

# Recent Trends in Research on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: From January 2016 to December 2018

Yutaka Ueda

## Abstract

This study reviews research on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) published between 2016 and 2018. In line with the OCB research that came before 2016, many of the current studies strive to determine the individual factors influencing OCB, which have become more diverse than ever. Several OCB studies focused on organizational-level antecedents of OCB. However, most of the reviewed literature was based on data collected at the individual level. That is, the researchers asked employees about their perceptions of their organizations instead of collecting objective data. Likewise, while several OCB studies addressed the mediating role of OCB, they did not establish their models with a convincing reason for why OCB would mediate the relation between the factors they analyzed. A few key implications for future study are provided in reaction to this review of the research.

**Keywords:** organizational citizenship behavior, review, antecedent, mediator, consequent factor

## 1. Introduction

Research on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) began in the early 1980s (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983) and continues to grow around the world. Most OCB research aims to identify the antecedents or consequences of OCB. These factors are diverse, encompassing various aspects of individuals, interpersonal relations, and organizations.

To explore trends in today's OCB research, this review included studies on the topic published between 2016 and 2018 that were available on Science Direct or EBSCOhost. The OCB research surveyed in this study might not be exhaustive because the author could only access research that was permitted for use by the contract between these databases and the author's university. Even so, this review effectively makes the current trends in OCB research more readily available to a wider audience.

## 2. Grouping Policy of OCB Research

About seventy papers were retrieved from the two databases mentioned above (Table). First, the papers were divided into four categories. The first group focused on the antecedents of OCB, the second comprised research on the consequent factors, the third consisted of research that treated OCB as a mediator, and the fourth included studies that created new measures or conceptualizations of OCB. Because the first group received the majority of papers, it was further classified into individual, interpersonal, or organizational antecedents of OCB.

**Table OCB Research between 2016 and 2018**

studies	sample	nations	OCB dimensions	Scale	Relationships
Akturan et al. (2016)	220	Turkey	basic 5	Podsakoff et al. (1990)	knowledge sharing → OCB
Ali et al. (2018)	250	Pakistan	OCBI	n.a.	ethical leadership → organizational justice → OCBI
Alkhadher & Gadelrab (2016)	1184	Kuwait	1	Williams & Anderson (1991)	interpersonal justice → OCB
Arain et al. (2017)	256	Pakistan	ACB-I, ACB-S	Somech & Drach-Zahavy (2000)	teacher's ethical leadership → students' moral identity → students' OCB (ACB means OCB in an academic context.)
Aranda et al. (2018)	419	n.a.	1	Lee & Allen (2002)	psychological contract breach → negative affect → OCB *moderator: age
Atta & Khan (2016)	494	Pakistan	1	Lee & Allen (2002)	organizational politics → OCB
Bagozzi et al. (2016)	212	Netherland, Philippines	basic 5 except onscientiousness	MacKenzie et al. (1991)	experienced pride → OCB *moderator: national culture
Battal et al. (2017)	221	Turkey	basic 5	Podsakoff et al. (1990)	OCB, decision making styles → transformational leadership
Boyd & Nowell (2017)	369	US	OCBO, OCBI	Williams & Anderson (1991)	sense of community as resource or responsibility → OCB
Carnevale et al. (2018)	262	China	promotive voice, helping	Liang et al. (2012)	leader narcissism → OBSE → OCB moderator: leader consultation
Cheasakul & Varma	124	Thailand	1	Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1990)	passion, empowerment → organizational commitment → OCB (Only 15 in 24 items of Podsakoff scale were used.)
Chen et al. (2019)	381	China	CCB	Groth (2005)	organizational legitimacy → network relationship strength → CCB *moderator: network heterogeneity
Choochom (2016)	417	Thailand	1	n.a.	personal resources, job resources, job demands → work engagement → OCB
Clarke & Sulsky (2017)	168		civic virtue, helping	Podsakoff et al. (1990), Van Dyne & Lepine (1998)	gender → OCB *moderator: gender heterogeneity
Cohen et al. (2017)	176	US	1	original	professional skepticism → OCB
Costa & Neves (2017)	220	US	1	MacKenzie et al. (1993)	psychological contract (PC) breach → emotional exhaustion → OCB *moderator: forgiveness & revenge cognitions
Dirican & Erdil (2016)	645	Turkey	OCBI, OCBO	Lee & Allen (2002)	demographic characteristics → OCB (No hypotheses in advance.)
Eyupoglu (2016)	35	Turkey	1	Podsakoff et al. (1990)	OCB of the academic staff was analyzed. (No hypotheses in advance.)

studies	sample	nations	OCB dimensions	Scale	Relationships
Fehr et al. (2017)	155	China	1	Lee & Allen (2002)	air pollution appraisal → self-control resource depletion → OCB, CWB
Garcia et al. (2017)	228	Philippines	civic virtue, helping	Podsakoff et al. (1990)	intimate partner aggression → psychological distress → OCB *moderator: POS
Griep & Vantilborgh (2018)	516	n.a.	OCBO	Dalal et al. (2009)	psychological contract (PC) breach ↔ OCBO, CWB (A reciprocal relationship was analyzed.)
Harwika (2016)	40	Indonesia	1	n.a.	servant leadership → OCB
He et al. (2018)	242	China	CCB	Vigoda-Gadot (2007)	CCB → emotional exhaustion → employee silence *moderator: organizational identification
Ilies et al. (2018)	104	US	1	Lee & Allen (2002)	justice, autonomy, support → intra- and interpersonal need fulfillment → job satisfaction → OCB
Intarakhamhang et al. (2017)	547	Thailand	1	n.a.	psychological characteristics, work environment → OCB → work behaviors
Ishaque & Shahzad (2016)	517	n.a.	1	Podsakoff et al. (1990)	internal marketing → job satisfaction → OCB
Jahani et al. (2018)	312	Iran	basic 5	Podsakoff et al. (1990)	organization's ownership, employee's demography → OCB (No hypotheses in advance.)
Jenkins et al. (2016)	423	US	OCBI, OCBO	Lee & Allen (2002)	hindrance demands, challenge demands → family-to-work enrichment → OCB
Jeon & Newman (2016)	475	n.a.	1	Lee & Allen (2002)	egoism → job satisfaction → OCB equity sensitivity → justice perception → OCB
Kao & Cheng (2017)	504	Taiwan	Service oriented OCB	Battencourt et al. (2001)	ethical ideology, moral leadership, ethical climate → OCB
Kasa & Hassan (2016)	293	Malaysia	1	Lee & Allen (2002)	"Flow" characteristics → OCB
Kesen (2016)	177	Turkey	conscientiousness, helping, civic virtue, sportsmanship	Podsakoff et al. (1990)	organizational identification → OCB → individual creativity
Khan et al. (2018)	278	Pakistan	OCBI, OCBO	Lee & Allen (2002)	employee burnout, employee commitment → OCB
Laurence et al. (2016)	116	various	helping	Podsakoff et al. (1990)	self-initiated overload, organization-imposed overload → OCB
Leephajaroen (2016)	144	Thailand	basic 5	Podsakoff et al. (1990)	Big 5 personality, organizational commitment → OCB
Lin et al. (2016)	215	Taiwan	1	Farh et al. (1997)	EWC (employee welfare committee) program → OCB
Little et al. (2016)	163	US	OCBI	Lee & Allen (2002)	Leader's IEM (interpersonal emotion management) strategies → LMX → OCB
Livi et al. (2018)	765	Italy	OCBI	Williams & Anderson (1991)	organizational socialization → interpersonal strain → OCB *moderator: POS
Louw et al. (2016)	124	Australia	1	Lee & Allen (2002)	mastery approach orientation → OCB
Mahootf et al. (2018)	237	Iran	basic 5	Podsakoff et al. (1990)	OCB → multiple commitment, family-centered care
Malik & Naeem (2016)	215	Pakistan	1	Organ (1988)	organizational virtuousness → POS → OCB
Mercado & Dilchert (2017)	789(s1), 248(s2), 131(s3)	n.a.	1	Podsakoff et al. (1990)	family interference with work (FIW) → OCB, CWB
Miao et al. (2018)	Meta Analysis			---	leader's emotional leadership → OCB (Some aspects of national culture had an effect as moderators.)

