

Should I Leave or Not? The Role of LMX and Organizational Climate in Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Turnover Relationship

Ankur Nandedkar
Millersville University of Pennsylvania

Roger S. Brown
Northwestern Oklahoma State University

This study attempts to investigate the complex nature of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions. We argue that leader member exchange and organizational climate will moderate the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions. The results of hierarchical regression analysis conducted on the data obtained from 216 employees working in the retail industry provide support to the hypothesized relationships. Implications for management practice and future research directions are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

Workplace behaviors that are critical to organizational performance have intrigued scholars and practitioners alike for decades. One such behavior that is discretionary, not formally recognized or rewarded, is termed as Organizational citizenship behavior. (Organ, 1988; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). It has been demonstrated that this behavior is highly valuable to the effective functioning of the organization (Podsakoff, Whiting., Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). Arguably, it is one of most extensively studied topics in organizational behavior. On the account of importance that OCB commands, researchers have linked it with several vital outcomes such as rewards (Allen, 2006), performance judgements (Allen & Rush, 1998), social capital (Bolino, Turnley, & Bloodgood, 2002), turnover (Chen, Hui, & Segó, 1998), organizational effectiveness (Walz & Niehoff, 2000), productivity (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991), customer satisfaction (Yen & Niehoff, 2004), task performance, etc. (Rapp, Bachrach, & Rapp, 2013). One such relationship that has intrigued researchers is OCB and turnover relationship. Turnover is an important organizational phenomenon (Mor Barack, Nissly, & Levin, 2001), and for the organizations to be competitive, the need to retain high performing employees is immense (Younge & Marx, 2015). Scholars in the past have studied turnover as it represents a salient organizational problem because of the numerous costs associated with it (Mitrovska & Eftimov, 2016; Griffeth, Hom, Gaertner, 2000). The consequences of turnover include resources spent on recruiting, selecting, and socializing new personnel. Additionally, if the departed employees were working on the interdependent tasks with other colleagues in the unit, some of the work may come to an abrupt halt (Staw, 1980). It can have a negative impact on efficiency (Alexander, Bloom, & Nuchols, 1994), sales

(Kacmar, Andrews, Van Rooy, Steilberg, & Cerrone, 2006; McElroy, Morrow, & Rude, 2001), and productivity (Huselid, 1995; Shaw, Gupta, & Delery, 2005).

Despite the importance of OCB and turnover for the effectiveness of an organization, limited research exists on the dynamics that govern this relationship. For instance, Chen (2005) reported that OCB explained more variance in employee turnover as compared to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In a meta-analysis, Podsakoff et al. (2009) indicated a weak negative relationship between OCB and turnover intention, and suggested the requirement to examine contextual variables to further understand the nature of OCB and turnover intentions relationship. This was echoed in the study by Khalid, Jusoff, Ismail, Kassim, & Rahman (2009) as results demonstrated gender to be the moderator of the negative relationship between OCB and turnover. Taken together, it is critical to explore further the contingencies that have a potential to promote or restrict turnover among employees that engage in OCBs. In this paper, we argue that the direction of OCB-turnover intention relationship will depend on specific contextual factors involved. As such, the main contribution of this study is to investigate the factors that govern the nature of the OCB -turnover relationship. This research is an attempt to answer the call made by scholars (Podsakoff et al., 2009; Khalid et al., 2009) for further understanding the complexities associated with OCB- turnover relationship.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Turnover Intentions

Research focusing on behavioral antecedents of turnover has been limited (Chen et al., 1998). Most the studies investigating the impact of behaviors such as lateness, tardiness, and absenteeism on turnover intentions did not find those to be good predictors of turnover (Benson & Pond, 1987; Rosse, 1988). Chen et al. (1998) suggested that a reason for such inconclusive results is that these behaviors are forms of avoidance or withdrawal behaviors, which are non-discretionary in nature and tied to the organizational reward system. On the other hand, behaviors such as OCB have a potential to impact turnover intentions mainly because of the fact that these behaviors are discretionary in nature. The main premise behind this argument is behavioral intentions that represent dissatisfaction with the organization should deter people from engaging in pro-social behaviors.

Preliminary research focusing on OCB- turnover intention has shown promising results. For example, Aryee and Chai (2001) found a negative correlation between OCB and turnover intentions. Chen et al. (1998) demonstrated evidence of weak-negative relationship between OCB and actual turnover. The study indicated a positive relationship between OCB and turnover intention. In addition, Dalal (2005) conducted a meta- analysis and reported a moderately negative relationship between OCB and counterproductive work behaviors. In an effort to extricate OCB research, Konovsky & Organ (1996) have suggested that contextual factors should have precedence over dispositional ones. It is consistent with the views of a majority of organizational scholars who emphasize the importance of contextual factors over dispositional variables (Davis-Blake & Pfeffer, 1989; Sharoni, Tziner, Fin, Schultz, & Zilberman, 2012). Therefore, the purpose of this study is to focus on two contextual factors - Leader member exchange (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) and Organizational climate (James & James, 1989), which have the potential to affect OCB and turnover intentions relationship. The choice of leader member exchange (LMX) and organizational climate is consistent with prior research as these variables have been studied as contextual variables in many important organizational outcomes such as safety performance (Smith-Crowe, Burke, & Landis, 2003), affective commitment (Buch, 2015), organizational citizenship behavior (Hofmann, Morgeson, & Gerras, 2003), role overload (Tordera, González-Romá, Peiró, 2008), and follower resilience etc. (Smith, 2015). In this study, we propose that employees who engage in OCBs and perceive their relationship with the supervisor to be high quality and the organizational climate to be supportive, are less likely to leave. On the other hand, if employees who engage in OCB but feel that they do not receive required support and that the organizational climate is unfavorable, are likely to quit.

