Differential Effect of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Involuntary Citizenship Behavior on Turnover Intention and Emotional Exhaustion
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\textbf{Abstract:} Organizational citizenship behavior is pro-social behavior that involves an employee voluntarily undertaking tasks that are outside their specified contractual obligations. This behavior improves organizational performance and is something that all organizations and leaders welcome from their employees. However, when a supervisor asks subordinates for organizational citizenship behavior, employees may often feel resentful as their discretion has been removed. This is known as involuntary citizenship behavior, the situation where employees are forced or coerced to perform tasks beyond their contractual obligations that benefit the organization. This study explains the negative effects of involuntary citizenship behavior. Organizational citizenship behavior is demonstrated when people are satisfied with the present situation. However, involuntary citizenship behavior is related to dissatisfaction or stress. Thus, we demonstrate the different impacts of organizational citizenship behavior and involuntary citizenship behavior on turnover intentions and emotional exhaustion. We emphasize the negative impact of involuntary citizenship behavior, and suggest that efforts should be done to reduce the negative effects of involuntary citizenship behavior.
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\section{1. INTRODUCTION}

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is pro-social and extra-role behavior that involves an employee voluntarily undertaking tasks that are outside their specified contractual obligations \cite{1}. This behavior is efficient and important as it improves organizational performance \cite{2}. Thus, all organizations and leaders welcome OCB from their employees. However, when a supervisor asks subordinates for OCB, their discretion is removed, and this situation is known as involuntary citizenship behavior (ICB). ICB may benefit the organization, but involves employees performing tasks beyond their contractual obligations \cite{3}. This study explains the negative effects of ICB. OCB is demonstrated when people are satisfied
with the situation they are currently in [2]. However, ICB is related to dissatisfaction or stress [3]. Thus, we demonstrate the different impacts of OCB and ICB on exhaustion and turnover intentions. In this study, we surveyed employees of several organizations to see whether the effects of OCB and ICB on their respective organizations are different and the extent to which ICB has negative effects on the organizations. This study emphasizes the negative impact of ICB, and suggests that efforts should be made to reduce its' negative influences. On the whole, organizations that are able to achieve results through OCB and not ICB will be more productive and efficient.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1. Organizational citizenship behavior

OCB is the voluntary performance of tasks that are essential for an organization by its employees that lie outside the scope of their formal functions in the organization [2][4][5]. These extra-role behaviors improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the organizational members and organization, even if they are not formally requested or instructed by the organization or its leader [4].

OCB is personal behavior that can be recognized officially without regard to individual duties or roles [2]. OCB is discretionary, voluntary behavior, not a response from any type of formal demand from someone within the organization [2][4][5]. This positively affects the efficiency of the organization, and promotes social development and prosperity. OCB occurs voluntarily by employees without direct involvement in the formal reward system [6], although employees who undertake OCB may be indirectly rewarded in such ways as positive managerial assessments.

2.2. Involuntary citizenship behavior

ICB is an involuntary extra-role behavior that results from the coercion and pressure of the organization, and has a negative impact on the organization. However, ICB paradoxically emerged because of the positive effects of OCB. OCB is not a direct action required by employees in their job description or formal roles [7]. Additionally, when cooperating with colleagues through OCB and serving the growth and development of the organization, it is possible to achieve individual, group and organizational development [8]. For this reason, some organizations attempt to force OCB, and instigate ICB on their employees. Although OCB positively affects not only individuals, but also organizational aspects, ICB results in negative consequences. ICB, which is performed in a forced and coercive way, reduces the levels of employees' job satisfaction and their commitment to the organization, and ultimately it is studied as a negative variable leading to job burnout.

2.3. Turnover intention

Turnover intention (TI) is an employee's intention, will and attitude to leave an organization [9]. TI can be expressed through a three-stage evaluation of employees [10]. Firstly, the current job is assessed to determine whether it is satisfactory or not to an employee [11]. If it is not, then there is a tendency to turnover. Secondly, if the employee sees turnover as more beneficial than remaining in the organization, TI occurs [11]. Finally, we explore and evaluate alternatives [11]. This involves comparing an organization with other organizations that employees can transfer to. If an employee judges that another organization is better than the organization that they currently work for, they will display a willingness to turnover.

