



The Strategic
JOURNAL of Business & Change
MANAGEMENT

ISSN 2312-9492 (Online), ISSN 2414-8970 (Print)



www.strategicjournals.com

Volume 6, Issue 1, Article 4

**ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF ITS DEVELOPMENT IN A DIVERSITY
DRIVEN WORKPLACE**

Tamunomiebi, M. D., & Onah, G. O.

**ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF ITS DEVELOPMENT IN A DIVERSITY
DRIVEN WORKPLACE**

Tamunomiebi, M. D.¹ & Onah, G. O.²

¹Ph.D, Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, Rivers, State University [RSU],
Nkpolu-Oroworukwo, PMB 5080, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

²Doctoral Candidate, Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, Rivers State University
[RSU], Nkpolu- Oroworukwo, PMB 5080, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

Accepted: January 12, 2019

ABSTRACT

This paper theoretically reviewed the concept of OCB and its implication on a diverse workplace environment. In doing this, the paper identified the theoretical framework on which the concept of OCB is built upon through its sociological and psychological perspective. From that a critical assessment of development of OCB was determined as well as its various dimensions. In order to establish the influence of diverse workforce in the workplace, we also X-rayed the concept of diversify and identify the different forms in which an organization could be said to be diversity driven with critical focus on deep and surface level. In the course of extant literature exploration, we discovered that diversity is an important aspect of today's modern organization's strategy to remain competitive and innovative in its operational life as it affords them with different breeds of employees with higher potentials for behavioral tendency such as OCB. Finally we looked at the implications of diversity on OCB and consequently make recommendations based on our conclusion.

Keywords: Organizational Change Behavior, Diversity Issues

CITATION: Tamunomiebi, M. D., & Onah, G. O. (2019). Organizational citizenship behaviour: A critical review of its development in a diversity driven workplace. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, 6(1), 41 – 60

INTRODUCTION

Drawing from the unpredictable and competitive nature of today's business operating environment, organizations must be ready and willing to respond to these pressures through appropriate strategies in order to adapt adequately and effectively. Hence, the current environment is characterized by the great influence of globalization and increased workplace diversity (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2002). In line with this assertion, we can safely say that globalization and workforce diversity are certainly phenomenal issues shaping business operational dynamics irrespective of the sector in which the business operate. Globalization according to Aina and Reubena (2014) is basically concerned with a process of gradual integration of human endeavors across national boundaries. Also, Akindele, Gidado and Olaopo (2002) viewed it as the pattern of consolidation of economic, political, social and cultural relationships across the countries of the world.

This is as Robbins, Judge and Vohra (2017) asserts that with globalization, organizations are no longer limited by national borders; and this implies that globalization affords contemporary managers the opportunity to access any form of input resources (material or human) that best serve its needs from anywhere in the world as regards information, access to technology and global harmony. For instance, today some organizations operations cut across cultures and subsidiary in other countries and as a result create room for increased foreign assignments. Bearing this view in mind, it becomes discernable that globalization processes affect and are affected by business and work organization, economics, politics, technology, and social-cultural environment.

On the other hand, workplace diversity is considered as one of the most important aspect of the organization in that it looks at the extent to which organization's workforce differs in their demographics characteristics. According to Robbins et al (2017) there two basic forms of workplace

diversity a manager will have to deal with includes the surface level and the deep level. The surface level focuses on the differences in people which are easily observed such as age, race, gender, disability, ethnicity and sexual orientation. Deep level diversity on the other hand is concerned with those differences in values ,personality and work preferences that over time become more crucial in determining similarity as people get to know one another more. Consequently, managers are faced with various issues adapting to these individual differences to achieve set out goals. However, as managers are confronted with these diverse issues, employees are also not left out as they continuously struggle to cope with other organizational issues such as the nature of job design and organizational policy (absence of rest period, weekend work, early resumption, late closure etc.) that might most probably infringe on their personal life and at the same time influence their behavior on the job as some employees may tend to outperform on their task while others may underperform especially as it has to do with their identifiable differences in demographics.

However, the said behavior of an employee has different implications on the job but a behavioral tendency such as organizational citizenship behavior by an employee towards a colleague can avert supposedly service failure caused by the inability of a troubled or distressed colleague and thus bridge such gap by a helping behavior. Sutanto (2005) asserts that employee that demonstrates citizenship behavior positively give a huge contribution to the growth of his organization because he performs and behaves soundly in order to achieve organizational goals. A successful organization therefore needs employees who will do more than their usual job duties and perform beyond expectations. To give credence to this assertion Ahmad, Shaiful and Nik (2014) posits that to continuously survive in today's aggressive business arena , organizations must adopt fair

employment practices to attract and retain people with varied talents and in doing this, it inevitably makes a diverse workforce pool with different values and beliefs. Therefore, a rising body of study has revealed that managing diversity is a serious predictor of worker behaviors and outcomes such as OCB (Mor-Barak, Cherin & Berkman, 1998; Mor-Barak & Levin, 2002; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). In line with the forgoing, it is the interest of this paper to x-ray the origin of OCB construct under the following subheadings: introductory overview, the meaning and nature of OCB, its various components, its theoretical foundation with regards to psychological and sociological foundations, diversity issues, its implication to OCB, draw conclusion in line with the study outcome and finally make recommendations where necessary.

The meaning and nature of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior is a related constructs within the fields of Organizational Behavior (OB). Organizational Behavior is a field of study that investigates the impact that individuals, groups, and structure have on behavior within the organizations, for the purpose of applying such knowledge toward improving an organization's effectiveness. Organizational behavior is the systematic study of behaviors and attitudes of both individuals and groups within organizations (Vecchio, 1991). A collection of volunteer and non-obligatory behavior that is not defined in the official employee job descriptions but contribute to effective improvement of task and roles in an organization (Cohen, 2000). Organ believes that there is a critical difference between these two types of activity; are these behaviors rewarded; and, are they punishable in the case of omission. OCB and related activities should be understood independent of official reward system as OCB it is considered a behavior that is not rewarded by the organization, (Organ, 1998).

