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The Leading Causes and Consequences of Citizenship Pressure in the Hotel Industry

Abstract

Purpose — This study aims to examine the causes of citizenship pressure and to investigate the relationship between citizenship pressure, job stress, and turnover intentions. Specifically, the current study examines the effects of the personality trait of neuroticism and the organizational cultures of bureaucracy and the market.

Design/methodology/approach — Data were collected from 224 hotel employees in the People’s Republic of China using a self-administered survey questionnaire. The participants completed measures examining citizenship pressure, personality, organizational culture, job stress, and intention to quit. Structural equation modeling (SEM) was used to test the research hypotheses.

Findings — The results showed that employees who are more neurotic are more likely to experience citizenship pressure. Moreover, citizenship pressure was found to increase job stress and turnover intentions. However, a bureaucratic culture, which prizes stability, was found to reduce citizenship pressure.

Practical implications — This study presents factors that may influence hotel employees’ perceptions of citizenship pressure and reveals the negative consequences of such pressure. Thus, the study results contribute to a better understanding of citizenship pressure and can be used to develop guidelines to reduce citizenship pressure in work environments.

Originality/value — To the best of our knowledge, the current study is the first empirical study to examine the antecedents and consequences of citizenship pressure in the hotel industry. Moreover, previous citizenship pressure studies have mainly been conducted in a Western cultural context; it is unclear whether citizenship pressure can be similarly observed in China, where the nature and form of employment relationships differ significantly from those in Western countries.

Keywords — Citizenship pressure, organizational culture, organizational citizenship behavior, job stress, turnover intention

Paper type — Research paper
Introduction

In the hotel industry, customer demands are highly unpredictable. Therefore, hotel employees are often required to extend assistance beyond their primary tasks to help customers solve problems (Wang, 2009). Organ (1988) coined the term “organizational citizenship behaviors” (OCBs) to describe discretionary behaviors that go beyond the obligations prescribed in one’s job description and that are not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system.

In recent years, a small but growing number of studies have reconsidered the contemporary understanding of OCBs in light of new evidence about the non-voluntary aspects of such behaviors. For example, Vigoda-Gadot (2007) noted the concept of compulsory OCBs, and Bolino and Turnley (2005) termed this phenomenon “citizenship pressure.”

In contrast to conventional OCBs, citizenship pressure is not based on the genuine, spontaneous goodwill of individuals; rather, it emerges in response to external pressures from significant others in the workplace (e.g., managers and co-workers) who want to increase employees’ workload by involving them in extra-role behaviors that are beyond the scope of their job description. “Some employees may capitulate to such pressures, but others will regard them as illegitimate or abusive” (Vigoda-Gadot, 2007, p. 380). Those who interpret these pressures negatively have been found to respond negatively both psychologically and in terms of their performance (Bolino and Turnley, 2005). For example, Bolino and Turnley (2005) found that citizenship pressure caused individuals to fail in balancing their work obligations and their family duties. Moreover, their leisure or personal time was threatened by citizenship pressure. Citizenship pressure also tends to increase job stress and ultimately to affect intentions to remain with the organization (e.g., Chuang and Lei, 2011).

Considering that employers often informally reward OCBs, employees who feel they lack job security are highly likely to feel pressured to engage in discretionary activities to
increase their career success and/or retain their jobs. Choi (2006) noted that internal and external factors surrounding the hotel industry change rapidly; these factors include new hiring patterns (i.e., casual employment, contract employment, and outsourcing). These environmental factors create job insecurity among hotel employees and can drive them to involuntarily engage in OCBs. However, in the hospitality literature on human resource management, studies of turnover intentions have not considered changes in the workplace and the citizenship pressure that hotel employees experience, which may be related to the persistent lack of research on OCBs in the hospitality literature. According to Ravichandran et al. (2007), of the 200 articles published since the emergence of the OCB theory, only a dozen focused specifically on the hospitality industry (e.g., Liang, 2012). Furthermore, the existing citizenship pressure studies have mainly been conducted in a Western cultural context, with very few researching China (Peng and Zhao, 2012). There are two main reasons for further investigations to test the generalizability of prior research findings to China. First, the Chinese hotel industry has experienced significant growth with the adoption of open policies in recent years. However, the industry currently faces resource management problems, such as high turnover rates and an unwillingness of university graduates to enter the industry (Zhang and Wu, 2004). Moreover, the nature and form of employment relationships in China are significantly different from those in Western countries (Hui et al., 2004). For example, North American employers typically rely on rules and legal protections to enforce contracts (Pearce, 2001), whereas China is known for its reliance on human relationships when managing employees. The absence of a strong regard for legal contracts in the employer-employee relationship indicates that such exchange relationships may depend on social and interpersonal mechanisms rather than formalisms arising from legislation (Hui et al., 2004).
With these issues in mind, the current study examines the influences that increase citizenship pressure while focusing on the Chinese hotel industry. The specific objectives of this study are, first, to examine both the internal and external forces that make employees feel obligated to engage in OCBs. Moreover, given the scarce number of previous studies and to provide a better understanding of citizenship pressure, the current study also examines the consequences of citizenship pressure. Finally, this study empirically tests the theoretical model and the structural relationships among the constructs in the context of the Chinese hotel industry.

**Literature review and conceptual framework**

**Citizenship pressure**

In the workplace, employees often experience job demands—“aspects of the job that require sustained physical and/or psychological effort and are therefore associated with certain physiological and psychological costs” (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004). These in-role work requirements often cause stress when meeting them requires significant effort on the part of the employee. However, researchers have argued that this type of stress may be rather good because it creates challenges and feelings of fulfillment or achievement (Cavanaugh et al., 2000). Conversely, employees feel pressured when they engage in relatively more discretionary citizenship behaviors that go beyond their in-role duties (Bolino et al., 2010).

