Geneviève Morin

Direction de l'enseignement
et de la recherche
École nationale d'administration
publique, Canada
genevieve.morin@enap.ca
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0654-7491

David Talbot

Direction de l'enseignement
et de la recherche
École nationale d'administration
publique, Canada
david.talbot@enap.ca
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9675-2703

Advancing Corporate Social Responsibility: Development of a Measurement Scale Unveiling Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Culturally Diverse Environments

ABSTRACT

Objective: The modern concept of corporate social responsibility (CSR) is increasingly becoming integrated into the practices of organizations. One of the distinctive individual competencies in CSR is the ability to work in a multicultural environment. This study proposes a suitable empirical measurement tool that facilitates understanding organizational citizenship behaviors focused on cultural diversity (OCBCs).

Methodology: To validate the OCBC measure, 980 participants completed the questionnaire (n = 980). An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted on one part of the sample as a prerequisite to a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on the other part of the sample.

Finding: This tool enabled the identification of two main types of OCBCs: cultural initiative and cultural helping. These actions enhance organizational practices for integrating cultural diversity and promoting diverse cultural values.

Value Added: This study furthers the understanding of OCBCs and the role of individuals in culturally diverse contexts. This study contributes to international human resource management research and practice by developing an instrument for use in expatriate contexts or in those associated with organizational cultural diversity. It provides a deeper look at OCBs and contributes to the scientific literature on the role of human resources in promoting sustainable development in organizations.

Recommendations: The OCBCs measurement tool could assist human resource managers seeking to encourage and facilitate the performance of appropriate OCBCs in the workplace. This performance will allow OCBCs to facilitate informal learning.

Key words: organizational citizenship behaviors, measurement scale, cultural diversity, cultural initiative, cultural helping, ethical behavior.

Introduction

International recruitment is an attractive option for organizations facing staffing shortages or a lack of skilled labor (Morence et al., 2020; Han et al., 2022). The world currently has a growing number of expatriates (Han et al., 2022), estimated at approximately 57 million (Han et al., 2022; Ireland, 2021). Growth is expected to continue over the next few years at a compound annual rate of roughly 5% (Ireland, 2021). International assignments require expatriates to adapt to complex work and non-work contexts, generating many challenges (Chen et al., 2010; Lee & Nguyen, 2019). Expatriates are expected to interact effectively with people from different cultural backgrounds, which also generates significant challenges (Grobelna, 2015; Zhang et al., 2022). These assignments are regularly associated with low adaptation (Coughlan et al., 2019) and high financial costs (Bader et al., 2021). On average, international organizations have an estimated yearly cost of expatriate failure ranging from US$200,000 to US$1.2 million (Lee et al., 2019). The failure rate and costs of failure do not differ between the different types of international organizations (Iorgulescu & Răvar, 2014). Therefore, many organizations rely on new employee training to develop cultural competency, foster adaptability, improve individual performance, and limit expatriate failure (Morris & Robie, 2001; Phanphairoj & Piromsombat, 2019). Over the past two decades, however, research findings have instead shown that 70–90% of organizational learning occurs continuously yet informally in the workplace (Cerasoli et al., 2018). This type of learning leads employees to identify or create learning opportunities outside of traditional training contexts (e.g., cultural discovery, awareness activities, and mentoring programs for skill development) (Bell, 2017; Ford et al., 2018).

One form of informal practice in organizations are organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs). These behaviors are voluntary, not prescribed by the organization, and can help improve the company's effectiveness and efficiency in the context of cultural diversity (e.g., Kadam et al., 2021; Kumari et al, 2022; Ng et al., 2019; Popescu et al., 2018). This study responds to the invitation from Ng et al. (2019) to further the understanding of OCBs and the role of individuals in cultural contexts. Previous studies have primarily focused on OCBs in

general, without considering behaviors associated with cultural diversity (Kadam et al., 2021). Therefore, the main objective of this study is to propose a suitable measurement instrument that facilitates the understanding and analysis of organizational citizenship behaviors focused on cultural diversity (OCBCs).

This research is a component of the modern Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) standpoint that aims to construct a suitable empirical assessment instrument to enhance the comprehension of OCBCs. This goal aligns with modern CSR's anticipations of inclusivity and regard for diversity. Organizations recognize CSR as a managerial approach that enhances business efficacy by balancing financial gain and societal welfare. They acknowledge it as an essential element of their development strategy (Carroll, 2021; Coelho et al., 2023). The worldwide dedication to sustainable development has progressed from a limited and frequently sidelined notion to an intricate and multi-faceted concept, progressively pivotal in corporate determinations (Cochran, 2007; Barauskaite & Streimikiene, 2021). Consequently, this investigation endeavors to enhance our insight into OCBCs and the role of individuals in culturally diverse settings, presenting opportunities for cultivating an all-encompassing, cooperative, and considerate workplace ambiance.

General scales for assessing OCBs must be more specific to capture essential facets of OCBs (Chiaburu et al., 2015). This study provides two main potential contributions and two managerial implications. First, this study contributes to international human resource management research and practice by developing an instrument for use in expatriate contexts or in those associated with organizational cultural diversity. Second, it provides a deeper look at OCBs and contributes to the scientific literature on the role of human resources in promoting sustainable development in organizations (Macke & Genari, 2018; Amrutha & Geetha, 2020).

The remainder of this article is divided into four sections. The first section introduces the model, the main concepts associated with OCBs, and their potential applications in diversity management. The second section proposes a measurement instrument for OCBCs and explains the study's methodology. The third section presents the analyses of the results, and the last section presents the discussion, limitations, and conclusions of the study.

OCBs

OCBs have received increasing attention from organizational behavior researchers (e.g., Bolino et al., 2013; Dekas et al., 2013; de Geus et al., 2020; Hafeez et al., 2022; Podsakoff et al., 2009). They are defined as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization" (Organ, 1988, p. 4). OCBs are grounded in organizational studies and the human relations tradition of cooperation and collaboration (Organ, 2015; Tran & Choi, 2019).

The concept of OCBs is based on Barnard's (1968) and Katz's (1964) earlier distinctions between in- and out-of-role behaviors. Moreover, the roots of almost all forms of OCBs can be traced back to Katz's (1964) framework. Eventually, Smith et al. (1983) introduced OCBs, which Organ (e.g., 1988, 1994, 1997, 2006, 2013, 2015, and 2018) and many other researchers (e.g., Hafeez et al., 2022; Podsakoff et al., 2000, 2009; Ying et al., 2015; Zhang & Xu, 2019) used with increasing precision.

In a critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature on OCBs, Podsakoff et al. (2000) identified 30 potential OCB dimensions. Based on their definitions, the authors reported a lot of conceptual overlap between the concepts. This review led Organ et al. (2006) to organize the dimensions into seven common themes: (a) helping, (b) sportsmanship, (c) organizational loyalty, (d) organizational compliance, (e) individual initiative, (f) civic virtue, and (g) self-development. Helping behavior is defined as "behavior [that] voluntarily involves helping others with, or preventing the occurrence of, work-related problems" (Organ et al., 2006, p. 308). People with sportsmanship "Not only do not complain when they are inconvenienced by others but also who maintain a positive attitude even when things do not go their way, are not offended when others do not follow their suggestions, are willing to sacrifice their interest for the good of the work group, and do not take the rejection of their ideas personally" (Organ et al., 2006, p. 308).

Organizational loyalty involves "promoting the organization to outsiders, protecting and defending it against external threats, and remaining committed

to it even under adverse conditions" (Organ et al., 2006, p. 309). Organizational compliance is defined as the "internalization and acceptance of the organization's rules, regulations, and procedures, which results in a scrupulous adherence to them, even when no one observes or monitors compliance" (Organ et al., 2006, p. 309). Additionally, individual initiatives are defined as "voluntary acts of creativity and innovation designed to improve one's task or the organization's performance, persisting with extra enthusiasm and effort to accomplish one's job, volunteering to take on extra responsibilities, and encouraging others in the organization to do the same" (Organ et al., 2006, p. 309).