The construct organizational citizenship behavior was first introduced by Organ and his associate in the early 1980's despite the fact that its origin can be traced back to Barnard (1938) who initiated the concept of OCB while using system approach in analyzing organizations. Before the construct of OCB, workers tend to dwell on what is stated in the job description which is the ideal psychological contract which according to Rousseau (2007) is the commitment and mutual obligations between the employer and the employee for a specific task in exchange for money hence, this in- role behavior coined workers mentality to gain satisfaction working within their specified job boundaries (task performance). Borman and Motowidlo (1993), view task performance as a performance behavior that meet the required expectation of the organization's technical core. Organ (1988) noted that this job attitude blur the understanding of workers from thinking outside the box which constraint employees willingness to assist colleagues and their disposition to cooperate with others in the course of their job with the notion that the basic contract has been attained owing to the knowledge that they will not be held liable in the omission of any extra -role. Hence, the need to identify employee with helping behavior that can do more than their statutory requirement emerged.

In this light, Katz (1964) asserts that employees require three types of behavior for any organization to function well. Employees must be induced to enter and remain with the organization, employees must have the ability to perform the job requirements or any specific role, as and when assigned, employees must have characteristics of innovation and perform spontaneously, that is beyond their job description (Werner, 2000). In other word one could clarify that going beyond task expectation does not restrict employee from meeting the job description and this suggests that the birth of OCB do not render task performance ineffective but rather enriched task

performance by exceeding assigned requirement thus behavior that contributes to the technical core of the organization are referred here as task performance, while those that contribute to organizational performance by shaping the organization's social and psychological environment are known to be OCB. Consequently, Organ proposed a variant of the happy/productive worker hypothesis: in his version, job satisfaction is believed to predict organizational citizenship behavior rather than (task) performance. Borman and Motowidlo proposed that organizational citizenship behavior (which they termed contextual performance) should be better predicted by personality, whereas task performance should be better predicted by general mental ability. Over the past two decades, awareness in behavior that generally fits the definition of OCB has increased dramatically (Podsakoff et al., 2000). However, scholars have not been completely consistent with the terminology used to label it. Labels for domains of behavior that overlap with OCB as described by Organ (1988) included pro-social organizational behavior (Brief & Motowidlo, (1986); organizational spontaneity and George & Jones, 2002) extra role behavior. As Motowidlo (2000) pointed out, although the behavioral domains of OCB and contextual performance overlap a great deal, there initially were some important definitional differences. Specifically, Organ (1988) originally suggested that OCB must be discretionary and non-rewarded, which was not the case for contextual performance. Almost a decade later, Organ (1997) recognized the conceptual difficulties associated with these requirements "what is discretionary varies a great deal from person to person and from situation to situation" He then redefined OCB as behavior that contributes "to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance" (Organ, 1997).

Later, in Organ classic book *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: "the Good Soldier Syndrome"* Organ (1988)

defined OCB as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization". This definition emphasizes that the behavior must be voluntary not role prescribed or part of formal job duties. Graham (1991) argued that, the requirement to distinguish between in- role and extra- role behaviors are difficult to apply, because this distinction varies across jobs, roles, and organizations, and over time. Entwistle (2011) differentiates the discretionary effort to prescribed activities inherent in task (intra role) from not prescribed activities that are not part of the prescribed duties (extra role). For intra role, here could be a discretionary voluntary effort level that goes beyond the minimum task performance level required at work, or in other words, it employs more effort at work than is required to avoid a reprimand or resignation; it means working as efficiently as possible in the prescribed tasks, above the minimum required. OCB as discretionary extra- role behavior is conceptually distinguished from required in- role performance. While an in- role behavior includes all types of activities that employees are expected to perform according to formal employment contract, OCB refers to a range of activities that go beyond it.

Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Scholastic postulations indicate that behavioral dimension of OCB are inconsistent to a large extent. The first operationalization of OCB was by Smith et al. (1983) who identified altruism as a behavior intended to help a specific person and the second aspect tagged as general obedience, or conformity with norms. Later on, Organ (1988) improved and advanced the concept to a five-dimension construct as Altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue. Podsakoff et al (2009) further categorized Organ's dimensional construct into two category "Courtesy" and "altruism" viewed as mainly benefiting individual, whereas

“conscientiousness,” “sportsmanship,” and “civic virtue” are directed at the organization. Similarly, Williams and Anderson (1991) segmented these five dimensions into two groups OCB-I and OCB-O. OCB-I reflects behaviors that are beneficial to a particular individual and thus in some way add value to the organization; and OCB-O, linked to behaviors that profit the organization as a whole.

More so, Van Dyne et al. (1995) offered a classification comprising of four dimensions: (a) social participation viewed as active involvement in organizational affairs, a component similar to “altruism” (b) obedience, which is similar to “conscientiousness” and “civic virtue” (c) loyalty which reflects devotion to organizational values and objectives by way of staying and working with the organization under any circumstance which is similar to sportsmanship and (d) functional participation, which is dissimilar to OCB dimension but rather similar to Coleman and Borman’s (2000) conceptualization of job task citizenship performance (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). On the whole, LePine et al., (2002) asserts that Organ’s (1988) five-dimensional model has the greatest amount of empirical research which Costa & McCrae, (1992) also refer to as the big five dimensions classified as altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue hence in the next paragraph we shall look at the five dimensions of OCB individually.

Altruism

Altruism is a construct by Organ (1988) viewed as a helping behavior that involves voluntary assistance to others with work related task. For instance a capable employee who decides to put a new employee through in work rules and procedure. Khalid & Ali (2005) and Jahangir, Akbar & Haq (2004) define altruism as voluntary behavior that includes helping others concerning an organizational assignment or a challenge. Podsakoff et al., (2000) viewed altruism as

helping behaviors that employees engage in order to assist others in the organization, as well as those behaviors aimed at preventing conflict. In other words, it includes the behavior that is directly and intentionally aimed at helping a specific person in face-to-face situations (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983).

Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness which denotes going and doing things above minimum requirement suitable in organizational norm which is similar to behaviors labeled as general compliance by Smith et al. (1983). Conscientiousness expresses certain role behaviors exhibited by an employee which exceed minimum requirement (Chiun et al, 2009). In other words, it is a sincere devotion to the organization, as well as respect for the rules of the organization beyond the organization’s expectations (Organ, 1988). An employee who seeks to know if work is going on smoothly while on leave is termed as a conscientious worker (Podsakoff et al., 2000). It can also be said to be the concern of an employee towards the rules and regulations of the organization for the genuine benefit of the organization.

Sportsmanship

Sportsmanship reflects the employee’s desire or willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining which can also be viewed as having a team spirit (Chiun et al 2009; Podsakoff et al 2000 and Smith, Organ & Near, 1983). It could be said to be staying optimistic to accommodate others excesses. In furtherance with this, sportsmanship centers on positive attitude and disposition of employee even during stressed circumstance without resentment. An employee’s willingness to assume and carry out an extra temporary task, without complaining, when he has a right of objection may serve as an example of such behavior (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Employees’ goodwill at the workplace observing positive aspects of work among the negative linked to polite gesture aim at

preventing work related conflict like consulting with others before taking action (Allison et al 2001). Accordingly, Organ (1988) labeled sportsmanship as the behavior of warmly tolerating the irritations that are an unavoidable part of nearly every organizational setting in an attempt to avoid conflicts and interpersonal work-related problems. In other words, it could be said to refer to an employee desire to stay positive and tolerant about the difficulties experienced in the workplace which Organ and Ryan, (1995) and Organ, (1990) expressed as an exhibition of willingness to tolerate minor and temporary personnel inconveniences and impositions of work without grievances, complaints, appeals, accusations, or protest.

Civic Virtue

Civic virtue is a constructive involvement in organizational process like reading one's mail, attending meetings, and keeping abreast of larger issues involving the organization (Organ (1988). More so, Podsakoff et al (2000) views civic virtue as a willingness to participate actively in an organizational affairs as regards to the issues bothering the organization. It can be explained as a behavior that shows attention to participation in communal life and an employee's complete commitment to an organization or maximum interest or a non-compulsory habits that employee display to have interest in organization matter. Graham (1991) regards civic virtue as organizational participation which involves employee interest in organizational affairs guided by ideal standards of virtue expressed by complete involvement in organizational governance for instance, sharing an opinion and innovative ideas with others while George & Jones (2002) refer to it as making a constructive suggestion which includes all deliberate acts of creativity and innovation in organizations. In the same light, Van Scotter , (2000) view civic virtue to center on self-disciplined behaviors such as working hard, and taking the initiative to solve a problem at work. It

could be said to include the strength and determination that drive people to act with the deliberate intention of promoting the organization's interest. This is as Chiun Lo,(2009) and Khalid & Ali (2009) conceptualize civic virtue as the willingness of employees to participate actively in the operations of the organization.

Courtesy

Courtesy has to do with positive relationship during co-operational processes in an organization which helps in reducing and preventing work-related issues that involve individual problems through positive attitude. This is as Podsakoff et al (2000) stated that assessing and doing what is best for an employee can help in strengthening courtesy behavior among the organizational staff. Courtesy could be said to be the gesture that help others in preventing interpersonal problems from occurring, such as giving prior notice of the work schedule to someone who is in need, consulting others before taking any actions that could disrupt others (Organ, 1990). Courtesy are demonstrated in the interest of preventing creations of problems for co-workers for instance leaving the copier or printer in good condition for other workers' use (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006). Courtesy includes a behavior that focuses on the prevention of problems and taking the necessary and timely steps in order to minimize the effects of the problem in the future. In addition, courtesy could be a good gesture like expression of gratitude to a colleague or a display of apology as an admission of guilt to bring cohesion amongst coworkers.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

Social Exchange Theory - A Sociological Perspective

From the observation gained from literature review, it is revealed that every concept and construct draws from a given theoretical foundation which usually helps the researcher to gain a better understanding of the subject matter under review. In view of this observation, organizational citizenship behavior

construct has been linked to center on the social exchange theory. According to Homans (1958) social exchange theory was developed to enhance the understanding of the human behavior in his social endeavors. In alliance with this view, Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005) said that social exchange theory (SET) actually is among the most leading conceptual models for understanding workplace behavior. It basically emerged through the intersection of economics, psychology and sociology and this is also why some scholars regarded it as Socio-psychological theory. Prominent among the scholars that contributed in the development of social exchange theory include Homans (1958), Blau (1964), and Emerson (1972).

According to Homans (1958) and Blau (1964) exchange theory deals with understanding the exchange of material and non-material resources between persons as well as groups working together in a given organization. However differing from economic exchange theory that tends to define actual transactions and its equivalent compensatory value, social exchange is considered to be discretionary in nature and the time of its reciprocation is usually not stated and also not enforceable in the event of failure (Blau, 1964). Although the norm further advocate's equality in terms of help received and returned, which implies that the importance placed on the exchange relationship is individualistic. It also suggests that the individual to whom the help is given normally feels indebted to the person offering the help for instance a co-worker, a supervisor etc. especially when he or she is freely provided with something he/she is in dire need of (Schaninger & Turnipseed, 2005).

Blau, (1964) asserts that people will usually go into and maintain a relationship with others in as much as they can satisfy their own self-interests and at the same time ensure that the benefits accruable is higher than the costs. Every individual will want to maximize his or her profits and minimize losses in relationship with others. Again in order to maintain

relationships, individuals will try to maintain those exchanges which have been verified to be fulfilling in the past why discontinuing with those which are seen to be more costly than rewarding, and to establish new relations which have a good chance of being more rewarding than costly. In line with these manifestations, social exchange is an action based on reciprocity. This means that when an individual renders help to another individual whether spoken or unspoken, such individual always bear in his mind and expects that the receiver owes him or her reward someday. However, such return may be instant or deferred depending on the circumstance in which such assistance was made.