In the literature, OCBs have been conceptualized 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” (Organ, 1988, p. 4). Positive consequences of OCBs have been widely discussed in the literature (e.g., Ma et al., 2010).
2013). For example, researchers have suggested that OCBs contribute to the effective functioning of an organization (Organ, 1988). Moreover, employees who engage in OCBs receive intrinsic rewards, such as a sense of accomplishment, feelings of growth, and a sense of helping others (Stoner et al., 2011).

However, there is a downside to engaging in OCBs. Because OCBs are often informally encouraged and rewarded, employees may feel pressured to perform OCBs within their organization. Bolino et al. (2010) introduced the term “citizenship pressure” and described the circumstances in which OCBs are implicitly required. Considering that citizenship pressure refers to an employee’s perception of how much pressure there is to participate in supposedly voluntary OCBs, it is distinct from in-role demands as well as OCBs. Citizenship pressure has been examined when assessing an individual’s perceived level of pressure to engage in three forms of OCBs: helping behavior, individual initiative, and loyalty behavior (Bolino et al., 2010). First, helping behavior refers to an individual’s willingness to provide support and assistance to co-workers in the organization when needed (Moorman and Blakely, 1995). According to Podsakoff et al. (2000), individual initiative is a specific type of OCB in which employees “engage in task-related behaviors at a level that is so far beyond minimally required or generally expected levels that it takes on a voluntary flavor” (p. 524). Some examples are going into the office on weekends, coming in early for work and staying late. Finally, loyalty behavior describes the promotion of the organizational image to outsiders (Moorman and Blakely, 1995). Examples include encouraging friends and family to use the organization’s products and promoting the organization’s products and services to potential users.

As discussed above, citizenship pressure occurs when employees perceive that OCBs are not truly voluntary, and therefore, they feel pressured to engage in discretionary activities.
Both the external stimulus and the personal characteristics of the individual experiencing the situation are likely to contribute to citizenship pressure. For example, different employees working in the same organizational environment and for the same supervisor might experience different levels of citizenship pressure (i.e., as a result of internal forces). Moreover, there may be contextual factors (i.e., external forces) that affect employees’ perceptions of citizenship pressure. Therefore, the current study focuses on both internal and external sources of citizenship pressure (see Figure I).

Researchers have found that citizenship pressure is likely to have negative consequences. For example, experiencing higher levels of pressure while engaging in involuntary extra-role behaviors can increase job stress and the intention to leave the organization (Jackson and Schuler, 1985). Despite the apparent importance of this topic, there is a significant lack of related studies. Therefore, in an effort to enhance our understanding of citizenship pressure, the current study examines its determinants and consequences.

**Internal forces**

Research projects investigating internal factors that may be correlated with OCBs are abundant (Lapierre and Hackett, 2007). Internal forces lead individuals to process information and behave differently from one another. Unlike external forces, internal forces are difficult to control because they are inherent to individuals. In the current study, we focused on personality traits in terms of their influence on citizenship pressure. In health
psychology, the predictive power of personality trait measures in stress research has been emphasized (Ebstrup et al., 2011). Vollrath (2001) noted that personality traits not only affect individual stress appraisal and coping processes but are also critical factors in one’s selection and shaping of stressful situations. This notion is supported by Carver and Connor-Smith (2010), who argue that personality traits influence individuals’ frequency of exposure to stressors, the type of stressors they experience, and their appraisal of stressors.

In the literature, a five-factor model of personality often called the Big Five (Costa and McCrae, 1992) has been widely used to describe the most salient personality traits. The Big Five is also one of the most popular personality theories used in the tourism and hospitality industry (Leung and Law, 2010). The five factors (i.e., neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness) describe basic personality dimensions. A review of the personality traits related to organizational behaviors suggests that four personality traits—agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and openness—are positively related to OCBs, whereas neuroticism is negatively related (Kaur and Singh, 2014; Magnus et al., 1993). For example, previous researchers have found a positive relationship between openness and OCBs (Elanain, 2007; Mount et al., 1998; Caligiuri, 2000). Furthermore, Elanain (2007) suggested that individuals who are high in openness to experience, conscientiousness, or emotional stability engage in the highest levels of OCBs. Among these four personality traits, openness to experience was found to be the most important predictor of OCBs. In a more recent study, Kaur and Singh (2014) confirmed that conscientiousness, openness to experience, agreeableness, and extraversion were all positively correlated with OCBs.

In contrast, unlike the personality traits discussed above, neuroticism has been found to be negatively related to job performance (Magnus et al., 1993). Neuroticism is a
personality trait that is related to emotional stability, and therefore, neurotic individuals lack the ability to monitor and control their feelings and emotions when addressing a stressful situation (e.g., Bolger and Zuckerman, 1995; Gunthert et al., 1999). In corroborating this notion, previous researchers have found that neurotic employees are more likely to experience greater exposure to stressful events, to be more reactive to stress (Bolger and Zuckerman, 1995) and to employ maladaptive coping strategies, such as self-blame and wishful thinking (Gunthert et al., 1999). Thus, when OCBs are involuntary, neurotic employees are likely to experience higher levels of citizenship pressure than others. Based on the above discussion, the current study focuses only on the personality trait of neuroticism when examining the relationship between personality traits and citizenship pressure; thus, we hypothesize as follows:

\[ H1. \] Neuroticism is positively related to citizenship pressure.

