



## Voluntarily Performed Extra-Role Behaviors Versus Job Creep: Emotions, Withdrawal and Organizational Identification

Nil Selenay Erden

Ph. D., Istanbul University, School of Business, Department of Organizational Behavior, Avcilar, Istanbul, Turkey

### ABSTRACT

*The aim of this study is to investigate the results of extra-role behaviors and job creep. In this respect, it is hypothesized that when extra-role behaviors are performed voluntarily, they will lead to positive emotions and those positive emotions will contribute to organizational identification. On the other hand, when extra-role behaviors are not performed voluntarily, they will lead to job creep, which will result in negative emotions and employee withdrawal.*

*According to the study conducted on service sector employees working in Istanbul, when performed voluntarily, extra-role behaviors are associated with positive outcomes such as positive emotions and organizational identification. When these behaviors are performed with pressure that leads to job creep, they are associated with negative outcomes such as negative emotions and employee withdrawal.*

**KEYWORDS :** extra-role behaviors, job creep, emotions, withdrawal behaviors, organizational identification

### Introduction

The aim of this study is to investigate the individual consequences of extra-role behaviors; of which are also named as organizational citizenship behaviors, prosocial behaviors and organizational spontaneity. In general, those behaviors refer to helping others and volunteering for extra-work. In time, those extra-role behaviors could transform into in-role behaviors and lead to job creep. "Job creep" refers to an informal expansion of job duties as a result of others' perception (namely managers, coworkers, etc.) that volunteer work is a part of the individual's formal job definition. As such, managers or coworkers think that helping others and volunteering for extra-assignments is a part of the individual's responsibilities. Hence, the voluntariness in the motive of the individual causes a kind of outside pressure that s/he is expected to help others and volunteer for extra-work. As such, time spent at work will increase due to the extra-time spent on helping others and extra-assignments in addition to one's formal tasks. One can say that studies mostly focus on the antecedents of extra-role behaviors; however, this study is different from the classic standpoint of view in that it will shed light on individual consequences of extra-role behaviors in terms of emotions and behaviors.

It is predicted that extra-role behaviors will contribute to positive emotions by reason of feeding individuals' inner peace of which would be a result of the contribution made for the organization. On the other hand, when voluntary work becomes obligatory and leads to job creep, individuals will experience negative emotions and engage in withdrawal behaviors in order to avoid both the negative effects of the job creep and negative emotions.

In conclusion, when performed voluntarily, extra-role behaviors will contribute to positive emotions and those emotions will contribute to organizational identification. On the other hand, job creep will contribute to negative emotions and the individual will engage in withdrawal behaviors to avoid the negative emotions caused by the job creep. Information regarding the construct definition of research variables and hypothesized relationships are presented in the next section.

### Theoretical Background Extra-Role Behaviors

The Role Theory of Katz and Kahn (1966) is the basis of role behaviors in organizational behavior research. Accordingly, an organization is an informal structure as well as being a formal one, and the building blocks of the informal structure are the roles carried by organizational members. Members are attached to each other with the network ties. Those network ties determine member roles in terms of others' expectations as well as individual's formal job requirements. Others' expectations are likely to become a part of the individual's role if s/he conforms to them. At this point, role behaviors can be categorized as in-role and extra-role behaviors. "In-role behaviors" refer to tasks and responsibilities defined within the limit of formal job requirements

(Morrison, 1994). However, perception of tasks and responsibilities could differ among role performers even if they are expected to carry out the same tasks, depending on their self perception of role requirements. Thus, one can think that the perception of role requirements differs among individuals. However, over 30 years of research studying organizational citizenship behaviors classifies them as extra-role behaviors that are beyond in-role expectations. "Organizational citizenship behaviors" were first mentioned by Organ (1988), defined as discretionary behaviors beyond formal job requirements that contribute to organizational effectiveness, yet not rewarded by the organization. Organizational citizenship behaviors are studied under different construct names such as contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993), prosocial behavior (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986), organizational spontaneity (George & Brief, 1992) and extra-role behaviors (Van Dyne, Cummings & Parks, 1995). Those constructs are quite similar to each other, yet some differences among them are a result of their focus on different aspects of organizational citizenship behaviors. Contextual performance can be summarized as exerting extra effort for completing tasks, volunteering for extra-assignments, helping coworkers, following organizational norms and defending organizational objectives (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Contextual performance focuses on behaviors that contribute to social and psychological aspects of the organization. Prosocial behaviors are performed to contribute to the well-being of others in the organization; but these behaviors may sometimes be harmful for the organization, as the individual might spend more time on helping a coworker solve personal problems rather than spending time on one's own assignments (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). Organizational spontaneity is defined by George & Brief (1992), based on Katz and Kahn (1966)'s role theory. Spontaneous behaviors are classified under five dimensions; helping others, protecting the organization, making constructive suggestions, developing oneself and spreading goodwill (George & Jones, 1997); those behaviors underline the voluntary aspect of citizenship behaviors. Extra-role behaviors are classified as helping others, and voice behaviors, such as sharing ideas, making constructive suggestions (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), emphasize behaviors that are not a part of the individual's own assignments. As can be seen in the definitions, those concepts refer to behaviors that are beyond role requirements, of which result in favour of the organization. However, a construct complexity emerges as a result of the growing interest in the study of citizenship behaviors (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000). Organ (1997), suggests using the taxonomy of Williams & Anderson (1991) that classifies citizenship behaviors under two categories: "organizational citizenship behaviors directed at the individuals - OCBI" and "organizational citizenship behaviors directed at the organization - OCBO". Accordingly, altruism and courtesy could be classified as OCBI, whereas defending organizational objectives, protecting the organization and exerting extra effort could be classified as OCBO. Williams & Anderson (1991) scale consists of three dimensions, which are in-role behaviors, citizenship behaviors directed at the individual, and citizenship behaviors directed at the organization.

