

I RESPECT YOU AND I HELP YOU: LINKS BETWEEN POSITIVE RELATIONSHIPS AT WORK AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Dominique Peyrat-Guillard

Angers University, Granem, France,
e-mail: dominique.peyrat@univ-angers.fr

Aldona Glinska-Neweś

Nicolaus Copernicus University, Torun, Poland,
e-mail: ajka@econ.umk.pl

Abstract

The main purpose of this article is to present links identified among manifestations of employee positive relationships and organizational citizenship behaviour. The presentation is based on the results collected through a questionnaire survey conducted in Polish companies. The data analysis shows particular associations between positive relationships and organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB). Our results suggest that OCB-I (the behaviours targeted toward other individuals in an organisation) may be triggered by respect and acceptance and that OCB-O (i.e. the behaviours targeted toward an organisation itself) may be considered as effects of the relationships manifesting honesty and reliability. We suggest research avenues to capture the processes behind the described associations.

Keywords: positive relationships at work, organizational citizenship behaviour

Paper type: Research paper

1. Introduction

Since the beginning of 21st century various positive organisational phenomena have been receiving the increasing interest of both researchers and business practitioners. The majority of contributors (including those in the field of positive relationships at work, PRW) are integrated within Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS) community. However, the significant influence on this positive approach development is made also by the researchers focused on the phenomena

such as organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB), positive organisational behaviour (POB) or corporate social responsibility (CSR).

In this article we will focus on the relationship between two variables: PRW and OCB. The article is based on the data collected within a bigger research project elaborating a concept of Positive Organisational Potential (POP). POP is defined as such configuration of company resources that stimulates the positive organisational culture and climate which in turn trigger development supporting employee behaviours (Glińska-Noweś, 2010). Both PRW and OCB are considered among the key areas of POP, while PRW is assumed to be the antecedent of OCB. The article is aimed to analyse this cause-effect relationship.

2. Positive relationships at work

Relationships are the essence of the organisation as organisations functioning is based on human cooperation (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005; Dutton and Heaphy, 2003). Organisations are formed by individuals who must interact in the purpose of getting the job done. These interactions and episodes of mutual exchange are building blocks that create a relationship in the long term. On the other hand, interpersonal relationships inside and outside an organisation make the human activity meaningful. They serve as a prism through which employees perceive, judge and experience their work (Blustein, 2011). Thus, the work experience is strongly shaped by relationships with others and co-workers affect what one thinks, feels and does (Kahn, 2007: 189). In their relationships people try to understand and give meaning to each other. They need this to steer their activities aimed at task accomplishment (Makin et al., 2000: 8). As a result many organisational facets are influenced by employee relationships, such as decision making, communication and the information flow or HR practices (Kram and Isabella, 1985; Rawlins, 1992).

The ties that bind co-workers together may vary from instrumental to friendship ties (Ibarra, 1993; LePine et al., 2012). The instrumental ties are built through work role performance and include the exchange of job-related resources, mainly information. The friendship ties are less connected with a formal structure and task roles. They contain an interpersonal affect, liking and social support exchange. Peers involved in this kind of ties are likely to communicate more often, more frankly and openly. The most effective and productive relationships consist of both, instrumental and friendship ties. Such multiplex ties result in at least three advantages for relationship partners: access to valuable information and knowledge, timing and referrals. Creation of the multiplex ties is not a rare situation in organisations. Friendship ties develop often in formal teams, while simultaneously they can evolve into decision making structures, communication channels or resource exchange systems (Krackhardt and Hanson, 1993; Lincoln and Miller, 1979).

Current research stream in management studies is focused on the importance of positive relationships at work. Positive relationships stimulate positive attitude to work, employees feel less overloaded, their well-being increases (Ragins and Dutton, 2007; Grant and Parker, 2009) while negative relationships cause the opposite. Employees involved in positive relationships experience the higher sense of meaningfulness, safety and availability (Kahn, 1990). They are more willing to invest their physical, emotional and cognitive energy in helping the others (Chiaburu and Harrison, 2008). All in all it results in positive effects for the organisation performance, such as effective knowledge management (Ibarra, 1993; Gersick et al., 2000), creativity (Atwater and Carmeli, 2009), job satisfaction and commitment (Halbesleben, 2012), decreases absence and employee turnover (Chiaburu and Harrison, 2008).

