
F. H. Abdul Rauf⁽¹⁾

Extending the Nomological Network of the Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Moderating effect of Work Family Conflict Self Efficacy on the Relationship Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Work Family Conflict.

(1) Department of Management, Faculty of Management and Commerce, South Eastern University of Sri Lanka, Oluvil, Sri Lanka.

Abstract: Studies on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) mainly focus on the positive effects, whereas the negative effects of such behavior for employees seem to be not well addressed. Work-family conflict (WFC) may be one of important negative consequences of OCB. The extent to which OCB is related to WFC, may be depending on the level of the work family conflict self efficacy (WFCSE) that employees have. This study examines the moderating effect of WFCSE on the relationship between OCB and WFC. A sample of employees from eastern region of Sri Lanka participated in this study. The study indicates a positive relationship between OCB and WFC. More specifically, results also indicate that the positive relationship between OCB and WFC was moderated by WFCSE. Further the results also revealed that while WFCSE play as a moderator, the relationship between OCB and WFC was stronger for employees with low levels of WFCSE. Implications for future research are also discussed.

Keywords: organizational citizenship behavior, work-family conflict, work family conflict self efficacy.

Introduction

In any organizations employers expect certain tasks and responsibilities from every employees to do. Generally, tasks can be divided into two. One is tasks which are prescribed in the job description, and the

other one is tasks which are outside of the job description but are necessary for effective function of the organizations. This is known as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). OCB was originally defined as behavior at an individual's discretion, which is not directly or explicitly rewarded, but which helps the fulfillment of the organization's objectives (Organ, 1988). Later, however, the definition was relaxed to "performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place" (Organ, 1997, p. 95).

OCB certainly contribute to organizational performance. As obvious from the definition itself, OCBs are behaviors which support to organizations purpose and are likely to improve their performance effectiveness. Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997) and Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach (2000) suggested OCBs can contribute to the effectiveness of organizations more positively through many ways. Specifically through a cumulative effect of increased employee performance, as a consequence of freeing up resources, through improved coordination of activities between team members, and through an enhanced ability for organization to attract and retain the best people and the ability to adapt to environmental changes. Borman and Motowidlo (1993) suggested that OCB enhances organizational effectiveness because it shapes "the organizational, social, and psychological context that serves as the critical catalyst for task

activities and processes” (p.71). These predictions are provided by evidence that OCBs are associated with beneficial outcomes for almost all forms of organizations (Cohen & Vigoda, 2000).

Previous research on OCB has generally focused on one of the following two themes. First, many studies have focused on identifying the antecedents of citizenship behavior (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002; Organ & Ryan, 1995). Second, research also done focusing on the positive consequences of OCB. But it is possible that engaging in OCB could also have some negative consequences for the employees who engage in OCB. However, only few researchers have suggested that there may also be a “dark side” to citizenship behavior (Bolino et al., 2005; Klein, 2007; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Hui, 1993). Therefore, having more studies on negative effects of OCB is felt necessary.

Employees who engage in OCB may undergo many negative consequences. Therefore, the present study extend the nomological network of OCB literature by examining the relationship between OCB and some individual-level factors, namely work-to-family conflict (WFC) and work family conflict self efficacy (WFCSE). In a replication and extension of Bolino and Turnley’s (2005) research, the present study offers an in-depth analysis of the relationship between OCB and WFC, examining the potential moderator of WFCSE.

When OCB results in negative effects for employees, supervisors should understand the risks of blindly encouraging OCB. The negative aspect of OCB has become obvious. For instance, an employee helping many colleagues, assisting superiors or doing extra works on a working day might bound the time available such employee has for doing his own work, which may result in personal costs like stress and frustration (Perlow & Weeks, 2002). Studies focusing on consequences of OCB from such employees perspective are very few. Organ and Ryan (1995) first noted that OCB may lead to more overload and stress for employees. Further, research studies by Bolino and Turnley (2005) investigated the personal costs for employees by engaging in OCB. Particularly, they focused on individual initiative in their research, which

