CHAPTER ONE

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR—ITS HISTORICAL BACKGROUND, CONCEPTUAL STATUS AND ANTECEDENTS: AN OVERVIEW
1.1 ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR - ITS HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

On the basis of empirical research, the most comprehensive and integrated definition forwarded for OCB is ‘individual behaviour that happens to be discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization. The word ‘discretionary’ refers to the specific behaviour in a specific context which is not an absolute requirement of the job description. The term ‘job description’ denotes the literal or clearly specifiable terms of the worker’s employment contract with the organization. Hence, OCB involves some degree of personal choice, such that the worker will not be punished if he or she chooses not to engage in the behaviour. The second part of the definition—‘not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system’ of the relevant organization denotes that engaging in OCB does not entitle one to rewards that are contractually guaranteed by any formal policies and procedures and that their attainment must be uncertain in terms of time and manner. In other words, a worker displaying OCB may certainly expect that in some vaguely defined manner, the behaviour eventually brings some rewards or returns, but not in any point-for-point, one-to-one correspondence between specific action and specific reward as promised by written or verbal guarantees. The last part of the definition of OCB requires that OCB in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization. ‘In the aggregate’ refers to the summing across time for a single worker and also summing across workers in the group, department or organization as well. It is aptly appropriate to mention here that most OCB actions, taken singly,
would not make a dent in the overall performance of an organization. Scholastic observations and theoretical profundity propose organizational effectiveness to be multidimensional and that the dimensions vary according to the different stakeholder groups connected to the organization (Freeman, 1984). Moreover, frameworks for studying organizations also generally concede that to be effective over any appreciable span of time, an organization need to adapt to changes in the environmental matrix that surrounds it, encompassing markets, technologies, cultures, industry structures, competitive pressures. In order to sustain or catapult effectiveness, organizations require anticipating and monitoring such changes and to implement strategic redirection. The implementation of the strategic changes derives from the many small changes that workers make in their behaviours, including the suggestions they put forward for how best to implement a new strategy. Making such suggestions generally goes beyond the gamut of core job responsibilities. Hence, discretionary behaviours like OCB contribute to organizational effectiveness to the extent that they involve monitoring the organization's environment, recommending noble or different initiatives by the organization to capitalize upon or to adapt to changing situations, and exercising a proactive stance toward enacting new initiatives practicably effective.

In 1977, Dennis W. Organ published a paper (Organ, 1977) in which he tried to explain that worker satisfaction affected productivity by making a distinction between quantitative measures of output or productivity and some other, more subtle, forms of worker contribution that happen not to be reflected in measures of individual output. It was suggested that these subtler contributions might take the form of helping coworkers, following the spirit as well as
the literal rules of workplace governance, and accommodating that managers often have to make to improve operations.

In order to delve more into the matrix of causation, Bateman (Bateman & Organ, 1983), actually intended to test the effects of job-overload on behaviour and attitudes in a project, on a group of non-academic employees at Indiana University at two different times, intercepted by a span of six to eight weeks. In the light of the findings of the particular study, Bateman proposed the supervisors’ ratings of the workers’ job performance, including both the rating of productivity and a measure of the cluster of the ‘subtler contributions’ mentioned in Organ’s 1977 write-up. The researchers constituted a crude measure by incorporating substantial items, to give rise to something that was called ‘qualitative performance’, as opposed to quantitative performance—that is productivity.

In order to identify the ‘subtler’, helpful and cooperative behaviours borne of job satisfaction, Ann Smith (Smith, Organ & Near, 1983) initiated a study in which she interviewed several supervisors in different manufacturing plants in Southern Indiana, asking them, “What are the things you’d like your employees to do more of, but really can’t make them do, and for which you can’t guarantee any definite rewards, other than your anticipation?” It is to noted here that managers apart from considering actions that they believe to be contributive to effectiveness, also mentioned things that make the manager’s job easier. Smith, from her premier study, reached to an array of rich inputs that she utilized in streamlining the research foundations of OCB. Moreover, it was almost certain that the behaviours identified would tend towards the mundane rather than bold innovative suggestions. It
appeared that most managers were trying to minimize present headaches, not trying to multiply them by entering scores of initiative from their charges (Organ, 1997a). In other words, the items used in the Smith et al. (1983) study represent OCB as actions that managers appreciate, because such actions either enhance effectiveness and efficiency or make the manager's job easier. These actions are not also tasks that can be enforced nor can they be promised specific or immediate incentives to employees for performing them.

