

Çalışanların Öğrenen Örgüt Algısının Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışlarına Etkisi

The Effect of Employees' Learning Organization Perceptions on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

H. Nejat BASIM*
Harun ŞEŞEN**
Cenk SÖZEN***
Köksal HAZIR****

ÖZET

Günümüzün rekabet yoğun iş yaşamında, örgütlerin birer öğrenen örgüte dönüşümü, onların rekabetçi yeteneklerini artırmalarını sağlamaktadır. Ayrıca, günümüzde çalışanların sadece kendilerinden beklenen rol davranışlarını değil, bunun ötesindeki, gönüllü sergilenen rol ötesi davranışları da sergilemeleri beklenmektedir. Örgüt yazınında bu tür davranışlar örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları (ÖVD) olarak isimlendirilmektedir. Öğrenmeyi destekleyen, astları güçlendiren bir liderlik stili uygulayan, takım çalışmasına ve iletişime değer veren yapıları ile öğrenen örgütler, çalışanların rol ötesi davranışlar sergilemeleri için uygun bir ortam hazırlayabilirler. Bu temel düşünceden hareketle yürütülen çalışmanın amacı, çalışanların öğrenen örgüt algılarının, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına etkilerini araştırmaktır. Yabancı veya yerli yazında böyle bir araştırmanın daha önce yürütülmemiş olması ise çalışmanın önemli bir boşluğu doldurmasını sağlamaktadır.

Çalışmaya, Türkiye'de faaliyet gösteren 20 farklı firmadan 436 beyaz yakalı çalışan katılmıştır. Analiz bulguları, araştırmaya katılan çalışanların öğrenen örgüt algıları ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasında aynı yönlü ve anlamlı bir ilişki olduğunu göstermiştir. Regresyon analizi sonuçları ise sürekli öğrenme, diyalog ve araştırma, gömülü sistemler ve destekleyici liderlik boyutlarının ÖVD üzerinde ilave varyans açıkladığını; ancak takım çalışması, güçlendirilmiş çalışanlar ve sistemler arası bağlantı boyutlarının ise ÖVD üzerinde böyle bir etki yaratmadığını ortaya koymuştur. Bu bulgular, öğrenen örgüt algısının çalışanların örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları üzerinde önemli bir etken olduğunu göstermektedir.

Ayrıca araştırma bulguları yöneticiler açısından değerlendirildiğinde de önemli sonuçlar sunmaktadır. Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları, çalışanların gönüllü ve örgütün işleyişine katkı yapan davranışlar olduğundan, bu tür davranışların çalışanlar tarafından sergilenmesi, hem örgütün ürün ve hizmet kalitesinin artmasına yardımcı olmakta, hem de böyle bir artış için hiçbir ilave maliyet ödenmemektedir. Şu halde bu davranışları artıracak yönde örgütü dönüştürmek, yönetsel anlamda da fayda sağlayabilecektir. Araştırmada, ortaya konulan bulgular tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı, öğrenen örgüt, sürekli öğrenme, destekleyici liderlik

Çalışmanın Türü: Araştırma

ABSTRACT

Discretionary behaviors that promote the effectiveness of organizations differ from formal role behaviors. These informal role behaviors have been termed as prosocial organizational behavior (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986; George, 1990) or organizational citizenship behavior (OCB; Bateman and Organ, 1983; Organ, 1988; Smith et al., 1983). Dennis Organ and his colleagues (Bateman and Organ 1983; Smith et al., 1983) were the first to conceptualize OCB, describing it 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, p. 4). Briefly, these behaviors are not compulsory in job definitions, are not rewarded or punished by organization management, and are discretionary.

Dimensions of OCB include altruism (discretionary behavior that intends to help others in the organization about a certain problem), conscientiousness (a general compliance that requires employees to go beyond their minimum job requirements), courtesy (intentions that consider others before acting or deciding and informing them about the actions), civic virtue (employees' self-responsibility about organizational problems and attention to the social and political life of the organization) and sportsmanship (willingness to accept the inevitable problems or matters that are related to the job; Organ, 1988).

As the ability to survive in an uncertain and turbulent environment is becoming more vital for work organizations today, the need for employees who voluntarily contribute to the organizational welfare beyond their formal roles is greater than ever (Somech and Drach-Zahavy, 2004). Therefore, organizational climate and structure need to be designed to support the emergence of OCBs.

Transforming an organization into a learning organization by spreading the learning culture throughout the organization may both expedite to cope with the uncertainty of the environment more effectively and to meet with OCBs more frequently because

* Doç. Dr., Başkent Üniversitesi

** Kara Harp Okulu

*** Yrd. Doç. Dr., Başkent Üniversitesi

**** Dr., Çağ Üniversitesi

employees' expectations will be satisfied. In this study we tried to demonstrate how employees' perceptions about their companies in the case the companies being learning organizations would affect their OCBs.

Many studies have focused on the antecedents of OCB or OCB's relation with some organizational factors. However, the learning capacity of the organization as an antecedent of OCB has not been treated as often. A common result of all these studies is that employee perceptions about the job atmosphere are crucial if employees are to behave beyond formal roles or display OCB (Somech and Drach-Zahavy, 2004).

In learning organizations, people focus on continuous learning processes that are carried out collectively by all of the employees rather than on their own performance results. In such organizations, people expand their own points of view beyond formal role definitions and develop a system approach (Senge, 1996). This approach facilitates organizational learning so that learning ability of the organization can support OCB within the organization (Somech and Drach-Zahavy, 2004).

