

СЕКЦІЯ 3 ДЕРЖАВНА СЛУЖБА

AN IDENTIFICATION OF DETERMINANTS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR: THE CONTEXT OF ASAN SERVICE IN AZERBAIJAN

ВИЗНАЧЕННЯ ДЕТЕРМІНАНТНОЇ ПОВЕДІНКИ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙНОГО ГРОМАДЯНСТВА: КОНТЕКСТ СЛУЖБИ ASAN В АЗЕРБАЙДЖАНІ

The current research investigates the determinants of organizational citizenship behavior by taking a look into the social and personal factors that either drive an individual's behavior drawing from the social circumstances at the moment of time, or personal motivation and inner characteristics that force an individual to act in favor or against good citizenship. The individuals here are considered public service officials that belong to public agencies providing public and governmental services to the country citizens. In particular, the ASAN Service context of Azerbaijan is considered here in order to shed a light on how organizational citizenship behavior is formed in the country and what factors drive the public service agents to be good citizens and perform positive act towards the citizens through the public service process. The literature review provides the detailed discussion on each determinant and links the findings to the scope of this research.

The literature mainly discusses how the determinants shape the organizational citizenship behavior. Such that, self-concept answers the question of "who I am?" as it is a profound and consequential question in that individual behaviors are influenced by one's response to this question. In one hand, self-concepts are influenced by individuals' beliefs and values developed through one's early life experiences. In another hand, employees' self-concepts develop through their organizational experiences as they identify with the values of their organizations. In other words, through an identification or self-conception process, individuals identify both with distinctive images of social foci and with individual roles.

Another determinant is identified as public service motivation which refers to a predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations, as it has been developed into an overarching construct that explains public sector workers' distinct motivation and orientation.

In another context, organizational behaviors result partially from individuals' efforts to maintain their membership in an organization, and organizational identity that emerges from their behaviors can be an important source of self-concept. The study adds up further determinants and provides the link between them and organizational citizenship behavior.

Key words: *organizational citizenship behaviour, public service, ASAN Service, Azerbaijan.*

Сучасне дослідження вивчає детермінанти поведінки організаційного громадянства, розглядаючи соціальні й особисті фактори,

які або зумовлюють поведінку індивіда, виходячи із соціальних обставин натепер, або особисту мотивацію та внутрішні характеристики, які змушують людину діяти на користь чи проти доброго громадянства. Індивіди тут вважаються державними службовцями, які належать до державних установ, що надають державні послуги громадянам країни. Зокрема, тут розглядається контекст служби ASAN в Азербайджані, щоб пролити світло на те, як формується поведінка організаційного громадянства в країні та які чинники спонукають агентів державної служби бути добрими громадянами й здійснювати позитивні дії щодо громадян через громадський процес обслуговування. Огляд літератури містить детальне обговорення кожного детермінанта й пов'язує висновки з обсягом цього дослідження.

У літературі в основному розглядається, як детермінанти формують поведінку організаційного громадянства. Наприклад, самопізнання відповідає на питання «хто я?», оскільки це глибоке й наслідкове питання тому, що на поведінку людей впливає відповідь на це питання. З одного боку, на самопізнання впливають переконання та цінності людей, вироблені в результаті раннього досвіду життя. З іншого боку, самопізнання працівників розвивається через їхній організаційний досвід, коли вони ототожнюються із цінностями своїх організацій. Іншими словами, за допомогою процесу ідентифікації або самопізнання люди індивідуально ідентифікуються як із характерними образами соціальних осередків, так і з індивідуальними ролями.

Інший детермінант визначений як мотивація державної служби, що стосується схильності реагувати на мотиви, засновані переважно або однозначно в державних установах та організаціях, оскільки вона була розроблена у всеосяжній конструкції, яка пояснює чітку мотивацію та орієнтацію працівників державного сектору.

В іншому контексті організаційна поведінка частково зумовлена зусиллями людей зберегти своє членство в організації, а організаційна ідентичність, яка впливає з їхньої поведінки, може бути важливим джерелом самопізнання. Дослідження додає подальші детермінанти й забезпечує зв'язок між ними й поведінкою організаційного громадянства.

Ключові слова: *поведінка організаційного громадянства, державна служба, служба ASAN, Азербайджан.*

UDC 35
DOI <https://doi.org/10.32843/pma2663-5240-2020.20.13>

Zeynalov Anar
Postgraduate Student at the Department
of Civil Service
Taras Shevchenko National University
of Kyiv

Introduction. Organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) refers to “behavior (s) of a discretionary nature that are not part of the employee’s formal role requirements, but nevertheless promote the effective functioning of the organization” [1, p. 4]. The importance of the OCB concept for scholars and managers is that incentive-based management of employee self-interest is rarely sufficient for achieving what is in an organization’s collective self-interest. Instead, organizations rely on everyday occurrence of selfless (or, at least, self-interest deferring) acts that directly help other members of the organization or that help the general needs and functioning of the organization. Organ [1, p. 23] identified five core dimensions of OCB: conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, altruism, and civic virtue. Subsequent scholarship has developed variations to the five-dimension approach (e.g., Williams & Anderson’s [2, p. 14] organizational and individual-oriented OCB types), but Organ’s dimensions continue to be at the core of measurement approaches in both the public and private sector. Public sector research on OCB is still far behind the private sector, but scholars have observed high levels of OCB in public organizations [3, p. 4; 4, p. 26]. There are reasons to believe that OCB has special salience in public organizations due to the relevance of generalized citizenship in government–citizen relationships and the goals of public administration reforms to achieve greater organizational responsiveness to citizens. OCB is a sociopolitical construct and has spillover effects between the workplace and political institutions [5, p. 17].