The positivity of relationships at work is rather difficult to define unambiguously. It is proposed to consider it with regard to a relationship strength (Mills and Clark, 1982), emotional weight of an attachment (Kahn, 1998), affective weight, mutuality and frequency of communication (Granovetter, 1973), or subjective experiences of vitality and aliveness, positive regard, mutuality and positive physiological reactions (Stephens et al., 2012). In our approach we define the positive relationships as connections among employees that are based on positive attitudes and emotions, such as benevolence, liking, respect, acceptance and trust. Among dimensions intended to describe the relationship quality, particularly the following are relevant as they served as a basis of items used in a survey described in this paper (Allen and Turner de Tormes Eby, 2012):

- 1) Affective tone which reflects the degree of emotions within the relationship.
- 2) Emotional carrying capacity that refers to the extent that the relationship can handle the expression of a full range of varied emotions.
- 3) Interdependence concerns frequency, strength and span of influence.
- 4) Intimacy is composed of self-disclosure and partner responsiveness.
- 5) Permanence is the degree to which a relationship is stable and obligatory.
- 6) Tensility reflects the extent that a relationship can bend and endure strain in the face of challenges and setbacks.

Employees, when asked why they continue their work even if they do not have to, answer that the reason is a relationship they developed with their workmates (Halbesleben, 2012). For the same reason the positive relationships at work are considered as an antecedent of helping behaviour/organisational citizenship behaviour cycle in an organisation (Chiaburu and Harrison, 2008). The next paragraph explains the nature, elements and organisational importance of organisational citizenship behaviours (OCB).

3. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)

Based on the concept of “willingness to cooperate” (Barnard, 1938) and on “innovative and spontaneous behaviours” (Katz, 1964), Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) was defined by Organ in his monograph as an “individual behaviour 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” (1988: 4). It corresponds to positive behaviours that are discretionary “in the sense of going beyond the enforceable requirement of the job description” (Organ, 1997: 88). Moreover, rewards in relation with OCBs are “at best indirect and uncertain, as compared to more formal contributions” (Organ, 1997:87). Some overlap with other extra-role behaviour constructs (e.g. prosocial organizational behaviours- Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; organizational spontaneity – Georges and Brief, 1992 and, particularly, contextual performance – Borman & Motowidlo, 1993) compelled Organ to elaborate the OCB nature in his 1997 article: he stated that it would be preferable to avoid, if possible, reference to extra-role behaviour in defining OCB because it contains elements that many people – including the respondents themselves – would consider being part of the job. Therefore he suggested to define OCB much along the lines of what Borman and Motowidlo (1993) called “contextual performance”, i.e. “behaviours [that] do not support the technical core itself so much as they support the broader organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core must function” (1993: 73). The difference between contextual performance and OCB is that the former concept “does not require that the behaviour be extra-role nor that it be non-rewarded”, it only contributes “to the maintenance and/or enhancement of the context of work” (Organ, 1997: 90). Organ’s “objection to contextual performance is not its definition but its name”, “cold, gray, and bloodless” which lead him to “hold on to OCB”, even if it could be redefined as “contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance” (Organ, 1997: 91), a definition taken up in a recent study on OCB (Klotz and Bolino, 2013). The proximity between the concepts of contextual performance and OCB also appears when we examine their different dimensions.

Borman and Motowidlo (1993) defined five categories of contextual performance, including volunteering for activities beyond a person’s formal job requirements, maintenance of enthusiasm and application when needed to complete important required tasks, assistance to other people, following rules and procedures even when it is inconvenient, and openly accepting and defending organization objectives. Organ (1997: 90) noted that these categories “sound much like OCB” which is also a multidimensional construct: seven different dimensions of OCB have been identified in the literature (Podsakoff et al., 2000; Organ et al., 2006), and these are indeed close to the ones of contextual performance: (1) Altruism

