Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Mexico:
A Collectivistic Perspective

Track: Culture, Social, and Ethical Issues

Key Words: OCB, Collectivism, and Mexico

Abstract

This study examined the dimensionality of the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in Mexico. The considered the collectivistic cultural background of Mexican professional employees and developed a framework based on both etic (universal) and emic (culturally specific) dimensions of OCB. The findings indicated that OCB in Mexico embraces eight dimensions. Altruism, Civic Virtue, and Sportsmanship were found to be the etic dimensions of Mexican OCB, while Interpersonal Harmony, Protecting Company Resources, and Professional Development were identified as emic dimensions for collectivistic cultures including Mexico. Last, Organizational Camaraderie and Organizational Dedication were recognized as emic dimensions of OCB only in Mexico.

Key Words: OCB, Collectivism, and Mexico

Introduction

The importance of understanding organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) lies in that it not only improves organizational performance financially, but also helps organizations to become more successful in activities such as the utilization of resources, coordination of employee activities in groups, attraction and retention of best employees, and adaptation to environmental changes (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Vardi and Weitz (2004) estimated that the cost of negative work behavior in organizations in the United States is as much as $200 billion per year. Opposite to workers with negative behavior are those called "good soldiers"; these are employees who are very committed to their organizations and willing to make extra efforts to achieve organizational goals, have been accentuated as the positive assets of organizations (Bolino, 1999; Hodson, 1991). In the past decades, researchers have found various constructive, helpful behavioral elements of OCB which expand beyond an employee's task responsibilities and add substantial value to organizational operations (Organ, 1988; Schnake, 1991; LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002; Lin et al., 2010).

A stream of OCB research has focused on cultures outside the U.S. and Western context (e.g., Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997; Farh, Zhong, & Organ, 2004; Kim, 2006; Lievens & Anseel, 2004; Paillé, 2009, 2010). Meanwhile, there have been a number of studies conducted cross-culturally in order to explore possible similarities and differences in OCB across borders. Farh, Podsakoff, and Organ (1990) conducted a study comparing Taiwan and the U.S. and found that certain OCB elements are salient in both countries. Organ and Lingl (1995) investigated OCB in similar cultures and found no major differences in OCB dimensions between American and British samples. Lam, Hui, and Law (1999) further compared two Western

1

countries, Australia and the U.S., to two Asian countries, Hong Kong and Japan. They concluded that individuals in Hong Kong and Japan are more likely to consider Sportsmanship and Courtesy as in-role behaviors. This type of behavior is a characteristic of cultures with high-power distance and strong collectivism, such as Hong Kong and Japan (Hofstede, 2003). For the most part, there appears to be a direct link between the national culture and some of the variance in OCB (Farh, Zhong, & Organ, 2004; Paine & Organ, 2000). Lam, Hui, and Law (1999, p. 600) suggested that ". . . there may be performance norms (etic OCB) that transcend cultural values . . . as well as performance norms (emic OCB) that are affected by particular cultural values". Farh, Earley, and Lin (1997) also held that Western and Asian countries diverge in the emic dimensions of OCB, suggesting both emic (culturally specific) and etic (culturally universal) dimensions of OCB to be further studied.

In spite of abundant cross-cultural findings, previous research has not yet paid high attention to OCB in Latin America countries, such as Mexico. Economically speaking, Mexico is the second most important country in Latin America after Brazil, representing a quarter of Latin America's GDP (U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, 2013). As Mexico is increasingly becoming a location for multinational companies, it is worthwhile to study the Mexican "good soldiers" who helped achieving and sustaining Mexico's economic performance. Thus, the purpose of this study is to examine the OCB in a Mexican context on the basis of the emic and etic dimensions of OCB. In view of previous findings in OCB, there is a need to attain an inclusive understanding on which OCB dimensions will be recognized in Mexico. To investigate the etic OCB, this study will explore the idea upon the collectivistic cultural background of Mexican employees.

Literature Review

Liu, Rose, and Blodgett (1999) argued that people are psychologically defined by their traditions, heritages, rituals, customs, and religions, and each of these factors explains significant variations in the norms, morals, standards, beliefs, and behaviors of people. Schmeling (2001) concluded that collectivism/individualism, one of Hofstede's (1980) five cultural dimensions, can differentiate most of the national cultures across the world. Western societies, including U.S., U.K., and Australia, are categorized into the individualistic culture. On the other hand, Asian and Latin American countries, such as China, Korea, and Mexico, tend to have high collectivistic tendencies (Hofstede, 1980; Hui & Triandis, 1986; Triandis, 1995).

Previous research regarded collectivism as an underlying cultural reason in establishing and distinguishing between-culture differences (Earley, 1993; Hui & Triandis, 1986; Kim et al., 1994). According to Earley (1998), a collectivistic culture is usually associated with conformity, obedience, and dependability. By the same token, Van Dyne et al. (2000) suggested that collectivist societies put their personal interests behind group interests to the point of sacrificing personal

2

interests in order to contribute to the welfare of the group even though such help might not directly relate to their individual benefit. The concept of collectivism helps to explain how members of a group view themselves, and how they treat others in the group (Gudykunst, 1998).

Conflict and Harmony

Wheeler, Reis, and Bond (1989) suggested that one of the noticeable characteristics of collectivists is that they like to distinguish between the in-group and the out-group. Steers and Sanchez-Runde (2002) argued that national cultures which encourage collectivism over individual interests strongly affect how individuals think and behave in the working environment. For instance, Leung (1988) found that the Chinese were more prompt than Americans in engaging in conflict with a stranger but very unlikely with an in-group member. That is, in getting group acceptance, individuals' harmonious relationships with other in-group individuals are crucial. Farh, Zhong, and Organ (2004) pointed out that "interactions with the group would diffuse organizational and personal roles, and preservation of harmony would be critical" (p. 250). Thus, employees in a collectivistic culture are usually encouraged to pursue interpersonal harmony and identify themselves as interconnected with others in the group. On the other hand, certain interpersonal conflict in Western countries can be viewed as "constructive, bounded, and task focused" (Farh, Zhong, & Organ, 2004, p. 244). Although there is only a small risk for interpersonal conflict to expand in a group in individualistic societies, conflict is more likely to grow to the point that it endangers the capability of the entire organization (Farh, Zhong, & Organ, 2004).

