

Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Review and Extension of its Nomological Network

Matthias Spitzmuller, Linn Van Dyne and Remus Ilies

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an updated, conceptually-based overview of the nomological network of the organizational citizenship behavior construct, with an emphasis on implications for future research. In doing so, we will use the OCB categorization framework based on the target of the behaviors, differentiating between citizenship targeted at the organization and citizenship targeted at the individual (McNeely and Meglino, 1994; Williams and Anderson, 1991). Previous literature reviews have mostly focused on 1) attitudinal and dispositional factors as antecedents of citizenship and 2) individual and organizational performance as consequences of citizenship (LePine et al., 2002; Organ and Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2000). We suggest that more recent research has widened the scope

of the nomological network of citizenship behavior, and thus, an updated literature review can help structure this emerging research on OCB. Accordingly, we discuss motivational and contextual antecedents of OCB, in addition to dispositional and attitudinal antecedents. In a similar fashion, we consider consequences of OCB for individual well-being in addition to consequences of OCB for individual, group, and organization performance.

There are at least four benefits of this broader perspective on citizenship behavior. First, with respect to the antecedents of OCB, we believe that a more dynamic understanding of the antecedents of citizenship behavior is needed to capture the complexities of the social environment in which OCB is embedded and to account for employee motivations

to engage in OCB. Second, with respect to consequences of OCB, the managerial orientation of most prior research on citizenship (Organ, 1997) has ignored consequences of OCB which go beyond effectiveness and efficiency implications. Third, recent research in social and personality psychology demonstrates the positive implications which prosocial behavior can have for those who perform these behaviors. Incorporating this perspective into research on citizenship can help generate a more complete understanding of the consequences of OCB for individual well-being as well as factors that sustain high levels of citizenship over extended periods of time. Fourth, an updated literature review can help structure these emerging areas of OCB research and can add to the research agenda for citizenship behavior for the next decade.

RESEARCH ON ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR – QUO VADIS?

It is almost thirty years now since Organ (1977) revisited the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance by differentiating quantitative measures of output from more subtle, qualitative aspects of work. Up to that point, a long tradition of research had failed to reach consensus on the nature of the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance (Brayfield and Crockett, 1955; Cherrington et al., 1971; Lawler and Porter, 1967; Vroom, 1964; see review by Judge et al., 2001), despite its practical appeal and its apparent face validity. By emphasizing more subtle, qualitative aspects of work, Organ widened the commonly accepted definition of job performance to include behaviors with positive effects on the psychological, social, and organizational context of work. Organ's idea set the stage for rapid growth in research on the nature, causes, and consequences of discretionary work behaviors, commonly referred to as organizational citizenship behavior (Organ, 1988) and contextual performance (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993).

Building on Organ's (1977) conceptualization, the first empirical studies on citizenship behavior were published in 1983. Bateman and Organ (1983) provided the first empirical support for the proposed relationship between job satisfaction and qualitative performance (later OCB); and Smith et al. (1983) developed the first measure of citizenship behavior which included subscales of helping and compliance. Further developing the concept, Organ defined OCB in 1988 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, 1988: 4). Acknowledging the related research on contextual performance, Organ updated the definition to 'contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that support task performance' (Organ, 1997: 91) in response to challenges that OCB is not necessarily extra-role and discretionary. Most recently, Organ et al. (2006: 34) emphasized the discretionary nature of OCB by defining it as 'discretionary contributions that go beyond the strict description and that do not lay claim to contractual recompense from the formal reward system'.

Since the early work of Organ and colleagues, the domain of citizenship behavior has grown at an impressive rate (Podsakoff et al., 2000), with two primary effects. First, researchers have identified a large number of related constructs. Second, there is an impressive amount of substantive research on the antecedents and consequences of OCB and related constructs. For example, in their review of research on organizational citizenship behavior, Podsakoff and colleagues (2000) noted that close to 30 different forms of citizenship behaviors had been suggested since Smith, Organ, and Near coined the term 'organizational citizenship behavior' in 1983. These include altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, civic virtue (Organ, 1988), interpersonal facilitation, job dedication (Van Scotter and Motowidlo, 1996), helping co-workers (George and Brief, 1992), loyalty, obedience,

participation (Van Dyne et al., 1994), loyal boosterism, personal industry, individual initiative (Moorman and Blakely, 1995), OCB-O and OCB-I (McNeely and Meglino, 1994; Williams and Anderson, 1991). The emergence of this large number of constructs demonstrates widespread interest in and relevance of organizational citizenship research. However, this proliferation of constructs has also been criticized.

First, some scholars have criticized the process used to introduce OCB-related constructs (LePine et al., 2002). For example, most research which proposed new types of OCB used factor analysis to identify and support different types of OCB. Unfortunately, however, very little research has investigated the potential conceptual overlap of the resulting constructs (see Van Dyne et al., 1995; and LePine et al., 2002, for two exceptions).

Second, because the convergent and discriminant validity of OCB constructs has not been examined conclusively, researchers could only speculate on the dimensionality of citizenship behavior. More recently, scholars have attempted to resolve this debate with meta-analytical techniques (LePine et al., 2002), multidimensional scaling, and cluster analysis (Coleman and Borman, 2000). However, conflicting results have prevented definitive resolution. For example, LePine and colleagues (2002) suggested that OCB should best be conceptualized as a latent construct, whereas Coleman and Borman (2000) suggested a three-factor structure of citizenship behavior. Moreover, other meta-analyses (Ilies et al., 2006a; Ilies et al., 2007) suggested that diverse facets of OCB differ in their relationships with common antecedents such as positive affect, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and leader-member-exchange. Thus, more recent findings support a multidimensional view of citizenship behavior.

Third, much of the construct work on citizenship behavior has been atheoretical. Based on Calder (1977), Van Dyne et al. (1995) criticized OCB research for developing first degree constructs derived from everyday explanations of socially constructed meaning, as opposed to using second degree constructs

supported by conceptual and empirical scientific evidence. Interestingly, even the first conceptualization of OCB proposed by Smith et al. (1983) has been criticized for being overloaded with socially constructed meaning. For example, Organ (1997) noted the managerial, status-quo bias of these behaviors that tend toward the mundane. Later research continued to introduce other first degree OCB constructs without clear theoretical rationale. There are, however, a small number of exceptions to this tendency. Van Dyne and colleagues (1994) developed a theoretically grounded approach to types of OCB based on political philosophy. Van Dyne and colleagues (1995) proposed a framework that differentiated affiliative versus challenging and promotive versus change-oriented behaviors. Finally, Moon et al. (2004) proposed a circumplex conceptualization of citizenship behavior as another example of a conceptually-based framework which can form the basis for cumulative research on OCB. Overall, however, we have to conclude that theoretically-based approaches to differentiating types of OCB are exceptions to the general tendency of researchers to list types of OCB.

