

BARTOSZ SEILER
HANNA BORTNOWSKA

Organisational Citizenship Behaviours and job burnout among employees of nonprofit organisations

1. Introduction

Nonprofit organisations (NPOs) are labour-intensive entities. They base their activities on motivated, committed staff who represent a peculiar set of characteristics and behaviours that enable the emergence of a specific, community-driven atmosphere.

Employees often contribute to nonprofit activities without being paid. For this reason, the literature devotes much attention to the problems of volunteering and volunteering management. In recent years, the prism of considering labour topics in the third sector has broadened. Fuelled by enterprise research, there is a growing interest in exploring the behaviours of all categories of employees (not just volunteers) that go beyond role-related requirements. This is one of the reasons why the concept of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) is being adapted to the context of the third sector (Aranda et al. 2018; Erks et al. 2021; Nonnis et al. 2020; Pimthong 2016; van Schie et al. 2015).

The activity of a nonprofit organisation, as already mentioned, requires highly motivated

Bartosz Seiler,
Faculty of Economics and Management,
University of Zielona Góra,
Poland,
ORCID: 0000-0003-0380-746x .
Hanna Bortnowska,
Faculty of Economics and Management,
University of Zielona Góra,
Poland,
ORCID: 0000-0002-7327-7524.

and committed staff. At the same time, however, employment in NPOs proves exhausting in terms of working conditions given that such organisations often deal with complex social issues that require resilience to stress. Solving these problems on a macroscale depends on external, that is institutional, factors. This in turn fuels the sense of agency among NPOs employees, and consequently, takes a high emotional and health toll on them. Employees in NPOs frequently grapple with fatigue, stress, pressure to work more, as well as a sense of powerlessness related to external obstacles in the implementation of their mission (Cypryńska-Nezlek, 2020). In such conditions, it is easy to experience burnout. According to Deng et al. (2021), employees in nonprofits are marked by high burnout rates. This was also confirmed by comparative studies carried out among managers of nonprofit, for-profit and public organisations, in which the highest rate of professional burnout was reported among NPOs leaders (Seiler and Bortnowska, 2021).

In the literature we find studies analysing different relationships between OCBs and job burnout (e.g. Baranik and Eby, 2016; Brown and Roloff, 2015; Kim, 2018; Pohl et al. 2023; Schepman and Zarate, 2008; Wang et al. 2022). However, they were conducted in for-profits and public organisations, while no such studies having been identified in NPOs. There is therefore a cognitive gap and a research gap in this area.

The aim of the article is to define the correlation between job burnout and organisational citizenship behaviours among employees of nonprofits.

The article is divided into 9 sections. In the introduction, the directions of research on organisational citizenship behaviours, the research gap and the purpose of the article are synthetically laid out. In the second section, the results of the literature review on OCBs are presented, while the third section addresses the job burnout. Section four discusses the relationship between OCBs and JB. Section five contains a description of our research methodology, and section six is where the results are shared. In the last sections, the results are benchmarked with some of the findings of other authors, conclusions were indicated as well as limitations and directions of future research.

2. Organisational Citizenship Behaviours

As per Organ (1988, p. 4; cf. Organ, 2018), OCB 'is an individual behaviour that is discretionary, not explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization'. OCB is viewed as individual behaviour which nonetheless has a cumulative effect

on the activities of employees, work teams and the organisation as a whole. Relationships between OCBs and, among others, organisational performance, including profitability, productivity, product quality, efficiency have been demonstrated (Podsakoff et al. 2013; Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1997; Podsakoff et al. 1997).

From a theoretical standpoint however, doubts were raised by the discretionary aspect of the definition proposed by Organ. It was pointed out that citizenship behaviour is a function of how employees perceive their duties at work (Morrison, 1994). It was also stressed that these can be expected by supervisors and co-workers, and therefore formally recognized and rewarded. Some studies have shown that these behaviours are factored in by managers, e.g. in the processes of recruitment (Podsakoff et al. 2011) and employee evaluation (MacKenzie et al. 1993). Building on the findings of Rioux and Penner (2001; cf. Bolino, 1999), attempted impression management may also spawn these behaviours. In other words, they can be used to shape a certain image in the eyes of colleagues and superiors with a view to obtaining specific rewards in return.

Doubts about whether OCBs can be classified as behaviours that go beyond role requirements have propelled alternative notions. Graham (1991; cf. Van Dyne et al. 1994) put forward a conceptualization of organisational citizenship behaviours that includes traditional in-role behaviours, extra-role behaviours, and political behaviours. From this point of view, OCB is an enlarged form of job performance and is not merely extra-role. Let us also note that Organ (1997) went on to modify his definition, stating that OCB supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place. In so doing, as noted by LePine et al. (2002), he aligned the definition of OCB with that of Contextual Performance proposed by Borman and Motowidlo (1997). Van Dyne et al. (1995), however, found that the distinction between in-role and extra-role behaviours - despite application difficulties with precise distinction between the two forms - has an important theoretical value (they classified OCBs as affiliative and promotive extra-role behaviours). This may prove important for the research of OCBs in nonprofits, as these tend to be less formalised and hierarchical than public and for-profit organisations (Anheier, 2005). In addition, nonprofits largely rely on the input of volunteers with a flexible scope of duties.

This begs the question about the similarity of OCBs and volunteer work. According to Finkelstein and Penner (2004, p. 384; Finkelstein, 2006), these are behaviours that 'involve long-term, planned, and discretionary acts that occur in an organizational context and that benefit nonintimate others'. Three common

features of OCBs and (formal) volunteering can therefore be identified (Rioux and Penner, 2001). First, they are discretionary prosocial behaviours. Secondly, they occur within the organisational context and the recipients of the benefits are entities related to the organisation or the organisation as a whole. Thirdly, in both cases there is no personal or social obligation to help. Let us stress another significant difference between volunteering and OCBs, consisting in the fact that, unlike volunteerism, OCBs are directed to familiar recipients-(Van Emmerik et al. 2003).

When discussing the essence of OCBs, it is important to establish the dimensions of these behaviours. Smith et al. (1983) identify to this end altruism and generalised compliance. Organ (1988) lists as many as five dimensions: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. Podsakoff et al. (2000), based on the examination of literature, expand it even further to include the following: helping behaviour, sportsmanship, organisational loyalty, organisational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, self-development. OCB taxonomies were also developed, among others, by: Graham (1991), Borman et al. (2001), Van Dyne et al. (1995). However, reporting after Williams and Anderson (1991), in many studies OCBs are reduced to: OCBI - behaviours directed at individuals and groups within the organisation, and OCBO - behaviours directed at the organisation as a whole (cf. MacKenzie et al. 2018).

