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Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of the present paper is to demonstrate that intercultural sensitivity and organizational citizenship behaviours are constructs of the social exchange theory and; intercultural sensitivity can explain the engagement in organizational citizenship behaviours by Uganda hotel staff. Design/Methodology/Approach: Contrary to current studies on organizational citizenship behaviours, this study adopted a mixed research design and its attendant characteristics so as to examine the extent to which intercultural sensitivity predicts organizational citizenship behaviours of Uganda Hotel staff. Findings: Intercultural sensitivity is a significant predictor of organizational citizenship behaviours of the hotel staff in Uganda Research Limitations/Implications: Admittedly, the instruments that measured the key variables of the study i.e. organization citizenship behaviour, intercultural sensitivity and organizational citizenship behaviours, were adapted to suit the Uganda hotel environment. The study was entirely cross sectional yet behaviour unfolds gradually. Above all, we adopted a positivistic approach to research yet it is highly structured. Little attention was paid to qualitative responses because; we only needed explanations for the quantitative results. Originality/Value: The paper proudly domesticates intercultural sensitivity and organizational citizenship behaviours within the social exchange theoretical framework and directly tested for the predictive relationship between intercultural sensitivity and organizational citizenship behaviors. Keywords: Organizational Citizenship Behaviours, Intercultural sensitivity

Background

The cardinal purpose of any organization such as a hotel is the need to enable members to survive based on their conscious behaviours. This implies that constructive human behaviours such as Organizational Citizenship Behaviours, significantly contribute to individual and social functioning. As a concept, Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) was pioneered by Barnard (1938) when he coined that of willingness to cooperate. Against this background, (Katz, 1964; Katz and Kahn, 1966) later conceptualized three forms of employee behaviors necessary in fostering organizational efficiency and effectiveness to date. These are; the decision to join and stay in the organization, the undertaking of one’s prescribed roles in a responsible manner and the performance of innovative and spontaneous activities beyond the mandatory job description. Subsequently, it was that of innovative and spontaneous behaviors that was reconceptualized as Organizational Citizenship Behaviors by Organ, (1988). However, while most recent scholarship on innovative
Employee behaviours, points to the need for enhanced attention on OCB (Weiping et al., 2017; Han et al., 2016; Ekowati et al., 2013), current studies on OCB in the hospitality industry have concentrated on how it impacts on other variables (Yurcu & Akinci, 2017), whether these behaviours exist or not (Erkiliç, & Gullüce, 2017) instead on the factors that could explain their growth since they are degenerating within certain hotels in Uganda as indicated in the following story.

Contextually, as we continue to celebrate the pervasion of OCB in organizational lives across the globe, an in-depth interview with hotel supervisors in Uganda revealed that that these behaviors had degenerated. For instance, it was indicated that certain employees continue to stick to what each is assigned to do and as a result; do not want to help their colleagues who might have excess workload. They work for specified schedules and as soon as their shifts are over, they sign out. There is rampant dodging of work, unnecessary absenteeism, and outright refusal to help colleagues. It was reported that some do not mind about the errors that their colleagues make even when they come to be aware of these errors before they happen. This was demonstrated by certain employees who turn a blind eye about what their colleagues do. Some employees do not alert their colleagues about those mistakes that they have committed even when they know that their mistakes have a spiral effect on what their colleagues do. Some employees were reported to offer selective assistance in that they only offer assistance to those that subscribe to their cultural backgrounds yet this is at the expense of the hotels. In addition, the interview revealed that certain employees complain a lot regardless of the minute nature of the problems that they encounter in the hotels examined. They are not tolerant to problems and this is manifested through reported perpetual dissatisfaction, grumbling, dodging work and not providing assistance to colleagues, failure to take initiatives, pretend to be so busy by walking around the hotels and engaging in unnecessary conversations about their supervisors and friends who engage in voluntary behaviours. Above all, certain employees were reported to have no regard for the hotels and what actually they stand for. Therefore, these employees segregate customers on the basis of who is likely to give them some money in return for the services that they offer to them.

