

Recent Trends in Organizational Citizenship Behavior Research: 2010-2015*

Yutaka Ueda

Abstract

Over the last thirty years, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has been considered as one of the important concepts about organizational behavior. Today, many researchers in various countries are conducting empirical research into OCB. This paper reviews empirical research into OCB between 2010 and 2015, drawing on two academic research databases, and identifies the latest trends in the research. The paper lists more than one hundred OCB studies, and classifies them into those that investigate the individual, interpersonal/group, or organizational antecedents of OCB. The characteristics of OCB are documented for each category. The paper presents several findings from the research review as a guide to useful future OCB research.

1. Introduction

More than thirty years ago Dr. Dennis Organ, and his co-researchers at Indiana University published two pioneering studies of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). OCB is defined as, “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006, p.3). Today, most textbooks on organizational behavior (OB) introduce the concept of OCB. It is well known among OB researchers that OCB is one of the most important concepts for

* This study was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (A), Grant Number 25245050, sponsored by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS).

undergraduate students majoring in OB or business administration as well as graduate students. Given the fact that the concept of OCB is spreading among OB researchers, and empirical research into OCB is conducted globally, it is important for any OB researchers to review OCB research periodically to understand its general trends. One of the most famous books on OCB reviewed OCB research up to the mid-2000s (Organ et al. 2006), and the author published similar reviews in 2009 and 2010 (Ueda, 2009, 2010). A new review is needed to cover the studies conducted over the last five years.

This paper reviews recent OCB research and identifies its trends and distinctive characteristics. The author used two academic research databases, *EBISCOhost Research Databases* and *Science Direct*, available at his university to identify all the research published between 2010 and 2015 that included the term “organizational citizenship behavior” in its abstract. This method may be insufficient to understand the whole picture of OCB research, because all the studies issued between 2010 and 2015 can be acquired by the author, as the university had a contract with the database companies for a limited number of journals. However, the databases include representative journals, and therefore we can expect to avoid, largely, the problem of a biased sample of studies. Further, even if the sample is limited in this way, an understanding of the current state of OCB research is useful.

The databases provided us with more than one hundred studies (Table 1). Table 1 lists the names of the researchers, the sample size, job categories, nationality of samples, and analytical models (including moderators) of each study. For example, when a research model assumes that one factor, A, will influence OCB, it is shown as “A → OCB.” If B is assumed as a mediator between A and OCB, it is displayed as “A → B → OCB.” If a study examined correlation rather than a causal relationship between A and OCB, it is written “A ↔ OCB.”

2. Classification Scheme

Generally, OCB research can be classified into studies focusing on the concept of OCB and those examining a causal relationship between OCB and other factors. Research that clarifies the nature of OCB or examines the dimensions of OCB is included in the former category. Although this area of study was relatively common

from the 1990s to the early 2000s, it no longer dominates OCB research because the concept and dimensions of OCB are well established and widely understood among OCB researchers. On the other hand, the latter category of empirical research continues to be pursued actively around the world. Empirical research is comprised of research that considers OCB to be a dependent variable and investigates the effect of antecedents on OCB, and research that considers OCB to be an independent variable and investigates the effect of OCB on outcomes. The number of studies investigating OCB's antecedents is much larger than those investigating the impact of OCB. Therefore, it is reasonable to subdivide the research into OCB's antecedents into the categories of individual, interpersonal/group, and organizational antecedents. This is a persuasive classification because Organ et al. (2006) adopt it in the most authoritative book on OCB, as well as by standard OB textbooks.

3. Individual Antecedents of OCB

OCB is fundamentally an individual behavior, and therefore it is tempting to investigate the causal relationship between OCB and other factors related to the same individual person. Studies that investigate a causal relationship between these two individual factors in fact have been the most common OCB research topic throughout the years it has been studied. This tradition has not changed in the empirical research conducted between 2010 and 2015.

Job satisfaction was the first antecedent of OCB examined by OCB research (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983), and continues to be investigated in several studies (Fatimah, Amiraa, & Halim, 2011; Huang, You, & Tsai, 2012; Magdalena, 2014; Miao, 2011; Staufenbiel & Konig, 2010; Webster, Beehr, & Christiansen, 2010).

Although the satisfaction-OCB relationship is intuitively understandable, some of the empirical research encountered methodological difficulties. For example, Huang et al. (2012) attempted to focus on the effect of satisfaction on OCB of the different satisfaction factors such as supervisor, coworker, pay, promotion, and work itself, and discovered that only "satisfaction with coworker" had a significant effect on OCBI (OCB for individuals) (Table 6, p. 523). However, they separated each factor for satisfaction using Varimax rotation for their factor analysis, without any explanation of their choice.

The validity of assumed non-correlative relationships among the factors should have been discussed, even in the situation of a sufficient value of Cronbach's *alpha* (greater than 0.7). Further, Fatimah et al. (2011) conducted a somewhat misleading empirical study that investigated job satisfaction as a dependent variable influencing OCB, although the researchers argued that job satisfaction had a positive effect on OCB (Table 4, p. 119).

Examining the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB, is one of the oldest research themes of OCB research, and a more complex analytical framework than a simple assumption of these two variables is necessary. For example, despite dealing with job satisfaction empirically, Webster et al. (2010) investigated the effect of a challenging and a hindrance stressor on OCB, with job satisfaction as a mediator. Similarly, Staufenbiel and König (2010) investigated the mediating roles of job satisfaction and organizational commitment between job insecurity and OCB.

Studies that investigate the relationship between individual personality and OCB are also typical. This review identified several studies that investigated the effect of personality and related individual factors on OCB (Aiqin, Xiuqin, Cao, Su, & Chen, 2012; Arshadi & Danesh, 2013; Bourdage, Lee, Lee, & Shin, 2010; Cohen & Liu, 2011; Finkelstein, 2012; Guay, Oh, Choi, Mitchell, Mount, & Shin, 2013; Jain, 2012; Kim & Lee, 2011; Salami, 2010; Seppala, Lipponen, Bardi, & Pirttila-Backman, 2012; Sinha, Oswald, Imus, & Schmitt, 2011; Winkel, Wyland, Shaffer, & Clason, 2011).

First, Guay et al. (2013), who investigated the effect of the Big Five personality traits empirically, were notable in focusing on the interactional effects of these personality traits on OCB. Arshadi & Danesh (2013) paid attention to the effect of openness to experience, conscientiousness, and agreeableness, three of the Big Five personality traits, on OCB. In particular, they did not investigate the direct effect of such personality traits on OCB, but sought to identify the mediating effect of surface acting between personality and OCB. Aiqin et al. (2012) investigated the effect of conscientiousness, one of the Big Fives, on OCB.

Bourdage et al. (2010) focused on similar personality traits to the Big Five and identified how the six dimensions of personality of the HEXACO model (honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience) influenced OCB and various motivations for OCB. In particular, they found there was a significant negative relationship between honesty-humanity and OCB when characterized by impression management.

A number of studies investigated personal factors rather than personality factors. The impact of individual values, ability, and behaviors on OCB was considered in some studies. Cohen and Liu (2011) considered individual values in terms of ten dimensions such as conformity, tradition, and benevolence, and found these values had an effect on OCBI (called “altruistic OCB” in their study) and OCBO (organizational OCB), partially mediated by organizational commitment. Hadjali, Salimi, and Salehi (2012) were interested in the relationship between customer orientation and OCB. Finkelstein (2012) and Kim and Lee (2011) investigated the effect of collectivism-individualism on OCB. Finally, a number of researchers investigated the effect of ability and related factors. Jain (2012), Salami (2010), and Winkel et al. (2011) investigated the effect of emotional intelligence, and Sinha et al., (2012) analyzed the relationship between students’ academic ability and OCB.

The Big Five or other personal factors that differentiate among people are unrelated to any judgment about whether a person is “good” or not. In contrast, although some OCB might be a burden to the individual, OCB is fundamentally a set of desirable behaviors directed towards the organization and/or coworkers such as a supervisor or peers. These types of desirable behaviors very often connect with other desirable factors. The effect of various desirable factors on OCB was investigated in a number of studies among the research reviewed for this paper. The factors were: psychological empowerment (Aksel, Serinkan, Kiziloglu, & Aksoy, 2013), personal ethics (Azeem & Akhtar, 2014), work-family (WF) balance (Carlson, Kacmar, Grywacz, Tepper, & Whitten, 2013), creative activity (Eschleman, Madsen, Alarcon, & Barelka, 2014), organizational identification (Evans & Davis, 2014), customer orientation (Hadjali, Salimi, & Salehi, 2012), organizational commitment (Fu, 2013; Magdalena, 2014), and emotional intelligence (Tofighi, Tirkari, Fooladvandi, Rasouli, & Jalali, 2014). In contrast, although there are fewer of these studies, some researchers investigated the effect of undesirable individual factors on OCB: emotional dissonance (Cheung & Cheung, 2013), workaholism (Choi, 2013), “cyber loafing” (Cinar & Karcioglu, 2015), burnout (iNandi & Buyukozkan, 2013), and “social loafing” (Karadal & Saygin, 2013).

