Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Proposal for a New Dimension in Counsellor Education

Frances A. Owen
Salvatore J. Pappalardo
Niagara University
Carol A. Sales
Brock University

ABSTRACT

To survive in rapidly changing schools and human service organizations, counsellors must not only be competent clinicians, they must also be able to respond to a variety of informal work expectations. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) is introduced from the organizational behaviour literature as a factor that contributes to the performance ratings of counsellors. Models of OCB are described and factors that encourage OCB are reviewed. A methodology for integrating OCB sensitization training into counsellor education programs is suggested as a means to prepare counselling interns for success as professional colleagues and employees.

RÉSUMÉ

Pour survivre dans les milieux en constante évolution des écoles et des services sociaux, il ne suffit plus pour les conseillers d'être des cliniciens compétents. Ils doivent également être en mesure de répondre à des attentes diverses non structurées concernant le travail. Le comportement Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) [Comportement organisationnel et civique] provient de la documentation sur le comportement organisationnel et est présenté comme un facteur contribuant aux évaluations d'efficacité des conseillers. Cet article décrit des modèles de l'OCB de même qu'il étudie les facteurs encourageant le comportement OCB. Il suggère également une méthodologie pour intégrer aux programmes d'éducation en counseling, une formation de sensibilisation à l'OCB, ceci afin de former avec succès les futurs collègues et employés professionnels qui sont les stagiaires en counseling.

Many practicing counsellors can think of a few colleagues past and present who, despite good clinical skills, receive little respect from co-workers and supervisors in their schools, and counselling organizations including group practices, university counselling services, mental health or community agencies. As colleagues, these are the people who insist on leaving work precisely at the scheduled

Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the Annual Conference of the North Atlantic Regional Association of Counselor Educators and Supervisors in September 1997 and the Annual Conference of the New York State School Counselors Association in March 1999.

The authors wish to thank the reviewers of an earlier version of this article for their insights and very helpful suggestions.

quitting time every day, who complain chronically without suggesting constructive solutions to organizational problems, who refuse to share resources or who see only the minimum number of clients specified for their job. These counsellors may have received high grades in their course work at graduate school and their specific clinical skills may be highly regarded but, despite these strengths, they are passed over for promotion or receive mediocre performance reviews at best. While they cannot be faulted on the basis of failure to live up to the specifications of their job, these counsellors view their role from a "minimalist" perspective and can be relied on for only the basics. The poor fit between the informal expectations held by the work group and the performance of these "minimalist" counsellors may result in frustration and resentment on both sides. Few counsellors, however, are trained in the skills necessary to analyze and rectify this issue of poor fit between the individual and the informal demands of the job and of the organization.

While a number of issues may contribute to this person-organization fit problem, one key factor may well be the counsellor's lack of sensitivity to those tacit behaviours that are strongly valued by more experienced professionals in their counselling organization. Dennis Organ, a pioneer in investigating Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB), defines this concept as ". . . an essential condition of organization . . . " that reflects ". . . a willingness [of] participants to 'go beyond what is required' " (Organ as cited in Staw & Cummings, 1990, p. 43). In contrast to the minimalist approach described above, good organizational citizens engage in behaviours beyond the basics such as volunteering to help out at a fund-raising event or accepting an extra intake. These are behaviours that are clearly not part of the job description but do reflect a willingness to contribute to the organization and its members.

To survive in professional settings and, more than this, to receive positive performance ratings, new counselling graduates need to have an understanding of the informal as well as the formal behavioural expectations that their supervisors and colleagues will have of them as individuals and as members of professional teams. Counselling Practicum and Internship courses typically focus primarily on the development of clinical skills. As directed in the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) Standards (1994), however, these courses should also introduce counselling students to the contextual dimensions of the profession. In this regard, Practicum and Internship texts (Alle-Corliss & Alle-Corliss, 1998; Baird, 1996; Faiver, Eisengart, & Colonna, 1995; Boylan, Malley, & Scott , 1995) usually include a section that addresses some organizational issues, particularly those related to the relationship between the supervisor and the intern. They may also include a discussion of formal versus informal organizational processes and challenges in professional relationships. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, however, is not typically included in these discussions.

A particular professional relationship challenge facing counsellors, especially those working in school settings, is the increasing pressure to be effective team members (Guerra, 1998; Talley & Short, 1996). Since Organizational Citizenship Behaviours have been shown to improve performance in work groups

(Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997), counsellors who engage in these behaviours may be especially valued team members.

