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Abstract Employees perform various tasks that are not rewarded by organizations. However, going beyond job duties may also result in negative outcomes for employees and organizations. Considering this, the present study is an attempt to examine the literature on citizenship pressure. To conduct the research study, a qualitative approach was adopted. The PRISMA approach was used to systematically report the literature review. The results indicated that studies on the dark side of organizational citizenship behavior with the term ‘Citizenship Pressure’ are growing. The majority of the literature on citizenship pressure is widely dominated by the Western context. The present study summarizes the research progress on citizenship pressure and provides an overview of the most commonly adopted predictors and outcomes of citizenship pressure. Hence, this may lead to future research. Studies on citizenship pressure are dominated by quantitative techniques. Nevertheless, this is the only study that examined the ongoing research trends on citizenship pressure using PRISMA. This study will provide guidelines for future studies.
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1. Introduction

Currently, businesses are facing immense pressure due to the ever-changing environment and increasing competition. Organizations are striving hard to deal with the dynamic environment and competition by increasing their effectiveness and efficiency. To deal with such circumstances are encouraging their employees for better performance and asking them to go beyond the job descriptions as well. Organizational citizenship behavior is the extrarole behavior performed by employees, but it is not rewarded by organizations (Organ, 1997).

Notably, to be a good employee, only performing regular job duties is not enough. Therefore, employees are asked to go beyond their job duties, which denotes OCB. Previously, the performance of extrarole behaviors was considered a driver of positive outcomes at both the employee and organizational levels. Traditionally, organizational citizenship behaviors are discretionary and voluntary activities that often go beyond or above employees’ formal job scope and are less likely to be formally rewarded, such as helping peers, undertaking additional job duties, working extra hours and voicing important issues, which can promote the functioning of organizations (Organ, 1997). A large amount of prior research has suggested that OCBs have positive impacts not only on individuals but also on organizations and units (Podsakoff et al., 2018).

Although organizational citizenship behavior brings positive outcomes for organizations, the new research stream has shifted its focus from positive outcomes to negative outcomes. When employees engage in OCB, the unique needs of organizations will drain their energy and resources and make them feel a certain strain (Jiang, Zhao, & Ni, 2017). Employees experience citizenship pressure when their organizations and leaders want them to engage in more OCBs (Bolino et al., 2015).

However, HR management research also acknowledges that additional responsibilities can be detrimental for employees, especially if the employer places excessive emphasis on voluntary behaviors, leaving employees with the impression that they have no other choice than to allocate significant energy to voluntary efforts (Deery et al., 2017). Such pressures can manifest in different ways; for example, employees may believe that performing their formally prescribed job duties is not sufficient to achieve a reputation as a valuable organizational member, or they may sense an expectation that they sign up for extra task assignments, even if their formal job obligations leave them with insufficient time to do so (Bolino et al., 2015; Bolino & Klotz, 2015; Bolino et al., 2010).

Citizenship pressure is a negative outcome for both employees and organizational researchers. However, it is dominated by quantitative studies, even though the decade has passed to the introduction of this construct. The majority of the previously conducted studies are quantitative and perception based (Ahmed, 2020; Altay et al., 2020; Bolino et al., 2015; De Clercq et al., 2021; Deery et al., 2017; Jiang et al., 2017; Liang, 2021; Liu et al., 2021; Organ, 1997). This affirms that there...
is a need to conduct a qualitative study that can explain the nature of the construct and present future directions for researchers. Accordingly, the present study has considered the qualitative approach to review the literature on citizenship pressure and present future directions so that the literature on this topic can be advanced.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Citizenship Pressure

Citizenship pressure denotes the perception of employees due to the excessive demand for going beyond the job (Bolino et al., 2010). The perceived amount of pressure an individual experiences while doing a job tends to result in negative outcomes for both the employee and the organization (Bolino et al., 2015). When an organization places an extra focus on the individuals to help others. Employees going through this phase experience feelings of pressure to help others (Bolino et al., 2010).