HYPOTHESES

Leader Member Exchange

LMX is a leadership theory characterized by a unique emphasis on leader and follower dyads (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). It is based on the premise that a supervisor has different relationships or patterns of behavior with each subordinate within the same workgroup (Gerstner & Day, 1997). With some of the subordinates, leaders develop high quality LMX relationships in which reciprocal exchanges go beyond what is formally required in the organization whereas with the other subordinates, low quality LMX relationships are formed that are limited to carry out the tasks required by the formal contracts (Liden & Graen, 1980). High quality LMX is characterized by higher levels of trust, liking, commitment and respect (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

Dienesch and Liden (1986) suggest that LMX is a multidimensional construct and assert that LMX relationships can build in various ways, and these are primarily based on three varying amounts of “currencies of exchange” (p. 625). The currencies of exchange are characterized by task-related behaviors, loyalty to each other, and mutual liking. The quality of exchange might depend on one, two, or all the three dimensions (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). Research has shown that quality of leader member exchange is a better predictor of organizational outcomes as compared to traits and behaviors of supervisors. An exchange relationship between each subordinate and supervisor is unique and develops over time. This relationship is categorized as high LMX relationship (in-group) or low LMX exchange (out-group). High LMX includes relationship aspects and low LMX is typically characterized by “exchanges” based on work tasks (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Northouse, 2010).

Subordinates that share high-LMX relationship are more likely than those in low LMX relationships to receive challenging task assignments, training opportunities, resources, information and support (Liden, Wayne & Sparrowe, 2000; Scandura, Graen & Novak, 1986). Subordinates with high quality LMX relationships may perform better because of the added support, feedback, resources and opportunities provided to them (Feldman, 1986). In addition, leniency bias appears to inflate performance ratings for employees with high-quality LMX relationships. However, in low quality LMX relationships, leaders rate members strictly according to established performance standards (Duarte, Goodson & Klich, 1994; Heneman, Greenberger, & Anonyuo, 1989).

Since organizations use performance based criteria for promotions and other rewards, each employee within the same workgroup can realize which employees are receiving advantages because of supervisor’s affinity towards them (high LMX). Even if a low-LMX subordinate frequently exhibits OCBs, by comparing what he receives and what others (high LMX) subordinates receive, feelings of dissatisfaction may arise. Moreover, research has shown that high-quality leader-member exchanges are related to important organizational outcomes such as less employee turnover (Graen, Liden, & Hoel, 1982), subordinate satisfaction, and greater organizational commitment (Graen, Novak, & Sommerkamp, 1982; Scandura & Graen, 1984). Therefore, when employees share a high LMX with a supervisor, they will be less likely to leave the organization because of all the privileges associated with high LMX. Thus, we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 1: Leader member exchange will moderate the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions, such that the relationship will be more negative for high-LMX employees.

Organizational Climate

Perhaps one of the most critical factors of a workplace that can help employees succeed is the climate. Organizational climate depicts an individual’s perception about the work environment which includes shared perceptions of organizational events, practices, procedures and behaviors that organizations reward and expect (Pullig, Joseph, Maxham, Joseph, & Hair, 2002). The way in which individuals perceive organizational climate dictates how they interpret events, predict outcomes, and evaluate the appropriateness of their subsequent actions (Jones & James, 1979). Previous research has

shown that climate perceptions are related to critical outcomes such as leader behavior, turnover intentions (Rousseau, 1988; Rentsch, 1990), job satisfaction (Mathieu, Hoffman, & Farr, 1993; James & Tetrick, 1986; James & Jones, 1980) and individual job performance (Brown & Leigh, 1996; Pritchard & Karasick, 1973). In addition, climate has been reported to have an impact on OCB (Cilla, 2011; Shin, 2012). Organizational theorists have debated extensively about the construct of organizational climate. It has been projected in the literature as a multidimensional concept and scholars have called for a more context specific approach to study climate (Schneider & Reichers, 1983; Griffin & Mathieu, 1997). Schneider (1990, 2000) suggests that the dimensions of organizational climate will differ depending on the purpose of the investigation and the criterion of interest, and that general measures of organizational climate will contain dimensions that are not relevant for each specific study.

Our conceptualization of climate for the current study is consistent with the James and James (1989) hierarchical model of meaning in organizations, which assumed the general factor of 'psychological climate'. The model projects organizational climate as perceptions of employees about their environment and the way they cognitively assess the environment through schemas derived from work related values (James & James, 1989). The concept of psychological climate emanates from the assumption that variables underlying valuations of the work environment dictate whether an individual will evaluate his work environment to be adverse or beneficial. (James & James, 1989).

The general factor proposed by James and James (1989) has four dimensions: 1) Leader support and facilitation, 2) Role stress and lack of harmony, 3) Job challenge and autonomy, and 4) Work group cooperation, warmth, and friendliness. Since the dimension of leader support and facilitation was explained by variables such as leader trust, facilitation, liking and interaction (James & James, 1989), it has been described as a dimension that is similar to the construct of LMX quality to a major extent (Coglister & Schriesheim, 2000). As such, we did not consider the dimension of leader support and facilitation in our study because of its conceptual overlap and lack of clear distinction with LMX quality.

