Some Possible Antecedents of Military Personnel Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Sait Gurbuz

Air Defense Captain, Turkish Land Forces, Istanbul, Turkey

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) describes actions in which employees are willing to go above and beyond their prescribed role requirements. Little or no attention has been paid to the OCB from military perspective. The purpose of this article is to investigate job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational justice, and trust in supervisor as the potential antecedents of OCB in a military setting. The research hypotheses are tested using sample data collected from 301 military personnel. The proposed antecedents were positively related to OCB. Yet, hierarchical regression analysis reveals that job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and trust in supervisor account for unique variances in OCB of the military personnel. Implications for the theory and practice of OCB are discussed, limitations of the study are discussed, and future research directions offered.

INTRODUCTION

As it is known in the management literature that organizations need employees who are willing to exceed their formal job descriptions (Katz & Kahn, 1978) in order to gain competitive advantage in market place. These behaviors (exceeding job requirements) over the years have generated a considerable amount of scholarly attention and conceptualized as an extra-role behavior (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Van Dyne, Cummings, & McLean-Parks, 1995), organizational citizenships behavior (OCB; Bateman & Organ, 1983), prosocial organizational behaviors (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986), organizational spontaneity (George & Brief, 1992), and con-

Correspondence should be addressed to Sait Gurbuz, Ph.D., Turkish General Staff, Personnel Department, Bakanliklar, Ankara, Turkey. E-mail: sgurbuz_99@yahoo.com

textual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). But among those, the topic of OCB has received the most attention and continues to stimulate interest among researchers. Organ (1988) defined OCB as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and is the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization" (p. 4).

Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) observe that OCB are important for organizational efficiency, effectiveness, innovation, and adaptability within diverse organizations. Podsakoff and Mackenzie (1997) have also pointed out that OCB are beneficial for organizations in ways besides contributing directly to group or organizational performance by making organizations move attractive place to work for one's coworkers. Most of the OCB research has focused on the antecedents/predictors of employee's OCB from a civilian organization perspective. But in military literature, antecedents of military personnel OCB have not been studied yet.

The purpose of this article is to examine the potential antecedents of OCB in a military. For that purpose, job satisfaction, organizational justice, trust in supervisor, and organizational commitment have been proposed as the predictors of military personnel OCB.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

More than half a century ago, Barnard (1938) stated that the willingness of individuals to contribute cooperative effort to organization was essential to effective attainment of organizational goals. Then, in the late 1970's, Katz and Kahn (1978) observed the importance of a class of discretionary behaviors that are beyond explicit role requirements but that are beneficial for organizational effectiveness. From this point of view, Organ (1988) conceptualized these behaviors as OCB to denote beneficial behaviors of employees that was not prescribed, but occurred freely to help others achieve the task.

Although it has long been recognized that OCB is extra-role and discretionary behaviors, more recent research has acknowledged that OCB may also be considered as in-role behavior. Morrison (1994), for instance, found that 18 of the 20 proposed OCB items were perceived as in-role behaviors by employees. Also, Vey and Campbell (2004) reported that participants categorized 17 of 30 OCB items as in-role work behaviors. Borman and Motowidlo (1993) proposed "contextual performance" by criticizing whether OCB is truly "discretionary." Also, OCB has been shown to be important for overall job performance in several studies. Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994) demonstrated that the measures of task performance and contextual performance have different antecedents and both task per-

formance and contextual performance contribute independently to rating of overall performance. Conway (1996) found that task and contextual performances are not completely independent, and that the independence differs by job type and type of contextual dimensions. The above empirical evidence and some telling criticisms caused Organ (1997) to rethink the defining character of OCB and he redefined OCB as "performance that supports and psychological environment in which the task performance takes place" (p. 95).

Dimensions of OCB

There is no clear consensus within the literature about the dimensions of OCB. Organ has introduced five components of OCB: altruism (e.g., helping behaviors directed specific individual), conscientiousness (e.g., efficient use of time and going beyond minimum role requirements), sportsmanship (e.g., tolerating the inevitable inconveniences of work without complaining), courtesy (e.g., informing other to prevent the occurrence of work-related problems), and civic virtue (e.g., participating in the life of company). Williams and Anderson (1991) have divided OCB into two types: OCB-I (behavior that is directed at individual in the organization) and OCB-O (behavior that is concerned with helping the organization as a whole). Some researchers (Mackenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter 1991; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994) are conceptualized in three factors as helping behaviors, civic virtue, and sportsmanship. But most OCB studies have been conducted on the basis of Organ's five OCB dimensions.