In view of social exchange theory tenets as discovered in the literature review thus far, we believed and indeed very obvious that, organizational citizenship behavior is a brainchild of social exchange theory and as such adequately serve as theoretical foundation for this study. This is as individual's action driven by social exchange mindset is observed to be voluntarily offered without any form of coercion from any angle. Therefore the individuals who engage in this type of action are rather motivated to do so because of their closeness and personal relationship with the person the help is being rendered to. Much more, this action is stimulated by what the person hope to gain from the receiver of the help either immediately or in the nearest future and such action or obligation is usually unspecified as it can be displayed in diverse ways. Niehoff and Moorman, (1993) as cited Gabriel (2015) summarized this in their assertion that social exchange covers unspecified obligation which is based on individual's trusting that the exchange parties will fairly carry out their obligations in the long run, and allows exchange parties reciprocate voluntarily. However, to reciprocate the support from the organization, the individual may reciprocate through job performance (Gabriel, 2015).

Theoretical Foundation - A Psychological Perspective

Drawing from Bolino, Hsiung, Harvey and LePine (2015) social exchange theory alone is not sufficient enough to explain the cognitive, emotional and unconscious processes that trigger the dynamic nature of organizational citizenship behavior in today's diverse workforce. To encounter this, Bolino et al. (2015) advanced a theoretical framework with a direct emphasis on the intra-individual development in organizational citizenship behavior. They intellectualized citizenship behavior as an enduring process that is highly stimulated by the individual's self-concept philosophies. Self-concepts encompass charts containing individual's perceptions about their qualities, social roles, and goals. However self-concepts may differ in their orientation, as individuals tend to think of themselves as independent individuals (i.e., individual orientation), in relationships with others (i.e., relational orientation) or as a part of a larger group (i.e., collectivistic orientation).

More so, according to Maylinn (2017) these orientations can be more or less innate (i.e. chronic orientation) or triggered by situational forces (i.e., working orientation). Chronic orientations can be seen as relatively stable, with a steady but gradual improvement as time progress, while working orientations can be viewed as temporally motivated self-concepts, which bring about inconsistent changes in the individual's motivation to demonstrate organizational citizenship behavior action. Furthermore, Bolino et al. (2015) contend that self-concept orientations indirectly affect an individual's development in organizational citizenship behavior, as they greatly determine the extent and kind of citizenship behaviors individuals' display, when they choose to display it as well as when they decide to alter their behavior. For instance, in their argument, they stressed that persons with individual self-concept mindset be it working or chronic in nature will be stimulated to perform organizational

citizenship behavior act due to impression management concerns and as such utilizes OCB as a means of achieving what they desire.

Diversity Issues

Individuals in our global world now interact across various backgrounds to compete in the world wide economy (Patel, 2016). With these increased globalization and competition, the workforce in all industrialized countries has become gradually diverse with the aid of technology; the distance between people and place has been bridged hence managers can easily identify and manage different characteristics that exist among employee (Griffin & Moorhead, 2014); with this assertions, organizations are aiming to become more diversified in order to gain competitive advantage by becoming more creative, innovative and open to useful change. In gaining competitive advantages, it requires more than recognizing individual differences like age, gender race etc but rather to accept these differences as valuable to the organizational growth (Betchoo, 2015).

Workforce diversity refers to those significant differences and similarities that are present among employees within an organization (Griffin & Moorhead, 2014). This is as Nwinami (2014) stressed that it represent those uniqueness which includes an individual's personality, age, gender, ethnicity/race, religion, marital status, income, the work experience etc. Similarly, Evans & Henry (2007), said diversity means the mixture of workforce from different socio-cultural backgrounds working together in an organization. It could be seen as the characteristics of a social grouping that reveals the degree of objectives or subjective differences existing among groups (Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007).

All these definitions simply reflect that diversity is all about characteristics that make people different or similar to one another like genders, ages, races,

ethnic backgrounds, religious beliefs, etc. But some scholars has noted other characteristics known as deep level diversity while the formal is regarded as surface level diversity (Rubbins ,Judge and Vohra 2017) and Aydan (2016) labeled the surface and deep level diversity as primary and secondary diversity.

Surface level diversity

Surface level diversity reveals the major dichotomy among different individuals as well as the highest impact on initial encounters which could be swiftly spotted and serve as a lens through which people view the world. It includes visible identity characteristics such as; gender, age, sexual orientation, physical abilities, ethnicity, race, etc. (Sayers, 2012; Robbins et al, 2017). Powell (2011) said they are those essential unchangeable personal characteristics that exert significant lifelong impacts and they shape our basic self -image sense of identity.

Deep level diversity

Deep level diversity tend to reveal features such as differences in value, personality, and work preference that become progressively more important for determining similarity as people get to know each other. These features seem to be less visible, exert a more variable influence on personal, and add a more subtle richness to surface level diversity (Sayers, 2012; Robbins et al 2017). Deep level diversity also known as secondary or experience base diversity consist of a wide range of differences that are acquired, discarded, and/or modified throughout one's lifetime and as a result, are less important to one's core identity. In the next paragraph we shall look at one element each of surface and deep level diversity and their implications on OCB dimensions.

Age (as a surface level diversity issue)

Age diversity is a shared phenomenon that is present in nearly all groupings, such as families, higher institutions, and team groups with members of

different ages as people with unique experiences that share a place in history as regards their generation. Generation is a group of persons born in a particular era, who have common attitudes, tastes, knowledge and experiences that affect their thoughts, values, beliefs and behaviors (Johnson & Johnson, 2010; Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2013) it can be said to be a group of people who were born and raised in the same social and historical background hence, Kopperschmidt (2000) defines it as an identifiable group that shares years of birth and significant life events that occurred in critical stages of their lives. Each generation bring alongside their different perceptions and expectations to the work environment. Perceptions of how they are to behave, how they will manage others and expectations of how they will like to be managed whose potentials should be recognized and taped into (Scott & Byrd, 2012). Generation could also be a group of people who have shared the same events through news, music, mood, education, parenting styles, and more, during a certain point in time (Murphy, 2007). Identified herein are four generation; the Verterans or traditionalist people born before 1943; the Baby Boomers born between 1943-1960; the generation Xborn between 1960-1980 and the generation Y or the Millennials born between 1980 – 2004. We shall briefly discuss the personality trait of each generation as it relates to work force (Egri & Ralston, 2004); (Eisner, 2005).

