

ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOURS AND WORK MOTIVATION OF EMPLOYEES IN FOR-PROFIT, PUBLIC AND NONPROFIT ORGANISATIONS

Hanna BORTNOWSKA^{1*}, Bartosz SEILER²

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

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

* Correspondence author

Purpose: The purpose of the article is to determine the correlation that exists between OCB and work motivation among employees in for-profit, public, and nonprofit organisations.

Design/methodology/approach: The cross-sectoral study was conducted in 2022. The sample consisted of employees representing three types of organisations: for-profit, public and nonprofit, one hundred from each type of entity mentioned. The opinions of the respondents were collected using a Google form and by means of a printed version of the survey questionnaire. In the research there were used the 12-item OCB scale developed by Spector. Employee motivation was examined using the WEIMS-PL scale, which is a translated equivalent of the Canadian Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale (WEIMS).

Findings: The correlations between the OCB-P subscale (towards people in the organisation) and the WEIMS-PL subscales were mostly positive but only negligible. Stronger correlations were observed between the WEIMS-PL and OCB-O (towards the organisation) subscales, particularly in the for-profit and nonprofit entities. In most cases they were positive and moderate in strength. A strong correlation was found between intrinsic motivation and OCB-O in NPOs and a slightly weaker one in for-profits. In public organisations this correlation was negligible. The correlations between OCB-O and 3 of the 4 subtypes of extrinsic motivation were also stronger in NPOs and for-profits than in public organisations: introjected regulation, identified regulation and integrated regulation.

Research limitations/implications: The study was only quantitative and not qualitative, relying solely on respondents' statements. The sample was purposively selected, which means that the results cannot be generalised, and the study only involved Polish organisations, which means that it was embedded in a specific cultural context that should be taken into account when formulating conclusions. In addition, the research was not longitudinal but cross-sectional. The results might be different in a longitudinal study. The data were lagged, which does not allow for strong causal inferences. Moreover, the use of questionnaire-based research may have triggered a common method bias.

Originality/value: The contribution of this study is that the OCB-WM correlation analysis was carried out in for-profit, public and nonprofit organisations, which has not been done before.

Keywords: organisational citizenship behaviours, work motivation, for-profit organisations, public organisations, nonprofit organisations.

Category of the paper: Research paper.

1. Introduction

From the classic Weberian perspective, an organisation is perceived as composed of a hierarchy of authority, division of labour and coordination mechanisms (regulations, procedures). At the end of the last century, the organisational citizenship dimension began to be more strongly emphasised (Bateman, Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983; Borman et al., 2001), even drawing parallels to political philosophy (Graham, 1991; Van Dyne et al., 1994). One of the concepts of organisational citizenship embraced by the literature is organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB).

Researchers dealing with the problem of citizenship behaviours in organisations point out that the success of an enterprise depends not only on how employees handle assigned tasks but also on whether they support the psychosocial context in which work takes place (Borman, Motowidlo, 1993; Organ, 1997; cf. Podsakoff et al., 2013; Podsakoff et al., 1997) - that is, whether they help their colleagues, interact with the organisation as a whole, participate in its functioning, voluntarily engage in work that does not formally enter the scope of their duties. Let us note that managers have a relatively high ability to control formal factors: tasks assigned to an employee occupying a specific post (often outlined in the job description) or the structure of positions. However, this is not so when it comes to engagement that goes beyond the scope of typical employee duties. These are more likely to be linked with factors that are, to a certain extent, beyond the direct control of managers: individual traits, professed values, displayed attitudes (cf. Smith et al., 1983; Farh et al., 1990; Williams, Anderson, 1991; McNeely, Meglino, 1992; Moorman et al., 1993; Organ, Lingl, 1995; Konovsky, Organ, 1996; Borman et al., 2001; Spector, Fox, 2002; Blakely, Andrews, Moorman, 2005; Blakely, Srivastava, Moorman, 2005; van Dick et al., 2006; Turnipseed, 2017; Urbini et al., 2020).

In the context of employees' citizenship behaviours within the organisation, the motivational aspect seems to play an important role. Rioux and Penner (2001), Finkelstein and Penner (2004; Finkelstein, 2006; cf. Finkelstein, 2008; Finkelstein et al., 2005) developed the area of research where motivators are approached as correlates of citizenship behaviours. We learn from the literature that OCB is a motivation-based behaviour, meaning that motivation spawns OCB (Davila, Finkelstein, 2013). In turn, the relationship between OCB and motivation has been examined, including as a mediating variable (Finkelstein, 2011; Ahmed, Khan, 2016; Shaaban, 2018; Margahana et al., 2018; Widarko, Anwarodin, 2022).

Research has shown that employees may differ depending on the type of the organisation. Cross-sectoral differences in work motivation, for instance, have been found among employees of for-profit and not-for-profit entities (De Cooman et al., 2011). A similar disparity was observed between public and nonprofit managers (Lee, Wilkins, 2011). Importantly, nonprofit entities rely on volunteers who differ from paid employees in the following areas: dispositions

(Elshaug, Metzger, 2001; Mitani, 2014) and attitudes (Laczo, Hanish, 1999; Pearce, 1993; cf. Liao-Troth, 2001).

As no publications were found that benchmarked OCB and motivation in organisations representing three major economic sectors, it was decided to undertake this research to fill this gap. The purpose of this article is to determine the correlation that exists between OCB and work motivation among employees in for-profit, public, and non-profit organisations. To this end, we conducted a survey.

The paper is divided into the following sections: introduction, literature review, methods, results, discussion, and conclusions. In the introduction, the research gap and the purpose are synthetically laid out. In the first main section, the results of the literature review on OCBs as well as work motivation were presented alongside the differences between for-profit, public and nonprofit organisations. Section two contains a description of research methodology, while section three is where the results are discussed. In section four, the findings were benchmarked with some of the findings of other authors. In the conclusion, implications for managers as well as limitations and future research suggestions were shared.

2. Literature review

2.1. Organisational citizenship behaviours

In the literature there are several concepts aiming to encapsulate behaviours geared towards helping colleagues and supporting organisations: Organizational citizenship behaviours (Bateman, Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983; Organ, 1988; Organ, Konovsky, 1989), Prosocial organizational behaviours (Brief, Motowidlo, 1986), Extra-role behaviours (Van Dyne et al., 1995), Contextual performance (Borman, Motowidlo, 1997), Citizenship performance (Borman et al., 2001).

According to Organ (1988), OCB is an individual behaviour that is discretionary, not explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organisation. Prompted to consider whether OCB covers extra-role behaviours as well, Organ modified his own definition stating that OCB supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place (Organ, 1997; cf. Morrison, 1994; Van Dyne et al., 1994). It is worth noting that this support may benefit the organisation in general or specific people, in which case it indirectly contributes to organisation development (Williams, Anderson, 1991).