In some studies, it is suggested that OCB could support interpersonal relations in the organization and that it also might be a useful tool for managers to use in fostering a lively work climate (Kidwell et al., 1997). In this respect, the discretionary characteristic of OCB might be both a motivational factor and one of the most important antecedents of teamwork in an organization.

As another antecedent of OCB, the clarity of the job might be conceptualized as the extent to which employees know what to expect in their daily routine and how explicitly rules and policies of the organization are communicated. OCB is closely connected to job clarity, comprehensible norms and rules, and good planning of work (Turnipseed and Murkison, 1996). Job clarity is especially related to the shared vision dimension of the concept of learning organization. Sharing the vision among the organization members may increase the clarity of the job. Podsakoff et al., (1996) suggested that if the employees knew the future of their work, their OCB exhibitions would be augmented.

Leader attitudes also play a key role in the emergence of OCBs in an organization (Brightman and Moran, 1999; Ehrhart, 2004; Turnipseed and Murkison, 1996). Some leader behaviors, especially transformational leadership behaviors, positively influence OCBs. Many studies have found a direct link between transformational leadership and OCB (e.g., Kent and Chelladurai, 2001; Koh et al., 1995; Podsakoff et al., 1990, 1996).

In conclusion, given the interactions described above, it can be summarized that organizational structure and climate have a direct impact on the emergence of OCBs. Thus, we may expect more OCBs from employees in a learning organization than from those in an unlearning one. Hence, the hypotheses can be stated as follows:

Hypothesis 1. There will be a positive relationship between employees' learning organization perceptions and their OCBs.

Hypothesis 2. All of the learning organization dimensions will contribute significantly to each of the OCBs independently.

In this study, the participants of the survey are white-collar workers from 20 different middle or large-sized companies in Turkey. The questionnaires, consist of Learning Organization Scale and OCB Scale, were posted to the human resources departments of the firms with an information note. Of the 600 questionnaires sent, 460 (76.6%) were returned. As a result, 436 valid responses were used in the study.

Findings indicated that intercorrelations between the learning organization and OCB dimensions show statistically significant positive relations between the learning organization and OCB dimensions ($p < 0.01$). Although intercorrelations between learning organization dimensions were high ($.71 \leq r \leq .86$), they were average ($.50 \leq r \leq .67$) between OCB dimensions. The relation between the learning organization and OCB dimensions was significant, positive, and average ($.24 \leq r \leq .55$).

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was performed to test whether learning organization dimensions explained additional variance in OCBs. The final model for altruism included continuous learning ($\beta = .11$; $p < .05$), dialogue and inquiry ($\beta = .12$; $p < .05$), and providing leadership ($\beta = .12$; $p < .05$). The conscientiousness model contained continuous learning ($\beta = .14$; $p < .05$) and dialogue and inquiry ($\beta = .16$; $p < .01$). The courtesy model comprised dialogue and inquiry ($\beta = .18$; $p < .001$) and providing leadership ($\beta = .09$; $p < .05$). The sportsmanship model contained continuous learning ($\beta = .13$; $p < .05$), dialogue and inquiry ($\beta = .14$; $p < .01$), and embedded systems ($\beta = .13$; $p < .05$). Lastly, the civic virtue model included continuous learning ($\beta = .16$; $p < .01$) and dialogue and inquiry ($\beta = .32$; $p < .001$). It is interesting that team learning, empowerment, and systems connections dimensions had no significant effects on any of the OCB dimensions.

The results of this study indicate that there is a significant and positive relation between employees' learning organization perceptions and their OCBs. Whereas the structures of the organizations are being transformed toward a learning organization, OCBs performed by employees found to be increased, yielding support for Hypothesis 1.

To explore whether learning organization dimensions explained additional variance in OCBs, we conducted a hierarchical regression analysis. Results showed that the dimensions of continuous learning and dialogue and inquiry were the most important factors in predicting and explaining the variance of OCBs. Although embedded systems and supportive leadership helped to explain additional variance of OCBs, other learning organization dimensions (team learning, empowerment, and systems connections) had no significant effect; therefore, Hypothesis 2 was partly supported.

These findings have some useful implications for managers. In today's working life, employees are obligated to move beyond their formal roles to increase the organization's accomplishments. Since the findings of this study revealed a strong and significant relationship between employees' learning organization perceptions and their OCBs, an organizational transformation toward a learning organization in those enterprises could augment OCBs throughout the organization.

This study displayed a strong relation between learning organization concept and OCBs. OCBs play a key role in developing the quality of the services produced by organizations. To exist in a competitive world, organizations have to improve their service qualities. If managers can transform their organizations into learning organizations, it seems that OCB exhibition within the organizations is likely be enhanced—as will the service qualities.

Keywords: Organizational citizenship behavior, learning organization, continuous learning, providing leadership

The type of research: Research

INTRODUCTION

Discretionary behaviors that promote the effectiveness of organizations differ from formal role behaviors. These informal role behaviors have been termed as prosocial organizational behavior (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986; George, 1990), extrarole behavior (Van Dyne et al., 1995), good soldier syndrome (Turnipseed and Murkison, 1996), contextual performance (Van Scotter and Motowidlo, 1996), and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB; Bateman and Organ, 1983; Organ, 1988; Smith et al., 1983). These extrarole behaviors, howsoever named, comprise many social behaviors, such as being sensitive about others' mistakes, discussing problems, finishing work on time, being innovative, helping others, and being voluntary (Kidwell et al., 1997; Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Dennis Organ and his colleagues (Bateman and Organ 1983; Smith et al., 1983) were the first to conceptualize OCB, describing it 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, p. 4). Briefly, these behaviors are not compulsory in job definitions, are not rewarded or punished by organization management, and are discretionary (Greenberg and Baron, 2000; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Tang and Ibrahim, 1998).

