

“Well, I’m Tired of Tryin’!” Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Citizenship Fatigue

Mark C. Bolino
University of Oklahoma

Hsin-Hua Hsiung
National Dong Hwa University

Jaron Harvey
University of Wyoming

Jeffery A. LePine
Arizona State University

This study seeks to identify workplace conditions that influence the degree to which employees feel worn out, tired, or on edge attributed to engaging in organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and also how this phenomenon, which we refer to as *citizenship fatigue*, is associated with future occurrences of OCB. Using data collected from 273 employees and their peers at multiple points in time, we found that the relationship between OCB and citizenship fatigue depends on levels of perceived organizational support, quality of team-member exchange relationships, and pressure to engage in OCB. Specifically, the relationship between OCB and citizenship fatigue is significantly stronger and positive when perceived organizational support is low, and it is significantly stronger and negative when the quality of team-member exchange is high and pressure to engage in OCB is low. Our results also indicate that citizenship fatigue is negatively related to subsequent acts of OCB. Finally, supplemental analyses reveal that the relationship between OCB and citizenship fatigue may vary as a function of the specific facet of OCB. We conclude with a discussion of the key theoretical and practical implications of our findings.

Keywords: organizational citizenship behavior, stress, strain, well-being

In contrast to task performance or in-role behavior, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) refers to employee behavior that is more discretionary, is less likely to be formally linked with organizational rewards, and contributes to the organization by promoting a positive social and psychological climate (Organ, 1997; Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006; Van Dyne, Cummings, & Parks, 1995; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Researchers have generally focused on how OCB is beneficial for both employees and organizations. Employees go beyond the call of duty by helping and mentoring coworkers, getting involved and keeping well informed about the organization, speaking up and encouraging others, volunteering to take on additional responsibilities, and so forth, and they are evaluated more favorably by their supervisors for doing so (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Whiting, Podsakoff, & Pierce, 2008). Likewise, when OCB is common in the workplace, it makes the organization a more attractive place to work (Organ et

al., 2006). Organizations also benefit from OCB because such behavior contributes to the development of social capital and “lubricates” the social machinery of the organization, thereby facilitating its effective functioning (Bolino, Turnley, & Bloodgood, 2002; Organ et al., 2006; P. M. Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997). Consistent with these ideas, empirical studies have found that OCB is associated with indicators of team and organization effectiveness, such as sales performance, productivity, product quality, and customer service ratings (see N. P. Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009, for a meta-analysis). In sum, there is considerable support in the literature for the idea that citizenship behavior at work is a positive thing (Organ et al., 2006).

Unfortunately, our theoretical understanding of OCB is incomplete. In particular, our theories and research do not explain the fundamentally different reactions that employees have to their experiences of engaging in OCB, which, of course, is important because these experiences are likely to influence how employees react to subsequent opportunities to engage in OCB (Bolino, Harvey, & Bachrach, 2012). On the one hand, and consistent with the sanguine view that management and organizational scholars have frequently advanced in their research, employees engage in OCB owing to positive motives or a desire to reciprocate positive treatment received from their organization or other individuals (e.g., Bateman & Organ, 1983; Organ, 1997). Because of assumptions regarding the stability of motives and patterns of reciprocity, this lens implies relative stability in patterns of OCB. That is, those individuals who engage in OCB continue to do so unless there is a change in the environment that somehow alters their motivation to engage in OCB. Indeed, this perspective is reflected in terms

This article was published Online First August 11, 2014.

Mark C. Bolino, Division of Management and Entrepreneurship, Price College of Business, University of Oklahoma; Hsin-Hua Hsiung, Department of Business Administration, National Dong Hwa University; Jaron Harvey, College of Business, University of Wyoming; Jeffery A. LePine, Department of Management, W. P. Carey School of Business, Arizona State University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Mark C. Bolino, Division of Management and Entrepreneurship, Price College of Business, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019-4006. E-mail: mbolino@ou.edu

such as “the good soldier syndrome,” which have been used in the literature to label employees who tend to engage in characteristically high levels of OCB.

On the other hand, recent research indicates that engaging in OCB can be draining and depleting (Bergeron, 2007; Bolino & Turnley, 2005), and thus, there are internal forces that may act to depress or even reverse an employee’s willingness or ability to continue engaging in OCB. Indeed, OCB involves the choice to invest cognitive, emotional, and physical resources in activities that go beyond what is technically required, and when these resources are scarce, an internal tension is created whereby concerns regarding the fairness and utility of engaging in these specific activities start to weigh more heavily on the individual, resulting in feelings of fatigue with regard to these specific behaviors. Ultimately, employees who might otherwise be very inclined to engage in OCB may react negatively when confronted with a subsequent opportunity or need for acts of citizenship. That is, when confronted with a coworker who could use some assistance, notice of a last minute meeting, or a problem that could be addressed with some suggestions and follow-up, an employee who might typically engage in OCB could react by saying to him or herself “enough is enough” or, in the words of the late blues musician Johnny Winter, “I’m just tired of tryin’.” Consistent with this type of reaction, the employee could ignore the coworker’s situation, skip the meeting, or withhold the suggestion.

The general idea that acts of OCB are associated with this type of introspection and reaction is consistent with research focused on the personal costs associated with citizenship (Bergeron, 2007; Bolino, Klotz, Turnley, & Harvey, 2013; Bolino & Turnley, 2005; Halbesleben, Harvey, & Bolino, 2009; Van Dyne & Ellis, 2004; Vigoda-Gadot, 2006). However, this research has not yet considered that the experience of feeling drained, worn out, and depleted may be attributed to going above and beyond the call of duty, and how these beliefs may make people less inclined to engage in future acts of OCB. It is important to note that although scholars have identified and examined concepts such as burnout and stress, which might appear to share a similar domain space, these concepts reflect general syndromes whereby the capacity to be effective in all aspects of life are diminished. What researchers have not considered, however, is that employees might experience fatigue attributed to OCB specifically and that while this may decrease the likelihood of future acts of OCB, it may not influence other aspects of effectiveness. That is, while employees might get fed up with helping coworkers, staying late, and making suggestions for changes in procedures, they may continue to perform their core job responsibilities at a high level.

To address this important theoretical shortcoming, we introduce the construct of *citizenship fatigue*, which we define as a state in which feeling worn out, tired, or on edge is attributed to engaging in OCB. Then, relying on conservation of resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989, 1998, 2001), we hypothesize that the association between acts of citizenship and citizenship fatigue is likely to be influenced by contextual factors in the work environment, such as organizational support, team-member exchange relationships, and citizenship pressure. We do not argue that OCB always leads to citizenship fatigue; rather, this should tend to occur when resources are low, there is a lack of resource gain following resource expenditures, or there is a loss or threatened loss of resources. Furthermore, we argue that citizenship fatigue will be negatively

associated with subsequent OCB (when considering past levels of OCB and other individual factors). We tested these theoretical ideas using data collected from multiple sources at multiple points in time from a sample of faculty working in private universities in Taiwan.

The Nature of Citizenship Fatigue

The origin of the construct *citizenship fatigue* is rooted in research that has sought to develop a more complete understanding of what happens when going out of one’s way on the behalf of others is an integral part of one’s job. In particular, studies of caregivers have identified compassion fatigue as an outcome associated with being highly compassionate and empathetic to those in need (Bride & Figley, 2007; Coetzee & Klopper, 2010; Kinnick, Krugman, & Cameron, 1996; Najjar, Davis, Beck-Coon, & Doebling, 2009). This research has found that compassion fatigue often occurs in workers in a number of occupations, including nurses (Coetzee & Klopper, 2010), clergy (e.g., Roberts, Flannelly, Weaver, & Figley, 2003), and social workers who respond to disasters or work with people suffering with HIV/AIDS, war veterans, or other traumatized populations (Bride & Figley, 2007). Here, our focus is on *citizenship fatigue*, which we define as a state in which employees feel worn out, tired, or on edge attributed to engaging in OCB. Citizenship fatigue is a state characterized by both affect and cognition, in that it involves a feeling of being worn out, tired, or on edge, as well as a belief that it is going beyond the call of duty or engaging in discretionary behaviors that is contributing to these feelings. While compassion fatigue is rooted in feelings of empathy and responsibility for the care of people in desperate and often hopeless situations, citizenship fatigue is rooted more in the willingness to engage in relatively discretionary acts that benefit the organization. Thus, whereas compassion fatigue is associated with feelings such as sadness and helplessness, employees who experience citizenship fatigue feel frustrated or underappreciated.

Citizenship fatigue bears obvious resemblance to felt stress, role overload, and burnout, but it is also different from these constructs in meaningful ways. For instance, *felt stress* typically captures the general sense that one’s job is stressful and that stressful things happen at work (Motowidlo, Packard, & Manning, 1986) or “a sense of time pressure, anxiety, and worry that is associated with job tasks” (Hunter & Thatcher, 2007: 954). *Role overload* describes individuals’ beliefs that they do not have enough time to get everything done at work, that they have too much work for one person to do, and that the amount of work they are expected to do is too great (Bolino & Turnley, 2005; Schaubroeck, Cotton, & Jennings, 1989). Both felt stress and role overload reflect individuals’ sense that their resources are being stretched or diminished in a way that influences their ability to be successful in their work. However, neither felt stress nor role overload are concerned with OCB in particular, and their effects often undermine employees’ ability to perform their jobs in general (e.g., Gilboa, Shirom, Fried, & Cooper, 2008), not just in the area of citizenship behavior.

Burnout is most commonly defined as “a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do ‘people work’ of some kind” (Maslach, 1982, p. 3). Because burnout reflects a general syndrome, where individuals’ overall energy or personal

resource levels are reduced, individuals who experience it are less able to perform across many different facets of their jobs (Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004). In contrast, citizenship fatigue is focused only on energy or personal resources devoted to engaging in OCB; for this reason, we expected to find that it would only hinder employees' citizenship behavior, leaving task- or in-role performance unaffected. For example, an employee who has regularly helped new employees get settled in on their first day at work may experience citizenship fatigue and no longer engage in this type of citizenship, but he or she is likely to stay engaged in his or her core job tasks. In other words, it is possible for employees who experience citizenship fatigue to cut back on their OCB but still focus on their core job tasks and perhaps even perform them at a higher level (Bergeron, Shipp, Rosen, & Furst, 2013). Citizenship fatigue is different from burnout, then, in at least two notable ways. First, burnout is much broader because it not only describes feelings of emotional exhaustion but also describes difficulty concentrating and thinking, being sympathetic and sensitive to others, and investing emotionally in others (Shirom & Melamed, 2006). Second, unlike citizenship fatigue, burnout entails feelings of reduced personal efficacy, in which people feel like they cannot perform their jobs effectively, particularly with regard to relating to other people associated with their job, such as customers, coworkers, patients, or students (Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004), which is not the case with citizenship fatigue.