In the course of conceptualising the problem at hand, researchers identified dimensions of OCB. Smith et al. (1983) distinguished altruism and generalised compliance, while for Organ (1988) that was: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue.

Podsakoff et al. (2000), based on examination of literature, singled out the following: helping behaviour, sportsmanship, organisational loyalty, organisational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, self-development.

2.2. Work extrinsic and intrinsic motivation

One of the most well-established theories of work motivation is Self-Determination Theory (SDT) (Deci, Ryan, 2000; Ryan, Deci, 2017, 2020). It suggests that ‘employees’ performance and their well-being are affected by the type of motivation they have for their job activities. SDT therefore differentiates types of motivation and maintains that different types of motivation have functionally different catalysers, concomitants, and consequences’ (Deci et al., 2017, p. 20).

SDT proposes that motivation lies on a continuum ranging from amotivation, extrinsic motivation to intrinsic motivation (Ryan, Deci, 2000). At the beginning of this continuum is amotivation which refers to the state of being unmotivated or lacking the willingness or intention to act (Ryan, Deci, 2000). It can occur, for instance, when an employee does not believe that he or she can perform in ways required of him or her (Deci, Ryan, 1985b). At the opposite end of the continuum is an intrinsic motivation which is characterised as the performance of an activity for its inherent satisfaction (Ryan, Deci, 2000). In between the extreme poles of the continuum there is an extrinsic motivation that can be controlled or autonomous (Chua, Ayoko, 2021). The SDT theory outlines four types of extrinsic motivation that differ in the degree to which the motivation has been internalised and assimilated with the self. The behaviours that follow from these four types of extrinsic motivation differ in their degree of autonomy. Those that have been more fully internalised will be the basis for more autonomous or self-determined actions. Thus, the degree of internalisation and the type of regulation that follows from these degrees of internalisation are ordered along a relative autonomy continuum’ (Deci, Ryan, 2009, p. 443).

According to Deci and Ryan (1985b, 2000; cf. Kotera et al., 2018) extrinsic motivation can be categorised into four subtypes: integrated regulation, identified regulation, introjected regulation and external regulation. They explain that employees with external regulation work only because that brings them an external reward. Introjected regulation arises when workers are motivated by self-image; they engage in work because they want other people to see them in a certain way. Identified regulation relates to employees who acknowledge the value of the work activity; they work because they understand that it is important for them. Integrated regulation arises when an employee has fully integrated a motivation within themselves; they work because they believe that work is a part of their identity.

The three lower forms of motivation (amotivation, external regulation, introjected regulation) are referred to as non-self-determined motivation or controlled motivation, while the three higher forms of motivation (identified regulation, integrated regulation, and intrinsic

motivation) are classified as self-determined motivation or autonomous motivation (Gagne, Forest, 2008).

2.3. Organisational citizenship behaviours and work motivation

The literature points out that motives may play an important role in OCB (Rioux, Penner, 2001). OCB is a motivation-based behaviour, which means OCB develops due to motivation (Davila, Finkelstein, 2013). The research also suggests that not all employees who engage in OCBs and other forms of voluntary helping behaviours expect recognition or some form of reward for their actions (Lyons et al., 2022).

According to other researchers, motivation and OCB are highly correlated (Organ, 1988; LePine et al., 2002; cf. Jacobsen, Beehr, 2022; Morgahana et al., 2018; Osman et al. 2015; Umar et al., 2022; Widarko, Anwarodin, 2022). Similarly, Tang and Ibrahim (1998) found a significant link between an individual's motivation and OCB, and Faria (2022) stated that three dimensions of work motivation (work structure motivation, commitment motivation, goal-setting motivation) have a significant effect on the organisational citizenship behaviours. Meanwhile, Wyche-Seawood (2019) conducted research among public-sector workers to determine that employees' levels of motivation may not result from citizenship behaviours alone, but rather employees' motives for citizenship behaviours.

Finkelstein (2011, p. 19) suggests that 'motives, and the types of OCB they foster, derive in part from individual differences in motivational orientation. Intrinsically-motivated individuals manifested internal, other-oriented motives for OCB, while those with extrinsic orientations were driven largely by external, self-focused objectives'. According to Widarko and Anwarodin (2022, p. 123) 'employees with high intrinsic motivation impact organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) better because they show an attitude of working more than other employees as a form of their perspective of responsibility'.

Enwereuzor et al. (2015) observed that external regulation and intrinsic motivation contributed significantly in negative and positive directions to the prediction of OCB, respectively, whereas identified regulation, amotivation, integrated regulation and introjected regulation all failed to contribute significantly to OCB. Whereas, van der Broeck et al. (2021) found that identified regulation is more powerful in predicting organisational citizenship behaviours.

For the purposes of comparison, let us point out that Ahmed and Khan (2016) found that both extrinsic and intrinsic motivations affect employee commitment to organisational citizenship behaviours, and in the view of Shaaban (2018), OCB can be developed throughout the application of extrinsic motivation more than intrinsic motivation among employees. Barbuto and Story (2011; cf. Barbuto et al., 2001), however, found no relationships between intrinsic process motivation and organisational citizenship behaviours, but they did find a significant negative correlation between employees' instrumental motivation and OCB, also discovering that self-concept external motivation was negatively related to OCB,

self-concept internal motivation was positively related to OCB-total, and goal internalisation was not related to OCB.

The literature also points to factors which mediate the relationship between work motivation and OCB, e.g. job satisfaction, job involvement, psychological empowerment, perceived organisational support, employee engagement, organisational justice and reward matching with personal goals (Ahmed, Kahn, 2016; cf. Hidayah, Hendarsjah, 2021; Kim et al., 2020; Rumengan et al. 2022; Uliyah, Ariyanto, 2021).

The presented study was conducted in for-profit and/or public organisations. However, there are few studies concerning volunteers as a specific employee category (characteristic of nonprofit entities). Van Schie et al. (2015) found that, for them, general self-determined motivation enhanced work engagement, whereas OCB was solely linked to organisation-focused, self-determined motivation. No comparative studies were identified that examine the relationships between the dimensions of work motivation (via WEIMS) and OCB (OCB-O, OCB-P) in three types of organisations: for-profit, public, and nonprofit. The possibility of existence of such difference is nevertheless implied by comparative studies carried out in these listed entities.

