

## Examining Influence of Perceived Organizational Support (POS), and Trust on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of Lecturer

Irma Muthoharoh<sup>1\*</sup>, Suryadi<sup>2</sup>, Matin<sup>3</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>Doctoral Program, Educational Management, State University of Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>2,3</sup>State University of Jakarta, Indonesia

\*Irma Muthoharoh<sup>1</sup>, [irmamuthoharoh\\_7617157911@mahasiswa.unj.ac.id](mailto:irmamuthoharoh_7617157911@mahasiswa.unj.ac.id)

### ABSTRACT

The importance of organizational support in relationships between organizations and lecturers; how work attitudes and lecturers behavior have influenced the relationship between lecturers and organizations known as social exchange theory. Most social exchange theory thinking and reciprocal specifications are used in perceived organizational support studies. A sense of obligation is given to lecturers through reciprocity specifications so they can give back to their organization. This study examines the outcomes of the perceived organizational support among Indonesian lecturers especially at the Islamic University of Jakarta. Path analysis was used to examine the proposed hypotheses. One hundred and nine out of hundred and fifty samples were selected randomly by using the Slovin formula. The findings show, there is a positive effect of perceived organizational support on organizational citizenship behavior.

### Keywords

Perceived organizational support, trust, organizational citizenship behavior, lecturer

### Introduction

Lecturers are one type of human capital that is a supporter and a key factor for sustainable effectiveness in higher education. Higher education requires lecturers who implement extra-role performance (i.e. OCB) as global demand and a paradigm shift from self-employment to teamwork. There is still much higher-performing tertiary education, especially private universities. Almost 70% of Indonesian children at the golden age level are private students. Ironically, the development of private universities still has many very complex internal problems. Besides internal conflicts plus problems about the quality of lecturers and accountability of the foundation. The government has paid much attention to state campuses but still lacks attention to private campuses. Colleges that perform well and can overcome crises are all our hopes. However, it is still far from the expectation that the lecturer has not done the expected OCB. Another proof of the low OCB of lecturers is programs that are not effective in several universities. Based on data from Kopertis regional 3 as of April 2017. There are 334 private universities, while data in 2013 have 479 private universities, it can be seen that many private universities are deactivated. There were 1,685 study programs, out of all the study programs there were

199 accredited A study programs, 737 accredited study programs B, 495 study programs accredited C, 237 study programs accredited C minimum, and 13 study programs not accredited. From these data, it shows that lecturers' OCB is still low, because the fact that achieving standard role performance is still very difficult, especially extra-role performance / OCB.

Many researchers have found that trust can influence OCB (Chen et al., 2108; Dolan et al., 2021; Nasra & Heilbrunn, 2016; Ocampo et al., 2018; Singh & Srivastava, 2009). Mayer and Schoorman (2005); Sjahrudin et al., (2020); Zeinabadi et al., (2017) found that trust in various levels of management has a positive influence on employees to stay focused on improving performance and greater improvement in OCB. OCB occurs when the workplace has an atmosphere of mutual trust between superiors and subordinates as well as among co-workers (Jehanzeb, 2020).

Mayer dan Schoorman (2005) states that trust in various levels of management had a positive influence on employees to stay focused on improving performance and greater improvement in OCB. OCB occurs when the workplace has an atmosphere of mutual trust between superiors and subordinates as well as among co-workers.

However, some studies show that trust does not always affect OCB Zeinabadi and Salehi (2011)

found that trust has a positive effect on OCB. This happens because of the job satisfaction that employees feel and their commitment to the organization, in other words when employees do not feel job satisfaction and have organizational commitment, the employee's OCB will be weak. Singh (2016) states that trust cannot affect OCB if the employee does not have a good perception of organizational support.

From the review of some of the findings of the researchers above, it is found that there are inconsistencies in the results of the research on the trust variable towards OCB. So the researchers found opportunities to research the presence or absence of the influence of trust on OCB.

In addition to trust, there is a predictor of OCB, namely affective commitment (Akar, 2018). Danish and Humayon (2015) found that organizational affective commitment has a fairly positive impact on OCB and employee performance.