Introducing citizenship fatigue should enable us to better understand how engaging in OCB can wear employees out. For example, while Bolino and Turnley (2005) found a positive relationship between engaging in individual initiative (one form of OCB) and both job stress and role overload, most studies have conceptualized felt job stress (or strain) as an antecedent of OCB and have found that it is negatively related to OCB (Chang, Johnson, & Yang, 2007); further, a recent meta-analysis found a nonsignificant relationship between OCB and role overload (Eatough, Chang, Miloslavac, & Johnson, 2011). One reason why it may be difficult to find a relationship between OCB and more general measures like

stress and overload is that there is nothing inherent in these outcomes that is related to citizenship behavior. Here, we suggest that it is possible for employees to experience citizenship fatigue without suffering from stress, role overload, or burnout. Indeed, people may experience citizenship fatigue as a result of negative feedback about their citizenship behavior, lack of recognition for engaging in OCB, or a personal appraisal that they would need to engage in too much citizenship in order to accomplish what they desire. When these or other circumstances initiate citizenship fatigue, it is unlikely that employees will experience felt stress, role overload, or burnout. Thus, in addition to being conceptually focused on reducing citizenship behavior, citizenship fatigue is also likely to be the result of events that are unrelated to felt stress, role overload, or burnout. Table 1 summarizes some of the key differences between citizenship fatigue and these other constructs.

Determinants of Whether Citizenship Leads to Citizenship Fatigue

Now that we have described the citizenship fatigue concept, we turn to the puzzle of why engaging in OCB sometimes leads to citizenship fatigue and sometimes does not. As a foundation for our discussion of this issue, we suggest that opportunities to engage in OCB constitute demands of which significant investments of resources are required on the part of employees (Bergeron, 2007). As such, conservation of resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989, 1998, 2001) is especially useful for understanding the factors that influence reactions to OCB. Central to COR theory are resources, which refer to objects, personal characteristics, conditions, or energies, that afford people the ability to cope with the stressful demands they face. COR theory posits that stress is created when there is either an actual or threatened net loss of resources, or a lack of resource gain, following resource investment. According to COR theory, then, citizenship fatigue is most likely to occur when the demands for engaging in OCB are outstripped by the resources available or when acting upon the

Table 1
Citizenship Fatigue Compared With Related Constructs

Feature	Citizenship fatigue	Felt stress	Role overload	Burnout
Key antecedents	High levels of OCB, underappreciation of OCB by others, or negative feedback about OCB.	Stressors in the work environment such as responsibility for others, organizational change, lack of control, or high pressure.	High number of tasks or responsibilities for one employee to perform.	Job demands, lack of resources, or difficult or intense interactions with customers or clients.
Individual experience	Feeling worn out, tired, or on edge attributed to engaging in OCB.	Feelings of pressure, anxiety, or worry associated with one's job or work situation.	Feeling that there is not enough time to accomplish everything at work.	Feelings of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a reduced sense of personal accomplishment.
Focal outcomes	Reduced levels of OCB.	Physical or psychological health consequence (e.g., headaches, depression), changes in job behavior, or performance.	Increased stress, decreased well-being, negative job attitudes, and reduced job performance.	Difficulty concentrating and thinking, being sympathetic and sensitive to others, and investing emotionally in others.
Representative item	"I am tired of going beyond the call of duty for my organization."	"My job is extremely stressful."	"I never seem to have enough time to get everything done at work."	"I feel burned out."

Note. OCB = organizational citizenship behavior.

opportunity is not associated with sufficient replenishment of resources. Next, we consider in more operational terms how citizenship fatigue results from OCB owing to (a) low levels of current resources, (b) the lack of resource gain following resource expenditures, and (c) the loss or threatened loss of resources. Specifically, we posit a series of crossover interactions that state differential and opposite relationships depending on particular conditions being present or absent.

Current resources. COR theory posits that stress is less likely to occur when people have resources that help them deal with stressors and challenges in their lives (Hobfoll, 1989). Similarly, the job–demands resources perspective (e.g., Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001) suggests that resources enable employees to better cope with job demands. Resources may be inherent in the work that people do or may be something provided by the organization (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004). Perceived organizational support (POS) is one resource that is likely to influence whether engaging in OCB is positively (or negatively) associated with citizenship fatigue. POS describes the degree to which employees feel supported by their organization (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Eisenberger, Ase-lage, Sucharski, and Jones (2004) pointed out that organizations provide employees with both tangible (e.g., wages) and socioemotional resources (e.g., respect, caring). If employees perform OCB because they have been given resources in the form of a positive, supportive exchange relationship with their employer, they should experience lower levels of citizenship fatigue. As such, engaging in OCB in the context of high levels of POS should lead to increased energy or lower levels of fatigue. However, when employees who engage in OCB lack organizational support, there is more likely to be a net loss of resources for going beyond the call of duty; therefore, engaging in additional discretionary behaviors is likely to be even more draining. As such, OCB contributes to higher levels of citizenship fatigue when POS is low.

Hypothesis 1: Engaging in OCB is associated with (a) more citizenship fatigue in situations where POS is low and (b) less citizenship fatigue in situations where POS is high.

Lack of Resource Gain

Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) suggests that individuals often form relationships that are characterized by open-ended exchanges where each party reciprocates the actions of the other. Team-member exchange (TMX) describes the exchange relationship between members of a group (Seers, 1989). In spite of the label, TMX has relevance beyond the team context in that it more broadly reflects the quality of cooperation or interpersonal exchanges among people who work together (Dierdorff, Bell, & Belohlav, 2011). High-quality TMX relationships are open-ended and flexible, and when TMX is high, employees look out for one another's interests. Consistent with principles of social exchange, Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007) found that coworkers who have high-quality TMX relationships tend to help one another. When an employee expends resources by engaging in OCB, such behaviors can still lead to resource gains to the extent that they are reciprocated by his or her peers. For instance, the time employees spend helping their colleagues may be completely repaid (or even "overpaid") if their colleagues help them out down the road. In this

context, OCB is an investment in a relationship that pays dividends down the road. When TMX is high, then, engaging in OCB should reduce feelings of citizenship fatigue.

However, when employees work in a department or group characterized by low-quality TMX relationships, engaging in OCB is likely to be more costly. Indeed, if employees are the only ones (or just one of a few) in their departments to engage in OCB, and their investment of resources is not offset through reciprocated acts of citizenship, COR theory suggests that they experience more stress. This argument is also consistent with the findings of a number of studies indicating that caregivers (e.g., nurses, social workers) tend to experience higher levels of emotional exhaustion when their acts of helping are not reciprocated (Schaufeli, 2006). Thus, citizenship fatigue resulting from the performance of OCB should be higher when TMX is low.

Hypothesis 2: Engaging in OCB is associated with (a) more citizenship fatigue in situations characterized by low-quality TMX relationships and (b) less citizenship fatigue in situations characterized by high-quality TMX relationships.

Lost Resources or the Threat of Resource Loss

Bolino, Turnley, Gilstrap, and Suazo (2010) studied *citizenship pressure*, which they defined as "a specific job demand in which an employee feels pressured to perform OCBs." They note that OCB, although not technically required, is often formally and informally rewarded, and as such, pressure is created on employees to be helpful, speak out, take on additional responsibilities, and engage in other forms of OCB (Bolino et al., 2010). If employees perceive that they *must* engage in OCB in order to receive desirable outcomes, such as the approval of others, higher performance ratings, or promotions (N. P. Podsakoff et al., 2009), they are likely to feel that such outcomes are threatened should they fail to perform OCB when the opportunity arises. Because OCB must be performed under the threat that desired outcomes may be taken away or otherwise lost (Hobfoll, 1989, 2001), it is more likely that OCB results in citizenship fatigue when it is performed under pressure. Thus, when citizenship pressure is high, performing OCBs is associated with higher levels of citizenship fatigue. In contrast, when employees do not feel pressured to engage in OCB and do so owing to their intrinsic motivation, such behaviors are likely to be viewed positively (Gagné & Deci, 2005). In these cases, performing OCBs should be more fulfilling, thereby resulting in lower levels of citizenship fatigue.

Hypothesis 3: Engaging in OCB is associated with (a) more citizenship fatigue when citizenship pressure is high and (b) less citizenship fatigue when citizenship pressure is low.

Citizenship Fatigue and the Expenditure of Future Resources

Our final hypothesis focuses on the central outcome of citizenship fatigue—namely, the future occurrence of OCB. COR theory suggests that if employees have expended significant resources coping with a demand in the past, there is likely to be a decline in the resources necessary to continue coping in the future, and individuals who lack resources tend to conserve what they have left by adopting a defensive posture (e.g., Hobfoll, 2001; Schö-n-

pflug, 1985). For instance, people who have encountered loss in prior relationships are often less willing to invest resources in future relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1994; Hobfoll, 2001). Extending these arguments to opportunities to engage in future acts of citizenship, if past OCB contributions have sapped resources and left employees feeling fatigued, employees are less able and willing to respond to the opportunity to engage in OCB.

Hypothesis 4: Citizenship fatigue is negatively associated with the future occurrence of OCB.

Figure 1 depicts the conceptual framework for our study and summarizes each of the hypotheses presented above. It also outlines when the data were collected that were used to test each of our hypotheses. We describe our data collection in greater detail below.

