

Exploring Behavioral Intentions in Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Development of a New Measure

Flóra Csontos¹, Judit Kovács^{2*}

¹School of Humanities/Psychology Program, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary.

²Institute of Psychology, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary.

***Corresponding Author**

E-mail: csontos.flora@arts.unideb.hu

ABSTRACT

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) refers to voluntary, extra-role behaviors that support organizational functioning. Initially, direct supervisors completed assessments of subordinates; later, the practice shifted to self-report instruments, which may be biased toward attitudes rather than actual behaviors. This study introduces a scenario-based instrument to assess OCB through behavioral intentions and compares it with an OCB questionnaire that measures attitude. Drawing on theories of Belief in a Just World (BJW), Leader-Member Exchange (LMX), and Perceived Organizational Justice, we have explored how these constructs relate to OCB in a Hungarian sample. Data were collected from 191 employees via online platforms, excluding top-level managers, in order to focus on lower hierarchical levels. Factor analysis of the scenario-based tool resulted in a reliable 10-item measure. Correlations indicated moderate convergence between the frequently used questionnaire and situational tools we developed ($r = .398, p < .001$). Both instruments showed expected associations with interpersonal justice, BJW, and LMX, though correlations were generally modest. Findings suggest that scenario-based measures capture behavioral intentions more effectively than attitudes, providing complementary insights into OCB. Limitations include sample size and the weak functioning of the Sportsmanship dimension.

Keywords: Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), Scenario-based measurement, Belief in a just world (BJW), Leader-member exchange (LMX), Perceived organizational justice.

Introduction

In contemporary organizations, voluntary employee behaviors beyond formal job duties are increasingly viewed as critical for performance and sustainability. Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) refers to voluntary, extra-role behaviors that employees exhibit beyond their job descriptions, without external pressure or the expectation of formal compensation, that benefit the organization (Soelton *et al.*, 2020; Mehrzad *et al.*, 2022; Yu, 2022; Nagdalian *et al.*, 2024). Evidence indicates that organizational citizenship behavior not only mediates the effects of employees' commitment and knowledge-sharing on performance outcomes (Sakhnenkova *et al.*, 2023; Achmad *et al.*, 2025) but is also positively associated with work-related well-being (Santos *et al.*, 2023), suggesting that engaging in OCB can enhance psychological health and organizational results. However, when employees perceive OCB as compulsory rather than voluntary, this perceived pressure increases their workload and may deplete their resources, leading to work-related stress (Liu *et al.*, 2019).

A common criticism of OCB measurement tools is that they were originally designed for leaders to evaluate their subordinates' OCB but are now often self-reported, making them more reflective of attitudes than actual behaviors (LePine *et al.*, 2002; Podsakoff *et al.*, 2003). Attitudes are cognitive-affective evaluations directed toward a specific object, person, or behavior, whereas behavioral intention reflects a more concrete commitment to action and serves as

Received: 28.06.2025 – Accepted: 08.10.2025 – Published: 15.12.2025

© 2025 Journal of Organizational Behavior Research. **Open Access** - This article is under the CC BY NC SA license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>)



a more direct predictor of actual behavior. In the context of practical, work-related phenomena, it is therefore particularly important to measure behavioral intention, as it more accurately captures whether an employee is genuinely inclined to exhibit a given behavior, in contrast to attitudes which may be more abstract or generalized (Ajzen, 1991; Nguyen & Hoang, 2022; Ouafa *et al.*, 2022; Efremov, 2023).

Building on these theoretical considerations, our study aims to develop a tool that reliably measures OCB, which can be completed solely by the employee and is less susceptible to social desirability bias by capturing behavioral intentions rather than attitudes.

We hypothesize that our instrument will correlate with existing questionnaire-based measures of OCB and will show stronger associations with related variables than previous research using these tools has identified.

Literature Review

Dimensions of OCB

OCB can be categorized both by its direction and by its content. In terms of direction, it is typically divided into behaviors directed at individuals (OCB-I) and behaviors directed at the organization (OCB-O) (Williams & Anderson, 1991). OCB-I involves helping behaviors directed toward coworkers, such as offering assistance or substituting for sick coworkers, whereas OCB-O includes actions that benefit the organization, such as adhering to informal rules and maintaining a positive work environment (Tan *et al.*, 2019). In terms of content, Organ (1988) identified five dimensions of OCB: altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and civic virtue. Altruism and courtesy generally correspond to OCB-I, while conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and civic virtue correspond to OCB-O (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2000; Trung *et al.*, 2022; Ncube *et al.*, 2023; Tam *et al.*, 2023). Altruism involves actions like substituting for a coworker or alleviating their workload, while courtesy involves respecting others' rights and privacy. Civic virtue pertains to participating in organizational activities and staying updated with changes. Conscientious behavior includes behaviors such as punctuality, precision, and limited breaks. Sportsmanship implies refraining from unnecessary complaints or from exaggerating issues at work (Soelton *et al.*, 2020; Kariri *et al.*, 2024).

