Chapter 2

Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Blue- and White-Collar Employees in Turkey[1]

This study investigated the relationship between employees` beliefs about their social world (social axioms: reward for application, social cynicism, religiosity, social flexibility, and fate control), their relational identification with their supervisor, and their organizational citizenship behavior (OCB; i.e., interpersonal facilitation, job dedication and organizational support) within collectivistic Turkish society. We expected OCB to depend upon one's relational identification with the supervisor and also to depend on several social axioms, given their salience in collectivistic cultures. We also investigated these relationships across white-collar and blue-collar workers, as this has not been studied much. To this end, we conducted a survey among 376 Turkish blue-collar and 147 white-collar factory employees. A series of hierarchical regression analyses confirmed our expectations that for both blue- and white-collar workers the reward for application belief was positively related to job dedication and organizational support. Religiosity was positively related to job dedication and organizational support only among blue-collar employees. As hypothesized, relational identification with the supervisor related positively to all dimensions of OCB in blue-collar employees and to interpersonal facilitation and organizational support in white-collar employees. However, the relationship between relational identification with the supervisor and organizational support appeared stronger for blue-collar than for white-collar employees. Apparently, relational identification with the supervisor is an important antecedent of OCB, particularly for blue-collar employees. Theoretical and practical implications of the study findings are discussed.

[1] This chapter has been resubmitted for publication as:
Cem-Ersoy, N., Born, M. Ph., Derous, E., & Van der Molen, H. T. (resubmitted). Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior among blue- and white-collar employees in Turkey.
This chapter was also presented at the 5th Biennial Conference of the International Academy of Intercultural Relations, Groningen, June 2007.

Chapter 2

2. 1. Introduction

Certain ingredients for cooking a delicious meal are fundamental, such as oil and salt, but if some extra suitable seasoning is added the meal will become tastier. This metaphor introduces the central concept of this paper namely organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The oil and salt represent the tasks that employees have to perform. The seasoning symbolizes OCB: "Individual behavior at work that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization" (Organ, 1988, p. 4). OCB has also been defined as employee behavior supporting the social and psychological fabric of the organization (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Examples of such behaviors include helping colleagues and taking the initiative to solve a task-related problem.

In collectivistic societies such as Turkey (Hofstede, 2001), social relationships and helping behaviors are of particular importance (Smith, Bond, & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2006). If such behaviors occur within organizations, these are referred to as forms of OCB. It therefore seems valuable to examine the occurrence of OCB in collectivistic culture and to look into potentially important antecedents of OCB in such a culture (Gelfand, Erez, & Aycan, 2007). Surprisingly, however, OCB has been investigated to a much lesser extent in collectivistic than in individualistic cultures (for notable exceptions, see Arslantaş, 2007; Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997; Hui, Lee, & Rousseau, 2004; Omar et al., 2007; Songür, Basım, & Şeşen, 2008). For instance, Arslantaş (2007) found positive effects of transformational leadership on OCB among blue-collar employees in a Turkish factory. Further, Songür et al. (2008) concluded that the justice perceptions held by Turkish white-collar employees had positive effects on their organizationally focused OCB. In China, Chen, Tsui, and Farh (2002) found loyalty to the supervisor to be a stronger predictor of OCB than organizational commitment.

Interestingly, neither of these studies examined antecedents of OCB (i.e., social beliefs and relational identification with the supervisor) among blue- and white-collar employees in a collectivistic society such as Turkey (Sluss & Ashforth, 2007). This study aimed to fill this void. To clarify our study goals, we will elaborate on two potential antecedents of OCB namely social axioms and one's relational identification to the supervisor.

First, we aimed to study *social axioms* as antecedents of OCB among Turkish employees. Leung and Bond (2004) formulated a taxonomy on social axioms, which are defined as individuals' general beliefs about the world. Studies have shown that employees' social world views may predict work-related behavior and attitudes (Andersson & Bateman 1997; Singelis, Hubbard, Her, & An, 2003; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). We are only aware of one Canadian study that investigated the relationship among social axioms and OCB (Kwantes, Karam, & Kuo, 2008). They found that employees who scored high on social cynicism considered OCB (particularly conscientious behavior) more as extra-role than intra-role behavior, whereas the reverse was true for employees who scored high on religiosity beliefs. Although studies have shown that employees' social world views may predict their work-related behavior and attitudes (Andersson & Bateman 1997; Singelis, et al., 2003; Youssef & Luthans, 2007), only one study has looked into social beliefs as determinants of OCB. Hence, the first purpose of this paper was to study social axioms as antecedents of OCB in a collectivistic culture (i.e., Turkey).

Second, with regard to the OCB of subordinates, several studies have demonstrated the importance of social exchange relationships among them and their supervisors (i.e., Leader Member Exchange, LMX Deluga, 1994) (Deluga, 1994; Hui, Law, Chen, & Tjosvold, 2008; Kamdar & Van Dyne, 2007; Settoon & Mossholder, 2002). Sluss and Ashforth (2007) introduced the concept of "*relational identification with the supervisor*" and defined it as the extent to which one defines oneself in terms of the relationship with his/her supervisor. Although studies examined the link between LMX and OCB, the relationship between one's OCB and his/her personal identification with the supervisor has not been investigated to date. Because Turkey is a collectivistic and hierarchical culture (Smith et al., 2006), employees' relational identification with their supervisor is expected to be especially salient for their OCB. The second aim of this study, therefore, was to examine another potential antecedent of OCB: subordinates' relational identification with the supervisor.

