

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIORS AND PSYCHOSOCIAL WORKING CONDITIONS EXAMINED THROUGH THE PRISM OF FOR-PROFIT, PUBLIC AND NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

Hanna BORTNOWSKA^{1*}, Bartosz SEILER²

¹University of Zielona Góra; h.bortnowska@wez.uz.zgora.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-7327-7524

²University of Zielona Góra; b.seiler@wez.uz.zgora.pl, ORCID: 0000-0003-0380-746X

* Correspondence author

Purpose: The aim of the article is to determine the relationship between OCBs and psychosocial working conditions.

Design/methodology/approach: The survey was conducted using the OCB scale developed by Spector and the COPSOQ tool. Statistical analysis was carried out using Statistica software.

Findings: The research demonstrates that the manifestation of OCB-O by respondents correlated with more aspects of psychosocial working conditions than in the case of OCB-P. When analyzing OCB-O, strong correlations were reported with the following variables: possibilities for development, job satisfaction, and meaning of work. In the case of OCB-P, these correlations were moderate. In addition, in the case of OCB-O, a weak relationship was also identified with the following variables: quality of leadership, social support, and influence at work. These correlations were negligible for OCB-P. The obtained results demonstrate that quantitative demands do not correlate with either OCB-O or OCB-P. However, in what concerns influence at work variable, a weak correlation was identified for OCB-O as well as a negligible correlation for OCB-P.

Research limitations: The study was only quantitative and not qualitative, while the research relied solely on respondents' statements. The sample was selected purposively, which means the findings cannot be generalized, and the study involved only Polish organizations, meaning it was embedded in a specific cultural context. Additionally, the research was not a longitudinal study. The data was lagged, which does not allow for strong causal inference. The use of questionnaire-based research may have triggered a common method bias.

Practical implications: managers of any type of organization should do their best to encourage employees to display OCBs. This may be facilitated by appropriate psychosocial working conditions, especially in the areas of: possibilities for development, meaning of work, job satisfaction.

Originality/value: According to our findings, at the moment of writing this paper there are also no comparative studies examining the relationship existing between OCBs and working conditions covering the three types of organizations: for-profit, public, and nonprofit. Besides, in the course of reviewing the literature, we found no studies examining the relationship between OCBs and influence at work and quantitative demands.

Keywords: organizational citizenship behaviors; working conditions; for-profit, public and nonprofit organizations.

Category of the paper: Research paper.

1. Introduction

In the empirical research on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs), two main trends can be distinguished. The first trend deals with the consequences of this type of behavior at the individual, unit and organizational level, whereas the second trend explores issues related to the antecedents of OCBs.

Primarily, OCBs have been studied in relation to job satisfaction (Bateman, Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983), organizational justice (Farh et al., 1990; Moorman, 1991; Niehoff, Moorman, 1993) and organizational commitment (Moorman et al., 1993; Williams, Anderson, 1991). Other analyses included dispositional factors: agreeableness, conscientiousness, positive and negative affectivity (Konovsky, Organ, 1996; Organ, Lingl, 1995). The relationship between OCBs on one hand and leader behaviors and task characteristics on the other hand has also been studied (Podsakoff et al., 1990; Podsakoff et al., 1996a, 1996b).

A separate category of antecedents explored in OCBs research have been those related to the job characteristics and the functioning of the organization, including: organizational formalization, organizational inflexibility, spatial distance (Podsakoff et al., 1996a, 1996b), workplace environment (Turnipseed, Murkison, 1996), perceived organizational support (Moorman et al., 1998). However, no studies were identified that would comprehensively analyze the relationship between OCBs and psychosocial working conditions as measured by the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire. Few researchers have used that instrument, and those who have, did so only to a limited extent (Jeon et al., 2018; Kosenkranius et al., 2020; Wemken et al., 2021).

Let us also point out that, in what concerns OCBs, some of the variables contained in the COPSQ were also analyzed, including: meaning of work (Maharaj, Schlechter, 2007; Chandra et al., 2017), social support (Kim et al., 2013; Halbesleben, Wheeler, 2015) or health (e.g. Baranik, Eby, 2016; Fu et al., 2022; Htun, 2022; Jain, 2009). However, no studies seem to have analyzed OCBs in detail in relation to variables such as, for example, quantitative demands or influence at work. According to our findings, at the moment of writing this paper there are also no comparative studies examining the relationship existing between OCBs and working conditions covering the three types of organizations: for-profit, public, and nonprofit.

The aim of the article is to determine the relationship between OCBs and psychosocial working conditions. To this end, a survey was conducted.

The article is divided into sections, which are as follows: introduction, literature review, methods, results, discussion, and conclusion. In the introduction, the directions of research on organizational citizenship behaviors, the research gap and the purpose of the article are synthetically laid out. In the second section, the results of the literature review on OCBs are presented, while the third section addresses the relationship existing between OCBs and selected aspects of psychosocial working conditions. Section four contains a description of our research methodology, and section five is where the results are shared. In the last section, the results are benchmarked with some of the findings of other authors, indicating implications for managers as well as limitations and directions of future research.

2. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

According to the classic definition presented by Organ (1988), OCB is an individual behavior that is discretionary, not explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization. Under this view, OCBs include behaviors that go beyond role-related requirements and are organizationally functional. Some researchers have pointed out that organizational citizenship behaviors are a function of how employees perceive their duties at work (Morrison, 1994) and that type of behavior is accounted for by managers in areas such as recruitment (Podsakoff et al., 2011) and employee evaluation (MacKenzie et al., 1993). Later and Organ (1997; compare: Van Dyne et al., 1994) modified his original definition, stating that OCBs support the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place. As noted by LePine et al. (2002), the definition of OCB thus became similar to the definition of Contextual Performance presented by Borman and Motowidlo (1997).

An important part of the conceptualization was the recognition of the dimensions of OCBs. Smith et al. (1983) identified to that end altruism and generalized compliance, whereas Organ (1988) distinguished: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. The taxonomies of organizational citizenship behaviors were also developed among others by Graham (1991), Podsakoff et al. (2000), Borman et al. (2001), Van Dyne et al. (1995). Williams and Anderson (1991) for their part argued that OCBs can be reduced to behaviors that 'benefit the organization in general' (OCBO) and 'immediately benefit specific individuals and indirectly through this means contribute to the organization' (OCBI).