Method

Sample and Procedure

The data presented in this article were part of a broader data collection effort. The focal employees in our study are faculty members (including full-time lecturers and professors) working in private universities in Taiwan. Because private universities in Taiwan receive limited support from the government, they rely on the willingness of their faculty to go beyond the call of duty in order to function effectively. Using surveys, researchers collected data from two sources (employees and peers) at three different points in time. Semesters in Taiwan run from the last week of February to the third week of June, and from the last week of September to the second week of January; the first wave of data collection took place in March, the second wave in June, and the final wave in October. All surveys included postage-paid return envelopes, which were mailed back to the second author upon their completion. In order to encourage participation, participants were given a gift card to a convenience store chain that was worth 100 NT dollars (or roughly \$3.40) for each survey completed. We used a translation-back translation procedure to ensure that all survey items were accurately translated into Chinese (Brislin, 1980).

We distributed the first survey to 800 faculty members who worked in 84 different departments across 56 universities; it included items that measured demographic variables (e.g., age, organizational tenure), control variables (e.g., negative affect, affective commitment), and TMX. For smaller universities, we randomly selected one department from each university, and for larger universities, we selected two departments from two different schools. For each department, we randomly selected and distributed surveys to at least half of its faculty members. Five hundred seventy-six employees responded to the first survey (72% response rate). Eliminating surveys with incomplete or invalid data resulted in usable responses from 547 employees.

Three months later, we sent a second survey to these 547 employees, and 424 of them responded (78% response rate). This survey assessed POS, citizenship pressure, and hours worked per week; we also measured citizenship fatigue at Time 2 in order to test Hypothesis 4. In order to obtain ratings of OCB that were not self-reported, we included a peer survey and asked employees to give it to a colleague working in the same department. This measure of OCB was used to test our first three hypotheses. Four hundred fifteen coworkers (76%) returned the peer survey. Eliminating surveys with missing data or that could not be matched left us with usable data from 365 dyads.

Approximately 4 months later, we sent a final survey to 332 employees who, as part of the second survey, indicated that they would be willing to complete one more survey. This Time 3 survey contained the measure of citizenship fatigue used to test our first three hypotheses. Employees again were asked to give a short survey to one of their colleagues in order to obtain ratings of OCB (that would be used to test Hypothesis 4). Although employees were encouraged to give the survey to the same coworker who provided OCB ratings on the second survey, we also indicated that another coworker in the same department would be acceptable. We received surveys from 280 employees and 272 coworkers for a response rate of 84% and 82%, respectively. Among the coworkers who participated in the third survey, 60% indicated that they had provided OCB ratings for the same person in the second survey. After we eliminated surveys with missing data or invalid responses, the final data set consisted of responses from 273 em-




Figure 1. Theoretical framework. T1 = Time 1; T2 = Time 2.

ployees (from 76 different departments across 52 private universities) and their peers.

Of the employees, 69% were male and 86% were married; their average age was 46 years, and their average organizational tenure was 9 years. In terms of position status, 18% were lecturers, 42% were assistant professors, 30% were associate professors, and 10% were full professors. Of the coworkers who provided valid responses on the second survey, 54% were male and 73% were married, their average age was 42 years, and their average organizational tenure was 8 years. With regard to their working relationship with the employees, 74% were peers, 21% were administrative personnel working in the same department, and 5% were department chairs. For the peers who responded to the third survey, 56% were male, 74% were married, their average age was 42 years, and their average organizational tenure was 8 years. With regard to their relationship with employees, 77% were peers, 20% were administrative personnel who worked in the same department, and 3% were department chairs.

We tested for nonresponse bias by comparing respondents who responded to the Time 1 and Time 2 surveys with those who responded at Time 1 but not Time 2 with regard to variables that were available (e.g., age, negative affect, TMX); likewise, we compared respondents who responded to surveys at all three times with those who did not respond at Time 3. These tests revealed no significant differences. Also, given the possibility that employees experiencing citizenship fatigue may have been less likely to distribute the peer survey, we looked at the level of citizenship fatigue of respondents who had ratings of OCB and those who did not. At both Time 2 and Time 3, we found that citizenship fatigue levels were not significantly different for those who did and did not have ratings of OCB, which suggests that citizenship fatigue did not influence the likelihood of obtaining peer ratings of OCB.

Measures

Citizenship fatigue. Consistent with best practices in scale development, we used our definition of the citizenship fatigue construct as the foundational element for the items in our measure. Given conceptual correspondence, we considered items from existing measures of compassion fatigue as a basis for items we could modify to measure citizenship fatigue. For instance, we modified the items “Because of my helping, I feel on edge about various things” and “I feel worn out because of my work as a helper” (Stamm, 2002) to “Because of going the extra mile for my department, I feel ‘on edge’ about various things” and “I feel worn out because I go beyond the call of duty for my department.” To ensure sufficient construct coverage, we added items that captured similar sentiments, but in somewhat different ways. For instance, we included, “I am tired of going beyond the call of duty for my department,” and “I often lack energy because I go beyond my job duties at work.”

We conducted a pilot study in order to assess the content adequacy of the resulting seven items and to ensure that citizenship fatigue is distinct from two constructs that might be considered similar—namely, citizenship pressure and burnout. Using a procedure developed by Hinkin and Tracey (1999), we presented the items used to measure citizenship fatigue, citizenship pressure, and burnout to respondents along with the theoretical definitions for each of the constructs. Because this procedure only requires the

evaluators to be unbiased and have the intellectual ability to perform the item rating task, Hinkin and Tracey (1999, p. 18) indicated that using university students is “very appropriate” for this technique. Therefore, the evaluators were 134 students enrolled in business administration courses at a public university in Taiwan. Roughly half of the students (49%) were undergraduates, while the remainder were graduate students seeking master’s degrees in business administration. Most of the students were male (55%), and their average age was 21 years.

Using a scale ranging from (1) *not at all consistent* to (7) *completely consistent*, respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which the seven citizenship fatigue items, the eight citizenship pressure items used by Bolino et al. (2010), and the 14 burnout items that comprise the Shirom–Melamed Burnout Measure (Shirom & Melamed, 2006) were consistent with each of the three theoretical definitions. Once again, a translation-back translation procedure was used to translate the items into Chinese. Two different versions of the survey, each presenting the constructs in a different order, were used; responses were not significantly different across the two versions. Analyses of variance (ANOVAs) and Duncan’s multiple range test were used to determine if the items were evaluated appropriately. The mean ratings for each item are displayed in Appendix A. The analysis indicated that all of the items, except one, were rated significantly higher ($p < .05$) on the appropriate construct than the other constructs. The seventh citizenship fatigue item, “I am getting tired of being a team player in my organization,” was not evaluated as being significantly more consistent with the citizenship fatigue construct than with the other two constructs. Therefore, this item was dropped, which left six items to measure citizenship fatigue that were distinct from citizenship pressure and burnout.

Responses to the six-item scale were made on a 5-point scale ranging from (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree*. As noted earlier, citizenship fatigue was measured at Time 3 to test our first three hypotheses and at Time 2 in order to test Hypothesis 4. Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .92 at Time 2 and .91 at Time 3.

We conducted a series of confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) to determine if citizenship fatigue (measured at either Time 2 or Time 3) is empirically distinct from measures of job stress (a four-item scale from Motowidlo et al., 1986), role overload (a three-item scale from Bolino & Turnley, 2005), and citizenship pressure (Bolino et al., 2010). Specifically, we compared five different models using maximum-likelihood estimation. Using data collected at Time 2, the four-factor model provided a significantly better fit— $\chi^2(183) = 441.76$, root mean square of approximation (RMSEA) = .07, Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI) = .91, comparative fit index (CFI) = .92—than any other model. For instance, the best fitting three-factor model, which had citizenship fatigue and role overload loading onto a single factor, had the following fit statistics: $\chi^2(186) = 686.59$, RMSEA = .10, TLI = .83, CFI = .85. A one-factor model had the following fit statistics: $\chi^2(189) = 1167.67$, RMSEA = .14, TLI = .67, CFI = .71.

We also examined the average variance extracted (AVE) to further evaluate the discriminant validity of our measures. Using the procedures outlined by Fornell and Larcker (1981), we found that the square root of the AVE ranged from .74 to .83 and averaged .79. These results suggest that the variance explained exceeded the amount of measurement error related to each con-

struct's items. Additionally, the square root of the AVE for any two constructs exceeded their correlation, which suggests that the measures capture distinct constructs. Taken together, these findings indicate that citizenship fatigue (measured at either Time 2 or Time 3), job stress, role overload, and citizenship pressure all had acceptable convergent and discriminant validity.

Moderators. POS was measured with Lynch, Eisenberger, and Armeli's (1999) eight-item scale. A sample item is "My department really cares about my well-being." We measured TMX with Seers, Petty, and Cashman's (1995) 10-item scale. A sample item is "How willing are other members of your department to help finish work that was assigned to you?" Finally, we measured citizenship pressure using Bolino et al.'s (2010) eight-item scale. Responses to the items in these scales were made on a 5-point scale ranging from (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree*. Cronbach's alphas for these scales were .92, .83, and .89, respectively.

Organizational citizenship behavior. We chose to indicate OCB with three narrow facets that, in concert, should cover the domain space of OCB in a fairly comprehensive way—helping, voice, and individual initiative. *Helping*, which we assessed using Van Dyne and LePine's (1998) seven-item scale, reflects interpersonally focused cooperative behavior. A sample item is "This particular coworker assists others in this department with their work for the benefit of the department." *Voice*, which we measured with Van Dyne and LePine's (1998) six-item scale, reflects unit-focused or organizationally focused behavior that is positive but more challenging in nature. A sample item from this scale is "This particular coworker speaks up and encourages others in this department to get involved in issues that affect the unit." Finally, *individual initiative*, which we measured with Bolino and Turnley's (2005) 15-item measure, reflects extra-conscientious activities that are focused more generally on organizational tasks and the work context. As Speier and Frese (1997, p. 172) noted, including individual initiative in the domain of OCB or contextual performance results in a "better and more well-rounded concept." A sample item is "Works late into the night at home." Consistent with the recommendations of Spector, Bauer, and Fox (2010), we asked peers to indicate how frequently the focal employee engaged in the activities described in the items using a 5-point scale ranging from (1) *never does this* to (5) *usually does this*.

