



The Relationship Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Work Engagement: The Example of Sports Park Employees*

Mehmet Akif FİLİZ¹, Mehmet KARGÜN²

¹Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi, Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü

²Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi, Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi, Spor Yöneticiliği Bölümü

Abstract

Orijinal Makale

This research aims to examine the relationship between work engagement and organizational citizenship behaviors of Sports Park employees. The research was designed by adopting the correlational research design, which is among the quantitative research methods. The G-power 3.18 statistical program was used to determine the research group. A total of 204 employees, 134 males (65.7%) and 70 females (35.7%), participated in the research. Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Scale and Utrecht Work Engagement Scale were used as data collection tools. The data obtained from the participants were analysed using the IBM SPSS package programme. It was found that there were positive, significant relationships between the work engagement scale and the sub-dimensions of the organisational citizenship behaviour scale, namely formal role behaviour, organisational voice, and helping. On the other hand, it was determined that 35.6% of the variance in the dependent variable was explained by the independent variables. As a result of the research, it was concluded that as the organisational citizenship behaviours of the employees increase, their engagement to work may also increase.

Keywords: Work
Engagement, Behavior,
Organizational Citizenship.

Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı ile İşe Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişki: Spor Parkı Çalışanları Örneği

Original Article

Öz

Bu araştırma, Spor Parkı çalışanlarının işe bağlılıkları ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırma nicel araştırma yöntemleri arasında yer alan korelasyonel araştırma deseni benimsenerek tasarlanmıştır. Araştırma grubunun belirlenmesinde G-power 3.18 istatistik programından faydalanılmıştır. Araştırmaya 134'ü erkek (%65.7), 70'i kadın (%35.7) olmak üzere toplam 204 çalışan katılım sağlamıştır. Araştırma kapsamında Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Ölçeği ile Utrecht İşe Bağlılık Ölçeği veri toplama aracı olarak kullanılmıştır. Katılımcılardan elde edilen veriler IBM SPSS paket programından faydalanılarak analiz edilmiştir. İşe bağlılık ölçeği ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ölçeği alt boyutlarından biçimsel rol davranışı, örgütsel ses ve yardımseverlik arasında pozitif yönlü anlamlı ilişkilerin olduğu bulgusuna ulaşılmıştır. Diğer yandan bağımlı değişkendeki %35.6'lık varyansın bağımsız değişkenler tarafından açıklandığı tespit edilmiştir. Araştırma sonucunda çalışanların örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arttıkça işe bağlılıklarının da artabileceği sonucuna ulaşılmıştır.

Yayın Bilgisi
Gönderi Tarihi: 10.03.2025
Kabul Tarihi: 16.04.2025
Online Yayın Tarihi: 29.04.2025

Anahtar kelimeler: İşe
Bağlılık, Davranış,
Örgütsel Vatandaşlık.

Sorumlu Yazar: Mehmet Akif FİLİZ

E-mail: mehmet.akf.flz@hotmail.com

How to cite this article: Filiz, M.A. & Kargün, M. (2025). The Relationship Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Work Engagement: The Example of Sports Park Employees. *Journal of Global Sport and Education Research*, VIII (1):45-57 DOI: 10.55142/jogser.1655170

*This research was conducted under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Mehmet Kargün within the scope of Mehmet Akif Filiz's doctoral thesis.

INTRODUCTION

The realisation of the target goals of organisations is closely related to the harmonious and harmonious formation of different elements together. In particular, elements such as employees' attitudes and behaviours that will benefit the organisation and their determination and engagement to their work support these coherent and harmonious behaviours. Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB), which is one of these behaviours, is the extra behaviours that are not officially rewarded as a result of the benefits provided to the organisation as a result of the actions and behaviours that the employee performs with his/her own free will outside the job description (Alper Ay, 2018). In a way, these behaviours are not among the actions or behaviours performed in line with a goal. Because they are instinctive behaviours that the employee performs instinctively without pursuing a goal (Organ, 1997). Organisational citizenship behaviours have important outcomes for the organisation and the employee. Increasing organisational engagement and effectiveness behaviours can be mentioned as examples. In fact, organisational citizenship behaviours, such as behaviours related to the organisation beyond the daily behaviour patterns of employees, such as the willingness to make an effort, can increase the performance level of the employee and produce beneficial results for the organisation (Hoy & Tarter, 2004). In order for a behaviour to be accepted as organisational citizenship behaviour, the behaviour to be performed by the individual must provide efficiency and benefit within the scope of organisational goals and objectives, which are not subject to job description or regulations, documents or punishment and reward factors by managers (Demirel & Özçınar, 2009). If the behaviours performed by the working individuals are among the behaviours that are punished or rewarded by the organisation, this action should not be considered within the scope of organisational citizenship behaviour. In the literature, it is stated that organisational citizenship behaviour should be examined in two parts: individual and organisational (Vey & Campbell, 2004). It is possible to say that the behaviours and attitudes formed between individuals are a set of behaviours that have direct effects on individuals and indirect effects on the organisation (Demirel & Güner, 2009). In general, OCB refers to the behaviours that individuals do in favour of the organisation without reward and punitive elements without being tied to their work. In this context, OCB include situations such as helping other colleagues in the problems that arise in the processes involving the performance of a job in organisations, facilitating the work of colleagues, not causing problems when asked to do a job even though the employee does not have a duty, not complaining about the fulfilment of tasks that arise suddenly or

