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Abstract: The importance of organizational citizenship behaviours for organizational success and outcomes have been well emphasized in literature. It has been considered crucial to the survival of organizations in today’s dynamic business locale. Although these set of behaviours are mutually beneficial to both organizations and employees, many researchers paid little attention to the benefits of organizational citizenship behaviours to the individual employees. The current paper aimed to accentuate the importance of organizational citizenship behaviours to the individual employees. Specifically, it examined the meaning of organizational citizenship behaviours, its dimensions, theoretical basis, the needs of the employees and the benefits of organizational citizenship behaviours to the individual employees. This paper proposed that the benefits of organizational citizenship behaviours to each employee can be inferred from the types of behaviours involved and the context in which such behaviours were enacted. It was concluded and recommended that organizational citizenship behaviours provide intrinsic and extrinsic benefits to the individual employees and therefore should not be seen as solely beneficial to the organizations at the expense of their employees.
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Introduction

Today’s organizations are constantly seeking ways to keep up with the incessant changes that is typical of the contemporary business environments. The transfer of information in the global market has brought about such changes as innovative and best practices, technological advancements and technical know-how. This necessitated the need for organizations to continuously improve on their people, products, productivity and processes for sustained relevance in the industry.
People are central to organizational effectiveness and outcomes since they coordinate and drive all other aspects of the organization. It is therefore important that employees behave in ways compatible with strategic organizational objectives and operations if desired outcomes are to be achieved. Organizational behaviour researchers have labelled these desirable employee behaviours as organizational citizenship behaviours (OCB).

Organizational citizenship behaviours may be defined as all forms of employee behaviours willingly exhibited to improve organizational performance and outcome. Robbins (2006) argued that OCB is flexible behaviour that is not part of employee formal job requirements, but that nevertheless promotes the effective functioning of the organization. Organ (1988) claimed that OCBs are behaviours that employees are not explicitly rewarded for exhibiting nor punished for not exhibiting. According to him, these are behaviours for which employees do not receive training to perform. Moorman (1991) described these behaviours as non-traditional on-the-job behaviours that are not usually captured by traditional job descriptions. Also, Schnake (1991) suggested that pro-social ethical behaviours such as helping new employees to understand the internal workings of the organization, assisting co-workers complete their jobs, attending meetings and volunteering to do things in excess of job prescriptions are some of the behaviours that can be associated with OCB.

Turnipseed and Rassuli (2005) described organizational citizenship behaviours as behaviours that defend the organization when it is criticized. According to Daniels et al. (2006), organizational citizenship behaviours include behaviours that urges peers to invest in the organization or any work behaviour that exceeds routine expectations. Organ's (1988) definition of OCB also suggests that OCB should be limited to extra-role behaviours. Extra role behaviour (ERB) was defined as behaviours which benefits the organization and/or is intended to benefit the organization, which is discretionary and which goes beyond existing role expectations (Van Dyne, Cummings and Parks, 1995). Organizational citizenship behaviour was therefore defined as functional, extra-role, pro-social organizational behaviours directed at individual, groups and / or an organization (Sharma, Bajpai & Holani, 2011).

Murphy, Athanasau and Neville (2002) noted that organizational citizenship behaviour has been described necessary for the growth, success, effectiveness and productivity of any organization. Literature also supported the impact of OCB on organizational
effectiveness and outcomes (Organ & Konovsky, 1989; MacKenzie, Podsakoff & Fetter, 1993; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Walz & Niehoff, 1996; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997; Podsakoff, MacKenzie & Bommer, 1997; Koys, 2001). The benefits of OCB to the organization was highlighted by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach (2000) to include: increasing co-worker or managerial productivity; releasing resources so they can be used for more productive purposes; coordinating activities within and across work groups; reducing the need to devote scarce resources to purely maintenance functions; strengthening the organizations' ability to attract and retain the best employees; increasing the stability of the organization's performance; and enabling the organization to adapt more effectively to environmental changes.

