

# Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Police: A Panacea for Change

Syed Muhammad Shaukat Shah\*

## Abstract

*Perhaps every organization would like their employees to display organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as it involves discretionally going beyond the job description for co-workers and the organization. Various scales are used to assess OCB however the present study developed a scale of OCB consisting of seven dimensions. The scale was tested in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) Police. Data were collected from 300 employees of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Police (KP Police). Results show that KP Police reported their OCB to be of moderate level. The qualitative input from KP Policemen also add to our comprehension of the factors influencing employees' disposition to engage in OCBs especially in a hard pressed organization of a third world country facing the menace of terrorism.*

**Keywords:** Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Police, Scale Development, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa

## Introduction

In the field of management, the concept of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) holds special place as it involves working beyond the requirements of the job. This significance is evident from the thousands of studies it has attracted in the previous three decades (Carpenter, Berry, & Houston, 2014; Podsakoff et al., 2014). The word organization citizenship behavior (OCB) was primarily devised by Dennis Organ and his colleagues on the bases of Barnard's and Katz's work (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Organ (1988) defined organizational citizenship behaviors as "individual behavior 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" (p.4).

It is not always possible to explore and activate all behaviors in the formal job role that are necessary for the achievement of organizational objectives (Van Yperen, Van den Berg, & Willering, 1999). Therefore strongly commitment and motivated employees are needed to discretionary go "extra mile" beyond the formal job roles for

---

\*Syed Mohammad Shaukat Shah, Ph.D Research Scholar, Abasyn University Peshawar, Email: [jadoon22@yahoo.com](mailto:jadoon22@yahoo.com)

the achievement of organizational goals. Such behaviors which are not covered in the formal job description but are voluntarily performed in the interest of organization are called organizational citizenship behaviors. These behaviors although very necessary for the success of organization are not usually directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff, et.al., 1993).

#### *Benefits of OCB*

OCBs play an important role in the employee and organizational outcomes. The consequences of OCB for individual employees include performance evaluations (MacKenzie et al., 1991; Werner, 1994), managers' reward allocation decisions (Allen & Rush, 1998; Podsakoff, et al., 1993; Podsakoff et al., 2000), and employee withdrawal (Chen, 2005; Chen, Hui, & Sego, 1998). At the organizational level they include a variety of effectiveness measures such as productivity, efficiency, costs, and profitability (Karambayya, 1990; Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1997). Similarly OCBs also develop coordination, cohesiveness and motivation in teams which also results in greater retention (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Organ, 1988; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997; Podsakoff et al., 2009).

The demonstration of OCBs also effect external measures of organizational effectiveness such as customer satisfaction. Yen and Niehoff (2004) argued that employees who extend their help to other fellows encourage teamwork and cooperation among coworkers, which culminates into better performance and enhanced customer satisfaction. In addition, OCBs such as keeping one-self well informed about his/her job results in greater customer satisfaction. Lastly, Yen and Niehoff (2004) argue that employees who display civic virtue by forwarding suggestions for improvement in customer services may also increase customer satisfaction. Confirming the previous studies, the results of a study of a bank in Taiwan concluded that OCBs were related to customer satisfaction (Yen & Niehoff, 2004). The meta-analysis of Podsakoff et al. (2009) also reported that organizational units whose employees reported greater OCBs usually have more satisfied customers than those possessing lower levels of OCBs.

#### *Determinants or antecedents of OCB*

Past research has concentrated on four major classes of antecedents of OCB: Individual (or employee) characteristics, task characteristics, organizational characteristics, and leadership behaviors or styles (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Individual characteristics consists of determinants of OCB such as perception of fairness, employee satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceptions of leader supportiveness, trust, and individual

personality traits such as agreeableness etc (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Daly et al., 2015; Haas et al., 2015). According to Podsakoff et al. (2000) “all three forms of task characteristics included in the substitutes’ literature (task feedback, task routinization, and intrinsically satisfying tasks) were significantly related to altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and civic virtue” (p.531).