Dimensions of OCB include *altruism* (discretionary behavior that intends to help others in the organization about a certain problem), *conscientiousness* (a general compliance that requires employees to go beyond their minimum job requirements), *courtesy* (intentions that consider others before acting or deciding and informing them about the actions), *civic virtue* (employees' self-responsibility about organizational problems and attention to the social and political life of the organization) and *sportsmanship* (willingness to accept the inevitable problems or matters that are related to the job; Organ, 1988).

Studies have shown that OCB is related to employees' job satisfaction (Feather and Rauter, 2004; Organ and Ligtly, 1995), organizational justice (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993; Williams et al., 2002; Zellars et al., 2003), performance (Bachrach et al., 2001; Cropanzano et al., 2003; Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1997), and organizational commitment (Chang and Chelladurai 2003; Feather and Rauter, 2004; Kent and Chelladurai, 2001). Organizational achievement increases correspondingly when OCBs are increased (Podsakoff et al., 2000; Organ, 1988). As the ability to survive in an uncertain and turbulent environment is becoming more vital for work organizations today, the need for employees who voluntarily contribute to the organizational welfare beyond their formal roles is greater than ever (Somech and Drach-Zahavy, 2004). Therefore, organizational climate and structure need to be designed to support the emergence of OCBs.

A learning organization is a dynamic one that is able to draw lessons from its right and wrong actions, to adapt those to the changing environmental conditions in a systematic way that improves the organization, and, finally, to transform and improve itself continually (DiBella and Nevis, 1998; Garvin, 1993; Pedler et al., 1991; Probst and Butchel, 1997; Redding and Catalanello, 1994; Senge, 1990; Watkins and Marsick, 1993). Learning organizations that have the capacity for faster learning can adapt to new conditions quickly, can have significant strategic advantages in a globalized and competitive world (Braham, 1998; DiBella and Nevis; Drew and Smith, 1995; Guns and Anundsen, 1998; Probst and Buchel; Redding and Catalanello, 1994), and can provide opportunities for employees to express themselves and contribute to organizational learning and achievement.

Transforming an organization into a learning organization by spreading the learning culture throughout the organization may both expedite to cope with the uncertainty of the environment more effectively and to meet with OCBs more frequently because employees' expectations will be satisfied. In this study we tried to demonstrate how employees' perceptions about their companies in the case the companies being learning organizations would affect their OCBs.

Interaction between Learning Organization and OCB

Many studies have focused on the antecedents of OCB or OCB's relation with some organizational factors. In the literature, the relationship between OCB and job satisfaction (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Feather and Rauter, 2004; Organ and Lingl, 1995), organizational commitment (Cropanzano et al., 2003; O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986), organizational justice (Ehrhart, 2004; Farh et al., 1990; Folger, 1993; Martin and Bies, 1991; Moorman et al., 1993; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993; Williams et al., 2002), motivation (Rioux

and Penner, 1999), and trust (Deluga 1995) has been explored frequently. However, the learning capacity of the organization as an antecedent of OCB has not been treated as often. A common result of all these studies is that employee perceptions about the job atmosphere are crucial if employees are to behave beyond formal roles or display OCB (Somech and Drach-Zahavy, 2004).

Peter Senge (1990) first used the term *learning organization* in his pioneer book “The Fifth Discipline”. After his progressive efforts, many authors (e.g., Braham, 1998; DiBella and Nevis, 1998; Drew and Smith, 1995; Garvin, 1993; Kline and Saunders, 1997; Marquardt, 1996; Redding and Catalanello, 1994) have followed him and enriched the concept. Senge (1990) described five disciplines (systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, and team learning) that learning organizations should possess, but he did not try to develop an evaluation tool. Adding on Senge’s work, Watkins and Marsick (1997) formed a seven-factor model that included Senge’s disciplines to evaluate the learning capabilities of an organization. These seven dimensions are *continuous learning* (creating continuous learning opportunities), *dialogue and inquiry* (promoting inquiry and dialogue), *team learning* (encouraging collaboration and team learning), *embedded systems* (establishing systems to capture and share learning), *empowerment* (empowering people toward a collective vision), *systems connections* (connecting the organization to its environment), and *providing leadership* (leaders model and support learning). This model seems to present a sound framework for the study of the interaction between OCB and learning organization perception.

In learning organizations, people focus on continuous learning processes that are carried out collectively by all of the employees rather than on their own performance results. In such organizations, people expand their own points of view beyond formal role definitions and develop a system approach (Senge, 1996). This approach facilitates organizational learning so that learning ability of the organization can support OCB within the organization (Somech and Drach-Zahavy, 2004). In addition to organizational learning, a positive and supportive job climate will increase the OCB in the organization (Min-Huei, 2004). Somech and Drach-Zahavy determined a positive correlation between organizational learning and OCB in their study. They suggested that specifically improving teamwork within the organization would increase employees’ helping tendencies and behaviors.