The literature demonstrates that organizational climate is paramount in enhancing organizational commitment and improving performance (Patterson, Warr and West, 2004; Fu & Deshpande, 2012). Specifically, climate that is characterized by high group cooperation is related to higher levels of OCB and reduced employee turnover. For instance, Whiteoak (2007) examined the impact of various group characteristics including group cohesion on goal commitment and turnover. The results demonstrated higher levels of workgroup cooperation was related to reduction in turnover. Cohen, Ben-Tura, & Vashdi (2012) investigated moderating effects of group cohesiveness on the relationship between in role and extra role behaviors. The results showed group cohesiveness was an important moderator in the prediction of OCB.

The level of job autonomy given to employees is a critical component of organizational climate. Job autonomy can be defined as the degree of control a worker has over his or her own immediate scheduling and tasks (Liu, Spector, & Jex, 2005). Job autonomy is associated with turnover intention among workers. Spector's (1986) meta-analysis on the effect of perceived autonomy showed that greater perceived autonomy decreased the likelihood of a worker quitting his or her job. Galletta, Portoghese, & Battistelli (2011) utilized a sample of 442 nurses, and found that affective commitment mediated the relationship between job autonomy and turnover intentions. Similarly, Harr & Spell (2009) reported that job autonomy moderated the negative relationship between distributive justice and turnover intentions. Ozer (2011) investigated the moderating role of task autonomy in the relationship between OCB and job performance and found that under high levels of task autonomy, OCB was positively related to job performance. The study conducted by Hwang and Chang (2009) demonstrated that work climate negatively influenced the turnover intentions. More specifically, the 'work group friendliness and warmth' was the strongest predictor of intent to leave.

The final component of organizational climate in our study is role stress and lack of harmony. Role related stress in the workplace includes role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload (James & James, 1989; Soderfeldt, Soderfeldt, & Warg, 1995; Blankertz & Robinson, 1997), and has been related to both behavioral and psychological job withdrawal (Bedeain & Armenakis, 1981). Role conflict and role ambiguity were reported to have a positive impact on turnover but the relationship was mediated by job

satisfaction and physical symptoms (Schuler, 1982; Kemery, Mossholder, & Bedeian, 1987). In addition, Mor Barak et al. (2001) conducted a meta-analysis and reported that role stress, availability of other employment opportunities, low organizational and social commitment, job dissatisfaction, and lack of social support were strongest predictors of turnover or intention to leave. Kim and Stoner (2008) also confirmed that role stress and social support had an interactive effect on turnover intention. Similarly, Amin and Akbar (2013) have emphasized the importance of harmonious relationship between coworkers to promote employee retention.

Stress associated with one's role in the organizational has been investigated in the context of OCB. One on hand, Eatough, Chang, Miloslavic, and Johnson (2011) conducted a meta-analysis to determine the effects of occupational role stressors on OCB and found two critical role stressors--role ambiguity and role conflict--had significant negative impact on OCB, while on the other hand, Bolino & Turnley (2005) found that higher OCB lead to increased job stress. Mosadeghrad, Ferlie, & Rosenberg (2011) utilized a sample of health care industry workers and demonstrated that job stress had a positive impact on turnover intentions of employees. Clearly, none of the studies have examined the joint effects of OCB and climate on turnover intention. It is imperative to understand the reaction of an employee who exhibits citizenship behaviors and perceives the climate to be characterized by job challenge and autonomy; work group cooperation, friendliness, and warmth; role stress and lack of harmony. This leads to –

Hypothesis 2 (a): The relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions will be more negative in a climate that is characterized by a high level of job challenge and autonomy, work group cooperation, warmth, and friendliness.

Hypothesis 2 (b): The relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions will be more positive in the climate characterized by high role stress and lack of harmony.

METHOD

The sample used for this study was composed of employees working in the retail sector across various organizations in the southern United States. A web-based questionnaire was utilized for the study. The URL containing the questionnaire was sent to 277 employees. A total of 231 responses were received; however, 15 were not included in the analysis due to lack of response to more than half of the items in the questionnaire. Thus, 216 usable responses were included in the final analysis for the study, which resulted in the final response rate of 77.9%. The non-response bias didn't affect the results as the response rate of study was more than 70 % (Singleton & Straits, 2005). The average age of participants was 29.67 years and their average tenure in the organization was 5.32 years. The percentage of male respondents in our study was 67%.

The survey questionnaire was hosted online on a third-party website where no personally identifiable data were collected from any of the respondents. As suggested by Dillman (1978), participants were explained regarding the focus of the study and the confidentiality of their responses. The importance of their participation to the study was also emphasized. This was done to improve the quality of data and the response rate. Participation in the study was voluntary and the participants could withdraw their participation at any time during the process of completing the survey.

Instruments

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

OCB was measured using a 20-item scale developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). The employees reported how frequently they exhibited the behaviors mentioned in the scale ranging from 1 (never) to 6 (always). The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.83.

Turnover Intentions

The construct was measured using a four-item scale adapted from Hunt, Osborn, & Martin (1981). Participants responded to the items using a Likert-type scale that was unique to each item in the scale. For example, one of the items in the scale was, ‘If you were completely free to choose, would you prefer or not prefer working for this organization?’ The corresponding answers to this were – 1. Prefer very much to continue working for this organization 2. Prefer to work here 3. Don’t care either way 4. Prefer not to work here 5. Prefer very much not to continue working for this organization. The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale was 0.86.