Factors affecting TI are divided into job related factors, individual characteristics, and external environment factors [12]. Job related factors include welfare, wages, and employee’s levels of job satisfaction. Individual characteristics include gender, age, and years of service. External factors include employment availability and unemployment. These affect the individual's TI, and the individual decides whether or not to go through with transferring
organizations.

2.4. Emotional exhaustion

Job burnout refers to an employees' feelings of helplessness, dissatisfaction, and indifference about their job. It is a psychological symptom involving a long-term response to workplace stressors [13]. Emotional exhaustion (EE) is one type of job burnout [14]. EE is essentially emotional fatigue felt by people who are undergoing job burnout [15]. People feel psychologically weak and extremely tired due to the indifference and feelings of emptiness generated by Job Burnout. EE occurs due to excessive work, problems in interpersonal relationships in the organization, differences in direction, which cause members to become psychologically exhausted, weakened, and indifferent to the organization [14]. EE, unlike other attributes of job burnout, involves negative feelings about the organization and is often exhausting. EE causes negative consequences for employees and organizations, such as the TI and stress of employees, which can lead to loss to both the organization and the individual [14].

2.5. Effect of organizational citizenship behavior and involuntary citizenship behavior on the turnover intention

OCB has a positive impact on both the organization and its employees [2]. Employees who undertake OCB are generally satisfied with their jobs due to their and their organization’s growth and development [16]. When satisfied with their jobs, employees tend to have positive feelings about their organization, and as a result they become loyal to the organization. This reduces the likelihood that an employee of the organization will want to move to another organization, and the likelihood of such a change [17]. This leads to a decrease in the TI of the employees of the organization [18]. OCB and the TI of employees are inversely proportional [18].

On the other hand, ICB may initially appear positive, but ultimately increases the likelihood of psychological and financial losses to both organizations and employees [19]. This leads to employees of the organization having negative feelings about their organization [3, 25, 26, 27]. Ultimately, if ICB is prevalent in an organization, employees lose their loyalty, and members of the organization inevitably compare their organization with others [19]. This means that employees are more likely to move to another organization. Finally, ICB is directly proportional to the turnover of employees, as opposed to OCB [19, 28]. Therefore, we set the following two hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1: OCB will have a negative relationship with TI.

Hypothesis 2: ICB will have a positive relationship with TI.

2.6. Effect of organizational citizenship behavior and involuntary citizenship behavior on the emotion exhaustion

EE occurs when employees of an organization have negative feelings about their job or have job burnout [14]. EE plays a negative role in an organization.

OCB is a voluntary action by employees that benefits the organization [20]. Employees who are satisfied with the organization that they work for and their jobs are rarely exhausted from work, and tend to have a very high level of satisfaction with their jobs [21]. OCB is inversely proportional to EE, since it positively affects members [21], which means that the possibility of EE is reduced if OCB are taken.

On the other hand, ICB is manifested by coercion by organizations or supervisors, making it difficult for employees to enjoy such behavior [3]. Employees who are forced to undertake ICB are more likely to lose interest in their organization and their work, and are more easily tired and burnt out because of their jobs. Further ICB negatively affects the interest of employees of the organization and organizational satisfaction [22]. Eventually, through this process, it is easy for employees to find
themselves facing job burnout and EE [19]. It means that ICB and EE have positive relations. We have established two hypotheses through this.

Hypothesis 3: OCB will have a negative relationship with EE.

Hypothesis 4: ICB will have a positive relationship with EE.

A research model is presented in Figure 1.

