

Developing a Scale Measuring of Spontaneous Behaviors in the Workplace

¹Laith Ali Yousif Al-Hakim, ²Mohammad Abdul Hassan Al-Eabodi

ABSTRACT

During recent years, research on spontaneous behaviors has been increasing but there is still need to develop and validate an instrument to measure this variable. Therefore, the aim of this study is to propose a scale to measure spontaneous behaviors. Based on the content analyses researchers developed a questionnaire. The sample consisted of 200 employees who work in the Al-Kafeel Specialist Hospital in the holy city of Karbala. The exploratory analysis identified five dimensions of this variable with (25) items.

Keywords: *Spontaneous Behaviors; Work well-being; Scale; Exploratory Factorial Analysis.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Through the increasing globalization and international competition. The importance of employing, retaining and human resources can help to increase the organizational competitiveness. It has become a critical factors of the various organizations success and their development. Among the most important of these factors are human resources that require special attention by organizations to direct their behaviors (Nadiri & Tanova, 2010).

In this context, Katz (1964) asserts that "an organization that relies solely on the planned behaviors in the job description is a very fragile social system" (George & Brief, 1992). In highly competitive environments, just a good performance or alignment with organizational strategies is not enough to ensure organizational effectiveness. Indeed, in this type of environment, organizations become more dependent on people who are ready to bypass their official duties as described in the organization's job description (Rocha & Turner, 2008).

Throughout the past twenty years, some studies in the field of organizational behavior have focused on categories of activities or behaviors that benefit organization, which may not be described as part of the official business role of any manager or employee within the organization. These behaviors have been described based on different theoretical structures, such as "Positive Organizational Behavior"

¹ Faculty of Administration and Economics, University of Kufa

² Faculty of Administration and Economics, University of Kufa

Brief & Motowidlo (1986), "Organizational Spontaneous" (George & Brief 1992), "Contextual Performance" Borman & Motowidlo (1993), "Additional Behavior" Van Dyne et al. (1995), "Organizational Civil Behavior" Smith et al. (1983); Organ (1988) and other behaviors (Rebzaev, 2009).

Therefore, a large number of research began focusing on the behaviors proposed by Katz (1964) for various members of the organizations. Every organization depends on several behaviors that employees demonstrate such as cooperation, assistance, and submit suggestions, which is called spontaneity behaviors (Zhu, 2013).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

In an organization's internal environment, which no longer provides long-term employment opportunities for everyone. The employees who seek to manage their careers must not only think carefully of exceeding or not exceeding to the description of their official duties. They must seek to recognize them as competent employees by both managers and co-workers. They may even seek to embrace a mixture of additional volunteer behavior and managing the impression of their professional success (Kang et al., 2012).

Doing the routine job tasks in the job description just well is not enough to get high performance. Peer assistance is often essential to the overall mission of the organization. For example, if a consultant surgeon does not help a new doctor to recognize routine procedures in a hospital, this may lead to major problems even though the surgeon has shown good behavior when performing his routine tasks. Accordingly, the need for behavior that was not proven in the job description or to get officially rewarded that contributes to achieving the goals of the organization emerged. One of these forms may take organizational citizenship behavior, positive organizational behavior, additional or spontaneous behavior in the workplace (Van Loon et al., 2015).

Spontaneity behaviors in the workplace contributes to effectively achieve organizational objectives. It seeks to enhance the social mechanism, which makes it smoother and easier to achieve the organization mission. Moreover, it beneficial to other colleagues in the organization. In general, the previous studies have shown that additional behaviors such as spontaneity, especially auxiliary behaviors, are positively correlated with organizational performance (Van Loon et al., 2015).

Over the last few decades, the researches about additional role activities in organizations has received increasing attention. It has been already provided areas of scientific research with terms such as pro-social organizational behavior, additional behavior, aid behavior, organizational citizenship behavior, and spontaneous behaviors, to refer to workplace behaviors that are voluntary and not formally described (Oplatka, 2013).

