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Abstract
This Study is conducted to examine the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational Commitment is defined as the sense of identity and individual’s dependence on the organization. Organizational citizenship behavior is a voluntary behavior that is not explicitly identified by the organization’s formal reward system and, in general, makes the responsibility level of the individual promoted in the organization. This research is fulfilled to study the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in Mazandaran Regional Water Organization. The statistical population of this research includes all 300 employees of Mazandaran Regional Water Organization, 40 employees of which have been chosen as sample, by random, to fill out the questionnaires. In order to analyze the data, statistical methods of the simple and multiple correlation coefficients were applied by the use of SPSS software. The findings resulted in refusing the research hypotheses regarding the existence of relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior dimensions.
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1. Introduction:
Organizations exist around us in different forms and shape our lives. Organizations are social entities composed of people and their relationships. Therefore, thinking about individuals’ behaviors and the affecting factors is of great importance to obtain better knowledge about the organization. Human’s behavior is determined by his beliefs, expectations, values and other mental perceptions. In other words, behavior is a consequence of human’s consciously made logical choices. The issue of organizational behavior and factors affecting behavioral aspects of human’s life has always been amongst the important issues in organizational researches. The importance lies in the fact that efficient use of the existing resources in each organization, especially human resources, is considered as a priority for the organizations’ managers. Hence, the factors affecting their behavior should be identified and controlled as well. In the current management system, much attention is paid to human resources issue and the most recent methods are designed in a way that more authorities be delegated to the employees and they can benefit better from opportunities, learn new things about achievement of overall goals and take a more active role (Daft, 1998). For this purpose, having professional and committed human resources is a requirement for every organization. The competitive challenging environment of organizations, the rapid and continuous changes of environment and complexities of providing services has revealed the importance of having committed, motivated and satisfied employees for the organizations more than ever. Organizational commitment is one of the behavioral aspects of people in the organization which has been paid much attention in recent decades. In addition, organizational citizenship behavior gained much attention and became the subject of many researches in recent decades. This study tries to investigate the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational commitment, like other concepts of organizational behavior has been defined in a number of ways. However, the typical approach to organizational commitment is to regard it as a kind of affective
affiliation or loyalty. Furthermore, the organizational citizenship behavior is to help the organization beyond the assigned duties.

In fact no organization can succeed without the employees’ commitment and attempt since the committed employees devote more time and attention to their work. Managers should maintain and develop commitment in themselves as well as in their employees.

2. Theoretical foundations:
2.1 Organizational commitment
Organizational commitment is defined based on the individual’s relative ability and involvement in a certain organization. It indicates the attitudes of people toward the organization’s values and goals (Mowday, et al, 1982). Organizational commitment as a practical concept renders solutions for special behaviors in the workplace like the employees’ turnover and absenteeism. In effect, it’s a general rule in organizational commitment that a high degree of commitment would bring about positive results for the organization. According to the definitions in organizational commitment, not only does a employee’s commitment, guarantee his permanence in the organization without considering the circumstances, but it also helps him take part in organizational activities (Steyrer, et al, 2008). Organizational commitment is defined as the degree of sacrifices that employees make (Meyer & Allen 1997). Employees evaluate the organization’s capabilities to compensate for their participation and continuous efforts. A positive evaluation would increase the employees’ interest and motivation for their meaningful participation. While other kinds of commitment related to family and profession can affect the employee’s behavior in the workplace, on the other hand, organizational commitment can totally affect the employee’s behavior (Mayer & Allen, 1997). Meyer and Allen in the definition of commitment’s dimension provided a three-factor model of organizational commitment. The factors consist of:

2.2 Affective commitment:
Affective commitment is the affective affiliation on the organization. This kind of commitment affiliation of employees concerning the work group has close relationship with persistence in the organization. This means that employees stay in an organization for their positive attitudes toward its goals and values. Those employees who are committed to the organization’s values with a higher affective affiliation and feel responsible for the achievement of its goals consequently would show higher productivity and lower job turnover. Affective commitment is regarded as the most optimal commitment component (Sinclair, et al, 2006; Murphy, 2009).

2.3 Continuance commitment:
Continuance commitment is related to the tendency of staying in the organization due to the expenses of turnover or benefits of staying (Meyer & Allen, 1997). It’s that kind of commitment which employees show when they need the job. In this situation, they keep the job not because they want it; they keep it for they need the job. Employees with high continuance commitment appear to have little attention therefore this type of commitment is not favorable component of commitment. (Murphy, 2009).

2.4 Normative commitment:
Normative commitment is defined as staying in the organization without sense of coercion (or requirement). It reflects the sense of responsibility for being a member of organization. Normative commitment doesn’t have the consequences of affective commitment but it’s considered more positive than the continuance commitment (Murphy, 2009). This type of commitment is caused by the fact that employee has the feeling that the organization treats him well and therefore he has to behave the same (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002).

