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Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has been shown to be essential for organizational functioning, and can be considered as especially important in the high-tech industry, which changes rapidly and where success is strongly dependent on the effort of employees. Research has mostly focused on individual level factors influencing OCB, and relatively little of research has studied the effect of context on OCB.

By using a qualitative interpretative approach, interviewing 6 experts and 2 managers, this study investigated how experts’ OCB was influenced by contextual factors that enabled, promoted, constrained and discouraged OCB. Five OCBs, relevant in a knowledge work context (Dekas et al. 2013) were studied: *voice, helping, civic virtue, employee sustainability and social participation*.

Results show that context has a strong influence on employees’ expression of OCB. All five OCBs had distinct contextual factors influencing them, but some general factors could be identified. Encouraging management communication played an important role in promoting OCBs. A flat, cooperative and open culture played an important role in promoting behaviors such as *voice* and *helping*. Type of job contract had also an influence on OCB. Autonomy and involving employees in decision making enabled for example *voice* behavior. Lastly, in a physically dispersed organization, electronic discussion platforms and team meetings showed to be important enablers of most OCBs.

At the end of the thesis a new conceptual model entitled the Dynamic Model of Organizational Citizenship Behavior is presented to fill a gap in understanding how OCB, job attitudes and organizational structures influence each other. The model contributes to OCB and management research by integrating earlier research and the results of this study into one conceptual model. The model shows that the factors are in a dynamic self-strengthening relationship with each other.
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INTRODUCTION

Employees’ contributions to organizations are not limited to the effort prescribed in formal roles and job descriptions (Kahn, 1990). In addition to formal tasks and responsibilities, employees engage in countless positive acts that support the core business and effective organizational functioning – employees contribute to the organizational, social and psychological environment where the core business takes place (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). By giving their time and effort to develop company practices, contribute with ideas that develop products and services, cooperate and help others, and promote the company on their free time, employees greatly contribute to many critical organizational outcomes.

These discretionary employee behaviors have been studied under many different names such as extra-role behavior (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), prosocial organizational behaviors (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986) and contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). One of the most popular terms used to describe these behaviors is organizational citizenship behavior (Organ, 1988, 1997). Organizational citizenship behavior is employee behavior that contributes “… to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance”. (Organ, 1997) and “… that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988, p. 4).

Decades of research on organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB), have shown that these behaviors are essential for organizational functioning and have been empirically shown contribute to team (Nielsen, Hrivnak, Shaw 2009), unit (Ehrhart, Bliese & Thomas, 2006) and organizational performance (Koys, 2001). More specifically, organizational citizenship behavior has been shown to improve the qualitative and quantitative performance of teams in papermill companies (Podsakoff, Ahearne, MacKenzie, 1997) and restaurants (Waltz & Niehoff, 1996). OCB has further been shown to causally drive the profitability of stores (Koys, 2001), and to promote development and innovation in the technology sector (Zhang, Wan & Jia, 2008).

In today’s knowledge economy where the external business environment is changing at an exponential pace, the pressure on organizations to innovate, change and to use resources effectively is constantly increasing. In practice this means that the need for employee contribution is rising. For example, employees are expected to fill the gap between pre-defined job descriptions and the needed behaviors to keep the company at
par with change (Dekas, Bauer, Welle, Kurkoski & Sullivan, 2013; Van Dyne & LePine 1998). Employees who just do what is needed to keep one's job, are not enough. Instead, engaged employees are what keeps modern companies ticking (Harter, Schmidt, Killham, Agrawal, 2009).

Especially in high-tech business, where the core business is driven by highly skilled experts, the need for employee input is high and increasingly growing (Zhang, Wan & Jia, 2008). Compared to heavy industry, which is comparatively stable, and where employee contribution to innovation and development is lower, experts in the high-tech industry work with creative problem solving to meet complicated and changing customer needs. (Reinhardt, Schmidt, Sloep & Drachsler, 2011) This kind of work requires large amounts of cooperation, problem solving and innovation. Also, product, service and internal process development can not solely be driven by managers or product developers because of the need for practical expertise combined with thorough understanding of customer needs – change has to be driven by the experts who have the needed competencies and knowledge about trends and customer needs.

The behavior of knowledge workers that contributes to effective functioning of the organization has been defined for example by Dekas et al. (2013) in their organizational citizenship - knowledge work scale (OCB-KW). In their mixed methods study of organizational citizenship behaviors at Google Inc., they identified 5 behaviors that were relevant OCBs in a high-tech knowledge work setting, namely voice, helping, civic virtue, social participation and employee sustainability. The five OCBs and their corresponding definitions are listed in Table 1.
Voice: Taking part in activities, making suggestions, or speaking out with the intent of improving company products, or some aspect of individual, group, or organizational performance.

Helping: Voluntarily helping colleagues with work-related problems or issues, or working to prevent incidents resulting in work-related problems.

Civic Virtue: Taking actions that indicate macro-level interest in the organization as a whole. Actions reflect a person recognizing that he is a part of a larger whole and accepting the responsibilities that such a membership brings with.

Social Participation: The employee participates in social activities and event during the work day that are not directly associated with core job tasks.

Employee Sustainability: Taking part in activities and events to maintain or improve one’s own well-being and health, or to support others’ intentions to maintain their well-being and health.

Table 1  The 5 OCBs in knowledge work. Modified from Dekas, Bauer, Welle, Kurkoski, & Sullivan (2013) OCB-KW scale.

How do experts contribute “to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance” (Organ, 1997), and how can this contribution be fostered?

1.1. Description of problem

Earlier research in OCB has mainly focused on studying individual psychological characteristics and job attitudes predicting organizational citizenship behavior (Dekas, 2010), using quantitative research with predefined scales of different OCBs. For example, previous research has found that certain personality characteristics (Bakshi, Kumar, Rani, 2009) job satisfaction, fair treatment, organizational commitment, leader supportiveness (e.g. Moorman, 1991; Organ & Ryan, 1995) and perceived organizational support (Chiaburu, Chakrabarty, Wang & Li, 2015) are all predictors of organizational citizenship behavior.

Most early research on OCB was theoretically based on Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964, 2006), which assumes that employees who feel supported by their organization, are treated fairly and are satisfied with their job, feel obliged to repay the organization in the form of good behavior, namely OCB (Schroeder, 2010). Therefore, the main ambition of the bulk of OCB research has been to map constructs of job attitudes that significantly correlate and predict employees’ willingness to express OCB. The implicit epistemological assumption has been that by statistically mapping all antecedents
which can be associated with OCB, we can get a complete picture of the circumstances under which OCB will be expressed by employees in an organization. This theoretical over-reliance on the social exchange theory has been criticized, and a call for research with other theoretical foundations has been made (Schroeder, 2010; Zellars & Tepper, 2003). Still, even though the theoretical foundation of the bulk of earlier OCB research has been relatively narrow, it has built a valuable foundation for understanding which individual attitudes correlate with this important organizational behavior.

What this individualistic-positivistic approach has been lacking is the understanding of the organizational context in which this behavior is expressed. The prevailing methodological individualism (Arrow, 1994) of earlier OCB research has been driven by an ontology, where the source of human behavior is exclusively within the individual, and depending on the individuals will to behave as an organizational citizen. Researchers have omitted other perspectives on organizational behavior, like considerations on the social, cultural and physical organizational setting as the source of the behavior (Johns, 2006, Juarrero, 2000). The almost exclusively positivistic methodology used in OCB research has reduced the thinking around OCB to an individual-psychological level, leaving out many explanations to behavior that can be found by examining the context in which the behavior takes place.

1.2. Originality and contribution

The contribution of this study to OCB research is threefold. Firstly, this study approaches OCB from a different angle than earlier research. Instead of seeing OCB as a result of individual psychological tendencies, OCB is seen as a result of employees being situated in an organizational context which enables, promotes, constrains and discourages these behaviors. The need for research, which investigates the direct mechanisms of context on OCB has been called for by Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (2006, p. 237). Second, this study applies a less used methodology in the research of OCB: an inductive and qualitative study using semi-structured interviews (Drever, 1995) for data collection. This method aims to give insight on the nature of OCB, compared to the frequently used quantitative methods. Third, the study is conducted in an environment and on a population rarely studied in OCB research: a high tech organization, where the subjects are highly skilled technology experts. This organizational and work context is greatly different compared to organizations in more traditional industries that were studied in early OCB research but also newer research.
Therefore, this study uses the more modern typology of OCBs by Dekas et al. (2013) that was been defined in their OCB-knowledge work scale. The reasons to use this specific typology in this study will be further motivated in the methods section.

In addition to the nature of work, the employees of the organization are also an interesting population in a sense that they are expected to have vastly different needs, attitudes and expectations towards their work and organization compared to many other populations. Experts in technology have shown to have quite different needs and motives to work compared to many other populations (Zhang, Wan & Jia, 2008), such as for example blue-collar workers, shopkeepers or waiters studied in earlier OCB research. This is also expected to influence the nature of the behavior of study, namely OCB.

This thesis contributes to the rich body of OCB research by studying the organizational context in which OCB takes place. Instead of considering employee behavior merely as a result of employee attitudes and traits, the ontological assumption is that OCB is behavior that emerges from employees’ interaction with their organizational, social and cultural environment. Which behaviors are expressed by people is the result of a broad combination of contextual factors influencing that behavior. This perspective is in stark contrast to the individualistic perspective taken by earlier research in OCB.

This thesis aims at building a holistic view of the the nature of organizational citizenship behavior in this specific organizational context. By analyzing the organizational context and contrasting this contextual view of the behavior with the view of the behavior of earlier research, this study aims to contribute to the understanding of the nature of organizational citizenship behavior as embedded in the organization and as a part of work itself.

1.3. Aim and research questions

The aim of this study is to get an understanding of the contextual factors which influence organizational citizenship behaviors in experts in a modern high-tech company. The aim of the study may be split into the following research questions:

1. What are the main motives for experts to express organizational citizenship behaviors?

2. Which factors in the organizational context enable and promote OCBs?
3. Which factors in the organizational context prevent and inhibit experts from expressing OCBs?

1.4. Definitions and delimitations

The objective of this study is to get a picture of the organizational context in which organizational citizenship behavior is embedded, and to understand how this context influences employee OCB. Therefore, this thesis does not actively take into account factors previously studied under the social exchange paradigm (such as job satisfaction, justice etc.), as this area has been studied extensively before, but also because the research method used in this study is not well suited for this purpose as psychological dispositions are not open for direct scrutiny (Johns, 2006). Individual factors are of less interest in this study, and will be explicated only if they are clearly seen influencing the results that are presented.

1.4.1. Definitions

Early research in organizational citizenship behavior contrasted the behavior with task performance, and required the behavior not to be explicitly defined in employment contracts and to be non-rewarded by formal incentive systems (Organ, 1988). This distinction received a large amount of critique because it was found practically impossible to separate behaviors as either in- or extra-role. Also, studies found that OCBs had an influence on performance evaluations and reward recommendations (Podsakoff, MacKenzie & Hui, 1993; Allen & Rush 1998; Kiker & Motowidlo, 1999). This critique led Organ (1997), to redefine OCB as behavior as

“... contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance (or the technical/technological/production system)”

This study will use this latter definition of OCB by Organ (1997), which does not separate between task and non-task behavior and which allows the behavior to be subject to formal rewards.

The behaviors which are of interest in this study are the organizational citizenship behaviors defined by Dekas et al. (2013). These behaviors are voice, helping, civic virtue, employee sustainability and social participation. When talking about OCB in this study, what are referred to are the five behaviors defined by Dekas et al. (2013). In contrast, when mentioning OCB in the theory-section of the study, what is referred to
are the OCBs used in the specific study referred to. Most often the OCBs used in previous research are the one’s defined by Organ in 1988, but a great amount of other OCBs have also been defined (for a review see Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach, 2000).

Context is defined in this thesis as “...context as situational opportunities and constraints that affect the occurrence and meaning of organizational behavior as well as functional relationships between variables” (Johns, 2006). In this thesis enablers, constraints, promoting factors and encouraging factors will be investigated in regard to how they influence employees engaging in opportunities to express OCBs.

I will use the conceptualization of context by Johns (2006), where he separated context into two different categories: omnibus context and discrete context. The omnibus context can be thought of as context in the broad sense, and describes who was studied, where they were studied, when they were studied and why the study was conducted. The discrete context is embedded in the omnibus context and is the context that influences behavior more directly. This is the organizational, task, social and physical context that influences human behavior. Discrete contextual factors are for example autonomy, availability of resources and built environment (Johns, 2006) A more thorough description of Johns’ (2006) framework and potential contextual variables influencing the behavior of experts in the company will be described more thoroughly in the theory section.

With organizational context I refer to the organizational reality in which employees work (discrete context), not the environment in which the organization itself operates.

1.5. Structure of thesis

This thesis consists of six chapters: introduction, theory, results discussion and conclusions. The theory part will provide a review of relevant OCB theory and research and different types of OCB identified by scholars. This part will first address classic OCB research based in the social exchange paradigm (Blau, 1964). The chapter continues with research taking into account contextual factors such as culture and climate, job characteristics, organizational structure and HRM practices. The method chapter includes a thorough explanation of the ontological and epistemological assumptions of the study and the methodological choices made. Furthermore, a description is given of the recruitment and selection process, the data collection and the
collected data. Lastly the method of analysis is described in detail. The results chapter presents the analysis: the nature of OCB at the company and contextual factors influencing this behavior in experts. In the discussion part I reflect on the study, its results, its restrictions and the conclusions that can be drawn. A new model termed The Dynamic Model of Organizational Citizenship behavior, is also presented. Implications for practitioners and recommendations for future research is given. Lastly, the conclusions chapter binds the study together and synthesizes the results.
2 THEORY: ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

2.1. The origin and definition of organizational citizenship behavior

One of the most widely used definitions of organizational citizenship behavior is given by Organ (1988, p. 4) 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.”

The definition was continued by a further description:

“By discretionary, we mean that the behavior is not an enforceable requirement of the role or the job description, that is, the clearly specifiable terms of the person's employment contract with the organization; the behavior is rather a matter of personal choice, such that its omission is not generally understood as punishable.”

The construct organizational citizenship behavior was popularized in the 70’s by Organ (1977), and was intended to fill a gap in understanding in the link between job satisfaction and organizational performance. The strong conviction about a relationship combined with low correlations found between satisfaction and core job performance, led Organ and colleagues (Bateman and Organ, 1983, Organ, 1977) to find alternative explanations for the job satisfaction-organizational performance link. The proposed explanation was that there was another, academically undiscovered type of employee performance, that was not directly related to task performance that contributed to organizational efficiency. Organizational citizenship behavior was found to be the missing type of employee behavior contributing significantly to organizational performance.

As mentioned earlier, the original definition of OCB by Organ (1988) received critique because it separated OCBs from in-role performance and because it required that the performance should not be rewarded. The distinction led to problems in practice because studies showed that the conception of which work was seen as in- or extra-role varied between individuals and situations. (Morrison, 2004; Vey & Campbell, 2004). For example, a study conducted by Vey and Campbell (2004) revealed that when employees were asked whether they saw certain OCBs as in- or extra-role many behaviors previously defined as extra-role, were in fact perceived by employees as in-role. Also, studies have shown that both managers and employees differ in how narrowly or broadly they define job roles, influencing their definition of behaviors as either in- or extra-role (Moideenkutty, 2005). Studies have further shown that OCBs have a strong influence on individual performance evaluations and reward
recommendations, which questions whether the behaviors can be considered non-rewarded (Podsakoff, MacKenzie & Hui, 1993; Allen & Rush 1998; Kiker & Motowidlo, 1999). These and many other studies put forward evidence about the fact that behaviors are not so easily definable as in-role or extra-role, non-compensated or compensated.

Organ (1997) attributed these practical problems in measurement and definition of the construct to the change in the nature of work. According to him, in the new emerging work context, specific job descriptions are transforming into generalities and the employee is expected to do whatever is required in the workplace. These reasons led to a redefinition of OCB by Organ (1997) to “... contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance”. After this redefinition, the concept changed from being mostly extra-role to being both in- and extra-role and also potentially falling within the formal incentive system of the organization. This definition of OCB distanced the concept from extra-role behavior (Dyne, Cummings & Parks, 1995) and made it more similar to the concept contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Organ, 1997) which is indifferent of whether the behavior is a part of the individual’s job description or rewarded.

The definition of organizational citizenship behavior has evolved till this day, and dozens of definitions are in active use in research still today. This has led to some potential theoretical problems. The field of OCB has focused mostly on the substantive side of research, without careful definition of the construct’s nature. For example, even after Organ’s (1997) redefinition of the construct, the original definition of the behavior has still been popular in research. Also, the typologies of behavior used to operationalize the construct tend to vary. The lack of conceptual rigor combined with the large amount of research has according to Van Dyne, Cummings and Parks (1995) and Van Dyne, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach (2000) led to risks related to construct validity. Large amounts of research without well-defined definitions for the measured construct may render the body of research useless.

### 2.1.1. Types of OCB

The amount of behaviors nested under the concept of OCB is immense. In a review of previous research, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach (2000) listed the majority of OCBs coined in research until year 2000. Examples of these can be found in the table under. (See Podsakoff et al., 2000 for a review)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helping</th>
<th>Organizational loyalty</th>
<th>Organizational compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>Loyalty boosterism</td>
<td>Generalized compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal facilitation</td>
<td>Spreading goodwill</td>
<td>Organizational obedience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacemaking</td>
<td>Endorsing and supporting organizational objectives</td>
<td>Following rules and procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual initiative</th>
<th>Civic virtue</th>
<th>Sportsmanship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Organizational participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal industry</td>
<td>Protecting the organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persisting with enthusiasm</td>
<td>Job dedication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2  Categories and subcategories of OCBs identified in earlier research (Modified from Podsakoff et al., 2000)

Even though the amount of potential OCBs to be used in research is large, the most popular scale is the one defined by Organ in 1988, which contains the behaviors Civic virtue, altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship and conscientiousness.

2.1.2. Measures of OCB

Researchers have operationalized OCB by using scales of predefined behaviors like the one’s above. These behaviors have usually been assumed to be extra-role, not directly compensated behaviors and have usually consisted of the five OCBs identified by Organ in his study in 1988. Surveys containing these behaviors have then been given supervisors who have assessed the frequency of these behaviors in their employees. (Pond, Nacoste, Mohr & Rodriguez, 1997). This method has been used due to the fear of common method bias, which may arise when the employee answers both a survey of the independent variable (such as justice) and OCB.

2.2. Explanations to OCB: Social exchange theory

The social exchange theory (SET) is the dominant theory used to explain why employees express OCB in organizations, and is used as an explanation for most research studying OCB on individual level. The social exchange theory (Blau, 1964)
posits that people make choices regarding social relationships based on the exchange of social and material resources. In OCB theory, organizations function partly through mutually desirable relationships between parties who receive and give different benefits, including socio-emotional benefits (Schroeder, 2010). According to the mass of OCB research, employees express OCB because they feel obliged to repay for the material and social benefits that the organization has provided them. Another slightly different perspective is that employees who can trust that their employers will treat them fairly in the future are willing to benefit the employer with OCB because they can trust that the behavior will be reciprocated by the organization at a later stage (Schroeder, 2010).

