

Full Length Research Paper

Organizational citizenship levels of academicians in terms of several variables: The sample of Physical Education and Sports Sciences

Ali Dursun AYDIN

Kafkas University, Sarikamış School of Physical Education and Sports Kars, Turkiye.

Received 06 April, 2015; Accepted 27 April, 2015

This study is performed with 176 academicians working in the institutions related to physical education and sports at universities. It aims to analyze organizational citizenship behaviours of academic personnel about the institutions they have been working in. Descriptive survey model was used, along with demographic data like gender, marital status, academic title. "Organizational Citizenship Behaviour" scale developed by Özaslan et al. and consisting of 21 expressions was used as data collection tool to determine organizational citizenship behaviour of people. Spearman's Correlation coefficient was calculated for the relation between scale scores in the analysis of data. In the analysis of 3 and more groups of Normally Distributed variables ANOVA test was applied. To compare 2 groups of variables which do not come from Normal Distribution in terms of scale score Mann-Whitney U test was used and to compare 3 and more groups of variables in terms of scale scores, Kruskal-Wallis H tests were used. At the end of the research, organizational citizenship behaviour of the participants and the averages related to its dimension were above normal. As a result of additionally made multi comparisons, although a significant result was not obtained between the organizational citizenship behaviour of the participants and its dimension in statistical level according to the working period in the institution, the ages, the marital status and the academic titles of the participants, several significant results were reached statistically according to their genders and administrative position in the institution.

Key words: Academician, organizational citizenship behaviour, altruism, organizational virtue, conscientiousness, Sportsmanship, courtesy.

INTRODUCTION

Organizational citizenship behaviour

With developing technology and therefore in globalizing world, day by day competition between organizations has become more than ever. While conscious consumers

encourage this competition, organizations have been making studies intensively on the way of gaining success by making each move which affects their success positively. Human resource which is one of the elements affecting success and efficiency in organizations has a

E-mail: alidursunaydin@gmail.com.

Authors agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

serious importance in this competition environment.

At the point of increasing the efficiency of the personnel, organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) has emerged as one of the concepts seriously emphasized recently. The basis of this concept also known as behaviours beyond role goes to Katz and Kahn (1978) who analyzed the same concept within the context of role beyond and role definition with Barnard (1938).

“Organizational Citizenship Behaviour” concept was defined by Smith et al. for the first time in their works called “Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents” published in 1983 (Smith et al., 1983).

Serious studies on organization citizenship behaviour which was evaluated as an important highlight within organizational behaviour were made (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Borman and Motowidlo, 1997; Brief and Motowidlo, 1986; George and Bettenhausen, 1990; Moorman, 1991; Munene, 1995; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993; Organ, 1988; Organ, 1990; Organ and Konovsky, 1989; Organ and Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff and Colgs, 1996a, 1996b; Podsakoff and Colgs, 1993; Podsakoff and Colgs, 1990, Puffer, 1987; Skarlicki and Latham, 1996; Smith and Colgs, 1983; Williams and Anderson, 1991) They define organizational citizenship behaviour as “behaviours which are performed voluntarily by personnel and are not expressed directly and clearly in job description but have positive contribution to organizational activity” (Vanypere et al., 1999: 377). In other words, organizational citizenship behaviour can be defined as including devoted behaviours of the personnel who display them for the benefit of the organization without expecting any response.

On the other hand, Greenberg and Baron defined organizational citizenship behaviour as an employee’s presenting more than expected from him/her apart from determined job description in the organization and bounden duty (Greenberg and Baron, 2008). Many examples like personnel’s harmony with each other, their healthy and fast communication, fitting more work into working hours voluntarily can be given.

Dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour

Many researchers defined various dimensions about the concept of organizational citizenship behaviour. Organ’s five dimensional evaluation “Altruism”, “Organizational Virtue”, “conscientiousness”, “Sportsmanship” and “Courtesy” is evaluated as the most accepted structure in the literature (Organ, 1990).