There are some other constructs that are similar to citizenship pressure. Different terms are used to discuss concepts similar to citizenship pressure, such as citizenship climate, culture of citizenship and organizational citizenship behavior norms. Some authors have used citizenship culture terminology to explain the instances in which an employee is found to be engaged in higher levels of organizational citizenship behaviors (Tepper et al., 2004). Chen (2008) used culture to discuss the citizenship culture in which employees are motivated to be good citizens of an organization, simultaneously promoting fair treatment, keeping them satisfied and providing support to employees. Although it looks that citizenship pressure is similar to the abovementioned concepts, it is worth mentioning that citizenship pressure is not related to employees’ tendency to engage in citizenship behaviors, but it is the employee’s perception of how much pressure he/she feels to engage in OCBs (Bolino et al., 2010; Gilson, 2017). Similarly, the notion of OCB norms is also used, according to which it is the degree to which “OCB is considered to be standard” within a group (Ehrhart & Naumann, 2004). Citizenship pressure may look similar to individual subjective norms, but these norms are concerned with the extent to which an individual acknowledges that he/she is asked to perform OCB by his/her coworker.

From the overall discussion, it is clear that citizenship pressure is different from other job stressors, such as role conflict and ambiguity. Citizenship pressure addresses the perception of an individual regarding how much he/she is stressed to engage in voluntary citizenship behaviors (Hammack, 2018).

3. Methodology

To conduct the systematic review, the present study followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement [53] and took place from October to November 2021. It is followed since the process helps to ensure that the research is rigorous.

The eligibility criterion of the papers for the present study is as follows:

1. Type of paper (e.g., literature reviews, case studies, research articles, conference papers);
2. Type of journal (i.e., peer-reviewed vs. nonpeer-reviewed);
3. Paper access (i.e., open access vs. paid);
4. Topic domain (i.e., management, marketing, psychology vs. sciences)
5. The time range of the publication;
6. Stage of publication (i.e., published vs. in review)
7. The language of the publication.

The eligibility criterion is fixed to ensure that the maximum quality articles may be entertained in the review. Accordingly, full-length papers published between 2010 and November 2021 were included. Paper should be open access, written in English and to make sure that the quality papers are included in the review only peer-reviewed journal papers were selected. Bolino et al. (2010) first introduced the concept of “Citizenship pressure”, so the paper inclusion year started in 2010 to include the maximum published material to date on citizenship pressure.

3.1. Information sources and search strategy

Both the leading search engines Scopus and Web of Science were selected for the paper search. Since citizenship pressures are different from the other constructs, the present study has strictly remained to term citizenship pressure only while searching so that similar constructs, such as compulsory citizenship behavior and job crafting, may be excluded. The generic combination of the keywords contained the research (Citizenship) AND (Pressure). Keywords were selected for the title abstract and keywords fields.

3.2. Data collection process
PRISMA guides about the systematic literature search and record of the data. Accordingly, the first step is the identification of the relevant sources. A paper search was applied in the Scopus database to search for relevant papers. This search resulted in 483 documents in the Scopus database.

The second step according to PRISMA is screening. Therefore, all the sources were screened to exclude possible duplicates. All of the duplicate documents were excluded in this step. The third step was to check the final list of documents that met the eligibility criterion of the study. The database allowed us to select papers that are not available as open access and language. Furthermore, the database also allowed us to exclude irrelevant disciplines such as nursing, energy, earth and planetary sciences, engineering, and computer sciences. Accordingly, the study selected the following disciplines: social sciences, arts and humanities, business management and accounting, and psychology. All these filters in the Scopus database allowed us to obtain sources meeting the eligibility criteria. Finally, a fourth step was performed to select the relevant papers meeting the eligibility criteria.

3.3. Study selection

The figure 1 shows the details of how the studies are screened and selected to be considered under the review.