Fourth, the lack of construct clarity becomes even more salient in light of the large body of substantive research that relates OCB to an increasingly complex network of antecedents and consequences. Schwab (1980) emphasized the critical importance of reaching consensus on construct definitions before moving on to substantive research, to avoid redundant and insufficiently distinct conceptualizations, construct contamination, and construct deficiency. Unfortunately, this has not been the case in OCB research. Instead, as noted by Van Dyne and colleagues (1995) and LePine and colleagues (2002), the large number of overlapping OCB constructs makes it increasingly difficult for the research domain to be cumulative, or to have a well-explicated nomological network (also see Moon et al., 2004; Organ et al., 2006; Organ, 1997; Podsakoff et al., 2000). In addition, although meta-analytic research has enhanced our understanding of the large body of OCB research (Harrison et al., 2006; Dalal, 2005;

Ilies et al., 2006a; Ilies et al., 2007; LePine et al., 2002; Organ and Ryan, 1995), these meta-analyses have also not resolved the debate over the nature and dimensionality of citizenship behavior.

Acknowledging these shortcomings of prior research, the remainder of this chapter is structured as follows. First, we argue that OCB research needs a conceptually-based framework which can help structure and summarize past research as well as guide future research. We then suggest that categorizing OCB based on the target of the behavior provides a parsimonious and conceptually meaningful framework which is supported by empirical research. Thereafter, we discuss the nomological network of citizenship behavior with a special focus on antecedents and consequences of citizenship which have received little or no attention in previous reviews. We conclude with a summary of past research that integrates these ideas and proposes an agenda for future citizenship research.

A SIMPLE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Before reviewing antecedents and consequences of citizenship behavior, we discuss the organizing framework which we use in our review of the nomological network of citizenship behavior. To avoid proliferation of OCB constructs and to contribute to accumulation of OCB findings, we discuss the substantive literature on OCB in terms of the intended beneficiary of the behavior. Thus, we organize this review by differentiating between citizenship behavior targeted at the organization [OCB-O] and citizenship behavior targeted at individuals [OCB-I]. Our objective in adopting this simple conceptual framework is aimed at integration of the literature, rather than differentiation so that big-picture general patterns in the relationships can emerge and serve as a foundation for guiding future research. We suggest that this simplified approach should highlight areas where future research is most likely to make important contributions. It also should help

to identify areas where research findings are clear and consistent, suggesting less need for additional studies of particular relationships.

Smith and colleagues' (1983) measure of OCB had two subdimensions – altruism and compliance – clearly differentiating citizenship targeted at the organization from citizenship targeted at individuals, with altruism representing interpersonal OCB-I and compliance representing impersonal OCB-O. The vast majority of subsequent OCB research can be subsumed into these two categories. For example, helping behavior (Van Dyne and LePine, 1998), task-focused interpersonal citizenship behavior, person-focused interpersonal citizenship behavior (Settoon and Mossholder, 2002), altruism (Organ, 1988), interpersonal facilitation (Van Scotter and Motowidlo, 1996), helping co-workers (George and Brief, 1992), and social participation (Van Dyne et al., 1994) reflect OCB targeted at individuals: OCB-I (Williams and Andersen, 1991). In contrast, loyal boosterism (Moorman and Blakely, 1995), loyalty, obedience, participation (Van Dyne et al., 1994), job dedication (Van Scotter and Motowidlo, 1996), conscientiousness, civic virtue (Organ, 1988), personal industry, and individual initiative (Moorman and Blakely, 1995) reflect OCB targeted at the organization: OCB-O (Williams and Anderson, 1991).

From a conceptual perspective, differentiating OCB-O and OCB-I is meaningful because OCB-I emphasizes interpersonal aspects of citizenship behaviors, whereas OCB-O focuses on impersonal citizenship. Based on this important conceptual distinction, there should be key differences in their respective nomological networks. Consistent with this, past theory and empirical research demonstrate that employees do not perform all types of OCB uniformly (Organ, 1997; Settoon and Mossholder, 2002; Van Dyne et al. 1995). In addition, research generally demonstrates that subdimensions of OCB differ in their relationships with antecedents and consequences only if they differentiate between citizenship behavior targeted at the organization, and citizenship behavior

targeted at individuals. More specifically, past research has established differential relationships of OCB-O and OCB-I with attitudinal, dispositional, motivational, and contextual antecedents (Colquitt et al., 2001; Flynn et al., 2006; Kamdar and Van Dyne, 2007; Rioux and Penner, 2001; Van der Vegt et al., 2006; Van Dyne and Farmer, 2004). In sum, we use the OCB-O and OCB-I framework to organize our review of the nomological network of citizenship behaviors. This approach is parsimonious and consistent with the differential relationships of OCB-O and OCB-I with their antecedents and consequences. In addition, we suggest that the OCB-O and OCB-I framework is especially relevant for reviewing more recent research that has relied on this framework (i.e., Bowler and Brass, 2006; Ilies et al., 2006a; Ilies et al., 2007).

ANTECEDENTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

In this section, we review research on antecedents of citizenship behavior. Early OCB research focused primarily on dispositional and attitudinal predictors, whereas more recent research has broadened its perspective by considering social ties and networks as antecedents at the meso level as well as contextual and organizational antecedents at the macro level. Since earlier reviews provide excellent summaries of the literature (Organ, 1997; Organ and Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2000), we emphasize more recent advancements in the literature.

The role of dispositions, attitudes, and motivations as antecedents of OCB

Dispositions

Since OCB is discretionary, it is more strongly influenced by personality and attitudinal factors than by ability, knowledge, or training (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Specifically, agreeableness and conscientiousness

are dispositional aspects of personality that predict performance of OCB in a wide variety of settings (Barrick et al., 1998; Organ and Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2000). For example, LePine and Van Dyne (2001) demonstrated relationships for agreeableness and conscientiousness with helping and voice citizenship. More important, conscientiousness was more strongly related to voice than to helping – and agreeableness was positively related to helping, but negatively related to voice. Consistent with this, meta-analytic evidence shows that agreeableness is more strongly associated with OCB-I and conscientiousness is a more effective predictor of OCB-O (Ilies et al., 2006a; Organ and Ryan, 1995).

More recently, researchers have focused on traits that predict prosocial behavior in general (i.e., a prosocial personality). For example, Penner et al. (1995) and Penner et al. (2005) identified dispositional empathy and helpfulness, based on self-perceived potency and competence to help, as two dimensions which comprise prosocial personality. Kamdar et al. (2006) demonstrated that the dispositional trait of perspective taking was more predictive of OCB-I (interpersonal helping) than OCB-O (loyal boosterism). Finally, positive and negative affectivity have been identified as personality predictors of OCB, with positive affectivity as a significant (but weak) predictor of OCB-I and negative affectivity as a significant (but weak) predictor of OCB-O (Organ and Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Research on dispositional antecedents of OCB has focused primarily on direct effect predictions. Unfortunately, research which examines the mediating (indirect) mechanisms through which personality impacts OCB is still in its nascent stages (Ilies et al., 2006a). Nevertheless, some studies consider moderated and/or mediated relationships. For example, some research suggests that personality influences citizenship behavior only to the extent that it influences thoughts and feelings about a job (Ilies et al., 2006; Organ and Ryan, 1995). This line of reasoning is congruent with trait activation theory

(Tett and Burnett, 2003), which suggests that attitudes and perceptions moderate the relationship between personality and work behavior (Kamdar and Van Dyne, 2007). In their recent meta-analysis on antecedents of OCB, Ilies and colleagues (2006) demonstrated that satisfaction mediated the effects of agreeableness and conscientiousness on organization-targeted behaviors. Moreover, both job satisfaction and positive affect mediated the effects of agreeableness and conscientiousness on individually-targeted behaviors. Another recent study investigated the interactive effects of personality traits and experienced states on intraindividual patterns of citizenship behavior (Ilies et al., 2006b). Results using experience-sampling methodology demonstrated that agreeableness moderated the intraindividual relationship between state positive affect and daily reports of citizenship behavior: highly agreeable employees exhibited more consistent patterns of citizenship behavior, such that their performance of OCB was less dependant on their state positive affect.

