5-2012

Organizational Citizenship Behavior- Individual or Organizational Citizenship Behavior- Organization: Does the Underlying Motive Matter?

Sarah J. Newland
Western Kentucky University, sarah_newland@hotmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses

Part of the Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR- INDIVIDUAL
OR ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR- ORGANIZATION:
DOES THE UNDERLYING MOTIVE MATTER?

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of Psychology
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

By
Sarah J. Newland

May 2012

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR- INDIVIDUAL
OR ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR- ORGANIZATION:
DOES THE UNDERLYING MOTIVE MATTER?

Date Recommended _April 13, 2012_

Elizabeth L Shoenfelt
Elizabeth Shoenfelt, Director of Thesis

Reagan Brown

Aaron Wichman

Kinchel C Doerner 21-May-2012
Dean, Graduate Studies and Research   Date

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to Dr. Elizabeth Shoenfelt for her assistance and support in the execution of my thesis. She has provided me with valuable insight pertaining to this project that extends to other aspects of my life, as well. I would also like to thank Dr. Reagan Brown and Dr. Aaron Wichman for serving on my committee and for giving me their support and encouragement throughout the research process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR- INDIVIDUAL
OR ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR- ORGANIZATION:
DOES THE UNDERLYING MOTIVE MATTER?

Sarah J. Newland   May 2012   38 Pages

Directed by: Dr. Elizabeth Shoenfelt, Dr. Reagan Brown, and Dr. Aaron Wichman

Department of Psychology   Western Kentucky University

        Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is considered behavior that benefits others, but is not a part of the employee's job description. Research has indicated that OCB can be divided into two categories, behavior that is directed towards other individuals (OCBI) and behavior that is directed towards the organization (OCBO). Research has also suggested that there are three different motives behind OCB, impression management, prosocial values, and organizational concern. This study examines the relationship between the motives and the type of OCB that is performed. The results failed to indicate that motives matter in determining which type of OCB is performed. Additionally, participants in all three motives were more likely to engage in OCBO behavior than in OCBI behavior.

Introduction

Many organizations attribute their success to their employees. Without hardworking and creative employees, most organizations would not be where they are today. It is quite probable that many of these employees are not merely completing their assigned tasks; they are rising above and beyond their job description to benefit the organization as a whole. This extra-role performance has been termed organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). OCB has been defined as participating in activities or actions that are not formally a part of the job description, but that benefit the organization as a whole (Borman, 2004). For example, OCB includes volunteering for extra work, cooperating with colleagues, and sharing ideas.

The construct of OCB derived from the need to encourage cooperation between organization members in order to help organizations run more smoothly (Borman, 2004). Katz (1964) indicated that behaviors which are helpful and cooperative are essential for organizational operations. He identified three different types of behavior that are essential for a successful organization. First, people must be motivated to remain with the organization. Second, the employees must understand and fulfill their role requirements based on their job description. Third, Katz claimed organizations need employees that are willing to do more than is required of them. This last claim marks the beginning of OCB. Bateman and Organ (1983) created the term, organizational citizenship behavior and defined it in their research. However, the most widely used definition of OCB is from Organ (1988) who defined OCB 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." More recently,

this definition has been altered to better distinguish between OCB and task performance. The revised definition states OCB is "performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place." This definition explicitly states that task performance and OCB are separate and clearly excludes the phrase that OCB is not "explicitly recognized by the formal reward system" (Organ, 1997).

As organizational citizenship behavior is defined as helping behavior that goes beyond the job description or task performance, it is important that the difference between task performance and OCB is noted. Borman (2004) explained that there are two distinctions between OCB and task performance. First, the tasks that comprise a job are unique to each job. Individuals in the same position might perform different tasks at different organizations. OCB usually is behavior that is generic and applies across jobs. A behavior that helps an organization in one job likely will help an organization in another job. For example, volunteering and putting in extra effort will contribute to every organization's success. Second, the predictors for task performance and OCB are different. An employee's personal characteristics and commitment will predict OCB; an employee's knowledge, skills, and abilities will predict their task performance. The premise is that those with knowledge skills, and abilities that are closely suited for a job will have higher task performance than will those without the closely matched knowledge, skills, and abilities.

OCB is important for organizations. Research has demonstrated OCB to be strongly correlated with indicators of employee effectiveness (Yen & Niehoff, 2004) and organizational success (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994). As OCB has such a profound

impact on individual and organizational functioning, organizations are interested in predicting OCB, stimulating OCB, and rewarding OCB. In recent years, organizational citizenship behavior has become of great interest to organizations; accordingly, many Industrial/Organizational psychologists have researched OCB. The research on OCB has increased dramatically over the years (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). In fact, current analyses revealed that 66% of the research on OCB related topics has occurred since the year 2000 (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). It is expected that this trend of increased research on OCB will continue.

Current Study

The current literature suggests that there are different dimensions of OCB (Organ, 1988, 1990) as well as different motives underlying engaging in OCB (Rioux & Penner, 2001). Research has not yet addressed whether there is a link between the different motives and the different dimensions of OCB. The current study will examine the motives and dimensions of OCB and determine whether there is a relationship between the two. The following literature review will discuss OCB in detail including the dimensions of OCB, the motives driving OCB, and who is affected by OCB. The relevant literature will be linked to the current study.

Antecedents to Organizational Citizenship Behavior

As organizational citizenship behavior is beneficial to organizations, it is important to examine the causes and antecedents of OCB. There is much research supporting the most prominent reasons for engaging in OCB. These reasons include job satisfaction, the perceived fairness of the organization, employee characteristics such as

personality meshing with the organizational culture, and the relationship between supervisors and subordinates.

