

WORK MOTIVATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIORS

A Field Study

JOHN E. BARBUTO JR. AND JOANA S. P. STORY

This study tested the relationship between employees' sources of work motivation and their display of organizational citizenship behaviors. Two hundred thirty-nine employees from 38 locations of four companies in the agricultural industry completed the Motivation Sources Inventory and were rated by their leaders in organizational citizenship behaviors. Results showed significant positive relationships between individuals' self-concept internal motivations and organizational citizenship behaviors. Results also showed significant negative relationships between instrumental and self-concept external motivations and organizational citizenship behaviors. A hierarchical regression with each of the significant covariates accounted for 12% of the total variance in organizational citizenship behavior. These results indicate that employees' sources of motivation offer some explanation of their organizational citizenship behaviors. Implications for future research and practice are discussed.

Introduction

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and its effects on individual and organizational performance has been the subject of extensive research over the past 25 years (Bateman & Organ, 1983; LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002; O'Brien & Allen, 2008). Organizational citizenship behaviors are widely considered positive behaviors, but their antecedents are less known. Those few studies that have examined antecedents have tested characteristics

such as conscientiousness (Organ & Lingl, 1995), agreeableness (Neuman & Kickul, 1998), need for achievement (Neuman & Kickul, 1998), organizational-based self-esteem (Tang & Ibrahim, 1998), emotional intelligence (Carmeli & Josman, 2006), and motives (Finkelstein, 2006). Organ (1997) called for increased research of the predictors of OCB, specifying that employee motives may offer empirical explanation of the phenomenon. Because employees' motives may guide

their behaviors, their motives may also guide their discretionary, nontask behaviors. While some studies have examined motives as a predictor of OCB, content theories of work motivation have not been researched, except for one study (Barbuto, Brown, Wheeler, & Wilhite, 2003).

Leonard, Beauvais, and Scholl (1999) proposed an integrative typology of work motivation, incorporating self-concept-based processes. Barbuto and Scholl (1998, 1999) operationalized this typology and used it to predict behavior of leaders. Subsequent work used the inventory to predict influence tactics and transformational leadership (Barbuto, Fritz, & Marx, 2000, 2002). Most studies of work motivation have focused on supervisory behaviors, so using it to predict employee behavior is a necessary progression. Barbuto et al. (2003) used the taxonomy in a preliminary examination of OCB, but findings were limited due to sample size and psychometric issues. The modest results reported required replication with a larger sample size and an updated work motivation measure. This article tests the relationship between employees' sources of motivation and their organizational citizenship behaviors.

Motivation and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

ANTECEDENTS OF OCB

Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) introduced OCB as discretionary individual behavior not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, which, in the aggregate, promoted the effective functioning of the organization. This concept was similar to Katz and Kahn's (1978) description of extra-role performance and shared some basic tenets with notions of performance beyond expectations, as described in the transformational leadership literature (see Bass, 1990).

Seminal research conducted testing the antecedents of OCB reported that job satisfaction was the best predictor (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983). However, many scholars have argued that job satisfaction was too broad of a construct for the accurate prediction of OCB (Deluga, 1994, 1995; Penner, Midili, & Kegelmeyer, 1997). The search for other reliable predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors has led

to studies of *personality* (Organ, 1990, 1994; Organ & Lingl, 1995; Penner et al., 1997), *job satisfaction* (Moorman, 1993), *employee attitudes* (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, & Bommer, 1996), *employee role perceptions* (Podsakoff et al., 1996), *procedural justice* (Aquino, 1995; Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997; Schappe, 1998; Skarlicki & Latham, 1996), *leadership characteristics* (Deluga, 1994, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 1996), *interview styles* (Latham & Skarlicki, 1995), *psychological capital* (Zhong, 2007), *locus of control* (Barbuto & Bugenhagen, 2006), and *motivation theories* (Barbuto et al., 2003; Finkelstein & Penner, 2004; Kemery, Bedeian, & Zacur, 1996; Rioux & Penner, 2001; Tang & Ibrahim, 1998).

Organ (1994) used the Big Five personality taxonomy in an unsuccessful attempt to predict OCB and concluded "the possible limitation with measures based on the Big Five is that they [personality dimensions] have more to do with temperament than motives" (p. 475).

Kemery et al. (1996) examined expectancy theory of motivation to predict organizational citizenship behaviors. Results supported the decision-making process explicated by expectancy theory and demonstrated some shared variance with OCB, which contributed significantly to understanding the motivation process of OCB. However, expectancy theory is a process-based model, so the content (sources) of motivation was not tested.

