A RESEARCH ABOUT THE RELATIONSHIP OF PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY AND ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICS PERCEPTION WITH COMPULSORY CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR AND THE PRESSURES BEHIND COMPULSORY CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

Suzan Ece Alkan[1], Tulay Turgut[2]

[1]Marmara University. secealkan@gmail.com
[2]Marmara University. tturgut@marmara.edu.tr

Keywords

Psychological safety, organizational politics perception, compulsory citizenship behavior, organizational citizenship behavior.

JEL Classification
D23, M12

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study is to examine the relationship of Psychological Safety (PS) and Organizational Politics Perception (OPP) with Compulsory Citizenship Behavior (CCB). In order to investigate whether CCB exists or not in Turkish institutions, 27 item-OCB scale is considered with its dimensions and asked with an introduction that whether the respondents have experienced any pressure for displaying these behaviors. Moreover, the potential pressures such as respondents' oneself, family, coworkers, organizational climate and supervisor were asked. Participants are composed of 170 employees working in Turkish finance institutions. CCB scale is divided into three factors which are labeled as Compulsory Harmony, Compulsory Devotion and Compulsory Conscientiousness. According to the results, PS does not make significant contribution on CCB but OPP makes a significant contribution. Results showed that CCB are not high among finance employees. However, employees mostly put pressure on themselves and secondly they feel the pressure of their family responsibilities for displaying CCB. Besides, self and family pressure both do not make significant contribution on CCB and its dimensions but manager, successful coworker and organizational climate pressures make significant contribution on CCB.

1. INTRODUCTION

COMPULSORY CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR (CCB) is a recent phenomenon which takes organizational scholars attention. CCB assumes that organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is exhibited by immediate supervisor, management or coworker pressure rather than voluntarism. However, OCB is assumed that it is exhibited with voluntarism rather than pressure. Most writings about OCB emphasized its positive side till today and many empirical studies state that OCB play a key role in increasing the effectiveness, efficiency and positive climate in the workplace but there are also other researches that give clues about the existence of pressure and coercive managerial implementations in the workplace and these results have risen the criticism about the voluntarism nature of OCB. Then, this question has risen: What kind of pressure is that?

Companies expect their employees to engage in more OCBs. Therefore, these extra-role behaviors become a norm of the workplace that creates coercion on workers to perform OCBs and they may feel themselves pressured directly or indirectly. These pressures may be "internal" which can be derived from the workers' own traits and preferences or "external" which may be stemmed from organizational factors such as immediate supervisor, coworkers, organizational culture, etc.

CCB concept is virtually a new phenomenon and literature about this concept is limited. CCB was analyzed on teachers in Israel schools (Gadot, 2007), on subordinates and supervisors in a large diversified company in southern China (Zhao et al., 2014) and on employee-coworker pairs in a large service company in China (Zhao et al., 2013). Also, the similar concept: Citizenship Pressure, which was developed by Bolino et al. (2010), was investigated among full-time employees enrolled in a Professional Master's of Business Administration (PMBA) program at two universities located in the southwestern United States (Bolino et al., 2010). However, CCB has not been investigated in Turkish culture yet. Therefore, this research was implemented on Turkish companies in order to seek that if there is any internal or external pressure on employees to exhibit CCB.

2.THEORETICAL FRAME AND HYPOTHESES

2.1.Compulsory Citizenship Behaviors

According to Organ, Podsakoff, and MacKenzie (2006), OCB is a behavior "that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization". Generally speaking, OCBs involve actions such as being helpful and cooperative, tolerating inconveniences at work, taking on additional responsibilities, and keeping up with company affairs (Organ et al., 2006). Besides, it is asserted that OCB increases the organizations' effectiveness and competitiveness (Bolino, Turnley & Bloodgood, 2002; Organ et al., 2006).

OCB is investigated from the positive side such as its positive image, its constructive implications, its contribution to individuals and organizations at multiple levels, and its general reinforcement of performance in the workplace till today but in recent years, the assumptions behind the concept are started to question and there are growing studies (Bolino, Klotz, Turnley & Harvey, 2013; Bolino, Turnley, Gilstrap & Suazo, 2010; Bolino, Turnley & Niehoff, 2004; Gadot, 2006; Salamon & Deutsch, 2006; Zhao, Peng, Han, Sheard & Hudson, 2013; Zhao, Peng & Chen, 2014) which have examined OCB from a different perspective focuses on internal or external pressures on employees for exhibiting those behaviors.

Gadot (2006) has proposed that OCB can arise from other motives, some of them less voluntary or less self-initiated. Among these motivations are the abusive and exploitative behavior of immediate supervisors and the pressure by management or peers to become involved in activities in which the employee would otherwise not involve himself (Tepper, 2000). For example, a manager may require that employees stay late to put in extra work on a project, or intrude on a worker's vacation to have him or her put the final touches on a presentation (Bolino et al., 2013). Thus, while the conventional approach has defined OCB on the assumption that all extra-role behaviors and OCBs are rooted in employees'

"good will," rarely has anyone taken a different perspective, suggesting compulsory antecedents to extra-role or citizenship behaviors in and around the workplace (Gadot, 2006). Gadot (2006) stated that if an external pressure is applied to perform OCB, then OCB (altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, civic virtue) lose its voluntary meaning.