5. RESEARCH METHODS

5.1. Sampling and procedures

In this study, we surveyed 200 employees from companies in various fields in Korea. A total of 152 samples were used for the final empirical analysis, being composed of 174 returned surveys minus 22 surveys which were not used for various reasons. The demographic characteristic of the sample was as follows: Gender - 91 males (59.3%) and 61 females (41.7%); Age - 52 (34.9%) were in their 20s, 38 (24.8%) were in their 30s, 34 (22.0%) were in their 40s and 28 (14.3%) were 50 or older.; Educational background - 21 (14.3%) only completed high school, 98 (64.3%) had a Bachelor's degrees, 21 (13.6%) held a master's or doctoral degrees (including graduate school students) and 12 (7.8%) were classified as others; Type of work - 54 (35.0%) were in office work, 35 (22.7%) were in sales work, 17 (11.0%) were in service work, 14 (9.8%) were in production or technical work, 17 (11.0%) were in professional work and 15 (10.5%) were engaged in other areas of work; Type of team worked for - 59 (39.0%) worked for a management team, 27 (17.5%) worked for a manufacturing team, and 66 (43.5%) were in other types of teams; Size of current team - 40 (26.6%) worked in teams of 5 or less, 56 (36.4%) worked in teams of 6 to 10, 40 (26.6%) were in teams from 11 to 20, 6 (3.9%) worked in teams from 21 to 30, and 10 (6.5%) worked in teams of more than 31; Length of time in current team - 57 (37.7%) had worked for less than 1 year in their currently work team, 54 (35.0%) had worked for 1 to 5 years, 22 (14.3%) had worked for 6 to 10 years, 6 (4.5%) had worked for 11 to 15 years, and 13 (8.5%) had worked for 16 years or more in their current team; Time working with their current leader - 41 (27.3%) had worked for less than 6 months with their current team leader, 49 (31.8%) from 6 months to 1 year, 46 (29.9%) from 1 to 5 years, 9 (6.5%) from 6 to 10 years, and 7 (4.5%) for 11 years or more; Finally, 11 (7.2%) were from the IT sector, 27 (17.5%) were from the manufacturing sector, 34 (22.0%) were from the service sector, 28 (18.8%) were from the financial/insurance sector, 35 (22.7%) were from public institutions and administration, and 17 (11.8%) were from other sectors.

5.2. Measuring variables

To conduct this study, we conducted a survey of many companies in Korea. All questionnaires were conducted using a Likert 7-point scale. Each item was measured from 1 point (not very) to 7 points (very much). The questionnaire was distributed either directly to members of the organization, or through the internet and then collected in person. First, OCB was surveyed using the sixteen-item scale developed by Smith et al. [23]. Second, we used a five-item scale developed by Vigoda-Gadot to measure ICB [3]. Third, we used a five-item scale developed by Bozeman and Perrewé to measure TI [24]. Fourth, EE was surveyed using only five items out of the sixteen items measuring job burnout as developed by Maslach, Jackson, and Leiter [14].

4. ANALYSIS

4.1. Exploratory factor analysis and reliability analysis

First, to verify and prove the validity of the survey conducted in our study, we conducted exploratory factor analysis. As a result of the factor analysis, each item was well grouped by variables. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure (KMO), which relates to the sample appropriateness of these factors was also meaningful by .883. In the reliability analysis of Table 1, Cronbach's Alpha value of each variable was 0.954 for OCB, 0.926 for ICB, 0.935 for TI, and 0.939
for EE. Cronbach's Alpha value of all variables is more than 0.70. Therefore, all of them are reliable. See Table 1.

4.2. Correlation analysis

Table 2 gives us the results of the correlation analysis. There was a negative correlation between OCB and TI ($r = -0.387$ at $p<.001$). OCB had a significant negative (-) correlation ($r = -0.160$) with EE at $p<.05$ level. Next, ICB was positively related to TI ($r = 0.358$) at $p<.001$. ICB was positively related to EE ($r = 0.499$) at $p<.001$ level. In addition, there was a positive relationship between TI and EE at the level of $p<.001$ and $r = 0.418$. However, ICB was not correlated with OCB. See Table 2.

4.3. Regression analysis

In this study, regression analysis was conducted to clarify the relationship between variables to test hypotheses. First, the regression analysis was performed to confirm and determine the effect of OCB and ICB on TI. The results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 shows that OCB had a significant negative effect on TI ($\beta = -0.383$, $p < .001$). So, hypothesis 1 was supported through this. Next, ICB also had a statistically significant effect on TI ($\beta = 0.353$, $p < .001$). Therefore, hypothesis 2 was supported through this.

Next, regression analysis was finished to determine the effect of OCB and ICB on EE. The final results of the regression analysis appear in Table 4.

In Table 4, OCB had a significant negative effect on EE ($\beta = -0.153$, $p < .05$). Hypothesis 3 was supported through this. ICB also had a statistically significant effect on EE ($\beta = 0.497$, $p < .001$). Hypothesis 4 was supported through this.

