

The Causes of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Motivational Analysis

Sheila M. Rioux
University of South Florida and
Development Dimensions International

Louis A. Penner
University of South Florida

This study addressed the role of motives in organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Three motives were identified through factor analyses: prosocial values, organizational concern, and impression management. Scales that measured these motives and other variables known to covary with OCB were administered to 141 municipal employees and were correlated with self-, peer, and supervisor ratings of 5 aspects of OCB. Relative to the other motives, prosocial values motives were most strongly associated with OCB directed at individuals, and organizational concern motives were most strongly associated with OCB directed toward the organization. Each of the motives accounted for unique amounts of variance in OCB. The results suggest that motives may play an important role in OCB.

In recent years, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has gained the attention of many industrial–organizational psychologists (Borman & Penner, 2001). The current interest in OCB can be traced back at least to Katz (1964). Katz's thesis, subsequently made more explicit by Smith, Organ, and Near (1983), was that for organizations to operate successfully, their employees must be willing to do more than the minimal formal and specified technical aspects of their jobs. The assumed importance of OCB to organizational success has led to numerous attempts to identify its proximal and distal causes. The present study represents one such effort.

Most conceptualizations of OCB suggest that it has two major dimensions: altruism—prosocial behaviors that are directed at specific individuals or groups within the organization—and conscientiousness (or generalized compliance)—prosocial behaviors directed at the organization. In 1995, Organ and Ryan carried out a meta-analysis of the correlates of each OCB dimension. For both dimensions, the largest correlations were for attitudinal variables such as job satisfaction, (perceived) fairness, organizational commitment, and (perceived) leader consideration. Overall, personality traits and measures of affect (e.g., negativity) correlated weakly with the two dimensions of OCB. The only exception was the trait of conscientiousness (Costa & McCrae, 1992). These findings led

Organ and Ryan to conclude that if dispositional variables play a role in OCB, it is only to the extent that they affect thoughts and feelings about a job. It is difficult to dispute Organ and Ryan's claim about the importance of attitudinal variables as causes of OCB. However, more recent reviews of the literature (e.g., Borman, Penner, Allen, & Motowidlo, 2001; Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmitt, 1997) suggest that Organ and Ryan's conclusion about dispositional variables and OCB may have been a bit premature. To be more precise, these studies provide substantial evidence that individual differences in personality traits and affect account for significant amounts of variance in OCB.

The present study takes a somewhat different approach to the role of individual-differences variables in OCB. Specifically, we investigated whether personal motives are related to OCB. Much of the current research on the causes of OCB either implicitly or explicitly assumes that engaging in such behavior is a reaction or a response to an individual's perceptions of his or her job and the organization for which he or she works. However, Penner, Midili, and Kegelmeyer (1997) suggested that OCB may also be a proactive behavior; that is, people may consciously choose to engage in OCB because such behaviors meet certain needs or satisfy one or more motives. Furthermore, to understand the causes of these actions, one must identify the motives that underlie them. Penner et al. (1997) were not the only researchers to consider the role of motives in OCB (see, e.g., Bolino, 1999; Folger, 1993). However, unlike these other authors, Penner et al.'s (1997) interest in motives and OCB was explicitly based on a functional approach to human behavior. The functional approach to behavior focuses on the function or purpose served by a behavior (Snyder, 1993). Identifying the purpose or purposes served by a particular behavior enables one to better understand it and why the person has performed it. This approach assumes that much of human behavior is motivated by a person's goals and needs. However, it does not assume that if two people engage in the same behavior, they have the same motives; nor does it assume that most behaviors serve only one motive. The same behavior may have multiple motives.

Sheila M. Rioux, Department of Psychology, University of South Florida and Development Dimensions International, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Louis A. Penner, Department of Psychology, University of South Florida.

This article is based on Sheila M. Rioux's doctoral dissertation, which was submitted at the University of South Florida. Portions of this research were presented at the 14th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, April 1999, San Diego, California. We are grateful to Tammy Allen, Walter Borman, and Mark Snyder for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this article.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Louis A. Penner, Department of Psychology, University of South Florida, 4202 East Fowler Avenue, PCD 4138, Tampa, Florida 33620-8200. Electronic mail may be sent to penner@chum1.cas.usf.edu.

We know of no studies that have taken a functional approach to OCB. However, in recent years, several researchers (e.g., Snyder and his associates; see Clary et al., 1998; Omoto & Snyder, 1995) have used a functional approach to study volunteerism—the donation of time and effort to some charitable or service organization. They and others (Clary & Orenstein, 1991; Penner & Finkelstein, 1998) have found significant and replicable associations among motives and the quantity and quality of volunteer activities.

These findings provided the theoretical impetus for the research reported here. There clearly are differences between volunteerism and OCB, but they also have some important characteristics in common. First, both are discretionary prosocial behaviors; people choose to volunteer and to engage in OCB. Second, both occur within an organizational context, and the recipients of the benefits of both OCB and volunteerism are either specific individuals associated with an organization or an organization itself. Third, unlike other kinds of prosocial actions (e.g., helping a family member), there is no strong sense of personal or social obligation to help. Finally, both kinds of prosocial behaviors typically occur over an extended period of time; they are not transitory responses to specific situations. These conceptual similarities and overlap between volunteerism and OCB led Penner et al. (1997) to propose that examining motives would further researchers' understanding of its causes. The present study empirically tested this proposal. To be specific, we developed a measure of motives for OCB. Then, in a field study, we measured motives and other variables previously shown to predict OCB. We expected that motives would correlate with OCB and explain variance in it not explained by other predictor variables.