They do not provide sufficient information to customers even when they know what they need. Some go to the extent of not respecting customers and simply ignore their requests. The prime reason for the continuing degeneration of OCB was the evident lack of willingness and ability amongst hotel staff to freely interact with one another regardless of their differences in cultural backgrounds. This is what is termed as intercultural sensitivity. By way of explanation, it was reported that most hotel staff were only bothered by the needs and aspirations of those colleagues that they share with the same cultural backgrounds. So, they are willing and able to offer help to only those that they share the beliefs, norms and values. This has led to the abandonment of numerous customer needs and aspirations. As a result, they are not focused on the pursuit of the goals for which these hotels exist.

Theoretically, OCB is largely rooted in the Social Exchange Theory (SET) that is proudly associated with Homans (1961) and Blau (1964). This theory posits that organizations function through mutually desirable relationships in which the parties involved reciprocate a variety of benefits, including those that are socio-emotional in nature. As such, individuals engage in Organizational Citizenship Behaviours as a gesture of reciprocation so as to maintain harmonious workplace interactions but without necessarily expecting to be paid (Homans, 1961). Therefore, it could be argued within the framework of the SET that the engagement in OCB by staff of any organization, is a function of the fact that employees are freely relating with one another beyond their cultural backgrounds to the extent that no work remains unattended to simply because of the continuing discrimination amongst staff on the basis of cultural differences. This again is what is termed as intercultural sensitivity. Therefore, within the context of this theoretical framework the continuing challenge of OCB within the hotel industry in Uganda can largely be attributed to the rejection of some of the postulates of the social exchange theory.

However, to date, there is a dearth of empirical literature that attempts to explain organizational citizenship behaviours from the point of view of intercultural sensitivity most importantly in the hospitality industry. This is academic unfairness. To this extent, the objective of this study is threefold: Firstly; to demonstrate that intercultural sensitivity and organizational citizenship behaviours are constructs that comfortably originate from the Social exchange theory (Homan, 1961; Blau, 1964) and not elsewhere as could be proclaimed by earlier scholarship. Secondly, to argue that both intercultural sensitivity and organizational citizenship behaviours are related and thirdly, that Intercultural sensitivity is a significant predictor of the organizational citizenship behaviours of Uganda hotel staff.
Literature review and hypothesis development

**Intercultural Sensitivity and Organizational Citizenship Behaviours**

Existent literature does not competently present a clear relationship between intercultural sensitivity and organizational citizenship behaviours. This is because; it is awash with mere statements against which general extrapolations can be made to underscore the relationship under consideration. However, the following arguments communicate the extent of relationship between Intercultural Sensitivity and Organizational Citizenship Behaviours with their attendant weaknesses. In an effort to explore the role of interactions in fostering organizational citizenship behaviours, Ghasem et al., (2016) argue that during voluntary cooperation, individuals do their duties beyond their responsibilities and use their energy and insight for developing their abilities in favor of organizational performance. However, this relationship is merely a derivative as it is noted from a study by Ghasem et al., (2016), that was conducted about the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational performance. Besides, their study design was qualitative that only endeavored to perform a correlation analysis against which such serious inferences were made without regard to its outstanding weaknesses. Interestingly, this study examined the predictive relationship between intercultural sensitivity and organizational citizenship behaviours and it adopted a mixed methods research design in which both qualitative and quantitative results were obtained. The attendant conclusions are ideally justifiable.

Furthermore, in a study by Noor et al., (2014), it was observed that diversity receptiveness which means a condition, in which people interact with others of different background at the workplace, is closely associated with intercultural sensitivity. This is because, Behjat & Chowdhury (2012) have argued that diversity receptiveness enhances communication besides the fact that it creates and promotes cultural sensitivity. Therefore, given the fact that diversity is synonymous with intercultural sensitivity, Noor et al., (2014), have the opportunity to argue that diverse employees who perceive that they are well managed by the supervisors in turn would lead them to exercise greater citizenship behaviors. To this extent, it could be argued that intercultural sensitivity could be related to organizational citizenship behaviours. However, what is interesting to note is that diversity awareness is simply related to and not intercultural sensitivity and to conclude with certainty that intercultural sensitivity predicts organizational citizenship behaviours is to remain fallacious. Therefore, while it may make sense to believe that intercultural sensitivity is related to organizational citizenship behaviours, this conclusion is better made based on the current study findings that determined the direct relationship between intercultural sensitivity and organizational citizenship behaviours of Uganda hotel staff.

