

Chapter 3

Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Turkish White-Collar Employees in Turkey and Turkish-Dutch White-Collar Employees in the Netherlands¹

This study examined the relationship between social axioms (reward for application, social cynicism, religiosity, social flexibility, and fate control), relational identification with the supervisor, and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB: interpersonal facilitation, job dedication, and organizational support) among Turkish white-collar employees in the Netherlands (n = 103) and in Turkey (n = 147). A series of hierarchical regression analyses showed a different relation between social axioms and OCB among Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands compared to their counterparts in Turkey. Specifically, reward for application was related positively to job dedication among Turkish employees in Turkey, but not among Turkish employees in the Netherlands. Religiosity was unrelated to interpersonal facilitation and organizational support among Turkish employees in Turkey, yet positively related to organizational support among Turkish-Dutch. As expected, among Turkish employees in Turkey, relational identification with the supervisor was positively related to OCB: namely, to interpersonal facilitation and organizational support. This relationship was not found among Turkish-Dutch workers. Finally, among Turkish-Dutch employees, their length of stay in the Netherlands appeared to weaken the relationship between relational identification with the supervisor and OCB, in particular interpersonal facilitation and organizational support. These findings are relevant for understanding determinants of OCB among immigrants and their counterparts living in their own countries, particularly to demonstrate cultural transformations with regard to immigrants.

¹ This chapter has been submitted for publication as: Cem-Ersoy, N., Born, Ph. M., Van der Molen, H. T., & Derous, E. (submitted). Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior among Turkish white-collar employees in Turkey and Turkish-Dutch white-collar employees in the Netherlands. This chapter was presented at the 19th Congress of the International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Bremen, Germany, July, 2008.

3.1 Introduction

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has been defined as employee behavior supporting the social and psychological fabric of the organization (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993), such as helping one's colleagues. OCB has positive impacts on several individual-level outcomes (e.g., employee performance and reward allocation decisions) as well as on organizational-level outcomes (e.g., productivity, efficiency, costs, customer satisfaction) (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff & Blume, 2009). However, studies have also shown that predictors of OCB may vary across cultures (Chen, Tsui, & Farh, 2002). For instance, organizational commitment has been found to be an important predictor of OCB in Western cultures (Lavelle et al., 2009), whereas research within the collectivistic culture of China has shown that commitment to one's supervisor is a more influential predictor of OCB than is organizational commitment (Chen et al., 2002).

Testa (2009) reported that ethno-cultural differences within national boundaries have become more manifest in determining antecedents of OCB. The work-force in a number of western countries has become highly diverse, and people from many different ethno-cultural backgrounds work together. The present study focuses on antecedents of OCB among employees from one of the largest minority groups in the Netherlands: the Turkish-Dutch (Myers et al., 2008). By studying employees' OCB, the present research extends previous work on Turkish-Dutch migrants, which has almost exclusively investigated their general acculturation attitudes (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2004; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2006). The effects of the antecedents of OCB will be compared to their effects among Turkish employees working in Turkey. To our knowledge, until now no study has compared antecedents of OCB among Turkish-Dutch employees with their Turkish counterparts working in Turkey. Hence, the first aim of this paper is to focus on this issue.

The first generation of Turkish migrants in the 1960s had low levels of education, worked in low-skill jobs, and had a low social status in Dutch society. Although unemployment is still higher among Turkish migrants than among native Dutch (CBS, July 21, 2008), the second generation of Turkish-Dutch is much more highly educated and has better jobs than their parents (Arends-Tóth, 2003). More recently, migration from Turkey only for the purpose of reunited families has declined, and more skilled workers have come to the Netherlands (CBS, January 15, 2009). These changes in migration imply that many Turkish-

Chapter 3

Dutch workers currently contribute to the Dutch economy in numerous types of jobs, also in those with a higher status. Interestingly, most studies have investigated blue-collar migrants of low SES involving manual labor, whereas scant research has focused on Turkish-Dutch white-collar employees, who typically occupy professional, managerial, or administrative positions. A second aim of this paper, therefore, is to extend previous research on Turkish migrants by investigating white-collar employees and comparing these with their white-collar counterparts in Turkey.

A final study aim relates to the investigation of several potential antecedents of OCB within both samples from a cross-cultural perspective. Social beliefs (i.e., social axioms) include people's general perceptions and cognitions about the social world, and have been shown to differ across cultures (Leung et al., 2002). These beliefs may form potential antecedents of OCB. For instance, Kwantes, Karam, and Kuo (2008) found that employees who scored high on social cynicism considered OCB (particularly as regards conscientious behavior) more as extra-role than as 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, Hubbard, Her, & An, 2003; Youssef & Luthans, 2007), we are only aware of the Kwantes et al. (2008) study that has looked into social beliefs as potential antecedents of OCB.

Many studies have demonstrated the importance of social relationships at work for OCB (Anderson & Williams, 1996; Kamdar & Van Dyne, 2007). In this sphere, we will investigate the relational identification of employees' with their supervisor (RI) (Sluss & Ashforth, 2007) as a potential antecedent of OCB. RI may be particularly relevant within a non-western, Turkish context as will be described below. Hence, a third aim of this paper is to focus on the way social beliefs and one's relational identification with the supervisor relate to OCB.

Below, we will first explain cultural characteristics of Turkish migrants in the Netherlands. We will then focus on social beliefs and their relevance to OCB, and will explain relational identification with the supervisor and the way it relates to OCB. Each section will feature several hypotheses.