According to Vigoda-Gadot and Cohen [6, p. 19], “citizenship behaviour is vital for any public system and administrative bureaucracy in quest of effectiveness, efficiency, fairness, social justice and overall healthy growth and development” [6, p. 13]. Managing OCB in the public sector, thus, takes on a challenge of understanding the way OCB works in its institutional setting. A further finding in public sector research is that OCB has strong organizational synergies with public service motivation (PSM); OCB complements PSM. The former one involves innovation and informal behavior, whereas the latter is more formally directed to public organizations and can motivate many areas of work beyond innovation [7, p. 22]. For example, research finds that PSM may substitute for the relationship between transformative leadership and OCB because it provides individuals with inner motivation to serve their organizations and fellow employees rather than to rely on external influencers such as the role of leaders [8, p. 19]. In Bottomley et al.’s [8, p. 20] study, as with an increasing num-

ber of other studies, PSM was shown to directly increase levels of OCB in organizations [4, p. 15; 9, p. 11]. Thus, empirical studies provide robust evidence of an important role played by OCB in public organizations and suggest PSM and OCB are closely related constructs. However, the results of the studies beg two key puzzles: first, whether there are different levels of OCB between sectors, and, second, whether there is a role for PSM in understanding this possible difference. Knowledge of such public–private differences provides a means for making better, sector-specific, managerial and behavioural interventions [10, p. 21]. As research on OCB in public organizations develops, it will be necessary to establish stronger empirical foundations of public sector distinctiveness with conceptual sharpness and clarity.

Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) Self-concept (S-C) and OCB

Self-concept is a question of “who I am?” which a profound and consequential question in is that individual behaviors are influenced by one’s response to this question. Moreover, individuals’ self-concepts are influenced by different elements of their life experiences. First, self-concepts are influenced by individuals’ beliefs and values developed through one’s early life experiences. Public service motivation could be understood as part of the personal identity that a government worker has developed through various life experiences.

Second, employees’ self-concepts develop through their organizational experiences as they identify with the values of their organizations. In other words, through an identification or self-conception process [11, p. 23], individuals identify both with distinctive images of social foci (e.g., family, school, work organization) and with individual roles (policeman, firefighter, bureaucrat, doctor), and then make a cognitive connection with these entities to define themselves. From this perspective, a question of “who I am?” can be answered by “where I belong (or where do I want to belong)?”

Arguably, by performing in certain roles in an organization and interacting with coworkers and supervisors, public employees learn certain values from their organizational experiences and internalize these values. In this context, their self-concept will be also formed by asking, “what am I doing (or what should I be doing)?” Organizational norms would thus also influence employees’ self-concepts in that employees would internalize aspects of their roles based on their beliefs about coworkers’ or citizens’ expectations. Based on this notion, this study posits that OCB values can be both an expression of

individuals' value and a reflection of employees' perceived norms and organizational values [12, p. 18].

Public Service Motivation (PSM) and OCB

Adlerian psychologists [13, p. 4; 14, p. 9; 15, p. 7] posit that individuals are more likely to cooperate with others when they have developed social interest. According to this school of thought, individuals are not always driven by their self-interest and will overcome self-centeredness for pursuit of social goals, develop empathy toward others, and, ultimately, will contribute to their community and society by developing social interest. Thus, the core concept of social interest involves concern for others [13, p. 6] as an inherent orientation of individuals who strive to be a part of society [13, 14, 15]. Adlerian psychologists' assertions imply that individuals with a high level of empathy are more likely to understand and identify others' difficulties, and to cooperate with others to be good members of their team. Accordingly, from this perspective, individuals' helping behavior can be influenced by this individual orientation.

Previous studies have found an association between individuals' prosocial orientation and cooperative behaviors. Penner [16, p. 14] examined the relationship between two prosocial personality factors (other-oriented empathy and helpfulness) and volunteerism and found that these prosocial personality factors have significant associations with engagement in volunteer activities. Finkelstein and Penner [17, p. 3] found that prosocial motives (organization concern, personal values and impression management) have significant influences on county government employees' citizenship behaviors. Rioux and Penner [18, p. 4] also found that prosocial value has a significant influence on several OCB components (altruism and civic virtue) in a sample of Florida city employees.

Public service motivation has been defined as "a predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations" [19, p. 5]. Thus, PSM has been developed into an overarching construct that explains public sector workers' distinct motivation and orientation. Although PSM is also influenced by public employees' organizational experiences [20, p. 18; 21, p. 9], it is frequently described more as an individual orientation influenced by factors such as parental socialization, religious orientation, professional identification and political ideologies [22, p. 7]. Moreover, PSM is expected to be closely related to prosocial orientation since altruism is one of the core components of PSM, leading PSM scholars to speculate that public employees with a high level of PSM will

have more compassion and demonstrate more initiative in engaging in prosocial behaviors.

Indeed, Houston [23, p. 8] found that government employees are more likely to engage in volunteering activities such as giving time, donating blood and making financial donations to charitable organizations than are private sector employees. Crewson [24, p. 11] also found that public employees with a high level of PSM are more likely to have a higher level of organizational commitment and to possess higher intrinsic motivation to help others. Several studies examined the association between PSM and OCB more directly. For example, Kim [4, p. 13] and Pandey et al. [25, p. 11] examined the impact of PSM on OCB and found that PSM is an important antecedent of OCB. Similarly, Rayner et al. [26, p. 12] found that public service ethos has a significant association with OCB toward individuals (OCBI).

