Review of Business, Accounting & Finance
Volume 01, Issue 02, 196 - 214

THE ROLES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE, JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR ON EMPLOYEES' PERFORMANCE

Zef Risal*[a]
Budiyanto[b]
Nur Fadjrih Asyik[b]
Agus Suroso[c]
Khuzaini[b]
Triyonowati[b]
Suwito[b]

[a] Faculty of Economics, Management Department, University of Madura, Indonesia
[b] Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Indonesia Surabaya (STIESIA), Indonesia
[c] Faculty of Economics, Management Department, Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Indonesia

Abstract

Purpose: This study is to examine the roles of organisational culture, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour on employees' performance. Through extensive review on related early work, such a topic still becomes active research areas. It is not merely inconsistent results but also the underlying logics in explaining those relationships.

Design/methodology/approach: The data were collected from the employees of SMEs of Indonesian, specifically in Sampang and Pamekasan regencies, East Java, through a survey questionnaire.

Findings: This study empirically confirms that organisational culture, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour are positively and significantly associated with employees' performance.

Originality: This work provides new insights into the dimensional effects of the problematic factors (organisational culture, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior) on employees' performance.

Keywords: organizational culture, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, employees' performance.

* Corresponding Author at: Faculty of Economics, Management Department, University of Madura, Indonesia
E-mail adresse: zefrisal@unira.ac.id
Received 14 January 2021; Accepted 30 March 2021

Introduction

The notion that organisational culture, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior are related to employee performance continues to intrigue organizational researchers. Yet the bulk of evidence shows the correlation between the those aspects and employee performance to be relatively low (e.g. Gregory et al. 2009; Balaji et al. 2020; Taormina, 2009; Krajcsák, 2018; Jungert et al. 2018; Garg, 2017; Rita et al. 2018; Yang and Wei, 2018; Klotz et al. 2018). Apparently, employee performance is a so sensitive (Pradhan and Jena, 2017), requiring more empirical studies that help organizations, pertaining how to manage or improve the quality of employee performance. Nasab and Afshari (2019) note that every organization, both private and public organizations in general, considers that employee is one of the important factors to support the success of all organizational activities. In this respect, organizations view an employee as the driver of all operational activities. However, whether or not an employee will give his or her services wholeheartedly to the organization and produce up to potential depends, in large part, on the way the worker feels about the social supports from fellow workers and supervisors (James and Lahti, 2011).

Empirically, McDonald and Smith (1995) conducted a study of 437 publicly traded companies to demonstrate the relationship between performance management programs and business performance. In this instance, performance management programs included the existence of explicit job goals, incentives and feedback mechanisms, along with ample learning opportunities to achieve the goals. The findings suggest that firms without performance management programs, and without employee development for that matter, tend to under-perform relative to industry financial averages, while those with performance management practices tend to perform at or above industry averages. At the same time, there are sufficient pragmatic evidences showing that financial offers have varying effects and may not be of much significance for escalating employee performance (Bonner et al. 2001; Camerer and Hogarth, 1999; Gupta and Shaw, 2014). This is due to the changing nature of work and rise of knowledge workers in post-globalization, which has defied the familiar views of individual work performance (Frese, and Fay, 2001; Ilgen and Pulakos, 1999). The question that arises over here is, if monetary incentives are incongruent on one's effort and performance, then what are the other associated behavioral factors that influence enhancing employee performance.

The relationship between high performance work practices or systems (or called organisational culture) and employees' performance has been the topic of a heated debate over the last decade (Lok and Crawford, 2004). Significant progress has been made in unravelling the links between such systems and performance, even though several theoretical and empirical problems remain. For example, as Bititci et al. (2006) and others have noted, there is no clear consensus on the number or content of the practices that should be included. Mohr et al. (2012) view organisational culture as recognised as one determinant of how people behave, more or less ethically, in organisations. It is also increasingly understood as an attribute that management can and should influence to improve organisational and employees' performance. When things go wrong in organisations, managers look to the culture as both the source of problems and the basis for solutions. Studies in the 1980s and thereafter, have proven that organizational culture has a

significant influence on job satisfaction, morale, loyalty and employee involvement, turnover, commitment, employee attitudes and motivation, and efforts to attract and retain talented employees (e.g. Fisher, 2000; Rollins and Roberts, 1998; Weiner, 1988; Denison, 1990; Marcoulides and Heck, 1993). However, while organisational culture have been investigated in considerable depth, thereis a smaller but growing body of research question its consequences on employees' performance (Pinho et al. 2014).

Another factor, attracting a considerable attention from organisational scholars that influence employee performance is job satisfaction (Harlie, 2010; and Baloch et al., 2016). According to Robbins (2008), employee performance is expected to be well correlated with an intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction refers to the extent to which an employee feels self-motivated, content & satisfied with his/her job, and intrinsic motivation refers to the motivation to perform an activity for itself, in order to experience the pleasure and satisfaction inherent in the activity (Deci et al. 1989). Theories of intrinsic motivation focus on satisfaction of the needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness (Gagné and Deci, 2005), or work design characteristics that lead to productive psychological states (Hackman and Oldham, 1976). Although there are several alternative pathways between perceived training opportunities and employee outcomes, research on this aspect suggests that job satisfaction could be a key variable on employee performance (Cerasoli et al. 2014). At the same time, Cerasoli et al. (2014) mention that despite the strong assumptions that workplace training influences employee outcomes (e.g. motivation, commitment, and work performance), there is a limited number of studies in field settings addressing these issues empirically. For the current study, it is considered as one of focused concerns to be addressed.