instantly. In addition, behaviours such as contributing to the regular, efficient and harmonious work environment of employees, expressing positive opinions towards other institutions or people in their social life related to the institution they work for, organisational engagement, protecting organisational resources, avoiding unnecessary waste of resources, contributing to the formation of a harmonious, peaceful and harmonious organisational climate instead of internal conflict and unrest are generally included in organisational citizenship behaviours. When considered in this context, organisational citizenship behaviours have many important aspects for both the employee and the organisation. Organisational citizenship behaviour may be directly or indirectly related to concepts such as the relationship between the organisation and the employee, organisational engagement and belonging.

Among these, the concept of work engagement (WE) is an important point for both the organisation and the employee. In order for the organisation to achieve its goals and objectives in the desired direction, the engagement of its employees to work can play an important role because work engagement is an important factor for employees to have a high level of performance, to work more efficiently and with a higher mood than normal (Freudenberger, 1974; Tutar, 2000). The concept of work engagement appears as a cognitive belief that the employee identifies with the job in a psychological way (Griffin et al., 2010). In addition to these psychological processes of work engagement, it also describes a positive psychological state about working towards work, supported by the employee's sense of willingness to work, dedication and focus (Schaufeli et al., 2002). In general, the concept of WE is a positive mood and cognitive state that is felt continuously rather than temporarily, not tied to a specific object, event, person or action (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). The concept of WE is a concept for employees who have certain characteristics. WE is not only a state that is formed by working hard or being willing to work hard. Many different factors can be mentioned in the formation and continuity of the concept of WE. These factors such as gender, age, tenure, the needs of the employee, the set of values that the employee believes in, individual characteristics, the educational level of the person, organisational citizenship, job qualifications, work and social environment, organisational climate are among the factors that affect the formation of work engagement in a person or their work engagement (Singh & Gupta, 2015). As there are factors that are effective in the formation or continuation of work engagement, employees with work engagement have certain characteristics. The job of an employee with work engagement is very important for him/her and he/she performs the actions required by his/her job in a complete manner (Güldü, 2019). In addition, all the

intensity of the employee will be on his/her work, and he/she will continue his/her work continuously without shirking or absenteeism. As the work engagement to work increases, their engagement to the organisation will increase and the expectation of working at work for a long time will increase, and the expectation of working at work for a long time will increase (Ebeh et al., 2017). This situation may contribute to the increase in organisational citizenship behaviours within the organisation and may directly or indirectly contribute to the realisation of the goals and objectives of the organisation.

Organisational citizenship behaviour can be defined as behaviours that do not involve a reward and punishment system, represent a voluntary basis, and are directed towards the benefits of the organisation. Work engagement, on the other hand, can be expressed in the most general sense as the level of pleasure employees get from their work and their willingness to continue their work (Lambert et al., 2018; Sharma et al., 2012). These two situations are among the important factors in the realisation of the goals and objectives of organisations and in the behaviours of employees towards work. In this direction, the relationship between WE and OCB is an important point for employees and the organisation they work for because organisational citizenship behaviour includes behaviours that benefit the organisation without depending on the reward and punishment system. In this context, the work engagement to his/her job can be effective in organisational citizenship behaviours. In this context, the main research question is: Is there a relationship between the organizational citizenship behaviors of sports park employees and their work engagement?

METHODOLOGY

This research was designed by adopting the correlational research method, which is among the quantitative research methods, in order to examine the relationship between organisational citizenship behaviours and work engagement of Sports Park employees. The relational screening model is the revealing of the relationship or effect between two different quantitative variables through a correlation coefficient (Fraenkel et al., 2012). The main purpose of the studies conducted in the form of correlation type relationship is to examine whether the variables change together or, if there is a change, in what way.

