

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242349551>

Comparing correlates of organizational citizenship versus in-role behavior of sales representatives in India

Article in *International Journal of Commerce and Management* · February 2006

DOI: 10.1108/10569210680000204

CITATIONS

32

READS

318

4 authors, including:



Unnikammu Moideenkutty
Sultan Qaboos University

9 PUBLICATIONS 230 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Gary Blau
Temple University

158 PUBLICATIONS 6,434 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Ravi Kumar R
Indian Institute of Management Bangalore

4 PUBLICATIONS 114 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

COMPARING CORRELATES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP VERSUS IN-ROLE BEHAVIOR OF SALES REPRESENTATIVES IN INDIA

Unnikammu Moideenkutty
Gary Blau
Ravi Kumar
Ahamdali Nalakath

ABSTRACT

Using a sample of 103 Indian supervisor-pharmaceutical sales representative dyads, this study hypothesized that procedural justice, distributive justice, perceived organizational support, and communication satisfaction with supervisor would have a stronger positive relationship to organizational citizenship behavior than to in-role behavior. Supportive result was found for one variable, i.e., communication satisfaction with supervisor had a stronger relationship to organizational citizenship behavior.

INTRODUCTION

Organ defined Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) as 'behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization' (Organ, 1988, 4). Researchers (Katz, 1964; Organ, 1990; Organ, 1997) have suggested that the motivational basis of extra-role contributions (including OCB) may be different from those of In-Role Behavior (IRB) or "behavior that is required or expected as part of performing the duties and responsibilities of an assigned work role" (Barksdale & Werner, 2001, 146). The purpose of this study was to use Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) and Norm Reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960) as frameworks to examine the differential relationships of selected correlates of OCB to IRB.

The correlates of OCB selected were procedural and distributive justice (Greenberg, 1987, 1990), Perceived Organizational Support (POS; Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986), and communication satisfaction with supervisor (Putti, Aryee, & Phua, 1990). Much of OCB research has focused on identifying the antecedents of OCB (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Relatively less attention has been paid to testing the differential relationships of these variables to OCB and IRB.

This study is also unique with respect to its sample. The sample consists of pharmaceutical sales representatives from India. Although OCB related studies have been done in Australia, Japan, and Hong Kong (Lam, Hui, & Law, 1999), People's Republic of China (Chen, Hui, and Segó, 1998), Singapore (Van Dyne & Ang, 1998), and Taiwan (Farh, Podsakoff,

& Organ, 1990), very little published OCB research has been done on Indian samples. The above studies have in general supported the social exchange theory and norm of reciprocity frameworks that underlie much of the OCB research in the USA. This is interesting because some of these countries are quite different from USA on Hofstede's (1993, 2001) cultural dimensions. This seems to indicate that meta-theories like social exchange theory and norm of reciprocity and hypotheses based on these theoretical frameworks have applications across diverse cultures. Based on Hostede's framework, there are both cultural similarities and differences between India and the USA. Both India and the USA have similar levels of masculinity and uncertainty avoidance. However, the countries are quite different in levels of power distance and individualism. Supportive findings for the study hypotheses will provide further evidence for the cross-cultural generalizability of OCB research based on social exchange theory and norm of reciprocity frameworks.

MOTIVATIONAL BASIS OF OCB

Katz (1964) argued that factors that will promote IRB would be different from those that would promote beyond role contributions. He suggested that IRB would be related to instrumental individual rewards, while beyond role contributions would be related to internalization of organizational goals and values. Organ (1990) argued that OCB is maintained in organizations by fairness in social exchange relationships. Later, Organ suggested that, in general, OCB would be related to "attitudes indicative of, or derived from a general state of morale in the workplace" (Organ, 1997, 94).