Several meta-analyses found that perceived organizational support is one of the predictors of OCB (Asgari et al., 2020; Margaretha et al., 2020; Nabilla et al., 2020; Shams et al., 2020). Azim and Dora (2016) found that employees with a high level of perceived organizational support will have positive attitudes and behavior (OCB). Organizations must realize how important organizational support is to their employees, such as giving awards and recognition to their employees, all of these good treatments are an indication that the organization cares about its employees and these employees will increase positive behavior (Choi, 2020; Ridwan et al., 2020; Thompson et al., 2020).

According to Fouzia et al., (2018) that organizational support is the most important predictor of employee attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors. Employee well-being perceptions become a predictor of organizational support perceptions, which can effect high levels of employee engagement and OCB (Bergeron et al., 2020; Jain et al., 2020; Tumiwa et al., 2000). In addition, Arrfou (2018) in his research found that the perceived organizational support is the main determinant of OCB, through providing support to subordinates and in the end it will increase commitment to the organization which will further encourage employees to carry out voluntary

behavior/extra-role performance to achieve desired organizational goals.

Some researchers found that perceived organizational support was not always able to create OCB, Devimageshkumar (2016) found that there was a weak and inconsistent influence between perceived organizational support for OCB. This happens because the perception and commitment of employees to the organization is different, their assessment and belief in the organization are not interrelated.

Khan and Ghufra (2018) found that perceived organizational support does not have a positive effect on OCB, this happens because there are employees who are more concerned with personal interests, promotions, and incentives. If their welfare is not considered, then their performance will be bad. In other words, when the performance is poor, voluntary behavior will not occur.

The findings above show that there is an inconsistency in the findings of the perception research about organizational support for OCB. So that researchers find opportunities to research the presence or absence of the influence of perceptions about organizational support for OCB.

## Literature Review

### Organizational Citizenship Behavior

OCB is discretionary individual behavior, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that thoroughly promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Ibrahim et al., 2018; Khalid et al., 2010; Organ, 1994; Suliman & Al Obaidli, 2013). Discretionary words mean that the behavior is not part of the employee's job description. And good behavior is an employee who offers support to the organization, even when the support is not verbally demanded or determined by the organization ((Jiao et al., 2017; Kasa et al., 2020; Ocampo et al., 2020; Organ, 1997). High organizational performance relies on employees who provide reciprocity that goes beyond their formal job duties to carry out their duties (Allen et al., 2018; Bies, 1989; Pond et al., 1997). Faruk (2013) defines OCB as a contribution to organizational effectiveness that is not mandated by individual work requirements or recognized by a formal reward system and

describes the challenges posed by narrowly defined models of rational self-interest. Because OCB is wisdom, it is not a behavior that is formally required.

Mehmet (2011) defined OCB as voluntary individual actions that are not clearly defined informal awards and punishment systems from organizations but support the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization as a whole. This behavior is usually not contained in job descriptions, does not need to be punished in violation cases and is not valued directly and formally, and is largely based on individual choices to improve the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the organization (Bergeron et al., 2013; Cohen & Vigoda, 2000; Nezakati et al., 2018; Nielsen et al., 2009; (Vey & Campbell, 2004; Wilkerson et al., 2008). From this definition, it can be understood that OCB refers to a job that employees may choose to do, done spontaneously and of their own volition, which is often outside the obligation (Bolino et al., 2013; Klotz et al., 2020; Munawir et al., 2016; Farrell et al., 2018; Spector et al., 2019). OCB may not always be directly and officially recognized or valued by the company, through salary increases or promotions for example, although of course OCB can be reflected in good supervision and peer assessment, or better performance appraisal. In this way, it can facilitate direct benefits for the future. Ultimately OCB must be able to improve the effective function of the organization (Zhang et al., 2011).

This understanding shows that OCB is an individual behavior in the form of voluntary (discretionary), whose emergence is not explicitly related directly to the system of rewards formally, but as a whole can drive organizational functions effectively (Spector et al., 2010). Formally OCB is not needed, but consciously or not, extra-role behavioral needs greatly help organizational effectiveness (April et al., 2004).

