

A Study on Relationship Between Locus of Control And Organizational Citizenship Behaviour of Employees



Management

KEYWORDS : Internal Locus of Control, External locus of Control, Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

DR. BABARAJU K. BHATT

Principal, Shri Manilal Kadakia College of Management & Computer Studies Ankleshwar, Gujarat State, INDIA

MR. VISHAL J. MALI

Research Scholar, Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University Udaipur, Rajasthan State, INDIA

ABSTRACT

It is said that success of a person depends on his/her way of attributing the events which he/she faces. This research paper is analyzing the various dimensions of Locus of Control like Internal Locus of Control, External Locus of Control (Chance) and External Locus of Control (Luck) and its possible relationship with Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of employees. In practical implication this relationship can be used for developing HR policies and training & development process. Using ANOVA and correlation study seeks to find out the correlation between Locus of Control dimension and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in addition variance with demographic factors.

INTRODUCTION:

The concept Locus of control is based on the extent to which people perceive certain events to affect outcomes. Rotter states that Individuals who have low perceptions of such events have an internal locus of control. They believe that their own actions produce outcomes. Those who have high perceptions of reason for certain events are characterized by an external locus of control. They believe that outcomes are the result of fate rather than the result of their own actions. The locus of control Construct first received attention when Rotter Published his assessment instrument of an Individuals generalized expectations for internal versus external locus of reward. The Rotter instrument, said to measure locus of control, was developed on the basis of the social learning theory. The theory focuses on the important role that reward, respect and gratification play in determining behavior. Rotter proposes the following definition of the concept of internal-external locus of control 'When a reinforcement is identified by the subject as following some action of his own but not being completely contingent upon his own action, then it is characteristically identified as the result of luck, chance fate, as under the control of an influential identified as external control. If the person identified that the event is in control of own behavior or his own stable characteristics, it can be identified as a belief in internal control

Organ (1988) defines OCB as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization". Organ's definition of OCB includes three critical aspects that are central to this construct. First, OCBs are thought of as discretionary behaviors, which are not part of the job description, and are performed by the employee as a result of personal choice. Second, OCBs go above and beyond that which is an enforceable requirement of the job description. Finally, OCBs contribute positively to overall organizational effectiveness. Organ's (1988) definition of OCB has generated a great deal of criticism. The very nature of the construct makes it difficult to operationally define. Critics started questioning whether or not OCBs, as defined by Organ, were discretionary in nature. Organ (1977), in response to criticisms, notes that since his original definition, jobs have moved away from a clearly defined set of tasks and responsibilities and have evolved into much more ambiguous roles. Without a defined role, it quickly becomes difficult to define what is discretionary. 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 officially required by the job description in order to re-

main competitive. Contextual performance is defined as non-task related work behaviors and activities that contribute to the social and psychological aspects of the organization.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

Locus of control refers to one's belief in his or her abilities to control life events (Strauser, 2002). In other words, locus of control is defined as one's thoughts of his/her belief that his/her own power or forces out of his/her control are influential in any positive or negative situation occurring during his/her life (Sardogan, 2006). The belief of locus of control is related to what reinforcements have happened throughout the individuals' lives, namely the results, prizes, their success or failures, refer to. These attributions refer not only to chance, fate, and powerful people out of one's control, but also to the results of his/her own attitudes (Basim and Sesen, 2006). While one's control on his/her own life dependent on chance, fate and powerful people is explained as external control; maintaining the individual control over one's life on his/her own is described as the internal control (Rotter, 1966). When environmental conditions are not sufficient to explain individuals' success or failures, locus of control can facilitate in making these situations clear. For instance, individuals may sometimes perceive good and bad events in different ways. To mention that these different ways are based on external and internal forces (Taylor, 2006). The concept of locus of control has an essential place in literature in helping students who have difficulty in learning and attitude. Locus of control is one of the vital concepts in the context of learning difficulty and attitude change. This concept covers the idea that individuals, throughout their lives, analyse the events as their attitudes or they believe that those events result from chance, fate or outside forces (Erdogan, 2003). Rotter (1966), in his study regarding Social Learning Theory, ascertains that some students display the prizes or reinforcements gained as a result of their knowledge and abilities while some other students display the forces out of their control. Rotter (1966), basing on his study, expresses the situations in which reinforcements occur according to the attitudes of the individuals as individuals' locus of control.