Empirical findings also indicate that correlates of OCB may have differential relationships with IRB. Mackenzie, Podsakoff, and Ahearne (1998) found that job satisfaction and organizational commitment were antecedents of OCB, but not of IRB. Williams and Anderson (1991) found that intrinsic and extrinsic job cognitions (components of job satisfaction) were related to OCB, but not to IRB. More recently, Welbourne, Johnson, & Erez (1998) found that gainsharing satisfaction was differentially related to different dimensions of role-based behavior. Specifically, they found that there were no significant correlations between job-role behaviors and gainsharing satisfaction. Significant correlations were seen between behavior in the career, innovator, and organization roles on the one hand, and gainsharing satisfaction on the other. Job role behavior is similar to IRB. Behavior in the other roles is similar to OCB. Thus, there are conceptual and empirical rationales for arguing that the correlates of OCB will relate differentially to IRB.

THE SOCIAL EXCHANGE FRAMEWORK

Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) has been the primary framework for understanding OCB (Konovsky, & Pugh, 1994; Lambert, 2000; Organ, 1988; Organ, 1990; Smith et al., 1983). Many social associations, including the relationships that develop at work, can be considered as exchange relationships (Blau, 1964). According to Blau (1964), exchange relationships can be broadly categorized as either economic or social. In economic exchange the terms of exchange are clearly specified, usually through a formal contract. In social exchange, while there is an expectation that some return will be made in the future for any favor rendered, the exact nature

and timing of the return is not stipulated in advance. Rather, it is left to the discretion of the one who makes it. Social exchange thus leads to the development of feelings of personal obligation, gratitude and trust. Employees are more likely to engage in OCB when employment relationships become social exchanges rather than economic exchanges (Organ, 1988, 1990). Thus, variables that promote a social exchange relationship in organizations will have a positive relationship to OCB.

However, variables that promote social exchange relationships may be only weakly related to IRB. This is because, while OCB is discretionary and can be altered in response to attitudes, IRB depends on many situational factors such as training, experience, and availability of materials, apart from effort (Organ, 1977). Thus, employees may have little latitude to change IRB. In addition, changing IRB may be risky for the employee (Organ, 1988). Recent research indicates that the relationship between procedural justice and OCB is stronger when employees define OCB as extra-role behavior (Tepper, Lockhart, & Hoobler, 2001).

Another reason why employees may engage in OCB in social exchange relationships is the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960). The norm of reciprocity enjoins on the recipient of a favor, the obligation to return the favor. However, according to Foa and Foa (1980), social resources differ in the ease and difficulty with which they can be exchanged. Foa and Foa establish a resource configuration representing the relative likelihood that specific resources might be exchanged. They propose that resources that are adjacent to each other in their configuration are more likely to be exchanged. According to Moorman (1991), specific acts of OCB belong to information resources or service resources. In the resource configuration of Foa and Foa, status and love are adjacent to information and services and are more likely to be exchanged in social exchange relationships. In organizational contexts, status and love are represented by variables that promote social exchange relationships. Therefore, OCB is a reasonable and likely way in which an employee can reciprocate good and fair treatment by the organization and supervisor (Tepper, Lockhart, & Hoobler, 2001; Moorman, 1991).

VARIABLES THAT PROMOTE SOCIAL EXCHANGE RELATIONSHIP

In OCB literature, a number of variables have been identified as those that promote social exchange relationship in organizations and therefore as correlates of OCB. These include, procedural and distributive justice (Organ & Ryan, 1995), POS (Cropanzano & Prehar, 1999; Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000; Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997), organizational commitment (Organ & Ryan), job satisfaction (Organ & Ryan), leader-member exchange (LMX: Cropanzano & Prehar, 1999; Masterson et al., 2000; Settoon et al.; Wayne et al.), supervisory trust (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994), and co-worker satisfaction and team-member exchange (Moideenkutty, 2000). In this study, we examine the differential relationship of distributive justice, procedural justice, POS, and communication satisfaction with supervisor to OCB and IRB. We chose these variables because, distributive justice, procedural justice, and POS promote social exchange relationship with the organization, while communication satisfaction with supervisor promotes social exchange relationship with the supervisor. The organization as a whole, and the supervisor are the two main foci for social exchange relationships at work (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000; Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996; Wayne, Shore & Liden, 1997).

