The Impact of Organizational Climate and Psychological Capital on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Taghrid S. Suifan

1 Department of Business Management, Faculty of Business, The University of Jordan, Jordan
Correspondence: Taghrid S. Suifan, Department of Business Management, Faculty of Business, The University of Jordan, Jordan. E-mail: t.suifan@ju.edu.jo

Received: August 4, 2015       Accepted: November 9, 2015       Online Published: December 18, 2015
doi:10.5539/ijbm.v11n1p224     URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v11n1p224

Abstract
The impact that organizational climate has on organizational citizenship behavior through psychological capital was examined in this study. The descriptive method was adopted with a questionnaire-based survey. The constructs of the study were measured by three scales adopted from previous works: the Organizational Climate Questionnaire developed by Koys and DeCotiis (1991), the Psychological Capital Questionnaire developed by Luthans et al. (2007), and the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale developed by Lee and Allen (2002). A random sample of employees at Jordanian banks was selected, and 227 out of the 250 distributed questionnaires were found to be valid for analysis. All the hypotheses were accepted; that is, organizational climate has a statistically significant relationship with organizational citizenship behavior, and psychological capital mediates the relationship between organizational climate and organizational citizenship behavior. For organizations to improve organizational citizenship behavior, the psychological capital should be taken into account.
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1. Introduction
Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has been specified as a work-driven facultative behavior undertaken by employees so that they can go beyond the minimum requirements of their jobs (Khurana et al., 2014). OCB is regarded as one of the most significant attitudes that influences employees’ behavior (Pourkiani, Farokhian, & Gheisari, 2014) promotes organizations’ effectiveness (Gholami et al., 2015; Rasheed et al., 2013), employee performance (Asiedu, Sarf, & Adje, 2014; Chiang & Hsieh, 2012), group performance (Sevi, 2010), and organizational commitment (Peterson, 2004; Zayas-Ortiz, Rosario, Marquez, & Gruñeiro, 2015).

Various antecedents of OCB have been reported in the literature. Huang, You, and Tsai (2012) identified three antecedents of OCB; organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and organization’s ethical climate. Zeinabadi (2010), Foote and Tang (2008), and Gyekye and Haybatollahi (2015) concluded that job satisfaction has a direct influence on OCB. Examples of other antecedents of OCB include organizational climate (OC) and psychological capital (PC). The positive association between OC and OCB was well-documented in the literature (Ghasemi & Keshavarzi, 2014; Hajirasouliha et al., 2014; Ahmadizadeh, Hezfollesan, Ghaleghir, Yadollahzadeh, & Heydarinezhad, 2014; Gholami et al., 2015; Hajirasouliha et al., 2014; Ahmadizadeh et al., 2012; Ahmadizadeh et al., 2014; Pourkiani et al., 2014). Similarly, there is a significant relationship between PC and OCB (Golestaneh, 2014).

However, there is still less research on OCB in Arab countries (Elamin & Tlaiss, 2015). In their 2015 paper on banking employees, Zayas-Ortiz et al. carried out a study to investigate the association between organizational commitment and OCB. Their findings confirmed the hypothesis that OC is positively correlated to OCB. Ghasemi and Keshavarzi (2014) showed that OC is positively correlated to organizational commitment. Recent evidence from Pakistan (Qadeer & Jaffery, 2014) pointed out indirect impact of OC on OCB. It was mediated by PC. Previously, Agyemang (2013) studied the relationship between OC, organizational tenure and OCB using a sample consisting of employees working for Ghanaian Banks. His results indicated a positive influence of OC on OCB. Suresh and Venkatammal (2010) revealed that OC as well as personality factors were related to OCB based on data collected from employees form Indian public organizations. Li et al. (2015) demonstrated the importance of PC among bank employees in China in decreasing the passive influence or organizational stress on job burnout. Accordingly, the aim of this study is to explore the relationships between OC, PC and OCB among employees in Jordanian banks. In doing so, the study
extends the existing literature through investigating the impact of OC along with PC on OCB in Jordanian banks.

The rest of this article has been organized as follows: section two presents hypotheses development, section three illustrates study methodology in terms of sample, measures, study model, in addition to questionnaire validity and reliability and section four displays the results based on data analysis. Finally, section five demonstrates discussion and conclusion part, in which limitations, future directions and practical implications were identified.

2. Hypotheses Development

2.1 Organizational Climate and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The distinction between various behaviors like role performance, both innovative and spontaneous, was first considered by Katz and Kahn in 1966, while the term OCB was first introduced by Organ and others in 1983 (Pourkiani et al., 2014). Despite the fact that OCB is a voluntary behavior, it has an effect on organizational performance (Senobari, 2008). According to Shahin et al. (2014), voluntary behavior is not part of job descriptions and is not an employment commitment. It is a kind of a behavior that does not lead to reward and failure to display it will not lead to punishment.