studies	sample	nations	OCB dimensions	Scale	Relationships
Mohammad et al. (2016)	192	Malaysia	1	Lee & Allen (2002)	distributive and procedural justice → OCB *moderator: Islamic work ethic (The moderating effect of IWE was not significant.)
Ng et al. (2016)	Meta Analysis			---	gender → OCB, CWB (Gender has an effect not on OCB but on CWB.)
Ogungbamila (2018)	191	Nigeria	1	Fox et al. (2012)	OCB → occupational burnout *moderator: work engagement
Ong et al. (2018)	455(study 1), 215(study 2)	US	1	Podsakoff et al. (1990)	CSR → prosocial motivation → OCB *moderator: task significance
Ozyilmaz et al. (2018)	300	Turkey	OCBO	Williams & Anderson (1991)	self-efficacy → OCB *moderator: employee trust in organization
Pelt et al. (2017)	Meta Analysis		---	---	general factor of personality → OCB
Piccoli et al. (2017)	570	Italy	OCBO, CWBO	Podsakoff et al. (1990), Bennett & Robinson (2000)	psychological contract breach, organizational injustice → OCB, CWB
Pimthong (2016)	640	Thailand, and others	1	Podsakoff & Mackenzie (1994)	servant leadership, organizational commitment → OCB → team effectiveness
Popescu et al. (2018)	119	Romania	basic 5	Podsakoff et al. (1990)	OCB → cultural intelligence (Significant but weak relationship.)
Rhee et al. (2017)	432	China	Chinese OCB	Farh et al. (1997)	horizontal and vertical collectivism → OCB *moderator: guanxi
Shanker (2016)	519	India	basic 5	Podsakoff et al. (1990)	OCB → organizational commitment
Shepherd (2017)	85	n.a.	altruism, general compliance	Smith et al. (1983)	furlough → OCB
Shoaib & Kohli (2017)	149	n.a.	1	Lee & Allen (2002)	goal setting → employee engagement → OCB
Terrier et al. (2016)	178	Switzerland	OCB for the environment	Boiral & Paille (2012)	personality → OCBE
Thakre & Mayekar (2016)	120	India	1	Fox & Spector (2001)	hope → organizational commitment, OCB
Thakur (2017)	41	India	1	Podsakoff et al. (1990)	abusive supervision → psychological contract breach → OCB
Tharikh et al. (2016)	250	Malaysia	1	n.a.	job satisfaction, organizational commitment → OCB
Thompson et al. (2016)	322	US	1	Smith et al. (1983)	coworker invisibility → target's revenge cognition → OCB
U-thaiwat et al. (2017)	70	US & Thailand	---	Gore et al. (2014), Schmitt et al. (2008)	The purpose of the study was developing a scale for UCB. (The purpose of the study was developing a scale for UCB.)
Wang & Bowling (2016)	300	US	OCBI, OCBO	Lee & Allen (2002)	general personality, work-specific personality → OCB
Wang et al. (2017)	336	China	team OCB	Euwema (2007)	LMX differentiation → shared leadership → OCB *moderator: servant leadership
Wombacher & Felfe (2017)	1362	Germany	OCBI, OCBO	Podsakoff et al. (1990)	team commitment, organizational commitment → OCB
Xie et al. (2017)	322	China	OCBO	Lee & Allen (2002)	calling → org. instrumentality → OCBO (Org. instrumentality fully mediates the relationship b/w calling and OCBO.)
Zhang (2018)	396	n.a.	1	Turnley et al. (2003)	HPPHRP (high performance human resource practice) → organizational instrumentality → OCB
Zhang et al. (2017)	468	China	1	Wayne et al. (1997)	justice climate → POS → OCB
Zhou (2016)	242	China	1	Hui et al. (1999)	abusive supervision → OCB *moderator: abusive supervision variability

### **3. Research on the Effect of Individual Antecedents of OCB**

#### **(1) Dispositional Factors**

One typical research topic has been the dispositional antecedents of OCB, such as gender, demographic, or personality factors. In their straightforward study, Clarke and Sulsky (2017) considered the effect of gender on OCB. They forecasted that employees would perform in gender-congruent ways; that is, men would perform more civic virtue than women, and women would appear more helping than men. Ng, Lam, and Feldman (2016) used meta-analysis to summarize past findings on the effect of gender on OCB. They differentiated self-ratings, supervisor ratings, and peer ratings of overall OCB and found women had more peer ratings of overall OCB than men.

Most researchers have recognized that gender has an effect on OCB, and therefore, have usually treated gender as a controlling factor. However, they rarely discussed why gender should be regarded as a controlling factor or why it affects OCB. Although Clarke and Sulsky (2017) explained, “because is it expected that women have communal traits, it is expected that women will engage in feminine, communal helping behavior” (p. 214), they did not offer a substantial reason why women have such traits.