We further aimed to examine this relationship among white- and blue-collar employees, since differences in OCB among these two groups are under-investigated but can be expected. Overall, white-collar employees have a more positive perception of their working environment (Morris, Conrad, Marcantonio, Marks, & Ribisl, 1999), whereas blue-collar employees are less satisfied with their work (Wright, Bengtsson, & Frankenberg, 1994). It is surprising, however,

that only a few studies have investigated OCB among blue-collar employees (Ramamoorthy & Flood, 2004; Arslantaş, 2007). For instance, in an Irish study, Ramamoorthy and Flood (2004) found that perceived task dependency among blue-collar employees positively influenced their pro-social behaviors. Furthermore, when the hierarchical structure of Turkish society is considered, differences in work-related attitudes among blue- and white-collar employees are expected even more. Turkey is among the highest power distant countries where subordinates (such as blue-collars) accept the higher status of their supervisors (Kabasakal & Bodur, 2002) more easily than in less hierarchical cultures. Therefore, as a third aim, we extend previous work that almost exclusively focused on OCB among white-collar employees by investigating blue-collar employees' social axioms and OCB in Turkey.

We present our hypotheses below. First, we explain the social beliefs (i.e., social axioms) framework in more detail and further clarify its relevance as a potential antecedent of OCB. Subsequently, we consider how employees' relational identification with their supervisor might affect their OCB. Finally, we discuss differences between blue- and white-collar employees in

Social axioms and OCB

Culture shapes norms, perceptions, and people's expectations, and is learned through childhood socialization (Triandis, 1994). Social axioms (Leung et al., 2002) have been defined as generalized beliefs about people, social groups, social institutions, the physical environment, and the spiritual world, as well as about events and phenomena in the social world (Leung et al., 2002). These social axioms are part of one's culture, are learned during socialization, and these beliefs affect people's perceptions about the world. Because social axioms are part of people`s social world, we argue that they will be related to people`s social behavior at work, which is referred to as OCB. In the present study, we investigate social axioms as antecedents of OCB, because social axioms are part of people's social world and therefore also shape people's interpersonal perceptions and behavior at work (Leung et al., 2002). Leung et al. (2002) identified five social axioms that apply across many cultures: *reward for application, social cynicism, religiosity, social flexibility* and *fate control*. Reward for application represents a general belief that hard work and careful planning have positive consequences. Social cynicism refers to a view that life is full of unhappiness because people and institutions cannot be trusted.

Religiosity refers to the belief in the existence of supernatural forces and useful functions of religious beliefs. Social flexibility characterizes a belief that there are many ways to achieve one`s aims, and therefore human behavior changes from situation to situation. Fate control symbolizes a world view holding that events are pre-determined and there are certain ways to change these outcomes (Leung et al., 2002). Some of these social beliefs are relevant to OCB. For instance, *reward for application* is a world view that states adversities in life can be overcome by hard work, and therefore it seems directly related to work behaviors.

Borman et al. (2001; see also Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996) distinguished three OCB dimensions: *interpersonal facilitation*, *job dedication*, and *organizational support*. Interpersonal facilitation and organizational support are other-directed, as they are aimed towards one's colleagues and the organization as a whole, respectively. In contrast, job dedication has a stronger focus on the self because it refers to types of behavior such as persistence, initiative in one`s job, and self-development. McNeely and Meglino (1994) reported that perceived reward-equity and recognition positively predicted organizationally focused OCB, whereas individual difference variables, such as one`s concern for others positively predicted interpersonally focused OCB. In a US-based sample, Moorman and Blakely (1995) looked specifically into the relationship between other-oriented/self-oriented forms of OCB on the one hand, and individualistic/collectivistic orientations of people on the other hand. They demonstrated that collectivistically oriented people showed more other-oriented OCB such as interpersonal facilitation and organizational support. Thus, varied dimensions of OCB may be predicted by different antecedents. It can, indeed, be argued that social axioms will relate differently to diverse dimensions of OCB. Table 1 presents and introduces our hypothesized relationships among social axioms and separate OCB dimensions. Note that social axiom descriptions are based on Leung et al. (2002).

Table 1

Descriptions of Social Axioms and their Hypothesized Relationships with OCB Dimensions (Hypotheses1a-g)

Social axiom	*Description and research findings*	*OCB dimensions*
Reward for application	A belief that hard work, knowledge, and thorough planning lead to positive consequences. The main reasoning behind this construct is that "hard work is a means to achieve more in the end" (Leung et al., 2002). Reward for application is positively related to the number of working hours per week. (International survey research, 1995)	Job dedication includes behavior such as working extra hours and volunteering for difficult tasks. Because job dedication and reward for application have a common focus, we argue that reward for application will relate positively to job dedication. (*Hypothesis 1a*)
Social flexibility	A belief that there are multiple solutions to social problems and that one has to deal with matters according to specific circumstances. (Leung & Bond, 2004). Social flexibility is positively related to self-transcendence which means that one feels concerned about the well-being of people one is closely related to (Leung et al., 2002). Social flexibility also relates positively to compromising and collaboration in interpersonal relationships (Leung et al., 2002).	The meaning of the social flexibility construct and research findings from previous studies involve a tolerant and egalitarian understanding of interpersonal relationships. We therefore hypothesize that social flexibility is positively related to interpersonal facilitation (*Hypothesis 1b*).

