Investigating the effect of organizational citizenship(OCB) behavior components on organizational agility

Saleh Moradi Aval[1], Ebrahim Haddadi[2*], Aleme keikha[3]

1.M.A student of educational administration, Department of Management, Islamic Azad University of Zahedan, Zahedan, Iran.
2.Assistant Professor of management, Department of Management, Islamic Azad University of Zahedan, Iran.
3.Faculty member, Department of Management, University of Zabol, Zabol, Iran.

Abstract

Purpose: The aim of the current study was to explain the impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational agility Customs staff of Zahedan city, the present study in terms of purpose is functional and in terms of collection method of data is descriptive survey based on correlation method. **Materials & Methods**: The statistical societies of this study are all employees of Zahedan customs surveillance area in 1395 that the number of them is 200 people. 131 people were selected as sample to determine the sample size using Morgan table, sampling method is simple random method. Padsakf Citizenship Behavior Questionnaire (2000) and organizational agility questionnaire of Sharif and Zhang (2008) was used to collect data to test hypotheses. **Findings:** Results of step by step regression shows that, work ethic, courtesy and chivalry as the component of organizational citizenship can significantly predict organizational agility. Work ethic explains higher prediction for organizational agility. After that Courtesy and chivalry had the higher prediction respectively. **Discussion:** improving organizational citizenship through work ethic of organization's personnel can strengthen the organizations goal and agility. At the second level courtesy and chivalry can be considered on the part of managers for achieving more agility in organizations.

* **Corresponding Author**   **Email: ab.haddadi@yahoo.com**

1.Introduction

Concept of organizational citizenship behavior   was subject of many researches in recent twenty years and importance of it is increasing (Tabarsa and Raminmehr, 1389). Scientific different theories are driven from field studies in public and private organizations and units, indicates the importance of treating citizens as a crucial factor in improving individual and organizational performance. According to conducted studies, organizational citizenship behavior increases management and organizational efficiency through strengthen team work spirit, cohesion and solidarity in the organization, increases the stability of organizational performance, increase organization compliance with environmental changes and ultimately improve the quality of services, (Padsakf and McKenzie, 1997).

Organizations, without the willingness of people to work voluntarily, are not able to develop the effectiveness of their collective wisdom. Difference of voluntary and mandatory cooperation has important .in the mandatory, person does his duties according to acceptable regulations and standards and only in extent of requirements compliance but in voluntary cooperation, the issue is raised over the task and people appear their efforts and energy and insight for the prosperity of their ability in favor of organization. Often, in this case, people pass their personal interests and accountability for the benefit of others is a priority (Tabarsa et al, 1389).

In addition to necessity of this behavior, development management and organization improvement of thinkers have introduced human resources empowerment as effective strategy on performance improvement of human resources and they believed that human resources empowerment is one of new age attitudes that nowadays, it is used by organizations and in fact, it is response to the urgent need of modern management. Nowadays, organizations and firms are facing challenges such as Agile and human capital development. Agility emphasizes on responding to the customer, the network of the global market, involvement of staff, integrity in business model, competency development and knowledge management.

As well as organizations requires to tools such as flexible structure, human capital, technology, information technology. Human capital is the most important and most valuable factor for the success of any organization, including governments. staff competence includes knowledge (including knowledge of technical knowledge and academic theories), skills (the ability of employees on completing working missions), talents and initiative of employees form hard section of it that knowledge and skills have the most role that staff attitudes constitutes soft part of it and includes innovation of staff in working and satisfaction of their job and it is considered as a prerequisite for staff that through which, they raise competences (Alam Tabriz, 1388, pp 41-40).

1.   Research Background

OCB has often been compared to contextual performance. Similarly, to OCB, this concept emerged in response to the realization that only looking at job specific work behaviors ignored a significant portion of the job domain. Originally, experts in this field focused only on activities that directly supported the output of the organization. As the job market became more aggressive, it became necessary for employees to go above and beyond that which is formally required by the job description in order to remain competitive. Contextual performance is defined as non-task related work behaviors and activities that contribute to the social and psychological aspects of the organization (Kidder & Parks, 2001).