External Forces

Unlike the internal forces described above, external forces are related to the environment and therefore vary according to situational factors. The current study specifically focused on the organizational cultures where individuals work. The concept of organizational culture originates from cultural anthropology and has been widely discussed in the organizational behavior, management, and marketing literature (e.g., Gregory et al., 2009; Homburg and Pflesser, 2000). Organizational culture refers to the beliefs and values that provide the norms of expected behavior that employees must follow (Schein, 2010). Thus, organizational culture functions as a social force that is largely invisible but very powerful (Schein, 2010). For example, organizational culture has been found to influence employees’ behavior beyond the
requirements of formal control systems, procedures, and authority (O'Reilly et al., 1991). In the same way that culture shapes one’s thoughts and directs one’s behavior, the perceived organizational culture significantly influences the attitudes and behaviors of employees (Vijayakumar and Padma, 2014).

The current study uses Cameron and Quinn’s (2011) competing values model (CVM) as a basis to examine the influence of organizational culture on citizenship pressure because it integrates many of the cultural dimensions proposed by other researchers and has been demonstrated to be empirically sound (Gardner et al., 2012). The CVM includes 39 indicators of effectiveness that vary along two dimensions and that join together to form four quadrants. The first dimension distinguishes the effectiveness criteria of stability and control from criteria that stress flexibility and discretion. The extremes of this continuum range from organizational stability and longevity on one end to organizational plasticity and versatility on the other. Conversely, the second dimension distinguishes between effectiveness criteria with an external focus and criteria that emphasize an internal focus and integration. This continuum ranges from the extremes of organizational independence and separation on one end to organizational cohesion and harmony on the other (Gardner et al., 2012). These two dimensions create four organizational cultural values—adhocracy, market, clan and bureaucracy—each of these values is a polar opposite, and they can therefore be viewed as competing values that reflect an organization’s culture: flexibility vs. stability and internal vs. external orientation. For example, clan culture, which focuses on cohesion, morale, participation, and loyalty, falls within the internal and stable quadrant and lies opposite from market culture, which falls within the external and flexible quadrant and emphasizes production, competition, and goal achievement. Accordingly, clan culture is characterized by high affiliation and concern for teamwork and participation. Organizational commitment can
easily be observed in the work environment because the employees in a clan culture act as a family, and the culture emphasizes social qualities such as trust, solidarity, and unity. Based on the findings of Podsakoff et al. (1997) that individuals who exhibit OCBs are more likely to belong to effective work groups within an organization, it is less likely that clan culture is associated with employees’ perceived citizenship pressure. On the contrary, market culture, which emphasizes efficiency and achievement, is positively related to citizenship pressure. Employees in this culture are achievement-oriented and value their personal interest more than organizational goals. Moreover, employees who focus on external competition, as in a market culture, do not have the energy to support others or engage in discretionary work activities. Because an organization with a strong emphasis on market culture needs to maximize its employees’ effectiveness and efficiency by all available means, an important goal of managers in such a culture is to make employees aware of the benefits of OCBs and to encourage such behaviors (Vigoda-Gadot, 2007). In addition, the pressure to strive for high levels of OCBs may increase the likelihood that managers will prompt employees to participate in extra-role behaviors by other means (e.g., abusiveness and exploitative activities). A prime example is creating a social atmosphere that encourages working hours beyond the formal workday without formal compensation. Thus, we propose the following hypothesis:

\[ H2a. \text{ Market culture is positively related to citizenship pressure.} \]

Furthermore, a bureaucratic culture focuses on rules, policies, procedures, efficiency, and control, and it lies opposite from adhocracy, which emphasizes risk taking, flexibility, innovation, and change. Employees in an adhocracy culture take initiative and drive for new
discoveries, and such behavior is supported by considerable workplace freedom. Conversely, a bureaucratic culture that is shaped by a controlled and structured work environment limits employees’ autonomy and participation in decision making, which in turn results in low levels of commitment to the organization. The extant literature reports that a lack of control and discretion in one’s job is associated with high levels of stress (Guterman and Jayaratne, 1994). Given that employees in a bureaucratic work environment already feel stressed and are less willing to make commitments to their organizations, they are likely to feel high levels of stress if they are also pressured to engage in OCBs. Thus, we hypothesize as follows:

\[ H2b. \text{ Bureaucracy culture is positively related to citizenship pressure.} \]

Consequences of citizenship pressure

Empirical studies show that citizenship pressure negatively influences employees by making their job requirements ambiguous and stressful (Bolino et al., 2010). The current study examined employees’ job stress and intention to quit as direct outcomes of citizenship pressure. The following discussion reviews the causal relationship between citizenship pressure and each of the consequent variables.

Job Stress

Job stress has become one of the most widely studied topics because of its significant negative consequences, such as burnout and job dissatisfaction (Leiter and Maslach, 1988; Hon et al., 2013). For example, in the late 1980s, researchers adapted the conservation of resources theory to understand the process of stress in an organizational setting (Hobfoll and Shirom, 2001). They suggested that stress occurs under three conditions: “a) when...
individuals’ key resources are threatened with loss; b) when resources are lost; or c) when individuals fail to gain resources following significant resource investment” (Gorgievski and Hobfoll, 2008, p.2). Other researchers further discussed various stressors in a work environment, including the organizational climate and structure, job quality, career development, the organizational structure, organizational change, and relationships among colleagues (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980). In the Greater China area, heavy workloads, a lack of work autonomy, and interpersonal conflicts are the most prevalent stressors for employees in mainland China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan (Chang and Lu, 2007; Lu, 1999).