In a study by Kandlosi, & Abdollahi, (2010), supervisor–subordinate based job-related communication and co-workers information exchange were related to organizational citizenship behaviour. On the basis of such a statement, one may argue that understanding how to communicate to another whether as a supervisor or a worker, is a significant predictor of organizational citizenship behaviours. This extent could indirectly denote a relationship between intercultural sensitivity and organizational citizenship behaviours because; the ability to communicate to others so that they can engage in OCBs is seen as having a bearing on intercultural sensitivity. The only weakness with this assertion is that it is based on a mere inference that is based on a study that was conducted about the power of cultural norms on effective communication in a workplace (Kandlosi, & Abdollahi, 2010). The current study established the direct predictive relationship between Intercultural sensitivity and OCBs in particular.

According to Chin, et al., (2016), diversity inclusion leads to the protection of individual attributes and employee engagement in voluntary behaviours. This is because, to Anderson, (2014); Shore et al., (2010), inclusion activities such acts as building a fair climate that values diversities, giving equal opportunities to individuals, and meeting the individuals' needs such as self-esteem and belonging can enhance positive relationships among employees, high levels of job satisfaction, high performance, organisational citizenship behaviour, organisational commitment, and creativity among others. To this extent, intercultural sensitivity associated with diversity inclusion, is related to Organizational citizenship behaviours. Interestingly however, all these very beautiful revelations are based on inferences and not a direct study of the relationship between intercultural sensitivity and organizational citizenship behaviours. This study examined the direct
relationship between these two constructs that have probably been ignored by contemporary scholarship. These gaps in empirical literature, were the basis for the hypothesis that:

H0. There is a significant and positive relationship between Intercultural Sensitivity and Organizational Citizenship Behaviours

Methods

The study adopted a mixed methods design strategy (Creswell, 2003). Using this strategy, both quantitative and qualitative data were collected using two data collection methods: a questionnaire and an interview guide. The purpose was to overcome any weaknesses associated with any one method which could have affected the awaited convergence on what constituted reality by the two designs (Saunders et al.; 2007) and as such for triangulation purposes.

Sample and procedure

According to the Hospitality report Uganda - Jumia Travel (2015), there are over 1,173,000 employees in the hospitality industry. Based on the guidance by the Krejcie & Morgan (1970), since our population was greater than 1,000,000, the required sample size was 384. This was obtained from the 100 hotels of the 516 (www.jovago.com/uganda hotels) in Uganda using simple random sampling and the lottery method in which cases were selected after replacement. In order to select the sample elements, sampling frames which were lists of staff in each hotel selected, were obtained from the human resource departments of the 100 (one hundred) hotels in Uganda that were selected. Atleast five respondents were targeted due to the busy schedule of the staff there in. Of the five respondents, one was a supervisor and the remaining four were subordinates.

After selection of the five elements from each hotel that participated in the study, a self-report questionnaire was issued to each respondent in the 100 hotels that were located in sixteen districts in Uganda. This resulted into the distribution of 500 questionnaires in total. At the end, we were able to collect only 350 questionnaires that after aggregation using the name hotel, representative of seventy (70) hotels. After data cleaning, 47 questionnaires were eliminated because of incomplete answers, and a remainder of 303 questionnaires was used for analysis. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. First part was about demographic characteristics regarding the respondents’ duration in service, age group, sex, marital status and qualification. The second part was for the measurements of intercultural sensitivity and organizational citizenship behavior.

The sample included 57.0 % (173) males and 43.0% (130) females; more than half of the sample were older than 31 years representing 54.0% (163). The majority of the sample was composed of graduates 47.0% (143) and diploma holders 32.0% (97) with the remaining consisting of certificate holders 19.0% (57), postgraduate holders 02% (0.6) and professors (15.0%). The years of service of the participants ranged from 5 years 32% (96) to between 6-10 years; 42% (127) to more than 10 years 26% (80). In terms of designation, supervisors were 22.0% (65) and subordinates were 78.0% (238).