Job Satisfaction

Research has examined the roles that mood plays on OCB. George and Brief (1992) determined that a more positive mood often results in a desire to perform more helping behavior. When job satisfaction is added into the equation, the results consistently support the model of a positive mood leading to job satisfaction, which leads to a higher frequency of OCB (Netemeyer, Boles, McKee, & McMurrian, 1997). This posed an interesting question. Does mood lead to job satisfaction which leads to OCB or does job satisfaction lead to a more positive mood which leads to OCB? Shoenfelt and Battista (2004) researched this question by examining the effects of job and life satisfaction on mood and organizational citizenship behavior. Their research was among the first to investigate the effects of both life and job satisfaction on mood state and OCB intentions. Shoenfelt and Battista hypothesized that positive life or job satisfaction would result in more OCB intentions than would no life or job satisfaction and negative life or job satisfaction. The participants were asked to read a work related scenario and then asked to role play an individual who was either satisfied or dissatisfied with either job or life. An adapted Faces Scale (Kunin, 1955) and the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) were used to check the induced job or life satisfaction state. The results suggested that those who are positively satisfied with either their life or their job are more likely to report a positive mood and more OCB intentions.

Perceived Fairness

Another predictor of OCB involves the employee's perceived fairness of the organization. This idea derives from Equity Theory (Adams, 1965). Equity Theory states that employees are constantly measuring the effort and inputs that they give to the organization with the outputs that they receive from the organization. If an employee feels that they are putting in more than they are getting out of the organization, the employee will perceive the organization as unfair. However, if the employee feels that the inputs and outputs are equal then they will perceive the organization as fair and might increase their OCB as a means of benefiting the organization (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1993). Organ and Ryan (1995) conducted a meta-analytic study designed to test some proposed predictors of OCB. Their analysis of 55 studies determined that job satisfaction and perceived organizational justice were positively correlated with OCB approximately the same degree. Job satisfaction and perceived organizational justice were the two best predictors of OCB.

Person-Organization Fit

Every employee and organization is unique. The key to finding quality employees involves discovering which people are the best fit for each organization. O'Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991) defined person-organization fit as the meshing of an individual's personality, beliefs, and values with the organization's culture and values. In theory, a strong overlap between individual and organizational values should result in higher job satisfaction. Netemeyer et al. (1997) hypothesized that the person-organization fit would have an indirect effect on OCB through its direct effect on job satisfaction. Netemeyer et al. found significant positive correlations between person-

organization fit and job satisfaction (*r = .77, p < .05), (r = .50, p < .05)*. They also

discovered a significant positive relationship between person-organization fit and OCB (*r

= .41, p < .05), (r = .29, p < .05)*. These results indicate that person-organization fit

influences both OCB and job satisfaction. These results suggest that employers should

consider assessing the potential person-organization fit of new employee candidates as a

part of the hiring process. This will help to predict which candidates' personality, values,

and beliefs will most likely match the organization's values and beliefs. These

candidates will be more likely to perform OCB.

Leader-Member Exchange

The relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and leader-member

exchange (LMX) was explored by Lapierre and Hackett (2007) to determine whether

LMX is an antecedent of OCB. Leader-member exchange theory refers to the

relationships between supervisors and subordinates. The researchers also examined the

relationship between trait conscientiousness and OCB. Lapierre and Hackett identified a

causal model that incorporates trait conscientiousness, OCB, LMX, and job satisfaction.

They discovered that conscientious employees will perform OCB in order to enhance

their LMX quality. A higher quality LMX will affect job satisfaction, which will then

result in more OCB occurrences. These results indicate that assessing conscientiousness

should be an integral part of the hiring process for organizations. The model also

suggests that OCB can be an antecedent as well as an outcome of OCB. For example,

OCB can result from higher trait conscientiousness, but it also can result in job

satisfaction. Because there are several factors that influence OCB, it is important also to

examine any possible consequences to participating in OCB at the individual level and the organizational level.

Consequences

Performance Appraisals

MacKenzie et al. (1993) claimed that it is a mistake to only evaluate employees based on sales productivity and performance. These researchers addressed whether OCB would affect a manager's appraisal of employee performance. The results demonstrated that most managers include OCB in their performance appraisals and, often, OCB and sales success are valued equally on the performance appraisals. More recently, Podsakoff at al. (2009) confirmed the previous results in a meta-analysis that included 206 samples. At the individual level, individuals who exhibit more OCB also received higher performance appraisals. In addition, those who engaged in more OCB also received more reward allocations than those who engaged in less or no OCB.

MacKenzie et al. (1993) established that organizational citizenship behavior can cause variance among managerial ratings of employees and also that employees should be aware of the factors that are involved in performance appraisals. However, it also is important to understand how employees perceive the use of OCB in their performance evaluations. Johnson, Holladay, and Quinones (2009) examined employee reactions to the use of OCB in performance appraisals and examined the differences in reactions to the appraisal by gender. It was hypothesized that employees would perceive using OCB in performance evaluations as more fair than excluding them from performance evaluations. The researchers also hypothesized that females would perceive heavier weightings of OCB in performance evaluations as more fair than would males. The

results demonstrated that employees perceived including OCB as a part of performance evaluations to be fair. Men perceived OCB that was weighted 20-30% to be the most fair, while women perceived OCB that was weighted 25-50% to be the most fair. This information is important because employees will react more positively to performance evaluations they feel are fair and balanced. Also, employees who sense fairness in the organization will demonstrate more organizational citizenship behavior. According to the research, the ideal weighting of OCB in performance appraisals should be 25-30%.