Tang and Ibrahim (1998) examined the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic antecedents of OCB for 155 American and 378 Middle Eastern workers and reported that organization-based self-esteem, need for achievement, and intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction were related to OCB altruism. However, because motivation was examined using an "à la carte" approach, results were difficult to interpret collectively. A suitable content-based motivation theory needs to be tested with organizational citizenship behaviors using stronger psychometric and design properties.

Penner and colleagues (Finkelstein & Penner, 2004; Rioux & Penner, 2001) identified three motives for OCB. Organizational concern motives were related to an individual's desire to help the organization that stems from pride and organizational identification. Prosocial values motives were related to an individual's desire to help peers and be socially accepted. Impression management motives were related to an individual's desire to be perceived as helpful in order to acquire or keep certain

rewards. Organizational concern and prosocial values motives correlated with OCB whereas impression management motives showed differing results. Although their research moved the field further and generated new dialogue, the motives used did not incorporate established content theories of work motivation.

Barbuto et al. (2003) examined a content-based motivation theory and found several significant relationships between employees' specific sources of motivation and their use of OCBs. They called for more research recommending a larger sample size and stronger psychometrics.

Becker and O'Hair (2007) investigated a relationship between Machiavellianism and OCB. Machiavellianism was defined as a predisposition toward manipulative behavior. Results reported a negative relationship between Machiavellianism and OCB and organizational concern and prosocial values motives, and a positive relationship between Machiavellianism and impression management motives.

SOURCES OF WORK MOTIVATION

Most content-based motivation theories are based on Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of needs: *physiological*, *safety*, *love*, *esteem*, and *self-actualization*. Empirical work has generally not supported any of the major tenets of Maslow's needs (see Alderfer, 1969). The most accepted and applied taxonomy of work-related motivation is the trichotomy developed and operationalized by McClelland (1961, 1985). Despite its general acceptance and use, the trichotomy and its measures (TAT) were widely criticized on the basis of both theoretical and measurement issues (see Barbuto & Scholl, 1998; Harrell & Stahl, 1981). McClelland's three needs—power, affiliation, and achievement—do not include other salient work motives, such as task enjoyment and adherence to principles and values. Subsequent research found that these missing aspects of motivation offer predicting value (Barbuto et al., 2000, 2002).

Leonard et al. (1999) drew from existing literature and proposed an integrative typology of motivation consisting of five sources: *intrinsic process*, *instrumental*, *self-concept external*, *self-concept internal*, and *goal internalization*. This typology was operationalized with subscales to measure the five sources of motivation (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998) and used to predict leaders'

influencing behaviors (Barbuto & Scholl, 1999; Barbuto et al., 2002) and leaders' transformational leadership behaviors (Barbuto et al., 2000). The meta-theory was used in a conceptual framework discerning followership behavior and compliance (Barbuto, 2000). The Motivation Sources Inventory better predicted both influence tactics and transformational leadership than did McClelland's trichotomy of needs (Barbuto et al., 2000, 2002).

Intrinsic Process Motivation

Intrinsic process motivation is derived from the sheer enjoyment of performing a task where the work itself acted as the incentive, because workers enjoyed what they were doing (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998). This motive also has been articulated as intrinsic motivation to obtain task pleasure (Deci, 1975) and intrinsic task motivation devoid of any external controls or rewards (Staw, 1976). This motive differs from the classic *intrinsic* or internal motivation seen in the literature; intrinsic process motivation was derived from immediate internal gratification, but classic definitions of intrinsic motives described internal challenge and achievement outcomes (Deci).

Instrumental Motivation

Instrumental motivation was derived from tangible rewards. Instrumental motivation integrated Etzioni's (1961) *alienative* and *calculative involvement*, Barnard's (1938) *exchange theory*, and Katz and Kahn's (1978) *legal compliance* and *external rewards*. Instrumental motivation was distinguished from the classic *extrinsic* or external motivation as this motive was derived from tangible external rewards, whereas *extrinsic* motivation depended upon social rewards like praise and public recognition.

Self-Concept External Motivation

Self-concept external motivation is derived from one's desire for affirmation of traits, competencies, and values (Leonard et al., 1999). The ideal self was adopted from role expectations of reference groups. It was characterized by seeking to satisfy reference group members, first to gain acceptance, and then status. This source of motivation was similar to Etzioni's (1961) social moral involvement; extrinsic interpersonal motivation described

by Deci (1975) and Staw (1976); and Barnard's (1938) social inducements, conformity to group attitudes, and communion. Classic articulations of extrinsic motivation included social rewards or social exchanges in its framework (Deci).