As already mentioned, the essence of the definiens of OCBs are the functionality of organizational citizenship behaviors that drives the direction of research on the consequences of this type of behavior at the individual, work-group, unit and organizational level. The relationship between OCBs and performance, including profitability, productivity, product quality and efficiency have been tested (Podsakoff et al., 2013; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, 1997;

Podsakoff et al., 1997). However, the leading direction has been the diagnosis of the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors. Primarily, OCBs have been studied through the prism of attitudinal and perceptual variables. The relationship between OCBs and job satisfaction (Bateman, Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983), organizational justice (Farh et al., 1990; Moorman, 1991; Niehoff, Moorman 1993) and organizational commitment (Williams, Anderson 1991; Moorman et al., 1993) have been studied. The research was further elaborated by the question of which of the attitude components is the determinant of OCBs (Organ, Konovsky, 1989; Williams, Anderson, 1991; Lee, Allen, 2002). Other analyses have focused on individual differences: agreeableness, conscientiousness, positive and negative affectivity (Organ, Lingl, 1995; Organ, Ryan, 1995; Konovsky, Organ, 1996; Borman et al., 2001), equity sensitivity (Konovsky, Organ, 1996; Blakely, Andrews, Moorman 2005), locus of control (Borman et al., 2001; Blakely, Srivastava, Moorman, 2005), motives, motive fulfilment and role identity (Rioux, Penner, 2001; Finkelstein, Penner, 2004; Finkelstein, 2006). The relationship between OCBs and leader behaviors has also been explored (Podsakoff et al., 1990; Podsakoff et al., 1996a and 1996b; Babcock-Roberson, Strickland 2010; Harris et al., 2014). Factors related to job characteristics and the functioning of the organization constituted a separate category, including: organizational formalization, organizational inflexibility, spatial distance (Podsakoff et al., 1996a, 1996b), and perceived organizational support (Alshaabani et al., 2021; Moorman et al., 1998).

3. OCBs and psychosocial working conditions

An analysis of the content of the Google Scholar database revealed that the COPSOQ was used in the course of research on OCBs (albeit to a limited extent) e.g. by Jeon et al. (2018) who conducted a quasi-experimental study evaluating the effects of six-month intervention (ethical leadership program for nursing unit managers). To that end, they used six dimensions of the medium-sized Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire II. Furthermore, Kosenkranius et al. (2020) set it out to verify whether off-job crafting intervention could offer performance benefits for the employers such as increased organizational citizenship behaviors among employees. The COPSOQ was used by them to measure cognitive job demands and emotional job demands. Wemken et al. (2021) also mention using six items of the COPSOQ to measure job demands in their study, although the obtained results were not presented as they went beyond the scope of their research.

Some of the variables included in the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire were also analyzed through the prism of OCBs. Research has frequently been carried out using scales other than those contained in the COPSOQ.

Classic studies have demonstrated a positive relationship between OCBs and job satisfaction (Bateman, Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983; Williams, Anderson, 1991). Meta-analyses have also confirmed this correlation (Organ, Ryan, 1995; LePine et al., 2002). Subsequent research – following the suggestion of Organ and Konovsky (1989) – focused on the fairness interpretation of OCBs. Meanwhile, research results obtained by Farh et al. (1990), Moorman (1991), Moorman et al. (1993) suggested that perception of justice is a better predictor of OCBs than job satisfaction.

The relationship between OCBs and perceived organizational support (POS) has also been studied in the context of social exchange theory. A positive correlation was found between POS and OCBs (Wayne et al., 1997; Chiang, Hsieh, 2012). According to Moorman et al. (1998), procedural justice is an antecedent to POS which in turn mediates its relationship to three OCBs dimensions (interpersonal helping, personal industry and loyal boosterism). It was also found that POS mediated the effects of interpersonal and informational justice on organizational citizenship behavior that are directed at the organization (OCBO) and its members (OCBI) (Cheung, 2013). According to Shanock and Eisenberger (2006) supervisors' POS is positively related to their subordinates' perceived supervisor support (PSS) and, in turn, subordinates' PSS is positively associated with their POS, in-role performance, and extra-role performance. Halbesleben and Wheeler (2015) - driven by the assumptions of the conservation of resources theory - found that higher perceived co-worker support is positively associated with greater investment in OCBs aimed at that co-worker. Whereas Kim et al. (2013), referring to the concept of motives in OCBs research, demonstrated, among others, that the quality of social support functions as a boundary condition that qualifies relations of motives with OCBs.

In the study, emphasis was also placed on meaningfulness as an antecedent of OCBs. It was demonstrated that the meaningfulness of work was significantly correlated with OCBs and also significantly predicted variance in OCBs (Sharma, 2019) and employees' perception of the meaningfulness of work had a significant positive influence on OCBs (Youn, Kim, 2022). In this context, research on employees not receiving any remuneration was also carried out. Erks et al. (2021) found that meaningfulness of volunteers is related to both employee engagement and OCBs at work. Meanwhile, Im and Chung (2018) found that organizational pride and trust mediates the relationship between employee volunteering meaningfulness and OCBs.

Numerous studies have been conducted on the relationship between leadership and OCBs (e.g. Farh et al., 1990; Jiao et al., 2011; Yang, Zhang, 2022). For instance, Podsakoff et al. (1990; compare Podsakoff et al., 1996a) indicated that the effects of the transformational leader behaviors on OCBs are indirect, rather than direct, they are moderated by followers' trust in their leaders. The research results indicated also a significant positive relation between charismatic leadership and OCBs (Babcock-Roberson, Strickland, 2010). The relationship between LMX (leader-member exchange) and OCBs was analysed, too (Harris et al., 2014).

The relationship between employee competency and OCBs has also been studied (e.g. Chuang et al., 2019; Hardin et al., 2020; Sumarsi, Rizal, 2022; Wortler et al., 2019), and so has been the relationship between (high-performance) HR practices and OCBs (e.g. Wei et al., 2010; Sun et al., 2007; Gupta, Singh, 2010; Snape, Redman, 2010). Conducting research in this area, Wei et al. (2010) included internal career opportunities and extensive training among HR practices. Against their expectations, their research has revealed that high-performance HR practices are not significantly related to OCBs. Different conclusions were provided by the study of Nadeem et al. (2019). By analyzing the relationship between HR practices (including competency development) and OCB, they determined that a high-performance work system is positively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior (compare: Snape, Redman, 2010). In addition, according to Sun et al. (2007; as quoted in Wei et al., 2010), ‘high-performance HR practices can shape positive psychological climate perceptions of employees since such HR practices would send a signal of long-term investment in employee competence, helping create shared employee perceptions of a supportive organizational context that encourages OCB’. Therefore, the results of the research conducted so far in this area are inconclusive.

Some studies have also been identified which have verified the impact of health on organizational citizenship behaviors. Researchers working in this field have concluded, among other things, that OCBs are positively related to employees’ health complaints (Fu et al., 2022) or health and safety has significantly positive effect on OCBs of employees (Htun, 2022). Baranik and Eby (2016) identified that a positive effect mediated the relationship between OCB-Is and general health. This issue has also been analyzed by Jain (2009). According to him, the dimensions of OCBs, namely organizational pride, social and functional participation and concern for organizational resources were found to be the positive predictors of the dimension of general health called sense of accomplishment and contribution. Moreover, the dimensions of OCBs, namely sportsman spirit and concern for organizational resources were found to be the positive predictors of the dimension of general health called hassle-free existence. Another study indicated that there was a significant positive effect of altruism, civic virtue and sportsmanship (dimensions of OCBs) on subjective well-being while conscientiousness (dimension of OCBs) had a negative impact on subjective well-being of employees (Yurcu et al., 2015). In the contrast, research by Naz et al. (2021) has revealed, that there is no significant interaction between general health and OCB

No studies have been identified that would examine in detail the relationship between OCB and quantitative demands or an influence at work.