An important part of the research on OCBs is testing the relationships of this type of behaviour with different variables. In previous studies, individual differences: agreeableness, conscientiousness, positive and negative affectivity (Borman et al. 2001; Konovsky and Organ, 1996; Organ and Lingl, 1995; Organ and Ryan, 1995), equity sensitivity (Blakely, Andrews and Moorman, 2005; Konovsky and Organ, 1996), locus of control (Blakely, Srivastava and Moorman, 2005; Borman et al. 2001), emotional intelligence (Turnipseed, 2017), empathy (McNeely and Meglino, 1992), motives, motive fulfilment and role identity (Finkelstein and Penner, 2004; Finkelstein, 2006; Rioux and Penner, 2001) have been tested for. The correlations between OCBs and the cognitive and affective components of attitude have been studied as well (Lee and Allen, 2002; Organ and Konovsky, 1989), and so has been the relationship between OCBs and emotions experienced in the workplace (Ziegler et al. 2002). Moreover, the links between OCBs and leader behaviours have been analysed (Babcock-Roberson and Strickland, 2010; Harris et al. 2014; Podsakoff et al. 1990; Podsakoff et al. 1996a, 1996b), and so have been factors related to the characteristics of work and the functioning of the organisation, e.g.: organisational formalisation, organisational inflexibility,

spatial distance (Podsakoff et al. 1996a, 1996b), perceived organisational support (Moorman et al. 1998; Alshaabani et al. 2021) or social support (Bastian and Sogirin, 2022; Han, 2010; Kim et al. 2013), workplace environment (Turnipseed and Murkison, 1996).

Lastly (or rather firstly, chronologically speaking), OCBs have also been examined in relation to attitudinal and perceptual variables: job satisfaction (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Smith et al. 1983) organisational justice (Farh et al. 1990; Moorman, 1991; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993), organisational commitment (Moorman et al. 1993; Williams and Anderson, 1991). We might also include in this dimension research on the correlations between OCBs and work engagement (Urbini et al. 2020), work alienation (Suárez-Mendoza and Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara, 2008), as well as job burnout (e.g. Abate et al. 2018; Carlson and Thompson, 1995; Lizano and Barak, 2015; Low et al. 2001).

The concept of OCB, as developed by organisational psychologists, has been adapted in recent years also on the basis of research into the nonprofit sector. Pimthong (2016), for one, examined the relationship between OCBs and organisational commitment, leadership and team effectiveness in NPOs. Erks et al. (2021) analysed OCBs' relationship with volunteer meaningfulness and nature of volunteer activity, Aranda et al. (2018) – with psychological contract breach, van Schie et al. (2015) – with organisational context. Nonnis et al. (2020) conducted research in an Italian nonprofit dealing with blood donations.

3. Job burnout

The authors of the most common definition of job burnout are Maslach and Jackson (1981, p. 1), who defined it as 'a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that occurs frequently among individuals who do <<people-work>> of some kind'. According to these authors, JB consists of three dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach and Jackson, 1981). 'Emotional exhaustion refers to feelings of being overextended and exhausted by the emotional demands of one's work. Depersonalization is characterized by a detached and cynical response to the recipients of one's service or care. Finally, reduced personal accomplishment refers to the self-evaluation that one is no longer effective in working with recipients and in fulfilling one's job responsibilities' (Demerouti et al. 2001, p. 499, after: Maslach et al. 1996). In relation to that concept, the two above-mentioned authors developed the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Maslach and Jackson, 1981; Maslach et al. 1996).

The authors of the first publications on JB stated, that it affects only representatives of social services, such as doctors, emergency services, care workers and teachers (Schaufeli and Buunk, 2003). However, over the years, subsequent empirical studies found that JB can concern all employees, regardless of the type of job they perform (cf.: Leiter and Maslach, 2023; Leiter and Schaufeli, 1996; Maslach et al. 2008).

According to some authors, the MBI has several shortcomings, both theoretical and psychometric ones (see more: Demerouti et al. 2001; Kalliath, 2000; Lee and Ashforth, 1996; Leiter, 1993). In response to these shortcomings, Demerouti et al. (2001) prepared an alternative questionnaire - the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI). It is based on a model similar to that of the MBI, but considers only 2 dimensions: exhaustion and disengagement from work.

The factors influencing job burnout have been examined in many studies. Cordes and Dougherty (1993) categorised burnout-related factors into 3 groups: job and role characteristics, organisational characteristics and personal characteristics. Maslach and Leiter (2005) identified 2 groups of factors which dominate the people before JB. The first group (situational predictors) include 6 antecedents: workload, control, award, social network, job fairness, and values. The second group contains the following individual antecedents: age, gender, marital status, experience (cf. Shoman et al. 2021).

The results of job burnout were also analysed by researchers. It is an important predictor of the physical consequences (e.g. hypercholesterolemia, obesity, type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular diseases, musculoskeletal pain, changes in pain experiences, prolonged fatigue, headaches, gastrointestinal issues, severe injuries, respiratory problems, mortality below the age of 45 years) as well as the psychological ones (e.g. insomnia, mood disorders, depressive symptoms, use of psychotropic and antidepressant treatment, hospitalisation for mental disorders and psychological ill-health symptoms). Job dissatisfaction, absenteeism, new disability pension, job demands, job resources, new disability pension, and presenteeism were identified as occupational outcomes (Salvagioni et al. 2017; cf. Aronsson et al. 2017; Bakker and de Vries, 2021; Bakker et al. 2023; Bayes et al. 2021; Edú-Valsania et al. 2022; Lizano, 2015; Patel et al. 2018; Seiler et al. 2023). 'A central problem in the burnout literature is that interventions to effectively prevent and reduce burnout are often advocated, but rarely designed and studied' (see more: Demerouti et al. 2021, p. 689).

Job burnout may be experienced not only by the employees of for-profits (e.g. Abate et al. 2018; Low et al. 2001; Yang et al. 2017) or in public organisations

(e.g. Lizano and Barak, 2015; Carlson and Thompson, 1995; Lee, 2018), but also in nonprofits (e.g. Craiovan, 2015; Pomerantz, 1991; Romina, 2016). Moreover, cross-sector research by Seiler and Bortnowska (2021) demonstrated that NPO managers are marked by the highest rate of professional burnout compared to the representatives of the managerial staff employed in the other types of entities.

Researchers dealing with the problem of job burnout in NPOs have looked into, among others, predictive indicators of this phenomenon in nonprofit organisations, breaking them down into two general categories: individual personality factors and organisational environment factors (Pomerantz, 1991). Deng et al. (2021) examined the effects of job demands and job resources on job burnout and psychological distress experienced by nonprofit employees. Job burnout among people performing certain professions in nonprofit organisations was also examined, e.g. Romina (2016) analysed this problem among psychologists, Leung (2009) - among social workers, and Craiovan (2015) - among persons who worked in the domain of social services, psychology and kinesiotherapy.

4. Organisational citizenship behaviours and job burnout

In the literature we find studies that analysed the links between OCBs and job burnout; they were conducted in for-profit and public organisations only (e.g. Baranik and Eby, 2016; Kim, 2018; Brown and Roloff, 2015; Schepman and Zarate, 2008; Wang et al. 2022). But the resulting findings are not clear. Sesen et al. (2011; cf. Wang et al. 2022) found a statistically significant negative relation between JB and OCB dimensions ($p < .01$), except for between emotional exhaustion and OCB-I ($r = .04$, $p > .05$) and between depersonalization and OCB-O ($r = -.24$, $p > .05$). According to these authors, the only contributor of the burnout dimension on OCB-O (toward organisation) was the reduced personal accomplishment while emotional exhaustion and depersonalization had no effect. Cropanzano et al. (2003) found that emotional exhaustion only effected OCB-O ($\beta = -.19$; $p < .01$) negatively and had no effect on OCB-I. Van Emmerik et al. (2005; cf. Nasiri, 2015) reported a negative relation between OCB and reduced personal accomplishment ($\beta = -.45$; $p < .01$) and between altruism and emotional exhaustion ($r = -.23$; $p < .01$). Chiu and Tsai (2006) identified negative correlations between OCB and emotional exhaustion ($\beta = -.19$; $p < .01$) and reduced personal accomplishment ($\beta = -.55$; $p < .001$).