Self-Concept Internal Motivation

Self-concept internal motivation was derived from one's desire to satisfy and reinforce his or her self perception of traits, competencies, and values (Leonard et al., 1999). Those motivated in this way set internal standards for traits, competencies, and values that become the basis for the ideal self. This motive was operational in individuals who are motivated to engage in behaviors that reinforce these personal standards and later achieve higher levels of competency. It has been described in other works as intrinsic motivation to overcome challenges (Deci, 1975) and as personal achievement (Staw, 1976).

Goal Internalization Motivation

Goal internalization motivation was derived from a need to believe in the cause or purpose of the organization (Leonard et al., 1999). It is different from the previous four sources because it represents the absence of self-interest (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998). However, high goal internalization does not necessarily mean that an individual agrees with an organization's mission. Goal internalization described the relative importance of the cause or mission, but not the extent to which value congruence existed.

MOTIVATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

Researchers have suggested that an individual's motivation was significantly related to his or her organizational citizenship behaviors (Finkelstein & Penner, 2004; Rioux & Penner, 2001; Tang & Ibrahim, 1998). Tang and Ibrahim (1998) noted statistically significant relationships between achievement motivation and organizational citizenship behavior. Penner and colleagues (Finkelstein & Penner; Rioux & Penner) reported statistically significant relationships between organizational concern and prosocial values motives and OCB. However, the strong correlations reported in the above mentioned studies may have been subjected to common

method variance due to single-source bias, which may have inflated the relationships. Other research also reported significant relationships between sources of motivation and leaders' behaviors (Barbuto & Scholl, 1999; Barbuto et al., 2000). These studies reported significant relationships among sources of motivation and leader-used influence tactics, transformational leadership behaviors, and follower compliance. The magnitude of these studies ranged from 3% to 12% of explained variance. Allen and Rush (1998) reported that leaders relied on their perceptions of followers' motives to rate employees' organizational citizenship behaviors. Thus, it is expected that employee's sources of motivation will have a significant relationship with their OCBs.

Many scholars considered OCB to be composed of conceptually distinct behavioral dimensions. However, a meta-analysis reported that the OCBs conceptualized by Organ (1998) were highly correlated to one another and that there was no apparent variation in relationships with the most popular set of antecedents of OCB (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). Furthermore, LePine et al. (2002) suggested that the score of OCB would be the aggregate score of the behavioral activities measured.

Individuals high in *intrinsic process motivation* participate in activities they enjoy and that also create pleasant working environments. On the surface, workers seeking enjoyable work conditions are more likely to assist others and create a helping work climate. However, this logic narrowly assumes that workers motivated by intrinsic process find organizational citizenship behaviors "fun." No research or conceptual representation of OCB leads to an anticipated relationship between intrinsic process motivation and OCB (no hypothesis).

Individuals high in *instrumental motivation* are likely to be enticed to participate in formally rewarded activities. They typically perform tasks and demonstrate behaviors to gain tangible rewards such as pay increases, promotions, and other added benefits (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998). Since organizational citizenship behaviors are not formally rewarded, it can be expected that instrumental motivation will have a negative relationship with organizational citizenship behaviors. However, Organ (1997) and others have debated the degree to which rewards motivate OCB performance. Research has suggested that employees use even indirect and

informal beliefs about future rewards in their decisions to engage in certain organizational citizenship behaviors. Thus, OCBs could be considered in larger contexts, such as performance reviews, future raises, or other settings in which reward decisions are made. However, Deci, Koestner, and Ryan (1999) conducted a meta-analysis examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. They reported that tangible rewards significantly undermined free-choice intrinsic motivation. Torlak and Koc (2007) reported that materialistic attitude is negatively related to OCB. Furthermore, Barbuto et al. (2003) found a small negative relationship between instrumental motivation and OCB. Given the discussion and results of the research described earlier, a small negative relationship between instrumental motivation and OCB is expected.

Hypothesis 1: Employees' instrumental motivation will be negatively related to their organizational citizenship behaviors.

Individuals high in *self-concept external motivation* pursue activities likely to result in external attribution of their traits, competencies, and values. In earlier work, Barbuto and Scholl (1998) suggested similarities between self-concept external motivation and McClelland's (1961) need for affiliation. Tang and Ibrahim (1998) found no relationship between employees' need for affiliation and organizational citizenship behaviors. Barbuto et al. (2003) found a significant negative relationship between self-concept external motivation and OCB, but they were cautious in their interpretation because of statistical power issues. A negative relationship could be expected between self-concept external and OCB because this source requires some element of social reward or recognition for employees' efforts; OCBs are not formally rewarded by leaders or organizations. However, it could be reasoned that because this motive is associated with soliciting positive feedback and acceptance from others, helping others on the job may result from this motive. Bolino, Turnley, and Niehoff (2004) argued that OCBs may be self-serving behaviors because of the positive attributions and social rewards that are elicited from OCB. However, no studies have established that social recognition or social rewards are in place for those engaging in OCBs. The discussion and cited prior research informs expectations for a

small negative relationship between employees' self-concept external motivation and organizational citizenship behaviors.