Procedural justice focuses on organizational processes, the fairness of the means used to achieve ends. Distributive justice focuses on the content, the fairness of the ends achieved (Greenberg, 1987; Greenberg 1990). When employees perceive that they are being treated fairly by the organization, they will tend to define their relationship with the organization as a social exchange (Organ, 1988; Moorman, 1991; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). As a result, employees will reciprocate fair treatment by the organization by engaging in discretionary behaviors like OCB. A number of studies have looked at the relationship between justice and OCB (Bies, Martin, & Brockner, 1993; Bennett, Lockhart, & Hoobler, 2001; Konovsky, & Pugh, 1994; Moorman, 1991; Moorman, Niehoff, & Organ, 1993; Organ & Ryan, 1995). Generally, these studies have found a positive relationship between both types of fairness perceptions, distributive and procedural justice, and OCB.

Perceived Organizational Support (POS) refers to the perception of employees that the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Shore, & Tetrick, 1991). Eisenberger et al. (1986) suggest that, in order to meet the needs for praise and approval, and to determine the organization's readiness to reward greater effort to meet organizational goals, employees form global beliefs about the organization's commitment to them. Such beliefs form the basis for POS, which will in turn increase employees' affective commitment to the organization and the expectancy that greater work effort will be rewarded. Affective commitment implies identification with, involvement in, and emotional attachment to the organization (Allen, & Meyer, 1996). Further, the belief that greater efforts will lead to rewards will help to establish trust in the long-term fairness of the organization to recompense positive, discretionary behaviors (Eisenberger et al., 1990). Thus, it appears that POS will promote the definition of the employment relationship in terms of social exchange, leading to feelings of obligation on the part of employees to reciprocate by engaging OCB. A number of studies have looked at the relationship between POS and OCB (Eisenberger et al., 1990; Lambert, 2000; Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998; Settoon et al., 1996; Wayne et al., 1997). In general, these studies indicate empirical support for a positive relationship between POS and OCB.

A number of studies have found a positive relationship between LMX and OCB (Wayne et al., 1997; Settoon et al., 1996) and supervisory trust and OCB (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Moideenkutty, 2000). The rationale for these studies is that the quality of the relationship between supervisors and employees will promote the definition of the employment relationship as a social exchange. Apart from that of LMX and supervisory trust, there is relatively less research regarding the relationship of other measures of supervisor-employee relationship quality and OCB. In this study, communication satisfaction with supervisor (Putti et al., 1990) was used as the measure of the quality of supervisor-employee relationship. Communication satisfaction with supervisor refers to the extent to which information available through the supervisor fulfills the individual's need for being informed about organizational activities (Putti et al., 1990). Communication satisfaction is not the result of simply being informed about task role requirements. It results from honest and sensitive communication by the supervisor. While the former may enhance in-role performance, the latter is indicative of the quality of supervisor-employee relationship. Generalizing from the findings regarding the relationship between LMX and OCB, and supervisory trust and OCB, it is reasonable to expect a positive relationship between communication satisfaction with supervisor and OCB.

Thus, there is theoretical rationale and empirical support for a positive relationship between procedural justice, distributive justice, POS, and communication satisfaction with supervisor on the one hand and OCB on the other. There is also theoretical rationale for arguing that these variables will have a stronger relationship to OCB than to in-role behavior. Therefore it can be hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 1a: Procedural justice will have a stronger positive relationship to OCB than to IRB.

Hypothesis 1b: Distributive justice will have a stronger positive relationship to OCB than to IRB.

Hypothesis 1c: POS will have a stronger positive relationship to OCB than to IRB.

Hypothesis 1d: Communication satisfaction with supervisor will have a stronger positive relationship to OCB than to IRB.