Altruism

This dimension defined as willingness, valuableness or altruism includes all optional behaviours which personnel exhibit for helping other members of the organization in

duty and problems related to the organization (İşbaşı, 2000). This may not be only among the personnel in the organization, may involve third party individuals like suppliers or business associates. Thus, it is expected among the personnel to have synergism, experience share and efficiency increase.

Organizational virtue

Organizational virtue behaviour which was defined as organizational participation by Graham (2000), organizational protection by Brief and Motowidlo (1986) in literature includes allegiance to the organization in all its aspects and the interest at high level (Şahin, 2013). In other words, people not only do the jobs in their job definitions, they also develop innovations for increasing their efficiency voluntarily.

Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness dimension can be characterized as the inner harmony of the personnel against organization rules. That is to say, although there is not a control, the dependence of personnel to business rules expresses conscience dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour.

Organ (1988) defines conscience, as their being volunteers to show behaviour and attendance to work, working regularly at work, punctuality, using resting time correctly and without overrunning beyond minimum role behaviour expected from the personnel.

Sportsmanship

Podsakoff et al. (1996a) evaluate sportsmanship dimension as avoidance behaviour and define it as the organization individuals refraining from negative behaviours which may cause any argument or tension in the organization. The tolerant and non-complaining manners of the personnel against negative events occur within the organization define this dimension.

Courtesy

Personnel in the organizations are in constant communication. This communication can also be evaluated as a piece of work that flows mostly. Organ presents that in case both the style and the content of this communication are performed gently, courtesy dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour develops. The personnel act in kindness both in their ordinary communication and information which can help them to do each other’s work better (Sezgin, 2005).

Table 1. Organizational citizenship behaviour of participants and sub-dimension averages.

	N	Average	SD
Altruism dimension	176	3,77	,6233
Organizational Virtue	176	4,05	,545
Conscientiousness Dimension	176	4	,615
Sportmanship Dimension	176	3,87	,585
Courtesy Dimension	176	4,26	,72
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Scale	176	4,01	,5119

MATERIAL AND METHOD

This study which analyzes organizational citizenship behaviours of the academic personnel according to its several demographic characteristics was implemented with the participation of 176 academicians in physical education and sports department in 2012 academic year. In the study along with demographic data like gender, marital status, academic title, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) scale which was developed by Özaslan et al. (2009) and consisting of 21 expressions was used.

Mentioned scale is 5 point likert type and has five sub-dimensions of "altruism", "Organizational Virtue", "Conscientiousness", "Sportsmanship" and "Courtesy". As a result of the literature study, the reliability analysis of the scale was determined as cronbach's alpha value "0.720" (Özaslan et al., 2009). In the evaluation of the scale, the average of points total corresponding to the answers which the participant gave was used. In the evaluation of the scale, the total average of score corresponding to the answers of articles given by the participant was used.

The analysis of data was made by using SPSS 15.0 package program. With collecting related scale articles, scale sub-dimension scores and total scale scores were obtained. For scale sub-dimensions score and total scale scores, Normality Analysis was carried out. Analysis result in analyses of variables coming from Normal Distribution parametric test techniques, in analyses of variables not coming from Normal Distribution nonparametric test techniques were used. Significance coefficient was taken as (α) 0.05 in the analyses.

For the relation between scale scores, Spearman's Correlation coefficient was calculated. In the analysis of 3 and more groups of Normally Distributed variables ANOVA Test was applied. To compare 2 groups of variables which do not come from Normal Distribution in terms of scale score Mann-Whitney U test was used; to compare 3 and more groups of variables in terms of scale score, Kruskal-Wallis H test were used.

