

A Review of Extra Role behavior as an Organizational Asset

Anugamini Priya Srivastava* and Sonal Shree

Assistant Professor, Symbiosis Institute of Business Management, Symbiosis International Deemed University, Pune, India; srivastavaanu0@gmail.com, sonalshree@sibmpune.edu.in

Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of this paper is to provide a theoretical review of EXtra role Behaviour (EXB). Further, it also explores some evidence to understand the extent to which EXB is required among teaching professionals. **Design/Methodology/Approach:** Research papers, articles and reports were explored to evaluate the understanding of the construct. Online databases were used to explore the articles to analyse the extra role behavior. **Findings:** Extra role behaviour is instrumental in shaping the organizational efficiency and effectiveness. Proper designing of processes to encourage such behaviour is desirable for overall productivity, performance, and sustainability of the organization. **Research Limitations:** Based on the theory based review, this paper provides concrete scope for future researches. It suggests future research to be conducted in longitudinal manner, with more variables in connection to extra role behaviour. **Implications:** By detailing EXB and how it brings about positive work outcome, this paper demonstrates the importance of creating a lasting impact through integration and encouragement of such behaviour and hence would be relevant to teachers and administrators in the field of education. It may also be relevant to human resource managers, leaders, and OD consultants who work towards understanding and bringing about change by focusing on desired performance behaviours. **Originality/Value:** This is a comprehensive literature review of the construct EXB which will benefit the academicians, researchers, and practitioners alike. It contributes towards ongoing research in the field.

Keywords: Discretionary Behaviour, Education, Employee Behaviour, Extra Role Behaviour, Positive Behaviour, Workplace Behaviour

1. Introduction

From time to time scholars have emphasized on the importance of employee behavior at workplace (Van Dyne & Le Pine, 1998; DiPaola, Tarter & Hoy 2005; Huang & You, 2011; Srivastava & Rastogi, 2019). Be it their commitment, or involvement in tasks, studies have shown the contribution of employee behaviour leading towards effectiveness and efficiency of the organization (Vigoda-Gadot, 2007a; Srivastava, 2017). In this context, a group of researchers highlighted the importance of extra role behavior in organizational set up (Organ 1988; Miceli & Near, 2013; Van Dick, van Knippenberg, Kerschreiter, Hertel, & Wieseke, 2008; Srivastava, & Rastogi, 2019). Extra role behavior refers to voluntary and discretionary behavior of employees which is targeted towards benefiting the organization (Van Dyne & Le Pine, 1998). Some

scholars considered extra role behaviour as voluntary behavior grounded on the willingness of the individual, while others considered it as compulsory behavior (Ganster & Schaubroeck, 1991). Although it is not considered as an ingredient of job appraisals or recognition, such behavior is needed to develop a healthy culture at workplace (Srivastava and Dhar 2015). Multiple studies have shown its relevance and importance in mainly service industry. Similarly, some has also addressed conceptual background of the term. However, to what extent extra role behaviour is relevant in teaching professionals, a literature review is missing. Furthermore, the definition of extra role behavior lacks proper limits, which makes extra role behavior measurement a difficult task. This is mainly due to improper definition by different employers and leaders in the organisation and contextual differences.

*Author for correspondence

Therefore, this study aims to review the literature available to understand the concept and evolution of 'extra role behavior'. Further, it gives some evidence to comprehend the extent to which extra role behavior is required among teaching professionals.

2. Methodology

Increasing number of scholars have conducted research in the area of extra role behavior. Therefore, it becomes very important to identify the development of literature in this field and identify the future scope of studies. The authors have presented a summarize literature review of extra role behavior to understand the potential gaps in this field. The primary purpose of the review was to provide the present status of writing in the field of extra role behavior, and to highlight the potential research areas which have been unexplored. This literature review will help the future scholars and researchers to understand the development of extra role behavior in the last few decades. As till date very few integrated literature review paper of this extra role behavior is found, this paper will contribute to add value to the ongoing research.