Counsellors should be made aware of the fact that, while prescribed behaviour is specified in the job description, the informal behaviour that is valued by an organization, the behaviour that marks new counsellors as good "organizational citizens," is usually not made explicit. Nevertheless, counselling organizations and schools expect counsellors not only to be competent clinicians, but also to be good organizational citizens. For counsellor educators concerned about preparing counsellors for success in the field it is important to sensitize counselling students to organizational factors such as Organizational Citizenship Behaviour that, while not directly clinical in nature, may have a significant impact on their performance ratings as counsellors working in various professional settings.

THE NATURE OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour has been variously described and examined since the 1930s when Chester Barnard introduced to the organizational behaviour literature the importance of an employee's "willingness to cooperate" (Organ as cited in Staw & Cummings, 1990). Barnard believed that ". . . the *willingness* of persons to contribute efforts to the cooperative system is indispensable" (Organ in Staw & Cummings, 1990, p. 44). Barnard's concept was revisited in the 1960s and 1970s by Katz and Kahn who ". . . distinguished between in-role and 'innovative and spontaneous behavior'" (Organ in Staw & Cummings, 1990, p. 45). It was their contention that organizations cannot function solely on the strength of prescribed behaviours such as those explicitly stated in job descriptions. Instead, Katz and Kahn argued that organizations also elicit:

> 'Performance beyond role requirements for accomplishments of organizational functions.' This last category includes cooperative activities with fellow members, actions protective of the system, original ideas for improvement of the system, self-training for additional contributions, and actions that promote a favorable climate for the organization in the external environment. (Organ, 1988, p. 21).

Despite their critical importance to organizational survival, these behaviours tend to be taken for granted since, taken individually, they are often small and are not recognized directly in job descriptions (Organ, 1988).

The apparent invisibility of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour belies its importance. Since the pioneering work of Katz and Kahn, and Organ, there has been a growing focus in the organizational behaviour literature on OCB. Skarlicki and Latham (1995) discussed the notion that OCB is comprised of two dimensions. The first, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour that is of benefit to the whole organization (OCBO), would include activities such as developing a new intake form to collect data necessary for the organization's effective functioning. The other type of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour focuses on individual members of an organization (OCBI). OCBIs are characterized by altruism or helping a coworker such as assisting a colleague who has a client in crisis or offering to take over clients from a colleague who is ill.

Lamertz (1998) also conceived of OCBs from a two-factor perspective and saw these as reflections of the two role-systems that are present in most organizations. The first of these systems is based on instrumental working relations while the second is rooted in affective social relations. The instrumental role system is based on formal work roles and is focused on task accomplishment, while the affective role system is rooted in friendship and interactions that meet the social needs of organization members. Lamertz emphasized that OCB must be seen not simply as extra role behaviour but, instead, as behaviour that occurs in a social context. Further, he found that people who work in a context which includes a high frequency of interaction with others exhibited a higher rate of OCBs than those involved in jobs that were more socially isolated. Specifically, OCBs that are directed toward the organization are more likely to occur when an individual is involved in a network of instrumental relations. Similarly, exchange among individuals is more likely to occur in the context of a network of affective relations (Lamertz, 1998). Given the high rate of social interaction of both an instrumental and affective nature in which counsellors engage, one would expect that members of this profession would exhibit a higher rate of OCBs than would members of other more instrumentally and socially isolated professions.

ORGAN'S MODEL OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Of all the various descriptions of OCB (Schnake,1991), the model that appears to have gained ascendance in the literature is Organ's five dimensional approach to organizational citizenship (Organ, 1988; Organ and Ryan, 1995; Schnake, Cochran, & Dumler, 1995). The five dimensions outlined in this model are altruism, conscientiousness, team spirit (or "sportsmanship"), courtesy and civic virtue.

Firstly, altruism is closely related to the concept of OCBI. In this model, altruism refers to discretionary behaviours that help colleagues to accomplish work-related tasks, such as volunteering to help a colleague who is overloaded or has fallen behind due to a client emergency. In a field as unpredictable as counselling, altruism would seem to be especially important. Few counsellors can rely on their day proceeding in exactly the manner they planned. With unpredictable demands, such as emergency calls, it is often impossible to meet client needs without the voluntary cooperation of colleagues. Absence of altruistic behaviour can have a negative impact on both individuals and work units. For example, a counsellor for a small middle school staff of three counsellors is selected to attend a national conference where they are introduced to the latest techniques used in brief therapy. Upon returning from the conference, the counsellor finds numerous excuses for not sharing this new information with colleagues thus depriving them of the benefit of this material in their practice.

