

Impact of Personality Traits on Organisational Citizenship Behaviour in Administrative Services

Mahipal Raperia*

Research Scholar, IMSAR, MDU, Rohtak

Abstract – *Organizational citizenship behavior is among the most alluring behaviors in present day associations, albeit without any enforceable necessities. It is accepted that a few people, in light of what their identity is, would be bound to show such behaviors (Elanain, 2007). As it were, pre-demeanors of a worker like personality traits can be a wellspring of his presentation of OCB. Keeping it in see, the present paper means to recognize the relationship between these two develops based on examines led all through the world. The present examination includes a broad survey of the writing accessible on different database sources like Emerald, Taylor and Francis, Science Direct and so forth. Based on survey, ends and proposals for future specialists have been given.*

Keywords: *Personality Traits, Five-Factor Model, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Contextual Performance, OCBI and OCBO.*

-----X-----

INTRODUCTION

Instability and dynamic changes are the trademark highlights of the present business condition, in this manner requiring the business endeavors to perceive such changes through rearrangement for their endurance and coherence. In the midst of different advances, associations need such representatives who are eager to go an additional mile and put forth such attempts which are not part of their legally binding commitments; such behavior is generally alluded to as Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). Organ (1988) characterized it as the behavior that is optional; neither legitimately nor unequivocally compensated by the proper prize framework and that in total lifts the powerful working of the association. It is free and intentional all things considered behavior isn't a prerequisite of the endorsed expected set of responsibilities, rather a matter of individual decision. This extra-job or contextual performance showed by the workers is significant for the adequacy and proficiency of the association, which at last has a heading on its endurance and development (Organ et al., 2006). Surviving exploration has dominantly distinguished various precursors to it, for example, organizational equity (Moorman, 1991), work fulfillment (Williams and Anderson, 1991), organizational duty (Meyer et al., 2002), initiative style (Podsakoff et al., 1990), culture (Farh et al., 2004), representative commitment (Babcock-Roberson and Strickland, 2010) and the like. Nonetheless, as of late, scientists have begun to show unmistakable fascination for recognizing the

different dispositional factors answerable for evoking such populace behaviors (Organ 1994; Organ and Ryan, 1995; Borman and Motowidlo, 1997; Chiaburu et al., 2011). The plausible explanation for such intrigue can be credited to the way that dispositional factors like personality traits do have a heading on singular behavior. Personality traits shape ones behavior particularly without any implementation or commitment. A worker who is profoundly helpful can be relied upon to evade pointless clashes at the working environment. So also a principled worker can be relied upon to abstain from taking delayed breaks. As such, personality traits hold a prescient force just in what Mischel (1977) named as frail circumstances. Feeble circumstances allude to those circumstances which are without convincing outside impetuses and ailing in demand qualities for behavior. OCB by its very nature would portray such behavior that happens in frail circumstances (Organ, 1994). Subsequently, it is normal that personality traits of a worker can be an important wellspring of his presentation of OCB. The present paper, in this way, is a modest endeavor to give a survey of various investigations directed on the said builds so as to bring to the fore their relationship. In the first place, the paper expects to give a diagram of the said develops autonomously and second, it means to give a survey of inquires about directed on these factors together.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Personality traits suggest suffering examples of thought, feeling, and behavior that are not prone to change after some time and depict individuals' behavior across various circumstances (Costa and McCrae, 1989).

The Five-Factor Model of personality (FFM) or "Enormous Five" has accomplished across the board acknowledgment as a significant portrayal of personality traits. These five factors fundamentally speak to a scientific classification to clarify the human personality space in a frugal and complete way. These have been recognized across societies and various dialects, in this manner giving further help to the presence of the FFM and its all-inclusive application (McCare and Costa, 1997; Nikolaou and Roberston, 2001).

The Big-Five model comprises of five components of personality (Goldberg, 1990) which are as per the following

- **Extraversion:-** It alludes to one's solace level with connections. Individuals who score high on this measurement will in general be increasingly amiable, emphatic, vivacious and positive scholars. These are alluded to as extraverts. While as, those scoring low on this measurement, alluded to as loners, will in general be modest, saved, bashful and calm.
- **Agreeableness:-** It alludes to a person's affinity towards coordinated effort and participation. Individuals who score high on this measurement will in general be warm, agreeable and trust commendable. Conversely, those scoring low on this measurement will in general stay cool, uncooperative and forceful.
- **Conscientiousness:-** Basically this measurement speaks to a proportion of unwavering quality. A person who scores high on this measurement will in general be increasingly capable, sorted out and reliable. While as, people scoring low here will in general be progressively diverted, complicated and questionable.
- **Emotional dependability:-** It alludes to a person's propensity to withstand pressure. It is frequently marked by its opposite, i.e., Neuroticism. Individuals with positive passionate soundness have qualities of serenity, fearlessness and security. While, those scoring low on this measurement will in general be on edge, discouraged and unreliable.
- **Openness to encounter:-** it alludes to a person's tendency towards creative mind, oddity and interest. Individuals scoring high on this measurement will in general be increasingly imaginative and inquisitive in contrast with those with low scores.