2.5 Organizational Citizenship Behavior: (OCB)
Organizational citizenship behavior is voluntary; it's not recognized explicitly by the official reward system and generally promotes the employee’s functioning at the organization (Wayne and Green, 1993). Voluntary means that this behavior is not a required task role or job description. On the contrary, this signifies the individuals’ commitment to the organization. This behavior is optional and its’ ignorance doesn’t lead to punishment.
OCB aims at improving the welfare of individual, group or organization. It looks like the managers try to encourage the subordinates to adhere to this behavior, but Matavidlo (2000) showed that managers couldn’t force the employees to do that. (Oplatka, 2006).
Eshnak (1991) regards the organizational citizenship behavior as a kind of functional, social, out-role and organizational behavior which focuses on the persons, groups or organization. From another viewpoint, Gram
(1991) distinguishes between role-related and role-unrelated tasks in defining OCB. He defines organizational citizenship behavior as a claim without any obligation from the civic viewpoint or political citizens, which depends on personal behavior which leads to affiliation for the organization. Later, Organ, referred to that as a behavior which is not based on task instead of an optional behavior without reward. He defined organizational citizenship behavior as a factor helping to maintain and increase a spiritual, psychological and social concept which enhance performance (Organ, 1997). Based on the revised definition of Organ, Hurth and Lucy (2001) showed that employees perform that behavior only when they believe that the managers would compensate it fairly. (Oplatka, 2006). Previous research has identified four viewpoints to explain organizational citizenship behavior (OCB): Social exchange, Identification, Impression Management, and Positive Relationships. (Blatt, 2008).

The social exchange view is based on tit-for-tat mechanism. Based on this view, the organization keeps those employees which compensate the organization’s positive behavior with high organizational commitment and citizenship behavior. When employees observe unfavorable behaviors such as limiting behaviors, short-term recruitment, low job security, and limited progress opportunities would compensate them by low organizational commitment and citizenship behavior (Liden et al. 2003). The second theoretical explanation for organizational citizenship behavior is based on principles of identification: employees perform the organizational citizenship behavior since they consider the organization with its social characteristics. Therefore, those behaviors which benefit the organization (e.g. organizational citizenship behavior) sound useful for the individuals themselves (Vegt et.al. 2003).

Organizational identification leads to internalization of the organization’s goals and as a result, people define their in-role-performance in a way to include the organizational citizenship behavior. (Coyle-Shapiro et al2004). Attempts for maintenance, protection, and improvement of the organization, naturally originate from conformance between individuals ‘self-impression and the organization’s impression of them. Identification of organization parallels people’s interests, the interest-based behaviors, and conformance behaviors which benefit organization. (Blatt2008).

Impression management provides the third definition of organizational citizenship behavior. Impression management like social exchange and identification processes defines organizational citizenship behavior as the continuous communication between the organization and employees. This view states that organizational citizenship behavior is motivated by strategic causes for example permanent employees look forwards to a better condition in future. (for which they perform the organizational citizenship behavior) (Blatt, 2008). Therefore, the organizational citizenship behavior is part of employees’ efforts to impress people’s perception of them, increase the performance appraisal level and promotion opportunities. (Bolino et at, 2006). Finally, research shows that organizational citizenship behavior is related to positive behavior with other employees. (Settoon and Mossholder 2002;Lamertz 2005; Bowler and Brass 2006).

Positive communications may increase organizational citizenship behavior by increased empathy and responsiveness to others employees’ needs such as behaviors concerning being a good colleague. (Settoon and Mossholder 2002).

2.5.1 OCB Dimensions

There are different opinions about the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior. Different researchers have considered different dimensions for OCB. Dimensions like helping behaviors, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational conformity, personal initiatives, conscientiousness, personal development, courtesy, civic virtue, and altruism are identified and regarded in different studies. But one of the most credible classifications of OCB dimensions which has gained most of the attention by researchers was introduced by Organ in 1988 which includes five dimensions. These dimensions include altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship and civic virtue. It will be discussed here briefly:

1- Altruism: it points to helping the other members of organization in performing tasks or solving problems such as helping the newcomers or amateurs. In some studies, altruism and conscientiousness are combined and appear as helping behaviors. Discretionary help or preventing work problems are examples of helping behaviors.

2- Conscientiousness: it refers to a group of optional behaviors which go beyond the minimum role requirements, and the ability of controlling environmentally sudden motivations. As an example we can mention a person who tries more to increase, profitability works more or rests less.