Researchers continue to recognize the importance of behaviors that exceed the expectations of the typical role or role requirements that benefit the organization (Vazquez, 2019). Hence many definitions of the concept of spontaneity in the workplace were appeared, including the definition of (Katz, 1964), which defined it as spontaneity behaviors that perform roles that contribute to

organizational effectiveness. Moreover, Oplatka & Golan (2011) has been defined it as organizationally beneficial behaviors that cannot be implemented based on formal role obligations and are not obtained through bonuses. While Palenzuela et al. (2019) defined it as an expression of charitable and spontaneity behavior towards the organization, which exceeds the formal obligations of the employee.

III. DIMENSIONS OF SPONTANEOUS BEHAVIORS IN THE WORKPLACE

Previous researches related to (spontaneous behaviors in the workplace and other related behaviors such as organizational citizenship behavior, positive organizational behavior) emphasizes that the high performance, tends to focus on the relationship between the organization's personal characteristics, feelings, thoughts, and attitudes. This literature implicitly assumes that the personal characteristics of individuals and their reactions in the workplace influence the extent to which they go beyond the call of duty. For example, a positive mood at work is a necessary factor for spontaneous behaviors (George & Jones, 1997). On it George & Brief (1992); George & Jones (1997) and later Koc et al. (2008) agree on the five dimensions he outlines (Katz, 1964) for spontaneous behaviors in the workplace as the following:

1. Helping Co-Workers:

The action that contributes to achieve the organizational goals is mainly a set of collaborative activities based mutual relations between employees. Within each working group in a factory or any department in a government office or any department of universities, there are many cooperative activities with the reward system absence (Katz, 1964). Furthermore, there are many ways that employees can act voluntarily to help co-workers perform the tasks assigned to them. The some employees have ability to pay attention to colleagues' mistakes by sharing supplies or providing assistance to their work. These auxiliary behaviors are voluntary in that do not appear in any job description and have not been planned or identified as job requirements. These daily actions "if they do occur" are often described as taken for granted (George & Brief, 1992). Co-workers help includes all forms of voluntary assistance that employees give to each other toward tasks accomplishment and goals achievement (George & Jones, 1997).

2. Protecting the Organization

Another form of behavior that enables an organization to provide procedures to protect it against disasters. There is nothing in the job descriptions that determines that the employee must be on the alert to save life and property of the organization. However, the worker who goes out through him to accidentally remove the rock in the way of the freight vehicle, or to secure an aging piece of machinery, or even to disobey orders, when they are wrong and dangerous, this worker is invaluable in the organization (Katz, 1964). The organization's protection also includes those voluntary actions in which the members of the organization participate to protect or save lives and property ranging from reporting fire hazards, locking doors safely, reporting suspicious or dangerous activities, to taking the initiative to

stop production process if possibility of human infection. This form of spontaneity behaviors in the workplace also includes protecting organizational resources (George & Jones, 1997).

3. Making Constructive Suggestions

Another dimension of actions beyond the scope of duty consists of constructive suggestions for improving production, maintenance, or other methods. Some organizations encourage their members to make constructive suggestions to them, but coming up with good ideas for the organization and formulating them for management is not the usual role of the employee. An organization that can motivate Employees who are close to employment problems can often provide helpful and constructive suggestions about these processes. A system that does not have contributions from members is unable to use potential resources effectively (Katz, 1964). The constructive proposition dimension includes all volunteer work for innovation and creativity in organizations. Instead of just performing their jobs within the status quo, employees who are engaged in the spontaneity behaviors. They will take steps forward and will try actively to find ways to improve individual, group, and organizational performance (George & Jones, 1997).

4. Developing Oneself

The fourth dimension of spontaneity behaviors related to employee self-development. The employees' self-development is performed their jobs better and their learning to take on more responsible jobs in the organization. The self-development would be no requirement in the job description to get better positions. But an organization that has employees who spend their time perfecting the knowledge and skills to find more responsible jobs will be has an additional resource for effective performance (Katz, 1964). Self-development of employees includes all voluntarily steps to improve their knowledge, skills, and abilities to improve organizational performance. In order to, expand a person's contributions to the organization in this type of spontaneity. Searching for and benefiting from advanced training courses is included keeping abreast of the latest developments in the employee's field or even learning a new set of skills (George & Jones, 1997).