Study 1: Scale Development

The goal of this study was to develop a reliable measure of motives for engaging in OCB. On the basis of extensive literature reviews and professional consultations, an initial set of 110 items concerned with the motives that might underlie OCB was created.¹ These items were used to create a scale that measured OCB motives, and then the factor structure and the psychometric properties of the scale were examined.

Method

Participants

There were two groups of participants. The first group contained 616 undergraduates (424 women, 172 men, and 20 participants who did not provide their gender). About 70% of the participants self-identified as European American, 10% as African American, and 10% as Hispanic; the remainder checked "other" or did not respond to this question. Seventy-five percent of participants were between the ages of 18 and 25 years, 77% were employed full-time or part-time, and 82% of these individuals worked more than 15 hr per week. The second group contained 178 undergraduates (131 women, 41 men, and 6 participants who did not provide their gender). Their demographic and employment characteristics were virtually identical to those of the first group. The jobs held by the participants ranged from low-level service positions to middle-level supervisory ones.

Procedure

The first group filled out the 110-item version of the Citizenship Motives Scale (CMS). The items were preceded by an explanation or a definition of

OCB and several behavioral examples of OCBs. Then, using a 6-point scale, the participants rated how important each motive statement would be in their decision to engage in OCB at a job (1 = *not at all important*, 6 = *extremely important*).

Results

Four of the 110 items were eliminated because of extremely skewed distributions (45% of the respondents chose the same response). The remaining 106 items were subjected to an iterated principal-axis factor analysis (Rummel, 1970). An examination of the scree plot of the eigenvalues for the factors led to the decision to extract three factors. These items were then subjected to an oblique rotation. Items that loaded .50 or higher on one factor and no more than .29 on any other factor were retained for further analysis. These decision criteria yielded 79 items. However, because the scale was intended for usage in field settings, we further reduced the number of items it contained. Two criteria were used in the selection of the items for the final version of the scale. The first was factor loadings; the second was the actual content of the items. This process yielded the 30-item CMS presented in Table 1.

Items loading on the first factor involved a desire by the participants for the company to do well and a desire for the participants to show pride in and commitment to the organization. Thus, this factor was labeled *Organizational Concern* (OC) motives. The second factor was labeled *Prosocial Values* (PV) motives because the items with the highest loadings on this factor involved a need to be helpful and a desire to build positive relationships with others. The final factor was labeled *Impression Management* (IM) motives because the items with the highest loadings on it were concerned with a desire to avoid looking bad to coworkers and supervisors and to obtain rewards. The three factors correlated significantly with one another: OC–PV, $r = .53$; OC–IM, $r = .36$; and PV–IM, $r = .30$.

The 30-item CMS was administered to the second group of participants, and the same principal-axis factor analysis was carried out. All items loaded on the same factors, and the intercorrelations between the pairs of factors were comparable to those found in the first sample. To further evaluate the similarity between the solutions from the two groups, we computed coefficients of congruence or agreement (Harman, 1976) between the factors obtained for each group. The coefficients of congruence were .98 for OC, .97 for PV, and .96 for IM. (Perfect agreement would be 1.00.)

Psychometric Properties

Subscale scores were calculated by giving the 10 items that represented each factor a unit weight of 1 for that subscale, and the remaining items were given a weight of 0. Among the first group of participants, the coefficient alphas for the subscales ranged from .94 (OC) to .91 (PV and IM); average interitem correlations ranged from .59 (OC) to .49 (IM). Among the second group of participants, the coefficient alphas ranged from .92 (OC) to .84 (IM); the average interitem correlations ranged from .54 (OC) to .35 (IM). Finally, 104 members of the second group of participants com-

¹ A detailed description of item selection and development is available from Sheila M. Rioux.

Table 1
Factor Structure of the Citizenship Motives Scale

Subscale and item	Factor		
	1	2	3
Organizational Concern			
Because I want to understand how the organization works.	.84	-.03	.02
Because I care what happens to the company.	.79	.03	-.03
Because I want to be fully involved in the company.	.79	.02	.05
Because I feel pride in the organization.	.78	.04	.02
Because the organization values my work.	.78	-.05	.03
Because I have a genuine interest in my work.	.77	.04	-.07
Because I want to be a well-informed employee.	.74	.05	.02
To keep up with the latest developments in the organization.	.71	.03	.05
Because the organization treats me fairly.	.69	.03	.05
Because I am committed to the company.	.67	.07	.00
Prosocial Values			
Because I feel it is important to help those in need.	.00	.81	-.09
Because I believe in being courteous to others.	.03	.76	-.06
Because I am concerned about other people's feelings.	-.02	.76	.02
Because I want to help my co-workers in any way I can.	.19	.73	-.11
Because it is easy for me to be helpful.	.11	.69	-.05
Because I like interacting with my co-workers.	.03	.68	.02
To have fun with my co-workers.	-.13	.67	.14
To get to know my co-workers better.	.04	.66	.15
To be friendly with others.	.02	.64	.04
Because I can put myself in other people's shoes.	.03	.57	.03
Impression Management			
To avoid looking bad in front of others.	-.06	.14	.78
To avoid looking lazy.	-.02	.05	.76
To look better than my co-workers.	-.01	-.14	.76
To avoid a reprimand from my boss.	.05	-.02	.74
Because I fear appearing irresponsible.	.03	.07	.70
To look like I am busy.	-.04	.05	.69
To stay out of trouble.	.03	.03	.65
Because rewards are important to me.	.06	-.08	.65
Because I want a raise.	.07	-.08	.63
To impress my co-workers.	.00	.09	.56
Eigenvalue (unrotated solution)	10.33	3.62	2.35
% of common variance explained	63	22	15
Cumulative % of common variance explained	63	85	100
% of variance explained eliminating other factors (semipartial <i>r</i> s)	24	22	26
% of variance explained ignoring other factors (<i>r</i> s)	51	46	39