Fate control	A belief that events are predetermined and that there are some ways for people to influence these outcomes (Leung et al., 2002). Although this belief accepts that there are ways to alter the outcomes, the reasons for the bad events are attributed to external forces such as fate or bad luck rather than internal causes such as an individuals` own faults. Fate control is negatively related to the enjoyment of working hard (Lynn, 1991; as cited in Van de Vliert & Janssen, 2002)	Because fate control includes a belief that events are predetermined and people can alter the events by wishful thinking rather than individual effort such as working hard, fate control will relate negatively to job dedication *(Hypothesis 1c)*
Social cynicism	This belief represents a biased view of human nature, a mistrust to social institutions, and a disregard of ethical means for achieving an end. Social cynicism is negatively related to company satisfaction and conscientiousness (International survey research 1995, as cited in Van de Vliert & Janssen, 2002). Social cynicism is also negatively related to cooperation in interpersonal relationships (Chen, Fok, Bond, & Matsumoto, 2006).	Because social cynicism is negatively related to conscientiousness and cooperation in interpersonal relations, we also expect a negative relation with interpersonal facilitation (Hypothesis 1d) and organizational support at work (Hypothesis 1e)

Religiosity	This represents a belief in the usefulness of religion. The main theme of this world-view is that religion is functional for people. Research has shown that religiosity is positively related to positive affect (Diener & Suh, 1999). Religiosity is also described as a set of cognitions that include concern for others and displaying good behavior by giving up one`s own egoistic interests (Bond, Leung, Au, Tong, & Chemonges-Nielson, 2004).	Because this belief focuses on self-restraint and concern for others, we expect that it will be positively related to other-oriented dimensions of OCB, namely interpersonal facilitation (Hypothesis 1f) and organizational support. *(Hypotheses 1g)*

OCB and relational identification to the supervisor

Research on the leader member exchange theory (LMX, Deluga, 1994) has found that mutual confidence between leaders and subordinates increases subordinates' OCB (Anderson & Williams, 1996). Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007) demonstrated that the social relationship with one's supervisor can moderate the effect of the subordinates' personality on their OCB. Specifically, they found that one's perception of the quality of the relationship with one`s supervisor moderated the relationship between conscientiousness and agreeableness on the one hand and OCB on the other hand. Research within the collectivistic culture of China has shown that commitment to one's supervisor is a more influential predictor of OCB than even one's organizational commitment (Chen et al., 2002). In collectivistic cultures, the self is considered to be an "interdependent" self. In other words, people in collectivistic cultures define their identities in terms of their relationships with others. Similarly, one's relational identification with the supervisor may be seen as an expansion of the self in the sense that the self exceeds one's personal characteristics by including "significant others", among whom are supervisors (Sluss & Ashforth, 2007). As Turkey is characterized as a collectivistic, hierarchical (i.e., high power

distant) culture with a strong dependence and acceptance of authority (Kabasakal & Bodur, 2002), we expected that:

Hypotheses 2a-c. Relational identification with the supervisor (RI) will be positively related to OCB (i.e., interpersonal facilitation, job dedication, and organizational support).

Findings in non-western and western samples showed differences in blue- and white- collars employees` perceptions of work, levels of stress, coping strategies, and other work-related phenomena. For instance, white-collar employees have a more positive perception of their working environment (e.g., being a more healthy environment) than do blue-collar employees. Yet, they experience higher levels of stress than their blue-collar counterparts (Kanai & Wakabayashi, 2001; Morris et al., 1999). Supervisors also play a more central role for blue-collar types of jobs in manufacturing because of the strict regulation of work tasks, and the checks with regard to safety regulations and product quality (Michael, Guo, Wiedenbeck, & Ray, 2006). Blue-collar employees therefore are more dependent on their supervisors than are white collar employees. In light of this reasoning, we hypothesized that:

Hypotheses 2d-f. Job status (i.e., blue-collar versus white-collar) will moderate the relationship between relational identification with the supervisor (RI) and OCB (i.e., interpersonal facilitation, job dedication, and organizational support). Specifically, the RI-OCB relationship will be stronger for blue-collar than for white-collar employees.

Relational identification as a mediator between reward for application and organizational support

In collectivistic societies, the "interdependent self" may result in a tendency to prioritize group goals above personal goals (Smith et al., 2006). Thus, when the self is defined collectively, the collective interest will be perceived as self-interest, and consequently people will inherently contribute to the collective goal (De Cremer & Van Vugt, 1999). Accordingly, a self-conception that includes the supervisor (i.e., relational identification with the supervisor) may motivate

employees to support the organization's collective interests. Since Turkey is characterized as a collectivistic culture of relatedness (Smith et al., 2006), we expect that employees' relational identifications with their supervisors will in particular be of central importance to the organizational support dimension of OCB.

Relational identification with the supervisor may also be critical in shaping the relationship between reward for application beliefs and organizational support. As reward for application implies perceiving the world as a fair place, it will be positively related to relational identification, which then becomes a source of self-validation from which employees seek emotional support and a sense of belonging. This in turn is expected to result in more willingness to support the organization. Hence, it was expected that:

Hypothesis 3. Relational identification with the supervisor will mediate reward for application beliefs and organizational support.

2. 2 Method

Participants and Procedure

Data were collected from a large textile factory in western Turkey. All employees in the factory (N = 663) were informed of the research and were invited to participate on a voluntary basis. Confidentiality and anonymity of responses were emphasized and assured. Questionnaires in paper-and-pencil form were distributed in a closed envelope to all employees. Large cardboard boxes were placed in a room where the employees had their daily lunch, and employees were requested to put the filled-in questionnaires into these boxes. A total of 523 employees completed the survey (a response rate of 78%). The sample size equaled 376 blue-collar (20% female, M_{age} = 26, SD_{age} = 6.91) and 147 white-collar employees (28% female, M_{age} = 28, SD_{age} = 6.07). Among blue-collar employees, 77 % had primary or secondary school education, whereas 23% had graduated from high school. Among white-collar employees, 51% had a university degree, whereas 46% were high school graduates. 53% of the white-collar employees and 55% of the blue-collar employees had at least 5 years of work experience. All participants worked full-time.