Hypothesis 2: Employees' self-concept external motivation will be negatively related to their organizational citizenship behaviors.

Individuals high in *self-concept internal motivation* are motivated to meet personal standards and pursue activities requiring their unique skills. When persons engage in behavior consistent with their self-concept, they are more likely to hold themselves to a high standard of performance. If self-imposed standards reflect a strong work ethic, it would follow that activities on the job that help others or go beyond the adequate roles are more likely to occur among individuals with self-concept internal motivation. Conscientiousness is considered to be the best predictor of OCB among the Big Five personality dimensions (Organ, 1994). Individuals who score high in conscientiousness are considered reliable, self-disciplined, and dependable (Barrick & Mount, 1991). These are also characteristics that individuals who score high in self-concept internal motivation would be likely to have. Barbuto and Scholl (1998) suggested similarities between self-concept internal motivation and need for achievement. Neuman and Kickul (1998) found a positive significant relationship between value for achievement and five types of OCB. Tang and Ibrahim (1998) found a positive significant relationship between OCB and achievement motivation. A positive relationship between employees' self-concept internal motivation and their exhibition of organizational citizenship behavior is expected.

Hypothesis 3: Employees' self-concept internal motivation will be positively related to their organizational citizenship behaviors.

Individuals high in *goal internalization* emphasize principles and values and are more likely to seek congruence with organizational goals and missions. Finkelstein and Penner (2004) reported that OCB is strongly related to motives such as organizational concern and prosocial values. Tang and Ibrahim (1998) found organizational citizenship behavior to be related to intrinsic satisfaction (described similarly in concept to both self-concept internal and goal internalization motivation).

In their work, intrinsic satisfaction measured the extent to which deeply held values were satisfied; this differs from goal internalization, which measures only the extent to which these values and principles are sources of motivation for individuals. Finkelstein and Penner reported that organizational concern motives (desire to help the organization that stems from pride and identification that the individual has towards the organization) was positively related with OCBs. Thus, a small positive relationship between *goal-internalized* motivation and organizational citizenship behaviors is expected.

Hypothesis 4: Employees' goal-internalized motivation will be positively related to their organizational citizenship behaviors.

Methods

SUBJECTS

The data for this analysis were collected from 239 employees and their leaders from 38 branches of four businesses in the agricultural industry in Nebraska. Seventy-six percent of the employees were men; average tenure with the cooperatives exceeded seven years, and turnover rates were less than 5%. All were high school graduates, and a small percentage (19%) had earned college degrees. The average annual salary of employees was \$36,000. The sample could be best characterized as working middle class.

MEASURES

Sources of Motivation

The Motivation Sources Inventory (MSI; Barbuto, 2004) was used to measure each employee's five sources of motivation. The inventory consists of five six-item subscales measured on a seven-point Likert-type scale. An earlier version of this instrument has been used to predict leader influence tactics (Barbuto & Scholl, 1999) and transformational leadership behaviors (Barbuto et al., 2000). Sample items include: for intrinsic process motivation, "I only like to do things that are fun"; for instrumental motivation, "Job requirements will determine how hard I will work"; for self-concept external motivation, "It is important that others approve of my behavior"; for self-concept internal motivation, "Decisions I make will reflect high standards that I set for myself"; and for goal internalization motivation, "I would not work for a company if I didn't agree with its mission." In this study, the MSI produced reliability coefficient ranging from 0.71 to 0.91 (see Table 1).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

OCBs were measured using a modified version of the Organizational Citizenship Behavior instrument (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Modifications of this instrument have been used frequently and deemed necessary because the construct requires contextual examination (Pond, Nacoste, Mohr, & Rodriguez, 1997). Minor modifications were made to create the context

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, Scale Reliabilities, and Intercorrelations (N = 239)

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. OCB	18.62	3.32	(0.91)					
2. Intrinsic Process	22.92	5.41	-0.08	(0.76)				
3. Instrumental	23.41	5.22	-0.19 ^b	0.54 ^b	(0.71)			
4. SCE	20.74	5.15	-0.13 ^a	0.40 ^b	0.54 ^b	(0.74)		
5. SCI	27.03	4.55	0.26 ^b	0.07	0.05	0.18 ^a	(0.86)	
6. Goal Internal	19.46	5.89	0.09	0.51 ^b	0.38 ^b	0.35 ^b	0.31 ^b	(0.73)
7. Gender (male)	0.76	0.40	-0.05	-0.00	0.08	0.01	0.03	0.01