Thus, according to Organ (1988) definition of OCB has at least three characteristics: a) the behavior is not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system; b) the behavior is discretionary, and c) in the aggregate, the behavior promotes the effective functioning of the organization. In addition Rossier (2005) that OCB was built from five dimensions, namely: civic virtue,

conscientiousness, altruism, courtesy, and sportsmanship.

Civic virtue is a commitment of employees to the political life of the organization and supports the administrative functions of the organization (Chwalibog, 2011; Deluga, 1995; Organ, 1988). Conscientiousness is the manifestation of work outside the task set by the organization, responsible and working hard (Organ, 1988; April et al., 2004; Burke et al., 2002). Altruism (the act of helping coworkers) is a voluntary act of helping coworkers in completing their work in unusual situations (Jahangir et al., 2004; Podsakoff, et al., 2000). Courtesy (the act of respecting others) is an act that focuses on preventing problems and making sure steps to reduce the occurrence of problems in the future, in other words, that Courtesy means alleviating problems when a colleague feels down and depressed about the development of his position. Courtesy is the voluntary care of an employee whose purpose is to prevent the problems of coworkers that are related to their duties (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Sportsmanship is defined as willingness, willingness, willingness to accept / tolerance (without complaining) about the inconveniences that arise and the demands of work, and maintain a positive attitude despite mistakes. And do not feel offended if a colleague does not help, and willingness to sacrifice personal desires for the sake of team affairs. And it is the ability to feel hurt by objections and denials (Chwalibog, 2011).

### **Perceived Organizational Support**

Perceived organizational support is the employee's beliefs about how much the organization cares about, respects contributions and pays attention to their welfare (Behavior et al., 2009; Coulter, 2012; Eisenberger et al., 2016; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Molfenter et al., 2021; Neves et al., 2014; Rhoades et al., 2013). Perceived organizational support is an organizational commitment to its employees (Armeli et al., 1998; Aselage et al., 2003; Neves & Eisenberger, 2014; Noruzy et al., 2011). Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) state that perceived organizational support is also assessed as a guarantee that assistance will be available from the organization when needed to carry out one's work effectively and to deal with stressful situations. If

employees feel that they get support from the organization will have a sense of meaning in the employee (Ahmed & Nawaz, 2015; Armeli et al., 1998; Eder et al., 2008; Kirkland et al., 2017). This is what will increase commitment to employees. This commitment will ultimately encourage employees to strive to help the organization achieve its goals, and increasing expectations that work performance will be considered and appreciated by the organization (Duke et al., 2009).

For employees, organizations are an important source of their socio-emotional needs (e.g. respect, caring, and tangible benefits such as salaries and health benefits) (Gyekye & Salminen, 2009). Feelings valued by the organization help bring together the needs of employees for approval, esteem, and affiliation (Casper et al., 2016). Positive evaluations from organizations also increase the belief that increased effort at work will be rewarded (Settoon et al., 2018). Therefore employees will pay more attention to the awards they receive from their superiors (Perryer et al., 2017). Positive evaluations from organizations also increase the belief that increased effort at work will be rewarded (Rockstuhl et al., 2020). Therefore employees will pay more attention to the awards they receive from their superiors (Zhou et al., 2020).

In addition, Arrfou (2018) in her research found that perceived organizational support is the main determinant of OCB, through providing support to subordinates and in the end will increase commitment to the organization which in turn will encourage employees to perform voluntary behavior / extra-role performance for achieving desired organizational goals. Some researchers found that the perceived organizational support was not always able to create OCB, Devimageshkumar (2016) found that there was a weak and inconsistent influence between perceptions of organizational support for OCB. This happens because employees' perceptions and commitment to their organizations are different, their assessment and trust in the organization are not interrelated. Whereas Ru (2018) states that perceived organizational support do not have a positive influence on OCB, this occurs because of employees who are more concerned with personal interests, promotions, and incentives, if employees do not get incentives then

the employee is not satisfied with the leader and feels heedless of his welfare, his performance will be bad. In other words when performance is poor then voluntary behavior will not occur.