Contextual performance consists of four elements: persistence of enthusiasm, assistance to others, rule and proscribed procedure following, and openly defending the organizations objectives) Law, Wong & Chen, 2005). OCB and contextual performance share their defining attributes as they both consist of behaviors other than those needed to perform the routine functions of the job. Both also require that these behaviors contribute to the overall success of the organization. Additionally, they also agree on the theme

that these behaviors are discretionary and each employee chooses the amount and degree to which they will perform them. However, while contextual performance and OCB share a good part of their content domain, there are some important differences between the two constructs. One of the main requirements of OCBs is that they are not formally rewarded, which is not the case for contextual performance. Organ (1997) contends that OCBs may at some point encourage some sort of reward, but that these rewards would be indirect and uncertain. Also, contextual performance does not require that the behavior be extra-role, only that it be non-task. The differences between contextual performance and OCB are slight and easy to miss, however, they do exist.

A different way of organizing the OCB construct was proposed by Williams and Anderson (1991). They divided up the dimensions of OCB into two different types of OCB based on whom the behaviors were directed at. Organizational citizenship behavior – individuals (OCBI) include behaviors that are aimed at other individuals in the workplace while organizational citizenship behavior-organizational (OCBO) include behaviors directed at the organization as a whole. Altruism and courtesy are actions aimed at other employees and thus fall under the umbrella of OCBIs. Conscientiousness, civic virtue, and sportsmanship are behaviors intended for the benefit of the organization and can subsequently be considered OCBOs.

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, as cited in Organ et al., 2006) examined paper mill workers and found that helping behavior was significantly related to product quality. MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Ahearne (1996, as cited in Organ et al., 2006) found that civic virtue and helping behavior were significantly related to the percent of team quota sales. Walz and Niehoff (2000, as cited in Organ et al., 2006) examined 30 different restaurants and found that helping behavior was significantly related to operating efficiency, customer satisfaction, and quality of performance. Researchers found that helping behavior was also negatively correlated with wasted food. Koys (2001, as cited in Organ et al., 2006) used a combination of OCB dimensions to form a composite measure of OCB. Results from this study indicated that the composite measure of OCB was positively correlated with restaurant profits.

More recently, Podsakoff, Blume, Whiting, and Podsakoff (2009) found that OCBs were positively related to unit-level performance and customer satisfaction. Nielsen, Hrivnak, and Shaw (2009), in their meta-analytic review of the existing group literature, examined the relationship between OCBs and performance at the group level. These researchers found a positive and significant relationship between overall OCB and performance at the group level. In addition, Nielsen et al. (2009) found that similar patterns of relationships existed for each dimension of OCB: civic virtue, sportsmanship, altruism, conscientiousness, and courtesy.

For human capital, causes organizational agility, must be agile himself and for the agility of human capital, the development of citizenship is required. Nowadays, the quite changeable and variable conditions governing organizations and their entry into the knowledge-based economy, increasing competition and the need for organizations effectiveness, now reveal require valuable generation of employees with organizational soldiers. Today, performance and behavior beyond what is formally stated in the job description, is expectable. Recently, extra-role behaviors or organizational citizenship behavior, is considered as an integral part of performance from management and have made a new wave in the existing knowledge of advantage organizational behavior (Fani, Muhammadi, Fathi & Azar, 1390; Dypayula and Hui, 2005; Maroczy and Zhyn, 2004).

Therefore, organizations Without the voluntary willingness of people to participate, aren't able to develop the effectiveness of their collective wisdom; difference of voluntary and mandatory cooperation has important .in the mandatory , person does his duties according to acceptable regulations and standards and only in extent of requirements compliance but in voluntary cooperation, the issue is raised over the task and people appear their efforts and energy and insight for the prosperity of their ability in favor of organization. Often, in this case, people pass their personal interests and accountability for the benefit of others is a priority (Tabarsa, Hadizade, Koshtegar, 1389).