Organizational Identification (OI) and OCB

Social identity theory posits that members of a society tend to construct part of their self-concept by identifying with certain social groups in their society [27, p. 14]. Organizational identity can be understood as one type of social identity that individuals can develop to define themselves in an organization. Individuals who develop a strong "perception of oneness with or belongingness to" their focal organization [28, p. 9] are more likely to depend on their organizational identity to define themselves. For example, a local government employee who has developed a strong identification with his or her organization is more likely to build a positive self-concept as a government worker. Thus, organizational behaviors result partially from individuals' efforts to maintain their membership in an organization, and organizational identity that emerges from their behaviors can be an important source of self-concept.

Although the concept of organizational identification was developed from social identity theory, organizational identification has some definitional similarity with the concept of organizational commitment as developed by Allen and Meyer and colleagues [29, p. 15; 30, p. 11; 31, p. 10], whose studies have identified three forms of organizational commitment – affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment – based on previous sociological studies. In particular, affective organizational commitment is similar to organizational identification in that affective organizational commitment has been defined as an "employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in, the organization" [32, p. 11].

Ashforth and Mael [28, p. 7] pointed out, however, that organizational identification does not necessarily presume strong affective attachment

to the organization since organizational identification is more of a cognitive process that enhances individuals' self-esteem, rather than an affective attachment to an organization. These conceptual differences are also reflected in Ashforth and Mael's organizational identification measure, which they intentionally designed to not overlap with organizational commitment and so does not contain statements that measure affective status. However, the distinction between organizational identification and affective commitment is still under debate. For example, Riketta [33, p. 10] conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis and concluded that organizational identification is highly correlated ($r = 0.79$) but distinct from affective organizational commitment, but the conclusion is questionable in that the corrected correlation between the variables included the value of 1.0 in the 95 % confidence interval. In addition, many scholars use organizational commitment and organizational identification interchangeably [34, p. 8; 35, p. 2]. The current study uses organizational identification rather than organizational commitment since this study is interested in public employees' self-concept rather than their affective attachment to their focal organizations to explain public employees' OCB.

Based on the underlying assumptions of social identity theory, this study examines whether organizational identification will lead public employees to engage in citizenship behaviors. Social identity theory implies that employees who identify with their organizations are more likely to engage in OCBs, since citizenship behaviors can enhance their self-worth in their organizations. Since individuals view their status as related to the status of the groups to which they belong, they engage in cooperative behaviors to enhance the status of their groups, which ultimately enhances their own self-esteem [36, p. 4]. Empirical studies have shown a positive relationship between organizational identification and OCB in the context of private sector organizations [37, p. 5; 38, p. 6; 39, p. 8]. Although few studies have examined this relationship in the context of government organizations, several studies have found a statistically significant association between organizational commitment and OCB [4, p. 5; 25, p. 8]. Based on findings from previous studies, it is expected that government employees who have a high level of collective identity will see their government agencies' success as their own personal success and engage in OCBs to enhance their agencies' productivity.

Subjective OCB Norms and OCB

Ehrhart and Naumann [12, p. 11] provided a theoretical foundation to explain the relationship between OCB norms and employees' OCB.

According to these researchers, group norms are more likely to form when such norms are critical for group survival and performance. They argued that, since OCB is critical for group performance, the formation of OCB norms can be critical for an organization's survival, and employees can be regulated by OCB norms in their organization. For example, since information about others' work behaviors (e.g., who will help fellow-employees when they are in trouble and how employees fill the gaps that bureaucratic procedures cannot provide in their formal procedures) is important information for enhancing their groups' performance, employees might seek information about the general OCB norms in their organizations, interpret whether there are strong informal rules about engaging in OCB or not, and use this information as their behavioral guideline regarding the importance of cooperating with other workers in their organizations.

Ehrhart and Nauman [12, p. 11] differentiated different types of OCB norms and suggested four different types of norms: 1) descriptive OCB norms, 2) group-prescribed OCB norms, 3) subjective OCB norms and 4) personal OCB norms. Descriptive OCB norms are formed by observing other group members' OCB in one's work context. According to Ehrhart and Nauman, descriptive OCB norms will be formed when more group members consistently engage in OCB.

Group members learn their group's OCB values by observing their group members' citizenship behaviors; when they find that other group members also expect those behaviors from them, they recognize that these behaviors reflect a behavioral guideline. From this perspective, engaging in OCB in their groups is learned behavior. Group-prescribed OCB norms are stronger OCB guidelines since they develop through normative pressures, as well as actual rewards and sanctions for engaging or not engaging in OCB. According to Ehrhart and Nauman, group members engage in OCB in this context to be a part of their group, and sometimes to avoid sanctions from other group members. Subjective OCB norms are individuals' perceptions of whether persons who are important to them engage in OCB. Finally, personal OCB norms are different from other OCB norms in that they are not related to external norms but are more like internal convictions and behavioral guidelines.