Leader Member Exchange

Quality of leader-member exchange was assessed using seven items which were adapted from Scandura and Graen (1984). The LMX7 measure as suggested by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) used a Likert-type scale which had various anchors specific to each item being used. For example, one of the item was, ‘How effective would you characterize your working relationship with your supervisor?’ The anchors for this item ranged from 1 (Extremely effective) to 5 (Extremely ineffective). Internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) reliability was 0.81.

Organizational Climate

To measure organizational climate, a psychological climate inventory (PC) adapted from James and James (1989) was used. Participants indicated the degree to which they felt each of the 13 items were representative of their organization on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The scale consists of three factors: job challenge & autonomy; work group cooperation, friendliness & warmth; role stress & lack of harmony.

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics for our study are shown in Table 1. Cronbach’s alpha values of all the scales are described along the diagonal in the table and are greater than the threshold of .70 established by Nunally (1978).

TABLE 1

		M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	TI	2.64	0.71	0.86					
2	OCB	4.27	0.54	-0.23	0.83				
3	LMX	4.38	0.76	-0.47**	0.51	0.81			
4	JCA	4.71	0.61	-0.32*	0.39**	0.19*	0.84		
5	WCFW	4.77	0.79	-0.26	0.44**	0.46**	0.34**	0.78	
6	RSLH	4.24	0.81	0.38	0.21*	-0.28*	-0.18	-0.39	0.89

**p < 0.01 (2-tailed); *p < 0.05 (2-tailed); N=216

Notes: Diagonal items represents reliability of constructs

TI= Turnover Intentions; OCB= Organizational Citizenship Behavior; LMX= Leader member exchange, JCA=Job Challenge & Autonomy; WCFW= Work group cooperation, friendliness, and warmth; RSLH= Role Stress and Lack of Harmony

In order to test for construct validity, we performed convergent validity and discriminant validity analysis. Convergent validity is the degree to which items of the same construct correlate to the construct (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). We used SmartPLS software to extract the factor loadings and cross loadings of all indicator items to their latent constructs. The results in Table 2 demonstrate that all items loaded on their respective construct from a lower limit of 0.56 to an upper limit of 0.92. In our results, each item’s

factor loading on its own construct was significant with all factor loading greater than 0.56 (t values > 3.31). The factor loading shown in Table 2 demonstrates the convergent validity measures for the latent constructs used in our study.

**TABLE 2
CONVERGENT VALIDITY**

	LMX	TI	OCB	JCA	WCFW	RSLH
LMX 1	0.57					
LMX 2	0.63					
LMX 3	0.64					
LMX 4	0.81					
LMX 5	0.83					
LMX 6	0.61					
LMX 7	0.69					
TI 1		0.63				
TI 2		0.78				
TI 3		0.92				
TI 4		0.83				
OCB 1			0.76			
OCB 2			0.81			
OCB 3			0.78			
OCB 4			0.85			
OCB 5			0.80			
OCB 6			0.87			
OCB 7			0.71			
OCB 8			0.59			
OCB 9			0.73			
OCB 10			0.76			
OCB 11			0.89			
OCB 12			0.82			
OCB 13			0.74			
OCB 14			0.67			
OCB 15			0.91			
OCB 16			0.89			
OCB 17			0.77			
OCB 18			0.68			
OCB 19			0.82			
OCB 20			0.76			
JCA 1				0.75		
JCA 2				0.79		
JCA 3				0.81		
WCFW 1					0.81	
WCFW 2					0.78	
WCFW 3					0.64	

Discriminant validity is the degree to which items differentiate between constructs or measure different constructs (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). It was assessed by a method suggested by Fornell and Larcker (1981). Table 3 indicates the result of discriminant validity of measured scales. The bolded numbers in matrix diagonal, representing the square root of AVEs, are greater in all cases than off diagonal elements in their corresponding row and column, which supports the discriminate validity of the scales used.

**TABLE 3
DISCRIMINANT VALIDITY**

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. TI	0.73					
2. OCB	-0.23	0.64				
3. LMX	-0.47**	0.51	0.59			
4. JCA	-0.32*	0.39**	0.19*	0.77		
5. WCFW	-0.26**	0.44**	0.46**	0.34**	0.81	
6. RSLH	0.38	0.21*	-0.28*	-0.18	-0.39	0.65

**p < 0.01 (2-tailed); *p < 0.05 (2-tailed) N=216

Hypotheses for this study were tested using various sets of hierarchical regression analysis.

Age and work experience served as the control variables in the hierarchical regression and were entered in the first block for all the models.

Hypothesis1 was tested using the regression model containing leader organizational citizenship behavior, LMX, turnover intentions as independent, moderating, and dependent variables respectively. The hypothesis suggested moderating effect of LMX in the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions. To test the hypothesis, turnover was entered as a dependent variable in the regression analysis. We entered other variables in a series of steps. The predictor variable OCB and LMX were entered in the second block. In order to examine the moderating effect of LMX, the interaction term (OCB*LMX) was created and entered as the third block. To reduce multicollinearity, all scores were mean-centered throughout the analysis. The results in Table 4 were significant when the interaction termed was introduced ($\beta = -0.34, p < .05$). As such, the results provided strong support for the moderating effect of LMX.