Today, teamwork is an inevitable necessity in organizational life (Katzenbach and Smith, 1994). Therefore, for an organization to gain a competitive edge, it is crucial that supportive systems that will facilitate teamwork within the organization be established. In some studies, it is suggested that OCB could support interpersonal relations in the organization and that it also might be a useful tool for managers to use in fostering a lively work climate (Kidwell et al., 1997). In this respect, the discretionary characteristic of OCB might be both a motivational factor and one of the most important antecedents of teamwork in an organization. Altruism and courtesy behaviors play critical roles in the increase of the power, quality, and effectiveness of team performance (Podsakoff et al., 1997). Nevertheless, Chen et al., (2002) suggested that organizational justice, supportive leadership, and intergroup support positively affected OCB and that OCB between team members would contribute to both individual and teamwork performance.

As another antecedent of OCB, the clarity of the job might be conceptualized as the extent to which employees know what to expect in their daily routine and how explicitly rules and policies of the organization are communicated. OCB is closely connected to job clarity, comprehensible norms and rules, and good planning of work (Turnipseed and Murkison, 1996). Job clarity is especially related to the shared vision dimension of the concept of learning organization. Sharing the vision among the organization members may increase the clarity of the job. Podsakoff et al. (1996) suggested that if the employees knew the future of their work, their OCB exhibitions would be augmented. Turnipseed and Murkison concluded similarly that a clear and comprehensive job had positive correlations with employees’ OCBs. Therefore, one can expect that employees in a learning organization in which the vision is shared within the organization (Senge, 1990; Watkins and Marsick, 1997) will exhibit more OCBs than ones in an unlearning organization.

Leader attitudes also play a key role in the emergence of OCBs in an organization (Turnipseed and Murkison, 1996; Brightman and Moran, 1999; Ehrhart, 2004; Daily et al., 2009). Some leader behaviors, especially transformational leadership behaviors, positively influence OCBs. Many studies have found a direct link between transformational leadership and OCB (e.g., Kent and Chelladurai, 2001; Koh et al., 1995; Podsakoff et al., 1990, 1996). Transformational leadership defined as “the process of influencing major

changes in attitudes and assumptions of organizational members and building commitment for the organizations mission and objectives” (Yukl, 1989:204) focuses on the leader-follower relationship (Bass, 1990). Transformational leaders could penetrate the ideals and moral values of their subordinates and encourage those employees to exert greater effort for the benefit of the organization (Yukl). Another way in which transformational leaders make followers go beyond formal roles may be their status as being role models (Koh et al.).

When employees perceive the leaders as role models and have personal support from them, they try to exhibit OCBs (Koh et al., 1995; Podsakoff et al., 1990) because of feeling necessity for extrarole behaviors. Whereas a leader’s supportive style has direct and positive correlations with conscientiousness, it also has indirect and positive correlations with altruism (Ehrhart, 2004; Farh et al., 1990). Organ and Ryan (1995) also pointed out that there was a positive correlation between leader support and altruism. Additionally, Bateman and Organ (1983) suggested that supportive leadership facilitates OCBs. In learning organizations the leaders’ supportive style may increase OCBs, too.

In conclusion, given the interactions described above, it can be summarized that organizational structure and climate have a direct impact on the emergence of OCBs. Thus, we may expect more OCBs from employees in a learning organization than from those in an unlearning one. Hence, the hypotheses can be stated as follows:

Hypothesis 1. There will be a positive relationship between employees’ learning organization perceptions and their OCBs.

Hypothesis 2. All of the learning organization dimensions will contribute significantly to each of the OCBs independently.

METHOD

Sample

In this study, the participants of the survey are white-collar workers from 20 different middle- or large-sized companies in Turkey. The companies were selected from “Turkey’s Biggest 500 Firms”, a list that is published every year by Istanbul Chamber of Industry, in 2006. In selecting the firms, we first evaluated 100 firms in terms of attainability, openness to change, and support of social research. Then, after listing the firms, we selected the first 20 firms to be contacted. In addition to the three criteria aforementioned the most important characteristic of these firms was their strong institutional structure. Besides having this institutional structure, these firms have been forced by intense competition in their industries to plan, design, and maintain change within their organizations and to satisfy their employees for long terms.

The questionnaires were posted to the human resources departments of the firms with an information note. Of the 600 questionnaires sent, 460 (76.6%) were returned. When we examined the returned questionnaires, we found that 24 were inappropriate due to incomplete data. As a result, 436 valid responses were used in the study. The participants consisted of 188 (43%) women and 248 (57%) men. The participants’ ages ranged from 22 years to 57 years, with the average age at 36.5 years. The participants had been working in their organizations for a minimum of 1 year and a maximum of 33 years, with the average at 8.8 years.

Measures

Dimensions of Learning Organization Questionnaire (DLOQ):

To assess the employees’ perception of their organization’s learning level, a survey developed by Watkins and Marsick (1997) was used. As mentioned above, in this questionnaire Watkins and Marsick described seven dimensions or action imperatives necessary for an organization to become a learning organization. The DLOQ was composed of 43 items. The continuous-learning dimension included 7 items, and each of the other dimensions included 6 items. A 6-point Likert scale, from *almost never* to *almost always*, was used to rate each item. Several studies have shown strong reliability and validity levels for the DLOQ (Basim et al., 2007; Hernandez and Watkins 2003; Watkins et al., 1997; Yang et al., 1998). In this study, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for each dimension of the scale ranged from .87 to .91. Overall, the reliability estimate for the entire scale was .96.