Civic virtue, on the other hand, is defined as "a macro-level interest in, or commitment to, the organization. This mindset is shown by a willingness to participate actively in its governance (e.g., to attend meetings, engage in policy debates, express one's opinion about what strategy the organization ought to follow, and so on), to monitor its environment for threats and opportunities (e.g., to keep up with changes in the industry that might affect the organization), and to look out for its best interests (e.g., to report fire hazards or suspicious activities, lock doors, and so on) even at great personal cost" (Organ et al. 2006, p. 310).

Moreover, personal development is defined as "voluntary behaviors employees engage in to improve their knowledge, skills, and abilities" (Organ et al., 2006, p. 310). Thus, the many types of OCBs previously identified in the literature fit into one of the seven categories mentioned above.

There is a strong link between OCBs and several desirable outcomes, such as individual or organizational performance quality (Lee et al., 2013; Ang & Van Dyne, 2015) and contextual performance (Ocampo et al., 2018). OCBs enable the analysis of performance contingencies and a more precise and complex measurement of organizational cooperation than when analyzing the relationship between individual performance efforts and outcomes (Tagliabue et al., 2020). Discretionary effort can thus be effectively operationalized by measuring the concept of willingness to cooperate (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

OCBs are considered ethical work behaviors that facilitate cooperation and help the collective function in the organization (Koo & Lee, 2022; Sguera et al., 2018; Chiu & Hackett, 2017). OCBs assume that employees care about their employer and do their best for the organization only if they feel financial and socio-psychological

appreciation from their employer (Mousa et al., 2020). In other words, employees care more about their organization when they perceive that their organization values them (Blau, 2017; Aryee et al., 2002). Social exchange theory suggests that employees engage in OCBs to respond to the favorable treatment and feedback they receive from their organization (Deckop et al., 2003; Koo & Lee, 2022). For instance, OCBs can occur when employees receive positive feedback for doing their best, regardless of expected performance thresholds (Miller et al., 2014). These unregulated behaviors are, therefore, non-reprehensible and have positive, shared results between individuals and organizations (Tagliabue et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020). Podsakoff et al. (2009) showed a strong link between OCBs and low employee turnover and absenteeism and high productivity and efficiency. Other research has identified predictors such as satisfaction (e.g., Chan & Lai, 2017; Batra & Kaur, 2021), motivation (e.g., Joo & Jo, 2017; Somech & Khotaba, 2017), productivity (e.g., Ismael et al., 2022; Kataria & Adhikari, 2022), autonomy (e.g., Akram et al., 2017), quality of work (Osman et al., 2021); and commitment (e.g., Hu et al., 2017). OCBs also contribute to the creation of a psychologically healthy work environment by (a) stimulating the development of interpersonal relationships, (b) avoiding creating difficult situations for others, (c) demonstrating a high tolerance to adverse situations (e.g., a lack of respect and fairness), (d) agreeing to abide by the rules and laws governing the organization's activity, and (e) voluntarily getting involved in the informal social and cultural events at the organization (Osman et al., 2021; Popescu et al., 2018).

Finally, organizations are always looking for ways to improve their performance and are increasingly considering using OCBs for this task (e.g., Yang et al., 2016; Hart et al., 2016). This need has led other researchers to adapt the concept of OCBs and these measurement scales to different contexts, such as higher education in Vietnam (Phuong, 2021), and different types of behaviors, such as environmental OCBs (Boiral, 2009; Ostertag, 2023) or community citizenship behaviors (Wu et al., 2022).

OCBs and cultural diversity in the organization

To our knowledge, the concept of OCBs was recently introduced into cultural diversity management research (Bizri, 2018). Although widely studied in various

industries, it seems that no research has yet examined OCBs associated with cultural diversity behaviors in organizations. Moreover, no OCB scale has been developed for this context.

In contexts characterized by cultural diversity, OCBs acquire particular importance, serving as drivers for fostering cultural diversity within the organizational setting (Kuknor et al., 2023). Acknowledging and appreciating cultural distinctions and individuals' capacity to adjust and engage effectively within an intercultural environment underpin the correlation between cultural diversity and OCBs (Kadam et al., 2021). Components such as conscientiousness, altruism, courtesy, team spirit, and civic virtue are pivotal (Haass et al., 2023). OCBs can manifest in various forms within culturally diverse settings, including involvement in cross-cultural mentoring initiatives, advocacy for cultural sensitivity, or active engagement in endeavors to nurture diversity and inclusion (Douglas, 2018; Naqshbandi et al., 2024). Several fundamental principles, such as intercultural sensitivity, intercultural communication, and diversity management, underpin OCBCs (Dahl, 2019). Intercultural sensitivity denotes individuals' capability to acknowledge, respect, and value cultural disparities, fostering an inclusive organizational atmosphere that encourages collaboration among individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds (Kuknor et al., 2023). Interpersonal communication across cultures is equally crucial, facilitating the sharing of ideas and resolving challenges within multicultural milieus (Dahl, 2019). Meanwhile, diversity management revolves around implementing organizational strategies and protocols that support integration and equal opportunities for all personnel, irrespective of their cultural heritage (Deepak & Perwez, 2023). By supporting such initiatives, organizations can foster a more inclusive culture and positive work environment and strengthen their social responsibility as proponents for promoting diversity (Paolillo et al., 2021; Ruiz-Palomino et al., 2023).

For the present study, the concept of environmental OCBs and its measurement scale (Boiral & Paillé, 2012) will be adapted into OCBCs aimed at identifying behaviors specific to managing diversity in the organization. The environmental OCBs categories — eco-initiatives, eco-civic engagement, and eco-helping — are easily oriented toward cultural diversity considerations that benefit the organizations, their employees, and society in general.

This adaptation leads us to propose the following definition of OCBCs; individual and discretionary social behaviors that are not explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and contribute to more effective management of cultural diversity in the organization. The first form of OCBC is cultural helping, which includes behaviors related to altruism. Some examples of cultural helping are encouraging other employees to act in a culturally competent manner, helping individuals solve problems associated with diversity, and collaboration among people of diverse cultures within an organization.

The second form of OCBC is cultural civic engagement in which people support diversity management policies, participate in cultural events involving the organization, and ensure a positive representation of diversity management. In this way, individuals help to develop information that can improve all cultural groups' meaningful integration within the organization or the development of cultural competencies in the cognitive, metacognitive, behavioral, and motivational dimensions.

The third form of OCBC are cultural initiatives, which are based on internal involvement and participation in activities. Some examples of cultural initiatives include making suggestions for improving diversity management, sharing information on cultural differences, and seeking to reduce social stigmas associated with cultural differences. Table 1 describes the main categories of OCBCs.

Table 1. Main OCBC categories

Main OCBC	Definition adapted to OCBC	Possible cultural applications
Cultural helping	Discretionary behavior and suggestions for improving cross-cultural practices or performance.	Behavior to encourage other employees to address these concerns;
		Efforts to avoid conflicts associated with cultural differences;
		Collaboration to promote diversity;
		Acceptance and positive attitudes toward inconvenience and additional workloads that may result from cultural practices (e.g., cross-cultural training, language barriers, implementation of cultural procedures, etc.);
Cultural engagement	Voluntary participation in an organization's intercultural programs and activities.	Adherence to cultural policies and objectives;
		Promotion of the organization's cross-cultural concerns to stakeholders;
		Development of knowledge, skills, and personal values to better understand and integrate diversity concerns into the organization and acquisition of information related to different cultures: religions, values, socio-political trends, food, etc.;
		Participation in cross-cultural training programs; Acquisition of information related to different cultures: religions, values, socio-political trends, food, etc.;
Cultural initiatives	Voluntarily help colleagues to better integrate cross-cultural concerns and cultural differences in the workplace.	Participation in intercultural activities;
		Sharing knowledge, information, and suggestions on stigma prevention;
		Initiating new projects and integration activities;
		Openly questioning practices that may hinder cultural openness, adaptation, integration, etc.