OCB and demographic variables

Studies on gender and OCB have yielded mixed results, but recent findings suggest that women are more inclined to demonstrate OCB (Aftab *et al.*, 2020). Consistent with gender role theory, men are more likely to engage in "heroic" or agentic forms of helping, whereas women are more likely to display relational and communal forms that foster harmonious relationships (Olsson *et al.*, 2021). This pattern suggests that similar gendered expressions may also occur in workplace citizenship behaviors. Thus, gender differences in OCB may depend on whether the focus is on OCB-I or OCB-O.

Research suggests that older employees engage more in OCB than younger ones (Mahmud *et al.*, 2025), which could be explained by already achieved career goals and seeking broader purpose, and the tendency that they are also more willing to share knowledge and value positive relationships (Wiktorowicz *et al.*, 2022).

Though many studies suggest that individuals in higher hierarchical positions tend to exhibit greater OCB (Brekeit *et al.*, 2022; Bhuchar *et al.*, 2025; Fousiani *et al.*, 2025), the literature lacks consensus on this matter. It is plausible that such behaviors are driven more by the desire to create favorable impressions and are perceived by managers as job responsibilities, rather than being genuinely voluntary (Liu *et al.*, 2019). To mitigate this potential bias, our research concentrated on employees occupying lower hierarchical levels.

Longer organizational tenure is positively related to OCB, as employees develop a sense of belonging, stronger interpersonal relationships, and greater commitment. They are also perceived as stable, valuable members, which fosters positive attitudes toward the organization and reciprocal OCB (Pradhan & Mishra, 2020; Hassan & Hatah, 2022).

OCB and Belief in a Just World (BJW)

While justice is a universal norm, belief in justice varies among individuals and constitutes part of a person's life and personality. Heider (1958), within the framework of balance theory, argued that people tend to interpret the social world as a coherent and morally ordered system. This cognitive inclination reflects the principle of balance, whereby individuals expect justice to operate as an inherent force that aligns actions with their consequences. As he observed,



"There is a tendency to see a good act leading to good, and a bad act leading to bad" (p. 81). Although Heider did not explicitly formulate the concept of a "Belief in a Just World," his work laid the conceptual foundation for later theorists. Building on this idea, Lerner (1980) developed the just world hypothesis, which posits that individuals are motivated to believe that people generally get what they deserve and deserve what they get. The belief in a just world (BJW) is an existentially protective illusion. Dalbert (1999) identified two dimensions of BJW: personal and general beliefs in justice. Personal BJW is more closely related to subjective well-being, while general BJW concerns beliefs about justice toward minority or disadvantaged groups.

Individuals who believe in a just world report higher job satisfaction and greater organizational loyalty, and they are more likely to engage in OCB. Altruism, one of the dimensions of OCB, correlates positively with BJW, as those who believe in a just world are more likely to help coworkers—an essential feature of OCB (Wang *et al.*, 2023). Han *et al.* (2022) suggested that OCB helps maintain the belief in a just world among those who hold it, motivating them to contribute to organizational justice. Therefore, OCB can be seen as typical behavior for those who believe in a just world.

OCB and Perceived Organizational Justice

Perceived organizational justice refers to how employees evaluate fairness issues at work, such as unexpected layoffs, treatment of the employees, or salary disparities (Wiseman & Stillwell, 2022). Colquitt (2001) identifies four dimensions of justice: distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational. Distributive justice concerns resource allocation or rewards (e.g., wages, promotions), while procedural justice focuses on whether decision-making processes are unbiased and consistent. Interactional justice refers to whether the leader treats subordinates with dignity, while informational justice refers to the perceived fairness and adequacy of information provided for decision-making and understanding situations.

Perceived organizational justice can affect job satisfaction, commitment to the group, performance, and OCB (Hermanto & Srimulyani, 2022). This is underpinned by the mechanism that perceived justice creates positive emotions, which in turn reinforces the sense of organizational support (Brockner & Wiesenfeld, 2019). Studies have shown consistently that employees who perceive organizational justice as positive engage in more OCB (Donglong *et al.*, 2020; Rahman & Karim, 2022).

The relationship between organizational justice and OCB is explained by social exchange theory as follows: By perceiving fairness in rewards, compensation, organizational processes, and interpersonal relationships, the employee not only maintains an economic relationship with the organization but also opens up to social relationships and becomes more committed over time (Yu, 2022).

Al-ali *et al.* (2019) stated that out of all dimensions of perceived organizational justice, OCB behavior is most accurately explained by interactional justice. If the employee doesn't perceive that they're being treated with dignity and fairness, they tend to "punish" the organization by reducing their engagement in OCB behaviors.

OCB and Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)

LMX theory highlights that leader-subordinate relationships shape resource allocation and work dynamics from both the leader (e.g., the focus given to an employee) and the subordinate (e.g., the effort invested in work) (Liang *et al.*, 2022). Leaders form closer, trust-based ties with ingroup members and more formal ones with outgroup members, thus creating hierarchical differences within the group. High-quality LMX - marked by mutual trust, respect, loyalty, information sharing, and influence (Petrilli *et al.*, 2024) - could foster employee support and involvement in decision-making, which can lead to a stronger bond between the leader and the subordinate, and thus the employee becomes a member of the ingroup (Tremblay *et al.*, 2021). Such relationships enhance job satisfaction, commitment, performance, and OCB, as subordinates reciprocate positive experiences with extra-role behaviors (Dasgupta, 2024; Santalla-Banderi & Alvarado, 2022).

