



AN OVERVIEW OF THE APPLICATION OF ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR (OCB) IN INDONESIA THROUGH A LITERATURE REVIEW

Ika Pratiwi^{1*}, Martinus Tukiran², Rinsan Hutabarat³, Jumadi⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Doctoral Program, Universitas Pakuan, Indonesia

Email: ikapratiwix0s@gmail.com^{1*}

Abstract

Research on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) has progressed significantly in the West, resulting in a number of meta-analyses that helped standardise the concept and set the path for future studies. OCB research, on the other hand, has not been extensively investigated in the literature despite its popularity in Indonesia. The research method for writing this paper is a literature review; data search is carried out through three online journal databases that researchers can access (Google Scholar, Garuda Indonesia Portal and Science Direct). This search criterion is research conducted from 2018 to 2022 and the construct of “organisational citizenship behaviour” as a dependent variable. Several articles and findings are highlighted in the review of OCB research in Indonesia. 1) The unit of analysis for the research was white-collar workers; 2) most research methods utilised questionnaire analysis tools; and 3) data for two or more variables were derived from a single primary source, making the research susceptible to common method variance. The implication for the next OCB research is that it is necessary to review OCB specific to several companies or certain job characteristics. The research on personality in Indonesia must also involve a discussion of Indonesian state culture.

Keywords: OCB, Empirical Study in Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

Researchers have been interested in organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) for over three decades (Bateman & Organ, 1983), particularly within the field of social organisations (Arthaud-Day et al., 2018; Bolino et al., 2019; 2022, Rotundo and Sackett). According to a meta-analysis conducted by Podsakoff et al. in 2000, 122 scientific publications were published in the five years since the term “OCB” was first used. The idea has become popular, as Google Scholar returned 3,711 journal articles when the phrase “organisational citizenship behaviour” is inputted. Not only in the West but also in Indonesia, a great deal of OCB research is ongoing. Wijayanto & Kismono (2004), who conducted one of the earliest studies on this concept in Indonesia, also demonstrated how Indonesian private hospital nurses' work engagement and sense of responsibility influenced its emergence. Other studies examining samples, research methods, and numerous antecedents followed this research (Aini et al., 2020; Hapsari, 2019; Ramdhani et al., 2022; Susanto, 2018). Despite the fact that OCB has been the subject of numerous studies in Indonesia, there are few review articles that address this design specifically. Review papers are necessary to standardise the construct and provide additional research opportunities (Galvan & Galvan, 2017). The paper is expected to begin with an explanation of the concept and history of OCB, followed by the method for selecting articles, a discussion of proposed future research on OCB in Indonesia, and a conclusion.

Constructs and History of Citizenship

According to Bateman and Organ (1983), the first definition of OCB is any workplace behaviour that can enhance organisational performance. It can be accomplished by assisting coworkers with their duties, refraining from complaining about minor problems at work, and protecting organisational assets. Given the significance of social psychology in the Bateman and Organ (1983) school of thought, it is unsurprising that many of the measures used to assess OCB strongly correlate with virtues, compliance, and collaboration. This viewpoint (Smith et al., 1983) believes that Altruism (a person's behaviour that directly aims to help a specific person in a situation where they face each other) and general compliance (a person's behaviour that is based more on individual awareness and is not directed directly at others but can help indirectly while in the system) are two terms that can be used to summarise the OCB construct, and both are significant. Subsequently, Organ (1997) revised his definition of OCB to include helpfulness, courtesy, and conscientiousness. In contrast to Organ et al. (2007), supervisors frequently have difficulty distinguishing between the term “courtesy” and “altruism” because their definitions frequently intersect. They contend that these concepts can be coupled with helpful behaviour in actual workplace settings, thereby breaking down OCB.

The idea of OCB proposed by Williams and Anderson (1991) also garners some interest. They divided OCB into two categories: OCB-O, or OCB behaviours directed at the organisation, and OCB-I, or OCB behaviours directed at individuals (such as coworkers or superiors). They do this because they believe it is essential to determine who OCB's true target is. If examined closely, Williams and Anderson (1991) did not significantly alter the core theories advanced by previous OCB researchers. They only distinguished between various types of OCB, a distinction that would become crucial in future research.

