The Effects of Work Values, Work-Value Congruence and Work Centrality on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Başak Uçanok

Abstract—The aim of this study is to test the "work values" inventory developed by Tevruz and Turgut and to utilize the concept in a model, which aims to create a greater understanding of the work experience. In the study multiple effects of work values, work-value congruence and work centrality on organizational citizenship behavior are examined. In this respect, it is hypothesized that work values and work-value congruence predict organizational citizenship behavior through work centrality. Work-goal congruence test, Tevruz and Turgut's work values inventory are administered along with Kanungo's work centrality and Podsakoff et al.'s [47] organizational citizenship behavior test to employees working in Turkish SME's. The study validated that Tevruz and Turgut's work values inventory and the work-value congruence test were reliable and could be used for future research. The study revealed the mediating role of work centrality only for the relationship of work values and the responsibility dimension of citizenship behavior. Most important, this study brought in an important concept, work-value congruence, which enables a better understanding of work values and their relation to various attitudinal variables.

Keywords—Work values, work-value congruence, work centrality, organizational citizenship behavior.

I. INTRODUCTION

GAINING a clear understanding of the work experience is important for deciphering the dynamics underlying extra-role behavior and developing organizational strategies. In the pursuit of understanding work related behavior, it is essential to indicate and understand the links between values, attitudes and behavior. This study contributes to relevant literature by investigating the effects of work values, work-goal congruence and work centrality on organizational citizenship behavior. The study mainly posits that the value a person attaches to work itself differs for each person. Therefore, the relationship between work values and organizational citizenship behavior will change according to the importance a person attributes to working. If values are defined as desirable end-states or in other words goals, then, not every goal can be attained solely by the act of "working". While working can fulfill some goals or values in the organizational setting some can be satisfied through other activities. Therefore, the degree of fulfilling one's work goals by the act of working emerges

Author is with the Department of Communication in Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, 34060, Turkey (phone: 90-212-3117540; e-mail: bucanok@bilgi.edu.tr).

as a key question in explaining the relationship between work values and behavior. This concept is defined as work-goal congruence in the context of this study. It is investigated whether those values, which can be attained by the act of working increase, work centrality greater than those values that can also be attained by other actions.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is defined as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization" [42]. By discretionary, it is stressed that the behavior is not an enforceable requirement of the job description [24]. The citizenship behavior is a matter of personal choice, such that its omission is not generally understood as punishable [20].

Socially responsible behaviors in the organization have been labeled as supra-role behaviors [33] and extra-role behaviors. Organizational citizenship behavior has its roots in the work of Katz and Kahn [32], who argued that an important behavior required of employees for the effective functioning of an organization is their undertaking innovative and spontaneous activities beyond the prescribed role requirement. OCB consists of informal contributions that participants can choose to make or withhold, without regard to sanctions or formal incentives.

Organizational citizenship, which is traditionally called "good soldier" syndrome, is on-the-job, work related behavior, not related to the formal organizational reward system, and promotes the effective functioning of the organization [64]. According to Özdevecioğlu [45], well-established relationships between the employee and the organization lie at the heart of excelling extra-role behavior and being a good corporate citizen.

Organ's five-factor conceptualization [42] of OCB has been the foundation of much research on organizational citizenship behavior (see Table I). These factors include altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness and civic virtue. Further research on the dimensionality of organizational citizenship has concluded that the original five dimensions of OCB could be condensed [53], [48]. Recent research has found support for a three-factor model of OCB [52]. In this recent conceptualization, "conscientiousness" is remove and "altruism" and "courtesy" are combined to form a single

"helping dimension" [51], [48] resulting in three factors; "helping behavior", "civic virtue", and "sportsmanship".

TABLE I
DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

Altruism	Voluntary actions that help another person with a work problem—instructing a new hire on how to use equipment, helping a coworker catch up with a backlog of work, fetching materials that a colleague needs and cannot procure on his own.
Civic Virtue	Is responsible, constructive involvement in the political process of the organization, including not just expressing opinions but reading one's mail, attending meetings, and keeping abreast of larger issues involving the organization?
Conscientiousness	Is a pattern of going well beyond minimally required levels of attendance, punctuality, housekeeping, conserving resources, and related matters of internal maintenance?
Sportsmanship	A citizen-like posture of tolerating the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without whining and grievances.
Courtesy	Subsumes all of those foresightful gestures that help someone else prevent a problem—touching base with people before committing to actions that will affect them, providing advance notice to someone who needs to know to schedule work.

The widespread interest in organizational citizenship stems primarily from the belief that these behaviors enhance organizational effectiveness [50]. Because of this, a great deal of research has attempted to identify those subordinate characteristics (conscientiousness, agreeableness, positive and negative affectivity), task characteristics (task scope, task feedback, intrinsically satisfying tasks, etc.), organizational characteristics (formalization, inflexibility, spatial distance, etc.), and/or leader behaviors (leader supportiveness, contingent reward behavior, transformational leadership behaviors, etc.) that encourage employees to exhibit OCB's [49].

Researchers have postulated two basic antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior; (1) work related attitudes and (2) personality [43], [5]. The relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and work related attitudes have stemmed mainly from social exchange theory [41]. Social exchange refers to relationships that entail unspecified future obligations and generates an expectation of some future return for contributions [4]. Blau specifies social exchange to be a voluntary action, which puts a party under obligation to reciprocate a benefit voluntarily rendered by some other party [4]. In order to free oneself from the obligation to reciprocate the return of service received, the person must in turn voluntarily serve the other party's interest. This view is supported by the premise that if employees view the organization as acting in their interests, they should not only experience greater satisfaction, but also return the favor by exhibiting more pro-social organizational behaviors [35].

Prior research (e.g. [36]) indicates that values are strong motivational forces that influence an individual's behavior. Krebs [32] concluded that to some extent, helping others is a function of how deeply one has internalized a norm or conviction that it is a person's duty to provide help when the

costs to the helper are not unreasonable [39]. Because values represent interpretations about socially desirable ways to behave, individuals experience guilt, shame, or self-depreciation when they act inconsistently with the social expectations they endorse [31]. According to cognitive dissonance theory [15], individuals seek a stable state in which there is a minimum of dissonance between values/attitudes and behavior. More recent empirical research demonstrates that values directly affect behavior by encouraging individuals to act in accordance to their values [16], [33].

Although there are studies that indicate a theoretical relationship between values and behavior the direct influence of work values on organizational citizenship has not been tackled. In this study, the theoretical link between work values and organizational citizenship has been established according to the reasoning that a specific goal or value that drives a person to work is an important determinant of behavior.

Organizational citizenship is, in a sense, an extra effort to support the functioning and effectiveness of the work environment and the work itself. The employee engages in formal job roles but in addition helps other colleagues, attends and participates in organizational activities, stays informed about the developments in the company, and does not complain about trivial matters. An important concept that needs consideration in identifying the antecedents why employees engage in citizenship behavior is to understand which values a person works for and how central a person regards working. In the next section, theory and previous research on work values and work centrality are reviewed and the relationship between these two concepts is discussed.

III. WORK VALUES

The literature on values is vast covering a large array of topics in sociology, organizational studies and psychology. Various researchers have defined values since the 1970's. An early definition by Rokeach [56], states that a value is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence [63]. Rokeach defines beliefs about preferable modes of conduct 'instrumental values' and beliefs about preferable end-states 'terminal values' [54]. In a value system, individuals rank-order their instrumental and terminal values along a continuum of importance. A value system is the sum of enduring standards of perception, attitudes and modes of behavior that serve the existence of a society [69], [36]. Rokeach's value definition inspired other researchers to view values specific to different life spheres in the same manner.