Building on the work of Campbell and colleagues (1993), Motowidlo et al. (1997) argued that personality would influence performance (comprised of contextual performance and task performance) through its influence on contextual knowledge or contextual work habits. Johnson (2003) noted, however, that this proposition has only received partial empirical support: Specifically, Schmit et al. (1996) reported that extraversion mediated the effect of contextual knowledge on contextual performance, but not for conscientiousness and agreeableness.

Finally, Organ and colleagues (2006) suggested that 'personality might influence manner or motive more than the substance of OCB' (p. 85). Specifically, they argued that dispositional traits may not explain differences in enacted levels of OCB, but they might explain why some individuals engage in citizenship. According to this line of reasoning, agreeable people are not predisposed to engage in citizenship behavior more frequently. Instead, their desire to mitigate the

discomfort of coworkers or friends leads to higher levels of OCB. We discuss motivational antecedents of citizenship behavior in greater detail below.

Attitudes

Since the early work of Organ (1977) and Bateman and Organ (1983), attitudes have received a great deal of attention as predictors of citizenship behaviors. Job satisfaction has consistently been identified as one of the strongest predictors of OCB, irrespective of the intended beneficiary (Ilies et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 2000). Moreover, organizational commitment (Organ and Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2000), justice and fairness perceptions (Colquitt et al., 2001; Organ and Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2000), and state positive affect (Ilies et al., 2006) are other affective and cognitive constructs associated with OCB. Interestingly, and consistent with our emphasis on OCB-O and OCB-I, organizational commitment and procedural justice perceptions were more strongly associated with OCB-O (Colquitt et al., 2001; Organ and Ryan, 1995) and interpersonal justice was more strongly associated with OCB-I (Colquitt et al., 2001).

Motivations

Most motivational approaches to citizenship behavior differ from approaches which focus primarily on attitudinal antecedents. Research on attitudes and OCB is typically based on social exchange theory and assumes that individuals perform OCB as a reaction to positive treatment at work (Rioux and Penner, 2001). In contrast, research on individual motivations as antecedents to OCB positions discretionary behaviors as proactive efforts directed toward satisfying basic human needs (Penner et al., 1997; Rioux and Penner, 2001). For example, Krebs (1991) argued generically that helping behavior (i.e., OCB-I) is based on a combination of egoistic and altruistic motives. Helping others, thus, provides personal benefits that enhance the helper's welfare and well-being. Krebs and others (Hornstein, 1991; Kenrick, 1991), however, acknowledge the inherent difficulties of disentangling egoistic and

altruistic motivational factors which trigger discretionary behaviors. Noting similarities between OCB and volunteering, Van Dyne and Farmer (2004) differentiated expressive functional motives and instrumental functional motives that lead to helping others (OCB-I). Expressive motives include helping for expression of role identity, ego protection, and self-enhancement. Instrumental motives, on the other hand, include economic and cost-benefit considerations.

To date, however, there is little empirical research on the motivational antecedents of citizenship. One notable exception is Rioux and Penner's (2001) measure of motives for engaging in OCB – the CMS or Citizenship Motivation Scale. This scale has a three-factor structure, consisting of:

- prosocial values (being motivated by helping others);
- organizational concern (being motivated by a sense of pride for being associated with the organization); and
- impression management (being motivated by looking good to obtain rewards).

Of these three motives, organizational concern and prosocial values predicted OCB. More importantly, organizational concern was more strongly associated with OCB directed at the organization and prosocial values were a stronger predictor of OCB directed at individuals. Although Bolino (1999) emphasized conceptual similarities between OCB and impression management, Rioux and Penner's (2001) self-report scale for impression management motives was not related to OCB. More recently, however, Bowler and Brass (2006) demonstrated that impression management can motivate citizenship behavior, especially when citizenship is targeted at employees with influential friends in the organization.

The role of task characteristics as antecedents of OCB

Podsakoff and Mackenzie (1997) suggested that task characteristics directly impact OCB,

and that they also moderate the effect of OCB on group performance. Consistent with this, Motowidlo et al. (1986) showed that high task demands reduced OCB-I. Podsakoff and colleagues' (2000) meta-analysis reported that task routinization reduced OCB-I. In contrast, job autonomy (Farh et al., 1990) and intrinsically satisfying tasks (Podsakoff et al., 2000) enhanced OCB. Recently, Bachrach et al. (2006) noted an increase in research on task characteristics and citizenship. Much of this research differentiates between OCB-I and OCB-O (Van der Veegt and Van de Vliert, 2005). For example, Bachrach and colleagues examined the moderating effect of task interdependence on the relationship between helping behavior (OCB-I) and group performance. Interestingly, they reported a non-monotonic effect of helping on group performance in the low task interdependence condition such that both low and high levels of helping led to lower group performance. Andersen and Williams (1996) demonstrated that employees seek and receive more interpersonal help (OCB-I) in task environments characterized by high task interdependence. These results suggest the benefits of additional work on task characteristics and citizenship.

The role of social relationships as antecedents of OCB

Like research on task characteristics and OCB, we observe an increasing trend in research on social relationships and citizenship behavior. Bowler and Brass (2006) argued, for example, that our understanding of interpersonal citizenship behavior is incomplete without considering the social relationships in which work is embedded. Specifically, they proposed that attitudinal, dispositional, and motivational approaches to citizenship behavior fail to account for the social environment surrounding citizenship. Moreover, Dovidio et al. (2006) suggested that quality of interpersonal relationships is a powerful predictor of human behavior which should add to our understanding of discretionary work behavior. In line with this reasoning, we now review employee


relationships with supervisors and co-workers as predictors of citizenship. Here, we focus primarily on OCB-I because interpersonal relationships have special relevance to OCB-I.

Relationships with supervisors as antecedents of OCB

Meta-analytic findings demonstrate that leadership and relationships of employees with their supervisors are powerful predictors of citizenship behavior. This includes leader supportiveness, transformational leadership, and contingent rewards (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Interestingly, dyadic relationships between leader and followers are more strongly related to OCB than universal leadership behaviors, such as transformational and transactional leadership (Organ and Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2000). In fact, leader-member exchange (LMX) is one of the most powerful predictors of OCB. Based on their review of previous research on OCB, Podsakoff and colleagues (2000) find that LMX was not only the strongest predictor of OCB among leadership behaviors, but among all predictors considered in their analyses, including individual characteristics, task characteristics, organizational characteristics, and leadership behaviors. A recent meta-analysis by Ilies and colleagues (2007) shows particularly strong relationships between LMX and interpersonal citizenship. In addition, research demonstrates that employees reciprocate high-quality LMX relationships with OCB-I directed specifically at the leader (Kamdar and Van Dyne, 2007). Moreover, again consistent with trait activation theory (Tett and Burnett, 2003), the results of Kamdar and Van Dyne demonstrate that LMX weakens the effects of personality on OCB-I. Other research shows LMX mediates and moderates the effects of other predictors on OCB. For example, Wang et al. (2005) demonstrated that leader-member exchange fully mediated the effect of transformational leadership on citizenship. Also, Sparrowe et al. (2006) showed that LMX moderated the effect of leader influence tactics on employee helping behavior.