Source: Adapted from Boiral and Paillé (2012, p. 436).

Methodology

This study tests and validates a measurement instrument for key dimensions of OCBCs. The study's methodological approach was chosen based on a validated methodology (e.g., Hall & Van Ryzin, 2018; Boiral & Paillé, 2012; Boateng et al., 2018). To ensure correspondence between a variable's construct (its conceptual definition) and the operational procedure for measuring it, the development and validation of the scale involved three steps: (a) adapting the items, (b) testing them, and (c) validating them.

Measure

The first step was to develop and evaluate a set of items built on the three dimensions of environmental OCBs (eco-initiatives, eco-civic engagement, and eco-helping). These dimensions were oriented toward diversity considerations. The list of items was developed based on the definition of these categories as they apply to OCBCs. This list includes thirteen items, of which four assess self-help behaviors, another four evaluate civic engagement, and five assess individual initiatives. To avoid estimation errors with negatively worded items, all items were positively worded (Henderson et al., 2020). The list of randomly ordered items was submitted to five bilingual researchers. The researchers were asked to form clusters of similar items and relate these clusters to the original environmental OCBs core categories. To facilitate this process, the categories were clearly defined. The five researchers also ensured that the two versions of the scale (English and French) corresponded with each other.

Table 1 presents the items of the OCBC measurement questionnaire adapted from Boiral and Paillé (2012). Although the items in the proposed questionnaire may seem generic, they encompass a wide range of OCBCs and can be applied to various contexts, organizations, and work activities. However, the more specific the OCBC items are, the more likely they are to apply only to specific organizations, industries, occupations, or circumstances (Boiral & Paillé, 2012). The application and generalization of these elements can, therefore, be problematic. For the same reason, most OCB measures developed and used in the literature remain

relatively general and unspecific (Organ et al., 2006; Boiral & Paillé, 2012). There-
fore, the list of items regarding OCBCs used in this study (Table 2) is in line with
the literature on OCBs. This list of items (Table 2) was presented in random order
to respondents, who then indicated how much they agreed or disagreed with each
item using a Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree).

Table 2. OCBC list items

Main OCBC categories	OCBC#	Suggested items
Cultural helping	OCBC 1	I spontaneously give my time to help my colleagues be culturally sensitive in everything they do at work.
	OCBC 2	I encourage my colleagues to adopt more diversity-conscious behavior.
	OCBC 3	I encourage my colleagues to express their ideas and opinions about cultural issues.
	OCBC 4	I willingly share my expertise with other colleagues to help them better understand cultural differences.
Cultural civic engagement	OCBC 5	I stay informed of my organization's cultural efforts.
	OCBC 6	I actively participate in cultural activities or programs organized by my company.
	OCBC 7	I make gestures of openness to diversity that contribute positively to my organization's image.
	OCBC 8	I volunteer for projects or activities that address cultural issues in my organization.
Cultural initiatives	OCBC 9	I weigh my actions before doing something that could affect colleagues from another culture.
	OCBC 10	I voluntarily carry out cultural actions and initiatives in my daily work activities.
	OCBC 11	I make suggestions about ways to promote cultural integration.
	OCBC 12	I suggest new practices that could improve my organization's performance in different cultural situations.
	OCBC 13	I am willing to take the time to share information about cultural issues with my colleagues.

Source: Adapted from Boiral and Paillé (2012, p. 436).

Participants

The questionnaires were distributed electronically to expatriates around the world. This mode of administration was chosen due to the scarcity of and difficult access to the target population (Bujold et al., 2022). One of the main advantages of online surveys is the openness and flexibility for addressing a wide range of issues. The online questionnaire also overcame the geographic distance and other restrictions associated with COVID-19. Potential participants were contacted via private Facebook groups. A total of 100 private expatriate groups out of the 175 groups contacted agreed to distribute the link to the questionnaire in electronic format.

The groups were identified with the keywords "abroad", "working abroad", or "expatriate" on Facebook, and invitations were sent to join the groups. Expatriates were invited to participate after reviewing the general objectives of the study and the consent form. The consent form summarized the ethical guidelines and objectives of the study. This approach resulted in the recruitment of 980 participants (n = 980) randomly assigned to two groups.

Group 1 (Study 1, exploratory factor analysis)

For Group 1, the survey questionnaires were completed by 333 expatriate workers who could express themselves in French (n = 242) or English (n = 91). A total of 277 women and 56 men returned completed questionnaires. The average age range of the respondents in the sample was 35–44 years (SD = 1.15), while the average total duration of expatriation was 64 months (SD = 68.76). We exceeded the minimum requirement of 130 participants (13 questions x 10) proposed by Hair et al. (2019).

Group 2 (Study 2, confirmatory factor analysis)

For Group 2, the survey questionnaires were completed by 647 expatriate workers who could express themselves in French (n = 313) or English (n = 334). A total of 516 women and 131 men returned completed questionnaires. The average age range of the sample was 35–44 years (SD = 1.19), while the average total duration of expatriation was 68 months (SD = 78.47). Therefore, the final sample

consisted of 647 expatriates at the time of the study. As shown in Table 1, they were predominantly white women, mostly between the ages of 25 and 44, and highly educated. The participants were mostly employed in the private sector. Table 3 presents the characteristics of this final sample.

Table 3. Sample characteristics (N = 647)

Gender	
Women	80.5%
Men	19.5%
Age	
18–24	4.2%
25–34	29.9%
35–44	29.7%
45–54	22.4%
55–64	9.6%
over 65	4.2%
Sector	
Public	25%
Private	75%
Level of education	
High school	6.4%
Undergraduate degree	28.3%
Graduate degree (and more)	65.3%
Number of years working abroad	
Less than one year	4.2%
1 to 5 years	27.6%
5 to 10 years	26.4%
Over 10 years	43.8%
Ethnicity	
White	84%
Asian	4%
Black	3%
Hispanic	2%
Native	1%
Other	6%

Source: Own elaboration.

Data analyses

The data analyses were conducted in two stages. The first stage tested the OCBC items on a sample of expatriates. This step focused on exploratory factor analysis (EFA) of the set of items to identify a compact and reliable subset of items to constitute the scale. Following Berger's (2021) recommendation, an EFA was conducted on one portion of the sample as a precursor to confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on the other portion of the sample. The main objective of the CFA was to explore the underlying factor structure of the OCBCs. The second stage validated the scale with a new sample of expatriates. This step focused on exploring theoretically expected relationships with other variables and aimed to examine and confirm the factor structure the EFA revealed. These two stages of analysis are described in more detail in the next subsection.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Following Watkins' (2018) recommendations, CFA was used to conduct the EFA. Most methodologists recommend that CFA be employed when the goal is to identify latent constructs responsible for dissimilarity in measured variables (e.g., Berger, 2021; Gaskin & Happell, 2014; Norman & Streiner, 2014; Price, 2017). This approach involves factor rotation to improve the interpretability of factor loadings. Due to the nature of the constructs, it was assumed that the factors would be correlated. Therefore, an *oblimin* rotation was used to identify the number of salient OCBC forms (Watkins, 2018). This approach allows for the fact that almost everything measured in the social sciences is correlated to some degree (Meehl, 1990; Berger, 2021). Therefore, this type of rotation allows for the identification of intercorrelations between factors (Brown, 2015; Price, 2017; Watkins, 2018). This method simplifies the factors by minimizing the cross-products of the saturations (Berger, 2021). Moreover, following the method developed by Roesch & Rowley (2005), items were retained if the primary loadings exceeded 0.50 and all secondary loadings were less than 0.35.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Stata v. 16.0 was used for the CFA based on the maximum likelihood method for parameter estimation. The CFA requires the use of several fit indices. The $\chi 2$ statistic was used to interpret the results. By current standards, the lower the value of $\chi 2$, the better the fit. The Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) were also used to refine the analysis. Some researchers recommend TLI and CFI values greater than 0.90 (Kline, 2015, p. 140), while others recommend values greater than 0.95 (Hu & Bentler, 1999, p. 1). For the RMSEA, values between 0.05 and 0.08 are considered desirable (Kline, 2015, p. 139). Alternative models were also tested to ensure that the chosen model was the best fit for the study data.