Although suggested by many scholars, little attention has been given to the benefits of organizational citizenship behaviours to the individual employees. For instance, Organ (1988) claimed that organizational citizenship behaviour can maximize the efficiency and productivity of both the employees and the organization, resulting in the effective functioning of the organization. Similarly, Bergun (2005) noted that OCB maximizes the efficiency and productivity of both subordinates and the organization. On the contrary, Haque, Khatibi and Karim (2011) opined that although OCB benefits both the organization and its personnel based on various approaches, it is of little importance in terms of individual profits.

Consequently, the focus of this paper is to accentuate the benefits of organizational citizenship behaviours to the individual employees. This task will be best achieved when the concept of organizational citizenship behaviours (OCB) is explicitly defined and the types (dimensions) of behaviours that make up this construct are carefully examined. Therefore, this paper will specifically explore:

- Dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour
- Theoretical basis of organizational citizenship behavior
- Benefits of organizational citizenship behaviour to the individual employees

**Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour**

Scholars have proposed different types of organizational citizenship behaviours which they referred to as the dimensions of OCB. At conception, Smith, Organ and Near (1983) proposed a two dimension model of organizational citizenship behaviours to include altruism and generalized compliance. The altruism dimension represents behaviours targeted at helping
individuals in the organization while the generalized compliance dimension represents adherence to organizational rules, norms and expectations. Organ (1988) subsequently revised the generalized compliance dimension and proposed a five dimension model which includes: Altruism (helping specific individuals), Conscientiousness (compliance with norms and going beyond minimally required levels of performance), Sportsmanship (tolerating the inevitable inconveniences of work without complaining), Courtesy (consulting or considering others before taking action; informing others to prevent the occurrence of work-related problems) and Civic Virtue (participating in and being concerned about the life of the company).

Williams and Anderson (1991) suggested that OCB consists of two types of behaviours: (1) behaviours directed at specific individuals in the organization, such as courtesy and altruism (OCBI); and (2) behaviours concerned with benefiting the organisation as a whole, such as conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue (OCBO). OCBI refers to the behaviours that immediately benefit specific individuals within an organization and, thereby, contribute indirectly to organizational effectiveness (Lee & Allen, 2002; Williams & Anderson, 1991). OCBO includes behaviours aimed at benefiting the organization without specific organizational members in view (e.g., adhering to organizational rules, voluntary participation in committees).

Subsequently, Podsakoff et al (2000) noted that despite the growing interest in citizenship-like behaviours, a review of the literature in this area revealed a lack of consensus about the dimensionality of the construct. They identified almost 30 potentially different forms of citizenship behaviour as proposed by researchers but found a great deal of conceptual overlap between these constructs. According to them, the seven common themes or dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviours include: (1) Helping Behaviour, (2) Sportsmanship, (3) Organizational Loyalty, (4) Organizational Compliance, (5) Individual Initiative, (6) Civic Virtue, and (7) Self Development.

Many researchers have identified helping behaviour as an important form of citizenship behaviour (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997; George & Brief, 1992; George & Jones, 1997; Graham, 1989; Organ, 1988; Smith et al., 1983; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996; Williams & Anderson, 1991). This type of behaviour involves voluntary acts of kindness towards others; and all behaviours aimed at preventing the occurrence of work-related problems...
(Podsakoff et al, 2000). Helping behaviour mirrors Organ’s altruism, peace-making, and cheerleading dimensions (Organ, 1988); Graham (1989) also labelled these behaviours as interpersonal helping. According to Williams and Anderson (1991) altruism represents organizational citizenship behaviours targeted towards individuals (OCB-I).

Sportsmanship is a form of citizenship behaviour that has received much less attention in the literature (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Organ (1990) has defined sportsmanship as “a willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining.” According to Podsakoff et al (2000), sportsmanship is a term that describes people who not only do not complain when they are inconvenienced by others, but also maintain a positive attitude even when things do not go their way, are not offended when others do not follow their suggestions, are willing to sacrifice their personal interest for the good of the work group, and do not take the rejection of their ideas personally.