4. Methods

The research process consisted of the following stages: literature analysis, research gap identification, formulation of research questions and hypotheses, sample and research tools selection, data collection and analysis, conclusions formulation, indication of research limitations and future directions. The research hypotheses were formulated as follows: H₁: OCB-O is positively associated with psychosocial working conditions in the organization (quantitative demands, influence at work, meaning of work, possibilities for development, social support, quality of leadership, job satisfaction, general health). H₂: OCB-P is positively associated with psychosocial working conditions in the organization (quantitative demands, influence at work, meaning of work, possibilities for development, social support, quality of leadership, job satisfaction, general health).

4.1. Sample

The study was conducted in 2022, in Poland's Lubuskie Voivodeship. The sample consisted of employees representing three types of organizations: for-profit, public and nonprofit. The sampling was non-random. No list of employees working in organizations of Lubuskie Voivodeship was available. The survey included three hundred respondents, a hundred from each type of entity. The participation in the study was voluntary.

There were more women (60.67%) than men among the respondents. The average age of participants in the research was 37.9. Most respondents (34.67%) had less than three years of work experience in the current organization, while slightly fewer had more than ten years (33.33%) or between four and ten years (32.00%) of work experience.

Most representatives of for-profit and public organizations held executive positions (79.50%). More than a third (37.50%) were employed in large entities, more than a quarter (25.50%) – in medium-sized entities. The fewest respondents worked in small (22.50%) or micro (14.50%) organizations. Most representatives of nonprofit entities were board members (43.00%). Every fourth (26.00%) was a paid employee. Members of organizations (19.00%) and volunteers (12.00%) were represented less. They were active in associations (79.00%), foundations (18.00%) or other entities (3.00%). More than every third nonprofit representative (38.00%) worked in an entity employing 10 or fewer people, and slightly fewer respondents - in an organization employing 11 to 20 people (31.00%) or more than 50 (22.00%). The fewest respondents from this group worked in entities employing from 20 to 49 people (9.00%).

4.2. Measures

Various research tools can be used to measure OCBs (e.g. Fox et al., 2012; Konovsky, Organ, 1996; Lee, Allen, 2002; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Spector et al., 2010; Williams, Anderson, 1991). In the course of our own research, we used - similarly to Glińska-Noweś and Szostek (2018) - the 12-item OCB scale developed by Spector (Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist...). Respondents were asked to choose one of the answers on a five-point scale (never -1, once or twice - 2, once or twice a month - 3, once or twice a week - 4, every day - 5). The score was then calculated simply as the average of responses from 1 to 5. Six items in the survey concerned behaviors directed towards the organization (OCB-O), while another six concerned behaviors towards people in the organization (OCB-P).

Various research tools can also be used to measure psychosocial conditions at work (for more, see: Baka, 2019). An international, standardized instrument used by the World Health Organization and the International Labor Organization for assessing psychosocial working conditions, health and well-being of employees is the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (COPSOQ) (compare Baka et al., 2019)¹. It was first developed in 2000 by Kristensen and Borg and is now available in 25 languages (<https://www.copsoq-network.org/>, 7.05.2022). It accounts for a broad spectrum of psychosocial working conditions and can be used in a number of economic sectors such as industry, services, communication (Baka, 2019). The COPSOQ has been validated in many countries (e.g. Berthelsen et al., 2014; Dupret et al., 2012; Moncada et al., 2014; Rosário et al., 2017; Nübling et al., 2006), including in Poland. The research work of Widerszal-Bazyl (2017) demonstrated that the eight scales of the COPSOQ II in the Polish version can be used in research examining psychosocial properties of work, considering them to be reliable and accurate. The results of analyses conducted by Baka (2019) also confirmed the high accuracy and reliability of the Polish version of the COPSOQ II. It was precisely this tool that we used in the course of our own research, namely the COPSOQ version validated in Polish conditions by Widerszal-Bazyl (2017), who confirmed the reliability of the following eight scales: 'Quantitative demands', 'Influence at work', 'Meaning of work', 'Social support', 'Job satisfaction', 'Possibilities for development' (4-question version; the 2-question version was unreliable), 'Quality of leadership', 'General health'. As in the original tool, the majority of the questions in the questionnaire were answered by participants using a five-point scale (varying from 'to a very little extent' to 'to a very large extent' or 'never/almost never' to 'always/almost always'). The exception was the 'Job Satisfaction' scale where the responses were: very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied, irrelevant/not applicable. The scales of the COPSOQ are formed by adding the points of the individual questions of the scales by giving equal weights to each question. These weights are as follows: 100, 75, 50, 25, 0. The scale value is calculated as the simple average - all scales go from 0 to 100. According to the instruction, respondent who answered less than half of the questions in a scale is regarded as missing ([http://www.mentalhealthpromotion.net/...](http://www.mentalhealthpromotion.net/), 20.05.2022).

The survey research came with certain limitations such as the need to rely on respondents' statements, limiting the territorial scope to one country, non-random sampling, or common method bias.

4.3. Data analysis

The statistical analysis of the data was carried out using the Statistica software. The internal consistency was confirmed using the standard Cronbach's alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951). It adopted the following values: 0.804436776 (OCB), while 0.854676525 (COPSOQ)². Subsequent analyses showed that the OCB-O and OCB-P variables have a distribution close to normal, while the remaining eight variables ('Quantitative demands', 'Influence at work', 'Social support'³, 'Job satisfaction', 'Possibilities for development', 'Meaning of work', 'Quality of leadership', 'General health') did not. This was confirmed by the results of the Shapiro-Wilk tests (Shapiro, Wilk, 1965)⁴ (Table 1).

Table 1.

Shapiro-Wilk test results for variables included in the OCB and COPSOQ tools

Variables	P For-profit (N = 100)	P Public (N = 100)	P Nonprofit (N = 100)	P Total (N = 300)
OCB-O	.00697	.21005	.23868	.081318
OCB-P	.03042	.61166	.08249	.100427
Quantitative demands	.03767	.03577	.03684	.000195
Social support	.00177	.07623	.00095	.000007
Influence at work	.00485	.00663	.00012	.000001
Job satisfaction	.00000	.00001	.00000	.000000
Possibilities for development	.02448	.00179	.00532	.000012
Meaning of work	.00155	.00041	.00000	.000000
Quality of leadership	.02553	.01787	.00219	.000000
General health	.00370	.00339	.02600	.000024

Explanation: - rejection the hypothesis of normality.

