



A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR AND CREATIVE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRIES IN TAMIL NADU

Dr. D. Suresh,

Assistant Professor,

Department of Business Administration,

AVVM Pushpam College, Poondi, Tamil Nadu.

ABSTRACT

Technology is growing exponentially, and there is no time to waste for organizations in designing and implementing a creative climate strategy. This study was conducted to explore the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) and organizational climates that promote creativity. By collecting data from employees of Automobile companies (N=201), multiple significant positive relationships were found between several of the dimensions making up both of these constructs. The results of this study show that employee perceptions of creative climates are moderately related to pro-social behaviors. For employees, working in organizations that promote a creative climate relates to having supportive social-exchange relationships and intrinsic motivation to do their jobs. Moreover, practical implications from this study suggest that organizations benefit as well. Employee perceptions of organizations with climates fostering and supporting creativity were strongly related to reports of creative output and productivity. Additionally, these perceptions were related to participants' self-reported discretionary efforts targeted toward both the organization and their fellow co-workers.

Introduction

Human societies represent a large anomaly in the animal world because they are based on a detailed division of labor and cooperation between genetically unrelated individuals

in large groups. This is obviously true for modern societies with their large organizations and nation states, but it also holds for hunter-gatherers, who typically have dense networks of exchange relations and practice sophisticated forms of food sharing, cooperative hunting, and collective warfare.

A current review of the OCB literature has identified a possible area that has yet to be addressed by researchers in the fields of organizational behavior (OB) and industrial and organizational (I-O) psychology. More specifically, based on similarities between the individual and organizational antecedent variables associated with OCB and those with an organization's climate that foster employee creativity – it indicates the possibility for a positive relationship to exist between the dimensions that comprise organizational climates for creativity and OCB.

The current study's rationale posits a more in-depth analysis of the relationship between organizational climates for creativity and OCB.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Definitions

From the time that Organ (1988) first coined the term in the 1980s, over 650 articles have been published on OCB and related constructs within the fields of OB and I-O psychology. Organ's (1988) original definition of OCB was "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". This definition was later modified such that OCB is "performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place". Perhaps this change was due to the fact that the original definition states that citizenship behavior is voluntary, however, individuals may indeed vary in whether they see citizenship behaviors as discretionary or not (Organ et al., 2006).

This modification also entertains the possibility that OCB may not only be performed by employees at their discretion, but that they may do so while using OCB instrumentally to enhance supervisor performance evaluations of them. More

specifically, Hui et al. employed a quasi-experimental field study to examine whether OCB was related to receiving formal organizational rewards such as promotions. Results showed that both self-ratings and supervisor ratings of employee OCB were related to promotions, and that employees who perceived OCB to be instrumental to their promotions were more likely to perform OCB before receiving a promotion.

Antecedents of OCBs

Research examining OCB has focused on potential antecedents, including personality traits (Borman, Penner, Allen & Motowidlo, 2001; Konovsky & Organ, 1996; Organ & Ryan, 1995), mood (Miles, Spector, Borman, & Fox, 2002), employee attitudes (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Organ & Ryan, 1995), leader behaviors (Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990), employee perceptions of fairness (Moorman, 1991; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993), and task characteristics (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996).

Past investigations of OCB have shown that the personality trait of conscientiousness predicts higher levels of employee altruism (Konovsky & Organ, 1996) and volunteering for extra work (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). Individuals with high levels of conscientiousness can be characterized as having qualities such as being dependable, careful, thorough, responsible, organized, achievement oriented, and aware of the planning of their future (Mount & Barrick, 1995). Research has also identified a positive relationship between conscientiousness and OCB as contextual performance (*i.e.*, contributions that sustain an ethos of cooperation and interpersonal supportiveness of the group) (Hattrup, O'Connell, & Wingate, 1998; LePine & Van Dyne, 2001; Van Scotter, & Motowidlo, 1996).

OCB can be encouraged by positive emotions as well (Isen & Daubmen, 1984). While negative emotions may prompt avoidance tendencies for individuals to exit certain situations, positive emotions might induce approach tendencies for individuals. For example, Isen and Daubmen demonstrated that people in good moods engaged in behavior that supported their mood- thus it makes sense that people in such a positive

affective state might choose to engage in altruistic behavior as a means for continuing to feel good.

Building on this rationale, Miles, Spector, Borman, and Fox (2002) tested portions of their model proposing that environmental conditions as perceived by employees relate to their emotional reactions that subsequently influence their behavior. These researchers found positive emotion to be a stronger predictor of OCB than perceived working conditions (e.g., organizational constraints, inadequate training/resources, amount of workload, and the perception of interpersonal conflict among workers). Specifically, employee perceptions of the work environment explained 11% of the variance in OCB, but when positive emotion was included in the analyses it accounted for additional 13% of the variance in OCB.

Similarly, organizational commitment has been studied as an antecedent to OCB (Organ & Ryan, 1995). Affective commitment is the emotional component of organizational commitment - characterized as an employee's psychological attachment to the organization (*i.e.*, employees stay with the company because they genuinely feel good from being at work) (Meyer & Allen, 1997). It should be no surprise then that relationships have been found between affective organizational commitment and OCB consistently (e.g., Moorman, Niehoff, & Organ, 1993; Organ & Ryan, 1995).

Social exchange variables are defined as the contextual and situational variables which result from the interaction between the employee and a variety of other actors - including the employee's supervisors, coworkers, or the employee's conceptualization of the organization as a whole entity (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). A social-exchange model of OCB suggests that trust in employees' supervisors' functions as a mediator of the relationship between perceptions of procedural fairness in the supervisor's decision-making and OCB.

Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007) demonstrated that in work settings where social exchange relationships were of high quality, the positive correlations between personality traits such as agreeableness and conscientiousness and both employee task- and contextual- performance were weaker. High quality social exchanges were defined as open-ended streams of transactions with participants both making contributions and receiving benefits, in the forms of leader-member exchange (LMX) and team-member

exchange (TMX). The authors explain their findings based on trait activation theory “where interactions in which high quality social exchange relationships weaken the positive effects of personality traits on performance” (Tett & Burnett, 2003, p.502).

These findings suggest that an employee’s personality may make a difference in predicting task performance and helping supervisors and co-workers when the quality of social exchange relationships is low. However, when high social exchange relationships are present, the amount of employee OCB will increase, regardless of their personality traits (Kamdar & Van Dyne, 2007). For the purposes here, such empirical evidence provides reason to support the exploration of the relationship between OCB and situational variables consisting of social-relational variables, such as those associated with organizational climates that support creativity.

Other social-relational variables such as distributive, procedural, and interactional forms of justice, which deal with employee perceptions of fair outcomes, procedures, and interpersonal treatment, respectively, have accounted for increases in the variance of OCB even after controlling for attitudes such as job satisfaction (Moorman, 1991). Moorman sought to delineate the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB using analyses to control for job satisfaction dimensions that resembled the social-relational variables procedural and interactional justice. Identifying the best predictor of OCB involved using structural equation modeling (SEM) to demonstrate that interactional justice, or the manner in which supervisors treated employees as they carried out organizational policies and procedures, accounted for more of the variance in OCB than procedural and distributive justice, and more than job satisfaction too (Moorman, 1991).

Essentially, it appears that employees may be especially likely to base their decision to engage in OCB on the extent to which they feel they are being treated fairly by the organization. If employees feel that they are treated fairly, they may also believe that their organization values their contributions and cares about their overall well-being; better known as perceived organizational support (POS) (Podsakoff et al, 2000). POS has also been shown to predict OCB on the basis of the norm of reciprocity; employees perform extra-role behaviors as reciprocation to the organization from their perception of being cared for and valued by the organization (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). The following section will discuss the organizational and individual outcomes associated with OCB, and further argue for the possible benefits of the present

research agenda.

Creative Organizational Climate

Definitions

Creativity can be defined as the generation of new ideas, which leads to innovation, or the translation of these new ideas into useful new products, and creativity is commonly believed to arise as a function of an interaction between the person and the situation (Amabile, 1997; Scott & Bruce, 1994). Although the terms *creativity* and *innovation* are not the same in the strictest sense, for the purposes here the terms will be used interchangeably. Sternberg and Lubart (1999) define creativity as “the ability to produce work that is both novel (i.e., original, unexpected) and appropriate (i.e., useful, adaptive for task constraints)” (p.3). However, innovation is about “a process of developing and implementing a new idea” (Van de Ven & Angle, 1989, p.12).

The terms “organizational culture” and “organizational climate” appear to be used somewhat interchangeably in the literature as well (McLean, 2005). However, some authors (e.g., Amabile, Conti, Coon, & Lazenby, 1996) make a distinction that is important when it comes to researching the phenomenon of organizational creativity and innovation. Whereas organizational culture is about deeply held assumptions, meanings, and beliefs, organizational climates are the perceptions of, or experiences in, the immediate work environment (McLean, 2005).

It is becoming increasingly important for organizations to focus on understanding not only their own climate, but also the external climate in which they chose to operate in. In a knowledge-based economy, during these especially turbulent times, organizations face rising needs to increase not only productivity among their workers, but also their creativity (Borghini, 2005). The speed of technological change as well as globalization and increasing competition have put enormous pressure on companies to be quick to solve problems and ready to develop new ideas for products and procedures (Atwater & Carmeli, 2009). Therefore, the goal of promoting creativity and innovation within and amongst employees is a major requirement for most organizations.

Antecedents of Creativity and Organizational Climates for Creativity

Identification of variables that might account for differences in creativity has been the topic of research and books abound in the creativity literature (Johnson, 2010). This has been the case since Guilford's (1950) address to the American Psychological Association, in which he pleaded for the systematic study of creativity within psychology. Consequently, whether or not this particular address triggered the surge in interest, the study of creativity has been approached from many different subfields of psychology such as social, organizational, personality, cognitive, clinical, and developmental ever since (Feist, 2006).

A creative person is often characterized by attributes connected with the generation of ideas, aspects of problem solving, and the drive to implement ideas (Barron & Harrington, 1981). Numerous studies and reviews have identified personality factors related to creativity and demonstrated that creative people tend to be open to new experiences, unconventional, self-confident, driven, ambitious, dominant, and impulsive (Feist, 1999; Helson, 1999). However, the question at hand still remains - what situational variables exist within organizations that also promote an individual's or group's creative output?

The creativity literature offers a wide range of internal and external factors that are related to organizational innovation (Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby, & Herron 1996). Creative and innovative behaviors at work seem to be promoted by a combination of both the employees' personal creative qualities and work environment factors that promote, instead of stifle, those qualities (Mathisen & Einarsen, 2004). Although research has identified several types of individual difference variables related to the creativity of employees, such as cognitive style (Martinsen & Kaufmann, 1991), openness to experience (Helson, 1999), and intrinsic motivation (Amabile, 1996), it is also clear that organizations can ultimately create an atmosphere in which creativity and innovation are either fostered or stifled.

