

## **Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A review and research agenda**

Laxmipriya Das, Research Scholar, Institute of Business and Computer Studies, Siksha O Anusandhan University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha

Dr. Sasmita Mohanty, Associate Professor, IBCS, Siksha O Anusandhan University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

### **ABSTRACT**

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is one of the significant concepts of human resource management that has held the attention of academia and industry. This paper makes an attempt at exploring the concept thoroughly by dissecting the antecedents, consequences, correlates constructs, and major researches are done in the field to date. Based on the Organizational Citizenship Behavior literature, the article develops a review paper that advocates the integration of the concepts of OCB in various organizations. The objective of this paper is to investigate the definitions of OCB, phases of evolution, Characteristic features of OCB and significance of OCB.

### **Keywords**

Definitions of OCB, Evolution of OCB, Characteristic features of OCB, Significance of OCB

### **INTRODUCTION**

In current decades, Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) has received attention worldwide from academics and practitioners. What constitutes a good employee? Are positive characteristics of 'good employee' still quantifiable in performance appraisals or is there anything else to take into account? The centrality of the concept is fathomed from the persistent reiteration from organizational scholars that organization could not survive or prosper without the member employees engaging in positive behaviors that are beyond formally prescribed behavior such as helping fellow workers (Katz, 1964; Organ, 1988; MacKenzie and Podsakoff, 1993). Various pioneering researchers have made significant contributions towards the application of OCB. This paper while providing a comprehensive understanding on the concept, presents an overview of some of the key studies, specifically focusing on the following questions:

- 1) What is an organization?
- 2) What are the phases of evolution of OCB?
- 3) What are the characteristic features of OCB?
- 4) What is the significance of OCB?

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **1. What is an organization?**

An organization is an entity, such as company, an institution or an association, comprising one or more people and having a particular purpose. The word is derived from the Greek word Organon.

#### **1.1 Definitions of Organization**

Louis Allen (1958), “organization is the process of identifying and grouping work to be performed, defining and delegating responsibility and authority and establishing relationships for the purpose of enabling people to work most effectively together in accomplishing objectives”.

An organization can grow and change in an orderly and progressive manner only if well-defined goals have been established to guide its progress. Since each component can accomplish only limited work, there should be departmental goals which serve as specific guides for subordinate units. These enable individual managers to operate with maximum freedom but always within the framework of over-all company objectives. Unless such goals are established, there is likely to be uneconomical commitment of capital funds, poor utilization of people and mediocre operating results over the long term.

Stephen P. Robbins and Mary Coulter (2002) defined organizing as ‘what tasks are to be done, who is to do them, how tasks are to be grouped, who reports to whom, and where decisions are to be made’.

Thus, organizing refers to important dynamic aspects such as what tasks are to be performed, who has to perform them, on what basis the tasks are to be grouped, who has to report to whom and who should have the authority to take decisions.

Alvin Brown (1945) defined organizing as ‘the part each member of an enterprise is expected to perform and the relations between such members, to the end that their concerted endeavor shall be most effective for the purpose of the enterprise’.

Koontz and O'Donnell (1972) considered organizing as 'the establishment of authority relationships with provision for co-ordination between them, both vertically and horizontally in the enterprise structure'. Organization is essentially a formal structure of people, which is set up to achieve some defined goals. A business unit or a manufacturing unit may be termed as a business organization or a manufacturing organization, because these are essentially formal structures of persons, who strive to achieve some defined goals.

## 2. What are the phases of evolution of OCB?

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is a concept that includes everything that employees do positive and beneficial, of their own free will and that encourages colleagues and benefits the business. Typically, workers who often participate in OCB may not be the best performers but they are considered to go beyond the minimum of effort needed to do a simply satisfactory job.

### 2.1 Definitions of OCB

In this review paper, different definitions of OCB are presented.