Values signify desired goals scaled according to importance, which guide a person's life [59], behavior that is directed towards goals [17], and criteria for choosing those goals [33]. Zedeck [70] has defined work values as goals that people strive to attain through working. In the definitions given above it is evident that the concept of goals is a core element of values and work goals are regarded to be synonymous to work values.

Theory and research on work values precede largely from the premise that work values are derived from people's basic value systems that help them navigate through the multiple spheres of their lives [53]. Work values are more specific than general life values as they apply to a specific life domain. As such, work values influence the importance of work in the life of the individual [60].

As is the case with the concept of values, different authors present definitions of the concept of work values. However, it is evident that the idea of an "attitude towards or orientation with regard to work" constitutes a central element of most interpretations. Most definitions of work values agree with the notion that work values are specific goals that the individual considers important and attempts to attain in the work context. One of the most important aspect that comes to fore from the theories of work and work motivation, is that workers differ with regard to the reasons they have for working and the needs they want to satisfy through work [3]. Similarly, Nord et al [40] has defined work values as, end states that guide individuals work related preferences that can be attained through the act of working.

Work values have been classified according to their types. Nord, et al [40] suggests that work values can be classified as intrinsic or extrinsic. Intrinsic work values refer to end-states that occur through work or in the course of people engaging in work activities such as a sense of accomplishment and are dependent on the content of work. Extrinsic work values refer to end states that occur as a consequence of work, regardless or independent of the state of the content of work per se such as family security [18], [25]. In addition to this binary classification, Ginzberg, et al [19] has suggested a third dimension. This third dimension is named social/environmental values referring to relations with co-workers and the work environment itself.

Ros et al [57] adopt the view that, like basic values, work values are beliefs pertaining to desirable end-states (e.g. high pay) or behavior (e.g. working with people) and examine the relationship between these basic values and work values. They argue that different work goals are ordered by their importance as guiding principles for evaluating work outcomes and settings, and for choosing among different work alternatives. Because work values refer only to goals in the work setting, they are more specific than basic individual values.

Other researchers [1], [6], [9], [38], [54], [58] have investigated the priorities that shape individuals' job preferences and concluded that these priorities constitute their work values. Despite a plethora of different labels, most work researchers appear to identify the same two or three types of work values:

(1) Intrinsic or self-actualization values,
(2) Extrinsic or security or material values,
(3) Social or relational values.

Elizur [13] arrived at a related trichotomous classification of work values by considering the modality of their outcomes. The first work value in this classification refers to working conditions, pay and benefits therefore is defined as the instrumental outcome of work. The second work outcome includes an affective element and refers to social relations with associates, therefore is named as the affective outcome. The final component is called the cognitive work outcome and refers to responsibility, interest and achievement. This classification largely overlaps with extrinsic, intrinsic, and social values introduced above. Ros et al [57] views these three types of work values as conceptually parallel to three of the higher-order basic human values: intrinsic work values directly express openness to change values—the pursuit of autonomy, interest, growth, and creativity in work. Extrinsic work values express conservation values; job security and income provide workers with the requirements needed for general security and maintenance of order in their lives. Social or interpersonal work values express the pursuit of self-transcendence values; work is seen as a vehicle for positive social relations and contribution to society. In addition to the three work values defined above, Ros et al. has suggested that a fourth distinctive type of work value could be defined which parallels the basic self enhancement higher-order value type [57]. This type of work values, like self-enhancement, should be concerned with prestige or power. The fourth type of value has been classified as extrinsic in some studies [18], [22], [58] or intrinsic in others [6], [9], [13].

Another study that supports the four-dimensional work value categorization of Ros et al. [57] is a cross-cultural study by Elizur et al. [14]. The study revealed that, the category designated as cognitive, could be split into two separate regions of intrinsic and of prestige values. Among the distinctive intrinsic work values were interesting work, meaningful work, opportunity for growth, and use of ability and knowledge. Among the prestige values were company that you are proud to work for, advancement, influence in the organization, and influence in work.

The results of a study on work values and its dimensions conducted in Turkey by Tevruz and Turgut [62] parallels the studies in the West. In their study, Tevruz and Turgut [62] derived 12 factors that explained work values and indicated that these factors aggregated on three value dimensions. These three value dimensions are referred to as 'functions of work' and are labeled individualistic, normative and worldly work values. The individualistic dimension includes; information seeking, independence, meaning in life, action seeking, and keeping oneself busy. The second dimension, normative work values, includes fulfilling religious duties, aiding society, creating order, and avoiding negativity. The worldly dimension, on the other hand, includes earning bread, enjoyment, and achieving status. These dimensions are in line with the value dimensions derived in the West. However, 'avoiding negativity' or 'negativity avoidance', a factor in the normative dimension, is composed of values such as; avoiding alienation, striving to be on the right track, preserving health, has not emerged as one of the factors of work values in Western studies. Tevruz and Turgut [62] argue that some of the values and goals are culture dependent and the 'avoidance' factor has emerged in their study due to the role of 'avoidance' in the Turkish culture.

As can be seen from the definitions and conceptualizations, work values constitute an important part of the experience of

work. Work values are central aspects of this experience since they determine the meaning people attach to work [18], [25], [26]. People try to make sense of their work experiences by judging how these experiences stack up against their work values [25], [26]. Work values, therefore, function as the evaluative standards people use to interpret their work experiences and determine the meaning that individuals attribute to work, jobs, organizations, and specific events and conditions [18], [25], [26].

IV. WORK CENTRALITY

The concept of work centrality has mainly been derived from basic values. According to Kanungo [27], work centrality is a normative belief about the value and importance of work in the configuration of one's life, and it is a function of one's past cultural conditioning or socialization. Some researchers (e.g. [27]) use the term 'work involvement' or 'involvement with work' to define work centrality. Work centrality is the degree of importance of work in general rather than involvement in the present job. Therefore, work centrality differs from other concepts like, organizational commitment and job involvement. An empirical study by Paullay, et al. [46] has clarified the distinction between work centrality and job involvement and has demonstrated that these two concepts actually appeared to be two distinct constructs. In the study by Paullay et al., job involvement is defined as the degree to which one is cognitively preoccupied with, engaged in, and concerned with one's present job; and work centrality is defined as the beliefs that individuals have regarding the degree of importance work plays in their lives [46]. Although a moderate, positive correlation was indicated between the measurement instruments of job involvement and work centrality, the confirmatory factor analysis provided support for the hypothesis that job involvement and work centrality were two distinct constructs.

The conceptualization of work centrality rests on the assumption that individuals place work in one of their life spheres and attribute differing levels of importance to those life spheres. Work centrality is rooted in the central life interest literature [11], [12], [23], [47], which refers to the importance a person places on work relative to other interests in life. Dubin [11] has argued that social behavior differ as individuals in modern industrial society proceed serially through distinctive social settings. An individual moves from one portion of life space to another and the portion of life space in which individuals focus their life interests become central. Not all social settings have equal salience for the individual. The individual's preference for carrying out particular acts in his/her work sphere, defines the basis of that person's work centrality [11], [12].

Work centrality has been studied in an international research project, MOW [39] that was carried out to understand how different countries compare with respect to the meanings they attach to work. The MOW project inspired other researchers to focus interest on the meaning of work and work centrality. In the context of the MOW study, work centrality has been defined as a general belief about the value of working in one's life.

In the MOW study, there are two major theoretical components of the work centrality construct; the value orientation and the decision orientation [39]. The value orientation toward working as a life role involves (i) identification with work, and (ii) involvement or commitment to working. The decision orientation view of work centrality parallels Dubins' [11] central life interests, Blau's [2] theory of behavioral settings, and Heider's theory of interpersonal relationships [21].

