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I. INTRODUCTION

Since last 50 years, managers, theoreticians, and researchers have recognized that organizations extract more and more from an individual for the completion of work assignments.

Katz (1964) states that within every organization social system exists and the people within the unit are considered as input to the system itself. Therefore, to motivate people within the system, three areas are considered. Effective organizational functioning is the first area. The second area is the behavioral patterns that lead to productive behavior. The last area is the situations that may elicit a given motivational pattern in an organizational framework.

Subsequent researchers, particularly Bateman and Organ (1983), expanded Katz' (1964) initial concerns by recognizing the impact of extra role behavior that is not part of the employee Job description. This intended behavior of employees can have a negative or positive effect on customers, and may determine how those customers observe services received from the organization.

The significance of understanding why workforce voluntarily exhibit behaviors that enhance performance within an organization has been broadly researched (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Prior research by Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1979) on organizational commitment state that this type of behavior as the comparative strength of an individual's recognition within the organization. Moreover, a concept to OCB was first supported by Scholl and Weiner (1982).

Researchers like Bateman and Organ (1983) determine that OCB is important for the internal functioning of the organization as well as the organization's effectiveness. Multiple research was done using the same concept in a research by MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Fetter (1993) for OCB and performance. Their research used OCB as a mode to measure performance with respect to the productivity of sales personnel. This study on the impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance in the telecom industry and its results are important and will provide management the capacity to better understand employees behavior while evaluating workforce along with their contribution.

Performance, in additional words, reflects a normative element that tell us whether an employee's behavior can be measured good or bad in light of the organization's objectives and goals. The personal either believes in or rejects the goals and objectives of an organization in order for the employee to exhibit behavior that impact organizational performance.

Two types of OCB are considered. Firstly organizational citizenship behavior individual (OCBI). It immediately gives recognition to specific personal and indirectly benefits the organization. OCBI can be observe when an another employee helps someone who is absent and take interest in welfare. Secondly, organizational citizenship behavior organization (OCBO) is a behavior increase organizational performance. Examples of OCBO would be when personal gives advance notice when they are going for a leave, adhere to informal rules that increase productivity, or follow rules and order among peers (Williams & Anderson, 1991).

This research will determine the important role that organizational citizenship behavior perform in determining levels of organizational performance within service organizations. OCB and its related variables are shown to be directly linked to organizational performance (Mackenzie et al., 1993).

Organ (1988) provided a multi-dimensional scale of organizational citizenship behavior. The scale contained five dimensions that make up the OCB construct. The five dimensions identified by Organ are altruism (welfare), courtesy, sportsmanship, civic virtue, and conscientiousness. Altruism is the category consisting of discretionary behaviors that aim at helping certain people in an organization with a relevant task or problem.

Courtesy includes proactive gestures that consider consulting with other workers in the organization before acting, giving advance notice, and passing along information. Sportsmanship refers to the forbearance of
doing some action such as filing petty grievances. Civic virtue is the involvement that the employee shows in the political life of the organization. Finally, conscientiousness is originally termed general compliance, which involves employees going beyond the minimum requirements of the organization.

### II. LITERATURE REVIEW

In the 1930s Chester Bernard observed the phenomena of organizational citizenship behavior, which he then termed “extra role behaviors”. Katz (1966) defined supra-role behaviors that improved the effectiveness of the organization. In the words of Katz and Kahn (1966) this, “includes any gestures that lubricate the social machinery of the organization and do not directly adhere to the usual notion of task performance”.

Managers and executives value employees who display “citizenship behavior” perhaps because they make their job easier. The extra time obtained by management allows and the manager to improve the organizational effectiveness by having more time for managerial issues. Bateman and Organ (1983) in the seminal article, Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee “citizenship” began a large series of articles into the topic of OCB.

The origin of the field of OCB is going back to the early of 1980s decade when Bateman and Organ (1983) introduced the construct of OCB. Organ (1988) defined OCB “as a behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of an organization.”

Building on Organ’s (1977) conceptualization, the first empirical studies on citizenship behavior were published in 1983. Bateman and Organ (1983) provided the first empirical support for the proposed relationship between job satisfaction and qualitative performance (later OCB); and Smith et al. (1983) developed the first measure of citizenship behavior which included subscales of helping and compliance. Further developing the concept, Organ defined OCB in 1988 as ‘individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate, promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization’ Organ, (1988: 4). Acknowledging the related research on contextual performance, Organ updated the definition to ‘contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that support task performance’ Organ, (1997: 91) in response to challenges that OCB is not necessarily extra-role and discretionary. Most recently, Organ et al. (2006: 34) emphasized the discretionary nature of OCB by defining it as ‘discretionary contributions that go beyond the strict description and that do not lay claim to contractual recompense from the formal reward system’.