Modern organizations are trying to survive in a competitive environment and their main target is to maximize their profits. Thus, in this competitive environment citizenship behavior is one of the means of being successful, thus managers expect and encourage employees to perform OCB. However, this encouragement can turn into a source of pressure if it is excessively implemented on employees. As Gadot (2006) states that abusive and exploitative activities may include exerting strong pressure on individuals to engage in unrecompensed extra-role work activities beyond their formal job definitions and creating a social atmosphere in which working extra hours beyond the formal work day with no formal compensation becomes the accepted norm. Employees may also be made to feel that unless they are willing to undertake these activities, their social position or even their formal standing in the organization, in terms of tenure, will be jeopardized.

Another important issue is that, there is not a clear boundary between extra-role and in-role behaviors. Although Organ (1988) conceived of OCB as extra-role activity, subsequent studies questioned its discretionary nature. In an attempt to increase competitiveness and the performance of the work unit, some managers and peers may try to narrow the gap between formal and informal work definitions (Gadot, 2006). Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) suggest that jobs are socially constructed rather than objectively defined. Thus, the distinction between in-role and extra-role behaviors cannot properly defined and as a consequence they are open to interpretations (Gadot, 2006).

When we examine the conceptualization of CCB, we can state that CCB concerns with external pressures like abusive supervision, market-based pressure, peer pressure, social and managerial pressure, etc. Moreover, prior work suggests that employees may engage in OCBs because they are worried about losing their job because of poor economic conditions, layoffs, or other uncertainties, and that engaging in citizenship behaviors may provide a way for workers to stand out from their peers. For instance, Salamon and Deutsch (2006) argued that employees engage in citizenship behaviors for instrumental reasons in order to demonstrate that they are exceptional employees worth retaining (Bolino et al., 2013). However, another similar concept which is called citizenship pressure also covers internal pressures besides external. It is defined as a specific job demand in which an employee feels pressured to perform OCBs. Conceptualizing citizenship pressure in this way suggests that feelings of pressure could stem from either internal (e.g., dispositional) or external (e.g., group norms, role perceptions, desire for advancement) forces (Bolino et al., 2010).

Then, these important questions have risen: Are we engaging in OCB with pressure or do we prefer to perform them with our own decisions? If there is any pressure, is it stemmed from internal or external factors?

In this study, we mainly focus on two perspectives. At first, we analyzed antecedents of CCB and select psychological safety and organizational politics perceptions as antecedents

to examine. As a second, we obtain the internal and external pressures behind CCB and the impacts of these probable pressures on employees are specified.

2.2. Psychological Safety as an Antecedent of Compulsory Citizenship Behaviors

Psychological safety is defined by Kahn (1990) as 'feeling able to show and employ one's self without fear of negative consequences to self-image, status, or career. More specifically, the concept of Psychological Safety is rooted in interpersonal interactions where individuals who perceive that they are not at risk interpersonally will be more willing to try new and different ways of getting work done hence increasing individual work performance (Ning & Jin, 2009).

Psychological Safety has many favorable outcomes such as greater job engagement (Kahn 1990), improved learning and performance (Carmeli et al., 2009), increased vitality and involvement in creative work endeavors (Karik & Carmeli, 2009), and reduced escalation of commitment to unpromising decisions (O'Neill 2009) at the individual-level.

As Dollard and Bakker (2010) asserted that a lack of Psychological Safety climate in an organization could lead to poorly designed jobs and chronic job demands. For example, high levels of work pressure may prevail because of a lack of policies, practices, and procedures aimed at maintaining work demands at manageable levels. An example could be a lack of procedures to report work overload and fatigue. A lack of Psychological Safety climate could also lead to increased pressure to hide emotions rather than express them.

In a less psychologically safe working environment, employees are less willing to examine the generally accepted ways of getting work done by suggesting new ways and eventually it negatively affects individual work performance which also covers extra-role activities (Li & Yan, 2009). We can infer that in low levels of Psychological Safety, the discretionary willingness nature of exhibiting OCB deteriorates and employees just "seem" to display extra-role activities because of refusing to face some undesirable outcomes such as losing job, retaliation from the supervisor, being compared with other co-workers who have OCBs and being assessed as inadequate by the supervisor if they do not display OCB etc. Thus, the discretionary nature of OCB deteriorates because of a social, environmental or managerial pressure on it. Besides, employees generally cannot resist or say "no" if there are coercive job demands because they think that their resistance may harm their social or formal position in the organization and also they feel that they may face with retaliation. However, in a psychologically safe working environment, employees can easily express themselves, opinions, thoughts, suggestions, etc. and therefore we expect that it has a negative effect on CCBs. Thus, we assert that:

H1: Psychological safety contributes negatively to compulsory citizenship behavior.

2.3. Organizational Politics Perception as an Antecedent of Compulsory Citizenship Behaviors

There are two widely used definitions of political behavior (Cropanzano et al., 1997). One view sees politics as an influence process that is exercised within work settings. In this view, politics includes a very general set of social behavior. However, a more common view defines politics more narrowly. In the more specific definition, the term politics is

limited to behavior that is strategically designed to maximize short term or long term self interests (Ferris, Russ & Fandt, 1989).

Since politics is an epidemic phenomenon in organizations, the impact of organizational politics on OCB has captured the interest of organizational scholars for quite some time (e.g., Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, & Toth, 1997; Gadot, 2000). In highly political environments, employees think that their performance will not be recognized properly and it is believed that rewards are generally given by considering group membership, power, nepotism, and retaliation motives rather than objective factors (Rusbult et al. 1990).