Cultural characteristics of Turkish migrants in the Netherlands and their cultural origins

Because migrants live in a culture that is different from that of their country of origin, their cultural transformations have been examined extensively. For instance, it has been

Chapter 3

shown (Güngör, 2008; Phalet & Schönplflug, 2001) that migrants maintain their ethnic cultural characteristics and adhere even more strongly to their ethnic cultural characteristics than do their native counterparts living in their own countries. Arends-Tóth and Van de Vijver (2004) shared this idea, as they reported that Turkish-Dutch migrants retained but also simultaneously altered their ethnic cultural characteristics. Specifically, they preferred to keep their cultural characteristics in private domains such as child-rearing, celebrations, and food habits, but adapted their behavior to the Dutch culture in functional and utilitarian domains such as social contacts and education. Because the work environment is one of the public domains where migrant employees are likely to come into contact with Dutch culture, their behavior may be considerably affected by Dutch cultural characteristics. Until now, however, the work domain remains under-investigated among the Turkish-Dutch population.

Further, whereas most research on migrants has concentrated on their acculturation and multiculturalism attitudes (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2004; Van Oudenhoven, Prins, & Buunk, 1998; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2006), only a few studies have aimed to explain migrants' work behavior in terms of the characteristics of their cultural roots. The Turkish-Dutch minority, in contrast, has been compared with the Dutch majority culture in many studies (Van Oudenhoven et al., 1988; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2006). It is also important to compare Turkish migrant workers with Turkish people working in Turkey in order to understand to what extent these groups share the same and different cultural aspects regarding work behavior (e.g., Bornstein & Cote, 2001; Güngör, 2008).

Social beliefs and OCB

Culture shapes norms, perceptions, and people's expectations, and is learned through childhood socialization (Triandis, 1994). Social beliefs (social axioms; Leung et al., 2002) are part of one's culture, as learned during socialization, and these beliefs affect people's perceptions about the world. Social beliefs have been defined as generalized beliefs about oneself as well as about the social and the physical world. They are regarded to be assertions about the associations between two entities, such as "Hard work leads to achievement in the end" (Leung et al., 2002). Social axioms are categorized into five dimensions: reward for application, social cynicism, social complexity, fate control, and religiosity. Reward for application represents a world view that people who work hard will achieve more in the end. Social cynicism is a world view that sees people and organizations in a negative and distrustful manner. Social complexity involves a view that people may have inconsistent behavior in different situations. Fate control refers to the belief that events are pre-determined

Chapter 3

in life and that ways exist to influence the results of these events. Finally, religiosity is a belief system that accepts the existence of supernatural forces and sees religion as functional in people's lives. This social five-axiom framework has been developed by Leung et al. (2002), who analyzed people's social beliefs within 41 cultures (Leung et al., 2002).

As regards OCB, previous research has made a distinction among interpersonal facilitation, job dedication, and organizational support (Borman et al., 2001; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996). Interpersonal facilitation and organizational support refer to other-directed behavior, as they are directed towards one's colleagues and the organization as a whole, respectively. In contrast, job dedication has a much stronger focus on the self, because it refers to types of behavior such as persistence, initiative in one's job, and self-development. Moorman and Blakely (1995) looked specifically into the relationship between other-oriented and self-oriented forms of OCB on the one hand, and individualistic and 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 than did individualistically oriented people. Hence, different dimensions of OCB may be predicted by varied antecedents, and it can be argued that social axioms will relate differently to diverse dimensions of OCB.

The main premise of the reward for application belief is that people who work hard will achieve more (Leung et al., 2002). The reward for application belief relates positively to the number of working hours per week, as well as to one's level of conscientiousness (e.g., Chen, Fok, Bond, & Matsumoto, 2006; International survey research, 1995). As job dedication involves working hard to solve a work-related problem and working extra hours to complete a work task, the reward for application belief and job dedication clearly have a common focus. We therefore hypothesize a positive relationship between reward for application and this particular OCB dimension for both samples:

Hypothesis 1a. Reward for application will relate positively to job dedication among Turkish-Dutch employees in the Netherlands and among Turkish employees in Turkey.

Regarding migrants, earlier research has studied the effects of demographic variables on their acculturation outcomes (Church, 1982; Furnham & Li, 1993). Education level has been demonstrated to be one of these important variables (Ataca & Berry, 2002; Jayasuriya, Sang, & Fielding, 1992; Ouarasse & Van de Vijver, 2005). Migrants with a higher education are

Chapter 3

able to adapt more easily to host cultures than are migrants with a lower education (Ataca & Berry, 2002). Migrants with higher education levels will be more likely to translate a belief that hard work pays off in efforts at work, because this belief has been justified and reinforced by the efforts they made throughout their educational process and by the resulting achievements. Immigrants who endorse reward for application beliefs also seem to have more active styles of coping within the host culture (Safdar, Lewis, & Daneshpour, 2006). The Turkish-Dutch sample in this study consisted of white-collar employees, implying that they all had at least vocational training. Some of them, however, had a considerably higher education such as a PhD degree. Hence, it can be argued that people with higher education levels are more likely to convert their reward for application beliefs into higher levels of efforts at work. In line with these ideas, we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 1b. Education level will moderate the relationship between the reward for application belief and job dedication among Turkish-Dutch employees in the Netherlands. More specifically, the relationship between reward for application and job dedication will be stronger at a higher educational level in this group.

Religiosity concerns the belief that supernatural forces control the universe and that religious beliefs are functional for living a happy life. People who endorse religiosity beliefs have the conviction that these beliefs have a positive influence on inter-personal relationships (Bond, Leung, Au, Tong, & Chemonges-Nielson, 2004). Religiosity has further been related to agreeableness (McCrae, 2002), which includes a concern for others and undertaking good behavior by giving up one's own egoistic interests (Bond et al., 2004). For the Turkish employees in Turkey, we thus expect a positive relationship between religiosity and that organizational citizenship behavior is focused on others:

Hypothesis 1c. Among Turkish employees in Turkey, religiosity will positively relate to other-oriented OCB: namely, interpersonal facilitation and organizational support.

