

Dispositional and Situational Differences in Motives to Engage in Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Abstract

This study analyzes the effects of dispositional and situational factors on different motives to engage in discretionary behaviors. Based on the work of Rioux and Penner (2001), we measure pro-social values, organizational concern, and impression management as motives to engage in discretionary behaviors. We then study, using analysis of variance on a sample of 192 employees coming from 15 services organizations in Chile, differences in these motives due to gender, affective commitment, and power distance. Results show that pro-social values are a stronger motive for women than for men, organizational concern motives are more important for employees that are affectively committed to the organization, and impression management motives are more important for employees with high power distance to their managers.

1 Introduction

Since the beginning of the century, research has paid increasing attention to motivations behind discretionary behaviors in organizations. The most widely studied discretionary behaviors are organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB), defined by Organ (1988) 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). Rioux and Penner (2001) were the first to study what motivates employees to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB). They proposed three motives that might explain why employees engage in OCB, i.e., impression management motives, organizational concern motives, and pro-social values motives. Following the work of Rioux and Penner (2001), other scholars have tested the relationship between motives and citizenship behaviors (Espejo, 2011; Finkelstein, 2006; Finkelstein and Penner, 2004; Grant and Mayer 2009). Whereas these studies provide evidence on the role of motivation on the performance of citizenship behaviors in organizations, there is still a need to understand these motives better. In particular, because of the positive effects of OCB in organizational performance (Podsakoff, Ahearne, and MacKenzie, 1997; Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994) and of the role of motivation in the emergence of OCB, it is relevant to understand if these motives vary among different employees.

Rioux and Penner (2001) discussed whether the three motives in the scale represent enduring dispositions or transitory reactions to organizational practices. Based on their findings and suggestions, we will associate some motives to dispositional characteristics and other motives to situational characteristics.

Rioux and Penner (2001) first argued that pro-social values may well reflect an enduring disposition suggesting that it may be a relatively stable aspect of a person's disposition and would not vary substantially as time passes by. One individual demographic factor generally associated to pro-social values is gender (biological sex). Carlo, Okun, Knight, and de Guzman (2005) studied gender (female) as a dispositional predictor of pro-social values in a study of motives to volunteer. If pro-social values are indeed an enduring disposition, female gender will likely be a strong predictor of this type of motivation not only to volunteer, but also as that to perform citizenship behaviors. Thus, we will study if women employees present higher scores of pro-social values as a motive to perform discretionary behaviors than men.

Second, Rioux and Penner (2001) argued that organizational concern may reflect a less enduring characteristic suggesting that it may be modifiable by an employee's thoughts and feelings about the organization. A strong feeling that an employee could experience is the level of attachment and affective orientation towards the organization (Kanter, 1968). This affective orientation is commonly known as affective commitment, which refers to "the relatively strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (Mowday, Steers, and Porter, 1979, p. 226). Thus, we will study if employees with a higher level of affective commitment to the organization present higher scores in organizational concern as a motive to engage in discretionary behaviors than less committed employees.

Third, Rioux and Penner (2001) did not establish whether impression management motives represent an enduring disposition or a transitory reaction to organizational practices. However, some studies have associated impression management tactics to dispositional characteristics, such as personality or cultural values (Delery and Kacmar, 1998; Kristof-Brown, Barrick, and Franke 2002; Snyder, 1974). Also, Gilmore, Stevens, Harrell-Cook, and Ferris (1999) called for research on additional personality traits that may relate to impression management. Even though that many personality traits might be related to impression management, we followed Elanain's (2007) recommendations to study the impact of a cultural characteristic, given that our study will be conducted in a Latin American setting. Chhokar, Zhuplev, Fok, and Hartman (2001) argued that individuals with high scores in power

distance may be more inclined toward benevolence if they feel their superiors desire such behavior. Following their approach, we believe that employees high in power distance may perform acts of citizenship motivated by a desire to enhance their self-image in the eyes of their superiors. The underlying assumption here is that engaging in citizenship behaviors is valued by superiors, which research has shown to be a realistic assumption (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Fetter 1991, 1993; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Hui, 1993). Thus, we will study if employees with high scores in power distance—a cultural variable that reflects individual values in social groups (Hofstede, 1983) - also present high scores in impression management motives.