Antecedents of OCB

Job Satisfaction

Jobs satisfaction is defined as an employee's overall affective state resulting from an approval of all aspects of his job (Vroom, 1964). An employee's level of satisfaction toward his job varies with specific aspects of the job, including the nature of the work, pay, promotion, coworkers, and organizational context (procedures, working condition). First research on the antecedents of OCB was conducted by Smith, Bateman, and Organ (1983), and they found job satisfaction to be the best predictor. Later, Schnake, Cochran, and Dumler (1995) found that job satisfaction is related only with two of the five dimensions of OCB. LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002), in their meta-analysis on OCB, found that OCB correlated with job satisfaction. Organ and Konovsky (1989) reported positive correlation between job satisfaction and OCB in their study of academics and managers. Also, Williams and Anderson (1991) found a positive relationship between OCB and job satisfaction in their study of professional managers. But, in contrast to previous studies, Schappe (1998) and Moorman (1991) found that job satisfaction is not related to OCB.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is defined as a psychological state characterizing an employee's relationship with the organization that has implications for the employee's decision to remain or leave the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Meyer and Allen (1991) argued that there are three dimensions of organizational commitment, which are affective (emotional attachment, due to positive emotions about the organization); normative (obligation, commitment because of an employee's internalization of organizational values and goals and an associated sense of obligation); and continuance commitment (cost-based, commitment to the organization because of the high perceived cost of leaving it).

Morrison (1994), O'Reilly and Charman (1986), and Schappe (1998) found a positive association between OCB and organizational commitment. However, Williams and Anderson (1991) found that organizational commitment is not related to OCB.

Employees who have positive attitudes toward their jobs and are committed to their employers will reciprocate by showing a willingness to engage in OCB. For that reason we proposed that organizational commitment and job satisfaction might be the predictors of military personnel OCB.

Organizational Justice

Organizational justice refers to people's perceptions of fairness in organizations. This construct has received a great deal of interest by human resources management and organizational behavior researchers in recent years. The theoretical link between organizational justice and OCB is proposed that one's inclination to engage in OCB stems from his or her justice perception (Organ, 1988). In other words, individuals who perceive unfairness might withdraw OCB. When individuals perceive fair treatment from his or her supervisor/organization, he or she will have more inclination to perform OCB. There are three types of organizational justice: distributive, procedural, and interactional (more recently studied in the OCB literature). In this research, we will focus on overall justice perceptions as predictors of the OCB.

Procedural justice is defined as the perceived fairness of the policies and procedures used to make decisions (Greenberg, 1983). Distributive justice is explained as the perceived fairness of outcomes that employee receives from organizations (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Interactional justice is defined as the perception of fair treatment by an organization's leaders and decision-makers (Bies, 2001).

Researchers such as Greenberg (1983); Konovsky and Folger (1991), Niehoff and Moorman (1993), and Organ and Konovsky (1989) found that OCB is correlated with overall fairness. However, Tansky (1993) observes that overall fairness is only associated with altruism.

Trust in Supervisors

Recently, research on trust in organizations is increasingly popular issue (see Kramer & Tyler, 1996). In this research, we will concentrate on the interpersonal trust or trust in supervisor from the perspective of the military setting. Trust can be defined as "an expectancy held by an individual or group that the word, promise, verbal or written statement of another individual or group can be relied upon" (Rotter, 1967, p. 651). Given this definition, it can be said that trust plays a central role in the some of the theories used to explain justice-behavior relationships. Social exchange relationships involve unspecified expectations for future reciprocation; thus, cooperative partners in social exchange must trust that the other party will reciprocate in kind (Blau, 1964). Hence, trust in supervisor has been linked with performing OCB (Butler, 1991; Deluga, 1995; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). Additionally, research has shown that trust mediates fairness-outcome relationships, such as the link between justice and OCB (Aryee, Budhwar, & Chen, 2002; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994).