From a social exchange theory perspective, political working environments are associated with ambiguity and uncertainty that results in psychological strain and lower morale which all of them deteriorates the altruistic and voluntary nature of OCB (Chang, Rosen, & Levy, 2009). If employees perceive an imbalance in the employee-organization exchange, they start to decrease effort from their job, firstly from their extra-role activities by thinking that the decrease in extra-role activities are less likely to be recognized and punished by supervisors (Rosen et al.2009a, b). However, the above perspective cannot fully explain the relationship between organizational politics and OCB. In the 1990s, scholars asserted impression management theory to explain the occurrence of OCB. These all propose that citizenship behaviors may stem from impression enhancing and self-serving motives (e.g., Bolino, 1999; Eastman, 1994). Previous research has found employees who exhibit higher levels of OCB receive higher performance evaluations and more rewards than those who exhibit lower levels of OCB (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). If OCB accrues individual benefits, employees may engage in such behaviors based on self-serving purposes rather than the motives of altruism, reciprocity, and concern for the organization (Rioux & Penner, 2001). Individuals are more likely to engage in impression management and feel self-serving motives in highly political environments (Bolino, 1999). Therefore, organizational politics may encourage individual employees to use citizenship behaviors as a means to shape their public image and pursue personal goals. Hence, it can be deduced that employees are not motivated to perform OCB due to negative feelings towards colleagues or the organization if they perceive the workplace as political (Hsiung et al., 2012). However, they feel obliged to perform OCBs as a tool to survive in the workplace because as Bolino et al. (2010) mentioned that managers are encouraging OCB by means of organizational norms and culture, employee performance evaluation, and stories that highlight the expected beyond-duty behavior (OCB). While there can be a direct pressure on employees for engaging in OCB such as a job demand, there can be also indirect pressures such as social and organizational so that employees feel pressured to perform OCB in order to survive in the political work environment.

Gadot (2006) stated that employees may experience different types of social and managerial pressure in terms of CCB, such as immediate supervisors, powerful peers and organizational climate which in turn influences compulsory citizenship's structure. Individuals working in a political environment should have high levels of job strain because they are unable to predict how others will act or to forecast what the most appropriate action to take would be (Harris & Kacmar, 2005). In highly political environments, employees do not think that their work efforts will be recognized and valuable rewards

will be distributed by considering those efforts (Cropanzano et al., 1997). Therefore, employees may think that they cannot create a difference if they solely fulfill their formal job tasks. In highly political environments, employees may feel themselves pressured to create a difference and feel strain to seek other activities such as OCB to show themselves in order to survive. Therefore, we can deduce that the organizational politics will be a source of pressure on employees for displaying OCB which turns out to be CCB. Thus, we assert that:

H2: Organizational politics perception contributes positively to compulsory citizenship behavior.

2.4. Research Question Regarding Contributions of Internal and External Pressure Sources on Compulsory Citizenship Behavior

Three motives are identified for OCB (Finkelstein & Penner, 2004; Rioux & Penner, 2001). Two are relatively other oriented: pride in and positive affect for the organization (Organizational Concern) and regard for and the desire to help coworkers (Prosocial Values). The more self-focused impression management motives refer to the desire to be perceived as helpful to acquire certain rewards or avoid negative consequences (Finkelstein, 2011). These negative consequences should be analyzed in depth such that they can be the fear of losing job, avoiding staying behind of other coworkers, the worry about getting a low performance rate by supervisor, etc. These may all create pressure on employees that they are aware or unaware of. As Bolino et al. (2010) states, it can be understood that employees can engage in OCB because of either their dispositions, or external factors. Similarly, Gadot (2006) states that it is possible for CCB that may result from various types of external pressure such as immediate supervisors and powerful peers.

From this point of view, we have separated the factors which can affect CCB such as the person itself, the family and the work environment that consists supervisor, powerful peers and organizational climate. Family responsibilities are added to the scale because we thought that it might be an indirect pressure on employees to show themselves at work and it can be a stimulus for not losing the job. At this point, our interest is to investigate whether some sources of pressure are more significant for employees in displaying CCB. Hence, we ask the research question below.

Research Question: Which sources of pressure most contribute to CCB?

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Sample and Procedure

The sample of this study consists of 170 employees who are working in various finance organizations located in Istanbul-Turkey. Questionnaire was uploaded to a survey program and e-mail was sent to 265 employees to invite them for participating to the study. In two weeks period, 170 participants responded the questionnaire hence 64% of response rate was achieved. A brief introduction explaining the purpose of the study was given to the participants. Also, the assurance of the study confidentiality was provided by mentioning the academic purposes of the study. The fulfillment of the questionnaires took less than

10 minutes. More than half of the respondents are female (60%). Most of them are between 31-40 years old (61%), married (64%) and university graduates (74%). Respondents' tenure in their current organization is 6 years in average and the tenure changes between a range of 1-21 years.

3.2.Measuring Instruments

3.2.1. Perception of Organizational Politics Scale

The shortened version of POPS scale with 12-item by Kacmar and Carlson (1997) is used. The response alternatives of the scale ranged from 1 (totally disagree) to 6 (totally agree). While low scores mean that organizational politics is low, high scores mean that organizational politics is high in the organization. Three items from the POPS scale were omitted because of the similarity of expressions with psychological safety scale: "There is no place for yes-men in this organization: Good ideas are desired, even when it means disagreeing with superiors", "Employees are encouraged to speak out frankly, even when they are critical of well-established ideas", "Employees here usually don't speak up for fear of retaliation by others".

3.2.2. Psychological Safety Scale

Psychological Safety is measured by a 7-item scale which was developed by Edmondson (1999). The response alternatives of the scale ranged from 1 (totally disagree) to 6 (totally agree). While low scores mean that psychological safety is low, high scores mean that psychological safety is high in the organization.