Dirican and Erdil (2016) addressed the effects of various demographic factors of academic staff, such as gender, age, rank, and tenure, on OCB. They found no significant effect of gender and tenure; however, they showed a significantly lower OCB directed toward the organization (OCB-O) for 21-30 years old than for other rank groups, a significantly higher OCB-O for lectures than associate professors, and a significantly lower OCB-O for research assistants than all other rank groups, except professors. They did not mention how or why these demographic factors had these effects on OCB.

Some researchers have shown interest in the effect of personality. Terrier, Kim, and Fernandez (2016) and Leephaijaroen (2016) aimed to identify the effect of the Big 5 personality types on OCB. Terrier, et al. (2016) empirically found that four factors of the Big 5 personality types, other than openness to experience, significantly influenced eco-civic engagement and that only openness to experience significantly affected eco-helping. Leephaijaroen (2016) was interested in the effect of the Big 5 personality types and organizational commitment on OCB and found different relationships between personality factors and OCB dimensions. For example, altruistic behavior was influenced by having an agreeable personality and a conscientious personality (in

addition to affective commitment and continuance commitment).

Wang and Bowling (2016) compared general personality factors and work-specific personal factors and found that work-specific personality traits had significant incremental relationships with OCB even after general personality traits were controlled. Pelt, Linden, Dunkel, and Bom (2017) conducted a meta-analysis and found that the general factor of personality explained a larger part of the variance in job performance, including OCB, than the Big 5 personality types.

## **(2) Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment is another individual factor that was frequently treated as an antecedent of OCB. Many researchers remain interested in the effect of organizational commitment. Tharikh, Ying, Saad, and Sukumaran (2016) revealed that job satisfaction and organizational commitment influenced OCB in a sample of teachers in Malaysia. Khan, Jehan, Shaheen, and Ali (2018) determined the validity of a model that showed that employee commitment partially mediates the depressing effect of employee burnout on OCB.

Leephaijaroen (2016), mentioned in Section (1), found that the three traditional dimensions of organizational commitment (continuance, normative, and affective) differently influence different types of OCB. Although all three dimensions impacted altruistic behavior, continuance commitment affected conscientiousness, courtesy, and civic virtue, and affective commitment influenced sportsmanship. Wombacher and Felfe (2017) studied the interaction between team commitment and organizational commitment and revealed that OCB and team citizenship behavior were higher when both types of commitments were high than when either of two was high.

Some research considered the mediating effect of organizational commitment. Cheasakul and Varma (2016) demonstrated that passion impacted organizational commitment, which in turn influenced OCB. Khan, Jehan, Shaheen, and Ali (2018) found that employee commitment mediated employee burnout and OCB. Finally, Thakre and Mayekar (2016) empirically revealed the validity of a model that described how employees' hope would influence organizational commitment and in turn, affect OCB.

## **(3) Individual Perceptual or Attitudinal Factors**

Researchers now acknowledge that the individual factors influencing OCB have

become diverse. The OCB literature below proposes new kinds of antecedents; excerpts are included to show the particularity of these terms.

Ozyilmaz, Erdogan, and Karaeminogullari (2018) and Bagozzi, Belschak, Verbeke, and Gavino Jr. (2016) focused on the effect of self-perception on OCB. Ozyilmaz, et al. (2018) found that the effect of self-efficacy on OCB differed based on trust in the organization. Although the effect of self-efficacy on OCB was strong when trust in the organization was low, it was very low when trust in the organization was high. In other words, trust in an organization and trust in self-ability interactively influence OCB. Bagozzi, et al. (2016) explored the effect of “experienced pride” on OCB. In their study, experienced pride meant “pride stemming from praise and recognition that a manager gives to his/her subordinate, which is further observed by either colleagues or customers of the employee” (p. 2).

Boyd and Nowell (2017), Cohen, Dalton, and Harp (2017), Louw, Dunlop, Yeo, and Griffin (2016), and Xie, Zhou, Huang, and Xia (2017) all paid attention to the effect of employees’ worldviews on OCB. First, Boyd and Nowell (2017) revealed that a “sense of community as responsibility” had a stronger positive effect on OCB than a “sense of community as resources.” In their study, the former referred to “a feeling of duty or obligation to protect or enhance the well-being of a group and its members” (p. 212), and the latter was defined as “an individual’s sense that their community serves as a resource for meeting key physiological and psychological needs such as the need for affiliation, influence, and connection” (p. 211).

Cohen, et al. (2017) analyzed the effect of “professional skepticism,” comparing “the neutral perspective” with “the presumptive doubt perspective.” They found the former to have a positive impact on OCB, while the latter negatively influenced OCB.

Louw, et al. (2016) revealed the positive effect of taking a “mastery approach orientation” on OCB. They defined mastery approach orientation as “a focus on achieving self-referent (intra-individual) competence through learning and development” (p. 568), which confronts the “performance approach orientation” and is related to intrinsic motivation. Xie, et al. (2016) paid attention to the process through which having a “calling” influenced “organizational instrumentality,” which in turn affected OCB. They explain that calling means a “transcendent summons, experienced as originating beyond the self, to approach a particular life-role in a manner oriented toward demonstrating or deriving a sense of purpose or meaningfulness and that holds

other-oriented values and goal as primary sources of motivation” (p. 79). Organizational instrumentality refers to “the degree to which individuals perceive their organization as instrumental to goal fulfillment” (p. 80).

Several researchers dissected specific kinds of individual factors. Although they highlighted the implications of their findings, they might not expect follow-up research because of the particularity of the factors they examined. Choochom (2016) focused on the antecedents and consequences of work engagement; personal and job resources were considered antecedents, and OCB a consequence. Personal resources included psychological immunity and intrinsic motivation, and job resources were a justice climate, teacher-student relationships, and colleague and supervisor support.

Fehr, Yam, He, Chiang, and Wei (2017) hypothesized that individuals’ “air pollution appraisals” would influence “self-control resource depletion,” which in turn would decrease OCB. Self-control resource depletion is a feeling of loss, as shown in one of the study’s question items: “Today, I felt like my willpower was gone.” Fehr, et al. argued that “employees’ self-control resources may be depleted by their appraisals of the natural environment that surrounds them” (p. 99); they suspected that a feeling of loss could be influenced by individuals’ psychological factors as well as contextual forces. Kasa and Hassan (2016) analyzed how OCB was affected by “flow characteristics,” described as “the ultimate positive experience” (p. 102) and a complex concept including absorption (being enthusiastic about one’s job), work enjoyment, and intrinsic work motivation.

Finally, Akturan and Cekmecelioglu (2016) studied the role of knowledge sharing. Knowledge sharing might not be a unique factor; however, Akturan and Cekmecelioglu found only significant relationships between knowledge sharing and creative behaviors, and between creative behavior and the five dimensions of OCB. This research might be accompanied by a methodological problem.