is a form of OCB (Organ et al., 2005; Bolino & Turnley, 2005). Bolino and Turnley (2005) proposed that employees could get frustrated, because they fulfill their roles as good citizens by engaging in individual initiative in addition to their task or in-role behavior. Based on the role theory, Bolino and Turnley (2005) proposed individual initiative to be associated with role overload, the experience of stress, and work-family conflict. Cooke and Rousseau (1984) states that stress and strain can take place when employees are not able to fulfill all of their roles with success. Therefore, personal life may also suffer, which may lead to work-family conflict. In this paper the author examine the relationship between OCB and such negative consequence of WFC and propose that this relationship may be contingent upon the specific self efficacy employees have for exhibiting OCB. Therefore, specific self efficacy employees have for managing WFC and engaging in OCB, may affect the relationship between OCB and the WFC.

Employees both women and men have to maintain personal and professional responsibilities and balance multiple roles which may increase the WFC. For every people both work and family are important parts in their lives. Therefore, they need to spend time and energy to manage multiple responsibilities. Number of researchers have addressed the relationship between work-family conflict and negative outcomes such as psychological distress and well-being, health outcomes, depression, overall physical health, heavy alcohol use, and hypertension (Schwartzberg & Dytell, 1996; Cleary, 1987; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1997; Frone, Barnes, & Farrell, 1994). Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) define work-family conflict as “a form of inter role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect. That is, participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family (work) role” (p. 77). Work-family conflict can arise as a result of job demands at working place which lead an employee more difficult to complete responsibilities related with his or her own family. Responsibilities associated with family may consists household responsibilities, childcare, the care of an aging parent, and more other family responsibilities.

WFC is concerned about three bases. The first one is time-based which point out the time requirements of one role harm the performance of the other role. The second one is strain-based which states that pressures associated with one role adversely affect performance in the other role, and the third one is behavior-based conflicts that is the behavioral requirements necessary for one domain is different or incompatible for the other domain. Furthermore, researchers have identified the bi-directionality of the construct; WFC can arise in the work domain (work-to-family conflict or work interfering with family, WIF) or in the family domain (family-to-work conflict or family interfering with work, FIW) (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992). OCB is a work-related variable and require extra time and effort, therefore current study focused on its effects on work interfering with family. Work-family conflict has been associated with a variety of negative outcomes, ranging from attitudinal, behavioral, and health-related variables. Because of these harmful effects, it is essential to identify the antecedents leading to work-to-family conflict and the moderating variables which may reduce it.

Engaging in citizenship behaviors also often involves devoting more time to work, either directly or indirectly by taking on extra demands. Behaviors such as attending extra organizational functions and keeping up with developments in the organization, adjusting one's work schedule to accommodate other employees, helping those that are absent, and assisting others with their workload can be considered as citizenship behavior. Perlow and Weeks (2002) discovered that employees often view helping behavior as an unwanted interruption from their "real work," with one employee stating: "The biggest frustration of my job is always having to help others and not getting my own work done" (p. 353). Thus, individuals who engage in citizenship behaviors may view such acts as unwanted demands, feeling pressured to work longer hours in order to fulfill their other work requirements. The rational model suggested that the resource drain model, individuals who work longer hours are likely to face higher levels of WFC. The rational model of work-family conflict predicts a linear relationship between the amount of time spent in the work and family domains and the degree of WFC experienced (Greenhaus, Bedeian, & Mossholder, 1987). Another

reason that OCB may impact WFC is explained by the resource drain model, which suggest that individuals have a limited amount of resources (Rothbard, 2001; Staines, 1980). Given that time, one type of resource, is clearly limited, employees are faced with the challenge of balancing their time between the work and family domains. Additionally, employees who have partners, children, and/or other familial obligations are faced with the additional challenge of simultaneously handling family role requirements. Employees who engage with OCB may suffer with high level of work load. The spillover model sheds light on why role overload is likely to influence work-family conflict. If situational variables, such as engaging in citizenship behaviors, require that more time be spent in one domain, fewer hours are available for the other domain, and work-family conflict is likely to arise. Therefore, it is hypothesized that individuals who engage in citizenship behaviors tend to spend more time engaged in work-related activities, thereby increasing their levels of WFC.

