

Personality and contextual antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior: A study of two occupational groups

PINAR H. IMER,^{*} HAYAT KABASAKAL,[†] AND ALI DASTMALCHIAN[‡]

Abstract

This paper examines the impact of personality trait of dispositional affect and contextual variables of multiple commitments on organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) in two occupational groups. Three dimensions of OCBs were considered: helping, civic virtue and sportsmanship behaviors. We used positive and negative affectivity scale to measure dispositional affect. For commitments, we examined affective and normative organizational and occupational commitments. The data were collected from 180 engineers and 180 teachers. The findings show that affect, multiple commitments and occupation all have significant impacts on different dimensions of OCBs. Dispositional affect had the most influence on all three dimensions of OCBs. In addition, helping behavior is affected by normative organizational commitment while civic virtue behavior is influenced by affective commitments (both organizational and occupational) and occupation. Sportsmanship behavior is explained by occupation and affective organizational commitment. Occupation has been shown to make a unique contribution to understanding OCBs. The present study showed that the teachers, for example, exhibited more civic virtue and sportsmanship behaviors than the engineers. Implications of the findings for future research and practice are discussed.

Keywords: organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), affect, commitment, occupation, professionals

Received 22 August 2013. Accepted 30 January 2014

Employee performance has been one of the most important areas of interest by researchers in organizational behavior. This interest has not only been focused on task or in-role performance (Williams & Anderson, 1991; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993), but also on extra-role performance. The latter is conceptualized mostly in the form of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and has been receiving increasing attention in the literature. Organ (1988) defined OCB as ‘behavior(s) of a discretionary nature that are not part of the employee’s formal role requirements, but nevertheless promote the effective functioning of the organization’ (p. 4). Scholars have used different labels for OCB-type behaviors. These include prosocial organizational behavior (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986;

^{*} Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Economics, Administrative and Social Sciences, Kadir Has University, Istanbul, Turkey

[†] Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey

[‡] Peter B. Gustavson School of Business, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, Canada

Corresponding author: pinar.imer@khas.edu.tr

O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; George, 1990, 1991; George & Bettenhausen, 1990), extra-role behavior (Van Dyne, Cummings, & McLean Parks, 1995), organizational spontaneity (George & Brief, 1992; George & Jones, 1997) and contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996). The literature on OCB has continued to evolve as the researchers have attempted to better understand the concept as well as its determinants and outcomes (e.g., Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009; Lavelle, 2010; Jiang & Law, 2012; Spector, 2013).

Earlier studies directly linked such discretionary and cooperative behaviors with individual or unit performance (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994, 1997), as well as to effective and efficient functioning of the organizations (e.g., Organ, 1997). Organizations function more effectively and overall performance is likely to get better when employees perform extra-role behaviors that help coworkers, supervisors, and the organization to achieve results along with their expected in-role behaviors (e.g., Karambayya, 1989; George & Bettenhausen, 1990; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997). Moreover, employees might benefit from such behaviors through rewards from the organizations, improved peer evaluations and improved quality of work life. This is despite the evidence that OCB can result in some negative and undesirable consequences for individuals such as role overload, stress and work-family difficulties (e.g., Bolino & Turner, 2005; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2013).

In today's global business environment increasingly characterized by flatter organizational structures, increased autonomy and responsibility of employees and teams as well as highly competitive markets (Blyton & Dastmalchian, 2006); differential effects of discretionary behavior contributions of employees to organizational effectiveness become even more visible. In line with this and in order to explain the difference among people in engaging in such voluntary extra-role behaviors, researchers have studied the antecedents of OCB for almost three decades (see Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000 for a review). Podsakoff et al. (2000) have identified four major categories of OCB predictors, (a) individual/employee characteristics, (b) task characteristics, (c) organizational characteristics, and (d) leadership behaviors. For individual/employee antecedents of OCB, research has mostly focused on contextual and positive employee attitudes such as organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Lee & Allen, 2002). In addition, the dispositional characteristics of individuals such as affect (George, 1990; Zeinabadi, 2010) and personality (Konovsky & Organ, 1993) have been examined in the literature as playing an important role in promoting OCB.

Within the OCB literature, consensus has not been reached on the relative contributions of contextual and personality related or dispositional antecedents in promoting such constructive behaviors. To investigate the effects of dispositional characteristics, some earlier studies (e.g., Organ & Lingl, 1995; Konovsky & Organ, 1996) focused on one or more of the personality characteristics in relation to the 'Big Five' personality dimensions of agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, openness to experience and emotional stability (McCrae & Costa, 1987). These studies found only partial support for the trait conscientiousness to predict OCB. On the other hand, results of a laboratory experiment by Comeau and Griffith (2005) suggested a different personality dimension, agreeableness, as a predictor of OCB. As an alternative to the 'Big Five' framework, dispositional affect has also yielded ambiguous findings in its relation to OCB. While positive affect (PA) did not appear as a predictor of OCB in Organ and Konovsky's (1989) research, it came out as playing a role in providing emotional help to others in the workplace in another study conducted in a recruitment firm (Toegel, Anand, & Kilduff, 2007). Such studies were conducted mostly in Western cultures, though there has been growing interest on the antecedents of OCB from the rest of the world. Due to such ambiguous results in previous research, there is still a need for investigating the contribution of personality aspects in better understanding OCB in the literature.

In addition to dispositions, organizational commitment, as an individual level contextual antecedent, has received a great deal of attention from researchers in explaining OCB. With the recent

global trends in societies where workforce is increasingly becoming more educated, flexible and boundaryless (Dastmalchian & Blyton, 1998, 2001; Blyton & Dastmalchian, 2006), the focus on organizational commitment as the driving force of an employee to stay in a job has shifted to alternative commitment foci such as occupation or work group commitments (Cohen, 2003; Liu & Cohen, 2010). This is particularly the case in today's tough economic times with job-reduction strategies for employers, where organizations are less likely to be willing to hire long-term employees, which has led to the assertion that employees are becoming less likely to commit to the organization – and perhaps more likely to commit to their occupation or their work group (Cohen, 2003). A few studies have been conducted based on such viewpoint, investigating the effects of multiple commitments on work outcomes including performance, withdrawal, absenteeism and turnover (Blau, 1986; Randall & Cote, 1991; Cohen, 1993, 1999, 2003; Liu & Cohen, 2010). The results of these studies suggest further investigation for a clarification of outcomes related with different commitment foci. For a better understanding of the influence of multiple commitments on OCB, further research is needed to provide more conclusive evidence for both scholars and practitioners.

Despite the growing amount of research on OCB antecedents, there has been limited research on the relative effects of dispositions and contextual facets of the concept for professional employees. A key aim of the current study is to investigate the relative roles of dispositional affect and multiple commitments in explaining OCBs among professionals. Specifically, our purpose is to examine the contributions of affect on OCBs and to better understand the contributions of multiple commitments in explaining such cooperative behaviors for professionals. We will explore that OCBs, while evidently influenced by affect and personality as well as attitudinal factors, would nevertheless be impacted by the managerial recruitment and selection processes. It follows that organizational decision makers have the ability to exercise discretion in designing the jobs and the organizational attributes in order for the work environment to be more favorable for employees.

