ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE AND EMPLOYEE EXTRA-ROLE BEHAVIOUR: A STUDY OF SELECTED PRIVATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA.

EDEH OGBU FRIDAY
Department of Business Administration
Faculty of Management & Social Sciences
Alex Ekwueme Federal University, Ndufu-Alike, Nigeria

And

ONUBA CHINWE OBIORA
Department of Industrial Relations & Personnel Management
College of Management Sciences
Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike

Abstract

This study examines the relationship between organizational change and extra-role behaviour of selected private secondary schools in Rivers state. It employed a cross-sectional research survey. Target population comprises all private secondary schools in Rivers state. Accessible population includes ten selected private secondary schools with a total population of 120 classroom teachers and administrative staffs. Sample size is 140 using Krejcie and Morgan (1970). Questionnaire serves as instrument for data collection. Face and content validity was used. Cronbach Alpha test was employed. Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was used to analyse the hypotheses with the aid of SPSS (20.0). The study found that organizational change measured in terms of effective communication and employee involvement promotes extra-role behaviour in the workplace. It concluded that organizational change that is anchored on effective communication and employee involvement as strategies to overcoming resistant to change will motivate employees to display extra-role behaviour in the workplace which will increase organizational performance. This study recommended that private secondary schools administrators should adopt effective communication as well as employee involvement as a strategy to overcoming resistance to change in their workplace.
Keywords: organizational change, extra-role behaviour, resistance to change, communication, involvement.

Introduction

Organization is a system with interdependent parts, boundaries, structures and methodologies of operations. Thus, for this system to function effectively, all the stakeholders that determine its success or failure must be on deck. One of the stakeholders whose absence can cause organization a lot of damage is the employee. An employee is the person that ensures that management functional areas are in motion all the time. Irrespective of the roles played by the organizational founding fathers to plan, organize, direct and control, employee on the other hand ensures the functionality of these management functions. However, employee that performs a discretionary duty outside his/her comfort zone or position will not just attract rewards but helps in improving the effectiveness and sustainability of the enterprise. Extra-role behaviour increases organizational performance (Edeh and Eketu, 2016). Employee discretionary behaviour brings about organizational innovativeness, creativity and knowledge sharing. Employee extra-role exhibition is positively associated with motivation, job satisfaction and opportunity for career growth.

Nevertheless, employee discretionary behaviour can be hindered if organization perceives that they need to metamorphose into another way of doing things. Thus, transformation becomes that metamorphosis that organization changes into. Organizational change therefore is a gear in which a driver uses to navigate to any direction he/she chooses. In order words, organizational leaders whose responsibilities is to employ the functions of management so as to achieve the goals of the organization must consider change as an important variable that either promote or disrupt the progress of the system. Change comes because of several reasons. Ekpenyong (2003) elucidates that change occur as a result of resource struggle, growth in terms of business expansion, ideology and leader. In support of this argument, Smith (1976) cited in Ekpenyong (2003) argue that change is like the flowering of the seed, external conditions may facilitate or impede growth, as not part of its mechanisms. What this implies is that change does not take place immediately but becomes reality overtime through implementation.

Organizational change is very significant to a very great extent because; it brings about human development, structural and procedural transformations. Change improves the human behaviour which drives the vehicle that carries the objectives of the organization. Change is a force that comes with both positive and negative effects on organizational performance. It is positive when it solves certain problems being faced by the organization; while it is negative when it fails to achieve the purpose it was meant for. The reasons why managers and other leaders of the organization apply change are as a result of challenges that are beyond their control and in order to resolve these maladies, change becomes an option. Change is not one sided, it affects almost every parts of the organization including the customers. Therefore, it has a perpendicular influence on both the initiator and assimilators. An initiator of change is part of whatever outcome the change will produce and the assimilators represent the employees, workers or subordinates of the organization.