Source: own study.

As a result, the majority of subsequent analyses of variables were conducted using non-parametric statistics. In the case of correlation analysis, a rule was adopted (similarly to e.g. Paliga, 2021) that when the distribution of at least one of the variables in a pair deviates from the normal distribution, the analysis of the relationship is carried out using Spearman's rho coefficient.

5. Results

Respondents stated that most of the analyzed behaviors were manifested once or twice at all or once or twice a month. The respondents' average ratings for individual OCBs dimensions were as follows: 2.97 (OCB-O) and 2.88 (OCB-P) (let us recall the scale was from 1 to 5).

Participants in the study also assessed psychosocial working conditions in their organizations. Average ratings are shown in Table 2 (let us recall that items included in individual subscales could be assigned 100, 75, 50, 25 or 0 points). The highest average ratings were recorded for the following subscales: 'Job satisfaction' (71.13), 'Meaning of work' (71.06), 'Possibilities for development' (69.13), while the lowest for the subscales 'General health' (50.07) and 'Quality of leadership' (50.07).

Table 2.

Evaluation of psychosocial working conditions - the perspective of research participants⁵

Psychosocial working conditions (COPSOQ subscales)	Arithmetic means (N = 300)
Job satisfaction	71.13
Meaning of work	71.06
Possibilities for development	69.13
Influence at work	64.50
Social support	62.54
Quantitative demands	57.31
Quality of leadership	55.68
General health	50.07

Source: own study.

In order to verify the research hypothesis describing the relationship between OCBs (OCB-O and OCB-P) and psychosocial working conditions, a correlation analysis was performed using Spearman's rho coefficient. This decision, as already mentioned, was motivated by the failure of both analyzed variables to meet the assumptions regarding the normality of distribution. The results of calculations concerning Spearman's rho coefficient were interpreted as per the Dancey and Reidy (2004) classification⁶.

Spearman's rho values were analyzed separately for the two OCB subscales. The results obtained for the OCB-O subscale are shown in Table 3.

Table 3.

Spearman's rho coefficient values for the variables: OCB-O and psychosocial working conditions

OCB-O and:	Spearman's rho			
	For-profit (N = 100)	Public (N = 100)	Nonprofit (N = 100)	Total (N = 300) ⁷
Job satisfaction	.490305	.531123	.336725	.442378
Possibilities for development	.555628	.398137	.339517	.427580
Meaning of work	.548126	.530713	.263388	.426115
Quality of leadership	.165712	.360045	.289515	.271359
Social support	.239968	.277164	.277151	.254233
Influence at work	.270486	.256628	.253451	.253207
General health	-.041846	.244816	.097550	.102585
Quantitative demands	.089868	-.018034	.026176	.029617

* $p < 0,05$

Source: own study.

By analyzing the correlations of OCB-O and individual variables contained in the COPSOQ (for N = 300), it was found that the majority of them were positive. Only two of them can be described as negligible (namely 'Quantitative demands' and 'General health').

A weak correlation was reported for the subscales: 'Influence at work', 'Quality of leadership' and 'Social support', while a strong correlation was reported for the subscales: 'Possibilities for development', 'Meaning of work' and 'Job satisfaction'. Thus, the basis for confirming the H₁ hypothesis was found, but the identified correlations had different strengths.

In the analyzed for-profits, the highest correlations were recorded for the variables OCB-O and 'Possibilities for development', 'Meaning of work', 'Influence at work'. In public organizations, the highest correlations, compared with the rest, were observed for 'Job satisfaction' and 'Quality of leadership', whereas in nonprofit entities - for the 'Social support' subscale.

Table 4 shows the results of the correlation analysis for OCB-P and particular COPSQ subscales.

Table 4.

Spearman's rho coefficient values for the variables: OCB-P and psychosocial working conditions

OCB-P and:	Spearman's rho			
	For-profit (N = 100)	Public (N = 100)	Nonprofit (N = 100)	Total (N = 300) ⁸
Possibilities for development	.433465	.246208	.269932	.333343
Meaning of work	.428772	.415058	.100368	.319922
Job satisfaction	.314849	.445969	.222976	.319157
Quality of leadership	.162760	.286553	.151173	.185611
Influence at work	.126373	.186450	.213842	.181191
Social support	.139299	.252327	.169674	.176174
General health	.074106	.327473	.021323	.140749
Quantitative demands	.015292	.057132	-.052256	.012936

* $p < 0,05$.

Source: own study.

The correlations between OCB-P and COPSQ subscales were not as marked. Analyzing them among 300 respondents, they were indeed positive but only three were slightly above the 0.3 threshold denoting moderate correlation (those were: 'Possibilities for development', 'Meaning of work', 'Job satisfaction'). Thus, the basis for confirming the H₂ hypothesis was found, but the identified correlations had different strengths. Only three cases showed a moderate correlation.

In the analyzed enterprises, the highest correlations (moderate) were observed for the following subscales: 'Possibilities for development' and 'Meaning of work' (where 'Meaning of work' had a similar value also in public organizations). Meanwhile, 'Job satisfaction', 'Quality of leadership', 'Social support', 'General health' and 'Quantitative demands' were identified as the most important in public organizations. In nonprofits, the analyzed correlations had the highest value only in the case of 'Influence at work'.

6. Discussion & Conclusions

The research demonstrates that the manifestation of OCB-O by respondents correlated with more aspects of psychosocial working conditions than in the case of OCB-P. When analyzing OCB-O, strong correlations were reported with the following variables: ‘Possibilities for development’, ‘Job satisfaction’, and ‘Meaning of work’. In the case of OCB-P, these correlations were moderate. In addition, in the case of OCB-O, a weak relationship was also identified with the following variables: ‘Quality of leadership’, ‘Social support’, and ‘Influence at work’. These correlations were negligible for OCB-P. On the whole, the conclusion can be drawn that favourable psychosocial working conditions are associated to a greater extent with OCB-O than with OCB-P. This finds its theoretical justification in social exchange theory (compare Moorman et al., 1998; Organ, Konovsky, 1989; Wayne et al., 1997).

The results of the conducted research have therefore demonstrated that the strongest correlations with OCBs (both OCB-O and OCB-P) include aspects of psychosocial working conditions (measured using the COPSQ) such as: ‘Job satisfaction’, ‘Possibilities for development’ and ‘Meaning of work’. This confirms what emerges from the classic studies on the relationship between job satisfaction and OCBs, namely that there is a positive correlation between these variables (Bateman, Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983; Organ, Ryan, 1995; LePine et al., 2002). Previous research has also demonstrated that OCBs positively correlate with ‘Meaning of work’ (Sharma, 2019; Youn, Kim, 2022; Erks et al., 2021). However, previous findings on the relationship existing between OCB and competency development were not always unambiguous (compare Nadeem et al., 2019; Snape, Redman, 2010; Wei et al., 2010).