As mentioned above, OCB is a complex concept whereby it is influenced by many variables at the individual, task, organizational and leadership levels. Research reported in the extant literature is conducted using samples derived from various occupational groups, reporting, by and large, quite distinct findings. There is evidence in the literature suggesting differences in occupations in terms of their work behaviors due to a host of reasons including gender or gender-dominance of professions (e.g., Drogosz & Levy, 1996; Kidder, 2002), the need for interaction and interpersonal relations (e.g., Nikolaou, 2003), or the history and culture of specific professional or occupational groups (Bacon, Blyton, & Dastmalchian, 2010). Consistent with this, we believe different occupational groups and communities demonstrate different patterns of behaviors and that in studying the effects of organizational actions on employee attitudes and behaviors 'occupational difference as a potentially important factor is generally overlooked' (Bacon, Blyton, & Dastmalchian, 2010: 1225). Similarly, the role of occupation on OCB has been under-explored in the fields of human resources and organizational behavior, as has been identified more broadly by organizational scholars (e.g., Barley, 1996; Lawrence, 1998). Since different occupations require different education or training, selection and socialization processes, occupation by itself has a potential to have an influence in explaining OCBs. Earlier studies of OCB have not included occupation as an independent variable in their models. Therefore, an additional aim of this study is to contribute to OCB literature by examining the relationship between occupation and OCBs.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES

OCBs

The structure and dimensions of the OCB construct have been a major concern for researchers since the introduction of the construct in the early 1980s in organizational behavior literature. OCBs cover

a wide spectrum of work-related constructive behaviors. Different dimensions, mostly overlapping with each other were offered during the discourse of the construct. Organ, a leading researcher on OCB, came up with a classification of it to include dimensions of altruism, courtesy, cheerleading, peacekeeping, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and civic virtue (Organ, 1988; 1990a; 1990b). Empirical research (e.g., MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994) has shown that managers often had difficulty in recognizing some of these fine distinctions and tend to think of altruism, courtesy, cheerleading, and peacekeeping in a single helping behavior dimension. Conceptually, helping behavior is a second-order latent construct, consisting of Organ's (1988, 1990a, 1990b) altruism, courtesy, peacekeeping, and some aspects of his cheerleading dimensions (Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997). Helping behavior has been identified as an important form of citizenship behavior by almost every researcher interested in the construct (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; Organ, 1988, 1990a, 1990b; Graham, 1989; Williams & Anderson, 1991; George & Brief, 1992; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996; George & Jones, 1997).

As a dimension of OCB, helping behavior involves voluntarily helping others with, or preventing the occurrence of work-related problems. Organ (1990b) has defined sportsmanship as 'a willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining' (p. 96). This includes Organ's (1988) original sportsmanship dimension together with some part of conscientiousness aspect. Focusing on the remaining part of Organ's (1988) original conscientiousness dimension, one arrives at the OCB dimension of civic virtue. Civic virtue is the behavior indicating that an employee responsibly participates in, and is concerned about the life of the organization. This dimension stands for a macro-level interest in the organization as a whole. Such behavior is shown by a willingness to participate actively in the organization's governance (e.g., attend meetings, engage in policy debates, express one's opinion about what strategy the organization ought to follow, etc.), to monitor its environment for threats and opportunities (e.g., keep up with changes in the industry that might affect the organization), and to look out for its best interests (e.g., reporting fire hazards or suspicious activities, locking doors, etc.) even at a personal cost.

Research has suggested that helping, civic virtue and sportsmanship behaviors have the potential of improving organizational and work unit performance. Such improvements in performance are through: (a) reducing the need to allocate scarce resources to purely maintenance functions (Organ, 1988); (b) liberating these resources for more productive purposes (Organ, 1988; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993); (c) increasing coworker or managerial productivity (Organ, 1988; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991, 1993; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994); (d) serving as a means for coordinating activities between team members and work groups (Karambayya, 1989); and (e) help the organization in improving its ability to attract and retain the best-fit people by making it a desirable place to work for (Organ, 1988; George & Bettenhausen, 1990). In other words, citizenship behaviors are suggested to increase organizational and work unit performance since they lubricate the social machinery of the organization, reduce friction and increase efficiency (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993).

Dispositional affect

Affect has been examined in the literature in two different forms: dispositional and situational. Situational affect (affect as a state) is evaluated with emotions and mood for a rather short and specified period of time, while dispositional affect (affect as a trait) reflects more long-term and durable feelings, as part of one's personality in general (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Although states may sometimes seem more appropriate to predict situation-related attitudes or behavior, traits are accepted as the precursors of states as dispositional antecedents of attitudes and/or behavior

(e.g., George, 1991; 1992). Affect is claimed as a personality structure representative of generalized affective states (Clark & Isen, 1982) and to understand where the affective states come from, personality traits become a major concern (George, 1992). Research provides evidence for the stability of such trait for periods as long as 30 years (Williams & Shiaw, 1999). Dispositional affect consists of two independent dimensions rather than being opposites, positive and negative affect (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Individuals high on the trait PA have an overall sense of well-being and evaluate themselves as being active, enthusiastic and tend to hold a positive outlook; while being able to experience positive affective states over time and across situations (George, 1992). Individuals who are low on PA tend to hold a weaker sense of well-being and have lower self-efficacy. People high on negative affect are more likely to hold a negative outlook and experience negative states over time and across situations. They are more prone to hold aversive feelings like anger, guilt, and fear. Individuals who are low on negative affect tend not to hold a negative outlook and are less likely to experience negative states (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988; George, 1992).

Studies on contextual performance have suggested personality characteristics to be particularly good predictors of contextual performance (e.g., Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996; Morgeson, Reider, & Campion, 2005). However, the studies examining the relationship between individual differences and OCB have provided ambiguous results (e.g., Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; Organ & Konovsky, 1989; George, 1991; Nikolaou & Roberston, 2001). For instance, Organ and Konovsky (1989) examined the influence of the personality trait of PA on OCB and found that when PA was studied simultaneously with cognition, it did not add to the explanation of variance in OCB. From a mood perspective, George (1991) tested the relationship between PA as a personality trait, mood as a state and citizenship behaviors. His results suggested the relationship of mood state to OCB, when measured separately. George and Brief (1992), argued for the importance of the trait PA to measure organizational spontaneity, which is a similar construct to OCB. In a study, Ball, Trevino, and Sims (1994) found no significant relationship between negative affect and OCB. Organ (1994), in a review of empirical studies of affect related measures of personality and OCB, found weak and insignificant results for relationships of such measures and OCB.

An important theoretical development of notice in linking dispositional affect and attitudes or behaviors is Forgas and George's (2001) affect infusion model (AIM). According to AIM, affect has a direct impact on individuals' cognitions and behaviors. AIM suggests people's attitudes to be partially a function of the affect that 'infuses' or influences their cognitive processing in forming evaluations of the attitude object in question. The AIM implicitly appears as a direct effects model, which does not assume any mediating influence between affect and cognition. Employees with the disposition of PA are more likely to perceive their work environment in a more positive way (George, 1996). In addition, people with a more positive outlook might well be inclined to preserve such feelings (e.g., Isen & Baron, 1991; Williams & Shiaw, 1999). Similarly, research has shown that people with negative affect are likely to interpret the stimuli from the external world negatively, and stay distant from their external world in the workplace by holding back from prosocial and helping actions and behaviors (e.g., Agho, Price, & Mueller, 1992; Somech & Ron, 2007).

Given the ambiguous findings with respect to the relationship between dispositional affect and OCB, there is still a need for further investigation of such relationship. It would be reasonable to expect that people holding a general positive outlook in general are more likely to perform cooperative gestures compared with people holding a negative outlook. Therefore, we suggest that:

Hypothesis 1: Dispositional affect is likely to directly influence OCBs. Specifically, dispositional PA will positively relate to OCBs, while negative affect will negatively relate to OCBs.