The another individual variable that may interfere above relationship is WFCSE. Individual's self-efficacy beliefs can effect the way how he or she perceive or manage conflict. Self-efficacy is defined as, "people's judgments in their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performance" (p. 391). The construct of self-efficacy has been applied to many types of domains, and has been applied as an approach to better understand an individual's expectations in handling and managing various tasks effectively. Bandura (1977) explained self-efficacy as a key factor of psychological change, selection of activities, quality of performance in a specific domain, and level of determination when one meets adverse or negative experiences. Bandura (1986) suggested that perceptions of and reactions to stress can be reduced or increased by an individual's self-efficacy. These functions of self-efficacy are also applicable to work-family conflict.

Previous research has shown evidence for a relationship between self-efficacy and multiple-role management. For example, it is hypothesized that a woman's self-efficacy beliefs regarding her work and family responsibilities can help to reduce the role conflict and role overload she may experience

(Erdwins et al., 2001). To put it in a different way, an individual's self-efficacy in a specific domain can offer information about how that individual will perceive and cope with challenges in that specific domain. When managing the conflict that starts between family and job related responsibilities, measuring WFCSE can offer a unique perspective on what might eventually facilitate to reduce the negative outcomes which are connected with OCB and WFC. Providing information regarding an individual's self-efficacy in managing WFC, may possible to reduce the level of WFC and the negative outcomes with which it has been connected. Understanding how WFCSE functions in the relationship between OCB and WFC could have meaningful beneficial implications for individual experiencing WFC. Therefore, to get a better understanding of how individuals perceive and manage work-family conflict is seems to be important to explore the links between work-family conflict and self-efficacy. In the current study, work-family self-efficacy is explored as a moderator of the relationship of OCB to work-family conflict. More specifically, it can be hypothesized that an individual's self-efficacy beliefs regarding the ability to manage work-family conflict would predict the level of work-family conflict that one experiences. In this way, assessing work-family conflict self-efficacy can help to further understand the relationship between OCB and work-family conflict. Based on the above discussion it is hypothesized that WFCSE will moderate the relationship between OCB and WFC, such that relationship will be stronger at low levels of WFCSE than at high levels of WFCSE.

Methods

A total 143 participants were approached and asked to participate in the study. The respondents participated voluntarily and were assured of confidentiality. The original questionnaire was in English and it was translated into Tamil. The response rate was 75% with a sample size of 107 participants. The sample was comprised of both male and female participants. Participants ranged in age from 22 to 51 years, with a mean age of 36.61 years ($SD=4.67$). All participants had children. The mean age of the children was 3.61 years, ranging from 1 month to 21

years. The participants reported the following levels of education: 43 (41.%) master's degree, 35 (38%) bachelor degree, 16 (18%) A/L, 6 (5%) Ph.D., 1 (1%) Post Doctoral Fellowship. The participants had an average of 7.08 years of tenure with their employing organization ($sd = 8.43$) and 10.80 years of experience in their profession ($sd = 11.39$). The participants are employed in the eastern region of Sri Lanka and worked in different sectors. e.g., healthcare (18%), education (71%) and insurance & finance (11%).

Data were gathered through a variety of measures including: a demographic questionnaire; a OCB scale; a work-family conflict self-efficacy scale; a work-family conflict scale. The demographic questionnaire measure their age, marital status, whether they have children, whether they are employed fulltime or part-time, number of hours in paid work, the job title, number of years served, and highest level of education. Questions regarding employment status, marital status, and whether or not the participant has children were used as a screening device to ensure that all participants met the criteria for inclusion in this study. The other parts measures other variables of interest in this study.

