

SHARED VALUES AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR OF GENERATIONAL COHORTS: A REVIEW AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

I. Yogamalar*
Anand A. Samuel**

Received: 27. 9. 2016
Accepted: 13. 11. 2016

Professional paper
UDC 005.96

The literature implies that in the contemporary workforce, one of the interesting and challenging tasks of the management is to effectively handle different generations who possess various value systems. Hence, the foremost aspiration of the current study is to present the empirical evidence on the diverse characteristics and values of generational cohorts; the interests of HR specialists, managers and researchers in dealing with multigenerational workforce and their impact on work-related outcomes, the responsibility of management; the influence of values on behavior (especially, in-role and extra-role behaviours) and various positive outcomes to employees and organizations. This article also reviewed the previous studies related to shared values or P-O fit, OCB and highlighted that very little research was conducted in academic institutions. This study shows the generational categories from the Western context and the Indian context. It also intends to identify the gaps in the generational research and pave the way for further investigation. Finally, based on the research gaps identified, this article suggests and discusses the importance of generational difference on shared values and OCB in academic field in the Indian context as well as reframes the list of shared values from academic perspective for further investigation. Moreover, academic field is one of the predominant workplaces where intergenerational communication is at a high rate. Thus, the more attention needs to be given to the behaviours of generational cohorts in order to attain the goal of the institution.

Keywords: Shared values, P-O fit, Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Gen X, Gen Y, Millennials, India.

* I. Yogamalar, VIT Business School, VIT University, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India. Phone +91 9626470770, E-mail: yogamalar@gmail.com

** Anand A. Samuel, PhD, VIT University, Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India. Phone +91 9566656780, E-mail: vc@vit.ac.in

1. INTRODUCTION

The investigation of generational differences among workforces is a critical issue but not much importance is given to management research (Westerman & Yamamura, 2007). In this decade, the academicians and the practitioners show much focus on this pertinent issue. Much interest is shown by human resource specialists, managers and researchers in dealing with multigenerational workforce (Cennamo and Gardner, 2008).

Research on generational differences are conducted in the US, the UK, Canada, Belgium, Australia and New Zealand. They shared similar demographic patterns, critical social incidents and changes and hence they followed similar generation category. But, from the cultural context it could be slightly different in countries like India and China (e.g. Roongrengsuke, 2010). The generational cohorts appear to be differing in their birth year, experience, life stage and career stage, work values, goals, and expectations (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). Mannheim (1953) stated that a generation is a cluster of people who were born and raised in the identical social and historical circumstances. Strauss and Howe (1997) defined generational categories, as baby boomers (born between 1943 and 1960); Gen X (born between 1961 to 1981) and Gen Y or Millennials (born between 1982 to 2004).

The indispensable factor in generational diversity is to comprehend the values, attitudes, and behaviours of generational cohorts. The empirical evidence shows that values are one of the factors that influence behaviour (e.g. Bardi and Schwartz, 2003). The investigators have studied the in-role and extra-role behaviours in organizations (Vilela et al., 2008). The investigation by Lyons (2004) confirms that the basic human value structure (e.g. openness to change and self-enhancement) of Millennials and Gen X is differing. Miller and Yu (2003) pointed out that each generation has its unique sets of work values and organizational values. The occurrence of the diverse values among generational cohorts enlightened the academic researchers, practitioners, and managers to contemplate and operationalise the research to draw the attitudes and behavioural outcomes. Values influence the work behaviour and direct their efforts toward organizational citizenship behaviour (Florea et al., 2013). The shared values or PO fit represent (Person-Organization fit) the similarity between the individual values and organizational values. The PO fit (Person-Organization fit) influences positive outcome to employees and organizations (Cable and Judge 1997; Kristof, 1996; McDonald and Gandz, 1992), workplace adjustment and career success (Judge, 1994), organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Finegan, 2000; Kristof-Brown, 2000).

This article reviews the literature regarding diverse characteristics of generational cohorts and their impact on various outcomes. The overview of literature posits the insight for further investigation on Gen X and Gen Y, also referred as Millennials.

2. THE DIFFERENCE IN GENERATIONAL CATEGORIES BETWEEN WESTERN CONTEXT AND INDIAN CONTEXT

A generation is defined as an “identifiable group that shares birth years, age, location, and significant life events at critical developmental stages” (Kupperschmidt, 2000). From the societal context, a number of investigators have examined the expression ‘generation’ as the group of people who are born in the identical epoch and share key historical or social life experiences (Wey Smola and Sutton, 2002). The people born in diverse phases such as conflict (war) and stability (peace) have a propensity to think and perform according to their situation (Gursoy et al., 2008). Such situations and life episodes discern the generational disparity (Jurkiewicz and Brown, 1998).

The generational cohorts share the similar characteristics (e.g., views, values and attitudes). The researches on Baby Boomers and Gen X were plenty. But, in the current scenario, the inflow of Gen Y or Millennials is experienced in workplace. Consequently, it is vital to consider the new generation’s involvement and characteristics in the workplace.

Several researchers have specified various criteria for generation category (e.g. Kupperschmidt, 2000; Jurkiewicz and Brown, 1998; Jennings, 2000). The classification is grounded on the assorted life events, family background, peer group experiences, socio cultural scenario and other multitude factors. Myriad studies carried out in western countries like the U.S, and the U.K, pursued the generational categories based on the Western context. From the Indian societal context, the impact of occurrence of events in the Indian society is far different from the Western society. Hence, it is very much essential to explore the same from the Indian context.

Tables 1 and 2 depict the generation categories from the Indian and the Western context employed in the previous research works (e.g. Roongrengsuke, 2010 & Erickson, 2009). They demonstrate different backgrounds and their impact on Indian and Western societies, in defining generation.