Previous but also contemporary research has been fixated on the social exchange theory as the explaining theory to why employees express OCB, even though Organ (1997) redefined OCB so that it was not required to be extra-role or non-remunerated. Using SET to explain behavior which is not discretionary is erroneous, as SET requires the behavior to be discretionary between the parties: a relationship built on trust that the other party will reciprocate in the future. This means that if OCBs may be remunerated and an expected part of work (as shown to be the case earlier), these behaviors fall outside the explanatory power of social exchange theory. Regardless of this fact, research subsequent to Organ’s (1997) paper has continued to explain OCB with the social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Schroeder, 2010).

Next, a compact literature review of previous OCB research is presented to describe the theoretical background in which this thesis is situated. First, the consequences of OCB will be presented, which will be followed a presentation of the individual, team and organizational antecedents of the behavior. This part will move successively from individual-level research to research investigating the organizational context and its effects on OCB.

2.3. Consequences of OCB

Research has found that OCB has positive consequences on the individual, group, and organizational levels. On an individual level, OCB has also been shown to be associated with positive supervisory performance evaluations (Podsakoff, MacKenzie & Hui, 1993) and reward recommendations (Allen & Rush 1998; Kiker & Motowidlo, 1999). Also, one study showed that employees who perform OCBs are more likely to be promoted (Hui, Lam & Law 2000). These studies show that using SET one-sidedly as the explaining
theory, leaves a part of the picture outside. These findings have given rise to a whole literature of OCB from an impression management framework (e.g. Bolino 1999).

On a unit level, Koys (2001) examined the connection between unit level OCB and the performance of stores. He found a causal relationship between OCB and store performance: OCB in year one resulted in higher store financial performance in year two. In addition, as mentioned shortly in the introduction, Podsakoff, Ahearne and MacKenzie (1997) found a positive relationship between OCB and unit performance in paper mills. The more team members helped each other with work-related problems and the less people complained about work-related problems, the higher the quantity and quality the paper was that they produced. Helping was especially related to the quality of the paper produced, resulting in smaller quantities of rejected paper.

Even though it seems as OCBs such as helping could be universally beneficial for work groups, in some job contexts helping may actual decrease performance on a group level. A study by Nielsen, Bachrach, Halfhill & Sundstrom (2012) has shown that in groups where jobs are interdependent, helping improves performance, whereas in work groups where the work is low in interdependence, helping decreases performance. These results show that OCB is not a “the more, the better” phenomenon and that it may actually in some contexts decrease organizational performance. Contextual factors which may moderate the effect of OCB on performance variables will be explained later.

2.4. Antecedents of OCB

Academics have studied OCB for nearly 40 years, and have found a large amount of antecedents to OCB. The relationship between most antecedents and employee behavior have been mainly explained by the social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Schroeder, 2010).

Research on the antecedents of OCB can be separated into the study of individual antecedents and contextual antecedents of OCB. Individual antecedents research has been focusing on traits, habits, knowledge, skills (e.g. Motowidlo, Borman & Schmit, 1997), personality, (Bakshi, Kumar & Rani, 2009) and job attitudes, such as job satisfaction (Organ & Ryan, 1995) and organizational justice (Moorman, 1991; Moorman, Niehoff & Organ, 1993; Organ et al., 2006, p. 74). Studies on contextual variables influencing OCB have on the other hand focused on 1) leadership behaviors, 3) task characteristics, 4) organizational characteristics and 5) group level factors.
Although these may be seen as variables in the organizational context, they have often been studied with self-assessment methods, which measure employees’ perceptions of these contextual variables, making the distinction between individual attitudes and organizational factors often hard to make.

Although most research on OCB has studied job attitudes and their effect on OCB, this literature review will only briefly review attitudinal research on OCB. The study will emphasize contextual factors influencing OCB, as this body of literature is more relevant for the research question of this paper.

2.4.1. Job attitudes as antecedents of OCB

Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (2006, pp. 93-94) stated that individuals are motivated to engage in OCBs because they want to or because they feel obliged to, and do it for three reasons: because it 1) furthers their own interest, 2) because it is beneficial for others, or 3) because they want to benefit the organization. The origins of OCB research started as mentioned earlier from satisfactions-causes-performance debate (Bateman & Organ, 1983).

Meta-analyses show that job satisfaction correlates more strongly with OCB than with in-role performance. (Organ & Ryan, 1995). The correlation between job satisfaction and job performance has been found to be 0.3 (Judge, Thoresen, Bono & Patton, 2001), whereas the correlation between job satisfaction and OCB has been estimated to be about 0.44 (Organ, Podskoff & MacKenzie, 2006). Subsequent research in attitudes increasingly focused on organizational justice, which has been found to be an important correlate to OCB (Moorman, 1991; Organ et al. 2006 p. 74). The original explanation for why justice matters for OCB from a SET framework was that if the employee could trust that the organization will treat them well in the long term, then she does not need to worry about compensation of some specific gesture of OCB (Organ & Konovsky, 1989). Moorman (1991) showed specifically that it was procedural justice, and not distributive justice, that predicted OCB. This indicated that OCB is predicted by the way the organization, and even supervisors treat employees.

Other attitudinal factors correlating with OCB has been found to be for example, positive affect (George, 1992), positive mood states (Smith, Organ & Near, 1983) and perceived organizational support (Moorman, Blakely & Niehoff, 1998)
Perceived organizational support is a variable that represents the extent to which employees believe that their organization looks out for them and cares for them (Shore & Shore, 1995) and value their contribution (Eisenberger Huntington, Hutchinson & Sowa, 1986). As mentioned in the introductory chapter, perceived organizational support (Chiaburu, Chakrabarty, Wang & Li, 2015) has been shown to be associated with organizational citizenship behavior. Moorman et al. (1998) found that procedural justice influenced perceived organizational support (POS) which in turn influenced OCB. It seems that organizations where management treats their employees justly employees feel valued by their organizations, which results in employees expressing citizenship behaviors.

Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) found in their three field studies that psychological ownership – employees’ ‘feelings of ownership’ of the organization – influence attitudes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organization-based self-esteem, as well as behaviors such as job performance and OCB.

2.1. Influence of organizational context on OCB

The fixation on social exchange theory as the explaining mechanism for why employees express OCB has mentally confined most OCB researchers to studying various attitudinal and individual constructs correlating with OCB. The behavior and its various correlates on the individual level have been described in a vacuum, assuming that it is up to the individual and her free will if she is willing to go above and beyond the call of duty, almost completely overlooking the organizational, social and cultural context in which this behavior is rooted (Johns, 2006). This eradication of context in epistemology and metaphysics follows a 2000-year trend in western philosophy and science (Juarrero, 2000). The nearly sole use of quantitative and individual methods to measure an organization-level phenomenon, has made most researchers fail to consider other theoretical explanations to why this behavior is expressed by employees, for example considering the influence of context.

Recently there has been an increasing number of studies investigating the influence of context on organizational behavior and OCB. This section will review this relatively sparse research on how organizational citizenship behavior is influenced by the organizational context. Before discussing research that investigates the influence of context on OCB, a description of Johns (2006) and Juarrero’s (2000) perspectives on organizations, organizational context and behavior are given.
Johns (2006) has divided context into two forms: omnibus and discrete context. *Omnibus context* is the broader setting of the study and answers the questions, who, where, why, when and why. Answers may be for example the industry, population, occupation, time and the rationale of the study. The *discrete context* is influenced by the omnibus context, and influences behavior more directly and is often the direct context in which subjects act. For example, task-related factors in this context are for example autonomy, uncertainty, accountability and resources, whereas social factors may be social density, social structure and social influence. Examples of physical factors could be for example temperature, light, the built environment and décor. (Johns, 2006)

Johns (2006) lists in his article a number of perspectives on context. The first perspective that Johns describes is *context as the salience of contextual features*, according to which the salience of features in the environment influences behavior. For example, the presence of a strict teacher may influence the behavior of wild students. According to Johns, this perspective is still not enough in explaining human behavior, as many contextual variables are subtle and unknown to the ones influenced by them. Consider for example well internalized cultural norms.

The perspective of *context as situational strength* views context as a factor constraining human agency (Mischel, 1968). For example, there are many situations where rules, norms and roles have the power to constrain individual tendencies that otherwise would be expressed. In organizations, this type of context can also be seen as situational constraints and opportunities to organizational behavior.

Another perspective analyzes *context as cross-level effect* in which situational variables at one level of analysis influence the variables on another, usually on a lower level. (Cappelli & Scherer, 1991) For example, the upper level construct *culture* influences the individuals via a cross-level effect. Culture is an emergent property and constrains the individuals and their behavior. Most often individuals have less influence on the culture in which they operate than what culture has on them.

Context can also be seen as a *combination or bundle of stimuli* (Johns, 2006). This perspective is especially important in an organizational context, as many different kinds of contextual factors influence employee behavior simultaneously and may interact with each other to produce unique effects. For example, the introduction of a new pay-for-performance scheme may be interpreted by employees in a very different
way depending on who introduces the system to the company or if employees have been given the possibility to have an influence. Also, a single event may constitute context which has a pronounced influence on the behavior of the individuals. Moreover, context can be seen as a shaper of meaning, where depending on context, the exactly same stimuli may be interpreted in completely opposite ways (Johns, 2006). For example, consider the influence of situation on how feedback is interpreted. Negative-constructive feedback given in front of a group of colleagues may be interpreted as degrading, whereas in private it may be interpreted a dutiful act by a colleague.

Next, OCB research investigating the effect of context on the behavior will be presented.

### 2.1.1. Task characteristics

The most popular taxonomy of task characteristics is provided by Hackman & Oldham (1976) in their job enrichment model. Hackman & Oldham’s model contains five dimensions that have the potential to improve job satisfaction and motivation towards work. These are autonomy, task identity, skill variety, task significance and feedback. Hackman and Lawler (1971) defined task autonomy as “the extent to which employees have a major say in scheduling their work, selecting the equipment they will use, and deciding the procedures to be followed” (p. 267, as cited in Organ, Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 2006, p. 109) According to Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie, task autonomy will increase employees sense of ownership and responsibility of task outcomes, and therefore increase their will to do what it takes (including OCB) to succeed at the task (2006, p. 109). The authors’ explanation stays within the social exchange paradigm. What they do not take into account as an explanation is that task autonomy itself may permit the employee express more variable behavior, which may give room for OCB.

Although task characteristics have been found to predict OCB, some debate exists of whether this is a direct effect or an effect mediated by job satisfaction (Todd & Kent, 2006). Also, some task characteristics may be prerequisites for employees to be able to express OCB. Bell & Menguc (2002) found that autonomy at work mediated the relationship between POS and certain forms of OCB, reflecting that a certain level of autonomy is needed for employees to express forms of OCB that require deviation from work routines, namely civic virtue, courtesy and altruism.
Cappelli and Rogovsky (1998) found in their study that employee involvement in decision making improved task characteristics, which had a direct effect on employee OCB. In addition, the three types of task characteristics used in leadership substitute research, task feedback, task routinization and task satisfaction have been shown to influence OCB. Task feedback and task satisfaction influence OCB positively whereas task routinization has shown to be negatively correlated with OCB (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000).

A meta-analysis including 42 studies summed that role ambiguity is negatively correlated with job satisfactions which in turn affects OCBs negatively. Also, role conflicts were found to be negatively associated with OCBs (Eatough Chang, Miloslavic & Johnson, 2011).

The effect of employee involvement on OCB has been studied thoroughly in two studies, one by Cappelli and Rogovsky (1998) and another by Chen and Chiu (2009). In their study Cappelli and Rogovsky, (1998) found that employee involvement in work practices showed to influence OCB positively, both directly and indirectly. The indirect effect was through improvement of work characteristics autonomy, identity, variety, significance and feedback (Hackman & Lawler, 1971). The following explanation to the indirect effect may be given: influencing one’s work most likely will improve it, which will improve one’s motivation towards it positively, as implied by the job enrichment model (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). It may be this motivational satisfaction (as in line with the Social exchange theory explanation to OCB) which then makes employees want to contribute by OCBs. Cappelli and Rogovsky found also that employee involvement in decisions of employment practices such as recruitment decisions, safety issues etc. had a positive effect on the autonomy, variety and significance -facets of job design. The facets all had a positive effect on OCB. The weakness of this study was that it measured a relatively narrow set of OCBs. Only OCBs such as sportsmanship (absence of complaining and constructive comment), helping and conscientiousness (e.g. timeliness) were measured. The newer study by Chen and Chiu (2009) found similar results. In their study done in seven companies in Taiwan, they found that task identity, task significance and autonomy influenced employee expression of OCB positively and this effect was mediated by job involvement.

Task interdependence has been defined by Wageman (2001, p. 198) as

“Task interdependence refers to features of inputs into the work itself that require multiple individuals to complete the work.”
How task interdependence influences OCB has been studied both experimentally in laboratories, and by using quasi-experimental studies. In their three studies, two laboratory studies and one quasi-experiment, Bachrach, Powell, Bendoly, & Richey (2006) found that the level of task interdependence in the group influences the importance attributed to OCB by evaluators. In a laboratory study, Comeau and Griffith (2005) found that both task and goal interdependence had a main effect on OCB. Nielsen, Bachrach, Halfhill, & Sundstrom, (2012) investigated whether the correlation between OCB and group performance was different between groups that were task independent and task interdependent. They found that OCB correlated positively with performance of task interdependent groups but had a neutral to negative correlation with groups that were task independent. Helping and other forms of OCB in groups where work is not task interdependent may lead to larger transaction costs, which lead to lower overall performance of the team.

2.2. Leadership behaviors

Different leadership behaviors have also been shown to influence OCB in employees. For example, ethical leadership (Brown, Treviño & Harrison, 2005), which is a form of leadership that is respectful towards ethical beliefs and the dignity and respect of others, has been associated with both individual and organization-targeted OCBs. This relationship is mediated by both the quality of relationship between leader and employee (LMX, leader-member exchange) and respect (Yang, Ding & Lo, 2015). leader-member exchange has been shown also by other studies to be associated with OCB (Settoon, Bennett & Liden, 1996). OCB has also been shown to be correlated with leader supportiveness (Netemeyer & Boles, 1997; Podsakoff et al. 2000; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983).

2.3. Technology

Kim and Lee (2006) inspected the role of organizational context and IT on employee information sharing. In their study they found that in organizations where companies have easy-to-use IT systems, and where employees use this information technology, knowledge sharing is enhanced. They also found that centralization was negatively associated with knowledge sharing. Knowledge sharing can be associated with both helping and voice, on Dekas et al.’s (2013) scale.
2.4. Normative and cultural factors

On a group level, the factors explaining OCB are different than on the individual level. On the group level, cultural and normative factors subject their own influence on employee behavior as a cross-level effect. There are many reasons why individual level OCB and group level OCB reflect each other. MacKenzie et al. (2011, pp. 561-562, cited in Podsakoff, 2014), name a few theories that explain this mechanism. Firstly, they name Bandura’s (1977) social learning theory, according to which people learn from others’ successful behavior. OCB by successful others is likely to create an environment that encourages others to engage in that same behavior. Also, these same behaviors may according to social exchange theory create obligations in others to reciprocate in similar or other ways (Blau, 1964). Thirdly, if OCBs are expressed often enough, they may become norms in the workgroup (Ehrhart & Naumann, 2004). Krebs (1970) has concluded that helping others is partially a result of how deeply one has internalized a conviction or norm that it is a person’s duty to help a person in need, especially when the price of helping is not excessively high.

For example, Vigoda-Gadot (2007) has found that 75% of subjects in his study felt strong pressure to perform OCBs, whereas Ehrhart and Naumann, (2004) have shown the strong effect of workplace norms on OCB. In the light of these studies, if OCB is expressed by employees because of normative pressure and not discretion, then the social exchange theory is not applicable as an explanation (Schroeder, 2010). In a study by Vigoda-Gadot (2007) employees were many times pressured by managers or supervisors to perform so called “voluntary” or “extra-role” behaviors. This changes the nature of these OCBs completely. According to Vigoda-Gadot, these behaviors should instead be called Compulsory Citizenship Behaviors.

Organizational climate is the “feeling in the air” in a company, which is produced by the procedures, rewards and practices of companies, whereas organizational culture stems from employees’ interpretations about the values, assumptions and philosophies that produce the climate that is experienced (Schneider, Gunnarson & Niles-Jolly (1994). OCB climate is a construct defined by Schneider, Gunnarson and Niles-Jolly (1994) as

“... a distinct group-level cognition that characterizes a favorable context for organizational citizenship behavior in a given work environment. More specifically, it is the shared belief amongst group members about certain policies, procedures, and norms in the work group that have bearing on citizenship behavior – namely, the things employees do that contribute to the social and psychological environment in which their task performance takes place.”
Schneider, Gunnarson and Niles-Jolly (1994) proposed that this climate could be promoted. Although they did not do any empirical work around their hypothesis, they set three criteria for an OCB climate to develop. First, they proposed that the perceptions of *group level fairness* would be important for group level OCB. This proposition is supported also by Tyler & Blader’s (2009) studies on the group engagement model. *Norms of helping and cooperation* was seen as the second central aspect of OCB climates. Norms are useful for organizational functioning because they regulate individual behavior even when formal mechanisms of control are absent. Research shows that groups form norms around behavior that is beneficial for the group as a whole (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959), relate to group survival, help avoid awkward situations between members, increase the predictability of member behavior, and behavior that expresses important values of the group, (Feldman, 1984). All these can easily be associated with OCB. Thirdly, Schneider et al. (1994) stressed the importance of *rewards based on broad contributions* to the organization as important for nurturing a OCB climate. The way salary is paid and other incentives distributed may have an effect on employee OCB. This makes the types of employment contracts made with employees an important factor influencing employee OCB. If contracts are restricted to payment for very specific task behaviors, then this may have a negative impact on employee contribution in the form of OCB, whereas if employees are paid for broad contributions, then this should give freedom to employees to behave more generally and therefore also express OCB. This relationship is explained by the model of Tsui, Pearce, Porter and Tripoli (1994) and will be explained later.

Positive relationships at work have also been shown to be associated with OCB. Peyrat-Guillard and Glinska-Neweś (2014) found in their study that positive relationships like respect and acceptance relate to OCB directed at individuals, and relationships of honesty and reliability relate to OCBs directed at the organization. Von Krogh (1998) argues that openness and trust in an organization promote active knowledge sharing among its members and that trustworthy behavior improves communication speed by empowering employees to freely share their personal knowledge and concerns. In a meta-analysis by Podsakoff et al. (2000), group cohesiveness was found to be a significant variable influencing OCB (conscientiousness, altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, and civic virtue) in employees.
2.5. HRM practices

Bowen and Ostroff (2004) have studied the influence of the HRM system on employee behavior via the concept of “the strength of the HRM system”, which is derived from the concept of “situational strength by Mischel (1968). According to them, the metafeatures of the HRM system, namely how salient, legitimate, consistent and distinct the system is perceived as, and how broad a consensus of among employees there is about the cause and effect linkages of the system, the stronger the effect of the HRM system on behavior there is.

A new growing stream of research instigated the study of the relationship between Human Resource Management (HRM) practices and OCB. Studies show that HRM practices such as non-monetary recognition practices, employee empowerment, competence development practices and information sharing practices are all related positively to employee OCB (see Paré, Tremblay & Lalonde, 2000 for a review). Zhang, Wan & Jia, (2008) have found that high performance human resource practices influence OCB positively in technology experts. Their definition of high performance human resource practices included 1) good people flow which included selective staffing, training, job security and employee mobility, 2) Appraisal and rewards, which rewarded long-term and results oriented performance, and 3) employment relations, including broad job descriptions and job designs with broad job descriptions, encouragement of participation and flexible job assignments. In their study they also studied the effect of HR practices on corporate entrepreneurship, and found a significant effect, which was fully mediated by OCB. This shows that OCB plays an important role in promoting organizational development and innovation.