To summarize, Organ and Ryan (1995) found that perceived justice, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and leader supportiveness are important predictors of OCB in their meta-analytic review of 55 studies. Also, job satisfaction (Williams & Anderson, 1991), interpersonal trust (Podsakoff et al., 1990), organizational justice (Knovsky & Pugh, 1994; Moorman, 1991), and organizational commitment (Becker, 1992) were found to be antecedents of OCB. Several demographic factors such as organizational tenure, age, and gender have been proposed as affecting OCB as well (Farh, Podsakoff, & Organ, 1990; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). So, we propose that job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational justice, and trust might be antecedents of military personnel OCB.

OCB in Military Literature

Even though there is much research about the OCB in civilian setting, there are only a few studies examined OCB in military context. Deluga (1995) was the first to study OCB among military personnel. He examined the relationship between subordinates' perceptions of 10 behaviors (availability, competence, consistency, discreetness, fairness, integrity, loyalty, openness, promise fulfillment, receptivity) thought to activate trust in supervisors and supervisory rating of subordinates' OCBs. The study was conducted in 64 supervisor subordinate dyads serving in the U.S. military. Deluga found that 10 supervisor behaviors facilitating interpersonal trust were positively associated with subordinate extra-role behaviors.

Klammer, Skarlicki, and Barclay (2002) examined the relationship between the perceived existence of procedures that provide opportunities for voice-mechanism (or being heard) and civic virtue dimension of OCB. Data were collected from 262

CF members. At the end of the research, these authors found a positive correlation between being heard and civic virtue.

Zellars, Tepper, and Duffy (2002) studied the relationship between subordinates' perceptions of abusive supervision and supervisors evaluations of subordinates' OCBs. The study was explored among a sample of 373 Air National Guard members and their supervisors. They found that the relationship between abusive supervision and subordinates' OCBs was stronger among subordinates who defined OCB as extra-role behavior.

Tepper and Taylor (2003) examined the relationship among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and OCB by using the some data from Zellars et al. (2002). Results supported that when supervisors perceived greater procedural justice, they engaged in more OCB, which contributed to subordinates' perceptions of procedural justice and, hence, subordinates' OCBs.

Finally, Geraghty and Collins (2003) identified potential contextual predictors of job performance for military officers. Data were collected from 105 Irish Defense Forces officers. The authors found that there were no differences in the extent to which contextual job components were a part of the jobs across four military units, but for one contextual factor, contextual components were a significant part of some jobs.

Hypotheses Tested

The present study examined relationships between OCB and its predictors. Based on the empirical evidence reviewed above, the following hypotheses were tested.

H1: Job satisfaction and organizational commitment are positively related to OCB.

H2: Organizational justice and trust in supervisor are positively correlated with OCB.

H3: Job satisfaction and organizational justice explain the unique variance in OCB.

H4: Trust in supervisor and organizational commitment explain the unique variance in OCB.

H5: As they jointly influenced OCB, organizational justice has a greater effect on OCB than job satisfaction and trust in supervisors.

H6: As they jointly influenced OCB, organizational commitment has greater effect on OCB than job satisfaction and trust in supervisor.

METHOD

Sample and Procedures

This study was conducted in the Turkish Land Forces. Questionnaires were used to collect data from officers and NCOs who are members of the Turkish Land Forces.

The military personnel were asked about their perception of organizational commitment, justice, trust in supervisor, and job satisfaction level, as well as OCB that they performed. Demographic information such as age, rank, status, education, and tenure were collected.

Firstly, each questionnaire was translated from English into Turkish and then back to English to ensure no meaning changes. Then, a pilot survey was conducted in 55 randomly selected military personnel. During the pilot survey testing, the questions proved to be easily understood by the participants.

Three hundred and forty-five questionnaires were distributed to the participants and 301 were them returned, for a response rate of 87%. Forty percent of the respondents were officers; the remaining 60% were NCOs. Tenure ranged from less than 5 years (17%), to 5–10 years (33%), to more than 11 years (50%). The participants were predominantly male (99%), and the median age was between 32 and 41 years old.