Considering that the concept of work centrality has been derived from work values, it is believed that work values or goals are an important determinant of centrality. Previous research has not focused specifically on the relations between work centrality and work values. However, it is possible to mention a few studies that might shed light on the role of work values on work centrality. In the study of Hirschfeld and Feild, work centrality has been defined as normative beliefs on the value and importance of working [23]. The study by Kanungo and Misra can be regarded as another study supporting the role of values on work centrality [28]. Similarly, the research conducted by Tevruz [61] states that the work sphere is related with the three dimensions of work values. According to the study, as one's values incline towards society development, self-actualization and avoidance of harm, the place working occupies in one's life increases. On the other hand, in the study of Turgut and Tevruz [64], as a person values societal development and independence, the time allocated for working increase and as one increasingly values earning bread and status, time allocated for working decreases.

The variance of wok values or goals among individuals is believed to create difference on the importance one attributes to working. It is also believed that those who increasingly value individualistic work goals will attribute greater importance to working than those who value worldly and normative work goals. Eventually, the changes in the degree of work centrality will affect various work related attitudes and behavior as employee performance, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment and job satisfaction. An employee who attaches greater importance to working will show greater performance, be more committed to his/her organization, and will exert greater job satisfaction than an employee who values working less. An empirical study, which directly links work values and work centrality was not evident in the literature. However, by definition, work centrality is affected by values and is formed by the person's beliefs towards working [39].

Previous research findings point that those who have high levels of work centrality, are more inclined to enjoy their job (job satisfaction), are more probable to have an affectionate bond with their organizations (organizational commitment and job involvement) and show greater effort doing their job (high performance). Attaching importance to work itself enables the employee to make use of his/her knowledge, skills and other attributes for bettering the job. A person who works for something that he/she values, gets involved with the job and does everything possible to do the best and eventually benefits the organization. Important indicators of the employee's will to exert effort for the job and do his/her best can be defined as

organizational citizenship behavior. In a study that involves organizational citizenship and work centrality, Diefendorff [10] found job involvement as the predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. The same study revealed a positive relationship between work centrality and the 'civic virtue' dimension of organizational citizenship.

Growing interest on the relationship between work centrality and organizational citizenship behavior is believed to contribute to understanding and explaining why people engage in extra-role behaviors. As pointed out earlier, for the employee to exert voluntary effort for the organization he/she has to believe that the worth he does is valuable. Mannheim et. al has developed a similar inference in defining the relation between work centrality and organizational citizenship [34]. They have concluded that for the person to contribute to their organization, they must first focus on their own job and work. In other words, the person has to focus on his/her work or has to view working central to life so that he/she could go beyond the formal requirements of their job and engage in extra-role behavior or organizational citizenship behavior.

Although it was mentioned that any studies investigating the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and work values have not been encountered in the previous argument, building on logical reasoning, a relationship between these two variables is assumed. On the other hand, we did come across evidence that showed a relationship between work centrality and organizational citizenship. Therefore, the development of the theoretical framework of the study is built upon the following reasoning:

The relationship between work values and organizational citizenship behavior is mediated by work centrality.

In accordance, the first hypothesis of our study is composed as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Work centrality mediates the relationship between work values and organizational citizenship behavior.

The hypothesis asserts that different work values have varying degrees of influence on work centrality. It is proposed that as the distance between the perception of working and the value it relates to (work-value congruence) change, the relation between values and work centrality will change accordingly. If a person can reach or fulfill his/her work values or goals by acts other than working, then work centrality may decrease for that person.

V. WORK-VALUE CONGRUENCE

Work-value congruence is a concept that is believed to exist in explaining relations between basic variables such as values/goals and attitudinal variables like centrality, satisfaction, citizenship and commitment. It is defined as the distance between one's values or goals and one's belief in attaining the specific value/goal through the act of work. Bourdieu [7], [8] asserts that the formation of goals in a specific life sphere, change according to the belief in reaching that specific goal. Individuals observe events around them and

make judgments –consciously or unconsciously- about the attainability of their goals and act according to their perception of the attainability of the goal. Zedeck [70] argues that work values influence the importance of work in the life of the individual, and add that this relationship is moderated by the perception of one in attaining the specified goals through the act of working (p.327).

An empirical study questioning the attainability of work values through working has not been found in the literature. Therefore, a pilot study by the author was designed to investigate the link between values and work. The participants were asked to rate work value dimensions defined by Tevruz and Turgut [62] in terms of their attainability by the act of working on a four dimensional scale. The results showed that the least attainable values through working were 'religiosity' and 'avoidance' and the values that can definitely be attained by working were 'making a living' and 'gaining status'. When these 12 work values are placed in the dimensions they were previously found to belong in Tevruz and Turgut's study [62], the work value dimension most likely to be attained by work occurred to be the 'worldly work values' and the dimension least likely to be attained emerged as the 'normative values' (Table II).

TABLE II
WORK AND VALUE CONGRUENCE

	Values	Mean	Std. dev.	Dim. Mean	Dim. Std. Dev.
Ind. Dimension	To gain / use information	2.24	0.683		
	To gain Freedom	2.48	0.863		
	To have an active life	2.52	0.682	2.365	0.456
	To keep busy	2.22	0.677		
	To find meaning in life	2.36	0.810		
Normative Dimension	To fulfill religious duty	3.14	0.661		
	To contribute society	2.02	0.908		
	To create order	1.90	0.788	2.474	0.529
	To avoid negativity	2.84	0.790		
Worldly Dimension	To make a living	1.34	0.690		
	To gain status	1.52	0.755	1.781	0.539
	To enjoy life	2.36	0.810		

In the light of the findings from the pilot study and the views of Bourdieu [7] and Zedeck [70] the second hypothesis is formulated as follows:

Hypothesis 2: The prediction power of 'individualistic' and 'worldly' work values' in explaining work centrality will be greater than that of 'normative' work values.

VI. Sample

The study is completed by the online contribution of employees working in small medium sized enterprises (SME's) in Turkey. Turkish SME's operate on a wide range of business areas and in differing geographical regions; therefore it is believed that employees in SME's would represent the general work values of Turkish employees. The research mainly aims to investigate the citizenship tendencies of employees holding different work values. 341 one the employees (45%) participated the study from Marmara, 149 (19.9%) from Central Anatolia, 75 (10%) Aegean, 70 (9.3%) White Sea, 12 (1.6%) South Eastern Anatolia, 29 (3.9%) Black Sea, 40 (5.3%) Eastern Anatolia and 21 (2.8%) has participated from abroad.

KOBİ-NET has prepared a directory, which contains the contact information of 8,000,000 SME employees who work in different cities and different sectors in Turkey. In order to reach a statistically representative sample, 100.000 employees have been randomly selected from a list containing 8.000.000 SME and the electronic link of the survey has been sent to employees' personal e-mail addresses. 1440 employees in total has participated the research. After a review of the responses, it has been indicated that some of the questionnaires were not completely filled so were not suitable for statistical analysis; therefore, the sample was reduced to 749. 188 (25.3%) of the participants are female and 555 (74.7%) are male; 133 (17.8 %) of them are high-school graduates, 467 (62.4 %) have university degrees, 103 (13.8 %) have masters and 34 (4.5%) of them hold a PhD degree. The average age of the participants is 33.64 and has 7.04 years of tenure.

VII. Procedure

The questionnaires have been sent via e-mail to the e-mail addresses of hundred thousand employees randomly selected from the directory KOBİ-NET has prepared. The average time for the completion of the questionnaire was estimated to be eight minutes. The study began on the 18th of July 2007 and has been suspended on the third week of August.