The study by Wan & Jia, (2008) is supported by the earlier mentioned studies by Chen and Chiu (2009) and Cappelli and Rogovsky (1998) who found job involvement to increase OCB. Cappelli and Rogovsky found also that letting employees influence employment practices (hiring, promotions, training and safety), had a positive influence on OCB through improved job characteristics. This shows that engaging employees in HR practices may increase OCB in employees.

The form of incentive system has also shown to influence helping and cooperation in work places. This effect is probably a result of increases in structural interdependence, defined by Wageman (2001, p. 198) as
“elements outside the individual and his or her behavior – that is, features of the context – that define a relationship between entities such that one affects (and is affected by) the other.”

These dependencies may originate in how goals are defined, in the nature of work itself, or according to which principles rewards are allocated. (ditto.)

For example, O'Bannon and Pearce (1999) found, when comparing two services companies, one with a gainsharing model and another using a traditional individual incentive system that the company with the gainsharing model scored significantly higher on cooperation and payment satisfaction, compared to the company using an individualistic model. Also, Fitzroy and Kraft (1987) found in their cross-sectional studies that group incentives were associated with cooperation, productivity and profitability.

### 2.5.1. Employment relationship

Studies (e.g. Morrison, 1994) have shown that employees on the same job differ in what they see as their job obligations, and that employees are more likely to engage in OCBs when they are regarded as in-role. The reason may be that when employees see OCBs as in role, they feel that these behaviors are not in fact discretionary. These findings question the social exchange theory explanation to OCB, because if employees perceive OCBs to be in-role, then they do not fall within the social exchange framework (which assumes discretionary acts of reciprocal behavior), but are instead explained by an economic framework. Organ’s newer definition of OCB from 1997 does not strictly require OCBs to be discretionary or not to be formally compensated, which means that also in-role and compensated behaviors may fall under the definition of OCB. This is where the relevance of employment contract comes in.

Tsui, Pearce, Porter and Tripoli (1997) have developed an employee-organization relationship strategy-model which describes different forms of relationships between the employer and the employee. In the model they have identified two prototypes of exchange relationships between employee and employer: quasi-spot contracts and mutual investment contracts.* In a quasi-spot relationship, obligations from both parties are specific: the employer provides specific and short-term payments for very specific employee behavior. In this relationship the employer does not provide any extra employment security, but neither expects any additional effort from the

*They also mentioned two imbalanced variants of these relationships, although these will not be described here.
employee. In the *mutual investment relationship* on the other hand, obligations are more open ended and less specific. The relationship is more fraternal, and the employer encourages employees to adapt more flexible and expandable working roles. In exchange the employer provides the employee with benefits like for example employment security and training. In summary, according to their model, the quasi-spot relationships and mutual investment relationships are balanced prototype models where the two forms of relationships differ on whether obligations between the parties are strictly specified and narrow, or if the relationship is more of a flexible and open-ended type. (Tsui, Pearce, Porter & Tripoli, 1997). The model can also be associated with the idea of the psychological contract (Rousseau, 1989).

In a study by Koh and Yer (2000) on temporary workers, the nature of the relationship was found to have implications for many job attitudes. A mutual investment relationship was associated with better job performance, job satisfaction, affective commitment towards the employer, fairness, work options and lower turnover intentions, compared to a quasi-spot relationship. As these attitudes have been shown to correlate with OCB in earlier studies, it can be expected that a mutual investment relationship will increase OCB. Such a relationship was demonstrated by Tsui et al. (2007).

The model by Tsui et al. (1997) model has some limitations in applicability. In the context of Finnish labor law, the employment security aspect is different compared to for example the USA. In Finland labor laws are significantly stricter, making it hard, or sometimes almost impossible for employers to fire employees that have permanent, open-ended contracts. There has to be well argued reasons to keep employees in temporary, fixed term contracts. This means that in practice, most employment relationships, including those where employees are contracted for specific types of work, are permanent, which means that employees automatically enjoy a significant level of employment security. Nevertheless, this model is valuable, as investments from the employers’ side may take other forms than employment security. Investments in the well-being and competence development of employees can be expected to have a similar effect. Also, regardless of the level of employment security, the contract made with the employer, for example if the contract is an hourly contact based on only specific types of work, compared to a monthly salary with loosely defined tasks, may have an influence, as argued by Schneider (1994).
3 METHODOLOGY

In this chapter I will describe and argue for the methodology that has been used to fulfil the aim of the study: getting a more holistic understanding of organizational factors that influence OCB in experts in a cybersecurity company. First I will describe the context of the study to give the reader an idea of the motives to research and the reasons for the choice of organization. Then the chapter will move successively from broader scientific-philosophical questions about ontology and epistemology to more practical questions about the methods used to gather data and the quality of the data itself. After I have clarified my ontological and epistemological assumptions about organizations and organizational research, I will argue for the methodological choices made, and why they are appropriate vis-à-vis my view of organizations and the knowledge extractable from them. Further, I will explain in detail the research design and analysis used, and argue why it is proper for the purpose of the study and the chosen research questions.

3.1 The context of the study

Because human behavior, in contrast to the “behavior” of dead physical objects, is determined by their context and history (Juarrero, 2000), this subchapter aims to give a picture of the organizational context in which the study is embedded. According to Cappelli and Scherer (1991, p. 56, in Johns, 2006) contexts are the surroundings that are associated with the phenomena of interest, and which aid to illuminate the phenomenon of interest. This context typically consists of units of analysis above the phenomenon that is directly studied. According to Johns (2006) it is important to describe the omnibus context of the study, to give the reader an idea of the setting in which the research was conducted and the broader context which surrounds the results. Johns compares this to journalistic practice, and argues, based on the words of other prominent scholars that “good research tells a story”. It should provide the reader an idea of who, what, when, where and why the study was conducted.

The background information that will be presented here was acquired through multiple meetings with managers at the company, and was also collected in connection with a previous consulting project that I did for the company 1.5 years earlier. The consulting services related to a change in incentive system that the company was to implement. The consulting firm I worked for at the time provided a motivational survey to the
subject company, where all employees at the company were queried about factors influencing their intrinsic motivation towards work and their work engagement. These results were used to support the decision of how to change the incentive system. In addition to meetings with managers in connection to this study and the previous consulting project, some general knowledge about the nature of the business was collected from the company webpage. Background information about the company will be presented next.

This study was conducted at a Finnish high-tech cybersecurity company during the winter of 2015 and the spring of 2016. With its workforce of about 150, the company is engaged in information security consulting by assessing, implementing and developing their customer companies’ cybersecurity in areas of corporate IT, digital business and industrial internet. The company was selected due to a couple of reasons. One reason was due to its suitability for the research question: the company and the high tech industry that it is part of, is an especially fast changing part of the economy. The technology industry is well known to be an important driver of change in the knowledge economy. (Kunda, 2006, cited in Dekas et al., 2013) This is interesting in the light of OCB, as OCB has been described as behavior which keeps companies at par with change (Dekas, 2013; Van Dyne & LePine 1998; Organ, 1997), which makes these behaviors likely to be very important for high-tech companies. A second factor influencing my choice of company was that I already had previous contact with the company through consulting work I had done for them earlier. Through the previous work I had become acquainted with the company, and become interested in the many social and organizational issues that they faced.

With a few members of management this study was agreed to be conducted as a part of a culture-mapping project. The company had been expanding in recent years both by hiring and by acquiring smaller information security companies both locally and abroad. This expansive strategy was to be continued, why defining the organizational culture had become an important question, so that choices about future acquisitions may be well informed in regard to organizational culture.

3.1.1. Relevant organizational history

In recent years the company has gone through three significant changes. Firstly, the company has acquired a smaller company, secondly, the company went public in the
end of year 2014, and third, the company changed its incentive system during the year 2015. Next these changes will be described briefly.

In 2014 the company acquired a smaller IT company of about 40 employees. This was the first acquisition and the start of an expansive corporate strategy. According to information from the COO at the time, about 30% of the company’s employees were from the acquired firm. In this study, two of the six interviewed consultants are from the acquired company, which makes them proportionally represented. At about the same time as the two companies were merged, they were also listed at the NASDAQ OMX Nordic stock exchange. Before the public listing, employees were able to buy company stocks.

Further, during the year 2015, a performance-based incentive system was abolished in favor of higher base pay and a company-wide gainsharing model in the form of a biennial bonuses. The motive to change the incentive system was to support the cultural change in the company to a more cooperative and customer centered one. Even though the company had a culture of helping and contributing, the behavior of employees was influenced by the pay-for-performance incentive system. For example, helping others in work related issues or even cooperating with others to create maximum customer value could be hindered if one’s performance goals were short. Instead, a gainsharing model was adopted on a company level, where bonuses based on company profitability were paid to all employees biennially. The aim of the new system was to develop a culture where employees focus on the collective’s and the customer’s best. Gainsharing models are popular in work contexts where cooperation is encouraged, for example in work where interdependency is important to organizational outcomes (Welbourne, Balkin & Gomez-Mejia, 1995). Even though gainsharing promotes cooperation and helping, gainsharing models increase the risk of free-riding, which may have negative consequences on organizational performance (Cooper, Dyck & Frohlich, 1992).

The benefits that the change in incentive system may have can be described theoretically. According to the law of relative effect (Brown and Herrnstein, 1975), when we make one type of behavior more attractive with the help of for example incentives, we inevitably decrease the relative incentive to perform other behaviors, which consequently decreases their frequency. In this case, when management abolished the financial incentive based on individual customer billable hours, they
automatically increased the relative attractiveness of other behaviors such as cooperation.

3.2. Ontology

My ontological view of individual behavior in organizations is that the individuals' behavior is determined by the organizational context when at the same time the organizational context is influenced by the individual's behavior (Cappelli & Scherer, 1991; Juarrero, 2000). In this view the individuals in an organization and the organization itself are inseparable, because the organization itself emerges from the interaction between its parts – inter alia the individuals. Organizational behavior should therefore not only be studied on an individual level, but particularly on an organizational level, as behaviors of the individuals are predisposed by the organization and its structure and vice versa. This means that when a group of individuals interact to produce a larger system in which they are part of, and when this system starts affecting the behavior of the individuals, causality is not linear between individuals, but acts on multiple levels (Juarrero, 2000). This systemic perspective, where the parts are themselves influenced of being parts of a whole, leads to the point where the group of individuals acquires additional properties, emerging from the system in which they are organized. Emergent properties are ultimately relationships between entities in a structure. This means that the properties do not reside within the entities themselves, but emerge in the interaction between the entities (Blau, 2009).

Blau (2009), the founder of social exchange theory, argued that many times social relationships are treated as properties of the individuals engaging in them, no different from their other characteristics. In modern research, the fact that relationships (or behaviors) between individuals are emergent properties is practically ignored (ibid., p. 3-4; Juarrero, 2000). For example, OCBs cannot be accurately understood only by examining the individual, as OCBs such as helping, voice and social participation are in essence behaviors that emerge in the interaction between at least two persons. For example, a person cannot help another if the other person does not have a problem, and if the person does not communicate the need for help. For example, in the case of voice, giving suggestions about how work could be done in a better way is not rational if no one is listening, for example if one's manager has an authoritarian management style.
Ignoring the emergent property of OCB is exactly what previous OCB research has done, at least methodologically. This is ironic because the main theory used to explain OCB is Social Exchange Theory, whose founder Blau (1964, 2009), saw social exchange behavior as fundamentally an emergent property of social groups. Organizational behavior, including OCB, is essentially an emergent property of organizations, and should therefore be studied with methods that takes the nature of the phenomenon into account.

3.3. Epistemology

An ontological interpretivist assumption assumes that the meaning and understanding that people attach to their realities and activities is of importance and interest in organizational research (Travers, 2001 p. 16-17). Bateson (2000, p. 250) argues that in organizations the only relevant reality to study is peoples' perceptions of objects, relations or events, not the physical objects themselves. In a socially constructed reality, like the organization, these “messages” (or mental images) about physical events or objects are more important than the physical reality itself, because it is based on this interpretation of reality that people and groups act. Therefore, the reality that I will be concerned with in this study is the subjective reality which individual action is based on. Indeed, the physical reality which the interviewees refer to is of interest in this study, but instead of studying the physical reality directly, I will study employees’ interpretation of it and its influence on their behavior.

By scrutinizing human experience directly, we are able to get a holistic picture of the cultural, social, psychological and physical and historical relationships that are of relevance for the subject, and which have influence in the person’s behavior. This context, which is systematically ignored in positivistic research is interesting because it gives the meaning and motives to behavior. Instead of deducing the motives and reasons to this behavior a priori, this study will openly study the contexts, and the contexts of contexts in which the behavior takes place (Bateson, 2000). Therefore, an interpretivist approach is appropriate.

3.4. Research design

This study used an inductive single-organization case study design. According to Eisenhardt (1989) case studies are used to understand the dynamics within single settings. This study therefore aims to understand the dynamics within the organization
which influence employees’ expression of organizational citizenship behavior. This study uses an embedded design (Eisenhardt, 1989), meaning that the analysis is done on multiple conceptual levels.

Six experts and two managers were interviewed to acquire the data that was used to answer the research questions of the study. The experts were interviewed using semi-structured interviews, while the managers were interviewed more freely to validate results and to acquire important broader contextual information.

The expert interviews were the main source of data and were aimed at getting an understanding of the nature of different OCBs, as defined by Dekas et al. (2013), and to understand the cause of these behaviors, enabled and constrained by various organizational factors.

3.4.1. Use of the scale by Dekas et al. (2013)

Most research in OCB has used the original typology of the behavior defined by Organ in 1988, which includes the behaviors altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and courtesy. This scale has been developed and used mostly in more traditional contexts such as manufacturing, retail and health care (Dekas et al., 2013). Although using the same scale through time and contexts may allow easy comparison of research, using the same scale without regard to context may pose some serious issues to the validity of the results. Since the development of the original scale by Organ, the nature of work has changed significantly. Organ himself mentioned in his paper re-defining OCB (1997) that the nature of work has changed significantly:

“[I]t does appear now that the way I described OCB ... was mightily influenced by fading attributes of a different kind of organization from the one we see taking shape now.” (p. 96)

In addition to the change that may be attributed to the flow of time, also a knowledge work environment is in many ways different compared to more traditional work contexts that have been used to validate the original scale by Organ (1988). This environment is different in in regard to working hours, the amount of autonomy given to employees, the type of work done etc. (see Dekas et al. 2013 for a review), which questions the applicability of a decades old OCB typology developed in more traditional settings. The OCBs studied in this thesis will therefore be derived from Dekas et al.’s (2013) OCB-knowledge work scale, which consist of 5 OCBs found to be relevant in a high-tech knowledge work context, namely voice, helping, civic virtue, social
participation and employee sustainability. With a qualitative study at Google Inc. the authors’ aim was to investigate the relevance of the original typology by Organ (1988) in a modern work context and to investigate if new types of OCBs would emerge to replace some of the previous ones defined by Organ (1988). The study showed that three of the five OCBs were outdated and non-applicable in a modern knowledge work context. Some behaviors that previously had been seen as beneficial for organizational performance, where now shown to have the opposite effect. For example, an original scale item such as “does not spend time in idle conversation”, was found by the authors to have jumped from avoidable behaviors to OCBs. In modern knowledge work, most of knowledge is transferred and innovations made in seemingly non-important discussions with co-workers (Dekas et al., 2013).

The scale by Dekas et al. (2013) will be used to define OCBs in this thesis. The scale was seen as relevant for this study, because it was developed especially with knowledge work in mind in a high-tech organization. The relatively good ecological fit compared to other available OCB typologies made the scale a natural choice as the source of behaviors to be examined in this study.

3.4.2. Change in aim of study

The design of this study was developed continuously during the research process. The original intention of the study was to focus on cultural and individual factors influencing OCB. This focus was changed when themes different than the ones expected started emerging during the data collection process. When the subjects were asked questions like: “what decreases your willingness to develop company procedures?”, instead of giving expected answers associated with justice, job satisfaction or other themes found significant by earlier OCB research, subjects often altered the question to focus on company structures and procedures that promoted or prevented their OCB. Many times employees were willing to engage in OCBs but were hindered by organizational structures and procedures. After continuous friction between the questions asked and the answers given by the subjects, the interview questions were finally changed to the following form: “what decreases your ability or willingness to develop company procedures?”. This form gave the interviewees room to take into account extrinsic factors influencing their behavior such as structural aspects promoting, enabling, constraining and discouraging OCB.
The insight about the role of organizational factors influencing OCB led also to a change in research questions. The original goal to study individual, social and cultural aspects influencing OCB was changed according to what the subjects saw as relevant factors influencing their behavior. The implications if this change on the validity of this study will be discussed in the end of this chapter.

3.4.3. Data sources and selection of interview subjects

The study used three different sources of data. The main source of data was in-depth semi-structured interviews with six experts in the company. In addition, two managers were interviewed several times during the research process, to acquire contextual understanding and to validate findings. As a third source, an open-ended cultural survey conducted by management of the company was used to validate the interview results regarding culture.

The six interviewees were selected using multiple methods with the objective to gain as much variation in the group as possible. The variation was hoped to be on five variables. Firstly, it was hoped to get employees from different teams, which would give insights of different social and work contexts. Secondly, it was hoped that there would be employees both engaging and not engaging in OCBs. This would give insight in both factors which inhibit and which promote OCB in experts. Thirdly, both genders were hoped to be represented. Fourth, a selection of employees both old and new to the company was hoped for. Fifth, variation in both age and experience was a criterion.

Invitations to the interview were sent to 19 experts by email. These were selected for the interviews with the above criteria in mind.

1. Twelve persons were invited to interviews by using the answers of a previously administered motivational survey conducted approximately a year earlier by the consultancy I worked for. The survey consisted of 120 claims, which were graded with a seven point Likert scale according to how well the claim describes one’s own work situation. The survey was not specifically designed for this study, and therefore no claims explicitly included OCB. Despite of that, three questions were seen as closely related to OCB, and were used as screening questions. Employees who answered both high and low on these questions were selected for interviews.
a. *I pay attention that people get a good image of the company*

b. *I often tell my friends excitedly about my work*

c. *I want my company to be successful*

Information regarding gender, age, team membership and duration of employment with the company were also used as selection criteria. The data could be found from the motivational survey.

2. The second wave of participants were called to interviews by asking a manager at the company to give a list of employees that may have viewpoints on engagement and commitment.

As mentioned earlier, additional data about the organization and its culture was obtained through a survey administered by the management of the company to their employees. The aim of the survey was to gain understanding of the culture of the company, and the factors which employees see as most important and which aspects should be changed. The data was not collected by me, which means that the data collection process cannot be guaranteed to be valid. Therefore, the data from the query will only be used as secondary, and will be used for triangulation of results from the interviews.

**3.4.4. Recruitment outcome – The resulting subjects**

The resulting six of experts seemed to represent the employees of the company well. The group of interviewees held individuals that seemed to be both committed to the organization and its objectives, and included one that seemed more detached from it. The interviewees were mainly from different teams, which should lead to good variation in job characteristics and social variables. The resulting group included two females, which made women well represented with the male-dominant industry in mind. Agewise the whole age distribution of the organization was represented. Subjects were between 20 and 50 years old. The group consisted of both experts (hereinafter referred to interchangeably as “experts” or “consultants”) working with technical data security consulting and administrative information security consulting. The resulting group held also two project leaders. One of the managers interviewed was recruited randomly for the study, while the other manager was the contact person for this study.
When presenting the results of the study, the consultants will be referred to with numbers, ranging from 1-6. The managers will be referred with numbers 1 and 2. When using citations that I see as even mildly sensitive or revealing information that may be used to identify the person, the number will be concealed to guarantee anonymity of the person. For the same reason and also for practical reasons, all subjects, regardless of gender are referred to as he.