#### **(4) Non-workplace Factors**

Garcia, Ng, Capezio, Restubog, and Tang (2017), Mercado and Dilchert (2017), and Jenkins, Heneghan, Bailey, and Barber (2016) all considered individual factors other than those of the workplace. Garcia, et al. (2017) observed the negative effect of “intimate partner aggression (IPA)” on OCB. An exemplary question item regarding IPA from their study is: “my partner punched or hit me with something that could hurt” (p.



110). Mercado and Dilchert (2017) analyzed the negative impact of family interference with work (FIW) or work interference with family (WIF) on OCB. Jenkins, et al. (2016) confirmed the validity of their model that revealed the mediated effect of FIW and WIF between job demands and OCB.

Comparing the effects of workplace and non-workplace factors, Laurence, Fried, and Raub (2016) revealed differences between the effects of “self-initiated” and “organizational-imposed” overloads. Their empirical results were not consistent: Study 2 demonstrated that self-initiated overload had a positive effect on OCB, whereas Study 3 showed organizational-imposed overload negatively impacted OCB.

#### **4. Interpersonal Factors**

One representative type of OCB research has focused on the effect of interpersonal-level factors, such as leadership. Ali, Ahmad, and Saeed (2018) revealed ethical leadership positively affected followers’ OCB, and Kao and Cheng (2017) empirically showed that moral leadership positively influenced followers’ OCB. Similarly, Arain, Sheikh, Hameed, and Asadullah (2017) demonstrated that teachers’ ethical leadership affected students’ OCB. Carnevale, Huang, and Harms (2018) revealed that leader narcissism decreased organization-based self-esteem (OBSE), which in turn negatively influenced helping as an aspect of OCB. Harwiki (2016) and Pimthong (2016) focused on the positive impact of servant leadership on OCB. Wang and Bowling (2016) focused on the relationship between leader-member exchange (LMX) and OCB, while Thakur (2017) and Zhou (2016) considered the negative impact of abusive supervision on OCB.

Miao, Humphrey, and Qian (2018) conducted a meta-analysis on the effect of leaders’ emotional intelligence on OCB. Likewise, Little Gooty, and Williams (2016) examined the effect of interpersonal emotion management strategy (IEMS) on OCB. They defined IEMS as when “individuals manage others’ emotions at work using the same tactics that they use to manage their own emotions” (p. 86). It consists of dimensions of situation modification, cognitive change, attentional deployment, and emotional response modulation. They empirically illustrated how these four dimensions respectively influenced LMX, which in turn affected OCB.

Livi, Theodorou, Rullio, Cique, and Alessandri (2018) addressed the role of organizational socialization as an interpersonal factor other than leadership. They showed that organizational socialization negatively influenced interpersonal strain, and

then the decrease in interpersonal strain facilitated OCB. Finally, Thompson, Carlson, Hunter, and Whitten (2016) focused the impact of coworker incivility on revenge cognition and the resultant decrease in OCB. Coworker incivility and revenge cognition might be difficult to understand; the former is described as when people “put you down or were condescending to you” (p. 55), and the latter was exemplified the item, “I want to see them hurt and miserable” (p. 56).

## **5. Organizational Factors**

### **(1) Psychological Contract Breach and (Perceived) Organizational Justice**

Many researchers have considered psychological contract (PC) breach and organizational justice as factors influencing OCB. These factors are usually regarded as variables at the organizational level. However, researchers usually collect the data on organizational justice not with objective measures or institutional rules guaranteeing fair treatment among employees but according to individual employees' perceptions of fair treatment. Further, psychological contracts do not refer to formal contracts, but employees' perceptions of implicit contracts with their organizations. PC has been defined as “individual beliefs regarding the mutual obligations that exist between employee and employer, and are based on the norm of reciprocity and social exchange theory (Costa & Neves, 2017, p. 125).” Research addressing the effect of PC and organizational justice on OCB should be classified as individual perceptions of organizational factors.

The following researchers discuss the effect of PC breaches. Costa and Neves (2017) revealed that a PC breach increased emotional exhaustion, which in turn decreased OCB. Aranda, Hurtado, and Topa (2018) confirmed the validity of a model that showed PC breaches would negatively impact negative affect, which would further decrease OCB. Piccoli, De Witter, and Reisel (2017) empirically examined the hypothesis that job insecurity would enhance PC breaches and organizational injustice, which would negatively affect OCB.

Grief and Vantilborgh (2018) found that PC breaches influenced OCB and vice versa. That is, they found that employees who are active in OCB “will have a wider zone of acceptance—reflecting what employees feel is acceptable variation within the agreed-upon PC—compared to their counterparts who have engaged in acts of CWB-O” (p. 144). However, a wide zone of acceptance facilitates a sense of PC and OCB, and it

makes less sense that OCB broadens the zone of acceptance.

Several studies discussed the effect of (perceived) organizational justice on OCB. Ilies, Lanaj, Pluut, and Goh (2018) considered how two types of justice would affect OCB through different processes. Intrapersonal need fulfillment would mediate the effect of procedural justice (and job autonomy) on OCB as well as the impact of interpersonal justice (and coworker support) on OCB. Jeon and Newman (2016) verified, in their Study 4, that justice perception mediated the impact of equity sensitivity on OCB. Mohammad, Quoquab, and Omar's (2016) research objectives were to determine the impact of distributive and procedural justice on OCB and whether an Islamic work ethic had a mediating or moderating effect between the two kinds of justice and OCB. Contrary to their hypotheses, they found neither a significant mediating nor moderating effect on OCB.

Alkhadher and Gadelrab (2016) focused on the different effects of the four dimensions of organizational justice and found that only interpersonal justice influenced OCB. Zhang, Qiu, and Teng (2017) examined a model that determined whether being in a justice climate influenced OCB through perceived organizational support (POS) as a mediator. Although their model used the term "justice climate," not organizational justice, the scale for justice climate was based on "individual perceptions of procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice with items adapted from Colquitt's (2001) scale" (p. 390). Thus, their "justice climate" is substantively similar to organizational justice, as Colquitt (2001) confirmed the validity of the typical scales of organizational justice. According to their empirical study, procedural and interpersonal justice had an effect on OCB, but the effect of informational justice was not supported. Finally, Malik and Naeem (2016) focused on the effect of organizational virtuousness, which they defined as the "pursuit of highest aspirations in the human condition" (p. 114). They showed that organizational virtuousness affected POS, which in turn influenced OCB.

