

# Personality Predictors of Citizenship Performance

Walter C. Borman, Louis A. Penner, Tammy D. Allen and Stephan J. Motowidlo

This article briefly introduces the criterion construct, citizenship performance, describes how this construct is different from task performance and presents a recently derived 3-dimension model of the domain. Evidence is then reviewed for links between personality constructs and citizenship performance. An update of the Organ and Ryan (1995) meta-analysis of personality-organizational citizenship behavior relationships suggests slightly higher correlations than those found in the meta-analysis and also indicates that personality, at least the conscientiousness and dependability constructs, correlates more highly with citizenship performance than with task performance. These results are discussed in the broader context of building models of job performance and studying linkages between individual differences and relatively specific criterion constructs.

## Introduction

This article briefly reviews the topic of contextual performance or citizenship performance,<sup>1</sup> and then advances the argument for a substantial link between certain personality constructs and citizenship performance. In particular, we (1) describe an initial model of citizenship performance; (2) discuss the conceptual origins of the construct, (i.e., precursors to the citizenship performance concept) and how this performance domain is different from task performance; (3) present a model intended to explain the relationship between ability, personality, task, and citizenship performance; (4) review empirical research that links personality predictors to citizenship performance; (5) introduce the Prosocial Personality Battery (Penner, Fritzsche, Craiger, and Freifeld, 1995) and describe research correlating its two scales (Other-oriented Empathy and Helpfulness) with citizenship performance and mentoring behavior; and (6) discuss the implications of this research in the broader context of building a science of personnel selection.

## The Citizenship Performance Construct

The lay view of job performance typically revolves around task performance. Indeed, the most common job analysis method, task analysis, usually results in task dimensions or task categories. However, Borman and Motowidlo (1993, 1997) have focused on a separate job

performance construct, citizenship performance. Citizenship performance contributes to organizational effectiveness but is important primarily because it 'shapes the organizational, social and psychological context that serves as the critical catalyst for task activities and processes' (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993, p. 71). Citizenship performance includes such activities as helping others with their jobs, supporting the organization and volunteering for additional work or responsibility. In particular, Borman and Motowidlo (1993) proposed a five-dimension model: (1) persisting with enthusiasm and extra effort as necessary to complete own task activities successfully; (2) volunteering to carry out task activities that are not formally part of own job; (3) helping and cooperating with others; (4) following organizational rules and procedures; and (5) endorsing, supporting and defending organizational objectives.

## Origins of the Citizenship Performance Concept

Borman, Motowidlo and colleagues were certainly not the first to recognize the importance of this criterion construct. Indeed, their work is substantially related to several earlier efforts. As far back as 1938, Barnard discussed the 'informal organization' and the need for organization members to be willing to cooperate for the good of the organization. Katz (1964) emphasized that cooperative and helpful behaviors beyond formal role prescriptions are important for

Walter C. Borman, University of South Florida and Personnel Decisions Research Institutes  
E-mail: wallyb@pdri.com

organizational functioning. More recently, Organ (e.g., Smith, Organ and Near, 1983), introduced the notion of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). OCB was defined as extra-role, discretionary behavior that helps other organization members perform their jobs or shows support for and conscientiousness toward the organization. OCB has been studied primarily in relation to its links with job satisfaction and organizational justice (Organ, 1997). Clearly, OCB contains substantial elements in common with the definition of citizenship performance developed by Borman and Motowidlo (1993).

Another closely related concept is prosocial organizational behavior (POB). Brief and Motowidlo (1986) defined POB as behavior that is directed toward an individual, group, or organization, with the intention of promoting their welfare. They identified nine functional dimensions that, again, cover constructs similar to those appearing in the five-dimension taxonomy presented above.

A third major source of support for the citizenship performance taxonomy comes from a model of soldier effectiveness developed for the U.S. Army by Borman, Motowidlo and Hanser (1983). The model assumed that soldier effectiveness is more than just successfully performing assigned tasks. In fact, the model comprised *only* those elements that are beyond task performance or the technical proficiency-

related part of the job. Borman *et al.* argued that the concepts of organizational socialization, organizational commitment and morale could be combined and integrated into a three-dimension performance model. Morale and commitment merge to form a performance dimension labeled 'determination'. The combination of morale and socialization yields 'teamwork,' and socialization and commitment merge to form 'allegiance'. Each of these three dimensions was, in turn, decomposed into five subdimensions (e.g., determination into perseverance, reaction to adversity, etc.).

The three domains briefly discussed above (i.e., OCB, POB and the model of soldier effectiveness) were grouped and integrated to form Borman and Motowidlo's (1993) five-dimension taxonomy. They believed that this taxonomy reflected all the concepts from those domains, while at the same time providing a parsimonious representation of citizenship performance. Table 1 displays the 5-dimension system, as well as the source of each of these dimensions.

Recent research has explored other possible ways to configure the citizenship performance domain. Coleman and Borman (2000) prepared a list of dimensions representing all the concepts contained in the various dimension sets (i.e., OCB: Becker and Vance, 1993; Graham, 1986; Morrison, 1994; Organ, 1988; Smith *et al.*, 1983; Van Dyne,

Table 1: The Borman and Motowidlo Contextual Performance Taxonomy

1.	Persisting with enthusiasm and extra effort as necessary to complete own task activities successfully Perseverance and conscientiousness (Borman, Motowidlo, & Hanser, 1983) Extra effort on the job (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Katz & Kahn, 1978)
2.	Volunteering to carry out task activities that are not formally part of own job Suggesting organizational improvements (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Katz & Kahn, 1978) Initiative and taking on extra responsibility (Borman <i>et al.</i> , 1983; Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Katz & Kahn, 1978)
3.	Helping and cooperating with others Assisting/helping co-workers (Borman <i>et al.</i> , 1983; Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Katz & Kahn, 1978) Assisting/helping customers (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986) Organizational courtesy and not complaining (Organ, 1988) Altruism (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983)
4.	Following organizational rules and procedures Following orders and regulations and respect for authority (Borman <i>et al.</i> , 1983) Complying with organizational values and policies (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986) Conscientiousness (Smith, <i>et al.</i> , 1983) Meeting deadlines (Katz & Kahn, 1978) Civic virtue (Graham, 1986)
5.	Endorsing, supporting, and defending organizational objectives Organizational loyalty (Graham, 1986) Concern for unit objectives (Borman <i>et al.</i> , 1983) Staying with the organization during hard times and representing the organization favorably to outsiders (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986)

Graham and Dienesch, 1994; Williams and Anderson, 1991; POB: Brief and Motowidlo, 1986; model of soldier effectiveness: Borman *et al.*, 1983). The 27 dimensions and their definitions were then sorted into categories according to their perceived content. Forty-four industrial-organizational psychologists completed the sorting task. From the sorting solutions, a pooled similarity matrix was developed and then an indirect similarity correlation matrix was derived (see Borman and Brush, 1993, for a description of this method).

Coleman and Borman (2000) conducted factor analyses, multidimensional scaling analyses and cluster analyses on this matrix and a consensus three-category solution emerged. This three-category system then formed the basis of a three-dimension model of citizenship performance. The new model appears in Table 2. The personal support dimension is virtually the same as the previous helping-others dimension; organizational support combines the conscientiousness and supporting-the-organization dimensions and conscientious initiative combines the extra effort and volunteering dimensions (Borman, Hanson, Kubisiak and Buck, 2000).