As a result, collectivistic societies would value harmony-enhancing environments over confrontational actions (Leung, 1987). In addition, employees in individualistic cultures prefer the direct communication approach, whereas those from collectivistic cultures prefer a conflict-avoidance approach, sometimes by the use of mediation methods (Leung, 1988; Ting-Toomey, Trubisky, & Nishida, 1989). When conflict occurs, employees in individualistic cultures tend to use active, aggressive, and confrontational tactics in dealing with conflicts in working environments, whereas individuals in collectivistic cultures are expected to use passive, participating, and avoiding tactics in order to avoid conflicts (Ting-Toomey et al., 1991). Further evidence was provided by Ohbuchi, Fukushima, and Tedeschi (1999); they found that, unlike individualistic Americans who are more likely to justify the causes of conflict, the collectivistic Japanese would rather focus more on relationship goals than initiate conflict. Thus, collectivistic societies tend to perceive avoidance of conflict as functional and appropriate (Kirkbride, Tang, & Westwood, 1991). In addition, previous studies have shown that members from collectivistic cultures tend to believe that social harmony and positive interpersonal relationships are more important outcomes than monetary rewards and wealth (Chen, 1995; Chen, Meindl, & Hui, 1998; Bolino & Turnley, 2008). These findings mirror Triandis' (1989) remark that collectivism determines the central value and social behaviors of many societies including Latin American countries.

Collectivism and OCB

National culture is significantly correlated with role definition in the working environment (Moorman & Blakely, 1995). Thus, what underlies extra-role or in-role behavior at work differs across cultures (Gelfand, Erez, & Aycan, 2007). The association between collectivism and OCB can help further understand employees' perceived relationships with their organization as well as group culture and norms (Moorman, 1993; Organ & Ryan, 1995). In previous studies, employees from collectivistic cultures, such as Chinese and Japanese, are more likely to consider their work-related behavior in line with their organizational tasks than their Western, individualistic counterparts (Lam, Hui, & Law, 1999; Paine & Organ, 2000; Blakely, Srivastava, & Moorman, 2005). Moorman and Blakely (1995) considered collectivism a potential predictor of OCB, and found that employees with collectivistic values perform a greater level of OCB than their counterparts in an individualistic society do. Munene (1995) argued that OCB in collectivistic societies tend to stress in-role duties, whereas persons in individualistic cultures are more likely to perform extra-role or what is known as "beyond the job description" (p. 117).

Furthermore, Moorman and Blankely (1995) and Lam, Hui, and Law (1999) found that employees with very collectivistic values are more prone to exhibit OCB toward peers. Similarly, Organ and Payne (1999) insisted that individuals in a collectivistic society "tend to favor interdependence, loyalty and helping, all of which are reminiscent of OCB-like behavior" (p. 250). An additional characteristic of collectivistic societies is that the members are more open to interpersonal interaction (Karambayya, 1991). According to Clugston, Howell, and Dorfman (2000), collectivists are more willing to show their group initiatives because of a higher regard for the workgroup. Overall, previous literature in OCB is consistent with the notion in socio-cultural analysis that collectivistic employees are more concerned about interpersonal harmony within their group (Triandis, 1995).

Research Framework

Conventional OCB

The dimensionality of OCB has been intensively investigated by previous research. Through several meta-analyses in the OCB literature (e.g., Organ, 1988; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2000; LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002; Schnake, 1991), researchers of OCB have focused on the various well-known dimensions and predictors. In general, OCB researchers usually measure at least some of the dimensions across studies (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). Among the shared dimensions, Organ's (1988) five dimensions are helpful in studying OCB across different cultures.

RQ1: Does OCB in Mexico include Altruism, Civic Virtue, Conscientiousness, Courtesy, and Sportsmanship?

OCB in the Maquila Industry

According to researchers, culture is one of the main factors that affect OCB dimensions in a specific location (e.g., Clugston, Howell, & Dorfman, 2000; Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997; Farh, Zhong, & Organ, 2004; Moorman, 1993; Moorman & Blakely, 1995). LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) argued that it is probable that there are definite unidentified cultural behaviors in the workplace (e.g., nurturing collegiate relationships) that might help identify different OCB dimensions.

Ortiz (2000) completed an original study involving the Mexico-U.S. border-based maquila manufacturing sector. With a focus on the maquila workforce population on the border between Mexico and the U.S., Ortiz (2000) came up with several previously undiscovered dimensions of OCB: Organizational Camaraderie, Organizational Sincerity, and Professional Development. The Professional Development dimension was not only identified by Ortiz (2000), but also later recognized by Farh, Zhong, and Organ (2004) in a study done in China which they labeled Self-Training. Ortiz's (2000) research explored the indigenous OCB dimensions in a Mexico-U.S. border culture setting and considered them unique (emic) rather than universal (etic) as in other cultures already studied. In his study, he also found some OCB dimensions from previous studies by Organ (1988) and Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1989) on the Western cultures. Thus, based on the knowledge from this approach, we think these indigenous dimensions can serve as a basis for the emic OCB dimensions in Mexico.

RQ2: Does OCB in Mexico include Organizational Camaraderie, Organizational Sincerity, and Professional Development?