Note. Values in boldface type indicate that those items had their primary loading on that factor.

pleted the CMS twice, 2 to 3 weeks apart. The test-retest reliabilities for the three subscales ranged from .82 (IM) to .71 (PV). The factor structure and the psychometric properties of the three subscales were essentially invariant across gender and work status (i.e., full-time vs. part-time).²

Study 2: Motives and OCB

This study addressed the major theoretical question in this research effort: Do motives play a unique and significant role in OCB? Municipal employees completed self-report measures of constructs that had been previously found to be correlated with OCB (see the *Method* section below) and the CMS measure. Because ratings of OCB may differ as a function of the rater (Morrison, 1994), self-, peer-, and supervisor ratings of OCB were obtained. We predicted that the zero-order correlations between the motives and the ratings of the dimensions of OCB would be significant. More important, we predicted that the motives would

differentially correlate with the dimensions of OCB. Specifically, we expected that (a) PV motives would correlate most strongly with the altruism dimension, or OCBs directed at individuals in the organization, and (b) OC motives would correlate most strongly with the conscientiousness dimension, or OCBs directed at the organization. We made no hypotheses about the correlates of IM motives because there was no clear theoretical basis for predicting differential correlations between IM motives and specific OCB dimensions.

Finally, we predicted that motives would account for unique variance in OCB. That is, when motives are entered into a hierar-

² Because of space considerations, initial studies of the construct validity of the CMS are not reported in this article. These studies provided some clear evidence that the PV subscale was construct valid; the picture for the other two subscales was less clear. A detailed description of the construct validity studies is available from Sheila M. Rioux.

chical multiple regression after other predictors of OCB, they will add significant accounts of explained variance in OCB ratings. The other predictors were selected on the basis of two criteria. First, the variable was already known to correlate with one of the dimensions of OCB, which enabled us to pit motives against other variables that were “shooting” at the same “targets.” Second, there was some presumed conceptual association between each variable and at least one of the motives, which enabled us to use variables other than OCB to examine the construct validity of the CMS.

Method

Participants

The participants were 145 individuals (88 male, 57 female) employed by a city government in Florida. They represented 73% of the 200 city employees who had agreed to participate in the study and received questionnaire packets. Ninety-one percent of the sample self-identified as White or European American. Ten percent of the sample were less than 30 years old, 30% were between 30 and 40 years old, 45% were between 40 and 50 years old, and the remainder were more than 50 years old. Thirteen percent had completed high school, 53% had completed 1 or more years of college, 21% had graduated from college, and 12% had completed some postgraduate education. Four percent had worked for the city for 1 year or less, 23% for 1 to 5 years, and 73% for longer than 5 years.

Measures

Organizational justice. There is a substantial prior literature that suggests a positive association between perceived organizational justice and the commission of OCB (see, e.g., Moorman, 1991, Organ & Ryan, 1995). Two aspects of organizational justice were assessed. The first aspect was distributive justice—the degree to which the rewards received by employees were perceived to be related to performance inputs. Distributive justice was measured with a six-item scale developed by Price and Mueller (1986), in which participants rate the degree to which they feel they are fairly rewarded by the organization. The second aspect was procedural justice—the degree to which fair procedures were used in the organization. Procedural justice was measured with a seven-item scale developed by Moorman (1991). A 5-point response format was used for both scales. Cronbach's alphas for the two scales were .94 and .89, respectively.

Positive mood. George (1991) and several other researchers (e.g., Borman et al., 2001; Fecteau, Allen, Fecteau, Bordas, & Tears, 2000; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996) have found that job-related moods are positively associated with OCB. Positive mood was measured by the Positive Affect subscale of the Job Affect Scale (Brief, Burke, George, Robinson, & Webster, 1988). The subscale consists of six positive mood adjectives: *active*, *strong*, *excited*, *enthusiastic*, *peppy*, and *elated*. Participants rated the extent to which each adjective reflected their current feelings at work by using a 5-point scale. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .92.