Finally, Acaray & Akturan (2015), and Cinar, Karcioglu, & Alioogullari (2013) found, in their empirical research, that organizational silence had a negative impact on OCB. Organizational silence may not be a familiar concept, even for organizational researchers. Acaray and Akturan (2015) define it as “the employees being silent and

withholding their opinions and thoughts related to about technical and/or behavioral issues in the workplace about improvement and development in their about their work or workplace in order of improvement and development” (p. 474). Distinctive factors cause different types of organizational silence, and Acaray & Akturan classified the different types as acquiescent silence (based on resignation), defensive silence (based on fear), and prosocial silence (based on consideration of others). Their empirical research demonstrated that OCB acquiescent and defensive silence negatively influenced OCB, prosocial silence positively affected OCB.

4. Interpersonal/Group Antecedents of OCB

The great majority of research into interpersonal/group antecedents has investigated the effect of leadership, except for Popescu, Deaconu, and Popescu (2015), who considered a group situation as an independent variable. There are two major themes in the literature on group antecedents. The first is the effect of a specific leadership style on OCB (Kaya, 2015; Kwak & Kim, 2015; Lu, 2014; Luo & Liu, 2013; and Zehir, Muceldili, Altindag, Sehitoğlu, & Zehir, 2013). The second theme is the relationship between a leader and a follower, such as an application of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory (Elstad, Christophersen, & Turmo, 2013; Huang, Wang, & Xie, 2014; and Little, Gooty, & Williams, 2015).

It is crucial to understand why researchers focus on one type of leadership, or LMX, as the antecedent to OCB. Behind each of these approaches is an assumption about social exchange that a leader with a particular type of leadership, or a leader's good relationship with followers, provides his/her followers with various benefits, and the followers give OCB to him/her or the organization in return. Kaya (2015), for example, who investigated the influence of spiritual leadership, contended that spiritual leadership is related to OCB because: “(t)his (spirituality) is somewhat similar to a possible interpretation of OCB, willingly performed and helpful acts of persons for the good of the organization or other people without being under pressure or any written rule. OCB is not expressed in words, but through willing acts, and includes caring and concern for others as in altruism” (p. 604).

Kwak and Kim (2015) also describe the process through which servant leadership

has an effect on followers' OCB: "when a servant leader performs extra-role behaviors, such as 'helping subordinates grow and succeed,' 'putting subordinates first,' and 'creating value for the community,' followers may observe, model, and mimic their leader by performing extra-role behaviors toward others" (p. 1289).

Further, Lu (2014), who considered the effect of ethical leadership, and Zehir et al. (2014), who addressed the effect of charismatic leadership that positively influences an organization's ethical climate, proposed similar arguments. For example, Lu (2014) said, "(t)he ethical leader acts with the best interests of employees in mind, and always cares for them. The benefits received should create feelings of obligation or commitment in the employees, who will engage in expected value actions such as OCB, to complete a reciprocal feedback loop" (p. 381).

Transformational leadership has been a popular leadership concept among the many types of leadership investigated by OB researchers. Humphrey (2012), Sani and Maharani (2012), and Yuan, Hsu, Shieh, and Li (2010) have investigated the effect of this leadership type on OCB. However, they each have different analytical frameworks. Although Sani and Maharani (2012) hypothesized a simple effect of transformational leadership on OCB, Humphrey (2012) and Yuan et al. (2010) investigated the mediating factors between transformational leadership and OCB. Humphrey (2012) investigated empirically whether transformational leadership influenced followers' organizational identification, which in turn would increase their OCB. Yuan et al. (2010) proposed that transformational leadership would have an effect on followers' emotional intelligence first, and OCB in the next step.

Other leadership studies include Ersoy, Born, Derous and van der Molen's (2012) confirmation of the effects of paternalistic and empowering leadership styles on organizational citizenship behavior. Babcock-Roberson and Strickland (2010) investigated the effect of charismatic leadership. In the discussion on the effect of situational leadership on OCB, the suitability of a leader for their followers tends to be emphasized. For example, according to Luo and Liu (2013), appropriate leadership differs depending on employee readiness, defined as "the critical capability of ability and willingness" (p. 1726). More OCB is expected when leadership matches employee readiness.

As the leader's behavioral aspect related to leadership, Peng and Chiu (2010) proposed a model where the effect of the supervisor's feedback environment on OCB

is mediated by stress and organizational commitment. Their analysis defines the feedback environment as “the contextual aspects of day-to-day supervisor-subordinate and coworker-coworker feedback processes rather than the formal appraisal feedback session” (p. 582).

Research that investigates the effect of LMX on OCB is also based on the assumption that OCB is encouraged through social exchange between a leader and followers. Although such research has been conducted since the 1990s, newer research considers mediating factors, and attempts to clarify how LMX influences OCB, as well as investigating the direct effect of LMX on OCB. For example, Elstad et al. (2013) investigated employees’ social exchange perception and commitment as mediating factors and Huang et al. (2014) investigated the mediating effect of followers’ identification with their leader, assuming “(f)ollowers are prone to feel loyalty to the leader rather than the organization. Thus, the leader’s role as a significant other is activated in the followers’ self-concept” (p. 1700).

Interestingly, Titrek, Polatcan, Gunes, and Sezen (2014) examined how OCB is affected by emotional intelligence, defined as “the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (Salovey & Mayer, 1990, p. 189). In particular, they focused on leaders’ emotional intelligence, and found empirically that, if a leader has high emotional intelligence, followers perceive more organizational justice, and in turn exhibit more OCB.

5. Organizational Antecedents of OCB

Although OCB researchers have focused more on individual factors and interpersonal/group factors in general, this review found a significant amount of OCB studies addressing the effect of organizational factors. The following is a brief review of the research, grouped by the similarity of the factor under examination. However, it is more difficult to classify organizational factors than individual or interpersonal/group factors because of their variety, and individual researchers may investigate a number of disparate factors.

First, Chen and Kao (2011), Gilbert, Laschinger, and Letter (2010), Haun, Steinmetz, and Dormann (2011), Staufenbiel and Konig (2010), and Whitaker and Levy (2012) investigated the effect on OCB of the work carried out by the organization. Chen and Kao (2011) examined whether the motivational work characteristics (knowledge-oriented) and social work characteristics (socially and contextually oriented) of the work-design model influenced OCB through collective efficacy and self-efficacy. Gilbert et al. (2010) demonstrated that structural empowerment lowered burnout syndrome, which in turn enhanced OCB. Haun et al. (2011) found work/non-work conflict decreased OCB but not task performance when the demands of the work and non-work domains were incompatible.

Second, a relatively large group of researchers have continued to investigate the effect of organizational justice, organizational trust, or perceived organizational support (POS) on OCB (Altuntas & Baykal, 2010; Duffy & Lilly, 2013; Lee & Peccei, 2011; Lilly & Virick, 2013; Titrek, Polatcan, Gunes, & Sezen, 2014; van Dijke, Cremer, Mayer, & Quaquebeke, 2012; van Dijke, Wildschut, Leunissen, & Sedikides, 2015). Lilly and Virick (2015) primarily considered the effect of coping behavior, and examined the mediating effect of organizational justice between coping behavior and OCB. Similarly, Titrek et al. (2014) also investigated organizational justice as a mediating factor. Duffy & Lilly (2013) empirically confirmed the validity of the model that proposed organizational trust as an influence on POS, which in turn had an impact on OCB. Van Dijke et al. (2015) considered the indirect effect of organizational justice on OCB through the impact of social connectedness with authority, although they focused primarily on “nostalgia” as a moderating factor, and did not emphasize the effect of organizational justice. Altuntas and Baykal (2010) divided organizational trust into the different types of trust in a manager, the institution, and a coworker, and examined the relationship between these and the standard five dimensions (altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue) of OCB. They found these types of trust had an effect on four dimensions of OCB, but not sportsmanship. Finally, van Dijke et al. (2012) were interested in whether the effect of procedural justice on OCB is moderated by leadership factors such as encouraging self-development and independent action. They found the effect of procedural justice on OCB is greater when a leader strongly encourages self-development, and the effect of procedural justice on OCB is also greater when a leader gives little encouragement to independent action.