With this paper we contribute to the literature on OCB and discretionary behaviors by providing a deeper understanding of the motives to perform OCB suggested by Rioux and Penner (2001). We also contribute to the literature on motivation, studying how individuals' motives differ according to dispositional and situational factors. Thus, the purpose of this study is to understand whether dispositional or attitudinal characteristics may alter the motivation of employees to engage in citizenship behaviors at organizations.

2 Theory and Hypotheses

2.1 Motives to Engage in Discretionary Behaviors

Penner, Midili, and Kegelmeyer (1997) suggested that OCB may be proactive behaviors. If so, individuals may choose to engage in OCB because they meet certain needs or satisfy one or more motives. Thus, scholars have studied different types of citizenship behaviors using a functional approach. The functional approach to behavior (Snyder, 1993) focuses on the purpose behind a behavior. The assumption behind this approach is that human behavior is motivated by a person's goals and needs. However, different people may have different motives to engage in the same behavior, and the same behavior may be fostered by multiple motives. In the discretionary behavior literature, some authors have proposed different motives to engage in different forms of OCB. Bolino (1999) was the first scholar who acknowledged that employees may perform OCB by non-selfless motives. In particular, he proposed that employees may engage in OCB by impression management motives. Building on Bolino and on more traditional approaches to OCB, Rioux and Penner (2001) developed a citizenship motives scale (CMS). They identified three motives as antecedents of OCB: impression management, organizational concern, and pro-

social values. Variables of this scale of motives have been used in empirical studies to predict why employees engage in OCB (Finkelstein and Penner, 2004; Grant and Mayer 2009; Rioux and Penner, 2001).

2.2 Factors That Affect Motives to Engage in Discretionary Behaviors

2.2.1 Pro-social Values

Pro-social values involve a need to be helpful and a desire to build positive relationships with others (Rioux and Penner, 2001). Grant and his colleagues have given considerably attention to this type of motivation in the preceding years (Grant, 2007; Grant, 2008a; Grant and Mayer, 2009; Grant and Wade-Benzoni, 2009; Grant and Gino, 2010; Grant and Berry, 2011). In one of these studies the authors analyzed the relationship between pro-social values and OCB directed at individuals (OCBI) and found support for a positive relationship (Grant and Mayer, 2009).

Bridges (1989) showed that women are more concerned than men with helping others. Another study revealed that women spend more time helping than men (George, Carroll, Kersnick, and Calderon, 1998). The results of another study show that adolescent girls are more likely than boys to express concern and responsibility for the well-being of others (Beutel and Marini, 1995) and place more importance to pro-social values (Beutel and Kirkpatrick Johnson, 2004). In the OCB literature, Allen and Rush (2001) found that in gender-neutral and male-typed jobs, women were perceived to engage in OCB more frequently than were men. More recently, Lin (2008) found that women exhibit higher scores on altruism than men. In light of these results, we expect that women will have higher pro-social values motives than men when engaging in discretionary behaviors. Thus, we propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1 Pro-social values motives to engage in discretionary behaviors will be higher in women than men.

2.2.2 Organizational Concern

Organizational concern motives are characterized by a desire of the employees for their company to do well. Also, these motives are characterized by a desire of the employees' to show pride and commitment to his or her organization (Rioux and Penner, 2001). In their study, Rioux and Penner found that organizational concern motives predicted OCB directed towards the organization. Finkelstein (2006) found that organizational concern predicted helping behavior, a form of OCB.

Employees who feel committed to their organization show an extra effort in favor of the organization and/or the people within it in the form of citizenship behaviors (Organ and Ryan, 1995). A broad definition of organizational commitment can be the psychological link between the employee and his or her organization that makes it less likely that the employee will voluntarily leave the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1996). The psychological linkage between employees and their organization can take three distinct forms: continuance, affective, and normative commitment (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Meyer and Allen, 1991). Affective commitment refers to identification with, involvement in, and emotional attachment to the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1996). In the discretionary behavior literature, several studies have shown a positive relationship between affective commitment and different forms of citizenship behaviors (Escribano and Espejo, 2010; Hoffman, Blair, Meriac, and Woehr, 2007; LePine, Erez, and Johnson, 2002; Morrison, 1994; Norris-Watts and Levy, 2004; Van Der Vegt, Vliert, and Oosterhof, 2003). We expect that employees who present a stronger affective commitment to the organization will engage in discretionary behaviors motivated by an altruistic concern for the organization. Thus, we propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2 Organizational concern motives to engage in discretionary behaviors will be higher for employees with a higher affective commitment than for employees with a lower affective commitment.