or Helping Behaviour, (2) Organizational Compliance, (3) Sportsmanship, (4) Organizational Loyalty, (5) Individual Initiative, (6) Civic Virtue and (7) Self Development. *Helping behaviour* has been identified as an important form of citizenship behaviour by virtually every researcher (Podsakoff et al., 2000). It “involves voluntarily helping others with, or preventing the occurrence of, work-related problems” (Podsakoff et al., 2000: 516). It includes Organ’s altruism. *Organizational Compliance* has been studied since a long time in the OCB area (Podsakoff et al., 2000) – what has been called generalized compliance by Smith et al. (1983). It captures “a person’s internalization and acceptance of the organization’s rules” which “results in a scrupulous adherence to them” (Podsakoff et al., 2000: 517), even when compliance is not monitored. *Sportsmanship* is a dimension that has received much less attention from the researchers. It corresponds to a “willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining” (Podsakoff et al., 2000: 517). *Organizational Loyalty* needs additional work to improve its measurement (Podsakoff et al., 2000). It entails “promoting the organization to outsiders, protecting and defending it against external threats, and remaining committed to it even under adverse conditions” (Podsakoff et al., 2000: 517). *Individual Initiative* includes behaviours that share the idea that the employee is going above and beyond the call of duty but these behaviours are difficult to distinguish empirically from in-role or task performance (Podsakoff et al., 2000). *Civic Virtue* is shown by a willingness to participate actively in the governance of the organization; to monitor its environment for threats and opportunities and to look out for its best interests even at great personal cost. (Podsakoff et al., 2000). However, this dimension was “garbled in the process of operationalization – it came out in questionnaire rating items that referred to attending meetings, keeping up with what was going on, reading and responding to announcements and mail” (Organ, 1997: 92). Finally, *Self Development* “includes voluntary behaviours employees engage in to improve their knowledge, skills and abilities” (Podsakoff et al., 2000: 525).

Two targets of OCB have been identified: OCB-I (Williams and Anderson, 1991; Organ, 1997) refer to contributions targeted toward an individual as they are acted out whereas OCB-O (Williams and Anderson, 1991; Organ, 1997) offer no immediate aid to any specific person(s), but demonstrate and sustain high standards for behaviours at work, like attendance or punctuality (the target is the Organization or unit as an entity). Each OCB dimension has been studied in relation with different antecedents, depending on the target of the behaviours.

Many antecedents have been studied in relation with OCB. We can distinguish four categories: individual (or employee) characteristics, task characteristics, leadership behaviours and organizational characteristics (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Numerous *individual (employee) characteristics* have been studied in relation with OCB: employee attitudes (satisfaction, organizational commitment...), dispositional

variables (agreeableness, positive affectivity...), employee role perceptions (role ambiguity, role conflict), demographic variables (tenure, gender), employee abilities and individual differences (professional orientation, need for independence...). Among these, the highest correlations were observed for the employee attitudes variables whereas the relations with the demographic variables were not significant. As concerns the *task characteristics* (task feedback, intrinsically satisfying task...), the relationships with OCB are all significant in the Podsakoff et al. (2000) meta-analysis. The third group of antecedents, *leadership behaviours*, includes an important number of variables (core transformational leadership, leader role clarification, supportive leader behaviours, Leader-Member Exchange...) that are significantly related to OCB. On the contrary, the relationships between *organizational characteristics* (organizational formalization, organizational inflexibility, cohesive group...) and OCB have shown mixed results. The correlations are not significant for organizational formalization or inflexibility. However, results are interesting for group cohesiveness with a significant and positive relation to altruism and courtesy (helping behaviour), sportsmanship, conscientiousness (individual initiative), and civic virtue (Podsakoff et al., 2000). The interpersonal relationship variable doesn't appear in the Podsakoff et al. (2000) table presenting the meta-analytic correlations between the four categories of variables and OCB. We have chosen to study the link between interpersonal relationship and OCB due to the limited number of organizational characteristics that have been already studied as antecedents of OCB, the mixed results of this category of antecedents and the interesting results concerning one of the organizational characteristics: group cohesiveness. We hypothesize a significant and positive correlation between interpersonal relationship and OCB. We have focused our study on the OCB dimensions that were positively linked to group cohesiveness: helping behaviour, sportsmanship, individual initiative and civic virtue.