Research Group

G-power 3.18 program was used as a reference in determining the research group. The α value was calculated as 0.05, the medium effect size as 0.15, and the Power ($1-\beta$) as 0.95. According to the result of Critical $F= 2.2.2.4447662$, Actual power= 0.9505747, it was

determined that at least 129 Sports Park employees should participate in the research. When the research group is analysed, it is seen that 134 of the participants are male, and 70 of them are female. Accordingly, it can be said that the research group can represent the universe. On the other hand, 20 of the employees stated that they had a high school education, 177 of them had a university education, and 7 of them had postgraduate education. 24 of the employees stated that their income was more than their expenses, 97 of them stated that their income and expenses were equal, and 83 of them stated that their income was less than their expenses. Regarding the distribution of the employees according to the duration of their employment in their current organisations, 75 of them have been working for 2 years or less, 69 of them have been working between 3-5 years and 60 of them have been working for 6 years or more. The average age of the employees was found to be 28.32 (Mean=28.32 n=204). This research was prepared with ethical approval from Tokat Gaziosmanpşa University Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee dated 24.12.2024, session number 21 and decision number 21.25. The data obtained in the research were collected through Google Forms.

Table 1. Research group

Gender	n	%
Male	134	65.7
Female	70	34.3
Education Status	n	%
High school	20	9.8
University	177	86.8
Postgraduate	7	3.4
Income Status	n	%
My Income is More than My Expenses	24	11.8
My Income Equals My Expenses	97	47.5
My Income is Less than My Expenses	83	40.7
Working Time	n	%
2 years or less	75	36.8
3-5 years	69	33.8
6 years or more	60	29.4
Age	n	Mean
Age	204	28.32

Data Collection Tools

(UWE) Work Engagement Scale

The one-factor model of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWE) developed by Schaufeli et al. (2002) and adapted into Turkish by Eryılmaz and Doğan (2022) consists of a total of 9 items and one dimension. The measurement tool is designed as a 5-point Likert type and there are no reverse-scored items in the scale. The internal consistency coefficient of the single-factor model was 0.91.

(OCBS) Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Scale

The measurement tool was developed by Van Dyne and LePine (1998) and adapted into Turkish by Sancar and Bekaroğlu (2020). The measurement tool consists of 3 sub-dimensions in total. These sub-dimensions are formal role behaviour, organisational voice and helping. The measurement tool is designed as a 5-point Likert type. There are no reverse-scored items in the measurement tool. The internal consistency coefficients of the sub-dimensions are 0.94, 0.90 and 0.96 respectively.

Data Analysis

IBM SPSS 24 package programme was used in the statistical procedures to be applied. The data obtained from the participants within the scope of the research. In order to decide which statistical procedures to apply, the kurtosis and skewness values of the measurement tools should take values between +1.5 and -1.5 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Accordingly, it was determined that WE scale and OCB scale sub-dimensions of formal role behaviour, organisational voice and cooperation showed normal distribution and statistical procedures were based on parametric tests. On the other hand, the mean score of the OCB scale was found to be 4.109. Among the sub-dimensions of the OCB scale, the mean score of the formal role behaviour sub-dimension was 4,483, the mean score of the organisational voice sub-dimension was 4,097, and the mean score of the helping sub-dimension was 4,314. Internal consistency coefficients, skewness and kurtosis values, mean scores and sub-dimensions of the scale are presented in Table 2.

Tablo 2. Statistical results related to WE scale and OCB scale sub-dimensions

Scale		Statistic
Work Engagement	Mean	4.109
	Std. Deviation	.606
	Skewness	-.738
	Kurtosis	.864
	Coefficient ω	0.875
	Coefficient α	0.911
Formal Role Behaviour	Mean	4.483
	Std. Deviation	.492
	Skewness	-.816
	Kurtosis	.553
	Coefficient ω	0.892
	Coefficient α	0.885
Organisational Voice	Mean	4.097
	Std. Deviation	.602
	Skewness	-.240
	Kurtosis	-.474
	Coefficient ω	0.849

	Coefficient α	0.862
	Mean	4.314
	Std. Deviation	.552
	Skewness	-.374
	Kurtosis	-.459
	Coefficient ω	0.879
	Coefficient α	0.862