2.2.3 Impression Management

Impression management refers to the process by which people try to influence the image that others have of them (Wayne and Liden, 1995). Bolino (1999) suggested that impression management motives may lead employees to engage in citizenship behaviors. Grant and Mayer (2009) found support for Bolino's proposition. In particular, they found that impression management predicted citizenship behavior directed at individuals and directed towards the organization.

Hofstede (1983), in his cross-cultural study, defined power distance as the degree to which a culture accepts that there are inequalities between various groups within a culture or an organizational hierarchy. The level of power distance is related to the degree of centralization of authority and the degree of autocratic leadership of the members of an organization (Hofstede, 1983). In high power distance countries such as Chile, high-power distance individuals see their supervisors as belonging to a different level or elite. Conversely, low-power distance

individuals see their supervisors more equally. High-power distance individuals can go outside of the boundaries of their job descriptions even in asymmetric relationships (Kirkman, Chen, Farh, Chen, and Lowe, 2009), and behave in ways to benefit their leaders (Javidan, Dorfman, de Luque, and House, 2006). One way to benefit the leader, or manager, or the organization as a whole, is to engage in discretionary behaviors (Kirkman, et al., 2009). This is consistent with Bolino's argument that employees who want to make a good impression to their superiors will engage in citizenship behaviors fostered by impression management motives. In this case, employees may influence their supervisors' perceptions about them by trying to look busy, doing some visible behavior, instead of actually working and devote time to work related outcomes. It is difficult for high-power distance individuals to come up with real work related outcomes, because they expect solutions to come from their leaders, not from themselves as followers (Javidan, et al., 2006). Thus, we believe that employees who perceive an asymmetric relationship with his or her superior will be more inclined to follow impression management techniques to influence the supervisor's impression about them. In other words, employees with higher power distance will be more inclined to engage in discretionary behaviors motivated by impression management motives. Thus, we propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3 Impression management motives to engage in discretionary behaviors will be higher for employees with a higher power distance than for employees with a lower power distance.

3 Methods

3.1 Sample

The study included 192 individuals working in fifteen different services organizations in Chile. Organizations were contacted by presenting the study to managers attending three programs for executives at a private Chilean University. We sent paper and on-line invitations to those managers. In the invitations we asked for voluntary participation in the study, and ask them to contact the authors for further information and data collection. Nineteen managers contacted us, but only fifteen of them (78.9%) agreed to participate in the study.

In each organization, between three and five (4.53 average) mid-range managers from different departments or work units were asked to respond to a survey that included measures of company size, industry, among other variables not included in this study. 66 manager's surveys were received (97%). For each one of those managers, up to four (3.33 average) of their direct subordinates were asked to respond to a different survey. The

subordinate's survey included measures of their motives to engage in discretionary behaviors, the factors that might affect their motivation, and other variables not included in this study. They were assured that their responses would remain confidential. 201 subordinate questionnaires were collected (91.4%), but nine were taken out of the sample due to missing data and obvious random responses, leaving 192 (95.5%) useful responses. Of the 192 individuals included in the sample, 104 were male (54%). The average age of the respondents was 35 years ($SD = 9.43$ years). Two employees did not provide their age. The majority (69%) had university education. Two employees did not provide their degree of education.

3.2 Variables and measures

We used a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree) in all scales. When needed, translations were done from English to Spanish using back translation method (Brislin, 1986). Motives to engage in to discretionary behaviors and factors that affect motivation were self-reported by employees.

To measure *affective commitment*, we selected three items of the scale by Allen and Meyer (1990). The scale in Spanish was previously used in Chile (Escribano and Espejo, 2010) with a Cronbach alpha of .86. In this study, the reliability of the scale was $\alpha = .84$. A sample item is "My organization means a lot to me". To measure *power distance*, we used the 3-item scale by Ang, Van Dyne and Begley (2003) adapted from the power distance scale by Dorfman and Howell (1988). The scale in Spanish was previously used in Chile (Escribano and Espejo, 2010) with a Cronbach alpha of .72. In this study, the reliability of the scale was $\alpha = .70$. A sample item is "I think is wrong to disagree with my boss".

After explaining and exemplifying the concept of discretionary behavior, we asked the participants to evaluate whether the different motives reflected their intention to engage in such behaviors.