In the bureaucratic system, all managers attempt to achieve more efficient while maintaining the organization pyramid hierarchical. Therefore, there are superficial and unreliable relations between people. But the human value and democratic system, correct and reliable relations is made among people. In such an environment, opportunity is given to the organization and its members that they will go as far as possible. On this basis, according to the citizens in a democratic value system is increasing. Now, the importance of citizens is perceived as one of the most important resources, their behavior can be seen as very important (Islam and Sayar, 1391).

Organizations need employees who tend to exceed their official obligations and duties. The action of the job task refers to OCB that many researchers have been analyzing it (Rezaei et al., 1390). Today, the concept of organizational citizenship behavior, have attracted the attention of managers and researchers. Attention to these behaviors can be one way to increase the effectiveness of organizations. Systematic study of behavior, leads to improve the ability and explain and predict and guidance, control and change behavior and it has uncovered the relationships between behaviors and important facts, and provides a basis to predict the exact behavior (Khalesy et al., 1389).

One of the most important characteristics of any organization to operate in a changing environment of today is the people who want to be involved in the organization successful changes, means that exhibit the same organizational citizenship behavior (Nasr-Esfahan et al.,1391). One factor that plays a fundamental role in the occurrence of these behaviors and organizational excellence is organizational agility of staff that in recent years, attention of a large number of major managers has attracted itself (Padsakf, Mackenzie, pins and Bachrach,2000; Vendine, Graham and Dinesh, 1994).

Today, due to the competitive and complex environment of field of organization, organizations are condemned to having an agile workforce, because the weak, disability and indifferent force, is a barrier to achieving the organization's goals and big dreams. Efficient and agile workforce can be a major indicator of organizational excellence to other organizations, in this sense, the world has come to believe after years experiencing that for a successful and a leader in the economic, competitive field, organizations must have capable and agile, specialized and high motivation workforce (Orly, 2010).

According to the presented concepts of organizational citizenship behavior has always been this question that if in economic organization such as Customs which is a very important economic government agency that requires to certain behaviors that is different in some cases with the organization behaviors in the private sector and can have a major impact on improving the economic situation and trade facilitation, can this type of behavior be considered? In customs organization of Zahedan often due to high formalization and complex legal procedures, people act weekly in the incidence of citizenship behaviors and haven't high agility in organizational activities and it seems that against the statements of Morrison (1994) that in the OCB and its components (altruism, work ethic, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue), employees should define the scope of their job responsibilities, considered limited tasks for themselves which will have losses for clients and organizations in short-term and long-term. so, it seems that we should be looking for agents that can have the relationship with the occurrence of such behavior by staff, so, in this study, we decided to study effect of organizational citizenship behavior components on organizational agility of Customs staff.

Finally, with regard to discussions and intellectual curiosity, main research question is as follows: Is citizenship behavior and its components (generosity, altruism, conscientiousness, social courtesy and politeness) impact on organizational agility of Zahedan Customs staff? So the researchers tried to explain the impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational agility of Zahedan Custom's staff and tried to prove the assumption that organizational citizenship behavior components affected on organizational agility of Zahedan Customs employees.

3. Method
1.2. Research Model
The research method of the current study is descriptive and correlational. According to the classification of scientific researches in terms of purpose, this study is an applied research. The statistical society included all employees of Zahedan customs surveillance area in 1395. the whole number of the statistical population was 200 people.

130 people were selected employing kerjeci & Morgan (1977) table to determine the sample size. The two methods of library studies and field methods were used to collect data. Library method is part of the job which is done theoretically that in this part, books, articles, theses and research, also referred to Iran's scientific centers of documentation and computer search to obtain papers and theses abroad have been used. Radom sampling method was employed for sapling at the first step 150 people from whole society who were volunteer for the study were selected. The all the questioner was presented to participants. All the people who completed the task correctly were 130 person so other invalid questionnaire were removed. Researchers administered the questionnaire to participants individually or in small group meetings, where the aims of the study were fully described, and the anonymity of participants 'answers was guaranteed.