There are OCB generalisations on which experts agree: Evaluations of job performance should not consider behaviours irrelevant to an employee's job responsibilities. However, if replicated frequently or over a long period, it can increase the organisation's or business's effectiveness. OCB is a negative and unproductive activity. Even though both are examples of extra-role activities, the two notions are distinct and do not exist on a continuum (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997). The absence of OCB does not imply the absence of harmful behaviour or vice versa. (Spector et al., 2010).

This literature review aims to enhance readers' comprehension of Indonesian OCB research. The systematic review is based on a collection of studies authored by Indonesian authors. The research articles are then analysed using the OCB concepts in use, research methodology, and antecedents.

METHOD

Accessible to academicians, ScienceDirect, Portal Garuda Indonesia, and Google Scholar are three online journal databases used for data searches. The search criteria are as follows: 1) The research was conducted between 2018 and 2022; 2) The dependent variable is the idea of “organisational citizenship behavior” or “organisational citizenship behavior”; 3) Submit the paper to Sinta 1 or Sinta 2, two reputable national or international journals, once it has been released.

DISCUSSION

In the search results, 10 articles met the criteria for inclusion. OCB research in Indonesia generally concentrates on paid office workers who perform administrative tasks. Quantitative primary data is collected through questionnaires. Most of the studies were published in business and economics journals, while the remainder appeared in psychology and education journals. For convenience, the findings are separated into various sub-sections.

OCB Constructs Researched in Indonesia

Organ (1988) or one of its adaptations (Organ et al.) is the source of the concept of organisational citizenship most frequently used by Indonesian academics. Both are modified either directly or indirectly (Ramdhani et al., 2022). Five components comprise the OCB: sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy, conscientiousness, and Altruism. Altruism is the degree to which a worker is “good enough” to assist other workers. A worker's conscientiousness indicates their desire to adhere to the rules, arrive on time, and get a good night's sleep. On the other hand, sportsmanship is the ability to cope with difficult working conditions. The next level of civic virtue is behaviour that demonstrates responsibility for the organisation's survival, and courtesy promotes personal conduct that aims to avoid conflict with coworkers.

Sahertian (2022) and Purba et al. (2022) employ the OCB framework developed by Williams and Anderson (1991), which is also of interest to Indonesian scholars. William and Anderson (1991) divided OCB into two levels based on the objective of the activity: OCB-I (individual), or behaviour directed towards individuals, and OCB-O (organisational), or behaviour directed towards the organisation. While OCB-I can be observed in the act of assisting colleagues with tasks that are not their responsibility, OCB-O can be observed in the degree to which an employee adheres to the unwritten norms of the company for which he or she works. Lee and Allen (2002) and McNeely and Meglino (1994) used this split based on behavioural goals.

Table 1. Description of OCB Research in Indonesia

No	Researcher	Year	Number of Subjects	Subject	Dimensions	Independen Variabel	Method	Journal Name
1	Fatdina, dina	2021	96	Nurse	Organ (1997) which consists of 5 dimensions: Altruism, Conscientiosness, Sportsmanship, Civic Virtue and courtesy	Organizational support, procedural fairness	Quantitative	Jurnal Psikologi UGM
2.	Karim, A	2021	189	Administration Employees	Organ (1997) which consists of 5 dimensions: Altruism, Conscientiosness, Sportsmanship, Civic Virtue and courtesy	Discipline, Work Ethic, Organizational Culture	Quantitative	Widyariset
3.	Prasetyawati & Putra	2022	172	Hospitality Employees	Organ (1997) which consists of 5 dimensions: Altruism, Conscientiosness, Sportsmanship, Civic Virtue and courtesy	Leadership	Quantitative	Jurnal Manajemen dan Pemasaran Jasa
4	Sahertian	2022	125	Banking Employees	William & Anderson (1991) : OCB-I & OCB-O	Leadership, Organizational Commitment and Self Efficacy	Quantitative	Jurnan Manajemen dan kewirausahaan
5	Purba et al	2022	209	Employees in cement companies	William & Anderson (1991) : OCB-I & OCB-O	Leadership, affective commitment	Quantitative	Asian Business & Manajemen
6.	Ramdhani et al	2022	227	Private employees	Podsakoff (2000) : Helping behavior, Sportsmanship, Individual initiative, Civic virtue, Organizational commitment, Compliance , Personal development	Meaning in life, meaning in work, Affective Personality	Quantitative	Makara Hubs-Asia
7.	Claudia,M	2018	130	Lecturer	Organ, et al (2006) yang terdiri dari 7 dimensi : Altruism, Conscientiosness, Sportsmanship, Civic Virtue, initiative, Self-development dan courtesy	Organizational Support, Job Satisfaction, organizational commitment	Quantitative	Jurnal of Indonesian Economy and Business
8.	Amir & Santoso	2019	295	Karyawan Profit & Non Profit	Lee & Allen (2022)which consists of 2 dimensions : OCB-O & OCB-I	Servant Leadership	Quantitative	Jurnal Siasat Bisnis
9.	Rahmi & Riyono	2019	102	Manufacturing Employees	Organ (1997) which consists of 5 dimensions: Altruism, Conscientiosness, Sportsmanship, Civic Virtue and courtesy	characteristics of work, quality of working life	Quantitative	Jurnal Psikologi UNDIP
10.	Tjahjono et al	2018	145	Lecturer	Organ (1997) which consists of 5 dimensions: Altruism, Conscientiosness, Sportsmanship, Civic Virtue and courtesy	Transformational Leadership	Quantitative	Jurnal Manajemen dan Pemasaran Jasa