Measures

In accordance with test translation guidelines (Van de Vijver, 2003), all measures were translated from English to Turkish and back-translated from Turkish to English. This was done by five bilingual translators. Four of these bilinguals were linguists whose mother tongue was Turkish and who had studied English language linguistics and the fifth was an industrial and organizational psychologist. Scales were adapted from existing measures and showed acceptable internal consistencies (see Table 2).

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, Alpha Reliabilities, and Correlations among Study Variables.

		Blue-collar employees			*White-collar employees*							
		M	*SD*	*α*	*M*	*SD*	*α*	1	2	3	4	5
1.	Age	25.63	6.91	--	28.33	6.07	--	--	-.10	.07	.83**	.04
2.	Sex	1.20	.40	--	1.28	.45	--	.07	--	.19*	-.19*	-.06
3.	Edu	1.71	.83	--	2.93	1.24	--	-.06	.00	--	-.13	.03
4.	WE	5.15	4.59	--	7.04	5.15	--	.76**	-.01	-.10	--	.05
5.	IF	3.38	.74	.69	3.62	.62	.69	-.01	.01	-.03	.03	--
6.	JD	3.44	.77	.79	3.74	.50	.73	.20**	.03	.10	.17**	.49**
7.	OS	3.94	.87	.74	4.55	.46	.65	.25**	.10	.00	.21**	.44**
8.	RA	4.01	.75	.76	4.29	.65	.84	.01	.06	.07	-.02	.25**
9.	R	3.87	.74	.69	3.88	.69	.67	.04	.01	.06	.00	.18**
10.	RI	3.21	.82	.69	3.47	.74	.64	.01	.02	.04	.02	.38**

Note. Correlations for the blue-collar sample are presented below the diagonal, whereas correlations for the white-collar sample are presented above the diagonal. Edu = Education; WE = Working experience (in years); IF = Interpersonal facilitation; JD = Job dedication; OS = Organizational support. RA= Reward for Application R= Religiosity; RI = Relational identification with the supervisor. Sex: 1= male; 2 = female; Education: 1= primary school; 2=secondary school; 3= high school; 4= university; 5= masters and PhD. * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$.

Table 2 (continued)

		Blue-collar employees			*White-collar employees*							
		M	*SD*	*α*	*M*	*SD*	*α*	6	7	8	9	10
1.	Age	25.63	6.91	--	28.33	6.07	--	.16	.31**	.04	.04	.04
2.	Sex	1.20	.40	--	1.28	.45	--	-.00	.06	-.13	-.24**	-.12
3.	Edu	1.71	.83	--	2.93	1.24	--	.15	.17	.02	-.11	.03
4.	WE	5.15	4.59	--	7.04	5.15	--	.03	.20*	.01	.01	.09
5.	IF	3.38	.74	.69	3.62	.62	.69	.38**	.32**	.15	.14	.23**
6.	JD	3.44	.77	.79	3.74	.50	.73	--	.53**	.31**	.10	.14
7.	OS	3.94	.87	.74	4.55	.46	.65	.67**	--	.35**	.14	.24**
8.	RA	4.01	.75	.76	4.29	.65	.84	.30**	.40**	--	.21**	.40**
9.	R	3.87	.74	.69	3.88	.69	.67	.25**	.30**	.55**	--	.13
10.	RI	3.21	.82	.69	3.47	.74	.64	.39**	.42**	.22**	.17**	--

Note. Correlations for the blue-collar sample are presented below the diagonal, whereas correlations for the white-collar sample are presented above the diagonal. Edu = Education; WE = Working experience (in years); IF = Interpersonal facilitation; JD = Job dedication; OS = Organizational support. RA= Reward for Application R= Religiosity; RI = Relational identification with the supervisor. Sex: 1= male; 2 = female; Education: 1= primary school; 2=secondary school; 3= high school; 4= university; 5= masters and PhD. * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior. OCB consists of three distinct dimensions, namely interpersonal facilitation, job dedication, and organizational support (Borman et al., 2001; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996). Interpersonal facilitation refers to helping co-workers when such assistance is needed (eight items; an example item is "I praise co-workers when they are successful"); job dedication refers to one's dedication to perform specific work-related tasks above and beyond the call of duty (eight items; an example item is "I put in extra hours to get work done"). The items for interpersonal facilitation and job dedication were adapted from Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996). Organizational support refers to supporting the organization even if it is undergoing hardships; this was adapted from Borman et al. (2001). The scale has five items; an example item is "I show loyalty to the organization by staying with the organization despite temporary hardships".

Semi-structured interviews with 30 white-/blue-collar employees were conducted by the first author in order to examine whether the existing scale items were feasible and whether there are any OCB specific to Turkish society (for a similar approach, see Wasti, 2003). Resulting from these interviews, the following items were added to the original scales: "Having a smile on one's face despite disagreeing with something", "Lending money to colleagues", "Doing the work without complaining", and "Keeping the workplace clean". A principal components factor analysis showed that "Having a smile on one's face despite disagreeing with something" and "Lending money to colleagues" loaded on the interpersonal facilitation dimension. Moreover, the analyses showed that "Doing the work without complaining" loaded on the job dedication dimension and that "Keeping the workplace clean" loaded on the organizational support dimension. Therefore, we added these items to the original scales. All items were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 = *never* to 5 = *very often*.

Subsequently, a series of confirmatory factor analyses (Amos, V.6) were conducted to test a three-factorial structure of the OCB scale for blue- and white-collar employees, separately. The three-factor model showed a good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999) both in the blue-collar sample, $\chi 2$ (df = 155) = 339.97, *n.s.*; RMSEA = .04; CFI = .91 and in the white-collar sample, $\chi 2$ (df = 155) = 188.97 $p \leq .05$; RMSEA = .02; CFI = .93. Further, conceptual agreement was reached when testing measurement invariance across both samples (see Table 3). As expected, the χ^2 of

the restricted models increased slightly but none of the $\Delta\chi^2$ -values was significant. When looking at the fit indices, it was seen that the constrained models fit the data well. Specifically, the fit statistics for the more restricted models did not alter much from those of the unrestricted models: RMSEA decreased slightly from .03 to .02 and CFI remained the same. Moreover, the parsimonious fit indices also suggested a good fit when the variance constraints were introduced. The parsimonious version of CFI (PCFI) increased slightly from .61 to .64.