Measures

The study variables were operationalized based on earlier scholarly scales. The two variables that were examined are: Intercultural sensitivity and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. All the items were anchored on a five point likert scale which ranged from 1= strongly disagree to 5= Strongly Agree. This is because the distances of scores such as 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 are equal and yield data which are approximately normally distributed (Likert (1932). The description of the measurements for each variable is as follows:

Intercultural sensitivity

Extant literature provides varying scales of Intercultural sensitivity but this study adapted the Intercultural sensitivity scale by Chen & Starosta (2000). This is a five dimension scale and these are: (i) interaction engagement, (ii) respect for cultural differences, (iii) interaction confidence, (iv) interaction enjoyment, and (v) interaction attentiveness. This scale was adapted because; it has been tested in the field of human resource management (Zakaria, 2000). Some of the sample items that have been adapted are: i enjoy interacting with fellow employees that come from different cultures and I am open-minded to my fellow staff from different cultures. These now appear as follows: As an employee of this hotel, i
enjoy interacting with fellow employees that come from different cultures. As an employee of this hotel, I am open-minded to my fellow staff from different cultures.

**Organizational Citizenship Behaviors**

Like its related variables aforementioned, OCB has numerous scales but this study adapted that by Organ (1988) which has altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue. This is because, in face of all the various factor structures proposed by the diverse scholars examined, Podsakoff et al.,(2009) as cited in Chun-Fang and Tsung-Sheng (2012:181), maintain that Organ’s (1988) five dimension remain popular.

**Data management and analysis**

Data were entered and analyzed using SPSS. We checked and managed data entry errors and missing values. A missing completely at random (MCAR) test was performed to determine the percentage of missing values in the data set. MCAR test results indicate that data was missing completely at random. Imputation of missing values was performed using the linear interpolation method. We tried to manage common methods bias using procedural methods as advocated for by Podsakoff et al., (2012). The study equally tested for the reliability of all the measurement scales using Cronbach alpha coefficient and none of the constructs had a cutoff point of less than 0.70 (Nunnally,1978) as summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural sensitivity</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behaviours</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study equally determined the content validity of the measurement items. This was done by a team of experts. The experts were: three professors from the behavioural psychology and human resource management. The results indicate that none of the constructs had a content validity index of less than 0.70 as summarized in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Partial CVI</th>
<th>Overall CVI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural sensitivity</td>
<td>Interaction engagement</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respect for cultural differences</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interaction confidence</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interaction enjoyment</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interaction attentiveness</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behaviours</td>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civic virtue</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Experts’ opinion

Factor analysis was performed to identify the patterns in data and to compress data to a controllable level (Field, 2005; Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). Using principal component analysis, only those factors with an Eigen value greater than 1 were retained (Guttman-Kaiser rule). The Kaiser- Meyer- Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett’s (1954) test of sampling adequacy was computed to ensure that factor analysis yielded distinct and reliable factors (Kaiser, 1974). The following criteria were used to determine the sampling adequacy (Kaiser, 1974): 0.90=Marvelous; 0.80=Meritorious; 0.70=Middling; 0.60=Mediocre; 0.50=Miserable and below 0.50, unacceptable. The KMO for these study variables
ranged between 0.89 and 0.98 and as such, ranged between meritorious and marvelous. Equally, it is only items with communalities of 0.60 and above that were retained. Results from the exploratory factor analysis yielded varying factors: For instance, Intercultural sensitivity yielded five factors and these were: Interaction engagement, Respect for cultural differences, Interaction confidence, Interaction enjoyment and Interaction attentiveness. These accounted for 69.07% of the variance. Organizational citizenship behaviours retained five factors and these are: Altruism, Conscientiousness, Courtesy, Sportsmanship and Civic Virtue. These accounted for 72.31% of the variance.

In order to determine the construct validity of the study variables, the following analyses were carried out: chi-square, GFI, RMSEA, CFI, NFI, RFI, IFI, and AGFI. Relatedly, to determine the relationship between the variables of the study: Intercultural sensitivity and organizational citizenship behaviours, the Pearson correlation analysis was run, and to further determine the influence of the variables on each other, linear regression analysis was used. In addition, structural equation modeling was used to test the fit of the research model. Below are the confirmatory factor analysis results for the variables of the study.