Fewer researchers have utilised a behavioural target-based division of OCB; however, this dimensional division contributes to our understanding of the causes of OCB. As an illustration, Amir and Santoso's (2019) research demonstrates that the results acquired for various types of OCB are distinct. In OCB-I, authenticity and standing behind were the only two significant servant leadership

components, whereas in OCB-O, standing behind and empowerment were the two relevant aspects. These findings are also consistent with Western-based studies. 2012 Arthaud-Day et al. observed that various personal values influence distinct OCB dimensions. Despite sharing a larger citizenship platform, the proportions of each are distinct.

The similarity of OCB structures studied by Indonesian researchers offers some opportunities for future development, particularly with regard to OCB in its unique form. Van Dyne and LePine (1998) provided a unique interpretation of OCB. Van Dyne and LePine (1998) categorised OCB based on active actions (promotive vs. prohibitive) and behavioural goals (affiliating vs. challenging). The basis for this classification is political philosophy. Van Dyne and LePine (1998) divided OCB behaviours into four categories based on these two typologies: stewardship (prohibition-affiliation), helping behaviour (affiliation-promoting), voicing/stating opinions, promotion-challenging, and whistleblowing (a challenging prohibition). Van Dyne and LePine's (1998) OCB behaviours can damage good relations between employees, such as when giving constructive opinions while disrupting group harmony (e.g., speaking up) or when reporting fraud committed by other employees even though it is "for the good of the organisation as a whole." It is a noteworthy distinction between Organ's (1988) OCB and Van Dyne and LePine's OCB model. Organ (1988) defines OCB as behaviour that contributes to group harmony and is compatible with organisational performance. It is strongly suggested that additional research be conducted on the various forms of OCB to gain a deeper understanding of this concept in Indonesia.

Respondents of OCB Research in Indonesia

From the data in Table 1, it is reasonable to conclude that the participants of OCB studies in Indonesia are representatives of the middle class or workers with the necessary skills or specialised training (Maron et al., 2016). Most respondents are employed by private companies, followed by those who worked in the public sector, speakers, and educators. The disparity in work experience between middle-class and low-class employees may result in distinct work behaviours (Berg et al., 2010).

In OCB research, the quantity of research on blue-collar and white-collar employees varies. White-collar respondents, primarily soldiers, professionals, students, corporations, and non-profit organisations, are the primary focus of most OCB research conducted in the United States, according to Podsakoff et al.'s review of the relevant literature.

This contrast suggests that, despite the general acceptance of the construct, research on the construct concentrates on specific individuals, particularly white-collar employees. This imbalance accounts for numerous research gaps in OCB. The measure reflects OCB among white-collar workers; therefore, the items may not apply to respondents with blue-collar jobs. According to Nielsen and Abildgaard's (2012) analysis of industrial psychology measurement instruments, different

results would be obtained if certain items were associated with cognitively demanding work duties or contained phrases more difficult for lower-class employees to comprehend.

Second, distinct correlations or interactions between OCB and constructs may exist for white-collar and blue-collar employees. Berg et al. (2010) found that research on other occupational constructs for these two categories yielded inconsistent results. Due to the scarcity of research focusing on blue-collar workers, these differences probably exist in the OCB construct, although they have not yet been identified.