Measures

All constructs are measured using a 5-point Likert scale in the study. All of the English versions of the questionnaires were translated into Turkish by the researcher and reviewed by a colleague, an associate professor of English at the University of Istanbul, to assure clarity of terminology. Some minor changes were made because of the characteristics of the Turkish Land Forces. The following measures were used in the present study.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

To be consistent with past research, the measures are adapted from past research in OCB literature (Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Five dimensions (including altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship, and civic virtue) of OCB were assessed using a 30-item scale. Fox, Ben-Nahum, and Yinon (1989) and Tansky (1993) argue that OCB rating by an employee or coworker may be more appropriate than a supervisor rating since the peer may observe some behaviors that supervisors are not in a position to observe. Hence, military personnel rated their own OCB. Higher scores indicated more OCB and lower scores indicated less. Two items were reverse scored. The Cronbach's alpha reliability for the overall OCB scale was 0.91.

Perceptions of Fairness

Distributive and procedural justice forms of organizational justice were used in the present study. Perceptions of distributive justice were measured with the Distributive Justice Index, developed by Price and Mueller (1986). This 5-item scale measures the degree to which rewards received by employees are perceived to be re-

lated to performance inputs. The scale shows the fairness of work outcomes pertaining to fairness of pay, work schedule, workload, and responsibilities. Perceptions of procedural justice were measured using 8 items developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.87.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment was gauged using a 15-item measure developed by Meyer and Allen (1991). Three facets (affective, normative, and continuance commitment) of organizational commitment were measured in the study. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.94.

Job Satisfaction

To measure satisfaction, a 20-item job satisfaction scale developed by Spector (1997) was used. Respondents were asked to indicate their degree of satisfaction on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*very dissatisfied*) to 5 (*very satisfied*) with regard to the various facets of their job. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.92.

Trust in Supervisor

Trust in supervisor was measured with the Condition of Trust Inventory developed by Butler (1991). Originally, this measure consisted of 44 items, but only 25 were used for this research after the pilot study. Trust in supervisor behaviors of the respondents were measured in terms of availability, competence, consistency, discreetness, fairness integrity, loyalty, openness, promise fulfillment, and receptivity. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.89.

RESULTS

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, coefficient alphas, and intercorrelations of the study variables. The coefficient alpha estimates for all the scales are greater than .70, which is the recommended level for the social sciences. So, internal consistency reliabilities of the all dimensions were quite respectable.

Table 1 shows that all variables investigated were significantly related to OCB. Organizational commitment and trust in supervisor had the strongest correlation with OCB ($r = .50$; $r = .45$, respectively; $p < 0.001$). The lowest correlation was between OCB and organizational justice ($r = .31$; $p < 0.001$). Hence, the first hypothesis, "Job satisfaction and organizational commitment are positively related to OCB," and the second hypothesis, "Organizational justice and trust in supervisor are positively correlated with OCB," were supported according to the correlation analysis results.

TABLE 1
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Among the Study
Variables

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. OCB	4.0	.42	(.91)[a]				
2. Job satisfaction	3.1	.64	.38	(.92)[a]			
3. Organizational commitment	3.7	.60	.50	.39	(.94)[a]		
4. Organizational justice	3.2	.88	.31	.61	.51	(.87)[a]	
5. Trust in supervisor	3.4	.80	.45	.41	.55	.64	(.89)[a]

Note. All correlations are significant at the 0.001 level (two-tailed).
[a]Cronbach's alpha reliabilities for related variables.

Effect of Control Variables on OCB

OCB did not vary significantly by the demographic factors such as rank, education, and tenure. However, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) on OCB reveals that the Army personnel in the Staff Branch (a kind of military branch) significantly perform more OCB than the other personnel (*M* varies from 3.1 to 3.8). Possible reason is that the personnel who in the Staff Branch have more chances to become generals than the other. This important career opportunity causes them to engage in more OCB. This branch also empowered personnel in the Army. Hence, it can be said that the empowered personnel engage more OCB than the other personnel.

Hierarchical Regression Analysis

A series of hierarchical regression analyses was performed to test the other hypotheses. In this analysis, OCB was used as the dependent variable. As shown in Table 2, in the first step, tenure, branch, and rank were included as the independent variables. These three predictors are found to be nonsignificantly associated with OCB.