The importance of OCB lies in its consequences: a key point of Organ's original definition of OCB (1988) and revised definition (1997) is that these behaviours enhance organizational performance because they "lubricate" the social machinery of the organization (Podsakoff et al., 1997). For many years, this assumption went untested. Now empirical evidences are available (Podsakoff et al., 2000). They provide general support for the hypothesis that OCB is related to organizational effectiveness, although the evidence is stronger for some forms of citizenship behaviour (i.e., helping) than for others (i.e., sportsmanship and civic virtue).

4. Method

The data presented in this paper come from the research project: 'Strategic management of the key areas of Positive Organizational Potential – determinants, solutions and models recommended for companies operating in Poland'. The

project was funded by the National Science Center research grant number DEC-2011/01/B/HS4/00835. The term of Positive Organizational Potential (POP), introduced in our previous project, refers to such a state and combination of company resources that stimulate positive, development supporting employee behaviours (Glińska-Neweś, 2010). In the current project we have been considering the key areas of POP, including positive employee relationships and OCB. The project consisted of few steps. First, on a basis of theories described in previous paragraphs, our team identified a list of items to be analysed in the next step. Then, the correctness and adequacy of this list was verified through an expert discussion panel. On such a foundation, in the third step, a questionnaire was designed and sent to over 1,000 managers representing companies operating in Poland. As the result 73 responses were collected. In this sample there was a dominance of large (i.e. employment over 250) Polish companies (100% of Polish capital), representing production sector, with average employee age of 30–40 years.

The questionnaire consisted of 4 parts. The first part concerned the elements of Positive Organizational Potential. Positive employee relationships consisted of 6 items related to dimensions described in the section 1. Organizational citizenship behaviour contained 5 items referring to: helping behaviour (question 7 and 9), sportsmanship (question 8), individual initiative (question 10) and civic virtue (question 11).

In the second part of the questionnaire respondents evaluated antecedents of POP elements, in particular resources connected with: tangible resources, strategy, organizational structure, internal communication systems, innovations, control, HRM, power, employee integration and identification with a firm and leadership. The third part was focused on company development indicators and the fourth regarded a company profile. In the questionnaire respondents were asked to evaluate a state of the listed items in their companies by answering to the question: ‘to what extent, in your opinion, each of these statements characterize your company?’ The scale used in the question was between 0% (I fully disagree) and 100% (I fully agree).

5. Results

Further analysis is based on the part of the results referring to the positive employees relationships in an organisation and organisational citizenship behaviour. Table 1 presents the variables and their correlation coefficients.

All correlation coefficients presented in Table 1 are positive and in most cases strong. Additionally, to capture the cause-and-effect relationship a regression analysis has been done. The multinomial logistic regression model has been estimated for each OCB item as dependent variables with PRW items serving as explanatory variables. The likelihood-ratio test revealed statistically significant

impact of PRW elements on OCB variables, particularly between PRW 5 and OCB 7 and between PRW 3 and OCB 11. The most relevant results of this analysis are presented in an appendix.

In the results two main regularities may be observed. As one might expect, the highest associations appeared between the positive relationships, in case of every item, and helping behaviours (item #7: employees help each other in solving important, job-related problems). Particularly, the strongest correlation appears for showing acceptance and respect as the element of positive relationships. This is also the most strongly correlated item with employee tolerance of the inconveniences at work (item #8) as well as avoidance of making job-related troubles for their co-workers (item #9). It may be assumed, that the aforementioned OCB items (items #7 and #9) represent notably OCB-I perspective as other employees are

Table 1.
Pearson correlation
coefficients
for personal
relationships and
OCB

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Employees can count on each other										
2. Employees show interest in each other	.86**									
3. Employees are frank with each other	.76**	.80**								
4. Employees like each other	.58**	.71**	.79**							
5. Employees show acceptance and respect each other	.66**	.79**	.79**	.84**						
6. Condition of IRs in employee teams translates into relationships among the teams in a company	.68**	.58**	.55**	.53**	.56**					
7. Employees help each other in solving important, job-related problems (helping behaviour, OCB-I)	.64**	.69**	.71**	.64**	.82**	.53**				
8. Employees tolerate minor, short-term inconveniences in their workplace – they do not complain about trivial details, they show willingness to make efforts for the sake of a company (sportsmanship, OCB-I)	.47**	.51**	.58**	.54**	.61**	.30*	.70**			
9. Employees avoid making job-related troubles for their co-workers (helping behaviour, OCB-I)	.50**	.51**	.59**	.54**	.60**	.35**	.68**	.86**		
10. Employee behaviours significantly exceeded the standard expectations at their positions (individual initiative, OCB-O)	.61**	.60**	.62**	.53**	.54**	.49**	.58**	.66**	.70**	
11. Employees are interested in and participate in the company's everyday life (civic virtue, OCB-O)	.64**	.62**	.66**	.59**	.61**	.50**	.59**	.73**	.79**	.87**