The literature search was confined to online database only:

- Emerald Full Text;
- EBSCO;
- ProQuest
- Elsevier's Science Direct;
- Google Scholar;
- JSTOR;
- Taylor & Francis;
- Science Direct.

Extra role behavior, voice behavior, helping behavior, citizenship behavior, voluntary behavior was used as keywords to derive research papers and working papers.

3. Literature Review

The EXtra role Behaviours (EXB) are those behaviours which are exhibited beyond the 'call of duty' and fall outside the premise of the formal reward system, i.e. they are not considered in the process of performance appraisals (Van Dyne & Le Pine, 1998). Extra-role behaviour is entirely voluntary, based on the discretion of employees rather than a compulsory form of behaviour,

and is aimed at benefitting the organization and not the individual. Being a voluntary behaviour, non-performance of EXB does not cause any penalty or punishment to the employees. Furthermore, extra-role behaviour can enable them to prevent their organization from unethical and illegal practices and raise productivity and performance to benefit the organization in the long run (Van Dyne & Ang, 1998).

Regarding physiology, behaviour is considered as the reaction of human organs towards external stimuli (Skinner, 1965). Similarly, in psychology, behaviour refers to all the responses of man and animals give to any stimulus, including the explicit and implicit behavior (Holt, 1933). To examine employee behaviour in an organization, scholars connected and analysed behaviour with the specific roles of the employees (Shore & Wayne, 1993). They proposed role as a specified set of behaviour that expected from a person at a specific position. In line with this proposal, role behaviour was ascertained as the behaviour which shown in response to role-related tasks and responsibilities (Huang & You, 2011); another scholar specified two kinds of role behaviour- in role behaviour and extra-role behaviour (Organ, 1988). IN-role Behaviour (INB) is defined as the compulsive behaviour expected from an employee for the successful accomplishment of assigned tasks. It is the 'core' role specific behaviour, which provides a base for performance appraisals and reward system (Tompson & Werner, 1997). Failure to exhibit INB can cause serious punishments or penalty, as it would affect the overall organizational outcomes (Brief & Motowildo, 1986).

On the other hand, EXB is the behaviour that is displayed beyond the formal lines of job requirements (Barnard, 1938; Katz & Kahn, 1966). Extra-role behavior is a discretionary behaviour, highly based on individual willingness and motivation to exhibit, to help or support individual, team and organization (Somech & Drach Zahavy, 2000). This "arbitrary behaviour" is mainly targeted towards the benefit of the organization, without any acknowledgement in the formal rewards system. Due to this, failure to perform extra role behaviour does not call for any punishment when not performed (Organ, 1988). Employees exhibiting extra role behaviour are also known as 'good soldiers' (Vigoda-Gadot, 2007a) as it is carried out for the greater good. They direct the effective flow of operations in the organization, with softer product process and no explicit individual advantage.

Barnard (1938), in his study on workplace management and efficiency, proposed the importance of informal professional linkages among employees at work. He suggested that employees' social and informal associations many a time accentuate the organizational hierarchy and effectiveness. Indicating EXB as a spontaneous and innovative behaviour, EXB was also explained as a part of in-role behaviour, and was defined in terms of being like gestures to orient new worker, helping others without exploiting other's rights and exhibiting friendly behaviour to co-workers (Barnard, 1968). Extending this argument, Katz and Kahn (1966) proposed the term 'extra role' behaviour as the behaviour "beyond the formal lines". They represented that employees' extra role behaviours which are exhibited beyond the traditional organizational roles, are a significant predictor of organizational effectiveness. Considering EXB as a discretionary behaviour, they stated it as an act of professional compassion displayed in the form of congeniality or helping behaviour to indicate the sense of citizenship in the organization and to benefit the organization. Later emphasizing more on the construct development, Bateman and Organ (1983) explained extra role behaviour as a source to lubricate the social mechanism in the organization. All these studies considered extra role behaviour as a part of In-role behaviour. Later after five years, Organ (1988) differentiated in-role and extra-role behaviour. He specified the formal organization as that organization where task behaviour is governed by organizational systems, policies, rules, and regulations to achieve effective technical production. Whereas informal organization are such organization where extra role behaviour among employees is encouraged, and the emphasis is given on welfare of co-workers to lower down the absenteeism and improve cooperation, goodwill, and helpfulness at the workplace. Further, Organ (1997) defined it as an agent of social and psychological climatic change also. From time to time, researchers proposed different aspects of extra-role behaviour (Organ, 1988; Organ & Ryan, 1995).