In contrast to most research on OCB and performance appraisal systems, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994) studied the manager's perspective. The study was designed to examine the effects that OCBs have on organizational success, and the effect that OCBs have on managers' evaluations of subordinates. The researchers hypothesized that OCBs will have a positive impact on evaluations completed by managers and that OCBs will have a positive impact on organizational performance. The results were consistent with previous research that established that OCB accounts for variance among managerial performance appraisals (MacKenzie, et al. 1993). The researchers were surprised to discover that the effects of certain OCBs on unit performance were not always positive. Civic virtue and sportsmanship had a positive effect on unit performance, but helping behavior did not. The researchers suspect that this is the result of one salesperson sacrificing his or her own sales in order to help another inexperienced salesperson learn the trade. Perhaps these results are due to the presence of a moderator or mediator in the relationship between OCB and job performance. Ozer (2011) determined that the relationship with coworkers acts as a mediator between OCB and job performance. The researcher also discovered that task autonomy serves as a positive

moderator for the mediated relationship between OCB and job performance. Therefore, higher OCB does not simply result in higher job performance. Task autonomy and coworker relations also have an influence on the relationship between OCB and the employees' job performance.

Turnover

When an employee is hired, the organization invests substantial amount of time, money, and resources in the employee. It is no surprise that when an employee leaves the organization, the organization loses the money that they had invested in that particular individual. Therefore, organizations are constantly investigating ways to reduce turnover. Podsakoff et al. (2009) indicated that OCB is negatively related to turnover and employee absenteeism. Chen, Hui, and Sego (1998) indicated that those with low levels of OCB are more likely to leave an organization than employees with high levels of OCB. By reducing the amount of turnover and absenteeism, organizations could save time and money and allocate their resources to difference aspects of the organization.

Selection

Research suggests that 99% of organizations use some form of an interview in their hiring process; therefore, it is important to examine the effects that responses to OCB screening questions have on hiring decisions (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Mishra, 2011). Podsakoff et al. determined that prospective employees who displayed higher frequencies of OCB related behavior during an interview were more likely to receive higher evaluations and higher salary recommendations. This research indicates that an individual who displays OCB in the interview is more likely to obtain a job than an individual who does not display any OCB. Additional research has indicated that a

structured interview is successful in predicting those employees that will be most likely

to perform OCB on the job (Allen, J. Facteau, C. Facteau, 2004).

Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The underlying dimensions of OCB have been a work in progress. OCB was

originally organized into two dimensions: altruism and compliance (Bateman & Organ,

1983). Compliance was later re-named conscientiousness. In 1988, Organ added

sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. Finally, peacemaking and cheerleading were

added by Organ in 1990 to complete the list of dimensions. Altruism, cheerleading, and

peacemaking were later grouped together in a category known as helping behavior

(Organ, 1997). The following list contains definitions and examples of each of the five

categories of OCB:

1. **Conscientiousness.** Conscientiousness refers to impersonal behavior that
   benefits the organization as a whole. In other words, it refers to behavior that
   is not directed at another individual. Examples of conscientiousness include
   an employee adhering to an organization's rules and regulations or an
   employee not using all of their vacation or sick days.

2. **Sportsmanship.** Sportsmanship is an employee's willingness to deal with
   poor situations without complaining. It is the only form of OCB that involves
   declining to participate in certain behaviors. For example, not engaging in
   gossip and not complaining about office size would be considered good
   sportsmanship.

3. **Courtesy.** Courtesy is demonstrated by preventing organization problems
   through communication and general consideration for others. An example of

10

courtesy involves letting co-workers know how they can reach an employee who is on vacation. The courteous behaviors attempt to prevent other employees from encountering unpleasant surprises.

4. **Civic Virtue.** Civic virtue is participating in the life and culture of the organization; this is not considered behavior that is targeted at individuals, rather, this behavior targets the organization. An example of civic virtue would be attending company events, such as meetings or picnics, which are not required for employees. It also includes contributing opinions on important organizational issues.

5. **Helping behavior.** Helping behavior includes altruism, peacekeeping, and cheerleading. Some examples of helping behavior include volunteering to orient a new employee, solving conflicts among employees, and acknowledging fellow employees' accomplishments.

Additional research has further categorized these five dimensions of OCB into behavior that is directed towards the individual (OCBI) and behavior that is directed towards the organization (OCBO; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Individual-level OCB consists of altruism, courtesy, peacekeeping, and cheerleading efforts directed at individuals. OCBI includes the helping behavior and the courtesy dimensions. Organizational-level behavior is directed towards the benefit of the organization. Conscientiousness, civic virtue, and sportsmanship are included in this category. Research conducted by Podsakoff, et al. (2009) found individual-level behavior to be related to performance appraisal ratings and reward distribution allocations among employees. Organizational-level behavior was found to be related to employee

efficiency, organizational turnover, and productivity among employees. In their research,

Lee and Allen (2002) constructed a 16-point scale designed to operationalize OCBI and

OCBO. The scale includes statements that describe either OCBI or OCBO behavior and

the participants are asked to indicate how often the described behavior is performed.

This scale is useful in determining the type of OCB that an individual is most likely to

perform. In addition to there being different dimensions of OCB, there are also different

motives for performing OCB.

Motives of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Throughout the years, it has become apparent that employees perform OCB for

very different reasons. Rioux and Penner (2001) indicated that there were three different

motives for engaging in OCB, which include: impression management, prosocial values,

and organizational concern. This information leads to the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1: Different motives for OCB will lead to the performance of different

types of OCB

Impression Management

Impression management involves the employee working to build a positive image

for their own personal gain and to avoid being perceived negatively. Bowler and Brass

(2006) indicated that employees of lower status tend to direct their helping behavior

toward those employees of higher status within the organization because they want their

actions to be visible to the decision makers within the organization. Those employees of

higher status are less likely to direct their helping behaviors at those of lower status

within the organization. Employees engaging in impression management are more likely

to direct their behavior towards individuals because those actions are usually more visible

than actions that are directed towards the organization. Bolino (1999) indicates that individuals motivated by impression management would be more likely to engage in altruistic behaviors, which can be classified as OCBI since altruism is considered a helping behavior. This finding leads to the first sub-hypothesis:

> *Hypothesis 1a:* Individuals who engage in OCB due to impression management will be more likely to engage in OCBI than will those motivated by organizational concern

Bowler and Brass' research is congruent with that of previous research which indicated that workers would engage in higher levels of OCB if they believed that it would help them get promoted (Hui, Lam, & Law, 2000). Once these employees received the promotions they engaged in less OCB. Likewise, Farrell and Finkelstein (2011) determined that coworkers were more likely to view reward allocation as fair when traditional motives behind OCB were perceived rather than self-serving motives. Halbesleben, Bowler, Bolino, and Turnley (2010) indicated that OCB can actually harm an employee when the supervisor perceives the employee is performing OCB as a means of impression management. According to the research, motives do matter when it comes to OCB and performance appraisals.