With respect to organizational climates for creativity, various dimensions have been identified in the literature (e.g., Amabile et al., 1996; McLean, 2005). Table 2

provides detailed definitions of eight key dimensions identified in the literature. Amabile et al. (1996) maintain that the social environment of creative and innovative organizations is characterized by a commitment to ambitious goals, provision of freedom and autonomy to their employees regarding the choice of tasks and how they are performed, encouragement of ideas, and sufficient time for creating ideas as well as appropriate feedback, recognition, and rewards for creative work by management.

When leaders provided support in such a manner it subsequently led to higher levels of creative involvement at work. Further, creativity was measured as a self-report of the frequency employees involved themselves in creative work. Interestingly, this study did not examine creativity as an outcome variable, but instead as an important component of employees' work involvement. Results showed that employee perceptions of a supportive and high-quality relationship between themselves and their leaders were related to the energy needed for employees to engage in creative tasks and for creative involvement to emerge, especially for jobs that demanded less creativity (e.g., less complex jobs such as inventory clerk, bank teller, security officer, or production employee) (Atwaer & Carmeli, 2009).

Social-exchange variables in relation to organizational climates for creativity have shown mixed results in the literature, however. Shalley, Gilson, and Blum (2000) surveyed 2,200 employees to examine the degree to which work environments were structured to complement the creative requirements of jobs. Proximal factors such as job characteristics (autonomy and complexity) were more strongly associated with any creative requirements of the jobs (i.e., problem solving, learning new technologies, etc.) than were distal factors such as organizational systems and procedures to support and encourage creative efforts (organizational support). However, organizational control (i.e., rules) was negatively related to any job creativity requirements. In contrast, a review of the available psychometric instruments for measuring work environments for creativity and innovation found that the combination of a supportive and challenging environment has been particularly shown to sustain high levels of creativity in individuals and teams (Mathisen & Einarsen, 2004).

However, the major factor identified in the literature that impedes creative performance is control (McLean, 2005). This could be control in decision-making, control of information flow, or perceived control in the form of reward systems that put too much emphasis on increasing extrinsic motivators. Kanter (1983) lists ten “rules for stifling innovation” that focus on control of actions, decisions, and information, the use of hierarchical structures, and a lack of supervisor support or encouragement. Accordingly, cultures that support and encourage control are likely to result in diminished creativity and innovation. The theoretical basis for this is that control negatively affects intrinsic motivation (Amabile, 1988), but expertise and creativity skills must be accompanied by intrinsic motivation to produce highly creative behavior. However, some degree of organizational formalization and centralization in key decision-making has also been shown to actually increase the organization’s ability to implement innovations as well (Kimberly, 1981).

Intrinsically rewarding work may also be associated with Maslow’s (1954) attainment of self-actualization, where the pursuit of higher-order, meaningful, self-defining goals can only follow suit from meeting basic survival needs (extrinsic goals). One final contention for the parallel between the dimensions of OCB and creative organizational climates may be due to a similarity in both constructs of providing organizational environments that particularly lead employees to strive for intrinsic goal attainment at work. That is, organizational climates that promote employee creativity may be inherently conveying a message of intrinsic goals and rewards to employees, which employees may recognize as superseding their more basic needs. It may then be possible that employees working in these environments - believing their own basic needs for resources are met - can more actively engage in helping fellow coworkers (OCB-I). Finally, if this is possible, then these same employees might also feel the need to reciprocate to the organization for having provided the necessary resources to meet the basic needs of the employee, and thus helping the employee attain the feelings of self-actualization (OCB-O).

Based on the preceding review of the literature on both OCB and organizational climates that promote creativity, the following hypotheses are proposed for the current

study:

Research Objectives

1. To study which dimensions of organizational climates for creativity and OCB are related.
2. To understand what is the relationship between the outcome variables (organizational creativity and productivity) and the dimensions of OCB.
3. To study which dimensions of organizational climates for creativity account for the most variance in the OCB dimensions.

Method

Participants

A total of 288 employees from five automobile industries in Chennai and Coimbatore of Tamil nadu, India, were selected to participate in the study,

After accounting for the one criterion that participants must have had at least six-months experience working for their current company, the study resulted in a total of 201 participants.

Measures

Organizational climate for creativity. Organizational climate for creativity was measured using the KEYS: Assessing the Climate for Creativity scale (to be referred to KEYS from hereafter) (Amabile et al., 1996) Items associated with each KEYS dimension are listed below.

Freedom. Freedom was measured with four items. Sample items include “I have the freedom to decide how I am going to carry out my projects” and “I feel little

pressure to meet someone else's specifications in how I do my work.” Higher scores on this dimension equate with employee perceptions of more freedom in their work ($\alpha = .78$).

Challenging work. Challenging work was measured with five items. Sample items include “I feel that I am working on important projects” and “The organization has an urgent need for successful completion of the work I am now doing.” Higher scores on this dimension equate with employees’ reporting experiencing plenty of extra challenges in their work ($\alpha = .86$).

Managerial encouragement. Managerial encouragement was measured with 11 items. Sample items include “My boss communicates well with our work group” and “My boss supports my work group within the organization.” Higher scores on this dimension equate with increased levels of perceived encouragement from one’s direct managers ($\alpha = .95$).

Work group supports. Work group supports was measured with eight items. Sample items include “My co-workers and I make a good team” and “Within my work group, we challenge each other's ideas in a constructive way.” Higher scores on this dimension equate with employee perception of higher quality teams with healthy work group relationships ($\alpha = .92$).