Among the organizational characteristics group cohesiveness, and perceived organizational support are found positively related to OCB whereas rewards not in leader’s control are negatively associated to altruism, courtesy, and (Podsakoff et al., 2000; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Tompson and Werner (1997) found that work-life conflict reduces organizational citizenship behavior whereas work-life facilitation reduces the conflict and enhances the chances of displaying discretionary behaviors. Almost similar results were compiled by Bolino and Turnley (2005).

#### *Dimensions of OCB*

The OCB and its constructs or dimensions had been discussed and researched with different names without consensus. Earlier researchers exploring OCB identified two main dimensions; *altruism* and *conscientiousness* (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; Organ & Konovsky, 1989). Subsequently scientists travelled three more dimensions; *sportsmanship*; *courtesy*; and *civic virtue* (Organ, 1988, Organ & Ryan, 1995). These five dimensions of OCB, altruism, conscientiousness (generalized compliance), sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue are widely used for determining OCB, and a valid and reliable scale (Podsakoff et al. 1990) is available for measurement of these dimensions.

Williams and Anderson (1991) also proposed two constructs of organizational citizenship behavior, OCB-I and OCB-O. OCBI is behavior aimed at helping an individual in the organization (helping a specific other person with a relevant task) while OCBO is behavior aimed at helping the organization as a whole (carrying out role requirements well beyond minimum required levels and helping organization in achieving goals). The previous work of various authors has been summarized to seven dimensions in the classic work of (Podsakoff et al., 2000). These are named as helping behavior, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and self-development. Let us discuss these dimensions in detail:

- i). **Helping Behavior:** Helping behavior can be job-related, such as helping a co-worker with a particular assignment or work task, or personal-related, such as helping a co-worker or superior with a private problem. The dimension of helping behavior also involves helping a customer (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

- ii). Sportsmanship: Sportsmanship is defined by Konovsky and Organ (1996) as “the inclination to absorb minor inconveniences and impositions accruing from the job without complaints or excessive demands for relief or redress” (p. 255).
- iii). Organization Loyalty: According to Podsakoff et al., (2000). organizational loyalty entails promoting the organization to outsiders, protecting and defending it against external threats, and remaining committed to it even under adverse conditions”(p.517).
- iv). Organizational Compliance: According to Organ and Ryan (1995) “it refers to more impersonal contributions to the organization such as excellent attendance, and adherence to organizational rules and policies” (p.782). An employee scoring high on this dimension will be law abiding noble citizen of an organization (Podsakoff et al., 2000).
- v). Individual Initiative: Individual Initiative includes discretionary actions of ingenuity, novelty in individual and organizational activities and processes. It involves exerting at high energy level, persistence, and taking and encouraging other to take extra responsibilities (Podsakoff et al., 2000)
- vi). Civic Virtue: It refers to behaviors that show active participation and attention regarding organizational matters (Organ & Ryan, 1995). This dimension constitutes actions such as voluntarily attending meetings, participating in seminars, keeping aware of organizational changes, and playing an active role in the decision making and performance of overall organization (Konovsky & Organ, 1996).
- vii). Self-Development: This dimension include behaviors like voluntarily indulging in enhancing knowledge, keeping apprised of the latest developments in their respective fields and learning new skills and techniques for the benefit of organization.

From the detailed literature review it was concluded that no prior study on OCB has identified OCB with these seven dimensions. For this purpose the present study was conducted in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) Police, for which a scale was developed measuring OCB with these seven dimensions. KP (formerly called North-West Frontier-Province, NWFP) is a province of Pakistan bordering Tribal areas and Afghanistan. After the incident of 9/11 in U.S., Pakistan faced the brunt of terrorism when it became an ally of the World in war against terror. KP was specially affected as it borders most of the tribal regions, bordering Afghanistan (Yusuf, 2014). Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Police (KP Police), which is the premier law enforcement agency of the province is bravely battling the wave of terrorism, and has sacrificed most of its brave men

when compared to other provinces against terrorism. KP Police has sacrificed the most number of cops from 2006 to 2015 and they include personnel from the rank of additional inspector general down to constables. Fida Hassan Shah<sup>1</sup> informed an international newspaper that as many as 1133 police men have been killed in the attacks all over the province since January 2006 against the 1508 policemen killed in the previous 35 years from 1971 to 2006 (Khan, 2015).