Third, Brenner, Lyons, and Fassinger (2010) and Kazemipour, Amin, and Pourseidi (2012) were concerned with the effect of organizational culture and related factors on OCB. Brenner et al. (2010) carried out a study that particularly focused on lesbian and gay employees. They investigated whether there was a relationship between an organizational climate that supported heterosexism and helping behavior and organizational compliance, although they identified no significant relationship. On the other hand, Kazemipour et al. (2012) demonstrated that workplace spirituality had a positive effect on OCB. Workplace spirituality is not a familiar concept. According to Milliman, Czaplewski, and Ferguson (2003), it “involves the effort to find one’s ultimate purpose in life, to develop a strong connection to coworkers and other people associated with work, and to have consistency (or alignment) between one’s core beliefs and the values of their organization” (p. 427).

Buch, Kuvaas, and Sysvik (2010), Evans, Goodman, and Davis (2011), Hsiung, Lin, and Lin (2012), and Lee and Peccei (2011) investigated employees’ perceptions of organizational policies. Hsiung et al. (2012) demonstrated that two factors mediated the negative relationship between the perception of organizational politics (POP) and OCB. Specifically, the relationship between POP and OCB was negatively mediated by job satisfaction and positively mediated by careerism. Lee and Peccei (2011) investigated the interactional effect of POS and POP on OCB. They found POP had no effect on OCBI when POS was low, and a negative impact when POS was high. Evans et al. (2011) demonstrated that perceived corporate citizenship positively influenced OCB, and organizational cynicism negatively influenced it. Buch et al. (2010) focused on the organization’s personnel policy, rather than all the organizational policies of the organization. They investigated perceived investment in employee development (PIED), which was defined as “employees’ appraisal of their organization’s commitment to their professional and personal growth, through helping them obtain, learn, and identify new skills and competencies” (p. 94). They found OCB was increased when PIED was high.

Fourth, some researchers were interested in the impact of the person-organization fit (the P-O fit) or related concepts on OCB (Ozcelik & Findilli, 2014; Ozdemir & Ergun, 2015; Shin & Choi, 2010; and Tsai, Chen, & Chen, 2012). Tsai et al. (2012) demonstrated that P-O fit had a positive effect on OCB, and Shin and Choi (2010) found perceived group-organization fit increased cohesion, which in turn enhanced group OCB. Ozcelik and Findilli (2014) considered the mediating effect of the P-O fit between

internal branding and OCB, and Ozdemir and Ergun (2015) investigated a model that proposed the person-environment fit (P-E fit) mediates the effect of organizational socialization on OCB. Both studies rested on similar assumptions that factors such as internal branding or organizational socialization would link employees' values with the organization's values. For example, Ozcelik & Findilli (2014) explained the effect of P-O fit on OCB: "(t)he concept of P-O fit) deals with the congruence between the employee's own personal values and the values of the organization, from an employee point of view" (p. 1123).

Depolo and Bruni (2015) looked at the effect of facilitation on OCB. They defined facilitation as "the extent to which participation in one role makes it easier to fulfill the requirements of another role" (p. 887). They considered the effect of work-family facilitation in terms of energy-based, time-based, behavioral, and psychological dimensions, and found that only time-based facilitation influenced OCB. Their discussion offers the explanation that "(s)ince OCB is usually associated with positive attitudes and feelings about the job performed, it is likely that teachers who score higher for OCB have learned to manage time and priorities at work, so that their performance tends to be better than the average"(p. 891).

Lilly and Virick's study (2013) was based on the premise that "organizations may use the situation of a natural disaster to demonstrate how the organization cares about the well-being of its employees by training them to engage in certain types of coping behaviors" (p. 151). They investigated whether the coping mechanism influenced OCB directly or indirectly through organizational justice or POS. However, although most of the causal relationships they assumed were significant through structural equation modeling (SEM), they did not analyze the fitness of their model sufficiently by considering other probable models.

Ho and Kong (2015) conducted their empirical study by assuming that idiosyncratic deals, or i-deals, which were defined as something like a special gift the organization gives to only some employees, would influence the employees' satisfaction, which in turn would encourage their OCB. They considered task and financial aspects of i-deals, and their interactional effect on satisfaction or OCB.

Finally, Fatima, Shafique, Qadeer, and Ahmad (2015) examined how human resource (HR) practice influenced OCB through job embeddedness, POS, and trust. HR practice was examined in terms of training, autonomy, and technology, in Salanova,

Agut, and Peiro's research (2005).

6. OCB as an Independent Variable

Many empirical studies have considered OCB to be a consequent factor that is affected by other factors, and they have sought to identify which factors facilitate or inhibit OCB. It is more difficult to focus on OCB as an antecedent factor. This is partially because each behavior classified as OCB and its effects are very subtle, and it is very difficult to explain the effect of OCB on other factors logically. This is the primary reason why this research avenue has gradually lost popularity among OCB researchers after some empirical studies in the 1990s. However, this review identified a number of studies that investigated OCB as an antecedent.

The studies are in two groups; one group comprises those directly dealing with OCB as an antecedent (Bergeron, Ostroff, Schroeder, & Block, 2014; Burns & DiPaola, 2013; Hadjali, Sakimi, & Salehi, 2012; Jimmieson, Hannam, & Yeo, 2010; Oh, Chen, & Sun, 2015; Ozer, Chang, & Schaubroeck, 2014; Paile & Grima, 2011; and Russo, Guo, & Baruch, 2014). The second group considers OCB as a mediator between the two other factors (Restubog, Bordia, & Bordia, 2011; Sani & Maharani, 2012). The latter group needs a clear explanation why OCB should be considered as a mediator between the two other factors.

In the first group, Oh, Chen, & Sun (2015) examined empirically whether employees' OCB influenced their performance rating. Although a direct relationship between OCB and personnel rating has been studied since the 1990s, they found that the level of group performance played a moderating role: the effect of conscientiousness on performance rating was greater for a poorly performing group than for a high performing group, while the effect of civic virtue on performance rating was the reverse. The researchers argued that, as conscientiousness is task-related OCB, and civic virtue is communal-life OCB, "supervisors are not just passive recipients of information, but rather they shape how information is used by directing attention to the areas that are most critical for group performance" (p. 1017).

Bergeron, Ostroff, Schroeder, & Block (2014) investigated the different effects of various types of OCB on researchers' productivity (not their supervisor's rating of their

productivity). Specifically, they hypothesized that internal OCB (similar to OCBO) would negatively influence researchers' productivity while external or professional OCB would have a positive impact on it. They defined professional OCB as "OCB directed externally toward the profession" (p. 103), and expanded the definition, "OCB directed toward the profession may include serving as a member of a journal's editorial board, helping to organize professional conferences, or serving as a discussant or chair of conference sessions, among other activities" (p. 103). However, further analysis is needed to determine whether these behaviors should be classified as OCB.

One of the most noticeable consequences of OCB is its effect on employees' stress. There are two different assumptions about how exhibiting OCB affects stress or mental health. One assumption is that OCB needs employees' time and energy, which makes them feel mentally and physically overloaded, and this worsens their mental health. In fact, a number of earlier studies found that exhibiting OCB caused stress (Bolino, Turnley, Gilstrap, & Suazo, 2010; Eatough, Chang, Miloslavica, & Johnson, 2011).

However, it is also possible to justify the assumption that OCB increases mental health because it may facilitate a person's good relationship with others, enhance their possibility of promotion, and improve their reliability. Therefore, because of this complicated phenomenon, an examination of the part played by moderating and mediating factors is necessary in order to understand the relationship between OCB and mental health. For example, Ozer et al. (2014) focused on the role of task interdependence and LMX as moderators. The effect of OCBI and OCBO on challenge stress and hindrance stress differs depending on these moderators. On the other hand, Russo et al. (2014) found that OCB has a positive relationship with mental health when career success was used as the mediating factor.

Jimmieson et al. (2010) demonstrated that teachers' OCB (civic virtue and professional development behavior) influenced their job efficacy, which in turn had an impact on students' quality of school life (SQSL). They argued that, "engaging in OCBs may provide the opportunity to enhance self-perceptions...one reason people engage in OCBs is to obtain a sense of efficacy and achievement" (p. 456-457).

Paille and Grima (2011) investigated how helping, civic virtue, and sportsmanship negatively influenced the intention to leave the organization or the current job. Earlier research had dealt with the negative relationship between OCB and intent to leave, but earlier research did not distinguish between OCB toward the organization and OCB

toward the individuals. Paille and Grima's (2011) major contribution to this field was their investigation of the effect of each of the three types of OCB on intent to leave. They found a marginal positive relationship between civic virtue and intent to leave the current job ($\beta = 0.094$, $p < 0.07$), contrary to their hypothesis. They commented that, "(b)ecause civic virtue is a more proactive type of OCB, it is plausible that employees wanting to change something in their job, but being unable to do so for any number of reasons, may express an intention to disengage from it, without thinking of leaving the organization" (p. 487-488). However, this warrants careful examination in future studies.