Organizational and occupational commitments

Commitment has been attracting the attention of both academics and practitioners since 1970s. The concept has been defined differently over time, yet the most frequently used definitions incorporate some kind of an attitude that reflects the feelings of attachment to, identification with or loyalty to, the object of commitment (Morrow, 1993). The construct of organizational commitment was first proposed as a way of explaining the unsatisfactory findings in relation to the effects of job satisfaction on work behaviors (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Lack of commitment was offered as an explanation for lack of relationships between job satisfaction and employee work behaviors such as absenteeism, turnover or even employee theft (Morrow, 1993). To have a better understanding of the construct and locate its contribution in both theory and practice, Allen and Meyer (1990) came up with three components of commitment labeled as affective, continuance and normative. These three components were linked to three general themes of affective attachment, perceived costs and obligation, which according to Allen and Meyer (1990) better explained the nature of the relationship between employees and the organization. Employees with strong affective attachment to the organization tend to remain in the organization because they want to, those with strong continuance commitment because they need to and those with strong normative commitment because they ought to do so.

More recently, research on commitment has recognized the importance of occupational commitment as a distinct focus, along with other objects of commitment like organization, supervisor, team and customer (Meyer, Stanley, Herskovitch, & Topolnysky, 2002; Meyer, Becker, & Vandenberghe, 2004). As the relationship between employees and employers become less stable and organizations continue to restructure, it is not unlikely that employees shift their loyalty to a broader base like their occupations (Snape & Redman, 2003). Lee, Carswell, and Allen (2000) have defined occupational commitment as the 'psychological link between an individual and his/her occupation that is based on an affective reaction to that occupation' (p. 800). One with higher occupational commitment strongly identifies with and has positive feelings about his/her occupation (Blau, 1985). Based on the three dimensional (affective, continuance, and normative) view of organizational commitment, Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) have presented evidence for a three dimensional structure of occupational commitment (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). When applied to occupational commitment, affective commitment implies a person's affective attachment to his/her occupation, continuance commitment involves the individual's assessment of the costs associated with leaving one's occupation, and normative commitment refers to a person's sense of obligation to remain in his/her occupation.

Cohen (1993, 2006) suggests that a reason for the interest in multiple commitments is employees simultaneously being exposed to more than one object of commitment in the workplace and an understanding about the process and magnitude of just one focus of commitment at a time might remain inadequate. Another reason for the interest in multiple commitments is that different commitments are suggested to be important predictors of work outcomes including performance, withdrawal, tardiness, and absenteeism (Blau, 1986; Cohen 2003). There is still need for evidence and call for research (Baruch, 1998) for differentiating between the types of behavior multiple commitments can significantly predict. Organizational commitment has been studied as an important antecedent of OCB (e.g., Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986, Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2000). Podsakoff et al. (2000) in their meta-analysis reported positive correlations of organizational commitment, especially affective organizational commitment, to types of OCB. Employees with strong psychological attachment or high commitment to the organization are supposed to be motivated to contribute meaningfully to the organization than less committed employees (Lee, 2001). Meyer and Allen (1991) argued that affectively committed employees direct their attention to aspects of their work performance that are believed to be valuable to the

organization. In an empirical study among UK National Health Service nurses, Lee (2001) found prosocial organizational behavior of helping to be significantly explained by occupational commitment.

Lee (2001) offers two mechanisms to explain the relationship between organizational commitment and OCBs, social identity theory (SIT) and social exchange theory (SET). SIT suggests a social psychological perspective to understand the antecedents and consequences of social identification in organizations. According to this theory, people tend to classify themselves and others into various social categories, such as organizational membership, gender and age cohorts or perhaps into occupational groups which would lead to the perception of belongingness to collective, a work group or an organization (Tajfel & Turner, 1985; Ashforth & Mael, 1989). As a result, this process of social identification affects co-operative and altruistic behaviors – thus a dimension of citizenship behaviors (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Furthermore, perception of belongingness may lead to a redefinition of one's work role within the organization (Morrison, 1994). For instance, employees high in affective commitment perceive their roles more broadly, and are more likely to engage in citizenship behaviors like helping others. In a similar way, O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) showed evidence that a high level of commitment was related to prosocial behavior such as voluntary participation and contributions beyond those narrowly defined by work roles (Lee, 2001). SET (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959; Adams, 1965) suggests that people who are committed to their company for various reasons will increase their effort on the job through mechanisms of social reciprocity. SET also suggests that increased effort on the job would serve as a means to receive rewards from colleagues, supervisors and/or the organization as a whole. Alternatively, when employees experience positive exchanges with the organization, they will reciprocate with higher levels of commitment, which in turn will motivate them to contribute to the organization with in-role behaviors such as reduced turnover and absenteeism, improved performance or extra-role behaviors. The relationship of commitment to OCB (Meyer et al., 2002) shows that commitment is likely to provide the impetus for employees to be more involved in informal activities such as OCBs in the organization.

Our focus in this study will be on affective and normative commitments since the meta-analytic findings of a study by Podsakoff et al. (2000) shows insignificant correlations between continuance commitment and OCB types (0.01 with altruistic behaviors and 0.05 with generalized compliance). Perhaps this type of commitment concerned with costs of leaving the object of commitment is related with other work outcomes like in-role performance (rather) than voluntary cooperative behaviors. In line with social identity and SETs, people who have a sense of belongingness and affective attachment to their object of commitment (organization and occupation), and/or have positive exchanges with respect to such concerns are expected to be more likely to go beyond in-role performance and perform extra-role behaviors like helping coworkers and having a general concern for their organizations. Similarly, people who have a sense of loyalty to their organizations and occupations are expected to be likely to engage in such extra-role behaviors. In addition, the findings in the literature on occupational commitment provide support for our position in this paper (e.g., Cohen, 2003, 2007; Liu & Cohen, 2010; Yousaf, Sanders, & Shipton, 2013). That is occupational commitment, or one's emotional identification with one's profession, has been generally reported to have positive associations with organizational commitment. This is despite the fact that each one of these commitment types – and the normative vs. affective sides of each (e.g., Meyer & Parfyonova, 2010) has different associations with organizational performance and employee performance constructs.

Furthermore, we expect that commitments as contextual variables will add variance in predicting OCBs above and beyond the variance explained by dispositional affect. In other words, in examining the relationship between commitments and OCBs, dispositional affect will serve as a control variable. The rationale for this expectation is that the dispositional characteristics are likely to be more enduring (as long as 30 years) and are likely to be shaped earlier in a person's life and are thus less

likely to be affected by contextual factors (which include the current experiences in the job or workplace). Therefore, we propose our second hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2a: Affective commitments (organizational and occupational) are likely to explain OCBs significantly above and beyond the variance explained by dispositional affect.

Hypothesis 2b: Normative commitments (organizational and occupational) are likely to explain OCBs significantly above and beyond the variance explained by dispositional affect.

Occupation (profession)

Researchers have investigated individual work outcomes among groups of people who belong to diverse occupations. Some of these studies compared such work or performance outcomes across occupations, others have reported results that belong to unique occupations and examined work behaviors in these occupational domains. Yet, to our knowledge, no studies on OCB have included occupation as an independent variable in their models. Occupation is referred to as the major business activity in which one engages in life for making a living. Although in commitment literature occupation is sometimes interchangeably used with profession and career, it is suggested to be a broader concept in the sense that it encompasses both professionals and nonprofessionals (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). For an occupation to be considered a profession, it is suggested that it should have certain characteristics that socially define and control the behavior of its members (Filley, House, & Kerr, 1976; Kerr, Von Glinow, & Schriesheim, 1977). A profession is usually characterized by an abstract body of knowledge, existing code of ethics and provision for formal training (Von Glinow & Novelli, 1982). Professions can be characterized by an orientation toward service, maintenance of education and performance quality standards, and licensing of practitioners (Freidson & Rhea, 1965; Kerr, Von Glinow, & Schriesheim, 1977; Von Glinow & Novelli, 1982).