Note: $p < 0.05^a$, $p < 0.01^b$ (two-tailed test). SCE = Self-Concept External; SCI = Self-Concept Internal; Goal Internal = Goal Internalization.

for workers in the sampled industry, which was agriculturally based. These modifications included surveying via structured phone interviews. Past studies in the organizational citizenship behavior literature have used adaptations of Smith et al. (1983) and have been judged reliable and valid (Aquino, 1995; Schappe, 1998; Tang & Ibrahim, 1998). Similar to Schappe's (1998) measurement of OCB, this study included the following six items: "(this person) helps others who have been absent catch up"; "(this person) meets work deadlines no matter what it takes"; "(this person) performs more than just the required tasks at work"; "(this person) is absent from work only when absolutely necessary"; "(this person) assists others when they have heavy workloads"; "(this person) takes on greater responsibilities than colleagues while at work." The six questions were scored using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 to 4 (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree) and items were parceled (LePine et al., 2002). This produced a reliability coefficient of 0.91.

PROCEDURES

Cooperative leaders distributed the MSI to employees, and data were collected in person by the first author. Participation in the research was voluntary, but organizations provided an incentive to participate, allowing respondents to attend a professional presentation about the five sources of motivation at an off-site location approximately three weeks after the data were collected. Anonymity was protected by having each employee return the inventory directly to the first author. A response rate of 73% was achieved, which may be attributed to the professional development opportunity.

Data for the employees' organizational citizenship behaviors were collected from their leaders via structured phone interviews. A structured script was used to ensure uniformity of the data collection procedures. The researchers contacted the supervisor of each employee who completed the MSI to schedule a time to conduct the interview. At the scheduled time, the interviewer phoned the supervisor and asked him or her to assess the degree to which that employee exhibited organizational citizenship behaviors.

Leaders were guaranteed full confidentiality and were encouraged to ask questions and add comments. Research procedures were approved in collaboration with

the Institutional Review Board to ensure the fair treatment of human subjects. An executive summary of this study was provided for the executive board members of the companies who had granted permission to conduct the study. No individual scores were shared with any leaders.

Analysis and Results

RESULTS OF SIMPLE STATISTICS AND REGRESSION ANALYSIS

The testing of hypotheses 1–4 revealed some relationships. No relationships between intrinsic process motivation and organizational citizenship behaviors were found. Significant negative correlation was found between employees' *instrumental motivation* and OCB ($r = 0.19, p < 0.01$) (H1). *Self-concept external motivation* was negatively related to OCB ($r = -0.13, p < 0.05$) (H2). *Self-concept internal motivation* was positively related to OCB-total ($r = 0.26, p < 0.05$) (H3). *Goal internalization* was not related to organizational citizenship behavior (H4).

While many of the hypothesized relationships were supported by significant relationships in the predicted direction, generally these relationships were small. The largest effect for OCB occurred in relation to self-concept internal motivation, with over 5% of explained variance. The estimated statistical power of these relationships were 0.95 ($p < 0.05$; two-tailed test) for all relationships greater than 0.15 (Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

To test the extent to which a combination of significant sources of motivation inform organizational citizenship behaviors, the three sources of motivation with significant correlations were entered in a hierarchical stepwise regression model, with OCB as the dependent variable. (See Table 2.) The resulting model accounted for close to 12% ($r^2 = 0.12$; $F = 14.28$; $p = 0.007$) of the variance in OCB. This variance accounted for is among the greatest for multiple sourced data in similar studies. This result demonstrates that employees' sources of motivation offer some explanation when examining organizational citizenship behavior.

Discussion

Much research in the organizational citizenship behavior realm has focused on the ability of dispositional or

Table 2. Stepwise Regression Analysis to Determine the Best Predictive Model (N = 239)

Model summary			
Model	R-square	Adjusted R-square	F-value
Model 1 (DV: OCB) ^a	0.119	0.122	14.28 ^b

^a Predictors: Self-Concept Internal, Instrumental, Self-Concept External.
^b $p < 0.01$

**Hierarchical Regression Analysis:
The Best Predictive Model of OCB**

Stepwise	R-square	F-change	*Sig. F-change
1. Self-Concept Internal	0.067	9.26	0.0014
2. Instrumental Motivation	0.105	3.20	0.0243
3. Self-Concept External	0.119	2.26	0.0491

Note: Dependent variable: organizational citizenship behavior.