Barnard (1938), more than half a century ago, indicated that individuals 'willingness to contribute cooperative activities' to the organization was indispensable for the successful achievement of organizational objectives. Maintaining the organization by exercising discretionary ownership may be translated to uplift the organization. The notion of employees' extra role activities is taken into account by Katz's (1964). Katz acknowledged that workers voluntarily devote extra resources to achieve the organizations efficiency. When designing his OCB system, Organ depended both on the principles of Barnard (1938) and Katz (1964).

Management departments, organizations and functions must exert power to support the organization. Executive roles are not limited to official positions alone. They are exercised by "all those who are power of control to some degree". Barnard inserts the 'co-operative system' which enables 'purposeful environmental changes', education and 'invention of successful approaches to human relationships'. The co-operative system includes organizational, individual, material and social economies. These allow allocation of utility values to physical resources, social properties, organizational and individual contributions. The organization goes into all

fields as it is 'the set of values which the organization considers to be a social structure' (Barnard 1968). Survival is the only indicator of the fourfold economy.

According to Organ, 1988 OCB is "an individual action that is voluntary, not explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate enhances the organization's successful functioning". OCBs aimed at the whole organization, such as support for the recruitment of suitable staff, recommendation for improvement of office facilities or work without pay overtime. These patterns are therefore helpful but difficult to maintain in the typical organizational structures.

Organ (1977) however indicated that a better OCB description has been given in Borman and Motowidlo's (1993) "contextual actions." No conceptions of discretion, rewards or intent are involved with this definition. This description only implies that the behaviors, rather than "the technological core," benefit "the organization, social and psychological environment." No particular motivation is assumed for the factor and no other context is given. The distinction between what and what is not included in the technological core exists with a certain degree of subjectivity. Probably the uncertainty will continue.

Morrison (1994) concluded that OCB was not generally viewed as "extra role" and workers who considered it "in-role" which demonstrated more of it. The extra-role performance behaviors are those behaviors which are not part of their formal role requirements because they cannot be recommended or needed for a particular job beforehand, but which help to ensure that the organization operates properly as a social system. Several extra role performance behavior are: assisting employees with an employment problem; tolerates temporary interference without complaints; maintains the healthy and physical hygiene of the workplace; to promote an atmosphere for work that is tolerable and minimizes interpersonal conflict distractions; and to protect and conserve organizational resources, etc (Bateman and Organ, 1983).

Organ consequently redefines OCB as the "contributions to preserving and improving the social and psychological context that enables the performance of the tasks" (Organ, 1997). OCB remains different from task performance in this redefinition because it is not directly related to specific job criteria or incentives. Task performance implies an employee's core job responsibilities. It is also known as "in-role prescribed behavior" (Koopmans et al. 2011). Task

performance is demonstrated in the specific results or outcomes as well as in their quality and quantity.

According to Halbesleben and Bellairs (2015) “people are motivated to choose behaviors that give them the best opportunity to achieve their future goals with regard to work, which often reflects as OCBs”. In certain situations, the goal of an individual may be to be perceived as a good citizen. When individual believe that OCBs will be instrumental in achieving its objective, they are more likely to engage in citizenship behaviors.

## **2.2 Evolution of OCB**

We can classify the sequence of continuous evolution of OCB from 1938 to 2018 chronologically.

First Phase (1938-1966) Theme: (Concept of Willingness and Open System)

One can find the roots of OCB in the concept of willingness to cooperate explained by Chester Barnard (1938). Barnard characterized an organization as a “cooperative system”. He postulated that a formal organization must achieve both “effectiveness” and “efficiency”.

Barnard argued that the “willingness” of members to contribute efforts to the cooperative system was “indispensable”. He described this notion of willingness as something different from “effectiveness” or “ability” and regarded it as something like a disposition to go beyond the formal duties of the individual member.

Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939) providing value-added contributions to efficiency and effectiveness (to use Barnard’s terminology).

The concept of an open system has been extended and formulated by Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn (1966). They specified the different classes of behaviors that such a system requires in order to attain effectiveness. The system needs to attract and keep people in the system, ensure that members reliably perform the tasks formally associated with the positions they hold and encourage spontaneous behaviors beyond formal role prescriptions.