In the course of reviewing the literature, we found no studies examining the relationship between OCBs and influence at work and quantitative demands. Our study has filled this research gap. The obtained results demonstrate that the quantitative demands do not correlate with either OCB-O or OCB-P. However, in what concerns the influence at work variable, a weak correlation was identified for OCB-O as well as a negligible correlation for OCB-P.

The results of the conducted research have also highlighted the differences in the relationship between OCBs and individual aspects of psychosocial working conditions, depending on the type of organization (for-profit, public and non-profit). Firstly, in the case of nonprofit entities, the relationship between OCBs and particular aspects of working conditions was not as strong. The biggest difference concerned the meaning of work aspect. In the case of nonprofits, the relationship between job meaning and OCB-P was negligible, and weak with OCB-O. In the remaining organizations, these correlations were consistently strong. Nonprofit entities are mission-driven in nature, and their activity is related to the fulfilment of important social needs (compare Moore, 2000; Rothschild, Milofsky, 2006); as such, working for them is frequently associated with a high level of meaning of work. However, as our research finds, it does not correlate strongly with OCBs. These findings are inconsistent with

the findings of Erks et al. (2021). Let us note, however, that in that study the primary focus was on volunteers, whereas our research also involved paid employees employed in the NPO sector. Additionally, job satisfaction in non-profit organizations as compared to for-profit and public organizations was also less strongly correlated with either OCB-O or OCB-P. Secondly, in public organizations, a larger number of psychosocial aspects of working conditions correlated more strongly with OCB-O and OCB-P than with the other two types of entities. This concerned, for example, the relationship between OCB-P and: 'Quality of leadership', 'Social support', 'General health'. Furthermore, in public organizations, OCB-O and OCB-P correlated more strongly with general health than in the remaining entities. Thirdly, in for-profit organizations, the difference consisted in the fact that there was a weaker correlation between OCB-O and 'Quality of leadership'. Meanwhile, in the case of OCB-P, there was a strong correlation with 'Possibilities for development', contrary to the remaining entities where it was weak.

The implications and practical research recommendations arising from this study are such that managers of any type of organization should do their best to encourage employees to display OCBs (both OCB-O and OCB-P). This may be facilitated by appropriate psychosocial working conditions, especially in the areas of: possibilities for development, meaning of work, and job satisfaction.

Finally, let us point out some of the limitations of this research. The study was only quantitative and not qualitative, while the research relied solely on respondents' statements. The sample was selected purposively, which means the findings cannot be generalized, and the study involved only Polish organizations, meaning it was embedded in a specific cultural context that should be accounted for when formulating conclusions. Additionally, the research was not a longitudinal study, but a cross-sectional one. The results may be different in a longitudinal study. The data was lagged, which does not allow for strong causal inference. Moreover, the use of questionnaire-based research may have triggered a common method bias.

A better understanding of this problem area would require more in-depth qualitative research studies and the use of techniques based on direct contact, interviews, observation, case study, etc. which would help capture its nuance more thoroughly. Future research using longitudinal data is also recommended. Further research might also consider verification of our research results on the relationship existing between OCBs and 'Quantitative demands' and 'Influence at work'. At the same time, it is worth continuing research on the differences between for-profit, public and nonprofit organizations in the area of OCBs.

References

1. Alshaabani, A., Naz, F., Magda, R., Rudnák, I. (2021). Impact of perceived organizational support on OCB in the time of COVID-19 pandemic in Hungary: employee engagement and affective commitment as mediators. *Sustainability*, Vol. 13(14), p. 7800. doi: 10.3390/su13147800.
2. Babcock-Roberson, M.E., Strickland, O.J. (2010). The relationship between charismatic leadership, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 144, 3, pp. 313-326, doi: 10.1080/00223981003648336.
3. Baka, Ł. (2019). *Kopenhaski Kwestionariusz Psychospołeczny (COPSOQ II). Podręcznik do polskiej wersji narzędzia*. Warsaw: CIOP-PIB.
4. Baka, Ł., Łuczak, A., Najmiec, A. (2019). *Kopenhaski Kwestionariusz Psychospołeczny jako narzędzie do oceny psychospołecznych warunków pracy*. Warsaw: CIOP-PIB.
5. Baranik, L. Eby, L. (2016). Organizational citizenship behaviors and employee depressed mood, burnout, and satisfaction with health and life: The mediating role of positive affect. *Personnel Review*, Vol. 45, pp. 626-642, doi: 10.1108/PR-03-2014-0066.
6. Bateman, T.S., Organ, D.W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 26, pp. 587-595, doi: 10.2307/255908.
7. Berthelsen, H., Lönnblad, A., Hakanen, J., Søndergård Kristensen, T., Axtelius, B., Bjørner, J.B., Westerlund, H. (2014). Cognitive interviewing used in the development and validation of Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire in Sweden. In: T. Isidorsson, K. Håkansson, M. Oudhuis, B. Schiller (Eds.), *Nordic Working Life Conference* (pp. 232-233). Conference paper presented at the 7th Nordic working life conference. Stream 26: methodological challenges for working life and labour market studies. Göteborg: University of Gothenburg.
8. Blakely, G.L., Srivastava, A., Moorman, R.H. (2005). The effects of nationality, work role centrality, and work locus of control, on role definitions of OCB. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, Vol. 12(1), pp. 103-117, doi: 10.1177/107179190501200109.
9. Blakely, G.L., Andrews, M.C., Moorman, R.H. (2005). The moderating effects of equity sensitivity on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 20(2), pp. 259-273, doi: 10.1007/s10869-005-8263-3.
10. Borman, W.C., Motowidlo, S.J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, Vol. 10(2), pp. 99-109, doi: 10.1207/s15327043hup10023.