Since the early work of Organ and colleagues, the domain of citizenship behaviour has grown at an impressive rate Podsakoff et al., (2000), with two primary effects. First, researchers have identified a large number of related constructs. Second, there is an impressive amount of substantive research on the antecedents and consequences of OCB and related constructs. For example, in their review of research on organizational citizenship behavior, Podsakoff and colleagues (2000) noted that close to 30 different forms of citizenship behaviors had been suggested since Smith, Organ, and Near coined the term ‘organizational citizenship behavior’ in 1983. These include altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, civic virtue Organ, (1988), loyalty, obedience, participation, loyal boosterish, personal industry, individual initiative (Moorman and Blakely, 1995). The emergence of this large number of constructs demonstrates widespread interest in and relevance of organizational citizenship research.

Organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) since 1980 has undergone definitional revision, but the construct remains the same at its core.” Katz (1964) in every organization some social system exists because people are the input of social system in the organization. Bateman and Organ (1983) say any extra work that is not the part of employee reward system is OCB. It refers to anything that employees choose to do, spontaneously and of their own accord, which often lies outside of their specified contractual obligations. Hui (2000) described that any employee who is dedicated towards the goal of the organization reflects true citizenship behavior.

"Organ when proceeds to define what he meant by discretionary, "It mean that the behavior is not an enforceable requirement of the role or the job description, that is, the clearly specifiable terms of the person's employment contract with the organization; the behavior is rather a matter of personal choice, such that its omission is not generally understood as punishable". He gives a clear explanation of what does and does not constitute OCB behavior in his example of a college professor. He states, "Thus, college professors who prep for their courses, teach, do research, and write are not by our construction exhibiting OCB, no matter how good their teaching and research is judged by others”. The notion is that fulfilling one's contractual obligations to the organization in which one works is just the in-role requirements. An OCB for the college professor may include picking up trash on the classroom floor after or before class and tossing it in the wastebasket or perhaps engaging in a conversation in the community that will promote the organization in a positive manner.

Seven common themes or dimensions on OCB are presented by Podsakoff, et al. (2000): Helping Behavior, Sportsmanship, Organizational Loyalty, Organizational Compliance, Individual Initiative, Civic
Virtue, and Self Development based on three sources of the partitioning and measurement of OCB by Katz (1964).

Currently, OCB is as a synonymous with the concept of contextual performance, defined as ‘Task that supports the social and psychological environment in which performance takes place’ Organ, (1997). Typical examples of OCB is encompasses organizational-related acts such as working overtime without (expectation of) remuneration, or volunteering to organize office-wide functions, and giving guidance to help a newcomer become familiar with his/her role and the office, a colleague to meet there deadlines, or volunteering to change shifts.

Schnake (1991), Organ, and Katherine (1995) have conducted meta-analysis of the OCB literature. Organ and Katherine (1995) conducted a meta-analysis with 55 studies, which showed that job attitudes are robust predictors of OCB. Different task, leadership, cognitive and positive affect studies have also been conducted Organ & Konovsky (1989).

Articles in the marketing and organizational decision journals have studied salespersons and managerial performance appraisals and evaluations MacKenzie, Podsakoff & Fetter (1991). Not all studies have embraced the new conceptualization of OCB as a new and better measure of performance.

OCB in regard to rewards, in-role, extra-role, dispositional factors [big-five], personality, and satisfaction Organ (1993); Organ (1994): Moorman (1993). Moorman and Blakely (1995) found that a collectivistic individual is more apt to engage in OCBs. The study demonstrated robustness of OCB to the issues of self-report bias and common method variance in that the use of multiple means of obtaining data is possible [e.g. employee self-report and the manager rating of the employee's OCB.

The organizational theorists that have been in search of the illusive relationship between job satisfaction and performance argue that performance depends on either a social structure or the organizational effectiveness and openness with employees. Satisfaction and a positive attitude can be achieved by maintaining a positive social environment with good communication, autonomy, participation, and trust Argyris (1964).

Multiple studies and meta-analyses have been conducted to look at the relationship between OCBs and organizational performance and success. Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994, as cited in Organ et al., 2006) looked at an insurance agency and found that the OCBs civic virtue and sportsmanship were both significantly related to indices of sales performance. Podsakoff, Ahearne, and MacKenzie (1997) Organ et al., (2006) examined paper mill workers and found that helping behavior was significantly related to product quality. MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Ahearne (1996) found that civic virtue and helping behavior were significantly related to the percent of team quota sales.