### **Citizenship Performance Distinguished From Task Performance**

An important distinction between task and citizenship performance is that task activities vary across jobs, whereas citizenship activities are quite similar across jobs. In fact, task-based job analysis typically has as a purpose discovering the tasks and task dimensions that differentiate one job from other jobs. On the other hand, such activities as volunteering and cooperating with others are largely the same for different jobs.

A study that supports a distinction between task and citizenship performance was conducted by Conway (1996). He had a panel of industrial-organizational psychologists review the performance dimensions and their definitions in 14 published studies and sort each dimension into one of two categories, task or citizenship performance. Results showed that 55% of the dimensions were very reliably sorted into the task category and 30% of the dimensions were sorted very reliably into the citizenship category. There was some disagreement about the remaining 15%. These findings suggest that for most performance dimensions the distinction is clear regarding classifying them into task or citizenship performance.

### **A Model of Ability, Personality, Task and Citizenship Performance**

Motowidlo, Borman and Schmit (1997) proposed a theory of individual differences in

task and citizenship performance (Figure 1). One of the most important elements in this theory is the notion that the antecedents of task and citizenship performance will be different. Task performance should be largely a function of cognitive ability, mediated primarily by task knowledge (knowledge of principles related to technical aspects of job performance), task skill (applying technical knowledge to perform tasks effectively) and task habits (characteristic responses to task situations that either facilitate or hinder the performance of tasks). However, personality should be the central antecedent of citizenship performance, mediated primarily by citizenship skill (applying knowledge about helping and coordinating, following organizational rules and procedures, etc.), citizenship habits (personal stylistic tendencies that facilitate or inhibit performing citizenship activities) and citizenship knowledge (knowing how to take effective action in situations calling for helping, following rules, volunteering, etc.). The mediating variables, citizenship knowledge and task habits, have as antecedents *both* ability and personality. Again, the central feature of this model is that cognitive ability is the main antecedent of task performance; personality is the main antecedent of citizenship performance. Testing the entire model is beyond the scope of this article, but what we try to do is to review and summarize research, especially that which is relevant to the personality-citizenship performance part of the model. As noted above, there is substantial conceptual overlap between OCB, as conceptualized by Organ (1997) and citizenship performance as it is conceptualized here. Thus, selected research on OCB will be a major part of the review that follows.

### **Relationships Between Personality Predictors and Citizenship Performance**

The most comprehensive review of relationships between personality and citizenship performance is the Organ and Ryan (1995) meta-analysis of the organizational and dispositional correlates of OCB. Among the organizational variables they considered were job satisfaction, leadership style, organizational justice and organizational commitment. The four personality traits included in the study were conscientiousness, agreeableness, positive affectivity and negative affectivity.

Organ and Ryan separately considered the altruism dimension of OCB, behaviors intended to benefit individuals within an organization and the conscientiousness, or generalized compliance dimension, of OCB, behaviors intended to benefit the organization.<sup>2</sup> They also divided the findings into those that were based on both

Table 2: Revised Taxonomy of Citizenship Performance

## A. Personal Support

Helping others by offering suggestions, teaching them useful knowledge or skills, directly performing some of their tasks, and providing emotional support for their personal problems. Cooperating with others by accepting suggestions, informing them of events they should know about, and putting team objectives ahead of personal interests. Showing consideration, courtesy, and tact in relations with others as well as motivating and showing confidence in them.

## Subdimensions

Helping – Helping others by offering suggestions about their work, showing them how to accomplish difficult tasks, teaching them useful knowledge or skills, directly performing of their tasks, and providing emotional support for their personal problems.

Cooperating – Cooperating with others by accepting their suggestions, following their lead, and putting team objectives over own personal interests; informing others of events or requirements that are likely to affect them.

Courtesy – Showing consideration, courtesy, and tact in relations with others.

Motivating – Motivating others by applauding their achievements and successes, cheering them on in times of adversity, showing confidence in their ability to succeed, and helping them to overcome setbacks.

## B. Organizational Support

Representing the organization favorably by defending and promoting it, as well as expressing satisfaction and showing loyalty by staying with the organization despite temporary hardships. Supporting the organization's mission and objectives, complying with organizational rules and procedures, and suggesting improvements.

## Subdimensions

Representing – Representing this organization favorably to outsiders by defending it when others criticize it, promoting its achievements and positive attributes, and expressing own satisfaction with the organization.

Loyalty – Showing loyalty by staying with the organization despite temporary hardships, tolerating occasional difficulties and adversity cheerfully and without complaining, and publicly endorsing and supporting the organization's mission and objectives.

Compliance – Complying with organizational rules and procedures, encouraging others to comply with organizational rules and procedures, and suggesting procedural, administrative, or organizational improvements.

## C. Conscientious Initiative

Persisting with extra effort despite difficult conditions. Taking the initiative to do all that is necessary to accomplish objectives even if not normally a part of own duties, and finding additional productive work to perform when own duties are completed. Developing own knowledge and skills by taking advantage of opportunities within the organization and outside the organization using own time and resources.

## Subdimensions

Persistence – Persisting with extra effort to complete work tasks successfully despite difficult conditions and setbacks, accomplishing goals that are more difficult and challenging than normal, completing work on time despite unusually short deadlines, and performing at a level of excellence that is significantly beyond normal expectations.

Initiative – Taking the initiative to do all that is necessary to accomplish team or organizational objectives even if not typically a part of own duties, correcting non-standard conditions whenever encountered, and finding additional work to perform when own duties are completed.

Self-Development – Developing own knowledge and skills by taking courses on own time, volunteering for training and development opportunities offered within the organization, and trying to learn new knowledge and skills on the job from others or through new job assignments.

self-reports and other-reports of OCB and those that were based on only other-reports.

Organ and Ryan found that, among the personality variables, only conscientiousness correlated significantly with OCB. Specifically, conscientiousness correlated .22 with the altruism component and .30 with the generalized compliance component (these are *rs* corrected for criterion unreliability and restriction-in-range; total *N* = 2172 and 1818, respectively). Correlations were lower when studies employing self-ratings of OCB were excluded (corrected *rs* = .04 and .23, respectively). However, substantially larger and more consistent relationships were found for the organizational variables. These findings led Organ and Ryan to conclude that if personality variables were related to OCB, the relationship was weak and probably mediated by the impact of personality on job satisfaction. Specifically, personality characteristics may affect satisfaction, which in turn influences OCB.

Organ and Ryan (1995) provided a comprehensive review of the literature concerning the relationships between personality and OCB. However, a considerable number of additional studies bearing on the personality-citizenship performance linkage have been conducted since the Organ and Ryan (1995) meta-analysis. In this section of the article, we review recent studies that have incorporated the four personality variables reported by Organ and Ryan (conscientiousness, agreeableness and positive and negative affectivity), as well as additional personality constructs that have been linked to various forms of citizenship performance.