The concept of OCB has also been characterized as constructive and cooperative extra-role gestures that are neither mandatory nor directly compensated by a formal organizational reward system. In addition, these behaviours have been described as having an accumulative positive effect on organizational functioning (Organ, 1988, 1990). In a paper on citizenship within organizations, Jill Graham (1986a) suggested that civic virtue is a worthwhile construct for capturing some of the important discretionary contributions by participants, based on the theoretical heritage of civic citizenship research in philosophy, political science and social history. To a further extent, Graham argued that 'organizational citizenship' may be conceptualized as a global concept that includes all positive organizationally relevant behaviours of individual organization members. Thus, this extended broader aspect of OCB comprises traditional in-role job performance behaviours, organizationally functional extra-role behaviours, political behaviours such as full and responsible organizational participation, that typically have been omitted from previous studies of citizenship.
In her concept of 'active citizenship syndrome', Inkeles (1969) extended this political philosophical perspective on civic citizenship and implemented the political sub-concepts of 'obedience', 'loyalty' and 'participation' to the global concept of citizenship in an organizational setting. Thus, her categories that emerged are—

(i) **Organizational Obedience** - It refers to the acceptance and conformity with respect to rules and regulations governing organizational structures, job descriptions and personnel policies. Obedience can be manifested in the form of adherence to rules and instructions, punctuality in attendance and task completion and stewardship of organizational resources.

(ii) **Organizational Loyalty**: It reflects the virtue of identification with and allegiance to an organization’s leaders and the organization as a whole, thereby transcending the parochial interests of individuals, work groups, teams and departmental units. Exemplary behaviours include taking initiatives to defend the organization against threats, contributing to its good reputation and cooperating with others to serve the interests of the organization as a whole.

(iii) **Organizational Participation**: It refers to the demonstration of interest in organizational affairs guided by ideal standards of virtue. It is validated by an individual’s keeping information on regular updates and is expressed through absolute and responsible involvement in organizational governance. Representative activities include attending non-required meetings, sharing informed opinions and novel concepts with others and being willing to deliver bad news or support an unpopular view to combat ‘groupthink’ (Janis, 1982).
1.2 OCB AND ITS PRESENT STATUS:

Organizational citizenship behaviors have been the subject of an increasing number of studies, particularly since the end of the 1990s (Bergeron, 2007; Paillé’, 2006). These studies have focused mainly on the analysis of bases, motivations, manifestations, impacts on performance, and practical implications of OCBs (Organ et al., 2006). Despite numerous definitions and approaches to the issue, OCBs are essentially expressed in voluntary initiatives not explicitly required in the definition of job responsibilities that contribute to the improvement of organizational functioning. In their review of literature on the subject, Organ et al. (2006) define these behaviors as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization” (Organ et al., 2006). The impact of these voluntary behaviors on organizational efficacy and work satisfaction is well documented.

Numerous management approaches and organizational theories have emphasized the importance of cooperation and collaboration between employees (Jones and George, 1998), active participation in activities not listed as specific responsibilities in job descriptions (Katz, 1964; Ouchi, 1981), sharing of knowledge and suggestions (Boiral, 2002), prosocial behaviors (Ramus and Killmer, 2007), and personal development (Rooke and Torbert, 2005). However, these taxonomic systems and empirical studies on OCBs remain focused on intra-organizational cooperative and supportive behaviors contributing to improving human relations and organizational functioning. Thus, the benefits of these behaviors
are most often assessed in relation to organizational performance or internal human relations rather than external stakeholders and the natural environment.

While helping to lay the groundwork for research on organizational behaviour, Katz stated that, “An organization which depends solely upon its blueprints for prescribed behaviour is a fragile social system.” (1964). Well before Bateman & Organ’s (1983) reference to OCB construct, Katz clearly acknowledged the value organizations should place on behaviours beyond those prescribed in employee job descriptions. Since Katz recognized the significance of extra-role behaviour to organizational success, the study of non-blue printed behaviour has experienced exponential growth.