VIII. Measures

The questionnaire was designed to cover questions about the demographic characteristics of the participants and tests relating to the five variables studied. An online link of the questionnaire was sent to participants including a cover letter that explained the purpose of the study, assured anonymity of the subjects and encouraged participation. The demographic section includes the city and sector the participant works in, length of service, education, job position, marital status and age of the participant respectively. The following section of the questionnaire includes separate tests for each one of the variables in question; work values, organizational citizenship behavior, and work-value congruence, work centrality.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

Organizational Citizenship Behavior is measured by the reduced version ([49] et. al, 1997) of the original test developed by Organ [42]. The items in this test were rated on a 6-point scale ranging from (1) 'definitely disagree' to (6) 'definitely agree'. The original 22-item test developed by Organ was translated into Turkish and examined by the author in the pilot study to reflect the intended meaning. Some of the items were modified to reflect the original meaning in accordance to the feedback received from the pilot study. The reliability of the five-factor test of Organ was found to be 0.77 in the pilot study.

Work Values

Work values are measured by a twelve-item test developed by Tevruz and Turgut [62]. The test was originally named "Work Goals" and was made up of 69 items that loaded on 12 factors. In a following study, the items loading on each of the 12 factors were combined and the test was modified to include 12 items. The reliability of the 12-item scale was found to be 0.76 in a study conducted on 1152 respondents (Tevruz, Turgut, Çinko, 2007: ongoing study). Work values are measured by the 12-item test in this study. The participants were asked to rate each item on a scale ranging from (1) 'not important' to (6) 'very important'. The reliability of the test was calculated to be 0.82 in the pilot study conducted by the author.

Work Centrality

Kanungo's [26] six-item test is used to measure work centrality in our study. The test is translated into Turkish and examined to reflect the intended meaning of the original items. The reliability analysis resulted in a 0.75 alpha score. The participants were asked to rate the items on a scale ranging from 'definitely agree' (1) to 'definitely disagree' (6).

Work-Value Congruence

The 12 item "work-value congruence" test is developed by the author to measure the degree to attain or achieve each of the work values. In this respect, the 12 work value items are listed and the participant is asked to rate each item on a scale ranging from 'can only be attained by working' (1) to 'can not be attained by working' (4).

IX. Data analysis

SPSS 11 statistical package is used to investigate the relations among variables in the research model. Cronbach alpha reliability scores are calculated for each of the tests used. Principal component and varimax rotation technique are adopted in the factor analyses to identify the dimensions of the variables. The relations among the variables are examined by simple, multiple and hierarchical regression analyses. Finally ANOVA and t-tests are used to examine the demographic data.

X. Findings

In the findings section factor analyses, correlation analyses and regression analyses are presented.

The factor analysis of the "Organizational Citizenship Behavior" (OCB) reveals three factors (KMO = 0.897 and Bartlett's Test significant at .000 level) explaining 61 per cent

of the total variance. After varimax rotation, the first factor materializes as a factor accounting for a vast 41 per cent of the variance. The factor is named "Helping Behavior" since it includes items that focus on helping others at work (α = 0.8630). The second factor, explaining 10.87 per cent of total variance, concerns the "Responsible Behaviors" one engages in the work setting. Since this factor includes items such as 'keeping up with organization announcements, memos, and so on', 'considers the impact of his or her actions on coworkers', it is named as "Responsible Behavior" (α = 0.8592). Third factor, on the other hand, represents not complaining about trivial matters in the organization and so, it is called "Optimistic Behavior" (α = 0.7047). When the 12th item in the test is removed, the reliability of the factor increases to 0.7426. However, since the question is regarded as an important item for the study it is kept. The helping and responsibility dimensions overlap with those of Organ's, however; the responsibility factor emerged as a combination of Organ's civic virtue and conscientiousness dimensions.

TABLE III
ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

	OCB	Factor Var. (%)	Loading	Alpha (%)
F1	HELPING	41.00		86.30
3	Helps others who have heavy workload.		.796	
2	Helps others who have been absent.		.777	
5	Willingly helps others who have work related problems.		.758	
4	Is always ready to lend a helping hand to those around him or her.		.735	
1	Helps orient new employees even though it is NOT required.		.701	
F2	RESPONSIBILITY	10.87		85.92
9	Attends meetings that are NOT mandatory, but are considered important.		.788	
11	Reads and keeps up with organization announcements, memos, and so on.		.767	
8	Attends functions that are NOT required, but help the company image.		.748	
10	Keeps abreast of changes in the organization.		.715	
7	Is mindful of how his or her behavior affects other people's jobs.		.598	
6	Considers the impact of his or her actions on coworkers.		.557	
F3	OPTIMISM	9.08		70.47
13	Always focuses on the positive side rather than what's wrong.		.785	
15	Tries NOT to make "mountains out of molehills'.		.739	
14	Does not complain about trivial matters.		.729	
12	Tries not to find fault with what the organization is doing.		.569	

The factor analysis on the independent variable "work values" has revealed three dimensions (KMO = 0.868 and Bartlett Bartlett's Test significant at .000 level) explaining 65

per cent of the total variance. Item number 11 has loaded on both the worldly and normative work value factors with similar scores, therefore was removed from the analysis. The results indicated that the factor structures of our analysis overlap at a degree with those of Turgut and Tevruz's [63] work value concept and its dimensions. Our study manifests that in addition to making a living and gaining status; gaining freedom, contributing to society and gaining/using knowledge, load on the "worldly" dimension of values. The "individualistic" dimension includes enjoying life, having an active life, finding meaning in life and keeping oneself busy. Finally the "normative" dimension is composed of fulfilling religious duty and avoiding negativity. The results indicate that some of the items that originally loaded on the individualistic and normative dimensions of work values have loaded on the worldly dimension in our study.

TABLE IV
WORK VALUES/GOALS

	WORK VALUES/GOALS	Factor Variance (%)	Loading	Alpha (%)
F1	WORLDLY VALUES	43.946		76.94
3	Guarantee ones future, gain economic freedom, making a living, earn money, gain assets and possessions, reach better living conditions, take after ones family and create a better life for ones children.		.828	
12	To enjoy plying desired job		.689	
4	To get informed, to learn and to develop self, to recognize life, to be able to use one's capacity, to produce value		.652	
1	To benefit society, to contribute to social and economic development, to create a society in peace, to serve society and benefit next generations		.615	
2	To gain status and prestige, to be accepted and to be respected y the society, to have a career, to gain power and authority		.597	
F2	INDIVIDUALISTIC VALUES	12.426		83.45
8	To actualize one's dreams, to satisfy one's pleasures and hobbies, to travel and have a good time		.812	
7	To pass the time, to keep oneself busy, to utilize time		.778	
9	Having an active life, developing social relationships, utilizing abilities and helping people		.747	
10	Directing one's life, to have done something in life and to achieve psychological satisfaction		.612	
F3	NORMATIVE VALUES	9.334		73.62
5	To fulfill one's religious duties, to gain Allah's compliance, and to prepare for one's afterlife		.856	
6	To avoid negativity, not to be alienated to oneself, to connect with life, to be useful and to be healthy and peaceful		.702	

The factor analysis of work centrality has revealed that all six items loaded on one factor (KMO = 0.850 and Bartlett's Test significant at .000 level) explaining 55 per cent of the total variance. The table below summarizes the factor loadings and factor reliability.