Results

Results of the exploratory factor analysis (EFA; part 1 of the samples)

The result of the Bartlett test [$\chi 2$ (78) = 1435.320; p < 0.000] suggests a dependence between the sample and the base population, indicating that the data are generalizable. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test yielded a value of 0.897, indicating that the data were amenable to factor analysis. An initial two-factor solution explained 54.64% of the variance in the solution. However, several problems arose when evaluating factor loadings for five items (OCBC4, OCBC7, OCBC9, OCBC11, and OCBC13). Items were retained if the primary loadings exceeded .50 and all secondary loadings were less than .35 (Roesch & Rowley, 2005). The CPE was rerun without the five problematic items.

Table 4 shows the CPE solution after rerunning the analysis excluding the five items. The final factor analysis of the remaining eight items resulted in a two-factor solution (59.86% of the variance).

Table 4. Final factor analysis after the exclusion of five items (N = 264)

Old item	New item label	Mean	SD		Factor	
					Factor 1	Factor 2
OCBC1	Cultural helping 1	3.92	0.99		0.02	**0.80**
OCBC2	Cultural helping 2	4.05	0.90		0.04	**0.81**
OCBC3	Cultural helping 3	3.73	1.04		-0.03	**0.76**
OCBC6	Cultural initiatives 1	3.66	1.16		**0.83**	-0.16
OCBC8	Cultural initiatives 2	3.47	1.15		**0.79**	0.07
OCBC10	Cultural initiatives 3	3.38	1.14		**0.78**	0.06
OCBC12	Cultural initiatives 4	3.38	1.12		**0.66**	0.15
OCBC5	Cultural initiatives 5	3.71	1.07		**0.73**	0.0003
				Cronbach's a	0.84	0.72
				Factor 1	1.0	
				Factor 2	0.47	1.0
Eigenvalue					3.93	1.08
% of variance					0.49	0.14
% of cumulative variance					0.49	0.63

The bolded numbers represent the eight relevant items after the analyses

Source: Own elaboration.

Factor 1 (variance explained: 49.13%; Eigenvalue: 3.93) was designated as cultural initiatives, as it includes items related to individual cultural initiatives and cultural and civic engagement in the workplace. OCBCs classified as cultural initiatives can be defined as discretionary behaviors or suggestions that are not recognized by the formal reward system and contribute to improving the organization's performance or cultural practices.

Factor 1 includes the following five items: OCBC 5 (I stay informed of my organization's cultural efforts); OCBC 6 (I actively participate in cultural activities or programs organized by my company); OCBC 8 (I volunteer for projects or activities that address cultural issues in my organization); OCBC 10 (I voluntarily carry out cultural actions and initiatives in my daily work activities); and OCBC 12 (I suggest new practices that could improve my organization's performance in different

cultural situations). These items have been renamed cultural initiatives 1, cultural initiatives 2, cultural initiatives 3, cultural initiatives 4, and cultural initiatives 5, respectively. Altogether, these items demonstrate the individual's autonomous ability to take charge, take calculated risks, anticipate the company's needs and demands, and positively evolve diversity within the organization.

Factor 2 (variance explained: 13.52%; Eigenvalue: 1.08) was designated as cultural helping because it includes items related to individual cultural support in the workplace. OCBCs classified as cultural helping were defined as voluntary, unrewarded behaviors aimed at helping co-workers better integrate solutions to cultural concerns in the workplace. Factor 2 includes the following three items: OCBC 1 (I spontaneously give my time to help my colleagues be culturally sensitive in everything they do at work); OCBC 2 (I encourage my colleagues to adopt more diversity-conscious behavior); and OCBC 3 (I encourage my colleagues to express their ideas and opinions about cultural issues). Common to these elements is the idea of building more relationships and interactions between individuals and developing new knowledge. The important thing is that everyone feels that they benefit when helping each other. In particular, the person who is helped gradually gains confidence in themselves and their abilities, colleagues, and organization. These items have been renamed cultural helping 1, cultural helping 2, and cultural helping 3, respectively.

To summarize, the EFA suggested a two-factor solution with eight items (OCBC 1, OCBC 2, OCBC 3, OCBC 5, OCBC 6, OCBC 8, OCBC 10, and OCBC 12). These factors reflect several aspects of OCBC and were defined as cultural initiatives (Factor 1) and cultural helping (Factor 2). This underlying structure was used as the basis for the CFA.

Results of the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA; part 2 of the sample)

The results indicate that the two-factor structure fits the data well [$\chi^2(19, N = 518)$, 98.752; $p < 0.000$; CFI = 0.949; TLI = 0.925; SRMR = 0.040; and RMSEA = 0.09]. We find that both CFI (0.941) and TLI (0.925) are > 0.9, and thus are considered acceptable (Pituch & Stevens, 2016). An SRMR (0.040) under 0.05 is considered a well-fitting model (Pituch & Stevens, 2016). A close examination of

the modification indicators provided by Stata suggests that adding several correlations between error terms would provide a better fit of the model to the data. The model was, therefore, rerun with these modifications, resulting in a better model estimate [χ2(15, n = 518), 63.78; p = 0.000; CFI = 0.97; TLI = 0.94; SRMR = 0.03; and RMSEA = 0.07].

Table 5 shows the factor loadings, composite reliability (CR), average variance extracted (AVE), and, for each construct, two internal consistency reliability indicators: Cronbach's *alpha* and Jöreskog's *p-index*. The CR estimates how much a set of latent construct indicators shares its measure of a construct. Conversely, the AVE represents the total variance ratio due to the latent variable (Boiral & Paillé, 2012) and assesses discriminant validity. Hair et al. (2019) recommended thresholds of 0.70 for CR and 0.50 for AVE. The AVE values for cultural helping (0.538) and cultural initiative (0.528) are greater than 0.5 and the value of the squared correlation (0.439). Therefore, there is no problem with discriminant validity or convergent validity.

Moreover, the internal consistency and reliability coefficients were calculated using Cronbach's *alpha* (cultural helping 0.74 and cultural initiative 0.84), and Jöreskog's *p-index* (cultural helping 0.86 and cultural initiative 0.94) yielded values higher than the 0.70 cut-off usually recommended in the literature (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Jöreskog's *p-index* is considered more reliable than Cronbach's *alpha* because it is less sensitive to the number of items in the scale (Jöreskog, 1971). Because the calculated values exceeded the recommended thresholds, it was concluded that the model provided evidence of the measures' reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity.