In contrast, for Turkish-Dutch employees in The Netherlands, this positive relationship is not expected. Although religiosity has been shown to be related to positively valued constructs such as agreeableness (McCrae, 2002) and positive affect (Diener & Suh, 1999), it has also

Chapter 3

been shown to be related to rejection of culturally distant groups (Safdar et al, 2006). Indeed, Safdar et al. (2006) showed that religiosity was associated with refusing inter-cultural contacts, the denial of customs and traditions of different cultural groups. Turkish and Dutch cultures have different religious backgrounds: namely, Islamic and Christian, respectively. Turkish-Dutch employees who endorse high religiosity beliefs therefore may be more likely to distance themselves from Dutch society. Indeed, it has been demonstrated that Turkish-Dutch people who had high religious identification were less likely to identify with the Dutch culture (Verkuyten, 2007; Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2007). In line with these studies, we consequently hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 1d. Among Turkish-Dutch employees in the Netherlands, religiosity will be negatively related to other-oriented OCB: namely, interpersonal facilitation and organizational support.

Although social cynicism, fate control, and social flexibility are social axioms that may be relevant to OCB, these dimensions were not used in any of our hypothesis, due to their low alpha coefficients (see the method section).

Relational identification with the supervisor (RI) and OCB

Various studies have highlighted the importance of social relationships at work for OCB (Anderson & Williams, 1996; Kamdar & Van Dyne, 2007). Mutual confidence between leaders and subordinates positively influences subordinates' OCB (Anderson & Williams, 1996). Accordingly, Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007) demonstrated that the quality of the social relationship with one's supervisor can reduce the effect of employees' personality factors on OCB.

Sluss and Ashforth (2007) recently introduced the concept of relational identification with the supervisor (RI). They defined this concept as the degree to which one defines oneself in terms of one's relationship with his/her supervisor. An employee's RI may be seen as an expansion of the self in the sense that the self exceeds one's personal characteristics by including "significant others": namely, one's supervisors (Sluss & Ashforth, 2007). Because Turkey is a collectivistic culture in which people define their self-concepts in terms of their relationships to others (Hofstede, 1991; Smith et al., 2006), employees' RI is expected to be especially salient for their OCB. Although positive social relationships have been shown to be important in individualistic cultures as well (Anderson & Williams, 1996; Kamdar & Van

Chapter 3

Dyne, 2007), one's RI seems much more relevant in collectivistic than in individualistic cultures. People in collectivistic cultures will more naturally define their self-concepts in terms of their relationships with others. Therefore, RI may be an important determinant of OCB among employees in Turkey.

Arends-Tóth and Van de Vijver (2004) showed that Turkish migrants adapt to the Dutch culture particularly in public life domains, the most important of which is the work environment. In line with these findings, we argue that Turkish-Dutch employees in the Netherlands will be familiar with Dutch individualistic values, and consequently their OCB will less likely be influenced by their RI than for Turkish employees in Turkey. Turkish-Dutch employees work in Dutch-managed organizations. This work environment will be an additional context in which to expect that the relationship between RI and OCB will be weaker for Turkish-Dutch employees in the Netherlands than for Turkish employees in Turkey. Our hypothesis consequently is:

Hypothesis 2a. Country of residence of the employees (i.e., Turkey vs. the Netherlands) will moderate the relationship between RI and OCB. Specifically, the relationship between one's RI and one's OCB will be stronger for Turkish employees in Turkey than for Turkish employees in the Netherlands.

Next to the educational level of migrants, the length of stay in the host society is another important demographic factor in the prediction of acculturation outcomes (Cortes, Rogler, & Malgady, 1994; Quarasse & Van de Vijver, 2005). Length of stay has been shown to be positively related to migrants' attitudes toward the foreign culture and to be negatively related to attitudes toward one's own ethnic culture (Cortes et al., 1994). Furthermore, Ouvarasse and Van de Vijver (2005) found that the longer Morroccans lived in the Netherlands, the less they identified positively with their own ethnic culture. Workplace relationships are considered important in the Turkish culture (Aycan, 2006). In particular, developing personal relationships between supervisors and subordinates is a common practice (Aycan, 2006). However, personalized relationships between supervisors and subordinates are not expected to be salient aspects in the Dutch workplace, due to the more individualistic nature of this society (Hofstede, 1991). Along these lines, it can be assumed that the longer Turkish-Dutch employees live in The Netherlands, the more they will adapt to the Dutch culture. Because RI seems to be a less salient characteristic of the Dutch workplace than of the Turkish work

context, Turkish-Dutch who live longer in the Netherlands will be more familiar with aspects of the Dutch workplace and consequently will be less likely to relationally identify with their supervisors. Moreover, RI of Turkish-Dutch workers in the Netherlands may be less likely to relate to OCB than with Turkish employees from Turkey. In light of this, we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 2b. Length of stay in the Netherlands will moderate the relationship between RI and OCB; such that the positive relationship between RI and OCB will become weaker the longer Turkish-Dutch workers are in the Netherlands.

3.2. Method

Participants and Procedure

103 Turkish-Dutch white-collar employees who are members of the Turkish Academic Network in the Netherlands (TANNET) and members of an e-group such as Middle East Technical University graduates in the Netherlands (METU-NL) (56% female, $Mean_{age} = 29$, $SD_{age} = 8.37$) and 147 white-collar employees from a textile factory in Western-Turkey (28% female, $Mean_{age} = 28$, $SD_{age} = 6.07$) participated in this study. Two groups were comparable in terms of their occupations. There were IT, chemical and mechanical engineers in both groups. There were also bank employees and managers in Turkish-Dutch group who work in comparable occupations in finance and accounting departments of the textile factory. Among the Turkish-Dutch employees, 25% had PhD degrees, 38% had university degrees, and 37% had vocational training. Among the Turkish employees in Turkey, 1% had a PhD degree, 51% had graduated from university, and 46% had high school. Among the Turkish-Dutch employees, 55% had at least 5 years of work experience compared to 53% of the Turkish employees. Of the Turkish-Dutch participants, 45% were born in the Netherlands and 38% had been living in this country for less than 10 years. We checked whether Turkish-Dutch employees in the Netherlands and Turkish employees in Turkey differed in terms of age, work experience, gender, and education. T-test results showed that there was no age difference, $t(245) = 3.10$, *n.s.*; no work experience difference, $t(245) = 2.07$, *n.s.* However, Turkish-Dutch was more highly educated than Turkish employees in Turkey $t(248) = 3.51$, $p \leq .01$ and there were more females among the Turkish-Dutch participants than among the Turkish participants in Turkey, $t(244) = 4.69$, $p \leq .05$.