The relationship between OCBs and burnout are also analysed taking into account variables such as: motivation (Margaretha, 2019; cf. Kim, 2018), job satisfaction (Sesen et al. 2011), flow (Kasa and Hasan, 2015), organisational support and psychological contract fulfilment (Brown and Reloff, 2015), performance management fairness (Bauwens et al. 2019), ethical climate (Wang et al. 2022), workplace incivility (Liu et al. 2022), affective and/or continuance commitment (cf. Khan et al. 2018; Aslam et al. 2012), job involvement (Chiu and Tsai, 2006), employee engagement (Adnan et al. 2021), structural empowerment (Gilbert et al. 2010).

As pointed out earlier, such research has been limited to commercial and public organisations, and no study of this kind conducted in NPOs was found. Kang (2012) was the only one who examined the relationship between JB and OCBs in - as he himself put it - 'private social welfare organisations'. However, it concerned only a selected category of employees, namely social workers. In the same vein, research by Schepman and Zarate (2008) was carried out among social service workers conducting direct service in small NPOs. By contrast, Van Emmerik et al. (2003) analysed the relationship between altruism and volunteering and moderating effects of burnout, but the volunteering part only concerned bank, city council or university employees.

The lack of such research constitutes a research gap because, as far as the performance of staff in NPOs is concerned, a stark difference can be observed compared to for-profit and public organisations. Comparative studies have highlighted differences between the three sectors, e.g. in the field of values and job attitudes (Borzaga and Tortia, 2006; Goulet and Frank, 2002; Lyons et al. 2006; Mirvis, 1992), work practices (Kalleberg et al. 2006). In addition, as has already been mentioned, the activities of NPOs rely on voluntary work, whereas research points to significant differences in dispositions (Elshaug and Metzger, 2001; Mitani, 2014) and attitudes (Laczo and Hanish, 1999; Pearce, 1993; cf. Liao-Troth, 2001) between paid workers and volunteers.

The results of the analysis became the basis for the formulation the following research hypothesis:

H: Job burnout is negatively correlated with OCBs among employees of nonprofit organisations.

5. Methods

5.1. Sample

The cross-sectional study was conducted in 2022, in Poland's Lubuskie Voivodeship. The research findings presented here are part of a larger research project examining OCB in three types of entities: for-profit, nonprofit and public organizations.

The sample consisted of 100 employees of NPOs. The participation in the study was voluntary. The sampling was non-random because no list of employees working in nonprofit organisations of Lubuskie Voivodeship was available. Respondents' opinions were collected using a Google Form, through direct contact and in cooperation with Ośrodek Wsparcia Ekonomii Społecznej in Zielona Góra (Support Centre of Social Economy).

There were more women (68%) than men among the respondents. The average age of participants in the research was 42.5. Most respondents (38%) had work experience in the current organisation ranging from 4 to 10 years, slightly fewer (36%) - longer than 10 years. Persons with the seniority in the current workplace shorter than 3 years were the least represented (26%).

Most representatives of nonprofit entities were board members (43%). One in four (26%) was a paid employee. Members of organisations (19%) and volunteers (12%) were less represented. They were mainly active in associations (79%) or foundations (18%). More than every third NPO representatives (38%) worked for an entity employing 10 or fewer people, and fewer respondents - in an organisation employing 11 to 20 people (31%) or more than 50 people (22%). Respondents working for entities employing from 20 to 49 people were the least represented (9%).

Nonprofits acting in the area of social and humanitarian aid, rescue (50%) and/or health care (33%) were the most numerous. There were relatively many representatives of entities involved in education and upbringing, R&D activities, scientific research (28%), as well as in sport, tourism, leisure, hobby (26%), local development (22%), culture and arts (18%). Respondents working on environmental protection (9%), support for NPOs and civic initiatives (8%) and/or religion (3%) were the least represented.

5.2. Measures

Various research tools are used to measure OCB, e.g. those developed by: Fox et al. (2012), Konovsky and Organ (1996), Lee and Allen (2002), Podsakoff et al. (1990), Spector et al. (2010), Williams and Anderson (1991). In the course of our own research we used – similarly to e.g. Glińska-Neweś and Szostek (2018) – the 12-item OCB scale developed by Spector (Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Checklist; retrieved from: <http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/ocbcpage.html>, 26.01.2018 – access date). Respondents were asked to select one of the answers on a 5-point scale (never -1, once or twice - 2, once or twice a month - 3, once or twice a week - 4, every day - 5). The scale value was calculated as the simple average – from 1 to 5. 6 items concerned behaviours directed toward the organisation (OCB-O), while the other 6 items concerned behaviours directed toward people in the organisation (OCB-P).

The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory¹ – a tool developed by Demerouti et al. (2001) – was used to measure JB among respondents. The Polish language version of the OLBI tool, prepared by Cieślak (Baka and Cieślak, 2010), was applied. This questionnaire consists of 16 items, 8 of which concern disengagement and the other 8 – exhaustion. Respondents give their answers on a 4-point scale, where 1 means ‘I strongly agree’ and 4 – ‘I strongly disagree’. Each subscale includes 4 items that are positively framed and 4 items that are negatively framed. Positively framed items should be reverse. The subscale score (range 1-4) is the sum of the items’ scores divided by their number for the subscales of exhaustion and disengagement (Baka and Basińska, 2016).

5.3. Data analysis

Statistical analysis of the data was performed using the Statistica software. Internal consistency was confirmed by the standard Cronbach’s alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951). The following values were adopted: 0.734440132² (for the OCB-O subscale), 0.770730380 (OCB-P), 0.734658309 (JB – disengagement), 0.797883753 (JB – exhaustion). Subsequently, factoring in the results of the Shapiro-



1 The OLBI was used, as it can be used to various professional groups and concerns all employees regardless of the industry or sector that they work (Baka and Basińska, 2016).

2 The scales forming part of the tool should exhibit a value of the α -Cronbach’s coefficient larger than 0.7. Questionnaires whose α -Cronbach’s coefficient is smaller than 0.6 should not be used (Brzeziński, 2011).

Wilk tests (Shapiro and Wilk, 1965)³, a decision was made to treat the distribution of the variables OCB-O, OCB-P, as well as of 'job burnout - disengagement' and 'job burnout - exhaustion' as normal distributions (table 1).