Veterans or Traditionalist - born before 1943

Traditionalists are people who grew-up influenced by great misery of world war II and as such face the world with a determined attitude to succeed in the mist of depression (Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2013). Despite the challenges of these sets of generation, they remain focused with vision and hard work whose foundation of resilience gave birth to other generations. They have a mindset that form the authoritative foundation across world culture whose credo other sets of belief relies on. According to

Zemke et al (2013), the core values of traditionalist are highlighted as honor, patience, dedication, sacrifice, and hard work, duty before pleasure, adherent to rules, respect for authority, conformity, law and order. They are disciplined, have respect for authority, they place a strong emphasis on teamwork and they prefer face-to-face interaction. They tend to work according to standards and are consistent in performing their job role. They have a cooperative and team oriented approach.

The Baby Boomers- born 1943-1960

These sets of generation were born during and after the World War II and they were raised in the time of opportunity, extreme optimism, and growth. They are known to be rational, inclusive, collaborative, task-oriented, highly productive, and skillful. They have a listening ear and hopeful in their dealings with others. Though, they hardly delegate as they always want to be in charge (Abrams & Von Frank, 2014).

Generation X- born 1960-1980

Generation Xers notably known as Busters are the generation after the golden era of the Baby Boomers, Gen X was born into a challenging socio-economic reality during the outbreak of the AIDS epidemic and the end of the Cold War (Reisenwitz, 2009). This is as (Johnson & Lopes, 2008) asserts that it lead to reliance on individual initiative and creativity. These generations were the first to witness mass media and technology; they like instant feedback seek self-satisfaction at work and are capable of working in multicultural surroundings. They like to have fun, and have a practical method to achieving results. Gen Xers are “work loyalty to their co-worker and supervisor but in disguise, this loyalty is to secure their job as a result of the setback experienced from their parents (Neil, 2010).

Generation Yers

These last generations are people born 1980 - 2004 also known as the Echo Boomers, the Millennium

Generation or Generation Next (Reisenwitz, 2009). This technology friendly and the newest generation on the job market are cherished, nurtured, and protected by their parents whom they see as their hero. They were born into an era of globalization, media, and immediate technology and so they are addicted to social media like partying and have a trend of all happenings on social media such as face book, twitter, linkedin, instagram, whatsapp etc. They make friends across the globe and will not take a break in communicating with their cherished friends except they are asleep though they value team work, multi-tasking, hard work and pay attention to others need (Neil, 2010). While the millennial are vibrant and full of energy to achieve organizational goal they value their own personal goals and can easily quit jobs that do not recognize their personal needs (Grubb, 2016). They have a lot to contribute to discussion, desire to be heard and respected.

They are selfless, rational, and competent. They do not resist change rather they have a positive view about change and see it as something desirable (Abrams & Von Frank, 2014). They like to work at their own pace and speed they understand the rapid rate at which technology is changing as such, they are very interested in developing their skills continually as they are so eager to start contributing in the organization as soon as they are part of the organization. They become loyal and committed to the organizations soon as long as they feel that the organization supports their goals (Johnson & Johnson, 2010).

Personality (as a deep level diversity issues)

As stated earlier deep level diversity encompass differences in values, personality and work preference that are more progressively important in determining similarities as people get to know one another better. Personality is the overall way in which an individual reacts to and interact with others and it could also be the enduring characteristics that

describe an individual behavior. According to Robbins et al, (2017), Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is the most widely used personality assessment instrument in the world. It is a 100-question personality test that asks people how they usually feel or act in a particular situation. Response revealed four characteristic and classify people into one of sixteen personality types individuals have that are friendly, sociable, and assertive otherwise known as the extraverts and individual that are timid, shy submissive, silent, and inhibited known as the introverts. We also have the sensing versus intuitive, thinking versus feeling and judging versus perceiving. Sensing types are practical people that prefer routine work and are very detailed people.

While the intuitive types look at the bigger picture. The thinking type are reasonable, logical and problem solving oriented while the feeling type rely on their personal values and are often very emotional. They judging types want to control while the perceiving types are flexible and spontaneous (Robbins et al, 2017). These classifications together describe the 16 personality types identifying every person by one trait from each of the four pairs. Now let us take a look at the personality assessment model that predicts how people behave in a real life situation (the Big Five Model).

The Big Five Personality (Five Factor Theory FFT)

Personality is the comprehensive ways in which an individual reacts and interacts with others often described as a term of measurable traits a person exhibits (Robbins et al, 2017). The “big five personalities represent a classification that comprehensively describes human personality, whose validity is strongly supported by empirical evidence (O’Connor, 2002). Personality traits are basic tendencies that refer to the abstract underlying potentials of an individual, whereas attitudes, roles, relationships, and goals are characteristic adaptations that reflect the interactions between basic tendencies

and environmental demands accumulated over time. The followings are the big five personalities; there are extraversion, openness to experience, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability out of which three will be discussed below.

Openness to experience

People who are open to experience have a high range of interests and fascination with novelty. They are particularly open people who are creative, curious, and artistically sensitive. Further to this, openness to experience are categorized as people who are being imaginative, cultured, curious, original, broad minded, intelligent, having a need for variety, aesthetic sensitivity and unconventional values (McCrae and John, 1992; Robbins et al, 2017).

Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness is related to personality dimension that describes someone to be dependable, organized persistent and responsible. Individuals with high conscientiousness tend to show self-discipline and often exceed expectations, they are neat, punctual, careful, self-disciplined and reliable (Singh & Singh, 2009; Elanain, 2007; Robbins et al 2017).