In recent years, there has been an increasing interest in the topic of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs). Much of this research (Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1994; Bateman & Organ, 1983; George, 1990; George & Bettenhausen, 1990; Moorman, 1991; Munene, 1995; Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990; Podsakoff, Niehoff, MacKenzie, & Williams, 1993; Schnake, 1991; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; Williams & Anderson, 1991) has focused on identifying the potential antecedents of OCBs, apparently under the assumption that these forms of behavior are functional to the organization. For example, Organ (1988) defined OCBs as "behavior(s) of a discretionary nature that are not part of the employee's formal role requirements, but nevertheless

promote the effective functioning of the organization” Indeed, as noted by several researchers specializing in this area, the basis for predicting a relationship between OCBs and performance is “typically logical and conceptual rather than empirical” (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, p. 88) and “rests more on its plausibility than direct empirical support” (Organ & Konovsky, 1989, p. 157). What little empirical support there is comes primarily from two studies (Karambayya, 1989; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994). In the first study, Karambayya (1989) examined the relationships between work unit performance and satisfaction and unit members’ citizenship behaviors in a sample of 18 intact work groups, comprised primarily of white-collar and professional employees from 12 different organizations. Karambayya found that members of work units that were rated as having higher levels of performance and satisfaction were generally found to display higher levels of citizenship behavior than were members of work units that exhibited lower levels of performance. In the second study, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994) examined the relationships between OCBs and organizational performance in a sample of 116 agencies in a major insurance company. Consistent with their expectations, they found that citizenship behaviors accounted for approximately 17% of the variance in agency level performance.

Many researches have observed that LOC has positive and significant affect on OCB and POS where POS does have the same effect on OCB. (Eisenberger,1986:500, Eisenberger,1990:51, Moorman,1995:351, 62 Randall,1999:159, Wayne,1997:82). As a matter of fact, the positive relationship between POS and OCB has received strong empirical support. Earlier researchers proved the notion that the higher the level of POS is, the more likely it is that the individual will perform voluntary behaviors that are beneficial to the organization (Eisenberger,1990:51, Wayne,1997:82). Shore and Wayne (1997:774) also maintained that POS was a better predictor of OCB than the foregone organizational commitment concepts. Furthermore, Eisenberger and colleagues found that employees with higher level of POS felt more obligated to help the organization to reach its objectives, committed themselves more to the organization, and engaged more in spontaneous behaviors as well as in-role performance.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE STUDY:

As per literature review studied total three Locsu of Control dimensions are considered to be appropriate and taken up for this correlation study between Locus of Control and Organizational Citizenship Behavior among the various levels of employees in Surat Region.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

- To find out the type of Locus of Control prevailing among the various level of employees of Surat Region
- To identify the correlation between Locus of Control and Organizational Citizenship behavior.

HYPOTHESIS:

Statement 1: There is a negative correlation between Locus of control and Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

SAMPLING AND METHOD OF ANALYSIS:

The Population of the study is the employees of different organization of Surat region. The respondents have been selected by simple random sampling technique through structured questionnaire. The questions are measured by using Likert five point scales. The data & Information have been collected from 250 employees and limited to year 2015.

RESULTS ANALYSIS:

As per the mean value most of the employees have Internal Locus of Control. It means they think that whatever happens around them is because of their own actions. It means whether they get success or failure; all will be due to their own efforts and not due to

any other external factors or luck. Whereas most of the employees have good organizational citizenship behavior. It means they all are respecting code of conduct which usually an ideal employee follows even when no one is watching him.