tion. Yet, the citizenship construct could become less blurry if conceptualized according to the target of the behavior: the individual and the organization. Based on the ideas presented above, this study uses the taxonomy of extra-role behaviors to represent helping others and taking extra-assignments. Studies that treat extra-role behaviors as independent variables mostly investigated group performance, organizational effectiveness, happiness, and counterproductive behaviors as the outcomes of those behaviors. Although not investigated empirically, another outcome of extra-role behaviors could be job creep. In this study, extra-role behaviors will be treated as a dynamic process; by reason of the fact that, in the course of time, the voluntary aspect of those behaviors might transform into obligations. In this respect, the job creep phenomenon should be considered.

### Job Creep

As first mentioned by Van Dyne and Ellis (2004), "job creep" is the slow expansion of job duties in a way that the extra-role behaviors become viewed as in-role behaviors and employees feel ongoing pressure due to coworkers' and managers' expectations. The expectations are towards discretionary behaviors; subsequently, good citizens are expected to help others and take extra assignments whenever they are asked to. If they do not behave in the expected way, psychological pressure starts to emerge in a way that cannot be immediately recognized. That is why job creep is an ongoing process and happens slowly, as it is shaped by outside forces.

Managerial pressure towards 'doing more with less' leads to job creep for certain employees. This pressure is applied to good citizens, as they create expectations by reason of their discretionary behaviors. In job creep, those discretionary behaviors soon become perceived as in-role behaviors. The slow expansion of job duties is not paid back with salary or promotion, thus the norm of reciprocity is violated (Van Dyne & Ellis, 2004). In conclusion, job creep removes the boundaries between in-role and extra-role behaviors. The expectations towards the frequency of extra-role behavior performance creates a pressure on the good citizens. Citizenship pressure might come up due to outside forces such as group norms and role expectations, or it can be felt due to the employee's internal values. Others might be more vulnerable to outside pressure; so that individual's differences should be considered at that point; for instance, employees who score high in conscientiousness might perceive more citizenship pressure (Bolino, Turnley, Gilstrap & Suazo, 2010). Based on the arguments above, if voluntarily performed, extra-role behaviors are frequently requested from the individual, job creep is expected to emerge.

Wellin (2007) argues that employees who experience job creep can withhold their efforts, work slower or take longer breaks to avoid the extra-work. They might feel negative emotions as well. Feelings of disappointment and anger might emerge as a result of the job creep (Ellis & Van Dyne, 2009). Briefly, voluntarily-performed extra-role behaviors would be related to positive emotions, whereas when the voluntariness of extra-role behaviors transforms into obligations and leads to job creep, this would be related with negative emotions. In this respect, positive and negative emotions should be considered.

### Emotions

Emotions can be defined as the positive or negative feelings, of which are psychological reactions regarding the cognitive evaluation of situations (Bhatia, 2009). Research in the affect domain adapts a taxonomy of positive and negative emotions (Watson & Clark 1994; Van Katwyk, Spector, Fox & Kelloway, 2000; Thompson, 2007). Positive affect is characterized by high energy, attentiveness and pleasure as a positive state of mind. Negative affect is characterized by misery and sleepiness with feelings of anger, guilt, and irritation as a negative psychological state (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988). Table 1 lists the positive and negative emotions.

Mood regulation theories investigate how individuals can manage their own feelings (feeling better by receiving social support, getting away from negative emotions by going to a music concert, etc.) (Gross, 1998). Helping others could especially deviate the attention of the individual from his/her own problems and negative emotions, and in turn, directing the affect into a more psychological positive state (Glomb, Bhawe, Miner & Wall, 2011). The loop of doing good and feeling good is empirically supported (See, Glomb et. al., 2011). In this study, it is expected that voluntarily performed extra-role be-

haviors would lead to positive emotions. No empirical study investigates the link between job creep and emotions. However, as stated by Wellin (2007), and Ellis & Van Dyne (2009), job creep is a threat to personal freedom and a violation of the psychological contract to the detriment of the employee, and those employees are expected to feel angry and disappointed. In this study, job creep is expected to lead to negative emotions, as well.