Organizational encouragement. Organizational encouragement was measured with 15 items. Sample items include “People are encouraged to solve problems creatively in this organization” and “New ideas are encouraged in this organization.” Higher scores on this dimension equate with employee perceptions of a stronger organizational vision and mission toward creativity and innovation ($\alpha = .78$).

Lack of organizational impediments. Lack of organizational impediments was measured with 12 items. Sample items include “There are political problems in this organization” and “There is destructive competition within this organization.” After reverse-scoring the items, higher scores on this dimension equate with employee perceptions of a healthier organizational culture free of creative roadblocks ($\alpha = .85$).

Sufficient resources. Sufficient resources was measured with six items. Sample items include “The facilities I need for my work are readily available to me” and “I can get all the data I need to carry out my projects successfully.” Higher scores on this dimension equate with employee perceptions of organizational support in the form of having the necessary resources to be creative at work ($\alpha = .92$).

Realistic workload pressure. Realistic workload pressure was measured with five items. Sample items include “I have too much work to do in too little time” and “There are unrealistic expectations for what people can achieve in this organization.” After reverse-scoring the items, higher scores on this dimension equate with employee perceptions of more organizational support in the form of having the necessary time to dedicate toward completing their work ($\alpha = .85$).

Creativity. Creativity is one of the KEYS outcome variables, and it was measured with six items. Sample items include “My area of this organization is innovative” and “A great deal of creativity is called for in my daily work.” Higher scores on this dimension equate with higher employee perceptions of individual and organizational creativity ($\alpha = .93$).

Productivity. Productivity is another KEYS outcome variable, and it was measured with six items. Sample items include “My area of this organization is effective” and “Overall, this organization is effective.” Higher scores on this dimension equate with higher employee perceptions of individual and organizational productivity ($\alpha = .91$).

Organizational citizenship behavior. OCB was assessed using the Podsakoff et al.’s (1990) 24-item measure that has reliably shown a five-factor model of OCB including conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy, and altruism. These OCB items were all reworded from the original third-person format used to obtain supervisor ratings to a first-person format suitable for the self-report methodology used presently. Responses are anchored on a seven-point Likert format that ranges from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Conscientiousness. Conscientiousness was measured with five items. Sample

items include “I am one of the most conscientious employees” and “I believe in giving an honest day’s work for an honest day’s pay.” Higher scores on this dimension equate with higher self-reported conscientiousness behaviors ($\alpha = .82$).

Sportsmanship. Sportsmanship was measured with five items. Sample items include “I consume a lot of time complaining about trivial matters” and “I have been called the “squeaky wheel” that always needs greasing”. After reverse-scoring the items, higher scores on this dimension indicate more self-reported sportsmanship behavior ($\alpha = .77$).

Civic virtue. Civic virtue was measured with four items. Sample items include “I attend meetings that are not mandatory, but considered important” and “I attend functions that are not required, but help the company image” ($\alpha = .72$). Higher scores on this dimension indicate employee behaviors that demonstrate commitment to the organization as a whole, displayed such as participating actively in meetings, monitoring the organization’s environment for potential threats, and looking out for its best interests.

Courtesy. Courtesy was measured with five items. Sample items include “I take steps to try to prevent problems with other workers” and “I try to avoid creating problems for coworkers” ($\alpha = .82$). Higher scores on this dimension demonstrate voluntarily helping others with, or preventing the occurrence of work-related problems.

Altruism. Altruism was measured with five items. Sample items include “I help others who have heavy workloads” and “I willingly help others who have work related problems” ($\alpha = .86$). Higher scores on this dimension equate with overall voluntary helping of co-workers.

Change-oriented OCB. Change-oriented OCB was measured using four items from Choi’s (2007) scale. Sample items include: “I frequently come up with new ideas or new work methods to perform my task,” and “I often suggest work improvement ideas to others”. Higher scores on this dimension equate with higher self-reported employee behaviors that challenge the status-quo in order to improve individual

productivity or organizational work flow ($\alpha = .79$).

Additionally, using this scale, OCB can also be assessed by the target the behavior is directed at; either the organization or individuals. Combining the conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and civic virtue dimensions created OCB-O as a separate dimension, and using the courtesy and altruism items created OCB-I.

Procedure

Participants completed the OCB and Climate for Creativity scales, as well as the demographic questions as a single survey .

A necessary condition for participating in this research was that the respondents met a pre-screening filter for full- or part-time employment, with a minimum of six continuous months at their current employers/organizations. The survey was configured to screen participants accordingly by redirecting those who reported having less than six months tenure in their organizations to move passed the non-demographic items (i.e., organizational climates for creativity and OCB).

Results

Table 1 Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation Matrix for KEYS and OCB Dimensions