Chapter 3

All participants were informed about the research via e-mails and were invited to participate on a voluntary basis. Confidentiality and anonymity of responses were emphasized and assured. Data were collected via e-survey (74% of data were collected via e-survey) and paper-and-pencil forms (26% of the data were collected via paper-and-pencil forms). Paper-and-pencil forms of the surveys were distributed in a closed envelope and collected in a closed envelope.

Measures

In accordance with test translation guidelines (Van de Vijver, 2003), all measures that originated from the English language were translated from English to Turkish and back-translated from Turkish to English by five bilingual experts. Four of these were linguists whose mother tongue was Turkish and who had studied the English language; the fifth was a bilingual Turkish industrial and organizational psychologist. The participants answered questionnaires in Turkish. Reliabilities overall were acceptable for research purposes (Nunnally, 1978) and can be found in Table 1.

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, Alpha Reliabilities, and Correlations among All Variables

		<i>Turkish-Dutch employees</i>			<i>Turkish employees</i>			1	2	3	4	5	6
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>α</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>α</i>						
1.	LS	17.48	13.11	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2.	Age	29.28	8.87	--	28.33	6.07	--	-.27*	--	-.10	.29**	.82**	.17*
3.	Sex	1.57	.49	--	1.28	.45	--	.15	-.24*	--	.06	-.19*	-.11
4.	Edu	1.84	.78	--	1.53	.50	--	-.27**	.25*	-.08	--	.33**	.28*
5.	WE	8.86	8.40	--	7.04	5.15	--	-.21*	.70**	-.31*	.20*	--	.15
6.	IF	3.30	.62	.72	3.69	.71	.65	-.15	.27**	-.08	.11	.28**	--
7.	JD	3.93	.47	.73	4.31	.57	.73	-.04	-.13	.05	.08	-.18	.39**
8.	OS	4.04	.50	.67	4.56	.45	.71	-.25*	.05	.01	.25**	.06	.54**
9.	OCB	3.75	.41	.84	4.18	.65	.84	-.19	.04	.02	.22**	.04	.84**
10.	RA	3.97	.63	.69	4.29	.69	.84	-.27**	.14	-.14	.20*	.09	.31**
11.	Rel	3.16	.63	.77	3.88	.74	.67	.08	-.18	-.04	.07	-.15	.02
12.	RI	3.09	.63	.65	3.47	.64	.64	-.26**	-.08	.04	.04	-.06	-.10

Note: Correlations for Turkish-Dutch employees are presented below the diagonal; correlations for Turkish employees in Turkey are presented above the diagonal. LS = Length of stay in the Netherlands; Edu = Education level; WE = Work experience; IF = Interpersonal facilitation; JD = Job dedication; OS = Organizational support; OCB = Total score of OCB scale; RA = Reward for application; Rel = Religiosity; RI = Relational identification with the supervisor. Gender: 1= male; 2= female; Education: 1= vocational school (vocational school and high school in the Turkish sample), 2 = university degree, 3 = PhD degree; Length of stay in the Netherlands and Work experience are expressed in years. All variables except length of stay in the Netherlands, age, gender education, and work experience are measured using a 5-point Likert scale. * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$

Table 1 (continued)

Means, Standard Deviations, Alpha Reliabilities, and Correlations among All Variables

		<i>Turkish-Dutch</i>			<i>Turkish employees</i>			7	8	9	10	11	12
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>α</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>α</i>						
1.	LS	17.488	13.11	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2.	Age	29.28	8.87	--	28.33	6.07	--	.13	.00	.01	.03	.04	.05
3.	Sex	1.57	.49	--	1.28	.45	--	-.08	.04	-.03	-.12	-.24**	-.12
4.	Edu	1.84	.78	--	1.53	.50	--	.15	.17*	.06	.10	.04	.10
5.	WE	8.86	8.40	--	7.04	5.15	--	.01	.20*	.15	.01	.04	.08
6.	IF	3.30	.62	.72	3.69	.71	.65	.35**	.30**	.80**	.22*	-.16	.20*
7.	JD	3.93	.47	.73	4.31	.57	.73	--	.43**	.77**	.29**	.12	.12
8.	OS	4.04	.50	.67	4.56	.45	.71	.40**	--	.70**	.32**	-.10	.22*
9.	OCB	3.75	.41	.84	4.18	.65	.84	.74**	.80**	--	.34**	.12	.27**
10.	RA	3.97	.63	.69	4.29	.69	.84	.23*	.36**	.35**	--	.39**	.40**
11.	Rel	3.16	.63	.77	3.88	.74	.67	.15	.27**	.15	.09	--	.13
12.	RI	3.09	.63	.65	3.47	.74	.64	.00	-.03	-.02	.06	-.15	--

Note: Correlations for Turkish-Dutch employees are presented below the diagonal; correlations for Turkish employees in Turkey are presented above the diagonal. LS = Length of stay in the Netherlands; Edu = Education level; WE = Work experience; IF = Interpersonal facilitation; JD = Job dedication; OS = Organizational support; OCB = Total score of OCB scale; RA = Reward for application; Rel = Religiosity; RI = Relational identification with the supervisor. Gender: 1= male; 2= female; Education: 1= vocational school (vocational school and high school in the Turkish sample), 2 = university degree, 3 = PhD degree; Length of stay in the Netherlands and Work experience are expressed in years. All variables except length of stay in the Netherlands, age, gender education, and work experience are measured using a 5-point Likert scale. * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$

Chapter 3

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). OCB consists of three distinct dimensions, namely interpersonal facilitation, job dedication, and organizational support (Borman et al., 2001; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996). Interpersonal facilitation (five items; an example item is “I help co-workers when they are successful”) refers to helping co-workers when such help is needed; Job dedication (five items; an example item is “I put in extra hours to get work done”) refers to one’s dedication to perform specific work-related tasks above and beyond the call of duty. 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 (five items; an example item is “I show loyalty to the organization by staying with the organization despite temporary hardships”) and was adapted from Borman et al. (2001).

Confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to test the three-factor structure of the OCB scale. Good fit indices were found for a three-factorial structure (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Specifically, the items for OCB showed a good fit in the Turkish-Dutch sample, χ^2 (df = 76) = 102.83, *n.s.*; RMSEA = .06; CFI = .93, as well as in the sample of Turkish employees in Turkey, χ^2 (df = 76) = 110.37, $p \leq .05$; RMSEA = .03; CFI = .91.

Conceptual agreement was reached when measurement invariance across both samples was tested (see Table 2 for values of the fit indices). As expected, the χ^2 of the restricted models increased slightly but none of the $\Delta\chi^2$ -values was significant. The fit indices indicated that the constrained models fit the data well. Specifically, the fit statistics for the more restricted models did not alter from the fit indices of the unrestricted models: RMSEA values and CFI values remained the same. The PCFI increased slightly, indicating a better model.

For Turkish-Dutch employees, alpha coefficients were .72 for Interpersonal facilitation, .73 for Job dedication, and .67 for Organizational support. For Turkish employees, alpha coefficients were .65 for Interpersonal facilitation, .73 for Job dedication, and .71 for Organizational support.

Relational identification with the supervisor (RI). An adapted version of Sluss and Ashforth’s (2007) 6-item relational identification with the supervisor scale was used (with 1 = *do not agree at all* to 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”.

Chapter 3

Confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to analyze the one-dimensional structure of the relational identification with the supervisor scale. Fit indices were very good both for Turkish-Dutch employees and Turkish employees in Turkey (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Specifically, the scale showed a good fit in the Turkish-Dutch sample, χ^2 (df = 5) = 11.17, *n.s.*; RMSEA = .06; CFI = .92, as well as in the sample of Turkish employees in Turkey, χ^2 (df = 5) = 4.39 *n.s.*; RMSEA = .02; CFI = 1.00.

Conceptual agreement was reached when measurement invariance across both samples was tested (see Table 2 for the values of the fit indices). Again, the χ^2 of the restricted models increased slightly but none of the $\Delta\chi^2$ -values was significant. The constrained models fit the data well, with the fit statistics for the more restricted models altering from the fit indices of the unrestricted models as follows: RMSEA remained the same, whereas CFI increased from .94 to .96.

Alpha coefficients were .65 for Turkish-Dutch employees and .64 for Turkish employees in Turkey.

Social axioms. An adapted Dutch (Van de Vijver, 2002) and Turkish version (Ataca, 2002) of the short 20-item social axiom scale was used (with 1 = *do not believe at all* to 5 = *believe very much*). Each axiom was measured using 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 Turkish-Dutch employees alpha coefficients were .69 for reward for application, .77 for religiosity, .71 for social cynicism, .50 for social flexibility and .25 for fate control. For Turkish employees in Turkey, alpha coefficients were .84 for reward for application and .67 for religiosity, .58 for social cynicism, .52 for social flexibility and .33 for fate control. Because social cynicism, fate control and social flexibility scales had low alpha coefficients, these scales were deleted and further analyses were conducted with the remaining social axioms.

Confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to analyze the one-dimensional structure of the reward for application and religiosity scales. Their cross-cultural equivalence was also tested. Overall, fit indices were good for both scales (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Specifically, Reward for application showed a good fit in the Turkish-Dutch sample, χ^2 (df = 4) = 5.28; *n.s.*; RMSEA = .06; CFI = .96, and in the sample of Turkish employees in Turkey, the fit was good as well, χ^2 (df = 4) = 8.39; *n.s.*; RMSEA = .05; CFI = .97. Items for Religiosity showed a

good fit in the Turkish-Dutch sample, χ^2 (df = 5) = 4.62; *n.s.*; RMSEA = .00; CFI = 1.00, and also in the sample of Turkish employees in Turkey, χ^2 (df = 5) = 5.84; *n.s.*; RMSEA = .02; CFI = .99.

In testing the cross-cultural equivalence of both scales, the constrained models appeared to fit the data well. Specifically, for Reward for application, the fit statistics for the more restricted models did not alter from the fit indices of the unrestricted models. In other words, RMSEA values and CFI values remained the same. The PCFI increased slightly, indicating a better model. For Religiosity, RMSEA decreased slightly from .01 to .00 and CFI increased slightly from .99 to 1.00. The PCFI also increased slightly, indicating a better model (see Table 2 for the fit indices).

Table 2

Overall Fit Indices for Testing Conceptual Equivalence among Turkish-Dutch and Turkish Employees in Turkey

	χ^2	<i>Df</i>	$\Delta\chi^2$	Δdf	RMSEA	CFI	PCFI
<i>OCB</i>							
Model I	213.65	152	-	-	.03	.91	.57
Model II	228.44	164	14.79	12	.03	.91	.62
<i>Relational Identification</i>							
Model I	15.56	10	-	-	.02	.94	.31
Model II	16.46	13	0.90	3	.02	.96	.42
<i>Reward for Application</i>							
Model I	13.67	8	-	-	.04	.95	.25
Model II	21.04	12	7.37	4	.04	.95	.38
<i>Religiosity</i>							
Model I	10.46	10	-	-	.01	.99	.33
Model II	13.04	14	2.58	4	.00	1.00	.46

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 Comprative Fit Index.