In the second stage, job satisfaction was added to the model. As shown in Table 2, after the inclusion of job satisfaction, the amount of explained variance increased to the level of .191 by the 122 amount of change. We added organizational justice to the equation in third step. Addition of this variable failed to cause a significant change because incremental variance explained is negligible ($\Delta R^2 = .011$). Therefore, the third hypothesis, "Job satisfaction and organizational justice explain the unique variance in OCB," was partly supported. In other words, job satisfaction explained the unique variance of OCB; however, when organizational justice is included, it failed to explain the unique variance of OCB. Hence, organizational justice was found to be unrelated to emergence of OCB, when it influenced OCB with job satisfaction.

TABLE 2
Hierarchical Regression Analysis Between OCB and the Other Variables
($N = 301$)

Variables	R^2	Adj. R^2	ΔR^2	F
Stage 1				
Rank				
Tenure	—	.060	—	3.374*
Branch				
Stage 2				
Rank				
Tenure	.191	.180	.122	17.288***
Branch				
Job satisfaction				
Stage 3				
Rank				
Tenure				
Branch	.202	.189	.011	13.273***
Job satisfaction				
Organizational justice				
Stage 4				
Rank				
Tenure				
Branch				
Job satisfaction	.304	.295	.102	16.502***
Organizational justice				
Trust in supervisor				
Stage 5				
Rank				
Tenure				
Branch				
Job satisfaction	.418	.408	.114	19.700***
Organizational justice				
Trust in supervisor				
Organizational commitment				

Note.   *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$.

In the fourth step, trust in supervisors was included in the equation. As seen in Table 2, the amount of explained variance in OCB increased by .102 to an overall level of .304. And in the final stage (fifth), as expected, the addition of the organizational commitment yields a significant change in the amount of explained variance ($R^2 = 418$; $\Delta R^2 = .118$). Hence, the fourth hypothesis, "Trust in supervisor and organizational commitment explain the unique variance in OCB," was supported.

To test the fifth and sixth hypotheses, we should examine the second, third, and fifth stages together. In the second stage, incremental variance ($\Delta R^2 = .122$)

explained by job satisfaction was significant. In the fourth stage, the incremental variance ($\Delta R^2 = .102$) explained by trust in supervisor was also not negligible. However, in the third stage, the incremental variance ($\Delta R^2 = .011$) explained by organizational justice was negligible. Military personnel's perceptions of organizational justice appear as not relatively stronger antecedents of OCB than their job satisfaction and trust in supervisor. Therefore, the fifth hypothesis, "As they jointly influenced OCB, organizational justice has greater effect on OCB than job satisfaction and trust in supervisors," was not supported. When we look at the final stage for explained unique variance of organizational commitment, we can conclude that organizational commitment is the strongest predictor of the military personnel OCB ($R^2 = .418$; $\Delta R^2 = .114$). So, military personnel's psychological states characterizing with the Army (organizational commitment) has a greater effect on OCB than the all other potential antecedent factors (job satisfaction, organizational justice, and trust in supervisor). Hence, the sixth hypothesis, "As they jointly influenced OCB, organizational commitment has greater effect on OCB than job satisfaction and trust in supervisors," was supported.

It can be also seen in Table 3 that when the control variables were controlled, the standardized beta coefficients for job satisfaction, trust in supervisor, and organizational commitment were positive and significant (.201, $p < 0.01$; 170, $p < 0.05$; .392, $p < 0.001$, respectively), whereas the beta coefficients for organizational justice were not significant.

A closer look into the results of the all-stage regression reveals that Army personnel's organizational commitment is the most important antecedent of OCB in the military. Trust in supervisor and job satisfaction, respectively, follow this factor as possible antecedents.

TABLE 3
Standardized Regression Coefficients for All Variables in Complete
Regression Equation ($N = 301$)

Variables	Beta	t
Controls		
Rank	.039	.799
Tenure	.085	1.507
Branch	.013	.230
Predictor variables		
Job satisfaction	.201	3.012**
Organizational justice	.060	.900
Trust in supervisor	.170	3.027*
Organizational commitment	.392	7.706***

Note.   *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this research was to test some possible variables (job satisfaction, trust in supervisor, organizational justice, and organizational commitment) as antecedents of OCB in the military context. We explored these factors of military personnel OCB in the military context in order to contribute the emerging theoretical explanation of OCB.