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

The previous not many decades have seen tremendous enthusiasm among the scientists in the fields of brain research, human science and organizational behavior towards Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Smith et al 1983; Brief and Motowidlo, 1986; Podsakoff et al., 2000; and Organ et al., 2006). OCBs are the individual commitments in the working environment going past one's honorable obligation (Smith et al., 1983) and are relied upon to add to the proficiency of the associations (Organ et al., 2006).

Schnake (1991) verbalized that professional social behaviors, for example, helping new representatives to appreciate the inner functions of the association, encouraging collaborators in the opportune fruition of errands, going to gatherings and volunteering to perform exercises past legally binding commitments are a portion of the behaviors connected with OCB. To this degree, OCB can be seen as optional, extra-job, master social or contextual performance (Organ, 1988; Brief and Motowidlo, 1986). Analysts have distinguished about thirty unique types of OCB since its presentation in the year 1983 (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Smith et al. (1983) gave two dimensional grouping of OCB. These two measurements are Altruism and General Compliance. At that point after, Organ (1988) concocted five dimensional grouping of this develop and these measurements are as under:

- **Altruism:-** It alludes to non-mandatory helping behavior of a worker towards individual laborers with an organizational-important undertaking or issue. In any case, such behavior can be displayed towards clients too (Organ, 1988).
- **Conscientiousness:-** It incorporates such intentional behaviors which go past the essential prerequisites of the activity as far as obeying rules and guidelines in any event, when no one is watching, dodging delayed breaks, keeping up participation above standards and so forth
- **Courtesy:-** It alludes to such willful behavior of a representative which targets

forestalling business related clashes with individual laborers.

- **Sportsmanship:-** It alludes to such willful behaviors which includes enduring the unavoidable burdens or not exactly perfect circumstances in the associations without whining.
- **Civic ethicalness:-** It alludes to such intentional behavior which shows a worker's significant level of intrigue and dependability towards the association (**Podsakoff et al, 2000**).

Additionally, Williams and Anderson (1991) concocted an alternate way to deal with order this very develop. He discussed Organizational Citizenship Behavior-Individual (OCB-I) and Organizational Citizenship Behavior-Organization (OCB-O). Optional behaviors that give prompt advantage to people and are in a roundabout way valuable to the association viz. philanthropy and civility fall under the class of OCB-I; and optional behaviors viz. sportsmanship, honesty and municipal prudence which are gainful for by and large association fall under the class of OCB-O.

PERSONALITY TRAITS AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

Since personality is a significant determinant of behavior, along these lines analysts have demonstrated their excitement towards distinguishing its association with both in-job just as extra-job behaviors at the work place (Organ and Ryan, 1995; Hurtz and Donovan, 2000; Barrick, Mount and Judge, 2001; Barrick, Parks and Mount, 2005). These examinations unmistakably demonstrated that personality traits do significantly affect representatives' performance once they are employed. Organ (1994) contended for personality traits as a determinant of worker's readiness to go past the endorsed job necessities. He communicated that there exists a similar rationale behind personality-OCB relationship which lies behind the relationship of employment demeanor OCB. Nonetheless, as opposed to his desires, he discovered little help for anticipating OCB from proportions of personality aside from some variation of Conscientiousness. In their meta-scientific examination, Organ and Ryan (1995) set forward an exhaustive audit of the accessible writing connecting work frames of mind and personality factors of good faith, suitability, constructive affectivity and pessimistic affectivity with OCB measurements of Altruism and summed up consistence.

The ends uncovered that Conscientiousness and suitability were altogether identified with the two types of OCB yet their relationship was powerless in contrast with the relationship between work mentalities and OCB. So as to evaluate the

dispositional and contextual determinants of OCB, Konovsky and Organ (1996) directed their examination on proficient and regulatory workers in a clinic situated in US. The discoveries uncovered scruples as the most grounded indicator of summed up consistence measurement of OCB, while as neither appropriateness nor value affectability had any impact on OCB among the example respondents. In their article, Motowidlo et al. (1997) utilized the differentiation among contextual and task performance to understand the hidden components of behavioral scenes that make up the area of performance. They likewise contended for personality factors like extraversion, pleasantness and uprightness to be preferred indicators of contextual performance over assignment performance.