3.2.3. Compulsory Citizenship Behavior Scale

Compulsory Citizenship Behaviors are measured by 27-item Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale which was compiled from the items of scales developed by Organ and Konovsky (1989; 1996), Bolino et.al (2010) and Gadot (2007). The items were selected by considering the most complaining topics at work by employees. CCB was measured with this compiled scale by asking respondents to indicate how often they felt pressure to engage in these behaviors such as altruism, sportsmanship, courtesy, civic virtue and generalized compliance (conscientiousness). The response alternatives of the scale ranged from 1 (with no pressure) to 6 (always with pressure). While low scores mean that CCBs are low, high scores mean that CCBs are high in the organization.

3.2.4. Pressure Sources Scale

The sources of pressures which can be stemmed from employees' themselves, their family, their coworkers, their managers and their working environment for displaying CCB are asked with an introduction: "If you think about yourself, the people that you interact and your working environment; could you please give a rating for the pressure is felt for each of the sources given below while considering the pressure ratings that you gave for OCB items in the previous section." The response scale ranged from 1 (with no pressure) to 6 (always with pressure). The 5-item pressure sources scale is as follows: "I feel that I am putting pressure on myself", "I feel the pressure of my family responsibilities", "I feel the pressure of my coworkers who are successful and have a strong career", "I feel the pressure of my manager", "I feel the pressure of my working environment".

4. EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

4.1. Reliability of the Scales

Cronbach's coefficient alpha was utilized and all the scales demonstrated high reliability of over .70 (Table 1).

Table 1: The Summary Statistics of Variables

Factors	Number of questions	Mean	SD	α
Compulsory Citizenship Behaviors	19	1.78	.83	.94
Organizational Politics Perception	9	2.97	.88	.86
Psychological Safety	7	3.29	.83	.84

4.2. Factor Analysis of Compulsory Citizenship Behavior

Factor analysis was carried out in order to determine factorial structure of the compulsory citizenship behavior. In factor analysis, principle components method and varimax rotation technique are used. Adequacy of the sample size and applicability of factor analysis is tested with Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett sphericity test. Through the analysis eight items are extracted because of their near factor loadings under more than one factor such that the difference of factor loadings is less than .100. The remaining 19 items are loaded under three factors. The three factors which are named as Compulsory Harmony, Compulsory Devotion and Compulsory Conscientiousness explain 67.896% of the total variance. The reliability analysis indicated that three factors have Cronbach's alpha of reliability coefficient greater than .70 (See Table 2).

Table 2: Factor and Reliability Analysis of Compulsory Citizenship Behavior

	Compulsory Citizenship Behavior Scale Factors	Factor Loading	% Variance Explained	α
Item No.	**Factor 1: Compulsory Harmony**		**24.576**	**.905**
18	Respecting to the right of the other employees	.839		
19	Trying not to cause problems for the coworkers	.814		
10	Warning the other employees for their good when unexpected problems occur	.743		
11	In work related problems do not hesitate sharing my resources with the others	.731		
12	Participating in all research and project groups for the improvement of the organization	.612		
9	Helping a new comer in his tasks	.598		
20	Do not complaining about the tasks under my responsibility	.535		
Item No.	**Factor 2: Compulsory Devotion**		**23.399**	**.896**
3	Investing more effort in my job beyond my formal job requirements	.766		
8	Performing actively in the conflict management within the organization	.745		
6	Helping others who has not come to work or who have been absent	.710		
1	Engaging in extra job tasks beside my own tasks	.704		
5	Assisting my supervisor even if I have no time or energy	.691		
2	Working extra hours for performing more than my own tasks without expecting any reward	.654		
7	Supporting the changes in the organization	.595		
Item No.	**Factor 3: Compulsory Conscientiousness**		**19.921**	**.874**
21	Working without taking a break	.853		
25	Rearranging or altering my personal plans because of work load	.755		
24	Going into the office and starting to work before the formal business hour	.677		
26	Trying to keep the attendance at work above	.669		
13	Dealing only with my job tasks through the formal business hours	.604		
KMO = .927; Bartlett's test of Sphericity = 2300.488; df = 171; p = .000				

4.3. Test of Hypotheses

Correlation analysis was performed to evaluate the relationships between the research variables. As shown in Table 3, there is a linear, significant, negative and weak relationship between psychological safety and compulsory citizenship behavior (r = -.177, p < .05). When we analyze the relationship between psychological safety and the dimensions of compulsory citizenship behavior, we can see that psychological safety weakly but negatively and significantly correlated with compulsory devotion (r = -.169, p < .05) and with compulsory conscientiousness (r = -.223, p < .01). However, there is not a significant relationship between psychological safety and compulsory harmony (r = -.081, p > .05).

Regarding organizational politics perception, it has linear, significant, positive and moderate relationship with compulsory citizenship behavior (r = .417, p < .01). Moreover, organizational politics perception is positively correlated with each dimension of compulsory citizenship behavior (with compulsory harmony: r = .363, p < .01; with compulsory devotion: r = .389, p < .01; and with compulsory conscientiousness: r = .349, p < .01).