Control variables. As described in the Results section, different combinations of control variables were examined in our analyses to determine if our findings were robust. Open-ended questions were used to assess employee characteristics (e.g., age, number of hours worked each week). Research performance was assessed using the number of National Science Council projects that the faculty member was involved with during the past 3 years, which is considered an indicator of research performance in Taiwan. Negative affect was measured using the 10 items from the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule that measure negative affect (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Finally, we measured affective commitment using a six-item measure (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

We conducted a CFA to examine the factor structure and item loadings for all of the focal variables in our study. The basic structure of our analysis is as follows. First, we specified a measurement model, whereby the items for each of the scales

used to measure the substantive variables involved in Hypotheses 1 through 3, which are depicted in the model in the top half of Figure 1, loaded on their respective factor. Because Hypothesis 4 was tested with two of the same variables from the previous analysis but measured at a different point in time, we performed a cross-validation of these items using a multigroup analysis. This analysis, in essence, reveals whether the measurement model involving these items and constructs is stable. In other words, it answers the question of whether the items measured at the different time periods are reflective of the same overarching constructs.

We first specified a model whereby we loaded items for POS (eight items), TMX (10 items), citizenship pressure (eight items), OCB–Time 2 (28 items), and citizenship fatigue–Time 3 (six items) on their respective factors. We specified OCB as a second-order factor, indicated by three first-order factors (helping, voice, and individual initiative). To account for obvious wording artifacts in each scale, we correlated seven error terms. Specifically, two items of the POS scale both explicitly refer to "help" that the organization provides and do not begin with the stem "My organization" as do the other items in the scale. Two items of the TMX scale begin with the long phrase "Do other members of your team usually let you know when," two other items begin with "How willing are," and two items deal with helping out teammates. Two items of the citizenship pressure scale begin with the stem, "I feel a lot of pressure to. . ." Two items of the voice scale refer to involvement in organizational matters rather than speaking up. Finally, two items from the individual initiative scale both refer to bringing work home to accomplish on days off. Given the large number of items, the data fit this model well in an absolute sense,¹ $\chi^2(1690) = 2795.25$, $\chi^2/df = 1.65$, RMSEA = .05, TLI = .89, CFI = .90. Moreover, we compared the fit of this model with 11 alternative models, and this model fit significantly better than any other model we tested. For instance, the alternative model with the best fit, which had POS and TMX loading onto a single factor, had the following fit statistics: $\chi^2(1694) = 3128.88$, RMSEA = .06, TLI = .86, CFI = .87. A one-factor model had the following fit statistics: $\chi^2(1700) = 4762.23$, RMSEA = .08, TLI = .70, CFI = .72.

We then specified a multigroup model to cross-validate the OCB and citizenship fatigue measures used to test Hypothesis 4. Group 1 consisted of the items for OCB–Time 2 and citizenship fatigue–Time 3 from the previous analysis, and Group 2 consisted of the items for OCB–Time 3 and citizenship fatigue–Time 2. The items loaded onto their respective factors, and the same errors were correlated. The results indicate that this model fit the data well,² $\chi^2(1042) = 2405.55$, $\chi^2/df = 2.31$, RMSEA = .05, TLI = .90, CFI = .90. More important, constraining the measurement weights, structural weights, structural covariances, and structural residuals to be equal across the two time

¹ The fit indices obtained without correlating any error terms were $\chi^2(1697) = 3192.37$, $\chi^2/df = 1.88$, RMSEA = .06, TLI = .86, CFI = .86.

² The fit indices obtained without correlating any error terms were: $\chi^2(1046) = 2589.44$, $\chi^2/df = 2.48$, RMSEA = .05, TLI = .88, CFI = .89.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Reliabilities for Study Variables

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Age	46.04	7.87	—											
2. Negative affect	1.74	0.76	-.16**	(.90)										
3. Affective commitment	4.87	1.29	.13*	-.38**	(.91)									
4. Hours worked per week	45.20	16.39	-.20**	.05	-.04	—								
5. Research performance	0.67	1.09	-.24**	-.06	.03	.12*	—							
6. POS	3.38	0.69	-.02	-.31**	.49**	-.09	-.00	(.92)						
7. TMX	3.63	0.50	.03	-.21**	.33**	-.10	-.07	.41**	(.83)					
8. CP	3.39	0.68	-.10	.35**	-.30**	.17**	-.09	-.42**	-.13*	(.89)				
9. OCB–Time 2	3.83	0.62	.00	-.01	.16**	.13*	.03	.13*	.23**	-.02	(.96)			
10. OCB–Time 3	3.81	0.63	-.08	-.02	.12*	.14*	.07	.08	.17**	-.03	.51**	(.96)		
11. Citizenship fatigue–Time 2	2.92	0.77	-.22**	.41**	-.39**	.19**	-.09	-.39**	-.24**	.64**	-.07	-.11	(.92)	
12. Citizenship fatigue–Time 3	2.95	0.76	-.22**	.38**	-.32**	.13*	-.04	-.38**	-.24**	.48**	-.07	-.03	.66**	(.91)

Note. *ns* = 260–273. Coefficient alphas are in parentheses along the diagonal. POS = perceived organizational support; TMX = team-member exchange; CP = citizenship pressure; OCB = organizational citizenship behavior.
* *p* < .05. ** *p* < .01, two-tailed tests.

periods did not result in a significant difference in fit (*df* = 38, change in $\chi^2 = 52.97, ns$).³

Results

A correlation matrix is presented in Table 2. The means, standard deviations, and alphas for all of the variables are shown here as well. It is worth noting that OCB (measured at Time 2) was not significantly correlated with citizenship fatigue (measured at Time 3), nor was citizenship fatigue (measured at Time 2) correlated with OCB (measured at Time 3). These nonsignificant correlations provide some initial support for our argument that the relationship between OCB and citizenship fatigue is contingent or conditional.

Because some employees were nested within the same departments, we first sought to verify that our observations could be treated independently by computing intraclass correlation (ICC) scores for our focal variables. The average ICC(1) score was only .048, which is less than the .05 to .10 values that are indicative of an even moderate nesting effect (LeBreton & Senter, 2008). Additionally, Kenny, Kashy, and Bolger (1998) suggested that there should be little chance of incorrectly rejecting null hypotheses or distortion in scale reliabilities when ICCs are relatively low, and “group” size is small, as is the case in our study. Based on this low ICC and the small group size, then, the level of nonindependence in our data should be inconsequential according to Kenny et al. (1998). Moreover, the ICC(2) scores were also very low on average (.12), and none of the scores approached the .70 benchmark for aggregation (Klein et al., 2000). Finally, we also performed a series of one-way ANOVAs to look at the significance of the between-group variance estimates (Bliese, 2000), and only one of the models was significant. Therefore, we used hierarchical regression to test our hypotheses.⁴

As suggested by a number of researchers (e.g., Becker, 2005; Carlson & Wu, 2012; Spector & Brannick, 2011), we first examined the hypothesized relationships using regression models that did not include any control variables, and we then assessed how adding theoretically relevant control variables would affect our findings. To begin, we examined three separate regression models in which we regressed citizenship fatigue on OCB, the relevant moderator (i.e., POS, TMX, or citizenship pressure), and the

interaction between OCB and the relevant moderator. In these analyses, we found that the interaction between OCB and TMX and citizenship pressure were both significant (*p* < .05, two-tailed), and the interaction between OCB and POS was marginally significant (*p* < .10, two-tailed).

We then examined models that accounted for two individual differences that could affect our findings. Specifically, in our sample, older workers were significantly less likely to report feelings of citizenship fatigue, possibly because they have more job experience. Further, researchers have argued that people with negative affect (NA) tend to be more likely to report negative feelings, and it has been argued that it is important to control for NA in studies that involve stress and strain (e.g., Burke, Brief, & George, 1993). Therefore, we again performed our analyses, including age and NA as control variables; in these regressions, all three of the hypothesized interactions were significant (*p* < .05, two-tailed).

Another potential influence on our findings is the possibility that employees might minimize citizenship fatigue by working longer hours or reducing their performance in other areas (Bergeron, 2007; Bergeron et al., 2013; Rapp, Bachrach, & Rapp, 2013; Rubin, Dierdorff, & Bachrach, 2013). In the three models used to test our hypotheses, then, we included the number of hours worked each week and research performance as additional control variables. As shown in

³ We conducted an additional CFA of the five variables in the upper half of Figure 1 (i.e., POS, TMX, citizenship pressure, OCB–Time 2, and citizenship fatigue–Time 3) using item parcels (Floyd & Widaman, 1995). In this model, OCB–Time 2 was a second-order construct represented by three first-order constructs (helping behavior, voice, and individual initiative); POS had four parcels; TMX had five parcels; citizenship pressure had four parcels; helping behavior had three parcels; voice had three parcels; individual initiative had seven parcels; and citizenship fatigue–Time 3 had three parcels. We obtained the following fit indices for this five-factor model: $\chi^2(364) = 497.70, \chi^2/df = 1.37, RMSEA = .04, TLI = .98, CFI = .98$. These results provide additional support for the five-factor model.

⁴ The only variable that exceeded the ICC(1) criterion of 0.12 and for which the ANOVA was significant was OCB measured at Time 3. Therefore, we reanalyzed the hypothesis involving this variable (i.e., Hypothesis 4) using hierarchical linear modeling. The results, which are available from the first author, were unchanged.

Table 3
Results of Regression Analysis Predicting Citizenship Fatigue: Moderating Effect of POS, TMX, and CP

Variable	Dependent variable: Citizenship fatigue–Time 3							
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3a	Step 3b	Step 3c	Step 4a	Step 4b	Step 4c
Control variables								
Age	−0.17**	−0.16**	−0.19**	−0.17**	−0.15**	−0.20**	−0.17**	−0.17**
Negative affect	0.34***	0.34***	0.24***	0.30***	0.22***	0.25***	0.30***	0.21***
Hours worked per week	0.09	0.10 [†]	0.06	0.08	0.04	0.05	0.08	0.02
Research performance	−0.08	−0.09	−0.10 [†]	−0.11 [†]	−0.05	−0.11 [†]	−0.10 [†]	−0.07
Independent variable								
OCB–Time 2		−0.05	0.00	0.00	−0.05	−0.01	−0.02	−0.06
Moderators								
POS			−0.33***			−0.31***		
TMX				−0.18**			−0.17**	
CP					0.38***			0.35***
Interaction effects								
OCB × POS						−0.12*		
OCB × TMX							−0.11*	
OCB × CP								0.14**
Model <i>F</i>	14.34***	11.48***	15.95***	11.41***	18.30***	14.47***	10.46***	17.05***
<i>R</i> ²	.18	.19	.28	.22	.31	.29	.23	.33
Adj <i>R</i> ²	.17	.17	.26	.20	.29	.27	.21	.31
Δ Adj <i>R</i> ²		.00	.09***	.03**	.12***	.01*	.01*	.02**

Note. $n = 273$. Standardized regression coefficients are reported. POS = perceived organizational support; TMX = team-member exchange; CP = citizenship pressure; OCB = organizational citizenship behavior; Adj = adjusted.