Prosocial Personality Battery. Several studies have found that Penner, Fritzsche, Craiger, and Freifeld's (1995) measure of prosocial dispositions, the Prosocial Personality Battery (PSB), correlates with self-reports and peer reports of OCB (see Allen, 1998, 1999; Borman et al., 2001; Fecteau et al., 2000; Midili & Penner, 1995). The PSB is a 56-item self-report measure. When factor analyzed, it yields two related factors (Penner et al., 1995). The first factor, called Other-Oriented Empathy, concerns prosocial thoughts and feelings. The second factor, called Helpfulness, concerns prosocial behaviors. The factors are positively correlated (ranging from .20 to .40, depending on the sample). The factor structure is virtually invariant across gender, age, and educational level. Participants used a 5-point scale to respond to the PSB items. Cronbach's alphas for the two factors were .82 and .72, respectively.

Motives for OCBs. The 30-item CMS, described in Study 1, was administered to participants. The respondents were given a description of OCB and asked to rate, using a 6-point scale, how important each of the 30 motives would be in their decision to engage in this behavior. As we discussed earlier, the scale contains three correlated but distinct subscales: PV, OC, and IM. Cronbach's alphas for the subscales were .88, .93, and .89, respectively.

OCB. OCB was measured using a scale developed by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990). We selected this scale because it has been used in several previous studies of OCB. It contains five subscales that purport to measure the five aspects of OCB proposed by Organ (1988): altruism—helping behaviors directed at specific individuals, conscientiousness—doing things that benefit the organization (e.g., being punctual, obeying rules), 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. It is generally agreed that altruism and courtesy concern OCBs directed at individuals (i.e., altruism) and the other subscales concern OCBs directed at the organization (i.e., conscientiousness). The OCB scale contains 24 items and uses a 5-point response format. Subscale scores are the simple sum of the relevant items.

To obtain independent ratings of each employee's OCB, we gave this scale to the target employees, two of their peers, and one supervisor; all of whom rated the target employee. The instructions and the wording of the items were changed to reflect the different perspectives of the three kinds of raters. The time frame for the ratings was the employee's behavior over the past week. In the self-ratings, the Cronbach's alphas for the three OCB subscales were less than .70: .60 for Sportsmanship, .65 for Courtesy, and .69 for Conscientiousness; the other alphas were .71 or higher. The subscales' alphas ranged from .74 to .86 in the peer ratings and from .80 to .87 in the supervisor ratings. The self-ratings of OCB were significantly correlated with peer ratings on four of the five subscales, and the average convergent correlation was .26. They were also significantly correlated with supervisor ratings on four of the five subscales; the average convergent correlation was .22. All five of the peer and supervisor subscale ratings were significantly correlated; the average convergent correlation was .38.³

Procedure

Participants were recruited through mail solicitations and personal visits. Employees who initially agreed to participate in the study received a packet of questionnaires. Each packet contained the following items: (a) the five self-report questionnaires (described above in the Method section) that were completed by the participant (to control for possible order effects, half of the participants were asked to complete the CMS before the OCB questionnaire, and the other half were asked to complete the CMS after the

³ A direct product model (Browne, 1989) was used to examine the latent structure underlying the matrix of raters and OCB subscales. The best fitting model indicated moderate convergent validity across the rating sources but a relative lack of discriminant validity of the OCB subscales within rating sources. Despite the discriminant validity problem, the separate subscales of the OCB measure were used in the analyses because of the relatively widespread acceptance of this conceptualization of the different aspects of OCB. Caution should be exercised, however, in interpreting the different regression analyses for the different OCB subscales.

OCB questionnaire⁴), (b) two OCB rating forms to be completed by peers of the participant, and (c) one OCB rating form to be completed by a supervisor of the participant. Participants were assured that all of these data would be anonymous and that no one in the organization would have access to them. To achieve this anonymity, each form in the packet was assigned a unique code number known only to Sheila M. Rioux and the participant.

After the participants completed the self-report measures, they asked two coworkers with whom they had regular contact and their immediate supervisor to complete the appropriate OCB rating form. To make it clear to the peers and supervisors whom they were rating, the participants wrote their names on a "post-it" note and placed it on the rating forms they distributed. After completing the questionnaires, all individuals (participants, peers, and supervisors), removed the post-it notes from the questionnaires, placed them in sealed envelopes, and returned the sealed envelopes to a central office in the organization through interoffice mail. Memos were periodically distributed to participants indicating what forms the researcher had received for each code number. The data were collected over a 6-week period.

Results

Psychometric Properties of the CMS

The factor structure and the individual factor loadings were virtually identical to those obtained with the student samples in Study 1. The coefficients of congruence between the solutions from the student and the worker samples were .97 for all three factors. The pattern of correlations among the factors was also similar to the pattern found in the student samples. None of the subscale means in the two samples differed by more than 3 points. However, relative to the student sample, the OC and PV means were significantly higher, and the IM mean was significantly lower.

Motives and OCB

Self-ratings. Before considering motives and OCB, we briefly discuss the intercorrelations among the predictor variables (i.e., procedural justice, prosocial personality, mood, and motives). These correlations provide data that speak to the construct validity of the CMS independent of its relationship with OCB. We expected that OC motives would correlate more strongly than the other two motives with variables that concerned affective reactions to the organization, such as organizational justice and mood. In contrast, PV motives would correlate more strongly with the prosocial personality measure. For the most part, these expectations were supported. The correlations between OC motives and procedural justice (.44) and mood (.49) were significant and higher than the correlations between either PV motives and these variables (.24 and .21) or IM motives and the same variables (.07 and .12). The correlations between PV motives and the other-oriented empathy and helpfulness dimensions of the PSB (.46 and .31, respectively) were also significant and higher than the comparable correlations for the OC motives (.27 and .02) and the IM motives (−.02 and .00). The only nonsignificant difference was PV–other-oriented empathy versus OC–other-oriented empathy.⁵

Turning to OCB, significant correlations were obtained between procedural justice and two of the OCB measure's subscales (Altruism and Sportsmanship); mood correlated significantly with all of the subscales except Conscientiousness. Other-oriented empa-

thy and helpfulness correlated significantly with the Altruism and Courtesy subscales of OCB. Other-oriented empathy also correlated significantly with the Conscientiousness and Civic Virtue subscales.