Cavanaugh et al. (2000) suggested that there are two types of job stressors: challenge and hindrance stressors. Challenge stressors refer to stressors that create challenges and feelings of fulfilment or achievement, such as time urgency and pressure to complete tasks. Researchers have found that challenge stressors enhance job attitudes and reduce turnover intentions (Podsakoff et al., 2007). Conversely, hindrance stressors create feelings of constrained personal development and work-related accomplishment, such as organizational politics, hassles, situational constraints, role conflicts, and role overload (Hon et al., 2013). Consistent with previous stress research, hindrance stressors negatively affect job satisfaction and lead to lower organizational commitment and job performance (Cavanaugh et al., 2000).

In the hotel industry, employees face a high risk of stress resulting from the nature of hotel jobs, which include long working hours and constant contact with customers (Hu and Cheng, 2010). Together with the given level of job stress, involuntary engagement in OCBs (i.e., a hindrance stressor) increases the stress placed on hotel employees. Hence, we hypothesize as follows:

*H3a. Citizenship pressure is positively related to job stress.*
Turnover intention

Staff turnover in the hospitality industry is markedly higher than in other industries. According to Holtom et al. (2008), the turnover rate for accommodation and food service employees in the U.S. has averaged approximately 50% per year over the last 10 years, whereas the rate for educational services has averaged just over 10%. Such high turnover can have a significantly negative impact on organizations’ productivity and profits (Blomme et al., 2010). For example, there are direct costs involved in hiring new staff, such as advertising, interviews, orientation, training and uniforms (Mohsin et al., 2015). Moreover, because new employees take time to learn the system and settle in to their new environment, they cannot be expected to provide effective service during this period. In addition, the loss of trained staff can result in a “brain drain” that can lead to a decreased competitive advantage (Powell and Wood, 1999).

Acknowledging these significantly negative consequences resulting from turnover, staff turnover has been widely examined in the hospitality industry. For example, Griffeth et al. (2000) conducted a meta-analysis of turnover antecedents. In their study, among the various causes of turnover, such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job search, comparison of alternatives, and withdrawal cognitions, job satisfaction showed the highest relationship to turnover. In studying the causes of management turnover in hotels, Stalcup and Pearson (2001) found that dissatisfaction with one’s employer and the industry are the major reasons for voluntary turnover. Additionally, previous researchers have suggested that a failure to balance one’s work and personal life can lead to increased job stress and intention to quit (Blau, 1994; Xiao and O’Neill, 2010). Pressure to go beyond the call of duty is likely to negatively affect employees’ ability to balance their work obligations and their family duties as well as their personal time. Bolino and Turnley (2005) specifically noted that
individual initiative behaviors, which are a type of OCB, are associated with work-family conflict. These work-family conflicts and work-leisure conflicts resulting from compulsory citizenship behaviors significantly decrease job satisfaction and increase intentions to leave the organization (Vigoda-Gadot, 2007). Based on the discussion above, we hypothesize as follows:

\[ H3b. \] Citizenship pressure is positively related to turnover intention.

**Research Model**

Figure II illustrates the research model. It depicts the specifications underlying each construct and the theorized causal relationships among the constructs. Because we were interested in overall pressure to engage in OCBs and did not expect differential effects on the outcomes in our study, we combined the three sub-dimensions (i.e., helping others, individual initiatives, and loyalty behavior) into a single measure of citizenship pressure. The research model is represented in correspondence to the hypotheses discussed earlier.

[INSERT FIGURE II ABOUT HERE]

**Method**

**Sample and procedures**

The sample comprised full-time hotel employees. Managers at 40 hotels (with 3- to 5-star certifications) in Guangzhou, China, were contacted by telephone to seek permission to collect data from their employees. Of the 40 hotel managers contacted, 12 agreed to the
distribution of the questionnaire among their employees. One of the co-authors visited the
hotels and distributed a total of 350 questionnaires to employees in different departments
(e.g., food & beverage, front office, housekeeping, facility & engineering, and HR). The
participants received a questionnaire and an envelope. They were asked to put their
completed survey in the envelope, seal the envelope, and place it in another large envelope
that we had prepared and left at the front desk. This procedure was used to preserve
anonymity, thus reducing the participants’ reluctance to answer truthfully and minimizing the
effect of social desirability bias.

At the end of the survey implementation, a total of 224 completed and usable
questionnaires were returned (response rate: 64%). The total sample included more female
participants than male (65.2% vs. 34.8%). The participants’ ages ranged from 18–55 years,
and the majority of the respondents were 18–24 years old (43.3%). The median age of the
respondents was 33 years. In terms of the highest level of education completed, 49.1% had
completed high school; 33.5% had obtained an associate’s degree; 15.2% had a bachelor’s
degree; and 2.2% had a graduate degree. The majority had been working for less than five
years (80.4%), while 13.8% had worked between 5 and 10 years, and 5.8% had worked for
more than 10 years. Most of the respondents (90.6%) held non-supervisory (or managerial)
positions.

Instruments

All of the scales used in the current study were originally developed in English. Two
bilingual professionals used the back-translation method to translate the scales into Mandarin
(Brislin, 1970). The two translators worked independently to ensure accurate measurement:
one completed the English-to-Chinese translations, and the other completed the Chinese-to-
English translations. The two translators later discussed the discrepancies between the English and Chinese versions to ensure semantic equivalency. The latent variables were measured in a manner consistent with the extant literature. The latent variables included were citizenship pressure, organizational culture, personality traits, job stress, and turnover intention. Multi-item scales were used to measure each variable in the current study (see Table I for the specific scale items).