OCB questionnaire:

OCBs were measured by adapting a scale from two different studies devised by Vey and Campbell (2004) and Williams and Shiaw (1999). The scale was designed to measure the five OCB dimensions that were suggested by Organ (1988), for a total of 19 items. The dimensions were altruism (5 items), conscientiousness (3 items), courtesy (3 items), sportsmanship (4 items), and civic virtue (4 items). Each item was answered by using a 6-point Likert scale, from *almost never* to *almost always*. In our study, Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the dimensions of the scale ranged from .67 to .77. Overall, the reliability estimate for the entire scale was .91.

Adaptation of the Scales:

To translate and adapt the measures to Turkish, we used a method based on a model described by Bristlin et al., (1973) that consisted of five steps: forward translation, assessment of forward translation, backward translation, assessment of backward translation, and local meeting with professionals. Two bilingual translators whose native tongue was Turkish performed the initial translation of the scales from English to Turkish independently. A group of six academicians from different universities performed the assessment of forward translations. These people were asked to review each item of both translations independently and to choose the best one in terms of clarity (i.e., the item had to express a single idea, and be easy to read and understand); common language (i.e., the item was expressed with language used by the general population); and cultural adequacy (i.e., the item was appropriate and relevant to Turkish culture). After a discussion among the group members, participants agreed on one of the translated items one by one or generated a new one. Another English-literature instructor then retranslated the agreed Turkish translation to English. A group consisting of the researchers, another English instructor, a Turkish instructor, and a psychology professor reviewed the backward translation. A panel made up of the researchers, two managers from a private-sector firm, and a psychology professor reviewed the final versions of the scales. The purpose of this final step was to ensure that final versions of the scales were clear, were culturally adequate, and included the common language used by employees in their daily life.

Table 1. Confirmatory Factor Analysis for DLOQ and OCB Scales

Scale/model	$\Delta\chi^2$	df	$\Delta\chi^2/df$	RMSEA	CFI	RFI	IFI	GFI
DLOQ								
Seven-factor	676.06*	839	0.80	0.0	0.99	0.82	1.05	0.82
One-factor	717.93*	853	0.84	0.0	0.94	0.80	1.04	0.75
OCB								
Five-factor	184.30*	142	1.29	0.05	0.96	0.83	0.96	0.84
Two-factor	211.20*	146	1.44	0.06	0.94	0.81	0.94	0.82
One-factor	732.98*	145	5.04	0.21	0.49	0.34	0.50	0.55

Note. RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; RFI = Relative Fit Index; IFI = Incremental Fit Index; GFI = Goodness of Fit Index

*p < .001.

To ensure that all the items were loaded on their hypothesized factors, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis independently on both measures of the questionnaire (see Table 1). On the DLOQ we tested seven-factor and one-factor models and, as hypothesized, the seven-factor model fit the data better than the one-factor model. Although the one-factor model produced some fitting indicators because of the high correlations between the dimensions, the seven-factor model fitted the data better.

To evaluate the factor structure of the OCB scale, we tested three different models, due to the findings of Hoffman et al., (2007). Hoffman and his colleagues reviewed the OCB literature and tested whether the OCB dimensions fitted to a two-factor or one-factor model; they reported that the one-factor solution was the best model. Therefore, we tested five-factor, two-factor, and one-factor models to find the best fit. The five-factor model was the original one described by Organ (1988). In the two-factor model, two latent variables were operationalized to correspond to the two-factor conceptualization of OCB of Williams and Anderson (1991), such that the OCB dimensions altruism and courtesy served as indicators of OCB-I (OCBs toward individuals), and the dimensions conscientiousness, civic virtue, and

sportsmanship served as indicators of OCB-O (OCBs toward organization). Then we tested the one-factor model by corresponding two latent variables, OCB-I and OCB-O. While two-factor and five-factor models fitted the data well, the one-factor model did not produce an acceptable solution (see Table 1). Though they both fitted the data well, the five-factor model produced more acceptable solutions than did the two-factor model. Thus, on the basis of the confirmatory factor analysis results, we used the five-factor scale, as it countenanced the purpose of the study.

RESULTS

Table 2 presents the zero-order intercorrelations between the learning organization and OCB dimensions. These results show statistically significant positive relations between the learning organization and OCB dimensions ($p < 0.01$). Although intercorrelations between learning organization dimensions were high ($.71 \leq r \leq .86$), they were average ($.50 \leq r \leq .67$) between OCB dimensions. The relation between the learning organization and OCB dimensions was significant, positive, and average ($.24 \leq r \leq .55$).

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was performed to test whether learning organization dimensions explained additional variance in OCBs. Table 3 shows the contributor learning organization dimensions for each OCB dimension after the effects of age, marital status, and job duration variables are excluded.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics, Reliability Scores, and Intercorrelations between Dimensions