Table 1. Shapiro-Wilk test results for the variables OCB-O, OCB-P as well as for job burnout (disengagement) and job burnout (exhaustion)

Variables	W	p
OCB-O	0,983197	0,233838
OCB-P	0,986154	0,383313
Job burnout -disengagement	0,988592	0,552857
Job burnout -exhaustion	0,986541	0,407524

Source: own study

Since the variables presented a distribution close to normal, the use of Pearson's correlation coefficient r to analyse the relevant correlations was considered. This, however, was ruled out as the relationship between the variables did not turn out to be rectilinear. Given that conditions for calculating Pearson's r correlation coefficient were not met, it became necessary to use its non-parametric equivalent - Spearman's rank correlation coefficient.

6. Results

The research demonstrates that, in what concerns the OCB-O subscale, the respondents awarded min. 9 and max. 29 points, whereas for the OCB-P subscale, the awarded ratings were min. 6 and max. 30 points. The arithmetic means differed slightly and stood at 17.42 and 17.36, respectively. The standard deviation was higher for the OCB-P subscale (4.5182 vs. 4.0755) (table 2). The mean score for the OCB-O subscale (3.152) was a bit higher than for the OCB-P subscale (3.037).

³ In the case of the Shapiro-Wilk test, the null hypothesis for this test is that the test sample comes from a normally distributed population. If the p-value is less than the conventional level of 0.05, then we reject the hypothesis of normality, otherwise we do not reject it (Dudley, 2012).

When analysing the data sourced from the OLBI questionnaire, it was found that in the case of the disengagement subscale, the respondents awarded slightly less points than in the case of exhaustion, i.e. a minimum of 8 and 9 points (respectively) and a maximum of 27 and 29 points (respectively). The arithmetic mean was also lower for the disengagement subscale (17.56 vs. 18.27), as was the standard deviation (3.9704 vs. 4.3380) (table 2).

Table 2. OCB-O, OCB-P, job burnout – disengagement, job burnout – exhaustion – selected descriptive statistics

Variables	Mean	Median	Mode	Min.	Max.	Standard deviation
OCB-O	17,42	17	17	9	29	4,0755
OCB-P	17,36	17	15	6	30	4,5182
Job burnout - disengagement	17,56	17	16	8	27	3,9704
Job burnout – exhaustion	18,27	18	16	9	29	4,2280

Source: own study

Let us note that the average score for the disengagement subscale was a bit lower (2.195) than for the exhaustion subscale (2.284). Both values indicate a moderate level of JB in the analysed dimensions⁴.

To test the research hypothesis regarding the correlation between OCB (OCB-O and OCB-P) and job burnout (in the dimensions: disengagement and exhaustion), a correlation analysis was carried out using Spearman's rho coefficient. The results of the study were interpreted in accordance with the Dancy and Reidy (2004) classification⁵. The analyses revealed only negligible correlations between variables: OCB-O and job burnout – disengagement ($r=0.043675$; $p < .05$), OCB-P and job burnout – disengagement ($r=0.112983$; $p < .05$), OCB-O and job burnout - exhaustion ($r= -0.000526$; $p < .05$), and OCB-P and job

⁴ The stanine standards: exhaustion scores below 1.90 indicate a low level of exhaustion, 1.91-2.74 – a moderate level, and higher than 2.75 – a high level; disengagement scores below 1.88 indicate a low level, 1.89-2.71 – a moderate level, and higher than 2.72 – a high level (Baka and Basińska, 2016).

⁵ Interpretation of Spearman's rho: ≥ 0.70 (very strong relationship), 0.40-0.69 (strong relationship), 0.30-0.39 (moderate relationship), 0.20-0.29 (weak relationship), 0.01-0.19 (no or negligible relationship) (Dancy and Reidy, 2004).

burnout - exhaustion ($r=.088092$; $p <.05$). We therefore did not gain formal statistical support for our hypothesis.

7. Discussion

Research on the correlation between JB and OCBs in for-profits and public entities does not bring clear results. However, some of the studies have managed to capture a negative correlation between the individual dimensions of both variables (e.g. Cropanzano et al. 2003; Sesen et al. 2011; Van Emmerik et al. 2005). As per our findings, such a relationship does not occur in the case of NPOs. The results are therefore not consistent with the conclusions presented by Kang (2012). Let us recall that Kant's study covered only social workers, whereas our research concerned a broader spectrum of categories of nonprofit employees: management, members of the organisation, paid employees, volunteers, all of whom were active not only in the area of social and humanitarian assistance or health care but were also engaged in: education and upbringing, scientific research, R&D, sport, tourism, leisure, hobbies, local development, or culture and arts.

The question arises: why is there no significant relationship between OCBs and job burnout in nonprofit organisations? The importance of factors that mediate or moderate the analysed relation should be verified in subsequent in-depth research where it might be worth exploring the specificity of employees of nonprofit organisations in terms of their characteristics (Elshaug and Metzger, 2001; Mitani, 2014) or job attitudes (Borzaga and Tortia, 2006; Goulet and Frank, 2002; Laczo and Hanish, 1999; Lyons et al. 2006; Mirvis, 1992; Pearce, 1993). It also seems advisable to consider the specificity of the work culture of nonprofit organisations as mentioned e.g. by Whitman (2009) or Rothschild and Milofsky (2006).

Let us also highlight another related issue that emerged in van Emmerik et al. (2003), with whose findings our own results may be partially consistent. Those authors demonstrated that job burnout is associated with OCBs, but not with volunteerism or helping kin and neighbours. This might imply that JB affects OCBs in the workplace, but not volunteering (which is an important resource in nonprofit organisations).

Let us also stress that in Poland the line between volunteering and paid work is somewhat blurred. Polish NPOs tend to be small organisations, and due to labour costs, they struggle to depart from exclusively voluntary activities towards full-time employment (Charycka et al. 2020). As a consequence, the

requirements towards employees exceed what stems from their contract and role (Charycka et al. 2020). This state of affairs may have influenced the results of our study. This shows how important the cultural context can prove in this type of research. After all, the nonprofit sector is marked by great diversity across different countries. It differs in terms of its level of development, e.g. in the area of: organisational capacity, financial viability, sectoral infrastructure (CSO Sustainability Index Explorer), as well as in terms of applied institutional solutions (Salamon and Anheier, 1997). On the other hand, meanwhile, this also highlights the need for a theoretical clarification of the boundaries between OCB and volunteering within nonprofit organisations.

8. Conclusions

The presented research showed a negligible correlation between dimensions of OCB (OCB-O, OCB-P) and dimensions of job burnout (exhaustion and disengagement) in NPOs. This may indicate the dissimilarity of the analyzed relationship in this type of entities, since most of the presented studies carried out among companies and public organizations showed the existence of a stronger relationship between analysed variables. The contribution of this study is that the OCB-JB correlation analysis was conducted in NPOs, which has not been done before.

9. Limitations and future directions of the research

The study was only quantitative and not qualitative. The study relied only on respondents' subjective statements. The scope and detail of the questions in the survey questionnaire had to be limited, making it difficult to collect complete or nuanced data. The small sample of employees of nonprofits was surveyed. This sample was selected purposively, which means the findings cannot be generalised, and the study considered only Polish NPOs, meaning it was embedded in a specific cultural context that should be accounted while formulating conclusions. Additionally, the research was not a longitudinal study. The data were lagged, which does not allow for strong causal inference. Furthermore, the questionnaire-based research used may have led to common method bias because it was used the same tool to collect various data from survey participants.