KP Police is following the policy of “Policing by Objectives” (Durrani, 2014). Policing by objective is management style adopted from management by objective and it involves improvement of organizational processes with a view of achieving desired results (Lubans & Edgar, 1979). The assumption is that assigned targets or objectives will compel policemen to achieve the goals. This strategy (efficient use of existing resources through strict control) works well in short run but in the longer run it fails due to the lack of will and participation of employees. At present KP Police especially in the leadership of Inspector General Police (IGP) Nasir Khan Durrani (took charge in September, 2013) has introduced many procedural and technical changes for improving of operational capabilities. However the present situation of uncertainty and terrorism in KP demands its Police to go beyond its job description to the level of self-sacrifice. Doing beyond the call of duty or job description is called organization citizenship behavior (Organ, 1988).

OCB operates on the theory of social exchange (Elstad, Christophersen, & Turmo, 2011). The theory of exchange proposes that when employees are favorably treated they develop a positive evaluation of their jobs, the organization, supervisors and colleagues and want to reciprocate the organization in return (Blau, 1964; Emerson, 1976; Foa & Foa, 1980; Homans, 1958; Thibaut & Kelly, 1959). Stafford (2008) explained that social exchanges consist of a link with others; is based on trust not on lawful compulsions; are not rigid; and do not involve open bargaining. When employees favorably evaluate the treatment of the employers they develop positive attitudes of satisfaction and commitment. These attitudes are then transformed into behaviors like OCBs (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Colquitt et al., 2013; Podsakoff et al., 2000).

In nutshell the present study is determining OCB level of KP Police with the seven dimensions of helping behavior, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and self-development. Furthermore this study is forwarding practical suggestions forwarded by KP Policemen for enhancing their OCB.

---

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Inspector General (AIG) Establishment KP Police

### Methodology

The study is exploratory in nature where the state of OCB in KP Police is determined with a cross sectional survey consisting of a questionnaire. Population of the study is the policemen working in police department KP i.e. 68176 (KP Police, 2016). The study used multi-stage-sampling which is one of the methods of probability sampling (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009). Eight police stations were selected as clusters and all the policemen (426) working in these eight police stations were taken as sample. 426 questionnaires were distributed among these police stations. The sample size of 426 out of 68176 employees truly represents the population with 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error, as recommended by Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill (2009). 300 fully filled questionnaires were received resulting in a return rate of 70 percent.

Questionnaire consisted of two parts. First part collected personal information whereas part second was a Likert type scale regarding OCB. Scale used in this study was personally developed and was inspired from the work of Podsakoff et al. (2000). The instrument was developed according to the suggestions of Podsakoff et al. (2000) and it largely benefited from the previous scale of Podsakoff et al. (1990). The scale was translated into Urdu, pilot tested and made as simple as possible for ease of understanding. The final reliability of OCB scale was (.736) in our study. An open ended question attracted valuable information about the perception and suggestions of KP Policemen regarding their OCB.

### Results

#### *Reliability Analysis*

Cronbach's Alpha ( $\alpha$ ) was used to check the reliability of the scale. In the present study the reliability of OCB scale was (0.736).