Organizational literature over the last twenty years is replete with studies of individual organizational behaviour that exceeds what is required by one’s job description. During the initial years, a number of terms appeared to describe such behaviour, including prosocial organizational behaviour (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986), civic organizational behaviour (Graham, 1991), organizational spontaneity (George & Jones, 1997), contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993) and the most widely used term ‘Organizational Citizenship Behaviour’ or OCB (Bateman & Organ, 1983). These terms, while not describing exactly the same behaviours, all share the general theme of individual performance that goes beyond what is expected of the individual by his or her organization (Podsakoff, et al., 2000)
Several researchers have demonstrated the value of OCB within the organization. OCB has been associated with improvements in manager evaluations of individual performance, superior group and unit level performance and enhanced organizational performance (Koys, 2001).

OCB is defined by Organ (1988) as: ‘the individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization’ ... ‘the behavior is not the product of a requirement demanded by job functions or description’ ... ‘the behavior is the product of a personal decision.’ In other words, employees perform OCB without any guarantee of immediate and substantial rewards from their organization for doing so (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Organ, 1988).

Meglino et al (1989) distinguish OCBO, directed at the organization, from OCBI, directed at individuals (Organ, 1997; Williams and Anderson, 1991). Therefore, OCB is extra-role behavior resulting from a performance that goes beyond what is strictly required by the job and which, by virtue of that nature, constitutes a powerful indicator of good job performance (Motowidlo and Van Scotter, 1994) from both the individual and the organizational perspective (Dunlop and Lee, 2004). This relationship seems to become more accentuated in the case of jobs with specific tasks related to the quality of service to customers (Kim et al., 2004; Bell and Mengüç, 2002; Blancero et al., 1995).
The use of individual, social and interpersonal factors in explaining employee's OCB has received wide attention (Boye and Jones, 1997). Although the social and interpersonal factors have been shown to exercise great influence (Robinson and Greenberg, 1998; Robinson and O'Leary-Kelly, 1998), the use of individual factors, such as workers' personality traits, has been less fruitful (Robinson and Greenberg, 1998). Specifically, the level of fairness in remuneration and processes that the employee perceives of the organization, or the extent to which the employee understands that the organization interacts fairly with him/her (distributive, procedural, and interactional justice), has acquired unquestionable research importance in the framework of social exchange since the beginning of the 1990s (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993; Moorman et al., 1998; Settoon et al., 1996; Shore and Wayne, 1993).

Social exchange theory (Thibaut and Kelley, 1959; Homans, 1961; Blau, 1964) states how individual behavior only influences those actions that will bring reward. When that does not occur, the responses cease. The supported influence of the workers' perceptions of determined elements of the organizational environment, where the organization forms a framework for social exchange, on OCB constitutes the non-task behavior most studied scenario (Vardi and Weiner, 1996; Boye and Jones, 1997; Vardi, 2001). Exchange theories include two types of exchange (Blau, 1964): "social" exchange; and "economic" exchange. The former is widespread since the exchange is neither finite nor tangible, while the latter stem from the actual contractual relationship and involve clear and tangible exchanges, such as salary (Organ, 1990). Among the perceptions that affect social exchange, one may highlight the leader support (Smith
et al., 1983), the anomic behavior of supervisors (Hodson, 1999), the leaders' level of honesty (Farth et al., 1990), the perceived organization support (e.g. Moorman et al., 1998), and values in the workplace (Van Dyne et al., 1994). Moorman (1991) made significant contributions to associations of different types of organizational justice and OCB.

The employees' perceptive-evaluative view of their organization, especially in terms of how fair they perceive it, is shown to be one of the most studied and significant factors in the explanation of OCB in the social exchange framework (Farh et al., 1990; Moorman, 1991; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993; Moorman et al., 1993; Konovsky and Pugh, 1994). In effect, perceptions of organizational experiences force the human resources to evaluate their exchange relationships with the organization (Blau, 1964; Homans, 1974), by weighing up the level of justice or equity of exchange. Thus, the workers who perceive a fair relationship tend to display more OCB through higher commitment and integration. On the other hand, those employees who perceive that relationship as one-sided or unfair tend to abandon OCB and redefine their relationships as purely material or tangible, economic exchanges, engaging in misconduct (Greenberg, 1990; Skarlicki and Folger, 1997).