The measurement models (CFA) of the study constructs

Since the constructs are not directly observed (James et al., 2006), there was need to specify a measurement model for each study variable. Furthermore, the measurement model is essential because it provides thorough testing for the reliability and validity of the scales employed to measure the latent constructs and their manifest variables (Loehlin, 1998). Note that for the measurement model to be reliable the Cronbach’s alpha (α> 0.7) and Composite Reliability (CR> 0.70) Convergent validity is measured by Average Variance Extracted (AVE) which should be (AVE>0.5). According to Hamdan et al., (2011), discriminant validity test shows how much variance in the indicators that are able to explain variance in the construct. Discriminant validity value obtained from the square root of AVE value. The square root of AVE should be greater than the values of correlation between the respective constructs (Fornell-Larcker, 1980). It is important to note that all the variables met this criterion. Below is a report of the confirmatory factor analysis results of each study variable.

The measurement model of Intercultural sensitivity

AMOS software was used to assess the relevance of the various indicator variables at explaining the latent variable called Intercultural sensitivity. The dimensions of Intercultural sensitivity are: Interaction engagement (ENG), Respect for cultural differences (RESP), Interaction confidence (CON) and Interaction attentiveness (ATT). The model results indicate that Interaction engagement (ENG), retained three items which had outer model loadings above 0.700, and these ranged from 0.70 to 0.80. Respect for cultural differences (RESP), retained three items that had acceptable loadings which were above 0.700 and these ranged from 0.73 to 0.78. Interaction confidence (CON) retained three items whose loadings were above 0.70 and these ranged from 0.75 to 0.80. Interaction attentiveness (ATT) retained three items and these equally had loadings above 0.70 and they ranged from 0.73 to 0.82. The detailed model is as follows:

![Fig.1: The measurement model of Intercultural sensitivity](image-url)
All of these indices met recommended guidelines and the model fit was considered acceptable (Byrne, 2010; Hair et al., 2010). Based on the model fit indices in Fig: 01, it is evident that all of these indices met recommended guidelines and the model fit was considered acceptable (Byrne, 2010; Hair et al., 2010). Based on the CFA results in the above figure, the four separate factors of the hypothesized model were moderately correlated and they all indicate desirable internal consistency attributes for all of the subscales. Evaluation of the confirmatory factor analysis results further indicates that the four factor model produced a better fit in terms of the stated indices above. Confirmatory factor analysis was used to load each summated factor onto its respective latent factor and the intercorrelations among these latent factors were examined clearly and it is here in stated that each manifest (measured) factor is theoretically relevant. This outer model loading results were further summarized in the table: 4, below for the purpose of relaying clarity of the fitness of the model.

### Table: 3. Summary of the measurement model for Intercultural Sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variables</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Indicator Reliability</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Discriminant Validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>INENG2</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INENG4</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INENG5</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESP</td>
<td>INRES2</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INRES4</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INRES5</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>INCON3</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INCON5</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INCON6</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>INATT2</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INATT4</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INATT5</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results in the table above, indicate that four dimensions were retained by the measurement model of intercultural sensitivity. These are: Interaction engagement, Respect for cultural differences, Interaction confidence and Interaction attentiveness. It is also clear that all the dimensions adopted in this intercultural sensitivity model were reliable since they obtained the Composite Reliability and Cronbach’s Alpha values more than 0.7.

### Measurement model of Organizational Citizenship Behaviours

AMOS software was used to assess the relevance of the various indicator variables at explaining the latent variable called Organizational Citizenship behaviours. The dimensions of Organizational Citizenship behaviours are: Altruism (ALT), Courtesy (COU), Sportsmanship (SPT) and Civic virtue (CIV). The model results indicate that Altruism (ALT), retained four items which had outer model loadings above 0.70, and these ranged from 0.72 to 0.80. Courtesy (COU) retained four items which had outer model loadings above 0.70 and these ranged from 0.70 to 0.80. Sportsmanship (SPT) retained four items that had acceptable loadings which were above 0.70 and these ranged from 0.71 to 0.83. Civic virtue (CIV) retained four items whose loadings were above 0.70 and these ranged from 0.72 to 0.80. The detailed model is as follows:
Fig. 2: The measurement model of Organizational Citizenship Behaviours

Based on the CFA results in Fig. 02 above, the four separate factors of the hypothesized model, were moderately correlated. All indicate desirable internal consistency attributes for all of the subscales (Byrne, 2010; Hair et al., 2010). Evaluation of the confirmatory factor analysis results further indicates that the four factor model produced a better fit in terms of the stated indices above. Confirmatory factor analysis was used to load each summated factor onto its respective latent factor and the intercorrelations among these latent factors were examined clearly and it is here in stated that each manifest (measured) factor is theoretically relevant. This outer model loading results were further summarized in the table below for the purpose of relaying clarity of the fitness of the model.