For blue-collar employees, alpha coefficients were .69 for interpersonal facilitation, .79 for job dedication, and .74 for organizational support. For white-collar employees, alpha coefficients were .69 for interpersonal facilitation, .73 for job dedication, and .65 for organizational support.

Relational identification with the supervisor. An adapted version of Sluss and Ashforth's (2007) six-item relational identification with the supervisor scale was used (1 = *do not agree at all*; 5 = *agree very much*). Example items are: "The relationship with my supervisor reflects what kind of a person I am at work" and "If someone criticizes my relationship with my supervisor, I feel personally insulted".

Confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to test the one-dimensional structure of the relational identification with the supervisor scale. Fit indices were very good both for blue- and white-collar employees (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Specifically, the scale showed a good fit in the blue-collar sample, $\chi 2$ (df = 6) = 14.98, *n.s.*; RMSEA = .05; CFI = .97, as well as in the white-collar sample: $\chi 2$ (df = 6) = 7.84 *n.s.*; RMSEA = .03; CFI = .97. Further, conceptual agreement was reached when testing measurement invariance across both samples (see Table 3). Alpha coefficients were .69 for blue-collar employees and .64 for white-collar employees.

2.2.3. Social axioms. An adapted Turkish version (Ataca, 2002) of the short, twenty-item social axiom scale was used (1 = *do not believe at all;* 5 = *believe very much*). Each axiom was measured with five items. Example items are: "Hard-working people will achieve more in the end" (reward for application) and "Belief in a religion helps one understand the meaning of life" (religiosity). For blue collar workers alpha coefficients were .76 for reward for application, .69 for religiosity, .59 for social cynicism, .54 for social flexibility and .51 for fate control. For white collar workers, alpha coefficients were .84 for reward for application, .67 for religiosity, .58 for social cynicism, .52 for social flexibility and a very low .33 for fate control. Because social

cynicism, social flexibility, and fate control scales had low alpha coefficients, these dimensions were deleted and further analyses were conducted with the remaining social axioms.

Subsequently, a series of confirmatory factor analyses was conducted to test the one-dimensional structure of the reward for application and religiosity social axiom scale. Analyses for the reward for application scale showed a good fit in the blue-collar sample, $\chi 2$ (df = 3) = 1.16; $p \leq 0.5$; RMSEA = .00; CFI = .92 and in the white-collar sample the fit was also adequate, $\chi 2$ (df = 3) = 8.39; $p \leq 0.5$; RMSEA = .11; CFI = .97. Analyses for the religiosity scale showed a good fit in the blue-collar sample $\chi 2$ (df = 5) = 3.62; *n.s.*; RMSEA = .00; CFI = 1.00 and in the white-collar sample $\chi 2$ (df = 5) = 12.77; $p \leq 0.5$; RMSEA = .06; CFI = .92. A conceptual agreement concerning the reward for application and religiosity scales was reached when measurement invariance was tested across both samples (see Table 3 for the fit indices).

Table 3

Overall Fit Indices for Testing Conceptual Equivalence among Blue- and White-Collar Samples

	$\chi 2$	*Df*	$\Delta \chi 2$	Δdf	*RMSEA*	*CFI*	*PCFI*
OCB							
Model I	528.94	310	-	-	.03	.91	.61
Model II	546.13	328	17	18	.02	.91	.64
Relational Identification							
Model I	22.82	12	-	-	.03	.96	.27
Model II	26.97	17	4.14	5	.02	.97	.39
Reward for Application							
Model I	9.55	6	-	-	.02	.99	.19
Model II	16.44	10	6.89	4	.02	.99	.33
Religiosity							
Model I	16.39	10	-	-	.03	.98	.32
Model II	17.57	12	1.18	2	.02	.99	.39

Note. Model 1 = no between group constraints; Model 2 = factor loadings constrained to be equal; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; RMSEA = Root Means Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; PCFI = Parsimonious Comparative Fit Index. None of the χ^2 values are significant.

Analysis of data

We checked whether blue- and white-collar employees differed in terms of sex, age, work experience, and education. T-test results showed no differences in female/male ratios between white- and blue-collar employees, t (516) = 1.94, *n.s.* However, white-collar employees were older, t (516) = 4.12, $p \leq .05$, had more work experience, t (542) = 4.11, $p \leq .05$, and had a higher educational level than blue-collar employees, t (478) = 12.40, $p \leq .05$. Therefore, these variables were included as control variables in further analyses.

To test the hypotheses, we performed a series of hierarchical regression analyses while controlling for the effects of age, educational level, work experience, and gender in a first step. To test the moderation hypotheses (H2d-f), we mean-centered the variables as advised by Aiken and West (1991). Mediation analyses (H3) were conducted in line with Baron and Kenny (1987) and Kenny, Kashy, and Bolger (1998). Tables 4-7 show the results of the regression analyses.

Hypotheses 1b-e were not tested because social cynicism, social flexibility, and fate control scales had low alpha coefficients. Note that the low reliabilities of fate control and social flexibility was also reported in previous studies (e.g., Kwantes et al., 2008).

2.3 Results

First, as can be seen from Table 4, reward for application related positively to job dedication for both blue-collar ($\beta = .27$; $p \leq .01$) and white-collar employees ($\beta = .33$; $p \leq .01$). (with no significant interaction between job status and reward for application, $\beta = .19$; *n.s.*) *Hypothesis 1a* which stated that reward for application would be positively related to job dedication was therefore supported for both blue and white collar workers.