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study will examine the impact of the OCB of the employees of an organization on the continuous commitment which further helps in determining the level of organizational performance with in service organization. The current study has the following objectives:

1. To analyze the correlation between Continuous commitment and performance altruism.
2. To analyse the correlation between Continuous commitment and performance civic virtue
3. To analyse the correlation between Continuous commitment and performance sportsmanship
4. To analyze the correlation between Continuous commitment and performance conscientious
5. To analyze the impact of OCB variables on Continuous Commitment.

HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis 1: Continuous commitment and performance altruism are independent of each other
Hypothesis 2: Continuous commitment and performance civic virtue are independent of each other.
Hypothesis 3: Continuous commitment and performance sportsmanship are independent of each other.
Hypothesis 4: Continuous commitment and performance conscientious are independent of each other.

Research Methodology

The study employs primary data collected by communicating with the respondents with the help of a structured questionnaire based on 5-point Likert Scale. The data was collected on a combination of simple random and judgment sample of 210 educated and salaried class employees of Telecom Sector. The survey was conducted during November 2015 to February 2016 in Delhi and NCR. The Statistical tool used in the study is Regression Analysis, Correlation Analysis, ANOVA & t - test. For analysis of data we have employed SPSS (15.0) for Windows.

IV. RESULT AND ANALYSIS

Correlation and regression analysis was conducted for the sample of N=210 employees of Telecom Service Industry. The respondent completion rate for the survey was 100% for both the scales. The scales were Organizational Continuous Commitment and Organizational Citizenship behavior. Correlation analysis is used to test Hypothesis 1, 2, 3 and 4 and then regression analysis is used to determine if improvement in OCB variables within service industry will improve continuous commitment within the same organization. Null
null hypothesis is tested on the alpha value of 0.05 for acceptance or rejection. Table -1 shows the Descriptive statistics of Continuous Commitment variables. Table 2 shows the correlation analysis of OCB variables with the continuous Commitment.

Table -1: Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>1.07160</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>3.457</td>
<td>.60348</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
<td>2.426</td>
<td>.83988</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>3.857</td>
<td>.66799</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>3.943</td>
<td>.86205</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table -2: Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>civic</th>
<th>continuous</th>
<th>sportsmanship</th>
<th>altruism</th>
<th>conscientiousness</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>-.275</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
<td>-.275</td>
<td>-.510</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.322</td>
<td>-.521</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>-.322</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>-.521</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion on Hypotheses:

Null Hypothesis 1
H01- Continuous commitment and performance altruism are independent of each other. (No relationship)
Alternate Hypothesis 1
H11- Continuous commitment and performance altruism are dependent of each other. (Relationship exists)

The mean for 210 employees answered to continuous commitment is 4.0 (Table-1) with standard deviation of 1.07(Table-1). It shows that employees are agreed for continuous commitment for their organization. It also shows that employees are aware of the costs associated with their leaving the organization where they work. The average for 210 employees answered to performance altruism is 3.89(Table-1) with the standard deviation of 0.67(Table-1). It shows that employees agreed that they have performance altruism that is they believe in helping co workers in the organization on a given task and courteously alert each other about the changes that may affect their performance.

A correlation analysis is performed to test the relationship which results that Pearson’s correlation is 0.802(Table-2). The positive co relation shows that continuous commitment and performance altruism are moving in same direction. The null hypothesis is rejected as calculated p value is .00(Table-2) which is less than critical value of 0.05. This further supports the calculated value of correlation between continuous commitment and performance altruism.

Null Hypothesis 2
H02- Continuous commitment and performance civic virtue are independent of each other. (No relationship)
Alternate Hypothesis 2
H12- Continuous commitment and performance civic virtue are dependent of each other. (Relationship exists)

The mean for 210 employees answered to continuous commitment is 4.0(Table-1) with standard deviation of 1.07(Table-1). It shows that employees are agreed for continuous commitment for their organization. It also shows that employees are aware of the costs associated with their leaving the organization where they work. The average for 210 employees answered to performance civic virtue is 3.46(Table-1) with the standard deviation of 0.60(Table-1). This indicates that employees have agreed that they have a tendency towards performance civic virtue. They are participating in the governance of how control is maintained in the organization.
A correlation analysis is performed to test the relationship which results that Pearson’s correlation is 0.533 (Table-2). The positive correlation shows that continuous commitment and performance civic virtue are moving in same direction. The null hypothesis is rejected as calculated p value is .00 (Table-2) which is less than critical value of 0.05. This further supports the calculated value of correlation between continuous commitment and performance civic virtue. This indicates that employees in telecommunication industry are participating in the governance of their organization.

