CHAPTER – III

REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Chapter three would be on review of literature of past studies which would draw theoretical underpinnings on the subject area of the research. This section would start with basic concepts on Ethics, Values and Organizational Citizenship Behavior of organizations globally and in Indian context. An honest attempt has been made by the researcher to present the empirical evidences on the study of the ethics and values wherein the term has been used interchangeably on Organization Citizenship Behavior.
CHAPTER-III

3.1 INTRODUCTION TO BUSINESS ETHICS

The growing attention to and awareness of business ethics can be attributed to a number of factors. These include the increased globalization and decentralization of business; an expanded corporate response to ethics; and the influence of various stakeholder groups focusing attention on both ethical successes and challenges. Previous research has investigated the role of a number of influences on ethical behavior (Dubinsky and Ingram, 1984; Hunt and Vasquez-Parraga, 1993). Broadly speaking, these influences have been categorized as either individual or situational. Individual characteristics include things such as stages of cognitive moral development, locus of control (Singhapakdi et al., 1996; Trevino and Youngblood, 1990), and demographic characteristics such as sex, age, and education (Ford and Richardson, 1994). Interestingly, this body of research has yielded inconsistent findings (Ford and Richardson, 1994). More consistent findings have been generated from situation level variables such as ethics, reward systems, rules (Ferrell and Gresham, 1985; Jones, 1991), social learning (Trevino and Youngblood, 1990), and ethical culture (Babin et al., 2000; Chonko and Hunt, 2000; Hunt et al., 1989; Trevino et al., 1998). It is this area that
offers promise in better understanding the causes of ethical behavior in organizations. Specifically, we believe that corporate ethical values (CEV), a major dimension of organizational culture (Schein, 1984), can significantly impact the behavior of individuals within the organization. However, the relationship between CEV and ethical behavior may not be direct. It is likely that CEV are manifested through fair and just policies, procedures, and decision making. Working in an environment characterized by these business practices likely promotes feelings of commitment and loyalty by employees.

Although a variety of antecedents to ethical behavior have been explored, the outcomes of employee ethical behavior in organizations have rarely been examined. Attempts to enhance ethical behavior would appear to be an appropriate end in and of it but we also believe that given the effort likely to be expended to enhance ethical behavior there are likely to be other positive outcomes. One potentially important outcome of ethical behavior may be a greater amount of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB). This is consistent with research reported by Turnipseed (2002) who found a relationship between ethical behavior and OCB. Furthermore, given that OCB have been found to be associated with enhanced unit-level performance (Posdakoff and Mackenzie, 1994) as
well as with higher individual productivity (Turnipseed, 2002), we believe
that OCB is an important construct to include in our study as an outcome
of ethical behaviors.

3.2 ETHICS

"Ethics is concerned with moral obligation, responsibility, and social
justice. Ethics reflects the character of the individual and more
contemporarily perhaps, the character of the business firm, which is a
collection of individuals." (Wiley, 1995). Ethics as: "...that which is to
do with a code of conduct which clarifies one's duty towards other
human beings, even beyond what is required by law. In other words, an
ethical code defines what is morally right or wrong in a particular field
of human activity - in this case business affair." (Harris, 1995 cited in
Mauro et. al, 1999). While Business Ethics has been defined as a range
of criteria whereby human actions are judged to include such things as
societal expectations; fair competition; the aesthetics of advertising and
the use of public relations; the meaning of social responsibilities,
reconciling corporate behavior at home with behavior abroad; the extent
of consumer sovereignty, the relevance of corporate size, the handling of
communications and the like (Walton, 1997 cited in Mauro et.al, 1999).
Ethics is a highly elusive, enigmatic, complex and sensitive concept (Singh, 2001). It is 'moral or ethical statement may assert that some particular action is right or wrong; or that some actions of certain kinds are so; it may offer a distinction between good and bad characters or dispositions; or it may propound some principle from which more detailed judgments of these sorts might be....' (Mackie, 1977).

According to Lamb et al. (2004), ethics refers to the 'moral principles or values that generally govern the conduct of an individual or a group'. Chakarborty, (2002) prefers 'ethics in business' to 'business ethics'. He believes that 'business ethics' sends out the message that business is first and ethics is a secondary rider. This mitigates against the genuineness of spirit. 'Ethics in business' conveys a sense of priority. Ethics is first. Ethical choices are unavoidable. The three basic areas of managerial decision making are: Choices about the law—what it should be and whether or not to obey it; choices about economic and social issues beyond the domain of the law—usually called 'grey areas' or 'people values'; and choices between self-interest and the interests of the company/its stakeholders (Nash, 1993). Regarding law, Pfizer CFO David Shedlarz (Couto et. al, 2005) says: 'It is critically important to do right. It is not adequate to meet the letter of the law— the spirit and the
intent are what have to be kept keenly in mind.’ Choices are simple, either self-regulate or let the laws take over. As is clear from recent developments, governments in both India and the US have come out with stringent rules and regulations because of the unethical practices of corporations.