Hypotheses 1f-g expected religiosity to relate positively to interpersonal facilitation and organizational support. No significant relations were found for interpersonal facilitation and religiosity among blue and white-collar employees. *Hypothesis1f* thus was not supported. Religiosity was significantly related to organizational support ($\beta = .16$; $p \leq .05$) among blue-collar employees, but not so among white-collar employees. Therefore, *Hypothesis 1g* was only partially supported (see Table 4).

Table 4

Hierarchical Regression of OCB Dimensions on Social Axioms (Reward for Application; Religiosity) among Blue- and White-Collar Employees (Hypotheses 1a, 1f, 1g)

	Blue-collar employees									*White-collar employees*								
	IF			*JD*			*OS*			*IF*			*JD*			*OS*		
	β	R^2	ΔR^2	β	R^2	ΔR^2	β	R^2	ΔR^2	β	R^2	ΔR^2	β	R^2	ΔR^2	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step1																		
Age	-.13			.15			.15			.11			.40*			.41*		
Educ	-.03			.10			.06			.03			.07			.15		
WE	.15			.08			.10			.05			-.23			-.19		
Sex	.09	.04	.04	.01	.06**	.06**	.15	.08	.08	-.09	.04	.04	.02	.08	.08	.03	.13*	.13
Step 2																		
RA	.12			.27**			.25**			.12			.33**			.34**		
R	-.03	.06	.01	.12*	.18**	.13	.16*	.22**	.14*	.00	.06	.01	.00	.18*	.10*	.08	.26**	.13**

Note. Educ = Education; WE = Work experience; RA= Reward for Application; R= Religiosity; IF = Interpersonal facilitation; JD = Job dedication; OS = Organizational support. * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$.

Hypotheses 2a-c predicted that relational identification with the supervisor (RI) would be positively related to all three dimensions of OCB. In the blue-collar sample, RI related positively to interpersonal facilitation (β = .33; $p \leq .05$), job dedication (β = .38; $p \leq .05$), and organizational support (β = .39; $p \leq .05$). Furthermore, in the white-collar sample RI related positively to interpersonal facilitation (β = .22; $p \leq .05$) and organizational support (β = .26; $p \leq .05$), but not to job dedication (β = .16; *n.s.*). Therefore, *Hypotheses 2a-c* were fully supported for blue-collar employees while *Hypotheses 2a and 2c* were supported for white-collar employees.

We further expected job status to moderate the effect of relational identification with the supervisor (RI) on all three dimensions of OCB: namely, interpersonal facilitation, job dedication, and organizational support *(Hypotheses 2d-f;* see Table 5*)*. Results showed that RI (β = .05; *n.s.)*, job status (β = .02; *n.s.*) and their interaction term (β = -.29*; n.s.)* did not relate significantly to interpersonal facilitation. This implies that job status did not moderate the relationship of RI and interpersonal facilitation. *Hypothesis 2d* was not supported.

Further, RI (β = .32; $p \leq .01$) related significantly to job dedication. Job status related marginally significantly (β = .10; p = 08), and their interaction term (RI x Job status; β = .50; $p \leq .01$) related significantly to job dedication. Thus, employees who scored high on RI showed more job dedication, and this effect was stronger for blue-collar than for white-collar employees. *Hypothesis 2e* was supported.

Finally, RI (β =.36; $p \leq .01$) related significantly to organizational support, but job status did not relate significantly (β =.06; *n.s.*). Their interaction term (RI x Job status; β = .49; $p \leq .05$) related significantly to organizational support. This means that employees who scored high on RI showed more organizational support, and that the effect was stronger for blue- than for white-collar employees. Hypothesis 2f was supported.

Table 5

Hierarchical Regression of OCB dimensions on Demographics, Job Status and Relational Identification (Hypotheses 2d-f)

	Interpersonal facilitation			*Job dedication*			*Organizational support*		
	β	R^2	ΔR^2	*B*	R^2	ΔR^2	*B*	R^2	ΔR^2
Step1									
Age	.06	--	--	.18*	--	--	.19		
Educ	.00	--		.07	--		.01		
WE	.10	--	--	.01			.05		
Sex	-.02	.02	.02	-.02	.04	.04	.12	.07	.07
Step2									
Job status	.02	.02	.00	.10†	.05†	.01†	.06	.07	.00
Step3									
RI	.05	.02	.00	.32**	.15**	.10**	.36**	.20**	.13**
Step 4									
Job status x RI	-.29	.03	.01	.50**	.17**	.02**	.49*	.21*	.01*

Note. Educ = Education; WE = Work experience; RI = Relational identification with the supervisor. †$p \leq .10$, * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .0$

Hypothesis 3 concerned the potential mediating effect of RI on reward for application and organizational support. Mediation occurs when (1) *reward for application* significantly affects *relational identification*, (2) *RI* has a significant unique effect on organizational support, and (3) the effect of *reward for application* on organizational support significantly shrinks upon the addition of the mediator to the model (Baron & Kenny, 1986; Kenny et al., 1998).

Results of the hierarchical regression analyses (see Tables 6-7) showed that reward for application related significantly to RI in the blue-collar ($\beta = .23$; $p \leq .01$) and white-collar sample ($\beta = .40$; $p \leq .01$). The first condition for mediation was therefore met in both samples.