## **(2) Other Organizational Factors**

When studies consider the organizational factors shaping individual members' OCB, a multilevel problem between the organizational level and the individual level can arise. Each study appeared to strive to resolve this problem by collecting the data on individuals' perception of the organizational factors.

Lin, Chen, and Chen (2016) addressed the effect of organizational welfare practices

on OCB. However, they collected data on employees' perceptions of welfare practices rather than through objective measures. Similarly, Zhang (2018) considered on the impact of the high-performance human resource practice (HPHRP) of an organization on OCB. Instead of collecting objective measurement values of HPHRP, Zang asked employees to specify the degree to which they agreed with twenty-seven items on "employees' post-placement, training, internal turnover, job safety, job description, objective evaluation, incentive pay, and wide participation" (p. 1129).

Shepherd (2017) analyzed the negative effect of mandated furlough, that is, "the act of requiring employees to take an unpaid leave of absence from work" (p. 166). His analysis revealed that federal government employees' OCB significantly decreased after they received mandated. Jahani, Mahmoudjanloo, Rostami, Nikbakht, and Mahmoudi (2018) aimed to recognize how different types of hospital ownership (university, private, or public) influenced employees' OCB. They found that among Podsakoff and others' five dimensions, conscientiousness and sportsmanship differed significantly by ownership.

Kao and Cheng (2017) collected data from 504 employees from 36 hotels. They hypothesized that ethical ideology (idealism and relativism), as an individual variable, and ethical climate, as an organizational variable, would influence OCB. However, their scale included levels of variables that differed from their intention to measure organizational-level factors. For example, in one of the question items in the former category, they proposed, "people should make certain that their actions never intentionally harm another even to small degree," and in the question items of the latter category, they included, "in this hotel, everyone sticks by rules and procedures." Both items measure individual perceptions of the organizational situation rather than organizational-level variables.

Ong, Mayer, Tost, and Wellman (2018) examined a model for how corporate social responsibility (CSR) would encourage prosocial motivation and increase OCB. They asked employees to select their perception of CSR, based on "eight items that describe employees' perceptions that their organization is generally active in CSR" (p. 47). Rhee, Zhao, Jun and Kim (2017), who considered the effects of horizontal and vertical collectivism on OCB, collected data at the individual-level rather than organizational-level; for instance, they include the item, "the wellbeing of my coworkers is important to me" (p. 1134) for horizontal collectivism. Ishaque and Shahzad (2016), who analyzed

the effect of internal marketing on OCB, have this problem in common with the previous studies.

## **6. OCB as an Independent Variable**

A few studies dealt with OCB as an independent variable affecting other consequent factors, and some of them, unfortunately, lacked sufficient logical consideration of how or why OCB would influence consequent factors.

Ogungbamila (2018) empirically examined whether OCB would increase burnout syndrome. Similarly, He, Wang, Wu, and Estay (2018) also indicated OCB enhanced emotional exhaustion. These studies are persuasive because they conducted analyses based on past studies that showed OCB having a negative effect on employees' mental states.

However, the assumptions of the following studies might be unjustified. Popescu, Fistung, Popescu, and Popescu (2018) strove to find an effect of OCB on cultural intelligence (CQ). According to them, when an individual shows CQ, it refers to his "capacity to efficiently manage his evolution in different environmental cultures" (p. 639). The researchers conducted a regression analysis with OCB as an independent variable and CQ as a dependent variable, without explaining the logic behind how CQ is influenced by OCB. Based on conventional wisdom, the "capacity" of individuals is fixed at least in the short term, and it proves impossible to be affected by individuals' actions, including OCB.

Next, Mahootl, Vasli, and Asadi (2018) analyzed the impact of OCB on family-centered care (FCC). Here, FCC was described as "the adoption of an innovative strategy in pediatric healthcare planning, delivery, and assessment, and [it] can lead to the mutual cooperation of parents, families, and healthcare workers (HCWs) with an emphasis on the needs of parents and families" (p. 3). They suggest FCC would be influenced by OCB because it is "is altruism-oriented. On the other hand, nurses develop altruistic or prosocial characteristics through understanding the concept of PFCC as these two concepts are correlated together" (p. 5). PFCC means patient and family-centered care. While Mahootl, et al. (2018) assumed OCB would affect FCC because it is altruism-oriented as is FCC, they should account for nurses with altruistic personality who tend to accept FCC on the one hand and perform OCB, on the other hand.

Battal, Durmus, and Cinar (2017) hypothesized that OCB and decision-making style

would affect transformational leadership. However, they failed to enhance their argument due to the logical weakness of their explanation. Finally, Shanker (2016) studied the relationship between organizational commitment and OCB. Although organizational commitment is usually treated as an antecedent of OCB, Shanker assumed a correlational relationship between the two factors and conducted a regression analysis, treating OCB as an independent variable and organizational commitment as a dependent variable, without explaining the regression model explicitly.

### **7. OCB as a Mediator**

Some empirical research has established a model with OCB as a mediator. Some of these studies lack a convincing reason for why OCB would mediate the relation between the factors they analyzed.

Kesen (2016) considered the relationship between organizational identity and individual creativity as mediated by OCB. Although he predicted that organizational identity would affect OCB and OCB would affect individual creativity, he did not propose a persuasive explanation for why OCB should be included as a mediator. Pimthong (2016) proposed a model in which servant leadership and organizational commitment would influence team effectiveness through OCB, without explaining why OCB would be a mediator. As a result, while servant leadership directly affected team effectiveness, only the effect of organizational commitment on team effectiveness was partially mediated by OCB. Intarakhamhang, Kijthorntham, and Peungposop (2017) provided a model in which psychological characteristics and work environment would impact work behaviors through the intermediary of OCB. They just cited Pimthong (2016) as foundational research for considering the mediating role of OCB.

### **8. Development of OCB Concept and its Dimensions**

Some researchers have developed new concepts of OCB that apply to people other than traditional corporate employees. U-thaiwat, Supparerkchaisakul, Mohan, and Fansler (2017) developed multiple dimensions of university citizenship behavior. They proposed new dimensions, such as enthusiasm, which they related to diligence, and interpersonal relations, which they associated with friendships, in addition to the regular dimensions of OCB, such as altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, courtesy, and sportsmanship. Eyupoglu (2016) did not propose a new concept of OCB for academic

staff, but he did analyze academic staff's OCB based on the traditional five dimensions.

## **9. General Overview**

OCB research from 2016 to 2018 can be summarized as follows. First, a large number of studies regarded OCB as a dependent variable and aimed to identify its antecedents. This result is not a big surprise because the tendency began with the start of OCB research. Because OCB refers to the behaviors of employees, it is easy to conceive of various factors that may have even a little effect on behaviors. It is also facile to assume and build an empirical model in which these factors will influence OCB. This kind of research holds the advantage of helping researchers publish refereed papers. However, from an academic perspective, focusing on overly trivial or culturally specific factors is of questionable value to OCB research and the entire academic society of Organizational Behavior.

