Volume 6 Issue 1 2019

JCRL

Journal of Corporate Responsibility and Leadership

Reviews of Research on Leadership, CSR & OCB

Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Evolution of Research

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/JCRL.2019.002

Monika Tomaszewska
Faculty of Economic Sciences and Management,
Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń, Poland
e-mail: monika.tomaszewska1@abs.umk.pl

Abstract

Purpose: The aim of the article is to explore the patterns underlying the antecedents discussed in OCB studies between 1980 and 2018 to reveal and discuss possible existence of a common framework created by variables which show positive or negative relationship with organizational citizenship behaviors.

Design/methodology/approach: The research aims at filling the gap in the body of knowledge by clarifying the issue of OCB's antecedents with the use of the chronological systematic literature review of scientific output in the field between 1980 and 2018, reviewing each decade separately and searching for common patterns shown by variables.

Findings: Variables impacting OCB might come from three different levels. Directions from which antecedents come were named as individual, organizational, and environmental. Above-mentioned create a framework for interrelations which are complex and often create synergies.

Research and practical implications: Discussed interrelations between different levels of antecedents and antecedents themselves should be further verified theoretically and empirically. Scholars in their future studies should take into consideration the existence of different levels of antecedents and interrelations between them. The most important managerial implication is that the leaders and managers at different levels on organization should and can much easier acknowledge and observe

dynamics of the general framework of antecedents rather than how single variables based on numerous theories impact the behavior of each worker. **Originality/value:** The study reviewed literature related to the concept of organizational citizenship behavior including brief introduction to its roots and definition, and most importantly the systematic literature review of some of the variables impacting OCB named here antecedents. Such an in-depth theoretical analysis is an important contribution to the field and shows that framework is not as simple as they were previously perceived. **Paper type:** Review.

Keywords: organizational citizenship behaviors, OCB, antecedents, systematic literature review.

1. Introduction

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB) phenomena, defined as discretionary individual behaviors which are not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in aggregate promote the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988), are in the huge interest of management researchers, however the amount of research in the field is not always related to increasing the clarification of the issue. There is plenty of literature resources in the field, however, many researchers write about the same things, and sometimes they are not even exact or correct, because they lose attachment to the classical – oldest, researches. Scholars furthermore mostly provide new definitions and explanations to what OCB is, what causes might influence them, broadening the number of antecedents, and revaluating same antecedents in different models and constraints, what are relations between them, and how are they resulting on company's performance showing the strong attachment to methodological individualism.

In this article, the author is focused on filling the gap in the body of knowledge by clarifying the issue of OCB's antecedents based on the chronological systematic literature review in the field. Focusing on antecedents, the paper aims at revealing and discussing possible existence of the common framework created by variables influencing investigated behaviors. The article based on the methodology of systematic literature review in a chronological order is needed to cope with complexity and dispersion of the theories underlying prior studies on antecedents of OCBs. The common framework of different interrelated levels of antecedents should also add into intelligibility not

for only scholars but also practitioners. Categorization of antecedents within subcategories might help understanding interrelationship between antecedents and individual actions.

In fact, Podsakoff et al. (2000) conducted a broad literature study discussing citizenship behaviors including, next to numerous other aspects, their antecedents. Their study, based on the report of the meta-analytic relationships between OCBs and their antecedents, was following the categorization of antecedents into four major categories (1) individual (employee) characteristics, (2) task characteristics, (3) organizational characteristics, and (4) leadership behaviors. However, the authors unexpectedly concentrated on discussing results of studies and matching them with existing theories focusing on strength within which theme-categories impact OCB rather than the framework coming from the proposed categories leaving there visible gap to fill.

This article is not intended to examine the categories of OCB antecedents proposed by Podsakoff et al. (2000) but its aim is to explore the patterns underlying the antecedents discussed in OCB studies between 1980 and 2018. The literature review conducted in a chronological order (from oldest papers to the newest ones) is not only to identify and highlight the major issues which were discussed in the past, but to show the general changes in the field of OCB. Importantly such a study is driven by methodological improvement for identifying what is the kind of structure hidden behind variables statistically revealed to have relationship with OCB. To find out how ideas develop over time is the easiest way to understand them in the context of a fuller and bigger picture.

The structure of the remaining parts of the manuscript is as follows. Section 2 discusses in detail research methodology, how each one of the Scopus searches was conducted, how reviewed articles were chosen and the general idea behind the cognitive process underlying conducted research. Sections 3 to 6 present and discuss the findings of the most interesting and influential publications dealing with the antecedents of OCBs, issued between 1980 and 2018. Section 3 differently than other following sections contains additional information on the roots of the OCB concept and its definition. Section 7 shows further discussion of the results, their meaning for scholars and practitioners, and possible directions for future research. Section 8 is a brief conclusion of the article.

2. Method of study

The study employs the method of systematic literature review (Czakon, 2011). The process of research sampling included searching for relevant literature lists in the Scopus database. It was decided to search for the phrase 'Organi?ational Citizenship Behavi?r' in the titles, abstracts and keywords of publications indexed in Scopus (topic search). There were few assumptions behind the searching process: (1) it was decided to not use abbreviation, as it confuses results with different terms, (2) a wild-card technique was used to include the publications written in both (i.e. British and American) spelling variants of English, (3) it was a topic search, to not judge research by its title, (4) results were not limited to the Business, Management and Accounting subject area as results from other fields might cover important issues, (5) results were judged by their h-index, (6) the searching process was divided into four searches each of which was covering 10 years periods. Periods are detailed in Table 1. Furthermore, available resources with an appropriate h-index were divided into categories due to the date of their publication, so that they could be analyzed in a chronological order.

Table 1. Number of Scopus results and h-index for each decade

Year of publication	Number of results	h-index
1980–1989	4	3
1990–1999	90	54
2000–2009	630	111
2010–2018	1931	58

Source: Own study.

After reading abstracts, articles considered as irrelevant for current research were excluded. Remaining articles then were analyzed within four tabular displays created in Microsoft Excel. Each table included: year, author(s), the number of citations, and findings. Findings included the summary of the article mostly on a base of abstract, but also obviously, findings and concluding sections. Finally, the findings were coded accordingly to their content and ascribed to subgroups in a way that one article could be included in many groups that suit its results.

The categorization of reviewed literature from the chronological order into subgroups related to their findings gave possibility to have

a wider perspective on existing literature. This method of review even if might need a lot of time not only shows how the theory of OCB has developed, what were, and are interests of researchers, what is the knowledge to build on, but also what is the lack in existing knowledge.