[†] $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed tests.

Table 3, in Step 1, age, NA, hours worked per week, and research performance were entered as control variables. In Step 2, we entered our independent variable (OCB) into the model. In Steps 3a–3c, we entered the relevant moderator (i.e., POS, TMX, and citizenship pressure). Finally, in Steps 4a–4c, we entered the interaction terms between OCB and the moderator. The interaction terms involving OCB and POS, TMX, and citizenship pressure were all statistically significant ($p < .05$, two-tailed).⁵ In order to understand the nature of these interactions, we plotted simple slopes. These plots are depicted in Figures 2 through 4.

As shown in Figure 2, the relationship between OCB and citizenship fatigue is significant and positive when POS is low ($\beta = .30$, $p < .05$). In other words, as expected, engaging in OCB is positively related to citizenship fatigue in situations where employees feel there




Figure 2. Interaction effect of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and perceived organizational support (POS) on citizenship fatigue.

is a lack of support from the organization. Thus, Hypothesis 1a was supported. However, the negative relationship between OCB and citizenship fatigue when POS is high is not significant; thus, Hypothesis 1b was not supported. Figure 3 depicts the interaction of OCB and TMX in predicting citizenship fatigue. Here, the relationship between OCB and citizenship fatigue is not significantly different than zero when TMX is low. The slope is positive but not significant; thus, Hypothesis 2a was not supported. But when TMX is high, there is a statistically significant negative association between OCB and citizenship fatigue ($\beta = -.38$, $p < .05$). That is, whereas low TMX does not influence whether OCB fosters citizenship fatigue, high TMX creates a situation where additional OCB-related contributions actually decrease the level of citizenship fatigue. Thus, Hypothesis 2b was supported.

Figure 4 illustrates how citizenship fatigue is influenced by the interaction of OCB and citizenship pressure. First, the relationship between OCB and citizenship fatigue is not significantly different than zero when citizenship pressure is high. We expected the relationship to be positive in this condition, so Hypothesis 3a was not supported. However, when citizenship pressure is low, there is a statistically significant negative association between OCB and citizenship fatigue ($\beta = -.39$, $p < .05$). That is, whereas high citizenship pressure does not influence whether OCB fosters citizenship fatigue,

⁵ We also tested a model in which all three interactions were included in the same model; however, in this model, none of the interactions were significant (the interaction between OCB and citizenship pressure was marginally significant, $p = .053$). The results of a power analysis suggested that our sample size makes it difficult to detect multiple interactions simultaneously; however, the interactions may also explain some of the same variance in our dependent variable, and this could also account for the non-significant results in this analysis.




Figure 3. Interaction effect of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and team-member exchange (TMX) on citizenship fatigue.

low citizenship pressure creates a situation where higher levels of OCB actually decrease the level of citizenship fatigue. Thus, Hypothesis 3b was supported.

In order to determine if citizenship fatigue undermined the future occurrence of OCBs, as predicted by Hypothesis 4, we used the measure of citizenship fatigue collected at Time 2 as our independent variable and the measure of OCB collected at Time 3 as the dependent variable. Again, following recommendations regarding the use of control variables (e.g., Becker, 2005; Carlson & Wu, 2012), we first regressed OCB (at Time 3) on citizenship fatigue and found a statistically significant relationship ($\beta = -.11, p < .05$, one-tailed). We next constructed a model that included two theoretically important control variables involving workload. Specifically, in order to control for earlier levels of OCB and thereby capture changes in OCB that might result from citizenship fatigue, we controlled for OCB at Time 2. We also controlled for the number of hours that employees worked each week to address the possibility that employees are simply putting in longer hours (Bergeron, 2007). In this model, the relationship between citizenship fatigue and OCB at Time 3 was significant and negative ($\beta = -.13, p < .05$, one-tailed).

Given that employees who are highly committed to their organizations tend to engage in more OCB (Dalal, 2005), we also controlled




Figure 4. Interaction effect of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and citizenship pressure (CP) on citizenship fatigue.

Table 4
Results of Regression Analysis Predicting OCB

Variable	Dependent variable: OCB–Time 3		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Control variables			
OCB–Time 2		0.49***	0.49***
Hours worked per week		0.11*	0.11*
Affective commitment			0.00
Research performance			0.02
Independent variable			
Citizenship fatigue–Time 2	–0.11*	–0.13*	–0.12*
Model F	3.15*	32.25***	19.24***
R ²	.01	.28	.28
Adj R ²	.01	.27	.27
Δ Adj R ²		.26***	.26***

Note. $n = 260$. Standardized regression coefficients are reported. OCB = organizational citizenship behavior; Adj = adjusted.
* $p < .05$. *** $p < .001$, one-tailed tests.

for affective commitment in the model testing our hypothesis. As shown in Table 4, controlling for hours worked per week, research performance, affective commitment, and OCB at Time 2, citizenship fatigue remained a significant predictor of OCB at Time 3 ($\beta = -.12, p < .05$, one-tailed); therefore, Hypothesis 4 was supported.⁶ Appendix B provides a summary of the findings we obtained when the specific types of OCB (i.e., helping, voice, and individual initiative) are used rather than a composite measure.

Furthermore, in order to demonstrate that it is citizenship fatigue, and not simply role overload or job stress, which affects subsequent OCB, we regressed OCB at Time 3 on role overload and job stress, respectively; we also investigated two additional models that included OCB at Time 2 as a control variable; and we examined models that included role overload or job stress and all of the control variables included in the regression model used to test Hypothesis 4. Neither role overload nor job stress was significantly related to OCB at Time 3 in any of these analyses, providing additional evidence that citizenship fatigue is distinct from these constructs.

Discussion

A great deal of research suggests that OCB results from a sense of commitment and that employees enjoy going the extra mile for their organizations (Organ et al., 2006). Despite this sanguine view of citizenship, it has also been argued that performing OCB can contribute to employee stress and overload (Bolino & Turnley, 2005). Drawing upon COR theory, we argued that employees who engage in OCB experience reduced levels of citizenship fatigue when they feel supported by their organization, have high-quality TMX relationships with their peers, and do not feel pressured to be a good organizational citizen. At the same time, we argued that citizenship fatigue would be

⁶ Because some employees asked a different peer to provide OCB ratings at Time 2 and Time 3, an alternative explanation for changes in OCB observed could be change in rater versus a change in actual behavior. From the data in the third wave of surveys, 152 peers reported that they had provided ratings for the same participant at Time 2. Therefore, we reanalyzed our model using this smaller sample, where OCB ratings came only from the same peer, and the results did not change.

more pronounced when POS is low, TMX relationships are lower in quality, and employees feel pressured to engage in OCB. Further, our theorizing suggested that, ultimately, citizenship fatigue would lead employees to cut back on their OCB. Overall, our findings were supportive of these ideas in that the relationship between OCB and citizenship fatigue was stronger and positive when POS was low, and it was stronger and negative when TMX was high and pressure to engage in OCB was low. Further, we found that citizenship fatigue was indeed negatively related to subsequent OCB.

Contributions

Our research contributes to the literature in at least three ways. First, our introduction of the citizenship fatigue construct is an important theoretical contribution in and of itself. Indeed, the general idea of citizenship fatigue is likely to resonate in the minds of employees who engage in OCB, at least under certain conditions, and to date, no theory or research has attempted to account for this phenomenon. To the extent that citizenship fatigue has logical implications to subsequent acts of citizenship, the construct could serve as an important basis from which to provide a superior understanding of citizenship behavior itself. Additionally, and from the perspective of the occupational stress literature, whereas prior research has conceptualized a wide variety of job stressors having to do with aspects of the core task activities and environmental factors and where effects are direct and immediate (Demerouti et al., 2001), we have identified a stressful demand associated with activities that are more contextual and volitional, with effects that may be situationally dependent and emerge more slowly. Third, from the perspective of the OCB literature, our conceptualization of citizenship fatigue not only offers a useful counterpoint to perspectives on OCB that have been largely positive (Bolino et al., 2013), but it also suggests a unique conceptual lens that recognizes a more complete set of motives that may be considered by actors confronted with opportunities to engage in OCB. As such, our article answers the call for research that provides a more balanced view of positive organizational behavior such as OCB (Fineman, 2006). Finally, rather than being triggered by disposition or reciprocity for satisfying work or being treated fairly (Organ et al., 2006), we contend that actors consider their experiences and environmental factors that influence their balance of resources and that these appraisals influence both feelings of fatigue, and more distal decisions regarding future OCB-related contributions.

Directions for Future Research

Although our study contributes to existing research, it also suggests some important avenues for future research. In particular, given the important implications of citizenship fatigue, another worthwhile avenue for future research is to examine additional factors that affect citizenship fatigue. In this study, we focused on organizational factors and how they might influence citizenship fatigue. As noted earlier, though, recent investigations indicate that OCB sometimes contributes to work–family conflict (Bolino & Turnley, 2005; Halbesleben et al., 2009). Likewise, OCB can sometimes distract employees from fulfilling their in-role job responsibilities (Bergeron, 2007). When engaging in OCB results in the loss of resources that might otherwise be devoted to family or in-role duties, it should be more likely that OCB leads to citizenship fatigue. Furthermore, performing some types of OCB may be more demanding and consume more resources

than engaging in other forms of citizenship. For instance, there may be greater time costs associated with going out of one's way to help a colleague or coming in on a weekend to finish a project than being courteous, tolerating inconveniences, and defending the organization when people criticize it (Bergeron, 2007). Thus, while we used broad measures of OCB and citizenship fatigue, it might also be useful in future studies to investigate how performing certain acts of citizenship may be likely to result in more specific feelings of citizenship fatigue (e.g., being tired of helping others or working weekends).