Work-family conflict self-efficacy was measured using the Work-Family Conflict Self- Efficacy Scale (Cinamon, 2003). It measures the perceptions of self-efficacy to manage work-family conflict. The scale consists of ten items. It is measured using a 5-point Likert scale, participants are asked to rate how confident they are in handling a given situation. The responses range from 1 (complete lack of confidence) to 5 (complete confidence). A sample item from the work family conflict self-efficacy subscale is: "How confident are you that you could fulfill your job responsibilities without letting them interfere with your family responsibilities?"

Organizational citizenship behavior was measured using the OCB scale developed by Williams and Anderson's (1991) . The scale has seven OCBO items and seven OCBI items. An example of an item is: "I defend the organization when other employees criticize it". Scores ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) and the Cronbach's alpha for the scale was .79. The Mean value and Standard Deviation for OCB was 5.20 and 0.72 respectively.

Work-to-family conflict was measured using scale developed by Netemeyer et al. (1996). The scale has five items. Scores ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Cronbach's alpha for the scale was .78. An example of an item is: "The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life".

Data were screened by checking for normality, linearity, and multicollinearity. Normality was assessed by checking the normal distribution, kurtosis and skewness values. It was seen that the kurtosis and skewness values of all the variables were between -1 and +1. This indicated that the variables did not deviate from the normality assumption. Homoscedasticity is related to normality and when the normality assumption is met the relationship between the variables is said to be homoscedastic (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The correlation matrix of the variables was investigated and no multicollinearity was detected. Other than this, the examination of the correlation matrix showed no multicollinearity because of the absence of bivariate correlations above .90 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The scales used were self reported, rising concerns about the influence of common method variance on the results of this study. One factor test was conducted to investigate this possibility, results indicate that common method variance is not likely to be a serious threat to validity.

Furthermore, the correlations among factors vary from 0.13 to 0.86, shows that the strong affect of common method bias is very unlikely. Another reason is OCBs are not reported to others more often as they are only a personal choice of spontaneous behavior. Therefore, reporting on behaviors such as OCBs by the self report system is more valid than the others or other method of data triangulation. Checking the responses also done again to the same sample using the items which are reverse coded resulted dropping of some responses due to mismatch of answers. Ultimately a total of 104 responses were retained for further analysis.

Hierarchical regression analysis (Cohen & Cohen, 1983) was used to test the first hypothesis. In step 1 of hierarchical regression, gender was entered as control variable. After a review of the literature, the variable gender was considered as control variable.

Gender (1 = Male, 2 = Female), which could co vary with the dependent and independent variables and therefore, could be included as control variables in this analysis (e.g., Zellars et al., 2002; Aquino et al., 2004). OCB was entered in step 2. The dependent variable WFC was entered in step 3.

In the hierarchical regression analysis (Cohen & Cohen, 1983) in step 1, when gender was entered as control variable, it explained 8% of the variance in WFC ($F_{2, 135}=13.96$, $P<0.01$). OCB was entered in step 2, explained an additional 40% percent of the variance ($(F_{3, 134}=54.957)$, $P<0.01$). Therefore, first hypothesis, OCB will be strongly related to WFC is supported with these results. The results, with the standardized Beta coefficients, adjusted R^2 at each step of the regression, changes of adjusted R^2 at each steps, and squared partial correlations are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Results of hierarchical regression for WFC

Variables	Adjusted R^2	ΔR^2	β	ΔsR^2
<i>Control.</i>	084			
Gender			.047	.002
Age			.298	.088
OCB	.518	.405***	.682***	.414

Notes: ΔR^2 - change of adjusted R^2 , β - beta coefficient, ΔsR^2 - squared partial correlation; * $p<0.1$, ** $p<0.05$, *** $p<0.01$

Moderated Hierarchical regression analysis (Cohen & Cohen, 1983) was used to test the second hypothesis. In step 1 of moderated hierarchical regression, gender was entered and it was controlled. In the second step, OCB and WFCSE, the main effects were entered. In the third step, the interaction term, the OCB WFCSE the two- way interactions was entered into the equation. Interpretations were drawn based on the results of the analysis. The variables were centered to reduce multicollinearity (Aiken & West, 1991).