Drawing from above, irrespective of the relevance of change in the workplace, if managers fail to involve their employees in its implementation, it becomes very difficult to achieve. Thus, since employees are the ones that will carry out the change plans, it is imperative to get them involved during its acceptance and its implementation to avoid resistance. It is believed that once transformation has taken place in the workplace through effective communication and employee involvement, then employees will very excited to engaged in discretionary (extra-role) behaviours that will enhance firm's effectiveness and efficiency. Thus, previous studies revealed that discretionary behaviour has been investigated by scholars using another predictor variable in the same country but in different industry. Omoruyi, Chipunza and Samuel (2011) investigated perceptions of justice and discretionary behaviour of survivors after firm's restructuring at a consolidated bank in Nigeria. One of the finding of their study shows that the bank did not involve employees before and after the downsizing exercise. In another context, Eketu and Edeh (2015) investigated the role of social intelligence on workers' extra-role behaviour of independent road transport companies in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. Their finding revealed that workers extra-role behaviour is strongly dependent on the social intelligence of the supervisors and managers. Dialoke and Edeh (2016) investigated the correlational analysis between workers extra-role behaviour and organizational socialization of selected road passenger transport operators in Umuahia, Abia State, Nigeria. Their finding show that workers' extra-role behavior is strongly dependent on the organizational socialization of workers'.

From the foregoing trends of investigations, it shows that gap still exists and this is what has inform this study by investigating the relationship between organizational change and employee

extra-role behaviour in selected private secondary schools in Rivers state, Nigeria with the following specific objectives:
1. To identify the relationship between communication and extra-role behaviour
2. To ascertain the relationship between involvement and extra-role behaviour

Research hypotheses
HO1: Communication does not have any significant relationship with extra-role behaviour
HO2: Involvement does not have any significant relationship with extra-role behaviour

Literature Review
The concept of organizational change
     Organizational change is the transformation of process, level, structure, methods, individual behaviour as well as leadership in the workplace. When there is an alteration in any of the above variables in the above definition, it is assumed that change has taken place. Harris and Hartman (2002) perceived change as a behaviour, event, or circumstance that differs from a previous behaviour, or circumstance. For Radovic-Markovic (2008), organizational change is viewed as the implementation of new procedures or technologies intended to realign an enterprise with the transforming demands of its business environment, or to capitalize on business opportunities. Management scholars, Jones and George (2006) on the other hand, perceived organizational change as the moving away of an enterprise from its present state and towards some desired future state to increase its efficiency and effectiveness. In addition, Elijah and Muathe (2016) viewed organizational change as alterations in workers' involvement, products or services from the market it serves, the way it interacts with customers or suppliers, quite apart from others. These alterations may arise from the point of decision-making by the organizational elites; it can also come as a result of environmental influence which the elites cannot handle by themselves rather it will cause them to alter the former arrangements.

     Organizational alteration comes in two phase; planned and unplanned. Planned change is a type of change that organization anticipates or has anticipated that it will happen. For this type of change, members of the organization are aware that there is going to be change in their behaviour, work methods, culture and leadership. Take for instance; when a manager of a particular branch is transferred to another branch, every member of the organization is aware that another manager will be posted to lead them. Thus, the members of that organization will begin to make adjustment to receive the new manager that will come. Most planned change emanate from the organization. Examples of planned change include change of leadership, change of organizational structure, adoption of new technology, strategy to overcome industry's rival, change in organisation's culture and firm's diversification. On the other hand unplanned change is a type of change that organization does not anticipate its coming. It can also be referred to as uncertain type of change. This type of change can come as a result of change in political environment, government regulations or policies, change in global markets, change due to natural disaster, change due to war, etc. However, these alterations are always thwarted, delayed or hindered by organizational members. They do this because of the benefits they are getting from the previous ways of doing things; hence they will not want anything to take away their ego, influence and benefits. Some of the factors that are responsible for resistance for change in the workplace are hereunder stated.

Types of organizational change
     Change in the workplace can be categorized into planned and unplanned.

Planned change: From the word 'plan' it means the organization anticipated a change before embarking on it. Planned change therefore is a type of change that organization plan for. For instance, a firm moves from one structure to another to alter the organization (Nel, et al. 2011).

Unplanned change: This is the opposite of planned change. It is defined as a type of change that is not planned for or anticipated but it just happens. This type of change is usually associated with the external environment turbulences.

Resistance to change

Several factors are responsible for change resistance. Kinicki and Kreitner (2003) elucidated that resistance to change arises as a result of the following ten reasons.

1) An individual's predisposition toward change: This is an outgrowth of how one learns to handle change and ambiguity as a child. While some people are distrustful and suspicious of change, others see change as a situation requiring flexibility, patience, and understanding (Wanberg and Banas, 2000).