METHODS

Sample

The sample for this study consisted of sales representatives from the Indian subsidiary of a multinational pharmaceutical company and their supervisors. The sales representatives were based in different parts of India and surveys measuring the independent variables (procedural justice, distributive justice, perceived organizational support, and communication satisfaction with supervisor) were mailed to individual representatives from the Human Resources department of the company. Respondents were given the option to identify themselves on the survey. Of the 385 surveys mailed, 185 were returned for a response rate of 48 percent. One hundred and seven respondents (27.8%) identified themselves on the survey. Approximately six months later, surveys measuring the dependent variables (IRB and OCB) were mailed to the supervisors of these representatives. All of these surveys were returned, however due to missing data only 103 matched dyads could be used in the analysis. Of the 107 respondents, 97.2 percent were males and 68.2 percent were married. Almost two thirds of the respondents, (63.6%), had worked for the company for at least five years. More than 70 percent of the respondents were less than 36 years old. All respondents had a bachelor's degree and 10.5 percent had graduate degrees. Demographic data were not collected from the supervisory sample.

Measures: Demographic variables

The demographic variables measured were age, tenure, marital status, educational level, and number of individuals supported by the respondent including him/herself.

Procedural justice

Procedural justice was measured with 7 items from the 10-item scale reported in Moorman (1991) and Niehoff and Moorman (1993). This scale contains items indicating judgments about decisions made about the respondent's job in general, by the manager or representatives of the company. The items refer to both fair procedures in the workplace (5 items in the original scale, e.g. "When decisions are made about your job in general, your manager and / or representative of your company: Allow employees to challenge or appeal decisions") and the degree to which procedures are applied fairly by organizational representatives (5 items in the original scale, e.g. "When decisions are made about your job in general, your manager and / or

representative of your company: Treat you with respect and dignity"). Reliabilities ranging from .85 to .98 have been reported for the full scale (Moorman; Niehoff & Moorman). Three items measuring fairness of procedures were dropped at the insistence of the company in order to shorten the length of the survey. The reliability (Cronbach's alpha) for the 7-item scale used in this study was 0.87 in this study. The responses for this scale were never true (1) to always true (7).

Distributive Justice

Distributive Justice was measured with 4 items from the 6-item Distributive Justice Index developed by Price and Mueller (1986). This scale measures the degree to which employees perceive rewards received by them to be related to their contributions. Each item refers to the degree to which each respondent believes he or she is rewarded fairly in relation to his or her education, experience, and so on (e.g. "Please indicate the extent to which you feel fairly rewarded by your organization: Considering the responsibilities that you have?"). Two items were dropped from the survey at the insistence of the company. Moorman (1991) reports reliability of 0.94 for the full scale. In this study, the 4-item scale had a reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of 0.91. The responses to this scale ranged from extremely unfair (1) to extremely fair (7).

Communication satisfaction with supervisor

Communication satisfaction with supervisor was measured with 4 items from the Organization Communication Relationship scale reported in Putti et al. (1990). This scale measures communication satisfaction with co-workers, immediate supervisor, and top management, and organizational influence. Only 4 out of 9 items measuring communication satisfaction with immediate supervisor were used in this study (e.g. "I can tell my immediate supervisor when things are wrong"). Though 6 items with the highest factor loadings were included in the draft survey, 2 items were dropped at the insistence of the company. Putti et al. report reliability of 0.90 for the composite scale. The reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of the 4-item scale used in this study was 0.91. Responses ranged from disagree strongly (1) to agree strongly (7).

POS.

Perceived organizational support was measured with 3 items from the short version of the scale developed by Eisenberger and colleagues (1986). Only 3 items (e. g. "The organization really cares about my well being") could be used to measure this construct due to the limitations on the length of the survey. The short version of the original scale has 17 items. Eisenberger et al. report reliability of 0.93 for this version of the scale. The 3-item scale used in this study had a reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of 0.80. The responses for this scale ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7)

IRB

We intended to measure in-role behavior with the 5, positively worded items (e.g. "Meets formal performance requirements of the job"), from the 7-item in-role behavior scale developed by Williams and Anderson (1991). These items describe behaviors that are formally evaluated and rewarded in organizations. Williams and Anderson report reliability of 0.91 for their 7-item scale. We obtained reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of 0.82 for the 5-item scale. However, substantial improvement in reliability was possible by deleting one item ("Engages in activities

that will directly affect his/her performance evaluation”) from the scale. When this item was deleted the reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) increased to 0.92. We decided to drop this item from the scale and the analysis was conducted with the 4-item scale. The responses for this scale ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7).