### 3.4.5. Data collection method

The interviews were conducted as semi-structured thematic interviews, usually at the customers’ office in booked meeting rooms. Two subjects were interviewed in cafeterias. Discussions with managers were done by phone or in informal meetings. The information about the previously mentioned cultural survey was requested from one of the managers of the company in a possibly raw format.

When using a semi-structured interview, the researcher asks open-ended questions which are followed by queries that probe for additional detailed and contextual data. The answers of interviewees provide rich contextual and in-depth data which gives insight in individual and shared meanings that are attached to lived experiences (Piercy, 2004). Semi-structured interviews were considered appropriate for a number of reasons. Firstly, the method was suitable because of my ontological assumption that the context and time in which human behavior is situated is a defining and significant factor of behavior. A method that captured these aspects of reality was considered appropriate. A data collection method that would not take context into account in rich detail (for example a quantitative and standardized OCB scale) would be insufficient for explaining employee behavior from this perspective. Secondly, a semi-structured interview was seen relevant, as the approach is interpretivist. This method offered the possibility to structure the interview according to existing theory, keeping the answers relevant while simultaneously giving the interviewees influence over their answers according to what they saw as relevant.

In addition, because the theme of the study was mainly unstudied, a method that was open enough for unexpected findings was necessary. A more standardized method would not have been fit for this purpose because theory regarding the issue is sparse.

The interview as a method gave a clear advantage in comparison to less interactional methods: during data collection it provided the interviewer with information about
which aspects of reality were relevant for the interview subjects, which enabled calibration of the interview questions, and finally even the research questions.

The interview was divided into the following parts:

1. An introduction, where I explained the main idea of the study (without naming the term “organizational citizenship behavior”);

2. Contextual questions-part, where I asked about contextual information that could be of interest when interpreting answers on key questions;

3. In the third part I asked the subjects key questions regarding the 5 OCBs given by Dekas et al. (2013);

4. In the fourth part I focused on three organizational changes that had been made at the company during the recent years;

5. Lastly, in the cultural part, the interviewees were asked to describe aspects in the company culture that they consider important, and three aspects that they hoped could be changed. These questions were asked due to a request from the company. The answers were used as a part of their culture development program. Favorably, these cultural questions gave important contextual information that was of value when interpreting answers to key questions.

The introduction had an important role in framing the study, and gave the respondent a clear picture of what kind of information was of interest in the study. Examples of OCB (Dekas et al., 2013) were given, but without naming the term “organizational citizenship behavior”. The interview guide presents this part more thoroughly (see Appendix 2).

The contextual questions had the role to extract understanding about the work and the organizational context in which the employee operated. Furthermore, the employee’s relationship with the company, and the employee’s attitude towards the company was of interest. The posed questions were for example: “What do you do at this company?”, “What is your relationship with this company?” and “What are your main areas of responsibility?” Many of the introductory questions and their final form were inspired by a foundational qualitative study on work engagement by Kahn (1990). The contextual part was followed by the key questions regarding factors influencing OCB.
The *key questions* had a central role in the interview and were aimed at getting an idea of the nature of the five different kinds of OCB (Dekas et al., 2013) in the employees’ work, and the factors influencing this behavior. The five OCBs were operationalized in by first giving a thorough description of the category of behavior, which was followed by questions about factors influencing the employees’ capability to express these behaviors.

All interviews were conducted in Finnish. The first interview was treated more as a pilot interview, testing initial questions, and using the reactions of the interviewee as information to further develop the interview. After the initial pilot interview, the final interview guide was mostly complete, and is described above.

### 3.5. Analysis

The analysis in this thesis was done with an embedded design, meaning that analysis was done on multiple levels (Eisenhardt, 1989). The primary focus of the study was to analyze structures and procedures of the organization that influence the expression organizational citizenship positively and negatively. Other secondary aspects that were taken into consideration were the individual motives behind specific OCBs, and further cultural and normative aspects influencing OCB.

The analysis was done using the free qualitative analysis software TAMSAnalyzer, which allows the researcher to attach multiple codes to the same passage of text. The interviews were first coded using inductive coding attaching short text tags to passages that referred to factors influencing employees’ behavior. An example list of codes can be found in Appendix 3. These coded passages where then categorized with additional dimensions of codes falling into two categories:

1. The taxonomy of five OCBs defined by Dekas et al. (2013): *voice, helping, civic virtue, social participation* and *employee sustainability* was used to categorize the coded passages according to which behavior was effected. The identification of which category the behavior fell into was done by Dekas et al.’s definitions of the specific behaviors and by questions developed to measure the behaviors with the OCB-KW scale (can be found as Appendix 1). In addition, a category *general OCB* was used when the interviewee spoke generally about benefitting the organization without referring to any specific OCB in the Dekas et al. taxonomy.
A self-generated taxonomy was also used to classify the inductively coded factors into organizational structures or practices that either enabled, promoted, constrained or discouraged employees from expressing the different OCBs above.

In the end of the primary analysis, each passage had been labeled with at least three tags that indicated: the contextual factor which influenced OCB, how it influenced (enabled, promoted, constrained or discouraged), and which OCB was influenced.

From here forward the coded passages were analyzed under each of the five categories of OCBs to find aggregated categories of factors, which can be found in the results part of the study. During the second round of analysis it became clear that in most cases it was impossible to separate constraining and discouraging factors from each other. In a similar manner, enabling and promoting factors were often hard to separate clearly. This led to merging of the categories into ‘enablers and promoters’ and ‘constraints and discouraging factors’.

The text was analyzed completely in Finnish. Coding was done in English and suitable quotes, used to support arguments in the thesis, were translated into English when needed.

3.6. Evaluation of quality

This subchapter discusses issues of the quality of the study. Miles and Huberman (1994) have listed five criteria according to which the quality of qualitative research may be assessed. The first criterion is objectivity, which is the freedom from unacknowledged researcher bias and the acknowledgement of bias that is in awareness. The second is reliability, which refers to the stability and consistency of the research process. The third is internal validity, which refers to the truth value of the results and answers the question “do the results make sense to the subjects of the study?” The fourth criterion is external validity, which depends on if the results are transferrable to a larger picture or other settings, and if the results are in accordance with what is already known. The last criterion is the utility of the study, which refers to the value of the study to the participants and research in general. Next I will discuss factors in the research process which may have influenced these criteria.
3.6.1. Bias and reliability

The selection method used may have biased the sample. Joining a study such as this is itself an expression of OCB, whereas the selection method may have selected for individuals that have a heightened tendency or possibility to express OCB, leading to individuals less prone falling off. Furthermore, the fact that the study was conducted in a single setting influences the results. A discussion about the benefits of using multiple organizations in a study like this can be found in the concluding chapters of the thesis.

The research process has been relatively consistent according the reliability criterion by Miles and Huberman (1994). All interviews were held during a three-month period, and were conducted by me. Some inconsistency was a result of the fact the interview guide was changed after the first two interviews from focusing solely on individual and cultural factors to enquiring also about contextual factors influencing behavior. Still, changing the focus of the study improved the validity of the study, which makes the tradeoff in reliability acceptable.

3.6.2. Researcher influence

As in all research, the researcher has inevitably had an influence on the results to some extent. Whereas in positivistic research this effect is downplayed or even completely ignored, the influence of the researcher is acknowledged in subjectivist epistemology (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006). Next I will describe my influence as a researcher according to Miles and Huberman’s (1994) objectivity criterion. Also my relation to the company, and the risks and possibilities it involves will be described.

As mentioned earlier, my contact with the organization was initiated in connection with a consulting project 1.5 years earlier. I provided the organization with a motivational survey intended to support decision making in relation to a change in incentive system. The theoretical framework of the motivational study was based on Ryan and Deci’s self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000). One central argument relating to the self-determination theory is that humans are intrinsically motivated by the psychological needs autonomy, competence and relatedness. These forms of motivators are celebrated by some scholars and laypersons as superior to financial incentives, especially in a knowledge work context (Pink, 2009; Pfeffer, 1998; Kohn, 1993).

My earlier work in the company may be reflected in the results in a few ways. Firstly, it may be noticed in the answers of respondents in that they may be influenced by the
ideas of self-determination theory, disseminated at the company in conjunction with presenting the survey results in the monthly meeting. Furthermore, if the interviewees still remembered my role as a consultant, they may have answered in a way that they expected that I want to hear. This bias is called *demand characteristics* (Orne, 2009). Another issue that may arise is that employees are not sure about the confidentiality of the interview, especially because of my earlier work with the management of the company. This should not be a problem as there should not be any major trust issues between different parties in this company. To eradicate any employee suspicions regarding confidentiality or impartiality, the confidentiality of the interview was strongly highlighted when briefing the interview.

The interviews were transcribed by the author. Before analysis the transcripts were read once through “mindfully” with using as little *ex ante* concepts as possible. After reading the transcripts, the observations were separated into analytic themes, dividing the “human lived experiences” of the interviewees (Travers, 2001, pp. 18-40). Coding was done using an integrated approach between inductive coding and the “start list method” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 58). This is the phase of the study most prone for bias from my side, as the "start list" used to code the data was partially self-generated and has influenced the way I have interpreted the results.

### 3.6.3. Factors improving the validity of the results

As earlier mentioned, my original intention was to study individual and cultural factors influencing OCB by asking subjects to describe factors which decreased their willingness help express OCBs. Instead of getting answers regarding attitudes and culture, answers continuously referred to structural factors which influenced behavior. Lastly, the aim of the study was changed and interview questions accordingly.

The fact that the aim of the study changed during the research and interview process I believe improved the *internal validity* of the results obtained. The fact that the results emerged spontaneously from interviewees themselves, and not from my *a priori* expectations is clearly a factor that improves the validity of the results obtained.

However, the results may also be a result of socially desirable answering – because OCBs are clearly desirable behaviors, talking openly about not being willing to express them may have been felt by employees as awkward. Employees’ references to external factors influencing their behavior may also result from the fundamental attribution
error, which posits that people have a tendency to underestimate their own role in negative behavior and overestimate the role of the environment.

A third reason for employees to not speaking about for example attitudes influencing their daily behavior may be that they are not conscious about the association between them and their behavior (Lee, 1991). Knowing that some of one’s behavior is a result of one not identifying with the organization is not something that most people are conscious about, but which still influences behavior.

A second factor which has the potential to improve the validity of the results is that the findings were validated with two of the managers of the company. Meetings with the managers were arranged to present the results of the study and to discuss solutions to issues that had come up during the interviews.

**3.6.4. Generalizability of results**

The aim of qualitative research is not to give universally generalizable results but to get an interpretation of events in the particular research setting in which the study was conducted, and from where findings can be transferred to other similar settings (Anderson, 2010). The results are likely to be relevant, but not fully generalizable to practitioners in the high-tech industry interested in improving organizational functioning and adaptability by increasing OCB in their company.
4 FINDINGS

This chapter presents the results of the study. It follows two logics, using both the separation of context into omnibus and discrete context by Johns (2006), and the taxonomy of OCBs by Dekas et al. (2013). The chapter will begin by describing the broader context of the study, which is the omnibus context and other macro-level aspects that could be identified in the interviews. Then the chapter will continue with the specific OCBs by Dekas et al, and describe factors in the discrete context that influence this behavior.

4.1 The omnibus context and its influence on the company

According to Johns (2006), the omnibus context is the broader context influencing the discrete context which is at a lower level. For example, the industry in which a company operates influences the leadership and culture practices of the companies within the said industry. The omnibus context could be identified according to Johns by asking the questions who, when, where and why?

Operating in the high-tech industry was one of the most salient contextual variables on the omnibus level influencing the organization and its culture. The high-tech IT industry is fueled by the competence and motivation of its employees. Skilled IT experts are one of the most important and valued resources in the industry (Paré, Tremblay & Lalonde, 2000). This aspect of omnibus context was reflected in the company as respect for expertise: a central slogan and initiative of management was to make the company a “best place for professionals” (Manager 1). The aim of the company was to become the best employer for cybersecurity experts. This initiative was reflected on all levels of the organization, for example on the culture, which was characterized by equality, high autonomy, openness and participatory decision making.

The high-tech industry is known for flat organizations, autonomous teams and considerable autonomy in employees’ work (de la Mothe & Foray, 2001, p. 102). In the case at hand, this was one of the most prominent features of the organizational culture: the trust and autonomy that permeated all levels of the company. Autonomy was fueled by the respect for expertise and an attitude that the experts are themselves the right people to decide how and when they would do their work. Also decisions regarding one’s own and the team’s way of working were decided about together, keeping a pragmatic attitude towards work and company praxis.
“A good thing is that we can do things quite autonomously both on individual and on team level. Nobody pushes us strictly into any pre-defined model.” (Consultant 5)

“No bureaucracy, work procedure or approach is sustained by force. Together we find what works and together we trash things that do not work.” (Consultant 6)

This pragmatic attitude towards work and team level procedures was likely to be driven by the low hierarchy and the equality in the company. This is also a prominent feature of the high-tech industry, where experts usually know better than managers how work should be done and organized.

“[The monthly meetings] bring openness to this company. They make us employees know in a very detailed manner what is happening and what management is planning next.” (Consultant 4)

The CEO was seen as leading this aspect of culture by good example. For example sometimes by cleaning up after others, and by putting their dirty dishes into the dishwasher. This low hierarchy was coupled with extensive information sharing, signaling respect for employees in the company, and giving employees the information needed to do autonomous decisions in their daily work.

The company strived to keep all information open for employees at all times. When the company went public in 2014, this policy was weakened in regard to economic data due to the restrictions that public companies are subject to. This was circumvented by management by giving employees additional non-financial data so that employees would be kept on track when at the same time following the restrictions set on public companies.

The respect that was signaled towards the experts in the form of autonomy, trust, open information and investments in their competencies was clearly valued by employees, and likely influenced the employees’ will to contribute to the company, like stipulated by the central tenets of social exchange theory (Blau, 1964). For example, one expert phrased this in the following way:

“When the company obviously wants to invest in its people, then employees are willing to contribute to the company.” (Consultant 2)

The fact that the employees were mostly highly skilled experts in information security derived from that the company operates in the high-tech industry. The demographic part of the omnibus context is mentioned by Johns (2006) to be an omnibus variable having a subtle but important influence on results in research. What can be assumed to
separate experts in knowledge work from for example blue collar workers studied by earlier OCB research, is their attitude towards professional self-development, developing their work and their will to contribute to the company’s products and business. Furthermore, a discourse typical for the high-tech industry is that they are changing the world and having an impact (Fisher, 2010). This is in line with the interpretation of context as “giving meaning”. This factor was shown to be for two consultants (6 & 3) important motivators to contribute to the well-being of the company.

“I feel that this work is valuable for our customer companies and society as a whole. I promote the manifesto of our company anyway ... at suitable occasions I tell people that we do these things and that it is important ... then if needed, I remind them that they can get help from us.”
(Consultant 6)

One consultant saw the company as a tool to use to contribute to high-tech in a larger scale than would been possible alone. Consultant 3 phrased it in the following way when asked about what makes him want to contribute to the company:

“Maybe I think more about how I can contribute to cybersecurity in general, in a wider context.”
“This company has opened doors to much bigger systems: the systems of customers. Before I would install programs into my own [hobby] systems ... now when I walk in the street I encounter stuff that I have inspected myself... sometimes it is a bit scary, oh no! [playfully].”
(Consultant 3)

The same consultant found it important that the contributions that he gave to the company should also contribute to society more broadly and permanently, and not only to the company itself. These findings show that some employees were driven by a broader mission than just benefiting the company. This may stem from the high-tech and IT omnibus context in which discourses about changing society are common (Fisher, 2010). For many experts, this has been a context that has influenced them throughout their lives: through the internet, hobbies, technical studies and professional life.

The abovementioned descriptions of the organizational culture given by interview subjects could be reflected in the cultural survey done by management, which means that these findings should represent the organization as a whole.

Next, the different forms of OCB described by Dekas et al. as well as contextual factors influencing employees' expression of these behaviors will be listed and elaborated. The factors promoting, encouraging, preventing and discouraging the expression of these behaviors are mostly on a discrete context-level, although they are influenced by the
omnibus context. The omnibus context may also be seen influencing these behaviors directly, for example through the characteristics and motives of employees.

4.2. Voice

**Voice**: Taking part in activities, making suggestions, or speaking out with the intent of improving company products, or some aspect of individual, group, or organizational performance.

4.2.1. The nature of voice at the company

In the interviews voice behavior could be identified on four levels: 1) developing one’s personal work, 2) developing team procedures and processes, and 3) participating in decision-making on the company level. Further, an important form of voice was also 4) the development of company products and services. Although these levels are conceptually separate, they are often intertwined, for example in the case of developing one’s personal work and the work of the team.

This study showed clearly that developing one’s job, one’s team’s procedures and the business was many times a natural part of everyday work done for customers, making it also a part of so called task-performance (Organ, 1997). Product and service development was described by a senior consultant (no. 6) to be an important part of many experts’ job, because the company had no separate product development budget.

“This consulting work is such that there are no standard products. When a customer case comes along, the thinking begins ... Of course we also do have sessions when we think about how some service could be standardized. It is a continuous dialogue through email, face-to-face and in Yammer™.” (Consultant 6)

In addition to development of procedures and products in connection to customer work, also separate meetings and sessions were organized for this purpose. Continuous reflection about how work could be done better and more efficiently was seen as something natural for experts in this field:

“Very often when I do a task I ask myself: ‘is this really the best way to do this? Isn’t there any better way?’ ... You notice when you speak with your colleagues that they think about these things too ... it is a typical expert company where there are a lot of people who are well educated and experienced. Of course everyone has a perspective on what could be the best way to do things, and of course their perspective is always the right one.” (Consultant 6)

In addition to developing one’s own and the team’s work, also improving company products and services was an important form of voice. Growing one’s own, the team’s
and the company’s expertise, when at the same creating value for customers was one main motive to for this type of voice, and was reflected in most interviews. This may be a factor stemming from the demographics (omnibus context): experts who are driven by professional self-development. When asking what his attitude is towards developing the business, one consultant answered:

“New stuff is always interesting, and it brings new potential into customer interaction. It also increases one's own knowledge and understanding about these things ... [and] you get more business for your team, and you can expand the supply and assortment of what can be delivered [to customers] ...” (Consultant 4)

Developing the company and its procedures was sometimes motivated by the will to contribute by using ones’ experience and expertise, especially for more senior employees (Consultants 2, 4 and 6):

“By this age I have seen quite a bit. Different organizations, their procedures and all kinds of changes. I have started to get a clear picture of how things should be done, and I'm glad to give my opinion on how I see things.” (Consultant 2)

In a similar manner as above, an important motivation for experts to develop their work, products or services, was the increase in expertise it often entailed. Research and product development simultaneously developed expertise as it benefitted the customer:

“If I today do some development work, next time I can say to the customer: '[click! -sound with tongue], no problemos! Now we have integrations in this and that direction, here and there ... or an entirely new service.” (Consultant 4)

Voice could also be promoted by managers by delegating research projects to interested consultants. Those interested in product development could be asked to do research and evaluate new trending themes for business potential, to find new “tracks” for the team or the company. This is supported by earlier research (e.g. Morrison, 1994) that has shown that employees are more likely to engage in OCBs when they are regarded as in-role.