To measure *impression management* motives, we selected three items of the impression management scale by Rioux and Penner (2001). The reliability of the scale was $\alpha = .82$. A sample item is "To avoid looking bad in front of others". To measure *organizational concern* motives, we selected two items of the organizational concern scale by Rioux and Penner (2001). The reliability of the scale was $\alpha = .83$. A sample item is "Because I care about what happens to the company". To measure *pro-social values*, we selected three items of the pro-social values scale

by Rioux and Penner (2001). The reliability of the scale was $\alpha = .70$. A sample item is “Because I feel it is important to help those in need”

4 Results

4.1 Construct Validity

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics, correlations, and reliabilities (Crombach’s α) for the study variables. Pro-social values is positively related to gender, organizational concern is positively related to affective commitment, and impression management is positively related to power distance. These results are in line with our hypotheses. Additionally, organizational concern and affective commitment are positively related to pro-social values.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE:

To examine the discriminant validity of the theoretical model of motives we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). We performed this analysis using EQS 6.1. We started by examining a 5-factor model with pro-social values, organizational concern, impression management, affective commitment, and power distance loading on separate factors. We compared this 5-factor model with more parsimonious nested models. We analyzed (a) a 4-factor model with organizational concern and pro-social values loading on a single latent factor, (b) a 4-factor model with organizational concern and affective commitment loading on a single latent factor, (c) a 3-factor model with impression management, organizational concern, and pro-social values loading on a single latent factor, (d) and a 1-factor model. The results of this comparison of nested models are summarized in table 2. The results of the CFA show that the 5-factor model yields a good fit [chi-square (67) = 100.375; $p < .000$; RMSEA = .051, CI for RMSEA = (.025; .069), CFI = .967, SRMR = .053] according to Hu and Bentler (1999) and Kline’s (2005) recommendations. The fit of the 5-factor model is significantly better than the fit of all other models. Therefore, the 5-factors considered in our model are indeed distinct latent constructs.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE:

4.2 Hypothesis Testing

We tested the hypotheses using univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) using SPSS 17. This procedure allows to study if significant differences in dispositional and situational factors lead to differences in motivation to engage in discretionary behaviors. For each dependent variable (motive), we analyzed main effects and interactions. First, we divided each factor in two groups, one with the individuals above the mean value for that factor, and the other with the individuals below the mean value for that factor. Then, we tested whether the mean values of each group were significantly different from each other using a t-test of mean differences. We found all differences to be significant ($p < .001$). Table 3 shows the number of individuals and mean values for each group, as well as the tests for differences between groups for the independent variables. Table 4 summarizes the mean values for the different motives in each group and table 5 presents the results of the ANOVA tests.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE:

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE:

INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE:

Hypothesis 1 predicted that pro-social values would be higher for women than for men. Results supported this hypothesis. Specifically, women expressed higher pro-social values as motives to engage in discretionary behaviors than men ($MS = 22.033$, $F = 29.295$, $p < .000$). Only one additional significant effect appeared in the analysis. Affective commitment ($MS = 8.176$, $F = 10.871$, $p < .001$) was positively related to pro-social values.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that organizational concern motives to engage in discretionary behaviors would be higher for employees with a higher affective commitment than for employees with a lower affective commitment. Results supported this hypothesis. Specifically, employees who feel a strong linkage to their organization expressed a higher organizational concern motivation ($MS = 50.215$, $F = 60.903$, $p < .000$). No other significant effects appeared in this analysis.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that impression management motives to engage in discretionary behaviors would be higher for employees with a higher power distance than for employees with a lower power distance. Results supported this hypothesis. Specifically, employees with a higher power distance expressed a higher impression management motivation ($MS = 29.911$, $F = 10.189$, $p < .002$). No other significant effects appeared in this analysis.

5 Discussion

Previous research has shown that individual motives, such as pro-social values, organizational concern, and impression management foster different types of citizenship behaviors. The present study shows how these motives to engage in OCB are affected by dispositional and situational factors. First, pro-social values are a more important motive to perform OCB for women than for men. This result is consistent with Rioux and Penner (2001) theory, which positioned this motive as a more dispositional rather than situational characteristic. We showed that one particular dispositional variable that affects this motivation is gender. Second, organizational concern motives are higher when the employee is more affectively committed to the organization. This result is also consistent with Rioux and Penner (2001) theory, which positioned this motive as a more situational rather than dispositional characteristic. We showed that one particular situational variable that affects this motivation is affective commitment. Finally, impression management motives to perform OCB become more salient when the employee is higher in power distance. This result is in line with our assumptions, suggesting that impression management is a more dispositional rather than a situational characteristic. We showed that one particular dispositional variable that affects this motivation is power distance.