Materials and Methods

Sampling and Procedure



A convenience sampling method was applied using a Hungarian sample. Participants were recruited via online platforms. In order to ensure that the study results would be statistically valid, we conducted a power analysis using G*Power. Assuming seven independent variables, a desired effect size of 0.15, an alpha level of 0.05, and a statistical power of 90%, the required sample size was determined to be 130 participants. This criterion was met, as 191 valid responses were collected.

Participants were required to be at least 18 years of age, currently employed, and not occupy a top-level manager position. Participants were informed in accordance with the approved ethics protocol, and completion of the questionnaire was conditional upon providing informed consent. Data collection took place between October 2023 and March 2024. Ethical approval for the study was granted under the reference number UD-IP-2023/31.

The questionnaire included four major sections, in addition to the collection of demographic information. Demographic questions assessed participants' gender, age, type of residence, level of education, and work-related variables such as years in the labor market, years with the current employer, and type of occupation.

Instruments

Belief in a Just World

Belief in a just world was assessed using a scale originally developed by Dalbert (1999). The 13-item version was shortened and translated into Hungarian by Berkics (2008), resulting in an 8-item scale. Responses were given on a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("Strongly disagree") to 6 ("Strongly agree").

The scale comprises two subfactors. Items 1, 3, 6, and 8 assess general belief in a just world, whereas items 2, 4, 5, and 7 assess personal belief in a just world. Example items for general belief include: "I think basically the world is a just place," and "I am confident that justice always prevails over injustice." Items reflecting personal belief include: "I believe that I usually get what I deserve," and "I think that important decisions that are made concerning me are usually just."

Perceived Organizational Justice

Perceived organizational justice was assessed using Colquitt's four-dimensional questionnaire (Colquitt, 2001). As no validated Hungarian version was available, we employed our own translation. Although the instrument covers all four dimensions of organizational justice, the present study focused exclusively on interpersonal justice, in line with prior literature.

Responses were recorded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("to a very small extent") to 5 ("to a very large extent"). Items concerning interpersonal justice required respondents to evaluate the extent to which their supervisor behaved with respect and courtesy during the implementation of decision-making procedures. A sample item is: "To what extent does your supervisor treat you with dignity?"

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)

The quality of the relationship with supervisors was measured using the Leader-Member Exchange Scale (LMX) developed by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), which includes one factor and seven items. Due to the absence of a validated Hungarian version, we used our own translation. Responses were provided on a five-point Likert scale, with the meaning of endpoints varying by item.

Sample items include: "How well does your leader understand your job problems and needs?" (1 = "Not at all", 5 = "To a very great extent") and "How would you characterize your working relationship with your leader?" (1 = "Extremely ineffective", 5 = "Extremely effective").

OCB - Questionnaire-Based

OCB was assessed using a 14-item version of the scale developed by Williams and Anderson (1991), translated into Hungarian by the authors, as no validated Hungarian version exists. Responses were recorded on a five-point Likert scale (1 = "Never", 5 = "Very frequently") based on participants' behavior in the past month.



The scale includes two subfactors: the first seven items pertain to OCB-I (interpersonal behaviors toward coworkers), and the remaining seven measure OCB-O (organizationally directed behaviors). Items 10, 11, and 12 are reverse-coded.

Example items from the OCB-I factor include: "I helped others who have a heavy workload," and "I passed along information to coworkers." Example OCB-O items include: "I gave advance notice when I was unable to come to work," and "My attendance at work was above the norm."

OCB - Scenario-Based

In addition to questionnaire-based measurement, we developed workplace-related scenarios to assess OCB (**Table 1**). Responses were given on a nine-point Likert scale, with endpoints tailored to the context of each scenario.

Following Organ's five-dimensional framework (Organ, 1988), we created three scenarios per dimension to guarantee a wide spectrum for different situations. Care was taken to avoid ethical dilemmas in the scenarios to ensure that responses would solely reflect OCB tendencies. Each dilemma offered two contrasting options: one prosocial (representing OCB) and one self-interested. To illustrate, consider a sample situation for the Altruism dimension. In this scenario, a newly hired coworker enters the workplace, about whom the respondent has previously received unfavorable information from acquaintances. The coworker lacks familiarity with organizational systems and processes, and their assigned mentor fails to provide adequate guidance. In this context, participants are asked to indicate whether they would be willing to provide support, even if doing so entails remaining at work beyond regular hours, by responding on a 9-point scale ranging from 1 ("I would not offer my help") to 9 ("I would offer my help"), thereby allowing for a graded measurement of behavioral intention rather than a binary decision. Such a format ensures sensitivity to individual differences in prosocial motivation and provides a nuanced assessment of OCB-related tendencies.

Table 1. Scenario-Based OCB Instrument (15 Items with Response Options).