Table 1: Reliability Analysis

| S.NO | Variable | Number of Items | Cronbach's Alpha ( $\alpha$ ) |
|------|----------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| 1    | OCB      | 22              | 0.736                         |

#### *Validity Analysis*

The content and face validity of the questionnaire was checked by veteran research scholars who validated the questionnaire and gave the permission for data collection. As there was no high correlation (all correlations are  $< .7$ ) among the seven dimensions of OCB, its construct validity is confirmed and there was no need for carrying out factor analysis. Another reason of abandoning factor analysis was that factor analysis is a reduction technique that reduces the various dimensions or

factors, whereas our aim was in depth analysis, and not reduction. The correlation matrix is given as Table 2.

Table 2: Correlations Matrix (All Dimensions)

|                             | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      | 6      | 7 |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---|
| 1 Helping Behavior          | -      |        |        |        |        |        |   |
| 2 Sportsmanship             | .568** | -      |        |        |        |        |   |
| 3 Organizational Loyalty    | .311** | .496** | -      |        |        |        |   |
| 4 Organizational Compliance | .237** | .275** | .371** | -      |        |        |   |
| 5 Individual Initiative     | .516** | .316** | .502** | .431** | -      |        |   |
| 6 Civic Virtue              | .488** | .060   | .569** | .476** | .693** | -      |   |
| 7 Self-development          | .622** | .639** | .254** | .239** | .535** | .210** | - |

$p > .05$ , \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ ,

#### *Distribution of respondents*

Response rate of the respondents was 70%. All the respondents were divided according to different characteristics i.e: wing, gender, marital status, age, education, designation, experience, and pay. This shows diverse characteristics of the respondents of KP Police. 95% of the respondents were from operation wing whereas 5% were from investigation wing. Respondents predominantly were male i.e. 95.3% whereas only 4.7% percent were female. Most of them i.e. 76.7% were married. A majority i.e. 30% had FA/FSC degree (twelve) years of education, and 40.7% of the respondents were between the ages of 29-38.

Most of the respondents i.e. 68.7% were constables followed by head constables, i.e.16.3%. 35.7% of participating policemen/women had 6-10 years of experience within the organization. A majority of employees 69.3% were taking a monthly salary that fell in the range of 20000 to 30000 Pakistani rupees (\$200 to \$300).

#### *Descriptive Analysis for Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)*

The Tables (3) shows the items asked for organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). These questions were asked for seven different dimensions starting from Helping Behavior. The frequency, percentage and mean average score of responses for each question are given. The figure in brackets is percentage, the minimum and maximum for mean average score is 1 & 5. The mean average score of 1 through 2 both inclusive mean “low”, from 2.1 through 3 both inclusive mean “moderate” and from 3.1 through 5 both inclusive mean “high”.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