There was an identification of willingness and the concept of organization as an open system in the first phase. Researchers succeeded in showing the importance of an open system:

Katz and Kahn noted that the three classes of behavior are mainly driven by different motivational methods.

1. “System rewards” that accrue to members as a function of membership in the system.
2. “Instrumental” or “incentive rewards” motivate task performance and productivity beyond the satisfactory level.
3. “Spontaneous” cooperation (which takes place beyond formal roles) is inspired by the sense that one has absolute “citizenship” in the system.

Thus, it shows that both “willingness” of members and open system which includes “system rewards”, “incentive rewards” and “spontaneous” cooperation – plays an important role in organizational effectiveness.

#### Second Phase (1967-1977) Theme: (Rewards and Productivity)

In the second phase, various forms of rewards and individual productivity are identified.

The inherent difficulty of specifying the “spontaneous cooperation” posted by Katz and Kahn, presents serious challenges to researchers who would endeavor to elicit it as a form of contribution by individual members.

In 1967, Lawler and Porter, who thought that job satisfaction was the result of rewards that employees derived from the organization – whether they be extrinsic or intrinsic rewards.

As Porter and Lawler noted that various forms of reward would not necessarily bear a close correspondence with the work productivity of individuals. Rewards are only connected to individual productivity to bear much in the way of a statistical association.

Managers as well as union leaders continued to express agreement with the notion that “a satisfied worker is a productive worker”. But another explanation could be that many managers include more in their concept of “productivity” or “performance” than measurable output. May be they add to it what Katz and Kahn defined as “spontaneous” contributions, especially those that go beyond the narrow definition of the task or job description, more than just the productivity that provides the direct connection to bonus pay for the individual.

Organ (1977) suggested that what managers really mean when they say “a happy worker is a productive worker” is not about measurable physical or monetary results, but rather the more qualitative gestures that help to sustain the “cooperative system”.

There was an identification of rewards such as intrinsic and extrinsic and these rewards are connected to individual productivity. Researchers succeeded in showing the importance of rewards and productivity for a successful organization.

### Third Phase (1983-1994) Theme: (Growth of OCB)

This was the developmental phase of OCB. Two broad dimensions of OCB, the measures of task performance and contextual performance, five different types of OCB and its measurement are identified.

In an initial study by Bateman and Organ, the authors developed an instrument of 30-items of OCB including behaviors such as compliance, altruism, dependability, cooperation and punctuality.

Further defining the OCB construct, Smith and colleagues (1983) developed a 16-item, two factor measure of citizenship behavior that focused on altruism (helping) as well as generalized compliance.

In 1988, William and Anderson have defined two broad OCB dimensions as:

1. OCBO or general compliance actions directed towards the profit of an organization.
2. OCBI or altruistic behaviors immediately benefitted specific individuals within the organization and indirectly contributed to the organization effectiveness.

A scale of 24-item was developed by MacKenzie, Podsakoff, Fetter and Moorman (1990) to measure these behaviors.

In 1993, Borman and Motowidlo presented a two-dimensional model of individual performance.

1. The first dimension task performance,
2. The second dimension contextual performance lent heavily on the existing OCB and pro-social organizational behavior.

By questioning whether OCB really is “discretionary”, Borman and Motowidlo (1993) proposed “contextual performance”. In several studies OCB has proven important for overall job success. The measures of task performance and contextual performance, demonstrated by Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994) and this contribute separately to overall success scores.

Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994) have defined and developed a scale of 34-item to quantify the five different types of OCBs – obedience and loyalty, social engagement, support and functional involvement. OCB has been conceptualized as “a global concept that includes all positive behaviors of individual (Van Dyne et al. 1994)”

Thus, it can be inferred that Organ and colleagues still greatly affect the idea of the OCB.