Srivastava (2010) in his research explains that the behavior that will emerge from perceived organizational support is an increase in extra-role behavior (OCB) and a decrease in stress levels and withdrawal behaviors such as absenteeism and resignation. In addition, Asgari (2008) explains that a good lecturer's perceived organizational support will improve the quality of their working life and will create a sense of "moral duty" in them to the organization so that they will feel they have an obligation to pay it. The quality of superior-subordinate interaction is also believed to be a predictor of OCB. The organization will run well and can achieve the goals that have been determined if it has been embedded in the lecturers of trust in the organization.

### Trust

Trust is a psychological state when you believe in the actions of your superiors because you expect something positive from their actions (Foote & Li-Ping, 2008; Karriker et al., 2009; Korkmaz et al., 2020; Suliman & Al Obaidli, 2013). Whereas trust plays a very important role in human relations, and effective management in an organization is to enhance interpersonal relationships and organizational trust (Jahangir et al., 2004; Pond et al., 1997; (Praktika, 2014; (Van Dyne et al., 1994). Trust is related to the characteristics of attitudes and behavior of employees or organizations (Jafari et al., 2021; Kacmar et al., 2018; Sharma et al., 2011). And trust relates to a person's willingness to accept the actions of others, people will not follow others who he does not trust, and people believe that people will not help or at least hurt someone in the organization. (Dipaola et al., 2001; Dipaola & Hoy, 2005; Eskew, 1993).

In another meta-analysis, it is explained that trust can be defined as an expectation from employees, groups, or organizations for activities and a decision based on ethical principles and fairness and moral truth (Langton et al., 2013; Taghinezhad et al., 2015)). Employees will feel valued and respected and employees will reciprocate with trust and commitment to the organization (Armstrong &



Stephens, 2007; Glaeser et al., 2017; Sapienza et al., 2015)). Individual trust comes from individual expectations about interpersonal relationships and behavior within the organization (Nohe & Hertel, 2017). As explained by Narang & Singh (2012), that trust can affect affective commitment and continue commitment as well as OCB. It is recognized that trust in the workplace is a very important factor for improving organizational performance and building long-term trust and a sustainable process (Lee et al., 2013). Restructuring, high employee turnover in the workplace, leadership transitions, team dynamics, and changing operational strategies can all affect the process of building trust in the workplace (Ocampo et al., 2018). Therefore, to increase the desired employee attitudes such as trust, superiors need to convey to their subordinates a commitment that superiors care about the welfare and needs of employees or called POS (Farh et al., 2004). POS is a measure of the organization's commitment to its subordinates and employee commitment to providing feedback by behaving outside the formal rules Organ, 2000).

### Objectives of The Research

The study's major goal is to look at the impact of perceived organizational support and trust on OCB. A hypothesis can be made based on the theoretical examination and frame of mind that there is a favorable influence of perceived organizational support on OCB, as well as a positive effect of trust on OCB.

### Methods

In this study, a survey method with a casual approach and path analysis was applied. The survey is used to describe the causal relationship as well as to test the hypothesis. The data is evaluated and measured using a quantitative approach. Endogenous variables and exogenous variables are the two types of variables used in route analysis methodologies. Perceived organizational support, trust, and OCB are all variables. The OCB is an endogenous variable, while perceived organizational support and trust are exogenous

factors. The population is all the lecturers of the Islamic University of Jakarta with 109 lecturers.

### Analysis of Result

The following table shows a summary of the findings of the descriptive statistics computation.

Table 1 Summary of Descriptive Statistics

Description	OCB	POS	Trust
Average	157,61	155,86	152,55
Standard Error	0,65	0,86	0,68
Median	158	157	154
Mode	155	157	158
Standard Deviation	6,81	9,00	7,07
Variance	46,3522	81,0827	49,9164
Range	36	37	36
The Lowest	137	136	133
The highest	173	173	169
Total score	17179	16989	16628
Sample Size	109	109	109

Table 2 ANAVA for the Test of Significance and Linearity of Regression Equations  $\hat{Y} = 89,880 + 0,435X_1$

Source of Variance	df	SS	ANS	F <sub>count</sub>	F <sub>table</sub> $\alpha = 0,05$
Total	109	2712511			
Coefficient (a)	1	2707504,96			
Regression (b/a)	1	1653,39	1653,39	52,768 **	3,93
Residue	107	3352,65	31,33		
Suitable Tuna	34	1253,59	36,87	1,282 <sup>ns</sup>	1,59
Error (Galat)	73	2099,06	28,75		