Finally, although Hadjali et al. (2012) empirically examined the effect of OCB on customer orientation (hence their study is included here) they did not explain explicitly why customer orientation would have an effect on OCB. In fact, it is difficult to argue that a behavior such as OCB, which is oriented to the organization and its members, facilitates changes in attitudes toward customers.

Restubog et al. (2011) argued that, "when organizations fail to fulfill their psychological contracts, employees reciprocate by underperforming and not engaging in discretionary behaviors. Employee withdrawal in this way should greatly impact on their career advancement within the organization" (p. 430). The researchers tested whether OCB was a mediating factor between the breach of the psychological contract and career success, although they did not obtain a significant result.

Sani and Maharani (2012) proposed a model in which OCB mediates the relationship between transformational leadership or organizational commitment and job performance. The relationship between organizational commitment and job performance was found to be mediated by OCB, but transformational leadership was not mediated by OCB. Despite the new analytical framework that the researchers proposed, their description about why it is more appropriate to consider OCB as a mediating factor is insufficient. In their review of earlier research, they found that one factor was a significant antecedent of OCB, and the other was a consequent factor of OCB. However, a more persuasive argument is needed for adding OCB as a mediator to the direct causal model of the two factors.

7. Sample: Common Methods Bias and Nationality

OCB researchers are urged to avoid common methods bias (CMB). CMB occurs when employees who exhibit OCB are asked to evaluate their own OCB. When employees answer a questionnaire about their attitude or personality, CMB can be avoided by having employees' OCB evaluated by someone who can observe the employee's performance, such as a peer or a supervisor. This type of sample is listed as "supervisor (peer)-subordinate dyad" in Table 1. Although it is desirable to investigate the relationship between variables in this more rigorous manner, it certainly makes data collection more difficult and time consuming. In particular, some Asian supervisors are often reluctant to show inside-group information to outside-group people (from the supervisor's perspective, his/her subordinates are inside-group members to him/her, and academic researchers are outside-group members).

This review has found that there are fewer studies that adopt the supervisor (peer)-subordinate dyad sample than studies that use the normal sample method, where the employees exhibiting OCB evaluate their own OCB. However, superior researchers (judged by the quality of the research, and of the journals where the research is reported) tend to adopt the supervisor (peer)-subordinate dyad.

Although OCB research exists in many countries, it is almost impossible to identify any international trends in OCB research because the databases used in this review are not unbiased. For example, we found many studies that used Turkish samples. However, this is not because researchers in Turkey conduct OCB research more frequently than researchers in other countries, but because the journal *Procedia*, where many Turkish researchers submit their papers, is accessible in our databases.

In Asia, OCB research has been conducted with Chinese, Taiwanese, Indian, Indonesian, Malaysian, Philippine, and Korean samples, but studies from other Asian countries, including Japan, were not accessed during this review.

8. Discussion and Conclusion

We have identified several features of recent OCB research through conducting this review. They are discussed below.

(1) Although a number of studies investigate OCB as a consequence of several factors, we found some studies that investigated OCB as an antecedent. It is certainly desirable that researchers focus on OCB's role as an antecedent in terms of the development of OCB research. However, rather than simply examining how OCB, which is one individual factor, influences other factors, it is more important to argue logically why OCB influences the other factors, and why that relationship should be examined empirically. Further research is needed along these lines.

(2) Few studies investigate national differences or characteristics that may have an effect on the result. Studies seldom describe and examine national culture, as Farh, Earley, and Lin (1997) and Farh, Zhong, and Organ (2004) documented in their descriptions of the uniqueness of Chinese culture. Rather, most studies apply measures developed in western society to people in other countries, without considering any cultural effect. A meta-analysis that compares the empirical results of studies in different cultures will be necessary in the future.

(3) Many studies have used the basic five-dimension model of OCB created by Organ and other Indiana University researchers. Although the author agrees that the five-dimension model is the standard model, it is not applicable to all labor environments, as Farh et al. (1997) and Farh et al. (2004) have already demonstrated. However, very little attention has been paid to this problem.

(4) The quality of analysis differs across nations. Some of the papers reviewed here used very primitive analytical techniques, such as correlation analysis or cross table analysis, which may not be acceptable even in a master's thesis in the US.

(5) Many researchers are interested in OCB as the antecedent of other factors. However, each OCB study tends to adopt a range of factors without consideration of the effect of the factors they have chosen. Such studies are likely to be of little value in the systematic development of OCB research.

This review of recent OCB research reveals that OCB remains a popular field of investigation among OB researchers. The number of factors considered relevant to OCB has increased and their field has enlarged. However, individual factors such as OCB are influenced by a myriad of factors, or influence a myriad of factors. Therefore, it is possible for any researcher to analyze and find a causal relationship between innumerable factors and OCB without a careful and logical consideration of the necessity or the value of the research. Significant relationships can be also found readily

if researchers use simple correlation or cross table analysis. However, it is doubtful that these studies are of significant academic value. Any OCB researcher should describe the relationships logically, and explain why their analytical framework is worth testing, if their empirical results are to attract attention from other researchers.

It is desirable that OCB research, which began in the 1980s, remains popular among academic researchers of organizational behavior. However, as many more researchers from many countries have started to conduct OCB research, the field may have lost its unified approach, which was evident from the 1980s to the 2000s. Some of the fragmented research appears to spring from self-serving motives. Today, we need to encourage interaction among OCB researchers across the world.

(Professor, Faculty of Economics, Seikei University)

References

- Acaray, A. and Akturan, A. (2015). The relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour and organizational silence, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 207, 472-482. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.117
- Ahmed, I., Ramzan, M., Mohammad, S. K., and Islam, T. (2011). Relationship between perceived fairness in performance appraisal and OCB: Mediating role of organizational commitment, *International Journal of Academic Research*, 3(5), 15-20.
- Aiqin, L., Xiuqin, S., Yongfu, C., Yonggang, S., and Xiaoyang, C. (2012). Conscientiousness and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating role of organizational justice, *Social Behavior & Personality: an international journal*, 40(8), 1293-1300.
- Aksel, I., Serinkan, C., Kiziloglu, M., and Aksoy, B. (2013). Assessment of teachers' perceptions of organizational citizenship behaviors and psychological empowerment: An empirical analysis in Turkey, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 89, 69-73. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.08.811
- Altinkurt, Y. and Yilmaz, K. (2012). Relationship between school administrators' organizational power sources and teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors, *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 12(3), 1843-1852.
- Altuntas, S., and Baykal, U. (2010). Relationship between nurses' organizational trust levels and their organizational citizenship behaviors, *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 42(2), 186-194. doi: 10.1111/j.1547-5069.2010.01347.x
- Arasli, H. and Baradarani, S. (2014). Role of job satisfaction in the relationship of business

- excellence and OCB: Iranian hospitality industry, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 109, 1406-1415. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.644
- Arshadi, N. and Danesh, F. (2013). Designing and testing a model of precedents and outcomes of emotional labour in an industrial organization in Iran, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 84, 1529-1533. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.784
- Azeem, S. M. and Akhtar, N. (2014). Personal ethics and organizational citizenship behavior among doctors in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, *International Journal of Academic Research*, 6(4), Special section, 25-30. doi: 10.7813/2075-4124.2014/6-4/B.4
- Babcock-Roberson, M. E., and Stricklan, O. J. (2010). The relationship between charismatic leadership, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behaviors, *Journal of Psychology*, 144(3), 313-326. doi: 10.1080/00223981003648336
- Bateman, T. S., and Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between after and employee "citizenship," *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587-595. doi: 10.2307/255908
- Bergeron, D., Ostroff, C., Schroeder, T., and Block, C. (2014). The dual effects of organizational citizenship behavior: Relationships to research productivity and career outcomes in academe, *Human Performance*, 27(2), 99-128. doi: 10.1080/08959285.2014.882925
- Binnewies, C., Sonnentag, S., and Mojza, E. J. (2010). Recovery during the weekend and fluctuations in weekly job performance: A week-level study examining intra-individual relationships, *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 83(2), 419-441. doi: 10.1348/096317909X418049
- Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., Gilstrap, J. B., & Suazo, M. M. (2010). Citizenship under pressure: What's a "good soldier" to do? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(6), 835-855. doi: 10.1002/job.635
- Bourdage, J. S., Lee, K., Lee, J. and Shin, K. (2012). Motives for organizational citizenship behavior: Personality correlates and coworker ratings of OCB, *Human Performance*, Vol. 25(3), 179-200. doi: 10.1080/08959285.2012.683904
- Bowling, N. A., Burns, G. N., and Beehr, T. A. (2010). Productive and counterproductive attendance behavior: An examination of early and late arrival to and departure from work, *Human Performance*, 23(4), 305-322. doi: 10.1080/08959285.2010.501048
- Brenner, B. R., Lyons, H. Z., and Fassinger, R. E. (2010). Can heterosexism harm organizations? Predicting the perceived organizational citizenship behaviors of gay and lesbian employees, *Career Development Quarterly*, 58(4), 321-335.
- Buch, R., Kuvaas, B., and Dysvik, A. (2010). Dual support in contract workers' triangular employment relationships, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77, 93-103. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2010.02.009
- Burns, W. R. T. and DiPaola, M. F. (2013). A study of organizational justice, organizational citizenship behavior, and student achievement in high schools, *American Secondary*

Education, 42 (1), 4-23.

- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Grzywacz, J. G., Bennett, T., and Dwayne, W. (2013). Work-family balance and supervisor appraised citizenship behavior: The link of positive affect, *Journal of Behavioral & Applied Management*, 14(2), 87-106.
- Chang, C., Tseng, K., and Chen, C. (2012). The moderating role of online community participation in the relationship between internal marketing and organizational citizenship behavior, *Social Behavior & Personality: an international journal*, 40(10), 1725-1738.
- Chen, C. V. and Kao, R. (2011). A multilevel study on the relationships between work characteristics, self-efficacy, collective efficacy, and organizational citizenship behavior: The case of Taiwanese police duty-executing organizations, *Journal of Psychology*, 145(4), 361-390. doi: 10.1080/00223980.2011.574168
- Cheung, F. Y., and Cheung, R. Y. (2013). Effect of emotional dissonance on organizational citizenship behavior: Testing the stressor-strain-outcome model, *Journal of Psychology*, 147(1), 89-103. doi:10.1080/00223980.2012.676576
- Choi, Y. (2013). The differences between work engagement and workaholism, and organizational outcomes: An integrative model, *Social Behavior & Personality: an international journal*, 41(10), 1655-1665. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2013.41.10.1655
- Cinar, O. and Karcioglu, F. (2015). The relationship between cyber loafing and organizational citizenship behavior: A survey study in Erzurum/Turkey, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 207, 444-453. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.114
- Cinar, O., Karcioglu, F., and Aliogullari, Z. D. (2013). The relationship between organizational silence and organizational citizenship behavior: a survey study in the province of Erzurum, Turkey, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 99, 314-321. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.499
- Cohen, A., and Liu, Y. (2011). Relationships between in-role performance and individual values, commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior among Israeli teachers, *International Journal of Psychology*, 46(4), 271-287. doi: 10.1080/00207594.2010.539613
- Demir, K. (2015). Teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational identification in public and private preschools, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 174, 1176-1182. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.734
- Depolo, M. and Bruni, I. (2015). Teachers' facilitation between work and family roles: Myth or reality? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 186, 886-893. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.142
- Duffy, J. A. and Lilly, J. (2013). Do individual needs moderate the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior, organizational trust and perceived organizational support? *Journal of Behavioral & Applied Management*, 14(3), 185-197.
- Eatough, E., Chang, C., Miloslavic, S., & Johnson, R. (2011). Relationships of role stressors with organizational citizenship behavior: A meta-analysis, *Journal of Applied Psychology*,

- 96(3), 619-632. doi: 10.1037/a0021887
- Eagan, M., Sharkness, J., Hurtado, S., Mosqueda, C., and Chang, M. (2011). Engaging undergraduates in science research: Not just about faculty willingness, *Research in Higher Education*, 52(2), 151-177. doi: 10.1007/s11162-010-9189-9
- Elstad, E., Christophersen, K. A., and Turmo, A. (2012). Exploring antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviour among teachers at Norwegian folk high schools, *Studies in Continuing Education*, 34(2), 175-189. doi:10.1080/0158037X.2011.611798
- (2013). Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior among educators in language education for adult immigrants in Norway, *Adult Education Quarterly*, 63(1), 78-96. doi: 10.1177/0741713611429386.
- Ersoy, C. N., Born, M. P., Derous, E., and Molen, H. T. (2012). The effect of cultural orientation and leadership style on self- versus other-oriented organizational citizenship behaviour in Turkey and the Netherlands, *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 15(4), 249-260. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-839X.2012.01380.x
- Eschleman, K. J., Madsen, J., Alarcon, G., and Barelka, A. (2014). Benefiting from creative activity: The positive relationships between creative activity, recovery experiences, and performance-related outcomes, *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 87(3), 579-598.
- Evans, W. R., Goodman, J. M., and Davis, W. D. (2011). The impact of perceived corporate citizenship on organizational cynicism, OCB, and employee deviance, *Human Performance*, 24(1), 79-97. doi: 10.1080/08959285.2010.530632
- Evans, W. R. and Davis, W. (2014). Corporate citizenship and the employee: An organizational identification perspective, *Human Performance*, 27(2), 129-146. doi:10.1080/08959285.2014.882926
- Farh, J. L., Earley, P. C., and Lin, S. C. (1997). Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society, *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*, 42(3), 421-444.
- Farh, J. L., Zhong, C. B., and Organ, D. W. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior in the People's republic of China, *Organizational Science*, 15(2), 241-253. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1030.0051
- Fatima, M., Shafique, M., Qadeer, F., and Ahmad, R. (2015). HR practices and employee performance relationship in higher education: Mediating role of job embeddedness, perceived organizational support and trust, *Pakistan Journal of Statistics & Operation Research*, 11(3), 421-439.
- Fatimah, O., Amiraa, A. M., and Halim F. W. (2011). The relationships between organizational justice, organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction, *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 19(S), 115-121.
- Finkelstein, M. (2012). Individualism/collectivism and organizational citizenship behavior: An

- integrative framework, *Social Behavior & Personality: an international journal*, 40(10), 1633-1643.
- 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 & Organizational Psychology*, 85(1), 199-220. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.2011.02032.x
- Fu, Y. K. (2013). High-performance human resource practices moderate flight attendants' organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior, *Social Behavior & Personality: an international journal*, 41(7), 1195-1208. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2013.41.7.1195
- Gilbert, S., Laschinger, H. K. S., Leiter, M. (2010). The mediating effect of burnout on the relationship between structural empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviours, *Journal of Nursing Management*, 18(3), 339-348. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2834.2010.01074.x
- Guay, R. P., Oh, I. S., Choi, D., Mitchell, M. S., Mount, M. K., and Shin K. (2013). The interactive effect of conscientiousness and agreeableness on job performance dimensions in South Korea, *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, 21(2), 233-238. doi: 10.1111/ijsa.12033
- Hadjali, H. R., Salim, M., and Salehi, M. (2012). A study on organizational citizenship behaviors toward customer-orientation: A case of nursing home, *International Journal of Academic Research*, 4(4), 137-144. doi: 10.7813/2075-4124.2012/4-4/B.20
- Haun, S., Steinmetz, H., and Dormann, C. (2011). Objective work-nonwork conflict: From incompatible demands to decreased work role performance, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(2), 578-587. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2011.05.001
- Ho, V. T. and Kong, D. T. (2015). Exploring the signaling function of idiosyncratic deals and their interaction, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, forthcoming.
- Holtom, B. C., Burton, J. P., and Crossley, C. D. (2012). How negative affectivity moderates the relationship between shocks, embeddedness and worker behaviors, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 434-443. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2011.12.006
- Hsiung, H., Lin, C., and Lin, S., (2012). Nourishing or suppressing? The contradictory influences of perception of organizational politics on organizational citizenship behaviour, *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 85(2), 258-276. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.2011.02030.x
- Huang, C., You, C., and Tsai, M. (2012). A multidimensional analysis of ethical climate, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors, *Nursing Ethics*, 19(4), 513-529. doi: 10.1177/0969733011433923
- Huang, J., Wang, L., and Xie, J. (2014). Leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of identification with leader and leader's reputation, *Social Behavior & Personality: an international journal*, 42(10), 1699-1711. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2014.42.10.1699