2.4. Differences between for-profit, public and nonprofit organisations

Working conditions in the discussed organisations provide a context that may potentially relate to OCB. It is indicated that the differences between for-profit, public and nonprofit organisations concern two basic issues (Moore, 2000): defining source of revenues and the value produced by organisations. The analysis of available empirical comparative studies allows for flagging differences between entities in each of the three sectors also in several other areas: 1. motives, values and practices of managers (cf. Lee, Wilkins, 2011; LeRoux, Feeney, 2013; Miller-Stevens et al., 2015; Miller-Stevens et al., 2018), 2. motives, values and attitudes of employees (Borzaga, Tortia, 2006; De Cooman et al., 2011; Goulet, Frank, 2002; Hamann, Foster, 2014; Lyons et al., 2006; Miller-Stevens et al., 2015; Mirvis, 1992; Stater, Stater, 2019), 3. work organisation (Benevene et al., 2011; Ben-Ner, Ren, 2015; Kalleberg et al., 2006; Matz-Costa, Pitt-Catsouphes, 2010; McNamara et al., 2012), 4. organisational culture (Bercea et al., 2019; Emanuele, Higgins, 2000; Sarros et al., 2011; van der Wal et al., 2008), 5. production scope and service quality (Amirkhanyan et al., 2008; Larsson et al., 2022; Trætteberg, Fladmoe, 2020), 6. image and reputation of organisations and their employees (Pepermans, Peiffer, 2022; Peiffer et al., 2020).

The results of the literature analysis became the basis for formulating the research hypotheses. They were presented in Table 1.

Table 1.
Research hypotheses

H _{1a} : There is a strong correlation between intrinsic motivation and OCB-O in for-profit organisations.	H _{2a} : There is a strong correlation between intrinsic motivation and OCB-O in public organisations.	H _{3a} : There is a strong correlation between intrinsic motivation and OCB-O in nonprofit organisations.
H _{1b} : There is a strong correlation between intrinsic motivation and OCB-P in for-profit organisations.	H _{2b} : There is a strong correlation between intrinsic motivation and OCB-P in public organisations.	H _{3b} : There is a strong correlation between intrinsic motivation and OCB-P in nonprofit organisations.
H _{1c} : There is a strong correlation between extrinsic motivation and OCB-O in for-profit organisations.	H _{2c} : There is a strong correlation between extrinsic motivation and OCB-O in public organisations.	H _{3c} : There is a strong correlation between extrinsic motivation and OCB-O in nonprofit organisations.
H _{1d} : There is a strong correlation between extrinsic motivation and OCB-P in for-profit organisations.	H _{2d} : There is a strong correlation between extrinsic motivation and OCB-P in public organisations.	H _{3d} : There is a strong correlation between extrinsic motivation and OCB-P in nonprofit organisations.
H _{1e} : There is a strong correlation between amotivation and OCB-O in for-profit organisations.	H _{2e} : There is a strong correlation between amotivation and OCB-O in public organisations.	H _{3e} : There is a strong correlation between amotivation and OCB-O in nonprofit organisations.
H _{1f} : There is a strong correlation between amotivation and OCB-P in for-profit organisations.	H _{2f} : There is a strong correlation between amotivation and OCB-P in public organisations.	H _{3f} : There is a strong correlation between amotivation and OCB-P in nonprofit organisations.

Source: own study.

To verify the research hypotheses, a survey was conducted.

3. Methods

The research process consisted of the following stages: literature analysis, research gap identification, formulation of research problem and hypotheses, sample and research tools selection, data collection and analysis, formulation of conclusions, indication of research limitations and future directions.

The cross-sectoral study was conducted in 2022, in Poland's Lubuskie Voivodeship. Participation in the survey was voluntary. The sample consisted of employees representing three types of organisations: for-profit, public and nonprofit, one hundred from each type of entity mentioned. The sample was non-random as there was no list of employees working in the Lubuskie Voivodeship. The opinions of the respondents were collected using a Google form and by means of a printed version of the survey questionnaire, through direct contact and in cooperation with the Social Economy Support Centre in Zielona Góra (Ośrodek Wsparcia Ekonomii Społecznej).

3.1. Sample

There were more women (60.67%) than men among the respondents. The average age of the participants of the research was 37.9 years. Most (34.67%) had less than 3 years' work experience in their current organisation, slightly fewer had more than 10 years (33.33%) or between 4 and 10 years (32%).

Most representatives of profit and public entities held managerial positions (79.5%). More than a third (37.5%) worked in large organisations and more than a quarter (25.5%) in medium-sized ones. The least number worked in small (22.5%) or micro (14.5%) organisations. Most NPO representatives were board members (43%). One in four (26%) was a paid employee. Members of organisations (19%) and volunteers (12.00%) were less represented. They were mainly employed by associations (79%) or foundations (18%). More than one in three NPO representatives (38%) worked in an entity with 10 or fewer employees, and fewer respondents worked in an institution with 11 to 20 employees (31%) or more than 50 employees (22%). Those working in organisations with between 20 and 49 employees were the least likely (9%).

3.2. Measures

In the course of our own research we used the 12-item OCB scale developed by Spector (Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Checklist; Retrieved from: <http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/ocbcp.html>, 26.01.2018). 6 items concerned behaviours directed toward the organisation (OCB-O), others 6 – behaviours toward people in the organisation (OCB-P). Respondents were asked to select one of the answers on a 5-point scale.

Employee motivation was examined using the WEIMS-PL scale (Chrupała-Pniak, Grabowski, 2016), which is a translated equivalent of the Canadian Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale (WEIMS) developed by Tremblay et al. (2009) based on self-determination theory (Deci, Ryan, 2000). This tool consists of 18 statements measuring various types of work motivation, and more precisely: 6 subscales including 3 statements each: amotivation (AMO), extrinsic motivation (integrated regulation – INTEG, identified regulation – IDEN, introjected regulation – INTRO, external regulation – EXT), intrinsic motivation (IM). Respondents rated the statements using a 7-point Likert scale¹.

The questionnaire was sent out to three hundred employees representing one of three types of organisations: for-profit, public and nonprofit. Participation in the study was voluntary.

¹ Work self-determination index (W-SDI) can also be calculated using this scale through the following formula: $(+ 3 \times IM) + (+2 \times INTEG) + (+1 \times IDEN) + (-1 \times INTRO) + (-2 \times EXT) + (-3 \times AMO)$. The range of possible scores on the W-SDI is between ± 36 for a 7-point Likert-type scale (and ± 24 for a 5-point Likert-type scale). The total score derived from this formula reflects individuals' relative level of self-determination. A positive score indicates a self-determined profile and a negative score - a nonself-determined profile (Tremblay et al., 2009).

3.3. 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: $\alpha = 0.804436776$ (OCB), while $\alpha = 0.857749793$ (WEIMS-PL)².


