

EXAMINING THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL CAPITAL DIMENSIONS ON CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIORS OF MOGHAN'S AGRO INDUSTRY COMPANY EMPLOYEES

Abutaleb Shahi

Department of Management, Germi Branch, Islamic Azad University, Gemri, Iran

Hosein Alipour (PhD)

Department of Management, Khalkhal Branch, Islamic Azad University, Khalkhal, Iran

Mohammad Feizi (PhD)¹

Department of Management, Meshkin Branch, Islamic Azad University, Meshkin, Iran

Abstract

The main purpose of this article is, determining the Relative Importance of Social Capital dimensions on citizenship behavior in Moghan's Agro Industry Company employees. In this correlation research, data has collected from 104 employees of Moghan's Agro Industry Company by two questionnaires with study of variables. We used Relative Importance method and Spearman Correlation to analyze the research hypothesis. The findings show that there is a relationship between relational dimension and citizenship behavior and also this dimension have the most relative weight influence on behavior citizenship in comparison other social capital dimensions.

Keywords: *social capital, structural, structural, cognitive, citizenship behavior*

INTRODUCTION

The first thing of importance in a theory capable of informing practice would be a clear definition and understanding of the subject of the theory. Put differently, being able to formulate clearly and consistently what one is speaking about is important. However, over the last 10 years reviewers of social capital research and theories have observed no emerging agreement on a precise definition of social capital (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998; Schuller, Baron and Field, 2000; Nahapiet, 2008). Mondak even saw a risk of the concept becoming muddled and deprived of any distinct meaning (Mondak, 1998).

Social capital theory and research point clearly to the importance of networks, relationships, trust, norms and identity as potential explananda for the creation and sharing of knowledge. Nahapiet and Ghoshal's (1998) paper theorizes how, and in which ways, social capital is important. However, while the demonstration of the importance of social capital is essential, it may not be sufficient to meet the criterion of a good theory in Lewin's terms. Gaining a more

¹ Correspondence another: PhD In Public Administration +989141550612

practical understanding of how the dimensions of social capital evolve and interact is of particular importance in this respect (Nahapiet, 2008).

They identified three such clusters of facets, which they call: the structural, the cognitive and the relational dimension of social capital. A further specification in terms of operationalization into facets is presented as follows:

- The structural dimension: Network ties, network configuration and appropriate organization,
- The cognitive dimension: Shared codes and language, shared narratives,
- The relational dimension: Trust, norms, obligations and identification (Rune, 2008).

Social capital as a relevant factor of Job performance has been actively dealt with in the literature over the last few years. Job performance is a commonly used, yet poorly defined concept in industrial and organizational psychology, the branch of psychology that deals with the workplace. It's also part of Human Resources Management. It most commonly refers to whether a person performs their job well. Despite the confusion over how it should be exactly defined, performance is an extremely important criterion that relates to organizational outcomes and success. Among the most commonly accepted theories of job performance comes from the work of John P. Campbell and colleagues (Campbell & et al, 1993). Coming from a psychological perspective, Campbell describes job performance as an individual level variable. That is, performance is something a single person does. This differentiates it from more encompassing constructs such as organizational performance or national performance which are higher level variables.

The conceptualization of job performance has been expanded in recent years to include *core task behaviors*, *citizenship behaviors*, and *counterproductive behaviors*. Core task performance refers to the basic required duties of a particular job. Citizenship performance refers to those extra behaviors engaged in by employees, over and above their core task requirements, which actively promote and strengthen the organization's effectiveness (e.g., helping coworkers; Hunt, 1996; Organ, 1988). Counterproductive performance refers to voluntary behaviors that harm the well-being of the organization (e.g., theft; Bennett & Robinson, 2000).

Rotundo and Sackett (2002) compared the relative importance of these three groups of performance behaviors in managerial ratings of subordinates' overall job performance. They found that each of these three categories of performance behaviors contributed to overall performance rating, with core task performance given the highest weight, followed by counterproductive performance and citizenship performance. Consistent with these findings, then, this study also focuses on three categories of performance behaviors, too (Rotundo and Sackett, 2002).