Table 3: Correlation Analysis for Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. **Psy. Safety**	1					
2. **Org. Politics Perception**	-.153*	1				
3. **CCB (19-tems)**	-.177*	.417**	1			
4. **Compulsory Harmony**	-.081	.363**	.885**	1		
5. **Compulsory Devotion**	-.169*	.389**	.904**	.690**	1	
6. **Compulsory Conscientiousnes**	-.223**	.349**	.857**	.667**	.653**	1

*p< .05; **p< .01

In order to reveal the contributions of psychological safety and organizational politics perception on compulsory citizenship behavior and on its dimensions, regression analysis was performed. As can be seen from Table 4, psychological safety and organizational politics perception together explain 17.7 percent of the variance of compulsory citizenship behavior (Adj.R^2 = .177, F = 19.218, p < .001). However, the beta coefficients show that the variances of compulsory citizenship behaviors are significantly predicted by only organizational politics perception (β = .399, p < .001); psychological safety (β = -.116, p > .05) is not a significant predictor of compulsory citizenship behaviors. Therefore, it can be concluded that organizational politics perception is the variable that can explain the variances of compulsory citizenship behaviors. Hence H2 is supported but H1 is rejected.

Table 4: Regression Analysis for Testing Hypothesis 1 and 2

	Dependent Variable **Compulsory Citizenship Behavior**
Independent Variables	**β**
Org. Politics Perception	.399***
Psy. Safety	-.116
Adj R²	.177
F	19.218***

***p< .001

Table 5 presents the contributions of psychological safety and organizational politics perception on each dimension of compulsory citizenship behaviors. As can be seen from Table 5, psychological safety and organizational politics perception together explain 12.2 percent of the variance of compulsory harmony (Adj.R² = .122, F = 12.751, p < .001). However, the beta coefficients show that the variances of compulsory harmony are significantly predicted by only organizational politics perceptions (β = .359; p < .001). Again, the variances of compulsory devotion are explained together by psychological safety and organizational politics perception (Adj.R² = .153, F = 16.300, p < .001). However the beta coefficients show that the variances of compulsory devotion are significantly predicted by only organizational politics perceptions (β = .371, p < .001). Therefore, it can be concluded that politics perception is the variable that can explain the variances of compulsory harmony and compulsory devotion. On the other hand, as can be seen at the last column of Table 5, variances of compulsory conscientiousness is significantly predicted by both psychological safety (β = -.173, p < .05) and organizational politics perception (β = .323, p < .001), (Adj.R² = .141, F = 14.901, p < .001).

Table 5: Regression Analysis for Dimensions of Compulsory Citizenship Behavior

Independent Variables	Dependent Variable **Compulsory Harmony**	Dependent Variable **Compulsory Devotion**	Dependent Variable **Compulsory Conscientiousness**
	β	**β**	**β**
Org.Politics Perception	.359***	.371***	.323***
Psy. Safety	-.026	-.113	-.173*
Adj R²	.122	.153	.141
F	12.751***	16.300***	14.901***

*p< .05; ***p< .001

4.4. Descriptive Statistics and Reliability of Pressure Sources

As it is seen in Table 6 below, self pressure is the most felt pressure with a mean of 3.71. The other pressures that are felt by employees respectively; family responsibility pressure with a mean of 3.15, organizational climate pressure with a mean of 3.07, manager pressure with a mean of 2.97, successful coworker pressure with a mean of 2.51. Also, the pressure sources scale demonstrated high reliability of over .70.

Table 6: The Summary Statistics of Pressure Sources on CCB

Factors	Number of questions	Mean	SD	α
Self Pressure	1	3.71	1.45	
Family Responsibility Pressure	1	3.15	1.49	
Successful Coworker Pressure	1	2.51	1.49	.81
Manager Pressure	1	2.97	1.53	
Organizational Climate Pressure	1	3.07	1.50	

4.5. Test of Correlations and Contributions of Pressure Sources on Compulsory Citizenship Behavior

In order to reveal the relational power of each pressure source with compulsory citizenship behavior and with its dimensions correlation analysis was first performed. As it is seen in Table 7, there are linear, significant and positive relationships between each pressure sources and compulsory citizenship behaviors. Compulsory citizenship behavior is correlated positively but weakly with self pressure (r = .199, p < .01) and with family responsibility pressure (r = .246, p < .01). On the other hand, it is correlated moderately with manager pressure (r = .508, p < .01), with successful coworker pressure (r = .508, p < .01), and with organizational climate pressure (r = .508, p < .01).

Table 7: Correlation Analysis for Pressure Sources

	Self Pressure	Family Responsibility Pressure	Successful Coworker Pressure	Manager Pressure	Org. Climate Pressure
CCB (19-items)	.199**	.246**	.508**	.508**	.508**
Compulsory Harmony	.176*	.197*	.490**	.341**	.372**
Compulsory Devotion	.181*	.196*	.449**	.505**	.507**
Compulsory Conscientiousness	.169*	.270**	.405**	.494**	.458**

*p< .05; **p< .01

To reveal the contributions of pressure sources on compulsory citizenship behavior and on its dimensions regression analysis was performed. As shown in Table 8, the pressure sources together explain 35.9 percent of the variance of compulsory citizenship behavior (Adj.R^2 = .359, F = 19.948, p < .001). That means the sources of pressure on employees significantly explain the variances of compulsory citizenship behavior. The beta coefficients show that the variances of compulsory citizenship behavior are significantly predicted by three pressure sources: successful coworker pressure (β = .346, p < .001), manager pressure (β = .239, p < .05), and organizational climate pressure (β = .210; p < .05). However, the contribution of successful coworker pressure on compulsory citizenship behavior is stronger.