Variable Name	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Freedom	2.49	.71	----														
2. Challenging Work	2.43	.73	.39**	----													
3. Managerial Encouragement	2.79	.79	.29*	.42**	----												
4. Work Group Supports	2.99	.65	.33**	.40**	.56**	----											
5. Organizational Encouragement	2.52	.73	.46**	.55**	.70**	.64**	----										
6. Lack of Organizational Impediments	2.81	.56	.24**	.08	.19**	.16*	.24**	----									
7. Sufficient Resources	2.96	.72	.29**	.28**	.58**	.46**	.55**	.16*	----								
8. Realistic Work Load Pressure	2.86	.70	.16*	-.12	.29**	.11	.19**	.48**	.31**	----							
9. Creativity	2.14	.77	.43**	.60**	.43**	.42**	.60**	.09	.24*	.01	----						
10. Productivity	2.89	.61	.32**	.46**	.55**	.51*	.60**	.21**	.57**	.09	.38**	----					
11. Conscientious	5.67	1.12	-.07	.06	-.03	.08	-.09	-.04	.00	-.17	-.03	.16*	----				
12. Sportsmanship	5.17	1.12	.17	.17	.33	.27	.23	.23	.25	.30	.14	.27	.06	----			
13. Civic Virtue	4.95	1.08	.02	.23	.15	.12	.14	.03	.14	-.11	.16	.25	.35	.07	----		
14. Courtesy	6.02	.91	.09	.09	.11	.20	.01	.13	.15	.01	-.01	.21	.60	.13	.44	----	
15. Altruism	5.84	.89	.09	.16	.16	.23	.07	.10	.24	.07	.07	.24	.39	.18	.41	.62	----
16. Change-oriented	5.16	.99	.21**	.26**	.03	.18*	.03	-.02	.10	-.07	.29**	.20**	.29**	.03	.37**	.36**	.53**

** - Correlation is significant at the .01 level. * - Correlation is significant at the .05 level. N = 201 Listwise.

Research Objectives

The first research objective was which dimensions of organizational climates for creativity and OCB are related. To address this research question, the author examined the bivariate correlation matrix including the eight climate for creativity dimensions and the OCB scales (see Table 1). All of the dimensions of climate for creativity were consistently and positively related to sportsmanship - correlations ranged from .17 to .33. This suggests that employee perceptions of organizational climates that meet all of the eight dimensions of creativity measured in the KEYS are significantly related to increased self-reported sportsmanship behaviors such as not complaining over trivial

matters, and not focusing on negative aspects of their organizations. Managerial encouragement ($r = .33, p < .01$) and realistic workload pressure ($r = .30, p < .01$) demonstrated the strongest relationships, suggesting that encouragement from one's direct manager and having realistic time deadlines are most strongly related to sportsmanship behaviors.

Challenging work ($r = .16, p < .05$), managerial encouragement ($r = .16, p < .05$), work group supports ($r = .23, p < .01$), and sufficient resources ($r = .24, p < .01$) displayed significant positive relationships with altruism. These results suggest that employee perceptions of having challenging jobs, being supported in their social-exchange relationships (including their managers and co-workers), and having the appropriate resources are related to increased self-reported altruistic behaviors.

The dimensions of challenging work ($r = .23, p < .05$), managerial encouragement ($r = .15, p < .05$), and organizational encouragement ($r = .14, p < .05$), displayed significant positive relationships with civic virtue. These results suggest that challenging jobs and perceived support from both managers and the organization relate to increased self-reported pro-organizational behaviors, such as attending functions or meetings that are not mandated.

Work group supports ($r = .20, p < .01$) and sufficient resources ($r = .15, p < .05$) displayed significant positive relationships with courtesy. These results suggest that

employee perceptions of being part of highly skilled and supportive work groups, with access to the appropriate resources to do their jobs are related to increased self-reported pro-social behaviors targeted at fellow co-workers.

Realistic workload pressure only displayed a significant relationship with conscientiousness ($r = -.17, p < .05$). Interestingly, this relationship is such that higher amounts of extreme pressures and time limits correlated with higher levels of self-reported conscientiousness behaviors (e.g., extreme organizational compliance).

Finally, change-oriented OCB displayed significant relationships with freedom ($r = .21; p < .01$), challenging work ($r = .26; p < .01$), and work group supports ($r = .18; p < .05$). This indicates that employee perceptions of having freedom in their jobs, having jobs with challenging work, and being in highly-skilled and supportive work groups are related to increased self-reported behaviors aimed at suggesting and implementing work improvement ideas and techniques.

Research objective was to find the potential relationship between the outcome variables (organizational creativity and productivity) and the dimensions of OCB. All of the OCB dimensions were significantly related to productivity ranging from .20 to .27 (see Table 6). While only sportsmanship ($r = .14, p < .05$), civic virtue ($r = .16, p < .05$), and change-oriented OCB ($r = .29, p < .01$), displayed significant relationships to creativity. This suggests that employees perceptions of organizations consisting of climates where a great deal of creativity is called for and where employees that believe that they actually produce creative work, correlated significantly OCB. Such behaviors include not complaining, attending optional organizational meetings, and making and implementing improvements to organizational and job processes. Finally, more of the OCB dimensions were related to productivity than to creativity, with stronger relationships to productivity than creativity as well. This result is interesting, but not unexpected, as OCB is essentially a discretionary form of employee productivity.

Research objective was to understand which organizational climates for creativity dimensions account for the most variance in each of the OCB dimensions. To answer this question I performed a series of multiple regression analyses with each OCB subscale mean as a criterion variable and then the eight KEYS climate dimensions as predictor variables for each analysis.

To begin, eight percent of the total variance of conscientiousness was accounted by the dimensions of climate for creativity, $R^2 = .08$, $F(8, 198) = 2.13$, $p < .05$. Work group supports ($\beta = .20$, $p < .05$), organizational encouragement ($\beta = -.30$, $p = .01$), and realistic workload pressure ($\beta = -.18$, $p < .05$) all displayed uniquely significant relationships with conscientiousness..