Table 5. Descriptive statistics and pairwise correlations

Variables	Factor loading	Mean	SD	CR	AVE	a	p	1	2	3	5	7	8	9	10
Cultural helping	-	3.82	0.78	0.776	0.54	0.74	0.86								
Cultural initiatives	-	3.45	0.87	0.848	0.53	0.84	0.94								
Cultural helping 1	0.80	3.79	0.99					1.00							
Cultural helping 2	0.75	3.93	0.94					0.60	1.00						
Cultural helping 3	0.63	3.69	0.97					0.42	0.49	1.00					
Cultural initiatives 1	0.74	3.55	1.10					0.30	0.28	0.32	1.00				
Cultural initiatives 2	0.77	3.33	1.16					0.40	0.36	0.35	0.63	1.00			
Cultural initiatives 3	0.71	3.38	1.09					0.43	0.37	0.31	0.47	0.57	1.00		
Cultural initiatives 4	0.77	3.37	1.07					0.45	0.44	0.32	0.43	0.53	0.59	1.00	
Cultural initiatives 5	0.63	3.66	1.03					0.30	0.33	0.29	0.50	0.47	0.45	0.47	1.00

All correlations are significant at $p > 0.01$

SD = standard deviation; CR = composite reliability; AVE = average variance extracted;
p = Jökesreg's index; a = Cronbach's a

Source: Own elaboration.

Alternative model

Two other competing models were compared to eliminate the possibility of one or more nested models that might have shown a better fit and led to the rejection of the two-factor model (Crede & Harms, 2019). Table 6 shows that the two-factor

model fit the data better than a one-factor model that grouped the cultural initiative and cultural helping items as a single factor [X^2 diff (20) = 250.37, p < 0.001].

The results indicate that participants distinguished between two types of OCBCs: cultural initiatives and cultural helping. The failure to examine the adequacy of plausible alternative models or the tendency to ignore conflicting evidence could be considered questionable research practices (Crede & Harms, 2019).

Table 6. Comparison of competing models

Competing models	x2	Df	x2/Df	RMSEA	CFI	TLI
Null-factor	1594.307	28	56.94	_	_	_
One-factor	250.37	20	12.52	0.149	0.853	0.794
Two-factors	98.752	19	5.20	0.090	0.941	0.925
Two-factors (measurement model)	63.79	15	4.25	0.07	0.969	0.942

Source: Own elaboration.

Discussion and conclusion

The main objective of this study was to develop a tool to measure OCBCs in the workplace. This tool identified two main types of OCBCs: cultural initiatives and cultural helping. Behaviors associated with cultural initiatives are related to employee-led pro-cultural diversity initiatives that result in culturally appropriate actions in the workplace. These actions enhance organizational practices for integrating cultural diversity and promoting diverse cultural values (Holmes et al., 2021). Since cultural initiatives address practices, it can be assumed that they contribute to improved performance (Boiral & Paillé, 2012). Cultural initiatives also result in culturally sensitive suggestions and voluntary initiatives to reduce bias (Mousa et al., 2020). These voluntary initiatives are a key aspect of

OCBCs as they involve practical actions or recommendations to improve the effective functioning and performance of the organization (Organ et al., 2006). This first type of OCBC is similar to the concept of individual initiatives (Organ et al., 2006), involving communications with others in the workplace that "improve individual and collective performance" (Moorman & Blakely, 1995, p. 130).

Conversely, cultural helping behaviors assist organizations in identifying and resolving sources of cross-cultural conflict or mitigating prejudice (Yamini et al., 2023). They also facilitate the communication of cultural integration procedures to new employees. However, these actions require an interdisciplinary approach that promotes employee dialogue and voluntarily sharing knowledge and expertise (Ramus & Killmer, 2007). The behaviors associated with cultural helping are related to shared supportive behaviors regarding cultural diversity in the organization. For instance, cultural helping can manifest as having serious concerns about cultural issues, mutual cultural support among colleagues, and more respectful behavior toward one another (Matschke, 2022). Table 7 summarizes the main characteristics of the two categories of OCBCs identified in this research, and Table 8 groups the final eight items of this scale.

Table 7. The two main types of OCBCs explored

	Cultural Initiatives	Cultural Helping
Definition	Voluntarily helping colleagues to better integrate cross-cultural concerns and cultural differences in the workplace	Discretionary behavior and suggestions for improving cross-cultural practices or performance
Main focus	Personal initiatives in the workplace	Mutual support between employees
Relevance and usefulness	Improving internal practices for integrating diversity Reducing prejudice Promoting diversity within the organization and different cultural values.	Promoting discussion, cooperation, and resolution of complex problems Empowering new employees to deal with diversity
Examples	Makes suggestions for reducing bias related to colleagues' backgrounds Improves equity and inclusion Implements a cultural exchange and discovery program	Assists the human resources department in identifying sources of cross-cultural conflict Explains cultural integration procedures to new employees Asks colleagues to get involved in a new diversity committee Helps colleagues resolve cultural conflicts or mitigate prejudices
Limitations	Motivation can drop if integrative initiatives are ignored by the organization Depends on the organizational context, such as corporate culture, management attitudes, telecommuting, geographic distance	Presupposes a climate of mutual support and the existence of inclusive practices. Some colleagues may show a lack of awareness or openness to diversity

Source: Own elaboration.

Table 8. OCBC items

Categories	Items
Cultural helping 1	I spontaneously give my time to help my colleagues be culturally sensitive in everything they do at work.
Cultural helping 2	I encourage my colleagues to adopt more diversity-conscious behavior.
Cultural helping 3	I encourage my colleagues to express their ideas and opinions about cultural issues.
Cultural initiatives 1	I actively participate in cultural activities or programs organized by my company.
Cultural initiatives 2	I volunteer for projects or activities that address cultural issues in my organization.
Cultural initiatives 3	I voluntarily carry out cultural actions and initiatives in my daily work activities.
Cultural initiatives 4	I suggest new practices that could improve my organization's performance in different cultural situations.
Cultural initiatives 5	I am willing to take the time to share information about cultural issues with my colleagues.

Source: Own elaboration.

Contributions and managerial implications

This research falls within two research areas: strategic human resource management and the relationships between the various social actors in the organization. These research areas are important elements of the social dimension of sustainable development. Notably, this study makes two main contributions. First, it contributes to international human resource management research and practice in several ways. As organizations around the world increasingly demand and value behaviors that go beyond formal role requirements, interest in identifying OCBCs is becoming increasingly significant (Kadam et al., 2021). However, a lot of the research on OCBs has relied on instruments that are not dedicated to identifying OCBCs. Chiaburu et al. (2015) explained that a general OCB instrument may

fail to capture important facets of OCBs. This study is the first investigation into developing an instrument for use in an expatriate context or in that associated with cultural diversity in organizations. The OCBCs instrument developed in this study captures aspects of the contemporary world of work (Dekas et al., 2013; Rurkkhum & Bartlett, 2018), where traditional management practices are noted as changing (Hoffman & Dilchert, 2012). This view could have several positive effects on companies, including improving workplace well-being, promoting employee development of OCBCs, fostering informal learning, and engaging employees to achieve the organization's social and economic goals. Second, this study provides a deeper look into OCBs and contributes to the scientific literature on the role of human resources in promoting sustainable development in organizations (e.g., Macke & Genari, 2018; Amrutha & Geetha, 2020). Ultimately, cultural diversity is highly valuable to individuals and organizations. Thus, protecting, promoting, and maintaining it is essential for sustainable development that benefits present and future generations. Notably, other studies have highlighted the complexity, uncertainties, and risks associated with working with unconventional stakeholders (Boiral et al., 2019, 2020). Human, social, and psychological dimensions of organizations are typically overlooked in corporate sustainability and the need to align organizational commitments with global Sustainable Development Goal priorities (Boiral et al., 2018). The clarifications provided by this new scale enable a better description and focus of OCBCs relating to the reality of multicultural organizations and voluntary behaviors that promote the inclusion of cultural diversity.