11. Borman, W.C., Penner, L.A., Allen, T.D., Motowidlo, S.J. (2001). Personality predictors of citizenship performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Vol. 9(1/2), pp. 52-69, doi: 10.1111/1468-2389.00163.
12. Brzeziński, J. (1999; 2011). *Metodologia badań psychologicznych*. Warsaw: PWN.
13. Burr, H., Berthelsen, H., Lluís, S., Nübling, M., Dupret, E., Demiral, Y., Oudyk, J., Kristensen, T., Llorens, S.C., Navarro, A., Lincke, H.-J., Bocéréan, Ch., Sahan, C., Smith, P., Pohrt, A. (2018). *The third version of the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire*. Retrieved from: <https://www.copsoq-network.org/assets/Uploads/The-Third-Version-of-the-Copenhagen-Psychosocial-Questionnaire.pdf>, 4.07.2022.
14. Chandra, S., Srivastava, S.C., Joseph, D. (2017). Meaning of work and organizational citizenship behavior for IT employees: the mediating role of affective commitment. *ICIS 2017 Proceedings*, No. 14. Retrieved from: <https://aisel.aisnet.org/icis2017/HumanBehavior/Presentations/14>, 5.07.2022.
15. Cheung, M.F.Y. (2013). The mediating role of perceived organizational support in the effects of interpersonal and informational justice on organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 34(6), pp. 551-572, doi:10.1108/LODJ-11-2011-0114.
16. Chiang, C.F., Hsieh, T.S. (2012). The impacts of perceived organizational support and psychological empowerment on job performance: The mediating effects of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 31(1), pp. 180-190, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2011.04.011.
17. Chuang, Y., Chiang, H., Lin, A. (2019). Helping behaviors convert negative affect into job satisfaction and creative performance: The moderating role of work competence. *Personnel Review*, Vol. 48(6), pp. 1530-1547, doi:10.1108/PR-01-2018-0038.
18. *Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (COPSOQ)*. Retrieved from: http://www.mentalhealthpromotion.net/resources/english_copsoq_2_ed_2003-pdf.pdf, 20.05.2022.
19. COPSOQ International Network. COPSOQ International Network for scientific research and risk assessment with the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (COPSOQ). Retrieved from: <http://www.copsoq-network.org/>, 5.07.2022.
20. Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the interval structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, Vol. 16, pp. 297-334, doi: 10.1007/BF02310555.
21. Dancy, C., Reidy, J. (2004). *Statistics without maths for psychology: using SPSS for Windows*. London: Prentice-Hall.
22. Dartey-Baah, K., Addo, S.A. (2019). Psychological identification with job: a leadership-OCB mediator. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. 27(3), pp. 548-565, doi: 10.1108/IJOA-10-2017-1262.

23. Das, S.C. (2021). Influence of organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) on organisational effectiveness (OE): experiences of banks in India. *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management*, Vol. 9, pp. 1-10.
24. Dudley, R. (2012). *The Shapiro–Wilk test for normality*. Retrieved from: <https://math.mit.edu/~rmd/46512/shapiro.pdf>, 4.01.2023.
25. Dupret, E., Bocéréan, C., Teherani, M., Feltrin, M., Pejtersen, J.H. (2012). Psychosocial risk assessment: French validation of the Copenhagen psychosocial questionnaire (COPSOQ). *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 40(5), pp. 482-90, doi:10.1177/1403494812453888.
26. Erks, R.L., Allen, J.A., Harland, L.K., Prange, K. (2021). Do volunteers volunteer to do more at work? The relationship between volunteering, engagement, and OCBs. *Voluntas*, Vol. 32, pp. 1285-1298, doi: 10.1007/s11266-020-00232-7.
27. Farh, J.L., Podsakoff, P.M., Organ, D.W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 16(4), pp. 705-721, doi: 10.1177/014920639001600404.
28. Finkelstein, M.A., Penner, L.A. (2004). Predicting organizational citizenship behavior: Integrating the functional and role identity approaches. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, Vol. 32(4), pp. 383-398, doi: 10.2224/sbp.2004.32.4.383.
29. Finkelstein, M.A. (2006). Dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior: Motives, motive fulfilment, and role identity. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, Vol. 34(6), pp. 603-616, doi: 10.2224/sbp.2006.34.6.603.
30. Fox, S., Spector, P.E., Goh, A., Bruursema, K., Kessler, S.R. (2009). *The deviant citizen: clarifying the measurement of Organizational citizenship behavior and its relation to counterproductive work behaviour*. Chicago: Loyola University.
31. Fox, S., Spector, P.E., Goh, A., Bruursema, K., Kessler, S.R. (2012). The deviant citizen: Measuring potential positive relations between counterproductive work behaviour and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 85, pp. 199-220, doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.2011.02032.x.
32. Fu, B., Peng, J., Wang, T. (2022). The health cost of organizational citizenship behavior: does health-promoting leadership matter? *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, Vol. 19(10), p. 6343, doi:10.3390/ijerph19106343.
33. Glińska-Neweś, A., Szostek, D. (2018). Organizational citizenship behaviors in public and private sector. *International Journal of Contemporary Management*, Vol. 17, pp. 45-58, doi: 10.4467/24498939IJCM.18.003.8382.
34. Graham, J.W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behaviour. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol. 4(4), pp. 249-270, doi: 10.1007/BF01385031.
35. Gupta, V., Singh, S., (2010). *Developing a set of high performance HRM practices and exploring its relationship with OCB and organizational justice*. Proceedings of the 2010 Meeting of the Southern Management Association, doi: 10.13140/2.1.1022.7528.

36. Halbesleben, J.R., Wheeler, A.R. (2015). To invest or not? The role of coworker support and trust in daily reciprocal gain spirals of helping behavior. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 41(6), pp. 1628-1650, doi: 10.1177/0149206312455246.
37. Han, S.J. (2010). The effect of the perception of self-efficacy and social support on organizational citizenship behavior among nurses in hospital. *Korean Journal of Adult Nursing*, Vol. 22(6), pp. 606-614.
38. Hardin, H., Azizu, A.M., Sari, W.O.D.P. (2020). the influence of competence, organizational culture, spiritual leadership on organizational behavior and its impact on lecturer performance at higher education in Baubau city. *International Journal of Management Progress*, Vol. 1(2), pp. 50-72, doi: 10.35326/ijmp.v1i2.784.
39. Harris, T.B., Li, N., Kirkman, B.L. (2014). Leader–member exchange (LMX) in context: how LMX differentiation and LMX relational separation attenuate LMX's influence on OCB and turnover intention. *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 25(2), pp. 314-328, doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.09.001.
40. Htun, N.W. (2022). *The effect of internal CSR and organizational culture on OCB and job performance of Pun Hlaing hospital* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from: <https://meral.edu.mm/record/8224/files/Nyein%20Wai%20Wai%20Htun,EMBAlI-22,%2017th.%20Bt.pdf>, 14.03.2023.
41. Im, S., Chung, Y.W. (2018). Employee volunteering meaningfulness and organizational citizenship behavior: Exploring the effects of organizational support, pride, and trust. *Sustainability*, Vol. 10(12), p. 4835, doi: 10.3390/su10124835.
42. Jain, A.K. (2009). Organizational citizenship behavior as a predictor of personal effectiveness and general health. *Academy of Taiwan Business Management Review*, Vol. 5(3), pp. 51-61.
43. Jeon, S.H., Park, M., Choi, K., Kim, M.K. (2018). An ethical leadership program for nursing unit managers. *Nurse Education Today*, Vol. 62, pp. 30-35, doi: 10.1016/j.nedt.2017.12.017.
44. Jiao, C., Richards, D.A., Zhang, K. (2011). Leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: OCB-specific meanings as mediators. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 26, pp. 11–25, doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9168-3.
45. Kim, Y.J., Van Dyne, L., Kamdar, D., Johnson, R.E. (2013). Why and when do motives matter? An integrative model of motives, role cognitions, and social support as predictors of OCB. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 121(2), pp. 231-245, doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2013.03.004.
46. Konovsky, M.A., Organ, D.W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. Vol. 17(3), pp. 253-266. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199605)17:3<253:AID-JOB747>3.0.CO;2-Q.