Extraversion

Extroversion people are relationship oriented, gregarious, assertive, sociable, dominance, ambitious, tendencies towards action, sensation-seeking, and the experience of positive affect (Bozionelos, 2004; Robbins et al, 2017). Individuals possessing this personality trait are often energetic, have positive emotions, assertive, sociable, and talkative (Elanain, 2007). People who are high in agreeableness are generally friendly, good natured, cooperative, warm, trusting, helpful, courteous, and flexible (Barrick, Parks & Mount, 2005; Robbins et al, 2017). In other word, we could say that people having this characteristic are compassionate, much more humane as they are able to relate and cooperate with other people more effectively.

Implication of Diversity on OCB

Drawing from respective views of scholar on the meaning and nature of diversity in the current economic other, it will be safe to state that diversity will have a positive implication on the development and sustenance of behavioral tendency such as OCB. This is because diversity allows and breeds breath into the organization people of varied skills and value system which leads to competitive advantage and a valuable phenomenon for organizational growth (Betchoo, 2015). To buttress this fact, Podsakoff et al., (2000) remarked that to achieve organizational goal in a diverse and competitive business world, organizations should seek for employees that are willing to go beyond the minimum requirement and surpass their target. In other words, a display of OCB is a necessary tool to survive in a diverse workplace with regards to their skills, knowledge, attitude and efforts of its workforce. Therefore a rising body of study has revealed that managing diversity is a serious predictor of worker behaviors and outcomes such as OCB (Milliken & Martins, 1996; Mor-Barak, Cherin, & Berkman, 1998; Mor-Barak & Levin, 2002; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). Hence, diversity issues has become an important area in organization as they find new ways to respond to challenges of individual sensitivity in terms of their needs and differences (Mathews, 1998).

Viewing the implication of age as a surface level diversity issue, one could see the need for organization to recruit diverse workforce in order to create a balance between the different influences of each generation with different behavioral capacity which will probably exhibit OCB. This is as Rowe, (2010) opines that each generation believes in its strengths as exceptional and beneficial to both organization and the coworkers. Having age diverse workforce in our view will certainly create interdependent work atmosphere within the workforce in that for the most aged workforce in the organization today (baby boomers) who irrespective

of their vast experience on the job also lacks the technological expert to self-reliant will always need the cooperation and assistance of the much younger worker (X and Y generation) with tech-savvy skills to effectively perform technology related task while they also depend on their wealth of experience to fit into the system adequately thereby creating room for harmonious working relationships and enhanced social cohesion through OCB disposition. Just as Schwartz & Schwartz, (2007) said that generation X value diversity, think globally, technologically literate and are willing to provide help in work related issues to co-workers and organization hence we can attribute this behavioral tendency to OCBI & OCBO.

Whitney, Greenwood, and Murphy (2009) asserts that, each generation differs from the others in terms of the values and behaviors hence the implications of these differences in the workplace can be both helpful and unhelpful to the organization. Again, an interaction was also found between the identification factor of job involvement and generation on the OCB dimension of courtesy, whereby Gen X employees who identify more with the organization evidenced more courtesy than Baby Boomers (Cennamo and Gardner, 2008). Courtesy relates to consulting with others at work about activities that may affect their work (behavior directed at the individual), and includes both informal and formal activities, such as announcing one's intentions in advance, transferring information, and so on (Organ, 1988). Graham (1991) regards civic virtue as organizational participation which involves employee interest in organizational affairs guided by ideal standards of virtue expressed by complete involvement in organizational governance which can be linked to the traditionalist or the Veterans which according to Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak (2013), they tend to work according to standards and are consistent in performing with deep involvement.

Similarly, Gen Y'ers are linked to OCB dimension civic responsibility and are inclined to volunteer (Leyden,

Teixeira & Greenberg, 2007). Even though the oldest generation work according to standards which is apposite implication, it is good to also note the negative effect of age as the older employees have the attitude of resisting change due to their advancement in age, they tend to have failing memories unlike the younger employee moreover, they are not innovative, they follow the same pattern to perform their job by focusing on the past hence unwilling to be trained on how to use new technologies, new processes or new skills which will definitely affect their overall performance (Josef, 2010).

Personality as a deep level diversity issue may affect OCB to a great extent as individual's work satisfaction is perceived as a bi - dimensional construct consisting of positive and negative affect (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Extensive literature reveals that agreeableness, one of personality model as a diversity issue is generally friendly, cooperative, helpful, courteous, and flexible (Barrick, Parks & Mount, 2005). This can be linked to OCB dimension such as courtesy being polite with coworkers and altruism as helping behavior (Digman, 1990). The relationship between the Big Five Personality and OCB reveals how different work culture and environment can affect the employee's OCB (Nadiyah, Nor Sara & Norliza, 2016). Previous investigations and findings reveals importance of personality dimensions as a predictor of OCB, in which it has shown positive significant results (Elanain, 2007; Golashani & Rahro, 2013; Patki & Abhyankar, 2016). Personality traits influence personal values and attitudes, as most recent empirical research has demonstrated (Oliver & Mooradian, 2003).

CONCLUSION

Following extensive literature, we were able to identify the origin of OCB with its roots traced back to task performance owing to the fact that only in-role

behavior was no longer sufficient for organizational survival. Previous literature on OCB tends to view rudiments as a behavior that is not part of an individual job description, a discretionary behavior, a behavior which neither will have direct reward or punishment in the case of omission. However we clarified that the definition of OCB should exclude those voluntary behaviors that are harmful to the organization and refer only to the functional voluntary behaviors that contribute positively to organizational functioning and effectiveness as an employee might intentionally absent himself from work without permission which could be disastrous to the organization. And again, a display of OCB should not exempt one from performing his/her main job. Literature indicates inconsistency in the behavioral dimension of OCB to a large extent as various scholars has different views however findings from literature reveals that Organ's (1988) five-dimensional model has the greatest amount of empirical research.