Prosocial Values

Prosocial values originate from a desire to be helpful. People engaging in OCB because of prosocial values are genuinely concerned with the welfare of others. The organization benefits subsequently, but the result is a side effect of the individual's actions towards the other employees. Rioux and Penner (2001) claim that prosocial

values is mostly associated with OCB directed towards the individual. This information leads to the second hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1b: Individuals who engage in OCB due to prosocial values will be more likely to engage in OCBI than will those motivated by organizational concern

Organizational Concern

Organizational concern is based on social exchange theory. Social exchange theory specifies that an employee engages in OCB because the organization has given them a good job and treats them fairly. These individuals feel obligated to give back to the organization that has given them so much. The employees feel that they owe the organization and they attempt to pay back the organization through performing OCB. Organizational concern is comprised of two elements. First, the individual wants to help the organization because he or she associates with it. Second, the individual believes that by impacting the organization in a positive manner he or she is also impacting the individuals within the organization (Halbesleben at al., 2010). Additionally, Rioux and Penner's 2001 research indicated that organizational concern is more associated with OCBO than OCBI. These findings lead to the hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1c: Individuals who engage in OCB due to organizational concern will be more likely to engage in OCBO than those motivated by prosocial values or impression management

Table 1 contains a visual of the results predicted by the sub-hypotheses

Table 1

Explanation of Hypotheses

OCB Type					
OCBI	$OCBI_{IM}$	=	$OCBI_{PV}$	>	$OCBI_{OC}$
OCBO	$OCBO_{OC}$	>	$OCBO_{IM}$	=	$OCBO_{PV}$

Method

Participants

Participants were 189 college students enrolled in psychology courses at a southeastern university. Students participated in the study in order to fulfill their Study Board requirements for class. Participation in the study was anonymous. The study included a manipulation screen, which eliminated 110 students from the 189 person sample. This loss of participants is more than likely due to the Psychology Department requiring undergraduate psychology students to participate in a study without any check on the quality of the participation. This is evidenced in the fact that several participants only took two minutes to complete the entire questionnaire.

Of the remaining 79 participants, 32.1% were male and 67.9% were female. The age range was 18-35 with a mean age of 20.31 years, $SD = 3.25$. The sample was predominately White / Caucasian (82.3%), African American / Black (12.7%), Asian (2.5%), Hispanic / Chicano / Latino (1.3%), and other (1.3%). The participants had an average of 4.47 (SD = 2.97) years of work experience. Tables 2 and 3 present the participants' work experience. Some 30 individuals participated in the impression management condition, 22 participated in the prosocial values condition, and 27 participated in the organizational concern condition.

15

Table 2

Demographics- Are you currently working?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes, Part-time	31	39.2
Yes, Full-time	8	10.1
No	40	50.6

Table 3

Demographics- Have you ever worked as a server at a restaurant?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	23	29.1
No	56	70.9

Measures

Lee and Allen's (2002) scale that measures OCBO and OCBI was used to measure the type of OCB intention. Items were presented in random order. A random number generator was used to determine the order of the items. A copy of this scale is included in Appendix A. Each participant was instructed to role play the individual in the vignette and to indicate on a 7-point scale (1 = *never*, 7 = *always*) how frequently they would participate in the identified behaviors. Of the 16 items on the scale, eight represent OCBI behaviors and eight represent OCBO behaviors. Lee and Allen estimated the reliability for the OCBI scale to be .83 and the reliability for the OCBO scale to be .88. The type of the reliability was not reported, but likely is internal consistency.

Procedure

Data were collected online through the Qualtrics survey platform. Students signed up for the study on Study Board (an electronic sign-up mechanism through the Psychology Department) and were then directed to the study on Qualtrics. The introduction to the instrument indicated that participation was voluntary, participation could stop at any time, and the responses would be anonymous and kept confidential. Each student participated in one of three motive situations. The participants were asked to read a short vignette describing the job of a restaurant server and his or her motive and then were asked to answer three basic comprehension questions about the vignette as a means of eliminating inattentive participants. These questions acted as a manipulation screen. The vignette conveyed that the participant was concerned with impression management, prosocial values, or organizational concern. The vignettes are included in Appendix B and the manipulation screen is included in Appendix C. Each participant was asked to answer questions about which types of behaviors he/she would be most likely to engage in if they were the individual in the vignette (i.e., to complete Lee and Allen's scale as though role-playing the individual in the vignette).

Demographic data were collected from each participant. The questions are included in Appendix D. This information included: race, age, gender, major, and whether they work part-time, full-time, or currently do not work.