| Item No. |   | Response  |           |          |            |           | MAS* |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|----------|------------|-----------|------|
|          |   | 1         | 2         | 3        | 4          | 5         |      |
| 1        | I help my fellow police men in work-related problems.   | - (-)     | - (-)     | - (-)    | 180(60)    | 120(40)   | 4.4  |
| 2        | I try my maximum to help citizens in need.  | - (-)     | - (-)     | - (-)    | 217 (72.3) | 83(27.7)  | 4.28 |
| 3        | I personally try to avoid any such act which may result in emotional or physical problems of my colleagues.   | 71(23.7)  | 193(64.3) | - (-)    | 30(10.0)   | 6(2.0)    | 2.02 |
|          | Helping Behavior  |           |           |          |            |           | 3.21 |
| 4        | I take organizational decisions positively.   | 108(36.0) | 156(52.0) | - (-)    | 24(8.0)    | 12(4.0)   | 1.92 |
| 5        | If my seniors reject my suggestion I do not complain.   | 71(23.7)  | 199(66.3) | - (-)    | 24(8.0)    | 6(2.0)    | 1.98 |
| 6        | I do not stop participating and giving suggestions if rejected, rather I always positively participate again. | 111(37.0) | 159(53.0) | - (-)    | 24(8.0)    | 6(2.0)    | 1.85 |
|          | Sportsmanship   |           |           |          |            |           | 1.92 |
| 7        | I always try to spread positive image of police department.   | - (-)     | - (-)     | - (-)    | 206(68.7)  | 94(31.3)  | 4.31 |
| 8        | I defend my police department in public in case of any criticism.   | - (-)     | 24(8.0)   | - (-)    | 117(39.0)  | 159(53.0) | 4.37 |
| 9        | I will never leave police department in any circumstances.  | - (-)     | - (-)     | - (-)    | 186(62.0)  | 114(38.0) | 4.38 |
|          | Organizational Loyalty  |           |           |          |            |           | 4.35 |
| 10       | I always take care of my duty hours.  | - (-)     | 24(8.0)   | - (-)    | 264(88.0)  | 12(4.0)   | 3.88 |
| 11       | I follow police rules and regulations even if no one monitors me.   | - (-)     | - (-)     | - (-)    | 180(60.0)  | 120(40.0) | 4.4  |
| 12       | I advise my colleagues to own police rules and regulations.   | - (-)     | - (-)     | - (-)    | 217(72.3)  | 83(27.7)  | 4.28 |
| 13       | I do not follow unnecessary rules and regulations(R)  | 134(44.7) | 163(54.3) | - (-)    |            | 3(1.0)    | 1.58 |
|          | Organizational Compliance   |           |           |          |            |           | 3.54 |
| 14       | I voluntarily take extra responsibilities and encourage other to do the same.                                 | 108(36.0) | 177(59.0) | - (-)    | 3(1.0)     | 12(4.0)   | 1.78 |
| 15       | I inform officers of any opportunity of improvement in individual tasks or organizational improvement.        | 179(59.7) | 109(36.3) | - (-)    | 6(2.0)     | 6(2.0)    | 1.5  |
| 16       | I often complete my tasks well before the dead line.  | - (-)     | 24(8.0)   | - (-)    | 162(54.0)  | 114(38.0) | 4.22 |
|          | Individual Initiative   |           |           |          |            |           | 2.5  |
| 17       | I keep my-self informed of changes in the police rules.   | - (-)     | 24(8.0)   | - (-)    | 85(28.3)   | 191(63.7) | 4.48 |
| 18       | I participate in meetings, which are not mandatory.   | 71(23.7)  | 135(45.0) | 82(27.3) | - (-)      | 12(4.0)   | 2.16 |
| 19       | I join the functions which are not obligatory but important for the better image of police.                   | 71(23.7)  | 217(72.3) | 6(2.0)   | - (-)      | 6(2.0)    | 1.84 |
|          | Civic Virtue  |           |           |          |            |           | 2.83 |
| 20       | I voluntarily attend courses and trainings.   | 111(37.0) | 153(51.0) | - (-)    | 24(8.0)    | 12(4.0)   | 1.91 |
| 21       | I keep myself well informed of the latest development in my field.  | - (-)     | 3(1.0)    | - (-)    | 177(59.0)  | 120(40.0) | 4.38 |
| 22       | I learn new set of skills in the job to expand my contribution to the police department.                      | - (-)     | - (-)     | - (-)    | 214(71.3)  | 86(28.7)  | 4.29 |
|          | Self-Development  |           |           |          |            |           | 3.53 |
|          | Overall   |           |           |          |            |           | 3.14 |

1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree; the values in parentheses are the percentages; \* shows means average score.