Ehrhart and Naumann's [12, p. 16] OCB norm theory is based on a multi-level perspective, in that descriptive OCB norms and group-prescribed OCB norms are group-level variables, while subjective OCB norms and personal OCB norms are individual-level variables. According to Ehrhart and Nauman, group-level OCB norms will influence individuals' subjective and personal

OCB norms and individuals' OCB norms will also strengthen or weaken group-level OCB norms as individuals engage in OCB in their groups. Thus, OCB norms serve as important behavioral guidelines as external regulators, and employees tend to seek the information especially when they do not have clear idea about how to behave in their organizations. Although all four components of OCB norms have theoretical implications, this study will focus on subjective OCB norms since the study is conducted at the individual level. Although personal OCB norms might conceivably have important implications, it might also overlap with individual prosocial orientation (PSM), and so is excluded from this study.

Job Satisfaction (JS), Organizational Justice (OJ), Task Interdependence (TI) and OCB

The current study also examines traditional OCB antecedents based on a social exchange theory perspective. Early OCB studies focused on the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB based on the assumption that satisfied employees would be more grateful toward their employers and thus show more OCB (Smith et al., 1983), and previous OCB studies conducted in the public-sector organizations have also examined the potential impact of job satisfaction on OCB [4, p. 15; 40, p. 9]. Although meta-analyses conducted by Organ and Ryan [41, p. 6] and Fassina et al. [42, p. 9] showed a positive relationship between job satisfaction and OCB, and other studies [43, p. 12] also confirmed job satisfaction as an independent predictor of OCB, the results of studies conducted in the public sector have not been so consistent. For example, while a positive association between job satisfaction and OCB was found in the studies conducted by Tang and Ibrahim [44, p. 6], the associations reported in studies conducted by Alotaibi [45, p. 7] and Kim [4, p. 9] were nonsignificant.

This study points out that the inconsistent relationship between job satisfaction and OCB might have occurred because previous studies did not consider different aspects of job satisfaction. Based on this notion, the current study attempts to review the relationship by considering two aspects of job satisfaction: 1) intrinsic job satisfaction and 2) extrinsic job satisfaction. Intrinsic job satisfaction refers to the extent to which employees feel positively about their job tasks themselves (e.g., satisfaction with feelings of accomplishment from the job) while extrinsic job satisfaction refers to the extent to which employees feel positively about the work environment (e.g., satisfaction with pay and supervision) [46]. While several studies have defined job satisfaction as a latent variable with two indicators – intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction

[47, p. 12] – other studies have defined job satisfaction as comprising two components and found discriminant validity between the components [48, p. 15; 49, p. 7]. By examining two facets of job satisfaction, this study will examine whether different types of satisfaction will have different relationships with OCB.

Researchers also have recognized organizational justice variables as important predictors of OCB [50, p. 8; 51, p. 5]. Since employees tend to judge the possibility of receiving reciprocity and the other parties' engagement in cooperative behaviors based on their perception of how fairly they are treated [52], organizational justice provides an important barometer for employees to decide to subordinate their short-term benefits and engage in OCB for the betterment of their coworkers or their employing organization in the long run [51, p. 10]. The current study examines two components of organizational justice-distributive justice and procedural justice. While distributive justice (DJ) focuses on an employee's perception of whether there exists an equal balance across employees with respect to the ratio of each person's contribution to the organization to the compensation each person receives from the organization [53, p. 14], procedural justice (PJ) refers to the perceived fairness of organizational processes [50, p. 12]. Several public-sector OCB studies also have recognized organizational justice variables as important antecedents of OCB [54, p. 6].

Given that OCB potentially involves employees helping each other, task interdependence is also examined in this study, since job tasks that are interdependent provide organizational members with a job setting where they are more likely to experience opportunities to engage in OCB. Grant [55, p. 6] suggested that task interdependence, which he referred to as relational job architecture, can provide employees opportunities to connect to other employees or to their clients and thus promote employees' prosocial motivation. As employees' jobs have a greater impact on other organizational members or clients, employees tend to develop a higher level of responsibility and find the importance of their jobs in relationship to other members' outcomes, which can increase employees' prosocial motivation [56, p. 9]. Employees may also develop prosocial motivation when they have more opportunity to interact with other organizational members, and thus develop an extended definition of their role as they come to understand what is expected from others and are concerned about others' work outcomes [57, p. 9]. Based on this notion, the current study includes intrinsic job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, procedural justice,

distributive justice and task interdependence as control variables in examining the associations between the self- concept related variables (PSM, organizational identification and subjective OCB norms) and OCB.

Goal Clarity (GC) and OCB

The first antecedent is goal clarity (GC), which scholars have demonstrated has an important relationship to performance in the public sector. Public organizations are supposed to be more likely to suffer from vague or ambiguous goals compared with the private sector [19, p. 2]. Role ambiguity can decrease performance by causing emotional and cognitive, but goal clarity works to reduce role ambiguity [58, p. 5]. The power of clear goals for performance lies in the way that “goals combine cognitive and motivational elements” [59, p. 8] to endow them with an “energizing function”. Goal clarity allows employees to regulate performance by more accurately assessing what resources employees have to achieve their goals and what types of performance-pursuing behavior they can engage in without detracting from ordinary task behaviour [60, p. 4; 61, p. 7]. Recently, public administration scholarship has shifted attention to associations that goal clarity might have with OCB. Specifically, goal clarity has been found to be positively associated with OCB. According to, the ability of employees to perform well and put in high levels of effort is dependent on managers being able to give clear instructions to employees so that “subordinates know how their tasks relate to the purpose of the organization”. Kahn et al. [62, p. 24] suggested that having a clear idea of what is expected from one’s work is a function of an ongoing feedback process between the employee and the organization, so, by developing clear goals, employees are actually developing a deeper integration with the goal orientations and values of the organization. However, one consequence of having clear goals is that employees may develop their efforts toward OCB but that these efforts may be crowded out over time because goals tend to be focused on formal, rather than informal, tasks. However, although this effect may diminish OCBs, there are other processes that could counteract it. For example, in the public sector, it has been found that having clear goals allows employees to internalize the goals and then act in a more autonomous way to improve performance including OCB, or even to create greater goal alignment and willingness to cooperate with colleagues. Ultimately, if employees do not have clear goals, they might disregard information that is necessary for them to perform well, and, further, clarity is needed for knowing when it is realistic to engage in OCBs.