The findings of the present research have two managerial implications. First, this scale can help human resource practitioners identify OCBCs in their organizations. Managers need to adjust to the new human resources approach that welcomes diversity (Yu et al., 2022; Baeza et al., 2022). Despite the importance of OCBs to organizational effectiveness, encouraging employee expressions of OCBs remains a challenge for HR managers (Rurkkhum & Bartlett, 2018, p. 108). The results from the scale could provide insights for practitioners, especially for human resource practitioners, on how to effectively generate and ensure the use of OCBCs in various organizations and teams, such as in multicultural teams.

The second implication is that the OCBCs measurement tool could assist human resource managers seeking to encourage and facilitate the performance

of appropriate OCBCs in the workplace. This performance will allow OCBCs to facilitate informal learning, thus improving employee skills and knowledge at a low cost (Moore & Klein, 2020). For example, organizational management should strategically implement informal learning in the workplace by creating a climate conducive to learning and further developing the OCBCs (Zia et al., 2022). The dynamic nature of knowledge acquisition in organizations may suggest that more than individual development is needed. Employees must also learn from others and encourage others to develop. This continuous form of development of the self and others highlights the importance of OCBs in helping organizations remain competitive (Dekas et al., 2013; Rurkkhum & Bartlett, 2018). Similarly, Nurjanah et al. (2020) asserted that OCBs exhibited by employees are essential for leaders to achieve their shared targets and goals. Therefore, developing behaviors such as OCBCs, which promote informal learning, is critical for culturally diverse organizations. Practitioners will then be able to evaluate the interventions they employ as change agents and motivate employees to engage in OCBCs by encouraging them to view their work roles more broadly.

Limitations and avenues for future research

Although the OCBCs instrument developed and validated in this study demonstrated acceptable psychometric and statistical results, there are several important limitations. First, the data were obtained from self-reported measurement scales. Therefore, social desirability bias could lead to errors. Future research could ensure that OCBC measures are obtained from supervisors or peers. Other procedural remedies, such as a multi-method perspective, could also be used to assess OCBCs (e.g., structured and semi-structured interviews). A multi-method approach would measure aspects of OCBCs that are not captured by single conventional methods, such as self-report studies (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Future research could also combine measurement methods, such as surveys, scaling, and qualitative research. However, consistent with how OCBs measures have been applied in more recent research (e.g., Li & Thatcher, 2015; Henderson

et al., 2020), OCBs measurement should not be reported by the supervisor or a third party. Indeed, LePine et al. (2002) argued that the conceptual framework should determine the source of OCBs assessments.

Second, the use of convenience sampling limits the study's generalizability. Therefore, future research could further examine this instrument with a probability sampling strategy. The main limitation of convenience sampling is its lack of representativeness, leading to selection bias and possibly reduced external and internal validity (Etikan et al., 2016). Still, convenience sampling was chosen because it is a strategy recognized for its vital role in locating, accessing, and engaging hard-to-reach populations, such as employees at private companies (Cohen & Arieli, 2011). Future research could use probability sampling. Finally, future research may also focus on how OCBCs may change over time (Organ, 2018).

Reference

Akram, W., Bashir, M., & Tufail, S. (2017). Impact of Organizational Justice and Structural Empowerment on Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Employee's Intention to Leave: The Mediating Role of Organizational Cynicism. *Journal of Contemporary Management Sciences*, *1*(2), 1–30.

Amrutha, V., & Geetha, S. (2020). A systematic review on green human resource management: Implications for social sustainability. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 247*, 119–131.

Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (2015). *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications.* Routledge.

Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, *23*(3), 267–285.

Bader, A. K., Bader, B., Froese, F. J., & Sekiguchi, T. (2021). One way or another? An international comparison of expatriate performance management in multinational companies. *Human Resource Management, 60*(5), 737–752.

Barnard, C. I. (1968), *The functions of the executive.* Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Barauskaite, G., & Streimikiene, D. (2021). Corporate social responsibility and financial performance of companies: The puzzle of concepts, definitions and assessment methods. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 28*(1), 278–287.

Batra, N. V., & Kaur, S. (2021). Psychological contract perspective on organizational citizenship behavior and its effect on employee turnover intention. *International Management Review, 17*(2), 87–147.

Baeza, M. A., Gonzalez, J., Chapa, O., & Rodriguez, R. A. (2022). Collectivistic norms, beliefs and Mexican OCBs: gender and generation differences. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management, 29*(2), 349–378. https://doi.org/10.1108/CCSM-06-2021-0107.

Bell, B. S. (2017). Strategies for supporting self-regulation during self-directed learning in the workplace. In *Autonomous learning in the workplace* (pp. 117–134). Routledge.

Berger, J. (2021). *Analyse factorielle exploratoire et analyse en composantes principales: guide pratique.* To cite this version: HAL Id: hal-03436771. https://hal.science/hal-03436771/document.

Bizri, R. (2018). Diversity management and OCB: the connection evidence from the Lebanese banking sector. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal.*

Blau, P. (2017[1964]). *Exchange and power in social life.* Routledge.

Boateng, G. O., Neilands, T. B., Frongillo, E. A., Melgar-Quiñonez, H. R., & Young, S. L. (2018). Best practices for developing and validating scales for health, social, and behavioral research: a primer. *Frontiers in Public Health, 6*, 149.

Bolino, M. C., Klotz, A. C., Turnley, W. H., & Harvey, J. (2013). Exploring the dark side of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*(4), 542–559.

Boiral, O. (2009). Greening the corporation through organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics, 87*, 221–236.

Boiral, O., & Paillé, P. (2012). Organizational citizenship behaviour for the environment: Measurement and validation. *Journal of Business Ethics, 109*, 431–445.

Boiral, O., Raineri, N., & Talbot, D. (2018). Managers' citizenship behaviors for the environment: a developmental perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 149*, 395–409.

Boiral, O., Heras-Saizarbitoria, I., & Brotherton, M. C. (2019). Corporate sustainability and indigenous community engagement in the extractive industry. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 235*, 701–711.

Boiral, O., Heras-Saizarbitoria, I., & Brotherton, M. C. (2020). Improving environmental management through indigenous peoples' involvement. *Environmental Science & Policy*, *103*, 10–20.

Brown, T.A. (2015), *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research.* Guilford Publications.

Bujold, A., Parent-Rocheleau, X., & Gaudet, M. (2022). Computers in Human Behavior Reports Opacity behind the wheel: The relationship between transparency of algorithmic management, justice perception, and intention to quit among. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, *8*(April), 100245. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2022.100245.

Carroll, A. B. (2021). Corporate social responsibility: Perspectives on the CSR construct's development and future. *Business & Society*, *60*(6), 1258–1278.

Cerasoli, C. P., Alliger, G. M., Donsbach, J. S., Mathieu, J. E., Tannenbaum, S. I., & Orvis, K. A. (2018). Antecedents and outcomes of informal learning behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 33*, 203–230.

Chan, S. H. J., & Lai, H. Y. I. (2017). Understanding the link between communication satisfaction, perceived justice and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, *70*, 214–223.

Chen, G., Kirkman, B. L., Kim, K., Farh, C. I., & Tangirala, S. (2010). When does cross-cultural motivation enhance expatriate effectiveness? A multilevel investigation of the moderating roles of subsidiary support and cultural distance. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(5), 1110–1130.

Chiaburu, D. S., Chakrabarty, S., Wang, J., & Li, N. (2015). Organizational support and citizenship behaviors: A comparative cross-cultural meta-analysis. *Management International Review, 55*, 707–736.

Chiu, R. B., & Hackett, R. D. (2017). The assessment of individual moral goodness. *Business Ethics: A European Review, 26*(1), 31–46.

Cochran, P. L. (2007). The evolution of corporate social responsibility. *Business Horizons*, *50*(6), 449–454.