Factor	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Continuous learning	3,71	0,99	(.87)											
2. Dialogue and inquiry	3,51	1,03	.76**	(.88)										
3. Team learning	3,58	1,07	.76**	.74**	(.89)									
4. Embedded systems	3,62	1,08	.75**	.71**	.82**	(.88)								
5. Empowerment	3,61	1,10	.70**	.73**	.81**	.82**	(.90)							
6. System connections	3,67	1,11	.72**	.71**	.79**	.80**	.86**	(.90)						
7. Providing leadership	3,96	1,08	.74**	.73**	.78**	.80**	.82**	.84**	(.91)					
8. Altruism	4,69	0,76	.39**	.39**	.34**	.38**	.33**	.36**	.39**	(.76)				
9. Conscientiousness	4,84	0,88	.30**	.31**	.26**	.27**	.27**	.28**	.29**	.50**	(.67)			
10. Sportsmanship	4,65	0,85	.40**	.40**	.38**	.40**	.35**	.38**	.37**	.55**	.56**	(.77)		
11. Civic virtue	4,70	0,83	.50**	.55**	.45**	.47**	.45**	.46**	.48**	.65**	.57**	.66**	(.72)	
12. Courtesy	5,22	0,76	.27**	.33**	.25**	.28**	.24**	.27**	.30**	.61**	.54**	.55**	.65**	(.76)

Note. Cronbach alpha coefficients were given on the diagonal in parentheses. ** $p < 0.01$, two-tailed. N = (436).

Table 3. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Results

	Altruism		Conscientiousness		Courtesy		Sportsmanship		Civic Virtue	
	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2
Step 1		.01		.01		.02		.02		.01
Age	.02		-.02		.07		.07		.05	
Marital status	-.08		.10		-.08		.07		.02	
Job duration	-.01		-.01		-.01		.01		-.03	
Step 2		.19		.11		.12		.21		.33
Continuous learning	.11*		.14*		-.02		.13*		.16**	
Dialogue and inquiry	.12*		.16**		.18***		.14**		.32***	
Team learning	-.08		.01		-.08		.02		.02	
Embedded systems	.10		.06		.02		.13*		.09	
Empowerment	-.07		.05		-.16		-.04		.04	
Systems connections	.01		.07		-.05		.04		.08	
Providing leadership	.12*		.08		.09*		.02		.11	
F	16.396***		10.404***		11.938***		19.383***		41.439***	

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$

As can be seen in Table 3, the final model ($F = 16.396$; $\Delta R^2 = .19$; $p < .001$) for altruism included continuous learning ($\beta = .11$; $p < .05$), dialogue and inquiry ($\beta = .12$; $p < .05$), and providing leadership ($\beta = .12$; $p < .05$). The conscientiousness model ($F = 10.404$; $\Delta R^2 = .11$; $p < .001$) contained continuous learning ($\beta = .14$; $p < .05$) and dialogue and inquiry ($\beta = .16$; $p < .01$). The courtesy model ($F = 11.938$;

$\Delta R^2 = .12; p < .001$) comprised dialogue and inquiry ($\beta = .18; p < .001$) and providing leadership ($\beta = .09; p < .05$). The sportsmanship model ($F = 19.383; \Delta R^2 = .21; p < .001$) contained continuous learning ($\beta = .13; p < .05$), dialogue and inquiry ($\beta = .14; p < .01$), and embedded systems ($\beta = .13; p < .05$). Lastly, the civic virtue model ($F = 41.439; \Delta R^2 = .33; p < .001$) included continuous learning ($\beta = .16; p < .01$) and dialogue and inquiry ($\beta = .32; p < .001$). It is interesting that team learning, empowerment, and systems connections dimensions had no significant effects on any of the OCB dimensions.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The results of this study indicate that, as predicted, there is a significant and positive relation between employees' learning organization perceptions and their OCBs. Whereas the structures of the organizations are being transformed toward a learning organization, OCBs performed by employees found to be increased, yielding support for Hypothesis 1.

When the intercorrelations between the dimensions were examined, it could be seen that the relation between the learning organization and OCB dimensions found to be significant and positive. This result indicates a strong correlation between learning organization perception and OCB. Forming a learning culture in the organization, making dialogue and inquiry effective, performing teamwork and team learning throughout the organization, empowering employees in their work by giving enough initiative, providing supportive leadership for organizational learning, and sharing knowledge within the organization—in other words, transforming to a learning organization—seem to lead to the emergence of OCBs.

To explore whether learning organization dimensions explained additional variance in OCBs, we conducted a hierarchical regression analysis. Results showed that the dimensions of continuous learning and dialogue and inquiry were the most important factors in predicting and explaining the variance of OCBs. Although embedded systems and supportive leadership helped to explain additional variance of OCBs, other learning organization dimensions (team learning, empowerment, and systems connections) had no significant effect; therefore, Hypothesis 2 was partly supported. These findings support Marquardt (1996), who mentioned the importance of dialogue in learning organizations, and Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2004), who suggested a positive correlation between organizational learning and OCBs. One possible explanation of why some learning organization dimensions have not contributed additional variances at the univariate level could be the totalitarian construct of a learning organization (Watkins and Marsick, 1993). As is shown in Table 2, the correlations between learning organization dimensions are high, and when we considered all of the dimensions independently, team learning, empowerment, and systems connections appeared to lose their effects.

These findings also have some useful implications for managers. In today's working life, employees are obligated to move beyond their formal roles to increase the organization's accomplishments. Since the findings of this study revealed a strong and significant relationship between employees' learning organization perceptions and their OCBs, an organizational transformation toward a learning organization in those enterprises could augment OCBs throughout the organization.

This study displayed a strong relation between learning organization concept and OCBs. OCBs play a key role in developing the quality of the services produced by organizations. To exist in a competitive world, organizations have to improve their service qualities. If managers can transform their organizations into learning organizations, it seems that OCB exhibition within the organizations is likely to be enhanced—as will the service qualities.