There was some variation between employees in whether product development and research was seen as extra-role or expected. According to one employee R&D was voluntary.

“Developing stuff is fully voluntary. If you want you can simply concentrate on your own work, and that's fully ok. But if you want to do research, of course you are allowed, and will be supported.” (Consultant, 4)

However, another consultant (6) said that developing one's work and the products and services provided for customers was something fully integrated in daily work.
According to him, this was an important part of the job as the company did not have any separate product development budget.

This has been studied and acknowledged by the studies by Vey and Campbell (2004) and Morrison (1994) in which employees and different parties had different conceptions of whether OCBs were in- or extra-role. In light of the newer definition of OCB by Organ (1997), the fact that some employees see voice as expected or in-role does not influence whether the behavior is seen as OCB, because according to the new definition OCB may be both in- and extra-role. In fact, what is interesting is how this expectation may be used to encourage voice in employees. Making voice in-role and an expected part of employees’ job may enable and encourage employees to this behavior, which is ignored if using only SET as the explaining theory to why employees express OCB. Next, factors in the discrete context that influence employees’ expression of voice will be described.

4.2.2. Factors enabling and encouraging voice in experts

Generally, one of the most important aspects promoting voice on all organizational levels was the open and non-hierarchical culture that permeated the whole company.

“Management has been able to conserve an open, rebel atmosphere where you always are allowed to directly challenge the establishment, the ideas and strategies of management.”
(Consultant 6)

The possibility to influence how things are done was an attribute of the company as a whole and employee empowerment was cultivated on all levels in the company. In addition to the fact that teams and individuals were empowered to make autonomous decisions about how to do their work as they saw best, employees were also given influence over larger company decisions through polls and surveys. For example, in connection to a significant decision in 2014 concerning where the company office should be moved, management opened a poll in the company intranet and communicated clearly that the opinion of the majority will have and influence on the decision. Another example is the before mentioned project of defining the culture of the organization. To get to an answer, management collects the answers electronically from the employees themselves.

As defined by Dekas et al. (2013) voice is also developing work on an individual level. According to one expert (3), innovation and development was driven on a micro level by the high autonomy that the professionals enjoyed in their daily work. Developing
one’s own work was mainly the responsibility of the experts themselves and they were empowered to choose where and when they wanted to work and which tools and programs they wanted to use to get their work done. This autonomy led to the proliferation of ideas, which likely were disseminated to colleagues and teams through various media.

At the company, the use of electronic platforms played a significant role in enabling voice in employees because employees worked to a large part from a distance and ‘in the field’ at customers. These platforms, like Microsoft Yammer™ enabled continuous discussion regarding the organization of work on a team level. Taking into account the mobility of the experts, electronic tools played an essential role in enabling voice, without which business and service development would not have been on such a high level. This finding is partially supported by the study by Kim and Lee (2006), who found that IT systems and their usability played an important role in enabling information sharing among Korean employees. Further, electronic platforms were used to enable employee participation in company-level decision-making, such as the decision mentioned above regarding the location of the office. By opening up electronic polls, through which employees were able to give their view on larger decisions, employees’ expression of voice was enabled further.

Another contextual factor enabling voice on a team level was team meetings which functioned as forums where team members were able to tell about projects they were working on. These meetings played also a role as forums where employees could discuss and share ideas about how work could be arranged. These enabled important face-to-face meetings that otherwise would have been scarce, as there was no fixed location where the teams worked. In addition, one expert mentioned that their team organized development days which were specifically organized for the team to develop their work procedures. These examples highlight the emergent property of voice behavior (and organizational behavior in general), where contextual opportunities and constraints influence if these behaviors can be expressed (Johns, 2006, the perspective of context as situational strength). If employees have an opportunity to express certain behaviors, then this will potentially increase the prevalence of it. In this case, opening up polls in Yammer™ increased the prevalence of voice behavior in employees. Expecting the only determinant for this behavior to be the willingness of individuals to express this behavior can be seen as naïve and methodologically individualistic (Arrow, 1994).
4.2.3. **Factors constraining and discouraging voice in experts**

A single-case example which was an anomaly at the company level will be presented first, because it highlights clearly the emergent property of organizational behavior, in this case *voice*.

The interview illustrated clearly how important it is for employee *voice* behavior that the employee is listened to and the ideas of the employee are taken seriously. In this particular case the employees’ manager did not respond to the development ideas of the employee gave and ignored them completely. When asked what makes him want to contribute for the company, he responded:

“If I have the opportunity ... you know, if you give suggestions and they all go to ‘file O’ because they come from you, then one’s eagerness to develop ends really fast.” (Consultant X, number concealed to preserve anonymity)

Even though this is a single case, and it seemed that the relationship between the manager and the employee was in a bad condition, this case carries an important point highlighting the importance of context in understanding the nature of *voice*. For *voice* to take place, employees must be heard and their words must have an influence. Although the employee most probably felt unfairly treated and likely unsatisfied with his job, here the main reason for the ‘low level of *voice*’ was that the employees’ suggestions were not taken into consideration. A correlational study within the social exchange paradigm would have explained the lack of voice with bad job attitudes, whereas the real reason for both the lack of voice and the bad job attitudes was in fact that the employee was being ignored. It is clear that it is irrational behavior to continue giving suggestions if they do not have an effect.

“When you put a glass ceiling above the monkeys’ cage, a while they will jump, but then they will learn and stop jumping. Even if you would lift the glass away, they will not continue. They learn.” (Consultant X)

Many times research which was not done in association to a customer project was constrained by customer work and billing quotas. Customer work had an imperative status at the company, going ahead of all other work, meetings, happenings etc. which was well accepted by the consultants.

“...customer-billable work goes always ahead, but if you have spare time then you can do some research... and you are encouraged to do it.” (Consultant 4)

According to one consultant (4) there was a more severe constraint making product development and research unattractive for employees to engage in, and it was the way
billable hours were counted. The utilization percentage which is the time spent on customer work, was commonly seen to be appropriate at 70% of total working hours. According to the expert the problem was that the percentage was counted of the total hours done, and not the typical full work-week of 37.5 hours worked in Finland. This meant that if you had worked a full work week of 37.5 with a utilization percentage of 70%, and then wanted to do some over-time research during the weekend, the utilization percentage would fall below the desirable percentage because total working hours would go up.

The balance between R&D and billable work is one important question for high-tech companies. Especially because most of development work is done in conjunction with customer work. This was seen as a factor discouraging voice.

“We have been bending and twisting this thing for so long, let’s just go and do this thing. The customer does not appreciate that we have been thinking this much. What they look at is how much time and money we have spent on this thing.” (Consultant 6)

4.3. Helping

Helping: Voluntarily helping colleagues with work-related problems or issues, or working to prevent incidents resulting in work-related problems.

4.3.1. Nature of helping at the company

Helping at the company came in many forms but mainly in the form of knowledge sharing, discussing problems, helping each other with heavy workloads and teaching younger consultants. The essential role of helping for company functioning can be boiled down to the following phrase by a consultant at the company, describing the situation in her team:

“People are in such a rush that they don’t have time to help. At the same time, the shortage of helping is the reason to the fact that people are in a rush, because they are constantly occupied with inventing the wheel over and over again.” (Consultant 6)

As experts at the company regularly came to situations where their personal knowledge was insufficient to solve customers’ problems, they frequently needed help from colleagues. In addition to help acquired and given to colleagues in the same team, there was also a need for cooperation between experts in different teams. This was common for example when more technical data-security experts and administrative data security experts needed the perspectives and expertise of each other in consulting work.
In all interviews it seemed that the employees were highly willing and motivated to help each other in work-related issues. Helping was seen by employees as something stemming from the people and the organization’s culture:

“It is a built in thing. Never has it happened that I wouldn’t have got help when I’ve needed it… correspondingly, never have I denied help from someone else … Of all the companies I have worked for, I have never been in a company where it works this well.” (Consultant 6)

The culture at the company was seen by the majority as open, cooperative and transparent, where information is shared freely between employees and management. This part of the culture promoted helping and cooperation among employees:

“…it is that we do work openly in cooperation. When there’s a culture of open discussion and when information is shared freely, then there is no feeling that information is being held back and no silos develop.” (Consultant 2)

Helping was also seen by many employees as their duty. When one consultant was asked if he usually helps colleagues, he replied “always” (Consultant 1). These findings are in line with one of Schneider’s (1994) criteria for an OCB climate to develop, that is norms for helping.

4.3.2. Factors enabling and promoting helping

Media that allowed employees occasionally to discuss work-related issues had an important role to facilitate helping, because many of the experts worked largely in the field at customers’ locations and at a distance. Requesting and giving help was frequently done using virtual platforms like Yammer™ or the company intranet. The company social network could be used to shout out for help or could be used to ask directly for advice from co-workers or managers. Additionally, team meetings played an important role in enabling helping between employees. Even though the raison d’être of the meetings was not explicitly to be a forum for helping, they often functioned as informal situations where it was possible to discuss work related problems with colleagues. Sometimes, even if non-disclosure agreements prevented employees from discussing openly about problems, employees were able to talk about the underlying structures of problems or by disclosing only the details of the problem in an anonymous manner, without revealing customer names or other critical facts. Knowledge and experience sharing was often done using the company intranet by uploading checklists, memos, flowcharts, instructions or guidelines that could be used by other employees when in the future encountering similar tasks or challenges.
Senior consultants could be engaged in master-apprentice arrangements, which systemized helping between them and newly recruited or inexperienced consultants.

“Almost always when we have got a new consultant, we have been made a team to work together ... This is how experience is transferred.” (Consultant 6)

Lastly, one task characteristic which increased helping between employees was interdependency in tasks. According to Consultant 6, the fact that technical and administrative information security experts were occasionally dependent on each other’s expertise, helping between these two groups was natural. Interdependency between people as a factor increasing OCB has been supported by earlier research. (Bachrach, Powell, Bendoly & Richey, 2006; Comeau & Griffith, 2005; Nielsen, Bachrach, Halfhill & Sundstrom, 2012).

4.3.3. Factors constraining and discouraging helping

Job characteristics could either promote or constrain helping. In contrast to interdependent projects which encourage helping, independent projects could discourage helping between employees. For example, consultants 4 and 2 mentioned that their work is independent and consists of large projects that require large amounts of in-depth understanding of the customer and their situation. According to Consultant 4, helping with another consultant’s job burden was usually not sensible as this required familiarizing with the case, which is time consuming. These findings are supported by studies by Nielsen et al. (2012) who showed that helping decreased team performance when interdependency was low, and increased performance when interdependency was high. This makes it clear that helping is not always a valued end in itself, but is a means to an end. Helping is valuable only if it serves a greater purpose.

Another work related factor which many times came up as a constraint for helping was customer work and billing quotas, especially when helping could not be billed from a customer. As earlier mentioned, employees that were paid on an hourly basis needed a “billing slot” which allowed them to get paid for the helping, whereas employees that were paid monthly, could be constrained by their 70% billing quota that had to be filled. Consultant 6, whom was paid on an hourly basis said

“I always help, but usually I ask if this work may be billed from someone. But I never refuse from helping.”

The previous performance based incentive system was partially based on individual billing quotas and had a strong discouraging effect on helping behavior:
“If your salary was dependent on how many percent you had billable work done, and the other person did not right away provide a project that could be billed, then those requests were completely ignored ... if 20% of your monthly salary was affected, then who would have been so crazy to lose that amount of money if not necessary.” (Consultant 1)

Consultant 1 noted that the after-effects of the previous incentive system is still felt in the company helping culture, but that helping was all the time increasing.

Strict non-disclosure agreements between customers and individual consultants or teams were also a factor that frequently complicated helping between employees. In some cases, no one else in the company knew about a customer case that a consultant was working on than the consultant himself.

“Sometimes when I walk along a customer’s corridor I may notice ‘hey, doesn’t that guy work for us?’” (Consultant 6)

Sometimes the NDAs were so strict that even one’s own manager did not know to which customer work was done.

“Sometimes you cannot say anything. In this case not even your own boss can help you with it.” (Consultant 3)

Uncertainty about what could be discussed and to whom, made it often difficult for consultants to discuss work-related issues freely with others. According to Consultant 6, the serious sanctions that breaching an NDA may have made people play on the safe side and rather talk less about work-related issues than too much.

An additional aspect constraining helping was the lack of a functioning competence and knowledge management system that employees could use as an index when searching for help in a certain issue.

“The new guy just can’t get the information about who knows about version-management. He just asks and asks around until someone says ‘Hey, that guy over there [knows]!’” (Consultant 3)

The need for such a system probably differs high-tech companies from for example heavy industry, and the need for such a system grows the larger the company grows. Managing knowledge in a company full of highly experienced experts with large amounts of specialized knowledge is a completely different business, because of the mere breadth and depth of expertise that can be found in the company.
4.4. Civic Virtue

**Civic Virtue:** Taking actions that indicate macro-level interest in the organization as a whole. Actions reflect a person recognizing that he is a part of an organization and accepting the responsibilities that such a membership brings with.

4.4.1. The nature of civic virtue at the company

At the company, Civic Virtue (CV) took the form of attending company monthly meetings, taking part in internal development projects, and supporting virtual systems that were important for the functioning of the company. One interviewee was also active in organizing events that were valuable for company-level knowledge accumulation. Some internal development projects were optional and hobby-like, and were explicitly meant not to be worked on during working hours.

In the case of civic virtue too (as with helping), the behavior cannot be seen as an end in itself. Attending meetings blindly without calculating the value that one can bring to and get from the meeting is clearly not rational. For example, two of the interviewees were willing to attend internal development teams only if they provided information or knowledge that was of value for them, and if they could themselves give something of value for the project (Consultants 6 & 2). In the case of company monthly meetings, consultant 2 considered it important to attend to keep up with what was happening in the firm.

4.4.2. Factors enabling and promoting civic virtue

An important factor promoting civic virtue was that management actively encouraged employees organizing events that were beneficial for the firm. Organizing events such as ‘morning coffee sessions’ where product and program suppliers presented their products was one example of events that were promoted by management.

In the case of attending meetings, employees had the possibility to attend company meetings from a distance, via electronic gear, which was and important enabler, as many consultants worked from a distance and did not have the possibility to attend physically. Dysfunctional gear sometimes hindered attending the meetings.
In the case of supporting in-house virtual systems, responsibility over these systems was sometimes delegated to employees, which made them in-role and non-discretionary.

“Somebody has to take care of the maintenance [of the systems] ... although I don’t myself have a lot of motivation do it, it only takes ten days a year.” (Consultant 3)

This case is exemplary of a OCB which is in-role and non-discretionary. According to the old definition of OCB by Organ (1988), this would not have been categorized as OCB as it was not extra-role, whereas according to the new definition (Organ, 1997) this behavior may be classified as OCB regardless of it being in-role. Reflecting this example with the work of Vigoda-Gadot (2007), this behavior could be classified as Compulsory Citizenship Behavior, if the consultant was reluctant to take on the responsibility.

### 4.4.3. Factors constraining and discouraging civic virtue

There were a number of factors restricting employees from expressing behaviors that could be classified under civic virtue. The main reason for employees not attending meetings was billing quotas and customer work. All interview subjects mentioned that customer work always goes before in-house events.

“I try to attend as much as I can. If I have customer work, it goes ahead, but otherwise I always attend when I’m free.” (Consultant 2)

Three consultants (6, 5, 4) said that customer work prevented them completely from attending monthly company meetings. They were prevented either by the fact that they had such agreements with customers that required them to be present at the customer simultaneously as the monthly meeting was arranged, or because of unfilled billing quotas which had to be filled.

“I haven’t got an impression that ‘you should be at the customer’s and not at the meeting’. It is always your own choice.” (Consultant 5)

“... but it may be the last drop that makes your utilization percentage too low.” (Consultant 4)

Even though accountability over billing percentages influenced daily decisions and could have been motivated by purely external regulation (Ryan & Deci, 2000), many times the reasons for the experts to prioritize customer work over in-house events was of their own choice. The experts expressed ownership over their work and wanted to do their work well and on time, which made them prioritize it over less important in-house events.
Sometimes such an obvious issue as the distance to the event worked as a threshold for attending events. Especially for one employee (Consultant 5) who worked from distance, the transition to the monthly meeting was seen as discouraging. He had tried to use some technical solutions to attend but these had been defunct.

The type of employment contract with the employer also influenced choices over whether the employee was willing to take on responsibility over extra internal development projects. Narrow deals with only specific times of effort contracted lessened the employees’ willingness to attend development teams. This is in line with Tsui et al.’s (1997) model.

"Because I’m an hourly worker, practically I only do stuff that has been agreed on in advance, that is work that can be billed, or some agreed [internal project]. So I do not necessarily attend all development projects unless they are contracted. People with a monthly salary do not have a similar threshold.” (Consultant 6)

The hourly worker was constrained both by the fact that no salary was paid for non-contracted work, but also by a psychological contract (Rousseau, 1989). Having a deal where only specific types of effort are specified, make the employees psychologically more prone to restrict one’s effort, even regardless that the employee may have positive job attitudes. In addition to not being paid for the work, the consultant was constrained by the fact that hours that he worked on internal projects were treated as expenses for the team, which decreased team profitability, at least on paper.

4.5. Employee sustainability

| Employee Sustainability: Taking part in activities and events to maintain or improve one’s own well-being and health, or to support others' intentions to maintain their well-being and health. |

In contrast to the more psychological Employee sustainability behaviors suggested by Dekas et al. (2013, see Appendix 1), the behaviors spontaneously described by experts in this company were more of behaviors that supported physical wellbeing. Employee sustainability (ES) could consist of employees participating in events and groups engaging in various physical activities: badminton and tennis groups, ski trips, orienteering and possibilities to try out new forms of exercise like Pilates. Employees engaged in these activities mainly on their free-time. The main motive for employees to engage in these events was interest. Constraints to engaging in these activities were mostly personal factors such as physical restrictions and time spent with family.
In addition to sports and other physical activities, the company provided health measurements for their employees, and the company provided also a room for relaxation and meditation.

In addition to physical health, Dekas et al. (2013) included also promoting colleagues’ psychological health as one important factor. At the Company, praising colleagues for their successes was one form of behavior of this type. This kind of behavior could be expressed on company monthly meetings where successful projects were presented. This kind of pure goodwill can be expected to be least influenced economic exchange, and more by social psychological or psychological factors such as a competitive atmosphere (which was largely absent at the company), or low job satisfaction.

4.5.1. Factors enabling and promoting employee sustainability

The mere amount of the possibilities to further one’s health and well-being was a factor enabling employee sustainability. These were provided by the HR and the company in general, but was also arranged by employees themselves. Also access to a room for relaxation and meditation was a factor influencing employee sustainability positively. Company meetings were settings in which praise could be given to colleagues with successful projects. (Manager 1, Consultant 1)

4.5.2. Factors constraining and discouraging employee sustainability

Factors constraining attendance to this type of events were mainly personal factors such as physical and family-related restrictions. No organizational constraints came up during the interviews.

4.6. Social participation

| Social participation: | The employee participates in social activities and event during the work day that are not directly associated with core job tasks. |

When having visited the company office about a dozen times, it can be said that the social atmosphere at the company is easygoing, positive and playful. Joking in the elevator and chatting in the coffee room seemed to be a natural part of the culture of the organization.
During the interviews there was variation in how socially active the employees said they were and how much they participated in various events. This is likely to be normal variation in personality characteristics, amount of social relationships, duration of employment with the company etc. Of the different forms of OCB, social participation is probably least associated with professional work and therefore least expected by the employer. Even though social participation is affected by many personal characteristics, there were some organization-level factors which clearly influenced the amount of social participation on an organizational level.