Furthermore, as described by Cho and Johanson (2008), it has been found that when employees perceive that their employment relationship is based on an economic exchange, they will meet the minimum requirements but do not exert extra effort such as helping co-workers, making suggestions for work improvements, performing duties beyond the minimum requirements, and participating in organizational meetings (Yen and Niehoff, 2004; Stamper and Dyne, 2001). These extra efforts are often called 'Organizational Citizenship Behavior' (OCB). OCB refers to employees' willingness to perform tasks that require effort beyond their prescribed role descriptions (Yen and Niehoff, 2004; Stamper and Dyne, 2001). Organ (1988) defined 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".

Alkahtani (2015) explained that one of the main reasons why OCB has attracted the attention of academics and practitioners is because of the proven significance of organizational effectiveness. Podsakoff et al. (2000) explained that OCB affects organizational performance through increasing the efficiency of co-workers and managers; increasing resources for more productive activities and goals effectively; making organizations more responsive to change in the environment; assisting team coordination for productive work; strengthening the ability to attract and retain talented employees and improve organizational stability. According to Ryan (2002), OCB is an extra-role behavior that is owned by an employee to improve organizational effectiveness and efficiency, this behavior is usually indicated by helping employees even though they do not call for aids, and helping managers to promote organizational effectiveness. In this case, Rayner et al.

(2011) found that OCB affects employee performance positively and can improve the quality of ethos in public service in UK. Similar results were also obtained by Al-Mahasneh (2015) and Ticoalu (2013) which the OCB has a positive and significant impact on employee performance. Koys (2001) as well as Deery et al. 2017, however, the influence of OCB on organizational outcomes and employees' performance is counterproductive. It is suggested because of the possible personal costs of performing such activities (Deery et al. 2017).

According to the above discussion, whether employees' performance is influenced by organisational culture, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour, it still becomes active research areas. It is not merely inconsistent results but also the underlying logics in explaining those relationships. As such, these concerns are the focus of the current study, by re-examining with different research scenario. Its aim is to provide new insights into the dimensional effects of the problematic factors (organisational culture, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior) on employees' performance.

Theory and hypothesis development

Employee performance

Employee performance is how a member of staff fulfils the duties of their role, completes required tasks and behaves in the workplace. Measurements of performance include the quality, quantity and efficiency of work. However, it can also be looked at in terms of behavior (Armstrong 2000). Landy (1985) stated that employee's performance is measured against the performance standards set by the organization. Performance in the form of task performance comprises of job explicit behaviors which includes fundamental job responsibilities assigned as a part of job description. Task performance requires more cognitive ability and is primarily facilitated through task knowledge (requisite technical knowledge or principles to ensure job performance and having an ability to handle multiple assignments), task skill (application of technical knowledge to accomplish task successfully without much supervision), and task habits (an innate ability to respond to assigned jobs that either facilitate or impede the performance) (Pradhan and Jena, 2017; Conway, 1999).

Anitha (2014) mentions that employee performance is basically outcomes achieved and accomplishments made at work. Performance refers to keeping up plans while aiming for the results. An individual can value simply working at a task or engaging in a certain type of activity regardless of his degree of success or proficiency at it or any extrinsic rewards obtained from it. Such tasks are what an individual would describe as "interesting". Although performance evaluation is the heart of performance management (Cardy, 2004), the performance of an individual or an organisation depends heavily on all organisational policies, practices, and design features of an organisation. This integrative perspective represents a configurational approach to strategic human resources management which argues that patterns of HR activities, as opposed to single activities, are necessary to achieve organisational objectives (Delery and Doty, 1996). Employee engagement is one of the key determinants fostering high levels of employee

performance, as is constantly shown in a number of studies (Macey et al. 2009; Mone and London, 2010).

Organizational Culture

Since the establishment of the organizational culture construct, some organizational researchers have applied ideas directly from Schein (Melé, 2003; Norton and Sussman, 2009), whereas others have challenged his approach. For example, subculture researchers have disputed Schein's assumption that organizational cultures are unitary (Martin and Siehl, 1983; Huang et al. 2011; Young, 1989; Igo and Skitmore, 2006; Riley, 1983). Other researchers, noting the apparent ambivalence and ambiguity found in culture, have contested the idea that the function of culture is to maintain social structure (Meyerson and Martin, 1987; Martins et al. 2008; Sebastião et al. 2017). Organizational culture has several functions within the organization, such as; culture has a role in setting boundaries, meaning culture creates clear differences between one organization and another; culture brings a sense of identity to members of the organization; culture serves as a mechanism for making meaning and control that guides and shapes employee attitudes and behavior; and culture can improve system stability (Robbins, 2006). As such, organizational culture can bring the organization better, and has a significant impact on employee performance (Nusari et al. 2018; Paais, 2018; Mohammed and Idris, 2017).