OCB in Collectivistic Cultures

Based on the Chinese cultural values of in-group collectivism, Farh, Zhong, and Organ (2004) uncovered two OCB dimensions and called them Interpersonal Harmony and Protecting Company Resources. According to Farh, Zhong, and Organ (2004, p. 241) ". . . Chinese formulation of OCB differs from that in the West, and is embedded in its unique social and cultural context". Studies have concluded that collectivistic societies, such as the Chinese, tend to engage OCB in a different way. Since collectivistic members would be less likely to initiate disagreement, they would appreciate gestures that keep harmony and avoid potential conflict (Bond et al., 1985). For example, Protecting Company Resources would be left to the employee's discretion (extra-role) in their culture. According to Farh, Zhong, and Organ (2004), the Chinese conceptualize the OCB dimension of Protecting Company Resources by using personal resources (e.g., information and social capital) to help the organization and to protect the firm from disaster (e.g., fire or flood). This OCB dimension has not been identified in the etic OCB literature (e.g., Podsakoff et al., 2000). Thus, given the collectivistic cultural similarities between Asian and Mexican people, we think that the OCB emic dimensions found in Asian collectivistic countries, namely, Interpersonal Harmony and Protecting Company Resources, may also appear in collectivistic Mexican employees.

RQ3: Does OCB in Mexico include Interpersonal Harmony and Protecting Company Resources?

Method

Ten different OCB dimensions are included in our research framework. In this section, we continue by refining the OCB scale in the Mexican context in order to assess the dimensionality, validity, and reliability following Churchill's (1979) suggested procedures for developing better measures.

Qualitative Data

We first employed qualitative interviews to examine the OCB of Mexican corporate employees. Thirty-five Mexican professional employees working in various Mexican states were chosen for the qualitative study. In order to obtain rich information, the Mexican employees chosen in the qualitative study belonged to several industries and have varied levels in management. In a one-month period, in-depth interviews were conducted. The central question of the interviews was about the personal beliefs related to OCB in their own work settings. To ensure consistency, identical procedures are used for the interviews (Yin, 1988). We used open-ended questions and encouraged the participants to elaborate on their experiences. Each interview lasted about two hours. The interviews were transcribed for conceptual analysis (Eisenhardt, 1989). In the analysis, we found that all the ten OCB dimensions identified in our research framework have been mentioned by the participants in the qualitative interviews, providing preliminary support to the theoretical framework.

Sampling Procedure

The next step involved the testing of the dimensionality of the OCB in Mexico. Podsakoff and colleagues (2000) suggested that job autonomy should be taken into consideration in sample selection in OCB-related studies, for the reason that freedom to make decisions in one's job is relevant to the decision on whether to engage in OCB. Therefore, employees with a high level of job autonomy were the target in our data collection. We purposefully targeted administrative employees who had relatively flexible prescribed roles that allow them to perform extra-role activities such as OCB. These administrative employees came from the following categories: first-line supervisors, management professionals, and technical administrators at both senior and junior levels.

We recruited participants in the shopping center management industry (land acquisition, design, security, cleaning, maintenance, marketing, financing, leasing, legal services, and management). Following previous statistical guidelines (Hair et al., 2006; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), we chose to target a total of 300 Mexican employees in the selected industry based on alpha level, desired statistical power, and the specific multivariate method to be used. Thus, a total of 300 Mexicans were directly contacted for this purpose, and 215 surveys were retuned in a three-month period, resulting in a 72% response rate. Out of these 215 surveys, 200 were usable questionnaires. To test for non-response bias, we contacted 6 non-respondents and found that the unanimous reason was no time for filling out the survey.

Constructs and Measurement

In the questionnaire, we included constructs for the ten OCB dimensions present in the research framework. Five of these dimensions, Altruism, Civic Virtue, Conscientiousness, Courtesy, and Sportsmanship, were created on the basis of Organ (1988). Organizational Camaraderie, Professional Development, and Organizational Sincerity were adapted from Ortiz (2000). Two additional dimensions, Interpersonal Harmony and Protecting Company Resources, were adapted from Farh, Zhong, and Organ (2004). Each of the ten OCB constructs was measured on a four-item scale, except for the construct of Protecting Company Resources, which was measured by a three-item scale. Thus, the combined OCB scale consisted of 39 items. The participants were asked to rate their own perceptions about other employees in their company, on each of the scales listed below, by using a six-point Likert-type scale which ranges from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (6). The measurement items are provided in the Appendix. Cronbach's alphas for the ten constructs are all greater than 0.70, establishing internal reliability as suggested by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994).

The questionnaire was first written in English and subsequently translated into Spanish with a back-translation technique to ensure cross-cultural equivalence as suggested by Werner and Campbell (1970). Furthermore, back-translation will be done using an interactive approach to minimize translation error (Brislin, 1980). The accuracy of the translation was confirmed by competent bilinguals (Brislin, Lonner, & Thorndike, 1973).

Statistical Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was performed in order to examine dimensionality using the Mexican sample. Factor loadings were taken into consideration for high stability and to maintain homogeneity as suggested by Singleton and Straits (2005). This helps not only to purify the scale, but also to maintain its parsimonious psychometric properties.

Results

Before Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted, Measure of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy were performed. The results indicated that the 39 items were appropriate for EFA. Generalized Least Squares was employed as the method for factor extraction due to the potential threat of normality (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Varimax rotation was selected because of its ability in facilitating the interpretation of the factor matrix (Hair et al., 2006). In the EFA, factors with multiple items having item loadings of 0.50 or better were considered desirable (Osborne & Costello, 2009), and a solution accounting for at least 60 percent of the total variance was considered satisfactory (Hair et al., 2006).

The initial EFA resulted in ten factors accounting for 72.21% of the variance. Nevertheless, factor ten did not load any item with factor loadings above 0.50, and factor nine only loaded one item with acceptable factor loading. Among the 39

items, 10 had factor loadings below 0.30 on any of the factors. Thus, we proceeded by removing the 10 items from further analysis. EFA was performed again, this time with eight factors to extract. The total variance explained was 69.05%. All the items loaded to particular factors with factor loadings above 0.50. Factor one loaded eight items and factor eight loaded two items. The results for the other factors became more parsimonious. The final EFA results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 is about here.