The majority of research on the relationship between leadership and citizenship behavior has focused on the positive effects of leadership behaviors on citizenship. Taking a different approach, Tepper et al. (2004) investigated potential negative consequences of abusive leadership on citizenship behavior. Results demonstrated that in the presence of abusive supervision, performance of OCB eventually led to lower levels of co-worker job satisfaction.

Relationships with co-workers as antecedents of OCB

Social relationships with peers also predict OCB (Bowler and Brass, 2006; Ng and Van Dyne, 2005; Van der Vegt et al., 2006). Consistent with social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), employees reciprocate quality relationships with co-workers by providing more interpersonal citizenship (Anderson and Williams, 1996; Kamdar and Van Dyne, 2007; Settoon and Mossholder, 2002).  wise, interpersonal relationship quality (Andersen and Williams, 1996), intensity of friendship (Bowler and Brass, 2006), team member exchange (Kamdar and Van Dyne, 2007), group cohesiveness, and cooperative group norms (Ng and Van Dyne, 2005) are positively related to OCB-I. Research also suggests that relationships among co-workers (TMX) are strong proximal predictors of OCB-I that constrain expression of dispositional traits, thus reducing the effect of personality on citizenship (Kamdar and Van Dyne, 2007).

Research has started to investigate potential negative consequences of social relationships on citizenship behavior. For example, Ng and Van Dyne (2005) showed that group task conflict reduced OCB-I in work groups, and Twenge et al. (2007) demonstrated that social exclusion reduced prosocial behavior (i.e., OCB-I). Reflecting on this finding, Twenge and colleagues suggested that social exclusion temporarily interfered with emotional responses and thus impaired empathic reactions to co-workers, which in turn, reduced prosocial behavior. Finally, Van der Vegt and colleagues (2006) used a relational approach in their study of expertness diversity and

interpersonal helping. Results demonstrated that team members who were not perceived as experts received less help, which led to increased team member frustration, and reduced intragroup learning.

CONSEQUENCES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

The consequences of organizational citizenship behavior have not been studied as extensively as antecedents of citizenship (Scott, 2007), perhaps because most empirical studies focus on OCB as a valuable outcome in and of itself. A few studies, however, consider OCB as the predictor of other outcomes. Most of these studies focus on OCB as a predictor of individual, group, and organizational performance. This tendency is not surprising due to the managerial bias of early work on OCB (Organ, 1997). Looking ahead, we view this as a major opportunity to expand our understanding of the nomological network of OCB. Specifically, we draw on research in social and personality psychology which provides strong evidence that helping behavior has important implications for those who do the helping.

We begin this section with a review of the literature on consequences of OCB for individual, group, and organizational performance. We then review the limited existing research on consequences of citizenship for those who perform OCB. We then make suggestions about future research on consequences of OCB for individuals, with special emphasis on individual well-being.

Consequences of OCB for individual and group performance, and organizational effectiveness

The conceptualization of job performance has been expanded to include citizenship behavior and contextual performance (Johnson, 2003; Motowidlo, 2003). Although this redefinition could be interpreted as reducing the need

for empirical research on OCB and job performance, and even though Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997) summarized eight conceptual reasons to support the assumed relationship between citizenship behavior and performance, surprisingly few studies have examined this relationship empirically.

At the individual level of analysis, MacKenzie and Podsakoff demonstrated positive effects of citizenship for those who exhibit OCB as well as for those who are the targets of citizenship. For example, those who exhibit OCB are rated as higher performers by supervisors (MacKenzie and Podsakoff, 1999; MacKenzie et al., 1991; 1993). From a conceptual perspective, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997) argued that OCB helps new employees become productive more quickly, and helps to spread 'best practices' in organizations, thus enhancing the performance of those who learn these best practices.

Moving to higher levels of analysis, research has demonstrated relationships between OCB and unit performance in terms of customer service quality and sales performance, as well as performance quality and quantity. Several studies have demonstrated significant relationships between citizenship and unit sales (MacKenzie et al., 1998; Podsakoff et al., 1997; Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1997). Walz and Niehoff (1996) showed citizenship was related to operating efficiency and customer service quality. Looking specifically at OCB-I and OCB-O, George and Bettenhausen (1990) demonstrated that group prosocial behaviors (OCB-I) were positively related to store sales. Explanations for these findings include enhanced coordination and reduced need for maintenance activities in units where employees regularly contribute OCB and enhanced coordination (Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1997). Finally, at the macro level of analysis, Schnake and Hogan (1995) demonstrated that OCB was related to organizational flexibility and efficiency.

Together, these studies provide support for relationships between citizenship behavior and performance on the micro, meso, and macro levels. Unfortunately, studies which

differentiate between OCB-I and OCB-O have produced inconsistent results. Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997) commented that the relationship between helping (OCB-I) and performance may be stronger than the relationships for civic virtue and sportsmanship (OCB-O) with performance. Another study, however, reported a significant negative relationship (-0.49) between helping (OCB-I) and sales performance (Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994). In contrast, other research has reported positive relationships between helping (OCB-I) and group and organizational outcomes (e.g., sales performance, operating efficiency, customer satisfaction, and quantity/quality of performance: MacKenzie et al., 1996; Podsakoff et al., 1996; Walz and Niehoff, 1996). Finally, Ng and Van Dyne (2005) showed that the relationship between group helping (OCB-I operationalized with both average and minimum levels) and group performance failed to reach significance. Podsakoff and colleagues (1997) noted that differences might be due to the nature of the work being performed such that task interdependence influences whether OCB contributes to or detracts from performance. Consistent with this, Bachrach and colleagues' (2006) findings show that task interdependence influenced the effectiveness of helping. Perhaps other inconsistent findings are due to group norms and/or organizational culture. Clearly, more research is needed to address the inconsistent findings about relationships for OCB-I and OCB-O with performance.

The consequences of OCB for those who perform OCB

Organ's (1988) original conceptualization of OCB assumed that OCB was positively intended and in aggregate would have positive consequences for organizations. More recent research has continued this focus, including potential benefits for the well being of other individuals, groups, organizations, and society in general (e.g., Penner et al., 2005). Consequently, a considerable amount of

research has investigated the effects of OCB on intended beneficiaries (individuals, groups, organizations).