** p < 0.01, * p < 0.05, N=73

their targets mostly. If so, our results suggest that they are particularly linked, and possibly shaped by mutual acceptance and respect as values influencing interpersonal relationships. In this group of antecedents the mutual liking should be also mentioned, as it is definitely individually-oriented and it is the most strongly correlated, comparing to its other correlation coefficients, with helping each other. This correlation, however, is weaker than in the case of other positive relationships items.

The second most strongly correlated item with positive relationship is 'employees are interested in and participate in the company's everyday life' (item #11). It is particularly associated with being frank with each other (item #3) and expectations that one can count on each other (item #1). The same elements of positive relationships are associated with OCB item #10: 'employee behaviours significantly exceed the standard expectations at their positions'. These two OCB items may be considered, on the contrary, as OCB-O perspective as they demonstrate high standard behaviour targeted in organisational performance. In the light of such assumption and our research results one may say that honesty and reliability, as the values being behind the analysed positive relationships elements, are more organisation-oriented.

The aforementioned results have been verified with the significance test of a difference on two correlations. It proved the significance of differences between the following associations:

- a) the items #3 and #10 correlation ($r=0.62$) and the items #5 and #7 correlation ($r=0.82$); $t=0,924$;
- b) the items #3 and #10 correlation ($r=0.62$) and the items #5 and #9 correlation ($r=0.60$); $t=0,851$.

Interestingly, the item: 'condition of interpersonal relationships in employee teams translates into relationships among the teams in a company' is the least correlated with OCB manifestations analysed in the survey. It suggests that organizational citizenship behaviours appear mostly in teams rather than among teams in an organisation. Anyway, if the positive relationships are contagious and they spread it on other teams in an organisation, they are linked and possible affect helping behaviours as well as interest and participation in a company everyday life (respectively $r=0.53$ and $r=0.50$).

6. Discussion and direction for future research

Our research work brings a contribution to the few studies which have analysed OCB at the organizational level and have studied the link between organizational characteristics variables and OCB. Among its limitations, this correlational field study cannot analyse the process by which interpersonal relationships affect citizenship behaviours. Moreover, we assume that interpersonal relationships are the antecedents of OCB but we cannot demonstrate this with our cross-sectional

data. Despite these limitations, our results are coherent with the ones observed with another organizational characteristics antecedent: group cohesiveness. The meta-analytic correlations (mean correlations corrected for sampling error and measurement reliability) calculated in the Podsakoff et al. study (2000) between the variable “cohesive group” and the different dimensions of OCB were all significant at $p < .05$. In their study, the correlation was .12 for conscientiousness (individual initiative), based on 7 studies and a total sample size of 2,456. It was .15 for civic virtue and .17 for sportsmanship (in each case based on 5 studies with a sample size of 1,544). The level was higher (.19 and .20) for altruism and courtesy (helping behaviour), based on 8 studies (sample size 2,651) for altruism and 5 studies (sample size 1,544) for courtesy. The correlations measured in our study between the different aspects of interpersonal relationships and these dimensions of OCB are higher. Even if we can suppose that these correlations are overestimated due to the contaminating effects of common method variance, the overall pattern of results reported in our results table support that, among the organizational characteristics variables, interpersonal relationships are an important antecedent to consider in further studies. The advantage of the study is to show particular associations between PRW and manifestations of OCB. Our results suggest notably two streams of their connections. First, we expect that OCB-I may be triggered by respect and acceptance being a basis of interpersonal relationships. Second, analogously, OCB-O may be considered as effects of relationships manifesting honesty and reliability. Consequently, we may assume that the second pair of values, i.e. honesty and reliability are more organisation-oriented than the first pair, which is more individual-oriented. It would be important, however, in future research to rely on different sources to measure the interpersonal relationship antecedent variable and the OCB dimensions. These dimensions could also be further studied in specific contexts of organizations, e.g. those representative of knowledge economy. For example, a qualitative research on OCB at Google Inc., based on focus groups, revealed eight dimensions of OCB at Google, with new dimensions as “employee sustainability” (“taking care of one’s own and others’ well-being”) and “social participation” (“participation in social activities”) and resulted in the development of a new scale to measure OCB of Knowledge Workers: the OCB-KW scale. It also revealed that some citizenship behaviours included in the previous literature (e.g. reflecting organizational compliance) could be irrelevant in the context of knowledge economy (Dekas et al., 2013). Another research avenue consists in analysing both OCB and counterproductive work behaviours (CWB) because employee often engage in both behaviours as reported in a recent study (Klotz and Bolino, 2013) based on moral licensing theory. Often considered as antithetical, OCB and CWB could in fact be observed for a same individual, for example for different targets (the co-workers for OCB and the organization for CWB, e.g. see Dalal et al., 2009).