Initially, researchers presented extra role behaviour as a synonym for Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB). They indicated the dimensions of OCB- altruism, civic virtue, consciousness, sportsmanship and courtesy, as the common element of extra role behaviour though a few explored the concept more and proposed the defensive element in extra-role behaviour. Van Dyne and LePine (1998) conducted an extensive study and provided four different aspects of extra role behaviour.

They proposed that extra role behaviour can be exhibited to encourage or promote certain events (promotive), to protect and prevent unethical or inappropriate behaviour (prohibitive), to strengthen relationship at work (affiliative) and to provide ideas to resolve issues (challenging). Further, they stated that extra role behaviour could be a combined form of these four attributes. Therefore, it may be a helping behaviour (affiliative promotive behaviour), voice behaviour (challenging promotive behaviour), stewardship (affiliative prohibitive behaviour), and whistle blowing (challenging prohibitive behaviour). If it benefits the organization, it is extra role behaviour. Adding to the literature, Miceli and Near (2013) suggested Whistle Blowing (WB) and Principal Organizational Dissonance (POD) as critical elements of extra role behaviour in addition to altruism, civic virtue, consciousness, sportsmanship and courtesy. They showed that extra role behaviour is not simply re-titling of OCB. Supporting Van Dyne and Le Pine (1998), they explained that extra role behaviour not only aims at benefitting the organization through positive work behaviour (commitment and job satisfaction), but also targets at preventing the organization against unethical and unfair situations. According to these authors, WB explains the process in which an employee raises his voice and reports about the unethical, illegal, negligent or wrong doing (criminal offence, damage to health and safety etc.) in organizational processes, before the authorities. These behaviours are generally aimed to protect the public interest (Miceli, Near & Dwor, 2013). On the other hand, POD explains the protesting behaviour of employees to oppose the unfairness or injustice done at the workplace. The authors suggested that when employees involve themselves in a preventive and promotional aspect of extra-role behaviour, it not only ensures the smoother flow of all the resources towards the organizational profitability and effectiveness but also enables managers to take corrective actions regarding the upcoming problems and issues (Srivastava & Dhar, 2015).

Extra-role behaviour is often taken as a voluntary behaviour. Vigoda-Gadot (2007b) showed that extra role behaviour is not a compulsive, forced or imposed behaviour. He argued that when extra role behaviour is made compulsory for all, the ultimate aim of benefitting the organization fails. The employees are then involved in it just to convince the supervisor and not to advance organizational effectiveness. Therefore, extra-role behaviour is specifically discretionary behaviour, based

on inner willingness and motivation of the individual. Extra-role behaviour must be derived from an individual's wish and will to exhibit, in favour of organization (Ganster & Schaubroeck, 1991). Due to these inbuilt characteristics, extra role behaviour is never accounted as an important element of the performance appraisals. Neither is it comprised of a formal reward system nor restricted by role responsibilities. Failure to exhibit extra role behaviour does not lead to any punitive punishment or penalty (Belogolovsky & Somech, 2010).

Extra-role behaviour is often considered as having a multidimensional attribute, which can be targeted towards individual, group and organization. Kobeg, Boss, Senjem and Goodman (1999) initiated the relevance of the multidimensional nature of extra role behaviour in organizations. These authors highlighted the influence different dimensions – individual, group and organizational characteristics can have on extra role behaviour. Extending this literature, Somech and Drach Zahavy (2000) conducted an analysis on primary and secondary schools. They presented the role of extra role behaviour towards stakeholders like students, school and team. Presenting EXB as unpaid tasks on an organizational level, they posited the role of EXB in the form of helping behaviour towards an individual, sharing and cooperative behaviour on team level processes, and voluntary involvement. Although EXB is considered as very significant for organizational productivity by many researches, yet very few analyzed its multidimensional aspect.