Description :

\*\* : Very significant regression ( $F_{\text{count}} > F_{\text{table}}$ )

ns : Regression is linear ( $F_{\text{count}} < F_{\text{table}}$ )

The regression equation =  $89.880 + 0.435X_1$ , for the significance test, Fcount 52.768 is greater than Ftable (0.05; 1:107) 3.93 at  $\alpha = 0.05$ . Because Fcount > Ftable, the regression equation is significant. For linearity test, Fcount of 1.282 is smaller than Ftable (0.05; 34:73) of 1.59 at  $\alpha = 0.05$ . Because Fcount < Ftable, the estimated point distribution forming a linear line is acceptable.

Table 3 ANAVA for the Test of Significance and Linearity of Regression Equations  $\hat{Y} = 75,213 + 0,540X_2$

Source of Variance	df	SS	ANS	F <sub>count</sub>	F <sub>table</sub> $\alpha = 0,05$
Total	109	2712511			
Coefficien t (a)	1	2707504,9 6			
Regression (b/a)	1	1572,60	1572,6 0	49,009 **	3,93
Residue	107	3433,44	32,09		
Suitable Tuna	29	1147,61	39,57	1,350 <sup>n</sup> s	1,61
Error (Galat)	78	2285,83	29,31		

Description :

\*\* : Very significant regression ( $F_{\text{count}} > F_{\text{table}}$ )

ns : Regression is linear ( $F_{\text{count}} < F_{\text{table}}$ )

The regression equation =  $75.213 + 0.540X_2$ , for the significance test,  $F_{\text{count}}$  49.009 is greater than  $F_{\text{table}}$  (0.05; 1:107) 3.93 at  $\alpha = 0.05$ . Because  $F_{\text{count}} > F_{\text{table}}$ , the regression equation is significant. For the linearity test,  $F_{\text{count}}$  of 1.350 is smaller than  $F_{\text{table}}$  (0.05; 29:78) of 1.61 at  $\alpha = 0.05$ . Because  $F_{\text{count}} < F_{\text{table}}$ , the estimated point distribution forming a linear line is acceptable.

Tabel 4 Direct Effects Between Variables

Direct Effects	Path Coefficient	T <sub>count</sub>	t <sub>table</sub> $\alpha = 0,05$	Description
X <sub>1</sub> on Y	0,343	4,907	1,98	Significant
X <sub>2</sub> on Y	0,325	4,658	1,98	Significant

## Discussion and Conclusion

The results of the first hypothesis analysis resulted in the finding that the POS had a direct positive effect on OCB. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that OCB is directly influenced positively by POS. Increased POS will increase OCB. The results of this study are in line with the results of Zare (2012), that employees who experience a high level of organizational support theoretically feel the need to repay favorable organizational treatment with attitudes and behaviors that in turn benefit the organization such as voluntary behavior or OCB.

The results of the second hypothesis analysis resulted in the finding that trust has a direct positive effect on OCB. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that OCB is directly influenced positively by the trust. Increased confidence will lead to an increase in OCB. The results of this study are in line with the research of Zeinabadi and Salehi (2011), that the trust variable is one of the predictors of OCB. From the results of these studies, it can be concluded that the high trust of lecturers in leadership can affect the improvement of lecturers' OCB. Vice versa, if the trust of lecturers at the Islamic University of Jakarta is low, the OCB of lecturers at the Islamic University of Jakarta is low.

## Recommendation

Based on the conclusions of the study, it is suggested that various efforts can be carried out to improve the OCB of lecturers at the Islamic University of Jakarta as follows: First, the Chancellor as the highest leader should be able to guide, direct and increase the sense of responsibility of lecturers towards their work and organization. And leaders should increase their care for lecturers so that lecturers feel the care and concern from leaders for the welfare and careers of lecturers, as well as increase the effectiveness of their leadership, and increase interaction between good leaders and lecturers and can provide comfort for all lecturers and the academic community in the campus environment. Second, for lecturers to always be involved in campus activities, to be involved in the tasks assigned to lecturers, to collaborate with other lecturers and leaders. The lecturer views that in carrying out his work as a lecturer he must have internal motivation, a commitment to continue to be in his organization/affective commitment, and a love for the work that is his responsibility. Third, for other researchers, this research can be used as a reference in further research related to lecturers' OCB because the scope of this research is limited to POS, and trust.