We explore connections between OCB and diversity and identified deep level diversity as differences in value personality, work preference and surface level diversity as identifiable differences like age, gender, race, ethnicity etc. We were able to view age from their generational differences in Verteran, baby boomers, generation X and Y. Looking at the implication of diversity issues on OCB, literature reveals the negative and positive aspect of diversity. From findings it is discovered that an organization that has a good mix of diverse generational employees and diverse personality traits are more likely to perform better. Hence employee should be trained or sensitize about stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination to enable them conquer or minimize troubles that comes with diversity and managers should identify the competencies of its workers as a valuable resources to the growth of the organization.

REFERENCES

- Abrams, J. & Von Frank, V. (2014). *The multigenerational workforce: communicate, collaborate and create community*. London: sage publication LTD.
- Ahmad, N. M., Shaiful, A. K. and Nik, R. N. (2014). Clarifying the effects of human resource diversity management practices on organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating role of diversity receptiveness, *Malaysian International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2, 147-155.
- Aina, E. H. & Reuben, D. (2014). Effects of globalization on human resource development and management in Nigeria international policy brief series, *Education and Science Journal*, 4 (1), 41-52.
- Akindele, S.T., Gidado, T.O. & Olaopo, O.R. (2002). Globalization, its implications and consequences for Africa. Accessed from www.internationalpolicybrief.org on 7/9/2018
- Ohiorhenuan, J.F.E. (1998). The South in an era of globalization in: *Cooperation South*, 3(2), 67-72.
- Allison, Barbara J., Voss, Richard S. ve Dryer, Shan. 2001. Student Classroom and Career Success: The Role of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, *Journal of Education for Business*, 76 (5), 282-289.
- Aydan, O. (2016). The Effect of Diversity Management on Job Satisfaction and Individual Performance of Teachers. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 11(3), 105-112.
- Barnard, C.I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Barrick, M.R., Parks, L. & Mount, M.K. (2005). Self-monitoring as a moderator of the relationships between personality traits and performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(3), 745-767.
- Betchoo, N. K. (2015). *Managing Workforce Diversity: A Contemporary Context (1st ed.)*. Retrieved oct 25, 2018, from <http://bookboon.com/en/managing-workplace-diversity-ebook>
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*, Wiley: New York.
- Bolino, M. C., Hsiung, H.-H., Harvey, J., & LePine, J. A. (2015). Well, I'm tired of tryin, Organizational citizenship behavior and citizenship fatigue. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(1), 56-74.
- 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*, New York: Jossey-Bass, 71-98.
- Bozionelos, N. (2004). The big five of personality and work involvement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19 (1), 69-81.
- Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. 1986. Pro -social organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, 11:710-725.

- Cennamo, L., & Gardner, D. (2008). Generational differences in work values, outcomes and person-organization values fit. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23 (8), 891.
- Chiun Lo, May. (2009). Dimensionality of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) in a Multicultural Society: The Case of Malaysia. *International Business Research*, 9(2), 1.
- Cohen, A. (2000). Do good citizens make good organizational citizens? *Administration and Society*, 32: 596-624.
- Coleman, V.I., & Borman, W.C. (2000). Investigating the underlying structure of the citizenship performance domain. *Human resource management Review*, 10 (1), 25-44
- Costa, P. T. & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Normal personality assessment in clinical practice: The NEO personality inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, 4, (1), 5-13.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874-900.
- Digman, J.M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41, 417-440.
- Egri, C., & Ralston, D. (2004). Generation cohorts and personal values: A comparison of China and the US. *Organization Science*, 15, 210-220.
- Eisner, S.P. (2005). Managing generation Y. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 70(4), 4-8.
- Elanain, H. A. (2007). Relationship between Personality and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Does Personality Influence Employee Citizenship? *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 3(4), 31-43.
- Emerson, R. (1972). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27(1), 31-34.
- Entwistle GH (2011). Measuring effort expended in the workplace: discretionary effort and its relationship to established organizational commitment and attachment dimensions. Boston: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Boston University.
- Evans, A. J., & Henry, O. (2007). Critical Review of Literature on Workforce Diversity. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(2), 072-076.
- Gabriel, J. M. O. (2015). Organizational citizenship behavior and corporate resilience in the domestic aviation sector in Nigeria. Ph.D. thesis in Management, Rivers State University of Science and Technology.
- George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (1997). Organizational spontaneity in context. *Human Performance*, 10, 153-170.

- George, J.M., & Jones, G.R. (2002). *Understanding and managing organization behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Golafshani, M. R., & Rahro, M. (2013). Identification of personality traits affecting on development of organizational citizenship behavior. *Middle East Journal of Scientific esearch*, 16(2), 274–281.
- Graham, J. W. 1991. An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4: 249–270.
- Griffin, R. W., & Moorhead, G. (2014). *Organizational Behavior: Managing People and Organizations*. Canada: Michael Schenk.
- Grubb, V. M. (2016). Grubb, V. M. (2016). Clash of the Generations: Managing the New Workplace Reality.
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63, [http://www.duo.uio.no/ Human Performance](http://www.duo.uio.no/Human Performance), 10, 85–97.
- Jahangir, N., Akbar, M. M., & Haq, M. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviour: Its Nature and Antecedents, *Journal of BRAC University*, 1, 75-85.
- Johnson, M., & Johnson, R. (2010). *Generations Inc.: From Boomers to Linksters- Managing the Frictions Between Generations at Work*. USA: AMACOM.
- Josef, H. (2010). *Managing the Aging Workforce: A Challenge for Human Resource Managers*. Germany: German National Library.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral science*, 9(2), 131-146.
- Khalid, S. A., Ali, H., Ismail, M., Rahman, N. A., Kassim, K. M., & Zain, R. S. (2009). Organizational citizenship behavior factor structure among employees in hotel industry. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 1, 16-25.
- Knippenberg, D. V., & Schippers, M. C. (2007). Work Group Diversity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 515-541.
- Kupperschmidt, B.R. (2000). Multigenerational employees: Strategies for effective management. *The Health Care Manager*, 19(1), 65-76.
- L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, Greenwich, CT: JAI. 17, 215–285.
- 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(1), 52–65.