Our findings can help to bring together different lines of research on organizational citizenship behaviors. On the one hand, the vast majority of studies look at dispositional and situational factors as antecedents of OCB (Organ, Podsakoff, and MacKenzie, 2006). On the other hand, a functional approach, studying the role of motives to perform OCB, is receiving increasing support (Espejo, 2011; Espejo and Cardona, 2005; Finkelstein, 2006; Finkelstein and Penner, 2004; Grant and Mayer 2009). This study suggests that individual motives to perform OCB can mediate the effect of individual and attitudinal factors. In other words, individuals are more inclined to become motivated to perform OCB in one way or another, depending on their own characteristics, on how they see their relationship with their supervisors, and on the attitude that they have developed toward the organization. Since previous literature indicates that this can have an effect on the type and level of OCB performed, motives can be seen as mediators in the relationship between dispositional and relational factors and OCB.

Although all hypotheses were supported, we also found an unpredicted result. Affective commitment not only explained differences in organizational concern motives, but also in pro-social values motives. A possible explanation for this result is the similar nature of both types of motives. Espejo (2011) proposed a four-category

typology of work motivation to classify different forms of motivation. To propose this typology he considered perceived locus of causality (Deci and Ryan, 1995) and perceived locus of consequence (Cardona, Lawrence, and Espejo, 2003), both of which could be external or internal. He proposed that motives could be intrinsic, extrinsic, institutional, or altruistic. Altruistic motives are characterized by an internal locus of causality and an external locus of consequence. Altruistic motives appeal to the benefits the individual expects others to experience as a consequence of the behavior. Thus, organizational concern and pro-social values are both altruistic motives. Although the recipient of behaviors motivated by pro-social values and organizational concern motives are different, both of them are motives aimed to appeal to the benefits the individual expects others (the organization or other people) to experience as a consequence of the behavior. The recipient of behaviors motivated by pro-social values is other people and the recipient of behaviors motivated by organizational concern is the organization itself. Due to similar nature of both types of altruistic motives it is not strange they share affective commitment as a common antecedent. As Organ and Ryan (1995) stated, employees high in affective commitment show an extra effort to their organization and/or the people within it by performing different forms of OCB. Thus, employees that engage in such behaviors that could either be motivated by a desire to build positive relations with other (pro-social values) and/or a desire to their organization to do well (organizational concern).

Despite the findings of this study, some limitations need to be considered. Self-reports of motives and factors that affect those motives were used to assess all measures, which may result in issues regarding common method bias. However, as noted by Conway and Lance (2010), other-reports are not necessarily superior to self-reports. Because in this study we measured mainly internal perceptions, we believe that self-reports were the best way of gather information. Second, all surveyed employees came from 15 non-manufacturing organizations in Chile. Services and manufacturing businesses have significant differences (Brax, 2005). Therefore, future research should study these hypotheses in a manufacturing setting and in a different culture. This could be especially important for power distance, because variations in this factor might be greater when comparing cultures than in only one nation. A final limitation of the study is related to the number of items used to assess organizational concern motives to engage in discretionary behaviors. Due to constrain in the length of questionnaire, we used only 2 items for this particular construct.

Several lines of further research could emerge from this paper. First, other individual variables could be studied as ways to affect motivation to engage in discretionary behaviors. For example, propensity to trust could affect employees' pro-social values motives. In a trustworthy environment, cooperation and teamwork are enhanced (Dirks and Ferrin, 2001; Kramer, 1999). Thus, more discretionary behaviors motivated by a desire to be helpful and build positive relationships with others could emerge. Conversely, in a non-trusty environment, such desire to be helpful and build positive relationships might be scarcer. Second, further research should analyze directly the moderating role of motives in the relationship between OCB and dispositional and situational factors. Third, qualitative studies could analyze the differences in quality of citizenship behaviors fostered by different motives. For example, Espejo and Cardona (2005) found that managers, in their evaluations of their subordinates' citizenship behaviors, tend to value less the behaviors related to impression management motives than the ones relate to intrinsic or altruistic motives. Finally, further research should study if the results of this study can also apply to challenging forms of discretionary behaviors, such as TCB (Morrison and Phelps, 1999) or voice (Farrell, 1983; Hirschman, 1970). Research on motivation and these challenging behaviors is at a very initial stage (Grant and Mayer, 2009).