Different occupations or professions are distinct from one another by cognitive, affective and technical requirements. These are likely to lead to varying in-role and extra-role performance outcomes (e.g., Drogosz & Levy, 1996; Kidder, 2002). Task-related characteristics including feedback, routinization and intrinsic satisfaction, are suggested to have consistent relationships with OCBs (Podsakoff et al., 2000, 2009). Podsakoff et al. (2000) in their meta-analysis suggested task characteristics to be important yet underemphasized in the literature as determinants of OCBs and called for further research. In this study we intend to do respond to this call by examining occupation's role as an explanatory variable in predicting OCBs while controlling for the effects of dispositional affect and multiple commitments. Therefore:

Hypothesis 3: Occupation will have an impact on OCBs significantly above and beyond those by dispositional affect and multiple commitments.

METHODOLOGY

Subjects and procedure

A questionnaire was developed and administered to measure the constructs OCBs, dispositional affect, and organizational and occupational commitments. Targeted sample included professionals from two occupational groups, teachers and engineers, working in Istanbul. A total of nine companies were visited for engineering participants from diverse businesses including information technology, automotive, food processing and control, and manufacturing. For teacher participants, 11 high schools were visited. Engineers returned 181 of the 250 questionnaires distributed, representing a 72% response rate, and

teachers returned 185 of the 330 questionnaires, with a 56% response rate. The final sample following missing values analyses yielded equal number (180) of usable questionnaires from both occupational groups, making our total for a total useable sample 360 individuals. The sample was composed of 199 females (57.5%) and 147 (42.5%) males, as reported by 346 participants. Of the 171 engineers who reported their gender, 60.2% were males and 39.2% were females. Of the 175 teachers reporting their gender, 75.4% were females and 24.6% were males. Three hundred four people reported their age, which was asked in intervals. The reported median age fell within the range of 31-35. Full-time work experience of the respondents yielded a mean of 10.4 years.

Measures

OCBs

OCBs were measured by the three commonly recognized and conceptually distinct dimensions of helping, civic virtue, and sportsmanship behaviors (Organ, 1988, 1990a, 1990b; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff et al., 1997). Podsakoff et al.'s (1997) 13-item scale was used to measure three types of OCBs. The scale was subjected to an exploratory factor analysis with principle components extraction and varimax rotation for the 13 items in the scale. One item originally used to measure helping behavior (I encourage others when they are down) was excluded from the scale due to high loadings on more than one factor. Confirming Podsakoff et al.'s (1997) original scale, six items loaded on helping behavior, 3 items loaded on civic virtue behavior and three items loaded on sportsmanship behavior. A sample item for each of the behaviors included: 'I willingly share expertise with others' for helping, 'I attend and actively participate in meetings' for civic virtue and 'I always focus on what is wrong with our situation, rather than the positive side (reverse item)' for sportsmanship behaviors. Respondents were expected to report their behaviors on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Reliability scores measured by Cronbach's α for helping, civic virtue and sportsmanship were 0.85, 0.69, and 0.70, respectively.

Dispositional affect

Positive and negative affectivity schedule (PANAS) developed by Watson, Clark, & Tellegen (1988) was used to measure dispositional affect. Positive and negative affect, as two distinct dimensions of dispositional affect, are captured with 20 adjectives, 10 for each disposition. PA items included the adjectives alert, attentive, enthusiastic, interested, excited, inspired, proud, determined, strong, and active. Negative affect descriptors were upset, hostile, distressed, afraid, irritable, scared, guilty, nervous, ashamed, and jittery. Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they generally feel the way each adjective stated on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely). PANAS has been extensively validated (for validation evidence, see Watson, 1988; Watson, Clark, & Carey, 1988; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). The item 'alert' was excluded from the final measure due to its vague meaning in Turkish language. An exploratory factor analysis with principle components extraction and varimax rotation yielded three factors for PANAS, accounting for 57.8% of the variance. Nine items of PA remained, while two factors came out for negative affect items. This factor structure was confirmed with an additional factor analysis for only negative affect items, explaining over 60% of the variance. The first factor consisted of five factors including scared, nervous, distressed, jittery, and upset. Conceptually, these items pertain to one's negative orientations in one's self, irrelevant of any object necessary to induce such states, named as internal negative affect. The second factor included the items ashamed, irritable, hostile, guilty and afraid; which indicate the feelings that are likely to come out with/of the interactions of individuals with others and named as others-oriented or social negative affect. The reliability coefficients for PA, internal negative affect and social negative affect were 0.89, 0.83, and 0.78, respectively.

Organizational and occupational commitments

We used Meyer and Allen's (1991) and their later work (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993) to define and measure organizational and occupational commitments. In this study, based on the findings in the literature (Meyer et al., 2002), we used two aspects of commitment – namely, affective and normative commitments. Six items pertaining to affective organizational commitment, three items for normative organizational commitment, five for each of affective and normative occupational commitments were used to measure the dimensions of organizational and occupational commitments. These specific items were selected after an exploratory factor analyses conducted for commitment items from Meyer, Allen, and Smith's (1993) organizational and occupational scales. Sample items were 'I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own' (affective organizational commitment), 'I would feel guilty if I left my organization now' (normative organizational commitment), 'I am enthusiastic about this profession' (affective occupational commitment) and 'I feel a responsibility to this profession to continue in it.' Respondents were expected to indicate their level of agreement with the statements on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). Reliability scores for affective and normative organizational and occupational commitments were 0.87, 0.72, 0.83, and 0.78.

Occupation

This variable was measured with a dichotomous variable with '0' for engineers and '1' for teachers.

FINDINGS

Since our data was collected from self-report responses to questionnaires, in order to check for the presence of common method variance, Harman's single-factor test was conducted (Harman, 1967; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). First, all the study variables were entered into an exploratory principle components analysis with no rotation forced to one factor. At the next step, all variables were entered into another principal components analysis using varimax rotation. In the initial analysis, when all the variables were forced to load on one factor, 34% of the variance was explained (did not reach the 50% level). As a result of the second analysis, three factors with eigenvalues >1 emerged to account for 61% of the variance. The first factor explained 21%, second factor explained an additional 21% and the third factor explained 19% of the variance. Since no single factor emerged from the second factor analysis accounting for most of the explained variance, common method variance is assumed not present. In addition, confirmatory factor analyses were performed using AMOS to check for the expected superiority of the three behavioral dimensions of OCBs (helping, civic virtue, and sportsmanship) to one factor. As expected, the results for the three-factor correlated model ($\chi^2(48) = 76.183$, $\chi^2/df = 1.587$, RMSEA = 0.040, $pclose = 0.817$, CFI = 0.981, GFI = 0.966, PGFI = 0.594) revealed a better fit compared with one factor model ($\chi^2(54) = 368.112$, $\chi^2/df = 6.817$, RMSEA = 0.127, $pclose = 0.000$, CFI = 0.794, GFI = 0.840, PGFI = 0.582). OCB rather came up as a higher order factor in further analysis.

