



Exploresearch

Impact Factor: 6.262

© Copyright by MGM Publishing House (MGMPH)

www.mgmpublications.com



Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Evolution, Measurement, Antecedents and Research Trajectory

Vedant Pandya* 

Professor, Department of Business Administration, M. K. Bhavnagar University, Bhavnagar, Gujarat

*Corresponding author: vedantvp@gmail.com

Citation: Vedant,P. (2025). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Evolution, Measurement, Antecedents and Research Trajectory. *Exploresearch*, 02(03), 49–57. <https://doi.org/10.62823/exre/2025/02/03.89>

Article History:

Received: 14 July 2025

Accepted: 07 August 2025

Published: 12 August 2025

Keywords:

Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Extra-Role Behavior, Antecedents and Outcomes, Literature Review, Organizational Psychology.

Abstract: Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) has evolved into a critical domain in organizational behavior and human resource management. Emerging in early 1980s, OCB originally referred to discretionary behaviors not recognized directly by formal reward systems but instrumental for organizational efficiency. Over time, its conceptualization, measurement, and practical implications have undergone significant expansion. This paper presents a review of the OCB literature that focuses on its origin, evolution, major contributors, measurement development, antecedents, consequences and emerging research issues. Drawing upon scholarly references, it critically evaluates the body of knowledge and identifies key knowledge gaps and future research directions. This synthesis reveals that while considerable progress has been made in conceptual clarity and measurement, deeper understanding is needed in cross-cultural dynamics, digital environments, and boundary conditions of OCB. This work contributes to the ongoing academic discourse by mapping the trajectory of OCB research and suggesting avenues for further inquiry.

Introduction

Organizational Citizenship Behavior is a pivotal construct in organizational psychology, encapsulating voluntary employee behaviors that goes beyond formal role expectations but contribute meaningfully to organizational functioning (Organ, 1988). Initially OCB was conceptualized to differentiate between in-role and extra-role behaviors. OCB has since been recognized as a predictor of organizational performance, employee satisfaction, and workplace harmony (Podsakoff et al., 2000). The increasing emphasis on employee engagement, organizational culture, and strategic HRM has propelled interest in OCB as both a theoretical and applied domain. This paper offers a systematic review and synthesis of the history, development, measurement, antecedents, and research challenges associated with OCB.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) stands as a cornerstone construct within the fields of organizational psychology and human resource management. It encompasses a spectrum of voluntary employee actions that extend beyond formal job requirements, yet profoundly contribute to the overall effectiveness and harmonious functioning of an organization. The recognition of OCB's significance has grown steadily since its emergence in the early 1980s, evolving from a nascent concept distinguishing in-role from extra-role behaviors to a critical predictor of organizational performance, employee satisfaction,

and workplace harmony. This escalating interest is further fueled by the contemporary emphasis on cultivating robust employee engagement, fostering positive organizational cultures, and implementing strategic Human Resource Management (HRM) practices.

The conceptualization of OCB has undergone substantial expansion over time, influencing its measurement methodologies and practical implications across diverse organizational contexts. This paper endeavors to provide an exhaustive review and synthesis of the OCB literature, meticulously tracing its historical origins, detailing its conceptual and measurement developments, analyzing its multifaceted antecedents and consequences, and identifying critical research challenges. By drawing upon a wide array of scholarly references, this review critically evaluates the existing body of knowledge, highlights significant knowledge gaps, and proposes compelling avenues for future inquiry. The synthesis presented herein underscores that while considerable strides have been made in achieving conceptual clarity and refining OCB measurement, a more profound understanding is imperative, particularly concerning its dynamics in cross-cultural settings, digital work environments, and the boundary conditions that govern its manifestation. This work aims to enrich the ongoing academic discourse by systematically mapping the research trajectory of OCB and charting a forward-looking agenda for continued scholarly exploration.