2.3 Measurement tools
2.3.1. Citizenship Behavior Questionnaire
There exist various measures of OCB in the literature (e.g. Konovsky & Organ, 1996; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). In this study, we used a Podsakoff Citizenship Behavior Questionnaire (2000). This questionnaire consists of 32 items designed to measure five aspects of OCB: Altruism, Conscientiousness, Sportsmanship, Courtesy and Civic Virtue. The rating scale was a 7-point Likert type scale, varying from 1=*does not apply at all to the person I am rating* to 7=*applies very well to the person I am rating*. the content validity was used in order to determine the validity of the study questionnaires, and Cranach's alpha was used for reliability that reliability coefficient of organizational citizenship behavior questionnaire was equal to0.84 and organizational agility questionnaire is equal to 0.83 which is indicative of the reliability of questionnaire.

2.3.2. Organizational agility questionnaire
Agility questionnaire (Sharifi and Zhang,2008) was used for organizational agility variable. To evaluate the reliability of this questionnaire, a preliminary study was conducted on a sample of 36 individuals. Afterwards, the reliability coefficient was calculated for each component of organizational agility using SPSS software.

4. Findings
The correlation between independent variables and the dependent variable is equal to 0.557. The coefficient of determination obtained 0/310 and this value indicates that 31% of changes in organizational citizenship behavior is concerned on organizational agility. Because it does not consider the degrees of

freedom, therefore, the adjusted coefficient of determination is used for this purpose which in this case is equal to 0/30.5 percent. According to the mentioned indexes, model has necessary efficiency.

Table 1. The significance of the regression by F test

model	Sum of Squares	Degree of freedom	Mean of squares	F	Sig
regression	5.60	1	5.60	57.62	0.001
remaining	12.45	128	0.097		
total	18.06	129			

According to the above table, calculated significance level for the statistics was 0.001 and shows the significance of the regression at the level of 0.99%. The drown Histograms chart about regression model confirmed normality assumption of data, so the estimated linear regression model was acceptable.

Table 2. the regression equation of organizational agility

Sig	T	Standard factor	Non-standard factor	model	
		Beta	Std. Erro	B	
0.000	8.36	0.557	0.252	2.10	Constant amount 1
	7.59		0.061	0.466	OCB
		Organizational Agility			

The entered variable in the regression equation is the main core of regression analysis that Listed in the table above. The regression equation can be calculated using not standardized coefficients column below: Organizational agility= OCB (0.466) + 2.10. It can be said with the promotion of one standard deviation of each independent variable, dependent variable will promote to amount of written coefficient. Or in other words, with the promotion of one standard deviation of each OCB, SD of organizational agility will enhance 0.466 units; as a result, they have positive relationship. Related t test to regression coefficients for independent variables are shown in this table. The value for this variable is equal to 0.000; as a result, it is effective on organizational agility. Stepwise regression of organizational citizenship behavior components on organizational agility, shows that ranking organizational citizenship behavior components and their impact on organizational agility Can be achieved and for this purpose the stepwise regression test was used that the results are shown in table 4.

Table 3: Results of stepwise regression for predicting the organizational agility

steps	variable	R	R^2_{Adj}	F	β	t	Sig
		0.463	0.208	34.96	0.463	5.91	0.001
first	Work ethic	0.597	0.347	35.22	0.398	5.51	0.001
	Courtesy +				0.383	5.29	
second	Work ethic	0.618	0.367	25.95	0.389	5.46	0.001
third	Courtesy + Work ethic +chivalry				0.351	4.83	
					0.162	2.26	

Note: R, $R^2_{Adj,}$ F,β , t, Sig stands for correlation, adjusted variance, beta, t test, and significance.