*Sig. F = two-tailed test. Intrinsic Process and Goal Internalization were not entered because they did not share significant variance with OCB.

motivational variables to predict OCB (Organ, 1990; Organ & Lingl, 1995; Tang & Ibrahim). This study contributed to this knowledge base, and the findings support the continued use of dispositional prediction of organizational citizenship behaviors. Significant relationships were found between employees' specific sources of motivation and their displays of organizational citizenship behaviors. These findings are similar to those supported by previous research using motivation to predict organizational citizenship behavior (Barbuto et al., 2003; Tang & Ibrahim); however, it also extends this work by using an updated measure of motivation and examining the sources of motivation in the aggregate. Furthermore, this work used data from leaders and employees, avoiding single-source or common method variance, which may inflate relationships.

Instrumental motivation was negatively related with OCB (H1). This means that individuals motivated by formal rewards were less likely to perform beyond expectations if performance was not tied to formal reward systems. Results were consistent with the seminal work and definition of OCB (Smith et al., 1983) and with findings that extrinsic rewards may undermine intrinsic

motivation (Deci et al., 1999). Results were also counter to assumptions that individuals may perform beyond expectations as a result of anticipated tangible rewards (Organ, 1997). Thus, OCB may be operant when there is a reward system in place for it; however, if not in place, individuals will not perform discretionary behaviors.

Self-concept external motivation had a negative relationship with OCB (H2). Thus, individuals who are motivated by external rewards such as recognition and praise are less likely to exhibit OCBs. Bolino et al. (2004) suggested that the self-serving nature of OCB may lead to impression management tendencies, which has been positively connected to OCB (Finkelstein & Penner, 2004). However, the relationship was in the opposite direction, consistent with Barbuto and colleagues' (2003) results that found a negative relationship between the two variables, but power issues led to conservative interpretation of results. In addition, results are consistent with the literature because OCBs are not formally rewarded by leaders or organizations; thus, employees who are looking for rewards most likely will not engage in discretionary behaviors.

As expected, self-concept internal motivation shared a positive relationship with OCB. Individuals who are motivated more to meet their own personal standards (versus external standards) are therefore more likely to engage in OCBs. This result is consistent with the past works of Tang and Ibrahim (1998) and Neuman and Kickul (1998), each of which reported that achievement motivation were related to OCB.

Contrary to expectations, goal internalization was not related to OCB. This means that for this population, the extent to which individuals are motivated by principles and values does not influence the extent of their displays of OCB. Tan and Tan (2008) reported that organizational concern motives (desire to help the organization, which stems from pride and identification that the individual has toward the organization) was positively related to OCB. Thus, it would be expected that goal internalization and OCB would be related. However, this finding can be explained as individuals motivated by goal internalization are motivated by this source only when their values are congruent with the values of the organization they work for. Thus, individuals in this sample may not share values with the organizations they

work for, and therefore not demonstrate organizational citizenship behaviors. Future work would need to test the extent to which individuals do (or do not) agree with their organization's values to determine if this may moderate the relationship between goal internalization and OCBs.

These findings contribute to the literature on antecedents of OCB, providing some significant correlates between content-based work motivation and OCB. The significant relationships were modest but informative for understanding the antecedents of these discretionary behaviors and the motivational sources behind them. Because motivation of employees was measured using self-reports and the OCBs were measured by using supervisor reports, common method variance was avoided, which also leads to more conservative relationship estimates than studies that use single-source data (i.e., Finkelstein, 2006). In studies that tested OCB using supervisory reports and employee data, the reported relationships between the variables were typically smaller, but their designs were more sound (Carmeli & Josman, 2006).

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

Based on the findings of this study, there are a few cautious implications for practice in business and leadership. First, leaders are cautioned that the relationships found in this study, while statistically significant, were relatively low, accounting for just 12% of the variance in the data. However, these relationships are in most cases stronger in effect size than those reported in previous studies of dispositional antecedents of OCBs.

Another implication that emerged is that sources of motivation can have an impact on employees' use of OCBs. Specifically, individuals higher in *instrumental* and *self-concept external* motivation demonstrated organizational citizenship behaviors less frequently. Also, individuals' *self-concept internal* motivation was positively correlated with organizational citizenship behaviors. This suggests, as Tang and Ibrahim (1998) found when they examined a similar construct in "need for achievement," that individuals with an inner drive for outcome-based satisfactions (i.e., self-concept internal) are more likely to exhibit OCBs.

Leaders are reminded that most studies of antecedents of OCBs have shown that dispositional variables such as personality, motivation, and attitudes account for less

than 15% of total variance, which means that 85% of organizational citizenship behaviors can be linked to variables other than these. Other factors, many situational or contextual in nature, clearly play a major role in our understanding of OCBs. For example, while motivation does relate to organizational citizenship behaviors, it is just as likely that prior work experiences, behaviors of colleagues, quality of working relationships, and education and training may play just as important roles in shaping individuals' organizational behaviors. Leaders should be cautious not to overreact to the findings of this study and assume that individuals motivated in certain ways will give them the best opportunities to garner organizational citizenship behaviors. These findings indicate that situational factors account for greater variance in organizational citizenship behavior than dispositional factors (Organ & Lingl, 1995; Organ & Ryan, 1995).