FINDINGS

According to data obtained, 84.1% of the participants are males ($n=148$). Classifying the participants according to their working periods in their institutions, it is seen that most participants have been working in the institution for 15 years and more (30.1%; $n=53$). Again as a result of classifying the participants according to their age groups, it is seen that most participants are between 36-45 age range (43.2%; $n=76$). In addition to these data, it is seen that most participants are academicians who are married (80.7%; $n=142$) and do not have administrative position

(77.8%; $n=137$). When academic titles of the participants were analyzed, it is possible to see that majority of 40.9% are academic staff ($n=72$).

According to Table 1, organizational citizenship behaviour of the participants and sub-dimension averages are at high level. In addition to this, while the highest average of the participants is organizational virtue sub-dimension, the lowest average belongs to altruism sub-dimension.

As a result of classifying participants according to their working periods in the institution, a significant difference is not found among the groups in terms of Altruism, Organizational Virtue, Conscientiousness, Sportsmanship, and Courtesy sub-dimensions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour ($p>0,05$) (Table 2).

As a result of classifying participants according to their marital status, a significant difference is not found among the groups in terms of Altruism, Organizational Virtue, Conscientiousness, Sportsmanship, and Courtesy sub-dimensions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. ($p>0,05$) (Table 3).

As a result of classifying participants according to their genders, a significant difference is not found among the groups in terms of Organizational Virtue, Conscientiousness, Sportsmanship, and Courtesy sub-dimensions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. ($p>0,05$). However, there is a significant difference between females and males in terms of Altruism Dimension ($p<0,05$). Altruism Dimension scores of males are higher (Table 4).

As a result of classifying participants according to their administrative status (being administrator and not) in the institutions they have been working, a significant difference is not found among the groups in terms of Altruism, Organizational Virtue, Sportsmanship, Courtesy sub-dimensions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. ($p>0,05$). However, there is a significant difference between the participants who have administrative position and not in terms of Conscientiousness Dimension ($p<0,05$). Conscientiousness Dimension scores of the ones who have administrative position are higher (Table 5).

As a result of classifying participants according to their academic title, a significant difference is not found among the groups in terms of Altruism and Organizational Virtue

Table 2. Organizational citizenship behaviour of participants according to working periods and comparison of sub-dimension levels.

		Your working period in the institution			Kruskal-Wallis H Test		
		N	Average	SD	Mean Rank	Chi-Square	p
Altruism Dimension	1-2 years	40	3,89	,696	79,26	4,416	0,220
	3-8 years	32	3,74	,663	102,23		
	9-14 years	51	3,82	,473	84,03		
	15 years and more	53	4,06	,663	91,48		
Organizational Virtue	1-2 years	40	4,16	,613	90,96	3,018	0,389
	3-8 years	32	4,07	,521	98,30		
	9-14 years	51	3,97	,466	89,76		
	15 years and more	53	4,02	,576	79,51		
Conscientiousness Dimension	1-2 years	40	4,14	,42	92,34	2,948	0,400
	3-8 years	32	4	,495	99,50		
	9-14 years	51	3,91	,67	85,97		
	15 years and more	53	3,85	,612	81,40		
Sportmanship Dimension	1-2 years	40	3,93	,59	88,45	0,931	0,818
	3-8 years	32	3,83	,642	94,41		
	9-14 years	51	3,88	,565	83,70		
	15 years and more	53	4,32	,577	89,59		
Courtesy Dimension	1-2 years	40	4,39	,767	92,96	2,301	0,512
	3-8 years	32	4,2	,682	97,64		
	9-14 years	51	4,21	,725	82,50		
	15 years and more	53	4,00	,71	85,39		
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Scale	1-2 years	40	4,12	,575	90,23	2,883	0,410
	3-8 years	32	3,99	,494	101,20		
	9-14 years	51	3,97	,469	84,26		
	15 years and more	53	3,89	,516	83,60		

Table 3. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour of Participants According to Their Marital Status and Comparison of Sub-dimension Levels.

