RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR SCALE FROM ISLAMIC PERSPECTIVE IN SAUDI ARABIA

Rajeh Bati Almasradi[1],* Siti Aisyah Panatik[2], Masood Hassan[3] , Nurul Farhana Noordin[1]
[1,2]School of Human Resource Development & Psychology, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, 81310 Johor Bahru, Malaysia
[3] Institute of Business Management (IoBM), Karachi, Pakistan
Email: rajehphd89@gmail.com
*Corresponding author

ABSTRACT: *Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) has been studied in non-Muslims context. However, literature revealed that there is a need for investigation of OCB in Islamic countries where are the employee follow the Islamic teachings and regulations. OCB, from an Islamic perspective, can be defined as the discretionary actions in accordance with Shari'ah that individuals portray in organizations in order to seek the pleasure of Allah by the protection of the objectives Islamic law. OCB from Islamic perspective consists of four dimensions, which are altruism, civic virtue, advocating high moral standards, and removal of harm. In this study, the researcher investigates the dimensions of OCB from Islamic perspective among 373 Saudi Arabian employees who are working in public universities to test the validity and develop the questionnaire. These employees were selected randomly. The questionnaires have 25 items. The findings of this study showed the high validity and reliability of the dimensions of OCB from an Islamic perspective in the Saudi Arabian context. The findings suggest that the Arabic version of OCB from an Islamic perspective is a reliable and valid tool for measuring OCB among employees of Saudi Arabia. The discussion of practical implication and future recommendation are also discussed in this paper.*

KEYWORDS: Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB); Scale; Reliability; Validity; Saudi Arabia

INTRODUCTION

Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) is employee behaviour that goes above, and beyond the call of duty, that is discretionary and not explicitly recognized by the employing organisation's formal reward system, and that contributes to organisational effectiveness [1,2]. OCB was first presented to the science world by Batman and Organ [3]. Organ [1] conceived OCB as a set of personal and arbitrary behaviours which were not directly captured in the formal remuneration system of organisations, but which are known to facilitate organisations' productivity. Thus, the way and manner specific things are done in an organisation have a determining influence on the tendency of employees to engage or not to engage in specific forms of OCBs. This can be seen in the report of Marinova, Cao, and Park [4] who found that workplace environmental characteristics such as organisational values act as pivotal mechanisms for generating employee OCBs.

Similarly, Lee and Ha-Brookshire [5] their study of 278 fashion retail employees found that the ethical climate of an organisation positively predisposes the employees towards engaging in facilitative OCBs. Thus, OCB may not be contextually invariant. However, and despite the role of context in generating OCB among employees, most of the extant studies assess the construct based on sweeping universal assumptions that can hardly be tenable when viewed against the apparent differences in worldviews of the relevant research context. For example, Becker and Randall [6] advanced an OCB scale having two factors, i.e., altruism and conscientiousness. There are several other similar studies [7-9]. However, a few exceptions to this trend exist, such as the Affiliative Oriented Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Scale for assessing OCB of Malaysian teachers [10] and Rurkkhum and Bartlett's scale for measuring OCB in the collectivist culture of Thailand [11].

Notwithstanding the efforts of researchers at developing OCB scales that are sensitive to specific contexts and cultures, our review fails to unearth OCB measures developed from the Islamic perspective. Islam as a life code circumscribes believers' entire existence and exerts a strong influence on how they interact among themselves in their private capacities and as members of economic organisations such as the workplace. Despite this pervasive influence, religion in general, and Islam is not fully appreciated as a pivot of employees' behaviour in Muslim countries. Some few measures are available that factor in the question of religious influence on employees' propensity to behave in altruistic and conscientiousness. These studies are inadequate and thereby points to the need to develop a measure is 100% Islamic.

Because of the foregoing introductory, this study seeks to reliable and validate the OCB from Islamic perspective scale for measuring employees' OCB from an Islamic perspective. Data was collected from the administrative employees in higher education in Saudi Arabia. This is due that all administrative employees in Saudi Arabia are Muslim, and they practice Islam. Therefore, OCB from the Islamic perspective is more relevant to this context.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour from an Islamic Perspective

Generally, employees who are Muslims are more motivated to exhibit organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) based on Islamic teachings and principles [12]. Islam urges people to do the best of their abilities in achieving tasks at workplaces as worshipping Allah. Also, employees are required to cooperate with their colleagues and help each other at work to gain a reward (*ajar*) from Allah. The contention of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour from Islamic Perspective can be further substantiated by delving into Islamic literature. For example, the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) in the authentic hadith related by Al-Baihaqi says:

يقول الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم: "ان الله يحب اذا عمل احدكم عملا ان يتقنه"
رواه البيهقي

Allah loves those workers who perform their works to the best of their abilities.

In line with this is the statement by Abuznaid [13] that Islam views work as an act of worship and that Muslims are always encouraged to perform extra good deeds (thus improving beyond than the prescribed limit of quality, leading to excellence), which can guide them closer to Allah. Allah says:

وتعاونو على البر والتقوى ولا تعاونوا على الاثم والعدوان واتقوا الله ان الله شديد العقاب (2:5 القران الكريم)

Help ye one another in righteousness and piety, but help ye not one another in sin and rancour: fear Allah: for Allah is strict in punishment. (Al-Quran, 5: 2)

Therefore, OCB from Islamic perspective encourages employees to do extra work more than what they are required to do by job contract in order to win the paradise by obeying Allah and his Prophet commands and protecting themselves from hellfire if they disobey Allah and his Prophet.