This paper also has some managerial implications. According to theories that explain motivation as a result of incentives (e.g. Barnard, 1938), managers need to suggest the correct actions to motivate their subordinates, according to their motivational profile. Thus, managers could promote certain types of motives in their organizations by fostering the factors that affect those motives. For example, if a manager wants to promote motives aimed at contributing to the goals of the organization (organizational concern), they should care about their subordinates' identification with, involvement in, and emotional attachment to the organization (affective commitment). This study also has implications for human resources selection practices. Selecting candidates with lower power distance can reduce impression management behaviors and women can perform more behaviors based on pro-social values motives.

This paper contributes to literature on discretionary behaviors by showing how different dispositional and situational factors can affect the motivation of employees to engage in discretionary behaviors. On the one hand, scholars can understand better the types of motivation to engage in discretionary behaviors and their role in the

process of generating OCB. On the other hand, managers can start taking actions in order to foster motivation to engage in discretionary behaviors by affecting this set of factors.

References

Allen NJ, Meyer JP (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of vocational behavior* 49:252-276.

Allen NJ, Meyer JP (1990) The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 63:1-18.

Allen NJ, Rush CR (2001) The influence of rater gender on ratings of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 31:2561-2587.

Ang S, Van Dyne L, Begley TM (2003) The employment relationships of foreign workers versus local employees: a field study of organizational justice, job satisfaction, performance, and OCB. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 24:561-583.

Barnard CI (1938) *The Functions of the Executive*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Bachrach DG, Bendoly E, Podsakoff PM (2001) Attributions of the "causes" of group performance as an alternative explanation of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86:1285-1293.

Bateman TS, Organ DW (1983) Job Satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". *Academy of Management Journal* 26:587-595.

Beutel AM, Kirkpatrick Johnson M (2004) Gender and prosocial values during adolescence. A research note. *The Sociological Quarterly* 45:379-393.

Beutel AM, Marini MM (1995) Gender and values. *American Sociological Review* 60:436-448.

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

- Brax S (2005) A manufacturer becoming service provider –challenges and a paradox. *Managing Service Quality* 15:142-155.
- Bridges JS (1989) Sex differences in occupational values. *Sex Roles* 20:205-211.
- Brislin RW (1986) The wording and translation of research instruments. In: Looner WJ and Berry JW (Eds.) *Field Methods in Cross-Cultural Research*. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Cardona P, Lawrence BS, Espejo A (2010) Incentive-based theory of work motivation. Working Paper. University of Navarra IESE, Barcelona.
- Carlo G, Okun MA, Knight GP, de Guzman MRT (2005) The interplay of traits and motives on volunteering: agreeableness, extraversion and prosocial value motivation. *Personality and Individual Differences* 38:1293-1305.
- Chhokar JS, Zhuplev A, Fok LY, Hartman SJ (2001) The Impact of Culture on Equity Sensitivity Perceptions and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Five-Country Study. *International Journal of Value-Based Management* 14:79–98.
- Conway JM, Lance CE (2010) What reviewers should expect from authors regarding common method bias in organizational research. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25:325-334.
- Deci EL, Ryan RM (1985) *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. Plenum, New York.
- Delery JE, Kacmar KM (1998) The influence of applicant and interviewer characteristics on the use of impression management. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 28:1649–1669.
- Dirks KT, Ferrin DL (2001) The role of trust in organizational settings. *Organizational Science* 12:450-467.
- Dorfman PW, Howell JP (1988) Dimensions of national culture and effective leadership patterns. *Advances in International Comparative Management* 3:127-150.
- Elanain, HMA (2007) The five-factor model of personality and organizational citizenship behavior in United Arab Emirates. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 72:47-55.

Escribano P, Espejo A (2010) Supporting or challenging the status-quo: Antecedents of OCB and taking charge behaviors. Paper presented at the Academy of Management. Montreal, Canada.

Espejo A (2011) Role perceptions and motivations to perform organizational citizenship behaviors. *Academia, Revista Latinoamericana de Administración* 48:126-139.

Espejo A, Cardona P (2005) Motivation to perform organizational citizenship behaviors. Paper presented at the Academy of Management. Honolulu, USA.