Extra-role behaviour is considered necessary for the overall success of the organization (Wright, George, Farnsworth, & McMahan, 1993; Van Dick, van Knippenberg, Kerschreiter, Hertel, & Wieseke., 2008). It may be targeted towards individual or team; the ultimate aim of the extra role behaviour is in favour of the organization only. Therefore, it can be said that “extra-role behaviours are not simply those that happen to occur within an organization, but those that are directed towards or seen as benefitting the organization” (as cited by Somech & Drach Zahavy, 2000; Van Dyne, Cummings & McLean Parks, 1995). Borman and Motowidlo (1993) supported the relevance of extra role behaviour and proposed that organizations win when individuals go beyond the formal tasks and contribute towards shaping the organization and social contexts to support task-related activities.

Katz and Kahn (1966) stated that organization in which cooperation among the team members are limited to formal roles and duties are doomed to fail. Borman, White and Dorsey (1995) stated that workers are considered to be efficient not when they themselves were productive, but when the people around them too were productive, helpful, and cooperative. Signifying the effect of EXB on performance, Organ (1988) specified that because extra role behaviour gives a valuable way to manage interdependencies among team members, it supports collective work outcomes like performance and productivity. It reduces the demand for high supervision and enables managers to give more time to planning, organising and controlling the fruitful tasks.

The theory of extra role behaviour is also context specific, i.e. definition and scope of extra role behaviour changes with the change in context (George & Jones, 1997; Chiaburu, Marinova, & Lim, 2007). Due to this reason, the influence of extra role behaviour on work outcomes differed in literature. This concept depends upon the one who defines it, the person who is being evaluated and at the time of evaluation. Somech and Drach Zahavy (2000) argued that the principal and teacher who work in the same school specify the scope of extra role behaviour in a common way (based on attraction-selection-attraction theory), while parents and students can widen or narrow the scope based on their requirements. Similarly, the scope of extra role behaviour will differ from industry to industry. The extra-role behaviour for a teacher and a software engineer can never be the same (Williams & Anderson, 1991; Nadiri & Tanova, 2010). This particular characteristic of extra role behaviour tends to confuse the scholars.

Scholars are still debating to categorize the distinguishing characteristics of in-role behaviour and extra role behaviour (Zhu, 2013). Context-specific nature is also a reason for the difference in the extent of the relationship between different variables and extra-role behaviour. Initially, the extra role behaviour was evaluated in different service (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Ahearne, 1998) and manufacturing industries (Hui, Law & Chen, 1999). Later, the attention of organizational behaviour scholars shifted to the schools and educational institutions. Commencing this regime, thirty-one years ago, Fullan (1985) pointed to extra-role behaviour as a critical element for school effectiveness. Following this study, Van Dyne and LePine (1998) expressed extra role

behaviour as an important element for school and student performance and emphasised on schools to learn the ways to cultivate extra role behaviour.

4. Definition - Extra Role Behavior

Explaining teacher's extra-role behaviour, DiPaola, Tarter & Hoy (2005) stated it as "voluntary and assistive teacher behaviours above and beyond performance expectations of their official role that "go the extra mile" to help students and colleagues succeed". Further, it is the "individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization", (Organ, 1988).