Organizational loyalty includes spreading goodwill and protecting the organization (George & Brief, 1992; George & Jones, 1997), and the endorsing, supporting, and defending organizational objectives construct (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997). Essentially, organizational loyalty entails promoting the organization to outsiders, protecting and defending it against external threats, and remaining committed to it even under adverse conditions (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Organizational compliance was called generalized compliance by Smith et al. (1983); organizational obedience by Graham (1991); OCB-O by Williams and Anderson (1991); and following organizational rules and procedures by Borman and Motowidlo (1993). It is also similar to Van Scotter and Motowidlo’s job dedication construct (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996). Organizational compliance involves employees’ internalization, acceptance and adherence to the organization’s rules, regulations, and procedures without all forms of coercion or surveillance. According to Podsakoff et al (2000), the reason this behaviour is regarded as a form of citizenship behaviour is that even though everyone is expected to obey company regulations, rules, and procedures at all times, many employees simply do not. Therefore, an employee who religiously obeys all rules and regulations, even when no one is watching, is regarded as an especially “good citizen (Podsakoff et al, 2000).”

The individual initiative dimension of OCB involves voluntarily engaging in task-related behaviours at a level that is so far
beyond minimally required or generally expected levels. According to Podsakoff et al. (2000), such behaviors include voluntary acts of creativity and innovation designed to improve one’s task or the organization’s performance, persisting with extra enthusiasm and effort to accomplish one’s job, volunteering to take on extra responsibilities, and encouraging others in the organization to do the same. All of these behaviors share the idea that the employee is going “above and beyond” the call of duty. This dimension mirrors the conscientiousness construct by Organ (1988), the personal industry and individual initiative constructs by Graham (1989) and Moorman and Blakely (1995).

George and Brief (1992) and George and Jones (1997) encapsulated the individual initiative dimension of OCB in their making constructive suggestions construct. Organ (1988) indicated that this form of behavior is among the most difficult to distinguish from in-role behavior, because it differs more in degree than in kind. Therefore, perhaps it is not surprising that some researchers have not included this dimension in their studies of organizational citizenship behavior (MacKenzie, Podsakoff & Fetter, 1991; MacKenzie et al., 1993) or have found that this behavior is difficult to distinguish empirically from in-role or task performance (Motowidlo, Borman & Schmit, 1997; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996).

The self-development dimension includes those voluntary behaviors employees engage in to improve their knowledge, skills, and abilities. According to George and Brief (1992) this might include “seeking out and taking advantage of advanced training courses, keeping abreast of the latest developments in one’s field and area, or even learning a new set of skills so as to expand the range of one’s contributions to an organization.” Podsakoff et al. (2000) noted that self-development has not received any empirical confirmation in the citizenship behavior literature. However, George and Brief (1992) identified developing oneself as a key dimension of citizenship behavior based on the work of Katz (1964).