3.3. Results

Preliminary analyses

Turkish employees in Turkey had a higher average score on the reward for application scale, $F(1,182) = 17.01, p \leq .05$, and on the religiosity scale, $F(1,182) = 70.57, p \leq .05$. Turkish employees in Turkey had identified more relationally with their supervisors than did Turkish-Dutch, $F(1,182) = 19.59, p \leq .05$.

Hypotheses

To test the *Hypotheses*, we performed a series of hierarchical regression analyses while controlling for the effects of age, educational level, working experience, and gender in a first step. To test the moderation hypotheses (H1b, H2a, and H2b), we mean-centered the variables as recommended by Aiken and West (1991).

Hypothesis 1a predicted that reward for application would be positively related to job dedication both among Turkish-Dutch and Turkish employees in Turkey. As can be seen from Table 3, reward for application related positively to job dedication for Turkish white-collar employees in Turkey ($\beta = .29; p \leq .01$) but not so among Turkish-Dutch white-collar employees ($\beta = .04; n.s.$). *Hypothesis 1a* therefore was supported for Turkish employees in Turkey but not for Turkish-Dutch employees in The Netherlands.

Hypothesis 1b predicted that educational level would moderate the relation between reward for application and job dedication among Turkish-Dutch employees in the Netherlands. Results showed that educational level marginally moderated the relationship between reward for application and job dedication ($\beta = .58; p = .06$) (see Table 4). There was a positive relationship between reward for application and job dedication among participants who were university graduates and held PhDs ($r = .35, p \leq .01$). However, this relationship was non-significant among people who had vocational or lower educational levels ($r = -.07, n.s.$).

Hypothesis 1c expected religiosity to relate positively to interpersonal facilitation and organizational support among Turkish employees in Turkey. Nevertheless, no significant relations between religiosity and interpersonal facilitation or organizational support were found (see Table 3). Therefore, *Hypothesis 1c* could not be supported.

Hypothesis 1d expected religiosity to relate negatively to interpersonal facilitation and organizational support among Turkish-Dutch employees. Religiosity, however, was unrelated

Chapter 3

to interpersonal facilitation and related *positively* to organizational support ($\beta = .29; p \leq .01$) among Turkish-Dutch employees. Therefore, *Hypothesis 1d* could not be confirmed.

Table 3

Hierarchical Regression of OCB Dimensions on Social Axioms (Reward for Application; Religiosity) among Turkish-Dutch and Turkish Employees in Turkey (Hypotheses 1a, 1c and 1d)

		<i>Turkish-Dutch</i>									<i>Turkish employees in Turkey</i>								
		<i>Interpersonal Facilitation</i>			<i>Job dedication</i>			<i>Organizational support</i>			<i>Interpersonal facilitation</i>			<i>Job dedication</i>			<i>Organizational support</i>		
		β	R^2	ΔR^2	β	R^2	ΔR^2	B	R^2	ΔR^2	β	R^2	ΔR^2	β	R^2	ΔR^2	β	R^2	ΔR^2
<i>Step 1</i>	Age	.14			.09			-.11			.11			.39*			.41*		
	Gender	.11			-.04			.12			.03			.11			.15		
	Education	.14			-.27			.14			.05			-.23			-.15		
	Work-exp	-.00			-.04			.02			-.09	.03	.03	-.01	.08	.08	.06	.14**	.14**
	Length-stay	-.02	.10	.10	-.05	.04	.04	-.18	.04	.04	--	--	--	--	--	--			
<i>Step 2</i>	RfA	.21*			.04			.22*			.18			.29**			.43**		
	Religiosity	.06	.14	.04	.05	.04	.00	.29**	.18**	.14**	.03	.07	.04	-.01	.16*	.08*	.03	.31**	.17**

Note. Gender: 1= male; 2= female; Education = Educational level; 1= vocational school (vocational and high school in Turkish sample), 2 = university, 3 = PhD. Work-exp = Working experience; Length-stay = Length of stay in the Netherlands, RfA = Reward for application, * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$

Table 4

Hierarchical Regression of Reward for Application and Educational level on Job Dedication among Turkish and Turkish-Dutch Employees (Hypothesis 1b)

		<i>Job dedication</i>					
		<i>Turkish-Dutch</i>			<i>Turkish</i>		
		β	R^2	ΔR^2	B	R^2	ΔR^2
<i>Step1</i>	Age	.02			.45		
	Work experience	-.01			-.35		
	Gender	-.03	.03	.03	.04	.05	.05
<i>Step2</i>	Educational level	.03	.04	.01	.16	.08	.03
<i>Step3</i>	Reward for application	.05	.04	.00	.33**	.18**	.10**
<i>Step 4</i>	Educational level X Reward for application	.58†	.08†	.04†	.06	.18	.00

Note. Gender: 1= male; 2= female; Education = Educational level; 1= vocational school (vocational and high school in the Turkish sample), 2 = university, 3 = PhD. † $p \leq .10$; * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$.

Chapter 3

Hypothesis 2a predicted that relational identification with the supervisor (RI) would be positively related to all three dimensions of OCB, and more strongly so among Turkish employees in Turkey. As can be seen from Table 5, RI related positively to interpersonal facilitation ($\beta = .33; p \leq .01$), job dedication ($\beta = .31; p \leq .01$), and organizational support ($\beta = .34; p \leq .01$). The interaction term (RI x country) was marginally significantly related to interpersonal facilitation ($\beta = .29, p = .06$), and significantly related to job dedication ($\beta = .49, p \leq .05$) and organizational support ($\beta = .46, p \leq .05$) (see Table 5). This implied the relationship between RI and the three OCB dimensions was stronger among the Turkish employees in Turkey than among the Turkish-Dutch employees. *Hypothesis 2a* thus was for the most part supported.