The term “organizational culture” has proved extremely popular with management theorist and managers alike since the publication of In Search of Excellence (Peters and Waterman, 1982). The term “culture” has its theoretical roots within social anthropology and was first used in a holistic way to describe the qualities of a human group that are passed from one generation to the next (Maull et al. 2001). According to Allaire and Firsirotu (1984), it can also be defined as shared values and beliefs gives identity to members and generates commitment beyond the ‘*self*’, and enhances social system stability. An examination of organisational culture begins by distinguishing between fundamental guiding beliefs and daily beliefs (Shahzad et al. 2012). Guiding beliefs provide the context for the practical beliefs of everyday life. As fundamental precepts, guiding beliefs rarely change since they are in the realm of universal truth. Daily beliefs are also part of the company culture and can be described as the rules and feelings about everyday behaviour. However these are dynamic and situational; they change to match context.

Martins and Terblanche (2003) summarise the functions of organisational culture as internal integration and coordination. Based on a literature study of the functions of organisational culture, internal integration can be described as the socialising of new members in the organisation, creating the boundaries of the organisation, the feeling of identity among personnel and commitment to the organisation. The coordinating function refers to creating a competitive edge, making sense of the environment in terms of acceptable behaviour and social system stability (which is the social glue that binds the organisation together) (Martins and Terblanche, 2003). Organisational culture offers a shared system of meanings, which forms the basis of communication and mutual understanding. If the organisational culture does not fulfil these functions in a satisfactory way, the culture may significantly reduce the efficiency of an organisation (Martins and Terblanche, 2003).

Therefore, according to above discussion organisational culture helps employees understand organisational events (Kuo and Tsai, 2019), and can thus enable them to communicate more efficiently and effectively, thereby reaching higher levels of cooperation with each other because they share common mental models of the situations the company finds itself in (McShane and Glinow, 2005). Magee (2002) argued that organisational culture is inherently connected to organisational practices, and so organisational performance is conditional on organisational culture. In line with the relationship between organisational culture and performance, the work of Kuo and Tsai (2019) suggests that organizational culture affects employees' productivity, performance, commitment, self-confidence, satisfaction and ethical behavior. Shahzad (2014), analyzing the overall impact of organizational culture directly or indirectly on employees' job performance, support that culture of organizations has a significant positive impact on employees' job performance at selected software houses in Pakistan. Similarly, Parry and Proctor-Thomson (2002) note that organizational culture plays important roles in internal integration and external adaptation, which together are valuable ingredients for performance outcomes. Although organizational culture provides a relatively stable and frugal pathway to improving performance of the firm, it has received little research attention particularly in bureaucratic or public organisation.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is defined as the extent to which an employee feels self-motivated, content and satisfied with his/her job. Job satisfaction happens when an employee feels he or she is having job stability, career growth and a comfortable work life balance. Implicitly Locke's (1969, p. 330) statement that "overall job satisfaction is the sum of the evaluations of the discrete elements of which the job is composed" has been the accepted definition for the content sampled by job satisfaction instruments. Scarpello and Campbell (1983) argue that the practice of using sum of facet satisfactions as the measure of overall job satisfaction is appropriate if one assumes that the satisfaction questionnaire is content valid. However, if overall job satisfaction includes consideration of variables not measured by a given instrument, the use of the facet sum as the overall measure is questionable.

The literature suggests that the antecedents of job satisfaction can be categorized into personal characteristics, role perceptions, and organizational variables (Brown and Peterson, 1993). A positive effect of job satisfaction on employee performance has important implications for a firm that wants to motivate and retain talented employees. Although the idea that an employee's job performance affects his or her job satisfaction is consistent with several psychological theories, such as intrinsic motivation theory (Deci and Ryan, 2012), few studies have found support for it (Iaffaldano and Muchinsky, 1985). Similarly, organizational studies of the sales force in marketing invariably find that the relationship between employee performance and job satisfaction is weak (Bagozzi, 1980; Brown and Peterson, 1993). As Brown and Peterson (1993) note, if the effect of job satisfaction on employee performance is insignificant, firm actions designed to increase job performance should not have a direct effect on job satisfaction and related outcomes, such as employee turnover.

The relationship between job satisfaction and performance has undergone extensive examination and remains almost a "holy grail" for researchers (Landy, 1989). Despite the low correlations found between job satisfaction and performance, the relationships between satisfaction and a range of other factors that are important in the examination of employee behavior (e.g., commitment and participation), and in turn their impact on performance, lead us to include satisfaction in our study. For example, Pettit et al. (1984) found that organizational communication significantly predicted job satisfaction but was a weak moderator of the job performance/job satisfaction relationship.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Moorman and Blakely (1995) built a model of 'Organizational Citizenship Behavior' (OCB) that comprises four components: interpersonal helping (helping colleagues in their work activities), individual initiative (communications for enhancing individual and group performance), personal industry (implementing tasks in a way that transcends the call of duty), and loyal boosterism (promoting the image of the organization to external stakeholders). Smith et al. (1983) popularized the concept of OCB in the employees' performance literature. OCB was defined as individual behavior that is discretionary/ extra-role, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ 1988). Distinct sub dimensions of OCB have been identified as: altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, civic virtue, and conscientiousness (Organ 1988). Note that in his current conceptualization of OCB, Organ (1997) has dropped the requirement for these behaviors to be extra-role, and not to be directly rewarded. The only requirement is that they are discretionary and contribute to organizational effectiveness.