The performed analyses demonstrated that most of the variables were not distributed close to normal. This was confirmed by the results of the Shapiro-Wilk tests (Shapiro, Wilk, 1965)³ (Table 2).

Table 2.

Shapiro-Wilk test results for variables included in the OCB and WEIMS-PL scales

Variables	P		
	For-profit (N = 100)	Public (N = 100)	Nonprofit (N = 100)
OCB-O	.00697	.21005	.23868
OCB-P	.03042	.61166	.38331
Amotivation	.00012	.00089	.00001
External regulation	.00001	.00233	.00000
Introjected regulation	.16285	.18673	.02781
Identified regulation	.00052	.01488	.02839
Integrated regulation	.03164	.00069	.00005
Intrinsic motivation	.00120	.00230	.00000

Explanation:

 - rejection the hypothesis of normality

Source: own study.

As a result, 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 coefficient⁴.

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 If the p-value is less than the conventional level of 0.05, then we reject the hypothesis of normality (Dudley, 2012).

⁴ As the variables OCB-O, OCB-P and introjected regulation 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. Results

Research participants used a 5-point Likert scale to respond to the statements included in the questionnaire used to assess OCB. The average ratings for both subscales of OCB in each of the three types of organisations: for-profit, public and nonprofit were compared (Table 3).

Table 3.
OCB-O and OCB-P in for-profit, public and nonprofit organisations

Organisational citizenship behaviours (OCB subscales)	Average		
	For-profit (N = 100)	Public (N = 100)	Nonprofit (N = 100)
OCB-O	2.8367	2.9250	3.1517
OCB-P	2.7433	2.8700	3.0367

Source: own study.

The lowest averages, both in OCB-O and OCB-P, were reported in for-profits (2.8367 and 2.7433, respectively). Meanwhile, the highest averages were noted in the case of NPOs (3.1517 and 3.0367, respectively).

Respondents also assessed their work motivation using the WEIMS-PL questionnaire. A 7-point Likert scale was used to provide the ratings. The obtained results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4.
Evaluation of work motivation - the perspective of research participants

Work motivation (WEIMS-PL subscales)	Average		
	For-profit (N = 100)	Public (N = 100)	Nonprofit (N = 100)
Amotivation	2.6767	2.8600	2.6900
External regulation	5.3700	4.5233	3.1033
Introjected regulation	4.2567	4.0967	4.2700
Identified regulation	4.6600	4.5000	4.6900
Integrated regulation	4.5367	4.8267	5.2267
Intrinsic motivation	4.8267	5.0267	5.3167

Source: own study.

The highest level of amotivation was found in public organisations (2.8600). External regulation (for which it is typical that employees work only because that brings them an external reward) was the most prevalent among representatives of for-profits (5.3700), and least prevalent in NPOs (3.1033). Introjected regulation, which arises when workers are motivated by self-image, was higher among employees of public organisations (4.0967) than among the rest (NPO: 4.2700; F-P: 4.2567). Identified regulation, integrated regulation and intrinsic motivation (which are classified as self-determined motivation or autonomous motivation) were highest in the case of employees of nonprofit entities.

In all three types of organisations, the WPAR index assumed positive values, which confirmed the existence of autonomous regulation in the performance of work among the analysed three respondent groups. It had the highest value among employees of NPOs (12.5467)

and was markedly lower in the other two groups: 7.5100 (public organisations) and 5.1867 (for- profits).

In order to verify the research hypotheses describing the correlation between OCB (OCB-O, OCB-P) and work motivation (amotivation, external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, integrated regulation, intrinsic motivation) in three types of organisation, a correlation analysis was performed using Spearman's rho coefficient. This decision, as already mentioned, was motivated by the failure of both analysed variables to meet the assumptions regarding the normality of distribution. The results of calculations concerning Spearman's rho coefficient were interpreted in accordance with the Dancey and Reidy (2004) classification⁵.

Spearman's rho values were analysed separately for 2 OCB subscales and for 6 WEIMS-PL subscales (Table 5).

Table 5.

Spearman's rho coefficient values for the variables: OCB-O, OCB-P and WEIMS-PL subscales

Variables	Spearman's rho		
	For-profit (N = 100)	Public (N = 100)	Nonprofit (N = 100)
	OCB-O		
Amotivation	-.000318	-.015376	-.114084
External regulation	-.011516	.078267	.001456
Introjected regulation	.461482	.189226	.364582
Identified regulation	.386466	.251554	.359514
Integrated regulation	.397350	.212898	.370762
Intrinsic motivation	.385293	.063751	.417530
	OCB-P		
Amotivation	.103052	.024313	-.145535
External regulation	-.110492	-.094700	-.062949
Introjected regulation	.288390	.060047	.148992
Identified regulation	.083256	.164430	.062105
Integrated regulation	.187254	.101587	.203752
Intrinsic motivation	.083497	-.080731	.148903

* $p < 0,05$.

Source: own study.

Most of the research hypotheses were rejected. Strong correlation was identified only in the case of the variables: intrinsic motivation and OCB-O in NPOs ($r = .417530$, $p < 0.05$; hypothesis H3a was confirmed). The correlation between introjected regulation and OCB-O in for-profits was also strong (hypothesis H_{1c} was partly confirmed). Some of the identified correlations were of moderate strength.

⁵ 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).

The correlations between the OCB-P subscale and the WEIMS-PL subscales were mostly positive but negligible. Only in two cases Spearman's rho coefficient adopted values indicating a weak correlation: OCB-P and introjected regulation in for-profits ($r = .288390$, $p < 0.05$) and OCB-P and integrated regulation in nonprofits ($r = .203752$, $p < 0.05$).

Stronger correlations were observed between the WEIMS-PL and OCB-O subscales, particularly in for-profits and nonprofits (they were not as marked in public organisations). In most cases they had positive and of moderate strength. A strong correlation was identified for the intrinsic motivation and OCB-O in NPOs ($r = .417530$, $p < 0.05$), and a slightly lower one ($r = .385293$, $p < 0.05$) was recorded in for-profits. In public organisations this correlation was negligible. In nonprofits and for-profits, compared to public entities, the correlations between OCB-O and 3 out of 4 subtypes of extrinsic motivation were also more pronounced: introjected regulation, identified regulation and integrated regulation.

In for-profits, the most significant relationship was observed for OCB-O and introjected regulation ($r = .461482$, $p < 0.05$); in NPOs, between OCB-O and intrinsic motivation ($r = .417530$, $p < 0.05$). In both, the correlations were strong. In public organisations, the OCB-O correlated most strongly with identified regulation, although in this case the value of Spearman's coefficient showed only a weak correlation ($r = .251554$, $p < 0.05$).