Table -2. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Conscientiousness

KEYS Dimensions	$R^2 = .08^*$	β	r	t
Freedom		-.06	-.07	-.73
Challenging Work		.11	.06	1.19
Managerial Encouragement		.03	-.03	.25
Work Group Supports		.20*	.08	2.21
Organizational Encouragement		-.30*	-.09	-2.51
Lack of Organizational Impediments		.07	-.04	.89
Sufficient Resources		.09	.00	.98
Realistic Work Load Pressure		-.18*	-.17*	-2.09

*** - $p < .001$, ** - $p < .01$, * - $p < .05$

This suggests that employee perceptions of support from their work groups related to increased self-reported compliance toward the organization. However, judging from the negative beta weights for both organizational encouragement and realistic workload pressure, it appears that more organizational support and less pressure to complete workloads related to increased reports of conscientiousness.

Climate for creativity also accounted for 19% of the variance in sportsmanship, $R^2 = .19$, $F(8, 198) = 5.76$, $p < .001$. Managerial encouragement ($\beta = .22$, $p < .05$) and realistic workload pressure ($\beta = .22$, $p < .01$) displayed significant relationships with sportsmanship (see Table 11). This suggests that employee perceptions of managerial support for creativity and realistic workloads and deadlines relates to increased self-reported sportsmanship behaviors (such as not making trivial complaints or finding fault with the organization).

Table 3. *Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Sportsmanship*

KEYS Dimensions	$R^2 = .19^{***}$	β	r	t
Freedom		.03	.17*	.38
Challenging Work		.11	.17*	1.33
Managerial Encouragement		.22*	.33**	2.18
Work Group Supports		.16	.27**	1.83
Organizational Encouragement		.17	.23**	-1.53
Lack of Organizational Impediments		.08	.23**	1.01
Sufficient Resources		.02	.25*	.29
Realistic Work Load Pressure		.22**	.30**	2.73

*** - $p < .001$, ** - $p < .01$, * - $p < .05$

Nine percent of the variance in civic virtue behaviors was significantly accounted for by the climate for creativity dimensions, $R^2 = .09$, $F(8, 198) = 2.36$, $p < .05$. Challenging work ($\beta = .17$, $p < .05$) and realistic workload pressure ($\beta = -.19$, $p < .05$) displayed significant beta weights for this regression, suggesting that employee perceptions including having more challenging work and less realistic workloads are related to increased self-reported pro-organizational behaviors (such as attending optional meetings and keeping up with announcements/memos, etc.)

Table 4. *Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Civic Virtue*

KEYS Dimensions	$R^2 = .09^*$	β	r	t
Freedom		-.08	.02	-1.05
Challenging Work		.17*	.23*	1.98
Managerial Encouragement		.10	.15*	.92
Work Group Supports		-.01	.12	-.12
Organizational Encouragement		-.03	.14*	-.24
Lack of Organizational Impediments		.10	.03	1.25
Sufficient Resources		.12	.14	1.32
Realistic Work Load Pressure		-.19*	-.11	-2.16

*** - $p < .001$, ** - $p < .01$, * - $p < .05$

Eleven percent of the variance in courtesy behaviors was significantly accounted for by climate for creativity, $R^2 = .11$, $F(8, 198) = 2.44$, $p < .01$. Work group supports ($\beta = .27$, $p < .05$), organizational encouragement ($\beta = -.41$, $p = .001$), and lack of organizational impediments ($\beta = .16$, $p < .05$) displayed significant relationships with courtesy (see Table 13). These results show that employees reported increased pro-social behavior

toward fellow co-workers when they were part of highly skilled and creatively supportive work groups, perceived less organizational support, and organizational culture that encourages creativity.

Finally, 13% of the variance of altruism behaviors was significantly accounted for by climate for creativity, $R^2 = .13$, $F(8, 198) = 3.72$, $p < .001$. Work group supports ($\beta = .25$, $p < .01$), organizational encouragement ($\beta = -.37$, $p < .01$), and sufficient resources ($\beta = .24$, $p < .01$) displayed significant relationships with altruistic behaviors. This result indicates that along with being a part of skilled and diverse work groups and perceiving less overall organizational support, employee perceptions of having more resources to do their jobs also related to increased self-reported pro-social behaviors toward fellow co-workers.

Table 5. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Courtesy

KEYS Dimensions	$R^2 = .11^{**}$	β	r	t
Freedom		.06	.09	.74
Challenging Work		.08	.09	.88
Managerial Encouragement		.11	.11	1.06
Work Group Supports		.27 ^{**}	.20 ^{**}	2.97
Organizational Encouragement		-.41 ^{**}	.01	-3.51
Lack of Organizational Impediments		.16 [*]	.13	2.07
Sufficient Resources		.15	.15 [*]	1.72
Realistic Work Load Pressure		-.10	.01	-1.14

*** - $p < .001$, ** - $p < .01$, * - $p < .05$

Table 6. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Altruism

KEYS Dimensions	$R^2 = .13^{***}$	β	r	t
Freedom		.01	.09	.12
Challenging Work		.16	.16 [*]	1.89
Managerial Encouragement		.05	.16 [*]	.48
Work Group Supports		.25 ^{**}	.23 ^{**}	2.76
Organizational Encouragement		-.37 ^{**}	.07	-3.16
Lack of Organizational Impediments		.08	.10	1.04
Sufficient Resources		.24 ^{**}	.24 ^{**}	2.75
Realistic Work Load Pressure		.00	.07	.05

*** - $p < .001$, ** - $p < .01$, * - $p < .05$

Discussion

This study examined the relationship between employee perceptions of how creative the climate was in their organizations and the extent to which they reported engaging in pro-social behaviors targeted at fellow co-workers and the organization as a whole.