Researchers conceptualize and operationalize OCB indifferent ways. In some studies, researchers measure all of the dimensions in a given OCB scale and examine each one independently (e.g., Tepper et al. 2001). In other studies, researchers focus on one specific type of OCB, such as interpersonal helping (e.g., Kamdar and Van Dyne, 2007; Korsgaard et al. 2010), individual initiative (e.g., Bolino and Turnley, 2005), or voice (e.g., Burris et al. 2008). Another common practice is to focus on two specific types of OCBs (e.g., helping and voice; Ehrhart, 2004; Hui et al. 2000). Researchers also rely upon measures that broadly categorize OCBs based on their target or beneficiary (i.e., citizenship directed at the organization or citizenship directed at other individuals; Williams and Anderson, 1991). In response to these classifications, we are in line with LePineet al. (2002) suggesting that the different types of OCB are not empirically distinct from one another and, instead, seem to equivalently tap "positive cooperativeness at work" (p. 61).

As OCB is important to organizational functioning, research in OCB has focused on both the antecedents and consequences both at the employee and organizational levels (Podsakoff et al. 2000). The antecedents of OCB comprise employee attitudes, role perceptions, demographics, stress, job satisfaction, interpersonal trust, organizational commitment and employee mood (Moorman and Blakely, 1995). In addition to the antecedents of OCB, researchers have examined the consequences of OCB extensively. Ehrhart et al. (2006) found that unit-level OCB was related to unit effectiveness. Whiting et al. (2008) reported that OCB had a significant effect on

performance evaluation decisions. The concept of OCB has been persistently in focus in empirical research since researchers and practitioners acknowledge its practical implications for job performance and organizational success such as productivity and competitive advantage (Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994). In addition, Basu et al. (2017) explore the relationship between OCB and job performance, using 501 respondents working in 15 healthcare organizations in Kolkata, India. The findings of the study indicate that OCB significantly predicts job performance. It is believed to confirm the assertion of earlier studies which has found OCB to improve the ability of co-workers and managers to perform their jobs through more efficient planning, scheduling and problem solving (MacKenzie et al. 1991), and contribute toward service quality (Hui et al., 2004). Thus, organizations that foster good citizenship behaviors are more attractive places to work and are able to hire and retain the best people (George and Bettenhausen, 1990).

Research Design

Data and Procedure

The data were collected from the employees of SMEs of Indonesian, specifically in Sampang and Pamekasan regencies, East Java, through a survey questionnaire. We employed a simple random technique to reduce the chances of unequal opportunities to take part in the study. Respondents included staff members from the company and its subsidiaries. To ensure the appropriateness of the content, the questionnaire was analysed and examined via a pretest with a small sample size. After that, formal questionnaires were distributed to the participants. We carefully followed the ethics of the research by assuring and satisfying our respondents about the use of their responses, which were voluntarily based. Initially, we shared the aim and objectives of the study. The instructions were conveyed accurately regarding the completing of the survey. Besides, the respondents were not bound to take part in the study or at any time and stage; they were free to withdraw as well as to refuse answering the questionnaire. In total, we distributed 205 questionnaires through the personal visits. In return, 110 questionnaires were received back. After applying the tests of data cleaning and screening, we finally proceeded with 92 valid cases for the final estimation of the hypotheses.

Measurement

Employee's performance. This factor was assessed on ten items and adapted from Okta et al. (2015). The sample items of the scale were "In accordance with the quality standard" and "Exceeding quality standard." These items were analyzed through a five-point Likert scale ("strongly agree 5" to "strongly disagree 1").

Organizational culture. In total, 13 items were employed to assess this factor. The sample items of the scale were "The emphasis on work achievement" and "having high trust in each other" – these items were adapted from the study by Okta et al. (2015). We employed a five point Likert scale for assessing the items. The options of the scale were "strongly agree 5" to "strongly disagree 1".

Job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was assessed through a five-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree 5" to "strongly disagree 1." The number of items was 13 and these were adapted from Okta et al. (2015). The sample items were "Work in accordance with one's ability" and "Enjoying the current work."

Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Organizational Citizenship Behavior was assessed through a five-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree 5" to "strongly disagree 1." The number of items was 7 and these were adapted from Chiang and Hsieh (2012) with modification. The sample items were "Helps others who have heavy workloads" and "Obeys company rules and regulations even when no one is watching".

Research findings

Reliability and validity analysis

Reliability and validity are used to evaluate the quality of research. They indicate how well a method, technique or test measures used in this study. In short, reliability is about the consistency of a measure, and validity is about the accuracy of a measure.

As a preliminary step in the analysis, bivariate (Pearson-r) correlations were calculated among the variables. The results of the analysis of variables show a positive correlation, as seen in Table 1. The correlation coefficients among the variables were at a medium level (between .412 and .776). As shown in Table 2, the Cronbach's alpha values (between .893 to .943) of the constructs all surpassed 0.7 (Hair et al. 1998). Since the average variance extracted (AVE) values were larger than 0.5 (Fornell and Larcker, 1981) and the factor loadings of all the items were significant and higher than 0.5 (Hair et al. 1998), the results demonstrate the satisfactory convergent validity of our measurement model.

Table 1: Correlations among variables.