First, consistent with the Bolino *et al.*'s (2010) citizenship pressure scale, citizenship pressure was measured using the constructs of helping behavior, individual initiative, and loyalty behavior. Helping behavior was assessed using ten items adopted from Settoon and Mossholder (2002); sample items include “makes an extra effort to understand the problems faced by coworkers.” Individual initiative behavior was evaluated using eight items adopted from Bolino and Turnley (2005); sample items include “I take work-related phone calls at home.” Loyalty behavior was measured using five items adopted from Moorman and Blakely (1995); sample items include “defends the organization when outsiders criticize it.” The respondents were asked how often they felt pressured to engage in these three components of OCBs. Responses were provided on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*never feel pressured*) to 7 (*always feel pressured*).

Organizational culture measures were adopted from Cameron and Quinn (2011). Specifically, two types of organizational culture, i.e., bureaucratic and market culture, were measured using eight items (four items for each organizational culture); sample items include “the glue that holds my business unit together is formal rules and policies” (bureaucratic culture), and “the glue that holds my business unit together is the emphasis on achievement and goal accomplishment” (market culture). We measured the personality trait of neuroticism using four items based on the Big Five personality scale (Costa and McCrae, 1992): “I get
irritated easily, “I get stressed out easily,” “I worry about things,” and “I get upset easily.”

For measures of job stress, two scale items from the occupational stress scale (Smith et al., 2000) were used: “My job is extremely stressful,” and “I feel a great deal of stress because of my job.” Finally, to assess turnover intention, two scale items from Boshoff and Allen (2000) were utilized: “I often think about quitting my job,” and “As soon as I can find a better job, I will quit this job.” All of these items were measured on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Data analysis

First, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and a reliability test were used to examine the dimensionality and internal consistency of each of the first-order reflective constructs (neuroticism, job stress, market culture, intention to quit, bureaucratic culture, loyalty behavior, individual initiative, and citizenship pressure to help others) and the second-order reflective construct (citizenship pressure). This analysis verified that the loadings performed well within their assigned constructs, which supports the dimensionality of each of the constructs included in the current study. Then, a structural equation model (SEM) test was conducted. Following Anderson and Gerbing's (1988) suggestion, the data were analyzed using a two-step approach wherein the overall measurement quality was confirmed using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), and an SEM analysis was conducted. The exploratory factor analysis was conducted using SPSS 22 software, and the SEM was conducted using LISREL 9.1 software. The covariance matrix was used as the input for all models, and the maximum likelihood estimation procedure was used to produce the model parameters.
Results

EFA and reliability test

The EFA results showed that all of the measurement items had factor loadings above 0.5, indicating that the items performed well in measuring the intended latent variables and further supporting the dimensionality of the constructs (Tables I and II). The reliability of the constructs was assessed by examining Cronbach’s alpha. Cronbach’s alpha values ranged from 0.75–0.97 for all of the constructs, which indicated an acceptable internal consistency across the construct items (Litwin, 1995).

[INSERT TABLE I ABOUT HERE]

[INSERT TABLE II ABOUT HERE]

Measurement model

The construct validity of the measurement model was evaluated using a $\chi^2$ test and four goodness-of-fit statistics. Considering that the significance of the $\chi^2$ test is highly dependent on the number of degrees of freedom, the ratio of the $\chi^2$ test to the degrees of freedom was calculated (i.e., $\chi^2/df$). If the ratio of the $\chi^2$ score to the degrees of freedom is 3 or lower, the model is acceptable (Hoe, 2008). The comparative fit index (CFI) (Bentler, 1992) and the non-normed fit index (NNFI) (Bentler and Bonett, 1980) were calculated to assess the fit of the tested model relative to the data. Values greater than 0.90 are the criteria for a sufficiently good CFI (Ullman, 2001), and a value of 0.95 or above was used for the NNFI. The root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) (Browne and Cudeck, 1993) was calculated.
with 90% confidence intervals (CIs) to assess the fit of the tested model compared with the perfect model; RMSEA values of 0.08 and below reflect a good model fit (Browne and Cudeck, 1993).

As Table III shows, the measurement model fits the data very well ($\chi^2_{(df=137)}=199.50$ [p<0.001], CFI=0.98, NFI=0.94, NNFI=0.98, IFI=0.98, and RMSEA=0.05). The measurement model was then analyzed using evaluations of convergent validity, discriminant validity, and reliability tests. As Table 4 shows, the convergent validity of the constructs was confirmed. The estimated values of Fornell and Larcker’s (1981) average variance extracted (AVE) for all constructs were greater than the unexplained variances (i.e., AVE>0.05), and all of the factor loadings for individual items were above 0.5. The composite reliability estimates ranged from 0.77 to 0.91, indicating adequate internal consistency of multiple indicators for each construct in the model (i.e., >0.7) (Hair et al., 1998). To ensure discriminant validity, the AVE must exceed the corresponding correlation estimates between the two factors (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). The results indicated that the shared variance of any of the constructs was not greater than the AVE of the construct (see Tables IV and V).