Studies discussed in this article were 'coded' as studies dealing with antecedents of OCB. To simplify the cognitive process, the author assumed that antecedents of OCB are all variables that have positive, negative, direct or indirect influence on OCB, also ones that are correlated and not disproved to have a causation effect on OCB. Within such understood antecedents - causes had different sources that could be understood as a level from which the antecedent came from.

3. Emergence of the concept of OCB and its antecedents (1980–1989)

Smith et al. (1983) defined OCBs based on Katz's (1964) idea, that every entity depends daily "on a myriad of acts of cooperation, helpfulness, suggestions, gestures of goodwill, altruism, and other instances of what we might call citizenship behavior" (Smith et al., 1983, p. 653). Katz (1964) identified three basic types of behaviors essential for functioning of an organization i.e.: (1) people must be induced to enter and remain within the system, (2) they must carry out specific role requirements in a dependable fashion; and (3) there must be innovative and spontaneous activity that goes beyond the role prescription (Katz, 1964; cited after: Smith et al., 1983, p. 653). Citizenship behavior is itself an innovative and spontaneous activity that goes beyond the prescribed role. Each organization should notice that it depends on all of these three behaviors; even citizenship behavior which is not specified, or included in any system or process prescription, but is the incentive of a worker which is above superiors' consciousness, and to some extent hard to predict as it comes from an individual to the system, i.e. organization (Katz, 1964; cited after: Smith et al., 1983, p. 653).

Bateman and Organ (1983) used the term of Citizenship Behaviors referring to behaviors which were defined by Katz and Kahn (1966) who distinguished between (1) in-role behavior, and (2) spontaneous behavior; where (1) in-role behavior is dependable role performance, and in opposite (2) spontaneous behavior it is the behavior that enhances the external image of an organization, cooperative gestures,

and actions protective of the system. It was mainly found out that in any organization are: "countless acts of cooperation without which the system would break down"; these are everyday acts which are taken for granted; however, only "few of them are included in the formal role prescriptions for any job" (Katz and Kahn, 1966, p. 339, cited after: Organ and Konovsky, 1989, p. 157). Main features given by Bateman and Organ (1983) to OCB, based on Katz and Kahn (1996) research, were that those behaviors: (1) are not prescribed or required in advance for a given job – they are supra-role, (2) "they lubricate the social machinery of the organization" (3) "do not directly inhere in the usual notion of task performance" (Katz and Kahn, 1966; cited after: Bateman and Organ, 1983, p. 588).

In 1988, Dennis Organ defined Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) with the most repeated and most reliable definition in the field, because it points the features of OCB, which are, or just should be determinants when it comes to accepting or rejecting given behavior as OCB. This definition (of Organ, 1988) has been chosen by the author as only one worth concerning, because it is not biased by hardness of measurement of OCB. Due to Organ's definition from 1988, Organizational Citizenship Behavior is "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization" (Organ, 1988, p. 4; quoted after: Podsakoff et al., 2000, p. 513). The above-mentioned definition includes four attributes of OCB, which must be strictly fulfilled. First of all, it is: (1) an individual behavior; pertains an individual person, as it was seen in preceding concepts, citizenship behaviors come from an individual person incentive and are beyond the system. This feature underlines accuracy of measuring OCB at the individual level. Secondly, OCB is (2) discretionary, by which Organ (1988) means that (a) "the behavior is not an enforceable requirement of the role or the job description", where job description is "the clearly specifiable terms of the person's employment contract with the organization", and (b) behavior is "a matter of personal choice" which means "that its omission is not generally understood as punishable" (Organ, 1988, p. 4; quoted after: Podsakoff et al., 2000, p. 513). Then, OCB is (3) not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system. It happens mostly because it (a) "is often subtle", (b) "difficult to measure", (c) "may contribute more to others' performance than one's own", and (d) may

"have the effect of sacrificing individual output" (Smith et al., 1983, p. 654). Finally, the last feature is that OCB (4) in aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization, which actually means that in some time cumulative OCB might have the impact on organization's effectiveness, which probably comes from Roethlisberger's and Dickson's (1964) interrelations between efficiency and cooperation, as efficiency leads to effectiveness.

The decade of the 1980s can be considered as the emergence phase of the OCB concept. So, very few studies can be find, which make attempts to identify the antecedents of OCBs.

Table 2. Scientific production in the research field dealing with OCBs' antecedents (1980–1989)

Author(s)	Year	Title	Cited
Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W., Near, J.P.	1983	Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents	1455
Organ, D.W., Konovsky, M.	1989	Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior	536

Source: Own study.

When it comes to antecedents of OCB, as noted by Smith et al. (1983), Bateman and Organ (1982) (who found that job satisfaction, as measured by the Job Descriptive Index, did correlate with the extent of citizenship behavior as independently rated by supervisors) suggested that "environmental variables" might independently affect both job satisfaction and citizenship behavior. Those environmental factors, proposed by Bateman and Organ (1982), were: leader supportiveness, individual attributes or traits such as neuroticism, which were further verified by Smith et al. (1983). Furthermore, these factors were also investigated leading to huge amount of research related to antecedents of OCB and other employee behaviors, which contributes significantly to research in the field.

Above mentioned job satisfaction as an antecedent can be perceived as an individual-level factor as it is strongly related to the subjective experience of the employee, however at the same time it is strongly impacted by the other environmental factors as it was noticed by authors.

Smith et al. (1983) verified proposed by Bateman and Organ (1982) factors of leader supportiveness (organizational level) and individual attributes or traits such as neuroticism. Leader supportiveness from the perspective of an employee is an organizational level antecedent, however claimed by Smith et al. (1983) to be itself citizenship behavior of a leader and make the leader work as a role model for the team, which social psychological and leadership studies suggest might be influencing behaviors of subordinates (Krebs, 1970; Berkowitz, 1970, cited after Smith et al., 1983, p. 656). Additionally, leader supportiveness increases individual-level job satisfaction effecting on willingness of employees to perform citizenship behaviors themselves. Individual-level neuroticism, which is according to research understood as emotional instability of individuals, is negatively correlated to the altruism dimension of OCB. Furthermore, the environmental level antecedent of rural background directly impacts OCB (Smith et al., 1983, pp. 656, 658).

4. Decade of the growth of studies on OCB and its antecedents (1990–1999)

The decade of the 1990s can be considered as the phase of growth in the research field lifecycle. This growth is also manifested in the increasing number of studies on the antecedents of OCBs (Table 3).