Behavioural Intention (BI) and OCB

Behavioural intention refers to the willingness to attempt engagement with a behavior. Following the theory of reasoned action (TRA) and the theory of planned behavior (TPB), intention is assumed to capture the motivational factors that influence a given behaviour [63, p. 9]. Specifically, people are considered likely to adopt public policies, such as pro-environmental behavior because they have the corresponding intention. Hines et al. [64, p. 11] developed an environmental behavior model which regards the intention to act as a major determinant of pro-environmental behavior, which is later reflected in Bamberg [65, p. 7]. Based on Ajzen’s [63, p. 6] TPB model, attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control are positively associated with behavioural intention, which in turn influences behaviour. Applying this idea to the current research, it is worthy to investigate how BI of public servants will influence their OCB in public service context.

Perceived Policy Effectiveness (PPE)

Public policy effectiveness is mainly assessed with the extent of its success and/or failure. Public policies are too diverse and a complete dataset does not exist. In addition, it is hard to define what is a policy failure. Some public policies have the opposite effect of what was intended or so obviously cause harm that they can unambiguously be labeled as a failure. But in many cases, it is not so clear whether the policy has rightly failed. Many policies have different dimensions, so that some dimensions can meet their targets while others can miss. Furthermore, policy evaluation is hard to do properly so it may be unclear how well a policy has fared. Also, what is a failure to one person might be a success to another, as different people have different policy preferences and policies often lead to winners and losers. One definition due to McConnell [66, p. 10] states that “a policy fails, even if it is successful in some minimal respects, if it does not fundamentally achieve the goals that proponents set out to achieve, and opposition is great and/or support is virtually non-existent”.

Public policy fails for many reasons. Even a relatively simple objective, such as a vaccination campaign, requires myriad pieces of information and expertise, and involves the mobilization, cooperation and coordination of a great number of people and organizations that must act in certain ways at precise times. Many policies fail because the tasks are hard to do. Add to that the propensity for corruption, incompetence and political motivations, to which many public policies are prone, and it seems quite natural that things often do not turn out as expected. But although these evident frailties of the policymaking process are serious

predicaments, they are problems that can in principal be dealt with. More effort, more information, better governance, smarter experts, more transparency and good will, all can do much to mitigate those problems and improve the delivery of public policy. Whole disciplines of economics, project management, and public administration provide theories, ideas and techniques for how to achieve better public policy results. Much improvement can certainly be achieved through such means. Better checks and balances on political organizations and improved accountability, for example, can surely do wonders to make public policy better serve the public interest.

The focus here, however, is on a different source of public policy failure. One that cannot be rectified by simply using better practices and more knowledgeable experts. The interest here is to understand the implication of the fact that public policies are embedded in complex systems. A complex system is one in which diverse agents linked in networks interact selectively following simple rules (that is, not necessarily optimizing) without centralized control, and from which emerges (often unpredictable) patterns, structures, uses and functionalities (that may be desirable or not), and do so continually, never settling on definitive equilibria, but always learning, adapting and evolving. In this section it is explicitly described how public policies fit this description of complex systems. More importantly, it is stressed why it is that these characteristics of the interactions that make up public policies imply that they are hard to control and are continually subject to failure. To set this up, consider the requirements of the standard approach to policy-making based on decision theory. A policymaker is tasked with solving a given problem. She collects information and enlists experts to determine a set of policy options. Each option is considered to determine the payoff it will entail in each future state of the world, taking in to account the probability of each possible contingency and possibly factoring in the strategic reaction of all relevant parties. From this analysis the option with the best net benefit is selected and implemented. Results are evaluated and the policy is fine-tuned if necessary. In many instances this approach works reasonably well. Yet, given the extent of policy failure, as documented in the previous section, in many other cases the approach fails.

Hence, the fundamental reason for this failure lies in the complex system nature of public policies. This section is setup in five subsections that each describe a 'pathology' of complex public policies that undermines the standard approach. Together these pathologies explain why it is that even when done with the best of intentions by the

best experts, that is with no corruption or incompetence, public policies nevertheless tend to fail.

The current study's approach in this section is not to try to be comprehensive or to pin down exactly what is or is not a public policy failure. The objective is simply to make the case that public policy often fails spectacularly by providing two examples of policies that have led to big conspicuous failures. Both examples are policies, which were well-thought through and debated and which have many defenders, including academics, experts, politicians, and often public opinion. That is, they are not one-time slip-ups that were quickly perceived and abandoned or rectified with little harm or damage. Their inclusion here does not mean that all instances of these policies have failed, but rather that there have been many cases of failures and a general disappointment with the idea.