#### Fourth phase (1996-2018) Theme: (Development of Knowledge Worker Scale)

In the fourth phase, OCB is redefined. There was development of knowledge worker scale. Task performance played a significant role. Organ (1997) has argued that the redefinition of OCBs in order to address criticism of a definition for OCB is a “contextual performance or contribution to maintaining and improving the social and psychological context that promotes task performance” (Morrison, 1994, Van Dyne, Cummings & McLean Park, 1994).

Previous research has demonstrated the overall effectiveness of the tasks and contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Conway, 1999).

OCB contributes to the success of the organization by improving the social and psychological climate that promotes job efficiency. The organization’s effectiveness can also be improved by linking it with operational efficiency, satisfaction of customers, financial performance and revenue growth (Organ, Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 2006).

Kuroski and Sullivan (2013) have recently established an OCB Knowledge Worker Scale (OCB-KW Scale) of 23-item, measuring five types of OCBs- that are extremely related to previous work, which identifies employee practices aimed at improving personal health and promoting other activities.

### **3 What are the characteristic features of OCB?**

Dennis Organ (1988) measured five characteristic features of OCB: altruism, courtesy, civic virtue, conscientiousness and sportsmanship.



They are:

- i. **Altruism:** Altruism concerns mainly organizational members in terms of helping approach. It includes behaviors that supports coworkers who work heavily and orients new people voluntarily or even without being asked for their jobs. Through altruism a person does not expect any help because he or she wants to improve the welfare of others.
- ii. **Conscientiousness:** Conscientiousness indicates impersonal behavior that helps the entire organization. In other words, it applies to behavior that is not related to someone else. For example, an employee who follows the rules of an organization, or an employee who does not waste any vacation or sick day.
- iii. **Sportsmanship:** Sportsmanship is the ability of the worker to work without complaining in difficult circumstances. It is the only form of OCB that leads to behavior deterioration. For example: Sportsmen would be considered good sportsmanship not to engage in gossip and not to complain about the office matter.
- iv. **Courtesy:** Communication and general empathy for others, avoiding organizational conflicts, demonstrates kindness. The courteous conduct attempts to prevent other workers' unpleasant surprises.
- v. **Civic Virtue:** The civic virtue is part of the life and culture of organizations; it is not regarded as an individual act, but as the target of the organization. Corporate activities such as gatherings and picnics will be an example of civic virtue.

#### **4 What is the significance of OCB?**

In recent years, OCB has increased interest in psychology and management literature. Organ considers OCB as personal behavior which is arbitrary, not clearly and explicitly demonstrated by a formal management system of organization which usually enhances the effectiveness of the organization. OCBs are realistic, effective and social behaviors (Alotaibi 2001). OCB is beneficial to employees in so far as it promote social relationships that have an impact on job performance. Organ (1988) defines OCB as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization”.

OCBs are vital to economic growth, because organizations can not anticipate the wide range of subordinate behaviors to achieve the objectives through job descriptions (Organ, 1988). Barnard (1938) emphasizes on the 'willingness to cooperate'. This 'willingness to cooperate' is distinct from the efficiency, ability or value of individual commitments. Katz and Kahn (1966 and 1978) in their social and psychological study, operating through an open system model of organization, brought attention to the different groups of behaviors that are crucial for organizational effectiveness.

It is now generally recognized that an integral element of organizational efficiency is the ability to engage to "go above and beyond" in the formal requirements of the prescribed roles (Barnard, 1938; Katz and Khan, 1966 and 1978; Organ, 1990).

The conceptualization of OCB by Organ's (1988) incorporates five forms of actions – altruism, courtesy, civic virtue, sportsmanship and conscientiousness – which are required for successful functioning of the organization.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The study was conducted by the use of systematic literature review analysis in which we have collected various research articles from Scopus indexed journal, item like OCB, history of OCB was searched, all the papers were analyzed according to the application of OCB in different regions nationally and internationally and summarized. In this study, applications of ten countries and seven organizations have been reviewed.