**TABLE 4
RESULTS OF HIERARCHIAL REGRESSION MODEL INVOLVING – TURNOVER INTENTION: DEPENDENT VARIABLE; ORAGNIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR: INDEPENDENT VARIABLE; LMX: MODERATING VARIABLE**

Dependent Variable	Predictor Variable	Std Coefficient Beta
TI	AGE	0.05
	WORK EX	0.07
	OCB	-0.11
	LMX	0.21*
	OCB*LMX	-0.34*
	R square	0.22
	Adjusted R square	0.21

* p<0.05 (2-tailed); ** p<0.01 (2-tailed)

Hypothesis 2 (a) predicted that the relationship between OCB and turnover will be moderated by organizational climate. We anticipated that the relationship between OCB and turnover will be more negative in a climate that is characterized as high on job challenge and autonomy as compared to a climate which is low on the dimension. The results shown in Table 5 demonstrated that job challenge and autonomy moderated the relationship between OCB and turnover, as the interaction term OCB*JCA was significant ($\beta = -.29, p < .01$). In addition, we examined another organizational climate dimension, workgroup cooperation, warmth, and friendliness as a moderator of the relationship between OCB and turnover intentions. As indicated, in Table 6., the results for the interaction term OCB*WCFW ($\beta = -.42, p < .001$) provide support to the hypothesized relationship.

TABLE 5
RESULTS OF HIERARCHIAL REGRESSION MODEL INVOLVING – TURNOVER INTENTION: DEPENDENT VARIABLE; ORAGNIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR: INDEPENDENT VARIABLE; JOB CHALLENGE AND AUTONOMY: MODERATING VARIABLE

Dependent Variable	Predictor Variable	Std Coefficient Beta
TI	AGE	0.11
	WORK EX	-0.03
	OCB	-0.14
	JCA	-0.19**
	OCB*JCA	-0.29**
	R square	0.22
	Adjusted R square	0.20

* $p < 0.05$ (2-tailed); ** $p < 0.01$, (2-tailed)

TABLE 6
RESULTS OF HIERARCHIAL REGRESSION MODEL INVOLVING – TURNOVER INTENTION: DEPENDENT VARIABLE; ORAGNIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR: INDEPENDENT VARIABLE; WORKGROUP COOPERATION, FRIENDLINESS AND WARMTH: MODERATING VARIABLE

Dependent Variable	Predictor Variable	Std Coefficient Beta
TI	AGE	0.05
	WORK EX	-0.02
	OCB	-0.27
	WCFW	0.23***
	OCB*WCFW	-0.42***
	R square	0.29
	Adjusted R square	0.27

* $p < 0.05$ (2-tailed); ** $p < 0.01$; p < 0.001*** (2-tailed)

Hypothesis 2(b) predicted that the relationship between OCB and turnover is moderated by organizational climate such that this relationship will be more positive for a climate that is high on role

stress and lack of harmony. The results described in Table 7 showed a significant moderating effect for the interaction term OCB*RSLH ($\beta = .21, p < 0.01$). Overall, our results demonstrated support for both hypotheses.

TABLE 7
RESULTS OF HIERARCHIAL REGRESSION MODEL INVOLVING – TURNOVER INTENTION: DEPENDENT VARIABLE; ORAGNIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR: INDEPENDENT VARIABLE; ROLE STRESS AND LACK OF HARMONY: MODERATING VARIABLE

Dependent Variable	Predictor Variable	Std Coefficient Beta
TI	AGE	-0.08
	WORK EX	-0.06
	OCB	0.17
	RSLH	0.09
	OCB*RSLH	.21**
	R square	0.32
	Adjusted R square	0.31

* $p < 0.05$ (2-tailed); ** $p < 0.01$, (2-tailed)

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATION

This paper extends the current literature on organizational citizenship behavior and turnover. We found that OCBs were negatively related to turnover intentions in the climate that was characterized by job challenge, autonomy, work group cooperation, warmth, and friendliness. In addition, OCBs were found to be positively related to turnover intentions in the climate that had high levels of role stress and lack of harmony. Our results are consistent with the research that was conducted by Podsakoff et al. (2009) and indicated a negative relationship between OCB and turnover intentions. Furthermore, we have demonstrated that organizational climate is a moderator of the relationship between OCBs and turnover intentions.

Another interesting finding of our study is that LMX served as a moderator in the relationship between OCB and turnover intentions. We found that for high LMX employees, OCB was negatively related to turnover intentions. It suggests that when employees engage in OCB and receive the required support from their supervisors, they feel that they are being valued so they are not inclined to leave. On the contrary, when employee share a low LMX with supervisors, they feel that their efforts and pro-social behaviors are not valued in the organization. This stimulates the feeling of dissatisfaction; and intentions of leaving the workplace are likely to develop.

