

The relationship between thinking style and Philosophical Thinking with Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Staff of Isfahan Province's Youth and Sport Offices

¹ Nahid Nasiri, ² Loghman Keshavarz

1. MS in Physical Education and Sport Sciences, University of Garmsar Payam Noor, Garmsar, Iran
2. Associate Professor, Faculty of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, University of Payam Noor, Iran

DOI Link: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v5-i8/1011>

Published Date: 06 August 2015

Abstract

The purpose of present study was to investigate relationship between thinking style and philosophical thinking with organizational citizenship behavior in staff of Isfahan province's youth and sport offices. The survey statistical sample was all staff of Isfahan province's youth and sport offices (N=395) from which 196 were selected based on Kedges and Morgan table by random classification method. To evaluate organizational citizenship behavior variable Padsakov and colleagues questionnaire (1990) including 25 questions in 5 groups was used, to evaluate thinking style variable Sternberg and Wegner questionnaire (1992) including 15 questions in three groups and to evaluate philosophical thinking Standard Philosophical Mind Questionnaire (PMQ) including 60 questions in three groups was used. Results of study showed that there is a meaningful relationship between two dimensions of executive style, judgment style and total scores of thinking style variable and organizational citizenship behavior variable. Though, this relation was not meaningful for legislative style group. There was also a significant relationship between all dimensions of philosophical mind and organizational citizenship behavior variable.

Keywords: Thinking Style, Philosophical Thinking, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Staff, Youth and Sport Offices, Esfahan Province.

Introduction:

Today For improvement of efficacy and productivity of staff in organizations, relations between different variables are evaluated and variables most effective on efficacy and productivity are recognized and finally, efficacy of whole organization will be improved by enhancement of these variables (Salimi and Andalib, 2015). Also using human resources

properly in an organization can have lots of advantages; on the other hand not using it accurately can damage the organization (Jaberi et al, 2013).

The concept of organizational citizenship behavior was introduced for the first time by Bateman & Organ in 1983. Primary research in the field of organizational citizenship behavior were mostly for identifying staff's responsibilities or behaviors which were often ignored (Bienstock and colleagues, 2003). These behaviors although were measured incompletely in conventional assessments or sometimes were ignored, were effective in organizational efficacy improvement. These behaviors and acts in work place can be defined as follow: "a series of voluntary behaviors which are not among one's formal responsibilities but are done and improve effectively the organizational roles and duties". For example, an athlete may not need additional training or helping his/her teammate, but he/she does anything to improve the function of the whole team. Padsakov and his colleagues classified this kind of behaviors which put organizational citizenship behaviors in seven categories: 1. helping behaviors, 2. Chivalry, 3. Personal creativity, 4. Civic virtue, 5. Organizational commitment, 6. Self-satisfaction and 7. Personal growth (Padsakov and colleagues, 2000). Moreover, Bolino & Turnley introduced loyalty, partnership, attention and respect, dedication and tolerability as indices of organizational citizenship behaviors (Bolino & Turnley, 2003).

It seems that one of the variables which can be effective on staff organizational citizenship behaviors is thinking style. Sternberg and Jung identified different methods that people use for processing information as thinking styles. He thought noting thinking styles is valuable in that thinking styles in society are considered the same as peoples' abilities and thus individual differences due to thinking styles are confused with different abilities (Sternberg and Jung, 2009). In other words, different thinking styles are important elements related to leadership, management and communication approaches (Melanie, 2006). Thinking styles are different methods by which people use their mind abilities. People minds use different thinking styles flexibly and this causes them relating daily activities with their responsibilities (MahdaviShakib, 1391). Two people with the same abilities may have different styles. Different styles are neither bad nor good; they are just different (Castells, 2004). Since thinking styles and preferential thinking in people are different, their functions and abilities are different according to preferred methods.

Other variable which seems to be influential on organizational citizenship behavior of staff is philosophical thinking. Scientific findings suggest that right thinking is the first principle of success and staff in an organization should look at all dimensions of problem scientifically to solve it like a researcher and use suitable information in organizational events and managing tasks (Bahari, 1385). Also, staff must be able to renew their past experiences in order to use them achieve organizational goals. Development of this thinking scheme for rational decision making, organizational stability, understanding relations between issue's causes, improving mood, collaboration and providence in planning help manager to prevent collapse of individual, staff and organization (Bahari, 1385).

According to Smith, philosophical thinking is identified based on the extent of universality, meditation and flexibility that one judge the problems he is called for solving them (Sokhanvar and Mahroozadeh, 1389).

Universality dimension: the one who has the ability to relate present to the future and look at phenomena by a systemic attitude and have generalization capabilities has universal thinking.

Meditation dimension: meditation means thinking and looking deeply to phenomena. The one who meditate look at tasks which are usual from other's point of view deeply.

Flexibility dimension: The one, who has flexibility, has not solid mind and is able to adapt new ways which are efficient in real world and is ready to collaborate for problem solving with belief in wisdom and convergence in achieving goals.