The finding of this study suggests that job satisfaction, trust in supervisor, organizational justice, and organizational commitment of the military personnel are positively associated with their OCBs. The findings also reveal that while organizational commitment, trust in supervisor, and job satisfaction are important antecedents of OCB, organizational commitment is the most important predictor of OCB in the military context, surpassing the incremental variance of the others. However, our expectation about organizational justice was not supported. Organizational justice is positively related to OCB, but regression analysis shows that this factor is unrelated to the emergence of OCB when it is included in equation with job satisfaction, trust in supervisor, and commitment. It can be said that military personnel put more emphasis on organizational commitment, trust in supervisor, and job satisfaction than on organizational justice as determinants of their OCB.

This study contributes to growing OCB literature, as well as the literature on job attitudes, trust in supervisor, and organizational fairness, in several ways. First of all, this study provides the first examination of antecedent factors of OCB from a military personnel perspective. Also, the study helps to bridge the gap in OCB literature in military organizations. It is expected that this would encourage other researchers to conduct research in this neglected area (military context).

Research conducted on OCB revealed that job satisfaction (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Schnake et al., 1995; Smith et al., 1983; Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler, & Ensley, 2004; Williams & Anderson, 1991), organizational commitment (Becker, 1992; Organ & Ryan, 1995), and trust in supervisor (Butler, 1991; Deluga, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 1990), and organizational fairness (Greenberg, 1983; Konovsky & Folger, 1991; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Organ & Konovsky, 1989) had strong effects on OCB. The result of the research is consistent with those studies in management except for organizational fairness.

In this research, organizational fairness was found to be positively correlated with OCB. However, when it was included in the equation with the other factors (job satisfaction, commitment, and trust), it failed to be a significant predictor of OCB. Similar to this research, Organ and Ryan (1995), in their meta-analytical study, contrary to their previous studies, found that fairness was not a better determinant of altruism than job satisfaction. Tansky (1993) also postulated that overall fairness was only related to altruism of OCB. Hence, in the military set-

ting, it can be said that organizational justice was not a better antecedent of military personnel OCB than organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and trust in supervisor.

Bateman and Organ (1983) conceptualized OCB as "good soldier syndrome," which is necessary for the prosperity and good functioning of every organization. In military, these kinds of behaviors are more important than civilian settings. OCB of military personnel is a new concept that has received little attention in the relevant literature. Yet, OCB of military personnel appears important in that it is directly or indirectly linked to military unit achievement. For military leaders and commanders, a key important of this study is that job attitudes (satisfaction and commitment), organizational fairness, and trust in supervisor of military personnel are related to their OCB. For that reason, military leaders should focus on managing military personnel perceptions of organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and trust in supervisor. Military leaders should also become more aware of the effects of military personnel's job attitude and trust in supervisor to engage in OCB.

Limitations and Future Research

The research has some limitations as well. First, all factors were assessed through self-reports, which might create the potential for common method bias. This bias might have inflated or deflated the association among the variables. In the future, in order to lessen the potential for bias, data should be collected from different sources.

Another limitation of the research is that because of time and financial constraints, this study was conducted in military personnel serving in the Turkish Army. In Turkey, societal culture has been described as being high on power distance, uncertainty avoiding, and collectivism (Hofstede, 1984; Gurbuz & Bingol, 2007). It has been known that cultural nuances might affect OCB by inhibiting or facilitating these kind of behaviors. The result of the research may not be considered as representative of all countries' military units. Thus, these results must be interpreted with considerable caution. Despite this limitation, the findings may prove useful for guiding future research.

This study focuses on the four antecedents of OCB, but there might be other factors that predict OCB; for example, leader member exchange, organizational culture, organizational cohesiveness, etc. Future research should investigate the other factors that might cause military personnel to engage in OCB.

Morrison (1994) found that 18 of the 20 proposed OCB items were perceived as in-role behaviors by employees. It would be valuable for further studies to determine specifically how military personnel conceptualize their various job behaviors. For example, some military personnel might see extra-role behaviors as more central to their job or in role behavior than others.

REFERENCES

Aryee, Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*, 267–286.

Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bateman, T., & Organ, D. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier the relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*, 586–595.