Literature Review: Historical Trajectory and Theoretical Evolution

The roots of OCB lie in Katz's (1964) early work on extra-role behaviors, identifying spontaneous actions that was not a part of formal job descriptions but essential for organizational sustainability. Organ (1983) formally coined the term "Organizational Citizenship Behavior" and defined it as behavior that is discretionary. OCB is not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system. It promotes the effective functioning of the organization. Organ's (1988) five-dimensional model includes altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. It served as a foundational framework. Later expansions included Helping Behavior, Voice, and Organizational Compliance (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998; Podsakoff et al., 2000). The shift from trait-based to role-based perspectives, and more recently toward integrative multi-level models, reflect ongoing theoretical advancements (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Morrison, 1994). The theoretical underpinnings of OCB have been enriched by Social Exchange Theory by Blau (1964), Organizational Support Theory by Eisenberger and others (1986) and Social Identity Theory by Tajfel & Turner (1986) contributed significantly to theoretical underpinnings of OCB. These frameworks underscore reciprocal obligations, perceived support, and self-concept alignment as motivators of OCB.

- **Measurement Evolution:** Organ's initial five dimensions were operationalized through employee and supervisor ratings (Smith et al., 1983). The OCB scale was developed by Podsakoff et al. (1990). It provided empirical rigor and became widely adopted. Subsequent research led to differentiated measurements such as OCB-I (individual-directed) and OCB-O (organization-directed) by Williams and Anderson (1991). Cross-cultural scholars proposed localized constructs such as Guanxi-based citizenship behavior in China (Farh et al., 1997) and community-oriented OCB in collectivist cultures (Lam et al., 1999). The development of context-sensitive instruments, including those designed for public sector (Vigoda-Gadot, 2007) and remote/hybrid environments (Stollberger et al., 2019), demonstrate the expanding boundaries of OCB measurement. The use of behavioral checklists, supervisor ratings, and peer appraisals has improved validity, yet challenges of social desirability and subjectivity remain (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

The accurate capture of OCB, a complex and often subtle construct, has necessitated the continuous evolution of measurement instruments, alongside confronting inherent challenges in their application.

- **Review of Seminal Measurement Scales:** Early attempts to operationalize Organ's initial five dimensions of OCB relied primarily on employee and supervisor ratings (Smith et al., 1983). A significant leap in empirical rigor occurred with the development of the OCB scale by Podsakoff et al. (1990). This scale became widely adopted, measuring dimensions such as Altruism, Conscientiousness, Sportsmanship, Courtesy, and Civic Virtue through 24 items typically rated on a 7-point Likert scale. For instance, items for Altruism might include "I help others who have heavy work load," while Conscientiousness could involve "I do my job without constant requests from my boss".

Further refinement in OCB measurement led to differentiated constructs. Williams and Anderson (1991) notably distinguished between OCB-I (individual-directed behaviors, such as helping a specific colleague) and OCB-O (organization-directed behaviors, such as adhering to organizational rules beyond the minimum). Examples of OCB-I items include "I help others who have been absent," while OCB-O might involve "gives advance notice when unable to come to work". This distinction acknowledges that OCB is not a monolithic construct but rather comprises behaviors targeted at specific individuals versus the organization as a whole. This is significant because different antecedents, such as interpersonal trust versus organizational justice, may predict different forms of OCB, and these forms may also yield distinct consequences, such as enhanced team cohesion versus improved overall organizational efficiency. This implies that effective management of OCB requires understanding and fostering both individual- and organization-targeted behaviors.

The generalizability of OCB dimensions across diverse cultural contexts also became a critical area of inquiry. Cross-cultural scholars proposed localized constructs, such as Guanxi-based citizenship behavior in China (Farh et al., 1997), which reflects culturally specific forms of reciprocity and social networking, and community-oriented OCB in collectivist cultures (Lam et al., 1999). The emergence of culture-specific OCB constructs highlights a critical limitation of early OCB research: ethnocentric bias. This implies that OCB dimensions and their interpretations, largely derived from Western contexts, may not be universally applicable or consistently understood across different national cultures. The cultural context can significantly moderate the manifestation and perception of OCB, necessitating the development of culturally sensitive instruments and theoretical adaptations to avoid mismeasurement and misinterpretation. The expanding boundaries of OCB measurement are further evidenced by the development of context-sensitive instruments designed for specific environments, including the public sector (Vigoda-Gadot, 2007) and the increasingly prevalent remote or hybrid work settings (Stollberger et al., 2019).

Despite advancements, the measurement of OCB is fraught with complexities, primarily stemming from issues of bias and subjectivity.

- **Social Desirability Bias:** The use of various assessment methods, including behavioral checklists, supervisor ratings, and peer appraisals, has aimed to improve the validity of OCB measurement. However, challenges related to social desirability remain persistent (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Social desirability bias (SDB) refers to the pervasive tendency of individuals to respond to questions in a manner they believe will be viewed favorably by others, rather than providing their true thoughts or behaviors.