A better understanding of the analysed problem would require more in-depth qualitative research. Future research using longitudinal data is also

recommended. It is also reasonable to consider carrying out a study that will analyse factors which mediate or moderate the relationship between JB and OCBs in nonprofits.

Abstract

Organisational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) are behaviours that go beyond the formal role and are organizationally functional. They may be linked, among others, to job burnout. This relationship has been studied in for-profit and public organisations. No such studies have been found for nonprofit entities operating in different areas. The aim of the article is to verify whether there is a correlation between job burnout and organisational citizenship behaviours among employees of nonprofits. To this end, survey research was conducted in 2022. A statistical analysis of the obtained data was performed using the Statistica software. It was found that the relationship under analysis does not occur in NPOs.

Keywords: *organizational citizenship behaviours; job burnout; nonprofit organizations.*

JEL

Classification: M12; M54; O15; L3.

References

- Abate, J., Schaefer, T., Pavone, T. (2018). Understanding generational identity, job burnout, job satisfaction, job tenure and turnover intention. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, Vol. 22(1), pp. 1-12.
- Adnan, M., Nawaz, A., Shah, S. M. J. (2021). Organizational Citizenship Behavior as a consequence of work-life balance: the mediating role of burnout and moderating role of employee engagement. *Sustainable Business and Society in Emerging Economies*, Vol. 3(4), pp. 683-695. DOI: 10.26710/sbsee.v3i4.2142.
- Alshaabani, A., Naz, F., Magda, R., Rudnák, I. (2021). Impact of perceived organizational support on OCB in the time of COVID-19 pandemic in Hungary: employee engagement and affective commitment as mediators. *Sustainability*, Vol. 13(14), pp. 1-21. DOI: 10.3390/su13147800.
- Anheier, H.K. (2005). *Nonprofit Organizations. Theory, management, policy*. London, New York: Routledge.

- Aranda, M., Hurtado, M. D., Topa, G. (2018). Breach of psychological contract and organizational citizenship behaviors in volunteerism: The mediator role of affect and the moderation of volunteers' age. *Voluntas*, Vol. 29, pp. 59-70. DOI: 10.1007/s11266-017-9923-4.
- Aronsson, G., Theorell, T., Grape, T., Hammarström, A., Hogstedt, Ch., Marteinsdottir, I., Skoog, I., Träskman-Bendz, L., Hall, Ch. (2017). A systematic review including meta-analysis of work environment and burnout symptoms. *BMC Public Health*, Vol. 17, p. 264. DOI: 10.1186/s12889-017-4153-7.
- Aslam, M. S., Ahmad, F., Anwar, S. (2012). Job burnout and organizational citizenship behaviors: Mediating role of affective commitment. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, Vol. 2(8), pp. 8120-8129.
- Babcock-Roberson, M. E., Strickland, O. J. (2010). The relationship between charismatic leadership, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, Vol. 144(3), pp. 313-326. DOI: 10.1080/00223981003648336.
- Baka, Ł., Basińska, B.A. (2016). Psychometryczne właściwości polskiej wersji oldenburskiego kwestionariusza wypalenia zawodowego (OLBI). *Medycyna Pracy*, No. 67, pp. 29-41. DOI: 10.13075/mp.5893.00353.
- Baka, L., Cieślak, R. (2010). Self-efficacy and social support and the effects of job stressors on job burnout and work engagement in teachers. *Studia Psychologica*, No. 48, pp. 5-19.
- Bakker, A.B., de Vries, J. D. (2021). Job Demands-Resources theory and self-regulation: New explanations and remedies for job burnout. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, Vol. 34(1), pp. 1-21. DOI: 10.1080/10615806.2020.1797695.
- Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., Sanz-Vergel, A. (2023). Job Demands-Resources Theory: Ten Years Later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 10, pp. 25-53. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-053933.
- Baranik, L.E., Eby, L. (2016). Organizational citizenship behaviors and employee depressed mood, burnout, and satisfaction with health and life: The mediating role of positive affect. *Personnel Review*, Vol. 45, No. 4, pp. 626-642. DOI: 10.1108/PR-03-2014-0066.
- Bastian, A., Sogirin (2022). The effect of social support on job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior as mediation. *Sains Organisasi*, Vol. 1(2), pp. 100-111. DOI: 10.55356/so.v1i2.17.
- Bateman, T.S., Organ, D.W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 26, pp. 587-595. DOI:10.2307/255908.
- Bauwens, R., Audenaert, M., Huisman, J., Decramer, A. (2019). Performance management fairness and burnout: implications for organizational citizenship behaviors. *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 44(3), pp. 584-598. DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2017.1389878.

- Bayes A., Tavella G., Parker G. (2021). The biology of burnout: Causes and consequences. *The World Journal of Biological Psychiatry*, Vol. 22, No. 9, pp. 686-698. DOI: 10.1080/15622975.2021.1907713.
- Blakely, G.L., Srivastava, A., Moorman, R.H. (2005). The effects of nationality, work role centrality, and work locus of control, on role definitions of OCB. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, Vol. 12(1), pp. 103-117. DOI: 10.1177/107179190501200109.
- Blakely, G.L., Andrews, M.C., Moorman, R.H. (2005). The moderating effects of equity sensitivity on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 20(2), pp. 259-273. DOI: 10.1007/s10869-005-8263-3.
- Bolino, M.C. (1999). Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors? *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 24, pp. 82-98. DOI: 10.5465/AMR.1999.1580442.
- Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T.D., Motowidlo, S. J. (2001). Personality Predictors of Citizenship Performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Vol. 9(1/2), pp. 52-69. DOI: 10.1111/1468-2389.00163.
- Borman, W.C., Motowidlo, S.J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, Vol. 10(2), pp. 99-109. DOI: 10.1207/s15327043hup1002_3.
- Borzaga, C., Tortia, E. (2006). Worker Motivations, Job Satisfaction, and Loyalty in Public and Nonprofit Social Services. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 35(2), pp. 225-248. DOI: 10.1177/0899764006287207.
- Brown, L.A., Roloff, M. E. (2015). Organizational Citizenship Behavior, organizational communication, and burnout: the buffering role of perceived organizational support and psychological contracts. *Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 63(4), pp. 384-404. DOI: 10.1080/01463373.2015.1058287.
- Brzeziński, J. (1999, 2011). *Metodologia badań psychologicznych*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Carlson, B. C., Thompson, J. A. (1995). Job burnout and job leaving in public school teachers: Implications for stress management. *International Journal of Stress Management*, Vol. 2, pp. 15-29. DOI: 10.1007/BF01701948.
- Charycka B., Gumkowska M., Arczewska M. (2020). *Zatrudnienie. Problemy personelu organizacji pozarządowych z perspektywy pracowniczej*. Warsaw: Klon/Jawor. <https://api.ngo.pl/media/get/137381> (15.02.2023 - access date).
- Chiu, S. F., Tsai, M. C. (2006). Relationships among burnout, job involvement, and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 140(6), pp. 517-530. DOI: 10.3200/JRPL.140.6.517-530.
- Cordes, C., Dougherty, T. (1993). A Review and an Integration of Research on Job Burnout. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 18, pp. 621-656. DOI: 10.5465/AMR.1993.9402210153.