Unfortunately, however, there is little research on the consequences of performing OCB for those who perform OCB. We are aware of only two studies that have considered satisfaction as an outcome of performing OCB (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Park and Van Dyne, 2006). Thus, we suggest that scholars have not fully recognized the positive implications of performing OCB for the actor – the person who performs OCB. In the next section, we develop specific ideas for ways that research in social psychology on prosocial behavior could inform research on the consequences of performing OCB for those who perform the behavior.

AGENDA FOR FUTURE RESEARCH ON CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

We start by emphasizing the importance of establishing a conceptual rationale for the types of OCB considered in future research. Consistent with our earlier critique of the proliferation of OCB constructs, we propose that a simple conceptual framework that contrasts types of OCB based on intended beneficiary (OCB-I and OCB-O) would provide focus and help researchers integrate and consolidate research findings. Although we acknowledge the viability of more complex approaches to conceptualizing OCB such as 2×2 frameworks that contrast types of OCB based on two dimensions (Van Dyne et al., 1995) or circumplex frameworks that contrast OCB on bipolar continua (Moon et al., 2004), we suggest that the OCB literature would currently benefit most from more basic comparisons of OCB based on intended beneficiary of the behavior. This would enhance the focus of OCB research and, in turn, should clarify basic similarities and differences in the antecedents and consequences of basic forms of OCB. We note that this approach would be consistent with the observations of Podsakoff and colleagues (2000) who emphasized the importance of

differentiating types of OCB only when there are differences in the nomological networks (antecedents and/or consequences) of these types of OCB. This approach is also consistent with the growing empirical consensus in the research community on the differences in OCB-I and OCB-O. We now consider specific areas for future research.

Consequences of OCB-I for those who perform it

Drawing on research from social and personality psychology on prosocial behavior (Brown et al., 2003; Kenrick et al., 1979; Penner et al., 2005; Thoits and Hewitt, 2001), we suggest that a new focus on implications of OCB for employees who engage in OCB offers a promising avenue for future research. Even though there is not a lot of social psychological research on the implications of prosocial behavior for individual well-being, existing research provides a rich source of information with the potential to enhance our understanding of the nomological network of organizational citizenship behavior. Not surprisingly, research in social and personality psychology on the consequences of prosocial behavior on individuals who enact them has focused almost exclusively on behavior directed at individuals, thereby ignoring the potential consequences of OCB-O on individuals. Because of that, this section will also focus primarily on prosocial behaviors directed at other individuals. Penner and colleagues' (2005) review chapter explicates positive consequences of performing prosocial behavior on individual well-being, psychological health, physical health, social behavior, and fitness. We review individual consequences for well-being, self-evaluation, physical and mental health, and personal development in the following section.

Individual well-being

Many studies have investigated the effects of prosocial behavior on individual well-being. In general, research demonstrates that prosocial behavior leads to higher positive affect (Piliavin et al., 1981). Furthermore, Cialdini

and Kenrick (1976) demonstrated that prosocial behavior can relieve/reduce bad moods. Kenrick and colleagues (1979) demonstrated that people learn to associate helping behavior with social rewards. Over time, people link helping others with positive outcomes, irrespective of social rewards provided in any particular instance. Restated, people internalize the rewards of prosocial behavior, such that helping can become intrinsically rewarding. This is one explanation for the mood-enhancing consequences of prosocial behavior.

Self-evaluation

Research also indicates that prosocial behavior leads to more favorable self-evaluations. Specifically, Van Willigen (1998) discussed the positive effect of prosocial behavior on life satisfaction, suggesting that prosocial behavior can convey a sense of personal control. Yogeve and Ronen (1982) demonstrated positive effects of prosocial behavior on self-esteem. In a study of elderly volunteers and non-volunteers, Hunter and Linn (1981) showed that volunteers had a stronger will to live and more positive feelings of self-respect (compared to non-volunteers). Likewise, studies by Giles and Eyster (1994) and Yates and Youniss (1996) reported positive consequences of prosocial behavior for personal efficacy, self-esteem, and confidence.

Physical and mental health

Social psychological research has examined prosocial behavior effects on physical and mental health of those who engage in the behavior. This research provides strong support for the health-enhancing benefits of prosocial behavior. Based on a study of older married couples, Brown et al. (2003) demonstrated higher longevity for those who provided social support to spouses, friends, relatives, and neighbors. More importantly, results demonstrated lower mortality even when controlling for demographics, personality, health, mental health, and marital-relationship. Interestingly, Brown and colleagues reported a non-significant

effect of receiving help on longevity and that providing help had more positive consequences for longevity than receiving help. In considering these findings, Brown and colleagues suggested that prosocial behavior may facilitate cardiovascular recovery from the after-effects of negative emotions, which in turn reduces mortality. Thoits and Hewitt (2001) demonstrated significant effects of volunteer work on physical health and decreased depression.

Penner and colleagues (2005) suggested three primary mechanisms as potential mediators of the relationships between prosocial behavior and physical and mental health: First, prosocial behavior can lead to more favorable self-assessments, which then translate into better mental and physical health. Second, helping others can provide distraction from personal troubles. Third, prosocial behavior includes a social component which facilitates social integration and interaction. Consistent with this, those who were isolated before engaging in prosocial behaviors benefited the most personally from engaging in prosocial behaviors (Musick and Wilson, 2003; Penner et al., 2005).

Personal development

Finally, research provides strong evidence that prosocial behavior has developmental consequences which facilitate individual development in subsequent life stages (Hansen et al., 2003; Johnson et al., 1998; Penner et al., 2005). Specifically, youth volunteers are less likely to smoke marijuana, abuse alcohol, perform poorly in school, or be arrested later in their lives (Barber et al., 2001; Eccles and Barber, 1999; Moore and Allen, 1996; Penner et al., 2005; Uggen and Janikula, 1999; Youniss et al., 1997).

To summarize, research in social and personality psychology demonstrates important positive consequences for those who engage in prosocial behavior. Prosocial behavior enhances psychological and physical health, individual well-being, and individual self-perceptions. It also has positive consequences for development in subsequent life stages. We note that the above social psychological

research differs from that typically conducted in organizational settings. Specifically, it is important to consider whether results of research on older people, volunteers in not-for-profit organizations, and those in social settings outside of organizations can be applied to or generalized to those in work organizations. Thus, we argue that considering consequences of performing citizenship to the actor is an exciting area for future research because it provides a considerable opportunity to widen our perspective on consequences of citizenship behavior.

Additional recommendations for future research

Having considered implications of the social psychological research on prosocial behavior for future research on OCB, we now turn to other recommendations for future research, including consequences of performing OCB-O for positive mood at work, work-related attitudes, interpersonal and inter-group relationships, and organizational level outcomes. We also consider potential negative consequences of OCB for those who perform the behavior, work group peers, and organizational effectiveness. Finally, we recommend consideration of more complex models that consider causality, bidirectionality, and nonrecursive relationships.