Item label	Item	Answer options 1 - 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 - 9
Altruism1	A coworker became ill because they ignored their health despite your advice. Would you offer to help them, even though that would mean postponing your own tasks on a critical, time-sensitive project?	1 = I would not offer my help. 9 = I would offer my help.
Altruism2	A new coworker has joined the workplace, about whom you have heard negative things through acquaintances. They are unfamiliar with systems and processes, and their mentor neglects them. Would you offer support, even if it requires staying longer at work?	1 = I would not offer my help. 9 = I would offer my help.
Altruism3	A coworker is dealing with a very demanding client. You know your coworker is stressed and tired due to personal problems. Would you take over the client, even though this would require you to spend more time at work?	1 = I would not offer my help. 9 = I would offer my help.
Courtesy1	You work at a company that handles many clients daily. One day, a recurring angry client calls, complains about the service, refuses to cooperate, hinders problem-solving, and personally insults you. Would you continue to handle them politely, or would you eventually hang up/transfer the call?	1 = I would eventually hang up the phone. 9 = I would try to listen and handle the client politely.
Courtesy2	A newly hired coworker invites you to lunch. You find them boring and irritating, but you are free at that time. Would you join them, or politely decline with an excuse?	1 = I would politely decline with an excuse. 9 = I would go to lunch with them.
Courtesy3*	At a major annual reception, a higher-ranking coworker from another division makes subtle derogatory remarks about you and your department. Would you respond or politely move on, taking advantage of the event's informal nature?	1 = I would respond and not leave the comment unanswered. 9 = I would simply move on.



Conscientiousness1	Your company has strict rules about punctuality. You are always on time, but one morning you oversleep due to illness and arrive late. Would you record the lateness honestly, or omit it from the attendance record?	1 = I would not record the lateness. 9 = I would record the lateness.
Conscientiousness2	After working overtime, you forget to switch off your computer and the lights. On the way home, you remember halfway. Would you return to turn them off, or leave them as they are?	1 = I would not return to switch them off. 9 = I would go back to switch them off.
Conscientiousness3	You notice a coworker's negligence in a key document: the error is purely cosmetic and does not affect the content. It does not reflect on your work, and you are very busy. Would you take the time to correct it, or leave it as it is?	1 = I would not correct the document. 9 = I would correct the mistake in the document.
Sportsmanship1*	Your manager sends you a document to forward, which contains several typos. You correct them, even though it takes time from your own work. Would you mention this to your manager at your next meeting, or keep it to yourself?	1 = I would mention the errors to my manager. 9 = I would not mention the errors.
Sportsmanship2*	During a strategic meeting, you notice that your manager is presenting outdated monthly data instead of the latest figures. Would you point this out immediately, or remain silent?	1 = I would point out the mistake. 9 = I would not mention the mistake.
Sportsmanship3*	Returning from lunch, you discover that someone has taken your chair, which you later find hidden behind a neighboring office door. Would you point out that it was not returned, or bring it back without comment?	1 = I would point out that they forgot to return the chair. 9 = I would say nothing and just put it back.
Civic Virtue1*	Your company values employee satisfaction. You are invited to a voluntary team-building event, but you are behind with your work. Would you attend, or stay to finish your tasks?	1 = I would continue working. 9 = I would attend the team-building event.
Civic Virtue2	Your company values growth and learning. You are invited to a training session that the company pays for, but it is outside working hours. You are behind with your tasks. Would you attend, or focus on your own work instead?	1 = I would continue working. 9 = I would attend the training.
Civic Virtue3	You are working on a project with a tight deadline when your manager asks you to represent them at another project meeting temporarily. Would you review the materials and prepare them, or rely on picking them up during the meeting, since it is not your main responsibility?	1 = I would not see it as my responsibility and would only substitute temporarily. 9 = I would try to get familiar with the project and represent my manager as best as I can.

Note. There are no reversed items. Items marked with * are not part of the final tool.

Results and Discussion

Descriptive Statistics

Out of the 191 respondents, 58 (30.37%) identified as male and 133 (69.63%) as female. The mean age of the participants was 35.2 years. Regarding educational attainment, 108 individuals (56.54%) had either a bachelor's or a master's degree, 22 (11.52%) had a qualification beyond the master's level, 59 (30.89%) reported having completed secondary education (including general secondary schools and vocational schools), and 2 participants (1.05%) had completed only primary education. Data on employment type (i.e., intellectual, physical, or mixed) were incomplete, as responding to this item was not mandatory. As a result, responses from 24 individuals were missing; however, this did not affect the subsequent analyses. Among those who provided information, 130 participants (77.84%) reported working in intellectual occupations, 23 (13.78%) in physical occupations, and 14 (8.38%) in mixed roles. On average, participants had been active in the labor market for 13.7 years and had been working for their current organization for an average of 6.91 years.

Internal Consistency / Reliability



Internal consistency was acceptable across the measured constructs, with Cronbach's alpha values of .817 for the general belief in a just world and .895 for the personal belief in a just world. For leader-member exchange, the Cronbach's alpha value was .937, and .709 was for the OCB situational measure. The organizational dimension of OCB, measured by the questionnaire, showed questionable internal consistency ($\alpha = .604$), falling below commonly accepted thresholds ($\alpha = .700$). The interpersonal OCB subscale ($\alpha = .771$) and the overall OCB scale score ($\alpha = .747$) demonstrated acceptable internal consistency. Our scenario-based behavioral intention measurement tool, with a total of 15 items, had a reliability of .650, but, by leaving out the whole dimension of sportsmanship and the third item of courtesy and the first item of Civic Virtue, we had an internal consistency of .709. As explained in more detail in the next section, we recommend the use of the 10-item version, and one reason for that is the higher value of reliability.