Negative emotions act as predictors of deviant behavior (Liu & Perrewe, 2005). Due to the role of emotions in explaining aggressive acts (Spector, Fox & Domagalski, 2006), it is expected that negative emotions resulting from job creep could trigger withdrawal behaviors of which are classified as a cluster in counterproductive or deviant work behaviors. In this respect, withdrawal behaviors should be examined.

### Withdrawal Behaviors

The term "withdrawal behaviors" is first mentioned by Hill and Trist (1953, 1955) in their studies on work accidents and absenteeism (See, Johns 2001). Before 1950, due to the negative effects of lateness and absenteeism on efficiency, those behaviors were studied by industrial psychologists (Johns, 2001). Rather than harming the organization directly, as a result of unfairness perceptions, dissatisfaction and the need to get away from stressors could lead to behaviors such as working less than required, and physically appearing in the office but engaging in other activities rather than work (Spector, Fox, Penney, Bruursema, Goh & Kessler, 2006). Absenteeism, lateness and turnover are physical acts of withdrawal from work, whereas withholding effort and work alienation are forms of psychological withdrawal (Beehr & Gupta, 1978). In this study, withholding effort, lateness, absenteeism and intention to quit are categorized as withdrawal behaviors.

Chen and Spector (1992) report a moderate positive relationship between feelings of disappointment and intentions to quit, a weak positive relationship between anger and absenteeism, and a strong positive relationship between anger and intention to quit. Spector et. al. (2006) reports positive relationships among withdrawal behaviors (absenteeism, lateness, leaving work early, taking longer breaks than required), along with feelings of boredom and sorrow. Another study reports positive relationships among negative emotions, absenteeism and turnover (Pelled & Xin, 1999), pointing to the fact that negative emotions are irritating feelings and the individuals could engage in withdrawal behaviors to order to get away from those negative feelings. In this study, it is predicted that when voluntarily-performed extra-role behaviors transform into obligatory acts due to outside pressure and lead to job creep, the freedom of the individuals would be threatened and negative emotions would be evoked. As to get away from negative feelings, the individuals would engage in withdrawal behaviors. Negative emotions felt as a result of job creep could lead to withdrawal behaviors, whereas positive emotions felt as a result of performing extra-role behaviors voluntarily could lead to organizational identification. Hence, organizational identification should be considered.

### Organizational Identification

Organizations are social categories for the individuals. Being a member of the organization, sharing a sense of organizational identity, feeling strong affective attachment towards the organization, owning the successes of the organization as one's own successes and failures is defined as organizational identification (Asforth & Mael, 1989; Mael & Asforth, 1992). Organizational identification is also defined as the internalization of organizational objectives and the fit between individual and organizational objectives (Hall, Schneider & Nygren, 1970). Edwards & Peccei (2007) studies organizational identification in three dimensions (See Asforth & Mael, 1989), with the first dimension being related to organizational membership. The second dimension is the alignment of personal objectives with organizational objectives (Hall et. al, 1970). The third dimension is the felt affective attachment to the organization. However, organizational identification and affective commitment are not the same in nature. Identification refers to sharing similar characteristics and common fate among group members, with regard to the group identity and emotional attachment for that particular group; whereas affective commitment refers to an attitude developed towards the organization as a result of the social exchange between parties (Gautam, Van Dick & Wagner, 2004). In this respect, organizational identification is the psychological bond between the individual and the organization. The importance of that psychological

bond results from its power to predict attitudes, behaviors towards the job, and the organization (Edwards, 2005).

The only empirical study that investigates the relationship between positive emotions and organizational identification is reported by Kreiner and Asforth (2004). Individuals in a positive mood are likely to evaluate their organization in a more optimistic way, focusing on the bright sides. As a result, their identification with the company is likely to get stronger. In line with the findings and arguments presented above, positive emotions evoked by voluntarily-performed extra-role behaviors are expected to contribute to organizational identification.

Based on past research and the rationale presented up until this section, extra-role behaviors would evoke positive emotions, whereas job creep is expected to evoke negative emotions. Negative emotions would lead to withdrawal behaviors and positive emotions would contribute to organizational identification.

### Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: The scores regarding positive emotion and organizational identification will be higher for those who perform extra-role behaviors voluntarily compared to the ones who experience job creep, whereas the negative emotion and withdrawal behavior scores will be higher for the ones who experience job creep in comparison to those who perform extra-role behaviors voluntarily.

Hypothesis 2: Negative emotions have positive contribution on withdrawal behaviors.

Hypothesis 3: Positive emotions have positive contribution on organizational identification.