Finally, hypothesis 1, 2, 3, and 4 were entirely supported, demonstrating that OCB and ICB are closely related to TI and EE. In particular, OCB had a negative relationship with TI and EE, and ICB had a positive relationship with TI and EE. Here we can compare the value of the beta. In the case of TI, OCB had a greater impact than ICB, but in the case of EE, ICB had a greater impact than OCB. These are the characteristics of the results.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

OCB lowers TI. If workers are satisfied, they will undertake more OCB, which will reduce TI. In such cases, workers are satisfied with their organizations and remain in their organization while carrying out pro-social activities. This is a win-win situation, good for both the employees and the organization, and conducive for high performance. Further, OCB can also help reduce tiredness and burnout.

In contrast, ICB raises TI. Since ICB is involuntary, members can be dissatisfied with the organization or leader who implements ICB. Thus, they may form an intention to leave the organization. Managers should keep this in mind. ICB increases EE. When people are exhausted, they get stressed, tired, and work performance is hindered. ICB can lower the performance of workers. Forcing ICB to take advantage of OCB, such as improving performance, will in the long term result in less success.

The voluntary behavior of employees should be encouraged, as what is needed to improve performance is not pro-social behavior or extra-role behavior but this voluntary behavior. Voluntary actions are formulated in the minds of employees, who see their performance as positive and worthwhile. As a result, employees work harder, and the atmosphere of the organization also changes positively, thus helping to maintain and develop the organization. In short, voluntary behavior in employees is important to improve organizational and employee satisfaction and encourage growth. Organizations should not force employees to work, and they should help their members voluntarily undertake extra tasks and activities.

6. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE STUDIES

Despite the significant results in this study,
there are several limitations.

First, this study described only the differential impacts of OCB and ICB with TI and EE. Therefore, it is necessary to examine and test the impact of other factors such as job engagement, satisfaction, stress, and organizational commitment, which are all performance-related variables. Performance-related variables can also have a significant impact on TI and EE, so looking at these will also be very valuable.

Second, this paper stresses the negative impact of ICB. Therefore, further studies should be conducted in which variables increase ICB, such as a leader's compulsive persuasion and abusive supervision. Compulsive persuasion and abusive supervision are closely related to ICB, and these are very likely to cause ICB.

Third, the main purpose of future studies should be to explain how to reduce ICB. A search of the causes of ICB will have to find a variety of ways of working to reduce it (i.e., specific culture and leadership).

Fourth, in this study, a sample was extracted solely from Korean companies. Therefore, it is difficult to generalize this study's results to other countries, which are influenced by different factors. Therefore, in future studies, we should address the issue of whether this study can be applied to other various countries. In the future, it will be more meaningful if we carry out research that complements these points.
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Table 1. Confirmatory factor analysis and reliability analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KMO=.883</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB1</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.270</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB2</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.211</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCB3</td>
<td>OCB4</td>
<td>OCB5</td>
<td>OCB6</td>
<td>OCB7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>-.226</td>
<td>-.218</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>-.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Variance  31.076  14.052  13.105  12.747

% Cumulative  31.152  45.128  58.233  70.980

Table 2. Correlation analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>Std. dev.</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>ICB</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>EE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>4.855</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICB</td>
<td>3.838</td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>3.729</td>
<td>1.661</td>
<td>-.387***</td>
<td>.358***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>3.630</td>
<td>1.570</td>
<td>-.160*</td>
<td>.499***</td>
<td>.418***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***: p<.001, **: p<.01, *: p<.05

Table 3. Regression analysis about turnover intention

Dependant: TI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(\beta)</th>
<th>(t)</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>-.383***</td>
<td>-5.484</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICB</td>
<td>.355***</td>
<td>5.066</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2) (Adjusted (R^2))</td>
<td>.275 (.265)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.239***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***: p<.001, **: p<.01, *: p<.05

Table 4. Regression analysis about emotional exhaustion

Dependant: EE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(\beta)</th>
<th>(t)</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>-.153*</td>
<td>-2.192</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICB</td>
<td>.497***</td>
<td>7.115</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2) (Adjusted (R^2))</td>
<td>.273 (.263)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.921***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***: p<.001, **: p<.01, *: p<.05