Podsakoff et al. (1990) in their research found out that another leadership approach might play a role in the OCB framework. The authors claim that transformational leadership behavior and its dimensions might have an indirect effect on OCB through individual worker's trust in leader (however, results were not fully attributable because of method biases). According to transformational leadership theory "effective leaders transform or change the basic values, beliefs, and attitudes of followers so that they are willing to perform beyond the minimum levels specified by the organization" (Podsakoff et al., 1990, p. 129). It seems important that transformational leadership might have an impact on individuals and their work attitudes and satisfaction (Podsakoff et al., 1990, p. 108). The authors of the mentioned research summarize that even though the leader behaviors in their research do not have any direct effects on OCBs, they might influence employees' trust (which in this research does not influence OCB), and satisfaction

Table 3. Scientific production in the research field dealing with OCBs' antecedents (1990–1999)

Author(s)	Year	Title	Cited
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	1930
Farh, J.-L., Podsakoff, P.M., Organ, D.W.	1990	Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction	243
Moorman, R.H.	1991	Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship?	1471
Tansky, J.W.	1993	Justice and organizational citizenship behavior: What is the relationship?	89
Deluga, R.J.	1994	Supervisor trust building, leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior	188
Moorman, R.H., Blakely, G.L.	1995	Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior	504
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	599
Andersson, L.M., Bateman, T.S.	1997	Cynicism in the workplace: Some causes and effects	239
Tang, T.L.-P., Ibrahim, A.H.S.	1998	Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior revisited: Public personnel in the United States and in the Middle East	81
Chattopadhyay, P.	1999	Beyond direct and symmetrical effects: The influence of demographic dissimilarity on organizational citizenship behavior	224
Randall, M.L., Cropanzano, R., Bormann, C.A., Birjulin, A.	1999	Organizational politics and organizational support as predictors of work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behavior	278

Source: Own study.

(which influences OCB); so that transformational leadership might have direct impact on employee approach which results in an indirect effect on OCB i.e. mediated by followers' trust in their leaders (Podsakoff et al., 1990, p. 129).

According to the research of Farh et al. (1990), task scope which seems to be a trait coming from an organizational level, has a direct impact on worker's altruism and compliance, higher than job satisfaction (satisfaction with task dimension). Leader fairness in research also shows direct impacts on altruism, and furthermore it impacts employees' job satisfaction, however, job satisfaction in their research has no causal effect on OCB. As above mentioned, the authors summarize that: task scope directly impacts job satisfaction (satisfaction with task) and OCB (altruism, and compliance dimensions). The leader fairness and task characteristic in the organizational surrounding are causing OCB, however job satisfaction is not supported to be a direct antecedent of OCB (instead leader fairness directly impacts both altruism dimension of OCB and job satisfaction dimension: satisfaction with supervisor) (Farh et al., 1990, pp. 715–716).

Moorman (1991) in his research supported four hypotheses within which procedural justice within an organization was an antecedent of four OCB dimensions, additionally research supported causal effect of perceptions of organizational justice on OCB, which according to author supports Organ's (1988, 1990) view "that the decision to behave as an organizational citizen may be a function of the degree to which an employee believes that he or she has been treated fairly by the organization" (Organ, 1988, 1990, cited after: Moorman, 1991, p. 851). According to further theory discussion, fairness perceptions might be an important element impacting an individual's OCB, however in the empirical investigation only, interactional justice dimension of fairness was significantly related to OCB (Moorman, 1991, pp. 851–852). The author summarizes that individual decision to perform OCB is or might be a "result of a general positive evaluation of the organizational system, institution, and authorities evoked by procedural justice" (Moorman, 1991, p. 853). To add upon previous research Moorman et al. (1993) conducted research supporting relationships between procedural justice and organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and OCB. Additionally, they found out there are no relationships between commitment and OCB and between satisfaction and OCB when implying control for justice and citizenship.

Also, the study of Tansky (1993) supports Moorman's (1991) perspective that employees do form perceptions of overall fairness and that these perceptions influence job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The study identified relations between perceptions of overall fairness and altruism and, job satisfaction and OCB. Furthermore, the author identified the relationship between the quality of the supervisory-subordinate relationship, perception of overall fairness and OCB. The relationship between perceptions of overall fairness and job satisfaction was significantly positive same as relations between overall fairness and organizational commitment dimensions. When it comes to job satisfaction it has shown strong direct and positive relationships with altruism, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue dimensions of OCB. The quality of the relationship between supervisor and subordinate shows positive and significant relation with OCB dimensions: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue; furthermore, the supervisory-subordinate relationship had a positive and significant impact on perceptions of overall fairness (Tansky, 1993, p. 201).

The study of Deluga (1994) further verified relations between leader trust-building activity, fairness perceptions, supervisor competence, in-role performance, the general quality of leader-member exchange (LMX) and OCB. Fairness perceptions were treated as supervisor trust-building behavior and were influencing OCB, but not associated with LMX quality, however, the LMX quality was positively related to OCB (had an impact on courtesy, conscientiousness, altruism, and sportsmanship). Fairness was supported to be supervisor trust-building behavior (which supports it as an organizational-level antecedent) and was predicting conscientious, sportsmanship courtesy, and altruistic behaviors. The author explains that in a social exchange relationship, employees experiencing higher-quality exchanges (equitable treatment) may feel obligated to reciprocate by performing non-prescribed OCB which has benefit for the organization and analogically subordinates perceptions of inequitable treatment – lower quality exchanges might result in decreasing OCB directed towards organization. When it comes to supervisor's competence it influenced negatively some of OCB dimensions i.e. conscientiousness and altruism. In-role performance impacted conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy, and altruism (Deluga, 1994, pp. 321–324).

When it comes to individual-level differences, Moorman and Blakely (1995) verified the relationship between OCB and

individualism-collectivism at the individual level of culture. The results suggested that individuals who were holding collectivistic instead of individualistic values might be more likely to perform citizenship behaviors. It is an important point that authors, in fact, discuss individual-level antecedents of OCB and point out that everyone depending on their traits and "because of who they are" might more or less likely to exhibit OCB. It is also important to note that everyone depending on their individual differences might vary when it comes to how much they are influenced by external factors including organizational and environmental level antecedents of OCB. When it comes to verified by Moorman and Blakely (1995) individualism-collectivism, it is a fundamental distinction differentiating cultures (Hofstede, 1980, cited after: Moorman and Blakely, 1995, p. 129). The above mentioned dimension can be, in fact, a bi-polar construct within which an individualist is considering own interests, and goals as more important than the interests of a group, whereas a collectivist has a need to be member of a group and prioritizes the interest of a group over individual (Hofstede, 1980; Earley, 1989; Wagner and Moch, 1986; cited after: Moorman and Blakely, 1995, p. 129).