The first hypothesis was that the motives would differentially correlate with OCB dimensions. There were significant correlations between PV motives and Altruism (.44) and Courtesy (.43; both altruism-related OCB subscales). As we expected, these correlations were significantly higher than those between PV and Conscientiousness (.13) and Sportsmanship (.03; both conscientiousness-related OCB subscales). However, contrary to the hypotheses, there was a significant correlation (.27) between PV motives and Civic Virtue (another conscientiousness-related subscale). OC motives correlated significantly with Civic Virtue (.55) and Sportsmanship (.25). The OC motives–Civic Virtue correlation was significantly higher than the PV motives–Civic Virtue correlation. However, OC motives also correlated significantly with Altruism (.32) and Courtesy (.25). (The unexpected findings are addressed below.)

The other major hypothesis was that the motives would account for unique variance in the OCB dimensions. To test this hypothesis, we carried out hierarchical linear regressions in which the criterion variables were the five OCB subscales and the predictors were procedural justice, distributive justice, mood, the two factors of the prosocial personality measure, and the three motives, entered last (PV, followed by OC and IM). PV motives accounted for significant amounts of unique variance in the regressions involving Altruism and Courtesy (both ΔR^2 s = .06). However, they also accounted for significant variance in a conscientiousness-related subscale, Civic Virtue (ΔR^2 = .03). OC motives accounted for unique variance in Civic Virtue (ΔR^2 = .13). IM motives accounted for significant variance in Sportsmanship (ΔR^2 = .04). None of the motives (or any other predictors) had significant regression weights on the Conscientiousness subscale.

These results of correlational and regression analyses were generally consistent with the hypothesis about how the motives would map onto the OCB dimensions. However, an unexpected finding was that PV motives correlated significantly with Civic Virtue and OC motives correlated significantly with Altruism and Courtesy. Also in the regression analysis, PV motives accounted for significant variance in Civic Virtue. To better understand these findings, we carried out additional analyses in which the substantial correlation (.57) between the PV and OC subscales was partialled out from these variables' relationships with OCB. Specifically, two hierarchical multiple regressions, using only motives, were performed on each of the OCB measure's subscales. In one, PV motives were entered before OC motives; in the other, this order was reversed. (IM motives were always entered last.) Whether entered first or second, PV motives accounted for significant amounts of variance in the Altruism subscale (ΔR^2 s = .19 and .10). OC motives accounted for significant variance in this subscale only when they were entered before the PV motives.

⁴ The order of presentation had no effect on scores on these measures; therefore, the two versions of these questionnaires were combined in the subsequent data analyses.

⁵ A *t* test for dependent correlations was used to compare these correlations.

Turning to Civic Virtue (a conscientiousness-related subscale), OC motives accounted for significant variance irrespective of the order in which they were entered (ΔR^2 s = .31 and .24). However, PV motives accounted for significant variance in Civic Virtue only when they were entered before OC motives.

Peer ratings. Two peers rated 135 of the participants on OCB. Eighty-seven percent of the peers had worked with the target person for at least 1 year, and 86% said that they had observed the target person at least 10 times in the past week. Averaged peer ratings were used in the analyses of this rating source. The correlations involving peer ratings of OCB are presented in Table 2. Procedural justice correlated significantly with all of the OCB subscales except Courtesy, and distributive justice and mood correlated significantly with Sportsmanship (r s = .17 and .22, respectively).

The PV motives–Altruism correlation (.24) was significantly higher than the PV motives–Conscientiousness (–.04) and PV motives–Sportsmanship (.11) correlations but did not differ from the PV motives–Civic Virtue correlation (.23). The OC motives correlated significantly with Civic Virtue (.34) and Sportsmanship (.24). The OC motives–Civic Virtue correlation was significantly higher than the OC motives–Altruism (.08) and OC motives–Courtesy (.05) correlations and nonsignificantly larger than the PV motives–Sportsmanship (.11) correlation. No significant correlations were found for the IM motives.

The peer ratings on the five OCB subscales were regressed onto the predictor variables in hierarchical regressions, with the motives entered last (see Table 3). Three of the five multiple regressions (Altruism, Civic Virtue, and Sportsmanship) yielded a significant R^2 . Again, the PV motives accounted for significant amounts of variance in the prediction of Altruism and Civic Virtue. The OC motives accounted for significant amounts of unique variance in Civic Virtue, and the IM motives accounted for significant amounts of unique variance in Sportsmanship.

Regression analyses were again used to partial out the covariation between PV and OC motives from their relationships with the OCB subscales. The unexpected significant relationship between PV motives and Civic Virtue disappeared when PV motives were entered after OC motives, but irrespective of the order in which OC motives were entered, they accounted for significant variance in Civic Virtue.