Hypothesis 2b expected that, among Turkish-Dutch employees, the interaction between RI and length of stay would be positively related to OCB. The interaction term (RI x Length of stay) was significantly related to interpersonal facilitation ($\beta = -.32, p \leq .05$) and organizational support ($\beta = -.31, p \leq .05$) (see Table 6), but not to job dedication. The relationship between RI on the one hand and Interpersonal facilitation and Organizational support on the other hand became weaker when Turkish employees had been longer in the Netherlands. Therefore, *Hypothesis 2b* was supported for two of the three OCB dimensions.

Table 5

Hierarchical Regression of OCB Dimensions on Demographics, Country of Residence, and Relational Identification (Hypotheses 2a and 2b)

		<i>Interpersonal facilitation</i>			<i>Job dedication</i>			<i>Organizational support</i>		
		<i>B</i>	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	β	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	β	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2
<i>Step 1</i>	Age	-.08	--	--	.18*	--	--	.17	--	--
	Education	.11†	--	--	.18*	--	--	.18	--	--
	Work-exp	.20†	--	--	.05	--	--	.12	--	--
	Gender	.07	.03†	.03†	.06	.08**	.08**	.12*	.14**	.14**
<i>Step 2</i>	Country of residence	-.16**	.05**	.02**	-.11*	.09*	.01*	-.27**	.19**	.05**
<i>Step 3</i>	RI	.33**	.16**	.11**	.31**	.19**	.10**	.34**	.30**	.11**
<i>Step 4</i>	Country of residence X RI	.29†	.16†	.00†	.49*	.20**	.01**	.46*	.31*	.01*

Note. Gender: 1= male; 2= female; Education = Educational level, with 1= vocational school (vocational and high school in the Turkish sample), 2 = university, 3 = PhD. Work-exp = Working experience; Country of residence = Participants' country of residence, with 1= the Netherlands, 2= Turkey; RI= Relational identification with the supervisor. † $p \leq .10$; * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$.

Table 6

Hierarchical Regression of OCB Dimensions on Demographics, Length of Stay, and Relational Identification (Hypotheses 2b)

		<i>Interpersonal Facilitation</i>			<i>Job Dedication</i>			<i>Organizational Support</i>		
		<i>B</i>	<i>R²</i>	<i>ΔR²</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>R²</i>	<i>ΔR²</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>R²</i>	<i>ΔR²</i>
<i>Step 1</i>	Age	.13	--	--	.10	--	--	-.00	--	--
	Work-exp	-.01	--	--	-.27	--	--	.12	--	--
	Gender	.07	--	--	-.04	--	--	-.00	--	--
	Education	.11	.09	.09	-.01	.03	.03	.20	.04	.04
<i>Step 2</i>	Length of stay	-.01	.09	.00	-.06	.04	.01	-.17	.07	.03
<i>Step 3</i>	RI	-.08	.10	.01	.04	.04	.00	-.08	.07	.00
<i>Step 4</i>	Length of stay X RI	-.32*	.15*	.04*	-.16	.05	.01	-.31*	.11*	.04*

Note. Gender: 1= male; 2= female; Education = Educational level, with 1= vocational school (vocational and high school in the Turkish sample),

2 = university, 3 = PhD. Work-exp = Working experience; Length of stay = Participants' length of stay in the Netherlands; RI= Relational

identification with the supervisor. Working experience and Length of stay are expressed in years.

* $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$.

3.4. Discussion

By studying employees' work behavior, the present research extended previous work on Turkish-Dutch migrants, which has almost exclusively investigated their general acculturation attitudes. More specifically, we looked into antecedents of Turkish-Dutch migrants' organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The first specific aim of this study was to compare the effects of antecedents of OCB to their effects on OCB among native Turkish employees in Turkey. A second aim was to investigate white-collar employees, in contrast to previous research among Turkish migrants, which had mainly studied blue-collar migrants of low SES. The third aim was to examine OCB determinants that seemed to be relevant from a cross-cultural perspective: namely, employees' social beliefs and their relational identification with the supervisors.

In relation to employees' social beliefs, it was hypothesized that different social beliefs would be related to different dimensions of OCB. As predicted (H1a), reward for application related to job dedication, but only among Turkish employees in Turkey and not among Turkish-Dutch. Because Turkish-Dutch employees may feel a larger emotional distance with regard to foreign – Dutch – work contexts, dedication to one's job may less naturally result from reward for application beliefs. The finding for Turkish employees in Turkey, their home country, however, is consistent with previous research that showed positive relations between reward for application and number of working hours (International survey research, 1995).

We expected educational level to positively moderate the relationship between reward for application and job dedication among Turkish-Dutch employees (H1b). There was indeed a stronger relationship between reward for application beliefs and job dedication among Turkish-Dutch workers who had a university degree (i.e., masters or PhD), than among those who had a lower level of education. This finding may be explained as follows: Because one's social beliefs are developed through socialization (Leung & Bond, 2002), people who continue their education may be more likely to think that hard work pays off. Although the Turkish-Dutch sample as a whole was composed of white-collar employees, some of them had a remarkably high level of education. Highly educated people thus seem to be more likely to translate their belief that hard work pays off into being more dedicated to their jobs. This result seems to support previous research that showed a positive association between educational level and better socio-cultural psychological adaptation as well as higher

self esteem (Jayasuriya et al., 1992; Pham & Harris, 2001).

We further expected religiosity among Turkish employees in Turkey to be positively related to other-oriented OCB: namely, interpersonal facilitation and organizational support (H1c). However, religiosity appeared to be unrelated to interpersonal facilitation and organizational support among these employees. Our sample consisted of white-collar employees, whereas religiosity may be an antecedent of job dedication and organizational support, particularly among blue-collar employees in Turkey. In addition, the findings showed that in the Turkish-Dutch sample of employees, religiosity was positively related to behavior directed to the organization (i.e., organizational support) rather than toward individuals (i.e., interpersonal facilitation). Although Dutch society is an individualistic one, people act together and cooperate for the common interests of organizations and society. This feature of Dutch society has been labeled *societal collectivism* by Hofstede (1991). The main premises of religiosity are giving up one's egoistic interest and feeling concern for others (Bond et al., 2004). Apparently, the adherence to religious beliefs for Turkish-Dutch employees implies that one is inclined to act in favor of such organizational and collective interests.