Results

A paired *t*-test was used to examine the difference between OCBI and OCBO behaviors by motive type. The *t*-tests revealed that there was a significant difference between the behaviors for all three motive types. Participants in the impression

management motive were more likely to engage in OCBO ($M = 46.6$, $SD = 8.5$) than

OCBI ($M = 41.2$, $SD = 8.99$), $t(29) = -5.606$, $p < .001$. Participants in the prosocial

values motive were more likely to engage in OCBO ($M = 45.27$, $SD = 6.89$) than OCBI

($M = 42.41$, $SD = 9.1$), $t(21) = -2.563$, $p = .018$. Participants in the organizational

concern motive were more likely to engage in OCBO ($M = 46.11$, $SD = 5.96$) than OCBI

($M = 39.41$, $SD = 8.45$), $t(26) = -5.266$, $p < .001$. Thus, all participants were more likely

to engage in OCBO than OCBI regardless of motive type.

The data were further examined with one-way ANOVAs (motive type with three

motives- impression management, prosocial values, organizational concern) with OCBI

and OCBO as the dependent variables. There were no significant differences by motive

type for OCBI, $F(2, 76) = .723$, $p = .489$, or for OCBO, $F(2, 76) = .212$, $p = .809$ (see

Appendix E). Table 5 provides the mean OCBI and OCBO values for each motive type.

Table 5

Mean OCBI and OCBO Values by Motive Type

Motive Type		OCBI	OCBO
Impression Management	*Mean*	41.2	46.6
	SD	(8.99)	(8.50)
Prosocial Values	*Mean*	42.41	45.27
	SD	(9.10)	(6.89)
Organizational Concern	*Mean*	39.41	46.11
	SD	(8.45)	(5.96)

The analyses indicate that all three motive types are more likely to engage in

OCBO. Strictly speaking, Hypothesis 1c was supported, but this result was not

dependent upon the motive of organizational concern.

In addition, there was a significant positive correlation between OCBI and OCBO, $r(77) = .75$, $p < .001$. This indicates that participants who are more likely to engage in one dimension of OCB are also likely to engage in the other dimension of OCB. Cronbach's alphas for the OCBI scale and OCBO scale were .903 and .904, respectively.

Discussion

The intent of this study was to examine the relationship between OCB motives (impression management, prosocial values, organizational concern) and OCB type (OCBI, OCBO). Hypothesis 1 predicted that different motives of OCB will lead to the performance of different types of OCB. This hypothesis was not supported by the results of the current study.

Hypothesis 1a predicted that individuals who engage in OCB due to the impression management motive would be more likely to engage in OCBI behavior than would those motivated by organizational concern. Although Bolino's (1999) research supported this hypothesis, the results of the current study indicated that participants in both the impression management motive and the organizational concern motive were each more likely to engage in OCBO than OCBI. Therefore, Hypothesis 1a was not supported.

Hypothesis 1b predicted that individuals who engage in OCB due to the prosocial values motive would be more likely to engage in OCBI than would individuals motivated by organizational concern. Rioux and Penner (2001) found this tendency to be true. However, the results of the current study indicated that individuals in both motive

conditions were more likely to engage in OCBO than OCBI. Therefore, Hypothesis 1b was not supported.

Hypothesis 1c predicted that individuals who engage in OCB due to the organizational concern motive would be more likely to engage in OCBO than would individuals motivated by prosocial values or impression management. Rioux and Penner's (2001) research supported this hypothesis. The results of the current study indicated that those engaged in the organizational concern motive are more likely to engage in OCBO than in OCBI. However, individuals in all three motive types were more likely to engage in OCBO behavior than in OCBI behavior. Strictly speaking, Hypothesis 1c is supported, but the result is not unique to the organizational concern motive.

Participants in this study were more likely to help the organization rather than other employees. This result may be due to the vignette describing the central character's relationship with the other employees as one in which "you have a nice working relationship, but prefer not to spend time with them outside of work." This line may have made participants feel as though they would not want direct their OCB toward these individuals. It might be interesting to see if the results would be different if this line were changed to read that the character enjoys spending time with the coworkers outside of work. In addition, the vignette specifies that the organization is currently looking for a new manager. Allen (2006) found that individuals who reported engaging in OCBO more frequently also reported receiving more promotions. With this research in mind, the participants may have felt that performing the behavior in the eight OCBO items on

the instrument would make them more noticeable and eligible for the promotion than would performing the behavior in the eight OCBI items.

An important implication for organizations is the need to increase team cohesion. The participants in this study were much more willing to direct their OCB at the organization than at other employees. This may suggest they do not feel a significant bond with their coworkers. According to Stout, Salas, and Carson (1994), teamwork has a positive impact on performance and interpersonal relations are considered an essential component to teamwork. Thus, if an organization increases their team cohesion then OCBI and unit performance should increase as a result.

The organization in the vignette was very positive and seemed to be a desired place of employment. MacKenzie et al. (1993) indicated that, according to Equity Theory, employees will increase their OCB if they feel that they are being treated well by the organization. Thus, this component of the vignette may explain why most OCB behavior in the current research was directed at the organization.

According to the current research, and contrary to Rioux and Penner's 2001 research, the results failed to indicate that OCB motives matter when it comes to predicting the type of OCB behavior that is performed. As there was a significant positive relationship between OCBI and OCBO, and as the motive behind the OCB did not matter, it is important for organizations to understand that it is important to inspire OCB without focusing on the type or motive behind the behavior. Instead of motives eliciting specific OCB behaviors, perhaps it is the type of job satisfaction (affective job satisfaction or cognitive job satisfaction) that serves as a predictor of OCB type. According to Moorman (1993), affective job satisfaction is a product of whether the job

21

elicits a good mood and positive feelings and cognitive job satisfaction is a product of the factual aspects of the job such as conditions, opportunities, and outcomes. Lee and Allen (2002) indicated that positive feelings (affective job satisfaction) motivate OCBI and measured judgments about work (cognitive job satisfaction) are associated with OCBO. Thus, the type of job satisfaction experienced may be a better predictor of whether OCBI or OCBO is performed than are the motives behind the behaviors.