5. Discussion

According to numerous researchers, motivation and OCB are strongly correlated (Organ, 1988; LePine et al., 2002; cf. Morgahana et al., 2018; Osman et al., 2015; Tang, Ibrahim, 1998; Umar et al., 2022; Widarko, Anwarodin, 2022). Many of the previous studies tackling this problem area concerned correlations between work motivation and OCB (e.g. Barbuto, Story, 2011; Enwereuzor et al., 2015; Margahana et al., 2018; Osman et al., 2015; Shaaban, 2018; Widarko, Anwarodin, 2022). However, the relationship between work motivation and OCB-P or OCB-O has rarely been explored (e.g. Barbuto et al., 2001; Finkelstein, 2011). In addition, such research was usually carried out in organisations of a select type [e.g. in public entities – Tang and Ibrahim (1998), Umar et al. (2022), Wyche-Seawood (2019); industry – Barbuto and Story (2011); Barbuto et al. (2001)]. This study contributes to expansion of current knowledge, including by issues related to the comparison of for-profit, nonprofit and public entities.

Based on the results of the conducted research, it can be generalised that work motivation correlates with OCB-O, but not with OCB-P. Note that van Schie et al. (2015) found a (slightly) different type of relationship, showing that in the case of volunteers, OCB-O correlates with organisation-focused motivation. It is noteworthy that Millette and Gagné (2008) did not find this type of relationship at all. However, in our study we show that work motivation (in subtypes: introjected regulation, identified regulation, integrated regulation, intrinsic

motivation) correlates with OCB-O (at least with moderate strength), and this applies to both NPO employees (not only volunteers) and for-profit employees. We learn after Morrison (1994) that citizenship behaviour is a function of how employees perceive their job responsibilities. It cannot be ruled out that supporting the organisation as a whole is more obvious to employees, and consequently, is more closely linked with work motivation. Or perhaps behaviours benefiting the organisation are more noticeable and more attractive as far as image is concerned?

Approaching this problem in more detail, there is clearly no relationship between OCB and external regulation. This corresponds to the findings of Barbuto and Scholl (1999), and an explanation for that may be that OCB involves behaviours that are not rewarded by a formal reward system. However, other types of regulation characteristic of extrinsic motivation may indeed be an important correlate of OCB. In the case of for-profit employees, the importance of introjected regulation comes to mind. Let us therefore stress the issue of image-related motivators. According to Rioux and Penner (2001), in some cases OCB may be motivated by the so-called impression management. In other words, these behaviours may serve to shape the image in the eyes of colleagues and superiors. Bolino (1999) goes as far as using the phrase 'good actor' in the context of OCB (as opposed to the concept of 'good soldier' – cf. Organ 1988). This would require us to consider whether the surveyed employees of commercial entities were particularly willing to engage in behaviour for the benefit of the organisation for instrumental reasons (cf. Barbuto, Story, 2011; Barbuto et al., 2001).

In employees of nonprofits, a very important correlate of OCB is intrinsic motivation, often identified among volunteer workers (Cappellari, Turati, 2004; Finkelstein, 2009; Fiorillo, 2011). However, a correlation between intrinsic motivation and OCB was also identified in employees of for-profits. The obtained results therefore differed from Barbuto and Story (2011; cf. Barbuto et al., 2001) who found no relationships between intrinsic process motivation and organisational citizenship behaviours in any of the four agricultural businesses. However, strong correlation between intrinsic motivation and OCB of teachers (as public-sector employees) were identified by Enwereuzor et al. (2015).

Another conclusion concerns the statement that, in the case of the correlation between motivation and OCB-O, differences were reported between employees of different types of organisations. Let us note that the correlation between the discussed variables did not apply to employees in the public sector. Similar results were obtained by Wyche-Seawood (2019) who found that employees' levels of motivation may not result from citizenship behaviours. Let us also recall that relationships between OCB and motivation can be mediated by different factors such as (Ahmed, Kahn, 2016): job satisfaction, job involvement, psychological empowerment, perceived organisational support, employee engagement, organisational justice, etc. Research indicates the three types of organisations differ in terms of motives (De Cooman et al., 2011) and job attitudes (including job satisfaction, organisational commitment, loyalty, social support) (Goulet, Frank, 2002; Borzaga, Tortia, 2006; Lyons et al., 2006; Hamann, Foster,

2014; Stater and Stater, 2019). It is therefore plausible that one of these factors accounts for the differences between the entities at hand. This will require thorough verification in subsequent research.

6. Conclusions

The main contribution arising from this study concerns the performance of the OCB-WM correlation analysis in for-profit, public and nonprofit organisations, something that has not been done before. The conducted research demonstrated that work motivation correlates more strongly with OCB-O than with OCB-P. However, strong correlation was reported only for the variables: intrinsic motivation and OCB-O in NPOs, as well as for introjected regulation and OCB-O in for-profits. Some of the identified relationships between OCB-O and WM were of moderate strength. Finally, the correlations between OCB-P and the subtypes of WM were mostly positive but negligible. Only in two cases weak correlation was found, namely: between OCB-P and introjected regulation in for-profits, and between OCB-P and integrated regulation in nonprofits.

The implications and practical research recommendations arising from this study are such that managers of any type of organisation should motivate employees to display OCBs (both OCB-O and OCB-P).

There are some limitations of this research. The study was only quantitative and not qualitative, relying solely on respondents' statements. The sample was purposively selected, which means that the results cannot be generalised, and the study only involved Polish organisations, which means that it was embedded in a specific cultural context that should be taken into account when formulating conclusions. In addition, the research was not longitudinal but cross-sectional. The results might be different in a longitudinal study. The data were lagged, which does not allow for strong causal inferences. Moreover, the use of questionnaire-based research may have triggered a common method bias.

A better understanding of this issue would require more in-depth qualitative research and the use of techniques based on direct contact, interviews, observation, case study, etc. which would help to capture its nuances more thoroughly. Future research using longitudinal data is also recommended. It is also worthwhile to continue studies on the differences between for-profit, public and non-profit organisations in the area of OCBs and work motivation, as well as to identify factors that mediate or moderate this relationship.