5. Spreading Goodwill

The role of organization members is contributed to create operations that can make a favorable climate for it in the community, or the communities that surround the organization. Staff can talk to friends, relatives, and acquaintances about the excellent or poor quality of organization in which they work. Therefore, to insure effective organizational performance, many members must sometimes be willing to do more than what job descriptions specify (Katz, 1964). The goodwill is voluntarily contribute to achieve organizational effectiveness. The goodwill instances contribute to organizational effectiveness by ensuring that organizations have the necessary resources from different stakeholder groups (George & Jones, 1997).

IV. METHODOLOGY

The scale of spontaneous behaviors in the workplace was developed based on a number of previous studies. Items scale to measure a helping co-workers were developed after based on Nilgün (2017). Moreover, the items scale of protecting the organization was developed based on Posey et al. (2015). Likewise, items scale of submitting constructive suggestions was developed based on Al-Hattami (2019). With regard to the items scale of developing oneself was developed based on London & Smither (1999). Finally, items scale of spreading goodwill were developed depending on Nimon & Zigarmi (2015). The questionnaire previously developed was answered by (200) employees in the departments of Al Kafil Specialized Hospital in Karbala Governorate.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

1. Normal distribution and Descriptive analysis:

The researchers calculated the means, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis of the responses in each item (table 1). Inspection of these values shows that, in overall, the values were not high in absolute value.

Table 1. Results of Normal Distribution and Descriptive Analysis

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
C1	3.86	.857	-.924	1.437
C2	4.30	.578	-.136	-.567
C3	4.14	.669	-.581	.875
C4	4.15	.805	-1.156	1.319
C5	4.20	.648	-.214	-.669
O2	4.10	.797	-.667	.117

O3	I	2	.970	.88 7	.695
O4	I	4	.811	- .818-	.229
S1	M	3	1.01 4	- 1.137-	1.01 0
S2	M	4	.703	- .824-	1.16 2
S3	M	4	.840	- 1.138-	1.23 8
S4	M	3	1.02 7	- .483-	- .080-
S5	M	3	.948	- .571-	.243
S6	M	3	1.01 1	- .983-	1.01 5
S7	M	3	1.14 3	- .967-	.274
S8	M	3	1.04 9	- .822-	.306
O1	I	4	.649	- 1.169-	1.42 2
O2	I	4	.636	- .626-	.951
O3	I	3	.728	- .919-	1.54 6
O4	I	4	.716	- 1.050-	1.31 3

O5	.07	.732	-	1.889
O6	.03	.785	-	1.393
G1	.12	.888	-	1.460
G2	.24	.822	-	1.636
G3	.86	1.073	-	.743

2. Exploratory factor analysis of the scale of (spontaneous behaviors in the workplace):

The main statistical tools used in this article were exploratory factor analysis (EFA), using SPSS V.24. In EFA all items were allowed to have loadings with the factors in the model and all factors were allowed to be correlated. The formative structure of the scale of spontaneous behaviors in the workplace consists of five dimensions and (28) paragraphs. To determine which paragraphs belong to this variable or that do not belong to it, the researcher conducted the exploratory factor analysis, as shown in (table 2).

Table 2. Factorial Structure

Item	Paragraph content My co-workers and I ...	Factors					Cronbach's alpha
C1	We tend to pool our available resources to solve each other's problems				594		.83
C2	We receive help and support from each other to fulfill the various tasks assigned to them				702		
C3	We feel accepted in our working group				693		

C4	Very satisfied with the prevailing spirit of cooperation between us				717		
C5	We support each other to face problems				722		
O1	We protect the hospital from threats to its resources		462		362		
O2	We intend to successfully prevent threats to the hospital's reputation and assets					674	
O3	We may participate in activities that protect the hospital from theft					759	
O4	We are actively trying to protect the hospital's reputation and assets from any possible damage					660	
O5	We persistently defend the hospital's reputation and assets from offending it and various threats		482		405	464	.84
S1	We offer effective suggestions for hospital senior management	754					
S2	We offer suggestions to all of our co-workers	569					
S3	We offer suggestions in different ways (oral and written).	631					
S4	We offer suggestions related to the hospital activities for all its departments continuously and objectively	797					.84
S5	We offer suggestions about the hospital's internal and external environment	793					
S6	We clarify the strengths and weaknesses of hospital activities when making suggestions	814					