In fact, although we did not address this possibility directly, the results of our supplemental analyses reported in Appendix B reveal potentially important differences in relationships for the different aspects of OCB that could be explored in future research. For example, the pattern of relationships with voice appeared to be somewhat different than those with helping and individual initiative. Specifically, the relationship between voice and citizenship fatigue was not influenced by any of our moderators. One explanation may be that challenging behaviors are driven more by individual differences, and so once an opportunity for voice arises, the behavior becomes more activated and robust to contextual forces. Although such research could enhance our understanding of citizenship fatigue, more generally it would enhance our understanding of OCB. Indeed, we feel that the development and tests of theory regarding specific facets of OCB are a necessary step to move the literature forward.

Another potentially useful avenue for future research would be to look at the factors that influence the intensity of citizenship fatigue experienced by employees. Investigations of compassion fatigue indicate that those who most often experience this type of fatigue are engaged in occupations where they have close contact with the beneficiaries of their work, such as a nurse helping a sick patient (Coetzee & Klopper, 2010). Interestingly, Grant (2007) suggested that proximity to beneficiaries of one's work can increase employees' motivation. Indeed, he argued that the greater the perceived impact of one's work on the beneficiary, the greater employees' motivation is to make a prosocial difference. It is possible, however, that employees who feel that their citizenship behavior makes a vital difference to their coworkers or organization may feel citizenship fatigue more intensely than those who do not view their efforts in this same light. Work reconciling these perspectives, then, would be useful.

Finally, research on the ways in which employees may cope with citizenship fatigue and investigations of other outcomes of citizenship fatigue are also warranted. For instance, our findings indicate that citizenship fatigue is associated with reduced levels of OCB, but these effects may be temporary. Indeed, employees who feel worn out from going the extra mile may take a temporary break from such behaviors and then resume their OCB after a period of recovery. Accordingly, it would be useful for investigators in future studies to look at patterns of citizenship over time and how citizenship may vary as a function of citizenship fatigue. Of course, prolonged periods of citizenship fatigue could cause employees to permanently scale back their OCB or disengage all together. For this reason, we encourage researchers to investigate the coping strategies that employees use to deal with citizenship fatigue and the effects of citizenship fatigue on other important outcomes.

Limitations

Although our study contributes to existing knowledge and offers some important avenues for future research, it also has some limita-

tions. A noteworthy strength of our research is that we were able to collect data from both employees and their peers at multiple points in time. At the same time, however, the generalizability of our findings may be somewhat limited. In particular, we collected data from faculty members working in private universities; furthermore, our data were collected in Taiwan, which has a more collectivistic culture than the United States, where most OCB research has been conducted. It is possible that engaging in certain types of OCBs may be less fatiguing in certain cultures. For instance, collectivists may find it more natural (and less resource consuming) to engage in helping behaviors than individualistic employees. Therefore, future studies must confirm that our findings are generalizable to employees working in other occupations and in other countries.

In addition, prior research suggests that task performance and OCB are significantly related (N. P. Podsakoff et al., 2009), and employees may sometimes make tradeoffs between task performance and OCB (Bergeron, 2007). Although we took into account the number of hours worked each week and included an indicator of research performance, we did not have a traditional measure of task performance. Thus, our findings should be viewed with this shortcoming in mind, and future research investigating citizenship fatigue should control for task performance using more direct measures obtained from archival performance records or from supervisor evaluations.

Another limitation of our study is that our approach to measuring OCB may have masked differences among the narrow facets. Indeed, the supplemental analyses reported in Appendix B reveal that the findings are somewhat different depending on the type of OCB being considered. Our measure of OCB focused on helping, voice, and individual initiative, which reflect different aspects of OCB and serve as broad indicators of the OCB construct; however, prior research has identified additional types of OCBs (Organ et al., 2006), and thus our broad measure of OCB may be somewhat deficient. As such, our findings could have differed if we had used a composite measure of OCB comprised of other types of OCB. Future studies, then, should examine the effects of other types of OCB on citizenship fatigue and how citizenship fatigue affects the future occurrence of such OCBs.

Finally, while we used existing scales to measure the focal variables in our study, our citizenship fatigue scale is new. As noted earlier, our measure was based on prior investigations of compassion fatigue, and the findings of our content adequacy study indicate that our items are consistent with our definition of citizenship fatigue and can be distinguished from items used to measure citizenship pressure and burnout; moreover, the six-item scale had high internal consistency reliability and good test-retest reliability (cf. Table 2), and our analyses indicated that the items used to measure citizenship fatigue were representative of that construct and distinct from other constructs, such as job stress and role overload. Nevertheless, as noted in footnotes 1 and 2, the fit indices for our CFAs indicated slightly poorer fit when we did not correlate any error terms for items in the existing scales, and very good fit was only achieved when using item parcels (see footnote 3). In light of the recent debate regarding the appropriateness of using item parcels in CFA (Little, Rhemtulla, Gibson, & Schoemann, 2013; Marsh, Lüdtke, Nagengast, Morin, & von Davier, 2013), researchers in future studies could investigate possible improvements in our citizenship fatigue scale and could also seek to further explore the distinctiveness of citizenship fatigue to related constructs such as burnout. This would allow for a more compelling case to be made that citizenship fatigue is unique relative to more general forms of job-related fatigue.

Practical Implications

There are some practical implications of this work. First, given that OCB is relatively discretionary behavior, employees who experience citizenship fatigue may be able to cut back on OCB without incurring significant costs. Indeed, when employees engage in less OCBs as a result of citizenship fatigue, it may be difficult or may take time for managers to detect it. Thus, organizations that continually encourage employees to go beyond the call of duty should be aware that while this may work in the short run, employees may eventually deplete the resources needed to achieve both high levels of task performance and OCB. Second, our findings indicate that employers can reduce citizenship fatigue if they provide a supportive environment for employees, encourage the development of high-quality exchange relationships among workers, and reduce the pressure to engage in OCB. Although these ideas are not necessarily new, our findings suggest the level of utility for practices grounded in these ideas may be much higher than previously thought, especially given how important OCB is to organizations that are increasingly dependent on the quality of social interactions.

Conclusion

Contemporary organizations are reliant on employees who are willing to make discretionary contributions intended to benefit coworkers and other employees as well as the organization as a whole. Citizenship behaviors have the capacity to both improve organizational life and facilitate the effective functioning of organizations. As such, OCB has been the subject of considerable research and has garnered the attention of scholars interested in positive organizational behavior. Nevertheless, employees who go the extra mile may experience citizenship fatigue, which can affect the future occurrence of OCB. In an era of scarce resources, further understanding citizenship fatigue is important in order to determine how individuals and organizations might more effectively manage task performance, discretionary contributions, and personal obligations in order to achieve a balance that will allow employees to be good organizational citizens in a way that is sustainable. In this way, organizations can ensure that their workers do not become, as Johnny Winter might have said, "tired of tryin'."

References

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1–18. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management*, 43, 83–104. doi:10.1002/hrm.20004
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587–595. doi:10.2307/255908
- Becker, T. E. (2005). Potential problems in the statistical control of variables in organizational research: A qualitative analysis with recommendations. *Organizational Research Methods*, 8, 274–289. doi:10.1177/1094428105278021
- Bergeron, D. M. (2007). The potential paradox of organizational citizenship behavior: Good citizens at what cost? *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 1078–1095. doi:10.5465/AMR.2007.26585791
- Bergeron, D. M., Shipp, A. J., Rosen, B., & Furst, S. A. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior and career outcomes: The cost of being a