3- Courtesy: it refers to employees’ attempts to prevent tensions or work problems in relation to others. In other words, it is the internal acceptance of organizational rules, procedures, and laws related to work affairs by an individual.
Sportsmanship: showing tolerance and forgiveness in difficult and critical conditions without complaint is referred to as sportsmanship. Sportsmanship is a behavior originated from interest in work, peers and superior.

Civic virtue: it refers to the responsibility which employees undertake as a member of organization. It's also providing a favorable image of the organization for the outsiders, such as recognition of environmental opportunities and threats even at their personal expense. (Mackenzie, et al 1993; Bell & Menguc 2002)

The relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and its history has been regarded extensively in previous researches. Most of experimental researches which focus on this relationship, studies the employees’ attributes, role characteristics, and leaderships’ attributes. (Oplatka 2006).

Since the employees’ attributes is related with the organizational citizenship behavior, researchers found out that a variety of dispositional, statistics variables and cognitive variables are closely related to the organizational citizenship behavior (e.g. Organ, 1988; smith et al, 1983; Turnipseed, 2002). Cognitive variables like job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perception of appropriateness and disinterest in reward, are positively related to organizational citizenship behavior. (Diefendorff et al, 2002; Organ, 1988, 1990; Somech & Bogler, 2002; Spector & fox, 2002). Furthermore, organizational factors like job feedback, internal satisfaction, group cohesion, and organizational support have close relationship with organizational citizenship behavior. (Kidwell et al, 1997; Podsakoff, 2000). On the contrary, work routine, role conflict, role ambiguity, bureaucratic work culture, and destructive peer competition have related with organizational citizenship behavior negatively. (Haworth & Levy, 2001; Spector & Fox, 2002; Thompson & Werner, 1997).

2.6 The relationship between organizational commitment and citizenship behavior:
O’Reilly & Chatman (1986) have revised moral commitment defined by Etzioni in order to study the relationship between OCB and organizational commitment. They state that even though identification and internalization are common concepts they are distinguished as different types. Identification represents a belongingness sense to the organization whether it is along with the organization’s goals and values or not. Internalization refers to higher levels of commitment according to which employees not only have a sense of belongingness to the organization but they also personally accept the goals and values of organization. They have identified another factor called compliance which is for measuring external reward and is not related to the extra-role performance of some employees. Identification has a significantly relationship with the extra-role performance of employees while that’s not the case for internalization. In a research by Williams & Anderson (1991) based on O’Reilly & Chatman, they tried to differentiate between compliance, identification and internalization. Their factor analysis couldn’t include the three components separately; therefore they combined these three components to make commitment as a one-dimensional factor. Commitment cannot show disagreements better than job satisfaction and it’s not related to OCB neither. Williams and Anderson concluded that in contrast with obtained results, organizational commitment has a potential for more study in relationship with OCB since there are firmly established theories for such relationship. (A. Malinak 1993).

3. Hypotheses:

3.1 The main research hypothesis: There is a relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

3.2 Sub-hypotheses: To examine the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior, the relationship of each three components of organizational commitment to organizational citizenship behavior will be studied separately. So, we define three sub-hypotheses as the following:

3.2.1 The first sub-hypothesis: There is a relationship between affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

3.2.2 The second sub-hypothesis: There is a relationship between continuance commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

3.2.3 The third sub-hypothesis: There is a relationship between normative commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

4. Research methodology:
Based on the nature and goals of the research, the method in this study is descriptive-survey, since the results examine what exist and uses sampling to make generalizations regarding the population. The statistical populations of this research are all employees of Mazandaran Regional Water Organization. It has about three hundred employees which have been chosen forty them as random sample. The questionnaires were distributed and filled out by this sample. Two standard questionnaires of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior were used for data gathering. The participants answered on a 5 degree Likert scale ranging from highly agree to highly disagree. The return rate has been 85%. For validity of
questionnaires, the content validity has been used. To do so the questionnaires were submitted to the related scholars and they confirmed the validity of questionnaires. To examine the hypotheses, descriptive and inferential statistics and Pearson correlation coefficient were used with the use of SPSS software.

5. Findings
As mentioned earlier the research purpose was to study the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. Based on the data, to test the research hypotheses, the Pearson correlation coefficient must be used. Therefore, the statistical hypotheses would be as the following:

5.1 The main research hypotheses: There is a relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

5.1.1 Null hypothesis: There is no significant correlation between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

5.1.2 Research (alternative) hypothesis: There is a significant correlation between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

Table 1 shows the matrix of correlation between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. The value of correlation coefficient equals to 0.207 which is a weak correlation between the two variables. The level of significance value equals to 0.24 which is more than 0.05, therefore the null hypothesis is not rejected. Because in case of rejecting the null hypothesis, we will have an error value of 0.24. Therefore, in the test the null hypothesis is accepted and the research (alternative) hypothesis is rejected. There is not a significant correlation between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. In other words, the research hypothesis is rejected. This means that the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior is rejected.