References

1. Ahmed, S.W., Khan, T. (2016). Does Motivation Lead to Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Theoretical Review. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research: Administration and Management*, Vol. 16(7), pp. 43-49.
2. Amirkhanyan, A.A., Kim, H.J., Lambright, K.T. (2008). Does the public sector outperform the nonprofit and for-profit sectors? Evidence from a national panel study on nursing home quality and access. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management: The Journal of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management*, Vol. 27(2), pp. 326-353. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30162847>.
3. Barbuto, J.E., Brown, L.L., Wilhite, M.S., Wheeler, D.W. (2001). *Testing the underlying motives of organizational citizenship behaviors: A field study of agricultural co-op workers*. 28th Annual National Agricultural Education Research Conference, pp. 539-553.
4. Barbuto, J.E., Scholl, R.W. (1999). Leaders' motivation and perception of followers' motivation as predictors of influence tactics used. *Psychological Reports*, Vol. 84(3_suppl), pp.1087-1098, doi: 10.2466/pr0.1999.84.3c.1087.
5. Barbuto, J.E., Story, J.S. (2011). Work motivation and organizational citizenship behaviors: A field study. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, Vol. 5(1), pp. 23-34, doi: 10.1002/jls.20202.
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. Benevene, P., Cortini, M., Callea, A. (2011). Teamwork: a comparison between nonprofit and public organizations. *INFAD Revista de Psicología. International Journal of Developmental and Educational Psychology*, Vol. 1(5), pp. 517-527.
8. Ben-Ner, A., Ren, T. (2015). Comparing workplace organization design based on form of ownership: Nonprofit, for-profit, and local government. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 44(2), pp. 340-359, doi: 10.1177/0899764013512422
9. Bercea, O-B., Lakatos, E.-S., Bacali, L. (2019). Comparative study regarding organizational culture: nonprofit organization and profit-oriented organization. In: S.A. Vaduva et al. (Eds.), *Civil Society: The Engine for Economic and Social Well-Being*. Springer Proceedings in Business and Economics, pp. 41-52, doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-89872-83.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. Bolino, M.C. (1999). Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors? *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 4(1), pp. 82-98, doi: 10.2307/259038.
 13. 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/s15327043hup1002_3.
 14. 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, pp. 52-69, doi: 10.1111/1468-2389.00163.
 15. Borman, W.C., Motowidlo, S.J. (1993). *Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance, personnel selection in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
 16. Borzaga, C., Tortia, E. (2006). Worker motivations, job satisfaction, and loyalty in public and nonprofit social services. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 35(2), pp. 225-248, doi: 10.1177/0899764006287207.
 17. Brief, A.P., Motowidlo, S.J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 11(4), pp. 710-725, doi: 10.2307/258391.
 18. Brzeziński, J. (1999, 2011). *Metodologia badań psychologicznych*. Warsaw: PWN.
 19. Cappellari, L., Turati, G. (2004). Volunteer labour supply: the role of workers' motivations. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, Vol. 75(4), pp. 619-643, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8292.2004.00265.x.
 20. Chrupała-Pniak, M., Grabowski, D. (2016). Skala motywacji zewnętrznej i wewnętrznej do pracy (WEIMS-PL). Wstępna charakterystyka psychometryczna polskiej wersji kwestionariusza Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale (WEIMS). *Psychologia Społeczna*, Vol. 11, pp. 339-355, doi: 10.7366/1896180020163808.
 21. Chua, J., Ayoko, O. (2021). Employees' self-determined motivation, transformational leadership and work engagement. *Journal of Management & Organization*, Vol. 27(3), pp. 523-543, doi:10.1017/jmo.2018.74.
 22. Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the interval structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, Vol. 16, pp. 297-334, doi: 10.1007/BF02310555.
 23. Dancey, C., Reidy, J. (2004). *Statistics without maths for psychology: using SPSS for Windows*. London: Prentice-Hall.
 24. Davila, M.C., Finkelstein, M.A. (2013). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and well-being: preliminary results. *International Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 3(3), pp. 45-51, doi: 10.5923/j.ijap.20130303.03.
 25. De Cooman, R., De Gieter, S., Pepermans, R., Jegers, M. (2011). A cross-sector comparison of motivation-related concepts in for-profit and not-for-profit service

- organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 40(2), pp. 296-317, doi: 10.1177/0899764009342897.
26. Deci, E.L., Olafsen, A.H., Ryan, R.M. (2017). Self-determination theory in work organizations: The state of a science. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 4, pp. 19-43, doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113108.
 27. Deci, E.L., Ryan, R.M. (1985a). The general causality orientations scale: Self-determination in personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, Vol. 19(2), pp. 109-134, doi: 10.1016/0092-6566(85)90023-6.
 28. Deci, E.L., Ryan, R.M. (1985b). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. Boston: Springer US.
 29. Deci, E.L., Ryan, R.M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behaviour. *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol. 11, pp. 227-268, doi: 10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01.
 30. Deci, E.L., Ryan, R.M. (2009). Self-determination theory: A consideration of human motivational universals. In: P.J. Corr, G. Mathews (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 441-456). New York: Cambridge University Press.
 31. Deci, E.L., Ryan, R.M. (Eds.) (2002). *Handbook of self-determination research*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press.
 32. Dudley, R. (2012). *The Shapiro–Wilk test for normality*. Retrieved from: <https://math.mit.edu/~rmd/46512/shapiro.pdf> (04.01.2023).
 33. Elshaug, C., Metzger, J. (2001). Personality attributes of volunteers and paid workers engaged in similar occupational tasks. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 141(6), pp. 752-763, doi: 10.1080/00224540109600586.
 34. Emanuele, R., Higgins, S.H. (2000). Corporate culture in the nonprofit sector: A comparison of fringe benefits with the for-profit sector. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 24, pp. 87-93, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25074269>.
 35. Enwereuzor, I., Onyishi, I., Awotubo, O. (2015). Beyond the Call to Duty: Linking Personality, Organizational Climate, and Work Motivation to Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *FUNAI Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 1-16.
 36. 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.
 37. Faria, L. (2022). The Effect of Personality on Work Motivation and Its Impact on Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Employees of Public Department in Portugal. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, Vol. 9(2), pp. 96-110, doi: 10.23918/ijsses.v9i2p96.