TABLE V
WORK CENTRALITY

	WORK CENTRALITY	Factor Var. (%)	Loading	Alpha (%)
F	**WORK CENTRALITY**	55.264		83.58
5	In my view an individual's personal life goals should be work oriented.		.803	
4	Work should be considered central to life.		.793	
1	The most important things that happen in life involve work.		.792	
6	Life is worth living only when people get absorbed in work.		.766	
2	Work is something people should get involved in most of the time.		.704	
3	Work should only be a small part of one's life.		-.577	

The factor analysis on "work value congruence" resulted in three dimensions (KMO = 0.848 and Bartlett Bartlett's Test significant at .000 level) explaining about 55 per cent of the total variance. However, the reliability analysis of the three factors has only confirmed the reliability of the first two factors (α_{F1}=0.7584; α_{F2}=0.7462). Therefore, the third factor was not included in further analyses (α_{F3}=0.3806). Since this variable represents the distance a person perceives a value to be reached by the act of working, it is important to review the mean scores of each item and each factor. The mean scores (see Table VI) show that the first factor is perceived to be more likely whereas the second factor is perceived to be less likely to be achieved by the act of working. Therefore the factors are as named as "high work-value congruence" and "low work-value congruence" respectively.

The correlation analysis shows that all three factors of the independent variable (organizational citizenship behavior - OCB) have significant and positive relations only with the "normative" dimension of work values and work centrality. Whereas, the helping and responsibility dimensions of organizational citizenship are significantly and positively correlated with the individualistic and worldly dimensions of work values. According to Table VII work centrality appears to be the only variable that is significantly correlated with all the other variables in question. Both "high" and "low work-value congruence" result to be in significant relations with all the sub dimensions of work values, "centrality" and the "responsibility" dimension of organizational citizenship. In addition "high work-value congruence" significantly correlates with the "optimism" dimension of organizational citizenship. These relations somewhat support and approve our research model.

TABLE VI
WORK-VALUE CONGRUENCE

	WORK-VALUE CONGRUENCE	Factor Var. (%)	Loadings	Mean	Factor Mean	Alpha (%)
F 1	**HIGH Congruence**	**34.82**			**2.656**	**75.84**
3	To have an active life		0.82	2.6		
11	To gain status		0.72	2.59		
12	To enjoy life		0.68	2.62		
2	To gain Freedom		0.62	2.64		
4	To find meaning in life		0.54	2.72		
1	To gain / use info		0.46	2.77		
F2	**LOW Congruence**	**11.32**			**3.22**	**74.62**
9	To avoid negativity		0.80	3.55		
10	To make a living		0.76	3.4		
7	To contribute society		0.73	3.13		
6	To fulfill religious duty		0.48	2.8		
F3	**....**	**8.436**			**2.27**	**38.06**
5	To keep busy		0.86	1.99		
8	To create order		0.60	2.55		

The correlation among values and citizenship are strongest between "worldly work values" and the "helping" and "responsible" citizenship dimensions (r = 0.119 and r = 0.256). On the other hand, the relation between "individualistic" values and "responsible citizenship" behavior is stronger than that of "normative" values and "responsible citizenship" (r = 0.127).

In the research model, the variables that are hypothized to predict one another are examined through a series of regression analyses. The regression results given in Table VIII show that our model is viable. The "high" dimension of work-value congruence inserted in the first step has significant effect on organizational citizenship (β = 0.132). "Work centrality" is included in the model in the second step having a significant effect on citizenship (β = 0.256). The insertion of "work centrality" has increased the predictive power of the model, but has also disabled the effect of work-value congruence on citizenship. This result signals the mediating role of "work centrality" between high work-value congruence and organizational citizenship. Finally, "worldly", "individualistic" and "normative" work values that are believed to have the greatest effect upon citizenship are inserted; and each factor had positive significant contribution on citizenship respectively (β = 0.213, β = 0.100 and β = 0.135).

In order to test the mediating role of work centrality between work-value congruence and organizational citizenship a set of regression analyses have been conducted. The results depicted in Table IX and X show that the effect of "high work-value congruence" on responsible and optimist citizenship becomes insignificant ($p_{Resp.}$ = 0.539 and $p_{Opt.}$ = 0.093) as centrality is inserted in the analyses. This result points out the mediating effect of centrality between "high work-value congruence" and both "optimist" and "responsibility" dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior.

TABLE VII
CORRELATION TABLE

	Helping	Resp.	Optimism	Worldly	Ind.	Norm.	Cent.	High C.	Low C.
Helping	1								
Responsibility	.000	1							
Optimism	.000	.000	1						
Worldly	.119**	.256**	.053	1					
Individualistic	.088*	.127**	.041	.000	1				
Normative	.080*	.082*	.140**	.000	.000	1			
Centrality	.082*	.241**	.151**	.225**	.284**	.199**	1		
High C.	.040	.102**	.115**	.144**	.344**	.237**	.382**	1	
Low C.	.029	.150**	.045	.191**	.160**	.084*	.233**	.503**	1

TABLE VIII
REGRESSION ANALYSIS REGARDING THE EFFECTS OF WORK VALUES, WORK-VALUE CONGRUENCE AND WORK CENTRALITY ON ORGANIZATIONAL
CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

	R^2	R^2_{adj}	ΔR^2	$P_{\Delta R2}$	F	ΔF	P_{Model}		Beta	t	Sig.
STEP 1	.033	.030	.033	.000	10.65	10.65	.000				
								High	.132	2.891	.004
								Low	.075	1.631	.103
STEP 2	.089	.085	.056	.000	20.35	38.48	.000				
								High	.050	1.071	.284
								Low	.051	1.148	.251
								Centrality	.256	6.203	.000
STEP 3	.148	.140	.059	.000	17.95	14.26	.000				
								High	-.007	-.137	.891
								Low	.024	.543	.587
								Centrality	.186	4.452	.000
								Worldly	.213	5.511	.000
								Ind.	.100	2.477	.014
								Normative	.135	3.472	.001

TABLE IX
REGRESSION ANALYSES ON THE MEDIATING EFFECT OF CENTRALITY BETWEEN WORK-VALUE CONGRUENCE AND RESPONSIBLE CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

	R^2	R^2_{adj}	ΔR^2	$P_{\Delta R2}$	F	ΔF	P_{Model}		Beta	t	Sig.
STEP 1	.013	.012	.013	.003	9.165	9.165	.003				
								High	.116	3.027	.003
STEP 2	.028	.025	.014	.002	9.614	9.942	.000				
								High	.069	1.683	.093
								Centrality	.129	3.153	.002
STEP 1	.003	.002	.003	.149	2.088	2.088	.149				
								Low	.055	1.445	.149
STEP 2	.022	.020	.019	.000	7.821	13.516	.000				
								Low	.022	.567	.571
								Centrality	.143	3.676	.000

TABLE X
REGRESSION ANALYSES ON THE MEDIATING EFFECT OF CENTRALITY BETWEEN WORK-VALUE CONGRUENCE AND OPTIMIST CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

	R^2	R^2_{adj}	$\nwarrow R^2$	$P_{\nwarrow R2}$	F	Δ F	P_{Model}		Beta	t	Sig.
STEP 1	.011	.010	.011	.000	7.826	7.826	.005				
								High	.107	2.798	.005
STEP 2	.055	.053	.044	.000	19.76	31.347	.000				
								High	.025	.614	.539
								Centrality	.225	5.599	.000
STEP 1	.025	.023	.025	.000	17.31	17.312	.000				
								Low	.157	4.161	.000
STEP 2	.067	.064	.042	.000	24.50	30.940	.000				
								Low	.108	2.847	.005
								Centrality	.212	5.567	.000

TABLE XI
REGRESSION ANALYSES ON THE EFFECT OF INDIVIDUALISTIC VALUES AND CENTRALITY ON RESPONSIBLE CITIZENSHIP DIMENSION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