Variable	1	2	3	4
Employee's performance	1			
Organizational culture	.611**	1		
Job satisfaction	.776**	.622**	1	
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	.554**	.512**	.412**	1

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed); n=92

Table 2: Measurement model

Construct	Mean	Standard Deviation	Loading	Cronbach's alpha	AVE
Employee's performance				.943	.876
EP1	4.143	0.501	.830		
EP2	4.135	0.456	.730		

EP3	4.245	0.674	.880		
EP4	4.313	0.643	.711		
EP5	4.127	0.717	.851		
EP6	4.104	0.435	.716		
EP7	4.202	0.864	.773		
EP8	4.015	0.643	.842		
EP9	4.122	0.712	.736		
EP10	4.038	0.528	.714		
Organizational culture				.921	.784
OC1	4.042	0.713	.812		
OC2	4.321	0.706	.814		
OC3	4.104	0.633	.746		
OC4	4.043	0.772	.732		
OC5	4.311	0.711	.771		
OC6	4.225	0.518	.716		
OC7	4.036	0.726	.722		
OC8	4.742	0.725	.865		
OC9	4.323	0.834	.853		
OC10	4.301	0.867	.736		
OC11	4.242	0.865	.714		
OC12	4.208	0.743	.823		
OC13	4.105	0.752	.749		
Job satisfaction	4.030			.893	.832
JS1	4.043	0.715	.725		
JS2	4.312	0.718	.714		
JS3	4.004	0.726	.727		
JS4	4.243	0.738	.783		
JS5	4.011	0.745	.812		
JS6	4.025	0.843	.721		
JS7	4.026	0.572	.837		
JS8	4.102	0.772	.784		
JS9	4.021	0.721	.832		
JS10	4.204	0.735	.851		
JS11	4.243	0.841	.768		
JS12	4.112	0.753	.885		
JS13	4.037	0.709	.823		
Organizational Citizenship Behavior				.942	.842
OCB1	4.015	0.733	.723		
OCB2	4.011	0.812	.738		
OCB3	4.112	0.727	.827		
OCB4	4.021	0.755	.762		
OCB5	4.004	0.634	.751		
OCB6	4.343	0.724	.732		
OCB7	4.022	0.723	.837		

Note: AVE, average variance extracted

Hypotheses testing

Table 3: Standardized coefficients, t-values, and Sig. for the whole sample

Hypotheses	Constructs	Standardized coefficient	t-value	Sig.	Support or not
H1	OC -> EP	.381	4.72	.000	Yes
H2	JS -> EP	.104	2.28	.002	Yes
H3	OCB -> EP	.264	2.84	.001	Yes

According to table 3, the research results support all the hypotheses. Organizational culture (B = .381, $p < 0.01$), Job satisfaction (B = .104, $p < 0.05$), and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (B = .264, $p < 0.05$) are positively and significantly associated with employees' performance.

Discussion and Conclusion

Through this simple study, we confirm that organisational culture which is conceptualised as the shared beliefs and values within an organisation (Roscoe et al. 2019) help to shape the behaviour patterns of employees. Employees who have a high organizational commitment and are more creative and steadier employees, will lead the organization toward becoming a more profitable one. Highly committed individuals crucially achieve the organizational goals: individuals with a low organizational commitment pay little attention to the organizational goals and are more concerned with gratifying personal interests than those of the organization (Soomro and Shah, 2019). Robbins (2001) suggests that employees with high commitment toward the organization will take the side of the organization that has employed them.

Organisational culture influences how people set personal and professional goals, perform tasks and administer resources to achieve them. Organisational culture affects the way in which people consciously and subconsciously think, make decisions and ultimately the way in which they perceive, feel and act (Roscoe et al. 2019). Kuo and Tsai (2019) have suggested that organisational culture can exert considerable influence in organisations particularly in areas such as performance and commitment. Researchers on organisational cultures have also proposed different forms or types of cultures. For example, Goffee and Jones (1998) identified four forms of organisational cultures (i.e. networked, mercenary, fragmented and communal). Martin (1992) viewed organisational culture from three perspectives (i.e. integration, differentiation and fragmentation). Wallach (1983) suggested that there are three main types of organisational cultures (i.e. bureaucratic, supportive and innovative). Since individuals bring their personal values, attitude and beliefs to the workplace, their levels of commitment to the organisation may differ. Values, attitudes and beliefs are reflected in different organisational cultures.

Job satisfaction has been the most commonly studied variable in organizational research (Spector, 1997), and there certainly has been no shortage of research on the relationship between job satisfaction and performance. The current research is unique, how-ever, in its attempt to frame this relationship more squarely within the social psychological literature that

directly studies the nature of attitudes in general and how their nature affects the relationship between attitudes and behaviour. As such, this research answers calls from a number of scholars (e.g., Pratkanis & Turner, 1994) for the application of psychological theory to the study of job satisfaction.

Statistical tests of Hypothesis 2 revealed considerable support – there is significant relationship between job satisfaction and employees' performance. The strength of this relationship depends on the degree to which satisfaction entails or leads to the attainment of the individual's important job values. The relationship would be absent were employment perquisites to vary with employee needs, were performance to be independent of employee needs. This result is consistent with early works. For example, Sutermeister (1971) has stated a cyclical model of the satisfaction and performance relationship. Life style is viewed as an important determinant of level of aspiration, which, in turn, affects individual effort in the work situation. The cyclical model states that satisfaction and performance are causes of each other. Thus, taken together these studies are in agreement that satisfaction is a much stronger cause of performance than the reverse. This view also seems to prevail in the work of Schleicher et al. (2004), showing a significantly larger correlation between job satisfaction and performance rather than other factors affecting job performance in their model.