#### *Conscientiousness*

The personality variable that has received the most research attention in relation to citizenship performance (or OCB) is conscientiousness. As noted above, Organ and Ryan (1995) found that conscientiousness was positively related to altruism and to generalized compliance. The relationship between conscientiousness and citizenship performance has since been supported in a number of additional studies. Neuman and Kickul (1998) found that conscientiousness related to all five types of OCB identified by Organ (1988; *rs* = .20-.41). Miller, Griffin and Hart (1999) found that conscientiousness was a significant predictor of citizenship performance ( $r = .42$ ), above and beyond any effects accounted for by neuroticism and extroversion. A study by Hogan, Rybicki, Motowidlo and Borman (1998) found a pattern of results suggesting that job and organizational characteristics may moderate the relationship between conscientiousness and citizenship

behavior. Specifically, for employees in jobs where promotion was unlikely, conscientiousness was the best predictor of citizenship performance. In contrast, in jobs where promotions were more likely, ambition was the best predictor.

Several studies have included measures of conscientiousness, citizenship performance, and task performance (Hattrup, O'Connell and Wingate, 1998; Hense, 2000; LePine and Van Dyne, in press; McHenry, Hough, Toquam, Hanson and Ashworth, 1990; Motowidlo and Van Scotter, 1994; Van Scotter and Motowidlo, 1996). The inclusion of both aspects of job performance is important because such studies are more broadly relevant to testing the Motowidlo *et al.* (1997) model that hypothesizes not only should personality predict citizenship performance, but these relationships should be stronger than personality-task performance relationships. In each of these studies, the results largely confirm this pattern — conscientiousness is related to citizenship performance and relationships between conscientiousness and citizenship performance are generally stronger than relationships between conscientiousness and task performance.

For example, as part of Project A, the large scale test validation research effort conducted in the US Army (e.g., Campbell, 1990), three summary personality factors were among several predictor measures developed for the study. In addition, five summary criterion constructs consistently emerged from the criterion research done on first-tour soldiers (core technical proficiency, general technical performance, effort and leadership, personal discipline and military bearing). The core technical proficiency criterion can be argued to be most unambiguously a task performance factor and the personal discipline criterion was most clearly a citizenship factor. Results of a concurrent validation study (*N* = 4,039; McHenry *et al.*, 1990) conducted in Project A showed, first, that general cognitive ability measured by the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery correlated substantially higher with the task dimension ( $r = .33$ ) than it did with the citizenship dimension ( $r = .08$ ). Second, all three personality factors correlated higher with the citizenship performance criterion than the task criterion, especially a conscientiousness construct, dependability (.30 vs. .11,  $p$  diff < .001).

Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994) also presented data relevant to the proposal that conscientiousness is a better predictor of citizenship performance than of task performance. Their dependability construct correlated .31 with citizenship performance and .18 with task performance ( $p$  diff < .01). More recently, Hense (2000) correlated conscientiousness, as measured

by the NEO Five Factor Inventory, with supervisor-ratings of citizenship and task performance. Conscientiousness correlated .20 with a summary rating of citizenship performance and .10 with a summary rating of task performance. Additionally, Hense found that conscientiousness correlated significantly with three specific aspects of citizenship performance (initiative, dependability and integrity), but with none of the specific aspects of task performance. The other studies cited above (i.e., Hattrup *et al.* 1998; Le Pine and Van Dyne, in press; and Van Scotter and Motowidlo 1996) showed similar patterns of correlations between conscientiousness, task performance and various forms of citizenship performance.

Thus, in addition to demonstrating a relationship between conscientiousness and citizenship performance, these studies provide further support for the assertion that personality constructs (conscientiousness in this case) are more strongly associated with citizenship performance than they are with task performance (Borman and Motowidlo, 1997). In this context, it should also be noted that Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994) found the same pattern of correlations with task and citizenship performance for other personality constructs, including work orientation, cooperativeness and locus of control. That is, the correlations between each of these variables and citizenship performance were significantly higher than the corresponding correlations with task performance.

Before concluding this section, it should be noted that some researchers have found non-significant correlations between conscientiousness and citizenship performance. For example, in a study of insurance sales representatives, McManus and Kelly (1999) failed to find a relationship between conscientiousness and citizenship performance. Similarly, Fecteau, Allen, Fecteau, Bordas and Tears (2000) found no relationship between conscientiousness and co-worker ratings of citizenship performance or between conscientiousness and interview scores designed to assess citizenship performance. Despite these null findings, overall, there appears to be considerable support for the assertion that conscientiousness is a reliable predictor of citizenship performance. Specifically, the mean uncorrected, sample-size weighted correlation between conscientiousness and citizenship performance in the studies just cited was .24 if studies that used self-ratings and others' ratings of citizenship performance are included; it is slightly lower ( $r = .19$ ) when studies using self-ratings are excluded. Tables 3 and 4 provide a summary of the studies linking conscientiousness (and several other personality traits) with citizenship performance. None of the studies presented in Table 3 was included in Organ and

Ryan's meta-analysis; these studies are either unpublished or published subsequent to the time of their literature review.

#### *Agreeableness*

Although the findings were not as strong as those concerning conscientiousness, Organ and Ryan's meta-analytic research suggested that agreeableness had a small, but significant relationship with OCB (Organ and Ryan, 1995). Specifically, these authors reported mean corrected correlations of .13 with altruism and .11 with generalized compliance. Recent studies also find that individuals who are more agreeable are more likely to engage in citizenship behaviors (LePine and Van Dyne, in press; Hense, 2000; McManus and Kelly, 1999; Neuman and Kickul, 1998; Van Scotter and Motowidlo, 1996). On the other hand, Fecteau *et al.* (2000) found negative correlations between agreeableness and citizenship performance.

The relationship between agreeableness and citizenship performance may be moderated by the element of citizenship performance being measured. For example, LePine and Van Dyne found evidence for what they termed a 'bi-directional' effect for agreeableness. As expected, agreeableness was positively related to cooperative behavior ( $r = .18$ ). However, also as hypothesized, agreeableness demonstrated a negative relationship with another form of citizenship performance, voice behavior, which consists of constructive, change-oriented communication that is intended to improve the organization. The authors argue that because highly agreeable individuals do not like to disrupt interpersonal relationships, they will be more likely to support the status quo. The findings highlight the multi-dimensional nature of citizenship performance and the importance of considering the specific criterion domain of interest when using personality as a predictor. Nonetheless, the mean uncorrected correlation between agreeableness and citizenship performance is .13 across these six recent studies. Again, see Tables 3 and 4 for a summary of these studies.

#### *Positive Affectivity*

Organ and Ryan (1995) reported mean corrected correlations of .15 and .07 between positive affectivity and, respectively, altruism and generalized compliance. Several more recent studies have operationalized positive affect as the respondent's mood over some limited time period and found that positive mood is related to OCB. For example, Rioux and Penner (in press) found that positive affect (i.e., mood) was related to self-reports of four of the five dimensions of

OCB. Additionally, Midili and Penner (1995) found that mood was related to co-worker ratings on two OCB dimensions and Facticeau *et al.* (2000) found mood to be related to co-worker ratings of citizenship performance. The mean uncorrected relationship from all of these studies is .18 and .16 when studies using self-ratings of citizenship performance were excluded (see Tables 3 and 4).