In the moderated hierarchical regression (see Table 2), gender was entered in step 1 explained 8% of the variance in OCBI ($F_{2,135}=13.96$, $P<0.01$). OCB and WFCSE entered in the next step explained an additional 40% of the variance ($\Delta F_{3,134}=54.95$), $P<0.01$). The cross product term of OCB and WFCSE

entered in step 3 explained an additional percent of variance in WFC ($\Delta F_{5,132}=161.03$).

Therefore, the hypotheses H2 was supported as OCB and WFCSE interacted to significantly influence WFC ($\beta = -0.06$, $t = -2.431$, $P < 0.01$, $sR^2 = 0.06$). The indicator sR^2 , the squared semi-partial correlation, was used to ascertain the unique contribution of each variable to the criterion. It indicates the incremental change in R^2 for a given variable beyond all other variables. Because the interaction was significant, follow up split group analysis was performed as recommended by Aiken and West (1991). Regression was done for OCB on WFC at low (1 standard deviation below mean) and high (1 standard deviation above the mean) levels of WFCSE. OCB was significantly interacted with WFCSE to WFC at low level of WFCSE ($R^2=0.68$, $p < 0.01$, $\beta = 0.52$) but not at high of WFC self efficacy ($R^2= 0.07$, $P=0.30$, $\beta=0.25$).

Table 2. Results of moderated hierarchical regression for WFC

Variables	Adjusted R^2	ΔR^2	β	ΔsR^2
Control	.084			
Gender			.045	.002
Main effects	.489	.405***		
OCB			.671***	.404
WFCSE	-.555***	.244		
Interaction effect	.741	.252**		
OCB X WFCSE			-.066**	.004

Notes: ΔR^2 - change of adjusted R^2 , β - beta coefficient, ΔsR^2 - squared partial correlation;
* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Therefore, the second hypothesis, WFCSE will moderate the relationship between OCB and WFC, such that relationship will be stronger at low levels of WFCSE than at high levels of WFCSE is supported with these results.

Findings and Conclusions

In this study the relationship between OCB and the WFC was tested. The results, in general, support OCB as a predictor of WFC. The current study

provided consistent with hypotheses, OCB is found to have significant positive relationship with WFC and also consistent with prior studies of OCB (Bolino & Turnley, 2005). The results suggest that when OCB is high the WFC is also high. The reason for this may be, when individuals get involved with more OCBs the time and energy they have to devote with family responsibilities becomes less and therefore, work and family conflict arise. The findings also provide support for the argument of WFCSE moderate the relationship between OCB and WFC. This means when the WFCSE is high the relationship between OCB and WFC is weaker vice versa. The reason for this may be, If employees possess high WFCSE they may be able to manage all the roles successfully when they experience with high WFC due to high OCBs. With high WFCSE they may meet all the demands to their maximum effectively. In line with expectations, WFC get decreased when the level of WFCSE is high. As such, Hypotheses 1 and 2 were supported with these results.

A reduced level of WFC is believed to be beneficial in reducing adverse consequences of WFC. On the other hand it is not wise to decrease OCB which is also an important aspect of achievement of organizational success. Therefore, challenging aspect of WFC be best alternative to increase OCB and to reduce the WFC through WFCSE. This may be more strong and effective as this is related with intrinsic motivation. It should be noted that when employees suffers from WFC due to high OCBs, WFC may be reduced through higher level of WFCSE. Self efficacy can both reduces stress and increases motivation. Therefore, it is possible to increase OCBs and reduce WFC by WFCSE among employees even though they are experiencing high level WFC.