Furthermore, the findings of the present study indicate that OCB significantly predicts employees' performance. Considering a behavioral explanation of the effect of OCB on job performance would complement and extend prior work that has focused more exclusively on the role of psychological empowerment (Moorman and Blakely, 1995). As we focus greater attention and effort on work-related activities, employees with high sense of OCB contributes more to the accomplishment of organizational goals and subsequently receive higher ratings of job performance (Liden et al. 2000; Maynard et al. 2014; Spreitzer et al. 1997). In a meta-analysis, Seibert et al. (2011) demonstrated similar view that empowerment has positive associations with job performance, providing implied support for the idea that empowerment serves as a mechanism linking OCB and job performance. More importantly, perhaps, we offer an additional conceptual explanation regarding how and why OCB influences employees' performance. That is, we suggest and find that OCB influences employees' performance because it provides employees opportunities and encourage them to speak up and offer constructive suggestions.

OCB may also improve performance by enhancing the organization's ability to attract and retain the best people (Organ. 1988). Many of the best employees and job candidates enjoy working in a positive environment with a closely knit group of co-workers. Helping behaviors may directly contribute to such an environment by enhancing morale and fostering group cohesiveness and a sense of belonging to a team, thus making the organization a more attractive place to work. Then, OCBs may help to enhance an organization's ability to adapt to changing environments in several ways. For example, when employees who are in close contact with the marketplace volunteer information about changes in the environment and make suggestions about how to respond to them, it helps an organization to adapt. Similarly, when employees voluntarily attend and actively participate in meetings, it may enhance an organization's responsiveness by aiding the dissemination of valuable information. In addition, when employees exhibit sportsmanship by demonstrating a willingness to learn new skills, it may enhance an organization's ability to adapt

to changes in its environment. Therefore through this study the assumption that OCBs contribute to the effectiveness of work teams and organizations has recently been tested empirically.

References

Allaire, Y., & Firsirotu, M. E. (1984). Theories of organizational culture. *Organization studies*, 5(3), 193-226.

Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance*. International journal of productivity and performance management*, 63 (3), 2014 pp. 308-323.

Armstrong, M. (1995). *A handbook of personnel Management Practices*. Kogan Page Limited London.

Bagozzi, R. P. (1978). Salesforce performance and satisfaction as a function of individual difference, interpersonal, and situational factors. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 15(4), 517-531.

Balaji, M. S., Jiang, Y., Singh, G., & Jha, S. (2020). Letting go or getting back: How organization culture shapes frontline employee response to customer incivility. *Journal of Business Research*, 111, 1-11.

Basu, E., Pradhan, R. K., & Tewari, H. R. (2017). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on job performance in Indian healthcare industries. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 66 (6), 780-79.

Bititci, U. S., Mendibil, K., Nudurupati, S., Garengo, P., & Turner, T. (2006). Dynamics of performance measurement and organisational culture. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 26 (12), 1325-1350.

Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2005). The personal costs of citizenship behavior: The relationship between individual initiative and role overload, job stress, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 740– 748.

Brown, S. P., & Peterson, R. A. (1993). Antecedents and consequences of salesperson job satisfaction: Meta-analysis and assessment of causal effects. *Journal of marketing research*, 30(1), 63-77.

Burris, E. R., Detert, J. R., & Chiaburu, D. S. (2008). Quitting before leaving: The mediating effects of psychological attachment and detachment on voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 912– 922.

Cardy, R.L. (2004), *Performance management: Concepts, Skills, and Exercises*, M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, NY

Chiang, C., and Hsiehl, T. (2012). The impacts of perceived organizational support and psychological empowerment on job performance: The mediating effects of organizational citizenship behaviour. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(1), 180–190.

Cho, S., & Johanson, M. M. (2008). Organizational citizenship behavior and employee performance: A moderating effect of work status in restaurant employees. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 32(3), 307-326.

Conway, J. M. (1999). Distinguishing contextual performance from task performance for managerial jobs. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 84(1), 3.

Deci, E. L., Connell, J. P. and Ryan, R. M. (1989). Self-determination in a work organization, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 4, 580–90.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2012). *Self-determination theory*. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), Handbook of theories of social psychology (p. 416–436). Sage Publications Ltd.

Deery, S., Rayton, B., Walsh, J., & Kinnie, N. (2017). The costs of exhibiting organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management*, 56(6), 1039-1049.

Delery, J. E., & Doty, D. H. (1996). Modes of theorizing in strategic human resource management: Tests of universalistic, contingency, and configurational performance predictions. *Academy of management Journal*, 39(4), 802-835.

Ehrhart, M. G., Bliese, P. D., & Thomas, J. L. (2006). Unit-level OCB and unit effectiveness: Examining the incremental effect of helping behavior. *Human performance*, 19(2), 159-173.

Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel psychology*, *57*(1), 61-94.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equations models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50.

Gagné, M. and Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 331–62.

Garg, N. (2017). Workplace spirituality and organizational performance in Indian context: Mediating effect of organizational commitment, work motivation and employee engagement. *South Asian Journal of Human Resources Management*, 4(2), 191-211.