RESULTS

Table 3. The relationship between WE scale and OCB scale sub-dimensions

Scale		1	2	3	4
	r	-	.562**	.410**	.533**
Work Engagement	p		.000	.000	.000
	n	204	204	204	204
	r	.562**	-	.584**	.644**
Formal Role Behaviour	p	.000		.000	.000
	n	204	204	204	204
	r	.410**	.584**	-	.641**
Organisational Voice	p	.000	.000		.000
	n	204	204	204	204
	r	.533**	.644**	.641**	-
Helping	p	.000	.000	.000	
	n	204	204	204	204

1=Work Engagement, 2= Formal Role Behaviour, 3= Organisational Voice, 4= Helping

Table 3 shows the relationships between the WE scale and the sub-dimensions of the OCB scale. It was determined that there were significant positive relationships between the work engagement scale and the sub-dimensions of the OCB scale, namely formal role behaviour ($r=.562$ $p=.000$), organisational voice ($r=.410$ $p=.000$) and helping ($r=.533$ $p=.000$).

Table 4. Results related to the prediction of WE

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t		Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	.656	.326		2.014	.045					
Formal Role Behaviour	.457	.095	.371	4.818	.000	.562	.322	.271	.535	1.869
Organisational Voice	.008	.077	.008	.109	.913	.410	.008	.006	.539	1.855
Helping	.317	.089	.289	3.551	.000	.533	.244	.200	.479	2.088

Dependent Variable: Work engagement

$F=38.472$

$P=.000$

$R^2=.356$

Model=Work engagement=.656+Formal Role Behaviour*.457+Organisational Voice*.008+Helping*.317

As a result of the regression analysis, it was determined that the model was statistically significant ($p=.000$ $p<0.05$ $F=38.477$) and 35.6% of the variance in the dependent variable was explained by the independent variables.

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

This study aims to examine the relationship between organisational citizenship behaviours and work engagement of sports park employees. In this direction, correlation analysis and multiple regression analyses between variables were conducted.

In Table 3, it was determined that there were positive and significant relationships between the work engagement scale and the sub-dimensions of the OCB scale, namely formal role behaviour ($r=.562$ $p=.000$), organisational voice ($r=.410$ $p=.000$) and helping ($r=.533$ $p=.000$). Aslan (2008), in his research on 225 nurses, stated that there was a positive and significant relationship between professional engagement and OCB. In their study, Öürücü and Hasırcı (2020) reported that there was a positive and significant relationship between vigour and organisational citizenship. Again, Cohen (2006), in his research on 569 teachers working in Northern Israel, stated that the relationship between teachers' engagement to their profession and OCB was highly positive and significant. Onan and Kılınç (2023), in their research on a sample group of 211 employees, stated that there was a positive and high level relationship between OCB and workaholism. In their study on 248 personnel working in public sports organizations in South Korea, Park and Kim (2024) stated that work engagement has a positive effect on organizational citizenship. Gül and Öngel (2023), on the other hand, stated that there was a significant and positive relationship between work engagement and organisational citizenship behaviour within the scope of the research conducted on a sample of 311 sector employees. Lyu (2006), in his study on a sample of 303 individuals, stated that there was a positive and significant relationship between WE and OCB. As a result of their research, Honnamane et al. (2024) found that gender alone may not have a significant effect on organizational results, but the interaction between gender and work engagement is important in shaping Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Kataria et al. (2013) conducted a study on 278 individuals and stated that there was a positive relationship between OCB and WE and that organisational citizenship would increase as WE increases. In their research, Christian et al. (2011) found that employees with high levels of work engagement actively participate in extra-role behaviors and activities, achieving the organization's goals efficiently and using the resources within the organization appropriately. Ng et al. (2019) reported that there were significant and positive relationships between WE and OC in their study conducted on 279 healthcare personnel. As a result of a study they conducted in Pakistan, Barkat et al. (2024) stated that transformational leadership has a positive effect on work engagement. On the other hand, Urbini et al. (2020) conducted a study on a sample of 719 individuals and