## **DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS**

In the current decades the sustenance of organizations depends on its human resource. Employees' willingness to walk the extra mile to perform better than the prescribed job behavior, are the organization that are moving faster in the growth ladder. Consequently, over the past decades, organizational citizenship behavior has attracted much attention from academia and industry alike as one of the most significant concept of human resource management. This paper intended at capturing and portraying the different perspectives on organizational citizenship behavior and evaluated its application in traditional organizations as well as in fast moving, technology driven globalised organizations where human capital is the

most significant asset of the company. Taking an analytical perspective, the paper looks into the origin and evolution of the concept while tracing to the current status of research in the field to enable a holistic understanding. At the one hand we dissect the constructs and approaches provided by varied scholars on OCB, its manifestations, antecedents, consequences and correlations. On other hand we also evaluate their applications in varied sectors across the globe. Country-wise segregation of research shows a dynamic adoption of the concept by scholars to evolve new dimensions and connections across organizational behavior and human resource management. It is also felt that more research is needed for assessing and predicting the magnitude of OCB present in employees accurately. It is possible only if the constructs are fully developed and conclusive. The current stage of research on OCB only supports a few constructs that partially explain the manifestation without committing to measurement or prediction. Furthermore there is a big gap also in OCB research on new age organizations that are knowledge driven, globalised, multicultural, based on freelance gig work, high skilled work force that demand altered citizenship behavior. Researches need to focus on the new parameters of OCB to cover these new trends in the organization.

## REFERENCES:

- [1] Bolino, M. C., & Klotz, A. C. (2015), "The paradox of the unethical organizational citizen: The link between organizational citizenship behavior and unethical behavior at work", *Current Opinion in Psychology*, Vol. 6, pp. 45-49.
- [2] Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2003), "Going the extra mile: Cultivating and managing employee citizenship behavior", *Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 17 No.3, pp.60-71.
- [3] Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2005). The personal costs of citizenship behavior: the relationship between individual initiative and role overload, job stress, and work-family conflict. *Journal of applied psychology*, Vol. 90 No.4, pp. 740.
- [4] Bolino, M. C., Harvey, J., & Bacharach, D. G. (2012), "A self-regulation approach to understanding citizenship behavior in organizations", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 119 No.1, pp.126-139.
- [5] Bolino, M. C., Hsiung, H. H., Harvey, J., & LePine, J. A. (2015), "Well, I'm tired of trying'!" Organizational citizenship behavior and citizenship fatigue", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.100 No 1, pp56.
- [6] Bolino, M. C., Klotz, A. C., Turnley, W. H., & Harvey, J. (2013), " Exploring the dark side of organizational citizenship behavior", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol.34 No.4, pp.542-559.
- [7] Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Bloodgood, J. M. (2002), "Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations", *Academy of management review*, Vol. 27 No.4, pp. 505-522.