Supervisor ratings. Supervisors rated 135 participants on OCB. Procedural justice correlated significantly with Sportsmanship (r = .21), and mood correlated significantly with Conscientiousness (r = .19). The PV motives correlated significantly (.21) with Altruism; this correlation was nonsignificantly larger than the correlations involving PV motives and Conscientiousness (.16), Civic Virtue (.17), and Sportsmanship (.14). As we predicted, the OC motives correlated significantly with the Conscientiousness, Civic Virtue, and Sportsmanship subscales (r s = .25, .25, and .20, respectively). The first two correlations were significantly greater than the OC motives–Courtesy correlation (.03). None of the correlations involving IM motives were significant. None of the hierarchical regressions were significant. However, when entered into the regression, OC motives produced a significant increment in the variance accounted for in Civic Virtue (ΔR^2 = .04).

The regressions conducted only on the motives explicated the relationships between them and the OCB subscales. PV motives accounted for unique variance in Altruism irrespective of the order

Table 2
Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Intercorrelations for Peer Ratings of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Procedural justice	(.89)												
2. Distributive justice	.39**	(.94)											
3. Positive mood	.36**	.20*	(.92)										
4. Other-oriented empathy	.16	–.02	.32**	(.82)									
5. Helpfulness	–.01	–.01	.23**	.36**	(.72)								
6. Prosocial values	.24**	.07	.21*	.46**	.31**	(.88)							
7. Organizational commitment	.44**	.15	.49**	.27**	.02	.57**	(.93)						
8. Impression management	.07	.06	.12	–.02	.00	.34**	.31**	(.89)					
9. Altruism	.24**	.14	.11	.05	.00	.24**	.14	–.03	(.85)				
10. Conscientiousness	.18*	–.04	–.02	–.05	–.16	–.04	.08	.02	.43**	(.74)			
11. Civic virtue	.17*	.00	.16	.06	.08	.23**	.34**	.02	.56**	.45**	(.86)		
12. Courtesy	.14	.03	.08	.03	–.06	.08	.05	.00	.73**	.65**	.60**	(.76)	
13. Sportsmanship	.27**	.17*	.22*	–.04	–.15	.11	.24**	–.05	.33**	.24**	.29**	.35**	(.78)
<i>M</i>	22.76	19.59	20.01	81.04	35.57	44.53	43.42	29.53	12.08	17.96	19.55	19.36	26.09
<i>SD</i>	5.75	5.93	5.33	11.61	8.33	7.16	8.65	10.33	1.86	3.64	3.07	3.06	2.72

Note. N = 130. Reliability coefficients appear in parentheses along the diagonal.
* p < .05. ** p < .01.

Table 3
Hierarchical Regressions for Peer Ratings of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Variable entered	R^2	Altruism	Conscientiousness	Civic virtue	Courtesy	Sportsmanship
Prosocial personality						
Other-oriented empathy	R^2	.0023	.0045	.0045	.0001	.0010
Helpfulness	R^2	.0024	.0389	.0135	.0032	.0232
	ΔR^2	.0001	.0344*	.0090	.0031	.0222
Organizational justice						
Distributive justice	R^2	.0272	.0434	.0147	.0033	.0575
	ΔR^2	.0248	.0045	.0012	.0001	.0343*
Procedural justice	R^2	.0783	.0885*	.0345	.0149	.1154*
	ΔR^2	.0511*	.0451*	.0198	.0116	.0579*
Positive mood	R^2	.0792	.0940	.0498	.0187	.1618*
	ΔR^2	.0009	.0055	.0153	.0038	.0464*
Motives						
Prosocial values	R^2	.1334*	.0942	.1055*	.0292	.1783*
	ΔR^2	.0542*	.0002	.0557*	.0105	.0165
Organizational commitment	R^2	.1525*	.0967	.1372*	.0452	.1787*
	ΔR^2	.0191	.0025	.0317*	.0160	.0004
Impression management	R^2	.1718*	.0984*	.1497*	.0498	.2146*
	ΔR^2	.0193	.0017	.0125	.0046	.0359*

Note. ΔR^2 is the value at the point when the variable was entered into the regression equation. Variables were entered into the regression equations in the order in which they appear in this table.

* $p < .05$.

in which they were entered (both ΔR^2 s = .04). However, the relationships between PV motives and Conscientiousness, Civic Virtue, and Sportsmanship (i.e., conscientiousness-related subscales) dropped to near zero when PV motives were entered after OC motives. OC motives accounted for significant variance in Conscientiousness and Civic Virtue irrespective of whether they were entered first or second (ΔR^2 s = .06 and .04 for Conscientiousness; ΔR^2 s = .06 and .03 for Civic Virtue).