47. Kosenkranius, M.K., Rink, F.A., de Bloom, J., van den Heuvel, M. (2020). The design and development of a hybrid off-job crafting intervention to enhance needs satisfaction, well-being and performance: a study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *BMC Public Health*, Vol. 20, p. 115, doi: 10.1186/s12889-020-8224-9.
48. Kristensen, T.S., Hannerz, H., Høgh, A., Borg, V. (2005). The Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire—a tool for the assessment and improvement of the psychosocial work environment. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, Vol. 31(6), pp. 438-449, doi: 10.5271/sjweh.948.
49. Lee, K., Allen, N.J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87(1), pp. 131-142, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.131.
50. LePine, J.A., Erez, A., Johnson, D.E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: a critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87(1), pp. 52-65, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.52.
51. Llorens, S.C., Pérez-Franco, J., Oudyk, J., Berthelsen, H., Dupret, E., Nübling, M., Burr, H. Moncada, S. (2019). *COPSOQ III. Guidelines and questionnaire*. Retrieved from: [https://www.copsoqnetwork.org/guidelines and questionnaire/](https://www.copsoqnetwork.org/guidelines%20and%20questionnaire/), 13.11.2019.
52. MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M., Podsakoff, N.P. (2011). Challenge-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational effectiveness: do challenge-oriented behaviors really have an impact on the organization's bottom line? *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 64(3), pp. 559-592, doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01219.x.
53. MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M., Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 57(1), pp. 70-80, doi: 10.2307/1252058.
54. Maharaj, I., Schlechter, A.F. (2007). Meaning in life and meaning of work: Relationships with organisational citizenship behaviour, commitment and job satisfaction. *Management Dynamics: Journal of the Southern African Institute for Management Scientists*, Vol. 16(3), pp. 24-41.
55. Moncada, S., Utzet, M., Molinero, E., Llorens, C., Moreno, N., Galtés, A., Navarro, A. (2014). The Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire II (COPSOQ II) in Spain - A tool for psychosocial risk assessment at the workplace. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, Vol. 57(1), pp. 97-107, doi:10.1002/ajim.22238.
56. Moore, M.H. (2000). Managing for value: Organizational strategy in for-profit, nonprofit, and governmental organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 29(1), pp. 183-204, doi: 10.1177/0899764000291S.
57. Moorman, R.H., Blakely, G.L., Niehoff, B.P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior? *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 41(3), pp. 351-357, doi: 10.2307/256913.

58. Moorman, R.H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 76(6), pp. 845-855, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.76.6.845.
59. Moorman, R.H., Blakely, G.L. (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 16, pp. 127-142, doi: 10.1002/job.4030160204.
60. Moorman, R.H., Niehoff, B.P., Organ, D.W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol. 6(3), pp. 209-225, doi: 10.1007/BF01419445.
61. Moos, R. (1986). *Work Environment Scale: Manual*. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.
62. Morrison, E.W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: the importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 37(6), pp. 1543-1567, doi: 10.2307/256798.
63. Nadeem, K., Riaz, A., Danish, R.Q. (2019). Influence of high-performance work system on employee service performance and OCB: the mediating role of resilience. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, Vol. 9, pp. 1-13, doi: 10.1186/s40497-018-0142-2.
64. Naz, S., Kousir, T., Khawaja, A.O. (2021). Leadership styles as predictors of employee general health and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Asian Social Studies and Applied Research*, Vol. 2(3), pp. 417-446.
65. Niehoff, B.P., Moorman, R.H. (1993). Justice as mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 36(3), pp. 527-556, doi: 10.2307/256591.
66. Nübling, M., Stöbel, U., Hasselhorn, H.-M., Michaelis, M., Hofmann, F. (2006). Measuring psychological stress and strain at work - Evaluation of the COPSOQ Questionnaire in Germany. *Psycho-Social-Medicine*, Vol. 3, pp. 1-14.
67. Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company.
68. Organ, D.W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, Vol. 10, pp. 85-97, doi: 10.1207/s15327043hup1002_2.
69. Organ, D.W., Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 135(3), pp. 339-350, doi: 10.1080/00224545.1995.9713963.
70. Organ, D.W., Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 74(1), pp. 157-164, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.74.1.157.

71. Organ, D.W., Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, Vol. 48*, pp. 775-802, doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x.
72. *Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist*. Retrieved from: <http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/ocbcpage.html>, 26.01.2018.
73. Owor, J.J. (2015). HR practices and OCB: mediating role of employee engagement in soft drink firms in Uganda. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, Vol. 6(9)(1)*, pp. 159-170.
74. Paliga, M. (2021). *Satysfakcja z pracy i wydajność pracowników: relacja (nie)oczekiwana*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
75. Podsakoff, N.P., Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Maynes, T.D., Spoelma, T.M. (2013). Consequences of unit-level organizational citizenship behaviors: A review and recommendations for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol. 35*, pp. 87-119, doi: 10.1002/job.1911.
76. Podsakoff, N.P., Podsakoff, P.M., Whiting, S.W., Mishra, P. (2011). Effects of organizational citizenship behaviors on selection decisions in employment interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 96(2)*, pp. 310-326, doi: 10.1037/a0020948.
77. 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, Vol. 26(3)*, pp. 513-563, doi: 10.1016/S0149-2063(00)00047-7.
78. 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, Vol. 82(2)*, pp. 262-270, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.82.2.262.
79. Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: a review and suggestion for future research. *Human Performance, Vol. 10(2)*, pp. 133-151, doi: 10.1207/s15327043hup1002_5.
80. Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Bommer, W. (1996a). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management, Vol. 22*, pp. 259-298, doi: 10.1016/S0149-2063(96)90049-5.
81. Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Bommer, W.H. (1996b), Meta-analysis of the relationship between Kerr and Jermier's substitutes for leadership and employee job attitudes, role perceptions, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 81(4)*, pp. 380-399, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.380.
82. Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R., Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly, Vol. 1*, pp. 107-142, doi: 10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7.