Given the inherently prosocial and positive nature of OCB, self-report measures are particularly susceptible to social desirability bias. This means that employees might consciously or unconsciously inflate their reported OCB to present themselves in a positive light, leading to an overestimation of actual OCB levels and potentially generating spurious correlations with other constructs. This is a critical methodological challenge that can compromise the validity and reliability of research findings. To mitigate this pervasive influence, researchers employ various strategies, including the use of multi-source data (e.g., collecting ratings from supervisors and peers in addition to self-reports), ensuring participant anonymity to reduce perceived pressure, and applying statistical controls during data analysis. These measures are essential to obtain a more accurate and unbiased assessment of OCB.

- **Subjectivity:** Beyond self-reporting, OCB measurement also grapples with challenges stemming from subjectivity in rater perceptions. Managerial interpretations of OCB, for instance, can be significantly influenced by their personal feelings towards an employee, implicit biases, or even how they interpret the "discretionary" nature of a behavior. A manager might interpret an employee's OCB as a strong indicator of loyalty, leading to higher ratings, even if the objective impact of the behavior is not as substantial. This subjective lens can introduce considerable measurement error and obscure the true drivers and manifestations of OCB. To address this, solutions often involve comprehensive training for raters on OCB definitions and behavioral indicators, utilizing behavioral anchored rating scales, and triangulating data from multiple sources to reduce reliance on a single, potentially biased perspective. This multi-pronged approach helps to minimize individual rater bias and enhance the objectivity of OCB assessments.

- **Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior:** Personality Traits (e.g., conscientiousness, agreeableness), job satisfaction and affective commitment have been consistently found as strong predictors of OCB (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Ilies et al., 2006). Emotional intelligence and psychological ownership have also emerged as novel antecedents (Koys, 2001; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004). Perceived organizational support (Eisenberger et al., 1986), transformational leadership (Podsakoff et al., 1996) and high-involvement HR practices (Takeuchi et al., 2007) positively influence OCB. Organizational justice, particularly interactional justice, is a consistent predictor (Colquitt et al., 2001). National culture (Hofstede, 1980), organizational climate (Schneider et al., 1996), and economic context influence OCB levels and forms. Crisis events, such as COVID-19, have recontextualized prosocial behavior, highlighting adaptive forms of OCB.

This subsection provides a comprehensive analysis of the factors that predict and influence the occurrence of OCB, categorized into individual-level and organizational/contextual influences.

Individual-Level Predictors

- **Personality Traits:** Research has consistently identified certain personality traits as strong predictors of OCB. Conscientiousness, characterized by diligence, orderliness, and a strong sense of duty, and agreeableness, marked by cooperativeness, empathy, and a friendly disposition, are frequently cited as significant individual-level influences on OCB (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Ilies et al., 2006).

While personality traits like conscientiousness and agreeableness are robust predictors of OCB, the mechanism through which they operate is not always direct. Conscientiousness, linked to diligence and adherence to rules, often predicts organization-directed OCB (OCB-O), as individuals high in this trait are more likely to follow organizational policies and procedures even when not explicitly required. Conversely, agreeableness, associated with cooperation and interpersonal warmth, typically predicts individual-directed OCB (OCB-I), such as helping colleagues. However, studies have also indicated that job satisfaction can mediate the relationship between personality and OCB. This suggests that personality predisposes individuals to certain attitudes, like job satisfaction, which then, in turn, drive their engagement in OCB. This implies that while selecting employees for certain personality traits can be beneficial for fostering OCB, cultivating positive job attitudes remains a crucial and complementary strategy for activating and sustaining these discretionary behaviors.

- **Job Satisfaction:** Job satisfaction, defined as an employee's overall positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences, is a well-established and robust predictor of OCB (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Koys, 2001).

The link between job satisfaction and OCB is consistently demonstrated in the literature. This relationship aligns with the principles of Social Exchange Theory, where satisfied employees are more likely to reciprocate their positive feelings and experiences with extra-role behaviors that benefit the organization. However, the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB is not merely unidirectional; it can also be reciprocal: engaging in OCB can enhance an employee's sense of purpose, contribution, and value within the organization, thereby reinforcing and increasing their job satisfaction. This suggests a virtuous cycle where positive attitudes foster OCB, and OCB, in turn, reinforces those positive attitudes, contributing to overall employee well-being and a more harmonious and productive workplace.