Public policy in Azerbaijan and the case of ASAN Service

The Development Concept "Azerbaijan – 2020: Outlook for the future"¹ has several policy directions, where the advancement of ICT technologies and enhancement of information society have been given a particular attention. Henceforth, the policy entails that the wide usage of ICT within the state and local government agencies, meeting the demand of the society for information products, creation of reliable e-government services system is at the centre of the agenda.

It is not by chance that the establishment of ASAN Service, which translates to "Easy" in Azerbaijani, is considered one-stop-shop for the delivery of public services to the people. Hence, the country's commitment to increasing access to public services in the OGP National Action Plan considerably helped for maintaining the ASAN's implementation. As early results, ASAN Service brought a combination of features ensuring higher transparency and effectiveness in public services. Since then, the citizens are able to access diverse service in a single visit, are aware of the cost of each service, while the government is more interactive with them. In addition, ASAN Service aimed to maintain highest ethical and professional standards, as highly skilled and motivated public servants deliver the services seven days a week. Regarding the transactions, Vusal Huseynov – Secretary of the Anti-Corruption Commission stated that "There are no hand-in-hand cash payments. All transactions in ASAN centers are either made online, through the post office or through pay-point kiosks. The procedures and transactions are continuously monitored thereby ensuring a more transparent environment".

¹ https://president.az/files/future_en.pdf.

Parallel to the achievements, several challenges were also identified. Such that, the government must pay more attention to the development of rigorous indicators for evaluating the progress of the services. Another challenge is the low penetration of ASAN at the local scale, as well as the collaboration with local government agencies. Henceforth, the government must promote the active participation and ownership of its vision by all levels of government and non-state actors.

As ASAN Service made great achievements in public service sector, its experience was started to be used in other countries as well. Such that, the Astana Civil Service Hub successfully promotes experience-sharing and “peer-to-peer” learning. The creation of Peer Learning (P2P)² Alliances is also a practical experience for reforms in order for ensuring exchange of experiences of decision-making on public policies and public services development.

Conclusions. The current study aimed to investigate the potential antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviour in the public service context, with particular emphasis on Azerbaijan. OCB has special salience in public organizations due to the relevance of generalized citizenship in government–citizen relationships and the goals of public administration reforms to achieve greater organizational responsiveness to citizens.

Previous studies found an association between individuals’ prosocial orientation and cooperative behaviors. prosocial motives (organization concern, personal values and impression management) have significant influences on county government employees’ citizenship behaviors. Although the concept of organizational identification was developed from social identity theory, organizational identification has some definitional similarity with the concept of organizational commitment, where three forms of organizational commitment were identified – affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment – based on previous sociological studies.

The current study uses organizational identification rather than organizational commitment since this study is interested in public employees’ self-concept rather than their affective attachment to their focal organizations to explain public employees’ OCB. Although all four components of OCB norms have theoretical implications, this study will focus on subjective OCB norms since the study is conducted at the individual level. Although personal OCB norms might conceivably

² <https://www.astanacivilservicehub.org/articles/view/astaninskiy-hab-prezentoval-tematicheskoe-issledovanie-smart-government-case-of-azerbajjan-v-baku>.

have important implications, it might also overlap with individual prosocial orientation (PSM), and so is excluded from this study.

The current study also examines traditional OCB antecedents based on a social exchange theory perspective. Early OCB studies focused on the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB based on the assumption that satisfied employees would be more grateful toward their employers and thus show more OCB (Smith et al., 1983), and previous OCB studies conducted in the public-sector organizations have also examined the potential impact of job satisfaction on OCB. Another antecedent is goal clarity (GC), which scholars have demonstrated has an important relationship to performance in the public sector. Public organizations are supposed to be more likely to suffer from vague or ambiguous goals compared with the private sector. Role ambiguity can decrease performance by causing emotional and cognitive, but goal clarity works to reduce role ambiguity. Based on Ajzen’s [63, p. 8] TPB model, attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control are positively associated with behavioral intention, which in turn influences behaviour. Applying this idea to the current research, it is worthy to investigate how BI of public servants will influence their OCB in public service context. The current study’s approach in this section is not to try to be comprehensive or to pin down exactly what is or is not a public policy failure. The objective is simply to make the case that public policy often fails spectacularly by providing two examples of policies that have led to big conspicuous failures.

One recommendation for the prospective research is to dig into the determinants that would positively influence OCB in public service context, build their conceptual model and conduct either a qualitative or quantitative methodology in order to validate the findings in a country context, which could further be applied to other countries and specific areas of public service.

REFERENCES:

1. Organ D.W. Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington, MA : Lexington Books, 1988. 132 p.
2. Williams L.J., Anderson S.E. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*. 1991. No. 17. P. 601–617.
3. Caillier J.G. Does public service motivation mediate the relationship between goal clarity and both organizational commitment and extra-role behaviours? *Public Management Review*. 2016. No. 18. P. 300–318.
4. Kim S. “Public Service Motivation and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Korea”. *International Journal of Manpower*. 2006. No. 27 (8). P. 722–740.