A second dimension in Organ's model is conscientiousness. This refers to an employee's accomplishment of job tasks that goes beyond the minimal requirements of the job. Counsellors who insure that a meeting room is appropriately prepared for a group session or individual session are showing evidence of consci-

entiousness. Conversely, counsellors who fail to leave a play therapy room ready for the next counsellor to use waste their colleagues' time and cause them considerable frustration. Another example of conscientiousness is a school counsellor who recognizes the impact that major changes can have in the community, such as the closing of the largest industrial plant in the area. These changes would affect not only the students but also parents in the community. The counsellor might initiate a series of evening programs designed to help parents to cope with the sudden economic shifts impacting their families.

The third dimension, team spirit, which Organ called "sportsmanship," is defined as the avoidance of negative behaviours such as complaining. This is particularly important in counselling organizations and schools that emphasize professional team work. A single chronic complainer can have a profoundly negative impact on the morale of an entire group. Consider, for example, a counsellor in a large urban high school working with twelve counselling colleagues. This counsellor complains constantly about the lack of coordination of activities and services offered by the counselling department. When a Director of Guidance Services is hired with a mandate to ensure service coordination, this counsellor then begins complaining that the Director's coordination efforts limit their ability to be creative in service delivery.

Fourth, courtesy suggests the demonstration of good social skills and a sensitivity to the concerns of others by giving colleagues advance notice and sharing information. For example, a counsellor who becomes aware of important changes in legislation that impact a colleague's practice is demonstrating courtesy by sharing that information. Similarly, counsellors who share articles and books on topics of professional interest to their colleagues strengthen the shared work of the agency. On the other hand, an absence of courtesy can jeopardize both the individuals and their colleagues. For example, a counsellor working with a team of two colleagues agrees to prepare a portion of a presentation for parents on the topic of university financing and admissions. The day of the presentation the counsellor arranges for a personal day off work, neglecting to either tell their colleagues about the change in schedule or giving them the portion of the presentation for which they was responsible.

Lastly, the fifth factor in Organ's model, civic virtue, reflects a person's participation in the organization's political activities, such as offering ideas at staff meetings for the improvement of organizational functioning. Political behaviour in organizations is often a source of frustration for professionals in the field and can create confusion for new counsellors. It is important that counsellors discuss with their supervisors the level of participation in activities such as committees or special projects that is to be expected from someone in their position. In counselling organizations and schools, civic virtue can be a double-edged sword. If a new counsellor participates too enthusiastically the impression can be created that this person is not respectful of those who are more senior in the organization or simply does not know their place. For example, a new counsellor in a four-person counselling department decides that the best road to success is to volunteer for

any and all committees which need members. Soon thereafter, however, they discover that membership on certain committees is prized but traditionally reserved for senior staff members and their senior colleagues are not impressed with someone usurping their position. On the other hand, a new counsellor who never volunteers to help out may be seen as disinterested in the work of the organization.

An understanding of this five-factor model can sensitize new counsellors to the informal expectations that their supervisors and colleagues may have of them. It also gives them a cognitive frame to help them understand the possible roots of conflicts they may encounter in the work setting.

MOTIVATION FOR ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

The motivation underlying the performance of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour has been the subject of considerable speculation. To some, OCB may be seen as ingratiation. Bolino (1999) pointed out that there has been recognition in the OCB literature of the possibility that impression-management may be a motivating factor for such behaviours. However, as Schnake (1991) points out, while some may feel the question of motivation is irrelevant, others emphasize that there is an important difference between the prosocial behaviours of OCB and political behaviour undertaken solely for the purpose of obtaining social or material reward. The distinction between these two types of behaviours is important. In proposing that counsellors be sensitized to OCB as an important factor in how organizations operate, it is not suggested that they be prompted to engage in insincere and self-aggrandizing behaviour. Rather, it is important that, through their counsellor training, they be made aware of the impact on organizational functioning of behaviours in which they engage voluntarily.