Connecting Bandura's Social Exchange Theory (2001), scholars ascertained extra role behaviour as a teacher's positive reciprocal behaviour. Studies have shown teachers' extra role behaviour as a significant contributor towards effective student learning attitude, a consequence of optimistic school climate and an asset to reduce principal's supervisory role (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Srivastava & Dhar, 2016a). These studies emphasised on the effectiveness of teacher's extra role behaviour. They argued that the teachers' role is not like other jobs that can be explained with few lines of instructions and specification. Their role cannot be described in the job descriptions or the employment contracts. Teacher's role is spontaneous and requires an approach to go beyond the formal lines to attain the entire array of student success. Teacher's EXB is necessary for the long-term growth and smoother functioning of the schools (Christ, Dick, Wagner & Stellmacher, 2003; Srivastava & Dhar, 2016a). Schools with teachers going beyond the minimum expectation of the job requirement are easily noticeable with respect to student performance and rankings. Bogler and Somech (2004) stated that extra role behaviour is a part of teacher's role; however, they restrict themselves to job specific roles when they want to punish the school authorities or when the contract expires. This ultimately influences the overall functioning of the school. Advancing the literature in the school context, Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2000) also showed extra role behaviour as instrumental towards successful reformation of the organizational processes.

Emphasizing on the role of extra role behaviour towards student, team and school, they considered extra role behaviour as an additional asset in the hands of the organization which reduces the need for costly processes to attain student achievement. According to the study, they ascertained extra role behaviour towards students as comprising direct and indirect behaviours targeted at advancing the teaching quality like obtaining proficiency in new subjects that adds to teaching, improving the capability to handle students' special needs. EXB towards team included behaviours that are purposely focused at helping a particular teacher, like helping other teachers to complete their workloads; familiarizing new teachers to school policies, norms and procedures. Extra-role behaviour towards organization signifies informal behaviour that is not targeted towards the specific person but is aimed to benefit the organization like volunteering for unpaid tasks, building innovative suggestions to develop the school. Organizing social activities, providing novel suggestions, volunteering school a committee, orienting new teachers, participating in school meetings, preparing to learn programs, punctual to school timings, and helping weak students were also provided as an important example of extra role behaviour activities in school premises (Elgammal, 2013b).

Following this study, a few scholars emphasized the importance of teacher's EXB towards student achievement, teacher's job satisfaction, and commitment. Belogolovsky and Somech (2010) studied extra role behaviour from the viewpoint of principals, teachers, and parents, and showed that the three groups differed in their assessment of teachers' targeted performance toward students, teams, or schools. Somech and Ron (2007) also examined the relative impact of individual and organizational characteristics on the extra role behaviour of teachers and presented that collectivism (an organizational variable with roots extending to national culture) was the most influential predictor of teachers' extra role behaviour. These authors argued that the teacher's extra role behaviour is needed in schools as teaching is a humanistic profession requiring more spontaneity than any other profession. Due to this, the teacher's extra role behavior requires more exploration, and it is essential to understand the diverse attributes that can encourage extra role behaviour in different school climate.

5. Research Gaps and Future Scope of the Study

The term EXB is well documented, but still many unexplored related areas exist which are yet to be explored and waiting to be tapped. Most of the studies have considered extra role behavior as an outcome of variables like transformational leadership, commitment, and many others. Therefore, more researches are required to explore how extra role behavior will be helpful in deriving organizational success and sustainability. Methodologies used to evaluate EXB used different measures based on their context. As extra role behavior is well mentioned as context specific variable, extensive studies are required to bring out the integrated measure for extra role behavior. Next, absence of concrete difference between extra role and in-role behavior has made examination of this behavior in different samples a difficult process. Therefore, future researchers are motivated to conduct in depth analysis to develop the difference between in-role and extra role behavior. Fourth, scholars can also explore extra role behavior as second order construct by defining different sub dimensions of EXB. Next, most of the studies till date considered EXB as individual level construct. Even though few examined it at a group level (multilevel analysis), more evidence is required to prove the same. Scholars also need to explore the relationship between employee's perception, organizational culture and human resource development practices with EXB. As EXB is not considered as a part of job appraisals, scholars can bring out modes to encourage EXB through non-monetary procedures. Moreover, longitudinal studies are also required to be conducted to examine the long term changes in exhibition of EXB. Although multiple studies were conducted on evaluating the concept and relevance of extra-role behavior, still better clarity of the idea is needed. Studies in different context and samples are required to generalize the previous results. Further, the theoretical support of other upcoming leadership theories and its effect on extra role behavior is needed.

