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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.
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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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>studies</th>
<th>sample</th>
<th>nations</th>
<th>OCB dimensions</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akturan et al. (2016)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>basic 5</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>knowledge sharing $\rightarrow$ OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali et al. (2018)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>OCBI</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>ethical leadership $\rightarrow$ organizational justice $\rightarrow$ OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkhadher &amp; Gadelrab (2016)</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Williams &amp; Anderson (1991)</td>
<td>interpersonal justice $\rightarrow$ OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arain et al. (2017)</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>ACB-I, ACB-S</td>
<td>Somech &amp; Drach-Zahavy (2000)</td>
<td>teacher's ethical leadership $\rightarrow$ students’ moral identity $\rightarrow$ students’ OCB (ACB means OCB in an academic context.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagozzi et al. (2016)</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Netherland, Philippines</td>
<td>basic 5 except conscientiousness</td>
<td>MacKenzie et al. (1991)</td>
<td>experienced pride $\rightarrow$ OCB *moderator: national culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battal et al. (2017)</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>basic 5</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>OCB, decision making styles $\rightarrow$ transformational leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnevale et al. (2018)</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>promotive voice, helping</td>
<td>Liang et al. (2012)</td>
<td>leader narcissism $\rightarrow$ OBSE $\rightarrow$ OCB *moderator: leader consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheasakul &amp; Varma</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1990)</td>
<td>passion, empowerment $\rightarrow$ organizational commitment $\rightarrow$ OCB (Only 15in 24 items of Podsakoff scale were used.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen et al. (2019)</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>CCB</td>
<td>Groth (2005)</td>
<td>organizational legitimacy $\rightarrow$ network relationship strength $\rightarrow$ CCB *moderator: network heterogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choochorn (2016)</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>personal resources, job resources, job demands $\rightarrow$ work engagement $\rightarrow$ OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen et al. (2017)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>original</td>
<td>professional skepticism $\rightarrow$ OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirican &amp; Erdil (2016)</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>OCBI, OCBO</td>
<td>Lee &amp; Allen (2002)</td>
<td>demographic characteristics $\rightarrow$ OCB (No hypotheses in advance.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyupoglu (2016)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>OCB of the academic staff was analyzed. (No hypotheses in advance.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studies</td>
<td>sample</td>
<td>nations</td>
<td>OCB dimensions</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fehr et al. (2017)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lee &amp; Allen (2002)</td>
<td>air pollution appraisal → self-control resource depletion → OCB, CWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia et al. (2017)</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>civic virtue, helping</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>intimate partner aggression → psychological distress → OCB *moderator: POS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griep &amp; Vantilborgh (2018)</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>OCBO</td>
<td>Dalal et al. (2009)</td>
<td>psychological contract (PC) breach ←→ OCB, CWB (A reciprocal relationship was analyzed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwidi (2016)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>servant leadership → OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intarakhamhang et al. (2017)</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>psychological characteristics, work environment → OCB → work behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishaque &amp; Shahzad (2016)</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>internal marketing → job satisfaction → OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahani et al. (2018)</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>basic 5</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>organization’s ownership, employee’s demography → OCB (No hypotheses in advance.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kao &amp; Cheng (2017)</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Service oriented OCB</td>
<td>Battencourt et al. (2001)</td>
<td>ethical ideology, moral leadership, ethical climate → OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesen (2016)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>conscientiousness, helping, civic virtue, sportsmanship</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>organizational identification → OCB → individual creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurence et al. (2016)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>helping</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>self-initiated overload, organization-imposed overload → OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leephaijaroen (2016)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>basic 5</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>Big 5 personality, organizational commitment → OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin et al. (2016)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Farh et al. (1997)</td>
<td>EWC (employee welfare committee) program → OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livi et al. (2018)</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>OCBI</td>
<td>Williams &amp; Anderson (1991)</td>
<td>organizational socialization → interpersonal strain → OCB *moderator: POS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louw et al. (2016)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lee &amp; Allen (2002)</td>
<td>mastery approach orientation → OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoofl et al. (2018)</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>basic 5</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>OCB → multiple commitment, family-centered care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercado &amp; Dilchert (2017)</td>
<td>789(n1), 248(n2), 131(n3)</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>family interference with work (FIW) → OCB, CWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miao et al. (2018)</td>
<td>Meta Analysis</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leader’s emotional leadership → OCB (Some aspects of national culture had an effect as moderators.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studies</td>
<td>sample</td>
<td>nations</td>
<td>OCB dimensions</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad et al. (2016)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lee &amp; Allen (2002)</td>
<td>distributive and procedural justice → OCB *moderator: Islamic work ethic (The moderating effect of IWE was not significant.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ng et al. (2016)</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td>gender → OCB, CWB (Gender has an effect not on OCB but on CWB.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogungbamila (2018)</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fox et al. (2012)</td>
<td>OCB → occupational burnout *moderator: work engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ong et al. (2018)</td>
<td>455(study 1), 215(study 2)</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>CSR → prosocial motivation → OCB *moderator: task significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelt et al. (2017)</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td>general factor of personality → OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccoli et al. (2017)</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>OCBO, CWBO</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990), Bennett &amp; Robinson (2000)</td>
<td>psychological contract breach, organizational injustice → OCB, CWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimthong (2016)</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>Thailand, and others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Podsakoff &amp; Mackenzie (1994)</td>
<td>servant leadership, organizational commitment → OCB → team effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popescu et al. (2018)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>basic 5</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>OCB → cultural intelligence (Significant but weak relationship.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhee et al. (2017)</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese OCB</td>
<td>Farh et al. (1997)</td>
<td>horizontal and vertical collectivism → OCB *moderator: guanxi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanker (2016)</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>basic 5</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>OCB → organizational commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd (2017)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>altruism, general compliance</td>
<td>Smith et al. (1983)</td>
<td>furlough → OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoab &amp; Kohli (2017)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lee &amp; Allen (2002)</td>
<td>goal setting → employee engagement → OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrier et al. (2016)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>OCB for the environment</td>
<td>Boiral &amp; Paille (2012)</td>
<td>personality → OCBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakre &amp; Mayekar (2016)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fox &amp; Spector (2001)</td>
<td>hope → organizational commitment, OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakur (2017)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>abusive supervision → psychological contract breach → OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tharikh et al. (2016)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>job satisfaction, organizational commitment → OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson et al. (2016)</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Smith et al. (1983)</td>
<td>coworker insensitivity → target's revenge cognition → OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-thaiwat et al. (2017)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>US &amp; Thailand</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Gore et al. (2014), Schmitt et al. (2008)</td>
<td>The purpose of the study was developing a scale for UCB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wombacher &amp; Felfe (2017)</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>OCBI, OCBO</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>team commitment, organizational commitment → OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xie et al. (2017)</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>OCBO</td>
<td>Lee &amp; Allen (2002)</td>
<td>calling → org. instrumentality → OCBO (Org. instrumentality fully mediates the relationship b/w calling and OCBO.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang et al. (2017)</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wayne et al. (1997)</td>
<td>justice climate → POS → OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhou (2016)</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hui et al. (1999)</td>
<td>abusive supervision → OCB *moderator: abusive supervision variability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

Özyilmaz, Erdogan, and Karaeminogullari (2018) and Bagozzi, Belschak, Verbeke, and Gavino Jr. (2016) focused on the effect of self-perception on OCB. Özyilmaz, 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.
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 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.
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.
*This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 19H01520.
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