Employee attitudes and moods

Since most social psychological research on prosocial behavior has occurred in non-work settings typically involving volunteers, adolescents, or older individuals, there is little evidence on the consequences of performing prosocial behavior for employee attitudes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, psychological ownership, and turnover intentions. We believe, however, that research on the consequences of OCB-O for affective, attitudinal and behavioral outcomes is a promising avenue for future research on citizenship behavior. Consistent with research on the mood-enhancing benefits of prosocial behavior, it seems reasonable that performing OCB-O should also have positive

consequences (based on sense of personal control) for positive mood (see Parks and Van Dyne, 2006). Given that the intended beneficiary of OCB-O is the organization, these positive consequences should also include an enhanced sense of contributing to the organization and making a difference. This could include positive attitudes directed at the organization, such as enhanced job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational identification, and psychological ownership. In some cases, however, these consequences might be negative. For example, Bolino and Turnley (2005) demonstrated that individual initiative (OCB-O) was positively related to role overload and job stress.

Interpersonal and intergroup relationships

Another promising area for future research is investigating the consequences of prosocial behavior on interpersonal and intergroup relations. Penner and colleagues (2005), for instance, suggested that prosocial behavior could be related to forgiveness, reconciliation, and sustained cooperation between groups. This supports our recommendations for considering an expanded set of outcomes of OCB. It also suggests benefits of drawing on the social psychological literature on forbearance and forgiveness (McCullough et al., 2003). Although we would expect generally positive cross-level group effects, there also is the possibility of negative effects. For example, Van Dyne and Ellis (2004) developed a theoretical model of potential negative consequences of OCB based on reactance theory. This could occur if coworkers resent an employee who makes them look bad by performing exceptionally high levels of OCB. These sorts of contrast effects can lead to reactance, exclusion, and even sabotage in extreme cases. Moreover, Bolino and Turnley (2005) demonstrated a positive relationship between individual initiative (OCB-O) and work family conflict.

Negative organizational consequences

Another area for future research would be to consider potential negative consequences

of OCB on organizational outcomes. For example, some types of OCB-I can strengthen interpersonal relationships but run counter to overall business objectives. Although showing 'genuine concern and courtesy toward coworkers, even under the most trying business or personal situation' (Moorman and Blakely, 1995) or supporting others in confrontations 'by providing a united front' (Andersen and Williams, 1996) most likely have positive consequences for the target of the OCB, the behavior may not necessarily contribute to overall group or unit performance. In some cases, these acts of interpersonal helping might even detract from work performance, such as when employees are distracted from performing their in-role work responsibilities because they are helping others with personal problems. In some cases, providing personal support might have long term positive consequences for the group, but in other cases the long term costs might be more negative than positive. Van der Veegt and colleagues (2006), for example, demonstrated that the flow of helping behavior in teams characterized by high expertness diversity can be unidirectional, such that those with low expertness do not receive help. This could lead to group frustration and decreased performance. In sum, helping (OCB-I) can be viewed as 'double-edged sword' (Ilgen et al., 2005: 530) because consequences can be positive or negative. Closer investigation of positive and negative consequences of OCB-I over time, thus, becomes especially worthwhile.

More complex and causal models

Another implication for future research is the importance of considering causality and more complex models. For example, some potential consequences of citizenship behavior (i.e., the consequences of OCB-I on individual or group performance or organizational commitment as discussed above) have already been identified as antecedents of citizenship behavior. This suggests the benefits of studies of possible bidirectional and/or nonrecursive relationships between types of OCB and factors which might be both antecedents

and consequences of OCB. Specifically, we recommend research on causal relationships between OCB and performance, positive affect, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this chapter, we have attempted to provide an updated overview of the nomological network of organizational citizenship. Using a conceptual framework based on the intended beneficiary of OCB, we have summarized previous research on dispositional, attitudinal, motivational, contextual, and social antecedents of OCB; consequences of OCB for individuals, groups, and organizations; as well as implications of OCB for individuals who perform these behaviors. We have argued that past research on consequences of OCB has been unduly narrow by focusing almost exclusively on performance implications of citizenship behavior. Drawing on social and personality psychology, we have outlined potential consequences of prosocial behavior (OCB-I) for individual well-being, physical and mental health, and social integration. Finally, we have developed a research agenda which we hope will stimulate future research on citizenship behavior.

REFERENCES

- Andersen, S.E. and Williams, L.J. (1996) 'Interpersonal, job, and individual factors related to helping processes at work', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81 (3): 282–296.
- Bachrach, D.G., Powell, B.C., Collins, B.J. and Richey, R.G. (2006) 'Effects of task interdependence on the relationship between helping behavior and group performance', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91 (6): 1396–1405.
- Barber, B.L., Eccles, J.S. and Stone, M.R. (2001) 'Whatever happened to the jock, the brain, and the princess? Young adult pathways linked to adolescent activity involvement and social identity', *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 16 (5): 429–455.
- Barrick, M.R., Stewart, G.L., Neubert, M.L. and Mount, M.K. (1998) 'Relating member ability and personality to work-team processes and team effectiveness', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83 (3): 377–391.
- Bateman, T.S. and 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.
- Blau, P. (1964) *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York, Wiley.
- Bolino, M.C. (1999) 'Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors?' *Academy of Management Review*, 24 (1): 82–98.
- Bolino, M.C. and 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.
- Borman, W.C. and Motowidlo, S.J. (1993) 'Expanding the Criterion Domain to Include Elements of Contextual Performance', in N. Schmitt, W.C. Borman, and Associates (eds), *Personnel Selection in Organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. pp. 71–98.
- Brayfield, A.H. and Crockett, W.H. (1955) 'Employee attitudes and employee performance', *Psychological Bulletin*, 52 (2): 396–424.
- Brown, S.L., Nesse, R.M., Vinokur, A.D. and Smith, D.M. (2003) 'Providing social support may be more beneficial than receiving it: Results from a prospective study of mortality', *Psychological Science*, 14 (4): 320–327.
- Bowler, W.M. and Brass, D.J. (2006) 'Relational Correlates of Interpersonal Citizenship Behavior. A Social Network Perspective'. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91 (1): 32.
- Calder, B.J. (1977) 'An Attribution Theory of Leadership', in B. M. Staw and G.R. Salancik (eds), *New Directions in Organizational Behavior*. Chicago, IL: St. Clair Press. pp. 179–204.
- Campbell, J.P., McCloy, R.A., Oppler, S.H. and Sager, J.E. (1993) 'A Theory of Performance', in N. Schmitt and W.C. Borman (eds), *The Changing Nature of Performance: Implications for Staffing, Motivation, and Development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. pp. 399–429.
- Cherrington, D.L., Reitz, H.J. and Scott, W.E., Jr. (1971) 'Effects of reward and contingent reinforcement on satisfaction and task performance', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 55 (6): 531–536.
- Cialdini, R.B. and Kenrick, D.T. (1976) 'Altruism as hedonism: A social development perspective on the relationship of negative mood state and helping', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34 (5): 907–914.