- Craiovan, P. M. (2015). Burnout, depression and quality of life among the Romanian employees working in non-governmental organizations. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, No. 187, pp. 234-238. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.03.044.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the interval structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, No. 16, pp. 297-334.
- Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E. Byrne, Z. S. (2003). The relationship of emotional exhaustion to work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88 (1), pp. 160-169. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.1.160.
- CSO Sustainability Index Explorer, <https://csosi.org/> (27.02.2023 - access date).
- Cypryańska-Nezlek, M. (2020), *Raport z badania. Wyzwania i zagrożenia pracy w NGO i nieformalnych ruchach społecznych*, https://www.rpo.gov.pl/sites/default/files/Raport%20z%20badania%20Marzena%20Cyprya%C5%84ska-Nezlek_0.pdf (16.09.2020 - access date).
- Dancey, C., Reidy, J. (2004). *Statistics without maths for psychology: using SPSS for Windows*. London: Prentice-Hall.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., Nachreiner, F., Schaufeli, W.B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86, pp. 499-512. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., Peeters, M.C.W., Breevaart, K, (2021). New directions in burnout research. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 30(5), pp. 686-691. DOI: 10.1080/1359432X.2021.1979962.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., Vardakou, I., Kantas, A. (2003). The convergent validity of two burnout instruments. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 12-23. DOI: 10.1027//1015-5759.19.1.12.
- Deng, G., Huang, C., Cheung, S. P., Zhang, C. (2021). Job demands and resources, burnout, and psychological distress of employees in the chinese non-profit sector. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, Vol. 12; p. 2310. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyt.2021.790064.
- Dudley, R. (2012). *The Shapiro-Wilk test for normality*. <https://math.mit.edu/~rmd/46512/shapiro.pdf> (04.01.2023 - access date).
- Edú-Valsania, S, Laguía, A, Moriano, J.A. (2022). Burnout: a review of theory and measurement. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. Vol. 19(3), p. 1780. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph19031780.
- Elshaug, C., Metzger, J. (2001). Personality attributes of volunteers and paid workers engaged in similar occupational tasks. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 141(6), pp. 752-763. DOI: 10.1080/00224540109600586.
- Erks, R. L., Allen, J. A., Harland, L. K., Prange, K. (2021). Do volunteers volunteer to do more at work? The relationship between volunteering, engagement, and OCBs. *Voluntas*, Vol. 32, pp. 1285-1298. DOI: 10.1007/s11266-020-00232-7.

- Farh, J.L., Podsakoff, P.M., Organ, D.W. (1990). Accounting for Organizational Citizenship Behavior: leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 16(4), pp. 705-721. DOI: 10.1177/014920639001600404.
- Finkelstein, M.A. (2006). Dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior: Motives, motive fulfillment, and role identity. *Social Behavior and Personality*, Vol. 34(6), pp. 603-616. DOI: 10.2224/sbp.2006.34.6.603.
- Finkelstein, M.A., Penner, L.A. (2004). Predicting organizational citizenship behavior: Integrating the functional and role identity approaches. *Social Behavior and Personality*, Vol. 32(4), pp. 383-398. DOI: 10.2224/sbp.2004.32.4.383.
- Fox, S., Spector, P.E., Goh, A., Bruursema, K., Kessler, S.R. (2012). The deviant citizen: Measuring potential positive relations between counterproductive work behaviour and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 85, pp. 199-220. DOI: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.2011.02032.x.
- Gilbert, S., Laschinger, H. K., Leiter, M. (2010). The mediating effect of burnout on the relationship between structural empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviours. *Journal of Nursing Management*, Vol. 18(3), pp. 339-348. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2834.2010.01074.x.
- Glińska-Neweś, A., Szostek, D. (2018). Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in public and private sector. *International Journal of Contemporary Management*, Vol. 17. DOI: 10.4467/24498939IJCM.18.003.8382.
- Goulet, L.R., Frank, M.L. (2002). Organizational commitment across three sectors: public, non-profit, and for-profit. *Public Personnel Management*, Vol. 31. pp. 201-210. DOI: 10.1177/009102600203100206.
- Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, No. 4(4), pp. 249-270. DOI: 10.1007/BF01385031.
- Han, S. J. (2010). The effect of the perception of self-efficacy and social support on organizational citizenship behavior among nurses in hospital. *Korean Journal of Adult Nursing*, Vol. 22(6), pp. 606-614.
- Harris, T. B., Li, N., Kirkman, B. L. (2014). Leader-member exchange (LMX) in context: How LMX differentiation and LMX relational separation attenuate LMX's influence on OCB and turnover intention. *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 25, Is. 2, pp. 314-328. DOI: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.09.001.
<http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/ocbcpage.html> (26.01.2018 - access date).
- Kalleberg, A. L., Marsden, P. V., Reynolds, J., Knoke, D. (2006). Beyond profit? Sectoral differences in high-performance work practices. *Work and Occupations*, No. 33(3), pp. 271-302. DOI: 10.1177/0730888406290049.

- Kalliath, T.J. (2000). A test of the Maslach Burnout Inventory in three samples of healthcare professionals. *Work & Stress*, Vol. 14. DOI: 10.1080/026783700417212.
- Kang, J. (2012). Relationship among job burnout, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in social workers using structural equation modelling. *International Journal of Contents*, Vol. 8, Iss. 3, pp. 57-63. DOI: 10.5392/IJoC.2012.8.3.057.
- Kasa, M., Hassan, Z. (2015). The role of flow between burnout and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) among hotel employees in Malaysia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 211, pp. 199-206. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.084.
- Khan, S., Jehan, N., Shaheen, S., Ali, G. (2018). Effect of burnout on organizational citizenship behaviors: Mediating role of affective and continuance commitment. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 2, pp. 1-13.
- Kim, J. (2018). The contrary effects of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations on burnout and turnover intention in the public sector. *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 39 No. 3, pp. 486-500. DOI: 10.1108/IJM-03-2017-0053.
- Kim, Y. J., Van Dyne, L., Kamdar, D., Johnson, R. E. (2013). Why and when do motives matter? An integrative model of motives, role cognitions, and social support as predictors of OCB. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 121(2), pp. 231-245. DOI: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2013.03.004.
- Konovsky, M. A., Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 17(3), pp. 253-266. DOI: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199605)17:33.0.CO;2-Q.
- Laczo, R.M., Hanisch, K.A. (1999). An examination of behavioral families of organizational withdrawal in volunteer workers and paid employees. *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 9(4), pp. 453-477. DOI: 10.1016/S1053-4822(99)00029-7.
- Lee, H. J. (2018). How emotional intelligence relates to job satisfaction and burnout in public service jobs. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, Vol. 84(4), pp. 729-745. DOI: 10.1177/0020852316670489
- Lee, K., Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87(1), pp. 131-142. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.131.
- Lee, R.T., Ashforth, B.E. (1996). A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of job burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81(2), pp. 123-33. DOI: 10.1037//0021-9010.81.2.123.
- Leiter, M. (1993). *Burnout as a developmental process. Considerations of models*. In: Schaufeli, W.B., Maslach, C., Marek, T. (Eds.). *Professional burnout: recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 237-250). Washington: Taylor & Francis.