Results of table 4 shows that among organizational citizenship behavior components, work ethic, courtesy and chivalry can significantly predict organizational agility, as it is coming in above table. at the first step work ethic (predictor variables) entered the regression equation and predicts 0/20.8 percent of organizational agility (criterion variable) and explain higher prediction for organizational agility. At the

second step Courtesy has been entered into the regression equation together with work ethic. Both of them predict 0/34.7 of the criterion variable changes. it has to be mentioned that Courtesy alone predict 0/13.9 of the criterion variable changes. at the third step, chivalry was entered the regression equation. Together with two other components predicted 0/36.7 changes of organizational. Furthermore, chivalry alone can predict only 0/2 changes in the organizational agility in customs. Finally, all three variables predict 0/36.8 of the variance of organizational agility.

5.Discussion

The results of the present study were in line with findings of (LePine, Erez, A., & Johnson, 2002; Nielsen, Hrivnak & Shaw, 2009; Organ, Podsakoff & MacKenzie 2006; Zanjirchi and Bogler & Somech, 2004). In this regard the finding of the current research reveals that Organizational citizenship behavior will be considered as a social source through the exchange of behavior, receives social rewards. so when employees feel that they will receive something more than an organization, their citizenship behavior will be better, in other words, according to Dipaola & Hoy (2005) staff attitudes of an organization about different subjects, is more effective than presence or absence of effective citizenship behaviors.

Part of this visions when entering a person on organization associated with him; but the organization can be involved in changing and shaping many of these attitudes (Fani, Mohammadi, Azar & Fathi, 1390). Also Khaky (1391) believes that attitude can controls presence or absence of organizational citizenship behaviors because the OCB is vital for organization survival. according to the viewpoint of theorists (Oregon, 1997) organizational citizenship behavior can maximize efficiency and improve organizational effective performance, organizational agility is also an important factor that enables manager that has been correct, effective and quickest collision with changes and use emerged potential opportunities arising from the change to the best , and move in order to improve the organization and supplying its aims and future needs and as well as provide high quality products and services in a relatively short time and organizational agility has promoted organization's ability to supply high quality products and services and therefore it is an important factor for the efficiency of the organization.

Furthermore, according to findings the organizational agility makes quickly and reactive adapt organizational factors than unexpected changes and providing new and quite different solutions. Researcher believes that managers will win future competitiveness orb that can effectively communicate with their human resources. So the following recommendation can be resented according to the findings.

-Managers should be respondent for the employees needs in regard to their enrichment and job displacement, this policy lets staffs to feel of valued at work, being purposeful and significance especially at the position which the jobs are challenging and meaningful and employees make with role ambiguity, role conflict and role overlapping, so their belief of their personal efficacy is reduced.

- Managers, should let employees participate in organizational decisions and avoid prejudice and discrimination in the decision-making and consider these issues in organization: Redefining the expectations of empowerment, modify, or remove rewards and discrimination acknowledgements , the emphasis on common objectives, establishing expectations for mutual accountability, focusing on standards and reward on making the value of collaboration, systematic thinking and collaboration skills training , defined a new strategy based on value creation.

- Managers noted the ability; commenting and having the right to vote to create this dimension of employee empowerment and the system of remuneration and job design, these cases should be based on competencies. If managers of organizations do not provide rewards for employees, or when rewards aren't based on the employees' competencies, a sense of disability will foster in staff.

- Managers in addition to doing effective works believed that they can create effect and feel controlling on result of their activities. It is suggested that jobs and the use of appropriate design job, clear goals and tasks, as well as to provide field of staff participation are noted in organization. For these cases, are other factors that make spirit of the influence people?

- Managers should have special attention to have the right of staff selection, freedom, discretion and employee autonomy in determining the necessary activities to perform their duties, this sense should be fostered in staff that managers have knowledge and controllers of what happens to people. Considering that the Customs Administration is developing, there is not remedy except more than ever the importance of the role of knowledge in sustainable development, as a result, the capacity to create, organize, share and apply knowledge, has become to one of the crucial aspects of competition in complex environments. So we should note to the level of staff knowledge and try to increase it.