The literature on values is vast covering a large array of topics in sociology, organizational studies and psychology. Various researchers have defined values since the 1970’s. An early definition by Rokeach, (1973) states that a value is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence. Rokeach, (1973) defines beliefs about preferable modes of conduct ‘instrumental values’ and beliefs about preferable end-states ‘terminal values’. In a value system, individuals rank order their instrumental and terminal values along a continuum of importance. A value system is the sum of enduring standards of perception, attitudes and modes of behavior that serve the existence of a society, Rokeach, (1973) value definition inspired other researchers to view values specific to different life spheres in the same manner. Values signify desired goals scaled according to importance, which guide a person’s life, behavior that is
directed towards goals, and criteria for choosing those goals. Zedeck, (1997) has defined work values as goals that people strive to attain through working. In the definitions given above it is evident that the concept of goals is a core element of values and work goals are regarded to be synonymous to work values. Theory and research on work values precede largely from the premise that work values are derived from people's basic value systems that help them navigate through the multiple spheres of their lives. Work values are more specific than general life values as they apply to a specific life domain. As such, work values influence the importance of work in the life of the individual. As is the case with the concept of values, different authors present definitions of the concept of work values. However, it is evident that the idea of an "attitude towards or orientation with regard to work" constitutes a central element of most interpretations. Most definitions of work values agree with the notion that work values are specific goals that the individual considers important and attempts to attain in the work context. One of the most important aspect that comes to fore from the theories of work and work motivation, is that workers differ with regard to the reasons they have for working and the needs they want to satisfy through work. Similarly, Nord et al has defined work values as, end
states that guide individuals work related preferences that can be attained through the act of working. Work values have been classified according to their types.

Work values can be classified as intrinsic or extrinsic. Intrinsic work values refer to end-states that occur through work or in the course of people engaging in work activities such as a sense of accomplishment and are dependent on the content of work. Extrinsic work values refer to end states that occur as a consequence of work, regardless or independent of the state of the content of work per se such as family security. Ros et. al, (1999) adopt the view that, like basic values, work values are beliefs pertaining to desirable end-states (e.g. high pay) or behavior (e.g. working with people) and examine the relationship between these basic values and work values. They argue that different work goals are ordered by their importance as guiding principles for evaluating work outcomes and settings, and for choosing among different work alternatives. Because work values refer only to goals in the work setting, they are more specific than basic individual values. Other researchers have investigated the priorities that shape individuals’ job preferences and concluded that these priorities constitute their work values. Despite a plethora of different labels, most work researchers
appear to identify the same two or three types of work values: (1) Intrinsic or self-actualization values, (2) Extrinsic or security or material values, (3) Social or relational values. Elizur, (1990) arrived at a related dichotomous classification of work values by considering the modality of their outcomes. The first work value in this classification refers to working conditions, pay and benefits therefore is defined as the instrumental outcome of work. The second work outcome includes an affective element and refers to social relations with associates, therefore is named as the affective outcome. The final component is called the cognitive work outcome and refers to responsibility, interest and achievement. This classification largely overlaps with extrinsic, intrinsic, and social values introduced above. Ros et al, 1999 views these three types of work values as conceptually parallel to three of the higher-order basic human values: intrinsic work values directly express openness to change values—the pursuit of autonomy, interest, growth, and creativity in work. Extrinsic work values express conservation values; job security and income provide workers with the requirements needed for general security and maintenance of order in their lives. Social or interpersonal work values express the pursuit of self transcendence values; work is seen as a vehicle for positive social
relations and contribution to society. In addition to the three work values defined above, Ros et al. (1999) has suggested that a fourth distinctive type of work value could be defined which parallels the basic self enhancement higher-order value type. This type of work values, like self-enhancement, should be concerned with prestige or power. The fourth type of value has been classified as extrinsic in some studies or intrinsic in others. Another study that supports the four-dimensional work value categorization of Ros et al. (1999) is a cross-cultural study by Elizur et al. The study revealed that, the category designated as cognitive, could be split into two separate regions of intrinsic and of prestige values. Among the distinctive intrinsic work values were interesting work, meaningful work, opportunity for growth, and use of ability and knowledge. Among the prestige values were company that you are proud to work for, advancement, influence in the organization, and influence in work. The results of a study on work values and its dimensions conducted in Turkey by Tevruz and Turgut, (2004) parallels the studies in the West. In their study, Tevruz and Turgut, (2004) derived 12 factors that explained work values and indicated that these factors aggregated on three value dimensions. These three value dimensions are referred to as 'functions of work' and are labeled
individualistic, normative and worldly work values. The individualistic dimension includes; information seeking, independence, meaning in life, action seeking, and keeping oneself busy. The second dimension, normative work values, includes fulfilling religious duties, aiding society, creating order, and avoiding negativity. The worldly dimension, on the other hand, includes earning bread, enjoyment, and achieving status. These dimensions are in line with the value dimensions derived in the West. However, 'avoiding negativity' or 'negativity avoidance', a factor in the normative dimension, is composed of values such as; avoiding alienation, striving to be on the right track, preserving health, has not emerged as one of the factors of work values in Western studies. Tevruz and Turgut argue that some of the values and goals are culture dependent and the 'avoidance' factor has emerged in their study due to the role of 'avoidance' in the Turkish culture. As can be seen from the definitions and conceptualizations, work values constitute an important part of the experience of they determine the meaning people attach to work. People try to make sense of their work experiences by judging how these experiences stack up against their work values. Work values, therefore, function as the evaluative standards people use to interpret
their work experiences and determine the meaning that individuals attribute to work, jobs, organizations, and specific events and conditions.