Following the above arguments as a guide, it may be stated that attitudes constitute the line that links most of the previous works, by referring to perceptions and, necessarily, to evaluations of the mentioned factors. In effect, the perception of organizational justice, in any of its forms, is a specific attitude toward the organization and/or its elements. Most of the new factors are
considered from the evaluative perception of the worker. Therefore, attitudes form a great part of the independent variables that have been studied in relation to OCB. The literature has addressed the interdependence of many organizational attitudes (Robbins, 2001) from a doctrinal perspective that permits us to speak of an unfavorable attitudinal environment.

It has been pointed out that attitude is an internal psychological state that becomes apparent through observable cognitive, affective and behavioral responses. Attitudes are evaluative perceptions of the organizational environment that generate psychological predispositions, which, in turn, generate organizational responses. Those responses include those that encourage organizational behavior and, within that, OCB. As Morgan (1986) stresses, the fundamental factor that influences organizational behavior comprises not so much the non-observance of, or maximum compliance with, the rules, explanations and principles stemming from social interaction or from the legitimate organizational system, as the perceptions and interpretations that take place; in other words, the so-called “images of the organization”. In short, from that perspective, the literature has used the perceptive-evaluative element – individual and collective attitudes – as a fundamental variable to explain OCB (Randall et al., 1999; Moorman and Harland, 2002; Tepper et al., 2001; Bommer et al., 2003).

With regard to the boundaries of the environment, whether the target is organizational or relational makes the work environment the natural framework for its analysis in OCB research. A second aspect involves selecting the most representative attributes of the environment. The internal
and external core evaluations are the appraisals individuals make of their work environment.

Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine & Bachrach (2000) identified almost 30 potentially different forms of OCB in the empirical literature. Moreover, LePine, Erez and Johnson (2002) identified more than forty (40) measures of behaviours that academic scholars have referred to as OCB or something similar to that.

1.3 DIMENSIONS OF OCB:

Several measures of OCB have been developed, but there is a serious inconsistency in their dimensionality which supports the observation of Podsakoff, Niehoff, MacKenzie, and Williams (1993) that the OCB factors depend on the sample. Various studies have reported 2 dimensions (Graham, 1986; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983), 3 dimensions (Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Turnipseed & Murkison, 1996), 4 dimensions (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991), 5 dimensions (Organ, 1988a; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994) and 6 dimensions (Chaitanya & Nachiketa, 2001). Dimensional disparity is an important concern, and due to the divergent methods and results of prior research, none of the structures can be considered optimal.

Although the dimensional inconsistency is problematic, two common themes of citizenship are found in the prior studies: prosocial, extra role behaviors aimed at others in the organization, and extra role behaviors done for the benefit of the organization.
Barr and Pawar (1995) were the first researchers to formally propose a dimension of OCB by an individual’s intended primary beneficiary or target of OCB. This dimension includes three classes: OCB toward a coworker, supervisor, and organization.

Consistent with Smith, et al. (1983), Podsakoff, et al. (1993), and Williams & Anderson (1991), it has been expected that OCB to be multi-dimensional, and comprised of distinct altruistic, other-directed behaviors, and extra role compliance, done for the sake of the organization. Subsequent research has expanded Williams and Anderson’s (1991) classifications to include mission-oriented, organization-oriented, and individual oriented behavior (Coleman & Borman, 2000; McNeely & Meglino, 1994). For example, McNeely and Meglino studied whether individuals with high levels of concern and empathy for others are more likely to engage in citizenship behavior directed at another individual or the organization.