Prior to going on with hypotheses testing, multicollinearity of the items was assessed and *t*-tests were conducted to see the mean differences between the two groups. Multicollinearity of the items was investigated using variance inflation factors (VIFs). Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham (2006) suggested VIFs fewer than 10 for the non-presence of multicollinearity. The VIFs for the variables ranged between 1.043 and 1.865. The results of the *t*-tests are displayed in Table 1. These results suggest that the two occupational groups, engineers and teachers as shown by their group means were different in terms of all three types of citizenship behaviors, dispositional affect (except social negative affect), affective attachment to the organization and occupation as well as their loyalty to their institutions and professions. Teachers were more likely to experience helping behaviors (6.02 vs. 5.81, $p < .01$), show a general concern for the organization (6.10 vs. 5.72, $p < .001$) and

TABLE 1. COMPARISONS OF OCCUPATION MEANS AND EQUALITY OF VARIANCES

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Mean E (n = 180)</i>	<i>Mean T (n = 180)</i>	<i>Levene significance</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>Significance (two-tailed)</i>
Helping OCB	5.81	6.02	0.602	-2.813	.005
Civic virtue OCB	5.72	6.10	0.224	-4.468	.000
Sportsmanship OCB	4.76	5.26	0.090	-3.804	.000
PA	5.08	5.37	0.180	-3.604	.000
NA-I	3.12	2.91	0.139	2.104	.036
NA-S	2.01	1.92	0.259	1.065	.288
Affective organizational commitment	4.83	5.52	0.808	-5.319	.000
Normative organizational commitment	3.88	4.84	0.000*	-6.769	.000
Affective occupational commitment	5.32	5.79	0.478	-3.664	.000
Normative occupational commitment	4.35	5.16	0.100	-6.441	.000

Notes. Degrees of freedom = 358.

E = engineers; OCB = organizational citizenship behavior; NA-I = internal negative affect; NA-S = social negative affect; T = teachers.

* $p < .05$.

behave in a sportsman way (5.26 vs. 4.76, $p < .001$) compared with engineers. All the variables, but normative organizational commitment had equal variances, confirmed by insignificance of F -values in Levene's test.

Means and standard deviations of the study variables, intercorrelations between the variables and scale reliabilities (along the diagonal in parentheses) are displayed in Table 2. The results suggest that helping behavior had positive and significant correlations with other behavior dimensions of civic virtue and sportsmanship. Helping behavior also had positive and significant associations with the independent variables of PA, and all the commitment variables. Table 2 shows that helping behavior had negative correlations with the dimensions of negative affect, and with internal and social negative affect. Civic virtue behavior was positively correlated with sportsmanship behavior and the rest of the independent variables. It was also shown to be negatively correlated with the two negative affect dimensions, internal and social negative affect. Sportsmanship behavior had significant positive correlations with PA, affective organizational and occupational commitment and with occupation. Sportsmanship behavior had relatively stronger negative correlations, compared with other OCB dimensions, with negative affect dimensions. This OCB dimension was not correlated significantly with normative organizational and occupational commitments. These indicate that all three dimensions of OCBs relate to affect, commitment, and occupation variables.

To test the research hypotheses, a hierarchical regression analysis was performed for each of the citizenship behaviors, helping, civic virtue, and sportsmanship. In the first step, dispositional PA, and the two dimensions of negative affect were entered. The second step tested the additional explained variance by the four commitment forms (affective organizational and occupational, normative organizational and occupational), followed by the additional effect of occupation in the third step. The results of the regression analyses are presented in Table 3.

First hypothesis expected the direct effects of dispositional affect on OCBs. The results of the first step in hierarchical regression for helping behavior ($R^2 = 0.222$, $F = 33.824$, $p \leq .001$) suggest PA ($\beta = 0.445$, $p \leq .001$) as a significant predictor of such behavior. Similarly, PA ($\beta = 0.427$, $p \leq .001$) also came out to be a significant predictor of civic virtue behavior ($R^2 = 0.223$, $F = 34.141$, $p \leq .001$). Sportsmanship behavior ($R^2 = 0.195$, $F = 28.665$, $p \leq .001$), on the other hand, was predicted in a negative direction by both internal negative affect ($\beta = -0.256$, $p \leq .001$) and social negative affect ($\beta = -0.200$, $p \leq .001$). Thus, this hypothesis finds support. These results suggest that professional workers with high positive outlook are more likely to help coworkers and be concerned about their organizations, while those holding a general negative outlook are likely to complain about trivial matters in the organization. These findings indicate that dispositions seem to be a major antecedent of citizenship behaviors. In other words, positive and negative affect as personality traits explain helping, civic virtue and sportsmanship behaviors as OCB dimensions in a significant and strong way for highly professional employees.

Second set of hypotheses predicted that context-related variables of affective and normative organizational and occupational commitment would explain additional variance in OCBs above and beyond the variance explained by dispositional affect. Hierarchical regression analyses suggest findings in line with this expectation in the second steps, when dispositional affect was controlled for in the first step. Above and beyond the remaining direct effect of PA ($\beta = 0.342$, $p \leq .001$), helping behavior ($R^2 = 0.282$, $F = 19.753$, $p \leq .001$) was significantly predicted by normative organizational commitment ($\beta = 0.123$, $p \leq .05$) in a positive direction. Civic virtue behavior ($R^2 = 0.289$, $F = 20.468$, $p \leq .001$), in addition to the significance of PA ($\beta = 0.305$, $p \leq .001$) as a remaining predictor in the second step, was significantly explained by affective organizational commitment ($\beta = 0.196$, $p \leq .001$) and affective occupational commitment ($\beta = 0.117$, $p \leq .05$). Sportsmanship behavior ($R^2 = 0.223$, $F = 14.415$, $p \leq .001$) was explained positively by affective organizational commitment ($\beta = 0.186$, $p \leq .01$) above and beyond the main and remaining significant negative

TABLE 2. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS, RELIABILITIES (IN PARENTHESES) AND INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG STUDY VARIABLES

Variables	Mean	SD	1a	1b	1c	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Helping OCB (1a)	5.91	0.733	0.85										
Civic Virtue OCB (1b)	5.91	0.817	0.66***	0.69									
Sportsmanship OCB (1c)	5.01	1.275	0.18***	0.22***	0.70								
PA (2)	5.22	0.789	0.46***	0.45***	0.17***	0.89							
NA-I (3)	3.01	0.962	-0.16**	-0.19***	-0.40***	-0.19***	0.83						
NA-S (4)	1.97	0.861	-0.17***	-0.21***	-0.38***	-0.18***	0.65***	0.78					
Affective OC (5)	5.18	1.277	0.35***	0.41***	0.28***	0.41***	-0.22***	-0.22***	0.87				
Normative OC (6)	4.36	1.420	0.30***	0.23***	0.06	0.23***	0.02	-0.01	0.40***	0.72			
Affective OcC (7)	5.56	1.241	0.31***	0.35***	0.22***	0.36***	-0.27***	-0.24***	0.47***	0.28***	0.83		
Normative OcC (8)	4.75	1.265	0.32***	0.25***	0.07	0.28***	0.02	-0.01	0.42***	0.56***	0.48***	0.78	
Occupation (9)	.5	0.500	0.15**	0.23***	0.20***	0.19***	-0.11*	-0.06	0.27***	0.34***	0.19***	0.32***	-

Notes. *n* = 360.

NA-I = internal negative affect; NA-S = social negative affect; OC = organizational commitment; OcC = occupational commitment; PA = positive affect.

p* ≤ .05, *p* ≤ .01, ****p* ≤ .001.

TABLE 3. HIERARCHICAL REGRESSION RESULTS FOR OCBs

Variables	Helping OCB			Civic Virtue OCB			Sportsmanship OCB		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
PA	0.445***	0.342***	0.344***	0.427***	0.305***	0.301***	0.089	0.019	0.012
NA-I	-0.022	-0.023	-0.027	-0.046	-0.015	-0.003	-0.256***	-0.232***	-0.215***
NA-S	-0.075	-0.060	-0.059	-0.102	-0.072	-0.077	-0.200**	-0.179**	-0.186**
Affective OC	-	0.080	0.083	-	0.196***	0.187***	-	0.186**	0.173**
Normative OC	-	0.123*	0.129*	-	0.057	0.039	-	-0.012	-0.039
Affective OcC	-	0.051	0.050	-	0.117*	0.120*	-	0.033	0.038
Normative OcC	-	0.093	0.099	-	-0.008	-0.024	-	-0.025	-0.048
Occupation	-	-	-0.031	-	-	0.090 _a	-	-	0.136**
R ² (adjusted)	0.222 (0.215)	0.282 (0.268)	0.283 (0.266)	0.223 (0.217)	0.289 (0.275)	0.296 (0.280)	0.195 (0.188)	0.223 (0.207)	0.238 (0.221)
F	33.824***	19.753***	17.302***	34.141***	20.468***	18.454***	28.665***	14.415***	13.714***
ΔR ²	-	0.060	0.001	-	0.066	0.007	-	0.028	0.015
F for ΔR ²	-	7.381***	0.387	-	8.156***	3.384 [†]	-	3.197*	7.069**

Notes. $n = 360$.