5. Cohen A., Vigoda E. Do good citizens make good organizational citizens? An empirical examination of the relationship between general citizenship and organizational citizenship behavior in Israel. *Administration & Society*. 2000. No. 32. P. 596–624.
6. Citizenship and management in public administration: Integrating behavioral theories and managerial thinking / Eds. E. Vigoda-Gadot, A. Cohen. Cheltenham, UK : Edward Elgar, 2004. 317 p.
7. Vigoda-Gadot E., Beeri I. Change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior in public administration: The power of leadership and the cost of organizational politics. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 2004. No. 22. P. 573–596.
8. Bottomley P.A., Mostafa A.M.S., Gould-Williams J.S., Cázares F.L. The impact of transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behaviours: The contingent role of public service motivation. *British Journal of Management*. 2016. No. 27. P. 390–405.
9. Gould-Williams J.S., Mostafa A.M.S., Bottomley P. “Public Service Motivation and Employee Outcomes in the Egyptian Public Sector: Testing the Mediating Effect of Person-Organization Fit”. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 2013. DOI: 10.1093/jopart/mut053.
10. Baarspul H.C., Wilderom C.P. Do employees behave differently in public-vs private-sector organizations? A state-of-the-art review. *Public Management Review*. 2011. No. 13. P. 967–1002.
11. Dutton J.E., Dukerich J.M., Harquail C.V. “Organizational Images and Member Identification”. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 1994. No. 39 (2). P. 239–263.
12. Ehrhart M.G., Naumann S.E. “Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Work Groups: A Group Norms Approach”. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2004. No. 89 (6). P. 960–974.
13. Leak G.K., Leak K.C. “Adlerian Social Interest and Positive Psychology: A Conceptual and Empirical Integration”. *Journal of Individual Psychology*. 2006. No. 62 (3). P. 207–223.
14. Bass M.L., Curlette W.L., Kern R.M., McWilliams Jr, A.E. “Social Interest: A Meta-analysis of a Multidimensional Construct”. *Journal of Individual Psychology*. 2002. No. 58 (1). P. 4–34.
15. Curlett W.L., Kern R.M. „Measuring Gemeinschaftsgefühl”. *Journal of Individual Psychology*. 2002. No. 58 (1). P. 1–3.
16. Penner L.A. “Dispositional and Organizational Influences on Sustained Volunteerism: An Interactionist Perspective”. *Journal of Social Issues*. 2002. No. 58 (3). P. 447–467.
17. Finkelstein M.A., Penner L.A. “Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Integrating the Functional and Role Identity Approaches”. *Social Behavior and Personality*. 2004. No. 32 (4). P. 383–398.
18. Rioux S.M., Penner L.A. “The Causes of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Motivational Analysis”. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2001. No. 86 (6). P. 1306–1314.
19. Perry J.L. “Bringing Society In: Toward a Theory of Public Service Motivation”. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 2000. No. 10 (2). P. 471–488.
20. Chen C.-A., Hsieh C.-W., Chen D.-Y. “Fostering Public Service Motivation through Workplace Trust: Evidence from Public Managers in Taiwan”. *Public Administration*. 2013. DOI: 10.1111/padm.12042.
21. Davis R.S., Stazyk E.C. “Making Ends Meet: How Reiventing Reforms Complement Public Service Motivation”. *Public Administration*. 2013. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9299.2012.02112.
22. Perry J.L. “Antecedents of Public Service Motivation”. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 1997. No. 7 (2). P 181–197.
23. Houston D.J. “Walking the Walk” of Public Service Motivation: Public Employees and Charitable Gifts of Time, Blood, and Money”. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 2006. No. 16 (1). P. 67–86.
24. Crewson P.E. “Public Service Motivation: Building Empirical Evidence of Incidence and Effect”. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 1997. No. 7 (4). P. 499–518.
25. Pandey S.K., Wright B.E., Moynihan D.P. “Public Service Motivation and Interpersonal Citizenship Behavior in Public Organizations: Testing a Preliminary Model”. *International Public Management Journal*. 2008. No. 11 (1). P. 89–108.
26. Rayner J., Lawton A., Williams H. “Organizational Citizenship Behavior and the Public Service Ethos: Whither the Organization?” *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2012. No.106 (2). P. 117–130.
27. Tajfel H. “Social Identity and Intergroup Behaviour”. *Social Science Information*. 1974. No. 13 (2). P. 65–93.
28. Ashforth B.E., Mael F. “Social Identity Theory and the Organization”. *Academy of Management Review*. 1989. No. 14 (1). P. 20–39.
29. Allen N.J., Meyer J.P. “The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization”. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*. 1990. No. 63 (1). P. 1–18.
30. Allen N.J., Meyer J.P. “Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: An Examination of Construct Validity”. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 1996. No. 49 (3). P. 252–276.
31. Meyer J.P., Allen N.J., Smith C.A. “Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three-component Conceptualization”. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1993. No. 78 (4). P. 538–551.
32. Mowday R.T., Steers R.M., Porter L.W. “The Measurement of Organizational Commitment”. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 1979. No. 14 (2). P. 224–247.
33. Riketta M. “Organizational Identification: A Meta-analysis”. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 2005. No. 66 (2). P. 358–384.
34. Cremer D.D., Knippenberg D.V. „How Do Leaders Promote Cooperation? The Effect of Charisma and Procedural Fairness”. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2002. No. 87 (5). P. 858–866.
35. Bergami M., Bagozzi R.P. “Self-categorization, Affective commitment, and Group Self-esteem as Distinct Aspects of Social Identity in the Organization”. *British Journal of Social Psychology*. 2000. No. 39 (4). P. 555–577.
36. Tyler T.R., Blader S.L. “The Group Engagement Model: Procedural Justice, Social Identity, and

Cooperative Behavior". *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 2003. No. 7 (4). P. 349–361.