The results revealed that three etic OCB dimensions, Altruism, Civic Virtue, and Sportsmanship, were underlying dimensions in the Mexican context. Two emic dimensions based on the Mexico-U.S. border maquila industry, Organizational Camaraderie and Professional Development, were found to be underlying OCB dimensions for Mexican employees. Two OCB dimensions previously identified for other collectivistic cultures, namely, Interpersonal Harmony and Protecting Company Resources, were also underlying dimensions for Mexican professional employees. Meanwhile, the dimension of Conscientiousness was not shown to be an underlying dimension. Factor one loaded eight items, three from Organizational Sincerity, four from Courtesy, and one from Professional Development.

Discussion of Results

In this study, we attempted to examine the OCB dimensions in Mexico by combining OCB dimensions found in the maquila industry (Ortiz, 2000), OCB dimensions found in other collectivistic cultures (Farh, Zhong, & Organ, 2004), and the emic OCB dimensions (Lam et al., 1999; Lievens et al., 2004; Organ, 1988). Our EFA results revealed a total of eight dimensions in the Mexican setting.

Factor one loaded a total of eight items that come from different origins. More specifically, four items came from Ortiz's scale (2000) based on the maquila industry. Among them, three items came from Organizational Sincerity and one came from Professional Development. The last four items, however, came from Organ's (1988) original OCB dimension of Courtesy. According to the conceptual definition, Organizational Sincerity is an employee's desire to take responsibility and demonstrate faithfulness to the firm and to its objectives (Ortiz, 2000). On the other hand, Courtesy is defined as positive behaviors with other workers in the firm, such as sharing information and giving advance notice of possible outcomes (Organ, 1988). Thus, factor one was named Organizational Dedication which clearly reflects the characteristics of both original dimensions.

Factor two favorably loaded three out of four items that were designed to measure the OCB dimension of Altruism. According to the definition (Organ, 1988), this discretionary behavior aims at helping certain people in a firm with relevant

8

tasks. Thus, our study found that Altruism is an etic (universal) dimension found in Mexican professional employees when compared to their Western and Asian counterparts.

Factor three strongly loaded all the four items that were designed to capture the dimension of Sportsmanship. This particular dimension was transformed by Ortiz (2000) to a maquila setting due to the differences. Thus, this study confirmed that the Sportsmanship dimension share commonality with that in Western societies.

Factor four was composed of two items from Civic Virtue and one item from Altruism. Civic Virtue is about the engagement that the workers demonstrate in the political life of the organization (Organ, 1988). For example, employees keep up with the firm's meetings, internal e-mails, announcements, etc. However, the Altruism question that loaded to this dimension is very similar to the above activities as it relates to internal organizational politics. Thus, Civic Virtue has been determined to be an etic (universal) dimension in the Mexican context as well as in the Western and the Asian environments.

Factor five loaded all the three items that were designed to capture the Asian OCB of Protecting Company Resources. The inclusion of this OCB dimension originated in an Asian context was mainly because of cultural forces. In an emerging economy that belongs to collectivistic culture, employees would conserve company resources such as supplies and electricity due to the scarcity of resources (Farh, Zhong, & Organ, 2004). We found a similar notion in a Mexican context. Thus, Protecting Company Resources can be seen as a common OCB dimension in collectivistic cultures.

Factor six effectively loaded three out of four items that were designed to capture the emic OCB dimension of Interpersonal Harmony. As in the above dimension, this OCB dimension was also first recognized in Asia. The investigation of this dimension in a Latin American country was the first of its kind. The result demonstrated that "good soldier" Mexican employees engage in routine behaviors that would pursue harmony and relationship goals rather than initiate conflict such as engaging in confrontational tactics (e.g., direct communication) (Ting-Toomey et al., 1991). Thus, this dimension is shown to be a common dimension in collectivistic cultures.

Factor seven was composed of two items from the emic dimension of Personal Development and one item from the etic dimension of Conscientiousness. The definition of Personal Development, according to Ortiz (2000), is the employee's aspiration to advance in his or her job-related education for the benefit of the organization even if the monetary resources come from the employee. It is partially in line with the concept of Conscientiousness in work settings. Even if a company does not provide flexible time for personal learning and development, employees are still self-motivated to sharpen their skills and apply them to work.

Factor eight consisted of two out of four items from the emic dimension of Organizational Camaraderie originated in the maquila industry. It is important to mention that the dimension needs further conceptualization and refinement through

semantics or idiosyncrasies. Due to its uniqueness in its collective cultural background, the OCB dimension of Organizational Camaraderie can be understood as an emic dimension for Mexican professional employees.

In summary, the following patterns are found. First, the etic dimension of Conscientiousness was not recognized as an OCB dimension in Mexico, but some of the concept was captured by Personal Development. This reflects work ethics of self-responsibility through learning and self-improvement. Second, Altruism, Organizational Camaraderie, Civic Virtue, Professional Development, and Sportsmanship were found to be core dimensions of Mexican OCB, confirming Ortiz's (2000) early findings. Third, Organizational Sincerity and the etic OCB dimension of Courtesy jointly create a sense of Organizational Dedication. The result clearly indicated that this OCB dimension is emic (unique) and not fully in line with the Courtesy concept recognized in other regions of the world. Finally, the Asian OCB dimensions of Interpersonal Harmony and Protecting Company Resources were strongly recognized in Mexican professional employees. This finding made it clear that there are some common OCB dimensions shared by different collectivistic societies and groups. Overall, the findings yielded rich insights through our effort to combine the etic (global) and emic (unique) contexts of OCB in an important Latin American country.