In their meta-analysis, Organ and Ryan placed studies that measured extroversion in the same grouping with those that measured positive affectivity because they believed that extroversion may be viewed as a component of positive affectivity. In our literature review we separately considered the relationship between extroversion and citizenship performance. The findings are somewhat inconsistent across studies. For example, several studies found a positive link between extroversion and citizenship performance (LePine and Van Dyne, in press; McManus and Kelly, 1999; Miller *et al.*, 1999). On the other hand, Neuman and Kickul (1998) found that extroversion was *negatively* related to the citizenship dimensions of altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, courtesy and sportsmanship (the last two correlations were nonsignificant). Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996) found a small but significant positive correlation between extroversion and interpersonal facilitation, but a negative, nonsignificant relationship between extroversion and job dedication. Finally, Hogan *et al.* (1998) found nonsignificant correlations between sociability and citizenship performance. Across these studies, the mean uncorrected correlation for extroversion is low ( $r = .08$ ,  $.06$  when self-ratings are excluded).

The reasons for the inconsistent results are not immediately clear; they may be due to differences in the nature of the jobs or situations under study. Specifically, this may be another example of a bidirectional effect as described earlier by LePine and Van Dyne. In highly structured jobs such as the retail clerk position studied in Neuman and Kickul, high levels of extroversion may detract from citizenship performance. On the other hand, extroversion may contribute to successful citizenship performance in jobs with less structure such as with the insurance representatives studied by McManus and Kelly.

These findings also suggest that the effect size for positive affect reported by Organ and Ryan may be an underestimate, because they included extroversion in this predictor category. In general, the results appear to be relatively robust when positive affect is measured as a state (i.e., mood). Additional research is needed to more clearly understand the unique effects of positive mood, positive affectivity as a trait and extroversion on citizenship performance.

### *Negative affectivity*

Findings concerning relationships between negative affectivity and citizenship performance reflect a fairly consistent, but low magnitude relationship. Organ and Ryan (1995) reported a mean average corrected correlation of  $-.06$  with altruism and  $-.12$  with generalized compliance. More recent studies produce comparable findings. LePine and Van Dyne (in press) reported correlations of  $-.11$  and  $-.12$  between neuroticism and voice and cooperative behavior, respectively. Other study correlations have ranged from  $-.13$  to  $-.23$  (Hogan *et al.*, 1998; Hui, Law and Chen, 1999; McManus and Kelly, 1999). Miller *et al.* (1999) found a somewhat more substantial correlation between neuroticism and citizenship performance ( $-.29$ ); however, because both sets of ratings were self-report, it is possible that the relationship was influenced by common method bias. One result inconsistent with the above was reported by Hogan *et al.* (1998). In their sample of correctional officers, the authors found a reverse relationship in that adjustment was negatively related to contextual performance. Combining the results of these studies we found that the mean uncorrected correlation between negative affectivity and citizenship performance is  $-.14$ ; and  $-.12$  when studies with self-ratings are excluded.

### *Other Variables*

Recent studies suggest that other personality variables, not considered by Organ and Ryan may be related to citizenship performance. We briefly consider these now.

### *Locus of control*

Individuals with an internal locus of control believe they control the events and consequences associated with their lives, whereas those with an external locus of control believe that life events are the result of circumstances outside their control (Paulhus, 1983; Rotter, 1966). Two studies have found empirical support for the relationship between locus of control and citizenship performance. In the study noted earlier, Motowidlo and Van Scotter reported a significant correlation ( $r = .26$ ) between internal locus of control and citizenship performance. More recently, Funderberg and Levy (1997) found a  $.33$  correlation between locus of control and self-reports on the altruism dimension of OCB, but a *negative* correlation of  $.34$  with peer ratings on the same OCB dimension, and Facticeau *et al.* (2000) found low negative correlations between locus of control and citizenship performance. The mean uncorrected correlation across these three studies

Table 3: Summary of Studies Correlating Personality Constructs with Citizenship Performance Criteria (Post-Organ and Ryan)

Study	Sample Characteristics	<i>r</i>	Criterion	N	Rating Source <sup>a</sup>
<i>Conscientiousness</i>					
Fecteau, Allen, Fecteau, Bordas, and Tears (2000)	College students	.09	Composite contextual performance	188	I
		.04	Composite contextual performance	76	P/S
Hattrup, O'Connell, and Wilson (1998)	Customer service and sales representatives in Mexico	.23*	Altruism and compliance combined	103	Sup
Hense (2000)	Employees from several organizations	.20	Composite contextual performance	152	Sup
Hogan, Rybicki, Motowidlo, and Borman (1998)	Letter/package delivery handlers	.20**	Work dedication	214	Sup
		.17**	Interpersonal facilitation	214	Sup
LePine and Van Dyne (in press)	Correctional officers	.19*	Contextual performance	94	Sup
	College students	.17*	Cooperative behavior	276	II
McManus and Kelly (1999)	Insurance representatives	.26*	Voice behavior	276	II
		.02	Contextual performance	116	Sup
Miller, Griffin, and Hart (1999)	Public sector employees in Australia	.42**	Contextual performance	104	Self
Neuman and Kickul (1998)	Jewelry sales clerks	.41**	Altruism	284	Sup
		.39**	Civic virtue	284	Sup
		.20**	Conscientiousness	284	Sup
		.23**	Courtesy	284	Sup
		.36**	Sportsmanship	284	Sup
Tillman (1998)	Working college students	.55*	Composite OCB	311	Self
Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996)	Air Force mechanics	.11**	Interpersonal facilitation	592	Sup
		.15**	Job dedication	592	Sup
<i>Agreeableness</i>					
Fecteau, Allen, Fecteau, Bordas, and Tears (2000)	College students	-.03	Composite contextual performance	188	I
		-.28*	Composite contextual performance coworker ratings	76	P/S
Hense (2000)	Employees from several organizations	.13	Composite contextual performance	152	Sup
LePine and Van Dyne (in press)	College students	.18*	Cooperative behavior	276	II
		-.16*	Voice behavior	276	II
McManus and Kelly (1999)	Insurance representatives	.20*	Contextual performance	116	Sup
Neuman and Kickul (1998)	Jewelry sales clerks	.25**	Altruism	284	Sup
		.25**	Civic virtue	284	Sup
		.34**	Conscientiousness	284	Sup
		.21**	Courtesy	284	Sup
		.24**	Sportsmanship	284	Sup
Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996)	Air force mechanics	.16**	Interpersonal facilitation	594	Sup
		.12**	Job dedication	594	Sup

<i>Positive affectivity</i>					
Facteau, Allen, Facteau, Bordas, and Tears (2000)		.13	Composite contextual performance interview scores	188	I
		.24*	Composite contextual performance	76	P/S
Midili and Penner (1995)	Home improvement store employees	.53*	Altruism	147	Self
		.17		94	Peer
		.23*		127	Sup
		.48*	Conscientiousness	147	Self
		.24*		94	Peer
		.24		127	Sup
		.29*	Sportsmanship	147	Self
		.33*		94	Peer
		.17		127	Sup
		.44*	Courtesy	147	Self
		.12		94	Peer
		.24*		127	Sup
		.51*	Civic Virtue	147	Self
		.19*		94	Peer
		.29*		127	Sup
Rioux and Penner (1999)	Florida city government employees	.26**	Altruism	141	Self
		.11		130	Peer
		.11		135	Sup
		.03	Conscientiousness	141	Self
		.02		130	Peer
		.19*		135	Sup
		.35**	Civic virtue	141	Self
		.16		130	Peer
		.06		135	Sup
		.20*	Courtesy	141	Self
		.08		130	Peer
		.11		135	Sup
		.29**	Sportsmanship	141	Self
		.22*		130	Peer
		.15		135	Sup
Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996)	Air force mechanics	.11**	Interpersonal facilitation	595	Sup
		.13**	Job dedication	595	Sup
<i>Extroversion</i>					
Hense (2000)	Employees from several organizations	.16	Composite contextual performance	152	Sup
Hogan, Rybicki, Motowidlo, and Borman (1998)	Letter/package delivery handlers	-.02	Work dedication	214	Sup
	Correctional officers	-.04	Interpersonal facilitation	214	Sup
LePine and Van Dyne (in press)	College students	.02	Contextual performance	94	Sup
		.14*	Cooperative behavior	276	II
		.30*	Voice behavior	276	II
McManus and Kelly (1999)	Insurance representatives	.29*	Contextual performance	116	Sup