5.2 Research sub-hypotheses:
5.2.1 The first sub-hypothesis: There is a relationship between affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

To test this hypothesis, here again the Pearson correlation coefficient will be used. Table 2 shows the test results for the first sub-hypothesis.

Null hypothesis: There is not a significant correlation between affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

Research (alternative) hypothesis: There is a significant correlation between affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

Table 2 shows the matrix of correlation between affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. The value of correlation coefficient equals to 0.28 which is a weak correlation between the two variables. The level of significance value equals to 0.11 which is more than 0.05, therefore the null hypothesis is not rejected. Because in case of rejecting the null hypothesis, we will have an error value of 0.11 while the acceptable error limit is below 5%. Therefore, in the test the null hypothesis is accepted and the research (alternative) hypothesis is rejected. There is not a significant relationship between affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. In other words, the research hypothesis is rejected and the relationship between affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior is rejected.

5.2.2 The second sub-hypothesis: There is a relationship between continuance commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

To test this hypothesis, here again the Pearson correlation coefficient will be used.

Null hypothesis: There is not a significant correlation between continuance commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

Research (alternative) hypothesis: There is a significant correlation between continuance commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

In the correlation matrix the value correlation coefficient equals to 0.16 which shows a weak correlation between the two variables. The level of significance value equals to 0.36 which is more than 0.05, therefore the null hypothesis is not rejected. Because in case of rejecting the null hypothesis, we will have an error value of 0.36 while the acceptable error limit is below 5% and 0.36 is a big error. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and the research (alternative) hypothesis is rejected. There is not a significant correlation between continuance commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. In other words, the research hypothesis is rejected and the relationship between continuance commitment and organizational citizenship behavior is rejected.
5.2.3 The third sub-hypothesis: There is a relationship between normative commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

To test this hypothesis, here again Pearson correlation coefficient will be used.

Null hypothesis: There is not a significant correlation between normative commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

Research (alternative) hypothesis: There is a significant correlation between normative commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

In table 4 the value of correlation coefficient equals to -0.05 which shows a weak correlation between the two variables. The level of significance value equals to 0.77 which is more than 0.05, therefore the null hypothesis is not rejected. Because in case of rejecting the null hypothesis, we will have an error value of 0.77 while the acceptable error limit is below 5%. Therefore, in the test the null hypothesis is accepted and the research (alternative) hypothesis is rejected. There is not a significant correlation between normative commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. In other words, the research hypothesis is rejected and the relationship between normative commitment and organizational citizenship behavior is rejected.

6. Conclusion:

In fact, a general rule in organizational commitment is that a high organizational commitment brings about positive outcomes for the organization. Evidences in other studies confirm this hypothesis. Organizational commitment is defined based on relative ability of an individual and extent of involvement in a certain organization and represents the individuals’ attitudes toward the organization’s values and goals. Organizational citizenship behavior from the civic viewpoint or political citizens is a claim without no obligation and it’s based on independent personal behavior which leads to belongingness to the organization. Based on the results of this study, there is low correlation between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in the studied organization. This means that none of the organizational commitment components in Mazandaran Regional Water Organization led to citizenship behavior among the employees. Not only does the employee’s commitment guarantee his staying in the organization, but it led to his participation the organization’s activities. Furthermore, it shows the level of an individual’s sacrifices. Since organizational citizenship behavior is a concept of individual’s commitment to the organization, the results of this research is beyond expectation and need more investigation in future studies.
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Annexure

| Table 1: Result of correlation test for organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior variables |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Organizational citizenship behavior | Organizational commitment |
| Pearson Correlation | 1 | .207 |
| Sig.(2-tailed) | .241 |
| N | 34 |

| Table 2: Result of correlation test for affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior variables |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Organizational citizenship behavior | Organizational commitment |
| Pearson Correlation | .207 | 1 |
| Sig.(2-tailed) | .241 |
| N | 34 |

| Table 3: Result of correlation test for continuance commitment organizational citizenship behavior variables |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Organizational citizenship behavior | Organizational commitment |
| Pearson Correlation | .161 | 1 |
| Sig.(2-tailed) | .364 |
| N | 34 |

| Table 4: Result of correlation test normative commitment and organizational citizenship behavior variables |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Organizational citizenship behavior | Organizational commitment |
| Pearson Correlation | -.050 | 1 |
| Sig.(2-tailed) | .777 |
| N | 34 |