Leaders often report that they are searching for self-motivated employees, under the assumption that these individuals will be most productive. Findings in this study, which are consistent with findings of past studies, demonstrate a significant positive relationship between individuals' *self-concept internal* motivation and their OCBs. Perhaps a more complex research design could incorporate both motives and situational contexts to assess the degree to which these motives exist in individuals and also the extent to which these motives are satisfied, and the work climate and structure in the organization. As a follow-up to research in leadership substitutes, path-goal, or other contingency-based theories, perhaps leadership behavior and organizational conditions, moderated by employees' sources of motivation, may serve as independent variables for predicting OCBs.

LIMITATIONS AND OTHER RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES

One limitation of this study was its focus on a single type of business. The participating organizations are similar in geographic location and the types of services they provide. The homogeneity of the sample may limit the generalization of results. However, because organizational citizenship behavior must be examined within a given context, the sample was useful for examining agriculturally based industry trends in OCB (Organ, 1990). A similar research design with a more diverse

sample population is a worthwhile endeavor and could prove to be especially valuable if other contextual variables, such as leaders' behaviors, job conditions, procedural and distributive justice, and so on are tested.

The Motivation Sources Inventory used to measure sources of motivation in this study demonstrated comparatively better psychometric properties than it had in a previous study with a similar population (Barbuto et al., 2003). One explanation for this difference may be the ongoing development of the MSI measure (Barbuto, 2002). This study used a more recent edition of the MSI, which resulted in stronger psychometric properties.

More research is needed on the antecedents of OCBs. Although many studies suggest these behaviors are important to the success of individuals and organizations (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1993; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994), after more than 20 years of research, the antecedents of these behaviors are still relatively unresolved. If and when the antecedents of these behaviors are known, leaders may be able to increase their frequency of occurrence in the workplace. The outcomes of such studies are certain to be both relevant and practical for leaders attempting to maximize organizational behavior and performance.

Conclusions

This article reported the results of a field study testing the relationships between employees' sources of work motivation and their use of organizational citizenship behaviors as rated by their leaders. Results of the study demonstrated that individuals' sources of work motivation were related to their use of organizational citizenship behaviors. Specifically, self-concept internal work motivation was most associated with individuals' display of organizational citizenship behaviors. Also, individuals' instrumental and self-concept external motivations were negatively related to organizational citizenship behaviors. These results indicate that organizations seeking organizational citizenship behaviors may select individuals higher in self-concept internal and lower in both instrumental and self-concept external motivation. We caution leaders that greater than 85% of organizational citizenship behaviors are derived from factors other than work motivation. Leaders may also keep in mind that effective leadership, such as transformational leadership,

has also been strongly related to OCB (Asgari, Silong, Ahmad, & Sama, 2008). Thus, leadership remains as one of the most important aspects related to employee discretionary behaviors. It is our hope that leaders and human resource personnel may consider the results of this work when making recruiting decisions. We also hope that researchers extend this work and continue field testing for the best predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors.

References

- Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, 142–175.
- Allen, T. D., & Rush, M. C. (1998). The effects of organizational citizenship behavior on performance judgments: A field study and a laboratory experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 247–260.
- Aquino, K. (1995). Relationships between pay inequity, perceptions of procedural justice, and organizational citizenship. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 8, 21–33.
- Asgari, A., Silong, A. D., Ahmad, A., & Sama, B. A. (2008). The relationship between transformational leadership behaviors, leader-member exchange, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(4), 140–151.
- Barbuto, J. E. (2000). Influence triggers: A framework for understanding follower compliance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11, 365–387.
- Barbuto, J. E. (2004). *The Motivation Sources Inventory*. Lincoln, NE: Future Leadership.
- Barbuto, J. E., Brown, L. L., Wheeler, D. W., & Wilhite, M. S. (2003). Motivation, altruism, and generalized compliance: A field study of organizational citizenship behaviors. *Psychological Reports*, 92, 498–502.
- Barbuto, J. E., & Bugenhagen, M. J. (2006). Preliminary relation between followers' locus of control and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Psychological Reports*, 98(3), 882–884.
- Barbuto, J. E., Fritz, S. M., & Marx, D. (2000). A field study of two measures of work motivation for predicting leaders' transformational behaviors. *Psychological Reports*, 86, 295–300.
- Barbuto, J. E., Fritz, S. M., & Marx, D. (2002). A field examination of two measures of work motivation as predictors of leaders' influence tactics. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 142, 601–616.
- Barbuto, J. E., & Scholl, R. W. (1998). Motivation Sources Inventory: Development and validation of new scales to measure an integrative taxonomy of motivation. *Psychological Reports*, 82, 1011–1022.