Study	Sample Characteristics	<i>r</i>	Criterion	N	Rating Source <sup>a</sup>
Miller, Griffin, and Hart (1999)	Public sector employees in Australia	.42**	Contextual performance	104	Self
Neuman and Kickul (1998)	Jewelry sales clerks	-.16**	Altruism	284	Sup
		-.16**	Civic virtue	284	Sup
		-.12**	Conscientiousness	284	Sup
		-.03	Courtesy	284	Sup
		-.06	Sportsmanship	284	Sup
Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996)	Air Force mechanics	.09*	Interpersonal facilitation	592	Sup
		-.02	Job dedication	592	Sup
<i>Negative affectivity</i>					
Hogan, Rybicki, Motowidlo, and Borman (1998)	Letter/package delivery handlers	.12*	Work dedication	214	Sup
		.21**	Interpersonal facilitation	214	Sup
Hui, Law, and Chen (1999)	Correctional officers	-.17*	Contextual performance	94	Sup
		-.13*	Composite OCB	347	Sup
LePine and Van Dyne (in press)	Sino-Hong Kong joint venture battery manufacturing employees	-.11*	Cooperative behavior	276	II
		-.12*	Voice behavior	276	II
McManus and Kelly (1999)	College students	.23*	Contextual performance	116	Sup
Miller, Griffin, and Hart (1999)	Insurance representatives	-.29**	Contextual performance	104	Self
<i>Locus of control</i>					
Fecteau, Allen, Fecteau, Bordas, and Tears (2000)	College students	-.08	Composite contextual performance interview scores	188	I
		-.03	Composite contextual performance	76	P/S
Funderburg and Levy (1997)	Manufacturing employees	.33**	OCBI	75	Self
		-.34**	OCBI	75	Peer
Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994)	Air Force mechanics	.26**	Contextual performance	392	Sup
<i>Collectivism</i>					
Allen (1999)	Employees from various settings	.15**	Served as mentor to others	387	Self
Fecteau, Allen, Fecteau, Bordas, and Tears (2000)	College students	.18**	Willing to mentor others	387	
		.11	Composite contextual performance interview scores	188	I
		-.13	Composite contextual performance	76	P/S
Moorman and Blakely <sup>b</sup>	Southeastern financial services organization employees	.23*	Interpersonal helping	155	Self
		.12	Individual initiative	155	
		.09	Personal industry	155	
		.23*	Loyal boosterism	155	
Van Dyne, Vandewalle, Kostova, Latham, and Cummings (2000)	Cooperative housing members	.22**	Helping	183	Self <sup>c</sup>

<i>Other-oriented empathy</i>					
Allen (1998)	Undergraduate students	.26**	Willingness to mentor others	194	Self
Allen (1999)	Employees from various settings	.26**	Willingness to mentor others	388	Self
	Experience as a mentor	.12*		390	Self
Facteau, Allen, Facteau, Bordas, and Tears (2000)	College students	.10 <sup>d</sup>	Composite contextual performance interview scores	188	I
		.24* <sup>d</sup>	Composite contextual performance	76	P/S
Midili and Penner (1995)	Home improvement store employees	.48*	Altruism	147	Self
		.35*		94	Peer
		.08		127	Sup
		.36*	Conscientiousness	147	Self
		.34*		94	Peer
		.13		127	Sup
		.24*	Sportsmanship	147	Self
		.25*		94	Peer
		.16		127	Sup
		.53*	Courtesy	147	Self
		.26*		94	Peer
		.10		127	Sup
		.28*	Civic Virtue	147	Self
		.27*		94	Peer
		.13			Sup
Negrao (1997)	Fast-food middle managers	.31*	Altruism	59	Peer
Rioux and Penner (1999)	Municipal employees	.42*	Altruism	141	Self
		.05		131	Peer
		.16		135	Sup
		.17*	Conscientiousness	141	Self
		-.05		131	Peer
		.10		135	Sup
		.27*	Civic Virtue	141	Self
		.06		131	Peer
		.11		135	Sup
		.37*	Courtesy	141	Self
		.03		131	Peer
		.13		135	Sup
		.16	Sportsmanship	141	Self
		-.04		131	Peer
		.13		135	Sup
Tillman (1998)	Working college students	.45*	Composite OCB	311	Self
<i>Helpfulness</i>					
Allen (1998)	Undergraduate students	.18*	Willingness to mentor others	194	Self
Allen (1999)	Employees from various settings	.28**	Willingness to mentor others	388	Self
		.26**	Experience as a mentor	389	Self

Study	Sample Characteristics	<i>r</i>	Criterion	N	Rating Source <sup>a</sup>
Facteau, Allen, Facteau, Bordas, and Tears (2000)	College students	.28*	Composite contextual performance interview scores	188	I
		.10	Composite contextual performance	76	P/S
Midili and Penner (1995)	Home improvement store employees	.27*	Altruism	147	Self
		.24*		94	Peer
		.02		127	Sup
		.08	Conscientiousness	147	Self
		.24*		94	Peer
		.00		127	Sup
		.20*	Sportsmanship	147	Self
		.15		94	Peer
		-.05		127	Sup
		.30*	Courtesy	147	Self
		.22*		94	Peer
		-.02		127	Sup
		.21*	Civic Virtue	147	Self
		.19		94	Peer
Negrao (1997)	Fast-food middle managers	-.02		127	Sup
		.29*	Altruism	59	Peer
Rioux and Penner (1999)	Municipal employees	.26*	Altruism	141	Self
		.00		130	Peer
		.08		135	Sup
		.01	Conscientiousness	141	Self
		-.16		130	Peer
		.10		135	Sup
		.13	Civic virtue	141	Self
		.08		130	Peer
		.00		135	Sup
		.20*	Courtesy	141	Self
		-.06		130	Peer
		-.01		135	Sup
Tillman (1998)	Working college students	-.02	Sportsmanship	141	Self
		-.15		130	Peer
		-.07		135	Sup
		.32*	Composite OCB	311	Self

Notes: <sup>a</sup>I = Criterion measure based on independent ratings from structured interview designed to assess OCB

P/S = Averaged ratings provided by one to three peers and Supervisors

Sup = Ratings provided by Supervisor

Self = Ratings provided by self

II = Criterion measure based on independent coding of group discussion communication

<sup>b</sup> Only correlations from values dimension of collectivism reported

<sup>c</sup> Self-provided ratings but collected 6 months later

<sup>d</sup> Predictor measure is perspective taking dimension of empathy

\**p* < .05 \*\**p* < .01

Table 4: Mean Uncorrected Correlations Between Personality and Citizenship Performance Criteria<sup>1</sup>

Personality Construct	Number of Studies	All Criteria		Self-Report Criteria Deleted		
		Total N	Weighted Mean Correlation	Number of Studies	Total N	Weighted Mean Correlation
Conscientiousness	12	2378	.24	10	1963	.19
Agreeableness	7	1554	.13	7	1554	.13
Positive Affectivity	5	985	.18	5	970	.16
Extroversion	8	1832	.08	7	1728	.06
Negative Affectivity	6	1151	-.14	5	1047	-.12
Locus of Control	3	599	.16	3	599	.12
Collectivism	4	857	.15	1	132	.04
Other Oriented Empathy	7	1343	.28	4	434	.17
Helpfulness	7	1343	.22	4	434	.15

<sup>1</sup>The only studies considered for these analyses were those conducted subsequent to the Organ and Ryan (1995) meta-analysis.

is .16, .12 when self-rating criteria are not considered.