NA-I = internal negative affect; NA-S = social negative affect; OC = organizational commitment; OcC = occupational commitment; PA = positive affect.

[†] $p \leq .10$, * $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$.

effects of internal ($\beta = -0.232, p \leq .001$) and social ($\beta = -0.179, p \leq .01$) negative affect. With a similar reasoning as above, this set of hypotheses also get partial support.

The third hypothesis was related to the explanatory power of occupation on OCBs beyond the dispositional and contextual variables. This hypothesis was tested with the third step in the hierarchical regression analysis performed for each behavior. Despite the fact that all three models were significant at the final stage of the hierarchical regression analyses, the additional explanatory power of occupation for helping behavior was insignificant, whereas it was significant at the level of $p = .07$ for civic virtue and at a level of $p = .01$ for sportsmanship behaviors. Occupation was able to positively explain significant additional variance in civic virtue ($\beta = 0.090, p \leq .10$) ($R^2 = 0.296, F = 18.545, p \leq .10$) and sportsmanship ($\beta = 0.136, p \leq .01$) ($R^2 = 0.238, F = 13.714, p \leq .001$) behaviors, above and beyond the variance explained by affect and commitment.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The study reported here was designed to examine the determinants of OCB. It investigated the relative contributions of personality related and contextual determinants in explaining helping, civic virtue, and sportsmanship behaviors. Data were collected from two professional groups, teachers and engineers. The aim of the study was also to shed light on the theoretical and practical implications of determinants of cooperative behaviors in order to better understand their implications on organizational and individual members' well being. Additionally, in an increasingly flat and global world we live (Friedman, 2005; Blunsdon, Reed, Blyton, & Dastmalchian, 2010), there is a need for better understanding the application of the models in different cultural settings. This study provides evidence based on data from Turkish professionals.

One of the more significant contributions of this study is to examine the role of occupation (or profession) as an independent variable in understanding OCBs. Although a variety of work attitudes and outcomes have been studied distinctly under different samples and settings from various occupational groups, none of those studies looked at the role of occupational or professional groups on the different attitudes and outcomes related with their work.

In order to study the impact of dispositions on OCBs, positive and negative affect as personality trait dimensions were hypothesized to have direct relationships with citizenship behaviors. PA came out to predict helping and civic virtue behaviors; its predictive power did not decrease much when the contextual variables were also in the equation. It remained as a significant and positive predictor of both behavior types. Sportsmanship behavior on the other hand, was impacted negatively by negative affect. People with internal and social negative outlook were more likely to complain about trivial problems in the organization. Our findings overlap with the ones from literature in the sense that certain behaviors can be predicted by distinct dispositional variables (e.g., Konovsky & Organ, 1996). Further, citizenship behaviors were found to be related to several personality constructs (Borman, Penner, Allen, & Motowidlo, 2001; Bowling, Wang, & Yan Li, 2012). AIM (Forgas & George, 2001), which implies a direct influence of affect on individual's cognitions and behaviors, might be relevant in this context. PA has a potential to lead to increased social awareness through increasing employees' willingness to engage in prosocial behaviors and hence practicing OCBs as a means of protecting their emotional states (e.g., Isen & Baron, 1991; Williams & Shiaw, 1999). Negative affect is suggested to inhibit helping behaviors (e.g., Agho, Price, & Mueller, 1992). Individuals with high negative affect have a tendency to increase the distance between self and others and hence to decrease their willingness toward prosocial acts (George, 1990; Somech & Ron, 2007). In line with such reasoning, perhaps one of the most interesting findings from our study was a two factor structure for negative affect, targeted toward one's self (internal negative affect) and targeted toward others (social negative affect). Justifying the two-factor structure of negative affect is beyond the focus of the present

study, but remains an issue that requires further investigation. Clarifying the relationship between personality and different dimensions of OCB, our findings suggest that positive personality orientation increases the likelihood of altruistic behaviors and general positive concerns about the organizations, while negative personality orientations decrease the sportsmanship behaviors.

In this study, multiple commitments, as contextual variables in relation to affective and normative organizational and occupational commitments, were hypothesized to explain helping, civic virtue and sportsmanship behaviors, above and beyond the variance explained by dispositional affect variables. Helping behavior was significantly explained by normative organizational commitment above and beyond dispositional PA. Helping behavior being influenced by one's loyalty to his/her institution appears to be a relatively new finding. In this connection, the literature suggests a different set of findings in that affective organizational commitment is a significant predictor for helping behaviors (e.g., Podsakoff et al., 2000). A possible explanation for our different finding may be the societal cultural values and setting. In a study conducted among young executives from different cultural settings, Kabasakal, Dastmalchian, and Imer (2011) found collectivistic values to be the only predictor of helping behavior for a Turkish sample. Under such conditions, it could be reasonable to think that people (even professionals) with strong feelings of affiliation with their groups could help others due to commitment on a loyalty or obligation basis to their organization.

Civic virtue behavior was significantly predicted with affective organizational and occupational commitments above and beyond the variance explained by PA. Professionals being affectively attached to their organizations and occupations were more likely to show a general concern for and have a feeling of responsibility to their organizations. Affective organizational commitment being more strongly related with civic virtue behavior than affective occupational commitment could be explained with target similarity in theory of reasoned action (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) formalized the theory by suggesting that the maximal prediction of behavior by attitude occurred when the attitude corresponded to behavior in terms of action, context, time and target. Thus, in the current study, civic virtue behavior related with organization is predicted by an attitude toward organization more strongly than an attitude toward another target, occupation.

Sportsmanship behaviors were positively explained with affective organizational commitment, above and beyond the variance explained by dispositional negative affect. Professionals affectively attached to the organization were less likely to complain about trivial workplace matters.

In theoretical terms, the study offered SIT (Tajfel & Turner, 1985) and SET (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959; Blau, 1964) as frameworks for investigating the relationship between multiple commitment foci and OCBs. The findings are in line with the expectations of both SIT and SET in such a way that the greater the identification with the organization (SIT), and the greater the benefits from the organization (SET); the higher is the likelihood of OCBs. It can be noted that the first mechanism (SIT) is appropriate for affective commitment (related to identification with or belongingness to some human aggregate such as an organization or an occupation), while the second one (SET) for normative commitment, which is related to moral understanding. Our findings show that the SIT mechanism can be observed for civic virtue and sportsmanship, while the SET for helping behaviors.