Discussion

In the interest of brevity, we forgo any detailed discussion of the psychometric properties of the motives measure. Suffice it to say that the CMS has a stable and replicable three-factor structure and appears to have acceptable internal and test-retest reliabilities. Although the motives measured in the CMS were empirically rather than "rationally" derived, they overlapped considerably with other conceptualizations of the reasons why workers might engage in OCB (e.g., Bolino, 1999; Ferris, Judge, Rowland, & Fitzgibbons, 1994). However, these motives may be more complex than earlier motive-based approaches suggested. For example, PV motives involve the need to be a helpful individual (value expression) and the need to be accepted and to interact smoothly with one's peers (social adjustment). OC motives also appear to have two interrelated components: a desire to help the organization because one identifies with and takes pride in the organization and because it is seen as being committed to one's welfare. IM motives appear to involve a desire to maintain a positive image and to avoid creating a negative one. Independent evidence of this interpretation comes from Forde (2000), who administered the CMS along with the IM portion of Paulhus's (1998) Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (Version 7) to a sample of working college students. The correlations between PV and OC motives and IM were $-.05$ and $.18$, respectively (n s); IM motives correlated $-.42$

(.01) with IM. That is, lower scores on the IM subscale were associated with more concern with IM.

Although the PV and OC subscales of the CMS were strongly related, there are good reasons to believe that they tap distinct constructs. First, in all of the factor analyses, the individual items loaded "cleanly" and consistently on the two factors. Thus, at the individual item level, the subscales were quite distinct. Second, in Study 2, the two subscales had different patterns of intercorrelations with other predictor variables and were differentially correlated with the Altruism and Conscientiousness subscales of OCB. Finally, Forde (2000) found that whereas the OC motive was significantly correlated with measures of affective commitment to the organization and perceived organizational support (r s = .38 and .40), the PV value was not (r s = .02 and .04). Thus, there is a consistent pattern of convergent and divergent correlations that suggests the two factors concern different constructs.

Why then are the factors so strongly intercorrelated? We would tentatively propose that although the constructs are distinct, they share certain important commonalities. A critical one is concern about the well-being of another entity and a desire to be helpful and cooperative. Thus, both PV and OC motives may be, at least partially, what Clary et al. (1998) called "value-expressive" motives; that is, the person is motivated by the values that he or she holds.

This study was driven by the premise that people often choose to engage in OCB because it meets certain needs for them. We hypothesized that if such motives were measured, they would show a theoretically coherent pattern of correlations with the relevant dimensions of OCB. We also expected that motives would account for significant amounts of unique variance in OCB. These hypotheses were generally supported. Considering first the zero-order correlations, overall, the strongest relationship for PV motives was with the Altruism dimension of OCB; the strongest

relationship for OC motives was with the Conscientiousness dimension. Furthermore, the PV motives–Altruism dimension correlations were invariably higher than the OC motives–Altruism dimension correlations, and the PV motives–Conscientiousness dimension correlations were invariably lower than the significant OC motives–Conscientiousness correlations. In some instances, significant associations were found between PV motives and conscientiousness-related subscales and between OC motives and altruism-related subscales. However, when OC motives were partialled out of the former relationships, they became nonsignificant; and when PV motives were partialled out of the latter relationships, they also became nonsignificant. In other words, across all three rating sources, the PV and OC motives cleanly “mapped onto” the relevant OCB dimensions. Thus, it seems reasonable to argue that OCB is, at least in part, a proactive behavior driven by motives.

There were no significant correlations between IM motives and either of the OCB dimensions. The significant negative correlation between the trait of IM and scores on the IM subscale (Forde, 2000) may partially explain these null results. Specifically, responses to this subscale may have been suppressed by a desire to avoid presenting oneself in a negative light. Indeed, the respondents who may have been the most likely to use OCB to manage impressions may have been the least likely to endorse the IM items.

Despite this potential problem, when IM motives were entered last into the hierarchical regressions, they added significant amounts of variance in both the self-ratings and the peer ratings of Sportsmanship, suggesting a cooperative suppression effect. At present, we cannot explain why this occurred. The three subscales were substantially intercorrelated, and, as Pedhazur (1997) noted, in such instances it is often difficult to understand at a theoretical or conceptual level why suppressor effects occur. It is clear that additional research is needed to further explore what role, if any, IM motives, alone or in combination with other motives, might have in OCB. Furthermore, it is certain that it would be premature to rule out IM motives as a cause of OCB.

The final issue to be considered is whether these motives represent enduring dispositions or transitory reactions to organizational practices. We would argue that PV motives may well reflect an enduring disposition. Recall that the strongest correlate of PV motives was the other-oriented empathy dimension of the PSB. This correlation was much higher than the correlations between PV motives and the measures of organizational justice and mood. Very similar correlations have been obtained in other studies that have used the CMS and the PSB (Forde, 2000; Tillman, 1998). These patterns of strong intercorrelations between PV motives and an enduring personality characteristic suggest that it may be a relatively stable aspect of a person's disposition and would not vary substantially from one job setting to another. In contrast, OC may be a less enduring and more modifiable motive, which is influenced by an employee's thoughts and feelings about the organization. In support of this conclusion are the consistently strong intercorrelations between scores on the OC subscale and measures of organizational justice, organizational commitment, and perceived organizational support. We do not believe, however, that the OC motive is a surrogate for such thoughts and feelings about the organization. Rather, it may moderate the relationship between them and OCB. For example, Tillman found that the

relationship between organizational justice and OCB differed as a function of the strength of OC motives.