Citizenship Behavior tells voluntarily actions, inclinations to personnel's dedication to supply comfort and welfare in other people. Beside modern career environments need the personnel that are good citizens which personnel show tendency to extent cooperation and help to peer, employer and customer (Alizdeh, 2009, 2). Personnel who aren't committed to their organization have a withdrawal behavior, which described as some actions which personnel do it refrain to do work (Feizi & at el, 2011, 53).

Sometimes employees go the extra mile by actually engaging in behaviors that are not within their job description—and thus that do not fall under the broad heading of task performance. This

situation brings us to the typical category of job performance, called citizenship behavior. Citizenship behavior is defined as voluntary employee activities that may or may not be rewarded but that contribute to the organization by improving the overall quality of the setting in which work takes place (Organ, 1988).

Who always maintained a good attitude, even in trying times? We tend to call those people “good citizens” or “good soldiers.” (Organ, 1988). High levels of citizenship behavior earn them such titles. Although there are many different types of behaviors that might seem to fit the definition of citizenship behavior, research suggests two main categories that differ according to who benefits from the activity: coworkers or the organization (Coleman & Borman, 2000).

The first category of citizenship behavior is the one with which you’re most likely to be familiar: interpersonal citizenship behavior. Such behaviors benefit coworkers and colleagues and involve assisting, supporting, and developing other organizational members in a way that goes beyond normal job expectations (Coleman & Borman, 2000).

Two important points should be emphasized about citizenship behaviors. First, as you’ve probably realized, citizenship behaviors are relevant in virtually any job, regardless of the particular nature of its tasks, (Motowidlo, 2000) and there are clear benefits of these behaviors in terms of the effectiveness of work units and organizations (Podsakoff & others, 2000). As examples, research conducted in a paper mill found that the quantity and quality of crew output was higher in crews that included more good citizens (Podsakoff, & at el, 1997). Research of 30 restaurants also showed that higher levels of citizenship behavior promoted higher revenue, better operating efficiency, higher customer satisfaction, higher performance quality, less food waste, and fewer customer complaints (Walz & Neihoff, 1996). Thus, it seems clear that citizenship behaviors have a significant influence on the bottom line.

Second, citizenship behaviors become even more vital during organizational crises, when beneficial suggestions, deep employee involvement, and a positive “public face” are critical. For example, Southwest Airlines relied on high levels of organizational citizenship behaviors after 9/11. Top corporate leaders worked without pay through the end of 2001, while rank-and-file employees voluntarily gave up days or weeks of paid vacation so that the employee profit-sharing plan could remain fully funded. The end result of this good citizenship was that Southwest suffered no layoffs after 9/11 and was the only major airline to make a profit that year (McGee-Cooper & Looper, 2005). From an employee’s perspective, it may be tempting to discount the importance of citizenship behaviors—to just focus on your own job tasks and leave aside any “extra” stuff.

The main purpose of this article is, determining the Relative Importance of Social Capital dimensions on citizenship behavior in Moghan’s Agro Industry Company employees. To achieve the above objective we determine under secondary objectives:

- determining the relationship between structural dimension and citizenship behavior
- determining the relationship between cognitive dimension and citizenship behavior
- determining the relationship between relational dimension and citizenship behavior

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

In this paper we have four main hypothesis. The statistical way of analysis of hypotheses is two ways, H1 is acceptance of hypothesis and H0 is rejecting of hypothesis. In other words, it means that H1 has positive meaning and H0 has negative meaning.

- There is a relationship between structural dimension and citizenship behavior
- There is a relationship between cognitive dimension and citizenship behavior
- There is a relationship between relational dimension and citizenship behavior
- Social capital dimensions is not equally important in influencing to citizenship behavior.