2) Surprise and fear of the unknown: when innovative or radically different changes are introduced without warning, affected employees become fearful of the implications.

3) Climate of mistrust: mistrust encourages secrecy, which begets deeper mistrust. Managers who trust their employees make the change process an open, honest, and participative affair.

4) Fear of failure: Intimidating changes on the job can cause employees to doubt their capabilities. Self-doubt erodes self-confidence and cripples personal growth and development.

5) Loss of status and/or jobs security: Administrative and technological changes that threatened to alter power bases or eliminate jobs generally trigger strong resistance.

6) Peer pressure: Someone who is not directly affected by a change may actively resist it to protect the interest of his or her friends and co-workers.

7) Disruption of cultural traditions and /or group relationships: Whenever individuals are transferred, promoted, or reassigned, cultural and group dynamics are thrown into disequilibrium.

8) Personality conflicts: Just as a friend can get away with telling us something we would resent hearing from an adversary, the personalities of change agents can breed resistance.

9) Lack of tact and /or poor timing: Undue resistance can occur because changes are introduced in an insensitive manner or at an awkward time.

10) Non-reinforcing reward systems: Individuals resist change when they do not forsee positive rewards for changing.

Apart from the sources of resistant to change highlighted above, Robbins, Judge and Sanghi (2009) argued that resistance to change can arise from the following both individual and organizational sources.

Table 1: Sources of resistance to change

Individual sources	Organizational sources
Habit: To cope with life's complexities, we rely on habits or programmed responses. But when confronted with change, this tendency to respond in our accustomed ways becomes a source of resistance.	**Structural inertia:** Organisations have built-in mechanisms – like their selection processes and formalized regulations to produce stability. When an organization is confronted with change, this structural inertia acts as a counterbalance to sustain stability.
Security: people with a high need for security are likely to resist change because it threatens	**Limited focus of change:** organizations are made up of a number of interdependent

their feelings of safety. **Economic factors:** Changes in job tasks or established work routines can arouse economic fears if people are concerned that they won't be able to perform the new tasks or routines to their previous standards, especially when pay is closely tied to productivity. **Fear of the known:** Change substitutes ambiguity and uncertainty for the unknown. **Selective information processing**: Individuals are guilty of selectively processing information in order to keep their perceptions intact. They hear what they want to hear and they ignore information that challenges the world they've created.	subsystems. Once can't be changed without affecting the others. So limited changes in subsystems tend to be nullified by the larger system. **Group inertia:** Even if individuals want to change their behaviour, group norms may act as a constraint. **Threat to expertise:** Changes in organizational patterns may threaten the expertise of specialized groups. **Threat to established power relationships:** Any redistribution of decision-making authority can threaten long-established power relationships within the organization. **Threat to established resource allocations:** Groups in the organization that control sizable resources often see change as a threat. They tend to be content with the way things are.

Source: Robbins, Judge and Sanghi (2009)

Strategies for Overcoming Resistance to Change

Stone (2008) suggested the following five strategies that can be used by managers to overcome resistance to change.

1) Communication: This refers to a situation where the change initiator educates the resistors of the incoming change. Proper communication is needed to quell every form of aggression about the new order.
2) Participation: Here, those resisting the change should be allowed to participate in decision-making concerning the new change.
3) Guarantee: Initiator of change need to assure those resisting change on how it will not affect their jobs or positions
4) Counselling: Those resisting change should be mentored properly on weekly basis especially the advantage the change will bring to the organization.
5) Reward: Those that embrace the change should be rewarded as this will motivate others to accept the new change.

Du Plessis (2007) and Swanepoel (2003) however highlighted the following six steps for overcoming resistance to change in the workplace.

Step 1: Mobilize commitment to change through joint diagnosis of business problems.
Step 2: Develop a shared vision of how to organize for competitiveness.
Step 3: Foster not only consensus for the new vision, but also the necessary competence to enact it and the required cohesion to move it along.
Step 4: Spread revitalization to all departments without pushing it from the top.

Step 5: Institutionalize revitalization through formal policies, systems, and structures.
Step 6: Monitor and adjust strategies in response to problems in the revitalization process.