Table 1: Classification of generation from Indian context

Classification of Category	Events Occurred in India
Traditionalists (1928 to 1945)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teens experienced the birth of an independent nation and the end of British rule, low rates of literacy, a poor economy, short life expectancies, mass impoverishment, stalled industrial development, & establishment of a democratic republic with elections
Baby Boomers (1946 to 1960)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nationalization of industries, public works, social reforms, public investment in education, initiated Green revolution (improved agricultural productivity) • Emerging political factions, the rupee was liberalized and underwent severe devaluation, economic options were limited by the sluggish economy, and personal values were influenced by the family, group, or caste into which one was born
Gen X or Socialists or Integrators or Non-traditional Generation or Mid-way Generation (1961 to 1979)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower restrictions on foreign investment/imports • Expansion of telecommunication, emergence of software and IT sectors, economic liberalization, emigration of IT graduates to the US, importance of self-expression and quality of life, middle class dominating the workforce • Influence of the Western culture
Gen Y or Y2K or Liberalization Generation or Millennials (from 1980 onwards)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased demand for consumer goods, economic liberalization, reformed policies and growth • Educational powerhouse, broad economic opportunity • Communal violence, high influence of the Western culture • Increased divorced rates, equal education and rights for all, etc.

Table 2: Classification of generation from Western context

Classification of Category	Events Occurred in Western Countries
Traditionalists (1928 to 1945)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A booming post – war economy • Rapid growth of suburbs • Increased availability of consumer goods • A boom in white-collar jobs • Traditionalists were loyal to organizations. • Acknowledged the hierarchy and rules in the institutions.
Baby Boomers (1946 to 1960); 1944 to 1960 (Gursoy et al., 2008); 1943 to 1960 (Strauss & Howe – generational theory, 1997)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vietnam war • Civil Rights movement • Widespread protests • Boomers were predominantly competitive.
Gen X (1961 to 1979); 1961 to 1980 (Gursoy et al, 2008); 1961 to 1981 (Strauss & Howe – generational theory, 1997)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A period of extraordinary social change • Economy was poor and laid off from jobs • Women entering the workforce • Rising divorce rates • The growth of electronic games and the Internet • Self-reliance became a paramount life value • X’ers were generally mistrustful to organizations, loyal to friends and dedicated to being a good parent.
Gen Y or Millennials (1980 to 1995); 1981 to 2000 (Gursoy et al, 2008); 1982 to 2004 (Strauss & Howe – generational theory, 1997)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gen Ys’ immersion in personal technology • The major events were the act of terrorism and school violence. • Y’s teen years were marked by an unprecedented bull market and a strong pro-child culture.

3. THE CHARACTERISTICS AND VALUES OF BABY BOOMERS, GEN X AND MILLENNIALS

An individual value system is fairly stable and it does not change considerably over time but societal value preference may change over time which is called value “shift” across generations (Inglehart, 1990). Baby boomers had their predominant values such as hard work and achievement (Collins, 1998), establishing sound rapport and relationship with peers and supervisors (Karp & Sirias, 2001), optimism, team orientation, and personal satisfaction (Leschinsky and Michael, 2004), learning new skills, personal improvement and creativity at work (Lyons, 2004), as prime factors. They ranked the value “health” as number one (Gibson et al., 2009).

Gen X grew up during the rapid growth of technology and social change, like financial, family and social insecurity and entered the workforce without expecting job security (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). They are very skeptical, self-focused and self – protective at work (Adams, 2000). Both Gen X and Gen Y consider ‘family security’ as an essential value (Gibson et al., 2009). Gursoy et al. (2008) sorted out the characteristics of Gen – X such as: they respond to instant gratification, work, importance to family, work-life balance, tech savvy, independent, self-reliant and self-sufficient, and low loyalty. They tend to establish strong communal relationships with colleagues rather than with employees (Raineri et al., 2012). They are more committed to their jobs (Lyons, 2004), and prefer organizations which value skills improvement, productivity and work-life balance (Wey Smola and Sutton, 2002).

The younger generation strives towards the purpose and meaning of work they perform (Twenge, 2009). The most experiencing subject of Gen Y is the growth of the Internet and technology (Lyons, 2004). They are the first generation to fight for equality in the workplace (Schawbel, 2014). They are quick learners and likely to be impatient (Zemke et al., 2000) and contemplate autonomy and work-life balance as significant (Wey Smola & Sutton, 2002); the more the merrier, the attitude of breaking the rules, and here today and gone tomorrow, are also their characteristics. They are great collaborators, favour team work, very confident, self-expressive, expect recognition and acknowledgement in their work and seek personal attention (Gursoy et. al., 2008).

Gen Y values ‘accomplishment’ (Gibson et. al., 2009), ‘status’ and ‘freedom to work’ (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008) as vital values. They do not expect just material compensation alone but quality of work experience, firm’s

culture and environment (Singh et. al., 2011). The preceding results proved the unique set of values and characteristics among the generation cohorts. Also, it showed the concept of 'value shift' from generation to generation based on their demands, needs, expectations, events happened during that era, circumstances, technology growth, the influences of family and peers, attitude, experiences, knowledge, self thrive etc.

4. THE IMPACT OF GENERATIONAL DIFFERENCE ON WORKFORCE AND ORGANIZATION

As another generation enters into the changing workforce, the managers are pushed to face them as well as the preceding employees (Wey Smola and Sutton, 2002). If the managers are deficient in taking the responsibility of dealing with the generational differences, it could lead to misunderstandings, miscommunications and mixed signals (Fyock, 1990), eventually, ending with the issues of employee retention and turnover (Westerman and Yamamura, 2007).