![Figure 1 Study Selection Workflow.](https://www.malque.pub/ojs/index.php/mr)
4. Results

The following section provides the detailed results of the systematic literature review. Table 1 and Figure 2 jointly show the number of publications in the domain of citizenship pressure over the year. Notably, the graph is going down due to the limited access available to download the papers but the overall trend shows that it is one of the emerging topics in behavioral sciences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study carefully selected 10 papers that were recently published in peer-reviewed journals. The abovementioned table 2 shows the details of the selected studies.

As per the findings reported in Table 1, the majority of the recently published work on citizenship pressure has been conducted in developed countries such as the USA and Canada. Additionally, the table also shows that the sample size of the studies ranged from 64 to 600+ with the domination of the quantitative studies. Although different theories are available to underpin the research framework, the table shows that there is no consistent theoretical approach to study citizenship pressure among employees working in different organizations. It is worth mentioning that the majority of the studies conducted on citizenship pressure have widely used the 8-item measure developed by Bolino et al. (2010).
Table 2 Details of the selected studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors, Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Qualitative/Quantitative</th>
<th>Sector/Industry</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Clercq et al. (2021)</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Textile, banking and healthcare</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Conservation of Resources Theory</td>
<td>8-item Bolino, Turnley, and Gilstrap (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liang (2021)</td>
<td>Northern Taiwan</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Retail and Distribution</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Social Exchange Theory</td>
<td>8-item Bolino, Turnley, and Gilstrap (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oney (2021)</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Personal services, healthcare</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Conservation of Resources Theory; Social Exchange Theory; Social Exchange Theory</td>
<td>14-item Williams and Anderson (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good, Halinski, and Boekhorst (2020)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Startups</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Social Exchange Theory</td>
<td>4-item Bolino et al. (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altaf et al. (2020)</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Manager and Supervisor</td>
<td>Optimization compensation Theory; Expectation theory</td>
<td>Details not given</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Discussion and future directions

The aim of the study is to examine the ongoing publication trend and offer future directions, particularly on the topic of citizenship pressure. It denotes the perception of the employee that he/she is being pressured rather than actual engagement in citizenship behaviors (Bolino et al., 2010). In this regard, the study adopted a qualitative approach and followed the PRISMA for data collection and reporting of the findings. After reviewing a bundle of papers published in recent years specifically on the topic of citizenship pressure. The present study offers certain future directions that can advance our understanding of the topic.

First, it is known that organizational citizenship behavior is of different types. For instance, Williams and Anderson (1991) proposed that citizenship behaviors are targeted toward either individuals or organizations. Moreover, according to Spector, Bauer, and Fox (2010), it is composed of different dimensions, such as altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. Therefore, it is anticipated that there will be different types of citizenship pressure on the individuals working within an organization. Thus, a dimensional conceptualization of citizenship pressure should be developed to advance the literature.
Second, as mentioned above, citizenship behaviors are of different types, so pressure is also of different types. The majority of the studies reviewed above have used only a single measure of citizenship pressure. Notably, it was introduced in 2010, which means that a decade has passed for this construct, but no new instrument to measure citizenship pressure has been introduced, which may have resulted in the biased results of previous studies. Future studies are encouraged to develop a new instrument for the measurement of citizenship pressure so that the different domains of the emerging constructs can be captured.

Third, as per the findings reported in Table 1, the majority of the studies are quantitative. This may hint at the weakness of the conceptualization of the construct since various similar constructs, such as compulsory citizenship behavior (Vigoda-Gadot, 2006) and job crafting (Tims & Bakker, 2010), are there. Therefore, it becomes necessary to advance the literature on citizenship pressure. Fourth, most of the studies are conducted in the service sector context, which may have resulted in biased literature evidence. More studies specifically in the manufacturing sector context are needed so that a more comprehensive and general view of citizenship pressure in all types of industries can be developed. Finally, the study offers that in the future, researchers must consider the data collection tools critically since the studies conducted in the USA have used online survey tools, which may potentially lead to misleading findings. It is recommended that interviews and self-administered questionnaires be used for data collection. More empirical evidence from the developing world is needed.
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