George, J. M., & Bettenhausen, K. (1990). Understanding prosocial behavior, sales performance, and turnover: a group-level analysis in a service context. *Journal of applied psychology*, 75(6), 698.

Goffee, R. and Jones, G. (1998). *The Character of a Corporation*, Harper Business, London

Gregory, B. T., Harris, S. G., Armenakis, A. A., & Shook, C. L. (2009). Organizational culture and effectiveness: A study of values, attitudes, and organizational outcomes. *Journal of business research*, 62(7), 673-679.

Hackman, J. R. and Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: test of a theory, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 250–79.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5th ed.). London: Prentice-Hall.

Huang, X., Rode, J. C., & Schroeder, R. G. (2011). Organizational structure and continuous improvement and learning: Moderating effects of cultural endorsement of participative leadership. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42(9), 1103-1120.

Hui, C., Lee, C., & Rousseau, D. M. (2004). Psychological contract and organizational citizenship behavior in China: Investigating generalizability and instrumentality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(2), 311.

Hui, C., Lam, S. S., & Law, K. K. (2000). Instrumental values of organizational citizenship behavior for promotion: a field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*(5), 822.

Iaffaldano, M. T., & Muchinsky, P. M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 97(2), 251.

Igo, T., & Skitmore, M. (2006). Diagnosing the organizational culture of an Australian engineering consultancy using the competing values framework. *Construction Innovation*, 6 (2), 121-139

James, K., & Lahti, K. (2011). Organizational vision and system influences on employee inspiration and organizational performance. *Creativity and innovation management*, *20*(2), 108-120.

Jungert, T., Van den Broeck, A., Schreurs, B., & Osterman, U. (2018). How colleagues can support each other's needs and motivation: An intervention on employee work motivation. *Applied Psychology*, 67(1), 3-29.

Kamdar, D., & Van Dyne, L. (2007). The joint effects of personality and workplace social exchange relationships in predicting task performance and citizenship performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1286– 1298.

Klotz, A. C., Bolino, M. C., Song, H., & Stornelli, J. (2018). Examining the nature, causes, and consequences of profiles of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(5), 629-647.

Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., Lester, S. W., & Jeong, S. S. (2010). Paying you back or paying me forward: Understanding rewarded and unrewarded organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 277– 290.

Koys, D. J. (2001). The effects of employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover on organizational effectiveness: A unit-level, longitudinal study. *Personnel psychology*, 54(1), 101-114.

Krajcsák, Z. (2018). Relationships between employee commitment and organizational cultures: a theoretical framework. International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 26 (3), 398-414.

Kuo, T., & Tsai, G. Y. (2019). The effects of employee perceived organisational culture on performance: the moderating effects of management maturity. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 30(3-4), 267-283.

Landy, F. W. (1985). *The psychology of work behavior 3rd Ed*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Landy, F.J. (1989). *Psychology of work behavior*. Pacific Grove CA: Brooks Cole

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.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Sparrowe, R. T. (2000). An examination of themediating role of psychological empowerment on the relationsbetween the job, interpersonal relationships, and work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 407–416.

Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction?. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 4(4), 309-336.

Lok, P., & Crawford, J. (2004). The effect of organisational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organisational commitment: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of management development,* 23(4):321-338.

Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30.

MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1991). Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 50(1), 123-150.

Magee, K. C. (2002). The impact of organizational culture on the implementation of performance management. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(3), 388 –403.

Martin, J. (1992). *Cultures in Organizations – Three Perspectives*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Martin, J., & Siehl, C. (1983). Organizational culture and counterculture: An uneasy symbiosis. *Organizational dynamics*, 12(2), 52-64.

Martins, E. C., & Terblanche, F. (2003). Building organisational culture that stimulates creativity and innovation. *European journal of innovation management*, 6 (1), 64-74

Martins, E., Pundt, A., Horsmann, C. S., & Nerdinger, F. W. (2008). Organizational culture of participation: Development and validation of a measure. *German Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(2), 195-215.

Maull, R., Brown, P., & Cliffe, R. (2001). Organisational culture and quality improvement. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 21 (3), 302-326.

Maynard, M. T., Luciano, M. M., D'Innocenzo, L., Mathieu, J. E., & Dean, M.D. (2014). Modeling time-lagged reciprocal psychological empower-ment–performance relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(6), 1244–1253.

Mcdonald, D., & Smith, A. (1995). A proven connection: performance management and business results. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, *27*(1), 59-64.

McShane, S. L., & Glinow, M. A. (2005). *Organizational behaviour: Emerging realities for workplace revolution*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, International Edition.

Melé, D. (2003). The challenge of humanistic management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 44(1), 77-88.

Meyerson, D., & Martin, J. (1987). Cultural change: An integration of three different views. *Journal of management studies*, 24(6), 623-647.

Mohr, D.C., Young, G.J. & Burgess, J.F., Jr. (2012). Employee turnover and operational performance: themoderating effect of group-oriented organisational culture. *Human Resource Management Journal,* 22(2), 216–233.

Mone, E.M. & London, M. (2010). *Employee Engagement Through Effective Performance Management: A Practical Guide for Managers*, Routledge, New York, NY.

Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of organizational behavior*, *16*(2), 127-142.