- Leyden, P., Teixeira, R., & Greenberg, E. (2007). The progressive politics of the millennial generation. New Politics Institute. http://www.newpolitics.net/node/360?full_report=1. Retrieved Oct 8, 2018.
- Mathews, A. (1998). Diversity: A principle of human resource management *Public Personnel Management*, 27, 175-183.
- Mayfield, J. & Mayfield, M. (2002). Leader communication strategies: Critical paths to improving employee commitment. *American Business Review*, 20 (2), 89-94.
- Maylenn, B.K.(2017). Development of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and the Effect of Psychological Contract Fulfillment - A Multilevel Longitudinal Study, accessed 21st Oct,2018 from <http://www.duo.uio.no/>.
- McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60(2), 175–215.
- Milliken, F. J., & Martins, L. L. (1996). Searching for Common Threads: Understanding the Multiple Effects of Diversity in Organizational Groups. *The Academy of Management Review*, 21, 402-433.
- Mor-Barak, M. E., & Levin, A. (2002). Outside of the corporate mainstream and excluded from the work community: a study of diversity, job satisfaction and well-being. *Community, Work & Family*, 5, 133–157.
- Mor-Barak, M. E., Cherin, D. A. & Berkman, S. (1998). Organizational and Personal Dimensions in Diversity Climate: Ethnic and Gender Differences in Employee Perceptions. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 34, 82-104.
- Motowidlo, S. J. (2000). Effects of task performance and contextual performance on systemic rewards. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(4), 526-535
- Murphy, S. (2007). *Leading a Multigenerational Workforce*. Washington, D.C.: AARP. Nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653–663.
- Nadiyah Maisarah Abdul Ghani, Nor Sara Nadia Muhamad Yunus, Norliza, Saiful Bahry. (2016). Leader's Personality Traits and Employees Job Performance in Public Sector, Putrajaya. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 37,46 – 51.
- Neil, S. (2010). Leveraging generational work styles to meet business objectives, *Information Management Journal*, 44(1), 28-33.
- Niehoff, B.F., & Moorman, R.H. (1993). Justice as mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior, *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3),527-556.

- Nwinami, S. J. (2014). An Assessment of the Effect of Workforce Diversity on Employee Performance at Tanesco. *Mzumbe: Master's Thesis*.
- O'Connor, T.G. (2002). Maternal antenatal anxiety and children's behavioural/emotional problems at 4 years. Report from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 180, 502 - 508.
- Oliver, J. M., & Mooradian, T. A. (2003). Personality traits and personal values: A conceptual and empirical integration. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 109-125.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 12(1), 43-72.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human performance*, 10(2), 85-97.
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., and MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*: Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- 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. (1998), *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: the good soldier syndrome*, Lexington book, Lexington, MA.
- Patel, T. K. (2016). A Study on Predictors to Maintain Workforce Diversity Among Teaching Faculties in Engineering and Management Institutes of Surat City. *Research Hub- International Multidisciplinary Research Journal (RHIMRJ)*, 3(5), 1-4.
- Patki, Sairaj. M., Abhyankar, Shobhana. C. (2016). Big Five Personality Factors as Predictors of Organization Citizenship Behaviour : A complex interplay. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3(2).
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A metaanalysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 122-141.
- 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, 513-563.

- Powell, G. N. (2011). *Women and Men in Management* (4th ed.). California: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Reisenwitz, T.H.(2009). Differences in generation X and generation Y:Implications for the organization and marketers. *The Marketing Management Journal*, 19 (2), 91-103.
- Robins, S.P, Judge, L.J. Vorhra, K. (2017). *Organizational behavior* (5th ed.), New Jessy: Pearson Education, *Review*, 10(1), 77–93.
- Rousseau, D.M. (2007). Organizational behavior in the new organizational era. *Annual*.
- Rowe, K. A. (2010). *Managing Across Gnereations*. USA: American Society for Training and Development.
- Sayers, J. (2012). Managing Diversity. Retrieved October 4, 2018, from www.bookboon.com/en/managing-diversity-ebook
- Schaninger, W. S., &Turnipseed, D. L. (2005). The workplace social exchange network: Its effect on organizational citizenship behavior, contextual performance, job satisfaction, and intention to leave. In D. L. Turnipseed (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Review of 'Good Soldier' Activity in Organizations* (pp. 209-242). New York, NY: Nova Science.
- Schwartz, N. Patota, D. & Schwartz, T. (2007), Leveraging Generational Differences for Productivity Gains," *Journal of United States Academy of Business*, 11(2), p.3.
- Scott, C. L., & Byrd, M. Y. (2012). *Handbook of Research on Workforce Diversity in a Global Society Technologies and Concepts*. USA: Business Science Reference.
- Singh, A., & Singh, A. (2009). Does Personality Predict Organisational Citizenship Behaviour among Managerial Personnel. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 35(2), 291–298.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behaviors: ItsSutanto, R. (2005). Dasar-dasarIlmu Tanah (KonsepdanKenyataan).
- Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & Mclean Parks, J. M. (1995). Extra-role behaviors:In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). In L.
- Van Scotter, J. R. (2000). Relationship of task performance and contextual performance
- Vecchio, R.V. (1991), *Organizational Behavior*, 2nd ed., the Dryden Press, Chicago, ILwith turnover, job satisfaction, and affective commitment. *Human Resource Management*

- Watson, D., Clark, L.A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of Positive and Negative Affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063-1070.
- Werner, J. M. (2002). Dimensions that make a difference: Examining the impact of in-role and extra-role behaviors on supervisory ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79: 98–107.
- Whitney, J.G., Greenwood, R.A., & Murphy, E.F. (2009). Generational differences in the workplace: Personal values, behaviors, and popular beliefs. *Journal of Diversity Management*. 4(3), 1-8
- Williams, K. Y., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organization Behavior* (pp. 77-140). Stamford CT: JAI Pr.
- Williams, L. J., and Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship behavior and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601–617.
- Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (2013). *Generations at Work: Managing the Clash of Boomers, Gen Xers, and Gen Yers in the Workplace 2nd Ed.*. USA: AMACOM