According to the Dutch Central Bureau of Statistics, the largest group of Muslims in the Netherlands is of Turkish descent (CBS, November 18, 2002). On the other hand, there is a public debate in the Netherlands that views Islam as a threat to Dutch values (Verkuyten & Zaremba, 2005). Gijsberts (2005) showed that 50% of the Dutch people think that western and Muslim ways of life are too different from each other and therefore cannot co-exist in harmony. These views about Muslims were found to strengthen migrants' religious in-group identifications (Verkuyten & Zaremba, 2005), and to increase their adaptation problems and inter-group conflicts. However, Verkuyten and Slooter (2007) also demonstrated that ethnic, cultural, and religious differences in intergroup relations do not always have negative consequences. For instance, highly educated Dutch people have more cognitive flexibility and therefore do not view differences as threats to the Dutch culture (Verkuyten & Slooter, 2007). The Turkish-Dutch sample in our research has a high status in Dutch society because these employees have respectable occupations such as in IT engineering, in chemical engineering, and in finance management. Because they have a high status and they work with highly educated Dutch people, they may be evaluated more favorably (Coleman, Jussim & Kelley, 1995). They therefore may see their own religious beliefs as a personal freedom but not as a way of separating and

distancing themselves from the Dutch culture. Note that the religiosity scale used in this research does not measure one's specific religion, but measures the functionality of religious beliefs such as "Belief in a religion makes people good citizens". Consequently, religious beliefs as measured using this scale may reflect good citizenship. Apparently, religiosity beliefs among white-collar Turkish-Dutch employees aid their adaptation to Dutch society, which differs from previous research that demonstrated that religiosity beliefs mainly seem to play a negative role in the adaptation of migrants to the host society (Verkuyten, 2007; Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2007).

Regarding the role of relational identification with the supervisor (RI) on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB; H2a), results showed that RI indeed was an important determinant of interpersonal facilitation and organization support among Turkish employees in Turkey. Yet, RI was not related to any of the OCB dimensions among Turkish-Dutch. Dutch society has an individualistic culture in which people define their self-concepts in terms of their individual characteristics rather than of their relationships with others (Hofstede, 2001; Smith et al., 2006). Interestingly, Turkish-Dutch employees thus may be adopting characteristics of the Dutch culture. As supervisors of Turkish-Dutch employees are mainly native Dutch, these findings may also be explainable by the thought that it may be difficult to include someone from another culture in one's self-concept. In addition, Turkish-Dutch employees work in Dutch-managed organizations, and therefore will learn that relationships with the supervisors in such a work context are not appreciated in the same way as they are in Turkey. Several of these factors may explain why RI was not related to OCB among Turkish-Dutch.

Finally, for Turkish-Dutch employees the moderation effect of length of stay in the Netherlands was examined on the relationship between RI and the OCB dimensions. As expected, length of stay of Turkish-Dutch employees moderated the relationship between RI and other-oriented OCB dimensions (i.e., Interpersonal facilitation and Organizational support) (H2b). The strength of the relationship between RI and other-oriented OCB dimensions became weaker among Turkish-Dutch employees the longer they had been living in the Netherlands. Cortes et al. (1994) also showed that length of residence in a foreign culture was negatively related to attitudes with regard to one's own ethno-cultural roots. Because one's definition of self in terms of relationships to others is a salient concept in Turkey, it is a part of Turkish ethnic culture and thus will less likely be adhered to by Turkish-Dutch workers who become more familiar with the Dutch culture over time.

Chapter 3

Limitations and future research. This is one of the first studies to compare the work behavior of Turkish-Dutch employees with their Turkish counterparts in Turkey. As with any study, however, certain limitations and suggestions for further research need to be mentioned. First, because we employed a cross-sectional design, we cannot draw strong causal inferences about the direction of the relationships. It would be useful to collect longitudinal data and/or to use experimental designs in order to make stronger causal inferences about the findings. Furthermore, self-report measures were used in this research. Future studies should include supervisors' and colleagues' evaluations of OCB and of employees' relational identification with the supervisor. These studies should also investigate the link between relational identification with one's colleagues and OCB, because colleagues are also part of the social network at work. Future research may also include blue-collar Turkish-Dutch employees in order to see whether the antecedents of OCB will be the same as for white-collar Turkish-Dutch workers. Despite these limitations, however, we strongly believe the present study adds to our understanding of white-collar migrants' OCB in native and host cultures, an area that had previously remained under-investigated.

In summary, this study is among the first to investigate social axioms and relational identification as potential antecedents of OCB among Turkish-Dutch and Turkish white-collar employees in Turkey. To date, the Turkish-Dutch minority has mainly been compared with the Dutch majority. Nevertheless, it also is important to compare Turkish-Dutch workers with their Turkish counterparts in order to see the effect of foreign culture on their work behavior. Our research findings show the importance of social axioms for employees' organizational citizenship behavior both among Turkish-Dutch and Turkish employees in Turkey. This study is also among the first to have explored the relationship between employees' relational identification with their supervisors and their organizational citizenship behavior. This relationship seems of more importance among Turkish employees in Turkey, who might be more inclined than Turkish-Dutch workers to maintain harmonious relationships with their supervisors. Although Turkish migrants in our sample stated that they felt more Turkish than Turkish-Dutch, our findings showed that they seem to adapt their behavior to Dutch culture. For instance, the length of stay of Turkish-Dutch migrants seems to be an important moderator between RI and interpersonal facilitation and organizational support, implying that the longer Turkish-Dutch people stay in The Netherlands, the more some of their attitudes and behavior

Chapter 3

become aligned to the Dutch culture. These findings may also be further investigated in migrant populations from other collectivistic cultures that are living in individualistic western societies.