Implications and Conclusions

The main purpose of this study was to examine the dimensionality of OCB in Mexico. Several emic and etic dimensions of OCB have been identified in this research. They are summarized in Table 2. The findings offer managerial implications for multinational and local companies in Mexico, and possibly in adjacent Latin American countries.

Table 2 is about here.

The findings were based on a sample collected from different regions in Mexico, and thus further enhanced the understanding of OCB in Mexico, a collectivistic Latin American culture and a growing economy. The findings are largely distinctive from Ortiz's (2000) OCB dimensions and provided new findings because the geographical context of this study is not only the Mexico-U.S. border-based maquila manufacturing industry. A sample from Mexican professionals in 23 Mexican states helps depicting the conventional practice of OCB by Mexican professional employees dealing with routine business in typical Mexican organizations.

Etic and emic dimensions of OCB have been previously found in other regions of the world. We confirmed this emic-etic paradigm in our findings. Indeed, some OCB dimensions were found to be common between Mexico and other cultures or regions where OCB have been studied. Nevertheless, some other OCB dimensions were found to be unique (emic)

10

(e.g., Organizational Dedication) or shared with only similar cultures (e.g., Interpersonal Harmony and Protecting Company Resources).

Managers should understand that Mexican employees possess some globally-shared understanding of OCB that are described in our results as the etic (universal) OCB dimensions. This research confirmed two etic dimensions of OCB. Altruism and Civic Virtue seem to be well-recognized by Mexican employees in the understanding of their relationship with the organization. On the other hand, some Asian regions such as China, Hong Kong, Japan, and Taiwan, share traits with strong collectivistic societies like Mexico in the understanding of certain OCB. They have several OCB dimensions in common: Interpersonal Harmony and Protecting Company Resources, and also Personal Development to some extent. Also, Mexico is the only country, thus far, identified with emic (unique) OCB dimensions of Organizational Camaraderie and Organizational Dedication. Without any doubt, these indigenous practices are essential for the development of OCB and a need to be emphasized in the management of organizational culture. These OCB dimensions will not only assist managers in comprehending the local Mexican culture and behavior, but also provide an enrichment of cross-cultural knowledge that contributes to the transfer of skills and knowledge between similar cultures. For example, Taiwanese companies operating in Mexico may feel "at home" if they understand that protecting company's interest and resources is regarded as an ethical value by local employees.

Our findings also offer incremental contributions to OCB research. In order to correctly capture the entire phenomena of OCB in different cultures, researchers often first define both emic (specific/cultural unique) and etic (universal/cultural global). Along this vein, we differentiated the Mexican OCB dimensions on the basis of the emic-etic approach. As such, we defined and differentiated a multi-item construct that adds value to cross-cultural OCB studies. This etic-emic approach (Taras, Rowney, & Steel,2009) is meaningful in OCB studies because researchers can readily relate to the fact that work behavior to some extent means the same in all cultures (etic) while at the same time, it may have certain dimensions that are culturally unique (emic). After years of studies in other countries and in different organizational settings, researchers have concluded that Western and Asian cultures each have unique OCB (emic) dimensions. Some concluded that some OCB dimensions are presented only in Western cultures, such as Sportsmanship, and other OCB dimensions seem more common in Asian countries, such as Interpersonal Harmony (Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997; Farh, Zhong, & Organ, 2004; Lam et al., 1999). They have found that some Asian cultures share, at the most, two common dimensions of OCB, Interpersonal Harmony and Protecting Company Resources. Our findings offer new knowledge through clarifying the commonalities of the OCB in a broader sense of collectivistic cultures, based on the fact that Latin American and Asian cultures are both collectivistic in nature.

11

Limitations and Future Research Recommendations

We acknowledge several limitations in this study. Even though we had participants from a variety of business backgrounds (e.g., land acquisition, design, security, cleaning, maintenance, marketing, financing, leasing, legal services, and management) and in different locations (23 states), they all belong to the shopping center management industry in Mexico. Thus, the participants may share some beliefs due to the industry characteristics. As mentioned in our data collection, these participants usually have a high degree of job autonomy. However, the national culture of Mexico is featured by high power distance, which is not consistent with a high degree of job autonomy. Thus, future research should choose other industries that are considered typical for a high power distance country like Mexico.

Another limitations was that more than half of the respondents were from the northern part of Mexico. The proximity to the U.S. might have affected the generalizability of the results due to the fact of cultural influences from the U.S. Future research may duplicate our research framework and collect data from different Mexican regions so that the results can be compared or validated. In addition, since this study relied on employee's self-reported data, common method bias may be a potential threat (Schnake, 1991). This type of bias can be lessened by including multiple feedbacks such as from coworkers and immediate supervisors.

A continuation of scale refinement is encouraged for future research. Most importantly, it will be interesting to investigate the OCB dimensions identified by us thus far in other emerging economies in Latin America, such as Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, and Panama.

We also recommend that future research perform confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using new data sets to analyze criterion validity (e.g., convergent and discriminant validity) as a continuation in the refinement process of OCB in Mexico. This is in line with previous efforts in OCB research (e.g., Coyne & Ong, 2007; Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997; Farh, Zhong, & Organ, 2004; Lievens et al., 2004; Ortiz, 2000; Paillé, 2009, 2010). Through this, future research can provide a better empirical understanding of the topic of organizational behavior and answering the how, what, where, and why of OCB in a more global context. It can also better contribute to cross-cultural OCB research toward an emic (indigenous) direction in order to uncover unique/indigenous dimensions in other cultures.

References

Blakely, G. L., Srivastava, A., & Moorman, R. H. (2005). The Effects of Nationality, Work Role Centrality and Work Locus of Control on the Role Definition of OCB. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 12(1), 103-117.

Bolino, M. C. (1999). Citizenship and Impression Management: Good Soldiers or Good Actors? *Academy of Management Review*, 24(1), 82-98.