Table: 4. Summary of Reflective Measurement model for Organizational Citizenship Behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variables</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Indicator Reliability</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Discriminant Validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>ALT1</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALT2</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALT4</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALT6</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COU</td>
<td>COU2</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COU3</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COU4</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPT</td>
<td>SPT2</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPT3</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPT4</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPT5</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIV</td>
<td>CIV2</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIV3</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIV4</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIV5</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results in the table above, indicate that four dimensions were retained by the measurement model of Organizational virtuousness. These are: Courtesy, Sportsmanship, Conscientiousness and Civic virtue. It is also clear that all the dimensions that were retained in this Organizational Citizenship behaviour model are reliable since they obtained the Composite Reliability and Cronbach’s Alpha values more than 0.7. In order to subject the data to further statistical tests such as correlation and regression, we had to determine the extent to which it conformed to parametric assumptions. After a careful analysis, it was determined that the data was in conformity with the parametric assumptions in terms of; linearity, normality, homogeneity of variance and multicolinearity as recommended by (Field, 2009).
Results

In this section, we present the correlation and regression results that were performed.

Zero Order Correlations

Table 5, presents Means, Standard Deviations (SD) and Zero Order Correlations of the study constructs. The study established a significant positive relationship between Intercultural Sensitivity and Organizational Citizenship Behaviours \( (r = .313, p \leq 0.01) \). This means that the more Ugandan Hotels are interculturally sensitive, the more their employees engage in organizational citizenship behaviours. In other words, the more staffs of Uganda hotel embrace a culture of harmonious interaction with others regardless of their divergent cultural backgrounds, the more they engage in organizational citizenship behaviours.

Table: 5: Showing Means, Standard Deviations (SD) and Zero Order Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Sensitivity (1)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior (2)</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>.313**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); N=303

The study further indicates that there is a significant positive relationship between Organizational Virtuousness and Organizational Citizenship behaviours \( (r = .313, p \leq 0.01) \). This means that the more an organization becomes virtuous, the more its employees engage in extra role behaviours (OCBs). In other words, the more Uganda hotels become virtuous in nature, the more their employees engage in behaviour of extra role nature. By way of an illustration, the more hotels in Uganda become optimistic and trustworthy, by way of being expectant of success regardless of current challenges (optimism) and have hope in the behaviour of their employees (trust), the more their staff become altruistic by wanting to help colleagues so as to address work related problems and courteous by in the form of not wishing to create work-related problems with their colleagues.

Regression results

The extent to which Intercultural Sensitivity predicts Organizational Citizenship Behaviours

Table 6 and figure 3 below; show the standardized regression weights, standard error, critical ratios and the probability values between the study constructs. Consistent with \( H_1 \), the study finds that Intercultural Sensitivity is a significant predictor of Organizational Citizenship behaviours \( (\beta = .212, CR= 2.021, P \leq 0.05) \). This means that when Intercultural sensitivity of hotel staff improves by 1 standard deviation, Organizational citizenship behaviours of hotel staff significantly improves (.212 standard deviations).

This further means that the more employees of Uganda hotels are open-minded to one another regardless of their cultural differences and ask for assistance, the more they help one another in situations when they encounter excess workload during the delivery of hotel services to customers. It also means that the more employees of Uganda hotels find it very easy to talk in front of their colleagues from different cultural backgrounds, the more they are able to address their petty differences and as such not complain to management even over minor issues that they could handle before they get out of hand. These relationships are supported by the following qualitative findings “……As a supervisor, I have through various meetings that I hold on every Sunday morning asked my staffs to feel free with one another because, I know that they have to assist each other at all times. Atleast my staffs know that I do not have to be asked to help” (Resp.4, operations manager of one hotel in Iganga). In a related interview, a respondent remarked that……” As a hotel manager, I want to tell you that competition is high….i take employees who are serious….. I have worked very well with employees who are not my tribe mates. They do not give you headache. You really see that they came to work and you do not here them complain…..” (Resp.6, a manager of a hotel in Jinja) To this extent, intercultural sensitivity can predict the engagement in organizational citizenship behaviours by employees of Uganda hotels.
Table: 6. Showing Standardized Regression Weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate Standardized β coefficient</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>--- Intercultural Sensitivity</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>2.021</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![SEM Model](image)

fig.3. showing sem model of organizational citizenship behaviours of uganda hotel staff

Discussion and recommendations

This study investigated the role of intercultural sensitivity in fostering organizational citizenship behaviours of Uganda Hotel staff. The following presentation focuses on the detailed discussion of the results.