Factor Analysis

We conducted an exploratory factor analysis, as this study did not involve the adaptation of an existing scale with an established structure, but rather the examination of a newly developed measurement instrument based on a theoretical model. Using the method of principal axis extraction and oblimin rotation, we determined the factors based on eigenvalues greater than 1. With this method, we determined one factor (**Table 2**). Items 6, 10, 11, 12, and 13 were excluded due to loadings below .30; these were the same items that had also been removed in the consistency analysis because of low reliability. It is not uncommon for OCB to be treated as a single factor, and several studies have approached it without distinguishing between OCB-I and OCB-O (LePine *et al.*, 2002; Casu *et al.*, 2021; Neves *et al.*, 2024).

Table 2. Factor Loadings of Items from Exploratory Factor Analysis.

Item number	Item label	Factor loading	Uniqueness
1.	Altruism1	0.569	0.676
2.	Altruism2	0.655	0.571
3.	Altruism3	0.558	0.688
4.	Courtesy1	0.514	0.736
5.	Courtesy2	0.366	0.866
6.*	Courtesy3	0.157	0.975
7.	Conscientiousness1	0.359	0.871
8.	Conscientiousness2	0.330	0.891
9.	Conscientiousness3	0.485	0.765
10.*	Sportsmanship1	0.181	0.967
11.*	Sportsmanship2	-0.268	0.928
12.*	Sportsmanship3	0.094	0.991
13.*	Civic Virtue1	0.247	0.939
14.	Civic Virtue2	0.341	0.884
15.	Civic Virtue3	0.374	0.860

Note. Factor loadings above .30 are considered substantial. Items marked with * were not retained in the final version of the scale.

Correlations

Treated both the situational tool and the scale-based questionnaire as measuring a single OCB factor, a moderate correlation was found between the situational measure and the overall OCB scale ($r = .398$, $p < .001$); (**Table 3**). This can be explained by the fact that although both instruments aim to assess the same phenomenon, in practice, they are suited to measure different aspects - namely, attitudes versus behavioral intentions.

We compared both tools with other relevant variables included in the study. Spearman correlations with the included variables can also be found in **Table 3**. As the belief in a just world is treated as comprising two distinct factors in the literature (Silva *et al.*, 2024), we followed the same practice. Furthermore, drawing on the literature, organizational



justice is also typically examined as several separate dimensions (Colquitt, 2001). In our study, we focused on the dimension of organizational justice most closely related to OCB - interpersonal justice (Al-ali *et al.*, 2019).

Within the Spearman correlations, we also examined whether the differences between correlations derived from the same sample were statistically significant, using Williams' test. In the case of general belief in a just world, the difference in correlations was statistically significant: $t(188) = -3.04$, $p = .0027$. The estimated difference: $\Delta p = -.185$ (two-tailed test).

No significant associations were observed between personal belief in a just world and either measurement tool. For interpersonal organizational justice, the difference approached significance at the exploratory 10% threshold ($p = .094$), which may be interpreted as marginal under a 10% significance level (common in exploratory research). Mathematically, the situational measure showed a stronger correlation, though the difference was not statistically convincing.

The correlation between LMX and OCB was identical across both measurement tools (situational and scale-based): $r = .178$, $p = .014$. This suggests that both methods capture the relationship between OCB and leader-member exchange to the same extent.

No significant differences were found regarding gender, age, or tenure. The fact that most comparisons did not yield significant differences between the two instruments does not undermine the value of the situational measure. On the contrary, it produced results consistent with, or even exceeding, those of the scale-based tool.

Table 3. Correlation between the situational OCB tool, OCB questionnaire, and the measured variables.

Variables	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.
1. Gender	α								
2. Age	.062	α							
3. Tenure	-.024	.730***	α						
4. General belief in a just world	.021	-.150*	-.154*	α					
5. Personal belief in a just world	-.002	-.186*	-.163*	.648***	α				
6. Interpersonal justice	.091	-.093	-.053	.202**	.410***	α			
7. LMX	.061	-.070	-.027	.267***	.443***	.706***	α		
8. OCB questionnaire	.147*	.170*	.228**	-.003	-.105	.065	.178*	α	
9. OCB situations	.228**	.173*	.107	.182*	.112	.158*	.178*	.398***	α

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

Conclusion

Organizational Citizenship Behavior has become an increasingly studied topic in the field of industrial-organizational psychology. Its practical relevance is supported and reinforced by the use of various measurement tools. One critique of questionnaire-based methods is their susceptibility to bias due to social desirability and response sets (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2023). To address these issues, we developed a tool to measure behavioral intention. From an initial set of 15 items, we ultimately created a 10-item situational measure based on internal consistency and factor loadings. This was compared with the OCB questionnaire-based scale, revealing a moderate relationship between the two instruments. This suggests that both tools are suitable for measuring OCB, yet each of them approaches the construct from a distinct perspective. Measuring behavioral intention was not widespread in OCB, but it can open new angles to measure OCB. Based on the literature and the correlation with frequently studied variables associated with OCB, as well as the strength of the relationship between the scale-based and situational tools, it can be concluded that the situational measure performed adequately (sometimes even more strongly than the scale-based measure). This is noteworthy because behavioral intention measures often yield weaker statistical associations than direct comparisons of scale scores (Conner & Norman, 2022). Given that attitudinal constructs measured on thematically consistent scales tend to

correlate more strongly due to thematic priming and response biases, the fact that the situational measure demonstrated comparable - or stronger - associations suggests its robustness and potential value as an alternative tool.