The OCB has been divided into four dimensions, based on Islamic perspective: altruism, civic virtue, advocating high moral standards, and removal of harm [12]. First, altruism refers to assisting co-workers with work-relevant tasks with avoiding doing anything against Islamic roles. This is supported by a verse from the Quran, which states that:

يقول الله عزوجل: "والذين تبوءوا الدار والايمان من قبلهم يحبون من هاجر اليهم ولايجدون في صدورهم حاجة مما أوتوا ويؤثرون على أنفسهم ولو كان بهم خصاصة ومن يوق شح نفسه فأولئك هم المفلحون." (القران الكريم, 59:9)

But those who before them, had homes (in Medina) and had adopted the Faith,- show their affection to such as came to them for refuge, and entertain no desire in their hearts for things given to the (latter), but give them preference over themselves, even though poverty was their (own lot). Moreover, those saved from the covetousness of their souls - they are the ones that achieve prosperity. (Al-Quran, 59: 9)

Second, civic virtue reflects that employee participation in his/her work's life by attending the meetings, and events with keeping in mind to do this by seeking the closer to Allah. Although, altruism and civic virtue are, theoretically, quite different as it was in the western findings, where the compliance is broader than it was from the Islamic perspective were helping employees must comply with the tenets of Shari'ah [12]. For example, assisting in developing the citizenship behaviour of employees may not be accomplished through indulging in acts that are haram(prohibited) such as selling of pork and alcohol either of the two seen as altruism or civic virtue from Islamic perspectives.

Third, advocating high moral standards (*da'wah*) is a basic Islamic principle that is captured as citizenship behaviour whereby employees who indulge in it strive to develop employees' moral and ethical behaviour, which ultimately increases organisational performance. This is in line with Shari'ah, as noted in an authentic hadith of the Prophet (PBUH):

يقول الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم : (من رأى منكم منكرا فليغيره بيده, فإن لم يستطع فبلسانه, فإن لم يستطع فبقلبه وذلك أضعف الايمان). رواه مسلم

Anyone amongst you who sees a munkar (misbehaviour/forbidden act) should correct it with the hands, if he cannot make correction with the hands, he should use his tongue to correct it (i.e., by speaking out against the bad act), if still he cannot use his tongue to make correction, he should utilise his heart (i.e., hate the act in himself), but that is the weakest of Iman (faith).

According to Kamil and his colleagues [12], organisational citizenship behaviour from the Islamic perspective is explained in this hadith when it urged to have the belief advocating high moral standards, which can increase several positive organisational outcomes if followed.

Finally, removal of harm refers to the voluntary of an employee to protect the organisation from harmful aspects. For example, when an employee helps new staff to get familiar with the organisation facilities in order to avoid that new staff might misuse them without intention. The Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) said in a hadith narrated by Bukhari and Muslim that:

يقول النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال: (لا يؤمن أحدكم حتى يحب لأخيه ما يحب لنفسه). رواه البخاري ومسلم

No one amongst you will be a believer until he loves others that which he loves himself.

Therefore, Muslims' employees are required to treat the organizations as their own business by taking care of remaining the flow of work.

The important factors that guided Muslims in the practice of Islam are the spiritual motivation attributed to the good or bad deed in observing the Islamic injunction. This is suggesting that the good deed is lead a follower to paradise, whereas, the bad deed leads to hellfire [12]. Note that when guided by this spiritual motivation (a good or a bad deed), the belief is that the worshiper seeks closeness with Allah. Thus, OCB from the perspectives of Islam, higher Islamic practice will lead to better outcomes for the associations and workforces in ways that satisfy Allah.

Definitions of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour from Non-Islamic perspective

Kinds of literature in the past have identified two main approaches known as "role" and "extra-role behaviour" in defining the concept of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB). The extra-role means the individual contributions in the workplace which go beyond the specified role requirements and not recognized by the reward system [14]. OCB is the voluntary behaviours of workers which ensure the improvement of the organization. This concept is prevalent and attracts attention [15].

OCB is defined as "individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization" [1]. OCB is also known as extra-role behaviours, which are the act of performing beyond the state job requirement. Subordinates impulsively go beyond the employment contract and carry out a non-obligatory task without expecting explicit rewards and recognition [1]. A most recent definition of OCB refers to helping with job-related problems, volunteering for extra duty

and tolerating the occasional inconveniences of work without complaining [16].

Dimensions of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour

Over the years, several dimensions have been attributed to OCB: for example, two [17], four [12], five [10], and seven [15] dimensions. Altogether, there are approximately 30 dimensions of OCB [18]. Organ [1] proposed a five-dimensional model of OCB consisting of altruism (assisting co-workers with work-relevant tasks); courtesy (being respectful and considerate of other employees); conscientiousness (fulfilling in-role duties well beyond required levels); civic virtue (participating in organizational life such as meetings, events, and governance); and sportsmanship (tolerating difficulties without undue complaints).

A different taxonomy was proposed which differentiated behaviours directed towards individuals, called OCBI, and behaviours directed towards the organization, called OCBO [17]. OCBI, for example, might include altruism as well as the other helping behaviours such as courtesy, peacekeeping, and cheerleading; and OCBO might entail conscientiousness as well as perhaps civic virtue and sportsmanship [17]. This scholastic stream in the OCB literature now includes altruism, courtesy, peacekeeping, and cheerleading in the OCBI category, and conscientiousness (sometimes termed compliance), civic virtue, and sportsmanship in the OCBO category [19].

Seven dimensions of OCB been developed: Helping Behaviour, Sportsmanship, Organizational Loyalty, Organizational Compliance, Individual Initiative, Civic Virtue, and Self Development [18]. In this study, the latest four-dimensional conceptualisation of OCB advocated in 2014 by Kamil and his colleagues [12] will be used.