4.6.1. Nature of social participation at the company

At the company, employees were socially active both during the workday, within work and outside of it during lunch and coffee breaks. Employees participated and arranged social events also outside of official working hours. In Dekas et al.’s (2013) scale social participation is defined as “Taking part in social activities during the workday that are not directly related to core job tasks”. This study showed that social events were also organized outside of official working hours. Also, an additional form of social participation, not taken into account by Dekas et al. was arranging social activities, in addition to merely participating in them. One of the interviewed consultants was especially active in arranging and attending social events.

The company had a rich set of events to participate socially in: a whiskey taster's club, an amateur astronomers club, gaming nights, movie nights, Super Bowl nights etc. Further, a handful of activities that could be classified under “employee sustainability”, ranging from tennis and badminton groups to running clubs, were usual. These were covered in the “employee sustainability” section. The social clubs and events were mainly the initiative of the employees themselves. According to two employees that actively arranged events, the fact that others easily attended, motivated them to arrange them.

4.6.2. Factors enabling and encouraging social participation

A number of discrete contextual factors could be identified that contributed to the great amount of social participation at the company. These will be listed below.

A central factor enabling and promoting social participation was the company office, which was a multipurpose office (activity-based working office) where only few
employees had fixed working locations. The company office was designed in a way that it promoted serendipitous meetings and discussions during workdays. The coffee room was a large central space with sofas, coffee machines and a foosball table. The office had large-sized balconies with a barbeque grills that could be used during the summer months. This was clearly a discrete contextual factor which influenced how much employees engaged socially during work days, especially those who worked at the office.

In addition to office characteristics, also work characteristics influenced the amount of social participation. The fact that many employees’ work was interdependent and executed in teams naturally influenced social participation positively.

One major reason for the proliferation of so many social activities and groups was the supportive attitude of management towards arranging such events. This attitude was communicated both verbally and symbolically. One especially active consultant said that management was almost always supportive when suggesting the founding new clubs or organizing new social events (Consultant X). One symbolic factor which signaled managements positive attitude towards these evens was that the company paid for pizza to all social events.

The company social network Yammer™, had an important role in stimulating social participation in different events. The network functioned as a place for planning and announcing of social events, getting the message to those interested in different activities.

“If you have a good movie and want others to come and watch, put some ‘Yammermail’ and see who attends. Most probably people will attend.” (Consultant 4)

Yammer™ was also used to chat with colleagues about more everyday and informal issues. (Consultant 4)

A third factor, both enabling and symbolically encouraging social participation was that the firm provided resources to arrange these events. The office was in free use outside office hours to anyone wanting to arrange an event. If employees wanted to arrange a movie night with others or alone, the projector could be used. The company whiskey club enjoyed both an own room and some company-paid whiskey samples. The company also offered free pizza in all social events.
4.6.3. Factors constraining and discouraging social participation

One large factor constraining social participation with colleagues was related to the fact that many consultants worked at customers’ locations and from home or abroad. When contacting interviewees by mail, three persons responded that they probably would not be the right persons for the interview, because they had been working out of office for such an extensive period of time. It is evident that working location has an influence on the extent to which an employee is able to engage socially in the company. For example, one consultant (6) said that he had become acquainted with only a few employees from the newly acquired firm because the new employees worked mainly out of office.

Another consultant (3) said that the reason he had not got acquainted was that there were so many new employees at a time, and that they worked in a bit of an isolated manner. Furthermore, since the amount of employees at the company had risen above 100 employees, one consultant (5) considered it impossible get familiar with all people at the company.

Personal factors such as time with family and physical restrictions due to age were also mentioned as reasons for not participating in social events. A conflict between social participation and family was probably and issue because many social events took place outside normal office hours.

4.7. Synthesis of findings and revisiting the research questions

The aim of this study was to gain an understanding of the nature of organizational citizenship behavior and to understand the essential influence of context on the five OCBs defined by Dekas et al (2013).

The research questions of this study were the following:

1. What are the main motives for experts to express organizational citizenship behaviors?

2. Which factors in the organizational context enable and promote OCBs?

3. Which factors in the organizational context prevent and inhibit experts from expressing OCBs?
The results show that OCB is indeed influenced by a complex set of organizational circumstances that enable, promote, constrain and discourage OCB in experts. The behavior of the experts was clearly influenced by many levels of context.

The motives of experts to express these five behaviors (research question 1) were highly varying, and could by no means be attributed to be purely discretionary acts of goodwill. The findings show that all five OCBs were partially elements of the consultants’ contracted work, and could be billed, contracted or discretionary, which makes the original definition of OCB as extra-role, non-expected, and non-compensated (Organ, 1988) clearly passé. This is something that has been acknowledged Organ (1997) himself, but has been ignored by a large part of the scientific community studying OCB. Further, the discretionary behaviors seemed not to purely expressed by a sense of reciprocation towards the organization, but seemed many times to be driven by intrinsic motives such as interest (for example in the case of research, voice).

The underlying figure is an approximation of the different OCBs and to which extent they were found to be contracted, billable and discretionary in the company studied. Note that all billable work was also contracted as illustrated by Figure 1.
As illustrated by Figure 1, social participation, helping and voice could all be in some cases part of billable work. All three five OCBs were also contracted, meaning that employees felt that it was part of their job. The extent to which the behavior was billable, contracted or discretionary had clear implications on employees expressing this behavior, because billable work had an imperative status at the company and because employees were also accountable for a certain amount of billable hours each month. Subtypes of the different OCBs that were non-billable were often constrained by billable work (both OCB and non-OCB) because of billable hours’ relative importance (e.g. attending meetings, civic virtue). Next, research questions 2 and 3 will be answered for each of the 5 OCBs separately.

The study revealed many contextual factors both on the omnibus and discrete level that influenced employees’ expression of voice. On the omnibus level, the most prominent factor influencing this OCB was the population that was studied and the influence of industry. Experts in cybersecurity seemed passionate about their work and were highly skilled in it. This likely influenced their eagerness to develop their work and their
organization. This omnibus context influenced also decision making practices (discretionary context) at the company, where employees were encouraged to give their input on how work should organized on all organizational levels. This was done by empowering employees to decide about their own and their teams' work, and by allowing teams extensive autonomy. Letting employees participate in company decision making also promoted this behavior. Forums that enabled discussion between experts, such as team meetings, Yammer™ discussion groups and electronic polls played an important role in enabling and promoting voice behavior in experts.

Helping was found to be an important form of OCB at the company, but was not universally advantageous, for example when work was highly independent in nature. This behavior was promoted by a culture of cooperation and information sharing, but had been negatively influenced by the previous performance based incentive system. Helping between the employees who worked largely from different locations was enabled by electronic media such as Yammer™. Also team meetings played an important role as forums where work-related issues could be discussed among colleagues. The strict NDAs between individual consultants and customer companies restricted helping by inducing insecurity about which customer-related issues could be discussed with others.

Civic virtue was promoted for example by management who encouraged these behaviors in employees. Responsibility over some internal project could be specifically delegated to an employee, which clearly promoted this behavior. Civic virtue such as attending internal meetings was non-billable, and was thus frequently constrained by important customer assignments or the need to fill unfilled billing quotas. Attending meetings could be facilitated by lowering the threshold to attend, for example by providing electronic videoconference gear which enabled attending meetings from a distance.

Social participation and employee sustainability were both influenced positively by the mere amount of events that were available, also the cooperative nature of work stimulated to participate socially. Most social events were organized by the employees themselves, which was stimulated by encouragement and resources by management. Electronic platforms such as Yammer™ played an important role in enabling these events because most of these events were announced about and promoted through this platform.
5 DISCUSSION

In this chapter I will evaluate the results of this study and juxtapose the findings with findings in earlier research. Based on the results of this study, I will list a number of propositions that have implications for future research and practice. Lastly these propositions are united in an integrative model that combines earlier OCB research with the findings of this study. The model is called the Dynamic Model of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (DMOCB).

This study has actively criticized the methodologically individualistic (Arrow, 1994) line of OCB research that has seen OCB purely as the result of the individual’s free will, and one-sidedly used Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964, Schroeder, 2010) as an explanation to why employees are willing to express OCB. Instead of seeing OCB as purely a result of employee attitudes and social exchange between employee and employer, the results of this study indicate that a more fruitful way to conceptualize OCB is as a result of a combination of economic and social exchange and a complex set of organizational circumstances that influence the behavior.

5.1. The nature of OCB

The findings showed that OCB could be part of customer billable work (as in the case of voice), and was many times seen as a part of one’s job and therefore could be seen as expected and contracted. This has been supported by earlier research. (e.g. Morrison, 1994, Organ, 2006 p. 176-187). Sometimes OCBs such as taking responsibility over internal development projects (civic virtue) could be delegated to employees, which rendered them non-discretionary (see also Vigoda-Gadot, 2007). Some OCBs could also be engaged in outside of official working hours, like in the case of social participation. Which made it completely discretionary.

These findings show that the nature of OCB is completely different in this omnibus context compared to the OCB that was defined in 1988 by Organ. The previous distinction between task behavior and OCB as extra-role behavior is practically useless in this job context. Also the criterion that the behavior should be non-rewarded is very hard to define. In a company with broad and fluid job contracts (Tsui et al., 2007, Schneider et al., 1994), employees may do whatever is needed to keep the organization running. This means that in addition to the fact that the forms of OCB have changed as argued by Dekas et al., 2013, the nature of OCB has also changed. The different OCBs
may be expressed because of a very broad number of reasons: they may be contracted, expected, delegated, rewarded, needed, discretionary or intrinsically motivated. Using social exchange theory as the sole explanation to explain employee expression of a list of pre-defined behaviors leaves a large part of the motives to behavior unaddressed: we can never know which of these behaviors are discretionary and which are in-role and expected parts of the economic relationship.

This does not render SET useless as a theory explaining positive and discretionary behavior towards the organization. The problem arises when OCB is operationalized as a fixed set of behaviors which are expected by the researcher to be fully discretionary expressions of gratitude towards the organization. Expecting a pre-defined scale of behaviors to be discretionary regardless of context is naïve as we cannot have complete a priori knowledge about which behaviors are discretionary and which are not without doing a thorough investigation of the specific organizational setting. SET is suitable as an explaining theory only when the behavior is seen by both parties as discretionary. Even in this case, the explaining psychological mechanism may be very different from the social exchange explanation. Alternative explanations may be found in social identity theory (Tajfel, 1979, Tyler & Blader, 2009), social norms (Schneider, 1994), intrinsic motivation and internalized motivation (Ryan & Deci 2010) and many more.

Last but not least, the expression of any organizational behavior, including OCB is a function of the organizational context which the individual is part of. Many structural and physical enablers and constraints in the discrete organizational context influences the behavior by enabling, constraining and moderating the expression of them. These constraints may be psychological, such as narrow job contracts (Rousseau, 1989; Tsui et al. 2007), or they may be physical, such as the lack of an electronic platform where job issues may be discussed.

* Social exchange theory assumes that there is a psychological distinction between the ‘organization’ and its ‘employees’. A possible psychological switch may take place when employees start identifying more strongly with the organization: employees who identify less with the organization may conceive the relationship more in the terms of SET, whereas employees who identify more strongly may apprehend the relationship more according to SIT. This is a hypothesis worth testing in future research.
5.2. **Proposition: Organizations must enable employees’ expression of OCB**

One of the main findings of this study is that mere employee willingness to express OCB is not enough. In addition, employees must be able to express these behaviors, which is enabled by organizational procedures and structures. In addition to providing enough autonomy to perform OCBs (as shown by Bell & Menguc, 2002), OCBs have to be enabled and supported also in other ways. For example, for employees to express voice, this behavior has to be enabled by decision making authority and participatory leadership practices. Helping should be enabled for example by a functioning knowledge database that enables employees to find the right people to ask help from. Social participation in the form of social events could be enabled by providing locations to organize the events at. Organizational constraints such as strict incentive systems connected to specific types of work may restrict autonomy to such an extent that even if employees would be willing to engage in OCB, they are not able. An employee willing to improve team working procedures (voice) may not be able because of an authoritarian manager who does not listen to suggestions. An employee working mainly from a distance may be willing to attend monthly meetings, but is not able because of the lack of technology to do so.

These findings are partially supported by earlier research that shows a direct relationship between various HRM practices and OCB (Paré, Tremblay & Lalonde, 2000). Also, studies by Cappelli & Rogovsky, (1998) and Chen & Chiu (2009), support this proposition. They found that employee participation in work-related decision making influences OCB positively.

5.3. **Proposition: OCB as a source of job satisfaction**

Earlier research has treated job satisfaction as pure antecedent to OCB, explaining that satisfied employees will be willing to express OCB in exchange to the employer’s investments in their well-being. What is surprising is that OCB has seldom been conceptualized as being an antecedent to job attitudes like job satisfaction (see for example Organ et al., 2006), although the behavior itself is per definition intended to enhance the organizational, social and psychological environment in the organization. It is clear how a OCBs such as helping may improve the satisfactory value of colleagues’ work.
A proposition not earlier mentioned in OCB research is that the causal relationship between OCB and job satisfaction also go in an opposite direction, even on an individual level. This is especially true for the OCB-KW behaviors defined by Dekas et al. (2013), where the listed behaviors have many elements that can be seen as intrinsically satisfying to people. Enabling these behaviors in work may actually have the potential to improve job satisfaction. In this study many interviews indicated that the experts seemed to enjoy engaging in behaviors such as voice, social participation and helping.

These preliminary findings are in line with the basic ideas of Self-Determination Theory (SDT), according to which human motivation and well-being is improved by satisfying the basic psychological needs of autonomy, competence and relatedness. Comparing the 5 OCBs in Dekas’ et al.’s scale to these three basic needs, many connections can be found. Having an influence on work through voice, can be associated with the autonomy factor in SDT. Competence can clearly be associated with voice and helping. Social participation and helping are clearly factors contributing to the psychological need of relatedness with other people. Also civic virtue and voice can vaguely be associated with this psychological need. These are listed in table 3 under.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juxtaposing the three basic needs of SDT with Dekas et al.’s 5 OCBs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice, helping,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social participation, helping, civic virtue, voice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3  Juxtaposing Dekas et al.’s (2013) 5 OCBs with SDT’s three psychological needs

Therefore, an initial proposition which I would want to make in the light of this study is that OCBs are themselves motivating aspects of the job, and may have the potential to improve job satisfaction directly. Therefore, to increase job satisfaction in employees, companies should make an effort to enable OCBs in employees, which then will increase the intrinsic satisfaction of work. Also, HRM practices that support the autonomous expression of OCBs may play an important role in nurturing intrinsically motivated OCB (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Schroeder, 2010) According to Cognitive Evaluation Theory, a sub-theory of SDT, interpersonal events and structures (e.g.
rewards, communication and feedback) may increase feelings of competence by giving positive feedback of achievement. Therefore, HRM practices can be used to increase OCB in employees if they nurture a feeling of autonomy and increase feelings of competence. This has been supported by the findings of Paré, Tremblay & Lalonde (2000).

5.4. **Proposition: OCB improves organizational functioning**

OCB is per definition behavior which improves the social and psychological context and organizational functioning (Organ, 1988, 1997). This study showed also, that one of the main motives of experts to express voice was to contribute to the team’s and organization’s functioning. For example, when the company was changing its incentive system (mentioned in method section), the original initiative came from the employees themselves. Employees were also asked to contribute with ideas and comments on how the system should be changed (voice).

As Cappelli and Rogovsky (1998) showed, employee involvement in decision making (enabling voice) influenced work characteristics positively, which then influenced OCB. The study addressed only three types of OCB, which where helping, sportsmanship and conscientiousness, but, employees’ activity in decision making could be labeled as voice in Dekas et al.’s (2013) scale.

It may be that correlations between attitudinal factors such as job satisfaction and OCB, found by earlier research, are in fact an effect of employees being able to influence the organizational context with the help of OCB. In an organizational context where employees have the possibility to express OCB, the organizational context should be more satisfying, which leads to employee satisfaction. This is logical, as OCB per definition is behavior through which employees have an influence on their organizational, social and psychological context. To take a few examples from helping and voice. If a company lacks processes and practices that facilitate helping between employees (e.g. no electronic platforms, scarce shared time with team, too rigid billing policy), this is highly likely to influence negatively both the amount helping and voice, and lessen employees impact on their surroundings, which will lower job satisfaction. Similarly, if an employee lacks the possibility to influence how work is done (e.g. if management does not listen, or no discussion forum is provided), this is likely to influence both voice and a sense of justice.
5.5. Proposing a new model: The dynamic model of organizational citizenship behavior

To this day, based on an extensive literature search in connection to this study, not one integrative model has been proposed to explain the mechanism through which the organization influences individual OCB and how the individual in turn influences the organization with this behavior. Organ et al. (2006) mentioned in their book on OCB, that the correlation between job attitudes and OCB are mere associations, and that the causal direction may go in either direction or/and that there may be common cause to both variables. (p. 90). I believe that the relationship between OCB and job attitudes is bidirectional, and that a third variable, organizational factors, influence both job satisfaction and OCB. Further, Organ (1997) mentioned in the concluding remarks of his article that what has been missing in a field of OCB study, which has focused so strongly on using individual level correlational field studies, is an understanding of the process through which individual OCB inflicts changes on the organization.

The Dynamic Model of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (DMOCB) is a proposed model to conceptualize how organizational factors, job attitudes and OCB are in a dynamic relationship with each other. The DMOCB proposes that there is a dynamic relationship between three factors:

a) organizational citizenship behavior, includes any employee behavior that supports the organizational, social and psychological environment of the organization, for example those identified by Dekas et al. (2013).

b) Job attitudes, include attitudes towards one’s organization but also towards the job. These include for example job satisfaction, justice perceptions, perceived organizational support, organizational identification, commitment and engagement

c) internal service quality, includes factors identified by Heskett, Jones, Loveman, Sasser and Schlesinger (1994) such as workplace design, job design, quality of HRM practices, quality of tools, leadership quality and internal support functions such as social and technological support.

I call the the model the Dynamic Model of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, because these factors are proposed to be in a dynamic relationship with each other. The central idea of the model is that when employees are enabled and encouraged to express OCB, this will initiate positive structural, attitudinal and behavioral changes in
organizations. When OCB is expressed by employees, *internal service quality, OCB* and *attitudinal factors* will begin a self-strengthening pattern, which will keep the organization dynamic, adaptive and financially healthy.

**Figure 2  The Dynamic Model of Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

1. The first proposition is stated in the original definition of OCB itself: behavior “...that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988, p. 4). If employees are enabled to express OCBs, then they are given the chance to influence the way the organization functions (here called Internal Service Quality, Heskett et al. 1997). For example, voice is a behavior which has the potential to effectively influence organizational practices, job characteristics and leadership, if the employee’s suggestions are taken into account. Social participation and helping have the potential to improve the organization's culture. Additionally, helping is itself a form of internal service with the potential to improve organizational functioning and job satisfaction in colleagues. Civic virtue, like attending company meetings and taking responsibility for the ‘system’, has likewise the potential to have an effect on how things are done in the organization, and therefore influence internal service quality.

2. The second relationship is between internal service quality and job attitudes. The thesis is that the better the internal service within the company, the more satisfied employees are with their job and their company, which is one of the main ideas of Heskett et al.’s (1997) Service Profit Chain. For example, decision making practices that are felt as fair by employees will be reflected in employee
justice perceptions (job attitude), and improved job characteristics, such as those proposed by Hackman and Oldham (1976) will directly improve job satisfaction.