	R^2_{adj}	ΔR^2	$P_{\Delta R}^2$	F	P_{model}		β	t	P
STEP 1	.079	.080	.000	59.963	.000				
						Ind.	.284	7.744	.000
Independent variable: Individualistic values Dependent variable: Centrality									
STEP 2	.015	.016	.001	10.703	.001				
						Ind.	.127	3.272	.001
Independent variable: Worldly values Dependent variable: The "Responsible" dimension of Organizational Citizenship Behavior									
STEP 3	.065	.049	.000	22.097	.000				
						Ind.	.066	1.677	.094
						Centrality	.230	5.813	.000
Independent variable: Individualistic Work Values and Centrality Dependent variable: The "Responsible" dimension of Organizational Citizenship Behavior									

TABLE XII
REGRESSION ANALYSES ON THE EFFECT OF NORMATIVE VALUES AND CENTRALITY ON THE RESPONSIBLE DIMENSION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP

	R^2_{adj}	ΔR^2	$P_{\Delta R}^2$	F	P_{model}		β	t	P
STEP 1	.038	.039	.000	28.148	.000				
						Normative	.199	5.305	.000
Independent variable: Normative values Dependent variable: Centrality									
STEP 2	.005	.007	.035	4.448	.035				
						Normative	.082	2.109	.035
Independent variable: Normative values Dependent variable: Responsible Dimension of Organizational Citizenship Behavior									
STEP 3	.063	.055	.000	21.671	.000				
						Normative	.042	1.088	.277
						Centrality	.240	6.171	.000
Independent variable: Normative values and Centrality Dependent variable: Responsible Dimension of Organizational Citizenship Behavior									

TABLE XIII
REGRESSION ANALYSES ON THE PREDICTIVE EFFECTS OF WORK VALUES ON WORK CENTRALITY

	R^2	R^2_{adj}	$P_{\Delta R}^2$	F	P_{model}		β	t	P
Model 1	.051	.049	.000	36.540	.000				
						Worldly	.225	6.045	.000
Independent variable: Worldly values Dependent variable: Centrality									
Model 2	.080	.079	.000	59.963	.000				
						Individualistic	.284	7.744	.000
Independent variable: Individualistic values Dependent variable: Centrality									
Model 3	.039	.038	.000	28.148	.000				
						Normative	.199	5.305	.000
Independent variable: Normative values Dependent variable: Centrality									

TABLE XIV
ANOVA TESTS FOR GENDER

	GENDER	N	MEAN	STD. DEV.	t	p
Worldly	Women	186	2.7419	.49654	2.46	.014*
	Men	543	2.6188	.61663		
Individualistic	Women	181	2.2099	.69929	3.29	.001**
	Men	530	1.9906	.79573		
Normative	Women	184	1.5054	.91733	-4.42	.000**
	Men	544	1.8860	1.03790		
*p < 0.05. **p < 0.01.						

It was also hypothesized in the study that work centrality would play a mediating role between "work values" and "organizational citizenship behavior". Therefore regression analyses are conducted to test the mediating role of work centrality for each dimension of work values and organizational citizenship. The analyses reveal that the mediating role of centrality is only evident between "individualistic work values", (Table XI) "normative work values" and the "responsible citizenship" (Table XII).

Another hypothesis projected that the coefficient of individual work values would be higher than that of worldly and normative work values' in the prediction of work centrality. Table XIII depicts the regression analyses that portray the effect of each work value on work centrality.

The analyses revealed that the coefficient of individualistic values have a stronger value ($\beta = 0.284$) than that of worldly and normative values ($\beta = 0.225$ and $\beta = 0.199$) and has enabled us to accept the hypothesis.

In order to indicate gender differences in work values the t-test was conducted. The t-test showed that the worldly, individualistic and normative values held significant variance according to gender ($p_{Worldly}$=0.014; $p_{Individualistic}$= 0.001; $p_{Normative}$ =0.000). However, since the Levene test did not indicate that there was equal variance between groups for worldly values, it could not be concluded that worldly values differed according to gender. Table XIV depicts that men attach greater importance to normative values than women do (mean$_{women}$=1.50; mean$_{men}$=1.88) and that women attach greater importance to individualistic values than men do (mean. $_{Ind/women}$=2.20; mean. $_{Ind/men}$=1.99).

XI. CONCLUSION

The research model is built on the premise that the specific goal or value that drives a person to work is important in determining behavior in the work setting. Tevruz and Turgut' study [59] on work values indicate that the person could work for worldly goals such as; gaining money or status; for normative goals like creating a home and an orderly life or individualistic goals of advancement and self-improvement. In the present study, Tevruz and Turgut's [59] work goals/values inventory is used and some differences in the items in the factor structure are determined. In Tevruz and Turgut's study the worldly values consisted of making a living, enjoying life and gaining status; the individualistic dimension includes gaining/using information, gaining freedom, having an active

life, finding meaning in life and keeping oneself busy; and the normative dimension was made up of fulfilling religious duty, contribution to society, creating an orderly life and avoiding negativity. This study manifests that in addition to the items that originally loaded in the worldly dimension in Tevruz and Turgut's study; gaining freedom, contributing to society and gaining/using knowledge also loaded on the same factor. The individualistic dimension on the other hand consist only of enjoying life, having an active life, finding meaning in life and keeping oneself busy. Finally, the normative dimension is composed of fulfilling religious duty and avoiding negativity. As can be seen, some of the items that originally loaded on the individualistic and normative dimensions of work values in Tevruz and Turgut's study have loaded on the worldly dimension in ours. This difference may be attributed to the samples used in the two separate studies. It is suggested that in order to confirm the validity of the factors, the test should be exercised on diverse groups in future research.

The difference in the item loadings of the factor structures in Tevruz and Turgut's and our study questioned the names given to each factor. The worldly value dimension is composed of items such as; a living and gaining status; gaining freedom, contributing to society and gaining/using knowledge, which designate the utility a person can access through working. Therefore, it is recommended that this factor be named "utility centered work values" rather than "worldly work values". The individualistic dimension includes items that focus on the individual goals a person may want to attain through work such as enjoying life, living an active life and finding meaning in life, it is recommended to name this factor "individual centered work values". On the other hand, since normative work values are made up of items which focus on avoiding the negative such as; fulfilling religious duty and trying to avoid negative events, it is suggested to name this factor "avoidance centered work values" instead of "normative work values".

Another important point that caught attention was that men attach greater importance to normative values than women and that women attach greater importance to individualistic values than men do. The study by Karakitapoğlu Aygün and İmamoğlu [28] on the values of university students revealed that women attach greater importance to universal values than men and that men attach greater importance to normative values than women. Since normative work values are composed of religiously oriented items such as; fulfilling religious duty and gaining God's content, studies investigating

the relationship between values and religiosity are also reviewed. In Uçanok's [62] study, men score higher in the belief and worship dimensions of religiousness in comparison to women. Similarly, Uysal [64] contends that men are more religious than women and that woman in the Turkish society seem to deviate from traditional religious values and become more secularized than men. The summary of these results portray that men in the Turkish society, hold stronger normative and religious values, compared to women. Therefore, it is of great importance that the variation of values in terms of gender be analyzed for other life spheres other than "work" in future studies.

Another presumption that plays role in the structure of the research is that differing work values have an effect on the centrality of work. The analyses show that the individualistic, worldly and normative values predict work centrality respectively. At this point, the analysis of the effects of the values in question on work centrality is crucial.

According to Dubin [11] and Borg [2], a person seeks to attain instrumental goals or values in the less preferred life spheres and seeks terminal goals or values in the preferred life spheres. In the study, worldly values fit into the instrumental value definition while individualistic values fit in the terminal value definition. Therefore, the result that those who hold individualistic values attach greater importance to work and those holding worldly and normative values attach less importance to work gain support. This result support the contentions of Dubin [11] and Borg [2] reveal that individualistic values have a higher prediction effect on work centrality compared to worldly and normative work values.