Farrell D (1983) Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect as responses to job dissatisfaction: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal* 26:596-607.

Finkelstein MA (2006) Dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior: Motives, motive fulfillment, and role identity. *Social Behavior and Personality* 34:603-616.

Finkelstein MA, Penner LA (2004) Predicting organizational citizenship behavior: Integrating the functional and role identity approaches. *Social Behavior and Personality* 32:383-398.

Gagne M, Deci EL (2005) Self-Determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 26:331-362.

George D, Carroll P, Kersnick R, Calderon K (1998) Gender-related patterns of helping among friends. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 22:685-704.

Gilmore DC, Stevens CK, Harrell-Cook G, Ferris GR (1999) Impression Management Tactics. In: Eder RW and Harris MM (eds) *The employment interview handbook*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp 321–336.

Grant AM (2007) Relational Job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. *Academy of Management Review* 32:393-417.

Grant AM (2008) Does intrinsic motivation fuel the prosocial fire? Motivational synergy in predicting persistence, performance, and productivity. *Journal of applied psychology* 93:48-58.

- Grant AM, Berry JW (2011) The necessity of others is the mother of invention: Intrinsic and prosocial motivations, perspective talking, and creativity. *Academy of Management Journal* 54:73-96.
- Grant AM, Gino F (2010) A little thanks goes a long way: Explaining why gratitude expressions motivate prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 98:946-955.
- Grant AM, Mayer DM (2009) Good soldiers and good actors: Prosocial and impression management motives as interactive predictors of affiliative citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 94:900-912.
- Grant AM, Wade-Benzoni KA (2009) The hot and cool of death awareness at work: Mortality cues, aging, and self-protective and prosocial motivations. *Academy of Management Review* 34:600-622.
- Hirschman AO (1970) *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Hoffman BJ, Blair CA, Meriac JP, Woehr DJ (2007) Expanding the criterion domain? A quantitative review of the OCB literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92:555-566.
- Hofstede G (1983) The cultural relativity of organizational practices and theories. *Journal of International Business Studies* 14:75-89.
- Hu, L, and Bentler, PM (1999) Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6:1-55.
- Javidan M, Dorfman PW, de Luque MS, and House RJ (2006) Conceptualization and measuring cultures and their consequences: A comparative review of GLOBE's and Hofstede's approaches. *Journal of International Business Studies* 37:897-914.
- Kanter RM (1968) Commitment and social organization: A study of commitment mechanisms in Utopian communities. *American Sociological Review* 33:499-517.
- Kirkman BL, Chen G, Farh JL, Chen ZX, Lowe KB (2009) Individual power distance orientation and follower reaction to transformational leaders: A cross-level, cross-cultural examination. *Academy of Management Journal* 52:744-764.

- Kline RB (2005) *Principles and Practices of Structural Equation Modeling*. The Guilford Press, New York.
- Kramer RM (1999) Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Review of Psychology* 50:569-598
- Kristof-Brown A, Barrick MR, Franke M (2002) Applicant impression management: dispositional influences and consequences for recruiter perceptions of fit and similarity. *Journal of Management* 28:27-46.
- LePine JA, Erez A, Johnson DE (2002) The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87:52-65.
- Lieberman DA, Remedios R (2007) Do undergraduates' motives for studying change as their progress through their degrees? *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 77:379-395.
- Lin CP (2008) Clarifying the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors, gender, and knowledge sharing in workplace organizations in Taiwan. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 22:241-250.
- MacKenzie SB, Podsakoff PM, Fetter R (1991) Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50:123-150.
- MacKenzie SB, Podsakoff PM, Fetter R (1993) The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of sales performance. *Journal of Marketing* 57:70-80.
- Meyer JP, Allen NJ (1991) A three component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review* 1:61-89.
- Morrison EW (1994) Role Definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal* 37:1543-1567.
- Morrison EW, Phelps CC (1999) Taking charge at work: Extrarole efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal* 42:403-419.