Individualism-collectivism obviously can distinct culture at different levels also national as was confirmed by work of Hofstede (1980) which might be proof that different levels of antecedents are not easily distinguishable which of course does not mean that they do not exist. It is clear and obvious that there are plenty of existing factors influencing individuals within nations both individually and collectively. Those above-mentioned factors are coming from different levels individually and in a cumulative intertwined manner, which disproves the point Moorman and Blakely (1995) made by mentioning that there is some evidence suggesting that a distinction between collectivists and individualists "may exist within cultures in the form of an individual difference". Researchers could wrongly assume that different dimensions could be summed up to be individual-level traits if they were all measured at individual level giving the organizational or national level generalizations of traits majority of individuals possess. Coming back to individualism-collectivism, the most important part is that as noted by authors such a cultural variable is clearly creating theoretical pattern within OCB as it is itself behavior supporting collective interest of the group within job environment mostly when it comes to actions such as interpersonal helping, individual initiative, and

loyal boosterism (Moorman and Blakely, 1995, p. 130). Furthermore, the research of Moorman and Blakely (1995) is a good example to clarify the view that culture itself depending on research perspective can fall into an individual, organizational or other environmental-level antecedent of OCB.

Going further into variations and interrelations between culture and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors it is worth mentioning the research of Farh et al. (1997). Above study was aimed on verifying the impact of cultural characteristics i.e. traditionalism and modernity and gender on OCB and interrelations with organizational justice (distributive and procedural) within the Chinese context. According to the results, there is stronger relation between organizational justice and OCB for individuals who score higher on modernity.

Furthermore, in the above study, organizational justice had a higher impact on OCB for males than for females. The authors rightly mention that organizational justice which has been proven to be an antecedent of OCB might differ when it comes to its impact on individual actions taking into consideration intertwined individual traits (such as gender) and contextual attributes (such as cultural values), above mentioned obviously might be the case for every antecedent which shows the intricacy of the case. The authors also make an important point mentioning that different societies have emphasis on different values and clearly different background shapes individuals differently creating different predictions can be made based on contractual relationships in society. When it comes to measured variables, traditional culture emphasizes "expressive ties between people respect for authority, filial piety, ancestor worship, male-domination, fatalism, and a general sense of powerlessness" (Yang et al., 1989; cited after: Farh et al., 1997, p. 424). Modernity, however, underlines "instrumental exchange" – "the principle that everyone has certain basic human rights such as receiving rewards based on his or her individual contributions" (Triandis, 1989; Erez and Earley, 1993, cited after: Farh et al., 1997, p. 424). It is important that the above-mentioned variables as stated by authors themselves are conceptually related to the cultural dimensions defined by Hofstede (1980), which were a foundation for differentiating whole societies. Traditionality is related to power distance and distribution of power among individuals in a given society. Modernity according to Farh et al. (1997) is related to mentioned already individualism-collectivism, as individualism is the most important constituent of

individual modernity or modernism (Yang, 1993, cited after: Farh et al., 1997, p. 435).

Coming back to individual-level traits according to Andersson and Bateman (1997) cynicism relates negatively to intentions to perform organizational citizenship behaviors. Cynicism can be defined as the attitude or individual trait of "dislike for, and distrust of others" or be an approach in a given context towards a given object. Andersson and Bateman (1997) summarize cynicism as "both a general and specific attitude, characterized by frustration and disillusionment as well as negative feelings toward and distrust of a person, group, ideology, social convention, or institution" (Andersson and Bateman, 1997, p. 461). For example organizational cynicism, according to Wanous et al. (1994), is "attitude of pessimism and hopelessness toward future organizational change induced by repeated exposure to mismanaged change attempts" (Wanous et al., 1994, cited after: Andersson and Bateman, 1997, p. 461). Cynicism can be also aimed against work in general, in this case, the individual person has the attitude in which work is perceived as "oppressive, unrewarding, and unworthy of effort" (Stern et al., 1990, cited after: Andersson and Bateman, 1997, p. 461). Cynicism might be perceived as an individual-level antecedent of OCB, however Bateman et al. (1992) mention that cynicism can aim towards different objects as a result of generalizations based on previous experiences i.e. "cynicism toward the leader of one corporation generalizes to cynicism toward the leaders of other corporations" (Bateman et al., 1992, cited after Andersson and Bateman, 1997, p. 461).

Research by Tang and Ibrahim (1998) was a broad investigation of different antecedents within different cultural contexts. Results have shown that a need for achievement, high intrinsic job satisfaction – related to enjoyment and performing activities for no reward except for joy, and low extrinsic job satisfaction (need for extrinsic reward) were antecedents of altruism, furthermore, low work-related stress and high organization-based self-esteem predicted compliance. Organization-based self-esteem which is "the degree to which organizational members believe that they can satisfy their needs by participating in roles within the context of an organization" (Tang and Ibrahim, 1998, p. 532) was predicting altruism. The most interesting part of the research was that it spotted differences between results in two different culture samples – Middle Eastern, and US citizens. Self-esteem in the Western culture (American: US) sample, was related only to altruism whereas

for the Middle Eastern sample, to both OCB dimensions: altruism and compliance. Also leader supportiveness had a stronger relationship with OCB for the Middle Eastern sample in comparison to the US sample.

Chattopadhyay (1999) continued research related to organization-based self-esteem, and verified relations among the above-mentioned, trust in peers, and demographic dissimilarity i.e. age, sex, and race of employees. According to research, age dissimilarity impacted peer relations. Peer relations and organization-based self-esteem were positively related to the level of employee altruism. The author explains that according to results the more employees trust and are attracted to their peers and perceive themselves as valued members of the organization, the more likely they are to engage in OCB. Furthermore, peer relations had a lessening effect on organization-based self-esteem. The impact of the age dissimilarity variable which had an influence on peer relations, organization-based self-esteem, and OCB was stronger for older employees. Data have also shown that the organization-based self-esteem, peer relations, and altruism of younger employees were higher if the age dissimilarity was higher. The author found significant association between sex (sex dissimilarity) and, organization-based self-esteem, altruism and marginally peer relations within groups dominated by women (unlike in groups dominated by men). When it comes to race (race dissimilarity) in white-dominated groups it had negative impact on organization-based self-esteem, peer relations, and OCB unlike for minority-dominated groups. The author sums up that demographic variables like individual employee traits, or demographic composition of the team are interrelated and might give complex results varying when it comes to strength and direction.

Randall et al. (1999) investigated and proved the relationships among organizational variables: organizational politics, organizational support, and their influence on employees' attitudes: job satisfaction, job performance, commitment, turnover intentions, and OCB. Political perceptions were negatively related to commitment, job satisfaction, and OCB, yet positively related to turnover intentions. Politics, however, had no strong association with performance. Organizational support had a strong positive relationship with affective commitment, job satisfaction, job performance, and OCB. The results were furthermore showing a negative correlation between support and turnover intentions. Additionally, 'support' and 'politics' variables had a strong – highly negative correlation.