OCB

We measured OCB using the sportsmanship and civic virtue dimensions of the OCB scale developed by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990). We used 4 items (e.g. “Consumes a lot of time complaining about trivial matters”) to measure sportsmanship, and 4 items (e.g. “Attends functions that are not required, but helps the company”) to measure civic virtue. We chose these two dimensions because our employee sample consisted of field sales representatives who work independently and are not in day-to-day contact with their supervisors or with each other. Because the employees are not in contact with each other, there is very little opportunity for helping each other or being courteous to each other. We did not use the conscientiousness items because these items measure performance of in-role behaviors well beyond the minimum requirements (Organ, 1988) and could be confounded with the measure of in-role performance. Podsakoff, Ahearne, and MacKenzie (1997) argue that managers have difficulty recognizing some of these fine distinctions of work behavior. Sportsmanship consists of behavior demonstrating tolerance of less than ideal conditions at work without complaining. Civic virtue consists of responsible participation in the affairs of the organization. In the case of our employee sample, the supervisors are most likely to have accurate information about these dimensions of OCB. This is because, first-line supervisors are the usual recipients of employee ‘gripes’ and they can easily observe employee participation in organizational affairs. We combined these two measures into a composite measure of OCB because we were testing for differential relationships with in-role behavior. The reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) of the 8-item organizational citizenship behavior scale used in this study was .83. The responses for the OCB scale ranged from disagree strongly (1) to agree strongly (7).

Analysis

First the items forming the independent variables were subjected to principal components factor analysis with orthogonal rotation. Then, the study hypotheses were tested as follows: first, the correlations between the independent variables and organizational citizenship behavior and in-role behavior were calculated, then, the significance of the difference between the respective correlations was tested with Hotelling’s t-test. Hotelling’s t is a t distribution with $df = N - 3$ (Walker & Lev, 1953). Hotelling’s t is the standard test statistic for comparing two correlation coefficients that are not independent (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991).

Results

Factor analysis of the 18 items constituting the 4 independent variables results in four factors with eigenvalues above 1. In general, the items loaded as expected on the four factors. The four factors together explained 68.018 percent of the variance in the items. Descriptive statistics, correlations, and reliabilities of the variables used in the study are shown in table 1. Though the correlations of POS and distributive justice with both OCB and in-role behavior were in the expected direction, they were not significant. Hence, Hotelling’s t-tests were not done in these cases. The Hotelling’s t for the significance of the difference between correlations for

communication satisfaction with supervisor was 2.245 ($p = 0.013$). In the case of procedural justice it was 1.547 ($p = 0.06$).

In general, when several significance tests are computed, some of them can become significant by chance. In such cases, the Bonferroni procedure can be used to guard against capitalizing on chance (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991). This procedure involves dividing the alpha level selected (0.05 in this case) by the number of explicit or implicit significance tests performed. It makes no difference whether the tests performed are independent or not. However, the Bonferroni procedure does not require that the same alpha level must be set for each test and the total alpha (0.05) can be allocated unequally. In other words, the tests can be weighted based on their importance. In this case, since only the correlation for communication satisfaction with supervisor and procedural justice was significant, the alphas for these two tests were set at 0.02 and the alphas for the remaining two (implicit) tests were set at $[0.05 - 2(0.02)]/2 = 0.005$. Using the adjusted alpha level of .02 instead of the conventional .05 level, provides a more conservative test of the hypotheses.