Bolino, M. & Turnley, W. H. (2008). Old Faces, New Places: Equity Theory in Cross-Cultural Contexts. *Journal of Organizational Behaviors*, 29(1), 29-50.

Bond, M. H., Wan, K., Leung, K., & Giacalone, R. A. (1985). How are Responses to Verbal Insult Related to Cultural Collectivism and Power Distance? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 16(1), 111-127.

Brislin, R. W., Lonner, W. J., & Thorndike, R. M. (1973). Cross-cultural Research Methods. New York: Wiley.

Brislin, R. W. (1980). Translation and Content Analysis of Oral and Written Materials. In H. C. Triandis and J. W. Berry (Eds.), Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 384-444. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Chen, C. C. (1995). New Trends in Rewards Allocation Preferences: A Sino-U.S. Comparison. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 408-428.

Chen, C. C., Meindl, J. R., & Hui, H. (1998). Deciding on Equity or Parity: A Test of Situational, Cultural, and Individual Factors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19(2), 115-129.

Churchill, G. A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16(1), 64-73.

Clugston, M., Howell, J. P., & Dorfman, P. W. (2000). Does Cultural Socialization Predict Multiple Bases and Foci of Commitment? *Journal of Management*, 26(1), 5-30.

Coyne, I. & Ong, T. (2007). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Turnover Intention: A Cross-cultural study. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(6), 1085-1097.

Earley, P. C. (1993). East Meets West Meets Mideast: Further Explorations of Collectivistic and Individualistic Work Groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(2), 319-348.

Earley, P. C. (1998). Taking Stock in our Progress on Individualism-Collectivism: 100 Years of Solidarity and Community. *Journal of Management*, 24(3), 265-304.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building Theories from Case Study Research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.

Farh, J. L., Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, 16(4), 705-721.

Farh, J. L., Earley, P. C., & Lin, S. C. (1997). Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(3), 421-444.

Farh, J. L., Zhong, C. B., & Organ, D. W. (2004). Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the People's Republic of China. *Organization Science*, 15(2), 241-253.

Graham, J. W. (1991). An Essay on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4(4), 249-270.

Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M., & Aycan, Z. (2007). *Cross-Cultural Organizational Behavior Annual Review of Psychology*, 58(1), 479-514.

Gudykunst, W. B. (1998). Individualistic and Collectivistic Perspectives on Communication: An Introduction. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22(2), 107-134.

Hair, J. F. Jr., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). Multivariate Data Analysis (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hodson, R. (1991). Workplace Behaviors. *Work and Occupations*, 18(3), 271-290

Hofstede, G. H. (1980). Culture Consequences: International Difference in Work-related Values. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Hofstede, G. H. (2003). Greet Hofstede Cultural Dimensions. http://www.geert-hofstede.com/hofstede_dimensions.php

Hui, C. H. & Triandis, H. C. (1986). Individualism-Collectivism: A Study of Cross-Cultural Researchers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 17(2), 225-248.

Karambayya, R. (1991). Work Unit Characteristics with Implications for Organizational Citizenship Behavior. North York, Canada: York University,

Kim, U., Triandis, H. C., Kagitcibasi, C., Choi, S., & Yoon, G. (1994). Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method, and Applications. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Kim, S. (2006). Public Service Motivation and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Korea. *International Journal of Manpower*, 27(8), 722-740.

Kirkbride, P. S., Tang, F. Y., & Westwood, R. I. (1991). Chinese Conflict Preferences and Negotiating Behavior: Cultural and Psychological Influences. *Organization Studies*, 12(3), 365-386.

Lam, S. S. K., Hui, C., & Law, K. S. (1999). Organizational citizenship behavior: Comparing perspectives of supervisors and subordinates across four international samples. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(4), 594-601.

LePine, J. A., Arez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The Nature and Dimensionality of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Critical Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 52-65.

Leung, K. (1987). Some Determinants of Reactions to Procedural Models for Conflict Resolution: A Cross-National Study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(5), 898-908.

Leung, K. (1988). Some Determinants of Conflict Avoidance. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 19(1), 125-136.

Lievens, F. & Anseel, F. (2004). Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Invariance of an Organizational Citizenship Behavior Measure across Samples in a Dutch-speaking Context. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(3), 299-306.

Lin, C. P., Lyau, N. M., Tsai, Y. H., Chen, W. Y., & Chiu, C. K. (2010). Modeling Corporate Citizenship and its Relationships with Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(3), 357-372.

Liu, L. C., Rose, G. M., & Blodgett, J. G. (1999). The Effects of Cultural Dimensions on Ethical Decision Making in Marketing: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 18(1), 91-105.

Moorman, R. H. (1993). The Influence of Cognitive and Affective Based Job Satisfaction on the Relationship between Satisfaction and Organization Citizenship Behavior. *Human Relations*, 46(6), 759-776.

Moorman, R. H. & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(2), 127-142.

Munene, J. C. (1995). 'Not-on-seat': An Investigation of Some Correlates of Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Nigeria. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 44(2), 111-122.

Nunnally, J. C. & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychometric Theory (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ohbuchi, K., Fukushima, O., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1999). Cultural Values in Conflict Management: Goal Orientation, Goal Attainment, and Tactical Decision. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30(1), 51-71.

Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Organ, D. W. & Paine, J. B. (1999). A New Kind of Performance for Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Recent Contribution to the Study of Organizational Behavior. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 14, 337-368.

Organ, D. W. & Ryan, K. (1995). A Meta-Analytic Review of Attitudinal and Dispositional Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 775-802.

Organ, D. W. & Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, Satisfaction, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 135(3), 339-350.

Ortiz, L. (2000). The Etic/Emic Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Mexico: A Cross-Cultural Research Study, Doctoral Dissertation. Edinburg, TX: University of Texas-Pan American.