5. OCB antecedent studies coming to their maturity (2000–2009)

In the decade of the 2000s, the research on OCBs seems to have entered in the maturity phase. Table 4 presents the most interesting and influential publications from this period dealing with the antecedents of OCBs.

Podsakoff et al. (2000) within their broad literature study discussed a lot of issues related to Citizenship Behaviors and also proposed that antecedents based on report of the meta-analytic relationships between OCBs and their antecedents might be categorized into four major categories (1) individual (employee) characteristics, (2) task characteristics, (3) organizational characteristics, and (4) leadership behaviors. Authors concentrate on discussing results of studies and matching them with existing theories concentrating on strength within which theme-categories impact OCB rather than the framework coming from the four proposed categories.

Turnley and Feldman (2000) verified relations between psychological contract-violations, unmet expectations, job dissatisfaction and different work behaviors i.e. intention to quit, neglect of in-role job duties, and OCB. According to results, violations are positively related to intentions to quit, and neglecting in-role job duties and responsibilities, and negatively related to OCB. Further psychological contract violation impacts and triggers unmet expectations and job dissatisfaction which affect job behaviors. Related to that Ensher et al. (2001) verified the impact of perceived discrimination (from supervisors, coworkers, an organization) on workers' behaviors and attitudes, showing that all above-mentioned sources of discrimination also negatively influence job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and OCB.

According to research of Stamper and Dyne (2001), full-time employees show more helping OCBs than part-time employees. Furthermore, the preferred work status as an individual, contextual factor of organizational culture moderated the above mentioned relationship between work status and OCB, and had higher impact for part-time workers (who would prefer to work full-time) than full time employees in a way they shown much lower OCB tendency. Additionally, a level of bureaucracy in organizational culture was influencing the impact of work status on OCB. Relation between work status and OCB was stronger in less bureaucratic organizations (which was against authors' hypothesized expectation). Bureaucratic culture itself was negatively related to helping behaviors. The age of employees

Table 4. Scientific production in the research field dealing with OCBs' antecedents (2000–2009)

Author(s)	Year	Title	Cited
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	1916
Turnley, W.H., Feldman, D.C.	2000	Re-examining the effects of psychological contract violations: Unmet expectations and job dissatisfaction as mediators	297
Stamper, C.L., Dyne, L.	2001	Work status and organizational citizenship behavior: A field study of restaurant employees	168
Ensher, E.A., Grant-Vallone, E.J., Donaldson, S.I.	2001	Effects of perceived discrimination on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and grievances	135
Lee, K., Allen, N.J.	2002	Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions	633
Diefendorff, J.M., Brown, D.J., Kamin, A.M., Lord, R.G.	2003	Examining the roles of job involvement and work centrality in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors and job performance	180
Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D.E., Byrne, Z.S.	2003	The relationship of emotional exhaustion to work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors	511
Tepper, B.J., Taylor, E.C.	2003	Relationships among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors	175
Deckop, J.R., Cirka, C.C., Andersson, L.M.	2003	Doing unto others: The reciprocity of helping behavior in organizations	118
Côté, S., Miners, C.T.H.	2006	Emotional intelligence, cognitive intelligence, and job performance	293
Piercy, N.F., Cravens, D.W., Lane, N., Vorhies, D.W.	2006	Driving organizational citizenship behaviors and salesperson in-role behavior performance: The role of management control and perceived organizational support	114

Source: Own study.

was also differentiating results as older employees and those with longer organizational tenure showed higher engagement in helping behavior. When it comes to gender, females exhibited more helping behaviors.

Explanation to 'negative antecedents' (variables which have negative relationship with OCB) might be the fact researched by Lee and Allen (2002) that workers' cognitions i.e. thoughts about work and affect i.e. their feelings about work influence work-related behaviors such as OCBs. Additionally, they influence different behaviors with different strengths as it was verified job affect contributes more to the prediction of OCB-I than job cognition which contributes more to the prediction of OCB-O than job affect. Furthermore, according to the results of Diendorff et al. (2002), there are strong relationships between job involvement, OCBs, and in-role performance. Job involvement is mostly positively correlated with altruism, civic virtue sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and in-role performance. Work centrality, however, was significantly correlated only with civic virtue dimension. For some dimensions of OCB (courtesy and sportsmanship dimensions), job involvement and OCB relationship were also different for men and women. Women who score high in job involvement are rated as engaging more in OCB, however, men, scoring higher in job involvement obtain results associated with lower OCB ratings.

Cropanzano et al. (2003) verified the negative impact of individuals' emotional exhaustion (defined as a chronic state of emotional and physical depletion of individuals) on organizational commitment, turnover intentions, performance, and OCB. Emotional exhaustion significantly influenced organizational commitment and turnover intentions. Emotional exhaustion furthermore impacted job performance, however, the impact of emotional exhaustion when organizational commitment was entered into the model made commitment became a strong predictor of performance ratings which means that emotional exhaustion showed only a nonsignificant direct relationship. Emotional exhaustion had impact on OCB-O, however after including commitment, the effect of exhaustion was not significant anymore, so that results of the above-mentioned research suggest that organizational commitment mediates the relationship between emotional exhaustion and OCB-O.

According to Tepper and Taylor (2003), leaders' procedural justice perceptions lead to supervisors' OCB which impacts procedural justice perceptions of subordinates, which directly influences subordinates' OCB. Additionally, mentoring behavior was a mediator for the

relationship between procedural justice perceptions of supervisors and subordinates. Procedural justice perceptions of supervisors and subordinates, mentoring behavior, had an impact on subordinates' OCB. Procedural justice perceptions were mediating the relationship between mentoring behavior and OCB performed by subordinates. Furthermore, the relationship between procedural justice perceptions and OCB was stronger if employees themselves perceived and defined OCB as extra-role rather than in-role behavior. Similarly, for supervisors who defined mentoring behavior as extra-role relationship between justice perceptions and mentoring behavior was stronger than for supervisors who defined such behavior as in-role.

According to Deckop et al. (2003), because of the fact that reciprocity is a fundamental rule and aspect of social life, the OCB which employees received from coworkers has a positive impact on future OCB. Mostly when it comes to helping behavior there is a positive relationship between OCB received from coworkers, and helping OCB exhibited to coworkers. Authors summarize that the rule of reciprocity is an important aspect of organizational life and important indicator of helping behavior exchange among employees, their organization, co-workers, and supervisors. The exchange of helping behaviors among workers can lead to creation of 'virtuous' cycles (when OCB increases as a result of repeated reciprocal helping among employees) and a 'vicious' cycles (if employees do not help others because they did not receive help) (Brass et al., 1998; Masuch, 1985, cited after: Deckop et al., 2003, p. 107).