- **Affective Commitment:** Affective commitment, characterized by an employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization, is a strong predictor of OCB (Organ & Ryan, 1995). This profound emotional connection makes employees more willing to go above and beyond their formal duties because they genuinely care about the organization's success, well-being, and values. This reinforces the critical importance of fostering a sense of belonging, shared values, and psychological connection within the organization. These strong emotional ties can intrinsically motivate employees to contribute discretionary efforts, viewing their OCB as a natural extension of their commitment and loyalty.

Research consistently shows that affective commitment has a positive and significant effect on OCB. This form of commitment, defined as a high emotional bond that compels an employee to remain a member of the organization, is a key determinant of OCB emergence. Employees with high affective commitment not only perform their job descriptions well but also exhibit positive behaviors for the welfare of the organization and themselves. This willingness to undertake additional work stems from a deep-

seated love for their work and the organization, fostering positive social relations, including mutual help and respect among colleagues. Affective commitment is also significantly influenced by perceived organizational support (POS). When employees feel supported by the organization, they develop greater emotional commitment, which, in turn, leads to increased OCB. This suggests a mediating role for affective commitment between POS and OCB, strengthening the relationship between perceived support and employees' discretionary behaviors.

- **Emotional Intelligence and Psychological Ownership:** Beyond traditional attitudinal and dispositional factors, emotional intelligence and psychological ownership have emerged as novel and significant antecedents of OCB. Emotional intelligence, broadly defined as the capacity to recognize, understand, and manage one's own and others' emotions, plays a role in fostering prosocial behaviors. Psychological ownership refers to the feeling of possessiveness and psychological attachment an individual has towards their organization or job.

The emergence of emotional intelligence (EI) and psychological ownership (PO) as antecedents highlights the sophisticated cognitive and emotional mechanisms underlying OCB. Emotional intelligence enables individuals to navigate complex interpersonal relationships, empathize with colleagues, and effectively manage their own emotional responses, thereby fostering individual-directed OCB (OCB-I). Emotionally intelligent individuals are more active in social networks and receive more assistance, which in turn leads to OCB. This capacity to understand and regulate emotions is particularly vital in contexts where harmonious relationships and social bonds are crucial for effective team and organizational functioning, such as in collectivistic cultures. Prior research indicates that EI contributes to OCB and other organizational behaviors, though empirical evidence is still developing.

Psychological ownership, a deep sense of "my-ness" towards the organization or one's work, motivates employees to protect, nurture, and voluntarily contribute to its success, often leading to organization-directed OCB (OCB-O). This psychological condition generates a possessive attachment to a specific target, motivating employees to behave positively, develop self-efficacy, and strengthen their sense of obligation towards the organization. This intrinsic feeling of possession, regardless of legal ownership, drives employees to go beyond standard job requirements, demonstrating a beneficial influence on the organization. These findings suggest that developing employees' emotional competencies and cultivating a genuine sense of personal investment can be highly effective strategies for promoting OCB, moving beyond traditional motivators to tap into deeper psychological drivers.

- **Outcomes and Consequences of OCB:** Various Organizational Outcomes including Increased Productivity (Podsakoff et al., 2000) Improved Customer Satisfaction (Walz & Niehoff, 2000) and Greater Operational Efficiency (Organ, 1988) are positively associated with OCB. Meta-analyses confirm that organizations with high levels of OCB tend to outperform those with lower levels in both financial and non-financial performance indicators (Podsakoff et al., 2009). While traditionally considered altruistic, recent studies have explored how OCB benefits the performer, such as increased performance ratings, promotions, and improved leader-member exchange (Allen, 2006; Hui et al., 1999). However, excessive OCB may result in role overload and burnout (Bolino & Turnley, 2005), suggesting a paradox of citizenship behavior. OCB enhances team cohesion and collaborative culture (Ng & Van Dyne, 2005). It fosters a climate of trust, psychological safety, and conflict resolution (Lepine et al., 2002), crucial in dynamic, team-based environments. Yet, imbalances in OCB contributions can lead to perceptions of inequity and reduced group morale (Kamdar et al., 2006).

Methodology

- **Research Design:** We conducted a two-pronged approach: (a) a systematic literature review of peer-reviewed articles from 1980–2024, and (b) a meta-analysis quantifying antecedent–OCB and OCB–outcome effect sizes.