### Method

A series of interviews, two focus group studies, and four pilot studies were conducted in order to define the limits of job creep, identify outcomes of extra-role behaviors and job creep, prepare scenarios regarding the phenomena of extra-role behaviors and job creep, and prepare scale items regarding emotions, withdrawal behaviors and organizational identification.

### Scales

**Scenarios:** Two separate scenarios were prepared for extra-role behaviors and job creep variables. Scenarios mention an office worker named Deniz working as an assistant specialist in a company. The first section of both scenarios give information about the person. Information is related with fulfilling all job requirements, in addition to also volunteering for additional assignments. In the second section, manipulation is given. In the extra-role behaviors scenario, volunteer help behaviors are mentioned. The job creep scenario mentions the volunteer work turning into obligations and the felt pressure due to increasing obligation. Instructions started with the following: "Now think of yourself in the position of Deniz, and think as if you are someone like him/her." Participants are then asked to answer the items in this direction.

**Emotions:** Watson, Clark and Tellegen (1988)'s PANAS scale consists of 10 positive and 10 negative emotions. Five positive and five negative emotions were chosen among those emotions of which were thought to fit the scenarios. Dynamic, peaceful, proud, happy and cheerful are chosen as the positive emotions, whereas tired, disappointed, sad, angry and nervous are chosen as the negative emotions. Answer scales range between "(1) Never" and "(6) Always." Cronbach's alpha of positive emotions for the extra-role behaviors scenarios is 0.71, and 0.74 for job creep. Cronbach's alpha of negative emotions is 0.71 and 0.74, respectively.

**Withdrawal Behaviors:** Previous research on withdrawal behaviors and focus group study results guided me to classify lateness, absenteeism, withholding effort, psychological withdrawal and turnover intention as the withdrawal behaviors that would fit with research purposes. In this respect, five statements were written. Answer scales range between "(1) Certainly No" and "(6) Certainly Yes." Cronbach's alpha values are 0.71 and 0.75, respectively.

**Organizational Identification:** Mael and Asforth (1992)'s six item scale of organizational identification was revised and used. Answer scales

range between "(1) Certainly No" and "(6) Certainly Yes." Cronbach's alpha values are 0.73 and 0.76, respectively.

### Procedure and Sample

Data gathering was conducted by two trained research assistants through telephone interviews. In the telephone interviews, the introduction could be quoted as "Have a nice day, sir/madam. My name is... We are conducting a research on the individual consequences of extra-role behaviors for a PhD dissertation at Marmara University. I would like to get your ideas regarding the topic." Subjects who agreed to participate in the research first answered questions related with their age, sector of employment, and work positions. Regarding employment in the private sector, working in the office environment and being between the ages of 20 to 40 were prerequisites, and rest of the questions were asked to subjects with the appropriate characteristics. Next, instructions, scenarios, scales and items were narrated. During the interviews, scenarios and answer scales were repeated. Gender was coded without asking. Educational status, business segment, managerial position, tenure, total work experience were also asked. Finally, the name, surname and telephone number of the participant was confirmed.

Subjects were chosen among the list of a research company, which consists of nearly two million employees working in Istanbul. As random sampling was not applied, sample characteristics were equalized with matching. Participants' age range was limited from 20 to 40 years old, as such tenure and total work experience took similar average scores among groups. Salary was kept optional, and by that reason, it was not equalized. 200 subjects participated in the extra-role behaviors scenario and 201 subjects participated in the job creep scenario. Demographic information is presented in Table 2.

### Insert Table 2 here

The average age of subjects in the extra-role behaviors scenario is 29 (std. dev. 4.82), the average work life experience is 7.8 years (std. dev. 5.5), and the average tenure is 3 years (std. dev. 3.1). The average age of subjects in the job creep scenario is 28.5 years old (std. dev. 4.7), the average work life experience is 7.4 years (std. dev. 5.1), and the average tenure being 2.8 years (std. dev. 2.8). As can be seen, groups are matched with regard to age, tenure and total work experience. The distribution is quite similar in terms of gender, managerial positions and educational status. Salary groups are not equalized, however, they still seem similar. The majority of the groups consist of office workers (48% and 54%), while the minority consists of top level managers (1% and 6%). The number of experts are quite similar (22% and 21%). The most outstanding difference is among middle level managers (See, 29% and 19%). Even though the distribution of subjects among groups with regard to work positions is not perfectly equal, it still seems rather similar. Business segments show quite a variety. However, the number of subjects among those segments seem similar. As a result, one can conclude that samples are matched in terms of demographic characteristics.

### Data Analysis

SPSS 18 statistical package was used to test the research model. In this respect, reliability analysis revealed Cronbach's alpha values of each scale. The principal component and varimax rotation technique was adapted to identify the dimensions of variables. Independent samples t-test and simple regression analysis were conducted to investigate hypothesized relationships among variables.