CWB could also relieve the stress associated with performing OCB and may have a combined effect on organizational performance (Klotz and Bolino, 2013). It seems important to take into account not only the benefits but also the costs of positive behaviours (Fineman, 2006). So, positive interpersonal relationships seem to favour citizenship behaviour but could also grant employees a moral licence to engage later in a counterproductive behaviour. Consequently, “enthusiasm surrounding the study of positive organizational scholarship should perhaps be tempered until we more fully understand the interplay between positive and negative behaviours in organizations” (Klotz and Bolino, 2013: 302). This offers an interesting research avenue for future work in this field.

References

- Allen, T.D., Turner de Tormes Eby, L. (2012), “The Study of Interpersonal Relationships: An Introduction”, in: Turner de Tormes Eby, L., Allen, T.D. (Eds.), *Personal Relationships. The Effect on Employee Attitudes, Behavior, and Well-being*, Routledge, New York, pp. 3–14.
- Atwater, L., Carmeli, A. (2009), “Leader-Member Exchange, Feelings of Energy, and Involvement in Creative Work”, *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 20, pp. 264–275.
DOI: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.07.009
- Barnard, C.I. (1938), *The functions of the executive*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Blustein, D.L. (2011), “A Relational Theory of Working”, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 79, pp.1–17. DOI: 10.1016/j.jvb.2010.10.004
- Borman, W.C., Motowidlo, S.J. (1993), “Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance”, in: Schmitt N., Borman W.C. (Eds.), *Personality selection*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp. 71–98.
- Brief, A.P., Motowidlo, S.J. (1986), “Prosocial Organizational Behaviors”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 11, pp. 710–725. DOI: 10.5465/AMR.1986.4283909
- Chiaburu, D.S., Harrison, D.A. (2008), “Do Peers Make the Place? Conceptual Synthesis and Meta-Analysis of Co-Worker Effects on Perceptions, Attitudes, OCBs, and Performance”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 93, pp.1082–1104.
- Cropanzano, R., Mitchell, M.S. (2005), “Social Exchange Theory: An Interdisciplinary Review”, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 31, pp. 874–900.
DOI: 10.1177/0149206305279602
- Dalal, R.S., Lam, H., Weiss, H.M., Welch, E.R. & Hulin, C.L. (2009), “A Within-person Approach to Work Behavior and Performance: Concurrent and Lagged Citizenship-counterproductivity Associations, and Dynamic Relationships with Affect and Overall Job Performance”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 52, pp. 1051–1066.
DOI: 10.5465/AMJ.2009.44636148
- Dekas, K.H., Bauer, T.N., Welle, B., Kurkoski, J., Sullivan, S. (2013), “Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Version 2.0: A Review and Qualitative Investigation of OCBs for Knowledge Workers at Google”, *Academy of Management Perspectives*, Published ahead of print February 28, 2013. DOI: 10.5465/amp.2011.0097