Finally, Podsakoff et al. (2000) submitted that when one examines the different types of citizenship-like behaviour that have been identified in the literature, they seem to fall into one of the following categories: helping behavior, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and self-development. They further suggested that since almost all of the citizenship behavior research was influenced by Katz (1964), perhaps it is not surprising that
these underlying dimensions bear a strong resemblance to the dimensions of “innovative and spontaneous” behavior that he identified in his original article, including (1) cooperating with others, (2) protecting the organization, (3) volunteering constructive ideas, (4) self-training, and (5) maintaining a favorable attitude toward the company. Organizational citizenship behaviors like all other human behaviors are not exhibited without a motive. There is always a reason behind all human behaviors no matter the context. Different theories have been posited to explain the reason people act the way they do in diverse situations. A major explanation to organizational citizenship behaviors was made by the social exchange theory, which was first introduced by Homans (1958) and further advanced by other researchers. Theoretical Basis of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors Social Exchange Theory Blau (1964) viewed exchange as comprising of economic or social relationships. Economic exchange is an organized contract in which both parties specifies in advance exactly what will be exchanged and when the exchanges will occur. This type of exchange relationship is not based on trust because the performance of the contractual obligations can be enforced by the appropriate authorities. Social exchange refers exchange relationships marked by mutual exchange of benefits on the basis of trust. There are no agreement or contract on what, when, where and how the exchanges will take place. Characteristically, it is initiated by one party spontaneously offering something of value to another party who in turn feels obligated to reciprocate or return the gesture. The consistency of reciprocation and value of reward will likely increase the rate of interaction between the parties concerned. The employment relationship is primarily contractual, characterized by a binding agreement between employers and their employees involving the exchange of employees’ time, effort and skills for organizations’ monetary rewards and benefits. However, social exchange develops in the course of employees’ interaction with co-workers, customers, supervisors and other managers. According to the law of reciprocity, when employees perceive that the organization have not only kept its part of the agreement but have also extended added benefits to them, they feel an obligation to repay the goodwill. Organ et al (2006) identified the core features of social exchange to include: voluntary actions of individuals that are motivated by
their consequences (proactive), an obligation by a party to reciprocate a benefit voluntarily rendered by some other party (reactive), and a confidence that the other party will, in good time and in some appropriate manner and situation, reciprocate benefits, contributions, or favors. According to Schroeder (n.d), the assumptions of social exchange are as follows:

1) Dyadic: Both parties are actively involved as giver and receiver in the exchange of non-contractual benefits.

2) Non-contracted/non-explicit: Further, both similarly view benefits as (mostly) discretionary in order to qualify as, and maintain, ‘social exchange’ (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005)

3) Frequent: Social exchanges should be on-going and frequent in order to maintain a generalized sense of obligation toward one another, and trust in reciprocity.

4) Observable: Both sides should be able to see something in order to feel an obligation to reciprocate

5) Long-Term Stability: Roughly equivalent exchange will occur over the long-term, but not necessarily in the short-term.

6) Benefits are coveted: In order to maintain social exchange, receiving parties must actually perceive that the discretionary acts are desirable.

Allameh, Amiri and Asadi, (2011) stated that the social exchange view is based on tit-for-tat mechanism. Based on this view, the organization keeps those employees which compensate the organization’s positive behaviors with high organizational commitment and citizenship behavior. Liden, Wayne, Kraimer and Sparrowe (2003) opined that when employees observe unfavorable behaviors such as limiting behaviors, short-term recruitment, low job security, and limited progress opportunities, they would compensate them by low organizational commitment and citizenship behavior.

**Needs theory of employee behaviors**

Human needs are numerous and often described as insatiable. These needs create a feeling of deficiency in the individuals and drive them to behave in ways that will likely lead to the fulfillment of these needs. Maslow (1970) arranged human needs in the order of importance to include basic or survival needs (physiological needs, safety needs, belongingness) and growth needs (self-esteem and self-actualization). The survival needs are the most important and then the growth needs. These needs are arranged such that if the lower level or survival needs are not
fulfilled, they continue to motivate and direct behavior towards their fulfillments. Consequently, as an individual fulfils his basic needs, the next need on the hierarchy takes precedence and begins to motivate until fulfillments. This process follows the satisfaction progression principle. According to Maslow (1970), employee needs include generous pay, job security, acceptance and recognition, self-esteem and self-actualization and the satisfaction of these needs is the basic motive behind all work behavior’s. Employees experience satisfaction with jobs that provides avenues to meet their needs. It has been noted from literature that job satisfaction is an antecedent of desirable work behaviors and performances (Mohammad, Habib & Alias, 2011).