According to Pourkiani et al. (2014, p. 283), OCB has many dimensions. These authors reported the following dimensions: organizational commitment, chivalry, relief behavior, organizational obedience, civic virtue, individual initiative, self improvement, social costume, self satisfaction, personal development, altruism, consciousness, effective and active assistance, persisting with extra effort and enthusiasm, defending and supporting organizational objectives, social manner, supporting organizational practices, supporting organizational resources, courtesy, and avoiding harmful behaviors for individuals and organizations. Peyrat-Guillard and Glińska-Neweś (2010) added other dimensions, such as organizational compliance, sportsmanship, and organizational loyalty.

For Suresh and Venkatammal (2010), OC refers to a collection of attitudes of an organization that affect individuals and groups, like rewards and interpersonal relations. Gholami et al. (2015) regarded OC as perceptions of employees related to an organization’s features like leadership style, decision-making process, as well as work norms.

With reference to the dimensions of OC, Pourkiani et al. (2014) used eight dimensions: harassment, team spirit, distance, thoughtfulness, enthusiasm, emphasizing the production, devotion, and dynamics and penetration. Suresh and Venkatammal (2010) used a scale covering five dimensions of OC: rewards and interpersonal relations, organizational processes, results, altruistic behavior, and clarity of roles and sharing of information. Jain et al. (2015) identified three dimensions of OC: discipline, democracy, achieving organizational goals, social and cultural factor, and organizational image.

Considering the relationship between OC and OCB, Ahmadizadeh et al. (2014) found a positive relationship between OC and staff OCB. Hajirasouliha et al. (2014) studied the impact of OC on OCB. They similarly reported that OCB has a positive relationship with OC. Concurrently, Pourkiani et al. (2014) confirmed the statistically significant relationship between OC and OCB. Gholami et al. (2015) investigated the relationship between these two constructs among hospital staff. They concluded that OC and its characteristics were positively correlated to OCB. Qadeer and Jaffery (2014) conducted a study to prove the relationship between OC and OCB. Using a sample consisting of 123 participants working in a multi-national consulting company, their contrasting results showed that OC did not significantly affect OCB. On the basis of these findings, the following hypothesis was formulated:

H1: OC is significantly related to OCB.

2.2 Organizational Climate, Psychological Capital, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

For this study, four dimensions of PC were considered: resilience, hope, optimism, and efficacy. Snyder (2002, p. 249), defined hope as “the perceived capability to derive pathways to desired goals, and motivate oneself via agency thinking to use those pathway”. Bouckenooghe, Zafar, and Raja (2015) defined resilience as “a person’s ability to rebound from conflict, adversity, failure and uncertainty and can even capture positive change, increased responsibility and progress.” (p. 254). Efficacy was defined by Walumbwa, Peterson, Avolio, and Hartnell (2010) as “confidence to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks” (p. 6). Finally, Han, Brooks, Kakabadse, Peng, and Zhu (2012) defined optimism as “explanatory style that attributes positive events to permanent, internal and pervasive causes, and negative events to external, temporary, and situation specific ones.” (p. 672).

As for the relationship between PC and OCB, Qadeer and Jaffery (2014) investigated the relationship between OC and OCB through PC. Their findings confirmed that PC is positively correlated to both OC and OCB.

Few studies have been conducted to investigate the influence that PC might have on OCB. Beal et al. (2013)
examined the effect of PC on OCB by recruiting a sample of 100 individuals at a government organization. Their findings showed that PC is positively related to OCB. Therefore, the following hypothesis was proposed:

**H2**: PC mediates the relationship between OC and OCB.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Sample

Participants of this study were 250 employees working in Jordanian banks in the capital city Amman. They were randomly selected from five commercial banks in Jordan. Data were collected in April 2015 using a questionnaire-based survey. Of the 250 questionnaires distributed, 227 were completed and returned, representing a 91% response rate. Respondents were asked to complete questionnaires based on a five-point Likert measurement scale (1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree).

#### 3.2 Measures

OC was measured using the Organizational Climate Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Koys and DeCotiis (1991). The OCQ scale (40 items) measures eight dimensions of OC: cohesion, autonomy, trust, support, pressure, fairness, recognition, and supervisor encouragement of innovation. PC was measured using the Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ) developed by Luthans, Avolio, Avey, and Norman (2007). The PCQ scale consists of 24 items covering four dimensions: optimism, hope, resilience, and self-efficacy. OCB was measured using the Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) Scale developed by Lee and Allen (2002). The scale consists of 16 items composed of two types of OCB: 8 items directed to individuals’ OCB and 8 items directed to organization’s OCB.