METHODOLOGY

In this correlation research, data has collected from 104 employees of Moghan's Agro Industry Company by two questionnaires with study of variables. Social Capital questionnaire, a 17 item according to Nahapiet and Ghoshal's (1998) theory and citizenship behavior, a 8 item according to Colquitt (2009), all the reliability and validity of measures has examined. Questionnaires reliability was estimated by calculating Cronbach's Alpha via SPSS software that is shown in the table 1.

Table 1. Results of questionnaires reliability

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha
Social Capital	0.70
Citizenship Behavior	0.84

We used Relative Importance method and Spearman Correlation to analyze the research hypothesis.

Regression analyses are typically conducted to capture people's decision policy. However, when inter-correlation among predictors exists (as is the case in this study), regression coefficients have long been judged inadequate to indicate the relative importance of a predictor because the impact of one predictor cannot be considered when holding the other predictors constant (Budescu, 1993; Hoffman, 1962). Currently, there are two preferred methods for determining a predictor's relative importance: Budescu's dominance analysis and Johnson's (2000, 2001) relative weights. According to Johnson and LeBreton (2004), both indices take a predictor's direct effect and its effect when combined with other predictors into account, and both yield importance weights that represent the proportionate contribution each predictor makes to R². When they are used for analysing the same data, both indices produce virtually the same results. Here, we computed Johnson's relative weights per rater (expressed as proportions of R²) because they are easier to compute than Budescu's dominance analysis.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

1- Descriptive Analysis

The data gathered from questionnaires shows that, ninety one percent are male and nine percent are female. The responder's degree is 5 percent M.A, 64 percent BA, 31 percent DA or under DA have degree. It means that the most of the employees have university degree. (Table 2)

Table2- Responders degree

Valid	Degree	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	MA	6	5	5	5
	BA	66	64	64	69
	DA or Under DA	32	31	31	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Table 3 shows work experience of the responders. According to table 4, from the precedence point of view about 11 percent of responders have less than 5 years' work experience, and 63 percent have between 6-15, 14 percent 16-25 and finally 12 percent have more than 25 years of managing experience. It shows that people with less experience are less than 11 years.

Table 3- Work Experience of the responders

Work Experience					
Valid		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Under 5	11	11	11	11
	6-15	66	63	63	74
	16-25	15	14	14	85
	More than 25	12	12	12	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

2- Hypothetical Analysis

Table 4, shows the correlation coefficients between the independent and dependent variables.

As can be seen in the table:

1. There is a significant relationship between cognitive and structural dimension with 0.572.
2. There is a significant relationship between cognitive and relational dimension with 0.330.
3. There is a significant relationship between relational and structural dimension with 0.368.

Table 4, correlation coefficients between the independent and dependent variables

Research Variables		CB	Cognitive	Structural	Relational
Citizenship Behavior	Spearman Correlation	1.000			
	Sig	.			
	N	104			
Cognitive	Spearman Correlation	.386**	1.000		

	Sig	.000	.		
	N	104	104		
Structural	Spearman Correlation	.225 **	.572 **	1.000	
	Sig	.000	.000	.	
	N	104	104	104	
Relational	Spearman Correlation	.820 **	.330**	.368**	1.000
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.
	N	104	104	104	104

The results of above table shows, that there is a correlation between the independent variables. Therefore, in such cases, using a method such as regression to find the net effect of social capital on the Citizenship Behavior is not suitable. Also, it shows that there is a relationship between social capital dimensions and citizenship behavior in Moghan’s Agro Industry Company. Strongly relationship seen between structural dimension and citizenship behavior.

Given the correlation between the independent variables, we have calculated the combined effects and weighted share of social capital three dimensions in influencing to citizenship behavior with used of relative importance technique.