- Humphrey, A. (2012). Transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors: The role of organizational identification, *Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 15(4), 247-268. doi: 10.1080/10887156.2012.731831
- iNandi, Y. and Buyukozkan, A. S. (2013). The effect of organizational citizenship behaviours of primary school teachers on their burnout, *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 13(3), 1545-1550. doi: 10.12738/estp.2013.3.1588.
- Jain, A. K. (2012). Moderating effect of impression management on the relationship of emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior, *Journal of Behavioral & Applied Management*, 13(2), 86-107.
- Jayasuriya, R., Jayasinghe, U. W., and Wang, Q. (2014). Health worker performance in rural health organizations in low- and middle-income countries: Do organizational factors predict non-task performance? *Social Science & Medicine*, 113, 1-4. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.04.042
- Jimmieson, N. L., Hannam, R. L., and Yeo, G. B. (2010). Teacher organizational citizenship behaviours and job efficacy: Implications for student quality of school life, *British Journal of Psychology*, 101(3), 453-479. doi: 10.1348/000712609X470572.
- Jones, D. A. (2010). Does serving the community also serve the company? Using organizational identification and social exchange theories to understand employee responses to a volunteerism programme, *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 83(4), 857-878. doi: 10.1348/096317909X477495
- Karadal, H. and Saygin, M. (2013). An investigation of the relationship between social loafing and organizational citizenship behavior, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 99, 206-215. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.487
- Kaya, A. (2015). The relationship between spiritual leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors: A research on school principals' behaviors. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 15(3), 597-606. doi: 10.12738/estp.2015.3.1988
- Kazemipour, F., Mohamad, A. S., and Pourseidi, B. (2012). Relationship between workplace spirituality and organizational citizenship behavior among nurses through mediation of affective organizational commitment, *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 44(3), 302-310. doi: 10.1111/j.1547-5069.2012.01456.x
- Kegans, L., McCamey, R. B., and Hammond, H. (2012). Organizational citizenship behavior and work experience, *Hospital Topics*, 90(3), 74-81. 8p. doi: 10.1080/00185868.2012.721699
- Kim, P. and Lee, J. (2012). The influence of collectivism and rater error on organizational citizenship and impression management behaviors, *Social Behavior and Personality*, 40(4), 545-556. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2012.40.4.545
- Kim, Y., Van Dyne, L., Kamdar, D., and Johnson, R. E. (2013). Why and when do motives matter? An integrative model of motives, role cognitions, and social support as predictors of OCB, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 121(2), 231-245. doi: 10.1016/

j.obhdp.2013.03.004

- Kwak, W. J. and Kim H. K. (2015). Servant leadership and customer service quality at Korean hotels: Multilevel organizational citizenship behavior as a mediator, *Social Behavior & Personality: an international journal*, 43(6), 1009-1020. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2015.43.6.1009
- Lawrence, J., Ott, M., and Bell, A. (2012). Faculty organizational commitment and citizenship, *Research in Higher Education*, 53(3), 325-352. doi: 10.1007/s11162-011-9230-7
- Lee, J. and Peccei, R. (2011). Discriminant validity and interaction between perceived organizational support and perceptions of organizational politics: A temporal analysis, *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 84(4), 686-702. doi: 10.1348/096317910X511197
- Li, H., Feng, Z., Liu, C., and Cheng, D. (2014). The impact of relative leader-member exchange on employees' work behaviors as mediated by psychological contract fulfillment, *Social Behavior & Personality: an international journal*, 42(1), 79-88. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2014.42.1.79
- Liborius, P. (2014). Who is worthy of being followed? The impact of leaders' character and the moderating role of followers' personality, *Journal of Psychology*, 148(3), 347-385. doi: 10.1080/00223980.2013.801335
- Lilly, J. D. and Virick, M. (2013). Coping mechanisms as antecedents of justice and organization citizenship behaviors: A multi-focal perspective of the social exchange relationship, *Current Psychology*, 32(2), 150-167. doi: 10.1007/s12144-013-9172-7
- Little, L. M., Gooty, J., and Williams, M. (2015). The role of leader emotion management in leader-member exchange and follower outcomes, *The Leadership Quarterly*, forthcoming. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.08.007
- Lu, X. (2014). Ethical leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating roles of cognitive and affective trust, *Social Behavior and Personality*, 42(3), 379-390. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2014.42.3.379
- Luo, H., and Liu, S. (2013). Effect of situational leadership and employee readiness match on organizational citizenship behavior in China, *Social Behavior & Personality: an international journal*, 42(10), 1725-1732. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2014.42.10.1725
- Magdalena, S. M. (2014). The effects of organizational citizenship behavior in the academic environment, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 127, 738-742. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.346
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, L. J., and Parfyonova, N. M. (2012). Employee commitment in context: The nature and implication of commitment profiles, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(1), 1-16. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2011.07.002
- Miao, R. (2011). Perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, task performance and organizational citizenship behavior in China, *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, Vol. 12(2), 105-127.

- Milliman, J., Czaplewski, A. J., and Ferguson, J. (2003). Workplace spirituality and employee work attitudes- An exploratory empirical assessment. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 16(4), 426-447.
- Miner, A. G., and Glomb, T. M. (2010). State mood, task performance, and behavior at work: A within-persons approach, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 112(1), 43-57. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2009.11.009
- Oh, S. H., Chen, Y., and Sun, F. (2015). When is a good citizen valued more? Organizational citizenship behavior and performance evaluation, *Social Behavior & Personality: an international journal*, 43(6), 1009-1020. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2015.43.6.1009
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., and MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*, Sage.
- Othman, R., Omar, N., Azam, A., Ibrahim, S., Farouq, W. A., Rustam, N., and Aris, N. A. (2014). Influence of job satisfaction and codes of ethics on integrity among police officers, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 145, 266-276. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.06.034
- Ozcelik, G. and Findikli, A. (2014). The Relationship between internal branding and organizational citizenship behaviour: The mediating role of person-organization fit, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 150, 1120-1128. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.127
- Ozdemir, Y. and Ergun, S. (2015). The relationship between organizational socialization and organizational citizenship behavior: the mediating role of person-environment fit, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 207, 432-443. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.113
- Ozer, M., Chang, C. H., and Schaubroeck, J. M. (2014). Contextual moderators of the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviours and challenge and hindrance stress, *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 87(3), 557-578. doi: 10.1111/joop.12063
- Paille, P. and Grima, F. (2011). Citizenship and withdrawal in the workplace: Relationship between organizational citizenship behavior, intention to leave current job and intention to leave the organization, *Journal of Social Psychology*, 151(4), 478-493. doi: 10.1080/00224545.2010.507266
- Pavalache-Ilie, M. (2014). Organizational citizenship behaviour, work satisfaction and employees' personality, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 127, 489-493. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.296
- Peng, J. and Chiu, S. (2010). An integrative model linking feedback environment and organizational citizenship behavior, *Journal of Social Psychology*, 150(6), 582-607. doi: 10.1080/00224540903365455
- Popescu, A. M. and Deaconu, A. (2013). High-school, organizational citizenship behavior moderator, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 92, 735-740. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.08.747

- Popescu, A. M., Deaconu, A., and Popescu, T. (2015). Organization's age and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), performance criteria at SMEs level. Case study - Bucharest - Ilfov development region, *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 22, 645-654.
- Restubog, S. L. D., Bordia, P., and Bordia, S. (2011). Investigating the role of psychological contract breach on career success: Convergent evidence from two longitudinal studies, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(2), 428-437. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2011.01.006
- Russo, M., Guo, L., and Baruch, Y. (2014). Work attitudes, career success and health: Evidence from China, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 84(3), 248-258. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2014.01.009
- Salami, S. O. (2010). Conflict resolution strategies and organizational citizenship behavior: The moderating role of trait emotional intelligence, *Social Behavior & Personality: an international journal*, 38(1), 75-86.
- Sani, A., and Maharani, V. (2012). The impact of transformational leadership and organizational commitment on job performance with the among lectures of faculty in the Islamic Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malanf Universityt: The mediating effects of organizational citizenship behavior, *International Journal of Academic Research*, 4(4), 102-106. doi: 10.7813/2075-4124.2012/4-4/B.15
- Salanova, M., Agut, S. and Peiró, J. M. (2005). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: the mediation of service climate. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1217-1227. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1217
- Seppälä, T., Lipponen, J., Bardi, A., and Pirttilä-Backman, A. (2012). Change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviour: An interactive product of openness to change values, work unit identification, and sense of power, *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 85(1), 136-155. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.2010.02010.x
- Serim, H., Demirbag, O., and Yozgat, U. (2014). The effects of employees' perceptions of competency models on employability outcomes and organizational citizenship behavior and the moderating role of social exchange in this effect, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 150, 1101-1110. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.125
- Shinh. Y. and Choi. J. N. (2010). What makes a group of good citizens? The role of perceived group-level fit and critical psychological states in organizational teams, *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 83(2), 531-552. doi: 10.1348/096317909X440233
- Simbula, S. and Guglielmi, D. (2013). I am engaged, I feel good, and I go the extra-mile: Reciprocal relationships between work engagement and consequences, *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 29(3), 117-125. doi: 10.5093/tr2013a17
- Sinha, R., Oswald, F., Imus, and Schmitt, N. (2011) Criterion-focused approach to reducing adverse impact in college admissions, *Applied Measurement in Education*, 24(2), 137-161.