- Dutton, J.E., Heaphy, E.D. (2003), "The Power of High-Quality Connections", in: Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E., Quinn, R.E. (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship. Foundation of a New Discipline*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc., San Francisco, pp. 263–278.
- Fineman, S. (2006), "On Being Positive: Concerns and Counterpoints", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 31, pp. 270–291. DOI: 10.5465/AMR.2006.20208680
- George, J.M., Brief, A.P. (1992), "Feeling Good-Doing Good: A Conceptual Analysis of the Mood at Work-Organizational Spontaneity Relationship", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 112, pp. 310–329. DOI: 10.1037/0033-2909.112.2.310
- Gersick, C.J.G., Bartunek, J.M., Dutton, J.E. (2000), "Learning From Academia: The Importance of Relationships in Professional Life", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 43, pp. 1026–1044. DOI: 10.2307/1556333
- Glińska-Noweś A. (2010), „Pozytywny Potencjał Organizacji jako prorozwojowa architektura zasobów przedsiębiorstwa”, in: Stankiewicz M.J. (Ed.), *Pozytywny Potencjał Organizacji. Wstęp do użytecznej teorii zarządzania*, „Dom Organizatora” TNOiK, Toruń, pp. 37–52.
- Granovetter, M. (1973), "The Strength of Weak Ties", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 78, pp. 1360–1380.
- Grant, A.R., Parker, S.K. (2009), "Redesigning Work Design Theories: The Rise of Relational and Proactive Perspectives", *Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 3, pp. 317–375. DOI: 10.1080/19416520903047327
- Halbesleben, J.R.B. (2012), "Positive Coworker Exchanges", in: Turner de Tormes Eby, L., Allen, T.D. (Eds.), *Personal Relationships. The Effect on Employee Attitudes, Behavior, and Well-being*, Routledge, New York, pp. 107–130.
- Ibarra, H. (1993), "Personal Networks of Women and Minorities in Management: A Conceptual Framework", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 18, pp. 56–87. DOI: 10.5465/AMR.1993.3997507
- Kahn W.A., (2007), "Meaningful Connections: Positive Relationships and Attachments at Work", in: Dutton, J.E., Ragins, B.R. (Eds.), *Exploring Positive Relationships at Work: Building a Theoretical and Research Foundation*, Lawrence Erlbaum, New York, pp. 189–206.
- Kahn, W.A. (1990), "Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 33. pp. 692–724. DOI: 10.2307/256287
- Kahn, W.A. (1998), "Relational Systems at Work", in: Staw, B.M., Cummings, L.L. (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 20, JAI Press, Greenwich, pp. 39–76.
- Katz, D. (1964), "Motivational Basis of Organizational Behaviour", *Behavioral Science*, Vol. 9, pp. 131–146. DOI: 10.1002/bs.3830090206
- Klotz, A.C., Bolino, M.C. (2013), "Citizenship and Counterproductive Work Behavior: a Moral Licensing View", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 38 No. 2, pp. 292–306. DOI: 10.5465/amr.2011.0109
- Krackhardt, D., Hanson, J.R. (1993), "Informal networks: The company behind the chart", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 71, pp. 104–111.
- Kram, K.E., Isabella, L.A., (1985), "Mentoring Alternatives: The Role of Peer Re-