TABLE 1
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Variables	N	Means	S.D	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Procedural Justice	103	4.66	1.15	(0.87)					
2. Distributive Justice	107	4.93	1.44	0.46**	(0.91)				
3. Perceived Organizational Support	107	5.25	1.10	0.65**	0.60**	(0.80)			
4. Supervisory Communication Satisfaction	107	5.66	1.19	0.64**	0.42**	0.62**	(0.91)		
5. In-Role Behavior	104	5.44	1.16	0.07	0.08	-0.06	0.03	(0.92)	
6. Organizational Citizenship Behavior	104	4.78	0.95	0.21*	0.11	0.11	0.23*	0.57**	(0.83)

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.

Reliabilities are on the diagonal in parentheses.

NA: Not Applicable.

The response categories for age were: 1=21-25 years, 2=26-30 years, 3=31-35 years, 4=36-40 years, 5=41-50 years, and 6=51 years or more.

Means and standard deviations of Procedural Justice, Distributive Justice, Supervisory Communication Satisfaction, Perceived Organizational Support, In-Role Behavior and Organizational Citizenship Behavior have been transformed to a 7-point scale.

Based on the adjusted alpha level (0.02), the results provide support for the hypothesis in the case of communication satisfaction with supervisor ($p = 0.013$). The ensemble adjusted p value (adjusted for the number of t tests and their weights) in this case (based on the formula provided by Rosenthal and Rubin (1983)) was 0.028. This is less than the alpha level of 0.05. The corresponding ensemble adjusted p value for procedural justice was 0.13.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to test the differential relationship of procedural justice, distributive justice, POS, and communication satisfaction with supervisor to OCB and IRB. It was hypothesized that these variables would have a stronger positive relationship to OCB than to IRB. The results provided partial support for the hypotheses. Communication satisfaction with supervisor had a stronger positive relationship to OCB than to IRB as predicted. Application of the Bonferroni procedure indicated that this was a robust finding. This result supports the findings of earlier studies that showed a stronger relationship of measures of satisfaction to OCB than to IRB (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Ahearne, 1998; Welbourne, Johnson, & Erez, 1998; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Results in the case of procedural justice, distributive justice and POS were in the expected direction but not significant.

The results of the current study indicate that OCB and IRB may have different motivational underpinnings. Communication satisfaction with supervisor, a variable that promotes social exchange relationship with the supervisor, appears to explain OCB better than IRB. It remains to be seen if economic exchange variables will explain IRB better than they explain OCB. Instrumental individual reward is an economic exchange variable that could be expected to correlate more strongly with IRB than with OCB. Other variables that could have a stronger relationship to IRB than to OCB include, role clarity (Blau, 1993), experience (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994), and ability (Arvey, 1972). Future studies could include both variables that are expected to correlate more strongly with OCB and variables that are expected to correlate more strongly with IRB to provide a stronger test of the differential relationships. Future research could also focus on testing the differential relationship of other correlates of OCB like supervisory trust and LMX to IRB. While researchers are now attempting to identify the differential correlates of different dimensions of OCB (Cropanzano, & Prehar, 1999; Masterson et al., 2000; Moideenkutty, 2000; Settoon et al., 1996), very little research has compared the differential correlates of OCB versus IRB. By doing so, this study contributes to OCB research.

Another important contribution of this study is the use of an Indian sample. Supportive results for communication satisfaction with supervisor indicates that meta-frameworks like social exchange theory and norm of reciprocity can be used to derive theoretical propositions that maybe applicable across diverse cultures. Further, it appears that, similar to the results obtained with American samples (Moorman, 1991), the quality of interaction with the supervisor is a potent source of influence on OCB in India. This finding is especially meaningful because of the nature of the sample. Pharmaceutical sales representatives work independently, promoting sales in their territories on their own. They have very little day-to-day contact with their supervisors. It is not surprising therefore, that the quality of the interaction with the supervisor is so important.

The primary methodological strength of this study is that the independent and dependent variables were measured from different sources and at different points in time. Perceptual and attitudinal variables were measured from the employees. Approximately six months later, their supervisors rated their OCB and in-role behavior. This method effectively addresses a frequent alternate explanation for correlational studies, namely, common method variance (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). Since the data on dependent variables were collected approximately six months after the data on independent variables, this can be considered as a predictive study and the results for communication satisfaction with supervisor suggests a causal relationship.