S7	Our suggestions are considered as positive or negative	714					.81
S8	We follow up on our proposals to ensure that they are understood by the hospital administration	728					
O1	We seek to define our own development needs			621			
O2	We are developing our knowledge and skills through self-learning			633			
O3	We are actively looking for feedback on our performance			580			
O4	We compare our self-assessments with current and future skill requirements			641			
O5	We try to explore self-development opportunities			697			.80
O6	We set self-development goals and evaluate progress towards achieving or adjusting our goals			699			
G1	We have the intentions to speak positively to others (family, friends, and others) about the hospital we work in		831				
G2	We have the intentions to improve the reputation of the hospital where we work		816				
G3	We have the intentions to speak positively to others (family, friends, co-workers, and others) about the leaders of the hospital where we work		659			425	
G4	We have the intentions to speak positively about our other colleagues in the hospital where we work		748				
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.854					

Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	2124.866					
Latent root	.62	.78	.26	.80	.47	Cumul ative: 16.962

Based on the Varimax rotation method, the outputs of Table 2 showed all twenty eight items were known as an accurate tool to measure spontaneous behaviors in the workplace. They were categorized in five factor loadings. Only twenty five items were remained, which were revealed a relatively good fit. Accordingly, the other three items (PO1, PO5, and SG3) were not included in the final instrument. Next, researchers assessed the internal reliability of the entire questionnaire, measured by Cronbach's α , which resulted in the very good result.

V. CONCLUSION

The spontaneous behaviors at workplace scale proposed for measuring five dimensions. The scale presents (helping co-workers, protecting the organization, submitting constructive suggestions, developing oneself, and spreading goodwill) with 28 items, as a main dimensions. Being this an exploratory work, the researchers proceed exploratory factorial analysis to look for a validity of (spontaneous behaviors at workplace) and the interpretation of each factor identified.

REFERENCES

1. George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1992). *Feeling good-doing good: a conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship*. Psychological bulletin, 112(2), 310.
2. George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (1997). *Organizational spontaneity in context*. Human performance, 10(2), 153-170.
3. Kang, D. S., Gold, J., & Kim, D. (2012). *Responses to job insecurity: The impact on discretionary extra-role and impression management behaviors and the moderating role of employability*. Career Development International, 17(4), 314-332.
4. Katz, D. (1964). *The motivational basis of organizational behavior*. Behavioral Science, 9(2), 131-146.
5. Koc, U., Paksoy, M., & Torlak, O. (2008). *How do extra-role behaviors affect salespeople's performance? An empirical examination*. Journal of Transnational Management, 13(1), 58-76.
6. Nadiri, H., & Tanova, C. (2010). *An investigation of the role of justice in turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior in hospitality industry*. International journal of hospitality management, 29(1), 33-41.

7. Oplatka, I. (2013). *The principal's role in promoting teachers' extra-role behaviors: Some insights from road-safety education*. Leadership and Policy in Schools, 12(4), 420-439.
8. Oplatka, I., & Golan, R. (2011). *The Teacher's Extra-Role Behaviors: Some Illuminations from a Study of the Israeli Religious State Education System*. Religious Education, 106(5), 516-536.
9. Palenzuela, P., Delgado, N., & Rodríguez, J. A. (2019). *Exploring the Relationship between Contextual Performance and Burnout in Healthcare Professionals*. Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 35(2), 115-121.
10. Rebzuev, B. (2009). *Elaboration of the Construct of Work Behavior and Development of Extra role Work Behavior Scale*. Psychology. Journal of Higher School of Economics, 6(1), 3-57.
11. Rocha, C. M., & Turner, B. A. (2008). *Organizational Effectiveness of Athletic Departments and Coaches' Extra-Role Behaviors*. Journal of issues in intercollegiate athletics.
12. Van Loon, N. M., Vandenabeele, W., & Leisink, P. (2015). *Clarifying the relationship between public service motivation and in-role and extra-role behaviors: The relative contributions of person-job and person-organization fit*. The American Review of Public Administration, 47(6), 699-713.
13. Vazquez, M. (2019). Degree: Master. *The Influence of Team Cohesion and Contextual Performance on Project Team Performance Over Time*. The Department of Psychology, DePaul University.
14. Zhu, Y. (2013). *Individual behavior: In-role and extra-role*. International Journal of Business Administration, 4(1), 23.