Maslow (1970) divided provided a five hierarchy needs theory in which the lower level needs such as physiological and safety needs can be categorized as extrinsic needs. Extrinsic needs are needs that can be met with physical or tangible items such monetary increments, permanent employment etc. On the other hand, the higher order needs may be categorised as intrinsic needs which can only be met by some internally gratifying incentives such as recognition and awards, promotion and higher responsibilities, challenging work content etc. although the need for belonging was labeled a lower level need, it qualifies at an intrinsic need due to the method of fulfillments or gratification. The need for belonging can be satisfied through cohesive groups and supportive leadership. This categorization of Maslow’s 1970 need hierarchy was illustrated in table 1:

Table 1: Description of Employee Needs from the Perspective of Maslow’s (1970) Hierarchy of Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs</th>
<th>Description of Needs</th>
<th>Category of Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physiological need</td>
<td>This includes the need for food and other basic requirements of life. This category of employee need can be satisfied with monetary incentives and generous pay</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Safety need</td>
<td>The safety need can be described as the employees’ need for job security. Since change is an inevitable aspect of life, employees express the need for job stability. This serves a platform to have all other needs met and so poses as a source of concern to the employees. This category of need can be met through employment confirmation and a stable work context.</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Belongingness

Belongingness is a need of the employees to be accepted and appreciated by the organization. Organizations consist of work groups or teams that see to the achievement of the set objectives. Employees seek to belong to a cohesive work group that appreciates their uniqueness and value their contributions. This need can be achieved through supportive leadership and cohesive work groups.

Self esteem

Employees express the need for high self-esteem in the discharge of their duties. They seek to improve their self-worth and value both to the organization and the industry at large. This need can be met through challenging work content and effective feedback on performances.

Self-actualization

Self-actualization is the peak of employee needs as proposed by Maslow (1970). Employees seek to progress and attain the peak in their careers, and so they value promotions and higher responsibilities in the workplace.

Herzberg (1966) proposed the motivator and hygiene factors of work. He opined that the hygiene factors determine employees’ feeling of dissatisfaction or no dissatisfaction. These consist of the working conditions, pay, job security, company policies etc. The hygiene factors are parallel to Maslow’s lower level needs, all of which can be satisfied extrinsically. According to Herzberg (1966), the gratification of the hygiene factors will not lead to job satisfaction but rather to no job dissatisfaction. Invariably, other factors are responsible for job satisfaction. These factors are called the motivator factors, and they include challenging jobs, awards and recognition, responsibility etc. The hygiene factors represent employees’ extrinsic needs while the motivator factors represent employees’ intrinsic needs.

Benefits of Organizational Citizenship Behavior to the Individual Employees

Podsakoff et al. (2000) noted that the majority of the early research efforts focused on the antecedents of citizenship behavior but more recent research has devoted an increasing amount of attention to the consequences of OCBs. They observed that recent research has focused on two key issues: (a) the effects of OCBs on managerial evaluations of performance and judgments regarding pay raises, promotions, etc., and (b) the
effects of OCBs on organizational performance and success. These two areas represent the benefits of organizational citizenship behaviors to the individual employees and to the organization. Concurringly, Poncheri (2006) argued that organizational citizenship behavior typically refers to behaviors that positively impact the organization or its members. However, most of the researches on the consequences of OCB have focused mainly on the organization with little emphasis on the gain of the individual employees. From the observation of Podsakoff et al (2000), researchers have only viewed employee benefits from extrinsic gains or tangible rewards from management consequent upon their exhibition of the desired behaviors. For instance, Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff & Blume, (2009) identified performance evaluations and managers’ reward allocation decisions as consequences of OCB for individual employees. In their opinion, managers take notice of employees who behave in ways that enhance the smooth execution of their duties and consequently rate these employees highly in terms of performance. There is higher likelihood for these managers to favor OCB performing employees in their reward allocation. Apart from the extrinsic reward that accrues to OCB performing employees, there are certain intrinsic benefits attached to these set of behaviors which have not been given due attention by researchers.