Second, researchers collect data from employees in various countries. In this survey, many studies used a Turkish sample, because it was easier to extract Turkish journals from the databases at the time. However, most research had a simple framework and empirical methods, making it difficult to conclude OCB research has developed in Turkey.

Third, although researchers have established multiple dimensions of OCB, many of the reviewed studies only used one comprehensive OCB dimension. Few researchers adopted the traditional five-dimensional model ("basic 5" in Table). Surely, considering OCB based on multiple dimensions would make the research more sophisticated. However, because previous research has found high correlations between OCB dimensions, and various factors similarly impact each OCB dimension, focusing on only one OCB dimension may be reasonable. It remains undesirable to compose one OCB dimension, using scale items that previous studies confirmed as separate, multiple dimensions. Rather, researchers should select one sub-dimension, such as helping or conscientiousness, as one aspect of OCB. As for multi-dimensional scales, the one developed by Lee and Allen (2002) is the most commonly used by researchers. Surprisingly, their scale was more popular than those of the Indiana University Group, such as Smith, et al. (1983) and Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990).

Fourth, like in past research, current studies mostly consider individual-level factors to be antecedents of OCB, compared to group- or organizational-level factors. When

researchers consider the impact of an organizational-level factor on OCB in terms of individual behaviors, they should be sensitive about the difference in levels between individuals and organizations empirically. Many studies collected data by asking employees how they perceived various aspects of their organizations. However, this method does not reflect organizational-level variables, but individual perceptions of organizational factors. The same organizational factors might be differently perceived by multiple employees, and the different perceptions of the organizational factors can differently impact their behaviors.

Fifth, although a few, there were studies that focused on the consequent factors of OCB or regarded OCB as a mediator. When considering the mediating role of OCB, it is necessary to assume that research may result in a new relationship that otherwise would not be recognized. However, research often considers on OCB a mediator easily when factors appear to impact OCB, which in turn appears to impact another factor.

Finally, several studies developed new concepts, such as customer citizenship behavior and university citizenship behavior. These are promising research topics.

## **10. Conclusion**

The author has reviewed OCB research several times by specifying the terms when papers were published (Ueda, 2016, 2010, 2004). Although it is not an exhaustive list due to the limitations of the papers available to the author, this paper provides a useful bird's-eye survey of recent OCB research. This survey reveals that OCB research continues to develop. However, the author warns that researchers should not concentrate exclusively on finding statistically significant results from their empirical models, without considering the applicability of their findings to society.

Originally, OCB research began with scholars paying attention to behaviors that were affected by job satisfaction and vice versa, which fell outside of formal role actions. In other words, if OCB always received the same effect from job satisfaction as formal role behaviors, the importance of OCB might be much lower than it is today. OCB researchers should clarify the importance of their original studies beyond the fact that OCB is important or that some factors may have a significant relationship with OCB. The author hopes researchers will carefully consider how their models and empirical results will contribute to Organizational Behavior research and further its development for years to come.



(Professor, Faculty of Economics, Seikei University)

\*This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 19H01520.

## References

- Ali, A., Ahmad, S., and Saeed, I. (2018). Ethical leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: Mediating role of organizational justice: A case study of educational sector. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(2), 386-399.
- Alkhadher, O. and Gadelrab, H. F. (2016). Organizational justice dimensions: Validation of an Arabic measures. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 24(4), 337-351.
- Akturan, A. and Cekmecelioglu, H. G. (2016). The effects of knowledge sharing and organizational citizenship behaviors on creative behaviors in educational institutions. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 235, 342-350.
- Arain, G. A., Sheikh, A., Hameed, I, and Asadullah, M. A. (2017). Do as I Do: The effect of teachers' ethical leadership on business students' academic citizenship behaviors. *Ethics & Behavior*, 27(8), 665-680.
- Aranda, M., Hurtado, M. D., and Topa, G. (2018). Breach of psychological contract and organizational citizenship behaviors in volunteerism: The mediator role of affect and the moderation of volunteers' age. *Voluntas*, 29, 59-70.
- Atta, M. and Khan, M. J. (2016). Perceived organizational politics, organizational citizenship behavior and job attitude among university teachers. *Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 26(2), 21-38.
- Bagozzi, R. P., Belschak, F., Verbeke, W., and Gavino Jr., J. C. (2016). Salesperson self-regulation of pride: effects on adaptability, effort, and citizenship behaviors between independent-based and interdependent-based culture. *Spanish Journal of Marketing*, 20(1), 1-17.
- Battal, F., Durmus, I., and Cinar, E. (2017). The effects of organizational citizenship behaviors and decision-making styles on transformational leadership behavior. *Turkish Studies*, 12/31 1-28.
- Bettencourt, L. A., Gwinner, K. P., and Meuter, M. L. (2001). A comparison of attitude, personality, and knowledge predictors of service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 29-41.
- Boiral, O., & Paille, P. (2012). Organizational citizenship behaviour for the environment: Measurement and validation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 109(4), 431-445.
- Boyd, N. M. and Nowell, B. (2017). Testing a theory of sense of community and community

- responsibility in organizations: An empirical assessment of predictive capacity on employee well-being and organizational citizenship. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 45(2), 210-229.
- Carnevale, J. B., Huang, L., and Harms, P. D. (2018). Leader consultation mitigates the harmful effects of leader narcissism: A belongingness perspective. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 146, 76-84.
- Cheasakul, U. and Varma, P. (2016). The influence of passion and empowerment on organizational citizenship behavior of teachers mediated by organizational commitment. *Contaduria y Administracion*, 61(3), 422-440.
- Chen, X., Chen, Y., and Guo, S. (2019). Relationship between organizational legitimacy and customer citizenship behavior: A social network perspective. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 47(1), 1-12.
- Choochom, O. (2016). A causal relationship model of teachers' work engagement. *International Journal of Behavioral Science*, 11(2), 143-152.
- Cohen, J. R., Dalton, D. W., and Harp, N. L. (2017). Neutral and presumptive doubt perspectives of professional skepticism and auditor job outcomes. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 62, 1-20.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.
- Costa, S. P. and Neves, P. (2017). Forgiving is good for health and performance: How forgiveness helps individuals cope with the psychological contract breach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 100, 124-136.
- Clarke, H. M. and Sulsky, L. M. (2017). The impact of gender ideology on the performance of gender-congruent citizenship behaviors. *Human Performance*, 30(4), 212-220.
- Dalal, R. S., Lam, H., Weiss, H. M., Welch, E. R., and Hulin, C. L. (2009). A within-person approach to work behavior and performance: Concurrent and lagged citizenship-counterproductivity associations, and dynamic relationships with affect and overall job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(5), 1051-1066.
- Dirican, A. H. and Erdil, O. (2016). An exploration of academic staff's organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior in relation to demographic characteristics. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 235, 351-360.
- Euwema, M. C., Wendt, H., & Van Emmerik, H. (2007). Leadership styles and group organizational citizenship behavior across cultures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*,

28(8), 1035-1057.