#### Collectivism

Several studies have demonstrated a link between individualism-collectivism and citizenship performance-related criteria. In general, collectivists are concerned for others and the community, whereas individualists focus on the search for rewards and satisfaction of personal needs (Early, 1989; Parsons and Shils, 1951). Research has shown that collectivists are less likely to engage in social loafing and shirking than are individualists (Early, 1989; Wagner, 1995). Moorman and Blakely (1995) found that individualism-collectivism related to the likelihood of engaging in OCB. Similarly, in a longitudinal study, Van Dyne, Vandewalle, Kostova, Latham and Cummings (2000) reported that collectivism was related to helping behavior measured six months later. Allen (1999) found that collectivism was related to a specific form of citizenship behavior, serving as a mentor to others. Specifically, individuals who had mentored others were higher in collectivism than were nonmentors. Nonetheless, these relationships are low to moderate (mean  $r = .15$ ), especially when self ratings are dropped from consideration ( $r = .04$ ).

#### Personal initiative

Personal initiative involves taking an active and self-starting approach to work and going beyond what is formally required in a job (Frese and Fay, 1997). Fecteau *et al.* (2000) found that personal initiative correlated .25 with ratings of OCB obtained through a structured interview. Because of this predictor variable's conceptual consistency with citizenship performance, it may be an

important personal characteristic to consider in future research.

#### The Prosocial Personality and Citizenship Performance

Another approach to the identification of the personality characteristics associated with citizenship performance is to use a personality inventory targeted directly toward those kinds of behaviors. Penner and his associated have done just that. These researchers have systematically investigated what they call the 'prosocial personality orientation' (Midili and Penner, 1995; Penner and Fritzsche, 1993; Penner, Fritzsche, Craiger and Freifeld, 1995; Penner and Finkelstein, 1998; Penner, Midili and Kegglemeyer, 1997; Schroeder, Penner, Dovidio and Piliavin, 1995).

In particular, Penner *et al.* (1995) developed the Prosocial Personality Battery (PSB) to measure individual differences in prosocial personality tendencies. The original version of the PSB was a 56-item self-report inventory that measures seven different personality traits believed to be associated with prosocial thoughts, feelings and actions. The traits are: affective empathy, cognitive empathy, egocentric or self-centered empathy, other-oriented moral reasoning, collectively-oriented moral reasoning, social responsibility and willingness to do favors for others. Factor analyses of the PSB, with a wide variety of samples, consistently yield two correlated factors. The traits with their primary loadings on the first factor are affective empathy, cognitive empathy, both kinds of moral reasoning and social responsibility. Penner *et al.* called this factor Other-oriented Empathy and argued that it primarily concerns prosocial thoughts and feelings. Willingness to do favors and egocentric empathy

have their primary loadings (the latter's loading is negative) on the second factor, which Penner *et al.* called Helpfulness. This factor primarily concerns prosocial actions. The two factors have acceptable internal consistencies (typically greater than .75) and display reasonable test-retest reliabilities (.70 or more over a two week time period).

Penner, his associates and other researchers have found significant correlations between the PSB dimensions and prosocial behaviors, including the speed with which bystanders intervened in an emergency (Harton, personal communication), the frequency of helpful acts by college students over a one month period of time (Penner and Fritzsche, 1993), the number of service organizations to which people belong (Penner, in press) and the amount of time a volunteer spends with a person with HIV or AIDS (Penner and Finkelstein, 1998). However, most relevant to this article is research that examined relationships between PSB scores and OCB dimensions.

Midili and Penner (1995) administered the PSB and measures of job satisfaction, perceived organizational justice and mood to a sample of employees of a large organization specializing in home improvement products. They also obtained self, peer and supervisor ratings of OCB. Other-oriented Empathy correlated significantly with self-reports of all five dimensions of OCB identified by Organ (*r*s ranged from .24 for sportsmanship to .53 for courtesy); see Table 3). Helpfulness correlated significantly with four of the five dimensions of OCB (*r*'s ranged from .08 for conscientiousness to .30 for courtesy). These findings have been substantially replicated in two other studies (Rioux and Penner, 1999; Tillman 1998). Midili and Penner also found significant correlations between other-oriented empathy and peer-ratings of all five OCB dimensions (*r*'s ranged from .25 for sportsmanship to .35 for altruism) and between helpfulness and peer-ratings of the altruism, conscientiousness and courtesy dimensions of OCB (*r*s = .24, .24 and .22, respectively). Negrao (1997) substantially replicated these findings with a sample of mid-level managers in a food service organization. She found correlations of .31 and .29 between peer-ratings on the altruism dimension of OCB and other-oriented empathy and helpfulness, respectively. (Negrao did not include a measure of the conscientiousness dimension).

Midili and Penner (1995) also conducted hierarchical regressions, with self and peer ratings of overall OCB regressed onto job satisfaction, perceived organizational support and the two PSB dimensions, the latter entered last into the regression equation. For both self and peer ratings of overall OCB and altruism, the PSB dimensions accounted for significant

amounts of unique variance in the regression equation. Thus, in this study the two personality dimensions specially targeted toward the criterion constructs of altruism and organizational citizenship accounted for variance in OCB not accounted for by job satisfaction and perceived organizational support.

Further evidence for the role of prosocial attributes in OCB comes from Facticeau *et al.* (2000). They examined the relationship between citizenship performance and some of the specific traits contained in the PSB factors. They found a significant relationship between a history of doing favors (from the Helpfulness factor) and scores from an interview designed to assess propensity to engage in citizenship performance ( $r = .28$ ); they also found a significant relationship between the perspective taking aspect of empathy (from the Other-oriented Empathy factor) and co-worker ratings of citizenship performance ( $r = .24$ ).

Allen (1998, 1999) examined the relationship between the prosocial personality and mentoring behavior. Acting as a mentor to others may be considered a specific form of citizenship behavior. In both a laboratory and a field study, Allen found that willingness to mentor others was significantly related to both dimensions of the prosocial personality (average *r*'s = .26 and .23, respectively). Additionally, she found significant mean differences on Other-oriented Empathy and Helpfulness between individuals who reported they had previously mentored someone (higher scores) and individuals who reported no such activity.

Reviewing the PSB results, the mean uncorrected correlation between Other-oriented Empathy and the various citizenship performance criteria is .28. The corresponding mean value for Helpfulness is .22. When only peer or supervisor reports are considered, the respective mean correlations are .17 and .15 (see Tables 3 and 4).