38. Finkelstein, M.A. (2006). Dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior: Motives, motive fulfillment, and role identity. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, Vol. 34(6), pp. 603-616, doi: 10.2224/sbp.2006.34.6.603.
39. Finkelstein, M.A. (2008). Predictors of volunteer time: The changing contributions of motive fulfillment and role identity. *Social Behavior and Personality: International Journal*, Vol. 36(10), pp. 1353-1363, doi: 10.2224/sbp.2008.36.10.1353.
40. Finkelstein, M.A. (2011). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and organizational citizenship behavior: A functional approach to organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Psychological Issues in Organizational Culture*, Vol. 2(1), pp. 19-34, doi: 10.1002/jpoc.20054.
41. 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.
42. Finkelstein, M.A., Penner, L.A., Brannick, M.T. (2005). Motive, role identity, and prosocial personality as predictors of volunteer activity. *Social Behavior and Personality: an International Journal*, Vol. 33(4), pp. 403-418, doi: 10.2224/sbp.2005.33.4.403.
43. Finkelstien, M.A. (2009). Intrinsic vs. extrinsic motivational orientations and the volunteer process. *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 46(5-6), pp. 653-658, doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2009.01.010.
44. Fiorillo, D. (2011). Do monetary rewards crowd out the intrinsic motivation of volunteers? Some empirical evidence for Italian volunteers. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, Vol. 82(2), pp. 139-165, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8292.2011.00434.x.
45. Gagne, M., Forest, J. (2008). The study of compensation systems through the lens of self-determination theory: reconciling 35 years of debate. *Canadian Psychology*, Vol. 49, pp. 225-232, doi: 10.1037/a0012757.
46. Goulet, L.R., Frank, M.L. (2002). Organizational commitment across three sectors: public, non-profit, and for-profit. *Public Personnel Management*, Vol. 31(2), pp. 201-210, doi: 10.1177/0091026002031002.
47. Graham, J.W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol. 4(4), pp. 249-270, doi: 10.1007/BF01385031.
48. Hamann, D.J., Foster, N.T. (2014). An exploration of job demands, job control, stress, and attitudes in public, nonprofit, and for-profit employees. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, Vol. 34(4), pp. 332-355, doi: 10.1177/0734371X13491.
49. Hidayah, N., Hendarsjah, H. (2021). The impact of quality of work life (QWL) and work motivation on the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) with job satisfaction as mediating variables. *JPPI (Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Indonesia)*, Vol. 7(3), pp. 499-506, doi: 10.29210/020211247.

50. Jacobsen, A., Beehr, T.A. (2022). Employees' Death Awareness and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Moderated Mediation Model. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 37, pp. 775-795, doi: 10.1007/s10869-021-09772-1.
51. Kalleberg, A.L., Marsden, P.V., Reynolds, J., Knoke, D. (2006). Beyond profit? Sectoral differences in high-performance work practices. *Work and Occupations*, Vol. 33(3), pp. 271-302, doi: 10.1177/073088840629004.
52. Kim, S.-H., Kim, M., Holland, S. (2020). Effects of intrinsic motivation on organizational citizenship behaviors of hospitality employees: The mediating roles of reciprocity and organizational commitment. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, Vol. 19(2), pp. 168-195, doi: 10.1080/15332845.2020.1702866.
53. 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.
54. Kotera, Y., Adhikari, P., Van Gordon, W. (2018). Motivation types and mental health of uk hospitality workers. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, Vol. 16, pp. 751-763, doi: 10.1007/s11469-018-9874-z.
55. Laczó, R.M., Hanisch, K.A. (1999). An examination of behavioral families of organizational withdrawal in volunteer workers and paid employees. *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 9(4), pp. 453-477, doi: 10.1016/S1053-4822(99)00029-7.
56. Larsson, O.S., Forsberg, Ch., Schneider, T. (2022). Comparing co-production in public, for-profit, and non-profit organizations: A survey of homes for the elderly in Sweden. *Nordic Journal of Wellbeing and Sustainable Welfare Development*, Vol. 1(1), pp. 51-66, doi: 10.18261/njwel.1.1.5.
57. Lee, Y.J., Wilkins, V.M. (2011). More similarities or more differences? Comparing public and nonprofit managers' job motivations. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 71(1), pp. 45-56, doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02305.x.
58. LePine, J.A., Erez, A., Johnson, D.E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behaviour: A critical review and metanalysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87(1), pp. 52-65, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.52.
59. LeRoux, K., Feeney, M.K. (2013). Factors attracting individuals to nonprofit management over public and private sector management. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, Vol. 24, pp. 43-62, doi: 10.1002/nml.21079.
60. Liao-Troth, M.A. (2003). Attitude differences between paid workers and volunteers. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, Vol. 11(4), pp. 423-442, doi: 10.1002/nml.11403.
61. Lyons, P., Bandura, R., Levitt, K.J. (2022). Identifying and cultivating voluntary helpful employee behavior. *Development and Learning in Organizations*, Vol. 36(4), pp. 9-12, doi: 10.1108/DLO-09-2021-0173.

62. Lyons, S.T., Duxbury, L.E., Higgins, C.A. (2006). A comparison of the values and commitment of private sector, public sector, and parapublic sector employees. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 66(4), pp. 605-618. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3843945>.
63. Margahana, H., Haryono, S., Muftasa, Z. (2018). The effects of job motivation and job satisfaction toward organizational citizenship behavior (ocb) and its impact on job performance of Paramedical Community Health Centers in the City of Bandar Lampung. *Journal of Resources Development and Management*, Vol. 46, pp. 1-10.
64. Matz-Costa, C., Pitt-Catsouphes, M. (2010). Workplace flexibility as an organizational response to the aging of the workforce: A comparison of nonprofit and for-profit organizations. *Journal of Social Service Research*, Vol. 36(1), pp. 68-80, doi: 10.1080/01488370903333645.
65. McNamara, T.K., Brown, M., Pitt-Catsouphes, M. (2012). Motivators for and barriers against workplace flexibility: comparing nonprofit, for-profit, and public sector organizations. *Community, Work & Family*, Vol. 15(4), pp. 487-500, doi: 10.1080/13668803.2012.732789.
66. McNeely, B.L., Meglino, B.M. (1992). Good soldiers or good duty? The role of work values and contextual antecedents in prosocial organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*, pp. 232-236, doi: 10.5465/AMBPP.1992.17515719.
67. Miller-Stevens, K., Taylor, J.A., Morris J.C. (2015). Are we really on the same page? An empirical examination of value congruence between public sector and nonprofit sector managers. *Voluntas*, Vol. 26, pp. 2424-2446, doi: 10.1007/s11266-014-9514-6.
68. Miller-Stevens, K., Taylor, J., Morris, J., Lanivich, S. (2018). Assessing value differences between leaders of two social venture types: benefit corporations and nonprofit organizations. *Voluntas*, Vol. 29, pp. 938-950, doi: 10.1007/s11266-017-9947-9.
69. Millette, V., Gagné, M. (2008). Designing volunteers' tasks to maximize motivation, satisfaction and performance: The impact of job characteristics on volunteer engagement. *Motivation and Emotion*, Vol. 32, pp. 11-22, doi: 10.1007/s11031-007-9079-4.
70. Mirvis, P.H. (1992). The quality of employment in the nonprofit sector: An update on employee attitudes in nonprofits versus business and government. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, Vol. 3(1), pp. 23-41, doi: 10.1002/nml.4130030104.
71. Mitani, H. (2014). Influences of resources and subjective dispositions on formal and informal volunteering. *Voluntas*, Vol. 25, pp. 1022-1040, doi: 10.1007/s11266-013-9384-3.
72. 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.
73. 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, pp. 209-225, doi: 10.1007/BF01419445.
74. 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.
75. Organ, D.W., Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 135(3), pp. 339-350, doi: 10.1080/00224545.1995.9713963.
76. Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company.
77. Organ, D.W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, Vol. 10, pp. 85-97, doi: 10.1207/s15327043hup1002_2.
78. Organ, D.W., Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 74(1), pp. 157-164, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.74.1.157.
79. Osman, A., Othman, Y.H., Rana, S.S., Solaiman, M., Lal, B. (2015). The influence of job satisfaction, job motivation & perceived organizational support towards organizational citizenship behavior (OCB): a perspective of American-based organization in Kulim, Malaysia. *Asian Social Science*, Vol. 11(21), pp. 174-182, doi: 10.5539/ass.v11n21p174
80. Paliga, M. (2021). *Satysfakcja z pracy i wydajność pracowników: relacja (nie)oczekiwana*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
81. Pearce, J.L. (1993). *Volunteers: The organizational behavior of unpaid workers*. Series: People and Organizations. London: Routledge.
82. Peiffer, M., Villotti P., Vantilborgh, T., Desmette, D. (2020). Stereotypes of volunteers and nonprofit organizations' professionalization: A two-study article. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, Vol. 31, pp. 355-372, doi: 10.1002/nml.21430.
83. Pepermans, R., Peiffer, M. (2022). Choosing jobs in the public, non-profit, and for-profit sectors: personal career anchors moderating the impact of sector image and reputation. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, doi: 10.1177/0734371X22113097.
84. 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.
85. 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.