Recent investigations into the relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and the perception of political behaviour in organizations have produced interesting findings. In his work on impression-management and OCBs, Bolino (1999) suggested that people are more likely to engage in OCBs as organizational politics increase since image enhancement may be more important in highly politicized environments in which performance appraisal and promotion decisions may become more subjective. Maslyn and Fedor (1998) examined the difference in the impact of politics at a work-group level and at an organizational-level. These researchers were interested in exploring previous findings (Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, & Toth, as cited in Maslyn & Fedor, 1998) that had suggested no significant relationship between organizational-level politics and organizational citizenship. Referring to Hirshman's work, Maslyn and Fedor (1998) hypothesized that increased rates of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour may relate to politics at the smaller work-group, rather than the organization-wide level, and may be associated with attempts to improve negative conditions. Their results confirmed this hypothesis. While perceptions of politics at an organizational-level did not predict OCB, citizenship behaviours did appear to be used in response to perceptions of group-level politics. Their

function at the group level may be to bring peace to troubled situations (Maslyn & Fedor, 1998).

The personal and organizational factors that contribute to the performance of Organizational Citizenship Behaviours are complex. From the perspective of social-exchange theory, it is not surprising that there appears to be a quid pro quo relationship between the individual and the organization that relates to the production of OCBs. If a person is happy with their job (Organ & Ryan, 1995) and assesses their treatment by the organization to be equitable (Organ & Konovsky, 1989), the likelihood that they will engage in OCBs increases. While there is some evidence that people may engage in OCBs out of a sense of professionalism rather than as a response to other factors (Van Dyne & Ang, 1998), there is other evidence that shows that employees who have a trusting and respectful relationship with their supervisor show higher rates of OCB (Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996) as do employees who believe that their supervisor is treating them fairly (Moorman, 1991).

There has been some effort to examine possible personality correlates of OCB. The focus of this work has tended to be on the relationship between personality dimensions and job satisfaction which has been shown to be related to OCB. The work of Organ and Lingl (1995) supports the connection between personality and job satisfaction suggesting that a person's level of agreeableness may relate positively to job satisfaction. Interestingly, level of conscientiousness was negatively related to satisfaction, perhaps reflecting the frustration that conscientious people may feel with coworkers who do not live up to their very high expectations, but positively related to compliance. However, the literature linking various personality dimensions to OCB is not conclusive (Organ as cited in Staw & Cummings, 1990; Hui, Organ, & Crooker, 1994).

While there is little reference in the literature to methodologies for direct training in OCBs and, in fact, the notion may be controversial given their voluntary nature, there has been some work in the area of training supervisors in methods to encourage OCBs in others. Skarlicki and Latham (1996) found that "... training that increases the skills of the leaders in applying the principles of organizational justice increases citizenship behavior on the part of an organization's members" (Skarlicki & Latham, 1996, pp. 165-166.). Moorman, Blakely and Niehoff (1998) have suggested that certain facets of organizational justice contribute to organization members feeling a sense of organizational support and it is this perception of support, rather than the justice itself that prompts citizenship behaviours.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP AND PERFORMANCE RATINGS

By definition (Organ, 1988) Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is not directly compensated by an organization. Prescribed behaviours, even if performed in an outstanding manner, are not OCBs. As Organ emphasizes, it is impossible

and, perhaps self-defeating, to try to assess OCB directly since one can never adequately account for every type of OCB that could ever be performed. Nevertheless, ". . . a person demonstrating OCB may certainly hope that in some ill-defined manner, the behavior will eventually bring some returns, but not in any point-for point, one-to-one correspondence as promised by written or verbal guarantees" (Organ , 1988, p. 5).

A counsellor attempting to fit into a new organizational setting may engage in OCBs in the belief that these will impact on their performance report despite the fact that the formal performance appraisal system focuses on prescribed behaviours. This hope may be quite realistic. While OCB will seldom be made explicit in the performance review system, there is a growing body of literature that supports the contention that a relationship does in fact exist between OCB and the perceptions of supervisors and peers concerning the performance of groups and of individuals (Skarlicki & Latham, 1995; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998; Allen, 1998). Further support for this relationship is found in Organ and Ryan's (1995) meta-analytic review. These authors confirm the positive relationship between OCB and performance and also point out that ". . . job descriptions for higher level positions are more open-ended and make it more difficult to distinguish between in-role performance and OCB" (Organ & Ryan, 1995, p. 791). This may well be the case for counsellors whose roles, depending on the setting in which they are working, may be loosely defined and require considerable flexibility. Thus, although OCB may not be listed on a performance review form, it appears that it does influence performance ratings. This relationship underscores the need for new counsellors to be made aware of OCB as a factor that may contribute to judgments being made about their performance.