Coelho, R., Jayantilal, S., & Ferreira, J. J. (2023). The impact of social responsibility on corporate financial performance: A systematic literature review. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 30*(4), 1535–1560.

Cohen, N., & Arieli, T. (2011). Field research in conflict environments: Methodological challenges and snowball sampling. *Journal of Peace Research, 48*(4), 423–435.

Coughlan, T., Fogarty, D. J., & Fogarty, S. R. (2019). Virtual proximity to promote expatriate cultural adjustment, innovation, and the reduction of stress levels. *International Journal of Applied Management and Technology, 18*(1), 6.

Crede, M., & Harms, P. (2019). Questionable research practices when using confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Managerial Psychology.*

Dahl, R. F. (2019). Principles for effective cross-cultural communication. In *Culture, conflict, and communication in the wildland-urban interface* (pp. 147–159). Routledge.

Deepak, S., & Perwez, S. K. (2023). Environment of Inclusion and Diversity Management on Perceived Diversity Climate. In *Developing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Policies for Promoting Employee Sustainability and Well-Being* (pp. 153–165). IGI Global.

Deckop, J. R., Cirka, C. C., & Andersson, L. M. (2003). Doing unto others: The reciprocity of helping behavior in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *47,* 101–113.

de Geus, C. J., Ingrams, A., Tummers, L., & Pandey, S. K. (2020). Organizational citizenship behavior in the public sector: A systematic literature review and future research agenda. *Public Administration Review, 80*(2), 259–270.

Dekas, K. H., Bauer, T. N., Welle, B., Kurkoski, J., & Sullivan, S. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior, version 2.0: A review and qualitative investigation of OCBs for knowledge workers at Google and beyond. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *27*(3), 219–237.

Douglas, M. M. (2018). Building an organizational environment of cultural competence.In Douglas, M., Pacquiao, D., & Purnell, L. (Eds.), *Global Applications of Culturally Competent Health Care: Guidelines for Practice*(pp. 203–213). Springer.

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R.S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5*(1), 1–4.

Ford, J. K., Baldwin, T. T., & Prasad, J. (2018). Transfer of training: The known and the unknown. *Annual review of organizational psychology and organizational behavior, 5*, 201–225.

Gaskin, C. J., & Happell, B. (2014). On exploratory factor analysis: A review of recent evidence, an assessment of current practice, and recommendations for future use. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, *51*(3), 511–521.

Grobelna, A. (2015). Intercultural challenges facing the hospitality industry. Implications for education and hospitality management. *Journal of Intercultural Management, 7*(3), 101–117.

Hafeez, M., Yasin, I. M., Zawawi, D., Qureshi, N. A., Hussain, S. T., & Arif, M. (2022). A Review of the Role of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in

Enhancing Corporate Sustainability: An Underpinning Role of Stern and Dietz's Value Model. *SAGE Open*, *12*(2), 21582440221099530.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). Mason, OH: Cengage.

Hall, J. L., & Van Ryzin, G. G. (2019). A norm of evidence and research in decision-making (NERD): Scale development, reliability, and validity. *Public Administration Review*, *79*(3), 321–329.

Han, Y., Sears, G. J., Darr, W. A., & Wang, Y. (2022). Facilitating Cross-Cultural Adaptation: A Meta-Analytic Review of Dispositional Predictors of Expatriate Adjustment. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 53*(9), 1054–1096.

Hart, T. A., Gilstrap, J. B., & Bolino, M. C. (2016). Organizational citizenship behavior and the enhancement of absorptive capacity. *Journal of Business Research,* 69(10), 3981–3988.

Haass, O., Akhavan, P., Miao, Y., Soltani, M., Jan, T., & Azizi, N. (2023). Organizational citizenship behaviour on organizational performance: A knowledge-based organization. *Knowledge Management & E-Learning*, *15*(1), 85.

Henderson, A. A., Foster, G. C., Matthews, R. A., & Zickar, M. J. (2020). A psychometric assessment of OCB: Clarifying the distinction between OCB and CWB and developing a revised OCB measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology,* 35, 697–712.

Holmes IV, O., Jiang, K., Avery, D. R., McKay, P. F., Oh, I.-S., & Tillman, C. J. (2021). A meta-analysis integrating 25 years of diversity climate research *Journal of Management, 47*(6), 1357–1382.

Hu, L.-L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 6*(1), 1–55.

Hu, Y.-L., Hung, C.-H., & Ching, G. S. (2017). Shifting between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: The effects of workplace support and engagement. *International Journal of Research, 6*(4), 37–56.

Iorgulescu, M.-C., & Răvar, A.S. (2014). Expatriate hotel managers' perspective on cross-cultural skills. *SEA: Practical Application of Science, 2*(1), 254–265.

Ireland, S. (2021). Global mobility: The world's best countries to live and work abroad, 2022. *CEOWORLD Magazine.* https://ceoworld.biz/2021/10/25/global-mobility-the-worlds-best-countries-to-live-and-work-abroad-2022/.

Ismael, F., Hussein, B., Ibrahim, M. S., & Akoye, S. (2022). The mediation role of organization citizenship behaviour between employee motivation and productivity: Analysis of Pharmaceutical Industries in KRG. *International Journal of Humanities and Education Development (IJHED), 4*(1), 10–22.

Joo, B.-K., & Jo, S. J. (2017). The effects of perceived authentic leadership and core self-evaluations on organizational citizenship behavior: The role of psychological empowerment as a partial mediator. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.

Jöreskog, K. G. (1971). Statistical analysis of sets of congeneric tests. *Psychometrika, 36*(2), 109–133.

Kadam, R., Balasubramanian, S., Kareem Abdul, W., & Jabeen, S. S. (2021). Predicting organizational citizenship behavior in a multicultural environment: The role of cultural intelligence and cultural distance. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, *21*(3), 602–624.

Kataria, S., & Adhikari, B. (2022). Evaluating Dimensions of Organization Citizenship Behavior–With Reference to Hospitals. *International Management Review,* 18.

Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science, 9*(2), 131–146.

Kline, R. B. (2015). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling.* Guilford Publications.

Koo, B., & Lee, E. S. (2022). The Taming of Machiavellians: Differentiated Transformational Leadership Effects on Machiavellians' Organizational Commitment and Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *178*(1), 153–170. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04788-2.

Kuknor, S., Bhattacharya, S., Sharma, B. K., & Bhattacharya, S. (2023). Organizational Inclusion and OCB: The Moderating Role of Inclusive Leadership. *FIIB Business Review*, *0*(0). https://doi.org/10.1177/23197145231183859.

Kumari, K., Abbas, J., Hwang, J., & Cioca, L. I. (2022). Does servant leadership promote emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior among employees? A structural analysis. *Sustainability*, *14*(9), 5231.

Lee, J., Weber, M. R., & Rivera Jr, D. (2019). A sociocultural perspective on expatriation willingness: The mediating role of cultural intelligence. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, 28*(1), 124–145.

Lee, L.-Y., & Nguyen, P.-T. (2019). A synthesis of expatriate competence, intelligence, adaptability, work-role demand and organisational support on expatriation effectiveness. *International Journal of Services and Standards, 13*(1–2), 83–103.

Lee, L.Y., Veasna, S., & Wu, W. Y. (2013). The effects of social support and transformational leadership on expatriate adjustment and performance: The moderating roles of socialization experience and cultural intelligence. *Career Development International*.

LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: a critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 52.

Li, A., & Thatcher, S. (2015). Understanding the effects of self and teammate OCB congruence and incongruence. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 30*(4), 641–655.

Macke, J., & Genari, D. (2019). Systematic literature review on sustainable human resource management. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 208*, 806–815. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.10.091.

Matschke, C. (2022). The Impact of Social Support on Social Identity Development and Well-Being in International Exchange Students. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 53*(10), 1307–1334.