Organizational citizenship behavior is a set of behaviors engendered by a collective work culture. This culture supports and promotes a learning climate which ultimately impacts employees’ productivity and resourcefulness. The characteristics of learning climates can briefly summarized as (Cunnigham & Iles, 2002; Luthans 2001; Senge, 1990): common purpose, empowered employees, openness to new ideas, supportive leadership, promoting dialogue and enquiry, effective feedback, organizational support systems, perception of fairness. These characteristics serve as the context for organizational citizenship behaviours in which employees learn new and improved practices, are encouraged to display ingenuity, learn from feedbacks on past performances, and express opinions and suggestions. It is a climate that promotes intrinsic job satisfaction among employees, leading to such outcomes as high self-esteem, self-worth and a sense of fulfillment. Therefore, the context in which OCB operates creates a platform for intrinsic satisfaction and rewards for the employees.

Also, the different types of organizational citizenship behaviors are also major indicators of the benefits of organizational
citizenship behaviors to the individual employees. With reference to the seven common themes of organizational citizenship behaviors proposed by Podsakoff et al (2000), OCB provides both intrinsic benefits (ego-stimulating and physically intangible rewards) and extrinsic benefits (physically tangible rewards) to the employees. The intrinsic benefits results from the dimensions of OCB which inspires capacity building, altruism and skill acquisition among the employees. On the other hand, the extrinsic benefits results from managements’ appreciation and recognition of such organizationally desired behaviors through pay raise, promotion, awards, sponsored vacation etc. Khan and Rashid (2012) observed that the intrinsic rewarding properties of OCB may be especially salient and important for teachers, who are acknowledged for having high stress jobs with low extrinsic rewards. The benefits of organizational citizenship behaviors to the individual employees have been summarized in table 2:

Table 2: The Benefits of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors to Individual Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>INTRINSIC BENEFITS</th>
<th>EXTRINSIC BENEFITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Capacity building and skill acquisition</td>
<td>Promotion and higher responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Self-actualization and a sense of fulfillment</td>
<td>Pay raise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Discovery and optimal use of employees’ potentials and capabilities</td>
<td>Awards and Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increased competence and self-worth</td>
<td>Sponsored vacation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Increased job relevant knowledge and expertise</td>
<td>Recommendation for further training and development packages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Increased Productivity</td>
<td>Job security/ Tenured job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sense of belonging, feeling of acceptance and value</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from Olowookere (2014)

**Intrinsic Benefits**

The intrinsic benefits may be described as those intangible benefits that serve to inspire employees’ sense of self and inner fulfillment. These are benefits of peculiar and special interest to the individual employees. These intrinsic benefits include:

1) Capacity Building and Skill Acquisition: Employees through the exhibition of organizational citizenship behaviors can develop
capacities and new skills. The individual initiative dimensions of OCB was defined by Podsakoff et al (2000) as voluntary acts of creativity and innovation designed to improve one’s task or the organization’s performance persisting with extra enthusiasm and effort to accomplish one’s job. This type of organizational citizenship behaviors will provoke inventive solutions and work approaches among employees. It encourages employees to think outside the box and to proffer out of this world solution to work related challenges. Individual initiative is a vital aspect of organizational citizenship behaviors because of organizations’ need for continuous improvement and innovation.

2) Self-actualization and a sense of fulfillment: Consequent upon employees’ display of helping sportsmanship and self-development dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior’s, employees experience increased productivity both qualitatively and quantitatively which culminates in a feeling of self-actualization and a sense of fulfillment. Each time employees meet or exceeds work targets they usually feel a sense of achievement and confidence in their capabilities.

3) Discovery and optimal use of employees’ potentials and capabilities: Organizational citizenship behaviors move employees to search the depth of their souls for inventions and to think through on problems until first hand solutions are reached. This helps to awaken the “sleeping giants” in each employee and to unleash employee potentials.

4) Increased competence and self-worth: The internalization and adherence to organizational rules and procedures helps employees develop a sense of mastery of work processes and increases their level of competence and self-worth. This represents the organizational compliance dimension of OCB defined as the internalization and acceptance of the rules, regulations and procedures which results in a scrupulous adherence to them, even when no one observes or monitors compliance (Podsakoff et al 2000).