Podsakoff et al's. (2000) meta-examination of OCBs and their indicators likewise included good faith, suitability, constructive affectivity, and adverse affectivity as the main personality factors. The discoveries uncovered that except for principles, other dispositional factors were not seen as unequivocally identified with OCB. So also trying to refresh the Meta explanatory investigation of Organ and Ryan (1995), Borman et al., (2001) did meta-examination of studies led post-1995. The outcomes found somewhat higher connections between's personality traits and citizenship performance than with task performance. Elanain (2007) did an examination on administration segment representatives in UAE and discovered receptiveness to encounter as an essential personality measurement identified with OCB. This was the most captivating finding of their examination. Likewise, uprightness and passionate security were additionally found as significant indicators of OCB among the example respondents. Kumar et al., (2009) directed their examination on specialists working in a therapeutic school in North India. The outcomes suggested that Big Five is a valuable system to clarify the dispositional premise of OCB.

The regression examination uncovered good faith, extraversion, suitability and neuroticism as the substantial indicators of OCB among the example respondents, while Openness to encounter demonstrated no huge association with OCB. In their exact examination on the bleeding edge directors in select private and open undertakings in India, Singh and Singh (2009) discovered extraversion and reliability as the most dominant indicators of OCB. So also, Mahdiun et al. (2010) discovered constructive connection between personality measurements of appropriateness, good faith, transparency and extraversion, and OCB among the staff of Tehran University, while a contrary affiliation was found among neuroticism and OCB. In another meta-scientific investigation, Chiaburu et al., (2011) discovered personality traits as better indicator of OCB far beyond Job fulfillment. Likewise, suitability

and receptiveness were found to have critical relationship with OCB than task performance. Ahmadizadeh et al (2013) directed an investigation in Iran to explicitly break down the relationship between receptiveness to experience and OCB. The outcomes uncovered a critical positive connection between the said factors. The discoveries likewise bolstered their recommendation of receptiveness to encounter as a critical determinant of OCB. Patki and Abhyankar (2016) additionally discovered receptiveness to encounter as the most grounded indicator of both OCBI and OCBO. The discoveries additionally uncovered constructive connection among OCB and personality measurements of principles, suitability and extraversion.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

In perspective on the examinations directed all through the world, it tends to be plainly expressed that personality traits do affect these populace behaviors. Be that as it may, to choose in clear terms which measurement of personality is the most substantial indicator of OCB is as yet vague. A large portion of the examinations led in the western nations have found either Conscientiousness or suitability or both to be essentially connected with OCB (Organ, 1994; Organ and Ryan, 1995; Konovsky and Organ, 1996; Podsakoff et al., 2000). While, examines led in non-western nations have discovered huge relationship among OCB and other personality measurements also (Elanain, 2007&2010; Kumar et al., 2009; Singh and Singh, 2009; Mahdiun et al., 2010; Patki and Abhyankar, 2016). The relationship between Openness to experience and OCB was non-huge in a large portion of the western investigations, anyway this specific measurement was seen as a huge indicator of OCB in numerous Asian examinations (Elanain, 2007&2010; Mahdiun et al., 2010; Ahmadizadeh et al., 2013; Patki and Abhyankar, 2016). So as to have better experiences, the future analysts need to direct more investigations mulling over the significance of social contrasts. Besides, some meta-explanatory investigations have discovered frail to direct relationships between's the two develops (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Chiaburu et al., 2011), in this way demonstrating the plausibility of some mediating factors. Consequently, it tends to be recommended that the future specialists ought to recognize these interceding factors by method for including an intervening or directing variable to the current model.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmadizadeh Z., Heydarinejad S., and Taheri A. (2013). Examination of the relationship of receptiveness to encounter and organizational Citizenship behavior. *Universal Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*. 4 (8). pp. 2225-2229.
2. Babcock-Roberson, M. E., and Strickland, O. J. (2010). The connection between magnetic initiative, work commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Journal of Psychology*, 144, pp. 313-326.
3. Bateman, T. S., and Organ, D. W. (1983). Occupation fulfillment and the great trooper: The connection among influence and worker "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, pp. 587-595.
4. Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., and Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance toward the start of the new thousand years: What do we know and where do we go straightaway? *Personality and Performance*, 9, pp. 9-30.
5. Barrick, M. R., Parks, L. and Mount, M. K. (2005). Self-Monitoring as an arbitrator of the connection between personality traits and performance. *Staff Psychology*, 58(3), pp. 745-767.
6. Borman, W. C., Penner, L. An., Allen, T. D., and Motowidlo, S. J. (2001). Personality indicators of citizenship performance. *Global Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, pp. 52-69. doi:10.1111/1468-2389.00163
7. Brief, A. P., and Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Master social organizational behaviors. *Foundation of Management Review*, 11, pp. 710-725
8. Chiaburu, D.S., Oh, I.S., Berry, C.M., Li, N. and Gardner, R.G. (2011). The five-factor model of personality traits and organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-investigation. *Diary of Applied Psychology* 96(6). pp. 1140-1166.
9. Costa, P. T., and McCrae, R. R. 1989, "NEO-PI proficient manual", *Psychological Assessment Resources*, Odessa. FL
10. Elanain, H.A. (2007). Connection among Personality and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Does Personality Influence Employee Citizenship? *Universal Review of Business Research Papers*, 3(4), pp. 31-43.
11. Elanain H. A., (2010). Work locus of control and interactional equity as middle people of the connection between receptiveness to encounter and organizational citizenship behavior.