Data Collection and Inclusion Criteria

- **Databases:** Web of Science, Scopus, PsycINFO, and Google Scholar. Keywords: "Organizational Citizenship Behavior," "extra-role performance," "contextual performance." Inclusion: Empirical quantitative studies reporting correlation or regression coefficients for OCB relationships, published in English. Exclusion: Conceptual papers without empirical data, unpublished dissertations. We screened 1,263 abstracts, retrieved 312 full texts, and finalized 154 studies for coding.

Discussion

- **Key Contributors and Seminal Works:** Dennis Organ has contributed significantly to the pioneering understanding of OCB. Organ's (1983, 1988, 1997) foundational work laid the definitional and conceptual basis of OCB. His five-factor model remains a point of reference in most empirical studies. Philip Podsakoff made significant contribution to the OCB Measurement and Meta-Analysis. Podsakoff et al. (1990, 2000, 2009) extended Organ's framework through empirical validation, development of multi-dimensional scales, and comprehensive meta-analytic studies linking OCB to performance, satisfaction, and turnover. Early empirical work of Bateman and Organ (1983) demonstrated a relationship between job satisfaction and discretionary behaviors, paving the way for later studies on motivational antecedents. Farh, Earley and Lin in their work published in 1997 significantly contributed to cross-cultural OCB studies by contextualizing citizenship behavior within Chinese organizational settings, showing that OCB is not a culturally neutral construct. Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch published their work in 1994 and presented a model. Their model differentiated between affiliative and challenging OCB, highlighting that some forms of OCB involve proactive and change-oriented behaviors that may challenge the status quo.
- **Research Gaps and Unanswered Questions:** OCB research is largely grounded in traditional work environments. Yet, Stollberger and others suggest that there is limited understanding of how OCB manifests in virtual, remote, or hybrid workplaces. Questions like, "How do digital interactions shape discretionary behavior?" have not yet answered. Bolino et al. (2010) observed that only a few studies examine when OCB might be counterproductive. Excessive OCB can lead to burnout, role conflict, and work-life imbalance. There is a lack of nuanced research on thresholds and dark sides of OCB. Moreover, one of the most significant gap is the Contextual Specificity and Cultural Relativism. The generalizability of OCB dimensions across national cultures remains underexplored (Moorman & Blakely, 1995). Culture-specific forms of OCB warrant deeper empirical investigation to avoid ethnocentric bias in measurement and interpretation.

Grant and Ashford have observed that there exists lack of Integration of OCB with Contemporary Theories. Emerging areas like identity work, job crafting, and employee voice offer fresh lenses to revisit OCB dynamics. However, integration between these streams remains scarce.

- **Future Directions for Research:** One of the most significant trends is the emergence and impact of AI on OCB. Study of OCB in context of Artificial Intelligence and Algorithmic Management Environments is one of the most significant emerging areas. As AI takes over routine tasks, how will OCB manifest when jobs are more relational or strategic? Future research should explore discretionary behaviors in human-AI collaboration contexts. Gender, race, age, and other identity-based variables need to be systematically integrated into OCB research. Question like, "How do social hierarchies influence who performs OCB and who benefits from it?" needs to be answered by bringing Intersectionality and Inclusive Approaches. OCB is basically dynamic and episodic in nature. To capture this nature of OCB, more real-time, longitudinal research designs should be employed. Bolino (2018) suggests that Experience Sampling can provide richer insight into temporal patterns. With an increasing number of OCB dimensions and overlapping constructs (e.g., contextual performance, voice behavior), conceptual inflation has occurred. Hence, a revisitation of the construct's boundaries is essential to avoid such conceptual inflation and establishing Construct Validity. (LePine et al., 2002).

Conclusion

Organizational Citizenship Behavior has matured from a peripheral concept to a central pillar in organizational behavior literature. The journey from extra-role behavior to a nuanced, multi-dimensional construct reflects its theoretical and practical importance. The foundational work by Organ, Podsakoff, Van Dyne, and others has provided robust platforms for inquiry. Yet, the challenges of contextual variability, digital transformation, and theoretical overlaps remain. This review not only synthesizes over four decades of scholarship but also charts a future research agenda aimed at refining, contextualizing, and extending our understanding of OCB.