ANOVA results shows that Internal Locus of Control variance with the Experience and marital status of the employee. It means that response on internal locus of control gets varies as per the difference in experience and marital status of employees. We found that Locus of Control (Chance) and Locus of Control (Luck) has significant variance with age and designation. It shows that response on that Locus of Control (Chance) and Locus of Control (Luck) is different based on different age and designation of employees. While Organizational Citizenship behavior shows significant variance with Experience of the employee. And at last Organizational Citizenship behavior has significant variance with age which means there is a difference in organizational citizenship behaviour among male and female.

Correlation Analysis- Variables (LOC (Internal), LOC (E-Chance), LOC (E-Luck), OCB)

		LOC (Internal)	LOC(E-Chance)	LOC (E-Luck)	OCB	LOC
OCB	Pearson Correlation	.010	-.019	-.027	1	-.029
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.812	.674	.824		0.584
	N	239	239	239	239	239
LOC	Pearson Correlation	.685(**)	.657(**)	.589(**)	-.029	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.584	
	N	239	239	239	239	239

Above correlation analysis exhibits that there is positive correlation between Internal Locus of Control and Organizational Citizenship behavior. External Locus of Control (Chance) & External Locus of Control (Luck) and Organizational Citizenship Behavior have negative correlation but it’s not significant for the sample of the study. This finding is consistent with the many literature review that internals are better than externals in performance and obeying company rules.

CONCLUSION:

In this research our efforts were to examine the relationship between Locus of Control and Organizational Citizenship Behavior with reference to employees of Surat region. The most of the employees found to have more of internal locus of control then external locus of control. Response on internal locus of control gets varies as per the difference in experience and marital status of employees. Locus of Control (Chance) and Locus of Control (Luck) has significant variance with age and designation. Organizational Citizenship behavior shows significant variance with Experience of the employee. There is positive correlation between Internal Locus of Control and Organizational Citizenship behavior. External Locus of Control (Chance) & External Locus of Control (Luck) and Organizational Citizenship Behavior have negative correlation. By this we conclude that companies should not only keep track on citizenship behavior of employees but they must go to root cause that is type of locus of control prevailing in employees. Once it is identified company should promote developing internal locus of control among employees to ensure good organizational citizenship behavior in employees.

REFERENCE

1. Bar-On, R. (2002). "Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-I): Technical Manual". Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems. | 2. Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L. (1995), "Individualism - Collectivism as an Individual Difference Predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behavior," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, pp.127-142 | 3. Organ, D. W. (1988), "Organizational Citizenship Behavior - The Good Soldier Syndrome". Lexington, Massachusetts/Toronto: D.C. Heath and Company. | 4. Eachus, P. & Cassidy, S. (1997) "Self-efficacy, Locus of Control and styles of learning as contributing factors in the academic performance of student health professionals", *Proceedings of the First Regional Congress of Psychology for Professionals in the Americas*, Mexico City. | 5. Findley and Cooper (1983) Cited in Grants, Mandy. 2002. "Do you have the power to succeed: locus of control and its impact on education". *Psy 324, advanced social psychology*. | 6. Hodgkinson, G.P. (1992), "Development and validation of the strategic locus of control scale", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 13, pp. 311-7. | 7. Lefcourt, H.M., Von Baeyer, C.L, Ware, E.E., & Cox, D.J. (1979) "The Multidimensional- Causality Scale: The development of a goal specific locus of control scale". *Canadian journal of behavioral science*, 11 (4), 286-304. | 8. Littunen, H. and Storhammar, E. (2000), "The indicators of locus of control in the small business context", *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, Vol. 8, pp. 343-60. | 9. Deluga, R.J. (1995), "The Relationship Between Attributional Charismatic Leadership And Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25 (18), pp.1652-1669. | 10. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchinson, S. and Sowa, D. (1986), "Perceived Organizational Support", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.75 No. 1, pp.500-7. | 11. Kaufmann, J.D; Stamper, C.L. & Tesluk, P.E. (2001), "Do Supportive Organizations Make For Good Corporate Citizens", *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 13 (4), pp.436- 449. |