15]. Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M. & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship and the quantity and
- [16]. 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. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(1): 107–142.
- [17]. Shrestha, P. (2016). *Organizational justice and employee work outcomes in service sector of Nepal*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Management, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- [18]. Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(1), 653-663.
- [19]. Somers, M. J., & Burnbaum, D. (1998). Work-related commitment and job performance: It's also the nature of the performance that counts. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 19(1), 621-634.
- [20]. Tanaka, K. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior in contemporary workplaces in Japan. *Japan Labor Review*, 10(3), 5-18.
- [21]. Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & Parks, J. M. (1995). *Extra-roles behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (A bridge over muddied waters)*. Research in Organizational Behavior, 17(1), 215-285.
- [22]. Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation*. Academy of Management Journal, 37(1), 765-802.
- [23]. Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 601–617.

**Prakash Shrestha, Ph.D.**

**Faculty of Management, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal.**