Our study has some crucial implications for management practice. First, supervisors should design impartial and objective systems when assigning jobs, duties, and responsibilities. The reasons behind why one gets some resources while others do not should be clearly underscored so that differences are understood by every employee, which, in turn, will obviate any misunderstandings between supervisor and their subordinates. Second, the supervisor should strive to maintain a good working relationship with all the employees, more specifically, employees who regularly engage in OCBs. This good working relationship can be achieved through promoting an environment of more informal interaction between supervisors and subordinates. Finally, managers should strive to keep a watch on employees and offer them personal guidance and counselling to reduce stress and to promote harmony in the workplace. The

study has two major limitations. First, the research design was cross-sectional, so we cannot infer the causation among the variables based on results. A longitudinal design is recommended to establish causality. Second, a survey was the only method used to collect data for the study. Therefore, our results may be affected by the common method variance.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

It is crucial that managers in the current workforce recognize contextual factors that impact employees who conduct OCB. Employers find it beneficial to have employees who exhibit OCB as these behaviors are positively related to performance outcomes such as task performance (Podsakoff et al., 2009). Given the value of these OCB-exhibiting employees, it is important to examine factors that impact turnover intentions amongst these employees. This paper examined two contextual factors (LMX and Organizational Climate) that impact the OCB-turnover intentions relationship. Our contribution lies in explaining the specific conditions in which OCB may have a positive or negative impact on turnover intentions. Precisely, our study shows that high LMX relationships and favorable organizational climate can be instrumental in retaining employees that perform OCB frequently. This study would be beneficial to employers who are pursuing ways to minimize turnover of OCB-exhibiting employees. Employers can therefore implement policies and programs to encourage high LMX relationships and establish a favorable organizational climate to increase the retention of employees that employers don't wish to lose. This study also focused on OCB- turnover intentions from the individual level which is consistent with Schnake and Dumler (2003) that considers OCB to be at the individual level. It is the combined OCB from a group perspective that may affect a department, division, or organization in terms of turnover intentions (Khalid et al., 2009).

This paper provides the foundation for some interesting avenues for future research. Future studies should explore the impact of interventions designed to change the organizational climate on reducing the turnover intentions. In addition, research has suggested that job embeddedness is an important predictor of turnover intentions (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablinski, & Erez, 2001). Examining the nature of this relationship in the presence of OCBs is likely to yield some interesting results. Ang, Van Dyne, and Begley (2003) found that a difference exists in the OCB exhibited by local employees as opposed to foreign employees. It is suggested that further research be done to see if the impact of the contextual factors affecting the OCB- turnover intentions relationship is different if we consider employee characteristics such as nationality and marital status. This study was conducted using a sample of the population from the southern United States, so there is an issue of generalizability beyond the US that can be addressed with replicative studies in other parts of the world.

In conclusion, this study posits that both leader member exchange and organizational climate play a vital role in OCB and turnover intentions relationship. This paper extends and supports the stream of research that emphasizes the importance of contextual variables over dispositional factors while studying the behavioral dynamics associated with turnover.

REFERENCES

- Allen, T. D. (2006). Rewarding good citizens: The relationship between citizenship behavior, gender, and organizational rewards. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*, 120-143.
- Allen, T. D., & Rush, M. C. (1998). The effects of organizational citizenship behavior on performance judgments: A field study and a laboratory experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 247-260.
- Alexander, J. A., Bloom, J. R., & Nuchols, B. A. (1994). Nursing turnover and hospital efficiency: An organization-level analysis. *Industrial Relations, 33*, 505-520.

- Amin, Z., & Akbar, K. P. (2013). Analysis of psychological well-being and turnover intentions of hotel employees: An empirical study. *International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies*, 3(3), 662-671.
- Ang S., Van Dyne L. & Begley T.M. (2003) “The employment relationships of foreign workers versus local employees: a field study of organizational justice, job satisfaction, performance and OCB. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 561-583.
- Aryee, S., & Chay, Y. W. (2001). Workplace justice, citizenship behavior, and turnover intentions in a union context: Examining the mediating role of perceived union support and union instrumentality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 154-160.
- Bedeian, A. G., & Armenakis, A. A. (1981). A path-analytic study of the consequences of role conflict and ambiguity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(2), 417-424.
- Bolino, M., & Turnley, W. (2005). The Personal Costs of Citizenship Behavior: The Relationship Between Individual Initiative and Role Overload, Job Stress, and Work- Family Conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90 (4), 740-748.
- Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Bloodgood, J. M. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(4), 505-522.
- Benson, P., & Pond, S. (1987). An investigation of the process of employee withdrawal. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1, 218-229.
- Blau, P. M. (1987). *Social exchange theory*.
- Blankertz, L. E., & Robinson, S. E. (1997). Turnover intentions of community mental health workers in psychosocial rehabilitation services. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 33, 517–529.
- Brown, S., & Leigh, T. W. (1996). A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 358–368.
- Buch, R. (2015). Leader–member exchange as a moderator of the relationship between employee–organization exchange and affective commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(1), 59-79.
- Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and Discriminant Validation by the Multitrait-multimethod Matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56 (2): 81-105.
- Cilla, M. J. (2011). Exploring the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational climates for creativity (unpublished master's thesis). San Jose State University, San Jose, CA.
- Chen, X. P. (2005). Organizational citizenship behavior: A predictor of employee voluntary turnover. In D. L. Turnipseed (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational citizenship behavior* (pp. 435-454). New York: Nova Science.
- Chen, X., Hui, C., & Siego, D. J. (1998). The role of organizational citizenship behavior in turnover: Conceptualization and preliminary tests of key hypotheses. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 922-931.
- Cohen, A., Ben-Tura, E., Vashdi, D. (2012). Personnel Psychology, The relationship between social exchange variables, OCB, and performance. What happens when you consider group characteristics? *Personnel Review*, 41, 6, 705-731.
- Coglister, C., & Schriesheim, C. (2000). Exploring work unit context and leader- member exchange: a multi- level perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 487-511
- Dalal R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1241–1255.
- Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. (1975). A vertical dyad approach to leadership within formal organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 46-78.