The consideration and the understanding factor of generational cohort have a great impact on employee productivity, innovation and corporate citizenship (Kupperschmidt, 2000), effective recruitment materials, training methods, hiring processes, and benefit packages (Leschinsky and Michael, 2004), and help to meet diverse employee needs (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). Zemke et al. (2000) reflect the positive work atmosphere where young and old generation employees work together in the work sphere with kinfolk's affiliation. They differ in their learning styles, potential and so on. The considerable focus ought to be given to understand the values and attitudes of different generation employees to enhance productivity, morale and retention. When the next generation will be in charge of the top management level, their values will have a great impact on the organizations (Wey Smola & Sutton, 1998), organization culture (Judge & Bretz, 1992), and the achievement and breakdown of HR programs (Jurkiewicz, 2000).

The generational difference is the imperative cause of conflict in organizations (Adams, 2000). The difference in generational values leads to intergenerational conflict in workplace (Gibson et al., 2009). Therefore, organizational scientists demonstrated and illustrated the exertion of managers and HR professionals concerning more on divergence of generational values and its individuals and organizational performance.

Twenge (2010) reviewed the empirical evidence on generational difference in work values and explained the way to recruit, retain, and motivate the multigenerational workforce. Based on the review, he found that Gen Y did not consider work a centre point in their lives; they gave more importance to leisure, and salary. To retain the Gen Y workforce, he suggested the management should give attention to work-life balance issues and flexible schedules while recruiting them.

5. THE MAGNITUDE OF GENERATIONAL VALUES IN THE WORKFORCE

Rokeach has defined values as “enduring beliefs that a specific mode of conduct is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence” (Rokeach 1973, p. 5). Two lists of values namely terminal and instrumental values are presented. Values define what people believe to be fundamentally right or wrong and the changing value system of the workforce possibly will have an effect on organizational values (Wey Smola and Sutton, 1998). The exploration on values provides great insights at individual, group, society and organizational level. Values have considerable impact on attitudes and behaviours (Brown, 2002). The work values and the attitudes of employees towards work are influenced by the generational swarm (Gursoy et al., 2008).

Values are the basis for the purpose and goal of an organization (Posner, 2010a). They play a key role in a firm’s culture and ethics (Dickson et al.2001; Hofstede 1984), in managerial decision making and behaviour (Allport et al., 1960; Rokeach, 1973; Beyer, 1981; Keast, 1996; McGurie et al., 2006; Singh et al., 2011). They are also the key factor in planning and implementing effective management practices and organizational sustainability (Florea et al., 2013), and in managerial values and leadership styles (Agrawal and Krishnan, 2000). Posner states: “*They are at the heart of the culture of an organization*” (2010b, p. 536). The researchers argue that values refer to what is important to us in our lives (Weber, 2015). Weber (2015, p. 494) states: “*Values are deeply personal and individualistic*”. Each person is unique. Every individual has his/her own set of value system. A value which is significant to one person may not be important to another.

Many studies have examined the importance of values in determining employee behaviours. Wey Smola and Sutton (2002) have investigated the generational difference towards work values and beliefs and its influences on employee’s job satisfaction and commitment have been reported by Gursoy et

al. (2008), satisfaction and motivation by White (2006). The attitude towards work is influenced by to what extent the employees value their job and hence it is essential to understand their values (Chu, 2008).

It is apparent from the research perspective that the values have greater impact on work attitude, individual and organizational behaviour. Several researchers have focused on the importance of work values, individual values and work-related outcomes (e.g. job satisfaction and commitment) from the generational context. Organizational values are the principles which direct the behaviour of the workforce in an organization. Values are established by means of organization's mission and goals, structure, available resources, policies and procedures and its actions (Schein, 1992). The perceived organizational values are associated with commitment (Gosh, 2010).

Organizational values are the set of commonly held beliefs detained by the workforce concerning the ways of attaining the goals. The organizations have to recognize the functions of the organization, ascertain objectives or select the preferable substitute of firm's activities (Enz, 1988).

6. THE SIMILARITIES AND DISPARITY OF SHARED VALUES OR P-O FIT (PERSON-ORGANIZATION FIT), AND ITS IMPORTANCE

The term 'Person-Organisation fit (P-O fit)' describes the connection between individual and organizational goals; individual liking or needs and managerial systems or structures; and individual personality and organizational climate (Kristof, 1996). It has been investigated widely (Posner, 2010a, 2010b; McDonald & Gandz, 1992; Kristof, 1996; Finegan, 2000). The expression 'Person-Organization (P-O) fit' depicts the relation between individual liking or necessity and company systems or structures; and individual difference and organizational climate (Kristof, 1996). The P-O fit is also mentioned as 'shared values' or 'value congruence'.

The P-O fit is derived from the interactionist theory of behaviour (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). It explains the social interaction between the growing child and the grown adults. P-O fit comprises of two perspectives i.e. supplementary fit & complementary fit, and needs-supplies & demands-abilities. The supplementary fit refers to the similar characteristics between the individual and the others whereas the complementary fit refers to the person's characteristics which make the environment whole. The needs-supplies perspective refers to the fit which occurs when the organization meets the

individual's needs, desires or preferences and the demands-abilities perspective refers to the fit which occurs when the individual is able to meet the organizational demands (Kristoff, 1996).

Cennamo & Gardner (2008) examined the P-O values fit across generations and found that there were generational differences on individual work values and no differences in perceived organizational values. Also, they reported that the younger generations gave more importance to status. Significant differences were found in work values across generations (Rani & Samuel, 2016; Hansen & Leuty, 2012). The Gen Y employees and older managers hold different work values preferences (Winter & Jackson, 2015). The divergent perceptions of work-family conflict and job insecurity had been displayed by different generational cohorts (Buonocore & Ferrara, 2015).