stated that there were positive and significant relationships between organisational citizenship and WE in parallel with the findings of the current study. In another study, Özdem (2012) conducted a study on 832 participants and stated that there were positive and significant relationships between organisational citizenship, professional engagement and organisational engagement variables and that professional and organisational engagement together explained 27% of organisational citizenship. In their research, Ting et al. (2024) found that employee engagement and transfer of training were also found to positively influence organizational citizenship behavior. Ahmad et al. (2014), in their research on 230 individuals, stated that there were high-level relationships between OCB, professional and organisational engagement and teachers' perceptions of empowerment. Manafe (2025) found in his research that organizational citizenship behavior is positively affected by organizational culture and work engagement, while workload does not play a significant role. It has also been confirmed that work engagement is a mediator in these relationships. He emphasizes the importance of creating a positive organizational culture and increasing work engagement in order to improve job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. In another study, Dennis and Katherine (2006) reported that there were positive and significant relationships between professional engagement and organisational citizenship behaviour. These results are directly or indirectly parallel to the findings of the present study. The relationship between work engagement and OCB can be said to be related to factors such as employees' attitudes, behaviours, career intention and social importance towards their jobs. The work engagement to his/her job can positively affect the formation of positive attitudes, behaviours and actions for the benefit of his/her organisation, regardless of the reward and punishment system or the benefit he/she will receive in return. In this direction, it can be said that as work engagement increases, the employee's organisational citizenship behaviour will increase. It was concluded that the relationship between sports park employees' level of work engagement and organisational citizenship behaviours was positive and significant, and 35.6% of the variance in work engagement was explained by independent variables.

In the context of the results of this research, it can be presented as an important recommendation that organisations adopt approaches aimed at increasing the levels of work engagement and organisational citizenship behaviours of employees. On the other hand, the research has some limitations. This study is based solely on the perceptions of employees of a municipality's sports park. The study data were collected in a cross-sectional design, which makes it difficult to identify causal relationships. For future studies, longitudinal designs can

be used to examine the change and impact of these relationships over time in more depth. However, in future studies, qualitative or mixed method methodological methods can be preferred, contributing to the emergence of in-depth and multi-faceted findings on the subject. The generalisability of the study's findings is limited because the sample was drawn from only one region. The limits of generalizability can be increased through studies conducted across different regions and cultures. The generalisability of the study may be increased with the effect of different variables and different research methods. Awareness-raising trainings and seminars can be added during the orientation process. The levels of work engagement and organisational citizenship of employees can be measured at regular intervals and necessary actions can be taken accordingly.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, M.S., Malik, M. I., Sajjad, M., Hyder, S., Hussain, S. & Ahmed, J. (2014). Linking teacher empowerment with organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Life Science Journal*, 11(4), 105-108.
- Alper Ay, F. (2018). *Örgütsel davranışta ve insan kaynakları yönetimi uygulamalarında örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı*. Beta Yayıncılık.
- Aslan, Ş. (2008). The investigation of relation between organizational citizenship behavior with organizational commitment and professional commitment. *Journal of Management and Economics*, 15(2), 163-178.
- Barkat, W., Waris, I., Ahmed, R. & Dad, M. (2024). Transformational leadership and frontline managers work engagement, innovative work behavior, organizational citizenship behavior, and employee sustainability in the hotel industry in Pakistan. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 23(2), 315-336. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2024.2282217>
- Buluç, B. (2008). The relationship between organizational health and organizational citizenship behaviors in secondary schools. *Turkish Journal of Educational Sciences*, 6(4), 571-602.
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel psychology*, 64(1), 89-136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x>
- Cohen, A. (2006). The relationship between multiple commitments and organizational citizenship behavior in Arab and Jewish culture. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69(1), 105-118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.12.004>
- Demirel, Y. & Özçınar, M. F. (2009). The effect of organizational citizenship behavior on job satisfaction: a research on different sectors. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 23(1), 130-144.
- Dennis, W.O. & Katherine, R. (2006). A meta-analtic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48 (4), 775 – 802.
- Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 108-119. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256902>
- Ebeh, R. E., Njoku, E. C., Ikpeazu, O. C. & Benson, L. (2017). Organizational commitment and job involvement among casual workers: The role of organizational justice. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*, 5(4), 17-32. <https://doi.org/10.37745/gjhrm.2013>
- Eryılmaz, A. ve Doğan, T. (2012). Subjective Well-Being at Work: Investigating of Psychometric Properties of Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 15(1), 49-55.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E. & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* (7th Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Freudenberger, H. (1974). Staff Burnout. *Journal of Social Issues*, 30 (1), 159-165. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1974.tb00706.x>
- Griffin, M. L., Hogan, N. L., Lambert, E. G., Tucker-Gail, K. A. & Baker, D. N. (2010). Job involvement, job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment and the burnout of correctional staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37(2), 239–255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854809351682>
- Gül, N. & Öngel, G. (2023). The effect of work engagement and organizational identification on organizational citizenship behavior. *Anadolu University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 24(1), 451-470. <https://doi.org/10.53443/anadoluibfd.1218757>
- Güldü, Ö. (2019). The effect of perceived social support on job involvement levels of hospitality industry employees: Mediation role of agreeableness personality trait. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 1(1), 17-28.
- Hodson, R. (2002). Management citizenship behavior and its consequences. *Work and Occupations*, 29(1), 64-96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888402029001004>