Further, RI related significantly to organizational support in the blue-collar sample ($\beta = .32$; $p \leq .01$), but not in the white-collar sample ($\beta = .14$; *n.s.*). Because the second and third conditions for mediation were only met for blue-collar employees, we therefore continued to test the mediation effects only for the blue collar employees. Specifically, a Sobel test (Baron & Kenny, 1986) further demonstrated that the effect of reward for application on organizational support shrank significantly upon the addition of the relational identification with the supervisor to the model, $z = 3.54$; $p \leq .05$, showing partial mediation. Thus, *Hypothesis 3* was supported for blue-collar employees, only.

Table 6

Hierarchical Regression of Relational Identification and Organizational Support on Demographics, Reward for Application, and Relational Identification among Blue-Collar Employees (Hypothesis 3)

		Relational identification		Organizational support		
		β		*B*		
		Step1	*Step2*	*Step 1*	*Step2*	Step 3
1.	Age	.00	-.01	.12	.11	.12
	Education	.04	.03	.09	.07	.06
	Work experience	.05	.02	.10	.13	.12
	Sex	.06	.04	.00	-.00	-.03
2.	Reward for application		.23**		.33**	.25**
3.	Relational identification					.32**
	R^2	.00	.06**	.09**	.21**	.31**
	Adj R^2	-.00	.04**	.07**	.19**	.29**
	ΔR^2		.06**		.12**	.10**

Note. * $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$.

Table 7

Hierarchical Regression of Relational Identification and Organizational Support on Demographics, Reward for Application, and Relational Identification among White-Collar Employees (Hypothesis 3)

		Relational identification		Organizational support		
		β		*B*		
		Step1	*Step2*	*Step 1*	*Step2*	Step 3
1.	Age	-.04	-.10	.32	.24	.27
	Education	.06	.05	.13	.12	.11
	Work experience	.02	.08	-.13	-.05	-.07
	Sex	-.17	-.11	.02	.08	.10
2.	Reward for application		.40**		.40**	.34**
3.	Relational identification					.14
	R^2	.03	.19**	.08	.24**	.25
	Adj R^2	-.00	.15**	.04	.19**	.20
	ΔR^2		.16**		.16**	.01

Note. * $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$.

To sum up, reward for application was related to job dedication for both blue- and white-collar employees. Religiosity was related to organizational support among blue-collar employees, but not so among white-collar employees. RI related positively to interpersonal facilitation job dedication and organizational support among blue-collar workers. In the white-collar sample, RI related positively to interpersonal facilitation and organizational support but not to job dedication. The relationship between RI and job dedication, RI and organizational support was stronger for blue-collar employees than for white-collar employees. RI partially mediated the relationship between reward for application and organizational support among blue-collar workers.

2.4. Discussion

In a field study conducted among Turkish blue- and white-collar textile employees, we investigated two social beliefs and relational identification with the supervisor as determinants of their OCB. In doing so, we extended previous work that almost exclusively focused on OCB among white-collar employees by investigating both white and blue-collars' social axioms, relational identification, and OCB in a collectivistic society.

First, we hypothesized that reward for application and religiosity would be related to different dimensions of OCB. More specifically, findings showed that reward for application was related to job dedication for both blue and white-collar employees, thus supporting Hypothesis 1a. Employees who believe that hard work pays off are also more likely to work extra hours. This finding is consistent with previous research that showed a positive relation between reward for application and the number of working hours (International survey research, 1995). No significant differences were found for blue- and white-collar employees. Although not hypothesized, reward for application also related positively to organizational support in both blue- and white-collar samples, meaning that those employees who believe in hard working are more likely to support the organization they work for. We further expected religiosity to be positively related to interpersonal facilitation and organizational support (H1b-c). Indeed, blue-collar employees who had religious beliefs supported their organizations. Although not hypothesized, religiosity was also related to job dedication among blue-collar employees.

Among white collar employees, however, religiosity beliefs were not related to any of the OCB dimensions. Because blue-collar employees have a low level of education, their religiosity beliefs may be more likely to determine their work behaviors than that of white-collar employees. Uecker and Regnerus (2007) indeed found that education reduced the importance of religion in people's lives. Higher education therefore may lessen the effects of religious beliefs on the behavior of white-collar employees. However, this interpretation is highly speculative; further studies should strive to validate this finding seek more empirical support.

Interpersonal facilitation and organizational support are related to others in nature, whereas job dedication is typically oriented towards one`s job. Building further on these assumptions, we expected religiosity (which also assumes orientation towards others, i.e., doing good for others) not to relate to job dedication, but instead to relate to interpersonal facilitation and organizational support. However, in some cultures/communities (such as countries were Protestantism is common; the Calvinist cultures), a positive relation between religiosity and OCB can be expected. Future research can test this expectation.

In accordance with the second hypothesis, we found that relational identification to the supervisor was an important determinant of all OCB-dimensions among blue-collar employees and of interpersonal facilitation and organization support among white-collar employees (H2a-c). This finding is in line with previous research that demonstrated the importance of social exchange relationships between subordinates and their supervisors for their OCB (i.e., Leader Member Exchange, LMX, Deluga, 1994). Ashforth, Harrison, and Corley (2008) stressed the significance of relational identification with the supervisor on organizational behaviors. Nevertheless, very little research up till now has empirically examined this relationship (Sluss & Ashforth, 2008). Our findings therefore add to the literature insofar as we found positive relations among blue -and white-collar employees' relational identification with their supervisor and their OCB (for blue-collar employees, this holds for all OCB dimensions; for white-collar employees, this holds for interpersonal facilitation and organizational support). These positive relations clearly fit Turkish society, which is a culture of relatedness (Smith et al., 2006) in which people define their self-concepts in terms of their relationship to others. Relational identification with the supervisor, on the other hand, was not related to job dedication among white-collar employees. Previous research showed that blue-collar employees are more

dependent on their supervisor while executing their tasks than are white-collar employees (Michael et al., 2006). This may be the reason why job dedication for white-collar employees was not affected by their relational identification with their supervisors.