Meehl, P. E. (2012). Why summaries of research on psychological theories are often uninterpretable. In Snow, R. E., & Wiley, D. E. *Improving inquiry in social science* (pp. 13–59). Routledge.

Miller, M. V., Carlson, J., & Sigurdsson, S. O. (2014). Improving treatment integrity in a human service setting using lottery-based incentives. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management, 34*(1), 29–38.

Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*(2), 127–142.

Moore, A. L., & Klein, J. D. (2020). Facilitating informal learning at work. *TechTrends, 64*(2), 219–228.

Morris, M. A., & Robie, C. (2001). A meta-analysis of the effects of cross-cultural training on expatriate performance and adjustment. *International Journal of Training and Development, 5*(2), 112–125.

Morence, C. F., Esteves, M. F., Silva, N. R., & Moreira, A. C. (2020). Types and challenges of expatriation. *Encyclopedia of Organizational Knowledge, Administration, and Technology*, 2522–2532.

Mousa, M., Massoud, H. K., & Ayoubi, R. M. (2020). Gender, diversity management perceptions, workplace happiness and organisational citizenship behaviour. *Employee Relations*, *42*(6), 1249–1269. https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-10-2019-0385.

Naqshbandi, M. M., Tabche, I., & Hj Said, T. F. (2024). Knowledge exchanges for open innovation: the role of inter-organisational citizenship behaviours and organisational support. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, *22*(1), 88–104.

Ng, K.-Y., Van Dyne, L., & Ang, S. (2019). Speaking out and speaking up in multicultural settings: A two-study examination of cultural intelligence and voice behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 151*, 150–159.

Norman, G. R., & Streiner, D. L. (2014). *Biostatistics: The bare essentials* (4th ed.). Shelton, CT: People's Medical Publishing.

Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric Theory* (3rd edition). New York: MacGraw-Hill.

Nurjanah, S., Pebianti, V., & Handaru, A. W. (2020). The influence of transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitments on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) in the inspectorate general of the Ministry of Education and Culture. *Cogent Business & Management*, *7*(1), 1793521.

Ocampo, L., Acedillo, V., Bacunador, A. M., Balo, C. C., Lagdameo, Y. J., & Tupa, N. S. (2018). A historical review of the development of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and its implications for the twenty-first century. *Personnel Review, 47*(4), 821–862.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome.* Lexington books/DC heath and com.

Organ, D. W. (1994). Personality and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management, 20*(2), 465–478.

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.

Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. Sage Publications.

Organ, D. W. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior and the good soldier. In Rumsey, M. G., Walker, C. B., & Harris, J. H. (Eds.), *Personnel selection and classification* (pp. 69–84). Psychology Press.

Organ, D.W. (2014). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. In Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (Eds.), *Oraganizational Citizenship Behavior and Contextual Performance* (pp. 85–97). Psychology Press.

Organ, D. W. (2015). Organizational citizenship behavior. In Wright, J. D. (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences* (pp. 317–321). 2nd ed. Elsevier.

Organ, D. W. (2018). Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Recent Trends and Developments. *Annu. Rev. Organ. Psychol. Organ. Behav, 80*, 17–18.

Osman, R. H., Abdul Ghani, M., & Alis, N. (2021). The Relationship Between Ethnocultural Empathy And Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) Among Public Servants In Sabah. *International Journal of Education, Psychology and Counselling*, *6*(42), 469–481. https://doi. org/10.35631/IJEPC.642038.

Ostertag, F. (2023). Integrating OCBE Literature and Norm Activation Theory: A Moderated Mediation on Proenvironmental Behavior of Employees. *Sustainability*, *15*(9), 7605.

Paolillo, A., Sinval, J., Silva, S. A., & Scuderi, V. E. (2021). The relationship between inclusion climate and voice behaviors beyond social exchange obligation: The role of psychological needs satisfaction. *Sustainability*, *13*(18), 10252.

Pituch, K. A., & Stevens, J. P. (2016). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (6th ed.). Routledge.

Phanphairoj, K., & Piromsombat, C. (2019). The Influence of Cultural Training on Cultural Intelligence: a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Diverse Samples. *Multicultural Education, 5*(1).

Phuong, N. N. D. (2021). Organizational citizenship behavior: Scale development and validation. *Ho Chi Minh City Open University Journal of Science-Social Sciences*, *11*(1), 15–24.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management, 26*(3), 513–563.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(5), 879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879.

Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual-and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(1), 122.

Popescu, R. N., Fistung, D. F., Popescu, T., & Popescu, A. M. (2018). Is the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) a predictor for the cultural intelligence (CQ)? *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 238*, 638–646.

Price, L. R. (2017). *Psychometric methods: Theory into practice*. Guilford Publications.

Roesch, S. C., & Rowley, A. A. (2005). Evaluating and developing a multidimensional, dispositional measure of appraisal. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *85*(2), 188–196.

Ruiz-Palomino, P., Linuesa-Langreo, J., & Elche, D. (2023). Team-level servant leadership and team performance: The mediating roles of organizational citizenship behavior and internal social capital. *Business Ethics, the Environment & Responsibility*, *32*, 127–144.

Rurkkhum, S., & Bartlett, K. R. (2018). Organizational citizenship behaviour for collectivist cultures: instrument development and human resource development implications. *Human Resource Development International, 21*(2), 107–124.

Sguera, F., Bagozzi, R. P., Huy, Q. N., Boss, R. W., & Boss, D. S. (2018). The more you care, the worthier I feel, the better I behave: How and when supervisor support influences (un)ethical employee behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics, 153*, 615–628.

Smith, C., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*(4), 653.

Somech, A., & Khotaba, S. (2017). An integrative model for understanding team organizational citizenship behavior: Its antecedents and consequences for educational teams. *Journal of Educational Administration*.

Tagliabue, M., Sigurjonsdottir, S. S., & Sandaker, I. (2020). The effects of performance feedback on organizational citizenship behaviour: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 29*(6), 841–861.

Tran, T. B. H., & Choi, S. B. (2019). Effects of inclusive leadership on organizational citizenship behavior: the mediating roles of organizational justice and learning culture. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology, 13*, e17.

Wang, Y., Xu, S., & Wang, Y. (2020). The consequences of employees' perceived corporate social responsibility: A meta-analysis. *Business Ethics: A European Review, 29*(3), 471–496.

Watkins, M. W. (2018). Exploratory Factor Analysis: A Guide to Best Practice. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *44*(3), 219–246. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798418771807.

Yamini, S., Fousiani, K., & Wisse, B. (2023). Self-construal, face concerns and conflict management strategies: a meta-analysis. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management, 30*(2), 375–412. https://doi.org/10.1108/CCSM-07-2021-0130.

Yang, L.-Q., Simon, L. S., Wang, L., & Zheng, X. (2016). To branch out or stay focused? Affective shifts differentially predict organizational citizenship behavior and task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 101*(6), 831.

Yu, J., Lho, L. H., & Han, H. (2022). Corporate social responsibility (environment, product, diversity, employee, and community) and the hotel employees' job performance: Exploring the role of the employment types. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *29*(5), 1825–1838.

Zhang, B., Cai, X., Li, J., & He, B. (2022). Well-being and its associated factors among migrant workers in food and beverage industry: a cross-sectional study in China. *British Food Journal, 124*(11), 3855–3870.

Zhang, H., & Xu, H. (2019). Impact of destination psychological ownership on residents' "place citizenship behavior". *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, *14*, 100391.

Zia, M. Q., Huning, T. M., Shamsi, A. F., Naveed, M., & Mangi, R. A. (2022). Informal learning as mediating mechanism for the relationship between learning climate and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). In *Evidence-Based HRM: A Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship* (pp. 138–154). Emerald Publishing Limited.