The mean average score (MAS) of 3.21 for helping behavior shows that most of the participants scored “high” for the dimension of helping behavior. This means that policemen cooperate and help each other perhaps due to the collectivist nature of society. The MAS of 1.92 for sportsmanship shows that employees reported “low” on this dimension. This shows a non-sporty behavior as policemen stop giving suggestions when their suggestions are not incorporated. The highest mean average score of 4.35 for organization loyalty shows that participants scored “high” on this dimension. It means that policemen defend their



organization in public and will not switch over to other jobs. For the dimension of organizational compliance, the MAS of 3.535 fall in the “high” range. This is understandable as police is a disciplined organization and its rules and procedures need to be strictly complied. The MAS of 2.5 for individual initiative shows that the policemen are scoring “moderate” on this dimension. This implies that policeman do not feel high social obligation of suggesting and initiating improvement initiatives or they are not encouraged to take initiatives. The MAS of 2.827 for civic virtue shows that participants are scoring “moderate” on this dimension. This mean the policemen do not actively participate in organizational matters such as voluntarily attending meetings and seminars and keeping aware of organizational changes. The MAS of 3.53 for self-development shows that participants are reporting “high” for this dimension. This is a healthy sign showing that KP policemen avail the opportunity of learning and training when available and learn new skills valuable for the organization. It is also worthy to mention here that training is also linked to promotion in KP Police. The result is synonymous to Herzberg’s two factor theory which found that employees enjoy new learning and growth. The overall MAS of 3.085 for OCB shows that employees are “moderate” in the display of OCB behaviors, whereas the need of the time dictates that policemen shall be “High” on OCB.

### **Some Suggestions of KP Policemen**

Apart from the close ended items, one open ended question asking KP Police to describe “How the spirit of self-sacrifice can be promoted among KP Police? This question helped in collecting valuable suggestions from participants for improving their OCB.

- Duty timing is the major source of dissatisfaction for KP Police which is doing 12/24 hours duty. From constable to sub inspector (SI) police force is working in two shifts of six hours out of 24 hours in routine, whereas emergency duties are apart from this. No overtime is paid like other organizations for extra duties. The six hours break do not spare them a time for rest and to maintain work–life balance. The situation is even worse at the top as starting from SHO all higher level officers are performing 24 hours duty. In contrast Punjab police is doing only 8/24 hours duty and are also taking greater salary. This has led to a perception of injustice. This perceived inequity needs to be removed and pay and duties shall be equated with Punjab police. If the situation is erroneously perceived by KP Police, it shall be clarified to the KP Police as perceived injustice is as lethal as actual injustice. It is suggested that according to international

and local practices, KP Police duties shall also be reduced to 8 hours.

- Participants repeatedly asked to end the unfair distribution of duties. According to policemen, officers are keeping a large number of police men for themselves and their relatives and friends. They used a term “mama kaka” which means maternal and paternal uncle in Pashto. One police officer on the terms of anonymity disclosed that one DIG has kept 17 constables for his personal service. Policemen who have developed links with officers are enjoying their time where as those who have no references or linkages are sacrificed in their place. A clear and transparent mechanism of duty distribution shall be made.
- Personal protection gears like light bullet proof jackets, head safety, and secure transportation (bullet proof) shall be arranged for the force. Bullet proof jacket currently in use of police are around 10-15 kg in weight, which makes it almost impossible for them to stand, walk, or run with such a heavy jacket in severe hot and humid temperatures. As a solution police men take the concrete plates out of their jackets and fill it with paper to deceive their officers. One police man claimed that “officers have sold our heads”, “even after changing we cannot sleep due to cramps in our legs and backs due to the weight of these jackets”. Bullet proof jackets weighing 5.5 KG (along all accessories as weighted by the researcher himself) are available in market and some police officers have personally bought them. These light weight jackets shall be provided to the whole police force.
- As we know from the past literature that perceived organizational justice is linked to OCB, all activities such as, postings, transfers, training and promotion shall be carried out on merit. Although the new administration of KP Police has created some goodwill among the policemen regarding promotions and transfers, yet persistent merit for years is needed to restore faith on department. Participants reported that police men are transferred on the pressure of media, influential politicians and criminals. Constables inducted in grade five retires in grade five after 25 years of service without promotion. Constables shall be promoted to grade seven before retirement irrespective of whether they have completed their sixty years or not.
- Water and food shall be provided to policemen on routine duties and special duties. From the past two decades monthly food allowance given to constables stands at 680 rupees which is not less than a joke. Similarly pick and drop arrangements shall be provided to policemen for reaching and getting back from their

duties, timely and safely (a lot of police men have been targeted while trying to reach their duty places or returning from their duties). A one size uniform is distributed to all policemen who then adjust it for them-selves.