Although the results indicate a strong relationship between learning organization perceptions and OCBs, one possible limitation of these findings about the source of the data can be mentioned. The source of the ratings was self-report, which one may blame for common method variance as well as social desirability effects. In OCB research, mostly self-ratings or supervisor evaluations were used as the source (Cardona and Espejo 2002). However, because each source has its own bias (Organ, 1988), it is very hard to say which source is more valid than another. Certainly, a multisource design (e.g., supervisors, peers, subordinates, and self-reports) could be the best choice, but it is hard to design and execute such a study for many reasons (e.g., time, money, and participants). Van Dyne and Lepine (1998) advised that different rating sources might be appropriate for different purposes. They suggested that self-reports would be

appropriate for studies involving self-image, self-development, or self-perception; but for studies about observer reports, such as reward, promotion or transfer evaluations, in which the perceptions of others are important, supervisor or peer ratings would be more useful. Therefore, a self-report measure was appropriate for our study because we were interested in employees' own perceptions.

The partial correlations showed interesting findings, though we did not report them because we didn't focus on that kind of result. Most of the OCB studies seem to focus on the positive and desirable results of OCBs; however, it is widely accepted that OCBs have some unintended or adverse effects, too. For instance, Bergeron (2007) mentioned the social paradox of OCB in her study. Bergeron affirmed that, in some organizational phenomena, OCBs of employees might not be desired and that OCBs might have adverse effects on the evaluation of individual performance in a group. Similarly, in this study, though it was not reported, we found that team learning and empowerment negatively correlated with OCBs when the effects of other dimensions were controlled. In this context, it is obvious that there is an important gap about the possible "dark sides" of OCBs in the literature. Future studies focusing on these possible adverse effects may help improve the understanding of OCB.

REFERENCES

- Barksdale, K. and 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.
- Basim, H. N., Sesen, H. and Korkmazıyurek, H. (2007). A Turkish translation, validity and reliability study of the learning organization questionnaire. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 2(4), 368-374.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Bateman, T. S. and Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587-595.
- Bergeron, D. M. (2007). The potential paradox of organizational citizenship behavior: Good citizens at what cost? *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(4), 1078-1095.
- Braham, J. B. (1996). *Creating a learning organization*, California: Kogan Page.
- Brighman, B. K. and Moran, J. W. (1999). Building organizational citizenship. *Management Decision*, 37(9), 678-685.
- Burgoyne, J. (1999). Design of the times. *People Management*, 5(11), 39-44.
- Burns, B. M. and Collins R. W. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviour in the US context. <http://hsb.baylor.edu/ramsower/acis/papers/burns.htm> (23.02.2005).
- Chen, X. P., Lam, S. K., Schaubroeck, J. and Naumann, S. (2002). Group organizational citizenship behavior: A conceptualization and preliminary test of its antecedents and consequences. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1-6.
- Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E. and Byrne, Z. S. (2003). The relationship of emotional exhaustion to work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), 160-169.
- Daft, R. L. (2002). *Organization theory and design*, 7th Ed. New York: South Western Thomson Learning.
- Daily, B. F., Bishop, J. W., Govindarajulu, N. (2009). A conceptual model for organizational citizenship behavior directed toward the environment. *Business Society*, 48, 243-256.
- Deluga, R. J. (1995). The relation between trust in the supervisor and subordinate organizational citizenship behavior. *Military Psychology*, 7(1), 1-16.
- Dibella, A. and Nevis, E. C. (1998). *How organizations learn?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Drew, S. A. W. and Smith, P. A. C. (1995). The learning organization: change proofing and strategy. *The Learning Organization*, 2(1), 4-14.
- Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 57, 61-94.
- Evan, W. M. (1993). *Organization theory research and design*. New York: Macmillian Publishing.
- Farh, J. L., Podsakoff, P. M. and Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, 16, 705-721.

Feather, N. T. and Rauter, K. A. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviors in relation to job status, job insecurity, organizational commitment and identification, job satisfaction and work values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 81-94.

Fok, L. Y., Hartman, S. J., Patti, A. L. and Razek, J. R. (1999). The relationship between equity sensitivity, growth need strength, organizational citizenship behavior and perceived outcomes in the quality environment: A study of accounting professionals. *Journal of Social and Personality*, 15(1), 99-120.

Folger, R. (1993). Justice, motivation and performance beyond role requirements. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6, 239-248.

Garvin, D. A. (1993). Building a learning organization. *Harvard Business Review*, 78-91.

George, J. M. and Jones, G. R. (1997). Organizational spontaneity in context. *Human Performance*, 10, 153-170.

Graham, J. W. (1989). Organizational citizenship behavior: construct redefinition, operationalization and validation. Unpublished research report, Loyola University of Chicago.

Greenberg, J. and Baron, R. A. (2000). *Behavior in organizations*, 7th Ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Guns, B. and Anundsen, K. (1998). *The faster learning organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hernandez, M. and Watkins, K. E. (2003). Translation, validation and adaptation of the Spanish version of modified dimensions of the learning organization questionnaire. *Human Resource Development International*, 6(2), 187-196.

Hoffman, B. J., Blair, C. A., Meriac, J. P. and Woehr, D. J. (2007). Expanding the criterion domain? A quantitative review of the OCB literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 555-566.

Hunt, S. T. (1999). On the virtues of staying inside the box: Does organizational citizenship behavior detract from performance of some jobs? Unpublished research result.

Jacobs, R. L. (1995). Impressions about the learning organizations: What is to see behind the curtain. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 6(2), 119-122.