86. 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.
87. 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.
88. Rumengan, A.E., Wahyuni, E.S., Ramadhan, F., Gunawan, D. (2022). Does Organizational Commitment Mediate the Relationship Between Motivation and Organizational Citizenship Behavior? *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, Vol. 5(3), pp. 24231-24240, doi: 10.33258/birci.v5i3.6444.
89. Ryan, R.M., Deci, E.L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, Vol. 25, pp. 54-67, doi: 10.1006/ceps.1999.1020.
90. Ryan, R.M., Deci, E.L. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. New York: Guilford Publications.
91. Ryan, R.M., Deci, E.L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, Vol. 61, Article 101860.
92. Sarros, J.C., Cooper, B.K., Santora, J.C. (2011). Leadership vision, organizational culture, and support for innovation in not-for-profit and for-profit organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 32(3), pp. 291-309, doi: 10.1108/01437731111123933.
93. Shaaban, S. (2018). The impact of motivation on organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB): the mediation effect of employees' engagement. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 6(2), pp. 58-66, doi: 10.11648/j.jhrm.20180602.13.
94. 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.
95. 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.
96. 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.
97. Stater, K.J., Stater, M. (2019). Is it 'just work'? The impact of work rewards on job satisfaction and turnover intent in the nonprofit, for-profit, and public sectors. *American Review of Public Administration*, Vol. 49(4), pp. 495-511, doi: 10.1177/02750740188815.

98. Tang, T.L., Ibrahim, A.H. (1998). Antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviour: Public personnel in the United States and in the Middle East. *Public Personal Management*, 27, pp. 529-548, doi: 10.1177/009102609802700407.
99. Trætteberg, H.S., Fladmoe, A. (2020). Quality differences of public, for-profit and nonprofit providers in Scandinavian welfare? User satisfaction in kindergartens. *Voluntas*, Vol. 31, pp. 153-167, doi: 10.1007/s11266-019-00169-6.
100. Tremblay, M.A., Blanchard, C.M., Taylor, S., Pelletier, L.G., Villeneuve, M. (2009). Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale: Its value for organizational psychology research. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne des Sciences du Comportment*, Vol. 41(4), pp. 213-226, doi: 10.1037/a0015167.
101. Turnipseed, D. (2017). Emotional intelligence and OCB: the moderating role of work locus of control. *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 158, pp. 322-336, doi: 10.1080/00224545.2017.1346582.
102. Uliyah, I., Ariyanto, S. (2021). The effect of organizational culture and employee competence on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) with work motivation as a mediation variable (Case study in Pekalongan District Land Office). *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, Vol. 6(5), pp. 70-77, doi: 10.24018/ejbmr.2021.6.5.1010.
103. Umar, M., Mushtaq, K., Ali, S.A., Sial, M.H. (2022). The impact of motivation on bank citizenship behavior: mediating effect of job satisfaction. *Dynamic Relationships Management Journal*, Vol. 11(1), pp. 17-35, doi: 10.17708/DRMJ.2022.v11n01a02.
104. Urbini, F., Callea, A., Chirumbolo, A. (2020). Promoting individual and organizational OCBs: the mediating role of work engagement. *Behavioral Science*, Vol. 10, p. 138, doi: 10.3390/bs10090138.
105. Van den Broeck, A., Howard, J.L., Van Vaerenbergh, Y., Leroy, H., Gagné, M. (2021). Beyond intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: A meta-analysis on self-determination theory's multidimensional conceptualization of work motivation. *Organizational Psychology Review*, Vol. 11(3), pp. 240-273, doi: 10.1177/20413866211006173.
106. Van der Wal, Z., De Graaf, G., Lasthuizen, K. (2008). What's valued most? Similarities and differences between the organizational values of the public and private sector. *Public Administration*, Vol. 86(2), pp. 465-482, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9299.2008.00719.x.
107. van Dick, R., Grojean, M.W., Christ O., Wieseke, J. (2006). Identity and the Extra Mile: Relationships between Organizational Identification and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 17, pp. 283-301, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2006.00520.x.
108. 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.

109. 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.
110. Van Schie, S., Güntert, S.T., Oostlander, J., Wehner, T. (2015). How the organizational context impacts volunteers: A differentiated perspective on self-determined motivation. *Voluntas, 26*, pp. 1570-1590, doi: 10.1007/s11266-014-9472-z.
111. Widarko, A., Anwarodin, M.K. (2022). Work Motivation and Organizational Culture on Work Performance: Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) as Mediating Variable. *Golden Ratio of Human Resource Management, Vol. 2(2)*, pp. 123-138, doi: 10.52970/grhrm.v2i2.207.
112. 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.
113. Wyche-Seawood, N. (2019). *The predictive relationships between organizational citizenship behaviors and turnover intention on employee motivation in the public sector (doctoral dissertation)*. Northcentral University.