- KP Policemen have shown lack of trust on their officers, (especially top officials). Food was announced for “Sehat ka Insaf” program (a mass polio immunization program), but according to policemen, officers have even devoured their break fasts and lunches. It costs around 50,000 to 70,000 rupees to feed and mobilize police force of three police stations for one day from morning to evening in polio campaign. But the top officers do not provide that money.
- Number of police force needs to be doubled in areas such as Sarband, Mathani and Badaber. These posts have been attacked by hundreds of militants. Police shall have their own helicopters to carry their injured from far flung areas, reinforce their personnel in terrorism attacks, and provide air cover against terrorist. Sindh police is provided with latest drones and bomb disposing robots. Such drones and robots shall also to provide to KP Police. Similarly like army’s CMH hospitals, police hospitals shall be developed in every district to provide quick relief to the injured.
- Sufficient family accommodations shall be provided to KP Police in every district. If that is not possible at least market commensurate house rent shall be provided. Like army official, police officers shall also be provided plots in cities to discourage corruption. It is impossible for any police officer to buy a residential plot or house in city like Peshawar in his salary.
- There is only one school for the children of KP Police in the whole province. Police public schools shall be built in every district to educate the children of Policemen. If that is not possible in the short run then government shall pay for their educational expense. How can we expect a policeman to sacrifice his life for a school, college or university where he cannot send his own kids?
- Steps need to be taken to create sympathy among public for the sacrifices of police. The situation is such that public do not mourn and celebrate the sacrifices and success of police. To achieve this, communities shall be apprised of the sacrifices and achievements of KP Police, and the problems they are facing, through media and other platforms. This will reduce police community gap, and KP Police will win the trust and sympathies of common man. When police start getting respect, esteem and support from the community, they will take more interest in their

jobs, and will show greater commitment with the department. KP Policemen will even present themselves for sacrifices, above and beyond their job description.

## References

- Allen, T. D., & Rush, M. C. (1998) The effects of organizational citizenship behavior on performance judgments: A field study and a laboratory experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 83(2). pp. 247–260.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983) Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee “citizenship.” *Academy of Management Journal* 26(4). pp. 587–595.
- Blau, G. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W.H. (2005) The personal costs of citizenship behavior: The relationship between individual initiative and role overload, job stress, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 90(4). pp. 740-748.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993) Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt, W. C. Borman, & Associates (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). San Francisco Jossey-Bass.
- Carpenter, N. C., Berry, C. M., & Houston, L. (2014) A meta-analytic comparison of self-reported and other-reported organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 35(4). pp. 547-574.
- Chen, X.-P. (2005) Organizational citizenship behavior: A predictor of employee voluntary turnover. In D. L. Turnipseed (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational citizenship behavior* (pp. 435–454). New York: Nova Science.
- Chen, X.-P., Hui, C., & Sego, D. J. (1998) The role of organizational citizenship behavior in turnover: Conceptualization and preliminary tests of key hypotheses. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 83(6). pp. 922–931.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001) The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decisions Processes* 86(2). pp. 278-321
- Colquitt, J. A., Canlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., & Porter, C. (2001) Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of Organizational Justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86(3). pp. 425-445.
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., Long, D. M., Zapata, C. P., Conlon, D. E., & Wesson, M. J. (2013) Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 98(2). pp. 199.