This study stressed the effect of work-value congruence on the relationship between work values and work centrality, meaning that the person's perception of attaining his/her goals through working affects the importance attached to the act of working regardless of values. Some academicians [7], [70] dealt with this issue; however have not attempted to conceptualize the phenomena. This study has conceptualized the notion, calling it 'work-value congruence' enabling empirical research to test relationships with other variables. The analyses reveal that the variable does not have a strong moderator effect and that it is more meaningful when treated as an independent variable. Considering that work-value congruence is derived from values, it is reasonable to theoretically assume that it acts similar to values. Therefore, it can be concluded that this new concept is an enduring belief that shapes specific modes of attitudes and behavior and is a cornerstone in organizational research. This study is proud to introduce 'work-value congruence' that plays a key role in understanding and explaining the dynamics among values and other concepts.

Work-value congruence defines a process in explaining values and behavior similar to Vroom's motivation theory. Vroom's [68] theory alleges that people exert effort in line with their expectations to reach their goals. Vroom's theory assumes that behavior results from conscious choices and that people consider the outcomes associated with the various levels of performance and elect to pursue the level that generates their expected outcomes [68]. Work-value congruence on the other hand, represents the behavior and inclination of a person's expectation to reach their work goals/values. The analysis regarding the effect of work-value congruence on organizational citizenship behavior reveals that this variable significantly predicts the optimist and responsible citizenship dimensions. Those employees who believe that they can reach their goals or values through the act of working engage in responsible and optimist behaviors in the work setting.

Another important variable that significantly explains organizational citizenship behavior is work values itself. Our analyses reveal that both worldly and individualistic values predict the helping and responsible dimensions of citizenship and those normative values not only predict the two value dimensions mentioned above but also explain 'optimist' citizenship. An important point that needs attention in this interaction is that optimist citizenship can only be explained by normative values. Earlier in the discussion, it was mentioned that normative values consist of items 'fulfilling religious duty' and 'avoiding the negative'. In a sense, these items stress that the person working to attain normative values, actually try to sustain their personal belief system and ethical codes. Therefore, it might be expected that those working for normative values have an inclination towards securing their positions in their organization, without entering any conflict. The optimist dimension of citizenship is composed of items that center around preserving order in the work setting such as; focusing on the positive side, not complaining about trivial matters, not trying to find fault with what the organization is doing. In this respect, the supposition that a person working to avoid the negative engage in optimist behavior acquires meaning.

The effect of work values on organizational citizenship behavior is partially realized through the degree of importance a person attributes to working. The analyses reveal that the predictive power of individualistic and normative work values on responsible citizenship depend on work centrality. Also, the effect of worldly work values on responsible citizenship and the effect of normative values on optimist citizenship depend partly on work centrality. On the other hand, the effect of work values on the helping dimension of organizational citizenship is not dependent on the importance the person attributes to working. In other words, the reason why a person engages in helping behavior does not depend on the importance of working but is dependent on the values he/she possesses. These results impelled us to re-examine the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior. The inspection of the item loading on each citizenship factor showed that each citizenship factor refer to a different concept. While the helping dimension of citizenship refers to other employees in the organization, responsible citizenship refer to the act of work and the optimist dimension refer to the perception of events and problems in the organization. That is why work centrality that represents an attitude towards the act of work, explain responsible citizenship that also refers to the act work. The reason why centrality does not predict the helping dimension of citizenship gains meaning in the framework of 'attribution theory' [21]. Heider's (1958) attribution theory contend that objects, sentiments, ideas and events which are similar in one sense, are grouped together

and construed in accordance [21]. The items in the responsible citizenship dimension define behaviors that refer to the act of working. The reason that, work centrality explains responsible citizenship is believed to result from the similarity that both variables refer to the act of working. On the other hand, the items in the helping dimension define behaviors directed towards employees in the organization. The examination of the relation between work centrality and helping, indicate an indirect relationship between these two variables. Therefore, the insignificant effect of work centrality on helping gains meaning since these variables do not both refer to the same concept.

The only study that investigated the relationship between work centrality and organizational citizenship was conducted by Hirschfeld and Field [23]. A significant relation between centrality and the civic virtue dimension (responsible, constructive involvement in the organization) of citizenship is found in the study. The civic virtue dimension defined in Hirschfeld and Feild's study parallels the responsible dimension defined. Here, it is found that work centrality is significantly related to helping, optimism and helping citizenship respectively. The analysis revealed that centrality most strongly predicts the responsible dimension of citizenship. This finding is in line with the one derived from Hirschfeld and Feild's study and designates the strength of the relationship between these two variables.