- Mowday RT, Steers RM, Porter LW (1979) The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 14:224-247.
- Norris-Watts C, Levy PE (2004) The mediating role of affective commitment in the relation of the feedback environment to work outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 65:351–365.
- Organ DW (1977) A reappraisal and reinterpretation of the satisfaction-causes-performance hypothesis. *Academy of Management Review* 2:46–53.
- Organ DW (1988) *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington Books, Lexington, MA.
- Organ DW, Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB (2006) *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Organ DW, Ryan K (1995) A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology* 48:775-802.
- Penner LA, Midili AR, Kegelmeyer J (1997) Beyond job attitudes: A personality and social psychology perspective on the causes of organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Performance* 10:111-131.
- Piliavin JA, Callero PL (1991) *Giving blood: the development of an altruistic identity*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Podsakoff PM, Ahearne M, MacKenzie SB (1997) Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82:262–270.
- Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB (1994) Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research* 3:351–363.
- Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Hui C (1993) Organizational citizenship behaviors and managerial evaluations of employee performance: A review and suggestions for future research. In: Ferris GR and Rowland KM (eds) *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*. JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, pp 1–40.

Podsakoff NP, Whiting SW, Podsakoff PM, Blume BD (2009) Individual –and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 94:122–141.

Rioux SM, Penner LA (2001) The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A motivational analysis. *Journal of applied psychology* 86:1306-1314.

Simon H. (1993) Altruism and economics. *The American Economic Review* 83:156-161.

Snyder M (1974) Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 30:526–537.

Snyder M (1993) Basic research and practice problems: The promise of a "functional" personality and social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 19:251-264.

Van Der Vegt GS, Van De Vliert E, Oosterhof A (2003) Informational dissimilarity and organizational citizenship behavior: The role of intrateam interdependence and team identification. *Academy of Management Journal* 46:715-727.

Van Dyne L, le Pine JA (1998) Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predict validity. *Academy of Management Journal* 41:108-119.

Veroff J, Reuman D, Feld S (1984) Motives in American men and women across the adult life span. *Developmental Psychology* 20:1142-1158.

Wayne SJ, Liden RC (1995) Effects of impression management on performance: A longitudinal study. *Academy of Management Journal* 38:232-260

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, Correlations, and Crombach’s Alpha (N=192)

	Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Gender (0 = male; 1 = female)	.46	.50	-					
2	Impression Management	3.2	1.7	.07	(.82)				
3	Pro-social Values	5.9	.94	.	.12	(.70)			
4	Organizational Concern	6.2	1.0	.05	-.17	.44*	(.83)		
5	Affective Commitment	5.7	1.2	-.04	.00	.24*	.61*	(.84)	
6	Power Distance	3.0	1.4	.06	.28*	.01	-.17	.02	(.70)

Crombach’s alpha on diagonal

* p < .01

Table 2: Confirmatory Analysis of Nested Models

Model	Description	chi-square	df	RMSEA	CFI	SRMR	Δ chi-	Δ df	sig
Model 1	5-Factor model	100.375	67	.051	.967	.053	-	-	-
Model 2	4-Factor model	177.657	71	.089	.894	.077	77.282	4	.000
Model 3	4-Factor model	192.532	71	.095	.879	.067	92.157	4	.000
Model 4	3-Factor model	400.686	74	.152	.676	.139	300.311	7	.000
Model 5	1-Factor model	600.765	77	.189	.480	.163	500.390	10	.000

Notes: Comparisons were made with model 1

RMSEA: root mean square error of approximation; CFI: comparative fit index; SRMR: standardized root mean square residual

Table 3: Between-Subjects Factors

Factor	Level	Mean Values	N	p-value of mean differences
Power Distance	High	4.33	90	< .001
	Low	1.95	10	
Affective commitment	High	6.62	11	< .001
	Low	4.59	82	
Gender	Men	-	10	-
	Women	-	88	

Table 4: Mean Values for Motives to engage in OCB

Group	N	Mean value for I. Management	Mean value for Org. Concern	Mean value for PS. Values
Total Sample	19	3.20	6.21	5.99
High Power Distance	90	3.63	6.17	6.00
Low Power Distance	10	2.82	6.25	5.98
High Affective	11	3.15	6.65	6.14
Low Affective	82	3.28	5.62	5.79
Female	88	3.33	6.27	6.34
Male	10	3.09	6.17	5.69

Table 5: Results of ANOVA for Motives

Independent Variable	Mean Differences I. Management	F-Statistic I. Management	Mean Differences O. Concern	F-Statistic O. Concern	Mean Differences PS. Values	F-Statistic PS. Values
P. Distance	.81	10.19**	.08	.14	.02	.01
A. Commit.	.13	.05	1.03	60.90***	.35	10.87**
Gender	.24	.31	.1	2.58	.65	29.30***

** p < .002

*** p < .000