References

Alam Tabriz, A. (1388). *Intellectual Capital: measuring, disclosing, and managing*. Tehran: publications of training Centre and Industrial Research of Iran.

Aurelie, C; Lauras, M; Van W,Luk(2010). "A Model to Define and Assess the Agility of Supply Chains: Building on Humanitarian Experience, *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management* 40(8/9), 722-741.

Bogler, R. & Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. Teaching and Teacher Education, 20: 277–289.

Demneh Taheri, M; Zanjirchi, S, M and nejateyan Gh, M (1390). the role of working ethics in promoting organizational citizenship behavior. Ethics in Behavioral Sciences. Volume Number 2. 30-39.

Dipaola, M.F. & Hoy W. K. (2005). Organizational Citizenship of Faculty and Achievement of High School Student. The High School. 88 (3): 35-44.

Fani, A. A.; Mohammadi, J.; Azar, A.; Fathi, S. (1390). Study the pattern of the relationship between stress and organizational citizenship behavior with meta-analysis approach. Public Management Research, 4 (12): 52-29.

Islami, H, Azar, S (1386), "organizational citizenship behavior", devise No. 187 - Pages 56-59.

Khaky, Gh, (1391), *research methods with an approach to the Thesis writing*, Tehran, the country's scientific research center, publications of wisdom, first printing.

Khalesy, N.; Qaderi, A.; Khoshgam, M.; Borhaninejad, V. R.; Torosk, M. (1389). The relationship between organizational behavior and human resource empowerment in health centers University of Medical Sciences of Tehran, 1388. *Health Management*, 13 (42): 86-75.

Krejcie, R.V. & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.

Kidder, D., & Parks, J. (2001). The good soldier: Who is s(he)? Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22(8), 939-959.

Law, S. K., Wong, C., & Chen, X. Z. (2005). *The construct of organizational citizenship behavior: Should we analyze after we have conceptualized?* In D. L. Turnipseed (Ed.), Handbook of organizational citizenship behavior (pp. 47–65). New York: Nova Science Publishers.

LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & 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.

Markoczy, L. & Xin, K. (2004). *The Virtues of Omission in Organizational Citizenship Behavior*. University of California.

Nasr Esfehani, A, Scholl, S, Arefnejad, M (1391), study the impact of good character of managers on organizational citizenship behavior of studied staff: university of Esfahan, *research of Public Administration*, No. 15, fifth year, 45-62.

Nielsen, T. M., Hrivnak, G. A., & Shaw, M. (2009). Organizational citizenship behavior and performance: A meta-analysis of group-level research. *Small Group Research*, 40(5), 555-577.

Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct cleanup time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85-97.

Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 775-802.

Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie S. P. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. London: Sage Publications.

Podsakoff, M. P., Mackenzie, B. S., Puine, B. J., and Bachrach, G. D. (2000). "Organizational citizenship behaviors: a critical review of the theoretical and Empirical literature and suggestions for future research". *Journal of management*, Vol. 26, pp 513 - 563.

Podsakoff, N. P., Blume, B. D., Whiting, S. W., & Podsakoff, P. M. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 122-141.

Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Mishra, P. (2010). Effects of organizational citizenship behaviors on selection decisions in employment interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Advance online publication.

Podsakoff, P. M., and Mackenzie, S. B. (1997). "Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research". *Journal of Human Performance*, Vol.10, pp.133-151.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.

Rezaei K , H, R. Baqir, S. (1387). "The role of organizational justice in strengthening *organizational citizenship behavior*".1(3), 44-51

Tabarsa, Gh. Hadizadeh moghadam, A; Koshtegar, A. (1389). Providing a model to explain the factors affecting on organizational citizenship behavior. *The prospect of Public Management*, 1 (1): 114-101.

Tabarsa, G.A & Ramin mehr. H (1389). Providing model of organizational citizenship behavior, *management perspective*. 2(3), 11-42

Van Dyne, L. & Graham, J.W. & Dienesch, R.M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement. *Validation, Academy of Management Journal.* 37(4): 765-802.