- Barbuto, J. E., & Scholl, R. W. (1999). Leaders' motivation and perception of followers' motivation as predictors of influence tactics used. *Psychological Reports, 84*, 1087–1098.
- Barnard, C. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 1–26.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal, 26*, 587–595.
- Becker, J. A. H., & O'Hair, D. H. (2007). Machiavellians' motives in organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 35*(3), 246–267.
- Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Niehoff, B. P. (2004). The other side of the story: Reexamining prevailing assumptions about organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resources Management Review, 14*(2), 229–247.
- Carmeli, A., & Josman, Z. E. (2006). The relationship among emotional intelligence, task performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Human Performance, 19*(4), 403–419.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Deci, E. L. (1975). *Intrinsic motivation*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*(6), 627–668.
- Deluga, R. W. (1994). The relationship between attributional charismatic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25*, 1652–1669.
- Deluga, R. W. (1995). Supervisor trust building, leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 67*, 315–326.
- Etzioni, A. (1961). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Farh, J. L., Earley, P. C., & Lin, S. C. (1997). Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 42*, 421–444.
- Finkelstein, M. A. (2006). Dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors: Motives, motive fulfillment, and role identity. *Social Behavior and Personality, 34*(6), 603–616.
- Finkelstein, M. A., & Penner, L. A. (2004). Predicting organizational citizenship behaviors: Integrating the functional and role identity approaches. *Social Behavior and Personality, 32*, 383–398.
- Harrell, A. M., & Stahl, M. J. (1981). A behavioral decision theory approach to measure McClelland's trichotomy of needs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 66*, 242–247.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Kemery, E. R., Bedeian, A. G., & Zacur, S. R. (1996). Expectancy-based job cognitions and job affects as predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26*, 635–651.
- Latham, G., & Skarlicki, D. P. (1995). Criterion-related validity of the situational and patterned behavior description interviews with organizational citizenship behaviors. *Human Performance, 8*, 67–80.
- Leonard, N., Beauvais, L., & Scholl, R. W. (1999). Work motivation: The incorporation of self concept-based processes. *Human Relations, 52*, 969–998.
- LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 52–65.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance. *Journal of Marketing, 57*, 70–80.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- McClelland, D. C. (1985). *Human motivation*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Moorman, R. H. (1993). The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Relations, 46*, 759–776.
- Neuman, G. A., & Kickul, J. R. (1998). Organizational citizenship behaviors: Achievement orientation and personality. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 13*(2), 263–279.
- O'Brien, K. E., & Allen, T. (2008). The relative importance of correlates of organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior using multiple sources of data. *Human Performance, 21*(1), 62–88.
- Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 12*, 43–72.

- Organ, D. W. (1994). Personality and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management*, 20, 465–478.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85–97.
- Organ, D. W. (1998). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W., & Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 135(3), 339–350.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 775–802.
- 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(2), 111–131.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31, 351–363.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Marketing*, 22, 259–298.
- Pond, S. B., Nacoste, R. W., Mohr, M. F., & Rodriguez, C. M. (1997). The measurement of organizational citizenship behavior: Are we assuming too much? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27, 1527–1544.
- Rioux, S., & Penner, L. A. (2001). The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A motivational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 1306–1314.
- Schappe, S. P. (1998). The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Psychology*, 132, 277–290.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Latham, G. P. (1996). Increasing citizenship behavior within a labor union: A test of organizational justice theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 161–169.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653–663.
- Staw, B. M. (1976). *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation*. Morristown, NJ: Silver Burdett.
- Tan, H. H., & Tan, M. L. (2008). Organizational citizenship behavior and social loafing: The role of personality, motives, and contextual factors. *Journal of Psychology*, 142, 89–108.
- Tang, T. L. P., & Ibrahim, A. H. S. (1998). Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior: Public personnel in the United States and in the Middle East. *Public Personnel Management*, 27, 529–548.
- Torlak, O., & Koc, U. (2007). Materialistic attitude as an antecedent of organizational citizenship behavior. *Management Research News*, 30(8), 581–596.
- Zhong, L. (2007). Effects of psychological capital on employee's job performance, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 39(2), 328–334.
- John E. Barbuto Jr. is an associate professor of Leadership and Organizational Behavior at California State University at Fullerton. He can be reached at jbarbuto@fullerton.edu.*
- Joana S. P. Story is an assistant professor of Management at Universidade Nova de Lisboa. Dr. Story earned her Ph.D. from the University of Nebraska–Lincoln in 2010. She can be reached at joanastory@novabse.pt.*