Intercultural Sensitivity and Organizational Citizenship Behaviours

The study established that intercultural sensitivity is a significant predictor of organizational citizenship behaviours. This means that whenever employees of Uganda hotels enjoy interactions with their colleagues that come from different cultural backgrounds, they subsequently become encouraged to engage in more voluntary behaviours such as; helping one another during times of much workload, not giving up even when they have committed mistakes, being punctual and maintaining a clean workplace. This finding is in line with that by Kandlosi, & Abdullahi, (2010) who reported that supervisor–subordinate based job-related communication and harmonious co-workers information exchange, enhance the engagement in organizational citizenship behaviours. It is equally in line with Mohanty & Rath (2012) who argued that effective social interactions in which there is harmonious communication foster the engagement in Organizational Citizenship Behaviours. This relationship is further supported by the following qualitative responses.

As a dimension of intercultural sensitivity, interaction engagement that was interpreted by respondents to mean being open minded when dealing with colleagues from different cultures, was found to lead to OCB. This is because, respondents argued that every time they are open minded to the extent that they share their feelings and work related challenges with colleagues from different cultural backgrounds, they are in turn assisted by these colleagues who do not consider their cultural differences when it comes to work instead, they pay attention to the concerns raised by their burdened colleagues. This is what is called altruism as a form of organizational citizenship behaviours. Respondents noted that being frank and open minded to colleagues who may not necessarily be from the same cultural background has helped them to solve a number of work related challenges.

Respondents further revealed that whenever they are open- minded and share their views about their work, they become motivated to assist one another to the extent of preventing the occurrence of work related problems (courtesy). This is because, they believe that if a problem occurred, it has the capacity to affect the operations of the hotels that employ them. Therefore, they are usually out there to deter the occurrence of any problems so as to secure their employment. They equally argued that being open minded has helped employees to be tolerant with the problems that they undergo while at work (sportsmanship). This is because, when they share these challenges with their colleagues, they
get pieces of advice on how they can engage them other than complain to management regardless of the nature of these problems.

Relatedly, respect for cultural differences as a dimension of intercultural sensitivity, was understood to mean valuing cultural differences and found to lead to OCB. For instance, respondents revealed that when they value the ways of behaviour of their colleagues from different cultural backgrounds, in return these colleagues do not hesitate to assist a colleague who has excess work load (altruism). They also cannot sit and watch him or her commit a mistake without warning him or her about that impending problem (courtesy) because, they also continue to be warned by those other colleagues who do not necessarily come from the same cultural background. That they have learnt to tolerate one another(sportsmanship) because they respect one another and can even advise one another on how to go by the rules and regulations (conscientiousness) should they sense that a colleague is likely to abuse the expectations of the hotel.

In addition, respondents equally revealed that every moment they feel sure and contented of their relationship (interaction confidence); with all their workmates, they find themselves engage in OCB. For instance, it was stated that once colleagues do not take them for granted and remain assuring that their relationship is ok and necessary, they find it important to assist one another when burdened by work (altruism), can warn one another of the likely mistakes to be committed (courtesy), can find a reason for being obedient (conscientiousness) by way of living according to established rules and regulations of the hotel and can above all demonstrate that they are part and partial of the work that they do to the extent that they can stand and even defend the hotel to any outsiders (civic virtue).

In a related revelation, it was stated that when staff enjoy the interaction (interaction enjoyment) with their colleagues from different cultural backgrounds, because they feel interested in the relationship with their colleagues and the hotel at large, they come to engage in more OCB. Illustratively, it was stated that when an employee finds the relationship with colleagues as interesting, he or she cannot ignore another with excess workload (altruism). This is because; it will appear like a disappointment on the part of the colleague and the management since it is not expected. That this positive feeling makes them warn one another of impending mistakes (courtesy) so that they their colleagues do not get into such a trouble. In addition, they reported that they try as much as possible to go by the rules and regulations of the hotel (civic virtue) because; they feel that they are under obligation to portray their hotels as better and worthwhile entities.