3. The third proposition incorporates the classic social exchange theory perspective on OCB. Positive job attitudes will increase employees’ willingness to reciprocate with OCBs. (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Organ et al. 2006, p. 65-76)

4. The fourth proposition is based on motivational theories such as the Self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci 2000). According to the theory, behaviors which satisfy human basic psychological needs of autonomy, competence and relatedness are motivating and satisfactory activities in themselves. (Ryan & Deci, 2013). When examining the OCBs defined by Dekas et al. (2013) in the light of these psychological needs, it appears that many of these behaviors are motivating in themselves, especially if they are performed autonomously (Vigoda-Gadot, 2007, Gagné and Deci, 2005). For example, voice behaviors can be seen as contributing to a feeling of competence and autonomy whereas social participation, civic virtue and employee sustainability contribute to relatedness. Therefore, when an employee is given the possibility to express OCBs, this will contribute to the employees’ job satisfaction. There can also be seen a group-level effect: For example, it is quite natural to assume that a helping hand from a colleague when most acutely needed has a positive effect on job satisfaction. The group may also be mediated by the influence of OCB on the internal service quality, which then influences job satisfaction. This effect is explained by relationship 1 and 2.

5. The fifth proposition is the main finding of this study: some organizational procedures, leadership styles and structures (here called Internal service quality, Heskett et al. 1997) directly influence employees’ ability to express OCB. For example, a functioning knowledge database directly promotes helping between employees (which increases service quality). Participatory decision making enable employee voice, and freely usable resources like office space enables social participation. This effect may likewise be negative: strict rules and procedures may constrain employee OCBs completely. For organizations to enable employees’ expression of OCBs they have to remove structures that constrain these behaviors and advance structures and procedures which enable the expression of these behaviors.
Which are the factors of internal service quality that enable OCBs, and will kick start the positive feedback loop? This study has identified contextual factors that are found to enable employee expression of OCB, which include participatory decision making (enables voice), autonomy (voice and helping), technological solutions (voice, helping and social participation). Some OCBs can be expected to have a stronger effect on the organizational context than others. Voice and civic virtue can be expected to influence organizational procedures whereas helping, social participation and employee sustainability more the cultural environment of the organization. Further research on contextual factors influencing specific OCBs are needed. Likewise, more research on how specific OCB influence the organizational context are needed.

Employees who engage in OCB will ultimately influence the organizational, psychological and social environment which they are part of (the internal service quality). Taking a positive “Theory Y” viewpoint on humans at work (McGregor, 1960), employees will make an effort to improve the internal service quality of the company to serve their work better (1.), which will both improve job attitudes (2.) and optimize internal service to further enable OCB (5.). The improvement in job attitudes will further increase the willingness of employees to engage in OCB, which will, if enabled, further improve the internal service quality of the company. My definition of internal service quality is therefore in this thesis “the extent to which leadership, HR practices, work practices, processes and internal support systems promote work that is effective and satisfying to employees”. By making it possible for employees to influence company culture, processes and procedures and the HR practices themselves, leadership is extended to encompass all people employed by the organization.

If employees OCB is restricted, for example because of decreased autonomy at work, then in practice employees have less influence on the social, psychological and organizational reality in which they work. In this case, management must have the skills to keep the internal service quality at a high level with less employee input, to sustain the job satisfaction of employees and to guarantee the adaptability of the organization. In a high-tech organization, where work is done and developed by experts who are themselves knowledgeable about customer preferences and best ways to work, management has less to say about how the internal service quality should be organized. Therefore, in a knowledge work environment employee OCB is critical to keep the organization functional.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Link in DMOCB</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koys (2001)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Causal relationship between OCB and store performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen &amp; Chiu (2009)</td>
<td>1 &amp; 5</td>
<td>Task characteristics correlate with OCB (mediated by job involvement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heskett et al. (1997)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Internal service quality increases job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler &amp; Blader (2009)</td>
<td>2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>Fair decision making increases identification with group, which increases discretionary behavior and cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorman et al. (1998); Chiaburu et al. (2015)</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>POS correlates positively with OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsui et al. (1997); Schneider et al. (1994); this study</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Broad job descriptions enable and promote OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang et al. (2008); Paré, et al. (2000); O'bannon et al (1999)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>HRM practices influence OCB positively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cappelli &amp; Rogovsky (1998), Chen &amp; Chiu (2009); Van Dyne &amp; Pierce, 2004;</td>
<td>5 &amp; 1</td>
<td>Employee involvement in decision making (1) improved job characteristics which influenced OCB; job involvement mediated the correlation between OCB and task characteristics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4  Evidence of the links in the DMOCB**

The table above summarizes research which supports the links in the DMOCB. Links are grouped together (e.g. 3 & 4), as many of the studies referred to are cross-sectional
and correlational, which means that the causality may go in either direction (Organ et al. 2006).

5.6. Limitations of the study

This study used the OCB-KW scale developed by Dekas et al. (2013), to define the behaviors which represented citizenship behavior in a knowledge work context. Limitations of the scale stem from the fact that it was developed quite recently and has not been tested in other knowledge work contexts than the single organization where it was first developed, Google. Although I don't see other OCB scales any more valid, because in a similar manner, they too are likely to have restricted ecological validity, especially in new organizational environments, like a modern knowledge work environment. The scale by Dekas et al. may have some weaknesses in ecological validity, but probably less than a scale developed in a non-knowledge work context nearly thirty years ago (Organ, 1988). The differences in results of this study compared to earlier research may partially stem out of the fact that a different set of behaviors was used to define and operationalize OCB. The scale by Dekas et al., shared only two out of five behaviors with the scale originally developed by Organ in 1988.

The fact that the study was done in a single organization poses some limitations. Employees were generally satisfied with their company, management and work, which makes it hard to say anything about organizations which have dissatisfied employees. At the same time, the satisfaction of employees in the organization supports the central tenets of the DMOCB, as the company enabled OCB. Further support would have been given the model if another company with dissatisfied employees would have been studied. If this organization would have restricted employees’ OCB, then this would have supported the DMOCB.

5.7. Implications for future research

The original use of Social exchange theory to explain OCB was based on the initial definition of OCB, which defined the behaviors as discrete, non-expected and non-rewarded (Organ, 1988). Many lines of modern OCB research have continued to use this original definition, although Organ (1997) re-defined the behavior, not requiring it to be non-rewarded or extra-role. The results of this study show clearly that OCBs (in this case Dekas et al.’s, 2013) were many times be expected, rewarded and contracted, and also influenced by many contextual factors such as available resources,
opportunities for the behavior, encouragement, delegation and such. This makes social exchange theory alone insufficient to explain employees’ motives to the behavior.

It is time for OCB research to take a step or two away from social exchange theory as the sole explanation to OCB, especially in a modern knowledge work context. In this new context the nature of work is constantly changing and employee contribution cannot be clearly divided into task and non-task behavior, discretionary and non-discretionary, rewarded and non-rewarded behaviors, which makes it impossible to assume a universal psychological mechanism behind the behavior. This study showed that OCBs were a natural and important part of experts’ daily work, and were part of their expected contribution for the company. OCBs were expressed by employees depending on if the behaviors were seen as reasonable, if it was of value and if they had the opportunity to express these behaviors.

The fact that OCBs are not discretionary and further, not purely a result of the individual’s free will, makes it clear that this behavior should not be explained by one single psychological theory, like SET. The behavior can often be explained by other mechanisms than social exchange, such as economic exchange, organizational structures, culture etc.

Future research should move some focus on organization contextual factors like HRM practices, job characteristics, leadership behaviors and other structural factors driving and hindering the behavior. These contextual factors could many times have explained correlation between job attitudes and OCB in earlier research (as a hidden variable), but were practically ignored by researchers. Investigating contextual variables is a good idea also because many of these are possible to investigate with the ‘bare eye’, compared to intra-individual factors which have to be studied indirectly by various operationalizations (Johns, 2006). Findings of studies investigating structural variables is also of higher value for practitioners, because they are easier to influence compared to intra-individual factors.

Lastly, a richer set of research methods should be used in future OCB research. The weakness of most previous OCB research is that it has distanced itself from organizational reality by using solely quantitative methods, without proper investigation of the organizational reality in which the behavior takes place. By using interpretative methods in conjunction with positivist methods, we are able to acquire more valid results which are more likely to reflect the subjective reality of the research
subjects (Lee, 1991). For example, instead of using scales of in beforehand defined behaviors that are assumed to be beneficial for organizations regardless of context, we may use qualitative methods to define which behaviors are considered good employee behavior (citizenship) in a particular research context.

5.8. Implications for practice

Most earlier research has treated OCB as an end in itself, meaning that OCB would be a “the more, the better” phenomenon. Only a few researchers like Bergeron (2007) have mentioned about the potential trade-off between OCB and other important organizational behaviors. Before practitioners start promoting OCBs in their companies, they should define the OCBs that are strategically relevant for their organization or team, and also define the amount of a certain behavior needed.

This study contributes to practice by giving useful answers to how practitioners may start making structural changes in their organizations to increase OCB in employees. By allowing employees to influence the organizational context with OCBs, a positive feedback loop between improved internal service quality, job attitudes and OCB may be initiated.

* Although Bergeron (2007) used the old definition of OCB (Organ, 1988), and therefore made a distinction between task behavior and OCB.
6 CONCLUSIONS

The aim of this study was to get an understanding of the nature of organizational citizenship behavior in a modern knowledge work context and to investigate the influence of context on organizational citizenship behavior in information security experts. The study mapped contextual factors which enabled, promoted, constrained and discouraged the five types of OCB defined by Dekas et al. (2013): *voice, helping, civic virtue, employee sustainability* and *social participation*.

The findings of this study showed that the nature of OCB in this organizational context is highly different from OCB originally studied by Organ (1988). OCBs ranged from being discretionary, contracted and customer billable, and this varied between individuals and work groups. OCBs were also influenced strongly by organizational context, which could either enable and promote the behavior or constrain and discourage them. These factors ranged from cultural factors to leadership and to physical and technological factors influencing the behavior. For example, participating employees in decision making on many levels in the organization enabled *voice*. Electronic platforms enabled OCBs such as *voice, helping* and *social participation*. Encouraging management communication and resources gave rise to a large amount of employee-initiated events which promoted *social participation* among employees.

What these findings show is that OCB emerges in the social, psychological and organizational context in which employees reside. Instead of seeing OCB purely as a result of the individuals' free will to reciprocate good treatment by the organization, as stated by social exchange paradigm, OCB should be considered a result of a complex set of interacting motives (reciprocation, duty, responsibility, economic reasons) and contextual factors (social, cultural, physical and technological).

The findings of this study were integrated with previous research into the The Dynamic Model of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. The model explains how organizational context (called internal service quality, Heskett et al., 1997) influences both job attitudes and employees' expression of OCB, and correspondingly how OCB influences the organizational context. The model also shows how these factors are in a dynamic, self-strengthening relationship with each other.

The model is a first effort to answer wishes by prominent researchers in the OCB field. Organ et al. (2006, p. 237) called for investigating the direct mechanisms of context on
OCB, and Organ (1997) hoped for explanations on how the individual influences the organization through OCB.

The findings of this study and the resulting model contributes to OCB research by providing a possible explanation on how scattered findings of previous research fits together in a dynamic model. The model contributes also more broadly to management and organization literature by conceptually incorporating organizational structure into previous findings in OCB research.
SVENSK SAMMANFATTNING

INLEDNING

Detta arbetsbeteende har studerats under flera olika namn, men den kanske mest etablerade benämningen är Organisationsmedborgarbeteende (egen översättning av eng. Organizational citizenship behavior, OCB). OCB är beteende som bidrar till ”att underhålla och förbättra den sociala och psykologiska miljön som stöder prestationen i formella arbetsuppgifter” (egen översättning av Organ 1997) och som ”i aggregatet stöder organisationens effektiva funktion” (Organ, 1988, s. 4)


För att organisationer ska kunna klara sig i en allt mer konkurrensutsatt och föränderlig miljö, behöver de insatser från sin personal som går utöver det som specificerats i arbetsbeskrivningen. Vilka insatser som är mest nyttiga varierar från kontext till kontext. Nyligen har dock Dekas, Bauer, Welle, Kurkoski och Sullivan (2013) identifierat fem OCB som visats vara relevanta i modernt kunskapsarbete. Dessa är röst (Voice), hjälpande (Helping), frivillig delaktighet (Civic virtue), socialt engagemang (social participation) och främjande av hållbarhet (employee sustainability).

Vad är det som får personal att bete sig som organisationsmedborgare? Hur kan organisationer möjliggöra detta beteende hos sin personal?

Problem

Denna tidigare forskning har varit teoretiskt grundad i Sociala utbytesteorin (Social Exchange Theory, Blau, 1964) och har därmed byggt på antagandet att personal som upplever att de får stöd av sin organisation, behandlas rättvist och är nöjda med sitt arbete, vill betala detta tillbaka till sina organisationer med positivt beteende, dvs. OCB (Schroeder, 2010). Detta individcentrerade synsätt har gett viktiga insikter i vilka attityder som är associerade med frivilligt bidrag till organisationen, men har ignorerat den sociala, kulturella och organisationella kontexten i vilken OCB sker. Faktorer i organisationsmiljön, som möjliggör och begränsar OCB hos personalen, har oftast ignorerats helt.


För att få insikter i dessa frågor har 6 experter i ett finskt datasäkerhetsföretag intervjuats, med målet att få en rik bild av de faktorer som möjliggör, uppmuntrar, begränsar och hämmar deras OCB. För att få en så rik förståelse som möjligt av den komplexa organisationskontext som påverkar OCB, har en induktiv metod använts, vilket är en atypisk metodologi i OCB-forskning.

Syfte och forskningsfrågor

Syftet med studien var att få insikt i de faktorer i organisationen som möjliggör och uppmuntrar, begränsar och hämmar OCB hos personalen. För att uppfylla syftet ställs följande forskningsfrågor:
1. Vad är de huvudsakliga motiven för experterna att bete sig som organisationsmedborgare?

2. Vilka faktorer i organisationen möjliggör och uppmuntrar till detta beteende?

3. Vilka faktorer i organisationen begränsar och hämmar detta beteende hos personalen?

Närmandesätt

För att svara på forskningsfrågan har en induktiv forskningsdesign använts. Data har samlats in med semistrukturerade djupintervjuer med sex stycken av företagets datasäkerhetsexperter. Utöver detta har två högt uppstatta chefer intervjuats för att få en bättre bild av organisationens kontext. De OCB som forskades i var de 5 beteenden som identifierats av Dekas et al. (2013), nämligen röst, hjälpande, frivillig delaktighet, socialt engagemang och främjande av hållbarhet. Definitioner på dessa beteenden ges i tabellen under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Röst:</strong></th>
<th>Att ta del i aktiviteter, bidra med idéer eller göra sig hörd för att förbättra produkter eller någon aspekt av individuellt, teamets eller organisationens prestation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hjälpande:</strong></td>
<td>Frivilligt hjälper kolleger med arbetsrelaterade frågor eller problem, och arbetar för att förebygga framtida arbetsrelaterade problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frivillig delaktighet:</strong></td>
<td>Ta del i aktiviteter som pekar på ett intresse och ansvar för gemenskapen som helhet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social delaktighet:</strong></td>
<td>Tar del i sociala aktiviteter under arbetsdagen som inte direkt är kopplade till officiella arbetsuppgifter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Främjande av hållbarhet:</strong></td>
<td>Tar del i aktiviteter som bidrar till ens egen och andras hälsa och välmående.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tabell 1: De fem kategorierna av OCB, ur Dekas et al. (2013)

TEORI

**Definition och operationalisering av OCB**

Den populäraste definitionen på organisationsmedborgarbeteende är av Organ (1988 s. 4), som definierade beteendet som "individuellt beteende som är frivilligt och inte direkt kopplat till det formella belöningsystemet, och som aggregerat får organisationen att fungera effektivare." Efter att denna definition fått kritik, eftersom...
det var i praktiken omöjligt att definiera om ett beteende är belönat eller kontrakterat, omdefinierade Organ begreppet så att den inte uteslöt beteende kopplat till belöningsystem och beteende som definierats i arbetskontrakt. Organs (1997) nya definition var: "beteende som bidrar till att underhålla och förbättra den sociala och psykologiska miljön som stöder prestationen av formella arbetsuppgifter”.

OCB har oftast operationaliserats genom att be förmän avgöra hur mycket deras underställda ägnar sig åt olika förutbestämda OCB. Den populäraste listan av OCB som använts i forskning är utvecklad av Organ (1988) och innehåller 5 beteenden: frivillig delaktighet (Civic virtue), samvetsgrannhet (Conscientiousness), altruism, hövlighet (courtesy) och sportslighet (sportsmanship). Denna studie kommer dock att använda listan av Dekas et al. som grund.

**Tidigare forskning**

Forskningen kring OCB började i och med att antagandet att arbetstillfredsställelse är kopplat till organisationers produktivitet inte fick så starkt stöd i forskningen som förväntat. Korrelationen mellan arbetstillfredsställelse och individuell prestation var relativt låg. För att förklara hur tillfredsställelse bidrar till organisationers effektivitet, insåg Organ et al. (1988) att den individuella prestation som bidrog till organisationen var av annan typ än arbetsprestationen i formella arbetsuppgifter, nämligen prestation i formen av OCB. Arbetstillfredsställelse visades korrelera starkare med OCB (r=0.44, Organ, Podskoff & MacKenzie, 2006) jämfört med arbetsprestation (r=0.3, Judge, Thoresen, Bono & Patton, 2001).

**Sociala utbytesteorin**

Även om den sociala utbytesteorin har gett mycket insikter i varför personal vill bidra till sina organisationer, har nya alternativa perspektiv på varför personal beter sig som organisationsmedborgare presenterats.

**OCB på gruppnivå och OCB-klimat**


**Organisationsstruktur och OCB**

HRM-praxis har visats inverka på personalens OCB. Som tidigare förklarats av Schneider et al. (1994), så inverkar belöningssystemets omfattning på personalens OCB. Enligt en modell av Tsui, Pearce, Porter och Tripoli (1997) finns det två huvudtyper av arbetskontrakt: ömsesidiga investeringskontrakt där personal och företag investerar i varandra under en längre tid, och ”quasi-spot”-kontrakt, där arbetsgivaren betalar endast för prestation i specifika arbetsuppgifter, utan att ge extra trygghet eller andra nyttor för personen. I detta fall förväntas arbetstagaren inte heller bidra med extra investeringar i företaget.

Att involvera personal i utformandet av procedurer och praxis i organisationen har visats påverka OCB både direkt och indirekt. En studie av Cappelli & Rogovsky (1998) visade att då personalen gavs möjlighet att påverka hur arbetet görs, ökade detta OCB. Effekten av detta var både direkt och indirekt. Involverande av personal i hur arbetet ska organiseras påverkade hur belönande arbetet uppfattades (dimensioner: autonomi, identitet, variabilitet, signifikans och feedback), vilket påverkade OCB hos personalen positivt. En direkt effekt påvisades också, där involverande av personal i beslutssfattande påverkade OCB direkt. Vad OCB i denna studie innefattade var främst beteenden relaterade till sportmanskap (dvs. konstruktiv kommunikation), samvetsgrannhet och hjälpande.