- relationships in Career Development”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 28, pp. 110–132. DOI: 10.2307/256064
- LePine, J.A., Methot, J.R., Crawford, E.R., Buckman, B.R. (2012), “A Model of Positive Relationships in Teams: The Role of Instrumental, Friendship, and Multiplex Social Network Ties”, in: Turner de Tormes Eby, L., Allen, T.D. (Eds.), *Personal Relationships. The Effect on Employee Attitudes, Behavior, and Well-being*, Routledge, New York, pp. 173–194.
- Lincoln, J.R., Miller, J. (1979), “Work and Friendship Ties in Organizations: A Comparative Analysis of Relational Networks”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 24, pp. 181–199. DOI: 10.2307/2392493
- Makin, P.J., Cooper, C.L, Cox, Ch.J. (1996), *Organizations and Psychological Contract*, The British Psychological Society, Leicester.
- Mills, J., Clark, M.S., Ford, T.E., Johnson, M. (2004), “Measurement of Communal Strength”, *Personal Relationships*, Vol. 11, pp. 213–230.
DOI: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.2004.00079.x
- Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*, Lexington, MA.
- Organ, D.W. (1997), “Organizational Citizenship Behavior: It’s Construct Clean-Up Time”, *Human Performance*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 85–97.
- Organ, D.W., Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B. (2006), *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its nature, antecedents and consequences*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Ahearne, M., MacKenzie, S.B. (1997), “Organizational Citizenship Behavior and the Quantity and Quality of Work Group Performance”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 82 No. 2, pp. 262–270. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.82.2.262
- 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*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 513–563. DOI: 10.1177/014920630002600307
- Ragins, B.R., Dutton, J.E. (2007), “Positive Relationships at Work: An Introduction and Invitation”, in: Dutton, J.E., Ragins, B.R. (Eds.), *Exploring Positive Relationships at Work: Building a Theoretical and Research Foundation*, Lawrence Erlbaum, New York, pp. 3–25.
- Rawlins, W.K. (1992), *Friendship Matters: Communication, Dialectics, and the Life Course*, Hawthorne, Aldine, New York.
- Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W., Near, J.P. (1983), “Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 68, pp. 655–663.
DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653
- Stephens, J.P., Heaphy, E., Dutton, J.E. (2012), “High-quality connections”, in: Cameron, K.S., Spreitzer, G.M. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship*, Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 385–399.
- Williams, L.J., Anderson, S.E. (1991), “Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and In-role Behavior”, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 17, pp. 601–617. DOI: 10.1177/014920639101700305

Appendix

I RESPECT YOU
AND
I HELP YOU

Dominique Peyrat-Guillard
Aldona Glinska-Nowes

OCB (dependent variable)	PRW (independent variable)		
	PRW #5 Employees show acceptance and respect each other		
OCB #7 Employees help each other in solving important, job-related problems:	<i>coefficient</i>	<i>const</i>	χ^2 (<i>p-value</i>)
40%	0.0000	1.09861	
50%	0.10393	-3.91100	
60%	0.147294	-6.78364	
70%	0.243702*	-12.0324	90.6368
80%	0.368434***	-21.3894	(0.0000)
90%	0.526001***	-34.8437	
100%	0.808718***	-62.3078	
OCB #8 Employees tolerate minor, short-term inconveniences in their workplace – they do not complain about trivial details, they show willingness to make efforts for the sake of a company	<i>coefficient</i>	<i>const</i>	χ^2 (<i>p-value</i>)
40%	2.14407	-89.8929	
50%	2.13582	-87.1223	
60%	2.15346	-88.4765	
70%	2.13347	-86.5193	44.6485
80%	2.22143	-92.9907	(0.0000)
90%	2.27717	-97.6393	
100%	2.35123	-105.241	
OCB #9 Employees avoid making job-related troubles for their co-workers	<i>coefficient</i>	<i>const</i>	χ^2 (<i>p-value</i>)
40%	2.03882	-82.5406	
50%	2.11897	-86.1138	
60%	2.17943	-89.9828	
70%	2.19329	-90.8392	47.1855
80%	2.18697	-90.2079	(0.0000)
90%	2.23710	-94.1310	
100%	2.40134	-109.296	

Estimation of regression model output

Source: analysis
made with Gretl
(open-source
econometric
package).

I RESPECT YOU
AND
I HELP YOU

Dominique Peyrat-Guillard
Aldona Glinska-Newes

OCB (dependent variable)	PRW (independent variable)		
	PRW #3: Employees are frank with each other		
	<i>coefficient</i>	<i>const</i>	χ^2 (<i>p-value</i>)
OCB #10 Employee behaviours significantly exceed the standard expectations at their positions			
40%	-0.0174596	1.61018	
50%	-0.0439559	3.05293	
60%	0.0154470	0.909651	
70%	0.0863233*	-3.63181	66.3474
80%	0.0631130	-2.26921	(0.0000)
90%	0.161324**	-10.0384	
100%	2.35397	-208.082	
OCB #11 Employees are interested in and participate in the company's everyday life			
40%	0.0582054	-0.856443	
50%	0.0570643	-0.242831	
60%	0.0919618	-1.82447	
70%	0.123630*	-3.04613	58.7051
80%	0.149528**	-5.07636	(0.0000)
90%	0.204039***	-9.64662	
100%	2.40614	-208.470	

Estimation of
regression model
output
continued