1.3.1 HELPING:

It has been identified as a vital form of citizenship behaviour by virtually every researcher who has worked in this area (e.g., Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997; George & Brief, 1992; George & Jones, 1997; Graham, 1989; Mackenzie et al., 2001; Organ, 1988, 1990; Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1994; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Conceptually, helping behaviour involves voluntarily assisting others with, or preventing the occurrence of, work-related problems. The
first part of the definition (assisting others with work-related problems) includes Organ’s (1988, 1990) altruism, peacemaking and cheerleading dimensions; Graham’s (1989) interpersonal helping; Williams & Anderson’s (1991) OCB I; Van Scotter & Motowidlo’s (1996) interpersonal facilitation; Van Dyne and LePine’s (1998) helping behaviour; George & Brief (1992) and George & Jones’ (1997) helping others; and the helping coworkers and interpersonal harmony constructs of Farh et al. (1997) and Farh, Zhong & Organ (2004). It is also referred to as interpersonal citizenship behaviour or ICB (Settoon & Mossholder, 2002). The second part of the definition captures Organ’s (1988, 1990) concept of helping others by taking steps to prevent the creation of problems for coworkers. Empirical research (Bachrach et al., 2001; Mackenzie et al., 1999; Mackenzie et al., 2001; Podsakoff, Ahearne & Mackenzie, 1997; Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1994) has generally confirmed the fact that all of these forms of helping behaviour load on a single factor. Smith’s premier study in which she asked a group of evening MBA students to think of a specific subordinate and coworker and rate that person in terms of the frequency with which he/she exhibited OCB (Smith et al., 1983), revealed two separate factors in its analysis of responses. One factor was initially labeled “altruism”, but is interchangeably termed as “helping” and critics believe that it implies something like “selflessness” on the part of the doer. The items summed under this factor clearly denote a type of OCB that is directed at a specific individual—usually a coworker, but sometimes the supervisor or even the customer. Put on a different note, the target of the behaviour or the immediate beneficiary happens to be a person. Altruism manifests itself in ‘helping an incumbent learn the job’, ‘assisting an overloaded worker catch up with the workflow’ or ‘solve a problem.’
1.3.2 SPORTSMANSHIP:

It is a form of citizenship behaviour that has been defined as "a willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining." Precisely, "good sports" are people who do not complain when they are inconvenienced by others, who try to maintain a positive attitude even when things do not go their way, are not offended when others fail to accept their suggestions, are not reluctant to sacrifice their personal interest with a view to help the entire work group and do not grudge even if their ideas are rejected. Empirical research (e.g. Bachrach et al., 2001; Mackenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991; 1993; Mackenzie, 1994) that has included this particular construct in the context of other forms of OCB presented it to be distinctly different from them and to have somewhat different antecedents (Podsakoff et al., 1990; Podsakoff et al., 1996) and consequences (Podsakoff et al., 1997; Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1994; Walz & Niehoff, 2000). In order to be effective, organizations have to adapt to environmental forces by making changes— for example, in the physical layout of the workspace, in hours of operation etc. Quite inevitably, the burden of such organizational changes falls more on some members than on others. When these changes appear to be unfair to some people, they feel that they have a right to complain, or even to take their case to every possible level of appeal. However, there are differences in degrees for registering one's complaints when a change yields impositions, constraints and inconveniences. Sportsmanship conserves the stamina that can be devoted to constructive purposes. Every grievance, regardless of its disposition, consumes executive resources. Such stamina is subsequently lost from the more productive activities of planning, scheduling and organizational analysis.
1.3.3 CIVIC VIRTUE:

The dimension of civic virtue is derived from Graham’s (1991) discussion of the responsibilities that employees have as “citizens” of an organization. The concept of ‘civic virtue’ represents a macro-level interest in, or commitment to, the organization as a whole. It is expressed by a willingness to participate actively in its governance (e.g., to attend meetings, engage in policy debates, express one’s opinion about what strategy the organization ought to follow, and so on), to monitor its environment for threats and opportunities (e.g., to keep up with changes in the industry that might affect the organization), and to look out for its best interests (e.g., to report fire hazards etc.) even at great personal cost. Therefore, it may be emphasized that civic virtue describes a posture of responsible, constructive involvement in the political or governance process of the organization.