83. Rioux, S.M., Penner, L.A. (2001). The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A motivational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86(6), pp. 1306-1314, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.6.1306.
84. Rosário, S., Azevedo, L.F., Fonseca, J.A., Nienhaus, A., Nübling, M., da Costa, J.T. (2017). The Portuguese long version of the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire II (COPSOQ II) – a validation study. *Journal of Occupational Medicine and Toxicology*, Vol. 12(24), pp. 1-17, doi: 10.1186/s12995-017-0170-9.
85. Rothschild, J., Milofsky, C. (2006). The centrality of values, passions, and ethics in nonprofit sector. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, Vol. 17(2), pp. 137-143, doi:10.1002/nml.139.
86. Schepman, S.B., Zarate, M.A. (2008). The relationship between burnout, negative affectivity and organizational citizenship behavior for human services employees. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, Vol. 2(4), pp. 242-247.
87. Shanock, L.R., Eisenberger, R. (2006). When supervisors feel supported: relationships with subordinates' perceived supervisor support, perceived organizational support, and performance. *Journal of Applied psychology*, Vol. 91(3), pp. 689-95, doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.689.
88. Shapiro, S.S., Wilk, M.B. (1965). An analysis of variance test for normality (complete samples). *Biometrika*, Vol. 52, pp. 591-611, doi: 10.2307/2333709.
89. Sharma, A. (2019). Meaningfulness of work and perceived organizational prestige as precursors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, Vol. 7(1), pp. 316-323, doi: 10.18510/hssr.2019.7136.
90. Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W., Near, J.P. (1983), Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 68, pp. 653-663, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653.
91. Snape, E., Redman, T. (2010). HRM practices, organizational citizenship behaviour, and performance: A multi-level analysis. *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 47(7), pp. 1219-1247, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00911.x.
92. Spector, P.E., Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior. Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 12, pp. 1-24, doi: 10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00049-9.
93. Spector, P.E., Fox, S. (2010). Counterproductive work behavior and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Are they opposite forms of active behavior? *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, Vol. 59(1), pp. 21-39, doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2009.00414.x.
94. Spector, P.E., Bauer, J.A., Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artifacts in the assessment of counterproductive work behaviour and organizational citizenship behavior: Do we know what we think we know? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 95(4), pp. 781–790, doi: 10.1037/a0019477.

95. Suárez-Mendoza, M., Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara, P. (2008). The impact of work alienation on organizational citizenship behavior in the Canary Islands. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. 15, pp. 56-76, doi: 10.1108/19348830710860156.
96. Sumarsi, S., Rizal, A. (2022). The effect of competence and quality of work life on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) with organizational commitment mediation. *International Journal of Social and Management Studies*, Vol. 2(6), pp. 69-88.
97. Sun, L.Y., Aryee, S., Law, K.S. (2007), High-performance human resource practices, citizenship behavior, and organizational performance: a relational perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 50(3), pp. 558-577, jstor.org/stable/20159873.
98. Turnipseed, D. (2017). Emotional Intelligence and OCB: The Moderating Role of Work Locus of Control. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 158, pp. 322-336, doi: 10.1080/00224545.2017.1346582.
99. Turnipseed, D., Murkison, G. (1996). Organization citizenship behaviour: an examination of the influence of the workplace. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 17(2), pp. 42-47, doi: 10.1108/01437739610111222.
100. Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L.L., Parks, J.M. (1995), Extra-role behaviors: in pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 17, pp. 215-285.
101. Van Dyne, L., Graham, J.W., Dienesch, R.M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management*, Vol. 37(4), pp. 765-802, doi: 10.2307/256600.
102. Wang, L., Dong, X., An, Y., Chen, C., Eckert, M., Sharplin, G., Fish, J., Fan, X. (2022). Relationships between job burnout, ethical climate and organizational citizenship behaviour among registered nurses: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, doi:10.1111/ijn.13115.
103. Wayne, S.J., Shore, L.M., Liden, R.C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 40, pp. 82-111, doi: 10.2307/257021.
104. Wei, Y.C., Han, T.S., Hsu, I.C. (2010). High-performance HR practices and OCB: A cross-level investigation of a causal path. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 21(10), pp. 1631-1648, doi: 10.1080/09585192.2010.500487.
105. Wemken, G., Janurek, J., Junker, N.M., Häusser, J.A. (2021). The impact of social comparisons of job demands and job control on well-being. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, Vol. 13, pp. 419-436, doi: 10.1111/aphw.12257.
106. Widerszal-Bazyl, M. (2017). Kopenhaski Kwestionariusz Psychospołeczny (COPSOQ) – właściwości psychometryczne wybranych skal w polskiej wersji. *Medycyna Pracy*, No. 68(3), pp. 329-348, doi: 10.13075/mp.5893.00443.

107. Williams, L.J., Anderson, S.E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 17(3), pp. 601-617, doi: 10.1177/014920639101700305.
108. Wortler, B., Van Yperen, N.W., Barelds, D.P.H. (2019). Do individual differences in need strength moderate the relations between basic psychological need satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior? *Motivation and Emotion*, Vol. 44, pp. 315-328, doi: 10.1007/s11031-019-09775-9.
109. Yang, F., Zhang, Y. (2022). Beyond formal exchange: An informal perspective on the role of leader humor on employee OCB. *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 151, pp. 118-125, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.06.054.
110. Youn, H., Kim, J.-H. (2022). Corporate Social Responsibility and hotel employees' Organizational Citizenship Behavior: the roles of organizational pride and meaningfulness of work. *Sustainability*, Vol. 14, p. 2428, doi: 10.3390/su14042428.
111. Yurcu, G., Colakglu, U., Atay, H. (2015). The effect of organizational citizenship behavior on subjective well-being. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol. 6(1), pp. 120-130.

Footnotes

-
- ¹ Currently, the COPSOQ III is available in short, middle and long versions (Burr et al., 2018; Llorens et al., 2019).
 - ² The scales forming part of the tool should exhibit a value of the α -Cronbach's coefficient larger than 0.7. Questionnaires whose α -Cronbach's coefficient is smaller than 0.6 should not be used (Brzeziński, 2011).
 - ³ Except for the 'Social support' subscale in public organizations. As the variables OCB-O, OCB-P and social support had distributions close to normal, the use of Pearson's r correlation coefficient was considered to analyse the relationships between them. However, the analyses undertaken excluded this possibility, as the relationships between these variables did not appear to be linear. Since the conditions for calculating Pearson's r correlation coefficient were not met, again, it became necessary to use its non-parametric counterpart, the Spearman rank correlation coefficient.
 - ⁴ If the p-value is less than the conventional level of 0.05, then we reject the hypothesis of normality (Dudley, 2012).
 - ⁵ Calculations were made for N = 300, except for the 'Quality of leadership' scale (where N = 296). The difference is due to the fact that four respondents (in leadership positions) did not have a direct supervisor.
 - ⁶ Interpretation of Spearman's rho: ≥ 0.70 (very strong correlation), 0.40-0.69 (strong correlation), 0.30-0.39 (moderate correlation), 0.20-0.29 (weak correlation), 0.01-0.19 (no or negligible correlation) (Dancey, Reidy, 2004).
 - ⁷ Let us recall, that calculations were made for N=300, with the exception of the 'Quality of leadership' scale (N = 296).
 - ⁸ Let us recall once again, that calculations were made for N=300, with the exception of the 'Quality of leadership' scale (N = 296).