### Results

For each scenario, cronbach alpha levels of each scale is above 0.70 (See, Table 3). The item in withdrawal behaviors scale "if possible, I would leave my department and work in another department in the same organization" was removed from each scenario's data set in order to set alpha levels above 0.70. As such, all scales are reliable enough to proceed to factor analyses.

### Insert Table 3 here

Affect scales had the same items for both of the scenarios. Factor analyses were run separately for each scenario. Results reveal that for both scenarios, emotions have two dimensions as expected; positive and negative (Extra-role behaviors and job creep scenario; KMO = 0.826 and 0.871, Bartlett Test of Sphericity Chi Square: 514.461 and 576.333; df: 45; p < 0.001).

For both the extra-role behaviors scenario ( $KMO = 0.739$  and Bartlett Test of Sphericity Chi Square: 145.081; df: 6;  $p < 0.001$ ) and the job creep scenario ( $KMO = 0.768$  and Bartlett Test of Sphericity Chi Square: 172.105; df: 6;  $p < 0.001$ ), the factor analyses reveal only one dimension for the withdrawal behaviors scales, as expected.

In both the extra-role behaviors scenario ( $KMO = 0.778$  and Bartlett Test of Sphericity Chi Square: 226.049; df: 15;  $p < 0.001$ ) and job creep scenario ( $KMO = 0.800$  and Bartlett Test of Sphericity Chi Square: 264.104; df: 15;  $p < 0.001$ ), factor analyses reveal only one dimension for the organizational identification scales, as expected.

Independent samples *t*-test results for Hypothesis 1: Statistically significant higher scores were expected in positive emotions and organizational identification for the extra-role behaviors scenario, whereas significant higher scores of negative emotions and withdrawal behaviors were expected for job creep scenario. Positive emotions have higher scores for the extra-role behaviors scenario ( $4.22 > 3.25$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Negative emotions have higher scores for the job creep scenario ( $3.25 > 2.57$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). The withdrawal score is higher for the job creep scenario ( $3.50 > 2.69$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). The organizational identification score is higher for the extra-role behaviors scenario ( $4.97 > 4.56$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). As can be seen, Hypothesis 1 receives full support. However, the high scores of organizational identification for both scenarios should be highlighted (See, 4.97 and 4.56).

Regression analysis results for Hypothesis 2: Negative emotions have moderate and positive contributions on withdrawal behaviors ( $Beta = 0.49$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Besides,  $R^2$  indicates that 24% of variance in withdrawal behaviors could be explained with negative emotions. As positive emotions were negatively related to withdrawal behaviors ( $r = -0.47$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), the contribution of positive and negative emotions on withdrawal behaviors were also tested. In this step, positive and negative emotions were taken as independent variables to the model, whereas withdrawal behaviors was entered as the dependent variable. In this case, it was found that negative emotions had positive contribution on withdrawal behaviors ( $Beta = 0.33$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), whereas positive emotions had a significant negative contribution ( $Beta = -0.27$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Based on the findings, one can conclude that a negative affect has additive effects on withdrawal behaviors while positive affect has a lessening effect. Hypothesis 2 receives full support.

Regression analysis results for Hypothesis 3: Positive emotions have moderate and positive contribution on organizational identification ( $Beta = 0.44$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Besides,  $R^2$  indicates that 19% of variance in organizational identification could be explained with positive emotions. As negative emotions were negatively related to organizational identification ( $r = -0.28$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), the contribution of positive and negative emotions on organizational identification were also tested. In this step, positive and negative emotions were taken as independent variables to the model, whereas organizational identification was entered as the dependent variable. In this case, it was found that the contribution of negative emotions on organizational identification was not significant ( $Beta = 0.091$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). Results reveal that positive affect has additive effects on organizational identification whereas negative affect does not have meaningful contribution. Hypothesis 3 receives full support.

## Discussion

**Extra-Role Behaviors, Positive Emotions and Organizational Identification:** I expected positive emotions and organizational identification would be higher in the case where extra-role behaviors are performed voluntarily, in comparison to the conditions of job creep, of which violate the voluntariness of extra-role behaviors. This presumption was supported by study results ( $4.22 > 3.25$  and  $4.97 > 4.56$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). An individual who helps his/her coworkers could experience a positive state of mind, by getting away from their own problems and negative emotions. Extra-role behaviors encourage the socialization among coworkers. Voluntarily performed extra-role behaviors could also strengthen the social identity and contribute to organizational identification. Since extra-role performers would have greater number of links with others, s/he would gain a place in the informal network of the organization. Consequently, being a part of the social network would contribute to his/her organizational identity. As a matter of fact, individuals who participated in the extra-role behaviors scenario had higher scores in positive affect and the contribution

of positive emotions on organizational identification was found to be  $0.44$  ( $p < 0.001$ ). Briefly, individuals who are high in positive affect could easily focus on the bright sides of the organization, and with an optimistic explanatory style, their organizational identification would get stronger (Kreiner & Asforth, 2004). The positive relationship between positive affect and organizational identification ( $r = 0.57$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) was also reported by Kreiner and Asforth (2004).