Cote and Miners (2006) in their study concentrate on the individual-level. Their research is treating about individual traits which can be perceived as advantages influencing OCB. The researchers found out that emotional intelligence is positively related to task performance and OCB but relationship is impacted negatively by cognitive intelligence when it comes to performance and OCB-O (but not for OCB-I).

According to Piercy et al. (2006), management control understood as concerns the efforts of managers to influence the behavior and activities of employees to accomplish the objectives of the organization (Jaworski et al., 1993, cited after: Piercy et al., 2006, p. 249) was verified to be an antecedent to OCB. Additionally, perceived organizational support (POS) is a strong antecedent of OCB directly and even stronger because of the sales manager control, which shows that manager behavior is of high importance for the work behavior of employees. Perceived Organizational Support is an organizational variable which importantly

impacts OCB, in-role behavior, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The results of the study show that there is much stronger direct impact of manager control on POS than on OCB. Furthermore, impact of control on OCB is much higher indirectly through POS, because in results salespeople who perceived the organization as supportive were scoring higher on organizational commitment and OCB (Piercy et. al., 2006, pp. 249, 256–257).

6. Complexity of studies on OCB antecedents (2010–2018) – extension period or decline?

Studies from the last discussed period (2010–2018) were numerous, however not plenty of them discussed the antecedents of OCB, and if they did, the author of this article often excluded them due to overcomplicating issues which was not leading to clarification of things, such a situation is another confirmation for a need of a current study. The publications taken into analysis are listed in Table 5.

Huang et al. (2010) verified linkages between leadership trait: participative leadership behaviors and individuals' task performance and OCB-O. Those relationships were mediated by different mediators for managerial and non-managerial employees (such as: supporting, and front-line employees). 'Motivational mediator' of psychological empowerment had more power for managerial subordinates. However, for non-managerial subordinates, impact of participative leadership on OCB-O and task performance was mediated by 'exchange-based' mediator of trust-in-supervisor. The findings might suggest that the position of an employee within a company differentiates the models of employees. Even if in both samples participative leadership behavior was strongly related to psychological empowerment and trust-in-supervisor (Huang et al., 2010, p. 132), the ways it impacted managers and non-managers were different. For managerial subordinates, psychological empowerment was a strong predictor of task performance and OCB-O, however trust-in-supervisor was not significantly related to task performance and OCB-O. For non-managerial subordinates, trust-in-supervisor was strongly predicting task performance and OCB-O more than psychological empowerment. The authors conclude that in the above mentioned case the "motivational model of participative leadership" provides more explanation relationships

Table 5. Scientific production in the research field dealing with OCBs' antecedents (2010–2018)

Author(s)	Year	Title	Cited
Huang, X., Iun, J., Liu, A., Gong, Y.	2010	Does participative leadership enhance work performance by inducing empowerment or trust? The differential effects on managerial and non-managerial subordinates	103
Babcock-Roberson, M.E., Strickland, O.J.	2010	The relationship between charismatic leadership, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behaviors	92
Greguras, G.J., Diefendorff, J.M.	2010	Why does proactive personality predict employee life satisfaction and work behaviors? A field investigation of the mediating role of the self-concordance model	74
Bowling, N.A., Eschleman, K.J., Wang, Q., Kirkendall, C., Alarcon, G.	2010	A meta-analysis of the predictors and consequences of organization-based self-esteem	70
Avey, J.B., Palanski, M.E., Walumbwa, F.O.	2011	When leadership goes unnoticed: The moderating role of follower self-esteem on the relationship between ethical leadership and follower behavior	91
Rupp, D.E., Shao, R., Thornton, M.A., Skarlicki, D.P.	2013	Applicants' and employees' reactions to corporate social responsibility: The moderating effects of first-party justice perceptions and moral identity	86

Source: Own study.

between variables for managerial subordinates; while the "exchange-based model" might be more accurate in explaining relationships for non-managerial subordinates (Huang et al., 2010, p. 136).

Babcock-Roberson and Strickland (2010) also were interested in mediating effects. Their study verified a model linking leader charisma to organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) through the work engagement. The study found significant positive relationships among above mentioned variables, and show that effects of leaders' charisma on OCB are fully mediated by individuals' work engagement. The above-mentioned findings suggest that relationships among different

levels of antecedents are sophisticated and while at times some factors at one level can seem to be strongly related to OCB it might depend on underlying factor coming from a different level. In this case employees were more engaged in their work in the presence of a charismatic leader which was promoting OCB in the company (Babcock-Roberson and Strickland, 2010, p. 322).

An interesting individual-level variable of proactive personality was investigated by Greguras and Diefendorff (2010). Proactive personality is defined as the tendency to initiate change in a variety of situations (Bateman and Crant, 1993, cited after: Greguras and Diefendorff, 2010, p. 539). Research of Greguras and Diefendorff (2010) shows that as it was theorized before proactivity positively influences employee behaviors (Crant, 2000, cited after: Greguras and Diefendorff, 2010, p. 540) and leads to setting and attaining more self-concordance, and goal attainment, which later on predicts psychological need satisfaction. Self-concordance is a model and a trait related to individual goals and motivations based on the reasoning process behind and after goal pursuit (Greguras and Diefendorff, 2010, pp. 540, 553). Psychological need satisfaction predicts employee's life satisfaction, in-role performance, and OCB. Additionally, goal attainment directly predicts employee life satisfaction. In short, proactive personality is an indirect antecedent of OCB. It directly impacts goal self-concordance, goal attainment, and psychological need satisfaction. Above-mentioned variables influenced by proactivity have direct impact on life satisfaction, in-role performance, and OCB (Greguras and Diefendorff, 2010, p. 553).

Avey et al. (2011) examined the effects of ethical leadership on OCB and also deviant behavior. As expected, ethical leadership had positive relationship with OCB and negative with deviance behavior. Additionally relationships were moderated by individuals' self-esteem. If self-esteem was higher, then the relationships between ethical leadership and OCB, and ethical leadership and deviant behavior were both weaker. The above mentioned shows that again individual level traits are important in determining impact of organizational-level antecedents on individual work behaviors, as well that ethical leadership is another leadership approach worth consideration when it comes to its impact on "behavioral outcomes". It is also worth noticing that self-esteem seems to be a significant and of high interest antecedent of OCB.