Osborne, J. W. & Costello, A. B. (2009). Best Practices in Exploratory Factor Analysis: Four Recommendations for Getting the Most from your Analysis. *Pan-Pacific Management Review*, 12(2), 131-146.

Paillé, P. (2009). Assessing Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the French Context: Evidence for the Four-Dimensional Model. *Journal of Psychology,* 143(2), 133-146.

Paillé, P. (2010). Citizenship in the Workplace: Examining Work Attitudes as Predictors among French Employee. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(4), 53-64.

Paine, J. B. & Organ, D. W. (2000). The Cultural Matrix of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Some Preliminary Conceptual and Empirical Observations. *Human Resources Management Review*, 10(1), 45-59.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational Leader Behaviors and their Effects on Followers' Trust in Leader, Satisfaction, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.

Podsakoff, P. M. & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Organizational Performance: A Review and Suggestion for Future Research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 131-151.

Podsakoff, P. M. & MacKenzie, S. B. (1989). A Second Generation Measure of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Working Paper, Indiana University.

Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G., (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research, *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.

Schmeling, E. (2001). Good Citizens in a Global Economy: Individualism-Collectivism and Power Distance as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Diploma Thesis, Konstanz-Germany.

Schnake, M. (1991). Organizational Citizenship: A Review, Proposed Model, and Research Agenda. *Human Relations,* 44(7), 735-759.

Singleton, R. A. Jr. & Straits, B. C. (2005). Approaches to Social Research (5th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Steers, R. M. & Sanchez-Runde, C. J. (2002). Culture, Motivation, and Work Behavior. In M. J. Gannon & K. L. Newman (eds.), The Blackwell Handbook of Principles of Cross-Cultural Management, 190-216. Bodmin, UK: MPG Books.

Tabachnick, B. B. & Fidell, L. S. (2007). Using Multivariate Statistics (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Taras, V., R. & Steel, P. (2009). Half a Century of Measuring Culture: Review of Approaches, Challenges, and Limitations Based on the Analysis of 121 Instruments for Quantifying Culture. *Journal of International Management*, 15(4), 357-373.

Ting-Toomey, S., Trubisky, P., & Nishida, T. (1989). An Analysis of Conflict Styles in Japan and the United States. Paper Presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, San Francisco.

Ting-Toomey, S., Gao, G., Trubisky, P., Yang, Z., Kim, H. S., Lin, S. L., & Nishida, T. (1991). Culture, Face Maintenance, and Styles of Handling Interpersonal Conflict: A Study in Five Cultures. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 2(4), 275-296.

Triandis, H. C. (1989). The Self and Social Behavior in Differing Cultural Contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96(3), 506-520.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). Individualism and Collectivism. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (2013). The World Factbook. https://www.cia.gov/ library/publications/the-world-factbook/.

Van Deyne, L., Vandewalle, D., Kostova, T., Latham, M. E., & Cummings, L. L. (2000). Collectivism, Propensity to Trust and Self Esteem as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship in a Non-Working Setting. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(1), 3-23.

Vardi, Y. & Weitz, E. (2004). Misbehavior in Organization: Theory, Research, and Management. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Werner, O. & Campbell, D. (1970). Translation, Working through Interpreters and the Problem of Decentering. In R. Naroll and R. Cohen (eds.), A Handbook of Method in Cultural Anthropology, 398-420. New York: Natural History Press.

Wheeler, L., Reis, H. T., & Bond, M. H. (1989). Collectivism-Individualism in Everyday Social Life: The Middle Kingdom and the Melting Pot. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(1): 79-86.

Yin, R. K. (1988). Case Study Research: Design and Methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Table 1: Factor Analysis Results

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8
osinc1	**0.527**	0.275	0.159	0.158	0.223	0.145	0.295	0.405
osinc2	**0.611**	0.343	0.018	0.172	0.142	0.040	0.312	0.251
osinc4	**0.561**	0.329	0.125	0.254	0.216	0.103	0.332	0.287
pdev4	**0.612**	0.091	0.155	0.307	0.132	0.069	0.299	0.170
court1	**0.754**	0.274	0.337	0.160	0.193	0.247	0.008	-0.058
court2	**0.779**	0.251	0.245	0.154	0.217	0.179	0.043	0.047
court3	**0.651**	0.196	0.281	0.112	0.249	0.255	0.101	0.123
court4	**0.563**	0.171	0.194	0.144	0.171	0.292	0.077	0.137
alt1	0.304	**0.700**	0.136	0.321	0.129	0.103	-0.056	0.074
alt2	0.184	**0.851**	0.225	0.164	0.147	0.125	0.096	0.048
alt3	0.261	**0.752**	0.174	0.081	0.192	0.202	0.181	0.195
sport1	0.234	0.160	**0.598**	0.135	0.283	0.159	0.116	0.124
sport2	0.125	0.261	**0.499**	-0.051	0.215	0.230	0.261	0.038
sport3	0.301	0.230	**0.669**	0.214	0.162	0.214	0.055	0.123
sport4	0.328	0.190	**0.703**	0.280	0.177	0.106	0.217	0.101
alt4	0.338	0.439	0.064	**0.546**	0.184	0.120	0.156	0.098
civic1	0.193	0.214	0.284	**0.737**	0.107	0.090	0.258	0.061
civic3	0.295	0.269	0.203	**0.615**	0.112	0.111	0.053	0.217
preso1	0.354	0.112	0.155	0.189	**0.703**	0.243	0.122	0.007
preso2	0.211	0.186	0.259	0.044	**0.838**	0.186	0.078	0.092
preso3	0.179	0.213	0.158	0.126	**0.653**	0.266	0.025	0.185
harm1	0.243	0.109	0.143	0.198	0.202	**0.635**	-0.041	0.067
harm2	0.207	0.164	0.120	0.053	0.217	**0.891**	0.117	0.093
harm3	0.163	0.160	0.269	0.062	0.214	**0.595**	0.179	0.065
pdev1	0.233	0.112	0.226	0.129	0.019	0.107	**0.566**	0.141
pdev2	0.019	-0.069	0.191	0.057	-0.009	0.083	**0.511**	0.025
consc2	0.200	0.246	0.088	0.380	0.296	0.122	**0.502**	0.023
ocam1	0.426	0.361	0.233	0.254	0.177	0.199	0.119	**0.539**
ocam2	0.400	0.298	0.247	0.249	0.261	0.184	0.256	**0.503**
Eigenvalue	6.014	4.174	3.153	2.955	2.923	2.669	2.067	1.595
% of Variance	16.254	11.280	8.523	7.986	7.899	7.214	5.586	4.311