## References

1. Abdul Mutalib Mohamed Azim and Mohd Taib Dora, (2016). Perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating role of psychological capital. *Kolej Universiti Islam Melaka Melaka, Malaysia*, 9(2), 1–16.

2. Ahmed, I., & Nawaz, M. M. (2015). Antecedents and outcomes of perceived organizational support: A literature survey approach. *Journal of Management Development*, 34(7), 867–880. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jmd-09-2013-0115/full/html>
3. Aledeinat, M., & Alrfou, H. (2017). The effects of organizational support and organizational commitment on organizational citizenship behavior: (A conceptual framework). *International Journal of Management Sciences and Business Research*, 6(5), 1-9.
4. Allen, T. D., & Rush, M. C. (2001). The influence of ratee gender on ratings of organizational citizenship behavior 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31(12), 2561-2587.
5. Armeli, S., Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Lynch, P. (1998). Perceived organizational support and police performance: the moderating influence of socioemotional needs. *Journal of applied psychology*, 83(2), 288.
6. Armstrong, M., & Stephens, T. (2007). A handbook of employee reward management and practice: Kogan Page Publishers.
7. Asgari, A., Mezginejad, S., & Taherpour, F. (2020). The role of leadership styles in organizational citizenship behavior through the mediation of perceived organizational support and job satisfaction. *Innovar*, 30(75), 87-98.
8. Asgari, A., Silong, A. D., Ahmad, A., & Sama, B. A. (2008). The relationship between transformational leadership behaviors, leader-member exchange, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(4), 140-151.
9. Bergeron, D. M., & Thompson, P. S. (2020). Speaking up at work: the role of perceived organizational support in explaining the relationship between perceptions of organizational politics and voice behavior. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 56(2), 195-215.
10. Bergeron, D. M., Shipp, A. J., Rosen, B., & Furst, S. A. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior and career outcomes: The cost of being a good citizen. *Journal of Management*, 39(4), 958-984.
11. Casper, W. J., Martin, J. A., Buffardi, L. C., & Erdwins, C. J. (2002). Work-family conflict, perceived organizational support, and organizational commitment among employed mothers. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 7(2), 99.
12. Chen, C. H. V., Wang, S. J., Chang, W. C., & Hu, C. S. (2008). The effect of leader-member exchange, trust, supervisor support on organizational citizenship behavior in nurses. *Journal of Nursing Research*, 16(4), 321-328.
13. Choi, Y. (2020). A study of the influence of workplace ostracism on employees' performance: moderating effect of perceived organizational support. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 29(3), 333–345. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJMBE-09-2019-0159/FULL/HTML>
14. Chwalibog, E. (2011). Personality, temperament, organizational climate, and organizational citizenship behavior of volunteers Title. *Journal Of Education Culture And Society*, 1, 19–30.
15. Coulter, R., and Robbins. (2012). *Management* (Eleventh E). Pearson Education Inc.
16. Danish, R., Shahid, A., Humayon, A., & Nawaz, M. (2015). Association of affective commitment with organizational citizenship behavior and task performance of employees in the banking sector. *Journal of Yaşar University*, 10(39), 56-67.
17. Deluga, R. J. (1995). The relationship between attributional charismatic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25(18), 1652-1669
18. DeviMageshkumar, S. (2016). Influence of perceived organizational support, organizational commitment on organizational citizenship behavior among marketing executives. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 4(1), 194-201.
19. Dipaola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relationship to school climate. *Journal of School Leadership*, 11(5), 424-447.
20. Dolan, S. L., Tzafrir, S. S., & Baruch, Y.

