

EDITORIAL

Responsible management and organizational citizenship behaviour: 90-day rule and career cushioning

Vanessa Ratten 

Editor in Chief, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia
Email: v.ratten@latrobe.edu.au

Responsible management is a type of management practice that values good governance principles and stakeholder involvement (Dmytriiev, Freeman, & Hörisch, 2021). It recognizes that for management to work properly it requires consideration of business purposes based on the environmental context. This means managers are responsible for implementing the goals of an organization and for overseeing the process (Durst, 2024). The goal of this editorial is to focus on the reasons why responsible management practices are important in today's turbulent environment and to focus on organizational citizenship behaviours, the 90-day rule and career cushioning.

I appreciate this opportunity to discuss responsible management and organizational citizenship behaviours and place these topics in perspective in light of recent developments. Responsible management as a topic is loaded with a sense of equity. It represents a balanced approach that integrates economic and social objectives. The idea of responsible management is that it focuses both on the present and future (Van Rensburg, Davis, & Venter, 2014). It is concerned with how to help society through economic endeavours. It is a concept in progress and has been at the centre of sustainability ideas. Organizations have embraced the concept as they realize the need to be authentic.

In this editorial, I will share my reflections on the past, present, and future of responsible management and organizational citizenship behaviour. Organizational studies are dynamic and need to keep up to date with new trends (Ehrich, Cranston, & Kimber, 2004). Hopefully my thoughts will stimulate more engagement on this topic. A re-imagining of what responsibility means to management is required (Ramos-Gonzalez et al., 2022). Research on responsible management is based on different ideas that can limit the acceptance of a common definition.

The idea of responsible management has been in existence for a long time but more recently recognized due to an emphasis on social responsibility and leadership practices (Tabche, Behery, & Bin Ahmad, 2024). Understanding the connections business has with society is important and required in order to fulfil organizational goals. Talented managers manage the complexity of daily operations by strategically thinking about future needs (Tang & Naumann, 2015). This involves engaging in dialogue with others as a source of knowledge acquisition. Lasting change can happen when ethical leaders are prepared to deal with change (Yu, Xu, & Pichler, 2022). This enables them to be a positive force in society by shaping business behaviour.

Managers need to develop the capabilities of their employees by engaging in continual learning practices (Sun, Park, & Yun, 2024). This enables a more inclusive organizational environment to develop that integrates societal values. By engaging in effective learning environments managers can extend their organizational responsibilities. This can include facilitating debate amongst interested groups on issues of critical importance.

Responsible management is a process that values education and action. A functioning organization needs people that carry out specific tasks in a required time frame. Organizational citizenship behaviours enable an organization to continue despite hardships (Song, Kim, & Lee, 2019). They

acknowledge that people are often interdependent on each other. In management studies, organizational citizenship behaviours offer a way to understanding how a person's behaviour goes beyond role requirements due to a sense of obligation to a workplace. This means a person can have more altruistic values in terms of doing what is best for an organization. Graham (1991, 251) states 'citizenship describes the status of belonging somewhere, and it implies both rights and responsibilities'. In an organization people have contractual duties to perform their jobs in a certain way. These task oriented actions shape their role in an organization. However, there are also emotional and non-rational ways a person behaves based on their sense of belonging. This is an important way of understanding whether a person will do their duty as an organizational citizen (Jain, Giga, & Cooper, 2011).

In an organizational setting a person can have a shared commitment to its reputation and success. This means a person recognizes they need to work as a team in a work environment. By doing so there are relationship ties based on a shared commitment. Citizenship behaviours are a force of goodness in encouraging a community to develop (Imer, Kabasakal, & Dastmalchian, 2014). This provides a form of unity and common moral commitments. Good organizational citizens recognize they need to look after others. This enables better social relationships to develop based on a concern for others. Thereby, fostering a work environment that tolerates errors but provides support. Some organizational citizenship behaviours are not always known but based on circumstances (De Clercq & Belduque, 2022). This means they are required when needed in order to advance an organization's cause. Organizations are increasingly being required to show they have accountability and responsibility initiatives (Carroll, 2021). This means they tolerate ambiguity and uncertainty in job tasks as they know good employees will adjust.