Table 1: A summary regarding the dimensions of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour

Sources	Dimensions
Organ [1]	1. Altruism 2. Courtesy 3. Conscientiousness 4. Civic Virtue 5. Sportsmanship
Williams and Anderson [17]	1. OCBI (which include behaviours towards an individual). 2. OCBO (include behaviours directed towards organizations).
Podsakoff and colleagues [15]	1. Helping Behaviour 2. Sportsmanship 3. Organizational Loyalty 4. Organizational Compliance 5. Individual Initiative 6. Civic Virtue 7. Self-Development
Kamil and his colleagues [12]	1. Altruism 2. Civic virtue 3. Advocating a high moral standard 4. Removal of harm

METHODOLOGY

This article employed a set of questionnaires to study universities' administrative employees' perception of organizational citizenship behaviour from an Islamic perspective. OCB from Islamic perspective consists of four dimensions, which are altruism, civic virtue, advocating high moral standards, and removal of harm. In this study, the researcher investigates the dimensions of OCB from Islamic perspective among 373 Saudi Arabian employees who are working in public universities to test the validity and develop the questionnaire. These employees were selected randomly. The questionnaires have 25 items.

Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected by distributing questionnaires to the respondents. The researcher first contacted the Human Resource Department or the Department of Employees Affairs of each university in Saudi Arabia requesting permission to research the administrative employees. After permissions to conduct research is granted, the researcher dealt with the person-in-charge from each university. The researcher then requested the list of the administrative staff names to select the respondent based on simple random sampling. After selecting the respondents, the person in charge helped the researcher to distribute the questionnaires to respondents. The questionnaires distributed by hand and via email. As obtaining support from the university, the administration helped gain support from the respondents, confirming the purported use of the surveys, and increasing the probability of returning the questionnaires, the help from the person-in-charge gave the high response rate of the return questionnaires. Although the minimum sample size required in this study is 383, the research distributed 520 questionnaires.

Research Instrument

Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) was measured by using 25 items [12]. Sample item intends to measure citizenship behaviour include 'I do my work in the best way I can for the sake of gaining Allah's pleasure ' and 'I participate actively in organisations' meetings'. These items were rated on a 5-point response from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. The Cronbach alpha reported for this instrument that all four factors [Altruism, Civic virtue, Advocating high moral standards (*Da'wah*), and Removal of harm (*Raf'al haraj*)] had good reliability indices of .919, .849, .828 and .759 respectively [12].

The development of the research instrument involved adopting previously validated instruments that measure the OCB dimensions from an Islamic Perspective. Since this study was conducted in the Arabic-speaking context, all measurements were translated from English to Arabic using back-to-back translation method. This method was done to ensure transcription equivalence of the questionnaire after being translated. The back-to-back translation has been done by Dr Nurazmallail bin Marni of Islamic Civilisation Academy at Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM), an official translator in UTM by translating the English version questionnaire into the Arabic language. Then, the translated questionnaire was translated back into English by a different official translator from Saudi Arabia named Nama Certified Translation. The translated English version questionnaire was compared to the original version questionnaire, and it was validated by Dr. Abdel-Fattah M. Adel, Chairman of the Department of English at the University of Bisha in Saudi

Arabia. The equivalent of these two sets of questionnaire suggests the applicability of the Arabic version questionnaire.

Table 2: Organisational Citizenship Behaviour from Islamic Perspective Items

Dimension	Items
Altruism	1. I do my work in the best way I can for the sake of gaining Allah's pleasure. 2. I rely on Allah's reward only when I do good. 3. I sincerely help my co-workers for the sake of gaining Allah's pleasure. 4. I strive to correct mistakes on my initiative to suit the Islamic teachings. 5. As a Muslim, I feel obligated to deliver a quality job because I am being paid for my service. 6. I strongly feel I have to work because it is an act of worship to Allah. 7. As a Muslim, when I am disturbed, I make sure it does not affect my work. 8. I feel Allah's divine wrath will descend upon me if I do not work diligently for which I am paid for. 9. I feel obligated to assist co-workers who face difficulty with jobs. 10. For the sake of Allah, I accept responsibilities that are not a prescribed part of my job
Civic virtue	11. I participate actively in organisations' meetings. 12. If I find my organisation not doing the right thing, I feel obligated to make a positive change. 13. I prepare special gifts for my hard-working co-workers. 14. I think of ways to develop my organisation. 15. I help other co-workers who have heavy workloads. 16. I stay after work hours to help other employees. 17. I stay in the office during breaks in order to assist my co-workers on their job.
Advocating high moral standards	18. I encourage co-workers to observe Islamic teachings while doing their jobs. 19. I feel obligated to voice against un-Islamic acts in my organisation. 20. I humbly advise my co-workers about Islam. 21. I feel bad when I cannot make corrections to a wrong act in my organisation in accordance with Islam.
Removal of harm	22. I speak nicely about my organization even if I do not like its policies. 23. For Allah's sake, I encourage my co-workers to respect the organisation even though I am against its policies. 24. Even though I may not be happy with my organization's policies, I do protect the organisation's resources. 25. I orient new employees even though it is not required of me.

FINDINGS/DISCUSSION

Data screening and Preparation

This section discusses the process of data screening and preparation. After collecting questionnaires from the study sample, and before starting data analysis, data preparation and screening is necessary. This section explains the procedure performed for examining missing data, detecting and dealing with the outliers as well as the assessment of normality.

Missing Data

In the context of this study, from a total of 520 questionnaires were distributed, a total of 422 questionnaires were returned, representing an 81 % rate of return. After collecting the questionnaires, manual analysis was conducted to detect missing data. Missing data occur when a respondent fails to answer one or more questions of the questionnaires [20]. By checking the questionnaires, it is found that 19 questionnaires were uncompleted, and having missing data more than 10%, these cases were removed from the dataset.