- good citizen. *Journal of Management*, 39, 958–984. doi:10.1177/0149206311407508
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Bliese, P. D. (2000). Within-group agreement, non-independence, and reliability: Implications for data aggregation and analysis. In K. J. Klein & S. W. J. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations: Foundations, extensions, and new directions* (pp. 349–381). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolino, M. C., Harvey, J., & Bachrach, D. G. (2012). A self-regulation approach to understanding citizenship behavior in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 119, 126–139. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2012.05.006
- 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, 542–559. doi:10.1002/job.1847
- Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (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, 740–748. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.740
- 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, 505–522.
- Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., Gilstrap, J. B., & Suazo, M. M. (2010). Citizenship under pressure: What's a “good soldier” to do? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 835–855. doi:10.1002/job.635
- Bride, B. E., & Figley, C. R. (2007). The fatigue of compassionate social workers: An introduction to the special issue on compassion fatigue. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 35, 151–153. doi:10.1007/s10615-007-0093-5
- Brislin, R. W. (1980). Translation and content analysis of oral and written material. In H. C. Triandis & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 349–444). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Burke, M. J., Brief, A. P., & George, J. M. (1993). The role of negative affectivity in understanding relations between self-reports of stressors and strains: A comment on the applied psychology literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 402–412. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.78.3.402
- Carlson, K. D., & Wu, J. (2012). The illusion of statistical control: Control variable practice in management research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 15, 413–435. doi:10.1177/1094428111428817
- Chang, C., Johnson, R. E., & Yang, L. (2007). Emotional strain and organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis and review. *Work & Stress*, 21, 312–332. doi:10.1080/02678370701758124
- Coetzee, S. K., & Klopper, H. C. (2010). Compassion fatigue within nursing practice: A concept analysis. *Nursing & Health Sciences*, 12, 235–243. doi:10.1111/j.1442-2018.2010.00526.x
- 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. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job–demands–resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 499–512. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499
- Dierdorff, E. C., Bell, S. T., & Belohlav, J. B. (2011). The power of “we”: Effects of psychological collectivism on team performance over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 247–262. doi:10.1037/a0020929
- Eatough, E. M., Chang, C. H., Miloslavich, S. A., & Johnson, R. E. (2011). Relationship of role stressors with organizational citizenship behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 619–632. doi:10.1037/a0021887
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500–507. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500
- Eisenberger, R., Aselage, J., Sucharski, I. L., & Jones, J. R. (2004). Perceived organizational support. In J. Coyle-Shapiro, L. Shore, S. Taylor, & L. Tetrick (Eds.), *The employment relationship: Examining psychological and contextual perspectives* (pp. 206–225). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Fineman, S. (2006). On being positive: Concerns and counterpoints. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 270–291. doi:10.5465/AMR.2006.20208680
- Floyd, F. J., & Widaman, K. F. (1995). Factor analysis in the development and refinement of clinical assessment instruments. *Psychological Assessment*, 7, 286–299. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.7.3.286
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variable and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 39–50. doi:10.2307/3151312
- Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 331–362. doi:10.1002/job.322
- Gilboa, S., Shirom, A., Fried, Y., & Cooper, C. (2008). A meta-analysis of work demand stressors and job performance: Examining main and moderating effects. *Personnel Psychology*, 61, 227–271. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00113.x
- Grant, A. M. (2007). Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 393–417. doi:10.5465/AMR.2007.24351328
- Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Buckley, M. R. (2004). Burnout in organizational life. *Journal of Management*, 30, 859–879. doi:10.1016/j.jm.2004.06.004
- Halbesleben, J. R. B., Harvey, J., & Bolino, M. C. (2009). Too engaged? A conservation of resources view of the relationship between work engagement and work interference with family. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 1452–1465. doi:10.1037/a0017595
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1994). Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5, 1–22. doi:10.1207/s15327965pli0501_1
- Hinkin, T. R., & Tracey, J. B. (1999). An analysis of variance approach to content validation. *Organizational Research Methods*, 2, 175–186. doi:10.1177/109442819922004
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44, 513–524. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1998). *Stress, culture, and community: The psychology and philosophy of stress*. New York, NY: Hemisphere. doi:10.1007/978-1-4899-0115-6
- Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50, 337–421. doi:10.1111/1464-0597.00062
- Hunter, L. W., & Thatcher, S. M. B. (2007). Feeling the heat: Effects of stress, commitment, and job experience on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 953–968. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2007.26279227
- Kamdar, D., & Van Dyne, L. (2007). The joint effects of personality and workplace social exchange relationships in predicting task performance and citizenship performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1286–1298. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.5.1286
- Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Bolger, N. (1998). Data analysis in social exchange. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 233–265). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Kinnick, K. N., Krugman, D. M., & Cameron, G. T. (1996). Compassion fatigue: Communication and burnout toward social problems. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 73, 687–707. doi:10.1177/107769909607300314
- Klein, K. J., Bliese, P. D., Kozlowski, S. W., Dansereau, F., Gavin, M. B., Griffin, M. A., . . . Bligh, M. C. (2000). Multilevel analytical techniques: Commonalities, differences, and continuing questions. In K. J. Klein & S. W. J. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations: Foundations, extensions, and new directions* (pp. 512–553). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- LeBreton, J. M., & Senter, J. L. (2008). Answers to 20 questions about interrater reliability and interrater agreement. *Organizational Research Methods, 11*, 815–852. doi:10.1177/1094428106296642
- Little, T. D., Rhemtulla, M., Gibson, K., & Schoemann, A. M. (2013). Why the items versus parcels controversy needn't be one. *Psychological Methods, 18*, 285–300. doi:10.1037/a0033266
- Lynch, P. D., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (1999). Perceived organizational support: Inferior-versus-superior performance by wary employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 467–483. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.84.4.467
- Marsh, H. W., Lüdtke, O., Nagengast, B., Morin, A. J. S., & von Davier, M. (2013). Why item parcels are (almost) never appropriate: Two wrongs do not make a right—Camouflaging misspecification with item parcels in CFA models. *Psychological Methods, 18*, 257–284. doi:10.1037/a0032773
- Maslach, C. (1982). *Burnout: The cost of caring*. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall.
- Motowidlo, S. J., Packard, J. S., & Manning, M. R. (1986). Occupational stress: Its causes and consequences for job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 618–629. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.71.4.618
- Najjar, N., Davis, L. W., Beck-Coon, K., & Doebbeling, C. C. (2009). Compassion fatigue: A review of the research to date and relevance to cancer-care providers. *Journal of Health Psychology, 14*, 267–277. doi:10.1177/1359105308100211
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance, 10*, 85–97. doi:10.1207/s15327043hup1002_2
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 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*, 122–141. doi:10.1037/a0013079
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). The impact of organizational citizenship behaviors on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance, 10*, 133–151. doi:10.1207/s15327043hup1002_5
- 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*, 668–677. doi:10.1037/a0031733
- Roberts, S. B., Flannely, K. J., Weaver, A. J., & Figley, C. R. (2003). Compassion fatigue among chaplains, clergy, and other respondents after September 11th. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 191*, 756–758. doi:10.1097/01.nmd.0000095129.50042.30
- Rubin, R. S., Dierdorff, E. C., & Bachrach, D. G. (2013). Boundaries of citizenship behavior: Curvilinearity and context in the citizenship and task performance relationship. *Personnel Psychology, 66*, 377–406. doi:10.1111/peps.12018
- Schaubroeck, J., Cotton, J. L., & Jennings, K. R. (1989). Antecedents and consequences of role stress: A covariance structure analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 10*, 35–58. doi:10.1002/job.4030100104
- Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). The balance of give and take: Toward a social exchange model of burnout. *Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale, 19*, 87–131.
- Schönplflug, W. (1985). Goal-directed behavior as a source of stress: Psychological origins and consequences of inefficiency. In M. Frese & J. Sabini (Eds.), *Goal-directed behavior* (pp. 172–188). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Seers, A. (1989). Team-member exchange quality: A new construct for role-making research. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 43*, 118–135. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(89)90060-5
- Seers, A., Petty, M. M., & Cashman, J. F. (1995). Team-member exchange under team and traditional management. *Group & Organization Management, 20*, 18–38. doi:10.1177/1059601195201003
- Shirom, A., & Melamed, S. (2006). A comparison of the construct validity of two burnout measures in two groups of professionals. *International Journal of Stress Management, 13*, 176–200. doi:10.1037/1072-5245.13.2.176
- Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artifacts in the assessment of counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: Do we know what we think we know? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 781–790. doi:10.1037/a0019477
- Spector, P. E., & Brannick, M. T. (2011). Methodological urban legends: The misuse of statistical control variables. *Organizational Research Methods, 14*, 287–305. doi:10.1177/1094428110369842
- Speier, C., & Frese, M. (1997). Generalized self-efficacy as a mediator and moderator between control and complexity at work and personal initiative: A longitudinal field study in East Germany. *Human Performance, 10*, 171–192. doi:10.1207/s15327043hup1002_7
- Stamm, B. (2002). Measuring compassion satisfaction as well as fatigue: Developmental history of the compassion satisfaction and fatigue test. In C. R. Figley (Ed.), *Treating compassion fatigue* (pp. 107–119). New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge.
- Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & Parks, J. M. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 17, pp. 215–285). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Van Dyne, L., & Ellis, J. B. (2004). Job creep: A reactance theory perspective on organizational citizenship behavior as overfulfillment of obligations. In J. A. M. Coyle-Shapiro, L. M. Shore, M. S. Taylor, & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *The employment relationship: Examining psychological and contextual perspectives* (pp. 181–205). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behavior: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*, 108–119. doi:10.2307/256902
- Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2006). Compulsory citizenship behavior: Theorizing some dark sides of the good soldier syndrome in organizations. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 36*, 77–93. doi:10.1111/j.1468-5914.2006.00297.x
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 1063–1070. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063
- Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Pierce, J. R. (2008). Effects of task performance, helping, voice, and organizational loyalty on performance appraisal ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 125–139. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.125
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17*, 601–617. doi:10.1177/014920639101700305

(Appendices follow)

Appendix A

Results of Content Adequacy Analysis

Item	Citizenship fatigue	Citizenship pressure	Burnout
▪ Because of going the extra mile for my organization, I feel “on edge” about various things. (CF1)	5.31	4.24	3.01
▪ I feel worn out because I go beyond the call of duty for my organization. (CF2)	6.56	3.72	3.56
▪ Doing so much for my organization leaves me mentally or physically exhausted. (CF3)	5.78	3.80	3.55
▪ I often lack energy because I go beyond my job duties at work. (CF4)	6.21	3.54	3.37
▪ I am tired of going beyond the call of duty for my organization. (CF5)	6.36	3.91	3.66
▪ Volunteering to take on extra tasks and assignments at work has left me feeling drained. (CF6)	5.75	4.00	4.38
▪ I am getting tired of being a team player in my organization. (CF7) ^a	4.28	3.82	4.13
▪ I feel a lot of pressure to go the extra mile by doing a lot of things that, technically, I don’t have to do. (CP1)	4.83	6.29	2.53
▪ In this organization, the people who are seen as “team players” are the ones who do significantly more than what is technically required of them. (CP2)	3.48	5.72	1.85
▪ There is a lot of pressure to take on additional responsibilities and volunteer for extra assignments in this organization. (CP3)	3.87	6.42	2.30
▪ Simply doing your formally-prescribed job duties is not enough to be seen as a good employee in this organization. (CP4)	3.72	5.52	1.91
▪ My coworkers often go “above and beyond” the call of duty, and there is a lot of pressure for me to do so as well. (CP5)	3.64	6.44	2.38
▪ Management expects employees to “voluntarily” take on extra duties and responsibilities that aren’t technically required as a part of their job. (CP6)	3.83	5.95	1.86
▪ Just doing your job these days is not enough—there is a lot of pressure to go above and beyond the bare minimum. (CP7)	3.80	6.40	2.15
▪ I feel a lot of pressure to work beyond my formally-prescribed duties for the good of the organization. (CP8)	4.60	6.21	2.47
▪ I feel tired. (BO1)	3.36	1.93	5.44
▪ I have no energy for going to work in the morning. (BO2)	2.63	1.79	5.21
▪ I feel physically drained. (BO3)	2.92	1.70	6.04
▪ I feel fed up. (BO4)	2.90	2.08	4.99
▪ I feel like my “batteries” are “dead.” (BO5)	2.59	1.78	6.06
▪ I feel burned out. (BO6)	3.10	1.93	6.40
▪ My thinking process is slow. (BO7)	2.46	1.94	5.10
▪ I have difficulty concentrating. (BO8)	2.72	1.88	5.56
▪ I feel I’m not thinking clearly. (BO9)	2.45	1.87	5.71
▪ I feel I’m not focused in my thinking. (BO10)	2.48	1.85	5.49
▪ I have difficulty thinking about complex things. (BO11)	2.50	1.98	5.56
▪ I feel I am unable to be sensitive to the needs of coworkers and customers. (BO12)	3.02	2.06	5.29
▪ I feel I am not capable of investing emotionally in coworkers and customers. (BO13)	3.03	2.38	5.15
▪ I feel I am not capable of being sympathetic to coworkers and customers. (BO14)	2.83	2.33	5.05

Note. Responses were made on a scale ranging from 1 (*not at all consistent*) to 7 (*completely consistent*). Boldface type denotes a significantly higher ($p < .05$) mean score. CF = citizenship fatigue; CP = citizenship pressure; BO = burnout.