Null Hypothesis 3
H03: Continuous commitment and performance sportsmanship are independent of each other. (No relationship)

Alternate Hypothesis 3
H13: Continuous commitment and performance sportsmanship are dependent of each other. (Relationship exists)

The mean for 210 employees answered to continuous commitment is 4.0 (Table-1) with standard deviation of 1.07 (Table-1). It shows that employees are agreed for continuous commitment for their organization. It also shows that employees are aware of the costs associated with their leaving the organization where they work. The average for 210 employees answered to performance sportsmanship is 2.43 (Table-1) with the standard deviation of 0.84. (Table-1). This indicates that employees have agreed that they have a tendency towards performance sportsmanship. They are considering trivial issues seriously.

A correlation analysis is performed to test the relationship which results that Pearson’s correlation is -0.51 (Table-2). The negative correlation shows that continuous commitment and performance sportsmanship are moving in opposite direction. The null hypothesis is rejected as calculated p value is .00 (Table-2) which is less than critical value of 0.05. This further supports the calculated value of correlation between continuous commitment and performance sportsmanship. This indicates that employees continuously committed towards organization lacks sportsmanship and give emphasis to trivial matters taking place in the organization.

Null Hypothesis 4
H04: Continuous commitment and performance conscientious are independent of each other. (No relationship exists)

Alternate Hypothesis 4
H14: Continuous commitment and performance conscientiousness are dependent of each other. (Relationship exists)

The mean for 210 employees answered to continuous commitment is 4.0 (Table-1) with standard deviation of 1.07 (Table-1). It shows that employees are agreed for continuous commitment for their organization. It also shows that employees are aware of the costs associated with their leaving the organization where they work. The average for 210 employees answered to performance conscientiousness is 3.94 (Table-1) with the standard deviation of 0.84. (Table-1). This indicates that employees have agreed that they have a tendency towards performance conscientiousness. They are willing to perform their routine work within the organization.

A correlation analysis is performed to test the relationship which results that Pearson’s correlation is 0.373 (Table-2). The positive correlation shows that continuous commitment and performance conscientiousness are moving in same direction. The null hypothesis is rejected as calculated p value is .00 (Table-2) which is less than critical value of 0.05. This further supports the calculated value of correlation between continuous commitment and performance conscientiousness.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Regession analysis is done to identify the impact of set of variables on the continuous commitment. The values of independent variables are entered into the model and at the same time Enter method of variable involvement is used. The measure of R square indicates that the proposed model explains 72% of the dependent variables which is continuous commitment (Table-3). The measure of adjusted R square which evaluates the number of independent variables and the number of observations (participants), indicates that the model explains 71.4% (Table-3) of variations of the dependent variables. They are generally speaking satisfactory measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.57302</td>
<td>2.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significance P less than 0.05 value of the analysis variance (ANOVA) that allows evaluating the significance of the model indicates that the proposed model of the analysis is statistically significant (Table-4).

The impact weights (Beta Coefficients) of the independent variables on the dependent variables are shown in the (Table-5). The value significance P is less than 0.05 of the independent variables indicates the large impact of independent variables of the dependent variables. Table-5 shows that sportsmanship (P is equal to 0.00 < 0.05) and altruism (P is equal to 0.00 < 0.05) have significant impact on the continuous commitment.
The impact of civic virtue (P is equal to 0.72 > 0.05) and conscientiousness (P is equal to 0.833 > 0.05) is not statistically significant. Thus, the continuous commitment is reflected by the following regression equation: Continuous Commitment = 0.084 Civic – 0.268 sportsmanship + 0.666 Altruism +0.01 Conscientiousness, when p < 0.05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>172.687</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43.172</td>
<td>131.479</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>67.313</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>240.000</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The formula is made of the standardized beta coefficient.

The impact on the dependent variable is measured in standard deviation. So, when the altruism is increased by one unit the commitment is increased by 0.66 units, while the values of the other independent variables are considered to be constant. Following the same logic, the impact rates of the other variables could be defined. The values of the tolerance measure as a co-linearity statistic indicates the absence of the correlation (as all tolerance value are greater than 0.1). The values of the alternative co linearity measure VIF (Variance Inflation Factor) also indicate the unrelated independence of variables (all VIF are less than 2.5) (Table-5).

V. CONCLUSION

The results of the study support the notion that increase in Continuous Commitment can have the positive effect on performance of the organization within Telecom Industry. The study suggests that the employees who view the costs of staying within the organization have tendency to continuous perform their normal duties conscientiously. Management within the service industry organization can utilize the research findings to focus on those employees who enjoy their work and help the organization to improve its performance. The study also helps the mangers to understand the improvement areas of their employees. This could be possible through participative management, gain sharing, team building employee benefit system and role conflict. This would motivate employee for continuous commitment as well as OCB conscientious.
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