To broaden on self-esteem variable it is worth mentioning the research of Bowling et al. (2010). Self-esteem in general plays an

important role in predicting employee attitudes and behaviors (Brockner, 1988; Judge and Bono, 2001; Korman, 1970, 1976; Pierce and Gardner, 2004; cited after Bowling et al., 2010, p. 601). Bowling et al. (2010) broadened on the subject verifying relationships between general self-esteem and organizational-based self-esteem (OBSE), and also a few additional variables. General self-esteem, general self-efficacy, and emotional stability were positively related to OBSE (Bowling et al., 2010, p. 608). Within the research of Bowling et al. (2010), several, not to say numerous, different environmental variables were supported to have relationship with OBSE which shows complexity of interrelations between variables in the work environment. Other variables related to OBSE were: job complexity, autonomy, effective leader behaviors, social and organizational support, psychological ownership, salary, general job stressors, role ambiguity, role conflict, job insecurity (Bowling et al., 2010, pp. 608–609); job satisfaction, organizational commitment (affective commitment, but not normative commitment), job involvement (Bowling et al., 2010, p. 609). Furthermore, OBSE was showing relationships with work behaviors i.e., positive relationship with in-role job performance, and OCB. Negative relations were shown between OBSE and turnover intention. Additionally OBSE was negatively related to depression and physical symptoms. Such a huge number of different variables among one which is an antecedent of OCB clarifies the understanding of complexity of interrelations of different factors which are placed at different levels and influencing behaviors of individuals.

Rupp et al. (2013) in their study verified relationship between corporate social responsibility, which by definition is "actions on the part of the firm that appear to advance, or acquiesce in the promotion of some social good, beyond the immediate interests of the firm and its shareholders and beyond that which is required by law" (Waldman et al., 2006, p. 1703, quoted after: Rupp et al., 2013, p. 896), and OCB, and furthermore effects on moral versus immoral identity of an individual on it. The results show that individual perceptions on employer's CSR have positive relationships with OCB of employees and also job pursuit intentions of applicants. Relationships are mediated by distributive justice perceptions which show how individuals perceive how "the organization treats the focal participant" (Rupp et al., 2013, p. 901). To understand the 'mediating effect' and explain the significant two-way interaction between distributive justice and CSR, it is important to note

that in this research authors assume that CSR perceptions are about how individuals perceive how an organization treats external stakeholders (Rupp et al., 2013, p. 901). Additionally, moral identity of employees also moderated two above mentioned 'main' relationships in a way that effect of CSR on job pursuit intentions and OCB was stronger among employees and participants which scored high on moral identity. The effect of CSR on main variables was beyond the main effects of the perceived organizational prestige and expected treatment. Distributive justice positively affected job applicants' job pursuit intentions.

7. Discussion

After reviewing the literature of antecedents of OCB it is visible that there are 3 interwoven subgroups (levels) from which antecedents come from: (1) individual, (2) organizational, and (3) environmental. Individual-level antecedents (1) are variables that have impact on OCB and have their roots at a level of an employee, for instance their personality traits, attitude, and some of the demographic variables such as sex, age, etc. which are clearly individual traits. This first level of antecedents include proposed by Podsakoff et al. (2000) category of individual (employee) characteristics. (2) Organizational level antecedents include all variables influencing OCB which come from the organization, for instance, organizational actions, or culture, and additionally within this group author of this article would include antecedents which have their roots in a person of a leader, leader's attitude, and leadership approach. The second level of antecedents includes (three remaining antecedents categories proposed by Podsakoff et al. (2000) i.e. task characteristics, organizational characteristics, and leadership behaviors. Finally, the third level of antecedents could be named (3) environmental antecedents which are all variables which come from outside the organization, they might come from its micro- and macro-environment, i.e. ecology issues, national culture, and other demographic variables outside individual level.

Many times, the level of a given antecedent which might be found in discussed studies is not obvious. In fact one antecedent might be included in more than one group. For instance, a way in which an individual perceives the leader, the company, or the environment can be included in more than one group, or within a group which seems to have

the biggest impact through that variable on OCB, which is a question of the research methodology, and lack of possibility to obtain clear methodological individualism. It is a complicated task to decide on the level of the antecedent if issues related of the level of measurement and the level of analysis of the source are questionable. Future research on the behavior and its antecedents should not be limited to quantitative studies but also should include qualitative methods and awareness of existing interrelations. Above-mentioned awareness might be shown by methodological relationism, which seems to be the right direction already taken by modern social science. The relations between different antecedents and behaviors as it was visible in the reviewed literature create synergies, thus studies based on separate calculations at this level of current knowledge should not be main target for the future.

Future OCB research which still will use quantitative methodology should aim to provide clarification of issues rather than adding to complexity. However, even if overcomplicating issues is not the right direction for development of the field complexity should not be ignored. A good example for future studies might be Moorman and Blakely (1995), which verified the relationship of individualism-collectivism (which is known to be a national level-dimension) at the individual level of culture. Another similar study, which is a good example for future directions, is the research of Farh et al. (1997), which verified impact of other cultural characteristics on OCB, but also its interrelations with organizational justice, which additionally taken place in the Chinese context. The study of Bowling et al. (2010) should be also an example for future researchers because it shows complex interrelations among variables including OBSE impacting OCB.

8. Conclusions

The study reviewed literature related to proposed by Organ (1988) the concept of Organizational Citizenship Behavior including brief introduction to its roots and definition, and most importantly the systematic literature review of some of the variables impacting OCB named here antecedents. Such an in-depth theoretical analysis is an important contribution to the field and shows that framework is not as simple as it was previously perceived. It was visible that antecedents of OCB exist within the complex framework of interrelated variables, also it

was proposed that variables impacting OCB might come from three different levels. Directions from which antecedents come were named as individual, organizational, and environmental.

It was mentioned that antecedents of OCB are not only coming from different above-named levels but also are impacting each other in a highly complex manner, which is visible in prior empirical investigations discussed within this article. The interrelations between different levels of antecedents and antecedents themselves should be further verified theoretically and empirically. Scholars in their future studies should take into consideration the existence of different levels of antecedents and interrelations between them.

Obviously not only researchers should be more aware of a underlying framework and its impact on behavior, but more importantly this knowledge is essential for companies. Practitioners should be more interested and aware how different factors as a framework impact behaviors of employees, and in fact daily life of a company, and its future outcomes by plenty interwoven variables. The most important managerial implication is that the leaders and managers at different levels on organization should and can much easier acknowledge and observe dynamics of the general framework of antecedents rather than how single variables based on numerous theories impact the behavior of each worker.

Summing up, the review of literature shows that antecedents of OCB exist within the complex framework of interrelated variables and can be ascribed to three different levels according to direction from which they come from i.e. individual, organizational, and environmental. Above mentioned levels of antecedents are a basis for existing interrelations which should be further investigated.

References

Andersson, L. M., & Bateman, T. S. (1997). Cynicism in the workplace: Some causes and effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18(5), 449–469.