- Davis-Blake, A., & Pfeffer, J. (1989). Just a mirage: The search for dispositional effects in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*, 385–400.
- Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review*, *11*(3), 618-634.
- Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys: The Total Design Method*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Duarte, N., Goodson, J. & Klich, N. (1994) Effects of dyadic quality and duration on performance appraisal, *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*(3), 499-521.
- Eatough, E., Chang, C., Miloslavic, S. & Johnson, R. (2011). Relationships of Role Stressors With Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*(3), 619-632.
- Feldman, J. M. (1986) A note on the statistical correction of halo error. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*(1), 173-176.
- Fornell, C. & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Errors. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18*, 39-50.
- Fu, W. & Deshpande, S.P. (2012). Antecedents of Organizational Commitment in a Chinese Construction Company. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *109*(3), 301-307.
- Galletta, M., Portoghese, I., & Battistelli, A. (2011). Intrinsic motivation, job autonomy and turnover intention in the Italian healthcare: The mediating role of affective commitment. *Journal of Management research*, *3*(2), 1.
- Gerstner, C. R. & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*, 827-844.
- Graen, G., Liden, R., & Hoel, W. (1982). Role of leadership in the employee withdrawal process. *Journal of Applied Science*, *67*, 868-872.
- Graen, G., Novak, M. & Sommerkamp, P. (1982). The effects of leader-member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *30*, 109-131.
- Graen, G. B. & Uhl –Bien, M. (1995) Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi- level multi-domain perspective, *The Leadership Quarterly*, *6*, 219-247.
- Griffin, M. A. & Mathieu, J. E. (1997). Modeling organizational processes across hierarchical levels: climate, leadership, and group process in work groups. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *18*, 731-744.
- Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W. & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management*, *26*(3), 463-488.
- Hofmann, D. A., Morgeson, F. P. & Gerras, S. J. (2003). Climate as a moderator of the relationship between leader-member exchange and content specific citizenship: safety climate as an exemplar. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(1), 170-178.
- Hunt, J.G., Osborn, R.N. & Martin, H. J. (1981). A multiple influence model of leadership. *Technical Report no. 520. Institute for the Behavioral and Social Science*. Alexandria, Virginia: U.S. Army Research.
- Huselid, M. A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*, 635-672.
- Harr, J. & Spell, C. (2009). How does distributive justice affect work attitudes? The moderating effects of autonomy. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *20*(8), 1827-1842.

- Heneman, R., Greenberger, D. & Anonyuo, C. (1989). Attributions and exchanges: The effects of interpersonal factors on the diagnosis of employee performance, *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 466-476.
- Hwang, J. I. & Chang, H. (2009). Work climate perception and turnover intention among Korean hospital staff. *International Nursing Review*, 56(1), 73-80.
- James, L. R. & Jones, A. P. (1980). Perceived job characteristics and job satisfaction: an examination of reciprocal causation. *Personnel Psychology*, 33, 97-135.
- James, L. R. & Tetrick, L. E. (1986). Confirmatory analytic tests of three causal models relating job perceptions to job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 77-82.
- James, L.A. & James, L.R. (1989). Integrating work environment perceptions: explorations into the measurement of meaning. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 739-751.
- Jones, A. P. & James, L. R. (1979). Psychological climate: Dimensions and relationships of individual and aggregated work environment perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 23(2), 201-25.
- Kacmar, K. M., Andrews, M. C., Van Rooy, D. L., Steilberg, R. C. & Cerrone, S. (2006). Sure everyone can be replaced but at what cost? Turnover as a predictor of unit-level performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 133-144.
- Khalid, S. A., Jusoff, H. K., Ali, H., Ismail, M., Kassim, K. M. & Rahman, N. A. (2009). Gender as a moderator of the relationship between OCB and turnover intention. *Asian Social Science*, 5(6), 108-117.
- Konovsky, M. A. & Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17, 253-266.
- Kemery, E. R., Mossholder, K. W. & Bedeian, A. G. (1987). Role stress, physical symptomatology, and turnover intentions: A causal analysis of three alternative specifications. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 8(1), 11-23.
- Kim, H. & Stoner, M. (2008). Burnout and turnover intention among social workers: Effects of role stress, job autonomy and social support. *Administration in Social Work*, 32(3), 5-25.
- Liden, R. C. & Graen, G. B. 1980. Generalizability of the vertical linkage dyad mode of leadership, *Academy of Management Journal*, 24, 43-72.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J. & Sparrowe, R. T. (2000) An examination of the mediating role of psychological empowerment on the relations between job, interpersonal relationships, and work outcomes, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 407-416.
- Liu, C., Spector, P. & Jex, S. (2005). The relation of job control with job strains: A comparison of multiple data sources. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78(3), 325-336.
- Mathieu, J. E., Hoffman, D. A. & Farr, J. L. (1993). Job perceptions–job satisfaction relations: an empirical comparison of three competing theories. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 56, 370-387.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M. & Fetter, R. (1991). Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salesperson’s performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 123-150.
- Mc Elroy, J. C., Morrow, P. C. & Rude, S. N. (2001). Turnover and organizational performance: A comparative analysis of the effects of voluntary, involuntary, and reduction-in-force turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 1294-1299.
- Mitchell, T., Holtom, B., Lee, T., Sablinski, C. & Erez, M. (2001). Why people stay: Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 1102-1121.
- Mitrovska, S. & Eftimov, L. (2016). Calculating the cost for employee turnover in the IT industry in Macedonia by using a web calculator. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(1), 24-33.