		Marital Status			Mann-Whitney U Test		
		N	Average	SD	Mean Rank	U	p
Altruism Dimension	Married	142	3,77	,593	88,03	2.347,500	0,799
	Single	34	3,76	,746	90,46		
Organizational Virtue	Married	142	4,05	,521	86,95	2.193,500	0,404
	Single	34	4,11	,643	94,99		
Conscientiousness Dimension	Married	142	4,03	,61	89,73	2.240,000	0,509
	Single	34	3,93	,64	83,38		
Sportmanship Dimension	Married	142	3,87	,577	87,67	2.295,500	0,653
	Single	34	3,88	,62	91,99		
Courtesy Dimension	Married	142	4,27	,703	88,33	2.390,500	0,929
	Single	34	4,25	,803	89,19		
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Scale	Married	142	4,01	,487	87,73	2.304,500	0,681
	Single	34	4,01	,610	91,72		

Table 4. Organizational citizenship behaviour of participants according to their genders and comparison of sub-dimension levels.

		Your Gender			Mann-Whitney U Test		
		N	Average	SD.	Mean Rank	U	P
Altruism dimension	Female	28	3,58	,46	68,80	1.520,500	0,022*
	Male	148	3,81	,643	92,23		
Organizational Virtue	Female	28	3,95	,381	72,32	1.619,000	0,064
	Male	148	4,08	,571	91,56		
Conscientiousness Dimension	Female	28	3,89	,442	72,57	1.626,000	0,068
	Male	148	4,03	,641	91,51		
Sportmanship Dimension	Female	28	3,93	,465	90,54	2.015,000	0,815
	Male	148	3,86	,605	88,11		
Courtesy Dimension	Female	28	4,22	,502	75,57	1.710,000	0,138
	Male	148	4,28	,755	90,95		
Organizational Behaviour Scale	Female	28	3,93	,334	72,27	1.617,500	0,066
	Male	148	4,03	,538	91,57		

*p<0.05.

Table 5. Organizational citizenship behaviour of participants according to their administrative status in the institutions they have been working and comparison of sub-dimension levels.

		Do you have administrative position?			Mann-Whitney U Test		
		N	Average	SD.	Mean Rank	U	p
Altruism Dimension	Yes	39	3,84	,483	93,09	2.492,500	0,514
	No	137	3,75	,333	87,19		
Organizational Virtue	Yes	39	4,14	,506	98,36	2.287,000	0,167
	No	137	4,04	,555	85,69		
Conscientiousness Dimension	Yes	39	4,23	,555	108,74	1.882,000	0,004*
	No	137	3,95	,62	82,74		
Sportmanship Dimension	Yes	39	3,89	,567	89,95	2.615,000	0,838
	No	137	3,87	,592	88,09		
Courtesy Dimension	Yes	39	4,44	,627	102,38	2.130,000	0,051
	No	137	4,22	,74	84,55		
Organizational Behaviour Scale	Yes	39	4,12	,449	102,55	2.123,500	0,051
	No	137	3,98	,525	84,50		

*p<0,05.

(p>0,05) (Table 6). However, according to the average of Conscientiousness, Sportmanship, and Courtesy sub-dimensions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, it is seen that there are significant differences among groups statistically (p<0,05). The differences which groups they originate from are presented in Table 7 by

determining Post Hoc analysis.

According to multiple comparison results, there are significant differences between academic members and lecturers/instructors in terms of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Sportmanship (p=.001). Accordingly, academic staffs have higher Organizational Citizenship

Table 6. Organizational citizenship behaviour of participants according to their academic titles and comparison of sub-dimension levels.