This dimension has been operationalized in two forms. Konovsky & Organ (1996) stressed the more mundane, ongoing activities pertaining to governance, such as reading work related mail/e-mail, attending meetings, keeping oneself up-to-date with the current status of the organization, discussing with colleagues the issues of the day, and taking part in the various rituals that mark continuity of the organization’s traditions and identity. On the other hand, Graham (1989) stressed the less frequent and more dramatic instances of civic virtue, in which someone challenges existing organizational practices and policies, voices critiques or objections to policies proposed by high level officers, and more generally acts as the conscience of the organization (Graham, 1989). Thus, in a nutshell, civic virtue reflects a person’s recognition of being part of a larger whole and accepting the responsibilities that such membership entails, in the same way that citizens are members of a country. Organ’s
"civic virtue" has been referred to as "organizational participation" by Graham (1989) and "protecting the organization" by George & Brief (1992).

1.3.4 COURTESY:

It is a prominent dimension of OCB. It consists of actions that help preventing organizational problems (or problems of another coworker per se) from occurring. The fundamental idea operating here is to avoid practices that make other people's work harder and when a worker has to add to their existing load, he/she needs to give them enough notice so that they will be prepared to deal with the add-on problems. Behaviours in congruence to this particular dimension vary in degrees, like leaving the desktop, company printer in as good as the condition in which one has found it.

1.3.5 CONSCIENTIOUSNESS:

This dimension refers to helping behaviour in a more impersonal and generalized form to the group, department, or organization, like for example, punctuality in arriving at work or at meetings, exemplary attendance, and refraining from taking unnecessary work breaks or engaging in idle conversation during working hours. Thus, to speak in a crux, this particular dimension includes behaviours that exemplify a particularly high order of compliance with the constraints upon individuals necessary to make a cooperative system. Initially, this factor was called "generalized compliance", and later "conscientiousness". However, as research on OCB eventually delved into personality traits that might predict OCB and looked at a personality factor usually referred to as "conscientiousness", some confusion naturally arose as to whether the term referred to "conscientiousness" as a
behaviour or trait. Conscientiousness as a dimension of OCB does not imply merely strict obedience to an order. It denotes rather the more general adherence to the spirit as well as the letter of the rules or norms that define a cooperative system in an organizational setting.

This dimension has been called "organizational obedience" by Graham (Graham, 1991; Van Dyne et al., 1994), OCBO by Williams & Anderson (1991), following organizational rules and procedures by Borman & Motowidlo (1993) & contains some aspects of Van Scotter & Motowidlo’s (1996) job dedication construct. This particular dimension generally attempts to capture a worker’s internalization and acceptance of the organization’s rules, regulations and procedures, which results in a scrupulous adherence to them, even when no one observes or monitors compliance. This behaviour is considered to be a form of OCB because even though everyone is expected to comply by the organization’s rules, regulations at all times, many workers simply opt out. Therefore, it is a mark of a ‘good citizen’ when a particular worker religiously obeys all rules and regulations, even when no one is monitoring.
Numerous studies in the business literature have been conducted on the antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The reason for this popularity is the existence of positive relationships between OCB and both individual and organizational performance. It is interesting that researchers have examined many dispositional factors. Podsakoff et al. (2000) provide a detailed critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature for both antecedents and consequences of OCB. They have studied approximately 200 studies published between 1983 and 1999 and examined empirical research on four major categories of antecedents: individual (employee) characteristics, task characteristics, organizational characteristics, and leadership behaviors.

Employee attitudes, dispositional variables, employee role perceptions, demographic variables, and employee abilities and individual differences are dimensions of individual characteristics. While task characteristics include task feedback, task routinization and intrinsically satisfying task, organizational characteristics contain organizational formalization, organizational inflexibility, advisory/staff support, cohesive group, rewards outside the leader's control, spatial distance from leader, and perceived organizational support (POS). Finally, "Core" transformational leadership, reward – punishment behaviors, leader role clarification, leader specification of procedures, supportive leader behaviors, and leader-member exchange compose leadership behaviors. Many studies post-1999 continue to examine the antecedents. Lambert (2000) finds significant and positive relationships between worker's assessments of the usefulness of work-life benefits (e.g. child care and elder care) and OCB. Bell and Menguc (2002) having insurance salespeople as a sample show that the relationship between organizational