Vilken effekten av autonomi i arbete har på OCB har förklarats av Hackman och Lawler (1971). Enligt dem ger autonomi en känsla av ansvar, vilket gör att personen gör vad
som krävs för att få arbetet gjort (inklusive OCB). En annan studie av Bell & Menguc (2002) förklarade att effekten beror på att autonomi ger personalen möjlighet att avvika från arbetsrutiner, vilket behövs för att ägna sig åt vissa typer av OCB. Detta var sant för sådana typer av OCB som krävde upphovsringar i tid från officiella arbetsuppgifter för att kunna uttryckas.


**Arbetets egenskaper**


**METOD**

**Ontologi och epistemologi**

Beteende i organisationer är påverkas starkt av den organisationskontext där beteendet sker (Johns, 2006). Organisationsbeteende borde därför studeras på organisationsnivå, för att få en bild av den komplexa dynamik där beteende sker (Juarrero, 2000). I kontrast till tidigare forskning i OCB, där OCB har uppfattats (särskilt metodologiskt) som ett resultat av individens dispositioner och attityder så som arbetsvälmaende, personlighet, rättviseupplevelser etc., så fokuserar denna studie på organisationskontexten och dess påverkan på OCB. Eftersom OCB är ett beteende som framträder som ett resultat av komplex interaktion mellan individen och hennes organisationskontext, bör metoder som beaktar möjligast mycket av denna komplexitet användas. Ett kvalitativt och induktivt närmandesätt valdes för att förstå den komplexa kombination av faktorer som i organisationen påverkar experternas OCB. Vad som är av intresse är intervjusubjektens subjektiva uppfattning om vilka faktorer i organisationen som påverkar deras beteende.
**Forskningsdesign**

För studien intervjuades sex experter och två högt uppsatta chefer. Experterna var från olika team, var i olika åldrar, och hade varierande attityder gentemot sitt arbete och företaget. Intervjusubjekten rekryterades för att få ett mångsidigt sampel med personer att intervju. Som mål var att få personer från olika team och med olika attityder gentemot organisationen. Dessutom var målet att få möjligast mycket demografisk variation i gruppen. Rekryteringen gjordes med hjälp av tre metoder: genom att använda resultaten i en tidigare administrerad motivationsmätning, med tips från en person i ledningsgruppen och genom snöbollsurval. Personerna kallades till intervju per e-post, och av de 22 personer som tillfrågades svarade nio jakande. Av dessa valdes sju till intervju, med det tidigare nämnda målen i tanke.

Som datainsamlingsmetod användes semistrukturerade intervjuer. Intervjun var indelad i tre delar: en *introduktion* där syftet med studien och intervjun presenterades; en del med *kontextuella frågor*, där en bild av personens arbete och relation till organisationen eftersträvades; en del med *nyckelfrågor*, vars syfte var att få en insikt i de former av OCB som var relevanta för subjekten och de kontextuella faktorer som påverkar subjektens förmåga att uttrycka OCB antingen positivt eller negativt.


**RESULTAT**

Studiens resultat bidrog med viktiga nya insikter i OCB, samtidigt som resultaten är kompatibla med tidigare forskning i ämnet. I stället för att fokusera på arbetstillfredsställelse, rättvisa, personlighet eller andra faktorer på individnivå, fokuserade denna studie på kontextuella faktorer som antingen möjliggjorde och uppmuntrade eller begränsade och hämmade organisationsmedborgarbetande som definierat av Dekas et al. (2013).

**Organisationen**

Organisationen som forskades i var ett finskt datasäkerhetsföretag med en personalmängd på ca 150 personer. Experterna var sysselsatta med...
datasaferhetskonsultering. Deras arbete bestod av att bedöma mognadsnivån på kundföretags datasäkerhet samt på att implementera och utveckla företagens datasäkerhetssystem såsom företags-IT, digital business och industriellt internet.


Organisationen hade en platt struktur där både individer och team åtnjöt avsevärt mycket autonomi och frihet. Personalen hade möjlighet att påverka beslut som fattades på alla organisationssnivåer: allt från att välja vilka verktyg att använda i sitt eget arbete till att få påverka vart företagets kontor skulle flyttas näst.

**Experternas arbete**

Experternas arbete bestod främst av konsultarbete där de löste datasäkerhetsfrågor och problem hos kundföretag. Detta betydde att arbetets tid och plats kunde variera mycket beroende på person och olika kunduppdrag. Arbetet gjordes ofta utanför kontoret.

Majoriteten av konsulterna hade ett kontrakt med månadslön, och skulle uppfylla en kvot på 70 % kundfakturerbart arbete av full arbetstid månatligen, vilket betydde att de i teorin hade 30 % av sin arbetstid till allt annat än kundarbete. Detta kunde t.ex. bestå av möten, interna utvecklingsuppgifter som delegerats eller annat icke-fakturerbart arbete. Flera organisationsmedborgarbeteenden visade sig ofta vara kontrakterade eller en del av det arbete som var direkt kundfakturerbart. Detta är i linje med Organs (1997) nyare definition på OCB som inte kräver att beteendet faller utanför arbetskontrakt och officiella belöningssystem.

**Organisationskontextens påverkan på OCB**

*Röst*

I företaget bestod *röst* av bidrag till organisationen på tre nivåer: utvecklande av ens eget arbete, utvecklande av teamets processer och arbetssätt samt bidrag med idéer till hur organisationen kunde fungera. Ett av de främsta motiven för *röst*-beteende för experterna var bland annat att använda ens erfarenhet för att bidra till teamets, företagets, kundens och samhällets bästa. Denna form av OCB, särskilt utveckling av

Andra faktorer på organisationsnivå som bidrog till detta beteende var de påverkningsmöjligheter som gavs experterna, elektroniska plattformar som möjliggjorde diskussion och uttryckande av idéer, samt teammöten. Teammötena var ofta viktiga sammanhang där idéutbyte och utvecklingsdiskussioner möjliggjordes. Även mer formella utvecklingsdagar organiseras, vars uppgift var att uppmuntra personalen att bidra till hur saker gjordes. Ytterligare kunde röstbeteende som produktutveckling delegeras av chefer till konsulter intresserade av detta arbete.


**Hjälparende**

I intervjuerna reflekterades ofta att personalen var villig och motiverad att hjälpa andra i arbetsrelaterade frågor. I vissa fall verkade hjälparende vara en pliktfråga för konsulterna. Den tävlingsfria, öppna och samarbetsbenägna kulturen i företaget bidrog även till detta. Hjälparende tog formen av delande av information, diskuterande av arbetsrelaterade problem, hjälparende med tung arbetsbörda och coachande av juniora konsulter.

Det fanns flera faktorer på organisationsnivå som bidrog till detta beteende. t.ex. virtuella plattformar där det var möjligt att be om hjälp, även om man var på distans,

Det hittades också en mängd faktorer som hämmade och begränsade hjälpande mellan organisationsmedlemmar. Självständiga arbetsuppgifter, där konsulten jobbade ensam med stora självständiga projekt, var svåra att dela med sig eller att delegera. Detta är i linje med resultaten av Nielsen et al. (2012) som visade att hjälpande ökar organisationens effektivitet endast om arbetet är ömsesidigt avhängigt. I vissa fall gjorde arbetspress från egna kunder att konsulter inte hade möjlighet att hjälpa varann. En tydligt systemisk faktor som begränsade hjälpande mellan individer var sekretessavtal, vilka var vanliga i denna bransch. Dessa kunde vara stränga, vilket gjorde det svårt för konsulter att tala med andra om problem som uppstått i olika projekt. En annan faktor som försvårade hjälpande mellan konsulter var organisationens svaga metaminne, dvs. vetskapen om vad andra vet var svagt p.g.a. stora brister i en databas där man listat vem som har vilka kompetenser. Därmed hade konsulter svårt att veta av vem de kunde be om hjälp vid behov.

**Frivillig delaktighet**

*Frivillig delaktighet* förekom i form av att delta i månatliga möten, ta del av interna utvecklingsprojekt samt ansvara för och försörja interna teknologiska redskap. En konsult var också aktiv i att organiserar allmännyttiga evenemang i organisationen.

Flera organisationsfaktorer uppmuntrande till detta beteende. Exempelvis spelade uppmuntrannde kommunikation från ledningen till att en konsult var särskilt motiverad att organiserar evenemang. I fråga om möten spelade möjligheten att delta på distans en stor roll. Utvecklande av interna digitala verktyg gjorde att en konsult hade lättare att ta ansvar för arbetet (konsult 3). Detta strider emot sociala utbytesteorin, för att teorin bygger på frivilliga utbytesrelationer, medan delegerande ofta innefattar maktfaktorer.

På organisationsnivå var det vissa faktorer som begränsade frivillig delaktighet hos personalen. Exempelvis hamnade konsulter många gånger fatta beslut mellan kundarbete och deltagande i möten. I dessa fall var kundarbete alltid imperativt framför interna möten. (Konsulter 6, 5, 4, 2) Även avståndet till evenemanget höjde

**Främjande av hållbarhet**


Faktorer på organisationsnivå som möjliggjorde och uppmuntrade till främjande av hållbarhet var främst den stora mängden möjliga sätt att stödja sin hälsa, allt från sportklubbar till hälsomätningar och tillgång till en lokal för meditation och vila. Psykologiskt välmående stärktes genom månatliga möten där lyckade projekt kunde lyftas fram och beröm ges till medverkande. (Chef 1, konsult 1) Inga faktorer på organisationsnivå befanns begränsa främjande av hållbarhet.

**Socialt deltagande**

Det fanns stora skillnader mellan de intervjuade i hur aktivt de deltog i olika sociala aktiviteter med kolleger. Utöver individuella faktorer fanns det även organisatoriska faktorer som både uppmuntrade till och hämmade detta beteende på aggregerad nivå. Företaget hade en stor mängd klubbar och fritidsgrupper som alla kunde delta i. Företaget hade bland annat en whiskeyklubb, en amatörastronomklubb, spelkvällar, filmkvällar och mera. Utöver detta hade företaget sportklubbar som nämnts innan.

Kontorsutrymmena spelade en stor roll i möjliggörande och uppmuntrande till social interaktion. Ett aktivitetsbaserat kontor gjorde dagliga spontana interaktioner vanliga

Faktumet att arbetet gjordes till en stor del hos kunder eller hemifrån begränsade klart OCB. En konsult sade att det var svårt att bekanta sig med vissa, eftersom de var så sällan på kontoret. (Konsult 5).

**DISKUSSION**

Studiens syfte var att undersöka kontextuella faktorer som påverkar experters uttryckande av OCB. Resultaten visar att organisationsmedborgarbetande uppstår och begränsas av flera kontextuella faktorer inom organisationen. I kontrast till studier som förklarat detta beteende med *sociala utbytesteorin* (Blau, 1964, Schroeder, 2010), visade denna studie att de OCB som identifierats av Dekas et al. (2013) påverkas av en stor mängd organisationsfaktorer som begränsar, möjliggör och motiverar detta beteende. Varje typ av OCB visade ha sin egen profil av organisationskontextuella faktorer som begränsade, hämmade, möjliggjorde och uppmuntrade till beteendet, vilket ifrågasätter om det är klokt att behandla dessa beteenden under samma paraplybegrepp OCB.

Allmänt visade det sig att den tillit och öppna kultur som företaget hade, bidrog till OCB i organisationen. Företaget verkade också ha normer för hjälpmödest. Utöver detta hade största delen fast lön och tillräckligt med rörlighet (30 % av arbetstiden) för allmännyttigt arbete. Alla dessa motsvarar de kriterier av Schneider et al. (1994) som


**Den dynamiska OCB-modellen**

Figur 2  Den dynamiska OCB modellen

Intern servicekvalitet innefattar de faktorer inom organisationen som påverkar hur tillfredsställande arbetet är för personalen. Dessa är t.ex. ledarskap, verktyg, processer och praxis som understöder effektivt arbete. Exempel på intern service som stigit fram i denna studie är t.ex. autonomi, informationssystem, lokaler och deltagande ledarskap. Attityder är de subjektiva faktorer som tidigare forskning har visat korrelera med OCB. Exempel på dessa är arbetstillfredsställelse och rättviseupplevelser. OCB är de former av OCB som definierats av Dekas et al. (2013).

1. Den första relationen är inbäddad i själva definitionen av OCB. OCB är ett beteende som påverkar organisationen och dess psykologiska och sociala atmosfär positivt. Om personal har möjligheten att uttrycka till exempel röst, och deras idéer tas på allvar, kommer personalen att ha en inverkan på hur organisationen och den interna servicekvaliteten formas.


3. Den tredje relationen i modellen är den som påvisats av tidigare forskning, dvs. att positiva attityder gentemot företaget och jobbet leder till OCB, enligt rationaliteten i Sociala utbytesteorin (Blau, 1964)


**SLUTSATS**

För att organisationer ska kunna fungera effektivt och flexibelt i en allt mer föränderlig och konkurrensutsatt omgivning behöver företag personal som bidrar möjligast mycket till organisationens effektiva funktion. OCB är en form av beteende som har visats bidra starkt till organisationers effektivitet.

Till skillnad från tidigare forskning som endast koncentrerats på individpsykologiska faktorer, har denna studie har visat vilken roll organisationskontexten har i att möjliggöra, begränsa, uppmuntra och hämma OCB hos personalen. De påvisade resultaten kan användas av ledning och personal i diverse moderna organisationer för att utveckla organisationens praxis, procedurer och ledarskap så att de möjliggör en lämplig mängd med OCB.

**Studiens brister och tips för framtida forskning**
Denna studie hade ett antal svagheter. Först så genomfördes undersökningen i endast en organisation. Två eller fler organisationer skulle ha gett en rikare bild av exempelvis kulturella faktorers inverkan på individers beteende. Vidare kunde det ha varit intressant att kontrastera denna organisation med en organisation med låg autonomi eller personal med utgångsmässigt sämre attityder gentemot organisationen. Framtida forskning kunde undersöka olika typer av företag för att testa och validera de olika relationerna i den *Dynamiska OCB-modellen*.

En annan svaghet som redan nämnts ovan, var att denna studie använde en förutbestämd lista på OCB. Framtida studier kunde initieras med en kvalitativ undersökning för att identifiera de former av OCB som är relevanta i just den organisationskontexten.

Generellt sett är jag av åsikten att framtida forskning i OCB och andra typer av arbetsprestation borde använda en kombination av kvalitativa och kvantitativa metoder. Kvalitativa metoder kan användas för att definiera former av OCB som är relevanta i den specifika kontexten, och även för att förstå den organisationskontext som påverkar resultaten. Triangulering av metoder gör det möjligt att validera de resultat som fås med enskilda metoder.

REFERENCES


https://books.google.fi/books?id=qhOMLscX-ZYC&pg=PA2&source=gbs_toe_r&cad=4#v=onepage&q&f=false


APPENDIX 1  OCB-KW SCALE USED TO DEFINE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCB Category (and definition)</th>
<th>Final OCB-KW Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Employee Sustainability ($\alpha = .79$). Participating in activities to maintain or improve one's own health and well-being, or to support others’ efforts to maintain their health and well-being. | 1. Makes others feel comfortable ‘being themselves’ at work.  
2. Expresses his/her own authentic personality at work.  
3. Supports others’ efforts to make their personal health and well-being a priority.  
4. Praises others when they are successful. |
| Social Participation ($\alpha = .78$). Taking part in social activities during the workday that are not directly related to core job tasks. | 1. Gets to know his/her coworkers on a personal basis.  
2. Celebrates coworkers’ life events (e.g., birthdays, weddings, etc.).  
3. Participates in informal social activities with coworkers during the workday.  
4. Is playful in workplace interactions. |
| Civic Virtue ($\alpha = .84$). Taking actions indicative of a macro-level interest in the organization as a whole. Actions reflect a person's recognition of being part of a larger whole and accepting the responsibilities that such membership entails. | 1. Attends events that are not required, but help the [Google] community.  
2. Attends meetings that are not mandatory, but are considered important.  
3. Keeps up with organizational news (e.g., [Google]-wide announcements, organizational changes, etc.).  
4. Takes part in [Google]-sponsored knowledge-sharing opportunities (e.g., brownbags, talks, training courses, etc.).  
5. Volunteers for special projects in addition to his/her core job tasks. |
| Voice ($\alpha = .81$). Participating in activities, making suggestions, or speaking out with the intent of improving the organization's products, or some aspect of individual, group, or organizational functioning. | 1. Makes creative suggestions to coworkers.  
2. Voices opinions about work-related issues even if others disagree.  
3. Makes constructive suggestions to improve processes for getting work done.  
4. Encourages others in the group to voice their opinions regarding issues that affect the group. |
| Helping ($\alpha = .88$). Voluntarily helping coworkers with work-related issues or problems, or preventing the occurrence of work-related problems. | 1. Helps others who have heavy workloads.  
2. Willingly helps others solve work-related problems.  
3. Is always ready to lend a helping hand to those around him/her.  
4. Tries to prevent problems for coworkers.  
5. Considers the impact of his/her actions on coworkers.  
6. Communicates with others before initiating actions that might affect them. |
APPENDIX 2   INTERVIEW GUIDE

This interview guide has been translated from Finnish to English.

Introduction

• Thank the person for his time.

• Small talk

In this study I am interested in work behaviors done by employees, that are beneficial for the company, but may not be included in formal job descriptions, and may exceed expectations. Some researchers have listed this type of work for example as helping colleagues, giving constructive suggestions to improve company practices, attending company meetings and happenings, taking care of ones own and others working ability and well-being, and even participating socially to get to know colleagues personally. This behavior is of interest because it supports the core value creation process of the company. In this study I am interested in both factors that increase and decrease your ability or willingness to contribute to your company in the earlier mentioned ways.

• Reminder of anonymity and of the length of the interview (~1h). Reminder that the results will be used to develop the practices and the culture of the company. Ask if it is ok that the interview is recorded.

Contextual questions

What do you do at this company?

Which team are you in?

How long have you worked here?

What are your main areas of responsibility?

Do you have other, more informal roles at work?

How large a role does your work have in your life?

What is your relationship with this company? (what does Company X mean to you?)

Key questions

Which things or experiences increase your willingness to work for the best of the company?

Which things or experiences decrease your willingness to work for the best of the company?

Voice

*Definition and examples*

Are these a part of your job? Are these expected of you?
How much do you do these in your job?

Can you give some practical examples of this behavior in your work?

Which things increase your willingness and enable you to make an effort to develop the company, its procedures and services?

Which things constrain or decrease your willingness to behave like this?

Helping

Ditto.

Civic Virtue

Ditto.

Social Participation

Ditto.

Employee sustainability

Ditto.

Change questions

*There has been thee major changes in the company: fusion, going public and change in incentive system*

How do you feel about these changes?

Do you think these changes have influenced your expression of the behaviors we have discussed earlier?

Cultural questions

Which 3 things in the company culture are most important to you?

If you could change one thing, what would it be?

Closing

Thank you!
APPENDIX 3  LIST OF CODES – EXAMPLES

Each coded passage contained one code from each column. Left column contains an example list of codes generated with inductive coding method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Enabling</th>
<th>CivicVirtue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>EmployeeSustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Preventing</td>
<td>GeneralOCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>Promoting</td>
<td>Helping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td>SocialParticipation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CustomerBilling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DescriptionOfCompany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DontKnowWhatOthersKnow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DontKnowWhatOthersDo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FreedomOfSpeech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HourlyWage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImportanceOfWork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YammerOrIntra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobChar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LackOfCompetition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LackOfTime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LargeCommitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LowHierarchy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ManagerAsks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ManagerRelationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningfulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MutualInvestment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartOfJob</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PayForPerformance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SelfDevelopment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SessionOrEvent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SkillDatabase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SportsAndHealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeamResult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WeakCommunication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorkAttitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorkInterdependence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>