3.3 ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

OCB is defined as "discretionary behaviors on the part of an employee that directly promote the effective functioning of an organization, independent of an employee's objective productivity" (MacKenzie et al., 1998). The literature focused on OCB has used a variety of terms for describing the preferable employees' mentality, such as extra role behavior (Van Dyne and Cummings, 1990), organizational spontaneity (George and Brief, 1992), and support for collective interests over individual interests (Graham, 1991), before these concepts converged upon and accumulated in OCB studies. Despite the relatively inconsistent conceptualizations and the following applications, most of the conceptualizations had a commonality whereby the concept of OCB was crystallized. That is, most of these concepts denoted the fact that the organizational effectiveness is expected when employees are proactive and benevolent to the organization (Van Dyne et al., 1994). There have been five distinct elements constituting the concept of OCB (Bell and Menguc, 2002; Organ, 1988). Altruism is the discretionary behaviors motivating employees to help other employees' work related problems
whereas courtesy is also discretionary behaviors not to create work-related problems with others. Conscientiousness indicates the discretionary extra-role behaviors that exceed the requirements of the task, job, and work ethics (MacKenzie et al., 1993). Sportsmanship of employees is to tolerate circumstances unexpected or less preferable without complaining. Lastly, civic virtue is the behavior to participate organizational practices with the concern of the life of the company (Podsakoff et al., 1990).

Organization Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is also defined as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988). OCB provides a means of managing the interdependencies among members of a work unit, which increases the collective outcomes achieved; reduces the need for an organization to devote scarce resources to simple maintenance functions, which frees up resources for productivity; and improves the ability of others to perform their jobs by freeing up time for more efficient planning, scheduling, problem solving, and so on (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) are a special type of work behavior that are defined as individual behaviors that are
beneficial to the organization and are discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system. These behaviors are rather a matter of personal choice, such that their omissions are not generally understood as punishable. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors are thought to have an important impact on the effectiveness and efficiency of work teams and organizations, therefore contributing to the overall productivity of the organization.

Mart and William, (2003) stated that citizenship behaviors must be monitored and properly managed in order something is left here for such behaviors to have enhancing rather than deleterious effects on organizational and employee performance. Organ and Ryan, (1995) of Indiana University is widely credited with introducing OCB in academic literature. In the last three decades, it has grown to become a prominent stream of research.

Various behavioral scientists have got their own way of defining organizational citizenship behavior. According to Organ, (1988) the definition of organizational citizenship behavior is "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate, promotes the effective functioning of the organization. Organ, (1988) also noted that defining Organizational Citizenship Behavior as behaviors that are not formally
rewarded is actually too broad, as few "in-role" behaviors actually guarantee a formal reward. There is no doubt that Organizational Citizenship Behavior is discretionary behavior of an employee to provide "Extra" to his organization which is not a part of his defined duty. Van Dyne et. al, (1995) proposed the broader construct of "extra-role behavior" (ERB), defined as "behavior which benefits the organization and/or is intended to benefit the organization, which is discretionary and which goes beyond existing role expectations." Thus organizational citizenship is functional, extra-role, pro-social organizational behaviors directed at individual, groups and/or an organization. These are helping behaviors not formally prescribed by the organization and for which there are no direct rewards or punishments. Organizational Citizenship Behavior excludes those pro-social behaviors that are prescribed by the organization as performance requirements, and dysfunctional or noncompliant behaviors.