According to above, it should be mentioned that organizational citizenship behavior is a voluntary behavior that staff do honestly and satisfied with no expectation for reward and their thinking style and philosophical thinking can have a significant role in this regard. Thus, present study tries to assess the general question “is there a meaningful relationship between thinking style and philosophical thinking with organizational citizenship behavior?” in Esfahan youth and sport offices.

Materials and Methods:

The study was functional from objective point of view and descriptive from typing point of view in which data collection was done by survey. The survey statistical sample was all staff of Isfahan province's youth and sport offices (N=395) from which 196 were selected based on Kedges and Morgan table by random classification method. To evaluate organizational citizenship behavior variable Padsakov and colleagues questionnaire (1990) including 25 questions in 5 groups (conscience, toleration and patience, civic virtue, good faith and helping) was used, to evaluate thinking style variable Sternberg and Wegner questionnaire (1992) including 15 questions in three groups (legislative, executive and judgement) and to evaluate philosophical thinking Standard Philosophical Mind Questionnaire (PMQ) including 60 questions in three groups (universality, meditation, flexibility) was used. To assess questionnaire reliability, visual and content validity by sport management professors and to assess questionnaire validity, Cronbach's alpha coefficient (organizational citizenship behavior questionnaire, 0.85, thinking style, 0.84, philosophical thinking, 0.91) was used. Results found from questionnaires were analyzed using statistical methods in two levels, descriptive (frequency, percentage, average and standard deviation) and illative (ClomogrofSpernov tests, Pearson correlation coefficient, regression analysis, Lewin Test, correlated T and variance analysis).

Results:

Data distribution status for main variables under study based on Clemogrov Smirnoff test has been shown in table 1.

Table 1:

results of Colmogrov Smirnoff test about normal distribution of data assumption

Questionnaire	k-s-z		Significance level
Organizational citizenship behavior	0.6.7		0.855
Thinking style	1.141		0.067
Philosophical thinking	0.782		0.547

Based on results from table 1, regarding that reported z in Colmogrov Smirnoff test was not significant in any of variables, we can accept normal distribution assumption of society with 0.95 confidence and use parametric statistical test for analyzing data. Results of Pearson correlation coefficient test between thinking style and staff organizational citizenship behavior are shown in table 2.

Table 2:

Results of Pearson correlation coefficient test between thinking style and organizational citizenship behavior

Independent variable	Dependent variable	Frequency	R	Significance level
Legislator style	Organizational citizenship behavior	184	0.13	0.074
Executive style		184	0.24	0.023
Judgment style		184	0.18	0.036
Thinking style		184	0.21	0.031

Based on results from table 2 there is a significant relationship between executive and judgment styles and organizational citizenship behavior variable; although this relationship is not significant for legislative style. Also, observed r shows positive and significant correlation (not that much strong) between thinking style total score and organizational citizenship behavior.

Results of Pearson correlation coefficient test between philosophical thinking dimensions and staff organizational citizenship behavior are shown in table 3.

Table 3:

Results of Pearson correlation coefficient test between philosophical thinking dimensions and organizational citizenship behavior

Independent variable	Dependent variable	Frequency	R	Significance level
universality	Organizational citizenship behavior	184	0.58	0.001
meditation		184	0.48	0.001
flexibility		184	0.52	0.001
Philosophical thinking		184	0.66	0.001

Based on results from table 3 there is a significant relationship between philosophical thinking and organizational citizenship behavior.

Table 4 shows the results of correlation coefficient between thinking style and organizational citizenship behavior regarding philosophical thinking variable.

Table 4:

correlation between thinking style and organizational citizenship behavior regarding philosophical thinking variable

Independent variable	Control variable	Dependent variable	Frequency	R	Significance level
Thinking style	Philosophical mind	Organizational citizenship behavior	184	0.18	0.042

Results of table 4 shows positive and significant correlation between thinking style variable and organizational citizenship behavior, regarding philosophical mind, as the control variable.

Discussion and Conclusion:

Today For improvement of efficacy and productivity of staff in organizations, relations between different variables are evaluated and variables most effective on efficacy and productivity are recognized and finally, efficacy of whole organization will be improved by enhancement of these variables. Also organizations are facing with rapid and unpredictable changes and should keep pace with these changes in order to survive and maintain their positions (Salimi and Andalib, 2015). In this way, one of the variables which have been ignored in previous studies is organizational citizenship behavior.

Results show a significant relationship between judgment style dimension and organizational citizenship behavior variable; though this relationship is not significant for legislative style. This means that staff who have executive thinking style can better develop citizenship behavior in organization. Those who have judgment thinking style are willing to assess rules and plans. They prefer tasks in which ideas are analyzed. The one who has judgment thinking style prefers activities like critical papers, idea presentation, judgment about people and their works and plan assessment (Farhoosh and Ahmadi, 1392). Farhoosh and Ahmadi say in their study that staff who follow this style, probably get promotions to higher levels, thus it can be said consistent to present study. Also, Nazem (1388) says in his study results that staff in lower levels need executive thinking style, but in managerial upper levels legislative and judgment styles are preferred and this is consistent with present study, since it is clear that in organizational upper levels attention to organizational citizenship behavior elements including tolerance, conscience and good faith are considered more.