- Coleman, V.I. and Borman, W.C. (2000) 'Investigating the underlying structure of the citizenship performance domain', *Human Resource Management Review*, 10 (1): 25–44.
- Colquitt, J.A., Conlon, D.E., Wesson, M.J., Porter, C.O.L.H. and Ng, Y.K. (2001) 'Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (3): 425–445.
- Dalal, R.S. (2005) 'A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90 (6): 1241–1255.
- Dovidio, J.F., Piliavin, J.A., Schroeder, D.A. and Penner, L. (2006) 'The Social Psychology of Prosocial Behavior', Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eccles, J.S. and Barber, B.L. (1999) 'Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching band: What kind of extracurricular involvement matters?' *Journal of Adolescence Research*, 14 (1): 10–43.
- Farh, J.L., Podsakoff, P.M. and Organ, D.W. (1990) 'Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction', *Journal of Management*, 16 (4): 705–721.
- Flynn, F.J., Reagans, R.E., Amanatullah, E.T. and Ames, D.R. (2006) 'Helping one's way to the top: Self-monitors achieve status by helping others and knowing who helps whom', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91 (6): 1123–1137.
- George, J.M. and Bettenhausen, K. (1990) 'Understanding prosocial behavior, sales performance, and turnover: A group-level analysis in a service context', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75 (6): 698–709.
- George, J.M. and Brief, A.P. (1992) 'Feeling good—doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work—organizational spontaneity relationship', *Psychological Bulletin*, 112 (2): 310–329.
- Giles, D.E. Jr. and Eyer, J. (1994) 'The impact of a college community service laboratory on students' personal, social, and cognitive outcomes', *Journal of Adolescence*, 17 (4): 327–339.
- Hanson, D.M., Larson R.W. and Dworkin, J.B. (2003) 'What adolescents learn in organized youth activities: A survey of self-reported developmental experience', *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 11 (1): 25–55.
- Harrison, D.A., Newman, D.A. and Roth, Ph.L. (2006) 'How important are job attitudes? Meta-analytic comparisons of integrative behavioral outcomes and time sequences', *Academy of Management Journal*, 49 (2): 305–325.
- Hornstein, H.A. (1991) 'Neither altruism nor egoism', *Psychological Inquiry*, 2 (2): 135.
- Hunter, K.I. and Linn, M.W. (1981) 'Psychosocial differences between elderly volunteers and non-volunteers', *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 12 (1): 205–213.
- Ilgen, D.R., Hollenbeck, J.R., Johnson, M. and Jundt, D. (2005) 'Teams in organizations: From input-process-output models to IMOI models', *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56: 517–543.
- Ilies, R., Nahrgang, J. and Morgeson, F.P. (2007) 'Leader-member exchange and citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92 (1): 269–277.
- Ilies, R., Fulmer, I.S., Spitzmuller, M. and Johnson, M. (2006) 'Personality and citizenship behavior: The role of affect and satisfaction'. Paper presented at the 66th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management in Atlanta, Georgia.
- Ilies, R., Scott, B.A. and Judge, T.A. (2006) 'The interactive effects of personal traits and experienced states on intraindividual patterns of citizenship behavior', *Academy of Management Journal*, 49 (3): 561–575.
- Johnson, J.W. (2006) 'Toward a Better Understanding of the Relationship Between Personality and Individual Job Performance', in M.R. Barrick and A.M. Ryan (eds), *Personality and Work: Reconsidering the Role of Personality in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. pp. 83–120.
- Johnson, M.K., Beebe, T., Mortimer, J.T. and Syner, M. (1998) 'Volunteerism in adolescence: A process perspective', *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 8 (3): 309–332.
- Judge, T.A., Thoresen, C.J., Bono, J.E. and Patton, J.K. (2001) 'The job satisfaction – job performance relationship – A qualitative and quantitative review', *Psychological Bulletin*, 127 (3): 376–407.
- Kamdar, D., McAlister, D.J. and 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.
- Kamdar, D. and Van Dyne, L. (2007) 'The joint effects of personality and workplace social exchange relationships in predicting task performance and citizenship performance', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92 (5): 1286–1298.
- Kenrick, D.T., Baumann, D.J. and Cialdini, R.B. (1979) 'A step in the socialization of altruism as hedonism: Effects of negative mood on children's generosity under public and private conditions', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37 (5): 747–755.
- Kenrick, D.T. (1991) 'Proximate Altruism and Ultimate Selfishness', *Psychological Inquiry*, 2 (2): 135–137.
- Krebs, D.L. (1991) 'Altruism and egoism: A false dichotomy?' *Psychological Inquiry*, 2 (2): 137–138.

- Lawler, E.E., III and Porter, L.W. (1967) 'Perceptions regarding management compensation', *Industrial Relations*, 3 (3): 41–49.
- LePine, J.A., Erez, A. and 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.
- LePine, J.A. and Van Dyne, L. (1998) 'Predicting voice behavior in work groups', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83 (6): 853–868.
- LePine, J.A. and Van Dyne, L. (2001) 'Voice and cooperative behavior as contrasting forms of contextual performance: evidence of differential relationships with Big Five personality characteristics and cognitive ability', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (2): 326–336.
- MacKenzie, S.B. and Podsakoff, P.M. (1999) 'Do citizenship behaviors matter more for managers than for salespeople?' *Academy of Marketing Science*, 27 (4): 396–410.
- MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M. and Fetter, R. (1991) 'Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance', *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50 (1): 123–150.
- MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M. and Fetter, R. (1993) 'The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance', *Journal of Marketing*, 57 (1): 70–80.
- MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M. and Ahearne, M. (1998) 'Some possible antecedents and consequences of in-role and extra-role salesperson performance', *Journal of Marketing*, 62 (3): 87–98.
- McCullough, M.E., Fincham, F.D. and Tsang, J. (2003) 'Forgiveness, forbearance, and time: The temporal unfolding of transgression-related interpersonal motivations', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84 (3): 540–557.
- McNeely, B.L. and Meglino, B.M. (1994) 'The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial organizational behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79 (6): 836–844.
- Moon, H., Van Dyne, L. and Wrobel, K. (2004) 'The circumplex model and the future of organizational citizenship behavior research', in Turnipseed, D.L. (ed.), *Handbook of organizational citizenship behavior*. New York: Nova Science. pp. 1–22.
- Moore, C.W. and Allen, J.P. (1996) 'The effects of volunteering on the young volunteer', *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 17 (2): 231–258.
- Moorman, R.H. and Blakely, G.L. (1995) 'Individualism–collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16 (2): 127–142.
- Motowidlo, S.J. (2003) 'Job performance', in W.C. Borman, D.R. Ilgen, and R.J. Klimoski (eds), *Handbook of Psychology: Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, New York: Wiley. Volume 12, pp. 39–53.
- Motowidlo, S.J., Borman, W.C. and Schmit, M.J. (1997) 'A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance', *Human Performance*, 10 (2): 71–83.
- Motowidlo, S.J., Packard, J.S. and Manning, M.R. (1986) 'Occupational stress: Its causes and consequences for job performance', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71 (4): 618–629.
- Musick, M.A. and Wilson, J. (2003) 'Volunteering and depression: The role of psychological and social resources in different age groups', *Social Science and Medicine*, 56 (2): 259–269.
- Ng, K.Y. and Van Dyne, L. (2005) 'Antecedents and consequences of helping behavior in work groups', *Group and Organization Management*, 30 (5): 514–540.
- Organ, D.W. (1977) 'A reappraisal and reinterpretation of the satisfaction–causes–performance hypothesis', *Academy of Management Review*, 2 (1): 46–53.
- Organ, D.W. (1988) *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D.W. and Ryan, K. (1995) 'A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior', *Personnel Psychology*, 48 (4): 755–802.
- Organ, D.W. (1997) 'Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time', *Human Performance*, 10 (2): 85–97.
- Organ, D.W., Podsakoff, P.M. and MacKenzie, S.B. (2006) *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Park, G. and Van Dyne, L. (2006) 'Effects of motivational fit on satisfaction with organizational citizenship behaviors'. Paper presented at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychologists. Dallas, May.
- Penner, L.A., Fritzsche, B.A., Craiger, J.P. and Freifeld, T.R. (1995) 'Measuring the prosocial personality', in J. Butcher and C. D. Spielberger, (eds), *Advances in Personality Assessment*. Hillsdale, NJ: LEA. pp. 147–163.
- Penner, L.A., Midili, A.R. and Kegelmeyer, J. (1997) 'Beyond job attitudes: A personality and social