Antecedents of OCB in Indonesia

Table 1 contains a listing of numerous investigations on OCB in Indonesia. These antecedents or predictors can be divided into personal characteristics and external settings (such as groups or organisations). Individual differences can be observed through characteristics and tendencies, motivations, work attitudes, values, and affections. It is important to note that research on OCB that has been published in economics or management journals has focused more on external factors than research published in psychology-based journals.

Purba et al. (2014) and Ramdhani et al. (2017) investigated personality's role from an internal perspective. These findings suggest that extraversion and emotional stability contribute to OCB among Indonesian employees. Affective personality or emotional personality is also known to affect OCB among Indonesian personnel positively (Ramdhani et al., 2017). It contrasts research conducted in the West, identifying OCB through various factors. Although its relationship with OCB is insufficiently robust, conscientiousness is a trait with a consistent relationship (Konovsky & Organ, 1996; Organ & Ryan, 1995). The relationship between an individual's attitude and OCB is strengthened by indirect predictors such as conscientiousness and other orientation (Korsgaard et al., 2010; Lester et al., 2008). This discrepancy in results may provide a rationale for further study.

Viewpoints related to one's work constitute additional internal perspectives that have been extensively studied. Work completion and authoritative responsibility are work perspectives that reliably have critical positive outcomes on OCB, both in research in Indonesia (Biswan, 2019; Djati & Adiwijaya, 2009; Hapsari, 2009; Mahayasa et al., 2018; Purba et al., 2015; Sahertian, 2010), as well as in various countries (Guzman & Espejo, 2015; Lester et al., 2008; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Therefore, it is plausible that the country of domicile of respondents has no association with the relationship between labour settlements and official responsibilities to OCB.

In addition to human variables, external or contextual factors have been identified as OCB predictors. Scholarly contextual elements began to reveal group settings and characteristics associated with groups or organisations. In Indonesia, research has been conducted on organisational factors such as how people perceive organisational support (Claudia, 2018), organisational culture (Karim, 2021; Fatdina, 2021), and contextual factors such as employees' relationships with direct supervisors and

leadership (Amir & Santoso, 2019; Prasetyawati & Putra, 2022; Sahertian, 2022; Tjahjono et al, 2018). The findings of this study are consistent with those of many previous Western or international studies indicating that these components are essential and beneficial in OCB. (Bowler & Brass, 2006; Chan & Mak, 2012; Chiaburu & Byrne, 2009; Farmer et al., 2015; Walumbwa et al., 2010); (Bowler & Brass, 2006; Chan & Mak, 2012; Chiaburu & Byrne, 2009).

Research Methods Used to Research OCB in Indonesia

The fact that the majority of studies used self-reports and that all studies used primary data or questionnaires to collect OCB data is an intriguing finding. Podsakoff et al. (2003) acknowledge that self-report techniques have problems that enable common method variance. The common method variance is known if the study data originates from a single source, such as a self-report questionnaire that evaluates all dependent and independent variables. Nonetheless, Purba et al. (2022) demonstrated that their data were free from the possibility of common method variance by undertaking additional data analysis, indicating that advanced analytical techniques may anticipate data collection from a single source in organisational research. In no other OCB investigation in Indonesia was this discovered? OCB utilises the same sources as the meta-analysis by Podsakoff et al. (2000), as it is a socially desirable construct. It is, therefore, exceedingly susceptible to bias. In order to increase the credibility of the research findings, Indonesian OCB follow-up studies may continue to focus on this issue.

CONCLUSION

The preceding explanation provides various research suggestions for OCB in Indonesia. First, most OCB structures referenced Organ (2002; 2006). In the meantime, Indonesian scholars continue to detest the OCB framework proposed by William and Anderson (1991). Moreover, several academics have proposed OCB-based businesses or OCB constructs that can be tailored to the business's values or characteristics. According to a 2013 study by Dekas et al., Google, Inc. must develop OCBs that better reflect the company's characteristics. Consequently, although helping behaviour and voice are traditionally viewed as distinct concepts, Dekas et al.'s (2013) OCB version incorporates both.