Table 8: Regression Analysis for Pressure Sources on Compulsory Citizenship Behavior

	Dependent Variable **Compulsory Citizenship Behavior**
Independent Variables	**B**
Self Pressure	-.134
Family Responsibility Pressure	.006
Successful Coworker Pressure	.346***
Manager Pressure	.239*
Organizational Climate Pressure	.210*
Adj R²	.359
F	19.948***

*p< .05; ***p< .001

Table 9 presents the contributions of pressure sources on each dimension of compulsory citizenship behaviors. As can be seen from Table 9, pressure sources together explain 24.8 percent of the variance of compulsory harmony (Adj.R^2 = .248, F = 12.152, p < .001). The beta coefficients show that the variances of compulsory harmony are significantly predicted by only successful coworker pressure (β = .436, p < .001). The other four pressures are not significant predictors of compulsory harmony.

Regarding compulsory devotion, pressure sources together explain 32.6 percent of the variance of compulsory devotion (Adj.R^2 = .326, F = 17.327, p < .001). The beta coefficients show that the variances of compulsory devotion are significantly predicted by three pressures: successful coworker pressure (β = .277, p < .001), manager pressure (β = .245, p < .05), and organizational climate pressure (β = .249, p < .05). However, the contribution of successful coworker pressure on compulsory devotion is stronger.

Further, pressure sources together explain 28.7 percent of the variance of compulsory conscientiousness (Adj.R^2 = .287, F = 14.617, p < .001). The beta coefficients show that the variances of compulsory conscientiousness are significantly predicted by two pressures:

successful coworker pressure (β = .200, p < .05) and manager pressure (β = .322, p < .001). However, the contribution of managerial pressure on compulsory conscientiousness is stronger.

Table 9: Regression Analysis for Pressure Sources on Dimensions of Compulsory Citizenship Behavior

	Dependent Variable **Compulsory Harmony**	Dependent Variable **Compulsory Devotion**	Dependent Variable **Compulsory Conscientiousness**
Independent Variables	**B**	**β**	**β**
Self Pressure	-.086	-.120	-.152
Family Responsibility Pressure	-.039	-.037	.110
Successful Coworker Pressure	.436***	.277***	.200*
Manager Pressure	.069	.245*	.322***
Organizational Climate Pressure	.150	.249*	.139
Adj R²	.248	.326	.287
F	12.152***	17.327***	14.617***

*p< .05; ***p< .001

5. CONCLUSION

OCB is mainly criticized because of the accepted assumption in the literature that it has a discretionary nature. Scholars instead support the argument that OCB is not based on the genuine, spontaneous "good will" of the individual (Gadot, 2006). Instead, it emerges in response to external pressures by significant and powerful others in the workplace (i.e., managers or co-workers) who wish to increase the employees' work load by involving them in duties that are beyond the scope of their job description (Porpara, 1989).

When we take a look at the literature, it is considered that compulsory citizenship behaviors are measured by different scales. For example, Gadot (2007) measured compulsory citizenship behaviors with 5 items that includes pressure expressions and scholars mentioned the necessity to generate a more comprehensive scale which covers the pressures for engaging in more than one kind of OCB (altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy or civic virtue) and also it is mentioned that CCB can result from various types of external pressures such as immediate supervisors, powerful peers and organizational climate (Gadot, 2006; Zhao et al, 2013). From these points of view, we have used the OCB scale with an introduction that includes whether employees experience any

pressure to perform these CCBs in order to measure the pressure level on all CCB items. Also, we have thought that there can be external or internal pressures for performing these CCBs and we obtained five sources of pressures such as they may be stemmed from the self, family responsibilities, successful coworkers, immediate supervisors and organizational climate.

In the factor analysis of our CCB scale, 3 factors has emerged which are labeled according to the content of the items as compulsory harmony, compulsory devotion and compulsory conscientiousness. The first factor is labeled as compulsory harmony because of containing different items which were classified under different factors such as courtesy, altruism, civic virtue and sportsmanship in the literature and which express harmonic relationships. The second factor is labeled as compulsory devotion because of containing items which can be assessed as satisfactory behaviors such as engaging in extra job tasks, investing more effort in the job beyond the requirements, working extra hours, etc. The third factor is labeled as compulsory conscientiousness because of containing items which can be assessed as dutiful behaviors such as working without taking a break, starting to work before formal business hours, dealing only with job tasks through formal business hours, etc.

According to the results of correlation analysis, psychological safety is in a significant and negative relationship with CCB; but when it has been regressed together with organizational politics perception on CCB, it appeared to have no significant contribution to CCB. However, politics perception has a significant and positive contribution to CCB and its all three dimensions. Thus, politics perception should be considered as a pressure source for displaying compulsory citizenship behaviors. Employees generate two different behavior types in response to organizational politics: staying or leaving. When they leave the political organization, the problem is solved but when they choose to stay, they should cope with the political relationships so this coping refers to a pressure on the employee and it increases CCB.

Psychological safety has no significant contribution to CCB but it has a significant and negative contribution to compulsory conscientiousness. People feel safe in situations in which they trusted that they would not suffer for their personal engagement (Kahn, 1990) and not surprisingly, conscientiousness has also been considered as an aspect of contextual performance by Smith, Organ, and Near (1983). It can be stated that psychological safety has a negative contribution on the pressure level for displaying compulsory conscientiousness behavior and it affects the conscientiousness of the employees positively.