Limitations

This study was limited by the fact that only students enrolled in psychology classes at a single university participated. The sample was fairly young ($M = 20.31$, $SD = 3.25$) and the results may not generalize to a more typical work force. Only 29% of the participants had worked as a restaurant server previously; the other 71% may not have been able to relate to the character in the vignette.

Another limitation is the participation requirement by the university. Since there is not a check on the quality of the participation, many participants did not spend quality time reading the vignette and filling out the questionnaire. As a result, over a hundred participants were lost to the manipulation screen, leaving a relatively small sample. This limited the sample size and reduced the power for the analyses.

Future Research

Future Research should further explore the relationship between OCB motive and OCB type performed. A larger sample might provide more informative results and lend more power to the analyses. The current study indicates that participants are more likely to perform OCBO behavior, as measured by Lee and Allen's (2002) OCB scale, regardless of the motive. An additional study should be performed that explores whether

participants are just as likely to perform OCBO behavior if the vignette describes the other employees more favorably or if the organization is described negatively.

There are differences in the method of defining the dimensions of OCB. Some researchers categorize OCB as having six categories which include: sportsmanship, civic virtue, altruism, courtesy, peacemaking, and cheerleading (Organ, 1988). While others identify only two dimensions of OCB that each of the six categories fit into, individual-level and organizational-level (Podsakoff et al., 2009). The current study examined OCB as being categorized into OCBI and OCBO. It might be interesting to research the relationship between OCB motives and the type of OCB defined more specifically as the six dimensions.

Another avenue of research might involve examining the relationship between OCB motive type and the level of threat that coworkers feel when they observe the employee performing OCB. Employees more than likely feel more threatened when a coworker performs OCB due to impression management because they feel that their jobs or future promotions are in jeopardy (Farrell & Finkelstein, 2011). The research would need to determine a means of assessing OCB motives and then also assess the coworkers' reactions. Further, it would be very interesting to note whether the coworkers were more or less likely to engage in OCB after observing the coworker perform OCB and after identifying the motive behind the actions.

Previous research on OCB indicates that there is little information on OCB in different cultures. A future research opportunity might involve researching whether there are differences in reactions to using OCB in performance evaluations in individualistic and collectivist cultures (Johnson, Holladay, & Quinones, 2009). In theory,

individualistic cultures would likely have a more negative reaction than would collectivist cultures. Individualistic cultures place oneself as most important a collectivist cultures place the organization as most important. Those who place the organization as the most important priority should value OCB more.

While the present study contributes to the literature in understanding the lack of a relationship between OCB motive and OCB type, it also is interesting to add that motives might influence employee performance appraisals (Halbesleben et al., 2010). Research suggests that impression management might positively influence performance appraisals in the short term, but impression management may not lead to higher levels of performance in the long term (Schnake, 1991).

Conclusion

In summary, this study examined the relationship between OCB motives and the type of OCB performed. All participants were more likely to engage in OCBO behavior regardless of motive type. This finding leads to the conclusion that motives do not matter when it comes to predicting the type of OCB performed. The results also indicated that there is a significant positive relationship between both types of OCB. Therefore, if an organization can increase either OCBI or OCBO then the other will likely increase as well. Research on OCB is important because managers view it as beneficial and view those who engage in it as an asset (Yen & Niehoff, 2004). It is because of its importance to organizations that OCB research will continue for many years (Borman, 2004).

APPENDIX A: WHAT WOULD CHRIS DO?

Please imagine that you are Chris as described in the scenario. It is important that you think in terms of Chris' beliefs and values. Please respond as Chris would and indicate on a 7-point scale (1 = *never*, 7 = *always*) how likely you are to perform each of these behaviors.

1. Show pride when representing the organization in public. (OCBO)

2. Express loyalty toward the organization. (OCBO)

3. Willingly give your time to help others who have work-related problems. (OCBI)

4. Defend the organization when other employees criticize it. (OCBO)

5. Help others who have been absent. (OCBI)

6. Share personal property with others to help their work. (OCBI)

7. Assist others with their duties. (OCBI)

8. Show genuine concern and courtesy toward coworkers, even under the most trying

business or personal situations. (OCBI)

9. Keep up with developments in the organization. (OCBO)

10. Take action to protect the organization from potential problems. (OCBO)

11. Demonstrate concern about the image of the organization. (OCBO)

12. Adjust your work schedule to accommodate other employees' requests for time off.

(OCBI)

13. Attend functions that are not required but that help the organizational image. (OCBO)

14. Go out of the way to make newer employees feel welcome in the work group. (OCBI)

15. Offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization. (OCBO)

16. Give up time to help others who have work or nonwork problems. (OCBI)

Impression Management

Please carefully read the scenario. You will be asked to answer questions as you believe that Chris would answer them. It is important that you think in terms of Chris' beliefs and values. Please imagine that you are in Chris' shoes.

You work as a server at *Maggie's Roadhouse Grill.* You have been an employee there since the restaurant opened two years ago. *Maggie's Roadhouse Grill* is a popular location for meals and drinks and there is almost always a wait for a table. The restaurant serves a wide variety of food, but the specialty is the steaks that the chef cooks to perfection. The restaurant is closed on Sundays, but this has never seemed to hurt the business.

You arrive at work and greet all of your fellow coworkers, with whom you have a nice working relationship, but prefer not to spend time with them outside of work. During your shift, the night manager, Pat, pulls you aside to speak to you about an important issue. This is no big deal, because the managers often do this when they have a new policy or procedure that they would like to go over. You learn Pat's spouse received a new job several hours away and that they will be moving in three weeks. Pat mentions that *Maggie'*s will be looking for a replacement manager within the next couple of weeks. Pat smiles and encourages you to have a great shift.

As your shift progresses, you think about how this transition in management might affect you. You want to maintain the positive image you have established with Pat and want to avoid creating a negative image after Pat leaves.