- psychology perspective on the causes of organizational citizenship behavior', *Human Performance*, 10 (2): 111–132.
- Penner, L.A., Dovidio, J.F., Piliavin, J.A. and Schroeder, D.A. (2005) 'Prosocial behavior: Multilevel perspectives', *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56: 365–392.
- Piliavin, J.A., Dovidio, J.F., Gaertner, S.L. and Clark, R.D. III (1981) *Emergency intervention*. New York: Academic.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Ahearne, M. and MacKenzie, S.B. (1997) 'Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82 (2): 262–270.
- Podsakoff, P.M. and Mackenzie, S.B. (1994) 'Organizational citizenship and sales unit effectiveness', *Journal of Marketing Research*, 3 (3): 351–363.
- Podsakoff, P.M. and MacKenzie, S.B. (1997) 'Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research', *Human Performance*, 10 (2): 133–151.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B. and Hui, C. (1993) 'Organizational citizenship behaviors and managerial evaluations of employee performance: A review and suggestions for future research', *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 11: 1–40.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H. and Fetter, R. (1990) 'Transformational Leader Behaviors and their Effects on Followers' Trust in Leader, Satisfaction, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors', *Leadership Quarterly*, 1 (1): 107–142.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B. and Bachrach, D.G. (2000) 'Organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research', *Journal of Management*, 26 (3): 513–563.
- Rioux, S.M. and Penner, L.A. (2001) 'The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A motivational analysis', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (6): 1306–1314.
- Schmit, M.J., Motowidlo, S.J., Degrott, T., Cross, T. and Kiker, D.S. (1996) 'Explaining the relationship between personality and job performance'. Paper presented at the 11th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.
- Schnake, M. and Hogan, E. (1995) 'Organizational citizenship behavior and organizational effectiveness', in Southern Management Association Proceedings. Georgia: Southern Management Association. pp. 93–97.
- Schwab, D.P. (1980) 'Construct validity in organizational behavior', *Research in organizational behavior*, 2: 3–43. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Scott, B.A. (2007) *Employee popularity: Measurement and identification of antecedents and consequences*. Unpublished dissertation.
- Settoon, R.P. and Mossholder, K.W. (2002) 'Relational quality and relationship context as antecedents of person- and task-focused interpersonal citizenship behavior', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87 (2): 255–267.
- 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.
- Sparrowe, R.T., Soetjijto, B.W. and Kraimer, M.L. (2006) 'Do leaders' influence tactics relate to members' helping behavior? It depends on the quality of the relationship', *Academy of Management Journal*, 49 (6): 1194–1208.
- Tepper, B.J., Duffy, M.K., Hobbler, J. and Ensley, M.D. (2004) 'Moderators of the relationships between coworkers' organizational citizenship behavior and fellow employees' attitudes', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89 (3): 455–465.
- Tett, R.P. and Burnett, D.D. (2003) 'A personality trait-based interactionist model of job performance', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88 (3): 500–517.
- Thoits, P.A. and Hewitt, L.N. (2001) 'Volunteer work and well-being', *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 42 (2): 115–131.
- Twenge, J.M., Baumeister, R.F., DeWall, C.N., Ciarocco, N.J. and Bartels, J.M. (2007) 'Social exclusion decreases prosocial behavior', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92 (1): 56–66.
- Uggen, C. and Janikula, J. (1999) 'Volunteerism and arrest in the transition to adulthood', *Social Forces*, 78 (1): 331–362.
- Van der Vegt, G.S., Bunderson, J.S. and Oosterhof, A. (2006) 'Expertness diversity and helping in teams: Why those who need the most help end up getting the least', *Academy of Management Journal*, 49 (5): 877–893.
- Van der Vegt, G.S. and Van de Vliert, E. (2005) 'Effects of perceived skill dissimilarity and task interdependence on helping in work teams', *Journal of Management*, 29 (1): 729–751.
- Van Dyne, L. and Ellis, J.B. (2004) 'Job creep: A reactance theory perspective on organizational citizenship behavior as over-fulfillment of obligations', in J.A.M. Coyle-Shapiro, M. Shore, M.S. Taylor and L.E. Tetrick (eds), *The employment relationship: Examining psychological and contextual perspectives*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. pp. 181–205.

- Van Dyne, L. and Farmer, S.M. (2004) 'It's who I am: role identity and organizational citizenship behavior volunteers', in Turnipseed, D.L. (ed.), *Handbook of organizational citizenship behavior*. New York: Nova Science Publishers. pp. 181–207.
- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J.W. and Dienesch, R.M. (1994) 'Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation', *Academy of Management Journal*, 47 (4): 765–802.
- Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L.L. and McLean Parks, J. (1995) 'Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (A bridge over muddied waters)', *Research in organizational behavior*, 17: 215–285.
- Van Dyne, L. and LePine, J.A. (1998) 'Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity', *Academy of Management Journal*, 37 (1): 765–802.
- Van Scotter, J.R. and Motowidlo, S.J. (1996) 'Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81 (5): 525–531.
- Vroom, V.H. (1964) *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Van Willigen, M. (1998) *Doing Good, Feeling Better: The Effect of Voluntary Association Membership on Individual Well-Being*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, August, San Francisco, CA.
- Walz, S.M. and Niehoff, B.P. (1996) 'Organizational citizenship behaviors and their effect on organizational effectiveness in limited-menu restaurants', in J.B. Keys and L.N. Dosier (eds), *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*. Briarcliff Manor, NY: Academy of Management. pp. 307–311.
- Wang, H., Law, K.S., Hackett, R.D., Wang, D. and Chen, Z.X. (2005) 'Leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and organizational citizenship behavior', *Academy of Management Journal*, 48 (3): 420–432.
- Williams, L.J. and Anderson, S.E. (1991) 'Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors', *Journal of Management*, 17 (3): 601–617.
- Yates, M. and Youniss, J. (1996) 'A developmental perspective on community service in adolescence', *Social Development*, 5 (1): 85–111.
- Yogev, A. and Ronen, R. (1982) 'Cross-age tutoring: Effects on tutors' attributes', *Journal of Educational Research*, 75 (5): 261–268.
- Youniss, J., Yates, M. and Su, Y. (1997) 'Social integration into peer and adult society: Community service and marijuana use in high school seniors', *Journal of Adolescence Research*, 12 (2): 245–262.