Table 5. Social capital dimensions relative importance / weight to influence behavior citizenship with using Johnson model

Social capital dimensions	Net weight of each variable	relative weight of each variable with 100% ($R^2 \div$ Net weight of each variable)	N
Cognitive Dimension	0.106	13.8%	104
Structural Dimension	0.030	4%	104
Relational Dimension	0.629	82.2%	104
Total	R2 = 765%	100%	104

The results show that three dimensions of social capital explained 765 present of organizational citizenship behavior changes. Relational dimension has the highest priority and the structural dimension has the lowest priority. Relational dimension have 82 present, cognitive dimension have 11 present and structural dimension have four present relative weight

The findings of research show that there is a relationship between relational dimension and citizenship behavior and also this dimension have the most relative weight influence on behavior citizenship in comparison other social capital dimensions.

REFERENCES

1. Alizadeh, M, 2010, Explain the role of organizational culture on organizational citizenship behavior, organizational, Conference of Management of organizational citizenship behavior, Tehran University, School of Management.
2. Bennett RJ, Robinson SL. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 349–360.
3. Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E. (1993). A theory of performance: In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel Selection in Organizations* (pp. 35-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
4. Coleman, V. I.; and W.C. Borman. "Investigating the Underlying Structure of the Citizenship Performance Domain." *Human Resource Management Review* 10 (2000), pp. 25–44.
5. Colquitt J. A, J. A. Lepine, M. J. Wesson," *Organization Behavior: Improving performance and commitment in the work place*", Mc Graw-hill International '2009.
6. Hunt ST. (1996). Generic work behavior: An investigation into the dimensions of entrylevel, hourly job performance. *PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY*, 49, 51–83.
7. Johnson, J. W. (2000). A heuristic method for estimating the relative weight of predictor variables in multiple regression. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 35, 1–19.
8. Johnson, J. W. (2001). The relative importance of task and contextual performance dimensions to supervisor judgments of overall performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 984–996.
9. Johnson, J. W., & LeBreton, J. M. (2004). History and use of relative importance indices in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 7, 238–257.
10. McGee-Cooper, A.; and G. Looper. "Lessons on Layoffs: Managing in Good Times to Prepare for Bad Times." n.d., http://www.amca.com/articles/article_layoffs.html, (August 17, 2005).
11. Mondak, J. (1998). Editor's Introduction in *Political Psychology*, 19/3:434-40) (Special Issue: Psychological Approaches to Social Capital).
12. Motowidlo, S.J. "Some Basic Issues Related to Contextual Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Human Resource Management." *Human Resource Management Review* 10 (2000), pp. 115–26.
13. Nahapiet J & Ghoshal S. (1998). Social Capital, Intellectual Capital and the Organizational Advantage. *The Academy of Management Review* 1998. Vol. 23, No. 2, 242-266.
14. Nahapiet, J. (2008). The role of social capital in inter-organizational relations. In S. Cropper, M. Ebers, C. Huxham and P.S. Ring (eds.), *the Oxford Handbook of Inter-organizational Relations*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
15. Organ DW. (1988). A restatement of the satisfaction-performance hypothesis. *Journal of Management*, 14, 547–557.
16. Organ, D. W. *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1988.

17. Podsakoff, P.M.; S.B. MacKenzie; J.B. Baine; and D.G. Bachrach. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research.” *Journal of Management* 26 (2000), pp. 513–63.
18. Rotundo M, Sackett PR. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 66–80.
19. Rune, R., (2008), Social capital and organizational practice, EIBA conference, December 2008, p10.
20. Schuller, T., Baron, S. and Field, J. (2000). Social Capital: A Review and Critique. In Baron et. al. (2000). *Social Capital. Critical Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
21. Ulrike Grömping, 2006, Relative Importance for Linear Regression in R: The Package relaimpo, *Journal of Statistical Software*, October 2006, Volume 17, Issue 1.
22. Walz, S.M.; and B.P. Neihoff. “Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Their Effect on Organizational Effectiveness in Limited-Menu Restaurants.” In *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*, eds. J.B. Keys and L.N. Dosier. Statesboro, GA: College of Business Administration at Georgia Southern University (1996), pp. 307–11.