Regarding the research objective, the first research question asked which dimensions of climates for creativity were related to OCB. While sportsmanship was the only dimension of OCB to be significantly related to all eight dimensions of climates for creativity, the dimensions of civic virtue, courtesy, altruism, and change-oriented OCB all were significantly related to at least two dimensions of climates for creativity. Interestingly, conscientiousness was only significantly related to one climate for creativity dimension, realistic workload pressure. The more realistic pressure employees perceived for their workloads (e.g., absence of extreme time pressures), the less frequently employees reported being conscientious and compliant toward their organizations.

Research objective 2 asked the nature of the relationships between the eight dimensions of climate for creativity and the six OCB dimensions. To the question of whether or not climates for creativity as a whole predict OCB in the present study, the answer is yes. That is, for each separate dimension of OCB tested, including the two aggregated dimensions of OCB-O and OCB-I, the eight dimensions of climates for creativity accounted for significant amounts of variance in these variables.

The final research objective addressed the nature of the relationships between the KEYS criterion variables - creativity and productivity - and OCB. All of the OCB dimensions were significantly and positively related to productivity, with sportsmanship and civic virtue having the strongest relationships. This indicates that the more employees reported perceiving their organizations and work-units as efficient, effective, and productive, the more they reported pro-organizational behaviors. Since OCB can certainly be conceptualized as a form of employee performance, this finding makes sense.

Sportsmanship, civic virtue, and change-oriented OCB were significantly correlated with the creativity criterion variable, such that employees perceiving their organizations and/or work-units as being creative, i.e., where a great deal of creativity is called for, and where the people working with them believe that they actually produce

creative work, correlated significantly with participant reports of these three OCB dimensions.

These findings are consistent with Schepers and Van Den Berg (2007) where the social factors of work-environment creativity (similar to climate for creativity) facilitate pro-social behaviors such as employee knowledge sharing. The present study builds slightly on this topic, such that organizations which have employees who perceive a climate for creativity are not only related to employee pro-social behaviors such as knowledge sharing (OCB-I), but also significantly and positively related to pro-organizational behaviors, such as not complaining about trivial matters and keeping current with organizational information and/or functions.

Furthermore, change-oriented OCB was the OCB dimension most strongly related to the KEYS criterion variable of creativity. This finding indicates that employee perceptions of creative output and employee behaviors directed at improving employee and organizational efficiency in the forms of coming up with new ideas for work methods, and suggesting changes to unproductive organizational rules or policies are strongly related to one another.

Implications and Conclusion

Some of the key findings from this research might apply to a broader group of people. Theoretically, this study provides support for my argument made earlier regarding Maslow's (1954) theory of self-actualization as a possible model for how creative climates may relate to OCB. When employees report having the appropriate combination of challenging work with the required resources needed to perform their own work, they are more inclined not only to help their co-workers, but also comply with the organizational rules that are in place and not focus on negative aspects within the organization. Furthermore, they might view the fact of being employed by an organization with a creative climate in such a positive light that they feel the need to reciprocate in the form of OCBs toward both the organization and fellow co-workers.

Other implications might derive from the finding that creative climates are moderately related to employee reports of sportsmanship behaviors. Specifically, employee perceptions of the level and diversity of skills, open channels of communication, high levels of trust, and commitment in their work groups is a set of

variables that consistently demonstrated a significant relationship with pro-social behaviors directed at their co-workers and their organizations. Accordingly, top management could benefit from implementing measures to address these simple areas as core values in its organizations.

One such industry that can benefit greatly from using this type of information in the planning and design of climate strategies is the technology industry. Technology is growing exponentially, and there is no time to waste for such organizations in designing and implementing a creative climate strategy. Further research investigating the dynamics of organizational climates for creativity and OCB is required to gain a more complete understanding of the two constructs. However, the benefits as gleaned through this present study show that, even if by creating and instilling a climate for creativity, an organization may not achieve some lofty goal of innovating the “next big thing” in the short run, it is still possible that employees might exert discretionary, contextual, performance behaviors in the form of OCBs; pro-social behaviors directed not only toward their fellow co-workers, but also toward the organization as a whole.

Moving forward, it seems that there are additional benefits for organizations providing the climate and culture to encourage creativity, particularly if agility and adaptability to change is a constant necessity. However this application does not have to stop there. As demonstrated in the present study, creative organizational climates inherently consist of dimensions that lead to other successful outcomes, both organizationally and for individual employees.

Staffing work groups that are diversely skilled and supportive of the creative process, and designing jobs that are challenging and important are two dimensions that most consistently related to several of the OCB dimensions in the present study, and it may be that they are important for a variety of other outcomes as well.

As employees perceive their organizational climates in such a positive light - from having healthy social-relational exchanges between their co-workers, and intrinsically rewarding jobs, they respond with pro-social and pro-organizational behaviors. This knowledge seems only to be the tip of the iceberg for understanding how organizational climates support such discretionary behaviors, and much more research is needed to fully understand how they create the breeding ground for productivity and creativity. However,

once that information is uncovered, it may be useful for increasing organizational performance and employee cooperation in these troubling economic times.