Additionally, seven cases were dropped because the respondent in those cases selected one option for all questionnaire items. Altogether a total of 26 questionnaires were removed from the dataset in the data screening stage. A plausible reason for missing data is that administrative employees are always busy and have many tasks to do even inside or outsides their offices. Another reason for missing data may be due to the method of administering the questionnaire; in this method, respondents can submit the questionnaire even if it is uncompleted. After checking the missing data, a total of 396 completed questionnaires were entered the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 22 to screen data statistically to check the outliers.

Detecting and Treatment of Outliers

Outliers generally refer to cases that have values that differ from most cases in the dataset, mostly due to extremely high or low scores [21]. Outliers can be found in two forms, univariate and multivariate outliers. Univariate outliers refer to extreme values for many variables, while multivariate outlier refers to the case with an odd combination of extreme values in two or more variables [22]. In this study, a Mahalanobis D2 method was applied to detect the multivariate outliers.

Table 3: Multivariate Outliers using Mahalanobis D^2 value

No	Case ID	Mahalanobis D^2	P-value
1	12	125.55754	.00000
2	45	122.57426	.00000
3	82	120.70419	.00001
4	172	120.09330	.00001
5	2	120.01848	.00001
6	49	119.94169	.00001
7	37	118.91735	.00001
8	274	117.39183	.00001
9	319	116.70280	.00002
10	220	116.01034	.00002
11	383	114.89986	.00003
12	15	114.87884	.00003
13	94	114.44682	.00003
14	124	114.00210	.00003
15	356	110.76703	.00007
16	286	108.36579	.00013
17	118	107.73126	.00015
18	32	106.27417	.00022
19	189	103.14670	.00045
20	76	102.93436	.00047
21	341	102.59171	.00051
22	400	102.47828	.00053
23	289	100.74016	.00078

Firstly, a linear regression method using SPSS 22 was applied to calculate Mahalanobis D2 value. Subsequently, Chi-square statistics and associated probability values were calculated for Mahalanobis D2 value using the number of independent variables as degrees of freedom. All cases with associated chi-square probability of 0.001 or less can be considered as multivariate outliers [21]. Following the above criterion, a total of 23 cases were identified as multivariate outliers table 4.1

These cases were deleted from the dataset. The reason behind removing the outliers because they could result in non-normality of the data which could, in turn, influence statistical result [22]. After removing the outliers, the remaining cases will be considered for further analysis. Therefore, by completing the preliminary analysis (missing values and outliers treatment), a total of 373 good cases were retained to proceed to the next stage of data analysis.

Assessment of Normality

After completing the data screening of missing values and outliers, it is essential to assess the normality distribution of the data. Normality reflected the degree of data distribution corresponds to the normal distribution [22]. It is essential to verify that the data are not too far from normal as extremely non-normal data prove problematic in the assessment of the parameters' significances. Two statistical measures can be used to assess normality distribution, skewness, and kurtosis. Skewness assesses the extent to which a variable's distribution is symmetrical. Kurtosis is a measure of whether the distribution is too peaked [20]. Many rules of thumb have been identified with the accepted values of Skewness and Kurtosis. In this study, the rule of thumb proposed was considered, this rule accepts the variable values skewness and kurtosis fall in the range of -1 to +1. Table 4.2 states the results of the normality test using Skewness and Kurtosis of each item representing the univariate normality test [20]. It can be seen in that the values of Skewness and Kurtosis for all variable fall within the acceptance range of normality -1 to +1. The values of Skewness and Kurtosis for multivariate normality are presented in Table 4.2.

Common Method Variance

Common method variance (CMV) is the methodological issue, which often occurs in researches using a research instrument with similar scales and the same number of response options [23]. Consequently, researchers are encouraged to take essential steps to remedy any effects of CMV in their studies to avoid any problems in further data analysis. In this study, several steps were taken to reduce CMV. The researcher implemented the recommended statistical test Harman's one-factor test [24] on the returned questionnaires to check and correct for possible any common method bias in the data. Two main conditions need to be satisfied in order to confirm that the data are free from common method bias. First, there must be more than one factor with Eigenvalue greater than 1. Secondly, no one single factor must account for more than 50% of the total variance of study variables [23]. However, the result of Harman's test revealed that the mentioned two conditions were satisfied. A total of 9 factors emerged with Eigenvalue >1, and the principal factor accounted for only 35.102% of the total variance. Therefore, it can be safely concluded that CMV is not a threat to the validity of this dataset.

Table 4: The Skewness and Kurtosis of the Indicators

	N	Min	Max	M	SD	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	SE	Stat	ES
AL1	373	1	5	3.95	.951	-.701	.126	.120	.252
AL2	373	1	5	3.77	1.021	-.446	.126	-.415	.252
AL3	373	1	5	3.85	1.030	-.522	.126	-.625	.252
AL4	373	1	5	4.46	.632	-.990	.126	1.521	.252
AL5	373	1	5	4.51	.642	-1.211	.126	1.790	.252
AL6	373	1	5	4.47	.697	-1.228	.126	1.496	.252
AL7	373	1	5	4.10	.871	-1.046	.126	1.281	.252
AL8	373	1	5	4.09	.914	-.839	.126	.406	.252
AL9	373	1	5	4.35	.739	-1.314	.126	2.770	.252
AL10	373	1	5	4.14	.877	-.943	.126	.661	.252
CV1	373	1	5	3.81	.968	-.402	.126	-.433	.252
CV2	373	1	5	3.90	.909	-.451	.126	-.322	.252
CV3	373	1	5	3.47	1.127	-.353	.126	-.489	.252
CV4	373	1	5	3.85	.912	-.382	.126	-.581	.252
CV5	373	1	5	4.10	.793	-.736	.126	.802	.252
CV6	373	1	5	3.74	1.026	-.512	.126	-.258	.252
CV7	373	1	5	3.91	.896	-.653	.126	.309	.252
AHMS1	373	1	5	4.15	.724	-.530	.126	.253	.252
AHSM2	373	1	5	4.16	.795	-.753	.126	.497	.252
AHMS3	373	1	5	4.18	.763	-.676	.126	.284	.252
AHMS4	373	1	5	4.08	.788	-.570	.126	.417	.252
RH1	373	1	5	3.90	.870	-.522	.126	.138	.252
RH2	373	1	5	3.98	.828	-.565	.126	.151	.252
RH3	373	1	5	4.18	.798	-.908	.126	.944	.252
RH4	373	1	5	4.30	.735	-.912	.126	.873	.252
Valid N (listwise)	373								