- Daly, P. S., DuBose, P. B., Owyar-Hosseini M. M., Kibok, B., Eric M. S., & Philip, B. (2015) Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior in a sample of Korean manufacturing employees. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 15(1). pp. 27–50.
- Durrani N. K., (2014, August 24) Strategic framework for Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Police. Office of the Inspector General Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Police. Available at: [www.kppolice.gov.pk/sfw/swf.pdf](http://www.kppolice.gov.pk/sfw/swf.pdf).
- Elstad, E., Christophersen, K. A., Turmo, A. (2011) Social exchange theory as an explanation of organizational citizenship behaviour among teachers. *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 14 (4). pp. 405.
- Emerson, R. M. (1976) Social exchange theory. *Annual Review of Sociology* 2. pp. 335–362.
- Foa, E. B., & Foa, U. G. (1980) Resource theory. In *Social exchange* (pp. 77-94). Springer US
- Haas, N. E., Van Craen, M., Skogan, W. G., & Fleitas, D. M. (2015) Explaining officer compliance: The importance of procedural justice and trust inside a police organization. *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 15(4). pp. 442-463.
- Homans G. C. (1958) Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology* 63. pp. 597-606.
- Karambayya, R. (1990) *Contexts for organizational citizenship behavior: Do high performing and satisfying units have better 'citizens'*. York University working paper.
- Khan, J. A. (2015, August, 02) KP Police have sacrificed 1133 personnel since 2006. Available at: <https://www.thenews.com.pk/print/54247-kp-police-have-sacrificed-1133-personnel-since-2006>
- Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. (1996) Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 17(3). pp. 253-266.
- KP Police (2016). Summary of the sanctioned strength, KP Police. Available at: [http://kppolice.gov.pk/budget\\_hr/](http://kppolice.gov.pk/budget_hr/)
- Lubans, V. A., & Edgar, J. M. (1979) *Policing by objectives*. Hartford: Social Development Corporation.,
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1991) Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salesperson's performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 50(1). pp. 123–150.
- Organ, D. W. (1988) *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

- Organ, D. W. (1997) Organizational citizenships behavior: It's construct cleanup time. *Human Performance* 10(2). pp. 85–97.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995) A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology* 48(4). pp. 775-802.
- Podsakoff, N. P., Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Maynes, T. D., & Spoelma, T. M. (2014) Consequences of unit-level organizational citizenship behaviors: A review and recommendations for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 35(S1). pp. S87-S119.
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009) Individual-and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of applied Psychology* 94(1). pp. 122.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997) Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance* 10(2). pp. 133–151.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Hui, C. (1993) Organizational citizenship behaviors and managerial evaluations of employee performance: A review and suggestions for future research. In G. R. Ferris & K. M. Rowland (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resources management* (Vol. 11, pp. 1–40). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990) Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organization citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly* 1(2). pp. 107-142.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000) Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management* 26(3). pp. 513-563.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002) Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87(4). pp. 698–714.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2009) *Research methods for business students* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Essex, England: FT Prentice Hall.
- Smith, C., Organ, D., & Near, J. (1983) Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 68(4). pp. 653-66
- Stafford, Laura (2008) Social exchange theories. In Baxter, Leslie A.; Braithwaite, Dawn O. *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives*. Thousand Oaks. pp. 377–89.

- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959) *The Social Psychology of Groups*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Tompson, H. B., & Werner, J. M. (1997) The impact of role conflict/facilitation on core and discretionary behaviors: Testing a mediated model. *Journal of Management* 23(4). pp. 583-601.
- Van Yperen, N. W., Berg, A. E., & Willering, M. C. (1999) Towards a better understanding of the link between participation in decision-making and organizational citizenship behaviour: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 72(3). pp. 377-392.
- Werner, J. M. (1994) Dimensions that make a difference: Examining the impact of in-role and extra-role behaviors on supervisory ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 79(1). pp. 98-107.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991) Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management* 17(3). pp. 601-617.
- Yen, H. R., & Niehoff, B. P. (2004) Organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational effectiveness: Examining relationships in Taiwanese banks. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 34(8). pp. 1617-1637.
- Yusuf, M. (Ed.). (2014) *Pakistan's Counterterrorism challenge*. Georgetown University Press