- doi: 10.1080/08957347.2011.554605
- 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. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653
- Spector, P. E. and Che, X. X. (2014). Re-examining citizenship: How the control of measurement artifacts affects observed relationships of organizational citizenship behavior and organizational variables, *Human Performance*, 27(2), 165-182. doi: 10.1080/08959285.2014.882928
- Staufenbiel, T. and König, C. J. (2010). A model for the effects of job insecurity on performance, turnover intention, and absenteeism, *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 83(1), 101-117.
- Tillman, C. J., Lawrence, E. R., and Daspit, J. J. (2014). A tale of perception: The role of perceived intent on OCBs and interpersonal relationships, *Journal of Behavioral & Applied Management*, 15(3), 168-189.
- Titrek, O., Polatcan, M., Gunes, D. Z., and Sezen, G. (2014). The relationship among emotional intelligence, organizational justice, organizational citizenship behaviour, *International Journal of Academic Research*, 6(1), 213-220. doi: 10.7813/2075-4124.2014/6-1/B.30
- Tofghi, M., Tirgari, B., Fooladvandi, M., Rasouli, F., and Jalali, M. (2015). Relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior in critical and emergency nurses in south east of Iran, *Ethiopian Journal of Health Sciences*, 25(1), 79-88. doi: 10.4314/ejhs.v25i1.11.
- Tsai, W., Chen, H., and Chen, C. (2012). Incremental validity of person-organization fit over the big five personality measures, *Journal of Psychology*, 146(5), 485-509. doi: 10.1080/00223980.2012.656154
- Ueda, Y. (2009). Particularity of the Japanese organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) construct and antecedent factors: From the review of East Asian OCB studies, *The Journal of the Faculty of Economics*, Seikei University, 40(2), 43-66.
- (2010). Recent trends of research on contextual performance: How differently has it been treated from organizational citizenship behavior? *The Journal of the Faculty of Economics*, Seikei University, 41(1), 103-122.
- van Dijke, M., Cremer, D. D., Mayer, D. M., and Quaquebeke, N. V. (2012). When does procedural fairness promote organizational citizenship behavior? Integrating empowering leadership types in relational justice models, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 117(2), 235-248. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2011.10.006
- van Dijke, M., Wildschut, T., Leunissen, J. M., and Sedikides, C. (2015). Nostalgia buffers the negative impact of low procedural justice on cooperation, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 127(1), 15-29. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2014.11.005
- Webster, J. R., Beehr, T. A., and Christiansen, N. D. (2010). Toward a better understanding of

- the effects of hindrance and challenge stressors on work behavior, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76(1), 68-77. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2009.06.012
- Whitaker, B. and Levy, P. (2012). Linking feedback quality and goal orientation to feedback seeking and job performance, *Human Performance*, 25(2), 159-178. doi: 10.1080/08959285.2012.658927
- Winkel, D. E., Wyland, R. L., Shaffer, M. A., and Clason, P. (2011). A new perspective on psychological resources: Unanticipated consequences of impulsivity and emotional intelligence, *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 84(1), 78-94. doi: 10.1348/2044-8325.002001
- Wu, T. Y., Lee, S. J., Hu, C., and Yang, C. C. (2014). When supervisors perceive non-work support: Test of a trickle-down model, *Journal of Psychology*, 148(2), 215-251. doi: 10.1080/00223980.2013.774200
- Yildirim, O. (2014). The impact of organizational communication on organizational citizenship behavior: Research findings, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 150, 1095-1100. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.124
- Yuan, B. J. C., Hsu, W., Shieh, J., and Li, K. (2012). Increasing emotional intelligence of employees: Evidence from research and development teams in Taiwan, *Social Behavior & Personality: an international journal*, 40(10), 1713-1724.
- Zehir, C., Mucheldili, B., Altindag, E., Sehitoglu, Y., and Zehir, S. (2013). Charismatic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating role of ethical climate, *Social Behavior & Personality: an international journal*, 42(8), 1365-1375. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2014.42.8.1365
- Zhao, H., Peng, Z., and Chen, H. K. (2014). Compulsory citizenship behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: The role of organizational identification and perceived interactional justice, *Journal of Psychology*, 148(2), 177-196. doi: 10.1080/00223980.2013.768591

studies	samples			models
	number	jobs	nations	
Acaray & Akturan (2015)	462	employees	Turkey	organizational silence (acquiescent, defensive, prosocial) → OCB
Ahmadi et al. (2014)	248	unknown	unknown	workplace spirituality → OCB
Ahmed et al. (2011)	292	employees	Pakistan	perceived fairness → organizational commitment → OCB
Aiqin et al. (2012)	241	doctors and nurses	China	conscientiousness → organizational justice → OCB
Aksel et al. (2013)	332	teachers	Turkey	psychological empowerment → OCB
Altinkurt & Yilmaz (2012)	275	teachers	Turkey	administrators' power sources ↔ OCB
Altuntas & Baykal (2010)	482	nurses	Turkey	trust (in manager, institution, coworkers) ↔ 5 dims, OCB
Araslı & Baradarani (2014)	314	hotel workers	Iran	leadership etc. → job satisfaction → OCB
Arshadi & Danesh (2013)	153	employees	Iran	three dimensions of Big 5 → OCBI, OCBO
Azeem & Akhtar (2014)	75	doctors	Saudi Arabia	personal ethics → 5dims, OCB
Babcock-Roberson & Strickland (2010)	91	employees	US	charismatic leadership → work engagement → OCB
Bergeron et al. (2014)	614	faculty members	USA	OCB (internal, professional) → research productivity, career advancement
Binnewies et al. (2010)	133	employees	Germany	recovery → OCB
Bourdage et al. (2012)	262	employee-coworker	South Korea	personality → various motivated OCB → co-worker rating
Bowling et al. (2010)	227(S1) 219(S2)	employees	US	early arrival & late departure ↔ OCB
Brenner et al. (2010)	606	employees (gay/lesbian)	US or others	organizational climate, stigmatization salience → workplace outness → OCB
Buch et al. (2010)	2021	contract workers	Norway	perceived investment in worker development → OCB (mdrt: perceived agency support)
Burns & DiPaola (2013)	34	schools	USA	OCB → student achievement
Carlson et al. (2013)	205	supervisor-subordinate	USA	WF balance → positive affect → OCBI, OCBO
Chang et al. (2012)	178	employees	Taiwan	internal marketing, online community participation → OCB
Chen & Kao (2011)	602	police officers	Taiwan	work characteristic → collective efficacy or self-efficacy → OCB
Cheung & Cheung (2013)	264	teachers	China	emotional dissonance → burnout → OCB
Choi (2013)	178	consultants	South Korea	workaholism → OCB
Cinar & Karcioglu (2015)	360	public workers	Turkey	cyber loafing ↔ OCB

studies	samples			models
	number	jobs	nations	
Cinar et al. (2013)	256	employees	Turkey	organizational silence → OCB
Cohen & Liu (2011)	192	teachers	Israel	individual values, commitment forms → OCB-altruism, OCB-organization
Demir (2015)	159	teachers	Turkey	job status → OCB
Depolo & Bruni (2015)	124	teachers	Italy	facilitation (time-based, energy-based, behavioral, and psychological) → OCB
Duffy & Lilly (2013)	700	various workers	USA	organizational trust, POS → OCBO (mdrt: need for affiliation, power, or achievement)
Elstad et al. (2012)	366	teachers	Norway	perceived support, leader-employee relationship, clear leadership → teachers' perception → OCB
Elstad et al. (2013)	719	educators	Norway	perceived recognition, clear leadership, LMX → social exchange perception, commitment, economic exchange perception → OCB
Ersoy et al. (2012)	200	employed students	Turkey, the Netherlands	organizational support, leadership style → interpersonal facilitation
Eschleman et al. (2014)	341	various occupations (study 1)	USA	creative activity → recovery experience → OCBI, OCBO
Evans et al. (2011)	188	employed students	US	perceived corporate citizenship → OCB
Evans & Davis (2014)	336	employees	USA	perceived corporate citizenship → organizational identification → OCBI, OCBO
Fatima et al. (2015)	203	faculty members	Pakistan	HR practices → OCB
Fatimah et al. (2011)	169	teachers	Malaysia	job satisfaction → 5dims (mdrt: OCB)
Finkelstein (2012)	89	employed students	US	individualism, collectivism → OCBI, OCBO
Fox et al. (2012)	136(S1) 262(S2)	employees	US	organizational constraints, conflict, organizational justice, job satisfaction, emotions → OCB, CWB
Fu (2013)	346	supervisor-flight attendant	Taiwan	organizational commitment → OCB (mdrt: high performance HR practice)
Gilbert et al. (2010)	897	Healthcare professionals	Canada	structural empowerment → emotional exhaustion → OCBO, OCBI
Guay et al. (2013)	113	employees	South Korea	personality (Big 5) → OCB
Hadjali et al. (2012)	87	nurses	unknown	OCB → customer orientation
Haun et al. (2011)	61	employees-peer	German	work and nonwork demands → OCB
Ho & Kong (2015)	131(S1), 126(S2), 125(S3)	employee-coworker(S1), employees(S2,3)	unknown	i-deals (task, financial, task*financial) → competence, satisfaction → OCB