- Eyupoglu, S. Z. (2016). The organizational citizenship behaviour of academic staff in North Cyprus. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 39, 701-704.
- Farh, J. L., Earley, P. C., & Lin, S. C. (1997). Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(3), 421-444.
- Fehr, R., Yam, K. C., He, W., Chiang, T. J., and Wei, W. (2017). Polluted work: A self-control perspective on air pollution appraisals, organizational citizenship, and counterproductive work behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 143, 98-110.
- Fox, S. and Spector, P.E. Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (OCB-C). <http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/ocbcpage.html>
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Goh, A., Bruursema, K., and Kessler, S. R. (2012). The deviant citizen: Measuring potential positive relations between counterproductive work behaviour and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85(1), 199-220.
- Garcia, P. R. J. M., Ng, C. S. H., Capezio, A., Resubog, S. L. D., and Tang, R. L. (2017). Distressed and drained: Consequences of intimate partner aggression and the buffering role of supervisor support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 103, Part B, 106-116.
- Gore, J. S., Davis, T., Spaeth, G., Bauer, A., Loveland, J. M., & Palmer, J. F. (2014). Subjective well-being predictors of academic citizenship behaviors. *Psychological Studies*, 59(3), 299-308.
- Grief, Y. and Vantilborgh, T. (2018). Reciprocal effects of psychological contract breach on counterproductive and organizational citizenship behaviors: The role of time. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 104, 141-153.
- Harwiki, W. (2016). The impact of servant leadership on organizational culture, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) and employee performance in women cooperatives. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 219, 283-290.
- He, P., Wang, X., Li, Z., Wu, M., and Estay, C. (2018). Compulsory citizenship behavior and employee silence: The roles of emotional exhaustion and organizational identification. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 46(12), 2025-2048.
- Hui, C., Law, K. S., & Chen, Z. X. (1999). A structural equation model of the effects of negative affectivity, leader-member exchange, and perceived job mobility on in-role and extra-role performance: A Chinese case. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*,

77, 3-21.

- Ilies, R., Lanaj, K., Plunt, H., and Goh, Z. (2018). Intrapersonal and interpersonal need fulfillment at work: Differential antecedents and incremental validity in explaining job satisfaction and citizenship behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 108, 151-164.
- Intarakhamhang, U., Kijthorntham, W., and Peungposop, N. (2017). Causal model of work behaviors in the Narcotics Control Board. *International Journal of Behavioral Science*, 12(2), 110-124.
- Ishaque, A. and Shahzad, K. (2016). Impact of internal marketing on employee behaviors: Mediating role of job satisfaction. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(1), 233-250.
- Jahani, M. A., Mahmoudjanloo, S., Rostami, F. H., Nikbakht, H. A., and Mahmoudi, G. (2018). Datasets on organizational citizenship behavior in the selected hospitals with different ownership. *Data in Brief*, 19, 288-292.
- Jeon, G. and Newman, D. A. (2016). Equity sensitivity versus egoism: A reconceptualization and new measures of individual differences in justice perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 95-96, 138-155.
- Kao, F. H. and Cheng, B. S. (2017). Proservice or antiservice employee behaviors: A multilevel ethics perspective. *Human Performance*, 30(5), 272-290.
- Kasa, M. and Hassan, Z. (2016). Flow experience and organizational citizenship behaviour among hotel employees: Moderating effect of socio-cultural factor. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Science*, 224, 101-108.
- Kesen, M. (2016). Linking organizational identification with individual creativity: Organizational citizenship behavior as a mediator. *Journal of Yasar University*, 11/41, 56-66.
- Khan, S., Jehan, N., Shaheen, S., and Ali, G. (2018). Effect of burnout on organizational citizenship behaviors: Mediating role of affective and continuance commitment. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*, 18, 1-13.
- Laurence, G. A., Fried, Y., and Raub, S. (2016). Evidence for the need to distinguish between self-initiated and organizationally imposed overload in studies of work stress. *Work & Stress*, 30(4), 337-355.
- Lee, K. and Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 131-142.
- Leechaijaroen, S. (2016). Effects of the big-five personality traits and organizational commitments on organizational citizenship behavior of support staff at Ubon Ratchathani Rajabhat University. *Kasetasart Journal of Social Sciences*, 37, 104-111.

- Liang, J., Farh, C. I., and Farh, J. L. (2012). Psychological antecedents of promotive and prohibitive voice: A two-wave examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1), 71-92.
- Lin, S. Y., Chen, H. C., and Chen, I. H. (2016). When perceived welfare practice leads to organizational citizenship behavior. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 21, 204-212.
- Little, L. M., Gooty, J., and Williams, M. (2016). The role of leader emotion management in leader-member exchange and follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(1), 85-97.
- Livi, S., Theodorou, A., Rullo, M., Cinque, L., and Alessandri, G. (2018). The rocky road to prosocial behavior at work: The role of positivity and organizational socialization in preventing interpersonal strain. *PLOS ONE*, 13(3), 1-14.
- Louw, K. R., Dunlop, P. D., Yeo, G. B., and Griffin, M. A. (2016). Mastery approach and performance approach: The differential prediction of organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance, beyond HEXACO personality. *Motivation & Emotion*, 40(4), 566-576.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., and Fetter, R. (1991). Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of sales persons performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decisions Processes*, 50, 123-150.
- (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of sales performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1), 70-80.
- Mahootl, M., Vasil, P., and Asadi, E. (2018). Effect of organizational citizenship behavior on family-centered care: Mediating role of multiple commitment. *PLOS ONE*, 13(9), 1-18.
- Malik, S. Z., and Naeem, R. (2016). Organizational virtuousness, perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior: A mediation framework. *Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 26(1), 113-129.
- Mercado, B. K. and Dilchert, S. (2017). Family interference with work and its relationship with organizational citizenship and counterproductive work behaviors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 25(4), 406-415.
- Miao, C., Humphrey, R. H., and Qian, S. (2016). A cross-cultural meta-analysis of how leader emotional intelligence influences subordinate task performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of World Business*, 53(4), 463-474.
- Mohammad, J., Quoquab, F., and Omar, R. (2016). Factors affecting organizational citizenship behavior among Malaysian bank employees: The moderating role of Islamic work ethic. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Science*, 224, 562-570.