6. References

1. Barnard, C. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge: Mass.
2. Barnard, C. (1968). *The functions of the executive* (Vol. 11). Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
3. Bateman, T. & Organ, D. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "Citizenship". *The Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587–595. <https://doi.org/10.5465/255908>, <https://doi.org/10.2307/255908>.
4. Belogolovsky, E. & Somech, A. (2010). Teachers' organizational citizenship behaviour: Examining the boundary between in-role behaviour and extra-role behaviour from the perspective of teachers, principals and parents. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 914–923. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.10.032>.
5. Bogler, R. & Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 277–289. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.02.003>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.02.003>.
6. Borman, W.C. & Motowidlo, S.M. (1993). Expanding the Criterion Domain to Include Elements of Contextual Performance. Chapter In: N. Schmitt and W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel Selection in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; p. 71–98.
7. Borman, W.C., White, L.A. & Dorsey, D.W. (1995). Effects of ratee task performance and interpersonal factors on supervisor and peer performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(1), 168–177. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.80.1.168>.
8. Brief, Arthur P. & Motowidlo, Stephan J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 710–725. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1986.4283909>, <https://doi.org/10.2307/258391>.
9. Chiaburu, D.S., Marinova, S.V. & Lim, A.S. (2007). Helping and proactive extra-role behaviors: The influence of motives, goal orientation, and social context. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43(8), 2282–2293. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2007.07.007>.
10. Christ, O., van Dick, R., Wagner, U. & Stellmacher, J. (2003). When teachers go the extra mile: Foci of organisational identification as determinants of different forms of organisational citizenship behaviour among school-teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73(3), 329–341. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709903322275867>. PMID: 14672147.
11. DiPaola, M.F., Tarter, C.J. & Hoy, W.K. (2005). Measuring organizational citizenship of schools: The OCB scale, In: W. Hoy & C. Miskel (Eds.), *Educational Leadership and Reform*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing; p. 319–341.
12. Elgammal, I. (2013b, November). The use of learning contracts in achieving the learning outcomes, the case of Professional Development module, UWIC, UK. Paper presented at The 3rd Tourism International conference of The Arabic Universities Association, Alexandria, Egypt.