studies	samples			models
	number	jobs	nations	
Holtm et al. (2012)	279	executive-employee	US	negative shock → OCB (mdrt: job embeddedness)
Hsiung et al. (2012)	393	police officers	Taiwan	perception of organizational politics ↔ OCB
Huang et al. (2012)	352	nurses	Taiwan	ethical climate, job satisfaction, organizational commitment → OCBI, OCBO
Huang et al. (2014)	262	supervisor-subordinate dyad	China	LMX → followers' identification with leader → OCB (mdrt: perceived leaders' reputation)
Humphrey (2012)	128	employees	US	transformational leadership → organizational identification → OCB
iNandi & Buyukozkan (2013)	1699	teachers	Turkey	burnout ↔ 5dims
Jain (2012)	250	middle level executives	India	emotional intelligence → OCB (mdrt: impression management)
Jayasuriya et al. (2014)	963	health workers	Papua New Guinea	organizational culture, climate → OCB
Jimmieson et al. (2010)	170	teachers	Australia	OCBI, OCBO → job efficacy → student quality
Jones (2010)	162	employees	US	volunteer-program attitudes → organizational identification → OCBI, OCBO, OCB-loyalty
Karadal & Saygin (2013)	158	various job holders	Turkey	social loafing ↔ OCB
Kaya (2015)	383	teachers	Turkey	spiritual leadership → altruism, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, civic virtue
Kazemipour et al. (2012)	305	nurses	Iran	workplace spirituality → OCB
Kegans et al. (2012)	166	nurses	US	work experiences ↔ 5dims
Kim & Lee (2012)	353	employees	Korea	collectivism, individualism, perceived rater error → OCB
Kim et al. (2013)	247(S1) 281(S2)	supervisor-subordinate	India Malaysia	motives → role cognition → OCB (mdrt: coworker support, organizational support, social support)
Kwak & Kim (2015)	198	supervisor-employee-customer	South Korea	servant leadership → OCB → perceived service quality
Lawrence et al. (2012)	4550	faculty members	US	socialization, organizational justice → OCB
Lee & Peccei (2011)	137	employees	South Korea	POS, perception of organizational politics → OCBI
Li et al. (2014)	288	supervisor-subordinate	China	relative LMX → PC fulfillment → OCB
Liborius (2014)	626 (total)	students and workers	Unknown (online)	integrity, humility & forgiveness, interest and gratitude of leader → OCB (mdrt: followers' personality)

studies	samples			models
	number	jobs	nations	
Lilly & Virick (2013)	255	employees	USA	approach coping, avoidance coping → information justice, interpersonal justice → POS → OCBI, OCBO
Little et al. (2015)	163	leader-follower	USA	situation modification, cognitive charge, modulating the emotional response → LMX → OCB
Lu (2014)	104	supervisor-subordinate	China	ethical leadership → cognitive trust, affective trust → OCBI, OCBO
Luo & Liu (2013)	182	supervisor-subordinate	China	situational leadership, employee readiness → leader-follower match → OCB
Magdalena (2014)	60	teachers	Romania	job satisfaction, commitment, locus of control ↔ OCB
Meyer et al. (2012)	180	employee-peer	US	commitment (affective, normative, & continuance) ↔ OCB
Miao (2011)	130	supervisor-subordinate	China	POS, job satisfaction → OCB, helping, courtesy, conscientiousness, civic virtue
Miner & Glomb (2010)	1191		US	pleasant → OCB (mdrt: meta-mood clarity and attention)
Oh et al. (2015)	123	employees	China	conscientiousness, civic virtue → performance rating (mdrt: group performance)
Othman et al. (2014)	62	police officers	Malaysia	job satisfaction, ethical code → OCB
Ozcelik & Findikli (2014)	327	employees	Turkey	internal branding → P-O fit → OCB
Ozdemir & Ergun (2015)	202	employees	Turkey	organizational socialization → P-E fit → OCB
Ozer et al. (2014)	258	employee-partner	Asia	OCBI, OCBO → stress (mdrt: task independence, LMX)
Paille & Grima (2011)	355	working adults	France	altruism, helping, civic virtue, sportsmanship → intent to leave the organization, intent to quit the job
Pavalache-Ilie (2014)	62	employees	Romania	management position, self-efficacy → OCB
Peng & Chiu (2010)	259	supervisor-subordinate	Taiwan	supervisor feedback environment → affective-cognition → OCB
Popescu & Deaconu (2013)	196	students	Romania	individual OCB ↔ group OCB
Popescu et al. (2015)	73	small and medium enterprises	Romania	organization's age → OCB → SMEs performance
Restubog et al. (2011)	142	supervisor-subordinate	Philippin	psychological contract breach → OCB → career success
Russo et al. (2014)	10372	employees	China	OCB → career success → mental & physical health
Salami (2010)	320	public servants	Nigeria	conflict resolution strategy, trait EI → OCB

studies	samples			models
	number	jobs	nations	
Sani & Maharani (2012)	333	lectures	Indonesia	transformational leadership, OC → OCB → job performance
Seppala et al. (2012)	184	supervisor-subordinate	Finland	personal values, group identification, sense of power → change oriented OCB
Serim et al. (2014)	175	employees	Turkey	perceived competency model → OCB (mdrt: social exchange)
Shin & Choi (2010)	43	teams	South Korea	group-organization fit, group-task fit → cohesion, group efficacy → group-level OCB
Simbula & Guglielmi (2013)	157	teachers	Italy	work engagement → OCB
Sinha et al. (2011)	836	students	US	ability, high-school GPA, biodata → OCB
Spector & Che (2014)	146	supervisor-subordinate	USA	13 predictor variables → OCB
Staufenbiel & Konig (2010)	136	supervisor-subordinate	Germany	job insecurity → job satisfaction, organizational commitment → OCB
Tillman et al. (2014)	227	students	USA	heling → trust, loyalty, respect (mdrt: perceived intent)
Titrek et al. (2014)	255	teachers	Turkey	EQ → organizational justice → OCB
Tofighi et al. (2015)	150	nurses	Iran	emotional intelligence → altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness
Tsai et al. (2012)	134	employees	Taiwan	P-O fit → OCB
van Dijke et al. (2012)	91(S1) 137(S1)	students(S1) supervisor-subordinate	US, German	procejurial justice → self-perceived status → OCB (mdrt: leadership style)
van Dijke et al. (2015)	130	employees (S1)	Unknown (online)	procedural justice → social connectedness with authority → OCB (mdrt: nostalgia)
Webster et al. (2010)	143	supervisor-subordinate	US	stressor → job satisfaction, strains → OCBI, OCBO
Whitaker & Levy (2012)	202	supervisor-subordinate	US	feedback utility & seeking behavior → role clarity → OCB
Winkel et al. (2011)	234	employees	US	EI, impulsivity → OCBI, OCBO
Wu et al. (2014)	132	supervisor-suordinate	Taiwan	supervisors' perceived supervisor non-work support → subordinates' PSNS → OCBI, OCBO (mdrt: supervisors' perceived ingroup/outgroup membership of subordinates)
Yildirim (2014)	120	employees	Turkey	organizational communication ↔ 5dims
Yuan et al. (2012)	342	employees	Taiwan	transformational leadership → emotional behavior → 5dims
Zehir et al. (2013)	600	employees	Turkey	charismatic leadership → ethical climate → OCB

studies	samples			models
	number	jobs	nations	
Zhao et al. (2014)	388	supervisor-subordinate	China	compulsory CB → organizational identification → OCB (mdrt: interactional justice)

*5dims: altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, civic virtue