- Leiter, M., Maslach, C. (2004). *Areas of Worklife: A Structured Approach to Organizational Predictors of Job Burnout*. In: Perrewe, P., Ganster, D. (Eds.). *Research in Occupational Stress and Well Being* (pp. 91-134). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Leiter, M., Maslach, C. (2023). *Moving beyond the disease framework*. In: Day, A., Cooper, C.L. (Eds.). *The Social Context of Burnout and Mental Health* (pp. 137-149). The Routledge Companion to Mental Health at Work. New York: Routledge.
- Leiter, M., Schaufeli, W.B. (1996). Consistency of the burnout construct across occupations. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 229-242. DOI: 10.1080/10615809608249404.
- 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*, Vol. 87(1), pp. 52-65. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.52
- Leung, C. K. (2009). A study of job burnout among social workers in NGO family services in Hong Kong: implications for management. *HKU Theses Online (HKUTO)*. DOI: 10.5353/th_b4516784. <https://hub.hku.hk/handle/10722/132988> (09.-5.2023 - access date).
- Liao-Troth, M.A. (2001). Attitude differences between paid workers and volunteers. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, Vol. 11(4), pp. 423-442. DOI: 10.1002/nml.11403.
- Liu, W., Zhou, Z. E., Xuan Che, X. (2022). Effect of workplace incivility on OCB through burnout: The moderating role of affective commitment. *Key Topics in Work and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 55-67). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
- Lizano, E. L. (2015). Examining the impact of job burnout on the health and well-being of human service workers: a systematic review and synthesis. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance*, Vol. 39(3), pp. 167-181. DOI: 10.1080/23303131.2015.1014122.
- Lizano, E. L., Barak, M. M. (2015). Job burnout and affective wellbeing: A longitudinal study of burnout and job satisfaction among public child welfare workers. *Children and Youth Services Review*, No. 55, pp. 18-28. DOI: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2015.05.005.
- Low, G.S., Cravens, D.W., Grant, K., Moncrief, W.C. (2001). Antecedents and consequences of salesperson burnout. *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 35 No. 5/6, pp. 587-611. DOI: 10.1108/03090560110388123.
- Lyons, S. T., Duxbury, L. E., Higgins, C. A. (2006). Comparison of the values and commitment of private sector, public sector, and parapublic sector employees. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 66, No. 4, pp. 605-618. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00620.x.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P.M., Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson

- performance. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 57(1), pp. 70-80. DOI: 10.1177/002224299305700105.
- MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, N.P., Podsakoff, P. M. (2018). *8 Individual- and Organizational-Level*. In: Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, N.P. (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Citizenship Behavior* (pp. 105-148). Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190219000.013.8.
- Margaretha, M. (2019). Motivation and job burnout: the mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Management Science and Business Administration*, Vol. 5(4), pp. 27-33. DOI: 10.18775/ijmsba.1849-5664-5419.2014.54.1004.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S.E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, No. 2. DOI: 10.1002/job.4030020205.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S.E., Leiter, M. (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory*, 3rd ed. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Maslach, C., Leiter, M. P. (2005). *Stress and burnout: The critical research*, In: Cooper, C.L. (Ed.), *Handbook of Stress Medicine and Health*, Lancaster: CRC Press, pp. 155-72.
- Maslach, C., Leiter, M., Schaufeli, W.B. (2008). *Measuring burnout*, In: Cooper, C.L., Cartwright, S. (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of organizational well-being* (pp. 86-108). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McNeely, B. L.; Meglino, B. M. (1992). Good soldiers or good duty? The role of work values and contextual antecedents in prosocial organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*, pp. 232-236. DOI: 10.5465/AMBPP.1992.17515719.
- Mirvis, P.H. (2006). The quality of employment in the nonprofit sector: an update on employee attitudes. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, Vol. 3(1):23-41. DOI: 10.1002/nml.4130030104.
- Mitani, H. (2014). Influences of resources and subjective dispositions on formal and informal volunteering. *Voluntas*, Vol. 25, pp. 1022-1040. DOI: 10.1007/s11266-013-9384-3.
- Moorman, R.H, Blakely, G.L., Niehoff, B.P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 41(3), pp. 351-357. DOI: 10.2307/256913.
- Moorman, R.H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 76(6), pp. 845-855. DOI: 10.1037//0021-9010.76.6.845.
- Moorman, R.H., Niehoff, B.P., Organ, D.W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee*

- Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol. 6(3), pp. 209-225. DOI: 10.1007/BF01419445.
- Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: the importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 37(6), pp. 1543-1567. DOI: 10.2307/256798.
- Nasiri, M. (2015). The survey of conceptual modelling of causal relationship between job burnout with organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in campus recreation administrations. *International Journal of Sport Studies*, Vol. 5(6), pp. 642-646.
- Niehoff, B.P., Moorman, R.H. (1993). Justice as mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 36(3), pp. 527-556. DOI: 10.2307/256591.
- Nonnis, M., Massidda, D., Cabiddu, C., Cuccu, S., Pedditzi, M. L., Cortese, C. G. (2020). motivation to donate, job crafting, and organizational citizenship behavior in blood collection volunteers in non-profit organizations. *International Journal of Environmental Research & Public Health*, Vol. 17(3), p. 934. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph17030934.
- Organ D. W. (2018). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Recent Trends and Developments. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 5, pp. 295-306. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104536.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W., Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, Satisfaction, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 135(3), pp. 339-350. DOI: 10.1080/00224545.1995.9713963.
- Organ, D.W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, Vol. 10, pp. 85-97. DOI: 10.1207/s15327043hup1002_2.
- Organ, D.W., Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 74(1), pp. 157-164. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.74.1.157.
- Organ, D.W., Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 48, pp. 775-802. DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x.
- Patel, R.S., Bachu, R., Adikey, A., Malik, M., Shah, M. (2018). Factors related to physician burnout and its consequences: a review. *Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 8(11), 98, DOI: 10.3390/bs8110098.
- Pearce, J.L. (1993). *Volunteers: The organizational behavior of unpaid workers, series: people and organizations*. London: Routledge.