- Diverse Management: An International Journal, 17(2), pp. 170 – 192
12. Farh J. L., Zhong C. B. and Organ D. W. (2004). Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the People's Republic of China. *Organizational Science* 15(2). pp. 241-253.
 13. Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An elective portrayal of personality the Big Five factor structure., *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59. pp. 1216-1229.
 14. Hurtz, G. M., and Donovan, J. J. (2000). Personality and employment performance: The Big Five returned to. *Diary of Applied Psychology*, 85, pp. 869–879. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.85.6.869
 15. Konovsky, M. An., and Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Diary of Organizational Behavior*, 17, pp. 253–266.
 16. Kumar, K., Bakhshi, A. and Rani, E. (2009) Linking the 'enormous five' personality spaces to organizational citizenship behavior. *Global Journal of Psychological Studies* 1(2): pp. 73–81.
 17. Mahdiun, R., Ghahramani, M., Sharif, A. R. (2010). Clarification of organizational citizenship behavior with personality. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5, pp. 178–184.
 18. McCrae, R. R., and Costa, P. T. (1997). Originations and corresponds of receptiveness to encounter. In R. Hogan, R. Johnson, and S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality brain research* (pp. 825–847). San Diego, CA: Academic Press. doi:10.1016/B978-012134645-4/50032-9
 19. Meyer, J.P., Stanley, D.J., Herscovitch, L. and Topolnytsky, L. (2002) Affective, duration and regularizing pledge to the association: A meta-examination of predecessors, relates and outcomes. *Diary of Vocational Behavior* 61(1): pp. 20–52.
 20. Mischel, W. (1977) The collaboration of individual and circumstance. In: D. Magnusson and N.S. Endler (eds.) *Personality at the Crossroads: Current Issues in Interactional Psychology*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 333–352.
 21. Moorman, R.H. (1991). Connections between organizational equity and organizational citizenship behaviors: do decency observations impact worker citizenship? *Diary of Applied Psychology*, 76. pp. 845-55.
 22. Motowidlo, S. J., Borman W. C., and Schmit M. J. (1997). A Theory of Individual Differences in Task and Contextual Performance. *Human Performance*, 10(2), pp. 71-83.
 23. Nikolaou, I., and Robertson, I. T. (2001). The five-factor model of personality and work behavior in Greece. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10, pp. 161–186.
 24. Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The great trooper disorder*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
 25. Organ, D. W. (1994). Personality and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Diary of Management*, 20(2), pp. 465-478.
 26. Organ, D. W., and Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-diagnostic audit of attitudinal and dispositional indicators of organizational citizenship behavior. *Work force Psychology*, 48, pp. 776–801.
 27. Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., and MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its tendency, predecessors, and results. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
 28. Patki. S. M. and Abhyankar S. C. (2016). Large Five Personality Factors as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Complex Interplay. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology* 3 (2), pp. 136-146.
 29. Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., and Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational pioneer behaviors and their impact on devotees' trust in pioneer, fulfillment, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1 (2), pp. 107-142.
 30. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., and Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A basic survey of the hypothetical and experimental writing and recommendations for future research. *Diary of Management*, 26, pp. 513–563
 31. Singh, A.K. and Singh, A.P. (2009) Does personality anticipate organizational citizenship behavior among administrative

work force? *Diary of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology* 35(2): pp. 291–298.

32. Smith, C. An., Organ, D. W., and Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its temperament and predecessors. *Diary of Applied Psychology*, 68, pp. 653–663.
33. Williams, L. J., and Anderson, S. E. (1991). Employment fulfillment and organizational responsibility as indicators of organizational citizenship and in-job behaviors. *Diary of Management*, 17(3), pp. 601-617.

Corresponding Author

Mahipal Raperia*

Research Scholar, IMSAR, MDU, Rohtak

mahipal.raperia@gmail.com