Occupation was examined, as far as we know, for the first time in OCB literature, as an independent variable to explain OCBs. Many researchers have been interested in explaining contextual attitudes and behaviors of people from different occupations or professions to organizational actions (e.g., Bogler & Somech, 2004; Cohen & Kol, 2004; Paré & Tremblay, 2007; Bacon, Blyton, & Dastmalchian, 2010). Some researchers have attempted to define OCBs pertaining to a specific occupation or profession (e.g., Oplatka, 2006). Occupation or profession was deemed as an important variable since it involves both contextual and dispositional elements. The dispositional part concerns an individual's existence with his/her occupation for an indefinite amount of time (until the time she/he leaves the occupation). Starting with getting a special training for the

profession, an individual invests a portion of her/his life to that profession and usually earns a living out of it. In addition, dispositional characteristics of people might play a role in their choice of occupation or profession. The contextual aspect is mostly relevant with the place, affiliation or activity in that the individual realizes an investment in the profession or in the organization. Occupation appeared as a significant predictor of voluntary workplace behaviors of sportsmanship. Teachers were more likely to behave in a sportsman way than the engineers. This could be explained with the rationale pertaining to the nature of the professions, with teaching being more human oriented and engineering, more technical oriented. Civic virtue behavior is also suggested as a potential candidate to be influenced by occupation/profession, since regression results reported it almost significant. Investigations under different samples and sample sizes might yield stronger relationships. Helping behavior appeared as a more general construct and was not affected by occupation as a variable.

On another line of thinking, occupations/professions that have different ratios of men and women might have different norms and expectations. Within the framework of the present study, the teaching profession has a traditionally higher ratio of women compared with that of the engineering occupation. Indeed, the gender split in the two professions are different. There are more women teachers than men, while the gap between the gender types in the engineers was less compared with that of teachers, with some unreported gender information. Previous research has found that women are more concerned than men with helping others (Bridges, 1989; George, Carroll, Kersnick, & Calderon, 1998). However, in the study, occupation was not found to be a significant predictor of helping behavior. In other words, belonging to the teaching profession did not suggest any difference in terms of the helping dimension of OCBs. Future research needs to analyze how traditionally more masculine or feminine occupations would differ in terms of various OCB dimensions.

Though the present study has strong findings for the suggested antecedents of OCBs, it also has some limitations. The respondents are not likely to represent a general population, since data was collected from a single city (Istanbul) in a different cultural context, Turkey. So, the cultural setting can both be strength in providing an important contribution to the literature in terms of OCB antecedents and a weakness in terms of the generalizability of the results. In addition, data was collected by self-report ratings of professionals for all measures, and although common method variance was checked with a single-factor test, it still has a slight potential to influence the results of the study. Future research, designed with the inclusion of more of potential relevant antecedents, in larger samples and cross-cultural settings, could yield more accurate results about a general framework of OCB.

Both contextual and personality antecedents appeared as strong predictors for explaining OCB. Our results could serve as providing insights for personal and managerial implications in some aspects. For highly professional employees, supervisors are encouraged to acknowledge the function of social exchange principles in the work environment. They are advised to display supportive behaviors toward employees, since such behaviors have a potential to increase employees' positive evaluations of the institution and could lead to the engagement of cooperative behaviors on employees' behalf. One specific example for such supportive behaviors would be creating a work environment that helps people develop a sense of belongingness or feel that they are 'part of the family,' to benefit more from their macro-level interest in the organization. Further, our findings have practical implications in line with enhancing the occupational commitment of highly professional employees. We suggest that occupational commitment can be improved by investing in the professional development of the employees, by showing concern and interest for training and development and by involving them in projects that would lead to enhancement of their professional careers.

Dispositional variables indeed proved to be even more powerful compared with the contextual ones. Organizations can utilize our findings in relation to dispositional affect to create better working environments that facilitate the creation of more positive mood and inhibit the emergence of more negative affect. Findings suggest that organizations need to pay more attention to the dispositions of

employees by creating positive work climates through increasing the positive and minimizing the negative inputs and experiences. Positive climates can be created by increasing support and providing autonomy to employees (e.g., Patterson, Warr, & West, 2004; Farooqui, 2012). Negative climates can be minimized by eliminating interactions that create hostile and distressing work environments. These findings also point to a better employee selection process, which could provide the managers with an improved fit between employees and organizations.

Consistent with the suggestions in the literature (e.g., Barley, 1996), occupation has a potential for opening fruitful research avenues in studying work behaviors and attitudes. The present study has opened a door to consider aspects of occupation in examining determinants of OCB.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Authors would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions for finalizing the manuscript.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, vol. 2 (pp. 267–299). New York: Academic.
- Agho, A. O., Price, J. L., & Mueller, W. (1992). Discriminant validity of measures of job satisfaction, positive affectivity and negative affectivity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65, 185–196.
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1–18.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 20–39.
- Bacon, N., Blyton, P., & Dastmalchian, A. (2010). The impact of organizational change on steelworkers in craft and production occupational groups. *Human Relations*, 63(8), 1223–1248.
- Ball, G. A., Trevino, L. K., & Sims, H. P. (1994). Just and unjust punishment: Influences on subordinate performance and citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 299–322.
- Barley, S. R. (1996). Technicians in the workplace: Ethnographic evidence for bringing work into organizational studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(3), 404–441.
- Baruch, Y. (1998). The rise and fall of organizational commitment. *Human Systems Management*, 17, 135–143.
- 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, 587–595.
- Blau, G. (1985). The measurement and prediction of career commitment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 58(4), 277–288.
- Blau, G. J. (1986). Job involvement and organizational commitment as interactive predictors of tardiness and absenteeism. *Journal of Management*, 12, 577–584.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Blunsdon, B., Reed, K., Blyton, P., & Dastmalchian, A. (2010). Social change and ways of living: An introduction. In P. Blyton, B. Blunsdon, K. Reed, & A. Dastmalchian (Eds.), *Ways of living: Work, community and lifestyle choices* (pp. 1–14). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Blyton, P., & Dastmalchian, A. (2006). Work-life integration and the changing context of work. In P. Blyton, B. Blunsdon, K. Reed, & A. Dastmalchian (Eds.), *Work-life integration: International perspectives on managing multiple roles* (pp. 17–27). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers’ organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 277–289.
- Bolino, M. C., & Turner, W. H. (2005). The personal cost 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., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance, 10*, 99–109.
- Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T. D., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2001). Personality predictors of citizenship performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*(1/2), 52–69.
- Bowling, N., Wang, Q., & Yan Li, H. (2012). The moderating effect of core self-evaluations on the relationships between job attitudes and organisational citizenship behavior. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 61*(1), 97–113.
- Bridges, J. S. (1989). Sex differences in occupational values. *Sex Roles, 20*(3/4), 205–211.
- Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review, 10*, 710–725.
- Clark, M. S., & Isen, A. M. (1982). Toward understanding the relationship between feeling states and social behavior. In A. H. Hastorf & A. M. Isen (Eds.), *Cognitive social psychology* (pp. 73–108). New York: Elsevier North-Holland.
- Cohen, A. (1993). Work commitment in relation to withdrawal intentions and union effectiveness. *Journal of Business Research, 26*, 75–90.
- Cohen, A. (1999). The relation between commitment forms and work outcomes in Jewish and Arab culture. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*, 371–391.
- Cohen, A. (2003). *Multiple commitments in the workplace: An integrative approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen, A. (2006). The relationship between multiple commitments and organizational citizenship behavior in Arab and Jewish culture. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*, 105–118.
- Cohen, A. (2007). Commitment before and after: An evaluation and re-conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 17*, 336–354.
- Cohen, A., & Kol, Y. (2004). Professionalism and organizational citizenship behavior: An empirical examination among Israeli nurses. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 19*, 386–405.
- Comeau, D. J., & Griffith, R. L. (2005). Structural interdependence, personality, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Review, 34*(3), 310–330.
- Dastmalchian, A., & Blyton, P. (1998). Introduction to organizational flexibility in a cross-national perspective. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 9*(3), 437–444.
- Dastmalchian, A., & Blyton, P. (2001). Workplace flexibility and the changing nature of work: An introduction. *Special Issue Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 18*(1), 1–4.
- Drogosz, L. M., & Levy, P. E. (1996). Another look at the effects of appearance, gender and job type on performance-based decisions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20*(3), 437–445.
- Farooqui, M. R. (2012). Measuring organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as a consequence of organizational climate (OC). *Asian Journal of Business Management, 4*(3), 294–302.
- Filley, A., House, R. J., & Kerr, S. (1976). *Managerial process and organizational behavior*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Forgas, J. P., & George, J. M. (2001). Affective influences on judgments and behavior in organizations: An information processing perspective. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86*(1), 3–34.
- Freidson, E., & Rhea, B. (1965). Knowledge and judgment in professional evaluations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 10*, 107–124.
- Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat*. London, England: Penguin Books.
- George, D., Carroll, P., Kersnick, R., & Calderon, K. (1998). Gender-related patterns of helping among friends. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*(4), 685–704.
- George, J. M. (1990). Personality, affect, and behavior in groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 107–116.
- George, J. M. (1991). State or trait: Effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(2), 299–307.
- George, J. M. (1992). Extrinsic and intrinsic origins of perceived social loafing in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal, 35*, 191–202.
- George, J. M. (1996). Group affective tone. In M. A. West (Ed.), *Handbook of work group psychology* (pp. 77–94). New York: John Wiley.