One of the responsibilities of organizations is to clearly communicate values and priorities to employees so that an assessment of fit can be made (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). The disparity between an individual values and the work environment influences the employee performance negatively (Lubinsky & Benbow, 2000), suppresses motivation, hinders performance and results in greater level of dissatisfaction, turnover and stress (Posner, 2010b). The perception towards the organization tends to influence the behaviour (Moos, 1987; Walsh, 1987). The similarity between them results in positive work attitudes and organizational outcomes and eventually the important implication of management to attract and retain employees is fulfilled (Posner, 2010b).

The taxonomy of values has been developed by various investigators (Allport et al., 1960; England, 1967; Rokeach, 1973; Macdonald and Gandz, 1992) in organizational research. For operationalizing and measuring the personal values, Rokeach's value instrument became the most popular instrument. England attempted to evaluate the values of American managers from organizational perspective. As England (1967) had not focused on further refining of his list of value statement, Macdonald and Gandz (1992) derived the list of shared values by conducting in-depth interviews with business practitioners and HR communities. The originated list has significant connotation for HR functions and HR practices. Each value (e.g. Initiative, Openness, and Cooperation) in the list contains the same meaning from both the individual and organizational perspective. The computing of these values, either by ranking or scoring procedure, enables the investigators to obtain the individual – organizational value congruence. The existing of empirical validation regarding the link between value congruence and behavioural

outcomes (e.g. Organizational Citizenship Behavior) is scarce (Macdonald and Gandz, 1992). This article posits the existing instrument of personal values and shared values from business context, and also depicts the importance of operationalization of shared values from academic context as well as generation context.

7. ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR (OCB)

The concept of positive organizational behaviour emerged from the recently proposed positive psychology approach (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008) and OCB is considered positive organizational behaviour (Oplatka, 2009). Earlier the value of positivity in the workplace was in focus of psychology (i.e. positive psychology) and recently the notion 'positive organizational behaviour' emerged as a topic of research. The positive psychology moulds individuals into better citizens in the enterprise (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). The approaches to positivity in the workplace have emerged in this current era (Luthans, 2003).

OCB is classically defined as "individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and it promotes the (efficient and) effective functioning of the organization" (Organ, 1988, p. 4; Organ et.al., 2006, p. 3). The phrase 'organizational citizenship behavior' or 'good soldier syndrome' has been coined by Dennis Organ and his colleagues (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983; Organ, 1988). The behaviours which are neither forced nor rewarded by the enterprise (Asha & Jyothi, 2013) are termed as extra-role activities and they seemed to have an effect on intrinsic motivation of the individual (Ozcelik & Findikli, 2014). Prior to the contribution of Organ (1988), and Katz and Kahn (1966), the former researchers highlighted 'autonomous work behaviour' of employees in the organization. OCB also explains the intended attitude and involvement of employees in the organizations in which they contribute excessive efforts without the influence of organizational remuneration. Also, it refers to informal and voluntary conduct by employees at work; helps coordinate information and activities within a group (Podsakoff et al., 2000; Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1997).

Organ (1998) highlighted that OCB is employee's extra-role behavior, motivated by five dimensions such as altruism (concern for the welfare of others), courtesy (polite remark or respectful act), sportsmanship (fairness, sense of fellowship), conscientiousness (desire to do the task well) and civic virtue (standard of righteous behaviour). It is a common belief that the OCB

promotes organizational goals. Shragay (2011) noted that Gen X showed strongest and most positive effect on job involvement and OCB.

Podsakoff et al. (2000) examined many behaviors like helping behaviour, organizational loyalty, sportsmanship, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue and self-development.

OCB is strongly correlated with normative commitment (Meyer et al., 2002), employee engagement (Chaudhuri & Govil, 2015), emotional labour display strategies (Chou & Lopez-Rodriguez, 2014), organizational justice (Quratulain et al., 2012), job satisfaction (Chhabra & Mohanty, 2014).

Raineri et al. (2013) examined the generational differences in the relationships of support from organization and colleagues, and commitment to OCB. The result showed that the two different generations such as baby boomers and Gen X exhibited different work attitudes and behaviours, and no differences were found across cohorts in their exchange relationships with coworkers. Amayah and Gedro (2014) developed taxonomy of generational issues and it was framed based on OCB, work values, work attitudes, motivation, psychological traits, and technology. Negoro (2016) resulted that older generations got higher in-role perception of OCB than Gen Y.

8. SHARED VALUES OR P-O FIT AND OCB

Vilela et al. (2008) conducted a study in Spain among salespersons and supervisors, and confirmed that P-O fit has a positive effect on OCB. It was also reported that predictor of OCB (Ruiz-Palomino & Martinez-Canas, 2014) and P-O fit are significant factors for enhancing ownership and citizenship behavior (Ozcelik & Findikli, 2014). Lawrence & Lawrence (2009) examined the P-O alignment and organizational commitment in higher education sector in Australia. The purpose of shared core values in university is to attract, retain staff and students (Ferrari et al., 2005). The innovative research, life-long learning, and professional development as well as being socially and ethically responsive to their stakeholders and communities are the objectives of many universities (Lawrence & Lawrence, 2009).

When there is congruency between individual and organizational values, the employees tend to participate voluntarily by means of assisting others, holding up the fellow workers, and volunteering in organizational activities (Wei, 2012). This has an impact on servant leadership (Vondey, 2010). Khaola & Thotaone Sebotsa (2015) investigated the relationship among P-O fit and two

perspectives of OCB (OCBI – individual and OCBO – organizational). OCBI refers to the behaviour towards colleagues and OCBO refers to the behaviour towards an organization.

9. ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR OF ACADEMICIANS IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

OCB is a significant aspect of academician's performance in universities (Erturk, 2007). Nowadays, there is a great change in educational field in terms of culture, perception of students, faculty and stakeholders, purpose of education, curriculum, and exam pattern. Erturk Alper (2007) examined the OCB of Turkish university academicians and commented that the changes in the university system could affect the working conditions of academicians. Oplatka (2009) investigated the impact of OCB on individuals (teachers) and organization, and the results were analysed in three facets: the students, the team, and the organization as a unit. It was concluded from the teacher's score that they were 'self-fulfilled', and 'satisfied' by doing more than what was formally expected from them when they received positive feedback from peers, parents, and students.

Organ (1988) suggested that OCBs depended on context. The educational institutions vary from other organizations in many aspects (e.g. structure, working pattern, nature of job, etc.). The research on OCB conducted in educational institutions also supported two dimensions of OCB: OCB towards individual and OCB towards organization (OCBI and OCBO) (Skarlicki and Latham, 1995). This was found to be true in other disciplines too (Lee & Allen, 2002; Williams & Anderson, 1991). The concentration on OCB was not peak during the period from 1983 to 1988 (Podsakoff et al., 2000), but it caught the attention from 1993 onwards and more than 100 papers were published and it focused on various disciplines like HRM, hospital & health administration, community psychology etc. (Podsakoff et al., 2000). But there is a dearth of research in education field and there are very few citations worldwide (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Christ et al., 2003; Oplatka, 2006, 2009).

Also, there is little research related to the generational difference on behaviours in academic institutions. The various OCB factors are innovative instruction, comprehensive assessment of achievements, student-tailored instruction, taking classes during vacations for no additional pay, helping students beyond contact time, taking on new tasks with no monetary compensation, establishing personal attachment to needy students, helping new instructors, and guiding teachers professionally (Oplatka, 2006, 2007). The

status of teachers influences OCB more than other factors (Bogler and Somech, 2004).

10. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The above mentioned literatures disclose the relationship between the values and work-related behaviour. Studies related to the individual values, organizational values, and P-O fit in the workplace, generational differences and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour which are reported widely. Personal values differ across cultures. In Australia, the younger generations had high level of cynicism, negativity and less optimism (Cennamo and Gardner, 2008). In Europe, D'Amato and Herzfeldt (2008) found that there was a generational difference in learning orientation and leadership development intentions on organizational commitment and intentions to stay. Many researchers applied Rokeach theory and Schwartz value structure to categorize the individual values. McDonald & Gandz (1992), Kristof (1996), Finegan, (2000) presented the measure for shared values or P-O fit with regard to commitment.

OCB is considered positive behaviour and it moves toward organizational well-being without external motivation or formal reward system. It is evident from the literature that the match between individual values and organizational values leads to high commitment, job satisfaction and reduced turnover intentions. The pioneers of citizenship behaviour like Organ, Podsakoff and colleagues emphasized its significance in the workplace. The two perspectives of OCB, such as OCBI (Individual) and OCBO (Organizational) have been identified in the academic area, but from the generational context, there is a dearth of literature on OCB among academics (Lamm & Meeks, 2009; Lub et al., 2011; Shragay & Tziner, 2011).

The overview of the literature reveals that there is paucity of research on shared values and OCB from the cultural context, generational context and discipline context. It is managers' responsibility to deal with the disparity of generational cohorts by understanding their values, expectations, attitudes and behaviour. It was also evident from the studies by Wey Smola and Sutton (2002), Fyock (1990) and Kupperschmidt (2000).

The studies on generational difference were carried out in the USA, the UK, Australia, Canada, Belgium, Australia, New Zealand, and Korea. From the

Indian cultural context, not much work has been reported in the literature on generational differences. Singh et al. (2011) investigated the association between personal values and their impact on workplace across cultures in India, the USA and the UK context. The studies compared the generational difference between the US and China and concluded that national cultural context had an impact on generational values. Hence, it is very much essential to explore the generational value difference from the Indian context especially between Gen X and Gen Y as they are larger in today's workforce especially in academic area.

The shared values of different generations need to be explored further, as they influence the behaviour of the workforce. The shared values and the work-related behaviour (OCB) have been addressed in various disciplines, but not much in academic area. Macdonald and Gandz (1992) provided taxonomy of values which measured the shared values from the business context. For example, in the business context, the importance could be given more to the quality of the product, profit, etc. But, the same importance may not be given by other organizations (e.g. hospital setting, academic institutions etc.). Hence, the values set by various organizations differ according to their services. Therefore, the shared values from an academic perspective may be different from other service institutions.

This leads to the further investigation on exploring the shared values from academic perspective as well as the generational difference in defining the shared values. Moreover, the academic institution is the place where both Gen X and Gen Y perform their role. In the academic world, the consistent interaction between different generation groups is probably high. It is evident from the previous researches that the generational values are different. In academic institutions, the importance given by the management may be or may not be the same as the expectations of different generation workforce. If the values of workforce are congruent with the organizational values, the outcome could be positive.

Therefore, this article suggests that further investigation should be conducted into understanding the values of Gen X and Gen Y teaching faculty as well as their congruence with the perceived organizational values. The future study could also focus on the impact of value congruence and incongruence on the citizenship behavior of Gen X and Gen Y teaching faculty. Nowadays, both Gen X and Gen Y populations work as teaching faculty and they mostly interact with the students who are Gen Ys. The association between shared values of generational cohorts and behaviour outcome will enable managers and HR professionals to comprehend the values, attitudes and behaviour of generational