The necessity to investigate certain OCBs for particular companies or job qualities has implications for Indonesian businesses conducting OCB research. For instance, a nurse's duty to assist a patient is not OCB. Working for the State Civil Servant (ASN) outside of the bureaucracy may be contrary to OCB, despite being designed for efficiency.

Secondly, since most OCB research in Indonesia still concentrates on white-collar worker respondents, blue-collar workers cannot be used to verify the relationship between OCB constructs and other constructs. Other professions, jobs that differ from office jobs in terms of features, such as jobs held by non-permanent workers or jobs without job insecurity, such as white-collar professions,

are the focus of this line of research. Other types of jobs, such as blue-collar jobs or other jobs that differ from office jobs in terms of features, are also included in this line of research.

Thirdly, research on the inward perspective, as it pertains to the nature of this situation, reveals different results in Indonesia and the West. These non-normalised results may be one reason for additional research in Indonesia, particularly to determine if other developments are occurring as mediators between character and OCB. One worth noting is that character research has been conducted using build and estimation tools derived from Western culture. In the meantime, Hofstede and McCrae (2004) reveal how a nation's way of life influences an individual's personality. From this explanation, an exploratory comprehension of Indonesian characters must also include investigating the nation's way of life.

REFERENCES

- Amir, D. A., & Santoso, C. B. (2019). Examining a servant leadership construct and its influence on organisational citizenship behaviour, *Jurnal Siasat Bisnis*, 23(1), 37–49. <https://doi.org/10.20885/jsb.vol23.iss1.art>
- Arthaud-Day, M. L., Rode, J. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2012). Direct and contextual effects of individual values on organisational citizenship behaviour in teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(4), 792–807. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027352>
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee “Citizenship.” *The Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587–595.
- Berg, J. M., Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2010). Perceiving and responding to challenges in job crafting at different ranks: When proactivity requires adaptivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(2-3), 158–186. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.645>
- Bolino, M. C., Hsiung, H.-H., Harvey, J., & LePine, J. A. (2015). “Well, I’m tired of tryin’!” Organisational citizenship behaviour and citizenship fatigue. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(1), 56–74. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037583>
- Bowler, W. M., & Brass, D. J. (2006). Relational correlates of interpersonal citizenship behaviour: A social network perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 70–82. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.70>
- Chan, S. C. H., & Mak, W. M. (2012). Benevolent leadership and follower performance: The mediating role of leader-member exchange (LMX). *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 29(2), 285–301. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-011-9275-3>
- Chiaburu, D. S., & Byrne, Z. S. (2009). Predicting OCB role definitions: Exchanges with the organisation and psychological attachment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 24(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9100-x>
- Claudia, M. (2018). The influence of perceived organisational support, job satisfaction and organisational commitment toward organisational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Indonesian Economy and Business*, 33(1), 23–45.
- Farmer, S. M., Frank Barton, W., Van Dyne, L., & Kamdar, D. (2015). The contextualised self: How team-member exchange leads to coworker identification and helping OCB. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(2), 583–595. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037660>
- Fatdina, F. (2021). Peran dukungan organisasi yang dirasakan karyawan sebagai mediator pengaruh keadilan prosedural terhadap perilaku kewarganegaraan organisasi. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 36(1), 1 – 17.
- Galvan, J. L., & Galvan, M. C. (2017). *Writing literature reviews: A guide for students of the social and behavioural sciences* (Edisi ketubah). Routledge.