To understand the link with performance ratings it is important that counsellors avoid a homogenized view of OCB. Behaviour that is valued in one setting may be shunned or regarded as unimportant in another. Thus, the influence of certain types of OCB on performance ratings may vary from organization to organization (Skarlicki & Latham, 1995). For example, in one organization volunteer committee work, while not prescribed in the job description, may be seen as a major contribution to the organization. In another organization volunteer committee work may be seen as inappropriate if it reduces the time the counsellor spends helping colleagues with their work or if it reduces the number of clients they are able to see. An understanding of Organ's OCB model presented earlier in this paper would provide new counsellors with a useful tool with which to analyze the organizational factors at work in these two scenarios.

Since it is clear that there is a subtle but potentially powerful relationship between OCB and performance ratings, it is important that, during their training, counsellor interns be provided with an explanation of the contribution this association can make to their professional lives. New counsellors who have not been sensitized to the importance of OCB during their training may be ill-equipped to deal with such systemic issues in their work environment as have been mentioned.

SENSITIZING COUNSELLING INTERNS TO ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR: THE CHALLENGE FOR COUNSELLOR EDUCATORS

While, as Organ (1988) emphasized, there is no way to articulate every possible OCB in any given setting, it may be reasonable, nevertheless, to help counsellors-in-training become aware of the kinds of extra-role behaviours that may be valued in the wide variety of settings in which they will work.

Discussion of OCBs would seem to be a natural extension of work currently undertaken in internship classes. The kinds of conflicts that poor or nonexistent OCBs tend to promote are familiar topics of discussion in internship classes. Many interns observe conflicts in their placement sites. For students attempting to understand these conflicts, an explanation of Organ's five-factor model of OCB would offer a structured method for analyzing the nature of these problems and would suggest alternative behaviours that would be more constructive. To heighten students' awareness of the issue of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, the following material could be incorporated into an internship course unit.

1. *Overview of the Difference Between Prescribed In-Role Behaviour and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour*

   It would be useful to engage an internship class in discussion of the nature of the difference between expectations outlined in job descriptions and informal role expectations that they have observed during their internship experience. Students may be able to identify experiences in their own life when they, or someone they know, has engaged in extra-role behaviour that benefitted an organization or an individual, and to discuss the impact of this behaviour. Students could be introduced to the growing organizational behaviour literature on OCB. Analysis of real or fictitious cases prepared by the counsellor educator could be included to develop the students' skills in identifying OCB and its role in the organizational system.

2. *Discussion With Field Supervisor*

   In an effort to understand the kinds of OCBs that are valued in their placement settings, students could ask their field supervisors what behaviours, other than clinical skills, differentiate "good" from "bad" counsellors in their particular organization. In addition, supervisors could be asked to describe their "ideal" counselling colleague. With the permission of the field supervisors, these observations could be shared during the internship classes. Using Organ's model, students could be encouraged to identify which kinds of OCB appear to be valued in each site.

3. *Field Observation of OCB*

   During their placements, students could be asked to observe occurrences of OCB among counsellors and counsellor supervisors. Students could be encouraged to identify which of the five OCB factors seem to be prevalent in their placement settings. In class, students placed in different counselling set-

tings would be asked to share with others examples of OCB from their observations. This activity would give interns the opportunity to compare and contrast the implicit expectations of members of different kinds of organizations.

Activities such as those described above would assist students in gaining an understanding of the personal and systemic implications of OCB. Use of Organ's OCB model to analyze the nature of collegial interaction in internship placement sites and, later, their own work settings would assist them in becoming more accepted members of counselling organizations and schools.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

An area of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour research that has received little attention is possibility of gender differences. This is a particularly important topic in a profession such as counselling whose membership includes a large percentage of women. Since there is a body of research evidence that supports the stereotypic expectations of women suggesting that they tend to be more communally oriented and ". . . to manifest behaviors that can be described as socially sensitive, friendly, and concerned with others' welfare, whereas men tend to manifest behaviors that can be described as dominant, controlling and independent" (Eagly, 1995, p. 154), it would seem to be reasonable to assume that women would be likely to exhibit a higher rate of citizenship behaviours that are tied to the affective network identified by Lamertz (1998).