[INSERT TABLE III ABOUT HERE]

[INSERT TABLE IV ABOUT HERE]

[INSERT TABLE V ABOUT HERE]

Overall model

The estimated model provided a good fit based on the model fit indices ($\chi^2_{(df=144)} = 278.40$)
[p<0.001], CFI=0.96, NFI=0.91, NNFI=0.95, IFI=0.96, and RMSEA=0.07). As Table VI shows, three of the five hypotheses were supported, whereas the other two were not empirically supported because the path coefficient was not statistically significant (H2a), or it showed an influence in the opposite direction (H2b). In support of H1, neuroticism positively influenced citizenship pressure. This result suggests that a high level of neuroticism induces citizenship pressure. However, market culture did not influence citizenship pressure ($\beta=0.15$, $p=0.186$), which did not support H2a. Moreover, unlike our prediction, bureaucratic culture negatively influenced citizenship pressure. Therefore, H2b was not supported. A larger $\beta$ value for the causal path from neuroticism to citizenship pressure ($\beta=0.25$, $t=3.08$) than for the path from bureaucratic culture ($\beta=0.23$, $t=-2.13$) indicated that neuroticism is more influential than bureaucratic culture in predicting citizenship pressure. Furthermore, citizenship pressure was found to significantly influence job stress and intention to quit, supporting H3a and H3b. This result indicates that higher citizenship pressure leads to job stress and intention to quit. According to the parameter estimates, citizenship pressure can better predict employees’ intention to quit ($\beta=0.36$, $t=4.17$) than their job stress ($\beta=0.25$, $t=2.74$).

[INSERT TABLE VI ABOUT HERE]

Discussion

The current study attempted to identify the antecedents (i.e., internal and external forces) and consequences (i.e., job stress and intention to quit) of perceived citizenship pressure. This study therefore provides a theoretical contribution to the hospitality literature. Although
citizenship pressure has become common in the hospitality industry, to the best of our knowledge, no previous study has been conducted on the hospitality industry. Moreover, existing citizenship pressure studies have mainly focused on a Western cultural context. With the rapid development of China’s hotel industry, investigations to test the generalizability of prior research findings to China are extremely important. In addition to the theoretical contributions to the literature, the results of this study should provide HR managers in the hotel industry with a better understanding of the antecedents of citizenship pressure.

As we predicted, we found that neuroticism significantly increases citizenship pressure. In other words, employees with high levels of neuroticism seem to interpret OCBs in a negative light and to feel stress when asked to involuntarily shoulder additional responsibilities. This result supports previous research findings that neurotic individuals appraise stressful situations as highly threatening and have a low level of coping resources (Bolger and Zuckerman, 1995; Carver and Connor-Smith, 2010; Kaur and Singh, 2014). Supporting prior research findings that there are negative implications of citizenship pressure for employees (Bolino et al., 2010; Cavanaugh et al., 2000; Vigoda-Gadot, 2007), we also found that citizenship pressure is associated with undesirable consequences, such as job stress and intention to quit. Consequently, the more hotel employees feel pressured to be “good citizens” who are helpful, loyal, and willing to take on additional responsibilities, the more likely they are to quit their jobs. Previous research supports the finding that citizenship pressures lead individuals to consider leaving their jobs (Delfgaauw, 2007; Hu and Cheng, 2010). For example, Chen et al. (1998) noted that citizenship behavior and turnover are negatively related. However, when employees feel pressured to be good organizational citizens, it is likely to have the opposite effect. Thus, employees who feel citizenship pressure...
find the organizational environment to be less attractive and are likely to develop turnover intentions.

The study results, however, did not find a significant influence of market culture on citizenship pressure. Considering that organizations that are oriented toward a market culture emphasize production, competition, and goal achievement, we expected that employees in this type of culture already experience job stress while performing their tasks, and therefore, they are likely to feel pressured to engage in OCBs. Researchers who have studied work stress can provide a plausible explanation. Cavanaugh et al. (2000) noted that challenge-oriented stress, which refers to tasks that are associated with a heavy workload, time pressure, and high levels of responsibility, is positively related to job satisfaction and loyalty. Therefore, such positive feelings may counteract the pressure from engaging in extra-role behavior.

Another interesting finding from this study is that a bureaucratic organizational culture is negatively related to citizenship pressure, which contradicted our prediction. This finding contributes to the theoretical development of citizenship pressure, particularly the influence of a bureaucratic organizational culture on citizenship pressure, by suggesting that the influences can vary based on cultural orientations. We assumed that employees in a bureaucratic work environment might already feel stress while performing their required work. Consequently, we predicted that such employees would feel high levels of pressure when they are expected to engage in OCBs. However, Strydom and Meyer (2002) noted that the influence of such a working condition depends on the preferences of individual employees. Based on this notion, Chinese cultural values may provide a plausible explanation for our result. The predominant Chinese culture is deeply rooted in the Confucian value system, which emphasizes social hierarchy in social relationships (Pun et al., 2000).
Confucian principles suggest that individuals are part of a system of interdependent relationships. Moreover, Confucianism requires a broad commitment to the harmonious operation and appropriate arrangement of interpersonal relationships (Hwang, 1987; Chen and Starosta, 1997; Chen, 2000). Therefore, Chinese employees are likely to respect authorities and obey the rules in organizations (Bond and Hwang, 1986). These personal values of Chinese employees fit well with a bureaucratic organizational culture, and consequently, Chinese employees may not feel stressed in such a work environment. Accordingly, Chinese employees in a bureaucratic work environment may not feel stressed when they are asked to engage in extra-role behaviors for the sake of meeting organizational goals (e.g., smooth operation) and improving their relationships with their colleagues.