Though procedural justice did not show a significantly stronger positive relationship to OCB than to IRB, its relationship to OCB was positive and significant. However, contrary to expectations, distributive justice and POS did not show a significant positive relationship to OCB. Though in general fairness perceptions are related to OCB (Organ & Ryan, 1995), Moorman (1991) suggests that distributive justice evokes positive attitudes towards specific outcomes while procedural justice leads to positive evaluation of the organization. According to Organ (1997), the decision to behave as an organizational citizen is the result of a general positive evaluation of the organization. Thus, procedural justice is more likely to have a positive relationship to OCB than distributive justice. The lack of a positive relationship between POS and OCB is more difficult to explain. It may have been due to the weak operationalization of the POS construct in this study. We used only three items to measure POS due to space constraints. The three items may not have sufficiently captured the content domain of the construct, resulting in attenuation of the relationship.

It was argued that the weak relationship of social exchange variables to IRB maybe due to the fact that employees have little discretion to vary IRB. However, since task discretion was not measured in this study, it is not clear to what extent the subjects had the discretion to vary IRB. This is a limitation of this study and future research must include a measure of task discretion to clarify this issue. Another limitation of the study is that the sample consisted of pharmaceutical sales representatives. Since these employees worked independently, the differential relationship of social exchange variables to broader array of citizenship behaviors (e.g. altruism and courtesy) could not be tested. Future research may test these relationships in other organizations across different occupations. In this study, the correlation between IRB and OCB (0.57, $p < .01$) though high, was well within the ranges found in other studies (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998; Williams & Anderson, 1991).

A possible area of concern in studies such as this is regarding the problems associated with the use of instruments developed in the US with samples from other cultures. Fortunately, the present sample consists of pharmaceutical sales representatives who have to interact constantly with doctors. They are therefore well educated and fluent in English. Because of this we believe that problems associated with the use of the instrument are minimal.

CONCLUSION

The results of this study have practical implications. The results indicate that OCB is related to variables that promote social exchange relationship. If managers want to promote OCB, they must focus on such variables. On the other hand, as suggested by Katz (1964), managers may have to focus on instrumental individual rewards to encourage IRB.

Due to the competitive nature of the work and rewards based on individual performance, pharmaceutical sales is an area that is rife with potential for unethical practices. High quality interactions with supervisors can lead to increased trust (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). When there is increased trust, employees are more likely to share concerns about unethical practices with their supervisors. Such sharing may lead to clarification of ethical issues and the promotion of ethical behavior. This is important in the context of the current increased concern about unethical behavior in organizations.

REFERENCES

- Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49, 252-276.
- Arvey, R. (1972). Task performance as a function of perceived effort-performance and performance-reward contingencies. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 8, 423-433.
- Barksdale, K. & Werner, J. M. (2001). Managerial ratings of in-role behaviors, organizational citizenship behaviors, and overall performance: Testing different models of their relationship. *Journal of Business Research*, 51, 145-155.
- Bateman, T. S. & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employees citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587-595.
- Bennett, J. T., Lockhart, D., Hoobler, J. (2001). Justice, citizenship, and role definition effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (4), 789-796.
- Bies, R. J., Martin, C. I., & Brockner, J. (1993). Just laid off, but still a good citizen? Only if the process is fair. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6, 227-238.
- Blau, G. (1993). Operationalizing direction and level of effort and testing their relationships to individual job performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 55, 152-170.
- Blau, P.M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- 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 (6), 922-931.
- Cropanzano, R. & Prehar, C. A. (1998). *Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-La Mastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 51-59.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500-507.
- Farh, J. L., Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, 16(4), 705-721.