Organ, (1988) has postulated the following types of organizational citizenship behaviors

1- Altruism (Helping): is selfless concern for the welfare of others. helps others who have been absent, or helps others who have very workloads.

2- Courtesy: Take steps to try to prevent problems with other workers. does not abuse the rights of others.
3- Civic Virtue: Attends meetings that are not mandatory, but considered important. Keep abreast of changes in the organization.

4- Conscientiousness: Does not take extra breaks. Obey company rules and regulations even when no one is watching.

5- Sportsmanship: Consumes a lot of time complaining about trivial matters. Always focuses on what's wrong, rather than the positive side.

In very general language, organizational citizenship behaviors describe actions in which employees are willing to go above and beyond their prescribed role requirements.

The study of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has emerged as an extremely popular topic of organizational psychology, human resource management, and organizational behavior. It has been of increasing interest to both scholars and managers (Lepine, Hanson, Borman, & Motowidlo, 2000; Motowidlo, Borman & Schmit, 1997; Motowidlo & Schmit, 1999; Organ & Ryan, 1995). However, most of the OCB studies have been conducted in the US so that 'despite the voluminous and fruitful literature stemming from Organ, (1988) seminal work in this area, little about citizenship behaviour in a global context' has been conducted. (Farh, Early, & Lin, 1997). Only recently has OCB been studied in other international contexts such as in China, Singapore,
Taiwan, Australia, Japan and Hong Kong (Chen, Hui, & Sego, 1998; Hui, Law, & Chen, 1999; Lam, Hui, & Law, 1999; Tang, Furnham, & Davis, 2002; Van Dyne & Ang, 1998).

An argument may be made that OCB is simply ethical behavior; however, examination of the two constructs indicates clear differences. Ethics derives from the Greek word ethos, which means character or custom (Solomon, 1984). According to Solomon (1984), the etymology of the word suggests that its fundamental concerns are with individual character, including what it means to be a “good” person, and the social rules of right and wrong (morality), which govern one’s conduct. Ethics and morality cannot be separated and are commonly used synonymously (Shaw, 1999). There is neither a universally accepted definition of ethics nor a standard measure that allows an individual or event to be uniformly judged as ethical or unethical. Two individuals judged by many as highly ethical may have divergent views on such issues as capital punishment, abortion, affirmative action, layoffs, plant closings, environmental issues, or discrimination. Two ethical individuals may act consistent with their values and arrive at different conclusions about a given decision, as the meaning of “ethical” is individual specific. Family influences, religious values, personal standards, and needs
influence the individual's ethical conduct (Schermerhorn, 1999). An evaluation of ethical behavior may be further confused by dissimilar roles: employees, managers, shareholders, and consumers may view a given situation in different ways (Ferrell et al., 2000). Ethics must be evaluated with respect to personal values, which are the underlying beliefs and attitudes that are partial determinants of individual behavior. Values are the basic convictions that a "specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state . . ." (Rokeach, 1973). They contain a judgmental element as they convey an individual's ideas as to what is right and wrong in both a content and intensity state (Robbins, 1998). These values vary among people, and, consequently, there are "... different interpretations of what behavior is ethical and unethical in a given situation" (Schermerhorn, 1999). A difference between an ethical decision and a routine one is the amount of emphasis on personal values as the decision is being made (Ferrell and Fraedrich, 1994). Due to the individual component, there are several different and conflicting points of view or interpretations of ethics.
3.4 ETHICS AND VALUES ON ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Ethical concerns are an important area in business practices and research endeavors in the field of organizational chain management. In particular, ethical concerns become evident in situations of asymmetric relationships across organizations (e.g. in terms of power and dependence). There is a need to establish ethical structures, processes and performance measures in organizations. In previous research restricted parts of this idea across organizations have been addressed from an ethical perspective but not the whole process (Moberg, 2003; Geraint, 2003; Kidd, 2003; Carter, 2000; Cooper et. al, 1997; Stainer, 1997). Nevertheless, there have been a few recent research endeavors dedicated to the ethical concerns in organizational chain management as a whole. For example, Svensson and Baath, (2008) introduce and describe a conceptual framework of organizational chain management ethics based upon the automotive industry. Svensson, (2009) focuses on the transparency of organizational chain management ethics based upon case illustrations across organizations in the fashion and telecom industries. The dilemma is that these ethical frameworks in the field of
organizational chain management are still on a general level, where specific details are not provided on how to manage, monitor and evaluate ethical concerns across organizations. There are multiple research topics that may be linked implicitly or explicitly to ethical concerns in across organizations, such as: chain management ethics (Svensson and Baath, 2008; Svensson, 2009), corporate social responsibility (e.g. Dyllick and Hockerts, 2002), sustainable supply network management (Young and Kielkiewicz-Young, 2001), supply chain environmental management (Lippman, 1999), green purchasing strategies (Min and Galle, 1997), environmental purchasing (Zsidisin and Siferd, 2001), green marketing (Crane, 2000), environmental marketing (Sheth and Parvatiyar, 1995), environmental marketing management (Peattie, 1995) and environmental product differentiation (Reinhardt, 1999), reverse logistics (Zikmund and Stanton, 1971), sustainability labeling schemes (De Boer, 2003), environmental management (Hoffman, 2000), life-cycle assessment (Welford, 1999), sustainable supply chain management (Svensson, 2007), and ISO-14000-certifications (ISO, 2007).