- Honnamane, P. S., Sreekanth, K. & Girish, G. P. (2024). Moderating role of gender on work engagement, task performance and organizational citizenship behavior in Indian IT Sector. *International Journal of Religion*, 5(6), 753-758. <https://doi.org/10.61707/hnw26s68>
- Hoy, W. K. & Tarter, C. J. (2004). Organizational justice in schools: No justice without trust. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(4), 250–259. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540410538831>
- Karaman, A. & Aylan, S. (2012). Organizational citizenship. *Journal of Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 2(1), 35-48.
- Kataria, A., Garg, P. & Rastogi, R. (2013). Does psychological climate augment OCBs? The mediating role of work engagement. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 16(4), 217. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/mgr0000007>
- Lambert, E. G., Liu, J., Jiang, S., Zhang, J. & Kelley, T. M. (2018). The antecedents of job involvement: an exploratory study among Chinese prison staff. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 54, 21-33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlcrj.2018.06.002>
- Manafe, D. (2025). Workload and organizational culture as predictors of job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior: Work engagement as a mediating role. *Jurnal Fokus Manajemen Bisnis*, 15(1), 102-125. <https://doi.org/10.12928/fokus.v15i1.12721>
- Lyu, Y., Zhu, H., Zhong, H. J. & Hu, L. (2016). Abusive supervision and customer-oriented organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of hostile attribution bias and work engagement. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 53, 69-80.
- Ng, L. P., Choong, Y. O., Kuar, L. S., Tan, C. E. & Teoh, S. Y. (2019). Job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour amongst health professionals: The mediating role of work engagement. *International Journal of Healthcare Management*, 14(3), 797–804. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20479700.2019.1698850>
- Onan, B. D. & Kılınç, E. (2023). The effect of organizational citizenship behavior and workaholism on job satisfaction in manufacturing businesses. *International Journal of Arts and Social Studies*, 6(11), 224-248.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85–97. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_2
- Özdem, G. (2012). The relationship between the organizational citizenship behaviours and the organizational and Professional commitments of secondary school teachers. *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, 6(2), 12, 47-64. <https://doi.org/10.20460/JGSM.2012615773>
- Park, J. & Kim, J. (2024). The relationship between perceived organizational support, work engagement, organizational citizenship behavior, and customer orientation in the public sports organizations context. *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(3), 153. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14030153>
- Sancar, O. & Bekaroğlu, Ş. B. (2020). An Adaptation of Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale to Turkish: Validity and Reliability Study. *JOEEP: Journal of Emerging Economies and Policy*, 5(2), 99-107.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V. & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies: An Interdisciplinary Forum on Subjective Well-Being*, 3(1), 71–92. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>
- Schaufeli, W. & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job Demands, Job Resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 293-315. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
- Schaufeli, W., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V. & Bakker, A. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>
- Sharma, B.R., Srivastova, V.N., Ningthoujam, S. & Arora, V. (2012). Job involvement as a key component of work motivation: Search for predictors. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48(2), 325-340.

- Singh, A. & Gupta, B. (2015). Job involvement, organizational commitment, professional commitment, and team commitment: A study of generational diversity. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 22(6), 1192-1211.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (5th ed.). Pearson Education, Allyn ve Bacon, Inc.
- Ting, Q. H., Lew, T. Y., Goi, C. L., Sim, A. K. & Gim, G. C. (2024). Psychological capital and employee engagement as predictors of organisational citizenship behaviour in the industrial revolution 4.0 era: transfer of training as a mediator. *Current Psychology*, 43(6), 5219-5242.
- Tutar, H. (2000). *Küreselleşme sürecinde işletme yönetimi*. Hayat Yayınları.
- Urbini, F., Chirumbolo, A. & Callea, A. (2020). Promoting individual and organizational OCBs: The mediating role of work engagement. *Behavioral Sciences*, 10(9), 138. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs10090138>
- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W. & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 765–802. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256600>
- Vey, M. A. & Campbell, J. P. (2004). In-role or extra-role organizational citizenship behavior: which are we measuring? *Human Performance*, 17(1), 119–135. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327043HUP1701_6