Key: Stat = Statistic; M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; SE = Standard Error; Min = Minimum; Max = Maximum

Table 5: The Skewness and Kurtosis of the Construct

	N	Min	Max	M	SD	Var	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	SE	Stat	SE
Mean OCB Score	373	1.00	5.00	4.0561	.57908	.335	-.657	.126	1.477	.252
Valid N (listwise)	373									

Key: Stat = Statistic; M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; SE = Standard Error; Min = Minimum; Max = Maximum; Var = Variance

Table 6: Common Method Variance

Total Variance Explained						
	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
Comp	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	21.061	35.102	35.102	21.061	35.102	35.102
2	6.586	10.976	46.078	6.586	10.976	46.078
3	4.070	6.783	52.861	4.070	6.783	52.861
4	2.604	4.341	57.201	2.604	4.341	57.201
5	1.940	3.233	60.434	1.940	3.233	60.434
6	1.368	2.279	62.714	1.368	2.279	62.714
7	1.254	2.091	64.804	1.254	2.091	64.804
8	1.085	1.809	66.613	1.085	1.809	66.613
9	1.013	1.688	68.301	1.013	1.688	68.301

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Demographic Profile of Respondent

This section presents the demographic information on the final 373 respondents retained in the study. The specific demographic information sought in the study includes the respondents' gender, age, marital status, educational attainment, position, tenure and income. The results of the frequency descriptive analysis show that majority of the respondents were males (*n* = 286; 76.7%). In terms of age distribution, majority of the respondents are within the middle ages, as constituted by persons within the ages of 18 - 30 (*n* = 114; 30.6 %) ,31 - 45 (*n* = 223; 59.8%), and 46 - 60 (*n* = 36; 9.7 %).

The distribution in terms of Marital Status shows that married employees constitute most of the respondents (*n* = 272; 72.9%). The second largest group comprised of single persons (n=88; 23.6%). Only ten divorced persons make up a total of 2.7%. Simply three respondents (0.8%) indicated that they are widowed.

The distribution in terms of an educational qualification shows that bachelor's degree holders constitute many of the respondents (*n* = 227; 60.9%). The second largest group comprised persons with Secondary School or Less (*n* = 106; 28.4%). Master's Degree holders are 35 persons making up a total of 9.4%, with PhD holders accounting for only 1.3% (*n* = 5) of this group.

For the category of position, the result revealed that most respondents fall with the position of the technician (*n* = 143, 38.3%). The second largest group, according to the position, is a secretary (*n* = 66, 17.7 %), while managers and department received an equal number of respondents (*n* = 51, 13.7%). The remaining two groups with positions of office managers and security were (*n* = 41, 11.0%) and (*n* = 21, 5.6%).

In term of the years of experience, it was found that many respondents recorded years of experience 6-8 years (*n* = 95, 25.5%), followed by years of experience 3 to 5 years (*n* = 93, 24.9%). The years of experience less than two years and 9 to 11 years were (*n* = 65, 17.4%) and (*n* = 54, 14.5). Similarly, it was found that 39 respondents with years of experience for more than 16 years, representing 10.5%. Only 27 respondents were found within years of experience between 12 to 15 years.

In terms of income, majority of the respondents incomes are 4100-8000, as constituted by persons (*n* = 172, 46.1%), followed by 8100-12000 (*n* = 151, 40.5%). The employees who get more than 12000 are 37 representing 9.9%. Only 13 respondents were found within income less than 4000.

Table 7: Demographic Profile of Respondents

Demographic	Description	Frequency (*f*)	Percent (%)
Gender	Male	286	76.7
	Female	87	23.3
Age	18-30	114	30.6
	31-45	223	59.8
	46-60	36	9.7
Marital Status	Married	272	72.9
	Divorced	10	2.7
	Single	88	23.6
	Widowed	3	.8
Education	Secondary School or Less	106	28.4
	Bachelor's Degree	227	60.9
	Master's Degree	35	9.4
	PhD	5	1.3
Position	Manager	51	13.7
	Department Head	51	13.7
	Office Manager	41	11.0
	Secretary	66	17.7
	Technician	143	38.3
	Security	21	5.6
Experience	Less than 2 years	65	17.4
	3-5 years	93	24.9
	6-8 years	95	25.5
	9-11 years	54	14.5
	12-15 years	27	7.2
	More than 16 years	39	10.5
Income (in Saudi Riyal)	Less than 4000	13	3.5
	4100-8000	172	46.1
	8100-12000	151	40.5
	More than 12000	37	9.9

Convergent Validity

Convergent validity refers to the degree to which one indicator is positively correlated with other indicators designed to assess one construct [20]. Essentially, a test of convergent validity determines whether the items in a scale converge or load together on a single construct in the measurement model. It is recommended that items with factor loadings below 0.4 should be removed [20]. The items with factor loadings between 0.40 and 0.70 should be considered for removal from the scale only when deleting the indicator

leads to an increase in composite reliability or AVE above the suggested threshold value [20].