There are various areas of ethical concerns across organizations. For example, on an overall level there are both internal and external areas.
Robin and Reidenbach, (1987) develop a multidimensional scale for improving evaluations of business ethics, while Hunt et. al, (1989) develop a corporate ethics scale. On the one hand, “business ethics” has an external emphasis considering the gap between organizations’ ethical actions and behaviour in ongoing business practices and the marketplace’s or society’s perceptions of the organization’s ethical actions and behaviour in their business practices (Svensson and Wood, 2004). “Corporate ethics”, on the other hand, has an internal emphasis considering the gap between the management’s ethical actions, behaviour and the staff’s perception in ongoing business practices (Svensson and Wood, 2004).

It is not an easy task to determine what may be classified as ethical or unethical business practices across organizations as a whole. An essential factor is that there are expectations and perceptions that vary between organizations. These expectations and perceptions also vary in the marketplace and societies that surround organizations, and that influence the predominant belief or conviction of what may, or may not, be seen as ethical business practices. There are several areas that contribute to this variable situation. For example, government legislation may frame and define the criteria of ethical business practices across
organizations. Developed western style democracies have laws that govern the expected and perceived actions and behaviours in business practices as they tend not to be self-regulatory (Carson, 2003; Davies, 2001; Piety, 2004).

Historically, they have been able to impact societies' and their citizenry's expectations and perceptions of organizations' business practices (Grit, 2004; Whawell, 1998). Organizations are also confronted with societal expectations and perceptions beyond purely economic issues, such as environmental and social change responsibilities (Handelman, 2000; Handelman and Arnold, 1999). With the awakening of globalization has come a realization in first world economies that there are organizations who appear to have diverse sets of actions and behavioral standards depending upon the country in which they find themselves at the time (McMurtry, 2002; Sørensen, 2002).

OCB is intended and perceived positively, and is done primarily to benefit someone or something (the organization) other than the actor (Van Dyne et. al, 1995). Organizational desirability, positive intent, and positive other-perception suggest that OCB may be a value based phenomenon linked to individual ethical beliefs. Actions consistent with most definitions of OCB include prosocial behaviors (Brief and
Motowidlo, 1986) punctuality, helping others, innovating, and volunteering (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Organ, 1988). Counter-role behavior (Staw and Boettger, 1990) and a lack of undesirable behaviors such as arguing, complaining, and finding fault with others (Organ, 1990) also describe these extrarole behaviors. Smith et. al, (1983) suggest that OCB is comprised of two distinct categories: altruism, or helpful behavior aimed at specific individuals in the organization, and generalized compliance, directed at the organization. Smith et. al, (1983) describe OCB compliance behaviors as an impersonal sort of conscientiousness, more of a ‘good soldier’ or ‘good citizen’ syndrome of doing things that are “right and proper but for the sake of the system”. Underlying each of the individual OCBs, as well as Smith et. al, (1983) classes, is the undercurrent of ethics: the adjective “good” in ‘good soldier’ directly imputes ethics and values.

OCBs may be job related, and they advance the effective operation of the organization, either directly or indirectly, but are not tied to the formal reward system (Organ, 1988; Organ and Konofsky, 1989; Puffer, 1987; Williams and Anderson, 1991). Thus, failure to engage in these behaviors may not be formally penalized (Van Dyne et. al,1995). OCBs may be performed by a member of an organization with the intention of
promoting the welfare of the individual, group, or organization towards which the behavior is directed (Witt, 1991). Deciding to engage in these actions promoting the welfare of other individuals or of the organization is consistent with an ethical decision. However, actions may be taken, which promote the welfare of one at the expense of another, and, consequently, may be unethical. In either event, ethics appears to be integral to OCB.