13. Ganster, D.C. & Schaubroeck, J. (1991). Work stress and employee health. *Journal of Management*, 17, 235–271. doi: 10.1177/014920639101700202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700202>.
14. Fullan, M. (1985). Change processes and strategies at the local level. *The elementary school Journal*, 85(3), 391–421.
15. George, J.M. & Jones, G.R. (1997). Experiencing Work: Values, Attitudes, and Moods. *Human Relations*, 50, 393. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016954827770>.
16. Holt, B.E. (1933). Animal drive and the learning process. An essay toward radical empiricism. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 78(5), 554–561. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005053-193311000-00056>.
17. Huang, C.C. & You, C.S. (2011). The three components of organizational commitment on in-role behaviors and organizational citizenship behaviors. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(28), 11335–11344. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM10.1623>.
18. Hui, C., Law, K. S., & Chen, Z. X. (1999). A structural equation model of the effects of negative affectivity, leader-member exchange, and perceived job mobility on in-role and extra-role performance: A Chinese case. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 77(1), 3–21.
19. Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The psychology of organizations*. New York: HR Folks International.
20. Koberg, C.S., Boss, R.W., Senjem, J.C. & Goodman, E.A. (1999). Antecedents and outcomes of empowerment: Empirical evidence from the health care industry. *Group and Organization Management*, 24(1), 71–91. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601199241005>.
21. Miceli, M.P. & Near, J.P. (2013). An international comparison of the incidence of public sector whistle-blowing and the prediction of retaliation: Australia Norway and the US. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 72(4), 433–446. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8500.12040>.
22. Miceli, M.P., Near, J.P. & Dworkin, T.M. (2013). Whistle-blowing in organizations. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203809495>.
23. MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Ahearne, M. (1998). Some possible antecedents and consequences of in-role and extra-role salesperson performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(3), 87–98.
24. Nadiri, H., & Tanova, C. (2010). An investigation of the role of justice in turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior in hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 33–41.
25. Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. USA: Psychology Press.
26. Organ, D.W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85–97. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_2.
27. Organ, D.W. & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 775–802. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x>.
28. Shore, L.M. & Wayne, S.J. (1993). Commitment and employee behavior: Comparison of affective commitment and continuance commitment with perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(5), 774–780. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.5.774>. PMID: 8253631.
29. Skinner, B.F. (1965). *Science and human behavior*. NY: Simon and Schuster.
30. Somech, A., & Ron, I. (2007). Promoting organizational citizenship behavior in schools: The impact of individual and organizational characteristics. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(1), 38–66.
31. Somech, A. & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2000). Understanding extra-role behavior in schools: The relationships between job satisfaction sense of efficacy and teachers' extra-role behavior. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(5-6), 649–659. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(00\)00012-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(00)00012-3).
32. Srivastava A.P. & Dhar R.L. (2015). Training comprehensiveness: construct development and relation with role behavior, *European Journal of Training and Development*, 39(7), 641–662. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-06-2015-0039>.
33. Srivastava, A.P. (2017). Teachers' extra role behaviour: Relation with self-efficacy, procedural justice, organisational commitment and support for training. *International Journal of Management in Education*, 11(2), 140–162. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJMIE.2017.10002822>, <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJMIE.2017.083352>.
34. Srivastava, A.P. & Dhar, R.L. (2016a). Impact of Leader member exchange, human resource management practices and psychological empowerment on extra role performances: The mediating role of organisational commitment. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 65(3), 351–377. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-01-2014-0009>.
35. Srivastava, A.P. & Dhar, R.L. (2019). Authentic leadership and extra role behavior: A school based integrated model. *Current Psychology*, 38(3), 684–697. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-017-9634-4>.
36. Srivastava, A.P. & Rastogi, M. (2019). Understanding the Perception of Training Comprehensiveness. In: *Workforce Coaching, Mentoring, and Counseling: Emerging Research and Opportunities*. IGI Global; p. 85–104. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-9235-8.ch004>.
37. Tompson, H. & Werner, J.M. (1997). The impact of role conflict/facilitation on core and discretionary behaviors:

- Testing a mediated model. *Journal of Management*, 23, 583–572. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639702300405>.
38. van Dick, R., van Knippenberg, D., Kerschreiter, R., Hertel, G. & Wieseke, J. (2008). Interactive effects of work group and organizational identification on job satisfaction and extra-role behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72(3), 388–399. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.11.009>.
39. Van Dyne, L. & Ang, S. (1998). Organizational citizenship behavior of contingent workers in Singapore. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 41(6), 692–703. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/256965>, <https://doi.org/10.2307/256965>, <https://doi.org/10.5465/256965>.
40. Van Dyne, L. & LePine, J. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 108–119. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/256902>, <https://doi.org/10.5465/256902>, <https://doi.org/10.2307/256902>.
41. Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2007a). Redrawing the boundaries of OCB? An empirical examination of compulsory extra-role behavior in the workplace. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 21(3), 377–405. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-006-9034-5>.
42. Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2007b). Leadership style, organizational politics, and employees' performance: An empirical examination of two competing models, *Personnel Review*, 36(5), 661–683. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480710773981>.
43. Williams, L.J. & Anderson, S.E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601–617. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700305>, <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700305>.
44. Wright, P.M., George, J.M., Farnsworth, S.R. & McMahan, G.C. (1993). Productivity and extra-role behavior: The effects of goals and incentives on spontaneous helping. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(3), 374–381. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.3.374>.
45. Zhu, W., Newman, A., Miao, Q., & Hooke, A. (2013). Revisiting the mediating role of trust in transformational leadership effects: Do different types of trust make a difference?. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 94–105.