## Conclusions

As of 1995, Organ and Ryan's (1995) meta-analysis provided the best estimates of the magnitude of relations between personality constructs and OCB dimensions. The highest correlations were between conscientiousness and organizational compliance ( $r = .21$  uncorrected, .30 corrected) and between conscientiousness and altruism ( $r = .16$  and .22, uncorrected and corrected, respectively). Since 1995, 20 additional studies we could identify have examined relationships between personality variables and a variety of different OCB and citizenship performance criteria. Results of those studies show a somewhat higher mean uncorrected correlation

of .24 for conscientiousness. Mean uncorrected correlations for the post-1995 studies were also higher than in Organ and Ryan for the other three personality constructs they reviewed (.13 versus .10 and .08 for agreeableness; .18 versus .12 and .06 for positive affectivity; and -.14 versus -.05 and -.09 for negative affectivity).

We did not conduct a full meta-analysis on the post-1995 data, but a likely correction for criterion unreliability and restriction-in-range for our conscientiousness correlation is .08 based on the magnitude of the correction made by Organ and Ryan and in the Barrick and Mount (1991) and Tett, Jackson and Rothstein (1991) meta-analyses. Thus, a correlation of .32 appears to be a reasonable point estimate for the conscientiousness-citizenship performance relationship across the 12 studies reviewed. If studies using self-rating criteria are removed from consideration, this point estimate would likely be in the  $r = .27$  range.

For positive affectivity and the Penner *et al.* (1995) other oriented empathy and helpfulness constructs, using the corrections from Organ and Ryan, Barrick and Mount and Tett *et al.* as benchmarks, the likely corrected correlations would be approximately .22, .33 and .27, respectively, for these three personality constructs. If we exclude self-rating criteria from consideration, these estimates would be .20, .22 and .20. Overall, our review of the personality-citizenship performance relations for studies since Organ and Ryan suggest somewhat more substantial links than those found by these authors, but the differences are not particularly large.

Another perspective on these personality-citizenship performance links is that according to the Motowidlo *et al.* (1997) model of job performance, we would expect higher correlations between personality constructs and citizenship performance than between these constructs and task performance. For five of the studies reviewed here, there were data relevant to this hypothesis. In all these studies, conscientiousness or a related construct (e.g., dependability) correlated more highly with citizenship performance than with task performance; in most cases the differences between correlations was significant. In the Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994) study, from the Organ and Ryan review, several other personality predictors had a similar pattern of correlations (i.e., significantly higher correlations with citizenship performance than with task performance). Thus, when personality predictors, most notably conscientiousness or dependability, are correlated with both task and citizenship performance in the same studies, the personality-citizenship relations are consistently higher than those with task performance.

Moderate support for this pattern of personality-performance correlations, at least

for the conscientiousness construct, comes additionally from a comparison of the Barrick and Mount meta-analytic findings with both Organ and Ryan's and our post-1995 results. In Barrick and Mount (1991), the criteria were almost always overall performance ratings, and several researchers have demonstrated that these ratings are a function of both task and citizenship performance (e.g., MacKenzie, Podsakoff and Fetter, 1991; Motowidlo and Van Scotter, 1994; and Werner, 1994).

Accordingly, based again on the Motowidlo *et al.* (1997) model, we would expect that correlations between personality and overall performance, with a component of task as well as citizenship performance, would be somewhat reduced from when the criterion was purely citizenship performance. Indeed, although the differences are not great, the Barrick and Mount estimate of .23 for the validity of conscientiousness against overall performance is less than the Organ and Ryan estimate of .30 against organizational compliance and our estimate of .32 for citizenship performance criteria.

In a broader context, these attempts to examine links between individual predictor constructs (e.g., conscientiousness) and criterion constructs at a level more specific than overall job performance follow Campbell's recommendations for building a science of personnel selection (e.g., Campbell, McCloy, Oppler and Sager, 1993; Campbell, Gasser and Oswald, 1996). He argues for developing models and taxonomies of job performance and then studying linkages between individual difference constructs and each construct in the criterion model. By dividing the criterion space into task and contextual performance and then examining relations between personality constructs and each of these two performance domains, we begin to get beyond research on performance models that uses overall performance as the dependent variable (e.g., Borman, White and Dorsey, 1995).

Even more consistent with the Campbell *et al.* guidance is to refine further the criterion constructs we examine and make more specific hypotheses about individual differences-criterion construct relations. The LePine and Van Dyne (in press) notion of bidirectional effects is in this spirit. They found, as hypothesized, that agreeableness correlated positively with cooperative behavior, one component of citizenship performance and negatively with voice behavior, another component of citizenship (see also Pulakos, Borman and Hough, 1988).

Also consistent with the Campbell, *et al.* (1993, 1996) recommendations regarding gaining more understanding of predictor-criterion links is Penner's work on the predictor side. His identification of two personality constructs

hypothesized to predict specific kinds of organizational behavior (i.e., helping and supporting others) also moves us in the direction of better understanding these links.

In sum, this article has reviewed recent work on the citizenship performance construct (Coleman and Borman, 2000) and the Motowidlo *et al.* (1997) model that hypothesizes different antecedents for task performance and citizenship performance. The Organ and Ryan (1995) meta-analytic results are relevant for evaluating part of that model and more recent research on personality-citizenship performance relations were reviewed to supplement the Organ and Ryan findings. We conclude there is evidence that personality, at least for the conscientiousness and dependability constructs, correlates more strongly with citizenship performance than with task performance. These results were placed in the broader context of attempts to build multi-dimensional models of job performance (e.g., Campbell *et al.*, 1993, 1996) and then to learn more about linkages between individual differences and relatively specific criterion constructs.

## Notes

- 1 In this article, we use the term citizenship performance rather than contextual performance. There is no substantive difference between the two labels, but citizenship performance seems to offer a more familiar name for the construct.
- 2 Altruism and conscientiousness are the two major or overarching dimensions of OCB; the other dimensions are: courtesy trying to prevent work-related interpersonal problems from occurring; sportsmanship tolerating less than ideal circumstances on the job without complaining; and civic virtue responsibly involving oneself in and being concerned about the life of the company.