According to the results, it can be concluded that employees in finance sector do not feel much pressure for displaying compulsory citizenship behaviors. However, the highest pressure level that the employees felt is self pressure. It means that employees put pressure on themselves for displaying CCB. It is interesting that family responsibility pressure is the second most felt pressure by employees for displaying CCB. It may mean that employees try to be distinguished at work in order to continue earning money. We all hear from around that people are working for giving their children a good future,

increasing their quality of life, etc. We can assert that people are reflecting these thoughts about their family responsibilities to their work and maybe they think that they have to exhibit CCB in order to survive at work and continue to make a living. The third most felt pressure by employees is the organizational climate pressure. Organizational climate consists of norms, behaviors, rules, work and role definitions, etc. so these all generate employees' behavioral patterns at work. It means that employees display CCB by regarding these behavioral patterns. The fourth most felt pressure by employees is the manager pressure. This result is in line with Gadot's (2006) and Zhao's (2014) interferences about the immediate supervisor and abusive supervision. The least felt pressure by employees is the successful coworker pressure.

In the regression analysis, successful coworker, manager and organizational climate pressures make contribution to CCB and compulsory devotion. However, successful coworker pressure is the only pressure for making contribution on compulsory harmony despite its lower mean among other pressure sources. It has also contribution to compulsory devotion and compulsory conscientiousness. These results give us the clue that a low level of successful coworker pressure is enough for shaping the behaviors. Coworker pressure is an indirect pressure on employees, not such a direct pressure with giving orders by successful employees. Employees always compare themselves with coworkers and try to take actions according to these comparisons. When we analyze it from another point of view, coworkers are likely to be jealous of the relationship and threatened by the positive outcomes that OCB can bring about for the employee when they recognize that some of their coworkers are in high-quality LMX relationships with their supervisors (Bowler et al., 2010). Therefore, employees would like to engage in extra-role activities with the pressure of "catching-up" their coworkers. For example, the items in compulsory devotion and compulsory conscientiousness such as "Working without taking a break" , "Going into the office and starting to work before the formal business hour", "Investing more effort in my job beyond my formal job requirements" or "Engaging in extra job tasks beside my own tasks" are drawing a picture of a competitive working environment.

Manager pressure makes contribution to CCB, compulsory devotion and compulsory conscientiousness. Our study is in line with the phenomenon of abusive management suggested by Tepper (2000) and later developed by Zellars et al. (2002) and Tepper et al. (2004) but the managerial pressure in this study rather refers to excessive requests by the managers which the employees cannot refuse to comply (Gadot, 2007). Finance organizations are institutional organizations and the human resource management is professional so we do not expect that there can be a verbal or physical abuse on employees for engaging in CCB by the managers. We consider that manager pressure rather refers to indirect intervention in this study.

Organizational climate is another pressure for engaging in CCB. It covers the psychological relationships, the way the works are done, attributions, expectations and perceptions of the employees, etc. in the working environment. It has a contribution to CCB and compulsory devotion. It is meaningful that compulsory devotion includes several behaviors such as helping, managing conflicts, showing greater effort, taking responsibility

of extra tasks, working extra hours, supporting the changes and the organizational environment covers all the elements and behaviors in the workplace so it probably creates a social pressure on employees to perform these CCBs.

Family responsibility pressure and the pressure that is stemmed from the self are not significant predictors of CCB. Family responsibilities and the pressure that is stemmed from the self may not be considered as a pressure by participants because they are internal factors which depend on the employees' characters and family life. However; work–sourced (external) pressures such as successful coworkers, managers and organizational climate mostly put pressure on employees to perform CCB according to the results.

6. Limitations and Recommendations

The results of present study are based on a convenience sample so our results cannot be generalized. The data was collected in İstanbul / Turkey and from different finance institutions. Although the sample size is large enough, it may be implemented on a larger sample in further research for the results can be generalized. Also, our study is cross-sectional so we cannot conclude cause-effect relationships among the variables. It may be interesting to conduct this study in a longitudinal format in order to make cause-effect interpretations.

Our study is conducted in finance institutions with professional human resource implementations so low pressure level for displaying CCB is reasonable for our study. If a similar study is conducted in other sectors, in other organizational cultures or in family-owned businesses, higher level of pressure for displaying CCB might be revealed.

REFERENCES

Bolino, M., C., Turnley, W., H., Gilstrap, J., B., Suazo. (2010). Citizenship Under Pressure: What's A "Good Soldier" To Do? Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31, 835–855.

Bolino, M., C., Turnley, W., H., Bloodgood, J., M. (2002).Citizenship Behavior and the Creation of Social Capital in Organizations. Academy of Management Review, 27, 505–522.

Bolino, M., C., Klotz, A., C., Turnley, W., H., Harvey, J. (2013).Exploring the Dark Side of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34, 542–559.

Bolino, M., C., Turnley, W., H., Niehoff, B., P. (2004). The Other Side of the Story: Reexamining Prevailing Assumptions About Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Human Resource Management Review, 14, 229-246.

Bolino, M., C. (1999). Citizenship and Impression Management: Good Soldiers or Good Actors? Academy of Management Review, 24, 82–98.

Bowler, W., M., Halbesleben, J., R., B., Paul, J., R., B. (2010). If You're Close With the Leader, You Must Be a Brown Nose: The Role of Leader–Member Relationships in Follower, Leader, and Coworker Attributions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior Motives. Human Resource Management Review, 20, 309–316.

Carmeli, A., Brueller, D., Dutton, J. (2009). Learning Behaviours in the Workplace: The Role Of High-Quality Interpersonal Relationships and Psychological Safety. Systems Research & Behavioral Science, 26(1), 81–98.

Chang, C., H., Rosen, C., C., Levy, P., E. (2009). The relationship between perceptions of organizational politics and employee attitudes, strain, and behavior: A meta-analytic examination. Academy of Management Journal, 52, 779–801.