- Ng, T. W. H., Lam, S. S. K., and Feldman, D. C. (2016). Organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior: Do males and females differ? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 93, 11-32.
- Ogungbamila, B. (2018). Positive employee behaviors and occupational burnout in healthcare workers: Moderating roles of work engagement. *Indian Journal of Positive Psychology*, 9(3), 404-412.
- Ong, M., Mayer, D. M., Tost, L. P., and Wellman, N. (2018). When corporate social responsibility motivates employee citizenship behavior: The sensitizing role of task significance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 144, 44-59.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*: Lexington Books.
- Ozyilmaz, A., Erdogan, B., and Karaeminogullari, A. (2018). Trust in organization as a moderator of the relationship between self-efficacy and workplace outcomes: A social cognitive theory-based examination. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 91(1), 181-204.
- Pelt, D. H. M., van der Linden, D., Dunkel, C. S., and Born, M. B. (2017). The general factor of personality and job performance: Revisiting previous meta-analyses. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 25(1), 333-346.
- Piccoli, B., De Witte, H., and Reisel, W. (2017). Job insecurity and discretionary behaviors: Social exchange perspective versus group value model. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 58(1), 69-79.
- Pimthong, S. (2016). Antecedents and consequences of organizational citizenship behavior among NGO staff from Thailand, Myanmar, Laos, and Cambodia. *International Journal of Behavioral Science*, 11(1), 53-66.
- Popescu, R. N., Fistung, D. F., Popesucu, T., and Popesucu, A. M. (2018). Is the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) a predictor for the cultural intelligence (CQ)? *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 238, 638-646.
- Podsakoff, P. M. and MacKenzie, R. H. (1990). Transformational leadership behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(3), 351-363.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational

- leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.
- Rhee, J., Zhao, X., Jun, I., and Kim, C. (2017). Effects of collectivism on Chinese organizational citizenship behavior: Guanxi as moderator. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 45(7), 1127-1142.
- San Martin, S. F. and Topa G. (2019) Motivational orientations and organizational citizenship behaviors: The moderator role of perceived discrimination in the Brexit context. *Behavioral Sciences*, 9(3), 1-12.
- Schmitt, N., Oswald, F. L., Friede, A, Imus, A., & Merritt, S. (2008). Perceived fit with an academic environment: attitudinal and behavioral outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72, 317-335.
- Shanker, M. (2016). Organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment in Indian workforce. *Journal of Psychological Research*, 11(2), 397-408.
- Shepherd, R. L. (2017). Federally mandated furloughs: The effect on organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Defense ARJ*, 24(1), 162-189.
- Shoaib, F. and Kohli, N. (2017). Employee engagement and goal setting theory. *Indian Journal of Health and Well-being*, 8(8), 877-880.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., and Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653-663.
- Somech, A. and Drach-Zahavy, A. (2000). Understanding extra-role behavior in schools: The relationships between job satisfaction, sense of efficacy, and teachers' extra-role behavior. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(5-6), 649-659.
- Terrier, L., Kim, S., and Fernandez, S. (2016). Who are the good organizational citizens for the environment? An examination of the predictive validity of personality traits. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 48, 185-190.
- Thakre, N. and Mayekar, R. (2016). Hope, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour among employees of private sector organizations. *Indian Journal of Positive Psychology*, 7(4), 480-484.
- Thakur, M. B. (2017). Abusive supervision and related factors: The Indian context. *Journal of Psychosocial Research*, 12(1), 97-105.
- Tharikh, S. M., Ying, C. Y., Saad, Z. M., and Sukmaran, K. (2016). Managing job attitudes: The roles of jobsatisfaction and organizational commitment on organizational citizenship behaviors. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 35, 604-611.

- Thompson, M., Carlson, D., Hunter, E., and Whitten, D. (2016). We all seek revenge: The role of honesty-humility in reactions to incivility. *Behavioral and Applied Management*, 17(1), 50-65.
- Turnley, W. H., Bolino, M. C., Lester, S. W., and Bloodgood, J. M. (2003). The Impact of psychological contract fulfillment on the performance of in-role and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 29(2), 187-206.
- Ueda, Y. (2004). A preliminary review of researches on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Faculty of Economics, Seikei University*, 34(3), 1-87. (in Japanese)
- (2010). Recent trends of research on contextual performance: How differently has it been treated from organizational citizenship behavior? *Journal of Faculty of Economics, Seikei University*, 41(1), 103-122.
- (2016). Recent trends in organizational citizenship behavior research: 2010-2015. *Journal of Faculty of Economics, Seikei University*, 47(1), 9-41.
- U-thaiwat, P., Supparerkchaisakul, N., Mohan, K. P., and Fansler, K. (2017). Developing a scale for university citizenship behavior: Thai and U.S. academic contexts. *International Journal of Behavioral Science*, 12(2), 71-89.
- Van Dyne, L. and Lepine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 108-119.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2007). Redrawing the boundaries of OCB? An empirical examination of compulsory extra-role behavior in the workplace. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 21(3), 377-405.
- Wang, L., Jiang, W., Liu, Z., and Ma, X. (2017). Shared leadership and team effectiveness: The examination of LLMX differentiation and servant leadership on the emergence and consequences of shared leadership. *Human Performance*, 30(4), 455-168.
- Wang, Q. and Bowling, N. A. (2016). A comparison of general and work-specific personality measure as predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 24(2), 172-188.
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 82-111.
- Williams, L. J. and Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617.



- Wombacher, J. C. and Felfe, J. (2017). Dual commitment in the organization: Effects of the interplay of team and organizational commitment on employee citizenship behavior, efficacy beliefs, and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 102, 1-14.
- Xie, B., Zhou, W., Huang, J. L., and Xia, M. (2017). Using goal facilitation theory to explain the relationships between calling and organization-directed citizenship behavior and job satisfaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 100, 78-87.
- Zhang, L. (2018). Hypothetical analysis of employees' work performance based on HPHRP. *Procedia Engineering*, 211, 1128-1130.
- Zhang, L., Qiu, Y. and Teng, E. (2017). Cross-level relationships between justice climate and organizational citizenship behavior: Perceived organizational support as mediator. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 45(3), 387-398.
- Zhou, L. (2016). Abusive supervision and work performance: The moderating role of abusive supervision variability. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 44(7), 1089-1098.