Dimension	Title	N	Average	SD.	F	P
O.C.B	Academic Staff	72	3.37	.626	6.371	.002*
	Research Assistant	33	3.20	.621		
	Lecturer/Instructor	71	3	.619		
Courtesy	Academic Staff	72	3.3	.758	6.214	.002*
	Research Assistant	33	3.02	.855		
	Lecturer/Instructor	71	2.83	.790		
Sportmanship	Academic Staff	72	3.67	.879	6.985	.001*
	Research Assistant	33	3.43	.964		
	Lecturer/Instructor	71	3.1	.889		
Conscientiousness	Academic Staff	72	3.07	.870	4.440	.013*
	Research Assistant	33	2.92	.740		
	Lecturer/Instructor	71	2.67	.751		
Organizational Virtue	Academic Staff	72	3.31	.692	2.060	.131
	Research Assistant	33	3.23	.682		
	Lecturer/Instructor	71	3.08	.709		
Altruism	Academic Staff	72	3.59	.793	1.454	.237
	Research Assistant	33	3.45	.900		
	Lecturer/Instructor	71	3.35	.830		

p<0,05.

Table 7. Multiple comparison results of organizational citizenship behaviour of participants according to their academic titles and sub-dimension levels.

Post Hoc (Tukey Test)				
Dimension	Comparison		Difference Between Average	Significance
O. C. B.	Academic Member	Research Assistant	.168	.404
		Lecturer/Instructor	.371	.001*
Courtesy	Academic Member	Research Assistant	.279	.215
		Lecturer/Instructor	.464	.002*
Sportmanship	Academic Member	Research Assistant	.230	.443
		Lecturer/Instructor	.560	.001*
Conscientiousness	Academic Member	Research Assistant	.148	.652
		Lecturer/Instructor	.396	.010*

Behaviour and Sportmanship dimension than lecturers/instructors. On the other hand, again there are significant differences between academic member participants and lecturers/instructors in Courtesy and Conscientiousness dimension averages ($p=.002$, $p=.010$). Accordingly, it is seen that academic members have higher averages than lecturers/instructors in dimensions case.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

At the end of this study which analyzes organizational citizenship behaviour of academic staff with the participation of 176 academicians, it is seen that it has a

high average in organizational citizenship behaviour of the participants and sub-dimensions (OCB, $X=4,01\pm,5119$; Altruism, $X=3.77\pm,6233$; Organizational Virtue, $X=4,05\pm,545$; Conscientiousness, $X=4\pm,615$; Sportmanship, $X=3,87\pm,585$; Courtesy, $X=4,26\pm,72$). It can be considered that academicians who come together and perform activities like class distributions, exams and academic studies affect organizational citizenship behaviours positively. With regards to sub-dimensions it can be said that as there is less bureaucratic hierarchy and their educational levels are high, it caused that Altruism and Sportmanship dimensions of the academicians at universities are high. In related literature for example, in the study of Podsakoff et al. (1996a)

where they form a general frame for organizational citizenship behaviour, it is also stated that educational level, team spirit and hierarchy factors are effective in organizational citizenship behaviour and sub-dimensions.

A significant difference between participants working period in their institutions and organizational citizenship behaviours was not found statistically. However, it is seen that participants who have 1-2 year working period in the institutions have higher averages than other groups in courtesy, Conscientiousness and organizational virtue dimensions than organizational citizenship behaviour and its dimensions. Participants who have 15 year and more working period in the institution have more average than other groups in sportsmanship and altruism sub-dimensions. It is natural that people who start working recently want to develop more polite relations among each other with colleagues they have just become sincere. This situation can explain that people working 1-2 years have higher average than other groups in courtesy dimension. On the other hand, it can be evaluated conceivably that people who start working recently show behaviours including Conscientiousness and organizational virtue dimensions with triggering senses of belonging in institutional sense. It is possible to see altruism and sportsmanship behaviours of people whose working period in the institution is 15 years and more originating from owning institution and experience. When the related literature is analyzed it points out that organizational citizenship behaviour dimensions appears differently according to working periods of people in the institution (MacKenzie and Colgs, 1991,1993; Organ, 1988; Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994). In other words, differences in terms of organizational citizenship behaviour dimensions between experienced personnel in the institution and personnel with less experience relatively can occur. For example, Podsakoff and McKenzie emphasized in their studies in 1997 that data and experience sharing happened as a good example of in-house relations between experienced personnel and inexperienced ones.