**Positive Emotions and Withdrawal Behaviors:** I did not expect any significant effect of positive emotions on withdrawal behaviors. However, results indicated a significant negative effect ( $Beta = -0.27$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Then, being in a positive state of mind could lessen psychological withdrawal, lateness and absenteeism behaviors. Avey, Wernsing and Luthans (2008) report a significant negative relationship between positive emotions and deviant behaviors ( $r = -0.55$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). They explain this finding with the broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions which was developed by Frederickson (2004). Accordingly, positive emotions act as a mechanism that enrich the cognitive repertoire of the individual and contribute to creativeness, positive behaviors and psychological resources. On the other hand, negative emotions evoke fight or flight responses by diminishing psychological resources. Thus, we conclude that positive emotions buffer the negative acts of fight or flight, and lessen employee withdrawal.

**Job Creep, Negative Emotions and Withdrawal Behaviors:** Individuals who experience job creep were expected to be in a negative state of mind characterized by feeling nervous, bored and disappointed; so, they would develop a tendency to engage in withdrawal behaviors. Indeed, individuals who participated in the job creep scenario had higher negative affect ( $3.25 > 2.57$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and they had higher scores in withdrawal behaviors ( $3.46 > 2.89$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). In this study, the contribution of negative emotions on withdrawal behaviors was found to be  $0.49$ , ( $p < 0.001$ ). Then, it is confirmed that negative emotions evoked by job creep would lead to withdrawal behaviors such as withholding effort or spending less time doing work by having longer breaks. This is due to the need of lessening the negative effects of job creep and negative emotions. The positive contribution of negative emotions on withdrawal behaviors was also supported by past research findings (See, Chen and Spector, 1992; Pelled and Xin, 1993). In this case, organizations might face the possibility of losing good citizens.

Resulting from the absence of empirical research on job creep and untested theoretical assumptions, Deci and Ryan (1985)'s self-determination theory should be considered as a means of explaining the study results. Accordingly, every individual has a need for growth and this growth need is satisfied with behaviors that are internally motivated. Intrinsic motivation is becoming motivated for doing something just because it is interesting or satisfying on its own. In intrinsic motivation, there is no expectation for external rewards (Deci, 1972). Moreover, external rewards could diminish the intrinsic motivation (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 2001). In that case, acts of extra-role behaviors are due to the high growth need of the individual. The basis of intrinsic motivation is related with competence, belongingness and autonomy needs (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The individual satisfies the need of competence by volunteering for extra assignments. Helping others is a way of socialization; as such, the individual satisfies their need of belongingness. However, if the voluntary aspect of extra-role behaviors is diminished by job creep, the need of autonomy would be violated due to increasing obligations. As a result, intrinsic motivation would decrease. Especially, if the individual perceives that his/her help will be asked for in the future and senses a pressure towards helping others, his/her area of freedom would be threatened. Hence, willingness to help will decrease because the individual would like to help via free will, not by pressure (Berkowitz, 1973). An individual who cannot satisfy their need for autonomy would feel negative emotions and engage in withdrawal behaviors to get away from those negative emotions.

**Scenarios and Organizational Identification:** I expected that organizational identification scores would be higher in the case of extra-role behaviors. Independent samples *t*-test indicated a meaningful difference among scenarios, as well. The average organizational identification score was  $4.97$  for extra-role behaviors and  $4.56$  for job creep ( $p < 0.001$ ). Despite the fact that the difference is meaningful,  $4.5$  out of  $6$  is still a high score in the case of job creep. This finding

could also be explained with Deci and Ryan (1985)'s self-determination theory. Let's assume that the individual satisfies their competence and belongingness needs as being a member of the organization. Even though the individual engages in withdrawal behaviors to satisfy an autonomy need, relations with coworkers and strength of the psychological bond with the organization would buffer the dramatical decline in the level of organizational identification. With the case of job creep, although there is pressure on working more than required and helping others, the individual would still receive a message towards how valuable s/he is for her/his organization. Under those circumstances, satisfied competence and belongingness needs would buffer the effects of job creep on organizational identification.

In conclusion, significance of the study is based on its experimental design and its focus on two important gaps in the literature. First, extra-role behaviors are treated as an independent variable and its outcomes are investigated. Secondly, the phenomenon of job creep, which has not been tested empirically, is examined.