Prosocial Values

Please carefully read the scenario. You will be asked to answer questions as you believe that Chris would answer them. It is important that you think in terms of Chris' beliefs and values. Please imagine that you are in Chris' shoes.

You work as a server at *Maggie's Roadhouse Grill.* You have been an employee there since the restaurant opened two years ago. *Maggie's Roadhouse Grill* is a popular location for meals and drinks and there is almost always a wait for a table. The restaurant serves a wide variety of food, but the specialty is the steaks that the chef cooks to perfection. The restaurant is closed on Sundays, but this has never seemed to hurt the business.

You arrive at work and greet all of your fellow coworkers, with whom you have a nice working relationship, but prefer not to spend time with them outside of work. During your shift, the night manager, Pat, pulls you aside to speak to you about an important issue. This is no big deal, because the managers often do this when they have a new policy or procedure that they would like to go over. You learn Pat's spouse received a new job several hours away and that they will be moving in three weeks. Pat mentions that *Maggie*'s will be looking for a replacement manager within the next couple of weeks. Pat smiles and encourages you to have a great shift.

As your shift progresses, you think about how this transition in management might affect you. You are a helpful person and you want to do what you can to help. You are genuinely concerned with the welfare of others and will do what you can to help others adjust to the change.

Organizational Concern

Please carefully read the scenario. You will be asked to answer questions as you believe that Chris would answer them. It is important that you think in terms of Chris' beliefs and values. Please imagine that you are in Chris' shoes.

You work as a server at *Maggie's Roadhouse Grill.* You have been an employee there since the restaurant opened two years ago. *Maggie's Roadhouse Grill* is a popular location for meals and drinks and there is almost always a wait for a table. The restaurant serves a wide variety of food, but the specialty is the steaks that the chef cooks to perfection. The restaurant is closed on Sundays, but this has never seemed to hurt the business.

You arrive at work and greet all of your fellow coworkers, with whom you have a nice working relationship, but prefer not to spend time with them outside of work. During your shift, the night manager, Pat, pulls you aside to speak to you about an important issue. This is no big deal, because the managers often do this when they have a new policy or procedure that they would like to go over. You learn Pat's spouse received a new job several hours away and that they will be moving in three weeks. Pat mentions that *Maggie'*s will be looking for a replacement manager within the next couple of weeks. Pat smiles and encourages you to have a great shift.

As your shift progresses, you think about how this transition in management might affect you. You feel you are a real part of *Maggie's* and are proud to serve at the restaurant. *Maggie's* has given you a good job and treats you well. *Maggie's* takes care of its employees and you want to help take care of *Maggie's*.

APPENDIX C: MANIPULATION SCREEN

1. What prompted the meeting between Chris and Pat?

    a. New menu items

    b. Customer complaints

    c. Change in management

    d. Change in operating hours

2. Which statement is the most accurate?

    a. Chris likes to help people

    b. *Maggie's* treats its employees well

    c. Chris wants to have a positive image

3. Which statement is most true of Chris?

    a. Chris wants to avoid a negative image

    b. Chris wants a positive relationship with other employee's at *Maggie's*.

    c. Chris is proud to be a server at *Maggie's*

APPENDIX D: DEMOGRAPHIC ITEMS

1. Please indicate your age. _____

2. Please indicate your gender.

_____ Female

_____ Male

3. Please indicate the **primary** racial or ethnic group with which you identify. (If you are of a multi-racial or multi-ethnic background, indicate that group with which you identify **most of the time**.)

_____African American/Black

_____American Indian/Alaskan Native/Aleut

_____Asian

_____Hispanic/Chicano/Latino

_____Middle Eastern

_____Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander

_____White/Caucasian

_____Other: (Please specify)_____

4. Please indicate your major. _____

5. How many years of work experience do you have?

_____ 0	_____ 6
_____ 1	_____ 7
_____ 2	_____ 8
_____ 3	_____ 9
_____ 4	_____ 10
_____ 5	_____ 11+

6. Are you currently working?

_____ Yes, part-time (1-20 hours per week)

_____ Yes, full-time (21+ hours per week)

_____ No

7. Have you ever worked as a server at a restaurant?

_____ Yes

_____ No

8. What is your job title? _____

APPENDIX E: ANOVA: OCBI AND OCBO BY MOTIVE TYPE

Table 4

ANOVA: OCBI and OCBO by Motive Type

		Sum of Squares	Mean Square	*df*	*F*	Sig	Partial Eta Squared
OCBI	Between Groups	112.908	56.454	2	.723	.489	.019
	Within Groups	5936.637	78.114	76			
	Total	6049.544		78			
OCBO	Between Groups	22.453	11.227	2	.212	.809	.006
	Within Groups	4016.230	52.845	76			
	Total	4038.684		78			

Note: Significant at the *p* < .05 level.

APPENDIX F: WKU HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL FORM

WKU

A LEADING AMERICAN UNIVERSITY WITH INTERNATIONAL REACH
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

DATE: January 25, 2012

TO: Sarah Newland
FROM: Western Kentucky University (WKU) IRB

PROJECT TITLE: [302885-1] Work Events and Their Impact on Subsequent Worker Behavior
REFERENCE #:   IRB12-140
SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project

ACTION: APPROVED
APPROVAL DATE: 1/25/2012

REVIEW TYPE: Exempt from Full Board

Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this project. The Western Kentucky University (WKU) IRB has APPROVED your submission. This approval is based on an appropriate risk/benefit ratio and a project design wherein the risks have been minimized. All research must be conducted in accordance with this approved submission.

This submission has received approval based on the applicable federal regulation.

Please remember that informed consent is a process beginning with a description of the project and insurance of participant understanding followed by *an implied* consent form. Informed consent must continue throughout the project via a dialogue between the researcher and research participant. Federal regulations require each participant receive a copy of the signed consent document.