Avey, J. B., Palanski, M. E., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2011). When leadership goes unnoticed: The moderating role of follower self-esteem on the relationship between ethical leadership and follower behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98(4), 573–582.

Babcock-Roberson, M. E., & Strickland, O. J. (2010). The relationship between charismatic leadership, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Journal of Psychology*, 144(3), 313–326.

Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(2), 103–118.

Bateman, T. S., Sakano, T., & Fujita, M. (1992). Roger, me, and my attitude: Film propaganda and cynicism toward corporate leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(5), 768–771.

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1982). Job satisfaction and the good soldier. Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management, New York.

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.

Berkowitz, L. (1970). The self, selfishness, and altruism. In Macauley, J., Berkowitz, L. (Eds.), *Altruism and Helping Behavior*. New York: Academic Press.

Bowling, N. A., Eschleman, K. J., Wang, Q., Kirkendall, C., & Alarcon, G. (2010). A meta-analysis of the predictors and consequences of organization-based self-esteem. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83(3), 601–626.

Brass, D. J., Butterfield, K. D., & Skaggs, B. G. (1998). Relationships and unethical behavior: A social network perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(1), 14–31.

Brockner, J. (1988). *Self-esteem at Work: Theory, Research, and Practice*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Chattopadhyay, P. (1999). Beyond direct and symmetrical effects: The influence of demographic dissimilarity on organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(3), 273–287.

Côté, S., & Miners, C. T. (2006). Emotional intelligence, cognitive intelligence, and job performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(1), 1–28.

Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 435–462.

Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., & Byrne, Z. S. (2003). The relationship of emotional exhaustion to work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), 160–169.

Czakon, W. (2011). Metodyka systematycznego przeglądu literatury. *Przegląd Organizacji*, (3), 57–61.

Deckop, J. R., Cirka, C. C., & Andersson, L. M. (2003). Doing unto others: The reciprocity of helping behavior in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 47(2), 101–113.

Deluga, R. J. (1994). Supervisor trust building, leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67(4), 315–326.

Diefendorff, J. M., Brown, D. J., Kamin, A. M., & Lord, R. G. (2002). Examining the roles of job involvement and work centrality in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(1), 93–108.

Earley, P. C. (1989). Social loafing and collectivism: A comparison of the United States and the People's Republic of China. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*, 34(4), 565–581.

Ensher, E. A., Grant-Vallone, E. J., & Donaldson, S. I. (2001). Effects of perceived discrimination on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and grievances. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12(1), 53–72.

Erez, M., & Earley, P. C. (1993). *Culture, Self-Identity and Work*. New York: Oxford University Press.

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, 421–444.

Farh, J. L., Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, 16(4), 705–721.

Greguras, G. J., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2010). Why does proactive personality predict employee life satisfaction and work behaviors? A field investigation of the mediating role of the self-concordance model. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(3), 539–560.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 10(4), 15–41.

Huang, X., Iun, J., Liu, A., & Gong, Y. (2010). Does participative leadership enhance work performance by inducing empowerment or trust? The differential effects on managerial and non-managerial subordinates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(1), 122–143.

Jaworski, B. J., Stathakopoulos, V., & Krishnan, H. S. (1993). Control combinations in marketing: Conceptual framework and empirical evidence. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1), 57–69.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits – self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability – with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 80–92.

Katz, D. (1964). Motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9(2), 131–146.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York: Wiley.

Korman, A. K. (1970). Toward an hypothesis of work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54(1), 31–41.

Korman, A. K. (1976). Hypothesis of work behavior revisited and an extension. *Academy of Management Review*, 1(1), 50–63.

Krebs, D. L. (1970). Altruism: An examination of the concept and a review of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 73(4), 258–302.

Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 131–142.

Masuch, M. (1985). Vicious circles in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30(1), 14–33.

Moorman, R., (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and OCB: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845–855.

Moorman, R. H., Niehoff, B. P., & Organ, D. W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6(3), 209–225.

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.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Organ, D. W. (1990). The subtle significance of job satisfaction. *Clinical Laboratory Management Review*, 4, 94–98.

Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1), 157–164.

Pierce, J. L, & Gardner, D. G (2004). Self-esteem within the work and organizational context: A review of the organization-based self-esteem literature. *Journal of Management*, 30(5), 591–622.

Piercy, N. F., Cravens, D. W., Lane, N., & Vorhies, D. W. (2006). Driving organizational citizenship behaviors and salesperson in-role behavior performance: The role of management control and perceived organizational support. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34(2), 244–262.

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. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107–142.

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, 513–563.

Randall, M. L., Cropanzano, R., Bormann, C. A., & Birjulin, A. (1999). Organizational politics and organizational support as predictors of work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(2), 159–174.

Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. (1964). *Management and the Worker*. New York: Wiley Science Editions.

Rupp, D. E., Skarlicki, D., & Shao, R. (2013). The psychology of corporate social responsibility and humanitarian work: A person-centric perspective. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 6(4), 361–368.

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 655–663.

Stamper, C. L., & Dyne, L. V. (2001). Work status and organizational citizenship behavior: A field study of restaurant employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22(5), 517–536.

Stern, D., Stone, J. R., Hopkins, C., & McMillion, M. (1990). Quality of students' work experience and orientation toward work. *Youth and Society*, 22(2), 263–282.

Tang, T. L. P., & Ibrahim, A. H. S. (1998). Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior revisited: Public personnel in the United States and in the Middle East. *Public Personnel Management*, 27(4), 529–550.

Tansky, J. W. (1993). Justice and organizational citizenship behavior: What is the relationship? *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6(3), 195–207.

Tepper, B. J., & Taylor, E. C. (2003). Relationships among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(1), 97–105.

Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96(3), 506–520.

Turnley, W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2000). Re-examining the effects of psychological contract violations: Unmet expectations and job dissatisfaction as mediators. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(1), 25–42.

Wagner, J. A., & Moch, M. K. (1986). Individualism-collectivism: Concept and measure. *Group & Organization Studies*, 11(3), 280–304.

Waldman, D. A. et al. (2006). Cultural and leadership predictors of corporate social responsibility values of top management: A GLOBE study of 15 countries. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(6), 823–837.

Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., & Austin, J. T. (1994). Organizational cynicism: An initial study. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1994(1), 269–273.

Yang, K.-S. (1993). Chinese social orientation: An integrative analysis. In Cheng, L Y., Cheung, F. M. C., & Chen, C.-N. (Eds.), *Psychotherapy for the Chinese: Selected Papers from the First International Conference* (pp.19–56). Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Yang, K. S., Yu, A. B., & Yeh, M. H. (1989). Chinese individual modernity and traditionality: Construct definition and measurement. *Proceedings of the Interdisciplinary Conference on Chinese Psychology and Behavior*, 287–354.