The results have implications for OCB research and organizations. An implication of these findings for organizations may be a reemphasis on the importance of personal costs for employees. Employees exhibiting OCB may deliver better performance quantity and quality for the organizations, but may simultaneously harm themselves. Moreover, they could harm the organization indirectly by getting ill as a result of the stress or even quit because the personal costs get too high. Supervisors may reinforce employees engaging in

OCB, not realizing what motivations lie behind the citizenship behavior. Therefore, management should focus on the different motivations employees have and should not encourage OCB with the wrong motives. This study also suggest that management should pay attention to improve the level of self efficacy specially WFCSE when employees are encouraged to engage with OCBs. The management also may take measures on improving WFCSE among employees in order to improve the performance at workplace. Therefore, future research might need to find specific ways to improve WFCSE among employees. The findings of this study provide initial support for the important role of WFCSE in research focused at the downside of OCB.

References

- Aquino, M., M. Fyfe, L. MacDougal., & Remple. (2004). *West Nile virus in British Columbia*. Emerg. Infect. Dis.
- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Allen, T. D., Herst, D., Bruck, C., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences Associated with work-to family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 278-308.
- Bandura, A. (1977) *Social Learning Theory*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1986). Social Foundations of Thought and Action. *Fundamentos Sociales*. Barcelona: Mart.nez Roca.
- Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2005). The personal costs of citizenship behavior: the relationship between individual initiative and role overload, job stress, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 740-748.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt, W. C. Borman, & Associates (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp.71-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cinamon, G. R. (2003). Work-family conflict self-efficacy and career plans of young adults.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd Ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cooke, R. A., & Rousseau, D. M. (1984), Stress and Strain from Family Roles and Work-role Expectations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 252-260.
- Cohen, A., & Vigoda, E. (2000). Do good citizens make good organizational citizens? An empirical examination of the relationship between general citizenship and organizational citizenship behavior in Israel. *Administration and Society*, 32, 596-625.
- Cleary, P. D. (1987). Gender differences in stress-related disorders. In R.C. Barnett, L. Beiner, & G.K. Baruch (Eds.) *Gender and Stress*. New York: Free Press.
- Erdwins C. J, Buffardi L. C, Casper W. J, O'Brien AS (2001).The Relationship of Women's Role Strain to Social Support, Role Satisfaction, and Self-Efficacy. *Fam. Relations*, 50(3): 230-238.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M. & Cooper, M. L. (1997). Relation of work-family conflict to health outcomes: A four-year longitudinal study of employed parents. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70, 325-335.
- Frone, M. R., Barnes, G. M., & Farrell, M. P. (1994). Relationship of work-family conflict to substance use among employed mothers: The role of negative affect. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56, 1019-1030.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M. & Cooper, M. L. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work family conflict: Testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 65-78.
- Frone M. R. (2003) Work-family balance. In Quick J.C, Tetrick L.E (eds) *Handbook of occupational health psychology*. American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C, pp 143-162

- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 76–88.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Bedeian, A. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1987). Work experiences, job performance, and feelings of personal and family well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31, 200-215.
- 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*, 87, 52-65.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of sales performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 57, 70–80.
- Netemeyer, R.G., Boles, J.S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work – family conflict and family – work conflict scales, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81 (4), 400-410.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 775–802.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct cleanup time. *Human Performance*, 10, 85–97.
- Perlow, L., & Weeks, J. (2002). Who's helping whom? Layers of culture and workplace behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 345-361.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance*, 10, 133–151.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D.G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research, *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Hui, C. (1993). Organizational citizenship behaviors and managerial evaluations of employee performance: A review and suggestions for future research. In G. R. Ferris & K. M. Rowland (Eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* (Vol. 11, 1–40). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance*, 10, 133–151.
- Rothbard, N. P. (2001). Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 655–684.
- Staines, G. L. (1980). Spillover Versus compensation : A review of the literature on the relationship between work and non work. *Human Relations*, 33(2), 111-129.
- Schwartzberg, N.S. & Dytell, R.S. (1996). Dual-earner families: The importance of work stress and family stress for psychological well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1 (2), 211-223.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L.S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics, Fifth Edition*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 108–119.
- Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J. & Duffy, K. M. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87: 1068–1076.