On another hand, Kotter and Schlesinger (1979) cited by Kinicki and Kreitner (2003) outline the following six strategies on table 1.2 below for overcoming resistance to change.

Table 2: Six strategies for overcoming resistance to change

Strategy	Commonly used in situations	Merits	Demerits
Education+Communication	Where there is a lack of information or inaccurate information and analysis	Once persuaded, people will often help with the implementation of the change	Can be very time consuming if lots of people are involved.
Participation+involvement	Where the initiators do not hall all the information they need to design the change and where others have considerable power to resist.	People who participate will be committed to implementing change, and any relevant information they have will be integrated into the change plan.	Can be very time consuming if participators design an inappropriate change
Facilitation + Support	Where people are resisting because of adjustment problems	No other approach works as well with adjustment problems	Can be time consuming, expensive, and still fail
Negotiation + Agreement	Where someone or some group will clearly lose out in a change and where that group has considerable power to resist	Sometimes it is a relatively easy way to avoid major resistance.	Can be too expensive in many cases if it alerts others to negotiate for compliance.
Manipulation+Co-optation	Where other tactics will not work or are too expensive	It can be a relatively quick and inexpensive solution to resistance problems	Can lead to future problems if people feel manipulated
Explicit +Implicit coercion	Where speed is essential and where the change initiators possess considerable power	It is speedy and can overcome any kind of resistance	Can be risky if it leaves people mad at the initiators

Source: Kinicki and Kreitner (2003)

Employee extra-role behaviour

Extra-role behaviour is usually discretionary. It is not an obligation to exhibit it. Extra-role behaviour is a behaviour that benefits the organization and surpass job description requirements, they are discretionary in nature; they are not recognized by organisation's policies or compensation system; it does not require any punishment from the enterprise if not exhibited, and that it is positively channelled towards employee, group or enterprise in order to achieve firm's objectives (Dyne and Lepine, 1998; Somech and Zahavy, 1999). Whenever an employee engages in a job that is not originally assigned to him/her, such employee is exhibiting discretionary behaviour. This type of behaviour is displayed in the workplace where there is oneness, unity and understanding between the employee and the employer. Take for instance, if a company's secretary comes to work before the cleaner, instead of waiting for the cleaner to come before commencing work, the secretary can engage in cleaning the office. Extra-role behaviour was originally propounded by Bateman and Organ (1983). This behaviour is originally known as organizational citizenship behaviour (Organ, 1988). Salavati, Ahmadi, Sheikhesmaeili and Mirzaei (2011) in their work observed that several researchers have used different terminologies to mean the same thing with organizational citizenship behaviour. These include extra-role behaviour as put forward by Van Dyne, Cummings and McLean (1995); civic citizenship by Van Dyne, Graham and Dienesch (1994); prosocial behaviour by Brief and Motowidlo (1986); organizational spontaneity by George and Brief (1992); as well as contextual performance by Motowidlo, Borman and Schmit (1997).

Several researchers such as Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990); Bove, Pervan, Beatty and Shiu (2009) have also adopted Organ's (1988) organizational citizenship behaviour typology. Organ (1988) highlighted five dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour to include; altruism which refers to as helping co-coworkers; conscientiousness which means performing an extra-role in one's job; courtesy which refers to display or show kindness to co-workers; sportsmanship which refers to the ability of not complaining in the organization; and civic virtue which means to stay with company policies as well as procedures. However, Graham (1989) in his submission contended that organizational citizenship behaviour can also be categorized into three dimensions. These include organizational obedience, organizational loyalty and organizational participation. Podsakoff and colleagues highlighted seven perspectives of organizational citizenship behaviour to include helping behaviour, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic value, self-development (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine and Bachrach, 2000).

Several researchers in the fields of management, human resource management, quite apart from social sciences have carried out an empirical examination on organizational change management in different sectors of the economy using different criterion variables which are hereby presented. Radović-Marković (2008) investigated effective organizational change management. Finding of their study shows that most companies' operational strategies and structures reflect past business realities -making organizational inertia one of the most significant obstacles to change. Duru and Emerole (2017) investigated change management strategies and organizational commitment in Imo State. Findings of their study revealed that change management strategies have a positive significance relationship with organizational commitment. Chiavoghi and Emerole (2017) examined the effects of change management on employee commitment in deposit money banks in Umuahia. Findings of their study revealed that change management has a positive significant effect on employee commitment.