Limitations and Dimensions for Future Research

Our research has some limitations. The complexity of our scenarios could have contributed to why 5 out of the 15 scenarios, and the entire Sportsmanship dimension, had to be deleted from the tool. Cultural differences could have shaped how respondents understood cooperative behavior (Rossi *et al.*, 2023). It is possible that participants interpreted certain situations in ways that diverged from the assumptions of the literature on which the instrument was based. For instance, in the scenario where an employee notices that their manager is presenting outdated data during a strategic meeting, our framework assumes that remaining silent would reflect OCB. However, respondents may have considered pointing out the error and constructively contributing to the discussion as the more cooperative and supportive action. These interpretative differences suggest that cultural context plays a role in shaping perceptions of organizational citizenship, an issue that warrants further investigation.

The obtained correlations were relatively weak; however, even the widely used questionnaire-based tool did not yield stronger correlations in line with expectations based on theoretical and empirical background.

Regarding future research, it is certainly worth conducting similar research with a larger sample size and in different cultural contexts, ensuring that the situations are as clear and unambiguous as possible. Future studies could focus on refining the situational measure by adapting it to different sectors or industries, allowing for a more precise assessment of OCB in varied organizational settings. For example, the Courtesy dimension of OCB could be interpreted differently in a customer service role, where courteous behavior may constitute a core evaluative standard, whereas in domains such as programming or payroll administration, it is non-essential to the formal requirements of task performance.

Moreover, specific research questions could be explored, such as how remote work influences different dimensions of OCB or how cultural differences shape the validity and application of the situational measure. Further methodological advancements, such as combining situational tools with complementary methods (e.g., interviews or case studies), could provide additional insights into the construct and enhance its accuracy.

As a conclusion, we state that the tool holds significant potential for studying OCB in further research; however, the tool should be refined and tested further. This could contribute not only to enhancing organizational behavior research but also to helping practitioners cultivate a positive organizational culture.



Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank all participants for their valuable time and effort in completing the survey.

Conflict of Interest: None

Financial Support: None

Ethics Statement: The study was conducted in accordance with the universal ethical standards. Ethical approval was obtained from the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Debrecen (Approval No. UD-IP-2023/31). Participation was voluntary and anonymous, and informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to data collection.

References

- Achmad, A., Nurwati, Nasrul, & Mahrani, S. W. (2025). The role of organizational citizenship behavior in mediating sharing knowledge behavior and commitment to employee performance, Regional Secretariat of Bombana Regency. *International Journal of Accounting and Economics Studies*, 12(3), 69–73. doi:10.14419/9759s124
- Aftab, N., Ali Shah, S. A., & Khan, Z. (2020). The moderating effect of gender on the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in Pakistani university teachers. *Cogent Psychology*, 7(1), 1860480. doi:10.1080/23311908.2020.1860480

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T
- Al-ali, A. H., Qalaja, L. K., & Abu-Rumman, A. (2019). Justice in organizations and its impact on organizational citizenship behaviors: a multidimensional approach. *Cogent Business & Management*, 6, 1–18. doi:10.1080/23311975.2019.1698792
- Bate, G. B., Adeleye, A. O., Ijanu, E. M., Olalere, E. O., Amoo, A. O., Asaju, C. I., Shiaka, P. G., & Yerima, M. B. (2023). Quality assessment of wastewater: Physicochemical and bacteriological evidence from Dutse abattoir, North-West Nigeria. *World Journal of Environmental Biosciences*, 12(3), 58–66. doi:10.51847/5xxrD8Fbka
- Berkics, M. (2008). Perceptions of the fairness of social relations and competition in society [Doctoral dissertation, Eötvös Loránd University, Doctoral School of Psychology].
- Bhuchar, V., Sukirti, S., & Sharma, P. (2025). A comparative analysis of organizational citizenship behavior, employee morale, and job performance across hierarchical levels: exploring differences in private and government sector employees. *Journal of Neonatal Surgery*, 14(27S), 376–380. Retrieved from <https://www.jneonatsurg.com/index.php/jns/article/view/6445>
- Brekeit, K. A., AlOmran, A. N., Alqwaiz, A. F., & Alsawayeh, A. S. (2022). Pediatric bullet-related vascular injuries: a case report of two incidents in Saudi Arabia. *Interdisciplinary Research in Medical & Science Special*, 2(2), 23–28. doi:10.51847/0uxSuWERnz
- Brockner, J., & Wiesenfeld, B. M. (2019). Organizational justice is alive and well and living elsewhere (but not too far away). In R. Folger & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Social psychology and justice* (pp. 213–242). Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781003002291-9
- Casu, G., Mariani, M. G., Chiesa, R., Guglielmi, D., & Gremigni, P. (2021). The role of organizational citizenship behavior and gender between job satisfaction and task performance. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(18), 9499. doi:10.3390/ijerph18189499
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386–400. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386
- Conner, M., & Norman, P. (2022). Understanding the intention–behavior gap: the role of moderators of the intention–behavior relationship. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 938603. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.923464
- Dalbert, C. (1999). The world is more just for me than generally: about the personal belief in the validity of a just world scale's validity. *Social Justice Research*, 12, 79–98. doi:10.1023/A:1022091609047
- Dasgupta, P. (2024). A study on the effect of role stress, LMX, and TMX on organisational citizenship behaviour of nurses and their mediation by team commitment. *Journal of Health Management*, 26(1), 66–77. doi:10.1177/09720634231225008
- Donglong, Z., Taejun, C., Julie, A., & Sanghun, L. (2020). The structural relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior in university faculty in China: the mediating effect of organizational commitment. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 21, 167–179. doi:10.1007/s12564-019-09617-w
- Efremov, A. (2023). Relieving psychosomatic pain and negative emotions through dehypnosis. *Asian Journal of Individual & Organizational Behavior*, 3, 18–24. doi:10.51847/BPFsWgpeFd
- Fousiani, K., Scheibe, S., Griep, Y., & El Khawli, E. (2025). Unpacking the role of demographic characteristics in organizational citizenship behaviour: an intersectional approach. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 98(2), e70026. doi:10.1111/joop.70026
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219–247. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5
- Han, L., Zhou, H., & Wang, C. (2022). Employees' belief in a just world and sustainable organizational citizenship behaviors: The moderating effect of interpersonal intelligence. *Sustainability*, 14(5), 2943. doi:10.3390/su14052943