5) Increased job relevant knowledge and expertise: The self-development dimension includes voluntary behavior’s employees engage in to improve their knowledge, skills and abilities (Podsakoff et al 2000). Employees keep abreast of current happenings and
innovations in their fields and benchmark with rival organizations for improved performance. This kind of behaviors includes attending seminars and workshops, enrolling for skill acquisition, obtaining higher degrees etc.

6) Increased Productivity: Organizational citizenship behaviors are marked by diligence and resourcefulness, the combination of which will result in increased productivity on the part of the employees. Yao and Mingchuan (n.d) conducted an empirical study on organizational citizenship behaviour and business performance and found organizational citizenship behaviors to account for 63% of variance in individual performance ($R^2=0.63$, $F = 6.593$, $p < 0.01$). Also, they reported the dimensions of organizational loyalty, the following of organization, individual initiative, and maintenance interpersonal harmony to significantly influence individual performance. Increased productivity may be mental productivity (technical know-how) or physical output. This may be considered as the overall consequence of intrinsic satisfaction or benefits, that is, all other intrinsic benefits will ultimately impact on employee performance or productivity.

**Extrinsic Benefits**
Extrinsic benefits represent those tangible rewards that accrue to the individual employees as a result of their exhibition of organizationally desirable behaviors and performances. Management in an attempt to promote these coveted behaviors, publicly reward employees that behave in such a manner. These rewards include pay raise, promotion and higher responsibilities, awards and recognition, sponsored vacation, recommendation for further training and development packages, job security etc.

1) Pay raise: Management often use monetary incentives to encourage the occurrence of spontaneous and organizationally beneficial behaviors among employees. A pay raise may accompany employee promotion but can also be independent of any other incentives or activities. A pay raise will be useful in satisfying employees’ physiological and other basic needs. Therefore it serves to extrinsically benefit the employees.

2) Promotion and higher responsibilities: When employees display initiative and a sense of dutifulness, they are most likely to experience increased productivity both qualitatively and
quantitatively. Based on performance appraisal procedures in organizations, this outcome usually attracts rewards such as promotions and higher responsibilities. Managers will like to commit more strategic assignments to such conscientious employees in an attempt to maximize resources. Employees on the other hand enjoy the prestige and other benefits that come with the new position.

3) Awards and Recognition: Organizations usually recognize employees who have been instrumental to the achievement of strategic organizational objectives. Outstanding employees are given awards and publicly recognized by the organization. This category of reward is tangible and therefore labeled as extrinsic benefit that accrues to diligent employees in the organization.

4) Sponsored vacation: organizations sometimes reward diligence by sponsoring employees and their families on vacation trips to different countries of the world. This type of reward is tangible and therefore tagged extrinsic benefit to the employees.

5) Recommendation for training and development: Conscientious employees in organizations are sometimes recommended for training and development exercises in and outside the organization in a bid to further enhance their productivity. This reward is an extrinsic benefit because of its tangibility.

6) Job security: Many organizations attempt to retain their most productive employees; therefore they put policies in place that guarantees employees’ job security. Organizations confirm employees’ appointment and offer tenure to valued employees in order to secure the retention of such organizational assets. This is considered extrinsic benefits because it is conferred by the organization as a reaction to employees productive work behavior’s.

It is important to note that some rewards offer dual benefits to the employees. Some organizational rewards categorized as extrinsic benefits offer intrinsic satisfaction to employees in the long run. These rewards include promotion and higher responsibilities, awards and recognition, and recommendation for training and development. Although offered by the organization, they impact upon employees’ intrinsic satisfaction, self-esteem and productivity in the long run.

**Conclusion and Recommendation**

Organizational citizenship behavior’s are mutually beneficial
to both the organization and the individual employees. The social exchange theory suggested that OCB involves the voluntary exchange of benefits between the organization and its employees. At the organizational level, employees contribute to the achievement of organizational goals and global relevance. On the other hand, organizations offer equitable rewards to employees in response to productive work behaviors.
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