^aThis item was dropped.

(Appendices continue)

Appendix B

Findings Using Specific Types of Citizenship Behavior

Our theory and hypotheses focused on OCB as a global construct; accordingly, we used a composite measure of OCB in our analyses. Although it is possible that citizenship fatigue may be associated with more fatiguing types of OCBs, we do not have measures of citizenship fatigue that assess how tired employees are of engaging in helping, voice, and individual initiative. Nevertheless, in the supplemental analyses described in this section, we sought to determine the nature of the relationship between specific types of OCB and citizenship fatigue; likewise, we examined the effects of citizenship fatigue on specific types of OCB at a later time.

As reported in Table B1, we found that when helping is used instead of OCB, the moderating effects of TMX and citizenship pressure were still statistically significant ($\beta = -.11$ and $\beta = .13$, both $p < .05$); however, the interaction between helping and POS was not ($\beta = -.07$, $p > .05$). As shown in Figures B1 and B2, a plot of these interactions revealed a pattern that was very similar to the pattern found with the composite measure of OCB. Specifically, in Figure B1, when TMX is high, the relationship between helping and citizenship fatigue is negative ($\beta = -.52$, $p < .05$); however, when TMX is low, the relationship is not significant. Figure B2 shows that when citizenship pressure is low, helping is negatively related to citizenship fatigue ($\beta = -.39$, $p < .05$). When citizenship pressure is high, the slope is positive, but not significant.

With regard to voice, none of the interactions were significant ($\beta = -.04$, $-.07$, and $.05$, all $p > .05$). However, as shown in Table B2, with regard to individual initiative, all three of the interactions were significant ($\beta = -.13$, $-.11$, and $.16$, all $p < .05$); again, plots of the interactions, shown in Figures B3–B5, revealed a pattern of results that is quite similar to the patterns that were found when a composite measure of OCB was used. Specifically, in Figure B3, when POS is low, the relationship between individual initiative

and citizenship fatigue is positive ($\beta = .38$, $p < .05$); however, this relationship is not significant when POS is high. Although the interaction between TMX and individual initiative shown in Figure B4 is significant, and the slopes are in the expected direction, neither slope is statistically significant. Finally, as expected, Figure B5 shows that the relationship between individual initiative and citizenship fatigue is positive when citizenship pressure is high ($\beta = .37$, $p < .05$), and it is negative when citizenship pressure is low ($\beta = -.27$, $p < .05$).

In terms of the effects of citizenship fatigue on the occurrence of OCB in the future, consistent with what we found using the composite measure of OCB, citizenship fatigue at Time 2 was negatively related to Time 3 helping and voice, and the effect on individual initiative was marginally significant ($p < .10$). Tables B3 through B5 summarize these findings for helping, voice, and individual initiative, respectively.

Taken together, our findings regarding the interactive effects of OCB and POS/TMX/citizenship pressure and citizenship fatigue seem most relevant with regard to individual initiative and helping and less relevant with regard to voice. However, with respect to the occurrence of future OCBs, citizenship fatigue had its strongest effects on voice, helping, and individual initiative in that order. Generally speaking, though, the findings using specific dimensions of OCB were somewhat less supportive of our hypotheses. This is not too surprising given that our measure of citizenship fatigue is broad and general. As noted earlier, then, it may be worthwhile to explore the relationship between specific dimensions of OCB and fatigue that is specifically associated with performing such OCBs. For instance, one could determine when employees are more or less likely to feel tired of helping out others, volunteering to take on additional assignments, coming up with new ways of doing things, and so forth.

(Appendices continue)

Table B1

Moderating Effect of POS, TMX, and CP on the Relationship Between Helping and Citizenship Fatigue

Variable	Dependent variable: Citizenship fatigue–Time 3							
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3a	Step 3b	Step 3c	Step 4a	Step 4b	Step 4c
Control variable								
Age	−0.17**	−0.16**	−0.19**	−0.18**	−0.15**	−0.20**	−0.17**	−0.17**
Negative affect	0.34***	0.34***	0.24***	0.30***	0.21***	0.25***	0.30***	0.20***
Hours worked per week	0.09	0.09	0.06	0.08	0.04	0.06	0.09	0.02
Research performance	−0.08	−0.08	−0.09	−0.09	−0.04	−0.09	−0.09	−0.05
Independent variable								
Helping–Time 2		−0.06	−0.01	−0.02	−0.05	−0.02	−0.06	−0.06
Moderators								
POS			−0.32***			−0.30***		
TMX				−0.18**			−0.17**	
CP					0.38***			0.36**
Interaction effects								
Helping × POS						−0.07		
Helping × TMX							−0.11*	
Helping × CP								0.13*
Model <i>F</i>	14.34***	11.70***	15.87***	11.63***	18.69***	13.90***	10.57***	17.20***
<i>R</i> ²	.18	.19	.27	.22	.31	.28	.23	.32
Adj <i>R</i> ²	.17	.17	.26	.20	.29	.26	.21	.31
Δ Adj <i>R</i> ²		.00	.09***	.03**	.12***	.01	.01*	.02*

Note. $n = 273$. Standardized regression coefficients are reported. POS = perceived organizational support; TMX = team-member exchange; CP = citizenship pressure; Adj = adjusted.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed tests.




Figure B1. Interaction effect of helping behavior and team-member exchange (TMX) on citizenship fatigue.




Figure B2. Interaction effect of helping behavior and citizenship pressure (CP) on citizenship fatigue.

(Appendices continue)

Table B2
Moderating Effect of POS, TMX, and CP on the Relationship Between Individual Initiative and Citizenship Fatigue

Variable	Dependent variable: Citizenship fatigue–Time 3							
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3b	Step 3c	Step 3d	Step 4b	Step 4c	Step 4d
Control variables								
Age	−0.17**	−0.17**	−0.19**	−0.18**	−0.15**	−0.19**	−0.17**	−0.17**
Negative affect	0.34***	0.35***	0.24***	0.30***	0.23***	0.24***	0.30***	0.21***
Hours worked per week	0.09	0.10	0.06	0.07	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.01
Research performance	−0.08	−0.10	−0.10†	−0.11†	−0.05	−0.11*	−0.10†	−0.08
Independent variable								
Individual initiative–Time 2		−0.03	0.01	0.03	−0.04	−0.05	0.01	−0.04
Moderators								
POS			−0.33***			−0.30***		
TMX				−0.19**			−0.18**	
CP					0.38***			0.34***
Interaction effects								
Individual initiative × POS						−0.13*		
Individual initiative × TMX							−0.11*	
Individual initiative × CP								0.16**
Model <i>F</i>	14.34***	11.63***	16.34***	11.70***	18.37***	15.04***	10.67***	17.33***
<i>R</i> ²	.18	.19	.28	.22	.31	.30	.23	.33
Adj <i>R</i> ²	.17	.17	.27	.20	.29	.28	.21	.31
ΔAdj <i>R</i> ²		.00	.09***	.03**	.12***	.02*	.01*	.02**

Note. *n* = 273. Standardized regression coefficients are reported. POS = perceived organizational support; TMX = team-member exchange; CP = citizenship pressure; Adj = adjusted.

† *p* < .10. * *p* < .05. ** *p* < .01. *** *p* < .001, two-tailed tests.




Figure B3. Interaction effect of individual initiative and perceived organizational support (POS) on citizenship fatigue.




Figure B4. Interaction effect of individual initiative and team-member exchange (TMX) on citizenship fatigue.

(Appendices continue)




Figure B5. Interaction effect of individual initiative and citizenship pressure (CP) on citizenship fatigue.

Table B3
Results of Regression Analysis Predicting Helping

Variable	Dependent variable: Helping–Time 3		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Control variables			
Helping–Time 2		0.49***	0.49***
Hours worked per week		0.05	0.05
Affective commitment			0.03
Research performance			0.02
Independent variable			
Citizenship fatigue–Time 2	–0.15**	–0.12*	–0.11*
Model <i>F</i>	6.26*	32.96***	19.71***
<i>R</i> ²	.02	.28	.28
Adj <i>R</i> ²	.02	.27	.27
Δ Adj <i>R</i> ²		.25***	.26***

Note. *n* = 260. Standardized regression coefficients are reported.
* *p* < .05. ** *p* < .01. *** *p* < .001, one-tailed tests.

Table B4
Results of Regression Analysis Predicting Voice

Variable	Dependent variable: Voice–Time 3		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Control variables			
Voice–Time 2		0.44***	0.44***
Hours worked per week		–0.01	–0.01
Affective commitment			0.00
Research performance			–0.03
Independent variable			
Citizenship fatigue–Time 2	–0.20**	–0.16**	–0.17**
Model <i>F</i>	10.27*	26.23***	15.68***
<i>R</i> ²	.04	.24	.24
Adj <i>R</i> ²	.03	.23	.22
Δ Adj <i>R</i> ²		.19***	.19***

Note. *n* = 260. Standardized regression coefficients are reported.
* *p* < .05. ** *p* < .01. *** *p* < .001, one-tailed tests.

Table B5
Results of Regression Analysis Predicting Individual Initiative

Variable	Dependent variable: Individual initiative–Time 3		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Control variables			
Individual initiative–Time 2		0.43***	0.43***
Hours worked per week		0.16**	0.15**
Affective commitment			0.01
Research performance			0.04
Independent variable			
Citizenship fatigue–Time 2	–0.04	–0.08 [†]	–0.07 [†]
Model <i>F</i>	0.46	25.48***	15.27***
<i>R</i> ²	.00	.24	.24
Adj <i>R</i> ²	.00	.23	.22
Δ Adj <i>R</i> ²		.23***	.22***

^a *n* = 260. Standardized regression coefficients are reported. Adj = adjusted.

[†] *p* < .10. ** *p* < .01. *** *p* < .001, one-tailed tests.

Received May 7, 2013
Revision received June 11, 2014
Accepted June 24, 2014 ■