To date, little emphasis has been placed in the research literature on gender as it relates specifically to OCB. There has, however, been some focus on gender in relation to helping behaviour. Unlike the traditional view of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour as exclusively extra-role, helping can include both in-role and extra-role behaviours (Anderson & Williams, 1996) and can include behaviour beyond the work environment. Examinations of gender differences in helping behaviour seem to suggest that while there may not be a major difference between the genders in general rates of helping, the foci of the genders may be different. Baumeister and Sommer (1997), in describing general helping behaviour outside the work context, have suggested that women's helping behaviour tends to be more focused on close relationships whereas men's helping is focused on the broader social group. This view was supported in Eagley and Crowley's meta-analytic review of the literature on gender and helping (Eagley & Crowley, 1986). These authors suggested that gender roles encourage males to engage in helping that is larger and more heroic with both strangers and in close relationships, while females are encouraged to help in more nurturing and caring ways in the context of longer term relationships.

To the extent that helping behaviour and organizational citizenship behaviour may overlap, these results seem to suggest that, if a gender difference in rates of OCB does exist, women may be likely to engage in more affectively based OCBs. However, in the absence of clear data to confirm this assumption and, given the challenges that can face investigators examining gender differences (Eagley,

1995; Hyde & Plant, 1995), this assumption is purely speculative and deserves more rigorous study.

Another area that has received little attention is the relationship between age and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. Given the differences in work-related attitude held by members of various generations (Foot & Stoffman, 1996; Barnard, Cosgrave, & Welsh, 1998), it would seem reasonable to expect that these differences also would be reflected in Organizational Citizenship Behaviours. In school counselling, such an investigation may have particular relevance in those provinces that have instituted early retirement programs in education resulting, in some instances, in a dramatic downward age shift in the age of practicing counsellors.

Of interest to counsellors coping with increasing demand for service concurrent with typically decreasing funding and resources is the apparent link between OCB and time pressure. Hui, Organ and Crooker (1994) found that time pressure tended to depress the quality of OCB. This area would merit further investigation in the counselling profession in the face of escalating performance pressure.

In an examination of the role of the school counsellor as systems change agent, Napierkowski and Parsons (1995) discussed the creative use of power to influence a school system to change its perception of the role of the counsellor. Included in their discussion was an emphasis on the need for the counsellors to ensure that they are seen as valuable to members of their organizations. While it is important to differentiate between ingratiation and OCB, given the link between OCBs and performance appraisals, it would be interesting to examine whether the more influential counsellors in a school system were, in fact, those who also evidenced high levels of OCBs.

Organ's model offers a potential new tool for understanding the kinds of expectations that organizations may have concerning the informal behaviour that contributes to positive performance appraisals. While this model is useful as a starting point, new counsellors still need to interpret it in light of their own unique work context. In his extensive review of the OCB literature, Schnake (1991) emphasized the need for the development of a list of citizenship behaviours specific to each occupation. A clear direction for future research in OCBs and counsellors is the clarification of the specific nature of the OCB that is valued in counselling services. This kind of investigation would provide counselling interns and new graduates with more specific information about the variety of behavioural expectations they may face as they enter the workforce. While various measures of OCB exist (Smith, Organ, & Near as cited in Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter as cited in Organ & Lingl, 1995), none focus on issues specific to the counselling profession. Development of an inventory of behavioural expectations of counsellors would pave the way for the development of a counselling OCB questionnaire which would provide valuable data for the profession. Once the specific nature of OCB in the counselling context has been identified, it will be important to examine the link

between this counselling-specific OCB and performance ratings. In addition, such a counselling OCB measure would allow for follow-up evaluation of the suggested OCB sensitization program on the occurrence of OCB in internship settings and in the workplace.

References

Alle-Corliss, L. & Alle-Corliss, R. (1998). *Human Service Agencies: An Orientation to Fieldwork.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Allen, T. (1998). The effects of organizational citizenship behavior on performance judgments: A field study and a laboratory study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 247-260.

Anderson, S. E., & Williams, L. J. (1996). Interpersonal, job, and individual factors related to helping processes at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 282-296.