The respondents reported further that they felt satisfied with their relationship with their colleagues and the employer. In response, they noted that they are under obligation to address any minor problems they face during the process of doing their work other than complain to management at all times (sportsmanship). The satisfaction with their relationship with colleagues has made them not only help those burdened by work (altruism), but also being obedient to hotel rules and regulations (conscientiousness) as well as warn one another of impending mistakes (courtesy) because of the effect one’s mistake may have on the overall performance of the hotel.

Respondents further reported that every time they are focused on the relationship with their employer (interaction attentiveness); they have in turn been able to help their colleagues that are burdened by work (altruism), they cannot leave them to commit mistakes (courtesy), always help them to address their minor work challenges before they can complain to management (sportsmanship) and aggressively try as much as possible to live according to the rules and regulations of the hotel. Therefore, they make sure that they are focused on their work and nothing else during their shifts since they do not need to be embarrassed and probably lose their jobs because of inability to take care of their colleagues and customers. These results support the thrust of the social exchange theory (Homan, 1961; Blau, 1964). This is because, according to this theory when there is reciprocity and parties in a social exchange do not take one another for granted, voluntary behaviours will exist within a framework of respect for cultural differences where by parties will interact freely regardless of cultural differences.

Conclusion

On the basis of the findings about the study hypotheses, it can be deduced that Intercultural Sensitivity predicts Organizational Citizenship behaviours of the Uganda hotel staff. This means that when employees of Uganda hotels respect their colleagues that do not come from the same cultural backgrounds and interact with them freely, they can easily demonstrate more organizational citizenship behaviours.

Theoretical implications
Overall, the social exchange theory (Homan, 1961; Blau, 1964), is still relevant in explaining the engagement in organizational citizenship behaviours and staff demonstration of intercultural sensitivity. This is because, according to the study findings, as long as hotel staffs do not discriminate one another on ground of cultural differences to the extent that they interact freely with one another, they are bound to engage in organizational citizenship behaviours.

Methodological implications

This study established that the administration of both the quantitative and qualitative research methodology provides an opportunity to strike a compromise on the same opinion so as to allow for trust to be reflected in the nature of findings. Therefore, there is need for the administration of a mixed study design to future studies on Organizational citizenship behaviours because; this is when a balanced opinion shall always be secured. Therefore, this study calls for a pragmatic research approach.

Policy implications

There is need for policy makers to appreciate the components of organization citizenship behaviours in the formulation of essential policies that govern the smooth functioning of Uganda hotels. For instance, human resource management policies need to tap into staff that are willing to be altruistic, courteous, and sportsmen among others. Furthermore, there is need for policies to consider the need to eliminate discrimination on the basis of cultural differences. This is because; this tendency amongst staff affects their innovativeness and productivity.

Managerial implications

Since organizational citizenship behaviours are relevant in fostering organizational efficiency and effectiveness, there is need for management of hotels to ensure that they are permeated throughout hotel establishments with a view to laying a foundation for their growth and development. There is need for management to ensure that hotel staff do not discriminate one another on the basis of cultural differences. This is because, it has been proven that this practice paves way for the pervasion an environment that nurtures the staff engagement in organizational citizenship behaviours.

Limitations and suggestions for future research

As is associated with any other study, this study was not exceptional because, it encountered weaknesses that did not affect the nature of the findings. These are as follows The OCB instrument that the study used was simply adapted. This is because; it contains dimensions and items that were developed by scholars from the western world. This means that it does not entirely reflect the cultural orientations of organizations in developing countries like Uganda. Therefore, future studies need to focus on the evolution of OCB operationalization and measurement from the context of common cultural traits in the developing world. This will come a long way in aiding the derivation of realistic findings about this construct.

This study was purely cross sectional in nature because; the data was collected at a particular point in time. However, since OCB is like any other behaviour, it has the capacity to evolve across a long period of time. Therefore, there is need for future scholars to undertake a longitudinal study so that they can be able to track progress in this behaviour. This is likely to generate more dependable results.
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