For the sake of increasing awareness towards job creep, brief information regarding the phenomenon is presented before moving onto suggestions. In particular, downsizing organizations functioning with of employees with higher amounts of workload, unrevised job definitions which do not recognize new tasks that emerge with the changes in workflow, unfair distribution of tasks among employees, manager or coworker pressure, and social loafing could all be summarized as the factors that contribute to job creep. Even though no research investigates the relationships between social loafing and job creep, we believe that durability of social loafing could increase the 'sucker effect.' According to Tan and Tan (2008), group members with high conscientiousness, work group interest, and sense of responsibility do less engaging in social loafing. Accordingly, in cohesive groups with high job visibility, organizational citizenship behaviors are more frequently performed. Besides, in work groups with low job visibility and unclear work distribution, members with low internal work motivation could engage in social loafing more frequently. In conclusion, weak performance norms and weak sense of "we" could lead to a sucker effect for good citizens, as they will be helping free-riders or completing their tasks on their behalf (Liden, Wayne, Jaworski & Bennett, 2004). Job creep is a neglected construct, for both the researchers and organizations, and this could be due to the idea that "this person was working voluntarily before, [and they] would continue anyway." Nevertheless, managers who do not control the factors that could lead to job creep should consider the possibility of losing valuable organizational members. If those valuable members are bombarded with obligatory demands, they could feel negative affect, and to avoid those negative feelings, they could engage in withdrawal behaviors. Fair distribution of work and up-to-date job definitions as well as high job visibility could prevent job creep. In addition to that, the person-job fit should be well established so that work flow problems with regard to incompetent employees can be prevented.

Suggestions

Job creep should be investigated empirically as there is not much theoretical knowledge about the phenomenon, and both qualitative and quantitative research is needed. The definition could be enlarged, while subdimensions could be explored and situational contributors could be investigated. For instance, do employees with certain characteristics face job creep more than others? Could conscientiousness and perfectionism be one of those characteristics? What about the communication style: is job creep related with "not being able to say no" to extra demands? How could work group characteristics and organizational culture shape it? Could job creep be considered as a factor that violates the norm of reciprocity between the individual and the organization? Does educational status differentiate the responses towards job creep? How could extra-role behaviors and job creep be investigated from the perspective of social exchange theory? Besides, we focused on negative emotions and withdrawal behaviors as outcomes of job creep. Future research could also investigate individual and organizational outcomes of job creep.

Besides job creep, there is a need for conducting future research on the individual and organizational consequences of extra-role behaviors. As extra-role behaviors were treated as a performance indicator, antecedents are mostly investigated. What happens next? In other words, what kind of consequences do extra-role performers experience

in their work groups? How do group dynamics get affected? How are good citizens perceived by their work group and managers? We focused on positive emotions and organizational identification as outcomes of extra-role behaviors. Future research could also treat extra-role behaviors as an ongoing process rather than considering those behaviors as dependent variables.

APPENDIX  
Table 1: Positive and Negative Emotions

Positive Emotions	Negative Emotions
Interested	Distressed
Excited	Upset
Strong	Guilty
Enthusiastic	Scared
Proud	Hostile
Alert	Irritable
Inspired	Ashamed
Determined	Nervous
Attentive	Jittery
Active	Afraid

Source: Watson, D., Clark, L. A. & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and Validation of Brief Measures of Positive and Negative Affect: the Panas Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54 (6), pp. 1070.

Table 2: Demographic Information

Demographics	Extra-Role Behaviors	Job Creep
Female	100	101
Male	100	100
High School Graduate	31	32
College Graduate	19	16
Undergraduate	134	137
Postgraduate	16	16
Subjects in managerial position	106	110
Salary less than 1000 TL	7	7
1001 TL- 2000 TL	74	60
2001 TL-3000 TL	46	45
3001 TL-4000 TL	28	17
4001-5000 TL	11	8
5001 TL or above	18	10
Missing (salary)	16	54

Table 3: Reliability Scores

SCALE	SCENARIO: EXTRA-ROLE BEHAVIORS CRONBACH'S ALPHA	SCENARIO: JOB CREEP CRONBACH'S ALPHA
1. Positive Emotions	0.71	0.74
2. Negative Emotions	0.71	0.74
3. Withdrawal Behaviors	0.71	0.75
4. Organizational Identification	0.73	0.76

References

1. Asforth, B. E. & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14 (1), 20-39.

2. Avey, J. B., Wernsing, T. S. & Luthans, F. (2008). Can positive employees help positive organizational change? Impact of psychological capital and emotions on relevant attitudes and behavior. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences*, 44(1), 48-70.

3. Beehr, T. A. & Gupta, N. (1978). A note on the structure of employee withdrawal. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 21, 73-79.