Becker, T. E. (1992). Foci and bases of commitment: Are they distinctions worth making. *Academy of Management Journal, 35*, 232–244.

Bies, R. J. (2001). Interactional (in)justice: The sacred and the profane. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 89–118). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life.* New York: Wiley.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review, 11*, 710–725.

Butler, J. K. (1991). Toward understanding and measuring of trust: Evaluation of a condition of trust inventory, *Journal of Management, 17*, 643–663.

Conway, J. M. (1996). Additional construct validity evidence for the task/contextual performance distinction. *Human Performance, 9*, 309–329.

Deluga, R. J. (1995). The relation between trust in the supervisor and subordinate organizational citizenship behavior. *Military Psychology, 7*, 1–16.

Farh, J., Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management, 16*, 705–721.

Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fox, S., Ben-Nahum, Z., & Yinon, Y. (1989). Perceived similarity and accuracy of peer ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 781–786.

George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good—Doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work—Organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(2), 310–329.

Geraghty, B. J., & Collins, J. M. (2003). Becoming brass: Task related and contextual components of military officer jobs. *Military Psychology, 15*(4), 255–272.

Greenberg, J. (1983). Overcoming egocentric bias in perceived fairness through self-awareness. *Social Psychological Quarterly, 46*(2), 152–156.

Gurbuz, S. & Bingol, D. (2007). Cesitli orgut yoneticilerinin guc mesafesi, belirsizlikten kac1inma, eril-disil ve bireyci-toplulukcu kultur boyutlar1na yonelik egilimleri uzerine gorgul bir arastirma, *KHO Savunma Bilimleri Dergisi, 6*, 68–87.

Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.

Klammer, J., Skarlicki, D. P., & Barclay, L. (2002). Speaking up in the Canadian Military: Theories of voice, being heard, and generation in predicting civic virtue. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 34*(2), 122–130.

Konovsky, M. A., & Folger, R. (1991). *The effects of procedural and distributive justice on organizational citizenship behavior*. Unpublished manuscript, A. B. Freeman School of Business, Tulane University.

Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 656–669.

Kramer, R. M., & Tyler, T. R. (Eds.). (1996). *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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. (1991). Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*, 123–150.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991) Three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 15–23.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 845–855.

Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behaviors: The importance of the employees' perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 1543–1567.

Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from extra-role performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 475–480.

Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationships between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*, 527–556.

O'Reilly, C. & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 492–499.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The Good Soldier syndrome.* Lanham, MA: Lexington Books.

Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean up time. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 85–97.

Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 157–164.

Organ, D. W., & Ryan, I. C. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 775–802.

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research, 3*(1), 351–363.

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). 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., Moorman, R. H. & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly, 1*, 107–142.

Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1986). *Handbook of organizational measurement. Marshfield*, MA: Pittman.

Rotter, J. B. (1967). A new scale for measurement of interpersonal trust. *Journal of Personality, 3*, 651–655.

Schappe, S. P (1998). The influence of job satisfactions, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Psychology, 132*(3), 277–290.

Schnake, M., Cochran, D., & Dumler, M. (1995). Encouraging organizational citizenship: The effects of job satisfaction, perceived equity and leadership. *Journal of Management Issues, 7*(2), 209–221.

Smith, A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior its nature and ante-
  cedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*(4), 653–663.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause and consequences*. Thousand
  Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tansky, J. W. (1993). Justice and organizational citizenship behavior: What is the relationship? *Em-
  ployee Responsibilities and Right Journal, 6*(3), 195–207.

Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Hoobler, J., & Ensley, M. D. (2004). Moderators of the relationships be-
  tween coworkers' organizational citizenship behavior and fellow employees' attitudes. *Journal of
  Applied Psychology, 3*, 455–465.

Tepper, B. J., & Taylor, E. C. (2003). Relationships among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice
  perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*, 97–105.

Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & McLean-Parks, J. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of con-
  struct and definitional clarity. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational
  behavior* (Vol. 17, pp. 215–285). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Vey, M. A., & Campbell, J. P. (2004). In role and extra-role organizational citizenship behavior: which
  are we measuring? *Human Performance, 17*(1), 119–135.

Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predic-
  tors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17*, 601–617.

Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J., & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organiza-
  tional citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 1068–1076.