- Hassan, F., & Hatah, E. (2022). An analytical exploration of various non-pharmacological approaches utilized in managing diabetes among patients in Malaysia. *International Journal of Social Psychological Aspects of Healthcare*, 2, 27–37. doi:10.51847/JmKuHOeBQX
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. John Wiley & Sons Inc. doi:10.1037/10628-000
- Hermanto, Y. B., & Srimulyani, V. A. (2022). The effects of organizational justice on employee performance using the dimension of organizational citizenship behavior as mediation. *Sustainability*, 14(20), 13322. doi:10.3390/su142013322
- Kariri, H. D. H., Radwan, O. A., Somaili, H. E., Mansour, M. E. I., Mathkooor, S. A., & Gohal, K. M. M. (2024). The role of psychological capital in enhancing empowerment among female leadership. *Annals of Organizational Culture, Communications and Leadership, External Engagement Journal*, 5, 17–27. doi:10.51847/w41TjwMAzM
- LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: a critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 52–65. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.52
- Lerner, M. J. (1980). The belief in a just world. In M. J. Lerner (Ed.), *The belief in a just world. Perspectives in Social Psychology* (pp. 9–30). Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4899-0448-5_2
- Liang, Y., Liu, Y., Park, Y., & Wang, L. (2022). Treat me better, but is it really better? Applying a resource perspective to understanding leader–member exchange (LMX), LMX differentiation, and work stress. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 27(2), 223–239. doi:10.1037/ocp0000303
- Liu, F., Chow, I. H., & Huang, M. (2019). Increasing compulsory citizenship behavior and workload: Does impression management matter? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1726. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01726
- Mahmud, L., Nik Abdullah, N. A., Ahmad, M., & Ibrahim, I. I. (2025). The impact of age, working tenure, and gender on organizational citizenship behavior of technical and vocational education and training teachers in Malaysia. *International Journal of Accounting, Finance and Business*, 10(60), 105–118. doi:10.55573/IJAFB.106008
- Mehrzad, K., Yazdanpanah, F., Arab, M., Ghasemi, M., & Radfar, A. (2022). Relationship between stress, anxiety, and depression with happiness in students of Bam medical university in 2019. *Journal of Advanced Pharmaceutical Education & Research*, 12(2), 51–56. doi:10.51847/dJZ1dCmMK6
- Nagdalian, A., Askerova, A., Blinov, A., & Shariati, M. A. (2024). Evaluation of the toxicity of copper oxide nanoparticles toward pea seeds. *World Journal of Environmental Biosciences*, 13(3), 23–30. doi:10.51847/A2gMbUMBUD
- Ncube, M., Sibanda, M., & Matenda, F. R. (2023). The influence of AI and the pandemic on BRICS nations: South Africa's economic performance during crisis. *Annals of Organizational Culture, Communications and Leadership, External Engagement Journal*, 4, 17–24. doi:10.51847/lrMvYTE3OF
- Neves, P. C., Palma-Moreira, A., Andrade, C., & Au-Yong-Oliveira, M. (2024). Organizational citizenship behavior: Adaptation and validation of the OCB scale CCOE-R. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1475011. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1475011
- Nguyen, D. T., & Hoang, T. H. (2022). The influence of organizational capabilities on operational efficiency: a study of Vietnamese businesses. *Asian Journal of Individual & Organizational Behavior*, 2, 15–20. doi:10.51847/PapKxH2ZYU
- Olsson, M. I., Froehlich, L., Dorrough, A. R., & Martiny, S. E. (2021). The hers and his of prosociality across 10 countries. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 60(4), 1330–1349. doi:10.1111/bjso.12454
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books/DC Heath and Company. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1988-97376-000>
- Ouafa, B., Ifriqya, M., & Ikram, T. (2022). Evaluation of biological activities of *Chamaeleo chamaeleon*: A reptile used in traditional folk medicine in Algeria. *Journal of Biochemical Technology*, 13(4), 15–19. doi:10.51847/eD9GJaf2j7