- Foa, E. B. & Foa, U. G. (1980). Resource theory: Interpersonal behavior as exchange. In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberger, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 77-102). New York: Plenum Press.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 165-167.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 9-22.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16, 399-432.
- Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive*, 7, 81-94.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. (2nd Ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9, 131-146.
- Konovsky, M. A. & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 656-669.
- Lam, S. S. K., Hui, K., & Law, K. S. (1999). Organizational citizenship behavior: Comparing perspectives of supervisors and subordinates across four international samples. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(4), 594-601.
- Lambert, S. J. (2000). Added benefits: The link between work-life benefits and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(5), 801-815.
- MacKenzie, B. S., Podsakoff, P. M., & Ahearne, M. (1998). Some possible antecedents and consequences of in-role and extra-role salesperson performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 62, 87-98.
- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B., & Taylor, M. S. (1996). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 738-748.
- Moideenkutty, U. (2000). *Correlates and outcomes of organizational citizenship behavior directed toward the organization, the supervisor, and co-workers: A social exchange perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855.
- Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship? *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 351-357.
- Moorman, R. H., Niehoff, B. P. & Organ, D. W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behaviors: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employees Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6, 209-225.
- Motowidlo, S. J. & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 475-480.
- Niehoff, B. P. & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527-556.

- Organ, D. W. (1977). A reappraisal and reinterpretation of the satisfaction causes-performance hypotheses. *Academy of Management Review*, 2, 46-53.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. (1990). Motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In L.L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 12, pp. 43-72.). Greenwich, CT: Jai Press.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean up time. *Human Performance*, 10, (85-97).
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 775-802.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 262-270.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, S. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26, 3, 513-541.
- Podsakoff, P. M. & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12, 531-544.
- Price, J. L. & Mueller, C. W. (1986). *Handbook of organizational measurement*. Marshfield, MA: Pittman.
- Putti, J. M., Aryee, S., & Phua, J. (1990). Communication relationship satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Group & Organization Studies*, 15, 44-52.
- Rhoades, L. & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 4, 698-714.
- Rosenthal, R. & Rosnow, R. L. (1991). *Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis (2nd ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rosenthal, R. & Rubin, D. B. (1983). Ensemble-adjusted p values. *Psychological Bulletin*, 94, 540-541.
- Settoon, R. P. & Bennett, N. & Liden, R. L. (1996). Social exchange in organization: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 219-227.
- Shore, L. M. & Tetrick, L. E. (1994). The psychological contract as an explanatory framework in the employment relationship. In C. L. Cooper & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *Trends in organizational behavior* (Vol.1, pp. 91-110). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Shore, L. M. & Wayne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and employee behavior: Comparison of affective commitment and continuance commitment with perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 774-780.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653-663.
- Tepper, B. J., Lockhart, D., & Hoobler, J. (2001). Justice, citizenship, and role definition effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (4), 789-796.

- Van Dyne, L. & Ang, S. (1998). Organizational citizenship behavior of contingent workers in Singapore. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(6), 692-703.
- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W. & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: construct redefinition, measurement and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 765-802.
- Van Dyne, L. & Lepine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of constructive and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 108-119.
- Walker, H. M. & Lev, J. (1953). *Statistical Inference*. New York: Holt.
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M. & Liden, R. L. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 10, 82-111.
- Welbourne, T. M., Johnson, D. E., & Erez, A. (1998). The role-based performance scale: Validity analysis of a theory-based measure. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(5), 540-555.
- 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, 601-617.

Unnikammu Moideenkutty (umoideen@squ.edu.om) is Assistant Professor in Department of Management, College of Commerce and Economics, Sultan Qaboos University, PO Box 20, Postal Code 123, Al Khod, Sultanate of Oman.

Gary Blau (gblau@surfer.temple.edu) is Professor and Chair of Department of Human Resource Administration, Fox School of Business, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122.

Ravi Kumar (rrk@iimb.ernet.in) is Professor of Human Resource Management, Indian Institute of Management Bangalore, Bangalore-560076, India.

Ahmedali Nalakath (ahmedali@copasia.com) is Managing Director of Cornucopia-Asia Ltd., Bangalore, India.

This research was funded in part by a grant from the Assistant Vice-President for Post-graduate Studies and Research, Sultan Qaboos University, Sultanate of Oman.