Item Loading

Item loading is known as the link between the measured indicator for each variable and the reflective construct [20]. It indicates the level of reliability of the item. However, to assess the validity of the construct and to achieve the model fit, Hair and colleagues [20] recommend, firstly, removing the items with factors loading less than 0.50. Then, the items with factor loadings less than 0.50 should be deleted from the scale as when deleting the indicators leads to an increase in composite reliability or AVE above the suggested threshold value. The criterion for removing items is to ascertain that each construct has three items as a minimum [25]. For the evaluation of the model item loading, the researcher has run the PLS Algorithm. All items show factor loading more than .50. Based on the recommendation of Hair and colleagues [20], no items were removed with ascertain that each dimension still has at least three items. Table 4.5 illustrates the items and their respective loadings.

Table 8: Outer Loading for all Items

Construct	Dimension	Indicator	Loading
OCB	Altruism	AL1	0.52
		AL2	0.54
		AL3	0.57
		AL4	0.76
		AL5	0.77
		AL6	0.79
		AL7	0.73
		AL8	0.69
		AL9	0.78
		AL10	0.80
	Civic Virtue	**CV1**	0.82
		CV2	0.82
		CV3	0.73
		CV4	0.83
		CV5	0.78
		CV6	0.82
		CV7	0.84
	Advocating High Moral Standards	**AHMS1**	0.86
		AHMS2	0.89
		AHMS3	0.90
		AHSM4	0.87
	Removal of Harm	**RH1**	0.85
		RH2	0.88
		RH3	0.84
		RH4	0.78

As can be seen from Table 4.5, the results in the table show that all the items loading exceeded the minimum requirements where the item loadings ranged from 0.52 to 0.93. Therefore, the researcher can proceed to the next assessment, which is AVE to evaluate convergent validity at the construct level after the attainment of indicator reliability. The assessment of the convergent validity assessment at the construct level is presented next.

Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

The average variance extracted (AVE) serves as the indicator of a measurement model's convergent validity at the construct level. The AVE is the sum of the squared loading divided by the number of indicators in a construct [20]. AVE thus illustrates the amount of variance the items share with the constructs it purports to measure [26]. Average Variance Extracted (AVE) indicates, on average to what extent one construct can be explained by the variance of its indicators. A minimum AVE of 0.50 for each construct is recommended [20]. AVE values of 0.50 or higher indicate that on average, the construct explains more than 50 percent of the variance of its indicators. However, the researcher rerun PLS Algorithm. The result shows that the average variance extracted (AVE) was below .50 and did not meet the minimum requirements. Thus, all items with outer loadings ranging between 0.40 and 0.70 were examined [20, 25, 27], and only one item with low factor loading was removed which was AL1 until the model meets the minimum requirement of AVE, which is 0.50.

Moreover, it was revealed that altruism could be measured without AL1 [12]. Therefore, the significance of the item loadings and enough AVE values suggest that all indicators and first-order latent constructs have demonstrated adequate convergent validity. Table 4.6 exhibits Cronbach's Alpha, Composite Reliability, and AVE for each construct.

Table 9: Constructs Validity and Reliability

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	AVE
AHMS	0.902	0.932	0.773
AL	0.877	0.902	0.512
CV	0.91	0.929	0.65
RH	0.856	0.903	0.7

Key: AC = AHMS = Advocating High Moral Standards dimension; AL = Altruism dimension; CV = Civic Virtue dimension; RH= Removal of Harm dimension.

Discriminant Validity

Discriminant validity is the degree to which one variable is distinct from other variables in a research model. It is important to assess discriminant validity to ensure that no more variable represents the same construct in a research model. In this study, discriminant validity was assessed using the following three approaches. It should be noted that discriminant validity in measurement model can be assessed by using two traditional approaches, i.e. Fornnel-Lacher Criterion (the square root of AVE) and cross-loadings [22]. In addition to the HTMT criterion, which is recently advanced [28]. Therefore, this study used all the approaches mentioned above to assess discriminant validity.

Fornnel-Lacker Criterion: According to the Fornnel-Larcker criterion, discriminant validity is confirmed by comparing the correlation estimates between the constructs and the square root of the average variance extracted of the respective constructs [26]. In this study, as can be seen in table 4.7, all the AVE values higher than the squared inter-construct correlations that confirmed satisfactory discriminant validity for all the reflective constructs.

Cross-Loading Criterion: According to cross-loading criterion, discriminant validity is met when indicator loading of the construct is essentially greater than its cross-loadings [29]. For this study, table 4.8 exhibits that loadings of indicators associated with one construct are higher than the loadings on all other constructs. Which indicates that all reflective constructs have fulfilled the requirement of discriminant validity.

The Heterotrait Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) Criterion

More specifically, the most recently advanced approach for discriminant validity assessment is HTMT criterion [28]. The HTMT refers to the average of the correlations of indicators between different constructs, relative to the average of the correlations of indicators within the same construct. Based on this criterion, it can be said there is a lack of discriminant validity if HTMT ratios are closer to one. Two cut-off ratios are often considered in HTMT evaluation: (1). The conservative ratio of 0.9 (HTMT.90) [30], or (2). The stringent ratio of 0.85 (HTMT.85) [31].

Table 4.9 has indicated that there is no problem of discriminant validity between reflective constructs according to the ratio of HTMT. As it can be seen, the highest inter construct ratio of HTMT is 0.87 (between the construct of AHMS and RH). This ratio is below the cutoff 0.90, indicating the discriminant validity for reflective constructs. In summary, the result of measurement model assessment has shown that the model has achieved the recommended adequate levels of constructs validity and reliability, which authorises the researcher to proceed to the next stage and evaluate the structural model.