A significant difference was not encountered as a result of comparing participants' marital status and organizational citizenship behaviour and its dimensions statistically. Moreover, the average of organizational citizenship behaviour is the same in two groups. In the relevant analysis of literature it is seen that there are a few studies including marital status and organizational citizenship behaviour and dimensions variables and this study will be an example in the literature with this aspect.

As a result of evaluating participants' organizational citizenship behaviour and its dimensions according to gender variable significance results were achieved statistically. According to this, the average of male participants ($X=3,81\pm,643$) in altruism dimension is higher than the average of female participants ($X=3,58\pm,46$) in significance level. Related to the subject, the results of Lovell et al. (1999) show parallelism with this study

results. In the study, where Lovell and his colleagues analyzed organizational citizenship behaviour and gender relation, they reached significant results between male and female in altruism dimension.

As a result of analyzing the relation between participants' administrative position in the institutions they have been working and organizational citizenship behaviour and its dimensions, significant results were achieved in Conscientiousness Dimension in statistical level. According to this, altruism average of people who have administrative position in their institution as to the people who are not administrators is higher in significant level. When Conscientiousness dimension is evaluated as personnel's presenting self-devotion related to the institution beyond their job description which was determined by administration, it is possible to state that administrators in the institution can apply such example behaviour. According to Avila et al. (1988), administrators exhibit these behaviours themselves before expecting organizational citizenship behaviour from personnel.

In conclusion, as a result of the comparison on organizational citizenship behaviour of the participants according to academic titles and Courtesy, Sportsmanship and Conscientiousness dimensions, a significant result was not achieved statistically. According to this, academic members have higher averages as to the participants of lecturer and instructor staff in significant level. At universities academicians are promoted from research assistant staff to assistant professor after postgraduate. This extension of promoting time can direct people to negative thoughts about their institutions. Similarly, professorship is known as the top title which an academician can reach. So professors have this title as a result of working as an academic personnel for long years. This situation can cause professors to have high institutional belonging and so adopt their organizational citizenship behaviours. On the other hand, lecturers and instructors who do not do master degree and doctorate mostly do not have promotion status can be shown as their organizational citizenship behaviours are low. In literature although a study which associates organizational citizenship behaviour directly according to academicians' titles is not encountered, in some studies with organizational citizenship behaviours of academicians and teachers, some variables are compared; it is seen that organizational citizenship behaviour and its dimensions have high averages (Taşçı and Koç, 2007; Somerch and Drach-Zahavy, 2004).

Considering these data, in organizations where activities based upon harmony and cooperation like sports administration are organized, informal structure is strong Organizational Citizenship Behaviour can be said to make contributions to institutional efficiency. So in order to achieve Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, behaviours of the administrators in the organization in this aspect are important in terms of encouraging the personnel. This situation can simplify the formation of the

participant, organizational climate based upon interaction where information exchange is important and the communication and harmony among the personnel.