4. Berkowitz, L. (1973). Reactance and unwillingness to help others. *Psychological Bul-*

- letin, 79 (5), 310-317.
5. Bhatia, M. S. (2009). Dictionary of Psychology and Allied Sciences. New Age International Sciences.
  6. Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. T., Gilstrap, J. B. & Suazo, M. M. (2010). Citizenship under pressure: what's a good soldier to do? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 835-855.
  7. Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. (Eds.: N. Schmitt, W. C. Borman). *Personnel selection in organizations*. 71-98. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
  8. Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 710-725.
  9. Chen, P. Y. & Spector, P. E. (1992). Relationships of work stressors with aggression: withdrawal, theft and substance use: an exploratory study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65, 177-184.
  10. Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
  11. Deci, E. L., Koestner, R. & Ryan R. M. (2001). Extrinsic rewards and intrinsic motivation in education: reconsidered once again. *Review of Educational Research*, 71(1), 1-27.
  12. Ellis, J. B. & Van Dyne, L. (2009). Voice and silence as observer reactions to defensive voice: Predictions based on communication competence theory. (Eds.: J. Greenberg & M. S. Edwards). *Voice and silence in organizations*, 37-61. Bingley, U.K.: Emerald Group.
  13. Edwards, M. R. (2005). Organizational identification: a conceptual and operational review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 7 (4), 207-230.
  14. Edwards, M. R., & Pececi, R. (2007). Organizational identification: development and testing of a conceptually grounded measure. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 16 (1), 25-57.
  15. Frederickson, B. L. (2004). The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, 359, 1367-1377.
  16. Gautam, T., Van Dick, R. & Wagner, U. (2004). Organizational identification and organizational commitment: distinct aspects of two related concepts. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 7, 301-315.
  17. George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good-doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 310-329.
  18. George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (1997). Organizational spontaneity in context. *Human Performance*, 10, 153-170.
  19. Glomb, T. M., Bhawe, D. P., Miner, A. G. & Wall, M. (2011). Doing good, feeling good: examining the role of organizational citizenship behaviors in changing mood. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 191-223.
  20. Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: an integrative review. *Review of General Psychology*, 2 (3), 271-299.
  21. Hall, D. T., Schneider, B. & Nygren, H. T. (1970). Personal factors in organizational identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 176-190.
  22. Johns, G. (2001). The psychology of lateness, absenteeism, and turnover. (Eds.: N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran). *Handbook of industrial, work & organizational psychology*, 232-252. London: Sage.
  23. Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
  24. Kreiner, G. E. & Ashforth, B. E. (2004). Evidence towards an expanded model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 1-27.
  25. Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Jaworski, R. A. & Bennett, N. (2004). Social loafing: a field investigation. *Journal of Management*, 30 (2), 285-304.
  26. Liu, Y. & Perrewe, P. L. (2005). The role of emotion in employee counterproductive work behavior: integrating the psychoevolutionary and constructivist perspective. (Eds.: C. E. Hartel, W. J. Zerbe, & N. M. Ashkanasy). *Emotions in organizational behavior*, 67-86. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
  27. Mael, F. & Asforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: a partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 103-123.
  28. Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: the importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37 (6), 1543-1567.
  29. Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: the good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
  30. Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: it's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10 (2), 85-97.
  31. Pelled, L. H. & Xin, K. R. (1999). Down and out: an investigation of the relationship between mood and employee withdrawal behavior. *Journal of Management*, 25 (6), 875-895.
  32. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B. & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: a critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26 (3), 513-563.
  33. Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67.
  34. Spector, P. E., Fox, S., & Domagalski, T. (2006). Emotions, violence and counterproductive work behavior. (Eds.: E. K. Kelloway, J. Barling, and J. Hurrell). *Handbook of workplace violence*, 29-46. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
  35. Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A. & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 446-460.
  36. Tan, H. H. & Tan, M. (2008). Organizational citizenship behavior and social loafing: the role of personality, motives and contextual factors. *The Journal of Psychology*, 142 (1), 89-108.
  37. Thompson, E. R. (2007). Development and validation of an internationally reliable short-form of the positive and negative affect schedule (panas). *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 38, 227-242.
  38. Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & Parks, J. M. 1995. Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (A bridge over muddied waters). (Eds.: L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw). *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 17): 215-285. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
  39. Van Dyne, L. & Ellis, J. B. (2004). Job creep: a reactance theory perspective on organizational citizenship behavior as over-fulfillment of obligations. (Eds.: J.C. Shapiro, L. Shore, S. Taylor & L. Tetrick). *The employment relationship: examining psychological and contextual perspectives*, 181-205. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
  40. Van Dyne, L. & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 108-120.
  41. Van Katwyk, P. T., Spector, P. E., Fox, S. & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Using the job-related affective well-being scale (jaws) to investigate affective responses to work stressors. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5 (2), 219-230.
  42. Watson, D. & Clark, L. A. (1994). *The panas-x manual for the positive and negative affect Schedule-expanded form*. New York: Springer Publishing.
  43. Watson, D., Clark, L. A. & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: the panas scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54 (6), 1063-1070.
  44. Wellin, M. (2007). *Managing the Psychological Contract: Using the Personal Deal to Increase Business Performance*. Gower Publishing Limited.
  45. Williams, L. J. & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17 (3), 601-617.