groups, and facilitate HR communities to integrate the diverse subjects towards a determined goal of the organization.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, S. J. (2000): Generation X: How understanding this population leads to better safety programs, *Professional Safety*, 45, 26-29.
2. Agrawal, T. and Krishnan, V. R. (2000): Relationship between leadership styles and value systems, *Management & Labour Studies*, 25 (2), 136-143.
3. Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E. and Lindzey, G. (1960): *A Study of Values*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
4. Amayah, A. T. and Gedro, J. (2014): Understanding generational diversity: Strategic human resource management and development across the generational “divide”, *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, 26 (2), 36-48.
5. Asha, C. S. and Jyothi, P. (2013): Internal branding: A determining element of organizational citizenship behavior, *The Journal of Contemporary Management Research*, 7 (1), 37-57.
6. Bakker, A. B. and Schaufeli, W. B. (2008): Positive organizational behavior: Engaged employees in flourishing organizations, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29 (2), 147-154.
7. Bardi, A. and Schwartz, S. H. (2003): Values and behavior: Strength and structure of relations, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29 (10), 1207–1220.
8. Bateman, T. S. and 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.
9. Beyer, J. M. (1981): Ideologies, values and decision making in organizations, in Nystrom, P.C and Starbuck, W. (Eds.): *Handbook of Organizational Design*, New York: Oxford University Press.
10. Bogler, R. and Somech, A. (2004): Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20 (3), 277-289.
11. Brown, D. (2002): The role of work and cultural values in occupational choice, satisfaction, and success: A theoretical statement, *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 80 (1), 48-56.

12. Buonocore, F., Russo, M. and Ferrara, M. (2015): Work–family conflict and job insecurity: are workers from different generations experiencing true differences? *Community, Work & Family*, 18 (3), 299-316.
13. Cable, D. M. and Judge, T. A. (1997): Interviewers perceptions of person-organization fit and organizational selection decisions, *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82 (4), 546–561.
14. Cennamo, L. and Gardner, D. (2008): Generational differences in work values, outcomes and person-organisation values fit, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23, 8, 891-906.
15. Chaudhuri, M. and Govil, S. (2015): Organisational citizenship behaviour and employee engagement at a leading indian public sector oil company, *International Journal of Pluralism and Economics Education*, 6 (3), 237-250.
16. Chhabra, B. and Mohanty, R. P. (2014): Mediating role of organisation commitment in the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour: A study of Indian IT professionals, *International Journal of Indian Culture and Business Management*, 9 (4), 449 - 467.
17. Chou, S. Y. and Lopez-Rodriguez, E. (2014): Displaying emotions while being good citizens? a conceptual analysis of the moderating roles of commitment to the organization and commitment to the profession, *International Journal of Work Organisation and Emotion*, 6 (4), 338-351.
18. Christ, O., Van Dick, R., Wagner, U. and Stellmacher, J. (2003): when teachers go the extra mile: foci or organizational identification as determinants of different forms of organizational citizenship behavior among school teachers, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73 (3), 329-41.
19. Chu, K. H. L. (2008): A factorial validation of work values structure: Second order confirmatory factor analysis and its implications, *Tourism Management*, 29 (2), 320-330.
20. Collins, D. (1998): *Organizational Change: Sociological Perspectives*, London: Routledge.
21. DAmato, A. and Herzfeldt, R. (2008): Learning orientation, organizational commitment and talent retention across generations: A study of European managers, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23 (8), 929-953.
22. Dickson, M. W., Smith, D. B., Grojean, M. W. and Ehrhart, M. (2001): An organisational climate regarding ethics: The outcome of leader values and the practices that reflect them, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12 (2), 197-217.
23. England, G. W. (1967): Personal value systems of American managers, *Academy of Management Journal*, 10 (1), 53-68.
24. Enz, C. A. (1988): The Role of value congruency in intra-organizational power, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33 (2), 284-304.

25. Erickson, T. (2009): Generational Differences between India and the U.S. Harvard Business Review, available from - <https://hbr.org/2009/02/global-generations-focus-on-in> (Accessed: 10th February 2016).
26. Erturk, A. (2007): Increasing organizational citizenship behaviors of Turkish academicians: Mediating role of trust in supervisor on the relationship between organizational justice and citizenship behaviors, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22, 3, 257-270.
27. Ferrari, J. R., Kapoor, M. and Cowman, S. (2005): Exploring the relationship between students values and the values of postsecondary institutions, *Social Psychology of Education*, 8, 2, 207-221.
28. Finegan, J. E. (2000): The impact of person and organisational values on organisational commitment, *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 73 (2), 149-169.
29. Florea, L., Cheung, Y. H., and Herndon, N. C. (2013): For all good reasons: Role of values in organizational sustainability, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114 (3), 393-408.
30. Fyock, C. D. (1990): Americas Work Force Is Coming of Age: What every business needs to know to recruit, train, manage, and retain an aging work force, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
31. Gibson, J. W., Greenwood, R. A. and Murphy Jr., E. F. (2009): Generational differences in the workplace: Personal values, beliefs and popular beliefs, *Journal of Diversity Management*, 4 (3), 1-8.
32. Gosh, S.K. (2010): Perceived organizational values & organizational commitment, *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 45, 3, 437-445.
33. Gursoy, D., Maier, T. A. and Chi, C. G. (2008): Generational differences: An examination of work values and generational gaps in the hospitality workforce, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27 (3), 448-458.
34. Hansen, J. I. C. and Leuty, M. E. (2012): Work values across generations, *Journal of Career Assessment*, 20 (1), 34-52.
35. Hofstede, G. (1984): *Cultures Consequences: International differences in work-related values*, London: Sage Publications.
36. Inglehart, R. (1990): *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
37. Jennings, A. T. (2000): Hiring generation-X, *Journal of Accountancy*, 189, 2, 55-59.
38. Judge, T. A., and Bretz, R. D. (1992): Effects of work values on job choice decisions, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77 (3), 261-271.
39. Judge, T. A. (1994): Person - organisation fit and the theory of work adjustment: Implications for satisfaction, tenure and career success, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 44 (1), 32-54.