Five behaviors comprise OCB in Organ, (1988) conceptualization: altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue, each of which has an ethical context. Examination of the early Bateman and Organ, (1983) OCB instrument reveals a number of items that are based on ethical behaviors, e.g., follows rules conscientiously, helps others, not finding fault with others, not interfering with others, going out of one’s way to protect other employees and organizational property, and not wasting or harming company material or property. These behaviors reflect individual ethics and are consistent with Katz and Kahn, (1966) description of the spontaneous and innovative behaviors necessary for effective organizations. In the study conducted by Smith et. al, (1983) OCB implicitly focus on ethics with items including, "makes innovative suggestions, volunteers, helps others, and avoids
wasting time". Van Dyne et. al, (1994) developed an OCB measure that contains ethical behaviors such as: "represents organization favorably, defends organization against outside threats and employee criticism, does not waste time, does not waste organization resources, and shares ideas for new projects". Other items consistent with various views of ethics are: "makes creative suggestions to coworkers, uses professional judgment to assess right and wrong, does not avoid extra duties, works beyond what is expected, and cooperates with others" (Van Dyne et. al, 1994). The existence of factors accounting for the positive and negative extra-role behaviors that influence productivity has been acknowledged by both managers and union leaders (Katzell and Yankelovich, 1975). These extra-role behaviors reflect in performance evaluations (Avila et. al, 1988; DeNisi et. al, 1984; Jackson et. al, 1983; MacKenzie et. al, 1991), influence taking part in employee participation programs (Graham and Verma, 1991), and may be a factor in job involvement, organization commitment, and self-esteem (Brockner and Guare, 1983; Inkson, 1978; Randall, 1987; Schanke, 1991). A commonality of these behaviors is their basis in individual ethics. Causality of OCB has not been established, and various determinants have been theorized. Watson
and Clark (1984) argue that OCB is a function of affect, while Organ and Konofsky, (1989) suggest a cognitive basis.

An argument may be made that OCB is simply ethical behavior; however, examination of the construct indicates clearly that Ethics derives from the Greek word ethos, which means character or custom (Solomon, 1984). According to Solomon, (1984), the etymology of the word suggests that its fundamental concerns are with individual character, including what it means to be a “good” person, and the social rules of right and wrong (morality), which govern one's conduct. Ethics and morality cannot be separated and are commonly used synonymously (Shaw, 1999).

There is neither a universally accepted definition of ethics nor a standard measure that allows an individual or event to be uniformly judged as ethical or unethical. Two individuals judged by many as highly ethical may have divergent views on such issues as capital punishment, abortion, affirmative action, layoffs, plant closings, environmental issues, or discrimination. Two ethical individuals may act consistent with their values and arrive at different conclusions about a given decision, as the meaning of “ethical” is individual specific. Family influences, religious values, personal standards, and needs influence the
individual’s ethical conduct (Schermerhorn, 1999). An evaluation of ethical behavior may be further confused by dissimilar roles: employees, managers, shareholders, and consumers may view a given situation in different ways (Ferrell et. al, 2000). Ethics must be evaluated with respect to personal values, which are the underlying beliefs and attitudes that are partial determinants of individual behavior. Values are the basic convictions that a "specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state" (Rokeach, 1973). They contain a judgmental element as they convey an individual’s ideas as to what is right and wrong in both a content and intensity state (Robbins, 1998). These values vary among people, and, consequently, there are "... different interpretations of what behavior is ethical and unethical in a given situation" (Schermerhorn, 1999). A difference between an ethical decision and a routine one is the amount of emphasis on personal values as the decision is being made (Ferrell and Fraedrich, 1994).

Various researchers have attempted to take transformations in important work-related behaviours into account by studying changes in the "meaning of work" (MOW, 1987; England and Harpaz, 1990; Ruiz-Quintanilla and England, 1996), "work related ethics and beliefs"
(Buchhols, 1978, Dickson and Buchhols, 1977) and "work values" (Wollack et. al, 1971, Sagie et. al, 1996, Roe and Ester, 1999). This study examined a number of work values, ethics, beliefs, and norms that have been used by previous researchers and our considered to underpin OCB.

The literature provides a number of definitions of values. Rokeach, (1973) defines a value as "an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence". Super, (1980) defines a value as "an objective, either a psychological state, a relationship, or material condition that one seeks to attain". Over the years a great deal of research has been devoted to the study of values in relation to work (Gahan and Abesekera, 2009; Roe and Ester, 1999; Sagie et. al, 1996). Finally, Motowidlow and Van Scotter, (1994) have reported a significant positive relationship between internal locus of control and citizenship performance. Locus of control is defined as a generalized belief and expectancy that rewards reinforcement and outcome in life are controlled either by oneself or factors outside oneself (Rotter, 1966). Work locus of control can be considered either as a value or as a component of personality. When measured as a value, Spector,
(1982) noted that those with internal locus exhibit greater personal career effectiveness, exert greater effort, perform better on the job and demonstrate greater job satisfaction than externals. It predicts some aspects of OCB such as altruism, courtesy, and sportsmanship (Podskoff et. al, 2000; Konovsky and Organ, 1996). Cross-cultural researchers noted the conceptual similarities between measures of external locus of control and the nature-subjugation values (Kluckhohn and Strodbeck, 1961).