- George, J. M., & Bettenhausen, K. (1990). Understanding prosocial behavior, sales performance, and turnover: A group-level analysis in a service context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 698–709.
- George, J. M., & 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.
- George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (1997). Organizational spontaneity in context. *Human Performance*, 10, 153–170.
- Graham, J. W. (1989). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, operationalization, and validation*. Manuscript, Loyola University of Chicago.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (6th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Harman, H. (1967). *Modern factor analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Isen, A. M., & Baron, R. A. (1991). Positive affect as a factor in organizational behavior. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, vol. 13 (pp. 1–53). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Jiang, J. Y., & Law, K. S. (2013). Two parallel mechanisms for the relationship between justice perceptions and employees' citizenship behavior: A comparison of the organizational identification and social exchange perspectives. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 22(4), 423–435.
- Kabasakal, H., Dastmalchian, A., & Imer, P. (2011). Organizational citizenship behaviour: A study of young executives in Canada, Iran, and Turkey. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(13), 2703–2729.
- Karambayya, R. (1989). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Contextual predictors and organizational consequences*. Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.
- Kerr, S., Von Glinow, M. A., & Schriesheim, J. (1977). Issues in the study of professionals in organizations: The case of scientists and engineers. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 18, 329–345.
- Kidder, D. L. (2002). The Influence of Gender on the Performance of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 28(5), 629–648.
- Konovsky, M., & Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17, 253–266.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. (1993). *Dispositional versus contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior*. Manuscript, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA.
- Lavelle, J. J. (2010). What motivates OCB? Insights from the volunteerism literature. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(6), 918–923.
- Lawrence, T. (1998). Examining resources in an occupational community: Reputation in Canadian Forensic Accounting. *Human Relations*, 51(9), 1103–1131.
- Lee, H. J. (2001). Willingness and capacity: The determinants of prosocial organizational behaviour among nurses in the UK. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(6), 1029–1048.
- Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 131–142.
- Lee, K., Carswell, J., & Allen, N. (2000). A meta-analytic review of occupational commitment: Relations with person and work-related variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 799–811.
- Liu, Y., & Cohen, A. (2010). Values, commitment and OCB among Chinese employees. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 34, 493–506.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1991). Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 123–150.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 57, 70–80.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. J. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 52, 81–90.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61–89.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 538–551.

- Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., & Vandenberghe, C. (2004). Employee commitment and motivation: A conceptual analysis and integrative model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 991–1007.
- Meyer, J. P., & Parfyonova, N. M. (2010). Normative commitment in the workplace: A theoretical analysis and re-conceptualization. *Human Resource Management Review, 20*(4), 283–294.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnitsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*, 20–52.
- Morgeson, F. P., Reider, M. H., & Campion, M. A. (2005). Selecting individuals in team settings: The importance of social skills, personality characteristics, and teamwork knowledge. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(3), 583–611.
- Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 1543–1567.
- Morrow, P. C. (1993). *The theory and measurement of work commitment*. Greenwich, CT: Jai Press Inc.
- Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 475–480.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Nikolaou, I., & Robertson, I. T. (2001). The five-factor model of personality and work behavior in Greece. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10*(2), 161–186.
- Nikolaou, I. (2003). Fitting the person to the organisation: examining the personality-job performance relationship from a new perspective. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 18*(7), 639–648.
- O'Reilly, C., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 492–499.
- Oplatka, I. (2006). Going beyond role expectations: Toward an understanding of the determinants and components of teacher organizational citizenship behavior. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 42*(3), 385–423.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. (1990a). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, vol. 12 (pp. 43–72). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Organ, D. W. (1990b). The subtle significance of job satisfaction. *Clinical Laboratory Management Review, 4*, 94–98.
- Organ, D. W. (1994). Personality and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management, 20*(2), 465–478.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance, 10*, 85–97.
- Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*(1), 157–164.
- Organ, D. W., & Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Social Psychology, 135*(3), 339–350.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 776–801.
- Paré, G., & Tremblay, M. (2007). The influence at high-involvement human resources practices, procedural justice, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors on information technology professionals' turnover intentions. *Group and Organization Management, 32*(3), 326–357.
- Patterson, M., Warr, P., & West, M. (2004). Organizational climate and company productivity: The role of employee affect and employee level. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77*(2), 193–216.
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behavior: A meta analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(1), 122–141.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & 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., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research, 31*, 351–363.

- Podsakoff, P. M., & 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., 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.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management, 12*(Winter), 531–544.
- Randall, D. M., & Cote, J. A. (1991). Interrelationships of work commitment constructs. *Work and Occupation, 18*, 194–211.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*(4), 653–663.
- Snape, E., & Redman, T. (2003). An evaluation of a three-component model of occupational commitment: Dimensionality and consequences among United Kingdom Human Resource Management Specialists. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 152–159.
- Somech, A., & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior and employee's strain: Examining the buffering effects of leader support and participation in decision making. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 22*(2), 138–142.
- Somech, A., & Ron, I. (2007). Promoting organizational citizenship behavior in schools: The impact of individual and organizational characteristics. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(1), 38–66.
- Spector, P. E. (2013). Introduction: The dark and light sides of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*, 540–541.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1985). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Thibaut, J., & Kelley, H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Toegel, G., Anand, N., & Kilduff, M. (2007). Emotion helpers: The role of high positive affectivity and high self-monitoring managers. *Personnel Psychology, 60*(2), 337–365.
- Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & 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 Scotter, J. R., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 98–107.
- Von Glinow, M. A., & Novelli, L. J. (1982). Ethical standards within organizational behavior. *The Academy of Management Journal, 25*(2), 417–436.
- Watson, D. (1988). Intraindividual and interindividual analyses of positive and negative affect: Their relation to health complaints, perceived stress, and daily activities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 1020–1030.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Carey, G. (1988). Positive and negative affectivity and their relation to anxiety and depressive disorders. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 97*, 346–353.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 1063–1070.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17*, 601–617.
- Williams, S., & Shiaw, W. T. (1999). Mood and organizational citizenship behavior: The effects of positive affect on employee organizational citizenship behavior intentions. *The Journal of Psychology, 133*(6), 656–668.
- Yousaf, A., Sanders, K., & Shipton, H. (2013). Proactive and politically skilled professionals: What is the relationship with affective occupational commitment? *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 30*, 211–230.
- Zeinabadi, H. (2010). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) of teachers. *Procedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences, 5*, 998–1003.