- [8] 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*, Vol. 31 No.6, pp. 835-855.
- [9] Bove, L. L., Pervan, S. J., Beatty, S. E., & Shiu, E. (2009), "Service worker role in encouraging customer organizational citizenship behaviors", *Journal of business research*, Vol.62 No.7, pp. 698-705.
- [10] Bramel, D., & Friend, R. (1981), "Hawthorne, the myth of the docile worker, and class bias in psychology", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 36 No.8, pp. 867.
- [11] Chiaburu, D. S., Oh, I. S., Berry, C. M., Li, N., & Gardner, R. G. (2011), "The five-factor model of personality traits and organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis", *Journal of applied psychology*, Vol. 96 No.6, pp. 1140.
- [12] Choi, J. N. (2009), "Collective dynamics of citizenship behavior: What group characteristics promote group-level helping?", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 46 No.8, 1396-1420.
- [13] Costanza, D. P., Badger, J. M., Fraser, R. L., Severt, J. B., & Gade, P. A. (2012), "Generational differences in work-related attitudes: A meta-analysis", *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 27 No.4, pp. 375-394.
- [14] Daily, B. F., Bishop, J. W., & Govindarajulu, N. (2009), "A conceptual model for organizational citizenship behavior directed toward the environment", *Business & Society*, Vol. 48 No.2, pp.243-256.
- [15] Deluge, R. J. (1994), "Supervisor trust building, leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior", *Journal of occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 67 No.4, pp. 315-326.
- [16] Eskew, D. E. (1993), "The role of organizational justice in organizational citizenship behavior", *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol.6 No.3, pp. 185-194.
- [17] Graham, J. W. (1991), "An essay on organizational citizenship behavior", *Employee responsibilities and rights journal*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 249-270.
- [18] Johnson, R. E., & Chang, C. H. (2006), "I is to continuance as "We" is to affective: the relevance of the self-concept for organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*", *the International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, Vol. 27 No. 5, pp. 549-570.
- [19] 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 and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 83 No. 4, pp. 857-878.
- [20] Kysku, F., & Zarkada-Fraser, A. (2004), "An empirical investigation of corporate citizenship in Australia and Turkey", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 57-72.
- [21] Lavelle, J. J., Rupp, D. E., & Bruckner, J. (2007), "Taking a multifocal approach to the study of justice, social exchange, and citizenship behavior: The target similarity model", *Journal of management*, Vol. 33 No.6, pp. 841-866.
- [22] Lin, C. P., Lyau, N. M., Tsai, Y. H., Chen, W. Y., & Chiu, C. K. (2010), "Modeling corporate citizenship and its relationship with organizational citizenship behaviors", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 95 No. 3, pp. 357-372.

- [23] Lu, X. (2014), "Ethical leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating roles of cognitive and affective trust", *Social Behavior and Personality an international journal*, Vol. 42 No. 3, pp. 379-389.
- [24] Mackenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1993), "The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance", *Journal of marketing*, Vol. 57 No. 1, pp.70-80.
- [25] Maignan, I., & Ferrell, O. C. (2000), "Measuring corporate citizenship in two countries: The case of the United States and France", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 283-297.
- [26] Matten, D., & Crane, A. (2005), "Corporate citizenship: Toward an extended theoretical conceptualization", *Academy of Management review*, Vol. 30 No.1, pp. 166-179.
- [27] Newman, A., Nielsen, I., & Miao, Q. (2015), "The impact of employee perceptions of organizational corporate social responsibility practices on job performance and organizational citizenship behavior: Evidence from the Chinese private sector", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 26 No. 9, pp. 1226-1242.
- [28] Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989), "Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior", *Journal of applied psychology*, Vol. 74 No. 1, pp. 157.
- [29] Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009), "Individual-and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis", *Journal of applied Psychology*, Vol. 94 No. 1, pp. 122.
- [30] Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bacharach, D. G. (2000), "Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research", *Journal of management*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 513-563.
- [31] Rioux, S. M., & Penner, L. A. (2001), "The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: a motivational analysis", *Journal of applied Psychology*, Vol. 86 No. 6, pp. 1306.
- [32] Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002), "The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach", *Journal of applied psychology*, Vol. 87 No. 1, pp. 66.
- [33] Schnake, M. (1991), "Organizational citizenship: A review, proposed model, and research agenda", *Human relations*, Vol. 44 No.7, pp. 735-759.
- [34] Shamir, B. (1990), "Calculations, values, and identities: The sources of collectivistic work motivation", *Human relations*, Vol.43 No. 4, pp. 313-332.
- [35] Smith, C. A. O. D. W. N. J. P., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983), "Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents", *Journal of applied psychology*, Vol. 68 No. 4, pp. 653.
- [36] Stamper, C. L., & Dyne, L. V. (2001), "Work status and organizational citizenship behavior: A field study of restaurant employees", *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, Vol. 22 No. 5, pp. 517-536.
- [37] Sullivan, S. E., & Bhagat, R. S. (1992), "Organizational stress, job satisfaction and job performance: where do we go from here", *Journal of management*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 353-374.