Jones, A. M. and Hendry, C. (1995). The learning organization: Adult learning and organizational transformation. *British Journal of Management*, 5, June: 153-162.

Jones, G. R. (1995). *Organizational theory text and cases*. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing.

Katzenbach, J. R. and Smith, D. K. (1994). *The wisdom of teams: Creating the high-performance organization*. New York: Harper Collins Reissue.

Kent, A. and Chelladurai, P. (2001). Perceived transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and citizenship behavior: A case study in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 15, 135-159.

Kidwell, R., Mossholder, K. and Benneth, N. (1997). Cohensiveness and organizational citizenship behavior". *Journal of Management*, 23(6), 775-793.

Kline, P. and Saunders, L. B. (1997). Ten steps to a learning organization. New York: Great River Books.

Koh, W. L., Steers, R. M. and Terborg, J. R. (1995). The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 319-333.

Lepine, J., Erez, A. and Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 52-65.

Marquardt, M. J. (1996). *Building the learning organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Martin, C. L. and Bies, R. J. (1991). Just laid off but still a good citizen? Only if the process is fair. Unpublished research note, Academy of Management, Florida

Min-Huei, C. (2004). An investigation of the relationship of organizational structure, employee's personality and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Journal of American Academy of Business*, September, 428-431.

Moorman, R. H. and Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism – collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 127-142.

Moorman, R. H., Niehoff, B. P. and Organ, D. W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6, 209-225.

- Morrison, E. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(6), 1543-1567.
- Netemeyer, R., Mckee, D. O. and Mcmurran, R. (1997). An investigation into the antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior in a personnel selling context. *Journal of Marketing*, 61(3), 85-98.
- Niehoff, B. P. and Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-556.
- O'Reilly, R. and Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: the effects of compliance, identification and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 492-499.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, England: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. and K. A. Ryan (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 775-802.
- Organ, D. W. and Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1), 157-164.
- Organ, D. W. and Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 135(3), 339-350.
- Ortenblad, A. (2004). The learning organization: towards an integrated model. *The Learning Organization*, 11(2), 129-144.
- Pedler, M., Burgoyne, J. and Boydell, T. (1991). *The learning company*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M. and 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. and Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22, 259-298.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H. and Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers trust in leader, satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B. and 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), 513-563.
- Probst, G. and Buchel, B. (1997). *Organizational learning: The competitive advantage of the future*. London: Prentice-Hall.
- Redding, J. C. and Catalanello, R. F. (1994). *Strategic readiness: The making of the learning organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rioux, S. and Penner, L. (1999). The causes of organizational behavior: motivational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1306-1314.
- Robbins, S. P. (1990). *Organization theory structure, design and applications*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Rosen, R. (2005). *Life itself: A comprehensive inquiry into the nature, origin, and fabrication of life (Complexity in ecological systems)*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Schappe, S. (1998). The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and fairness perceptions on OCB. *Journal of Psychology Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 32/3, 277-291.
- Schnake, M. and Dumler, M. P. (1993). The relationship between traditional leadership, super leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. *Group and Organizational Management*, 18/3, 352-366.
- Senge, P. M. (1996). *The fifth discipline*. New York: Doubleday.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. and Near, Y. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653-663.
- Somech, A. and Drach-Zahavy, A. (2004). Exploring organizational citizenship behavior from an organizational perspective: The relationship between organizational learning and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 281-298.

- Tang, T. L. P. and Ibrahim, A. H. S. (1998). Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior revisited: Public Personnel in the United States and in the Middle East. *Public Personnel Management*, 27, 529-551.
- Tompson, H. B. and Werner J. M. (1997). The impact of role conflict / facilitation on core and discretionary behaviors: testing a mediated model. *Journal of Management*, 23(4), 583-601.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (1999). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39, 513-521.
- Turnipseed, D. and Murkison, G. (1996). Organizational citizenship behavior an examination of influence the workplace. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 17, 42-47.
- Turnipseed, D. and Murkison, G. (2000). Good soldiers and their syndrome: Organizational citizenship behavior and the work environment. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 2(2), 1-16.
- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W. and Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organization citizenship behavior: Construct, redefinition, measurement and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 765-802.
- Van Scotter, J. R. and Motowidlo, S. J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 525-531.
- Vandyne, L. and J. A. Lepine (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 108-119.
- Vey, M. A. and Campbell, J. P. (2004). In-role or extra-role organizational citizenship behavior: Which are we measuring? *Human Performance*, 17(1), 119-135.
- Watkins, K. and Marsick, V. (1993). *Sculpturing the learning organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Watkins, K. and Marsick, V. (1997). *Dimensions of the learning organization questionnaire* [survey]. Warwick, RI: Partners for the Learning Organization.
- Williams, L. and Anderson, S. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601-617.
- Williams, S. and Shiaw, W. T. (1999). Mood and organizational citizenship behavior: The effects of positive affect on employee OCB intentions. *The Journal of Psychology*, 133(6), 656-668.
- Williams, S., Pitre, R. and Zainuba, M. (2002). Justice and organizational citizenship behavior intentions: Fair treatment, *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 142 (1), 33-44.
- Yang, B., Watkins, K. E. and Marsick, V. J. (2004). The construct of the learning organization: dimensions, measurement and validation. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 15(1), 31-55.
- Yeo, R. K. (2005). Revisiting the roots of learning organization. *The Learning Organization*, 12(4), 368-382.
- Yukl, G. A. (1989). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.