- Guzman, F. A., & Espejo, A. (2015). Dispositional and situational differences in motives to engage in citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(2), 208–215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.09.029>
- Hofstede, G., & McCrae, R. R. (2004). Personality and culture revisited: Linking traits and dimensions of culture. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 38(1), 52–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069397103259443>
- Karim, A. (2021). Pengaruh disiplin, etos kerja, dan budaya organisasi terhadap organizational citizenship behavior pegawai administrator pelabuhan Tanjung Priok. *Widyariset*, 13(1), 21–30.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organisational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17(3), 253–266. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(199605\)17:3<253::CO;2-Q](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199605)17:3<253::CO;2-Q)
- Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., Lester, S. W., & Jeong, S. S. (2010). Paying you back or paying me forward: Understanding rewarded and unrewarded organisational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(2), 277–290. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018137>
- Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organisational citizenship behaviour and workplace deviance: the role of effect and cognitions. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 131–142. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.131>
- Lester, S. W., Meglino, B. M., & Korsgaard, M. A. (2008). The role of other orientations in organisational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(1), 829–841. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.504>
- Mangundjaya, W. L. H. (2013). Is there a cultural change in the national culture of Indonesia? Dalam Y. Kashima, E. S. Kashima, & R. Beatson (Eds.), *Steering the cultural dynamics: Selected papers from the 2010 Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology*. https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/iaccp_papers/105/ Maron, J., Kraus, L., Pogarell, O., Gomes De Matos, E., & Piontek, D. (2016). Occupational inequalities in psychoactive substance use: A question of conceptualisation? *Addiction Research and Theory*, 24(3), 186–198. <https://doi.org/10.3109/16066359.2015.1093122>
- McNeely, B. L., & Meglino, B. M. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial organisational behaviour: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(6), 836–844. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.6.836>
- Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extrarole efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4), 403–419. <https://doi.org/10.2307/257011>
- Nielsen, K., & Abildgaard, J. S. (2012). The development and validation of a job crafting measure for use with blue-collar workers. *Work and Stress*, 26(4), 365–384. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2012.733543>
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organisational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books/D. C. Heath and Com.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organisational citizenship behaviour: It is constructed clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 99–109. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_2
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organisation citizenship behaviour: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. Sage Publications.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organisational citizenship behaviour. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 775–802. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x>
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of organisational citizenship behaviour on organisational performance: A review and suggestion for future research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 133–151. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_5
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioural research: A critical literature review and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.87>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organisational citizenship behaviours: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and

- suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513–563. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600307>
- Prasetyawati, D., & W. Gunawan Putra, A. (2016). Efek nilai kerja, otonomi, dan work setting terhadap kepemimpinan dan perilaku organisasi pada industri jasa perhotelan. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Pemasaran Jasa*, 3(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.25105/jmpj.v3i1.477>
- Purba, D. E., Oostrom, J. K., Van Der Molen, H. T., & Born, M. P. (2022). Personality and organisational citizenship behaviour in Indonesia: The mediating effect of affective commitment. *Asian Business and Management*, 14(2), 147–170. <https://doi.org/10.1057/abm.2014.20>
- Rahmi, F., & Riyono, B. (2019). Pengaruh karakteristik pekerjaan terhadap perilaku kewargaan organisasi dengan mediator nilai-nilai kualitas kehidupan kerja. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 15(1), 64-76. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jpu.15.1.64-76>
- Ramdhani, N., Ancok, D., & Adrianson, L. (2022). The importance of positive affect: The role of affective personality in predicting organisational citizenship behaviour. *Makara Human Behavior Studies in Asia*, 21(2), 62–69. <https://doi.org/10.7454/mssh.v21i2.3501>
- Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 66–80. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.66>
- Sahertian, P. (2022). Perilaku kepemimpinan berorientasi hubungan dan tugas sebagai anteseden komitmen organisasional, self-efficacy dan organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). *Jurnal Manajemen dan Wirausaha*, 12(2), 156–169. Schwartz, S. H. (2017). Values and behavior: Taking a cross culture perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(10), 1207-1220. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167203254602>
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organisational citizenship behaviour: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653–663. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653>
- Spector, P. E. (2006). Method variance in organisational research: Truth or urban legend. *Organizational Research Methods*, 9(2), 221–232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428105284955>
- Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artefacts in assessing counterproductive work and organisational citizenship behaviour: Do we know what we think we know? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(4), 781–790. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019477>
- Tjahjono, H. K., Prasetyo, F., & Palupi, M. (2018). Kepemimpinan transformasional pada organizational citizenship behavior dan komitmen afektif. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Pemasaran Jasa*, 11(2), 217-232. <https://doi.org/10.25105/jmpj.v11i2.2771>
- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviours: evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 108–119. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256902>
- Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Oke, A. (2010). A cross-level investigation: servant leadership, procedural justice climate, service climate, employee attitudes, and organisational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(3), 517–529. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018867>
- Wijayanto, B. R., & Kismono, G. (2004). The effect of job embeddedness on organisational citizenship behaviour: The mediating role of sense of responsibility. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, 6(3), 335-354. <https://doi.org/10.22146/gamaijb.5554>
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organisational commitment as predictors of organisational citizenship and in-role behaviours. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601–617. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700305>