Furthermore, results between executive style and organizational citizenship behavior variable show significant relationship which is consistent with results from Cano-Garcia & Hughes (2000) studies. Those who have executive thinking style are willing to follow the rules and accept responsibility for tasks that are planned and organized in advance. This thinking style is preferred in educational environments and many other jobs, since doers will always do what they are told willingly and evaluate themselves based on organizational assessments, for example based on the extent to which they could fulfill others' orders. Generally, different styles may be provided differently regarding different aspect of a job. In fact any job that style requirements change, consistent with functional level improvement, propose debate about selecting staff in all levels (Nazem, 1388). Results of Salek and atash Poor study (1389) show that responsible people prefer executive thinking style, which is consistent with present study, since conscience can be regarded as main foundation of being responsible. Executive people prefer organizations that have clear policies.

Results of study show a significant and positive relationship between philosophical mind dimensions and total score of this variable with organizational citizenship behavior. This means that increasing philosophical mind in youth and sport offices improves organizational citizenship behavior. Based on results, universality dimension of philosophical mind has stronger relation with organizational citizenship behavior and flexibility and meditation dimensions are next.

Philosophical mind characteristics in universality dimension include looking at specific issues related to expanded background, relating future issues to long-term objectives and applying generalization power and patience in deep thinking. Staff who have meditation characteristics, have changed their thinking style and do not think of surroundings definitely and always have some doubt; they use comparative method for implicit tasks and these characteristics improve citizenship behavior and their function. Since characteristics in flexibility dimension include freedom from solid mind and evaluating thoughts regardless of

their source and attention to different aspects, authorities with philosophical thinking style will have extended view of problems and are sensitive to personal relations, they are far from solid mind and show patience in judgments which cause organizational citizenship behavior. These authorities have characteristics like self-confidence, diligent in solving problems, brave, with noble ideas, respect to other ideas and intimate relations with others. These characteristics (which are among elements consisting organizational citizenship behavior) have positive effect on their relations with staff and even clients. Staffs with high philosophical thinking have better performance. Philosophical thinking enhancement in staff allows them to have better view of problems regarding their responsibilities and can apply their managing principles properly. Based on results of a study by Demarchili and Rasoolnejad (1387) there is a significant and positive relationship between philosophical thinking and managers creativity. Results of this study show that philosophical thinking dimension is more related to creativity and meditation and flexibility are next, which is consistent with present study. Also Smith (1956) reached the conclusion that there is a direct relation between managers' philosophical minds with desired relations with others and managers' creativity and staff mood. And since desired relations with others, altruism and helping are among organizational citizenship behavior elements, it can be said that results of two studies are consistent.

References:

- Bahari, S (1385), Relationship between managers' philosophical mind and their performance, noble ideas in educational sciences, N.4, pp 45-53.
- Bolino M and Turnley W (2003), Going the extra mile: cultivating and managing employee citizenship behavior, *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 17, N. 3, pp. 60 – 71.
- Cano-Garcia, F& Hughes, E. H (2000), Learning and thinking styles: An analysis of their interrelationship and influence on academic achievement. *Educational Psychology*, 20, pp. 413-430.
- Castells, M (2004), *The power of identity: the information age: economy, society, and culture*, Tehran: Tarh-e-No Publication.
- Demarchili, F; RasoolNejad, A (1389), Relationship between philosophical mind and creativity in scientific board members of Azad universities in Zanjan province, *High education journal*, N.12, pp 125-144.
- Farhoosh, M; Ahmadi, M (1392), Relationship between thinking styles and learning approaches with improvement initiatives, *Revolutionary psychology: Iranians psychologists*, N.35, pp 297-306.
- Jaberi, A; Salimi, M; khazai pool, J (2013), The Study of the Effect of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations on Knowledge Sharing in Sport Organizations (Case Study: Isfahan Physical Education Organization Employees), *Journal of Sport Management* 5 (16), 55-75.
- Mahdavi Shakib, A; Ahanchian, M; Mahram, B (1391), Relationship between educational managers' thinking style with their revolutionary leading style base on Beth and Olio model, *Leading and educational management Journal*, N.4, pp 137-155.
- Melanie S, Jones, Ed.D (2006), Thinking style differences of female college and university presidents: a national study, Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Marshall University, Graduate College in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership.
- Nazem, F (1388), managers' thinking styles and its elements in Azad Universities, noble ideas in educational sciences; 4(2), pp 11-27.

- Salimi. M; Andalib. B (2015), Relationship between Information Technology and Organizational Entrepreneurship and Organizational Agility in Esfahan Province General Directorate of Youth and Sport, British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade, 8(1), 48-54.
- Salimi. M; Soltanhoseini, M; Ghasemi, H; Torkian Valashani, S (2012), The Ranking of the Obstacles Improving Professional Ethics in Sport Media Quarterly Journal of Communication Research, 18 (4), 9-29.
- Sokhanvar,N; Mahroozadeh, T (1389), Philosophical mind and looking to active teaching methods among mathematics teachers (elementary school), noble educational ideas journal, N.23, p 67.