- Petrilli, S., Giunchi, M., & Vonthron, A. M. (2024). Leader–member exchange (LMX) and adjustment to the work mode as protective factors to counteract exhaustion and turnover intention: a chain mediation model. *Sustainability*, 16(23), 10254. doi:10.3390/su162310254
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2023). Common method bias: It's bad, it's complex, it's widespread, and it's not easy to fix. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 11(1), 17–61. doi:10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-110721-040030
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: a critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513–563. doi:10.1177/014920630002600307
- Pradhan, A., & Mishra, S. (2020). Workplace attachment as a mediator of organizational tenure and organizational citizenship behavior. *Jindal Journal of Business Research*, 9(2), 91–105. doi:10.1177/2278682120969032
- Rahman, M. H. A., & Karim, D. N. (2022). Organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: the mediating role of work engagement. *Heliyon*, 8(5), e09450. doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09450
- Rossi, G., Dingemanse, M., Floyd, S., Baranova, J., Blythe, J., Kendrick, K. H., Zinken, J., & Enfield, N. J. (2023). Shared cross-cultural principles underlie human prosocial behavior at the smallest scale. *Scientific Reports*, 13, 6057. doi:10.1038/s41598-023-30580-5
- Sakhnenkova, T. I., Abdul-Kadyrova, L. R., Akhilgova, Z. A., Brovikova, A. A., Markov, O. O., & Saribekyan, A. A. (2023). Morphological and biochemical analysis of a 3D scaffold based on biocompatible polymer for tissue engineering. *Journal of Advanced Pharmaceutical Education & Research*, 13(3), 29–33. doi:10.51847/v8o0GbXJdN
- Santalla-Banderali, Z., & Alvarado, J. M. (2022). Incidence of leader–member exchange quality, communication satisfaction, and employee work engagement on self-evaluated work performance. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(14), 8761. doi:10.3390/ijerph19148761
- Santos, R. S., Lousã, E. P., Sá, M. M., & Cordeiro, J. A. (2023). First, be a good citizen: organizational citizenship behaviors, well-being at work, and the moderating role of leadership styles. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(10), 811. doi:10.3390/bs13100811
- Silva, C., Pedrero, V., Barrientos, J., Manzi, J., & Reynaldos, K. (2024). Just-world beliefs, system justification, and their relationship with people's health-related well-being: a narrative review. *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(10), 941. doi:10.3390/bs14100941
- Soelton, M., Visano, N. A., Noermijati, N., Ramli, Y., Syah, T. Y. R., & Sari, Y. J. (2020). The implication of job satisfaction is that it influences workers to practice organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in the workplace. *Archives of Business Review*, 8(5), 33–48. doi:10.14738/abr.85.8139
- Tam, L. T., An, H. T. T., Linh, T. K., Nhung, L. T. H., Ha, T. N. V., Huy, P. Q., & Luc, P. T. (2023). The impact of COVID-19 on value co-creation activities: a study of economics students in Vietnam. *Annals of Organizational Culture, Communications and Leadership, External Engagement Journal*, 4, 25–34. doi:10.51847/QeaHrAoLoL
- Tan, L. P., Yap, C. S., Choong, Y. O., Choe, K. L., Rungruang, P., & Li, Z. (2019). Ethical leadership, perceived organizational support, and citizenship behaviors: the moderating role of ethnic dissimilarity. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 40(8), 877–897. doi:10.1108/LODJ-04-2019-0160
- Tremblay, M., Parent-Rochelleau, X., & Sajadi, P. (2021). Are leaders and followers receiving what they give? A long-term examination of the reciprocal relationship between relative LMX and relative OCB-helping. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 29(3), 359–371. doi:10.1177/15480518211041629
- Trung, N. D., Diep, N. T., Huy, D. T. N., Mai, H. L. T., & Thanh, T. V. (2022). Assessment of industrial cluster infrastructure and recommendations for improvement in Hanoi, Vietnam. *Annals of Organizational Culture, Communications and Leadership, External Engagement Journal*, 3, 40–48. doi:10.51847/ghwShR5782



- Wang, C., Fu, W., Wu, X., & Wang, Y. (2023). Just world beliefs and altruistic behaviors of college students during the COVID-19 pandemic: the mediating role of empathy. *Current Psychology*, 42, 32244–32254. doi:10.1007/s12144-023-04233-9
- Wiktorowicz, J., Warwas, I., Turek, D., & Kuchciak, I. (2022). Does generativity matter? A meta-analysis on individual work outcomes. *European Journal of Ageing*, 19(4), 977–995. doi:10.1007/s10433-022-00727-w
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601–617. doi:10.1177/014920639101700305
- Wiseman, J., & Stillwell, A. (2022). Organizational justice: Typology, antecedents, and consequences. *Encyclopedia*, 2(3), 1287–1295. doi:10.3390/encyclopedia2030086
- Yu, T. W. (2022). The effects of organizational justice, trust, and supervisor–subordinate guanxi on organizational citizenship behavior: a social-exchange perspective. *Management Research Review*, 45(8), 985–1000. doi:10.1108/MRR-03-2021-0238