- (2005). Testing the causal relationships between procedural justice, trust, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Revue de gestion des Ressources Humaines*, 57, 79-89.
21. Duke, A. B., Goodman, J. M., Treadway, D. C., & Breland, J. W. (2009). Perceived organizational support as a moderator of emotional labor/outcomes relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39(5), 1013-1034. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1559-1816.2009.00470.X>
22. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 71(3), 500-507.
23. Farh, J. L., Zhong, C. B., & Organ, D. W. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior in the People's Republic of China. *Organization Science*, 15(2), 241-253. <https://doi.org/10.1287/ORSC.1030.0051>
24. Faruk, O. (2013). Relationship between the facets of job satisfaction and the dimensional of organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 18(1), 243-269.
25. Fouzia Hadi Ali, Sayyid Salman Rizavi, Ishfaq Ahmed, and M. R. (2018). Effects of perceived organizational support on organizational citizenship behavior-Sequential mediation by well-being and work engagement. *Journal of the Punjab University Historical Society*, 31(1), 61-71.
26. Gyekye, S. A., & Salminen, S. (2009). Perceived organizational support: An African perspective. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39(11), 2651-2668. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1559-1816.2009.00542.X>
27. Huseyin Akar. (2018). The relationships between quality of work-life, school alienation, burnout, affective commitment, and organizational citizenship: A study on teachers. *European Journal Of Educational Research*, 7(2), 169-180.
28. Ibrahim, M. A., & Aslinda, A. (2013). Relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) at government-owned corporation companies. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 3(3), 35-42.
29. Ince, M., & Gül, H. (2011). The effect of employees' perceptions of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behavior: An application in Turkish public institutions. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(6), 134.
30. Jahangir, N, Akbar, M., & Haq, M. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *BRAC University Journal*, 1(2), 75-85.
31. Jehanzeb, K. (2020). Does perceived organizational support and employee development influence organizational citizenship behavior?: Person-organization fit as moderator. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 44(6-7), 637-657. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ejtd-02-2020-0032/full/html>
32. Jiing-Lih, F., Chen-Bo, Z., & Organ, D. W. (2000). Organizational citizenship behavior in the people's Republic of China. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (pp. 1-6). Academy of Management.
33. Kacmar, K. M., Bachrach, D. G., Harris, K. J., & Noble, D. (2012). Exploring the role of supervisor trust in the associations between multiple sources of relationship conflict and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(1), 43-54.
34. Kasa, M., & Hassan, Z. (2015). The role of flow between burnout and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) among hotel employees in Malaysia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 211, 199-206.
35. Khan, R. U., & Ghufuran, H. (2018). The mediating role of perceived organizational support between qualitative job insecurity, organizational citizenship behavior, and job performance. *Journal of Entrepreneurship & Organization Management*, 7(228), 1-7.
36. Klotz, A. C., Bolino, M. C., Song, H., & Stornelli, J. (2018). Examining the nature, causes, and consequences of profiles of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(5), 629-647.
37. Korkmaz, T., & Arpacı, E. (2009). Relationship of organizational citizenship behavior with emotional