37. Jiao C., Hackett R.D. "The Effect of LMX on Employee Conceptualization and Display of OCB". Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings, Philadelphia, 2007. 9 p.

38. Dick R.V., Grojean M.W., Christ O., Wieseke J. "Identity and the Extra Mile: Relationships between Organizational Identification and Organizational Citizenship Behavior". *British Journal of Management*. 2006. No. 17 (4). P. 283–301.

39. Carmeli A. "Perceived External Prestige, Affective Commitment, and Citizenship Behaviors". *Organization Studies*. 2005. No. 26 (3). P. 443–464.

40. Noblet A., McWilliams J., Teo S.T.T., Rodwell J. "Work Characteristics and Employee Outcomes in Local Government". *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 2006. No. 17 (10). P. 1804–1818.

41. Organ D.W., Ryan K. "A Meta-analytic Review of Attitudinal and Dispositional Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior". *Personnel Psychology*. 1995. No. 48 (4). P. 775–802.

42. Fassina N.E., Jones D.A., Uggerslev K.L. "Relationship Clean-up Time: Using Meta-analysis and Path Analysis to Clarify Relationships among Job Satisfaction, Perceived Fairness, and Citizenship Behaviors". *Journal of Management*. 2008. No. 34 (2). P. 161–188.

43. LePine J.A., Erez A., Johnson D.E. "The Nature and Dimensionality of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Critical Review and Meta-analysis". *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2002. No. 87 (1). P. 52–65.

44. Tang T.L., Ibrahim A.H. "Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior Revisited: Public Personnel in the United States and the Middle East". *Public Personnel Management*. 1998. No. 27 (4). P. 529–529.

45. Alotaibi A.G. "Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Study of Public Personnel in Kuwait". *Public Personnel Management*. 2001. No. 30 (3). P. 363–376.

46. Spector P.E. *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997. 104 p.

47. Vandenberg R.J., Scarpello V. "The Matching Model: An Examination of the Processes Underlying Realistic Job Previews". *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1990. No. 75 (1). P. 60–67.

48. Hirschfeld R.R. "Does Revising the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Subscales of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form Make a Difference?" *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 2000. No. 60 (2). P. 255–270.

49. Brown S.P. "A Meta-analysis and Review of Organizational Research on Job Involvement". *Psychological Bulletin*. 1996. No. 120 (2). P. 235–255.

50. Tyler T.R., DeGoeij P., Smith H. "Understanding Why the Justice of Group Procedures Matters: A Test of the Psychological Dynamics of the Group-value Model". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1996. No. 70 (5). P. 913–930.

51. Organ D.W., Moorman R.H. "Fairness and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: What are the Connections?" *Social Justice Research*. 1993. No. 6 (1). P. 5–18.

52. Coyle-Shapiro J. "A Psychological Contract Perspective on Organizational Citizenship Behavior". *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 2002. No. 23 (8). P. 927–946.

53. Levinthal G.S. "What Should be Done with Equity Theory? New Approaches to the Study of Fairness in Social Relationships". *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* / ed. L. Berkowitz and W. Walster. Vol. 9. New York: Academic Press, 1980. P. 91–131.

54. Andrews M.C., Kacmar K.M., Harris K.J. "Got Political Skill? The Impact of Justice on the Importance of Political Skill for Job Performance". *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2009. No. 94 (6). P. 1427–1437.

55. Grant A.M. "Relational Job Design and the Motivation to Make a Prosocial Difference". *Academy of Management Review*. 2007. No. 32 (2). P. 393–417.

56. Pearce J.L., Gregersen H.B. "Task Interdependence and Extrarole Behavior: A Test of the Mediating Effects of Felt Responsibility". *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1991. No. 76 (6). P. 838–844.

57. Anderson S.E., Williams L.J. "Interpersonal, Job, and Individual Factors Related to Helping Processes at Work". *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1996. No. 81 (3). P. 282–296.

58. Pandey S.K., Wright B.E. Connecting the dots in public management: Political environment, organizational goal ambiguity, and the public manager's role ambiguity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 2006. No. 16. P. 511–532.

59. Lindenberg S., Foss N.J. Managing joint production motivation: The role of goal framing and governance mechanisms. *Academy of Management Review*. 2011. No. 36. P. 500–525.

60. Koopman J., Lanaj K., Scott B.A. Integrating the bright and dark sides of OCB: A daily investigation of the benefits and costs of helping others. *Academy of Management Journal*. 2016. No. 59. P. 414–435.

61. Niza C., Tung B., Marteau T.M. Incentivizing blood donation: systematic review and meta-analysis to Test Titmuss' Hypotheses. *Health Psychol.* 2013. No. 32 (9). P. 941–949. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0032740>.

62. Kahn R., Wolfe D., Quinn R., Snoek J., Rosenthal R. *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York, NY: Wiley, 1964. 470 p.

63. Ajzen I. The theory of planned behavior. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.* 1991. No. 50. P. 179–211.

64. Hines J.M., Hungerford H.R., Tomera A.N. Analysis and synthesis of research on responsible environmental behavior: A meta-analysis. *J. Environ. Educ.* 1986/87. No. 18 (2). P. 1–8.

65. Bamberg S. How does environmental concern influence specific environmentally related behaviors? A new answer to an old question. *J. Environ. Psychol.* 2003. No. 23 (1). P. 21–32.

66. McConnell A. What is policy failure? A primer to help navigate the maze. *Publ. Policy Adm.* 2015. No. 30 (3–4). P. 221–242.