Our findings also demonstrated that the relation between relational identification with the supervisor and organizational support is even stronger for blue-collar employees than it is for white-collar employees (H2f). Supervisors are very important to blue-collar workers in manufacturing (Michael et al., 2006) because blue-collar employees produce goods while their supervisors indeed provide guidance to them. Blue-collar employees get in touch with their supervisors more frequently because they depend more on their supervisor while executing their tasks than do white-collar employees (Michael et al., 2006). Consequently, blue-collar employees who define themselves in terms of their relationships to their supervisors are also more likely support their organizations.

Finally, relational identification with the supervisor (RI) partially mediated the relationship between reward for application and organizational support for blue-collar employees (H3). Blue-collar employees who consider that hard work pays off support their organizations, and this can in part be explained by the degree to which they relationally identify with their supervisors. As Turkish society has a hierarchical structure, blue-collar employees more easily accept the higher status of their supervisors (Kabasal & Bodur, 2002), and therefore their relational identification with their supervisor may partly explain the effect of reward for application beliefs on organizational support behavior. Our findings further showed that RI was not a mediator among white-collar employees. The reason for this may be that white-collar employees have more prestigious careers than do blue-collar employees, and therefore their careers may be more self-defining than their RI. Because white-collar employees' RI may be less important to them for executing their tasks in the proper manner, their RI may not play an important and mediating role between their reward for application beliefs and organizational support behavior.

A first practical implication of our study is that organizations should be aware of the supervisor's role for blue-collar employees, at least in a Turkish work context. This study showed that relational identification with the supervisor has positive effects for blue-collar employees: namely, an increased interpersonal facilitation, job dedication and organizational

support. Because supervisors play an important role in a Turkish society, employees will obey organizational rules because they care about their relationships with their supervisors. Supervisors therefore should be aware of their facilitating role on employees' OCB, and should try to build good relationships with their subordinates. However, blue-collar employees who include their relationship with the supervisor in their self-concept may be perceived as "dependent employees" or "unprofessional employees" in some cultures (e.g., The Netherlands, Sweden, and Canada), because these cultures are highly individualistic and lower in power distance. Thus, supervisors from individualistic and low power distant cultures should be aware of these cultural differences and nuances if they are supervising employees that are not just from individualistic but also from collectivistic and high power distant cultures. In multicultural societies and multinational organizations, one needs to put more effort into interpreting the behavior of employees who have different cultural backgrounds. Future research could investigate whether social axioms are stronger predictors of OCB than relational identification in low power distance cultures such as for instance The Netherlands, Sweden, and Canada. Cultural diversity on the work floor is a growing issue in many companies. Our findings are also interesting for national and multinational companies that want to improve intercultural communication and awareness on the work floor.

Some study limitations are worth mentioning. First, we made use of self-report measures. In order to limit socially desirable responses and multicollinearity, future studies could include supervisors` and colleagues` evaluations of OCB and their relational identification with the supervisor. Furthermore, a cross-sectional design was used since data were collected at only one point in time. Therefore, we cannot draw causal inferences about the direction of the relationships. This is the first study in this area, yet it would be useful to collect more longitudinal data and/or to use experimental designs in order to make stronger causal inferences about the research findings. Future studies could also investigate groups other than Turkish textile employees in order to see whether our findings generalize across other collectivistic cultures and occupations. Not only supervisors but also colleagues are part of employees' social relationships at work. Therefore, investigating the relation between employees' relational identification with their colleagues (other than supervisors) and their OCB could be another promising avenue for further research. Lavelle, Rupp, and Brockner (2007) indeed demonstrated

that commitment to colleagues is related to OCB towards colleagues. In the light of this further research can examine the link between relational identification with the colleagues and OCB directed towards colleagues. Wasti and Can (2008) also demonstrated that commitment to supervisor was related supervisor related OCB. Their findings provide support for the "compatibility" hypothesis which argues that multiple constituencies of commitment framework are necessary in explaining work attitudes and behavior. Further research therefore should examine whether multiple foci of relational identification can be related to different foci of OCB. Although our findings showed that relational identification with the supervisor were related to interpersonal facilitation and organizational support, further research should try to distinguish between lower-order collectives at the organization such as colleagues and work unit. For instance relational identification with co-worker may have a direct impact upon certain group-level outcomes (e.g., cooperation, team performance, unity) and certain organizationally-targeted yet individual-level outcomes (e.g., organizational identification, organizational support).

In summary, this study is among the first to investigate social axioms and relational identification as potential antecedents of OCB among white- and blue-collar employees in a collectivistic society (Turkey). To date, OCB has mainly been investigated in individualistic societies, but it might play an even a more important role in more collectivistic environments. Despite some study limitations, our research findings are promising as they show the importance of social axioms for employees' organizational citizenship behavior at work, in both a white- and blue-collar sample. In general, less research attention has been given to blue-collar employees in comparison to their white-collar counterparts. However, blue-collar employees are important sources of competitive business advantage, in particular in production-oriented entities. Hence, we strongly recommend more scientific research with respect to the OCB of blue-collar employees. Finally, the present study is the first to explore employees' organizational citizenship behavior and their relational identification with their supervisors. This relationship seemed of particular importance to the lower-educated, blue-collar employees, who might be more dependent on their supervisor, than to the higher-educated white-collar employees. Hence, we plead for more research on the role of the supervisor and other determinants of OCB, particularly among blue-collar employees, who have been relatively under-investigated when compared to white collars. Further research could take the potential moderating role of the type of culture

(e.g., individualistic/collectivistic; feminine/masculine) into account, because societal culture influences organizational culture. This helps us to understand reasons for certain behavioral differences taking place not only across cultures but also within cultures.