- intelligence. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1), 2432-2435.
38. Langton, N., Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Fundamentals of organizational behavior*. Pearson Education Canada
39. Lee, U. H., Kim, H. K., & Kim, Y. H. (2013). Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Its Outcomes. *Global Business & Management Research*, 5(1), 54-65
40. Margaretha, M., Susanti Saragih, A. M., & Frederick, A. E. S. (2020). Workplace spirituality, organizational citizenship behavior, perceived organizational support: a study from Indonesian Islamic banking employees. *Journal of Talent Development and Excellence*, 12(2s), 1032-1043.
41. Mayer, D. & Schoorman. (2005). Trust in management and performance: Who minds the shop while the employees watch the boss? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(5), 874-888.
42. Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior?. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(3), 351-357.
43. Nabilla, A., & Riyanto, S. (2020). The effect of job satisfaction perceived organizational support, and organizational climate with organizational citizenship behavior in PT XYZ's employee. *Saudi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5(8), 438-441.
44. Nasra, M. A., & Heilbrunn, S. (2016). Transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior in the Arab educational system in Israel: The impact of trust and job satisfaction. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 44(3), 380-396.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214549975>
45. Nohe, C., & Hertel, G. (2017). Transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: A meta-analytic test of underlying mechanisms. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1364.
46. Ocampo, L., Acedillo, V., Bacunador, A. M., Balo, C. C., Lagdameo, Y. J., & Tupa, N. S. (2018). A historical review of the development of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and its implications for the twenty-first century. *Personnel Review*, 47(4), 821-862.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-04-2017-0136/full/html>
47. Organ, Denis W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: the good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books.
48. Organ, Dennis W. (1994). Personality and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management*, 20(2), 465-478.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639402000208>
49. Perryer, C., Jordan, C., Firms, I., & Travaglione, A. (2010). Predicting turnover intentions: The interactive effects of organizational commitment and perceived organizational support. *Management Research Review*. 33(9), 911-923
50. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
51. Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: the contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86(5), 825.
52. Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(4), 698.
53. Ridwan, M., Mulyani, S. R., & Ali, H. (2020). Improving employee performance through perceived organizational support, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, 11(12), 839-849.
54. Rockstuhl, T., Eisenberger, R., Shore, L. M., Kurtessis, J. N., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., & Mesdaghinia, S. (2020). Perceived organizational support (POS) across 54 nations: A cross-cultural meta-analysis of POS effects. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 51(6), 933-962.  
<https://doi.org/10.1057/S41267-020-00311-3>
55. Rossier, J., Dahourou, D., & McCrae, R. R.

- (2005). Structural and mean-level analyses of the five-factor model and locus of control: Further evidence from Africa. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 36(2), 227-246.
56. Sapienza, P., Toldra-Simats, A., & Zingales, L. (2013). Understanding trust. *The Economic Journal*, 123(573), 1313-1332.
57. Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of applied psychology*, 81(3), 219.
58. Shams, M. S., Niazi, M. M., & Asim, F. (2020). The relationship between perceived organizational support, employee engagement, and organizational citizenship behavior: application of pls-sem approach. *Kardan Journal of Economics and Management Sciences*, 3(1), 35-55.
59. Singh, U., & Srivastava, K. B. (2016). Organizational trust and organizational citizenship behavior. *Global Business Review*, 17(3), 594-609.
60. Singh, U., & Srivastava, K. B. (2009). Interpersonal trust and organizational citizenship behavior. *Psychological Studies*, 54(1), 65-76.
61. Sjahrudin, H., & Sudiro, A. A. (2013). Organizational justice, organizational commitment, and trust in managers as a predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Interdisciplinary of contemporary Res. Bus.(IJCRB)*, 4(12), 133-141.
62. Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artifacts in the assessment of counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: Do we know what we think we know? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(4), 781-790. <https://doi.org/10.1037/A0019477>
63. Srivastava, S. (2011). Job burnout and managerial effectiveness relationship: Moderating effects of locus of control and perceived organizational support: An empirical study on Indian managers. *Asian Journal of Management Research*, 2(1), 329-347.
64. Suliman, A., & Al Obaidli, H. (2013). Leadership and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in the financial service sector: The case of the UAE. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, 5(2), 115-134. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17574321311321603/full/html>
65. Thompson, P. S., Bergeron, D. M., & Bolino, M. C. (2020). No obligation? How gender influences the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(11), 1338.
66. Tumiwa, D. G., & Pandowo, M. H. (2020). The influence of job embeddedness and perceived organizational support towards organizational citizenship behavior. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis dan Akuntansi*, 8(4). 251-259
67. Witt, L. A., Burke, L. A., Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (2002). The interactive effects of conscientiousness and agreeableness on job performance. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(1), 164.
68. Zare, E. (2012). Effect perceived organizational support on employees' attitudes toward work. *Science series data report*, 4(9). 28-34
69. Zeinabadi, H., & Salehi, K. (2011). Role of procedural justice, trust, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of teachers: Proposing a modified social exchange model. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1472-1481.
70. Zhang, Y., Liao, J., & Zhao, J. (2011). Research on the organizational citizenship behavior continuum and its consequences. *Frontiers of Business Research in China*, 5(3), 364-379.
71. Zhou, Y., & Miao, Q. (2014). Servant leadership and affective commitment in the Chinese public sector: The mediating role of perceived organizational support. *Psychological Reports*, 115(2), 381-395.