Please note that any revision to previously approved materials must be approved by this office prior to initiation. Please use the appropriate revision forms for this procedure.

All UNANTICIPATED PROBLEMS involving risks to subjects or others and SERIOUS and UNEXPECTED adverse events must be reported promptly to this office. Please use the appropriate reporting forms for this procedure. All FDA and sponsor reporting requirements should also be followed.

All NON-COMPLIANCE issues or COMPLAINTS regarding this project must be reported promptly to this office.

Please note that all research records must be retained for a minimum of three years after the completion of the project.

If you have any questions, please contact Paul Mooney at (270) 745-2129 or paul.mooney@wku.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence with this committee.

References

Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Allen, T. D. (2006). Rewarding good citizens: The relationship between citizenship behavior, gender, and organizational rewards. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. *36*, 120-143.

Allen, T. D., Facteau, J. D., & Facteau, C. L. (2004). Structured interviewing for OCB: Construct validity, faking, and the effects of question type. *Human Performance*, *17*, 1-24. Doi: 10.1207/S15327043HUP1701_1

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983.). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal*, *26*, 587-595. Doi: 10.2307/255908

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

Borman, W.C. (2004). The concept of organizational citizenship. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *13*, 238-241. Doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.70

Bowler, W.M., & Brass, D.J. (2006). Relational correlates of interpersonal citizenship behavior: A social network perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 70-82.

Chen, X. P., Hui, C., & Sego, D. (1998.) The role of organizational citizenship behavior in turnover: Conceptualization and preliminary tests of key hypothesis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83,* 922-931. Doi: 0021-9010/98

Diener, E., Emmons, R.A., Larsen, R.J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life

    scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *49*, 71-75. Doi:

    10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13

Farrell, S. K., & Finkelstein, L. M. (2011). The impact of motive attributions on

    coworker justice. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *26*, 57-69. Doi:

    10.1007/s10869-010-9174-5

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. Doi: 0033-2909/92

Halbesleben, J.R.B, Bowler, W.M., Bolino, M.C., & Turnley, W.H. (2010).

    Organizational concern, prosocial values, or impression management? How

    supervisors attribute motives to organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of*

    Applied Social Psychology, *40*, 1450-1489. Doi: 10.1111/j.1559-

    1816.2010.00625.x

Hui, C., Lam, S., & Law, K. (2000). Instrumental values or organizational citizenship

    behavior for promotion: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology,*

    85, 822-828. Doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.85.5.822

Johnson, S.K., Holladay, C.L., & Quinones, M.A. (2009). Organizational citizenship

    behavior in performance evaluations: distributive justice or injustice? *Journal of*

    Business and Psychology, *24*, 409-418. Doi: 10.1007/s10869-009-9118-0

Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*,

    9, 131-146. Doi: 10.1002/bs.3830090206

Kunin, T. (1955). The construction of a new type of attitude measure. *Personnel Psychology*, *8*, 65-78. Doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1955.tb01189.x

Lapierre, L. M., & Hackett, R. D. (2007). Trait conscientiousness, leader-member. *Journal of Occupation and Organizational Psychology*, *80*, 539-554. Doi: 10.1348/096317906X154892

Lee, K., & Allen, N.J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: the role of affect and cognition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*, 131-142. Doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.87.1.131

MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance. *The Journal of Marketing*, *57*, 70-80. Doi: 10.2307/1252058

Moorman, R. H. (1993). The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Relations*, *46*, 759-776.

Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., McKee, D. O., & McMurrian, R. (1997). An investigation into the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors in a personal selling context. *The Journal of Marketing*, *61*, 85-98. Doi: 10.2307/1251791

O'Reilly, C. A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and Organizational Culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *The Academy of Management Journal, 34*, 487-516. Doi: 10.2307/256404

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: the good soldier syndrome*. (pp. 1-43). Lexington: Lexington Books.

Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 12, pp. 43-72). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Organ, D.W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, *48*, 775-802. Doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x

Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: it's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, *10*, 85-97. Doi: 10.1207/s15327043hup1002_2

Ozer, M. (2011). A moderated mediation model of the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*, 1328-1336. DOI: 10.1037/a0023644

Podsakoff, P.M., & MacKenzie, S.B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *31*, 351-363.

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*, 513-563. Doi: 10.1177/014920630002600307

Podsakoff, N.P., Whiting, S.W., Podsakoff, P.M., & Blume, B.D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*, 122-141. Doi: 10.1037/a0013079

Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S.W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Mishra, P. (2011). Effects of

    organizational citizenship behaviors on selection decisions in employment

    interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. *96*, 310-326. Doi: 10.1037/a0020948

Rioux, S. M., & Penner, L. A. (2001). The causes of organizational citizenship behavior:

    a motivational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 1306-1314.

    Doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.86.6.1306

Schnake, M. (1991). Organizational citizenship: A review, proposed model, and research

    agenda. *Human Relations*, *44*, 735–759. Doi: 10.1177/001872679104400706

Shoenfelt, E. & Battista, L. (2004). A laboratory study of satisfaction effects on mood

    state, withdrawal intentions, and organizational citizenship behavior.

    Psychological Reports, *95*, 803-820. Doi: 10.2466/pr0.95.3.803-820

Stout, R. J., Salas, E., & Carson, R. (1994). Individual task proficiency and team process:

    What's important for team functioning. *Military Psychology*, *6*, 177-192.

Yen, H.R., & Niehoff, B.P. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviors and

    organizational effectiveness: Examining relationships in Taiwanese banks.

    Journal of Applied Social Psychology, *34*, 1617-1637. Doi: 10.1111/j.1559-

    1816.2004.tb02790.x

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*, 601-617. Doi: 10.1177/014920639101700305