There are, of course, some limitations in this study. One limitation is the samples that were used. It is clear that before definite judgments on the role of motives in OCB are made, these findings need to be replicated in other settings with other samples. Another practical concern is the IM subscale. At this time, its value in the prediction of OCB is limited. One reason may be the transparency of the items, but we are currently exploring another possibility. Namely, the manner in which the IM subscale is constructed and/or scored may fail to distinguish between IM that is “acquisitive” (i.e., intended to get something from others) and that which is “self-protective” (i.e., intended to avoid negative evaluations; Gangstead & Snyder, 2000). When these two kinds of IM motives are separated, a clearer relationship between IM motives and OCB may emerge.

Despite these limitations, the results of this study lend substantial support to the argument that motives play an important role in OCB. Thus, we would argue, as did Folger (1993), that individuals consciously choose to engage in OCB because such actions meet their own needs and enable them to attain desired outcomes.

The results also suggest that a functional approach to OCB may help organizations increase the incidence of this class of behaviors. More specifically, because the PV motive appears to be an enduring personal attribute, it may be possible to select for individuals who are motivated to help their coworkers. In contrast, the OC motive appears to be more situationally determined, and, thus, if an organization wishes to increase the level of this motive among its employees, it may need to engage in actions that evoke this motive.

Of course, the success of such strategies is an empirical question, and it remains for subsequent research to determine the practical value of a motivational approach to OCB. We would argue, however, that the results of the present study suggest that such an effort might further our understanding of OCB and increase its frequency among employees of large organizations.

References

- Allen, T. D. (1998, November). *Mentoring others: An investigation of linkages between personality, motives, willingness, and protege evaluation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Management Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Allen, T. D. (1999, April). *Mentoring others: Mentor dispositions and desired protege characteristics*. Paper presented at the 14th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.
- Bolino, M. C. (1999). Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors? *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 82–98.
- Borman, W. C., & Penner, L. A. (2001). Citizenship performance: Its nature, antecedents, and motives. In B. W. Roberts & R. Hogan (Eds.), *Personality psychology in the workplace* (pp. 45–61). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T. D., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2001). Personality predictors of citizenship performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 52–69.
- Brief, A. P., Burke, M. J., George, J. M., Robinson, B., & Webster, J. (1988). Should negative affectivity remain an unmeasured variable in the study of job stress? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 193–198.
- Browne, M. W. (1989). Relationships between an additive model and a multiplicative model for multitrait–multimethod matrices. In R. Coppi &

- S. Bolasco (Eds.), *Multitway data analysis* (pp. 507–520). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- Clary, E. G., & Orenstein, L. (1991). The amount and effectiveness of help: The relationship of motives and abilities to helping behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*, 58–64.
- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R., Copeland, J., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 1516–1530.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO PI-R professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Facteau, J., Allen, T. D., Facteau, C. L., Bordas, R. M., & Tears, R. S. (2000, April). *Structured interviews 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.
- Ferris, G. R., Judge, T. A., Rowland, K. M., & Fitzgibbons, D. E. (1994). Subordinate influence and the performance evaluation process: Test of the model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *58*, 101–135.
- Folger, R. (1993). Justice, motivation, and performance beyond role requirements. *Employee Responsibility and Rights Journal*, *6*, 239–248.
- Forde, D. S. (2000). *Correlates of organizational behavior motives*. Honors thesis, University of South Florida.
- Gangstead, S. W., & Snyder, M. (2000). Self-monitoring: Appraisal and reappraisal. *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*, 530–555.
- George, J. M. (1991). State or trait: The effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *76*, 299–307.
- Harman, H. H. (1976). *Modern factor analysis* (3rd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, *9*, 131–133.
- Midili, A. R., & Penner, L. A. (1995, August). *Dispositional and environmental influences on organizational citizenship behavior*. Paper presented at the 103rd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, New York, NY.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *76*, 845–855.
- Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of an employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*, 1543–1567.
- Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmitt, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, *10*, 71–84.
- Omoto, A., & Snyder, M. (1995). Sustained helping without obligation: Motivation, longevity of service, and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *68*, 671–687.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, *48*, 775–802.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1998). *Paulhus Deception Scales: Manual for the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding* (Version 7). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Pedhazur, E. J. (1997). *Multiple regression in behavioral research* (3rd ed.). Ft. Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.
- Penner, L. A., & Finkelstein, M. A. (1998). Dispositional and structural determinants of volunteerism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 525–537.
- Penner, L. A., Fritzsche, B. A., Craiger, J. P., & Freifeld, T. R. (1995). Measuring the prosocial personality. In J. Butcher & C. D. Spielberger (Eds.), *Advances in personality assessment* (Vol. 10, pp. 147–164). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Penner, L. A., Midili, A. R., & Kegelmeyer, J. (1997). Beyond job attitudes: A personality and social psychology perspective on the causes of organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Performance*, *10*, 111–132.
- 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 behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, *1*, 107–142.
- Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1986). *The handbook of organizational measurement*. Marshfield, MA: Pittman.
- Rummel, R. J. (1970). *Applied factor analysis*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68*, 653–663.
- Snyder, M. (1993). Basic research and practice problems: The promise of a "functional" personality and social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *19*, 251–264.
- Tillman, P. (1998). *In search of moderators of the relationship between predictors of organizational citizenship behavior and organizational citizen behavior: The search for motives*. Master's thesis, University of South Florida.
- Van Scotter, J. R., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*, 525–531.

Received February 25, 2000

Revision received February 27, 2001

Accepted February 28, 2001 ■