Organizational citizenship behaviour involves actions that go beyond traditional job requirements (Chen, Wang, Zhang, & Guo, 2021). It is a civic virtue individuals feel as being a member of an organization. It is not typically rewarded through a formal reward system but is evident in how a person behaves. Lee, Lin, Srinivasan, and Carr (2024, 9570) states organizational citizenship behaviour 'encompasses work behaviours that are above and beyond work duties and responsibilities'. Individuals who have an affective commitment to the wellbeing of their organization are more likely to engage in organizational citizenship behaviour. This means they display acts of courtesy and conscientiousness when interacting with their organization and society (Pohl, Vonthron, & Closos, 2019).

Organizations are changing in structure to reflect new workplace environments and changing societal needs (Sluss, Cooper, Morrell, & Thompson, 2022). More people working from home and in a hybrid work environment has replaced the traditional hierarchical system. As a consequence, more interactive and team focused systems have resulted. Bateman and Organ (1983) were amongst the first to use the term organizational citizenship values to identify extra-role behaviour by employees in an organization. An employee's willingness to go beyond their given roles is necessary to an organization's competitiveness (Sallach et al., 2024). It indicates that an employee is intrinsically motivated to act in a moral and ethical way. It is a positive behaviour that an employee shows that is not formally stated in their job description (Pereira-Moliner & Molina-Azorín, 2024). This means it benefits the entire organization rather than just an employee.

Organizational citizenship behaviour is a way to understand what employees choose to do rather than being forced to do as part of their employment contract. It is an expressive behaviour that embeds a sense of social solidarity. Therefore, it supports discretionary behaviour aimed at creating a happy workplace. Organizational citizenship behaviour helps to facilitate better group coordination and ability to adapt to environmental change (Poropat, 2010). Some organizations expect this behaviour as a source of organizational commitment.

The 90-day rule is a way to recognize the need for managers to review employee retention. As it is becoming hard to attract and keep good employees it is important to monitor retention and progress. This means keeping pace with new workplace practices as a way to ensure long term viability of an organization. The idea behind the 90-day rule is that if a person stays for at least 90 days they will be retained at the organization for a long time period. Thereby ensuring there is less turnover and more people that are trained can be retained.

It is useful to have a 90-day rule as there are many costs associated with training a new employee. The time spent educating a recruit needs to be invested wisely for the long term success of an organization. Within the first 90 days when a person is hired it is important that they are acclimatized to the organization. This means learning about the values of an organization. To do this an onboarding process is conducted. In order to reduce quick turnovers of staff it can be helpful to have a buddy system in place. This means another staff member is partnered with a recruit in order to provide them with assistance.

To get new recruits past the first 90 days job expectations should be clarified. This can include learning about responsibilities and obligations required due to industry practices. The organizational culture in terms of formal and informal practices should be discussed. This will help in providing realistic assessments about potential career progressions. New staff should be encouraged to share feedback and be confident in asking for help. This will foster a better workplace environment that emphasizes employee engagement. To do this new recruits should have regular check-ups to assess their progress. Thereby entering into open conversations about correct behaviour. This will enable issues to be discussed and inconsistencies to be fixed. As part of this process, it can be helpful to be authentic in discussions by providing real time and accurate workplace information.

Related to the 90-day rule is another informal term that highlights the role of responsible management and organizational citizenship behaviour. Career cushioning is an informal term that refers to obtaining future job opportunities whilst currently employed. It is a way that people hedge against future workplace changes to ensure they have a continual source of employment. As more people are reliant on their income for a range of expenses it helps them to be prepared. Due to the increased levels of automation and usage of technology in work more people are unsure of their future. Thus, career cushioning offers a way to soften the blow in case of unexpected career changes.

In order to cushion a person's career they can actively engage in self-promotion whilst working. This enables them to build a brand name that ensures they are known when future career opportunities arise. Networking is a way to do this and ensures others are aware of new skill capabilities. Some people constantly update their credentials online in order to increase their visibility in the marketplace.

The benefit of career cushioning is that an employee can make use of training initiatives to upskill themselves. This then increases their current value in their industry. Employees realize that many companies change hands or are restructured. Therefore, there are few jobs for life and usually people will have to change jobs in their career. In recent years, the major changes from the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in many people reviewing their work situations. This resulted in more emphasis on future work/life positions. The increased cost of living pressures and inflation has further increased pressure on financial stability. As a consequence, employees are prioritizing their own lifestyles instead of their work duties. The low job security existing in some industries has meant they are casually looking for new opportunities. This can involve reskilling to obtain better income prospects in the future.