Conflict of Interests

The author has not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

- Avila RA, Fern EF, Mann OK (1988). Unraveling the criteria for assessing the performance of salespeople: A casual analysis. *JPSSM*. 8:45-54.
- Bateman TS, Organ DW (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Acad. Manag. J.* 26:587-595.
- Borman WC, Motowidlo SJ (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Hum. Performance* 10(2):99-109.
- Brief AP, Motowidlo SJ (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Acad. Manage. Rev.* 10:710-725.
- Barnard C (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- George JM, Bettenhawn K (1990). Understanding prosocial behavior, sales performance, and turnover: A group-level analysis in a service context. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 75:698-709.
- Graham JW (2000). Promoting Civic Virtue Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Contemporary Questions Rooted in Classical Quandaries From Political Philosophy. *Hum. Resourc. Manage. Rev.* 10(1):7
- Greenberg J, Baron RA (2008). *Behavior in organizations* (9th ed.). Prentice Hall India
- İşbaşı JÖ (2000). Çalışanların Yöneticilerine Duydukları Güvenin Ve Örgütsel Adalete İlişkin Algılamalarının Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışının Oluşumundaki Rolü: Bir Turizm Örgütünde Uygulama. (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Antalya.
- Katz D, Kahn RL *The social psychology of organizations*. 2nd ed. New York: Wiley.
- Lovell S.E, Kahn AS, Anton J, Davidson A, Dowling E, Post D (1999). Does gender affect the link between organizational citizenship behavior and performance evaluation? *Sex Roles* 41:469-478.
- MacKenzie SB, Podsakoff PM, 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 SB, Podsakoff PM, Fetter R (1993). The Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Evaluations of Salesperson Performance. *J. Market.* 57:7040.
- Moorman RH (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship?. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 76:845-855.
- Munene JC (1995). "Not-on-Seat": An investigation of some correlates of organizational citizenship behavior in Nigeria. *Applied Psychology: An International Rev.* 44(2):111-122.
- Niehoff BP, Moorman RH (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Acad. Manage. J.* 36:527-556
- Organ DW (1990). The Motivational Basis of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, in *Research in Organizational Behavior*. Staw BM, LL Cummings (Eds). 12: 43-72. Greenwich: CT, JAI Pres.
- Organ DW (1990). The subtle significance of job satisfaction. *Clin. Laboratory Manage. Rev.* 4:94-98.
- Organ DW, Konovsky M (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 74:157-164.
- Organ DW (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington,
- Organ DW, Ryan K (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychol.* 48:775-802.
- Özaslan ÖB, Acar AB, Acar CA (2009). Duygusal Zekâ ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *İ.Ü.İ.F.İ.İ.E.D Yönetim*, 20(64):98-111.
- Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Bommer WH (1996b). Meta-analysis of the relationships between Kerr and Jermier's substitutes for leadership and employee job attitudes, role perceptions, and performance. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 81:380-399.
- Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior and sales unit effectiveness. *J. Market. Res.* 31:351-363.
- Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB (1997) Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Organizational Performance: A Review and Suggestion for Future Research, *Human Performance* 10(2):133-151, DOI: 10.1207/s15327043 hup 1002_5
- Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Bommer W (1996a). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *J. Manage.* 22:259-298.
- Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Fetter R (1993). Substitutes for leadership and the management of professionals. *Leaders. Q.* 4:1-44.
- Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Moorman RH, Fetter R (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Leadersh. Q.* 1(2):107-142.
- Puffer SM (1987). Prosocial behavior, noncompliant behavior, and work performance among commission salespeople. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 72:615421.
- Sezgin F (2005). «Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışları: Kavramsal Bir Çözümleme ve Okul Açısından Bazı Çıkarımlar» *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi C:25 S:1*.
- Skarlicki DP, Latham GP (1996). Increasing citizenship behavior within a labor union: A test of organizational justice theory. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 81:161-169.
- Smith CA, Organ DW, Near JP (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 68:655-663.
- Somech A, Drach-Zahavy A (2004). Exploring organizational citizenship behaviour from an organizational perspective: The relationship between organizational learning and organizational citizenship behaviour. *J. Occupat. Organ. Psychol.* 77 (3):281-298.
- Şahin MY, Akyel Y, Çolakoğlu T (2013), Örgütsel Vatandaşlık: Kamu ve Bağımsız Spor Örgütleri Yöneticileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma., *Int. J. Social Sci.* 6(8):1067-1083
- Taççı D, Koç U (2007). Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı - Örgütsel Öğrenme Değerleri İlişkisi: Akademisyenler Üzerinde Görgül Bir Araştırma, *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 7(2):373-382
- Vanyperen NW, Van Den Berg AE, Willering MC (1999). Towards a better understanding of the link between participation in decision-making and organizational citizenship behaviour: A multilevel analysis. *J. Occupat. Organ. Psychol.* 72:3-377.
- Williams LJ, Anderson SE (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behavior. *J. Manage.* 17:601-617.