Based on this evidence, the researcher considers that five work values and ethics (work orientations) represent important variables to explore in order to examine links with OCBs. They are: extrinsic values, intrinsic values, work ethics and beliefs, work norms, and work-locus of control. In order to represent these variables, some researchers have used the term “work values” (e.g. Dose, 1997), while some others have used the term “work ethics” (Heller, 1997). In this thesis, the researcher use the term “Work Values” or Work Ethics” alternatively to represent the five variables.

The researcher will now explore the theoretical and empirical links between work ethics and values and OCB by drawing upon four theories of “social exchange”, “other orientation”, “self determination”, and
"individual differences". These theories provide the foundation for the argument that study of OCBs needs to draw upon examination of antecedent work values and ethics, and that these antecedents may differ across form of ownership in a developing economy.

The first and most common theoretical framework for understanding why employees engage in OCBs, combines social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) with the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960). If an employee believes he or she is being treated fairly, the employee develops a positive commitment to the organization (Organ, 1988) and increased trust with the supervisor, which in turn increases the likelihood of OCBs (Cardona et. al, 2004). A social exchange relationship is a relationship that exists outside formal contracts and in which one's contributions and obligations are not explicitly stated (Blau, 1964). Unlike, economic exchange, social exchange relationships are based on unspecified obligations, in which there is no timetable for reciprocation. Though social exchange relationships tend to be targeted at a person or entity, an employee's general exchanges can be conceptualized using the construct of exchange ideology (Chiaburu and Bryne, 2009). Exchange ideology refers to an employee's beliefs about work and their organization (Eisenberger et. al, 2001). These beliefs may be weak or
strong. A weak exchange ideology exists when employees have a predisposition to perform regardless of whether they get anything from their organization in exchange - the positive work orientations are embedded in an employee’s values and ethics (e.g. considering working as social responsibility and as a way of life). As such, suggest that within social exchange theory, beliefs about the role of OCB emerge are individually held, and are known as work norms (Kamdar et. al, 2006). In contrast, employees with strong exchange ideology believe they should only perform at level congruent with what they get from the organization (Eisenberger et. al, 2001), entailing judgments about the value of reciprocity in the relationship (Chiaburu and Bryne, 2009). Empirical evidence indicates that employees reciprocate with extra role behavior after the organization has provided valued outcomes such as organizational fairness (Masterson et. al, 2000), trust (Aryee et. al, 2002), and generalized social exchanges (Shore et. al, 2006). In relation to this research undertaken, the social exchange perspective suggests that extrinsic and intrinsic rewards or work values are associated with a strong exchange ideology, while predisposition beliefs such as work norms and ethics are reflected in weak exchange ideologies.
The second theory is that of other orientation. This employs contextual and dispositional forms of other orientations to explain how choices and actions are shaped by both heuristic processes and social influence (Meglono and Korsgaard, 2004; Korsgaard et al., 2010). Individuals who are more other-oriented either dispositionally (individual differences) or as a result of contextual factors (such as group norms) are less likely to engage in rational and self-interested assessment of the consequences of their actions. The theory provides unique insights into a contrasting mechanism that underlies various forms of citizenship behaviors. The theory derives from evolutionary perspectives on altruism (Brewer, 2004; Simon, 1990) that posit a biological advantage associated with less dependence on rational judgment and greater sensitivity to social influence. Korsgaard et al., (2010) identify two mechanisms based on the norm of reciprocity: the obligation to reciprocate the benefits already received from another (paying you back) and the expected reciprocity that one’s action will stimulate future benefits from another (paying me forward). An individual’s willingness to accept and act on social cues (i.e. engage in heuristic processing) is motivated by the fundamental human drive toward other orientation (Brewer, 2004). There are both state and trait forms of other orientation. State forms result from
contextual factors that lead individuals to focus on others, which include such factors as group identity (Brewer, 2004; Penner et al, 2005) and working on other-oriented tasks (Smeesters et al, 2009). For example, individuals who strongly identify with their group are more likely to adhere to group norms, regardless of their personal preferences (Terry, Hogg and White, 1999). Trait forms of other orientation include predispositions such as empathy (Davis, 1980), prosocial values (Meglino and Korsgaard, 2004), and altruistic personality (Rushton, 1984). In relation to this study, the researcher argues that work norms, positive work ethics (prosocial values), and personality traits such as work locus of control should be considered as potential variables influencing OCB.