In conclusion, this editorial has focused on pressing management and organizational issues related to responsible management and organizational citizenship behaviours. As the world continues to change based on increased emphasis on work/life balance and artificial intelligence it is important to stress good management practices. This will ensure organizations survive into the future and become conduits of new innovative ideas.

References

- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587–595.
- Carroll, A. B. (2021). Corporate social responsibility: Perspectives on the CSR construct's development and future. *Business & Society*, 60(6), 1258–1278.
- Chen, S., Wang, Z., Zhang, Y., & Guo, K. (2021). Affect-driven impact of paradoxical leadership on employee organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 1–14.

- De Clercq, D., & Belausteguigoitia, I. (2022). Political skill and organizational identification: Preventing role ambiguity from hindering organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 28(5), 973–992.
- Dmytriiev, S. D., Freeman, R. E., & Hörisch, J. (2021). The relationship between stakeholder theory and corporate social responsibility: Differences, similarities, and implications for social issues in management. *Journal of Management Studies*, 58(6), 1441–1470.
- Durst, S. (2024). A plea for responsible and inclusive knowledge management at the world level. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, 54(1), 211–219.
- Ehrich, L. C., Cranston, N., & Kimber, M. (2004). Public sector managers and ethical dilemmas. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 10(1), 25–37.
- Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4(4), 249–270.
- Imer, P. H., Kabasakal, H., & Dastmalchian, A. (2014). Personality and contextual antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior: A study of two occupational groups. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 20(4), 441–462.
- Jain, A. K., Giga, S. I., & Cooper, C. L. (2011). Social power as a means of increasing personal and organizational effectiveness: The mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 17(3), 412–432.
- Lee, M. C. C., Lin, M.-H., Srinivasan, P. M., & Carr, S. C. (2024). Transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: New mediating roles for trustworthiness and trust in team leaders. *Current Psychology*, 43(11), 9567–9582.
- Pereira-Moliner, J., & Molina-Azorin, J. F. (2024). Conducting responsible research in hospitality management with greater societal impact. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 36(3), 893–905.
- Pohl, S., Vonthron, A.-M., & Closon, C. (2019). Human resources practices as predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour: The role of job breadth and organizational support. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 25(2), 224–238.
- Poropat, A. E. (2010). The validity of Performance Environment Perception Scales: Environmental predictors of citizenship performance. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 16(1), 180–190.
- Ramos-González, M. D. M., Rubio-Andrés, M., & Sastre-Castillo, M. Á. (2022). Effects of socially responsible human resource management (SR-HRM) on innovation and reputation in entrepreneurial SMEs. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 18(3), 1205–1233.
- Sallach, T., Mönke, F. W., & Schäpers, P. (2024). Cybervetting of organizational citizenship behavior expectations: Profile summary as a key in LinkedIn-based assessments. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 154, 108113.
- Sluss, D. M., Cooper, D., Morrell, D. L., & Thompson, B. S. (2022). It's not all just tit-for-tat: The impact of relational identification on subordinate's attitudes and interpersonal citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 1–25.
- Song, G. R., Kim, K. S., & Lee, M. W. (2019). The curvilinear relationship between career plateauing and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 25(6), 914–935.
- Sun, U. Y., Park, H., & Yun, S. (2024). Ethically treated yet closely monitored: Ethical leadership, leaders' close monitoring, employees' uncertainty, and employees' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 45(5), 702–719.
- Tabche, I., Behery, M. H., & Bin Ahmad, K. Z. (2024). Resonant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: A moderated-mediation analysis of followers' resilience. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 73(1), 18–42.
- Tang, C., & Naumann, S. E. (2015). Paternalistic leadership, subordinate perceived leader–member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 21(3), 291–306.
- Van Rensburg, M. J., Davis, A., & Venter, P. (2014). Making strategy work: The role of the middle manager. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 20(2), 165–186.
- Yu, A., Xu, W., & Pichler, S. (2022). A social hierarchy perspective on the relationship between leader–member exchange (LMX) and interpersonal citizenship. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 1–18.