Nasab, A. H., & Afshari, L. (2019). Authentic leadership and employee performance: mediating role of organizational commitment. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 40 (5), 548-560.

Norton Jr, W. I., & Sussman, L. (2009). Team charters: Theoretical foundations and practical implications for quality and performance. *Quality Management Journal*, 16(1), 7-17.

Okta, K., Umar, N., Musadiq, A., Utami, N. and Hamidah, N.U. (2015). The influence of organizational culture and entrepreneurial orientation on the job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and employee's performance, *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7 (2), 55-67.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

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

Parry, K., & Proctor-Thomson, S. (2002). Leadership, culture and performance: The case of the New Zealand public sector. *Journal of change management*, 3(4), 376-399.

Peters, T.J. and Waterman, R.H. (1982). *In Search of Excellence. Lessons from America's Best-run Companies*, Harper & Row, London.

Petty, M. M., McGee, G. W., & Cavender, J. W. (1984). A meta-analysis of the relationships between individual job satisfaction and individual performance. *Academy of management Review*, 9(4), 712-721.

Pinho, J. C., Rodrigues, A. P., & Dibb, S. (2014). The role of corporate culture, market orientation and organisational commitment in organisational performance: the case of non-profit organisations. Journal of management development, 33 (4), 374-398.

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.

Posdakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of marketing research*, 31(3), 351-363.

Pradhan, R. K., & Jena, L. K. (2017). Employee performance at workplace: Conceptual model and empirical validation. *Business Perspectives and Research*, *5*(1), 69-85.

Pratkanis, A. R., & Turner, M. E. (1994). Of what value is a job attitude? A socio-cognitive analysis. *Human Relations*, 47,1545–1576.

Riley, P. (1983). A structurationist account of political culture. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 414-437.

Rita, M., Payangan, O. R., Rante, Y., Tuhumena, R., & Erari, A. (2018). Moderating effect of organizational citizenship behavior on the effect of organizational commitment, transformational leadership and work motivation on employee performance. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 60 (4), 953-964.

Robbins, S. (2001). *Organizational Behavior*, 9th ed., Prentice Hall, Inc., New York, NY.

Roscoe, S., Subramanian, N., Jabbour, C. J., & Chong, T. (2019). Green human resource management and the enablers of green organisational culture: Enhancing a firm's environmental performance for sustainable development. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 28(5), 737-749.

Scarpello, V., & Campbell, J. P. (1983). Job satisfaction: Are all the parts there?. *Personnel psychology*, 36(3), 577-600.

Schleicher, D. J., Watt, J. D., & Greguras, G. J. (2004). Reexamining the job satisfaction-Performance relationship: The complexity of attitudes. *Journal of applied psychology*, 89(1), 165.

Sebastião, S. P., Zulato, G., & Trindade, A. D. (2017). Internal communication and organisational culture: The management interplay in the view of the Portuguese communication consultant. *Public Relations Review*, 43(4), 863-871.

Seibert, S. E., Wang, G., & Courtright, S. H. (2011). Antecedents and consequences of psychological and team empowerment in organizations: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(5), 981–1003.

Shahzad, F., Luqman, R. A., Khan, A. R., & Shabbir, L. (2012). Impact of organizational culture on organizational performance: An overview. *Interdisciplinary journal of contemporary research in business*, 3(9), 975–985.

Shahzad, F. (2014). Impact of organizational culture on employees' job performance: An empirical study of software houses in Pakistan, *International Journal of Commerce and Management,* 24 (3), 219-227

Smith, C. A. O. D. W. N. J. P., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of applied psychology*, 68(4), 653.

Spreitzer, G. M., Kizilos, M. A., & Nason, S. W. (1997). A dimensional anal-ysis of the relationship between psychological empowerment and effectiveness satisfaction, and strain. *Journal of Management*, 23(5), 679–704.

Stamper, C., & Dyne, V. L. (2003). Organizational citizenship: A comparison between part-time and full-time service employees. Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 44(1), 33-42.

Sutermeister, R. A. (1971). Employee performance and employee need satisfaction—Which comes first?. *California Management Review*, 13(4), 43-47.

Taormina, R. J. (2009). Organizational socialization: the missing link between employee needs and organizational culture. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 24 (7), 650-676.

Tepper, B. J., Lockhart, D., & Hoobler, J. (2001). Justice, citizenship, and role definition effects. *Journal of applied psychology*, *86*(4), 789.

Wallach, E. J. (1983). Organizations: The cultural match. *Training and Development Journal*, 37(2), 29-36.

Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Pierce, J. R. (2008). Effects of task performance, helping, voice, and organizational loyalty on performance appraisal ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 125.

Williams, S., & Shiaw, W. T. (1999). Mood and organizational citizenship behavior: The effects of positive affect on employee organizational citizenship behavior intentions. *The Journal of Psychology*, 133(6), 656-668.

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of management*, 17(3), 601-617.

Yang, Q. I., & Wei, H. (2018). The impact of ethical leadership on organizational citizenship behavior: The moderating role of workplace ostracism. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 39(1), 100-113.

Yen, H. R., & Niehoff, B. P. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational effectiveness: Examining relationships in Taiwanese banks. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(8), 1617-1637.

Young, E. (1989). On the Naming of the Rose: Interests and Multiple Meanings as Elements of Organizational Culture. *Organization studies*, 10(2), 187-206.