REFERENCES

[1]   C. Alderfer. *Existence, relatedness, & growth*. New York: Free Press, 1972.
[2]   R. Barker. *Ecological Psychology*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1968.
[3]   T. L. Beukman. *The Effect of Selected Variables on Leadership Behavior within the Framework of a Transformational Organization Paradigm*. University of Pretoria, Pretoria: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, 2005. http://upetd.up.ac.za/thesis/available/etd-11082005-083347/
[4]   P. M. Blau. *Exchange and Power in social life*. New York: Wiley, 1964
[5]   M. Bolino. Citizenship and Impression Management: Good Soldiers or Good Actors? *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 24, 1, 1999 pp. 82–98
[6]   I. Borg. Multiple facetisations of work values. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*. 39, 1990, pp. 401-412.
[7]   P. Bourdieu. Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction. in Brown, R. *Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change*. Tavistock, 1973.
[8]   P. Bourdieu, and J. C. Passeron. *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture*. Sage, 1977.
[9]   J. O. Crites. Factor Analytical Definitions of Vocational Motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 43, 1961, pp.330-337.
[10] J. Diefendorff, D. Brown, A. Kamin, and R. Lord. Examining the roles of job involvement and work centrality in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 23, 2002, pp. 93–108
[11] R. Dubin. Industrial workers' world: a study of the 'central life interests' of industrial workers, *Social Problems. (3),* 1956, pp.131-142.
[12] R. Dubin, J. E. Champoux and L. W. Porter. Central life interest and organizational commitment of blue-collar and clerical workers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20, 1975, pp. 411-421.
[13] D. Elizur. Facets of work values: a structural analysis of work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 1984, pp.379–389
[14] D. Elizur, I. Borg, R. Hunt and I. M. Beck. The structure of work values: A cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 12, 1991, pp.21-38.
[15] L. Festinger. *A Theory Of Cognitive Dissonance*. Tavistock, 1959
[16] W. C. Frederick and J. Weber. The values of corporate managers and their critics: An empirical description and normative implications. In Frederick, W. C. and Weber, J. (Eds.). *Business ethics: Research issues and empirical studies*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1990, pp.123-144.
[17] J. R. P. French and R. Kahn. A Programmatic Approach to Studying the Industrial Environment and Mental Health. *Journal of Social Issues*. 18, 1962, pp.1-47.
[18] J. M. George and G. R. Jones. Experiencing Work: Values, attitudes, and moods. *Human Relations*, 50 (4), 1997, pp.393-416
[19] E. Ginzberg, S. W. Ginsburg, S. Axelrad and J. L. Herma. *Occupational Choice: an approach to a general theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.
[20] M. Greenberg and B. Baron, B. *Behavior in Organizations*. Prentice Hall (6th Ed), Singapore, 2000.
[21] F. Heider. *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*. New York: Wiley, 1958.
[22] F. Herzberg, B. Mausner and B. B. Snyderman. *The Motivaiton to Work*. New York: Wiley, 1959.
[23] R. R. Hirschfeld and H. S. Field. General Commitment to Work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 21. 2000. pp.789–800.
[24] J. Ö. İşbaşı. Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı: Farklı Ölçeklerin Uygulanabilirliğine İlişkin Bir Çalışma. *8. Ulusal Yönetim and Organizasyon Kongresi*: 2000, pp.359–372.
[25] L. A. James and L. R. James. Integrating work environment perceptions: Explorations into the measurement of meaning. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 74, 1989, pp.739-751.
[26] E. E. Jones and H. B. Gerard. *Foundations of Social Psychology*. New York: Wiley, 1967.
[27] R. N. Kanungo. *Work Alienation*. New York: Praeger, 1982.
[28] R. N. Kanungo and S. Misra. The Basis of Involvement in Work and Family Contexts. *International Journal of Psychology*, 23, 1988, pp.267–282
[29] Z. Karakitapoglu Aygün and E. O. Imamoglu. Value domains of Turkish adults and university students. *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 142(3), 2002, pp. 333–351.
[30] D. Katz and R. Kahn. *The social psychology of organizations*. (2nd Ed.). New York: John Wiley, 1978.
[31] C. Kluckhohn. Values and value-orientations in the theory of action: An exploration in definition and classification. In T. Parsons & E. Shils (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1951.
[32] D. L. Krebs. Alturism: An Examination of the concept and a review of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 73, 1970, pp. 258-302.
[33] E. A. Locke. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. in M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally, 1976.
[34] B. Mannheim, Y. Baruch and J. Tal. Alternative models for antecedents and outcomes of work centrality and job satisfaction of high-tech personnel. *Human Relations, 50*, 1997, pp.1537–1561.
[35] B. L. McNeely and B. M. Meglino. Good Soldiers or Good Duty? The role of work values and contextual antecedents in prosocial organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Proceedings*. 1992, pp.232-236.
[36] Meglino, B. M. and Ravlin, E. C. (1998). Individual Values in Organizations: Concepts, Controversies and Research. *Journal of Management*, 24(3), 351-390
[37] R. H. Moorman. The Influence of Cognitive and Affective Based Job Satisfaction Measures on the Relationship between Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Human Relations* 46, 1993, pp.759–776.
[38] C. Mottaz. The relative importance of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards as determinants of work satisfaction. *The Sociological Quarterly*. 26(3). 1985, pp. 365-385.
[39] MOW (Meaning of Working International Research Team). *The Meaning of Working: An Eight Country Comparative Study*. London: Academic Press, 1987.
[40] W. R. Nord, A. P. Brief, J. M. Atieh, and E. M. Doherty. Studying meanings of work: The case of work values. In Brief, A. and Nord, W. (Eds.). *Meanings of occupational work: A collection of essays*. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1990.
[41] D. W. Organ, P. M. Podsakoff and S. B. MacKenzie. *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*. Sage Publications, 2006, USA.
[42] D. W. Organ. *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, 1988, MA: Lexington Books.

[43] D.W. Organ and A. Lingl. Personality, satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol.135 (3), 1995, pp.339–350

[44] D.W. Organ and K. Ryan. A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior, *Personnel Psychology*, 48 (4), 1995, pp.775–803.

[45] M. Özdevecioğlu. Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ile üniversite öğrencilerinin bazı demografik özellikleri ve akademik başarıları arasındaki ilişkilerin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, Sayı: 20, Ocak-Haziran 2003, 117–135.*

[46] I. M. Paullay, G. M. Alliger and E. F. Stone-Romero. Construct validation of two instruments designed to measure job involvement and work centrality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 1994, pp. 224–228

[47] M. F. Peterson and S. A. Ruiz-Quintanilla. Cultural socialization as a source of intrinsic work motivation. *Group & Organization Management, 28*(2), 2003, pp. 188-216.

[48] P. M. Podsakoff and S. B. MacKenzie. Organizational citizenship behavior and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research, 31*, 1994, pp.351–363.

[49] P. M. Podsakoff and S. B. MacKenzie. Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Organizational Performance: A Review and Suggestions for Future Research. *Human Performance.* 10(2), 1997, pp.133-151.

[50] P. M. Podsakoff, M. Ahearne and S. B. MacKenzie. Organizational Citizenship Behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 1997, pp.262–270

[51] P. M. Podsakoff, S. B. MacKenzie, R. H. Moorman and R. Fetter Transformational Leader Behaviors and Their Effects on Followers' Trust in Leader, Satisfaction, and Organizational Citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly* 1, 1990, pp.107–142.

[52] P. M. Podsakoff, S. B. MacKenzie, and R. Fetter. Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*, 1997, pp.123–150.

[53] P. M. Podsakoff, S. B. MacKenzie and R. Fetter. The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of sales performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 57, 1993, pp.70–80

[54] R. G. L. Pryor. Differences among differences: In search of general work preference dimensions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 1987, pp.426-433

[55] R.A. Roe and P. Ester. Values and work: Empirical Findings and Theoretical Perspective. *Applied Psychology: an International Review.* 48 (1). 1999, pp.1-21.

[56] M. Rokeach. *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press, 1973.

[57] M. Ros, S. H. Schwartz, and S. Surkis. Basic individual values, work values, and the meaning of work. *Applied Psychology: An international review,* 48 (1), 1999, pp.49-71.

[58] M. Rosenberg. *Occupations and values.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1957.

[59] J. J. Ryan. Work values and organizational citizenship behaviors: values that work for employees and organizations, *Journal of Business and Psychology.* 17 (1), 2002.

[60] B. Šverko. Origin of individual differences in importance attached to work: A model and a contribution to its evaluation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 34*, 28–39, 1989.

[61] S. Tevruz. Çalışma amaçları, bireyselci ve toplulukçu olma, çalışmanın yaşam içinde kapladığı yer. *M.Ü. Örgütsel Davranış Anabilim Dalı Bülteni,* (5), 1999, pp. 3–11

[62] S. Tevruz and T. Turgut. Çalışma Amaçlarının Tesbiti ve Çalışma Amaçları Testinin Geliştirilmesi. *Öneri Dergisi*, 6 (22), 2004, pp.33-44.

[63] T. Turgut and S. Tevruz. Çalışma Amaçları, Meslekler ve Çalışmaya Ayrılan Zaman. *Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi.* 3(1), 2003, pp.57–80

[64] D.L. Turnipseed. Are Good Soldiers Good? Exploring the Link between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Personnel Ethics. *Journal of Business Research*, (55), 2002, pp. 1–15.

[65] B. Uçanok. Çalışma Ahlakının Kontrol Odağı, Dindarlık ve Demografik Değişkenlerle İlişkisi. *M. Ü. Örgütsel Davranış Anabilim Dalı Bülteni.* Ekim 2004, (9), pp.3-18.

[66] N. Uyguç. Cinsiyet, Bireysel Değerler ve Meslek Seçimi. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İktisadi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 18(1),* 2003, pp.93-103.

[67] V. Uysal. *Geleneksellik-Cagdaslik Baglaminda Türkiye'de Dindarlik ve Kadin*. Camlica Yayinlari, 2003.

[68] V. Vroom. *Work and Motivation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964.

[69] G.B. Wright, C. P. Cullinan and D. M. Bline. The Relationship between Individual's Values and Perceptions of Moral Intensity: An Empirical Study. *Behavioral Research in Accounting, Supplement Conference Papers,* 9(26), 1997, pp.26-40.

[70] S. Zedeck. Commentary on Diversity and Work-Family Values. in Earley and Erez (1997). *New Perspectives on International Industrial / Organizational Psychology.* 319- 332, New Lexington Press, 1997, San Francisco.