- Mosadeghrad, M., Ferlie, E. & Rosenberg, D. (2011). A study of relationship between job stress, quality of working life and turnover intention among hospital employees. *Health Services Management Research*, 24(4), 170-181.
- Mor Barak, M. E., Nissly, J. A. & Levin, A. (2001). Antecedents to retention and turnover among child welfare, social work, and other human service employees: What can we learn from past research? A review and met analysis. *Social service review*, 75(4), 625-661.
- Niehoff, B. P. & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-556.
- Northouse, P. G. (2010). Authentic leadership. In *Leadership theory and practice* (5th ed., pp. 205-239). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books
- Ozer, M. (2011). A moderated mediation model of the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(6), 1328-1336.
- Patterson, M., Warr, P. & West, M. (2004). Organizational climate and company productivity: The role of employee affect and employee level. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(2), 193-216.
- Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., Paine, J. & Bachrach, D. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26, 513-563.
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M. & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behavior: A meta- analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior*, 94, 122-141.
- Pritchard, R. D. & Karasick, B. W. (1973). The effects of organizational climate on managerial job performance and satisfaction. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 9, 126-146.
- Pullig, C., James, I., Maxham, G., Joseph, J. & Hair, F. (2002). Salesforce automation systems: An exploratory examination of organizational factors associated with effective implementation and sales force productivity. *Journal of Business Research*, 55(5), 401-415.
- Rapp, A. A., Bachrach, D. G. & Rapp, T. L. (2013). The influence of time management skill on the curvilinear relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(4), 668.
- Rentsch, J. (1990). Climate and culture: interaction and qualitative differences in organizational meanings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 668-681.
- Rosse, J. G. (1988). Relations among lateness, absence, and turnover: Is there a progression of withdrawal? *Human Relations*, 41, 517-531.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1988). The construction of climate in organizational research. In C. L. Cooper, & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 139-158). New York: Wiley
- Scandura, T. A. & Graen, G. B. (1984). Moderating effects of initial leader-member exchange status on the effects of a leadership intervention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(3), 428-436.
- Scandura, T. A., Graen, G. B. & Novak, M. A. (1986) When managers decide not to decide autocratically: An investigation of leader-member exchange and decision influence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 4, 579-584.

- Schnake, M. E., & Dumler, M. P. (2003). Levels of measurement and analysis issues in organizational citizenship behaviour research. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76(3), 283-301.
- Schneider, B. & Reichers, A. (1983). On the etiology of climates. *Personnel Psychology*, 36, 19-39.
- Schneider, B. (1990). The climate for service: an application of the climate construct. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Organizational climate and culture* (pp. 383-412). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schneider, B. (2000). The psychological life of organizations. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. P. M. Wilderon, & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture and climate* (pp. 17-21). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schuler, R. S. (1982). An integrative transactional process model of stress in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 3(1), 5-19.
- Sharoni, G., Tziner, A., Fein, E. C., Shultz, T., Shaul, K. & Zilberman, L. (2012). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Turnover Intentions: Do Organizational Culture and Justice Moderate Their Relationship? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(1), 267-294.
- Shaw, J. D., Gupta, N. & Delery, J. E. (2005). Alternative conceptualizations of the relationship between voluntary turnover and organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 50-68.
- Shin, Y. (2012). CEO Ethical Leadership, Ethical Climate, Climate Strength, and Collective Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 108, 299-312.
- Singleton, R. A. & Straits, B. C. (2005). *Approaches to Social Research* (4th Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smith-Crowe, K., Burke, M. J. & Landis, R. S. (2003). Organizational climate as a moderator of safety knowledge-safety performance relationships. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(7), 861-876.
- Smith, J. E. (2015). An Examination of Authentic Leadership, Perceived Similarity, and Leader-Member Exchange as Moderators of the Relationship between Leader and Follower Resilience. *Master's Theses*, 4611. San Jose State University.
- Soderfeldt, M., Soderfeldt, B. & Warg, L. (1995). Burnout in social work. *Social Work*, 40, 638-646.
- Spector, P. E. (1986). Perceived control by employees: A meta-analysis of studies concerning autonomy and participation at work. *Human relations*, 39(11), 1005-1016.
- Staw, B. M. (1980). The consequences of turnover. *Journal of occupational Behavior*, 1, 253-273.
- Tordera, N., González-Romá, V. & Peiró, J. M. (2008). The moderator effect of psychological climate on the relationship between leader-member exchange (LMX) quality and role overload. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17(1), 55-72.
- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of management Journal*, 37(4), 765-802.
- Walz, S. M. & Niehoff, B. P. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: Their relationship to organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 24, 301-319.
- Whiteoak, J. (2007). The Relationship among Group Process Perceptions, Goal Commitment and Turnover Intention in Small Committee Groups. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 22(1), 11-20.
- Younge, K. A., & Marx, M. (2015). The Value of Employee Retention: Evidence From a Natural Experiment. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 25(3), 652-677.
- Yen, H. R. & Niehoff, B. P. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational effectiveness: Examining relationships in Taiwanese banks. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34, 1617-1637.