## References

- Allen, T. D. (1998) *Mentoring others: An investigation of linkages between personality, motives, willingness and protégé evaluation*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Southern Management Association, New Orleans, LA. November.
- Allen, T.D. (1999) *Mentoring others: Mentor dispositions and desired protégé characteristics*. Paper presented at the 14th Annual Meeting of Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA. April
- Barnard, C.I. (1938) *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Barrick, M.R. and Mount, M.K. (1991) The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, **44**, 1–26.
- Becker, T.E. and Vance, R.J., (1993) Construct validity of three types of organizational citizenship behavior: An illustration of the direct products model with refinements. *Journal of Management*, **19**, 663–682.
- Borman, W.C. and Brush, D.H. (1993) Toward a taxonomy of managerial performance requirements. *Human Performance*, **6**, 1–21.
- Borman, W.C., Hanson, M.A., Kubisiak, U.C., Buck, D. (2000) *Computerized Adaptive Rating Scales (CARS): Development and evaluation of the concept*. (Institute Report #350). Tampa, FL: Personnel Decisions Research Institutes.
- Borman, W.C. and Motowidlo, S.J. (1993) Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt and W.C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Borman, W.C. and Motowidlo, S.J. (1997) Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, **10**, 99–109.
- Borman, W.C., Motowidlo, S.J. and Hanser, L.M. (1983, August). *A model of individual performance effectiveness: Thoughts about expanding the criterion space*. Paper presented as part of symposium, Integrated Criterion Measurement for Large Scale Computerized Selection and Classification, the 91st Annual American Psychological Association Convention. Washington, DC.
- Borman, W.C., White, L.A. and Dorsey, D.W. (1995) Effects of ratee task performance and interpersonal factors on supervisor and peer performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **80**, 168–177.
- Brief, A.P. and Motowidlo, S.J. (1986) Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, **11**, 710–725.
- Campbell, J.P. (1990) An overview of the army selection and classification project (Project A). *Personnel Psychology*, **43**, 231–39.
- Campbell, J.P., Gasser, M.B. and Oswald, F.L. (1996) The substantive nature of performance variability. In K.R. Murphy (Ed.), *Individual Differences and Behavior in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Campbell J.P., McCloy R.A., Oppler S.H. and Sager C.E. 1993. A theory of performance. In N. Schmitt and W.C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Coleman, V.I and Borman, W.C. (2000) Investigating the underlying structure of the citizenship performance domain. *Human Resource Management Review*, **10**, 25–44.
- Conway, J.M. (1996) Additional construct validity evidence for the task-contextual performance distinction. *Human Performance*, **9**, 309–329.
- Early, P.C. (1989) Social loafing and collectivism: A comparison of the United States and the People's Republic of China. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **34**, 565–581.
- Facteau, J.D., Allen, T.D., Facteau, C.L., Bordas, R.M. and Tears, R.S. (April, 2000). *Structured interviewing for OCBs: Construct validity, faking and the effects of question type*. Paper presented at the 15th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New Orleans, LA.

- Frese, M. and Fay, D. (1997) The concept of personal initiative: Operationalization, reliability and validity in two German samples. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70, 139–16.
- Funderberg, S.A. and Levy, P.E. (1997) The influence of individual and contextual variables on 360-degree feedback system attitudes. *Group and Organization Management*, 22, 210–235.
- Graham, J. W. (1986) *Organizational citizenship informed by political theory*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management, Chicago.
- Hattrup, K., O'Connell, M.S. and Wingate, P. H. (1998) Prediction of multidimensional criteria: Distinguishing task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 11, 305–319.
- Hense, R.L. (May, 2000). The Big Five and contextual performance: Expanding person-environment fit theory. Unpublished manuscript. University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida.
- Hogan, J., Rybicki, S.L., Motowidlo, S.J. and Borman, W.C. (1998) Relations between contextual performance, personality and occupational advancement. *Human Performance*, 11, 189–207.
- Hui, C., Law, K.S. and Chen, Z.X. (1999) A structural equation model of the effects of negative affectivity, leader-member exchange and perceived job mobility on in-role and extra-role performance: A Chinese case. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 77, 3–21.
- Katz, D. (1964) The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9, 131–46.
- Katz, D. and Kahn, R.L. (1978) *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- LePine, J.A. and Van Dyne, L. (in press). Voice and cooperative behaviors contrasting forms of contextual performance: Differential relationships with big five personality characteristics and cognitive ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M. and 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.
- McHenry, J.J., Hough, L.M., Toquam, J.L., Hanson, M.A. and Ashworth, S. (1990) Project A validity results: The relationship between predictor and criterion domains. *Personnel Psychology*, 43, 335–354.
- McManus, M.A. and Kelly, M.L. (1999) Personality measures and biodata: Evidence regarding their incremental predictive value in the life insurance industry. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 137–148.
- Midili, A.R. and Penner, L.A. (1995, August). Dispositional and environmental influences on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York, New York.
- Miller, R.L., Griffin, M.A. and Hart, P. M. (1999) Personality and organizational health: The role of conscientiousness. *Work and Stress*, 13, 7–19.
- Moorman, R.H. and Blakely, G.L. (1995) Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 127–142.
- Morrison, E.W. (1994) Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management*, 37, 1543–1567.
- Motowidlo, S.J., Borman, W.C. and Schmit, M.J. (1997) A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 10, 71–83.
- Motowidlo, S.J. and Van Scotter, J.R. (1994) Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 475–80.
- Negrao, M. (1997, May). On good Samaritans and villains: An investigation of the bright and dark side of altruism in organizations. Unpublished manuscript. University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida.
- Neuman, G.A. and Kickul, J.R. (1998) Organizational citizenship behaviors: Achievement orientation and personality. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 13, 263–279.
- Organ, D.W. (1988) *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D.W. (1997) Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10, 85–97.
- Organ, D.W. and Ryan, K. (1995) A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 775–802.
- Parsons, T. and Shils, E.A. (1951) *Toward a general theory of action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Paulhus, D. (1983) Sphere-specific measures of perceived control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 1253–1265.
- Penner, L.A. (in preparation). The prosocial personality and volunteerism: A web-based national survey.
- Penner, L.A. and Finkelstein, M.A. (1998) Dispositional and structural determinants of volunteerism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 525–537.
- Penner, L.A. and Fritzsche, B.A. (1993) Magic Johnson and reactions to people with AIDS: A natural experiment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23(13), 1035–1050.
- Penner, L.A., Fritzsche, B.A., Craiger, J.P. and Freifeld, T.R. (1995) Measuring the prosocial personality. In J. Butcher and C. D. Spielberger (Eds.) *Advances in personality assessment*. (Vol. 10). Hillsdale, NJ: LEA
- Penner, L.A., Midili, A.R. and Kegglemeyer, J. (1997) Beyond job attitudes: A personality and social psychology perspective on the causes of organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Performance*, 10, 111–131.
- Pulakos, E.D., Borman, W.C. and Hough, L.M. (1988) Test validation for scientific understanding: Two demonstrations of an approach to studying predictor-criterion linkages. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 703–716.
- Rioux, S. and Penner, L.A. (in press). The Causes of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A

- Motivational Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- Rotter, J.B. (1966) Generalized expectancies for internal versus external locus of control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 81, 1 (Whole no. 609).
- Schroeder, D.A., Penner, L.A., Dovidio, J.F. and Piliavin, J.A., (1995) *The psychology of helping and altruism*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W. and Near, J. P. (1983) Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653–663.
- Tett, R.P., Jackson, D.N. and Rothstein, M. (1991) Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 703–742.
- Tillman, P. (1998) *In search of moderators of the relationship between antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The case of motives*. Unpublished masters thesis. University of South Florida.
- Van Dyne, L.V., Graham, J.M. and Dienesch, R.M. (1994) Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 765–802.
- Van Dyne, L.V., Vandewalle, D., Kostova, T., Latham, M.E. and Cummings, L.L. (2000) Collectivism, propensity to trust and self-esteem as predictors of organizational citizenship in a non-work setting. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 3–23.
- Van Scotter, J.R. and Motowidlo, S.J. (1996) Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 525–531.
- Wagner, J.A. (1995) Studies of individualism-collectivism: Effects on cooperation in groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 152–172.
- Werner, J.M. (1994) Dimensions that make a difference: Examining the impact of in-role and extra-role behaviors on supervisory ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 98–107.
- Williams, L.J. and Anderson, S. E. (1991) Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601–617.