40. Jurkiewicz, C. L. and Brown, R. G. (1998): Generational Comparisons of public employee motivation, *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 18 (4), 18-37.
41. Jurkiewicz C. L. (2000): Generation X and the public employee, *Public Personnel Management*, 29 (1), 55–74.
42. Karp, H. B. and Sirias, D. (2001): Generational Conflict: A new paradigm for teams of the 21st century, *Gestalt Review*, 5 (2), 71-87.
43. Katz, D. and Kahn, R. L. (1966): *The Social Psychology of Organizations*, New York: Wiley.
44. Keast, D. A. (1996): Values in the Decision-Making of CEOs in Public Colleges, *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 26 (1), 1-34.
45. Khaola, P. P. and Sebotsa, T. (2015): Person-Organization Fit, Organisational commitment and Organizational Identification, *Danish Journal of Management and Business Sciences*, 67-74.
46. Kristof, A. L. (1996): Person-organisation fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications, *Personnel Psychology*, 49 (1), 1-49.
47. Kristof-Brown, A. L. (2000): Perceived applicant fit: distinguishing between recruiters perceptions of person-job and person-organisation fit, *Personnel Psychology*, 53 (3), 643-671.
48. Kupperschmidt, B. R. (2000): Multigeneration employees: Strategies for effective management, *The Health Care Manager*, 19 (1), 65-76.
49. Lamm, E. and Meeks, M. D. (2009): Workplace fun: The moderating effects of generational differences, *Employee Relations*, 31 (6), 613-631.
50. Lawrence, A. and Lawrence, P. (2009): Values congruence and organizational commitment: P-O fit in higher education institutions, *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 7 (4), 297-314.
51. Lee, K. and Allen, N. J. (2002): Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: the role of affect and cognitions, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87 (1), 131-142.
52. Leschinsky, R. M. and Michael, J. H. (2004): Motivators and desired company values of wood products industry employees: Investigating generational differences, *Forest Products Journal*, 54 (1), 34-39.
53. Lub, X. D., Blomme, R. J. and Bal, P. M. (2011): Psychological contract and organizational citizenship behavior: A new deal for new generations? in Chen, J.S. (Ed.): *Advances in Hospitality and Leisure*, 7, Emerald press, 109-130.
54. Lubinsky, D and Benbow, C. P. (2000): States of Excellence, *American Psychologist*. 55 (1), 137-50.
55. Luthans, F. (2003): Positive organizational behavior (pob): implications for leadership and hr development and motivation, in Steers, R. M., Porter L.

- W. and Begley G. A. (Eds.): *Motivation and Leadership at Work*, New York: Mcgraw-Hill/Irwin, 187-195.
56. Lyons, S. (2004): An exploration of generational values in life and at work, ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection.
57. Mannheim, K. (1953): *Essays on Sociology and Social Psychology*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
58. Mcdonald, P. and Gandz, J. (1992): Getting value from shared values, *Organisational Dynamics*, 20, 64-77.
59. Mcquire, D., Garavan, T. N., Saha, S. K. and ODonnell, D. (2006): The impact of individual values on human resource decision-making by line managers, *International Journal of Manpower*, 27 (3), 251- 273.
60. Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J, Herscovitch, L. and Topolnytsky, L. (2002): Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates and consequences, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61 (1), 20-52.
61. Miller, P. and Yu, H. (2003): Organizational values and generational values: A cross cultural study, *Australasian Journal of Business and Social Enquiry*, 1 (3), 138-153.
62. Moos, R.H. (1987): Person-Environment Congruence in Work, School, and Health Care Settings, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31, 3, 231- 47.
63. Muchinsky, P. M. and Monahan, C. J. (1987): What is person-environment congruence? Supplementary versus complementary models of fit, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31 (3), 268-227.
64. Negoro, Y. (2016): The role perception of Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the Japanese hospitality industry: Culture-based characteristics and generational difference. *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 5196, available from- <http://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/5196>. (Accessed: 23rd 2016).
65. Oplatka, I. (2006): Going beyond role expectations: Towards an understanding of the determinants and components of teacher organizational citizenship behavior, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42 (3), 385-423.
66. Oplatka, I. (2009): Organizational citizenship behavior in teaching: The consequences for teachers, pupils, and the school, *International Journal of Educational Management*, 23, 5, 375-389.
67. Organ, D. W. (1988): *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
68. Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M. and Mackenzie, S. B. (2006): *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

69. Özçelik, G. and Fındıklı, M. A. (2014): The Relationship between Internal Branding and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: The Mediating Role of Person-organization Fit, *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 150, 1120-1128.
70. Podsakoff, P. M. and MacKenzie, S. B. (1997): The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research, *Human Performance*, 10 (2), 133-151.
71. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B. and Bachrach, D. G. (2000): Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research, *Journal of Management*, 26 (3), 513-563.
72. Posner, B. Z. (2010a): Values and the American Manager: A Three Decade Perspective, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 91 (4), 457-465.
73. Posner, B.Z. (2010b): Another Look at the Impact of Personal and Organizational Values Congruency, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97 (4), 535-541.
74. Quratulain, S., Khan, A. K. and Peretti, J. M. (2012): The moderating impact of Hofstede's cultural dimensions on the relationship between organisational Justice and organisational citizenship behaviours: A study in Pakistani work context, *European Journal of Cross-Cultural Competence and Management*, 2 (2), 149-171.
75. Raineri, N., Paille, P. and Morin, D. (2012): Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: An Intergenerational Study, *Revue Internationale De Psychologie Sociale*, 25 (3), 147-177.
76. Rani, N. and Samuel, A. (2016): A study on Generational differences in work values and person-organization fit and its effect on turnover intention of Generation Y in India. *Management Research Review*, 39, 12.
77. Rokeach, M. (1973): *The Nature of Human Values*, New York: Free Press.
78. Roongrengsuke, S. (2010): Attracting and retaining multigenerational workforce in China, India, and Thailand, SHRM Annual conference, 2010 presentation, <http://sapphire.shrm.org/annualconferenceondemand/2010-annual-conference/6292010-attracting-retaining-multigenerational-workforce-china-india-thailand.aspx> (Accessed: 26th February 2016).
79. Ruiz-Palomino, P. and Martinez-Canas, R. (2014): Ethical Culture, Ethical Intent, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Moderating and Mediating Role of Person-Organization Fit, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120 (1), 95-108.
80. Schawbel, D. (2014): 3rd Annual Study on the State of Gen Y Gen X and Baby Boomer Workers, <http://millennialbranding.com/2014/3rd-annual-study-state-gen-gen-baby-boomer-workers/> (Accessed: 23rd 2016).