Baird, B. N. (1996). *The Internship, Practicum, and Field Placement Handbook? A Guide for the Helping Professions.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall .

Barnard, R., Cosgrave, D., & Welsh, J. (1998). *Chips & Pop: Decoding the Nexus Generation.* Toronto: Malcolm Lester Books.

Baumeister, R. F. & Sommer, K. L. (1997). What do men want? Gender differences and two spheres of belongingness: Comment on Cross and Madsen (1997). *Psychological Bulletin, 122*, 38-44.

Bolino, M. C. (1999). Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors? *The Academy of Management Review, 24*, 82-98.

Boylan, J. C., Malley, P. B., & Scott, J. (1995). *Practicum & Internship: Textbook for Counseling and Psychotherapy* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Accelerated Development.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (1994) *CACREP Accreditation Standards.* Alexandria, VA. Available:http://www.counseling.org/cacrep/cacrep_standards.htm

Eagly, A. H. (1995). The science and politics of comparing women and men. *American Psychologist, 50*, 145-158.

Eagley, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature (Abstract). *Psychological Bulletin, 100*, 282-308.

Faiver, C., Eisengart, S., & Colonna, R. (1995). *The Counselor Interns Handbook.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Foot, D. K., & Stoffman, D. (1996). *Boom, Bust & Echo: How to Profit from the Coming Demographic Shift.* Toronto: Mcfarlane Walter & Ross.

Guerra, P. (1998). Revamping school counselor education: The DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund. *CTOnline*, Available: http://www.counseling.org/ctonline/archives/ct0298/revamping.htm

Hui, C., Organ, D. W., & Crooker, K. (1994). Time pressure, type A syndrome, and organizational citizenship behavior: A laboratory experiment. *Psychological Reports, 75*, 199-208.

Hyde, J. S., & Plant, E. A. (1995). Magnitude of psychological gender differences. *American Psychologist, 50*, 159-161.

Maslyn, J. M., & Fedor, D. B. (1998). Perceptions of politics: Does measuring different foci matter? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 645-653.

Lamertz, K. (1998). The Social Structure of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada: Organizational Behaviour Division, 19*, 5, 64-73.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employees citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 845-855.

Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? *Academy of Management Journal, 41*, 351-357.

Napierkowski, C. M., & Parsons, R. D. (1995). Diffusion of innovation: Implementing changes in school counselor roles and functions. *The School Counselor, 42*, 364-369.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 157-164.

Organ, D. W., & Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology, 135*, 339-350.

Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analysis of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 775-802.

Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 262-270.

Schnake, M. (1991). Organizational citizenship: A review, proposed model, and research agenda, *Human Relations, 44*, 735-759.

Schnake, M., Cochran, D., & Dumler, M. (Summer 1995). Encouraging organizational citizenship: The effects of job satisfaction, perceived equity and leadership, *Journal of Managerial Issues, 7*, 209-221.

Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 219-227.

Skarlicki, D. P., & Latham, G. P. (1995). Performance in a university setting. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 12*, 175-181.

Skarlicki, D. P., & Latham, G. P. (1996). Increasing citizenship behavior within a labor union: A test of organizational justice theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 161-169.

Staw, B. M. & Cummings, L.L. (1990). *Research in Organizational Behavior, 12*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press Inc.

Talley, R. C., & Short, R. J. (1996). Social reforms and the future of school practice: Implications for American psychology. *Professional Psycholoy: Research and Practice, 27*, 5-13.

Van Dyne, L., & Ang, S. (1998). Organizational citizenship behavior of contingent workers in Singapore. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*, 692-703.

Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*, 108-119.

About the Authors

Frances A. Owen is Associate Professor of Education at Niagara University where she teaches in the Counselling Program. She has worked as a psychologist in schools and community service agencies, and has been a supervisor in various human service agencies.

Salvatore J. Pappalardo is Professor of Education at Niagara University where he is Coordinator of the Counselling Program. He has supervised school counselling departments and is former Chair of the Department of Education at Niagara University.

Carol A. Sales is Associate Professor of Human Resources Management in the Department of Management, Marketing and Human Resources Management in the Faculty of Business at Brock University. She has experience as a school counsellor, and as a management consultant for business, industry and the not-for-profit sector.

Address correspondence to Dr. Frances Owen, College of Education, Box 2042, Niagara University, Niagara University, NY 14109. Telephone: 716-286-8548.