#### 3.3 Study Model

The presumed relationships between study variables are depicted in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. The study model](image)

#### 3.4 Validity and Reliability

The internal consistency of the scales was examined using the inter-item consistency reliability. The construct validity was evaluated using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Cronbach’s alpha ($\alpha$) for the scales as well as the overall model fit statistics can be seen in Table 1. According to the table, all scales showed acceptable construct validity and internal consistency reliability, since $\alpha$ value for the scales were above 0.7, the $\chi^2/df$ ratio was between 1 and 2, ($p < 0.01$), RMSEA values were equal or less than 0.08, and CFI values were equal or greater than 0.80.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$\chi^2/df$</th>
<th>($p &lt; 0.01$)</th>
<th>RMSEA (90% CI)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCQ</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCQ</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB Scale</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Results

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data in order to test the study hypotheses. The descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) of the study sample can be seen in Table 2.
Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the study sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>103 (55%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>124 (45%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34 (15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43 (19%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36–40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47 (21%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46–50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or above</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13 (6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123 (54%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89 (39%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year or less</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28 (12%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–5 years</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54 (24%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 years</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69 (30%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–15 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58 (26%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or above</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that 55% of the study sample was males and 45% were females. Of the participants, 15% were between 25 and 30 years old, 19% were between 31 and 35 years, 21% were between 36 and 40 years, 22% were between 41 and 45 years, and 17% were between 46 and 50 years. The sample included only 6% whose age was 51 years or above. The majority of the participants held a bachelor’s degree (54%), followed by 39% of the participants who held a master’s degree (39%). The percentage of participants with high school degrees was 3% only, and 4% of them held a Ph.D. degree. In relation to experience, the table shows that 12% of the participants had 1 year or less, 24% from 2 to 5 years, 30% from 6 to 10 years, and 26% from 11 to 15 years. Finally, 8% of the participants had 16 or more years of experience.

4.1 Tests of Hypotheses

Pearson correlations in addition to regression analysis were performed in order to test the suggested hypotheses. As shown in Table 3, OC ($r = 0.67$, $p < 0.01$) and PC ($r = 0.53$, $p < 0.01$) were positively related to OCB. Additionally, PC had a positive correlation with OC ($r = 0.42$, $p < 0.05$). The positive correlation coefficient between OC and OCB supports the first hypothesis (H1), which proposed that OC would have a significant impact on OCB.

Table 3. Pearson correlations between variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>OCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$.

To test the second hypothesis (H2), OCB was regressed on OC and PC using regression analysis. Table 4 shows the results of this test. The results revealed that OC was a significant predictor of OCB ($\beta = 0.68$, $p < 0.01$). The $R^2$ value indicates that OC explained 32% of the variance in OCB ($R^2 = 0.32$). The results also show that PC is positively correlated to OCB ($\beta = 0.33$, $p < 0.01$) with $R$ square $= 0.47$. Therefore, H2 was accepted.
Table 4. Result of regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R square</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The aim of this study was to investigate the relationships between OC and OCB. The study also examined if PC mediates the relationship between these two constructs. The analysis of the data collected from 227 employees at Jordanian banks pointed out a statistically significant impact of OC on OCB. Furthermore, the study concluded that PC mediates the influence of OC on OCB. In fact, the above results echo previous studies (Ahmadizadeh et al., 2014; Beal et al., 2013; Gholami et al., 2015; Hajirasouliha et al., 2014; Pourkiani et al., 2014; Qadeer & Jaffery, 2014). These findings support the notion that OC has an impact on OCB through PC. Consequently, organizations should take OC dimensions (harassment, team spirit, enthusiasm, devotion, distance, thoughtfulness, emphasizing the production, and penetration and dynamics) as well as PC dimensions (optimism, hope, resilience, and self-efficacy) into their consideration in order to enhance OCB levels among employees.

5.1 Limitation and Future Research

Due to the small sample size and common method bias, the generalizability of the above results to other organizations may be questionable. Additionally, data required for the purpose of the study were collected based on OCQ developed by Koys and DeCotiis (1991) to measure OC, PCQ developed by Luthans, Avolio, Avey, and Norman (2007) to assess PC and OCB scale developed by Lee and Allen (2002) to measure OCB. Finally, the results of the study is limited to the cross sectional design, in which changes in variables overtime cannot be reflected. Further research is required to investigate the same constructs on a larger sample. Since findings of this study are limited to banking sector in Jordan, future research should tackle other Jordanian industries.

5.2 Practical Implications

This study provides practical implications for organizations, particularly banks, and for managers. Employees’ engagement in OCB behavior can be increased in organizations by ensuring a healthy OC through concentration on harassment, team spirit, devotion, thoughtfulness, enthusiasm, distance, emphasizing the production, and penetration and dynamics, and by keeping hope, optimism, self-efficacy, as well as resilience in mind. The study showed that extra role behaviors on employees’ side are related to organizational climate. Therefore, for organizations to maintain OCB behaviors, positive aspects of OC should be ensured. On the other hand, physiological capital dimensions are related to OCB. Hence organizations can make employees more committed, adaptable, creative, cooperative, managed, effective and satisfied.
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