From the foregoing empirical review, it appears that none of the researchers was able to investigate the relationship between organizational change and employee extra-role behaviour in

private secondary schools especially in the Nigerian context. This has created a lacuna which this study intends to fill through the examination of organizational change and employee extra-role behaviour.

Research Methodology

This study employed a cross-sectional research survey. Target population for this study comprises of private secondary schools in Rivers state. Accessible population includes ten private secondary schools with a total of 120 classroom teachers and administrative staffs were surveyed. Simple random sampling technique was used. Sample size is 140 using Krejcie and Morgan (1970). Questionnaire was used as a method for data collection. 132 copies of questionnaire were retrieved out of 140 copies administered. Face and content validity was used to ascertain the validity of the instrument, while Cronbach Alpha test was employed to determine the reliability of the instrument. Five point Likert scale ranging from 5=Very great extent, 4=Great extent, 3=Moderate extent, 2=Low extent, 1=Very low extent was used to measure communication, involvement and extra-role behaviour with 4-items each. Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was used to analyse the hypotheses with the aid of SPSS (20.0).

Analysis of Data

The respondent's profiles were analysed with descriptive statistics and presented as follows: 34 respondents representing 26% were males, while 98 respondents representing 74% were females. This implies that 98 out of 132 respondents from the selected private secondary schools were females. The age brackets of 132 respondents' from selected private secondary schools in Rivers state shows that; 24 respondents' representing 18% were between the ages of 18-30 years. 72 respondents' representing 55% were between the ages of 30-40 years. 36 respondents representing 27% were between 40 years and above. This means that 72 out of 132 respondents were between the ages of 30-40 years. Educational qualifications of 132 respondents' from selected private secondary schools in Rivers state revealed that; 22 respondents' representing 17% hold OND/HND/NCE certificates. 89 representing 67% hold B.Sc/B.A/B.Ed degrees. 17 respondents' representing 13% holds M.Sc/MBA/M.Ed degrees. 4 respondent's representing 3% were holds other certificates. This implies that 89 out of 132 respondents' were holders of B.Sc/B.A/B.Ed degrees.

Bivariate Analysis

Table 3: Bivariate analysis between communication extra-role behaviour

			Communication	Extra-role behaviour
Spearman's Rho	communication	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.787**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	132	132
	Extra-role behaviour	Correlation Coefficient	.787**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	132	132

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The above result shows the bivariate analysis between communication and extra-role behaviour using Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient (rho). From the table, the correlation coefficient (rho) is high and positive (.787**). It also shows that communication has a positive

significant relationship with extra-role behaviour (p<0.05). This implies that as effective communication is employed to overcome resistance to change, employees are motivated to exhibit extra-role behaviour in the workplace.

Table 4: Bivariate analysis between involvement and extra-role behaviour

			Involvement	Extra-role behaviour
Spearman's Rho	Involvement	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.882[**]
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	132	132
	Extra-role behaviour	Correlation Coefficient	.882[**]	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	132	132

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The result above shows the bivariate analysis between involvement and extra-role behaviour using Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient (rho) as statistical tool. From the table, the correlation coefficient (rho) is high and positive (.882**). The result also shows that involvement has a positive significant relationship with extra-role behaviour (p<0.05). This means that as employee involvement increases on change management, extra-role behaviour also increases.

Findings

Based on the results above, the following findings were drawn.

1) Effective communication was found to have a positive significant relationship with employee extra-role behaviour. This indicates that as effective communication increases, employee discretionary behaviour will also increase in the workplace.

2) Involvement was found to have a positive significant association with employee extra-role behaviour. This implies that as employees are involved in change implementation; their extra-role behaviour will also increase.

Conclusion

This study concluded that organizational change that is anchored on effective communication and employee involvement as strategies to overcoming resistant to change will motivate employees to display extra-role behaviour in the workplace which will increase organizational performance.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusion, this study recommended that;

1. Private secondary schools administrators should adopt effective communication as a strategy to overcoming resistance to change in their workplace.

2. School proprietors and directors should involve their employees' on change management and implementation to avoid disruption of work.