Practical implications

The current study’s results can be used as a guideline to reduce citizenship pressure and the resulting job stress and turnover rates in the hotel industry. First, this study confirms the three dimensions of citizenship pressure (helping others, individual initiative, and loyalty behavior) and suggests that all three areas should be considered to address the full array of extra-role behaviors that impose pressure on hotel employees. According to our findings, when hotel employees are implicitly required to engage in what they see as extra-role behaviors, they experience a high level of stress and will develop intentions to leave the organization. Thus, hotel managers and directors and other service operations personnel should try to develop specific measures in line with the three-dimensional framework to reduce employees’ perceptions of citizenship pressure. Because each dimension of citizenship pressure has a different target, organizations may need to focus on one particular source of citizenship pressure that they want to eliminate, particularly if resources are limited.
Another practical implication of our findings is that human resource managers should be equipped with better insight into their employees’ levels of neuroticism, the personality trait that increases feelings of citizenship pressure. Therefore, special attention should be paid to neurotic employees via intervention procedures. Moreover, a bureaucratic organizational culture seems to fit well with Chinese cultural values (i.e., Confucianism) and helps to reduce perceived citizenship pressure in the hotel industry. As previous researchers have suggested, the prevailing Chinese cultural values have greatly influenced Chinese enterprise management systems and their centralized authority, hierarchical structures, and informal coordination and control mechanisms (Ng, 1998). Accordingly, Chinese employees, particularly those working in a bureaucratic culture, are reluctant to question authority and disagree with their supervisors (Pun et al., 2000). Therefore, hotel CEOs in China should make an effort to create and maintain a formal work environment and cultivate employees’ identification with Confucianism, which can reduce feelings of citizenship pressure.

Limitations and future research

Despite the positive contributions of the current study, it has certain limitations. The data were collected from a small sample of hotel employees in China, particularly in Guangdong province. Therefore, a limited ability to generalize the study results is undeniable. It would be interesting to determine whether data obtained from different provinces in China and from other countries would produce the same results as the current study. Another drawback of the current study is that it examined a limited number of antecedents of citizenship pressure. While attempting to identify the source(s) of citizenship pressure, we examined both internal (i.e., personality traits) and external influences (i.e., organizational culture). However, there are other possible influences on citizenship pressure that we did not examine in the current study.
study. To enhance our understanding of citizenship pressure, future research should include other factors that were not discussed in the current study. For example, regarding internal forces, future research may consider how personality traits such as a Type A personality (which reflects how people respond to stress) and an employee’s work ethic are related to citizenship pressure. Regarding external sources, additional organizational factors such as the organizational environment and practices could be explored and included in future studies. Moreover, it would also be interesting to examine the effect of citizenship pressure on other job outcomes, including performance and social loafing, as well as psychological outcomes (e.g., employees’ trust of their supervisors).
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Table I. Underlying dimensions of organizational culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Variance explained (%)</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bureaucratic Culture</strong></td>
<td>4.335</td>
<td>54.19</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalized place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leadership in this unit exemplifies coordinating, organizing, and smooth-running efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.894</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The glue that holds my business unit together is formal rules and policies.</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td>15.44</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My business unit emphasizes stability and efficiency. Smooth operations are very important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market Culture</strong></td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td>15.44</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My business unit is very result oriented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leadership in this business unit exemplifies a no-nonsense, aggressive, and results-oriented focus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The glue that holds my business unit together is the emphasis on achievement and goal accomplishment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My business unit emphasizes competitive actions and achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table II. Underlying dimensions of citizenship pressure

|                | Eigenvalue | Variance explained (%) | Cronbach’s α | Factor loadings |
|----------------|------------|-------------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|
| **Helping Others** | 10.656     | 46.33                   | .97          |                |                 |
| Listens to coworkers when they have to get something off their chest. |            |                         | .840         |                 |                 |
| Takes time to listen to coworkers’ problems and worries. |            |                         | .872         |                 |                 |
| Takes a personal interest in coworkers. |            |                         | .896         |                 |                 |
| Shows concern and courtesy toward coworkers even under the most trying business situations. |            |                         | .891         |                 |                 |
| Makes an extra effort to understand the problems faced by coworkers. |            |                         | .846         |                 |                 |
| Always goes out of the way to make newer employees feel welcome in the work group. |            |                         | .772         |                 |                 |
| Tries to cheer up coworkers who are having a bad day. |            |                         | .795         |                 |                 |
| Compliments coworkers when they succeed at work. |            |                         | .871         |                 |                 |
| Takes on extra responsibilities in order to help coworkers when things get demanding at work. |            |                         | .759         |                 |                 |
| Helps coworkers with difficult assignments, even when assistance is not directly requested. |            |                         | .814         |                 |                 |
| **Individual Initiative** | 3.386      | 14.724                  | .86          |                |                 |
| I check my email or voice mail from home. |            |                         | .542         |                 |                 |
| I bring things home to work on. |            |                         | .729         |                 |                 |
| I take work-related phone calls at home. |            |                         | .576         |                 |                 |
| I work late into the night at home. |            |                         | .803         |                 |                 |
| I attend work-related functions on my personal time. |            |                         | .745         |                 |                 |
| I travel whenever the company asks me to, even though technically I don’t have to. |            |                         | .673         |                 |                 |
| I work during my vacations. |            |                         | .579         |                 |                 |
| I check back with the office even when I am on vacation. |            |                         | .609         |                 |                 |
| **Loyalty Behavior** | 1.710      | 7.436                   | .91          |                |                 |
| Defends the organization when other employees criticize it. |            |                         | .787         |                 |                 |
| Encourages friends and family to utilize the organization’s products. |            |                         | .760         |                 |                 |
| Defends the organization when outsiders criticize it. |            |                         | .845         |                 |                 |
| Shows pride when representing the organization in public. |            |                         | .776         |                 |                 |
| Actively promotes the organization's products and services to potential users. |            |                         | .721         |                 |                 |
| **Citizenship Pressure** | 2.01       | 66.83                   | .75          |                |                 |
| Helping Others |            |                         | .789         |                 |                 |
| Individual Initiative |            |                         | .781         |                 |                 |
| Loyalty Behavior |            |                         | .879         |                 |                 |
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### Table III. Goodness of fit indices of the measurement model and the structural model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators of measurement model</th>
<th>Indicators of SEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$ test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p &gt; .05$</td>
<td>$199.50$</td>
<td>$278.40$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$/df &lt; 3</td>
<td>$1.46 (=199.50/137)$</td>
<td>$1.93 (=278.40/144)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit indices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI $&gt;.9$</td>
<td>$.94$</td>
<td>$.91$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNFI $&gt;.9$</td>
<td>$.98$</td>
<td>$.95$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI $&gt;.9$</td>
<td>$.98$</td>
<td>$.96$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative indices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI $&gt;.95$</td>
<td>$.98$</td>
<td>$.96$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA $&lt;.08$</td>
<td>$.05$</td>
<td>$.07$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table IV. LISREL results for measurement model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Std. loadings</th>
<th>SMC</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exogenous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N3</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC5</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC6</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC7</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC8</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC9</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC10</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC11</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC12</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endogenous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping Others</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Initiative</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty Behavior</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS1</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS2</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Quit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ1</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ2</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table V. Construct intercorrelations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>JS</th>
<th>IQ</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism (NR)</td>
<td>.75a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Culture (MC)</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.71a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic Culture (BC)</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.84a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Pressure (CP)</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.73a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress (JS)</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.82a</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Quit (IQ)</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.84a</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Square root of average variance extracted