The third theory is Self-determination theory (SDT). This is concerned with the motivation behind the choices that people make without any external influence and interference by focusing on the degree to which an individual’s behaviour is self-motivated and self-determined (Deci & Ryan, 1985). SDT is centered on the belief that human nature shows persistent positive features, with effort, agency and commitment seen as “inherent growth tendencies”. People have innate psychological needs that are the basis for self-motivation and personality integration. It is
used to explain theoretical links between employees values, personality traits and citizenship performance. Employees can be motivated to perform in particular way for many reasons: through intrinsic motivators; extrinsic motivators; or through prosocial motivators (Boston, 1987). Prosocial motivation - the desire to expend effort to benefit other people - involves self regulation interjected or identified with values and a focus on an outcome in the future (Grant, 2008) and a motivation to want to help or feeling that they have to help (Cunningham, Steinberg & Grey, 1980; Gagne, 2003). Intrinsic motivation refers is the desire to expend efforts based on interest in and enjoyment of work itself (Herzberg 1966 and Mc Gregor, 1960) represented by theories of self determination and intrinsic motivation (Deci, 1975; Deci and Ryan, 1985). Extrinsic motivation refers to the desire to expend effort to obtain outcomes external to the work itself, such as reward and recognition. Self determination theory suggests that pro-social behavior: can is concerned with values of concerns for others (Dreu, 2006; Meglino & Korsgaard, 2004; Schwartz, 1992) be supported by either values congruence (Gagne and Deci, 2005; Ryand and Connell, 1989) or a feeling of pressure and obligation (Gagne and Deci, 2005; Ryand and Connell, 1989); is a relatively enduring individual difference
or value (Grant, 2008) that is reflected in the personality traits; and predicts performance and productivity (Grant, 2008). The theory suggests the relevancy of intrinsic and extrinsic values or motives, social values and obligations, and psychological motives or personality traits in determining citizenship behaviors and performance.

The fourth theoretical perspective is Individual differences theory. This argues that behaviours that reflect a value of positive contribution also promote the viability of social and organizational networks and an enhanced psychological climate (Motowidlo et. al 1997). Three personality variables affect citizenship performance – based on contextual habits, contextual skills, and contextual knowledge – as do three cognitive ability variables – based on task habits, task knowledge, and task skills. Of these, contextual habits and task habits are related to cultural and work values. Work habits are patterns of behaviours that people learn over time and that either facilitate or interfere with the performance of behaviours (Motowidlo et. al 1997). However, people might know what should be done in a particular situation, and they might have skills necessary to do it, but they might also have habitual responses to such situations that conflict with their tendencies to do what they know should be done (Motowidlo et. al 1997). As such, work habits
or behavioural patterns that people learned over time might take the form of enduring characteristics of work values.

While the issue of cultural embeddedness, developing countries are considered to represent useful locations to examine work behaviours (Aycan et. al, 2007; Fariba, 2006; Chandrakumara and Sparrow, 2004; Budhwar and Debrah, 2001; Sparrow and Wu, 1998). We have selected a developing country in south Asia, namely, Sri Lanka, to examine the work value antecedents to OCBs under two forms of ownership: foreign-invested and domestic. Sri Lanka is considered to be South Asia’s most open economy, known as the “Gate Way to South Asia by foreign investors (Chandrakumara and Budhwar, 2005). It therefore offers a mix of domestic and foreign-owned organisations operating side by side within the same industrial sector. While this thesis affords a comparison of linkages of work values to OCBs under not different country of origin but with in the country specifically in the region of Uttar Pradesh between Private and Public organization as a case. The culture of public and private organization within the region of Uttarpradesh, (India) as the culture itself is an interesting one for exploring work related values or ethics which is used in this study as interchangably. There is an increasingly diverse work force within the country as a result of
internationalization of business. Theoretical and empirical evidence indicates that work values seem to diffuse through such channels as management literature, consultancy, training, by way of international conventions and laws, and through multinational corporate management (Roe and Ester, 1999).

3.5 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This thesis is designed to make two contributions viz., OCB and Business Ethics theories. It provides both empirical evidence and a theoretical explanation of those Business Ethics that can be considered as motivators or antecedent of OCBs. It also contributes to the growing body of knowledge and empirical findings relevant to Business Ethics and OCBs in the context of developing countries/country such as India. The researcher after going through the past studies on the subject area could gather a wider knowledge on this area and could substantiate with empirical evidences.
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