Table 10: Fornell-Lackrt Criterion

	AC	AF	AHMS	AL	CO	CV	JS	LMX	LO	OCB	PR	RH
AHMS	0.443	0.492	0.879									
AL	0.43	0.762	0.716	0.715								
CV	0.509	0.465	0.745	0.701	0.317	0.806						
OCB	0.528	0.64	0.882	0.896	0.395	0.907	0.526	0.578	0.388	0.703		
RH	0.474	0.458	0.773	0.649	0.281	0.755	0.363	0.399	0.272	0.858	0.275	0.836

Key: AC = Affective Commitment; AF = Affect dimension; AHMS = Advocating High Moral Standards dimension; AL = Altruism dimension; CO = Contribution dimension; CV = Civic Virtue dimension; JS= Job Satisfaction; LO = Loyalty dimension; PR = Professional Respect dimension; RH= Removal of Harm dimension.

Table 11: Cross-Loading

	AHMS	**AL**	**CV**	**RH**
AHMS1	0.86	0.62	0.74	0.69
AHSM2	0.89	0.60	0.60	0.64
AHMS3	0.90	0.63	0.63	0.71
AHMS4	0.87	0.67	0.65	0.67
AL2	0.32	0.54	0.35	0.28
AL3	0.25	0.52	0.28	0.23
AL4	0.55	0.76	0.47	0.44
AL5	0.52	0.77	0.42	0.44
AL6	0.56	0.79	0.43	0.48
AL7	0.54	0.73	0.61	0.50
AL8	0.54	0.69	0.59	0.49
AL9	0.56	0.78	0.55	0.57
AL10	0.64	0.80	0.69	0.63
CV1	0.63	0.62	0.82	0.63
CV2	0.62	0.61	0.82	0.64
CV3	0.45	0.41	0.73	0.48
CV4	0.62	0.53	0.83	0.60
CV5	0.60	0.66	0.78	0.62
CV6	0.55	0.51	0.82	0.62
CV7	0.70	0.60	0.84	0.65
RH1	0.66	0.51	0.67	0.85
RH2	0.66	0.57	0.69	0.88
RH3	0.65	0.51	0.61	0.84
RH4	0.62	0.58	0.55	0.78

Key: AC = AHMS = Advocating High Moral Standards dimension; AL = Altruism dimension; CV = Civic Virtue dimension; RH= Removal of Harm dimension.

Table 12: The HTMT Ratios

	AHMS	AL	CV	RH
AHMS				
AL	0.787			
CV	0.815	0.761		
RH	0.879	0.73	0.851	

Key: AC = AHMS = Advocating High Moral Standards dimension; AL = Altruism dimension; CV = Civic Virtue dimension; RH= Removal of Harm dimension.

Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive analysis is the basic analysis of the study variables. It reflects the view of the respondents toward each variable of the proposed model. This study involves four main variables and tow variables have eight dimensions. All variables and dimensions were measured using a five-point Likert scale, with slightly reworded anchors, ranging from "1 = *strongly disagree*" to "5 = *strongly agree*" [32]. For the five

scale measures, the mean is classified as low, moderate or high in the range between (1 to 2.33, 2.34 to 3.66 and 3.67 to 5) respectively. The table below presents the descriptive statistics for each variable.

Table 13: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Altruism	373	1.00	5.00	4.3555	.56359
Civic Virtue	373	1.00	5.00	3.8261	.76349
Advocating High Moral Standard	373	1.00	5.00	4.1414	.67472
Removal of harm	373	1.00	5.00	4.0912	.67631
OCB	373	1.00	5.00	4.1307	.57815
Valid N (listwise)	373				

As can be seen in the table above, organisational citizenship behaviour has the highest mean of (4.13). Moreover, the standard deviation for all dimensions falls in the range .57 to .76, which is smaller than 2, indicating the existence of considerable acceptable variability within the dataset. Furthermore, in term of dimensions, it was found that all dimensions fall in the high level with the mean (4.35, 4.14,4.09,3.82) for OCB-Altruism, OCB-Advocating high moral standard, OCB-Removal of harm, and OCB-Civic Virtue. Likewise, the standard deviation for OCB falls in .56, which is smaller than 2, indicating the existence of considerable acceptable variability within the dataset.

CONCLUSION

In this study, we have shown that the extant literature on OCB is replete with measures designed to assess the construct in workplace settings. However, the greater portion of the measures are generic and fail to take cognizance of contextual factors that make the construct immediately meaningful and relevant to respondents. Specifically, there are few measures for the assessment of OCB from the Islamic perspective. This lack of appropriate measure becomes even more pronounced when national peculiarities are further factored in the assessment of employees' OCB. This is precisely the situation concerning the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia where there is a virtual lack of a contextually relevant measure of OCB that reflects the Islamic ethos and worldview characteristic of the typical Saudi workplace. This study, therefore, addresses these lacunae by examining the psychometric properties of the Arabic version of the Organisational Citizenship Behaviour from Islamic Perspective (OCBIP) – a measure of OCB from an Islamic perspective – in a population of Saudi public service employees. The OCBIP was initially developed in the context of private sector organizations in South East Asia. Thus, an additional objective of this study is to find out the adequacy of the OCBIP as a measure of OCB in Saudi public sector organizations through analysis of its psychometrics. The results of the psychometric analysis show that the validity and reliability statistics for the four dimensions of the OCBIP of the Arabic version of the (altruism, civic virtue, advocating high moral standards, and removal of harm) fall within acceptable ranges as specify in the measurement literature. The results further suggest that the Arabic version of the OCBIP developed using from an Islamic perspective is a reliable and valid tool for measuring OCB among employees of Saudi Arabia. It is, however, recommended that similar studies with larger samples drawn from multiple locations across the more than one Arab country should be undertaken.