- Pimthong, S. (2016). Antecedents and consequences of organizational citizenship behavior among NGO staff from Thailand, Myanmar, Laos and Cambodia. *The Journal of Behavioral Science*, Vol. 11(1), pp. 53-66. DOI: 10.14456/ijbs.2016.5.
- Podsakoff, N.P., Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Maynes, T.D., Spoelma, T.M. (2013). Consequences of unit-level organizational citizenship behaviors: A review and recommendations for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 35, pp. 87-119. DOI: 10.1002/job.1911.
- Podsakoff, N.P., Podsakoff, P.M., Whiting, S.W., Mishra, P. (2011). Effects of organizational citizenship behaviors on selection decisions in employment interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 96(2), pp. 310-326. DOI: 10.1037/a0020948.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: a critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26(3), pp. 513-563. DOI: 10.1016/S0149-2063(00)00047-7.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Ahearne, M., MacKenzie, S.B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 82(2), pp. 262-270. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.82.2.262.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S., Moorman, R., Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*. Vol. 1. pp. 107-142. DOI: 10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: a review and suggestion for future research. *Human Performance*, Vol. 10(2), pp. 133-151. DOI: 10.1207/s15327043hup1002_5.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Bommer, W.H. (1996a). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 22, pp. 259-298. DOI: 10.1177/014920639602200204.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Bommer, W.H. (1996b). Meta-analysis of the relationship between Kerr and Jermier's substitutes for leadership and employee job attitudes, role perceptions, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81(4), pp. 380-399. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.380.
- Pohl, S., Djediat, A., Van der Linden, J., Closon, C., Galletta, M. (2023). Work engagement, emotional exhaustion, and OCB-civic virtue among

- nurses: a multilevel analysis of emotional supervisor support. *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 14, 1249615. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1249615.
- Pomerantz, S. (1991). Predictive indicators of job burnout in nonprofit organizations. Working paper (University of San Francisco. Institute for Nonprofit Organization Management); No. 15. San Francisco: Institute for Nonprofit Organization Management, College of Professional Studies, University of San Francisco.
- Rioux, S.M., Penner, L.A. (2001). The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A motivational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86(6), pp. 1306-1314. DOI: 10.1037//0021-9010.86.6.1306.
- Romina, S. (2016). Burnout effects on psychologist who works in Albanian NGO's. *European Conference on Education and Applied Psychology*, 13th International Scientific Conference, pp. 29-34.
- Rothschild, J., Milofsky, C. (2006). The centrality of values, passions, and ethics in the nonprofit sector. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, Vol. 17, pp. 137-143. DOI: 10.1002/nml.139.
- Salamon, L. M., Anheier, H. K. (1997). *Defining the nonprofit sector: A cross-national analysis*. Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press.
- Salvagioni, D. A. J., Melanda, F. N., Mesas, A. E., González, A. D., Gabani, F. L., Andrade, S. M. D. (2017). Physical, psychological and occupational consequences of job burnout: A systematic review of prospective studies. *PloS One*, Vol. 12(10), e0185781. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0185781.
- Schaufeli, W.B., Buunk, B.P. (2003). Burnout: An overview of 25 years of research and theorizing. In: Schabracq, M.J., Winnubst, J.A.M., Cooper, C. L. (Ed.), *The handbook of work and health psychology* (pp. 282-424). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, online version: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/book/10.1002/0470013400> (26.01.2023 - access date).
- Schepman, S. B., Zarate, M. A. (2008). The relationship between burnout, negative affectivity and organizational citizenship behavior for human services employees. *International Journal of Humanities and Social sciences*, Vol. 2(4), pp. 242-247. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1058451.
- Seiler B., Bortnowska H. (2021). Job burnout among the managers of Polish nonprofit, for-profit and public organizations. *Zeszyty Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Humanitas. Zarządzanie*, Vol. 22, Iss. 1, pp. 23-39. DOI: 10.5604/01.3001.0014.8746.
- Seiler, B., Bortnowska, H., Seiler, A. (2023). Teacher job burnout and psychosocial working conditions in school. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej. Seria Organizacja i Zarządzanie*, No. 176, pp. 555–575. DOI: 10.29119/1641-3466.2023.176.32.
- Sesen, H., Cetin, F., Nejat Basim, H. (2011). The Effect of Burnout on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: The Mediating Role of Job

- Satisfaction. *International Journal of Contemporary Economics & Administrative Sciences*, Vol. 1(1), pp. 40-64.
- Shapiro, S.S., Wilk, M.B. (1965). An analysis of variance test for normality (complete samples). *Biometrika* No. 52, pp. 591-611.
- Shoman, Y., El May, E., Marca, S.C., Wild, P., Bianchi, R., Bugge, M.D., Caglayan, C., Cheptea, D., Gnesi, M., Godderis, L. et al. (2021). Predictors of Occupational Burnout: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, Vol. 18, p. 9188. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph18179188.
- Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W., Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 68, pp. 653-663. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653.
- Spector, P.E., Bauer, J.A., Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artefacts in the assessment of counterproductive work behaviour and organizational citizenship behavior: Do we know what we think we know? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 95(4), pp. 781-790. DOI: 10.1037/a0019477.
- Spector, P.E., Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior. Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 12, pp. 1-24. DOI: 10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00049-9.
- Suárez-Mendoza, M., Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara, P. (2008). The impact of work alienation on organizational citizenship behavior in the Canary Islands. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. 15. Pp. 56-76. DOI: 10.1108/19348830710860156.
- Turnipseed, D. (2017). Emotional intelligence and ocb: the moderating role of work locus of control. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 158, pp. 322-336. DOI: 10.1080/00224545.2017.1346582.
- Turnipseed, D., Murkison, G. (1996). Organization citizenship behaviour: an examination of the influence of the workplace. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 17/2, pp. 42-47. DOI: 10.1108/01437739610111222.
- Urbini, F., Callea, A., Chirumbolo, A. (2020). Promoting individual and organizational OCBs: the mediating role of work engagement. *Behavioral Science*, Vol. 10, p. 138. DOI: 10.3390/bs10090138.
- Van Dyne L., Cummings L.L., Parks J.M. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: in pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 17, pp. 215-285.
- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management*, Vol. 37(4), pp. 765-802. DOI: 10.2307/256600.
- Van Emmerik, H., Jawahar, I. M., Stone, T. H. (2005). Associations among altruism, burnout dimensions, and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Work & Stress*, Vol. 19 (1), pp. 93-100. DOI: 10.1080/02678370500046283.

- Van Emmerik, I. H., Stone, T. H., Jawahar, I. M. (2003). The relationship between altruism and helping behaviors: some moderating effects of burnout. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, No. 1. B1-B6. DOI: 10.5465/AMBPP.2003.13793172.
- Van Schie, S., Güntert, S. T., Oostlander, J., Wehner, T. (2015). How the organizational context impacts volunteers: A differentiated perspective on self-determined motivation. *Voluntas*, Vol. 26, pp. 1570-1590. DOI: 10.1007/s11266-014-9472-z.
- Wang, L., Dong, X., An, Y., Chen, C., Eckert, M., Sharplin, G., Fish, J., Fan, X. (2022). Relationships between job burnout, ethical climate and organizational citizenship behaviour among registered nurses: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, e13115. DOI: 10.1111/ijn.13115.
- Whitman, J.R. (2009). Measuring social values in philanthropic foundations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, Vol. 19, pp. 305-325, DOI:10.1002/nml.221.
- Williams, L. J., Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 17(3), pp. 601-617. DOI: 10.1177/014920639101700305.
- Yang, F., Li, X., Zhu, Y., Li, Y., Wu, C. (2017). Job burnout of construction project managers in China: A cross-sectional analysis. *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 35(7), pp. 1272-1287. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.06.005.
- Ziegler, R., Schlett, C., Casel, K., Diehl, M. (2012). The role of job satisfaction, job ambivalence, and emotions at work in predicting organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 11(4), pp. 176-190. DOI: 10.1027/1866-5888/a000071.