Cropanzano, R., Howes, J. C., Grandey, A. A., Tooth, P. (1997). The Relationship of Organizational Politics and Support to Work Behaviors, Attitudes, and Stress. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18, 159–180.

Dollard, M., F., Bakker, A., B. (2010). Psychosocial Safety Climate as a Precursor to Conducive Work Environments, Psychological Health Problems, and Employee Engagement. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83, 579–599.

Eastman, K., K. (1994). In The Eyes of the Beholder: An Attributional Approach to Ingratiation and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Academy of Management Journal, 37, 1379–1391.

Edmondson, A., C. (1999). Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44, 350-383.

Finkelstein, M., A., Penner, L., A. (2004). Predicting organizational citizenship behavior: Integrating the functional and role identity approaches. Social Behavior and Personality, 32, 383–398.

Finkelstein, M., A. (2011). Instrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Functional Approach to Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Journal of Psychological Issues in Organizational Culture, Volume 2, Number 1.

Ferris, G., R., Russ, G., S. Fandt, P., M. (1989).Politics in Organizations.Pp. 143-170 in R.A. Giacalone & P. Rosenfeld (Ed.), Impression Management in the Organization. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gadot, E., V. (2007). Redrawing the Boundaries of OCB? An Empirical Examination of Compulsory Extra-Role Behavior in the Workplace. Journal of Business and Psychology, Volume 21, Issue 3, 377-405.

Gadot, E., V. (2006). Compulsory Citizenship Behavior: Theorizing Some Dark Sides of the Good Soldier Syndrome in Organizations. Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 36:10021–8308.

Gadot, E., V. (2000). Internal Politics in Public Administration Systems: An Empirical Examination of Its Relationship with Job Congruence, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and In-Role Performance. Public Personnel Management, 29, 185–210.

Harris, K., J., Kacmar, K., M. (2005).Easing the Strain: The Buffer Role of Supervisors in the Perceptions of Politics–Strain Relationship. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 78, 337–354.

Hsiung, H., H., Lin, C., W., Lin, C., S. (2012). Nourishing or Suppressing? The contradictory Influences of Perception of Organizational Politics on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 85, 258–276.

Kacmar, K., M., Carlson, D., S. (1997). Further Validation of the Perceptions of Politics Scale (POPS): A Multi-Sample Approach. Journal of Management, 23, 627- 658.

Kahn, W., A. (1990).Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work. Academy of Management Journal, 33(4): 692–724.

Karik, R., Carmeli, A. (2009). Alive and Creating: The Mediating Role of Vitality and Aliveness in the Relationship Between Psychological Safety and Creative Work Involvement. Journal of Organization Behavior, 30: 785–804.

Li, N.,Yan, J. (2009). The Effects of Trust Climate on Individual Performance. Frontiers of Business Research In China, 3, 27-49.

Ning, L., Jin, Y. (2009). The Effects of Trust Climate on Individual Performance. Front. Bus. Res. China, 3(1): 27–49.

O'Neill, O., A. (2009). Workplace Expression of Emotions and Escalation of Commitment. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39, 2396–2424.

Organ, D., W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Organ, D., W. (1988). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Organ, D., W., Konovsky, M. (1989).Cognitive Versus Affective Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74, 157-164.

Organ, D., W., Konovsky, M. (1996).Dispositional and Contextual Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol.17, 253-266.

Podsakoff, N., P., Podsakoff, P., M., Whiting, S., W., Blume, B., D. (2009). Individual- and Organizational-Level Consequences of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Meta-Analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 94, No. 1, 122–141.

Porpara, D.,V. (1989). Four Concepts of Social Structure. Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 19, 195–211.

Rioux, S., M., Penner, L., A. (2001). The Causes of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Motivational Analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 1306–1314.

Rosen, C., C., Chang, C., H., Johnson, R., E., Levy, P., E. (2009a). Perceptions of the Organizational Context and Psychological Contract Breach: Assessing Competing Perspectives. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 108, 202–217.

Rosen, C. C., Harris, K. J., & Kacmar, K. M. (2009b). The Emotional Implications of Perceived Organizational Politics: A Process Model. Human Relations, 62, 27–57.

Rusbult, C., Campbell, M., Price, M. (1990). Rational selective exploitation and distress: Employee reactions to performance based and mobility-based reward allocations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 487–500.

Salamon, S., D., Deutsch, Y. (2006). OCB as a Handicap: An Evolutionary Psychological Perspective. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27, 185– 199.

Salancik, G., R., Pfeffer, J. (1978). A Social Information Processing Approach to Job Attitudes and Task Design. Administrative Science Quarterly, 23, 224–253.

Smith, C., A., Organ, D., W., Near, J., P. (1983). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 655–663.

Tepper, B., J. (2000).Consequences of Abusive Supervision. Academy of Management Journal, 43, 178–190.

Tepper, B., J., Duffy, M., K., Hoobler, J., Ensley, M., D. (2004). Moderators of the Relationships Between Coworkers' Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Fellow Employees' Attitudes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 89, 455–465.

Zellars, K., L., Tepper, B., J., Duffy, M., K. (2002).Abusive Supervision and Subordinates' Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol.87, No.6, 1068-1076.

Zhao, H., Peng, Z., Chen, H., K. (2014). Compulsory Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Role of Organizational Identification and Perceived Interactional Justice. The Journal of Psychology, 148(2), 177-196.

Zhao, H., Peng, Z., Han, Y., Sheard, G., Hudson, A. (2013). Psychological Mechanism Linking Abusive Supervision and Compulsory Citizenship Behavior: A Moderated Mediation Study. The Journal of Psychology, 147(2), 177-195.