Table 2: OCB Dimensions in Mexico

Dimension	Conceptual Definition	Emic or Etic
Organizational Dedication	Unconditional dedication to the organization and coworkers demonstrated by proactively taking responsibilities and sharing information without hidden motives (New).	Emic
Altruism	Behavior that is intended to assist a certain individuals in a firm with important assignments (Organ, 1988).	Etic
Sportsmanship	Behavior that is intended to avoid the provocation of uncommon cost, inconveniences, and minor frustrations (Organ, 1990).	Etic
Civic Virtue	Participation behavior that an employee displays by participating, getting involved in, or being concerned about the interests of the organization (Organ 1988; Graham, 1991; Podsakoff et al., 1990).	Etic
Protecting Company Resources	Voluntary behavior that monitors and prevents the abuse of the organization's policies and its resources for personal benefit (Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997).	Emic for Collectivistic Cultures
Interpersonal Harmony	Behavior targeting at facilitating and preserving peaceful work environment and encouraging harmonious relationships at work (Farh, Zhong, & Organ, 2004).	Emic for Collectivistic Cultures
Personal Development	Engagement in activities in order to better support the organization's missions by acquiring extra skills and enrolling in professional degree programs (Ortiz, 2000).	Emic for Collectivistic Cultures
Organizational Camaraderie	Willingness to exceed the norm by demonstrating friendship and fairness in daily contact with coworkers (Ortiz, 2000).	Emic

Appendix: Measurement Items in Questionnaire

(Code) Measurement Item	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
(alt1) 1. The coworkers help to finish the details and the tasks of work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(alt2) 2. The coworkers are available to help at any given moment.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(alt3) 3. The coworkers have a good disposition for helping other coworkers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(alt4) 4. The coworkers help their boss at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(civic1) 5. The coworkers make an effort to speak positively about the company and to give a good image of it to the community.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(civic2) 6. The coworkers give good advice to others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(civic3) 7. The coworkers try to communicate to others before making a decision that could affect their work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(civic 4) 8. The coworkers share common resources of the company (i.e., office supplies).	1	2	3	4	5	6
(consc1) 9. The coworkers are always available when needed by the company.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(consc2) 10. The coworkers do a great effort to arrive early to begin work (i.e., they prepare their work area before starting the day).	1	2	3	4	5	6
(consc3) 11. The phrase, "The employee puts true effort into their work" applies my coworkers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(consc4) 12. The coworkers exceed the normal or average level of attendance at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(sport1) 13. The coworkers are involved in/or creating gossip.*	1	2	3	4	5	6
(sport2) 14. The coworkers bring personal problems to the professional working environment (i.e., personal problems from home).*	1	2	3	4	5	6
(sport3) 15. The coworkers are jealous of others in the company.*	1	2	3	4	5	6
(sport4) 16. The coworkers spend their time complaining about minor issues.*	1	2	3	4	5	6
(ocam1) 17. The coworkers demonstrate a good spirit of fellowship.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(ocam2) 18. The coworkers demonstrate a good attitude to all people.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(ocam3) 19. The coworkers are fair to others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(ocam4) 20. The coworkers treat everyone the same.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(osinc1) 21. The coworkers take the responsibility to motivate others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(osinc2) 22. The coworkers find ways to improve processes even if there are not sufficient resources to do so.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(osinc3) 23. The coworkers are faithful (loyal) to the company.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(osinc4) 24. The coworkers are creative in solving work problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(pdev1) 25. The coworkers try to improve their knowledge or work skills (e.g. they improve themselves or study in their free time).	1	2	3	4	5	6
(pdev2) 26. The coworkers make an effort to learn another language (e.g. English).	1	2	3	4	5	6
(pdev3) 27. The coworkers help other departments within the company.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(pdev4) 28. The coworkers give their opinions, ideas, and points of view to improve business environment (e.g. they give advice to achieve better quality work).	1	2	3	4	5	6
(court1) 29. The coworkers avoid creating problems for others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(court2) 30. The coworkers take preventive measures to avoid problems with others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(court3) 31. The coworkers consider the impact of their actions on others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(court4) 32. The coworkers do not abuse the rights of others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
(harm1) 33. The coworkers use illicit tactics to seek personal influence and	1	2	3	4	5	6

gain harmful effects on the interpersonal harmony of the company.*						
(harm2) 34. The coworkers use position power to pursue selfish personal gain.*	1	2	3	4	5	6
(harm3) 35. The coworkers take credit, avoid blame, and fight fiercely for personal gain.*	1	2	3	4	5	6
(harm4) 36. The coworkers often speak badly about the supervisor or colleagues behind their back.*	1	2	3	4	5	6
(preso1) 37. The coworkers conduct personal business on company time (i.e., go shopping).*	1	2	3	4	5	6
(preso2) 38. The coworkers use company resources for personal matters (i.e., use copy machines).*	1	2	3	4	5	6
(preso3) 39. The coworkers view sick leave as a benefit and make invalid excuses to take sick leave.*	1	2	3	4	5	6

* Reverse-coded items