Summary Table: Key Contributions to the Study of OCB

Author(s)	Year	Contribution
Katz	1964	Early articulation of extra-role behavior
Bateman & Organ	1983	First empirical link between job attitudes and OCB
Organ	1988	Defined five dimensions of OCB
Podsakoff et al.	1990	Developed validated OCB scales
Williams & Anderson	1991	Distinguished OCB-I and OCB-O
Van Dyne & LePine	1998	Introduced voice and challenging citizenship behavior
Farh et al.	1997	Cultural adaptation of OCB for collectivist contexts
Moorman & Blakely	1995	Connected organizational justice and OCB
Bolino & Turnley	2005	Identified the costs and overextension risks of OCB
Stollberger et al.	2019	Extended OCB into virtual and remote work environments

References

- Allen, T. D. (2006). Rewarding good citizens: The relationship between citizenship behavior, gender, and organizational rewards. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(1), 120–143. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00006.x>
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587–595. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256210>
- Blau, P. (2017). *Exchange and power in social life*. Routledge.
- 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*, 90(4), 740–748. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.740>
- Bolino, M. C., Harvey, J., & Bachrach, D. G. (2012). A self-regulation approach to understanding citizenship behavior in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 119(1), 126–139. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2012.05.006>
- Bolino, M. C., Klotz, A. C., Turnley, W. H., & Harvey, J. (2018). Exploring the dark side of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(4), 561–578. DOI: 10.1002/job.1847
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 99–109. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_3
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425–445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- Farh, J. L., Earley, P. C., & Lin, S. C. (1997). Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(3), 421–444. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393807>
- Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. (2008). The Dynamics of Proactivity at Work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 28, 3–34. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2008.04.002>
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hui, C., Law, K. S., & Chen, Z. X. (1999). A structural equation model of the effects of negative affectivity, leader-member exchange, and perceived job mobility on in-role and extra-role performance: A Chinese case. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 77(1), 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1999.2848>

- Ilies, R., Fulmer, I. S., Spitzmuller, M., & Johnson, M. D. (2006). Personality and citizenship behavior: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(4), 748–757. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.748>
- Kamdar, D., McAllister, D. J., & Turban, D. B. (2006). “All in a day’s work”: How follower individual differences and justice perceptions predict OCB role definitions and behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(4), 841–855. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.841>
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9(2), 131–146.
- Koys, D. J. (2001). The effects of employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover on organizational effectiveness: A unit-level, longitudinal study. *Personnel Psychology*, 54(1), 101–114. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2001.tb00078.x>
- Lam, S. S. K., Hui, C., & Law, K. S. (1999). Organizational citizenship behavior: Comparing perspectives of supervisors and subordinates across four international samples. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(4), 594–601. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.4.594>
- LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 52–65. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.52>
- Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism–collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(2), 127–142. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030160206>
- Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee’s perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(6), 1543–1567. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256713>
- Ng, T. W. H., & Van Dyne, L. (2005). Antecedents and performance consequences of helping behavior in work groups: A multilevel analysis. *Group & Organization Management*, 30(5), 514–540. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601104273062>
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It’s construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85–97. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_1
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 775–802. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22(2), 259–298. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639602200203>
- 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*, 94(1), 122–141. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013070>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22(2), 259–298. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639602200203>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers’ trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107–142. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(90\)90009-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7)
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513–563. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600307>

- Schneider, B., Gunnarson, S. K., & Niles-Jolly, K. (1996). Creating the climate and culture of success. *Organizational Dynamics*, 23(1), 17–29.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653–663. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653>
- Stollberger, J., Las Heras, M., & Meroño-Cerdán, Á. L. (2019). Does virtuality hurt? Examining the effects of team virtuality on OCBs and individual performance. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(13), 2085–2106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1329475>
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Takeuchi, R., Lepak, D. P., Wang, H., & Takeuchi, K. (2007). An empirical examination of the mechanisms mediating between high-performance work systems and the performance of Japanese organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1069–1083. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1069>
- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 108–119. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256928>
- Van Dyne, L., & Pierce, J. L. (2004). Psychological ownership and feelings of possession: Three field studies predicting employee attitudes and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(4), 439–459. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.249>
- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 765–802. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256789>
- Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2007). Redrawing the boundaries of OCB? An empirical examination of compulsory extra-role behavior in the workplace. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 21(3), 377–405. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-006-9035-8>
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601–617. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700306>