References

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, 587-595.*

Bove, L.L., Pervan, S.J., Beatty, S.E. & Shiu, E. (2009). Service worker role in encouraging customer organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business Research, 62, 698-705.*

Brief, A.P. & Motowidlo, S.J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 710-725.

Chiavoghi, N.P. & Emerole, G. A. (2017). Effects of change management on employee commitment – A study of selected deposit money banks in Umuahia. *International Journal of Business Systems and Economics, 11(2), 32-41.*

Duplesis, A.J. (2007). Organizational development and culture: Human resource's role in a future South Africa. *International Review of Business Research Papers 3(1), 1-10.*

Duru, M.I. & Emerole, G.A. (2017). Change management strategies and organizational commitment: A study of selected private road transport companies in Imo State. *International Academic Journal of Management and Marketing, 9(1), 95-102.*

Dialoke, I. & Edeh, F.O. (2016). Correlational Analysis of Workers Extra-Role Behaviour and Organizational Socialization: A Study of Road Passenger Transport Operators in Umuahia, Abia State. *Nigerian Journal of Management Sciences*, 5(2). A Publication of Faculty of Management Sciences, Benue State University, Makurdi, Nigeria.

Eketu, C.A. & Edeh, F.O. (2015). The role of social intelligence on workers' extra-role behaviour of independent road transport companies in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention, 4(10), 34-40.*

Ekpenyong, S. (2003)*. Elements of Sociology.* Ikoyi, Lagos: African Heritage Research and Publications.

Elijah, N.N. & Muathe, S.M.A (2016). Critical review of literature on change management on employees performance. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences, 6(3), 9-22.*

George, J.M., & Brief, A.P. (1992). Feeling good, doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psych Bull, 112, 310-329.*

Graham, J.W. (1989). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, operationalization, and validation*. Unpublished working paper, Loyola University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.

Harris, O.J. & Hartman, S.J. (2002). *Organizational Behavior.* New York: Best Business Books.

Jones, R.G. & George, M.J. (2006). *Contemporary management*. (4th edn.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Irwin.

Kinicki, A. & Kreitner, R. (2003). *Organizational behavior: Key concepts, skills & practices*. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Motowidlo, S.J, Borman, W.C., & Schmit, M.J. (1997). A theory of individual difference in task and contextual performance. *Journal of Human Performance, 10, 71-83.*

Nel, P., Werner, A., Du Plessis, A., Ngalo, O., Poisat, P., Sono, T., Van Hoek, L. & Botha, C.   (2011). *Human resources management*. (8ᵗʰ edn.). Southern Africa: Oxford University Press.

Omoruyi, Q., Chipunza, C., & Samuel, M.O. (2011). Perceptions of justice and extra-role behaviours of survivors after organizational restructuring at a consolidated bank in Nigeria. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 9(1), 1-14.*

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

Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G., (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggesti ons for future research. *Journal of Management, 26(3),513-563.*

Podsakoff, P.M, MacKenzie, S.B, Moorman, R.H, & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational   leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Q; 1,107 ± 42.*

Radovic-Markovic, M. (2008). Effective organizational change management. *Serbian   Journal of Management, 3 (1),119-125.*

Robins, S.P., Judge, T.A., & Sanghi, S. (2009). *Organizational behavior.* (13ᵗʰ edn.). New Delhi: Prentice Hall.

Salavati, A.; Ahmadi, F., Sheikhesmaeili, S., & Mirzaei, M. (2011). Effects of organizational socialization (OS) on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 3(5), 395-410.*

Somech, A. & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2000). Understanding extra-role behavior in schools: the relationships between job satisfaction, sense of efficacy, and teachers' extra-role behaviour. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16, 649-659.*

Swanepool, B.J., Erasmus, B.J., Van Wyk, M., & Schenk, H. (2003). *South African Human Resources Management. Theory and Practice*. (3ʳᵈ edn.). Cape Town: Kenwyn.

Van Dyne, L., J.W. Graham, & R.M. Dienesch. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academia Gerent J, 37, 765-802.*

Van Dyne, L.L, Cummings, J.M. & McLean, P. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (A bridge over muddied waters). *Research Organ. Behavioral, 17, 215-285.*

Wanberg, C.R. & Banas, J.T. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of openness to change in a reorganizing workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 132-42.*