Table VI. Antecedents and consequences of citizenship pressure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis codes</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Standardized coefficient paths</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Neuroticism → Citizenship Pressure</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>Market Culture → Citizenship Pressure</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>Bureaucratic Culture → Citizenship Pressure</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-2.13</td>
<td>.035*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a</td>
<td>Citizenship Pressure → Job Stress</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b</td>
<td>Citizenship Pressure → Intention to Quit</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001
When revising your paper, please prepare this report explaining how you have responded to each reviewer’s comments and suggestions specifically.

In addition to the responses to the reviewer’s comments below, in accordance with your suggestions, we revised the General Discussion section and included three sub-sections: theoretical implications, practical implications, and limitations and future research.

### REVIEWER A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions/comments from the Reviewer</th>
<th>Response from the Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 3, line 53: &quot;... whereas China is known for its reliance on human relationships when managing employees.&quot; Justify!!</td>
<td>Following your suggestion, we revised the sentences as follows: “For example, North American employers typically rely on rules and legal protections to enforce contracts (Pearce, 2001), whereas China is known for its reliance on human relationships when managing employees. The absence of a strong regard for legal contracts in the employer-employee relationship indicates that such exchange relationships may depend on social and interpersonal mechanisms rather than formalisms arising from legislation (Hui et al., 2004).”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| There is lack of theoretical justification for the H1 hypotheses; that should be strengthened. H1. Neuroticism is positively related to citizenship pressure | As per your suggestion, we strengthened the theoretical justification for H1. Specifically we revised the section as follows: “In contrast, unlike the personality traits discussed above, neuroticism has been found to be negatively related to job performance (Magnus et al., 1993). Neuroticism is a personality trait that is related to emotional stability, and therefore, neurotic individuals lack the ability to monitor and control their feelings and emotions when addressing a stressful situation (e.g., Bolger and Zuckerman, 1995, Gunthert et al., 1999). In corroborating this notion, previous researchers have found that neurotic employees are more likely to experience greater exposure to stressful events, to be more reactive to stress (Bolger and Zuckerman, 1995) and to employ maladaptive coping strategies, such as self-blame and wishful thinking (Gunthert et al., 1999). Thus, when OCBs are involuntary, neurotic
employees are likely to experience higher levels of citizenship pressure than others.”

“Specifically, the citizenship pressure construct is a second-order formative construct that is formed by three first-order dimensions: helping others, individual initiatives, and loyalty behavior. The remaining constructs are posited as first-order reflective constructs measured by multiple indicators.”

As discussed, previous researchers have examined individuals’ perceived level of pressure to engage in three forms of OCBs. We were interested in overall pressure to engage in OCBs and did not expect differential effects on the outcomes in our study. Thus, we combined the three sub-dimensions into a single measure of citizenship pressure.

As per your suggestion, we revised the section as follows:

“Explain and compare:

H1 Neuroticism → Citizenship Pressure .25 3.08 .002**
H3b Citizenship pressure → Intention to quit .36 4.17 .000***

As per your suggestion, we included the justification in the text.

Not clear to see additional value of this study to the current body of knowledge in the hotel industry.

Although citizenship pressure has become common in the hospitality industry, to the best of our knowledge, no previous study has been conducted on it within the hospitality industry. Moreover, the psychometric properties of citizenship pressure and its consequences have only been examined with
regard to a sample of Westerners. With the rapid development of China’s hotel industry, investigations to test the generalizability of prior research findings to China are extremely important.

| It seems that the resubmitted version was heavily revised from the previous one. However, this manuscript should be further revised. | Following your suggestions, we revised our manuscript substantially. We believe the overall quality of the paper has been greatly improved. |