REFERENCES

1. Organ, D. W., *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome.* Lexington, MA, England: Lexington Books (1988).
2. Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., and Near, J. P., "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, ***68***(4), 653–663 (1983).
3. Bateman, T. S. and Organ, D. W., "Job Satisfaction and the Good Soldier: The Relationship Between Affect and Employee "Citizenship."" *Academy of Management Journal*, ***26***(4), 587-595 (1983).
4. Marinova, S. V., Cao, X., and Park, H., "Constructive Organizational Values, Climate and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Configurational View," *Journal of Management*, ***45***(5), 2045–2071 (2019).
5. Lee, S. H. N. and Ha-Brookshire, J., "The Effect of Ethical Climate and Employees' Organizational Citizenship Behavior on U.S. Fashion Retail Organizations' Sustainability Performance," *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, ***25***(5), 939-947 (2018).
6. Becker, T. E. and Randall, D. M., "Validation of a Measure of Organizational Citizenship Behavior against an Objective Behavioral Criterion," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, ***54***(1), 160-167 (2016).
7. Mahembe, B., Engelbrecht, A. S., Chinyamurindi, W., and Kandekande, L. R., "A Study to Confirm the Reliability and Construct Validity of an Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Measure on a South African Sample," *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, ***41***(1). 1-8 (2015).
8. Neves, P. C., Paixao, R., Alarcao, M., and Gomes, A. D., "Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Schools: Validation of a Questionnaire," *Spanish Journal of Psychology*, ***17***, E17 (2014).
9. Irvine, D., "The Development of Measures of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Changes in Job Behaviours Related to Quality Management in Health Care," *Health Services Management Research*, ***8***(3), 143-161 (1995).
10. Selamat, N., Nordin, N., and Fook, C. Y., "The Development and Validation of a Preliminary Scale to Assess Affiliative Oriented Organisational Citizenship Behaviour," *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, ***26***(8), 19-32 (2018).
11. Rurkkhum, S. and Bartlett, K. R., "Organizational Citizenship Behaviour for Collectivist Cultures: Instrument Development and Human Resource Development Implications," *Human Resource Development International*, ***21***(2), 107-124 (2017).
12. Kamil, N. M., Sulaiman, M., Osman-Gani, A. M., and Ahmad, K., "The Dimensionality of Organizational

Citizenship Behavior from Islamic Perspective (OCBIP): Empirical Analysis of Business Organizations in South-East Asia," *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, ***19***(1), 17–46 (2014).

13. Abuznaid, S. A., "Business Ethics in Islam: The Glaring Gap in Practice," *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*, ***2***(4), 278–288 (2009).
14. Lo, M.-C., and Ramayah, T., "The dimensionality of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) in a Multicultural Society: The Case of Malaysia," *International Business Research*, ***2***(1), 48–55 (2009).
15. Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., and Bachrach, D. G., "Organizational Citizenship Behaviors : A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Future Research," *Journal of Management*, ***26***(3), 513–563 (2000).
16. Inelmen, K. O., Selekler-Goksen, N., and Yildirim-Öktem, Ö., "Understanding Citizenship Behavior of Academics in American- vs Continental European-Modeled Universities in Turkey," *Personnel Review*, ***46***(6), 1142–1164 (2017).
17. Williams, L. J., and Anderson, S. E., "Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and In-Role Behaviors," *Journal of Management*, ***17***(3), 601–617 (1991).
18. MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., and Paine, J. B., "Do Citizenship Behaviors Matter More for Managers Than for Salespeople?" *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, ***27***(4), 396–410 (1999).
19. Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., and Blume, B. D., "Individual- and Organizational-Level Consequences of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Meta-Analysis," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, ***94(***1), 122–141 (2009).
20. Hair, J. F. J., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., and Kuppelwieser, V. G., "Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM): An Emerging Tool in Business Research," *European Business Review*, ***26***(2), 106–121 (2014).
21. Tabachnick, B. ., Fidell, L. ., and Osterlind, S., *Using Multivariate Statistics.* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon/Pearson Education (2007).
22. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., and Anderson, R. E., *Multivariate Data Analysis (7th ed.).* New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall (2010).
23. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., and Podsakoff, N. P., "Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, ***88***(5), 879–903 (2003).
24. Podsakoff, P. M., and Organ, D. W., "Self-Reports in Organizational Research: Problems and Prospects," *Journal of Management*. ***12***(4), 531-544 (1986).
25. Stevens, J., *Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences* (2nd ed.) Hillsdale, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. (1992).
26. Fornell, C., and Larcker, D. F., "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *Journal of Marketing Research*, ***18***(1), 39-50 (1981).
27. Kline, R. B., *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press (2005).
28. Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., and Sarstedt, M., "A New Criterion for Assessing Discriminant Validity in Variance-Based Structural Equation Modeling*," Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, ***43***(1), 115-135 (2015).
29. Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., and Sarstedt, M., "PLS-SEM: Indeed, a Silver Bullet," *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, ***19***(2), 139–151 (2011).
30. Gold, A. H., Malhotra, A. and Segars, A. H., "Knowledge Management: An Organizational Capabilities Perspective," *Journal of Management Information Systems*, ***18***(1), 185-214 (2001).
31. Kline, R. B., *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling* (3rd ed.). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press (2011).
32. Likert, R., "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes," *Archives of Psychology*, ***22***(140), 5-55 (1932).