81. Schein, E. H. (1992): *Organisational Culture and Leadership (2nd Ed.)*: San Francisco, Jossey: Bass Publishers.
82. Seligman, M. E. P. and Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000): Positive Psychology: An Introduction, *American Psychologist*, 55 (1), 5-14.
83. Shragay, D. and Tziner, A. (2011): The generational effect on the relationship between job involvement, work satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior, *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 27 (2), 143-157.
84. Singh, P., Bhandarker, A., Rai, S. and Jain, A .K. (2011): Relationship between Values And Workplace: An Exploratory Analysis. *Facilities*, 29 (11/12), 499 – 520.
85. Skarlicki, D. P. and Latham, G. P. (1995): Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Performance in a University Setting, *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 12 (3), 175-181.
86. Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W. and Near, J. P. (1983): Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68 (4), 655-663.
87. Strauss, W. and Howe, N. (1997): *The Fourth Turning: What The Cycles of History Tell Us about Americas Next Rendezvous With Destiny*, New York: Broadway Books.
88. Twenge, J. M. (2009): Generational changes and their impact in the classroom: teaching generation me, *Medical Education*, 43 (5), 398-405.
89. Twenge, J. M. (2010): A review of the empirical evidence on generational differences in work attitudes, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25 (2), 201-210.
90. Vilela, B. B., Gonzalez, J. A. V. and Ferrin, P. F. (2008): Person–organization fit, ocb and performance appraisal: evidence from matched supervisor–salesperson data set in a spanish context, *Industrial Marketing Management*, 37 (8), 1005-1019.
91. Vondey, M. (2010): The relationships among servant leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, person-organization fit, and organizational identification, *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6 (1), 3-27.
92. Walsh, W. B. (1987): Person-Environment Congruence: A Response to the Moos Perspective, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31 (3), 347-352.
93. Weber, J. (2015): Identifying and Assessing Managerial Value Orientations: A Cross-Generational Replication Study of Key Organizational Decision-Makers Values, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 132, 3, 493-504.
94. Wei, Y. C. (2012): Person-Organization Fit and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Time Perspective, *Journal of Management and Organization*, 18 (6), 833-844.

95. Westerman, J. W. and Yamamura, J. H. (2007): Generational Preference for Work Environment Fit: Effects of Employees Outcomes, *Career Development International*, 12 (2), 150-161.
96. Wey Smola, K. and Sutton, C. D. (2002): Generational Differences: Revisiting Generational Work Values for the New Millennium, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23 (4), 363-382
97. White, C. (2006): Towards an understanding of the relationship between work values and cultural orientation, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 25 (4), 699-715.
98. Williams, L. J. and 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.
99. Winter, R. P. and Jackson, B. A. (2015): Work values preferences of Generation Y: performance relationship insights in the Australian Public Service. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1-19.
100. Zemke, R., Raines, C., and Filipczak, B. (2000): *Generations at Work*, New York: American Management Association.

**ZAJEDNIČKE VRIJEDNOSTI, PONAŠANJE POVEZANO S
ORGANIZACIJSKOM PRIPADNOŠĆU I GENERACIJSKE SKUPINE:
PREGLED TEORIJE I ODREDNICE BUDUĆIH ISTRAŽIVANJA**

Sažetak

U literaturi se podrazumijeva da je, u analizi suvremene radne snage, jedan od zanimljivih i izazovnih menadžerskih zadataka, povezan s učinkovitim upravljanjem različitim generacijama, koje imaju i različite vrijednosti. Stoga je prvenstveni cilj ovog rada prezentirati empirijske dokaze o različitim karakteristikama i vrijednostima generacijskih skupina, kao i interesa specijalista, menadžera i istraživača u području upravljanja ljudskim resursima, u odnosu na temu višegeneracijske radne snage, kao i njezinog djelovanja na: radne učinke, odgovornost menadžmenta, djelovanje vrijednosti na ponašanje i različite pozitivne učinke za zaposlenike i organizacije. U ovom se radu također prikazuju prethodna istraživanja uklapanja između pojedinca i organizacije te organizacijskog građanstva, pri čemu se naglašava kako se, do sada, posvećivala nedovoljna pažnja istraživanju ovih tema u akademskim institucijama. U ovom se radu istražuju kategorije generacijskih skupina, u zapadnom i indijskom kontekstu te se utvrđuju područja u kojima nedostaje znanja iz navedene problematike. Pritom se razmatra značaj generacijskih razlika na zajedničke vrijednosti te organizacijsko građanstvo u akademskim institucijama u indijskom kontekstu te se ponovno analiziraju liste zajedničkih vrijednosti, kao temelj za buduća istraživanja. Nadalje se ukazuje da je akademsko okruženje jedno od dominantnih radnih okruženja, sa snažnom međugeneracijskom komunikacijom, zbog čega je potrebno veću pozornost posvetiti ponašanju generacijskih skupina u kontekstu postizanja organizacijskih ciljeva.