References

- Alge, B. J., Ballinger, G. A., Tangirala, S., & Oakley, J. L. (2006). Information privacy in organizations: Empowering creative and extra-role performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(1), 221.
- Amabile, T. M. (1988). A model of creativity and innovation in organizations. In B. M. Stew & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 123-167). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in context: Update to 'the social psychology of creativity.'* Boulder, CO US: Westview Press.
- Amabile, T. M., & Conti, R. (1997). Environmental determinants of work motivation, creativity, and innovation: The case of R&D downsizing. In R. Garud, P. R. Nayyar, Z. B. Shapira, R. Garud, P. R. Nayyar & Z. B. Shapira (Eds.), *Technological innovation: Oversights and foresights.* (pp. 111-125). New York, NY US: Cambridge University Press.
- Amabile, T. M., Conti, R., Coon, H., & Lazenby, J. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*(5), 1154- 1184.
- Amabile, T. M., Schatzel, E. A., Moneta, G. B., & Kramer, S. J. (2004). Leader behaviors and the work environment for creativity: Perceived leader support. *Leadership Quarterly, 15*, 5-32.
- Atwater, L., & Carmeli, A. (2009). Leader-member exchange, feelings of energy, and involvement in creative work. *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*(3), 264-275.
- Baas, M., De Dreu, Carsten K. W., & Nijstad, B. A. (2008). A meta-analysis of 25 years of mood-creativity research: Hedonic tone, activation, or regulatory focus? *Psychological Bulletin, 134*(6), 779-806.
- Barron, F., & Harrington, D. M. (1981). Creativity, intelligence, and personality. *Annual Review of Psychology, 32*, 439-476.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee 'citizenship.' *Academy of Management Journal, 26*(4), 587-595.
- Bettencourt, L. A. (2004). Change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors: The direct and moderating influence of goal orientation. *Journal of Retailing, 80*, 165-

- Borghini, S. (2005). Organizational creativity: Breaking equilibrium and order to innovate. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 9(4), 19-33.
- Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T. D., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2001). Personality predictors of citizenship performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1), 52-69.
- Choi, J. N. (2007). Change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior: Effects of work environment characteristics and intervening psychological processes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28(4), 467-484.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997). *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention*. New York, NY US: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1241-1255.
- Dawkins, R. (2006). *The selfish gene (30th anniversary edition)*. New York, NY US: Oxford University Press.
- Dunn, W. S., Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., & Ones, D. S. (1995). Relative importance of personality and general mental ability in managers' judgments of applicant qualifications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(4), 500-509.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500-507.
- Fehr, E. & Fischbacher, U. (2003). The nature of human altruism. *Nature*, 425(6090), 785-792.
- Feist, G. J. (1999). The influence of personality on artistic and scientific creativity. In R. J. Sternberg, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Handbook of creativity*. (pp. 273-296). New York, NY US: Cambridge University Press.
- Feist, G. J. (2006). *The psychology of science and the origins of the scientific mind*. New Haven, CT US: Yale University Press.
- Guilford, J. P. (1950). Creativity. *American Psychologist*, 5(9), 444-454.
- Hatrup, K., O'Connell, M. S., & Wingate, P. H. (1998). Prediction of multidimensional criteria: Distinguishing task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 11(4), 305-319.
- Helson, R. (1999). A longitudinal study of creative personality in women. *Creativity Research Journal*, 12(2), 89-101.
- Isen, A. M., & Daubman, K. A. (1984). The influence of affect on categorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(6), 1206-1217.
- Johnson, S. (2010). *Where good ideas come from: The natural history of innovation*. New York, NY US: Penguin Group.
- Kanter, R. M. (1983). *The change matters: Innovation for productivity in the American*

corporation. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Kimberly, J. R. (1981). Managerial innovation. In P.C. Nystrom & W. H. Starbuck (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational design*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17(3), 253-266.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 656-669.
- LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (2001). Voice and cooperative behavior as contrasting forms of contextual performance: Evidence of differential relationships with big five personality characteristics and cognitive ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(2), 326-336.
- Martinsen, Ø., & Kaufmann, G. (1991). Effect of imagery, strategy and individual differences in solving insight problems. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 35(1), 69-76.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. Oxford England: Harpers.
- Mathisen, G. E., & Einarsen, S. (2004). A review of instruments assessing creative and innovative environments within organizations. *Creativity Research Journal*, 16(1), 119-140.
- McLean, L. D. (2005). Organizational culture's influence on creativity and innovation: A review of the literature and implications for human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 7(2), 226-246.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-855.
- Moorman, R. H., Niehoff, B. P., & Organ, D. W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6(3), 209-225.
- Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(4), 475-480.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-556.

- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 775-802.
- Piccolo, R. F., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2), 327-340.
- Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C. A., & Williams, E. S. (1999). Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: A two-sample study. *Journal of Management*, 25(6), 897-933.
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 122-141.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22(2), 259-298.
- Schepers, P., & van, d. B. (2007). Social factors of work-environment creativity. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 21(3), 407-428.
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 580-607.
- Spector, P. (2006). Method variance in organizational research: Truth or urban legend? *Organizational Research Methods*, 9, 221-232.
- Sternburg, R. J., & Lubart, T. I. (1999). The concept of creativity: Prospects and paradigms. In R. J. Sternburg (Ed.), *Handbook of creativity* (pp.3-15). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (5th ed). Boston: Pearson.
- Tett, R. P., & Burnett, D. D. (2003). A personality trait-based interactionist model of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 500 –517.
- Van de Ven, A. H., & Angle, H. L. (1989). An introduction to the Minnesota innovation research program. In A. H. Van de Ven, H. L. Angle, & M. S. Poole (Eds.), *Research on the management of innovation* (pp. 3-30). New York: Harper & Row.

- Van Scotter, J. R., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(5), 525-531.
- 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.
- Yen, H. R., Li, E. Y., & Niehoff, B. P. (2008). Do organizational citizenship behaviors lead to information system success? Testing the mediation effects of integration climate and project management. *Information & Management, 45*, 394-402.

