

## **Testing the Underlying Motives of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Field Study of Agricultural Co-Op Workers**

John E. Barbuto, Jr.  
Lance L. Brown  
Myra S. Wilhite  
Daniel W. Wheeler  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

### **Abstract**

This study tests the relationship between sources of motivation and organizational citizenship behaviors. One hundred seventy-five employees from 31 locations of two agriculturally based companies completed the motivation sources inventory (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998) and were rated by their supervisors for demonstrated organizational citizenship behaviors (Organ, 1997; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983). Results showed significant relationships between instrumental, self-concept external, and self-concept internal motivation and organizational citizenship behaviors. Implications of these findings for research and practice, and suggestions for future research are discussed.

### **Introduction**

Research of organizational citizenship behaviors has been extensive since its introduction close to twenty years ago (Bateman & Organ, 1983). The vast majority of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) research since has focused on the effects of OCBs on individual and organizational performance. There is consensus in the field that organizational citizenship behaviors are salient behaviors for organizational enterprises. However, the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors are not well established. Organ (1997) called for a greater attention in research foci on the predictors of OCBs, noting that employee motives may offer an empirical explanation of the phenomena. At the time, there were no strong measures of employees' sources of motivation. Barbuto and Scholl (1998; 1999) developed an instrument to measure employees' work motivation and used it to predict leaders' behaviors. Subsequent work also has demonstrated the strong predictive value of the Motivation Sources Inventory (Barbuto, Fritz, & Marx, 2000). This study seeks to explore the relationships between employees' sources of motivation and their organizational citizenship behaviors.

### **Antecedents of OCB**

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) was introduced by Smith, Organ and Near, (1983), which defined OCB as discretionary individual behavior, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, which, in the aggregate, promotes the effective functioning of the organization. This concept is similar to Katz and Kahn's (1978) description of extra-role behaviors and Barbuto's (2000) influence resistance zone behaviors.

Smith, et al. (1983) and Bateman and Organ (1983) conducted the first research on the antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, finding job satisfaction to be the best predictor. After 17 years of research, job satisfaction is still the leading predictor of OCB (Organ & Ryan, 1995). This is problematic because, descriptively, job satisfaction is in and of itself a challenging outcome sought by organizational managers. The resulting implications are restricted to suffice that OCB is likely when workers are satisfied. There are just as many questions regarding the antecedents of job satisfaction as there are questions about the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors. Many scholars believe job satisfaction is too broad 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 been increasing during the past ten years, during which time researchers have used, with varying degrees of predictive merit: personality (Organ, 1990; Organ, 1994; Organ & Lingl, 1995; Penner, et al., 1997), procedural justice (Moorman, 1993; Aquino, 1995; Skarlicki & Latham, 1996; Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997; Schappe, 1998), leadership characteristics (Deluga, 1994; 1995; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, & Bommer, 1996), motivational theories (Kemery, Bedeian, & Zacur, 1996; Tang & Ibrahim, 1998), and interview styles (Latham & Skarlicki, 1995). Most of these studies provided more questions than answers, with low correlations and little variance accounted for in the data. Organ (1990) proposed that an employee's individual dispositions would provide the most valuable explanation of organizational citizenship behaviors to researchers and practicing managers.

Organ (1994), after using McCrae and Costa's (1987) Big Five personality test in an unsuccessful attempt at predicting OCB, concluded, "the possible limitation with measures based on the Big Five is that they have more to do with temperament than motives" (p. 475). Recent research using motivation to measure an individual's disposition has renewed interest in examining Organ's (1990) model proposing that an individual's motives may relate to his or her organizational citizenship behaviors (Kemery, et al., 1996; Tang & Ibrahim, 1998).

Penner, et al. (1997) explored the impact of personality and motivation on OCB. Since no previous research had used motivation to predict OCB, they developed their propositions from the volunteerism research. They proposed that several types of motivation cited in volunteerism research are related to OCB: value expressiveness (Goal internalization), social adjustment (Self-concept - external), knowledge (Self-concept - internal), and career (Instrumental). However, they were unable to offer any empirical support for their propositions.

Tang and Ibrahim (1998) examined the antecedents of OCB in the United States and the Middle East (Egypt and Saudi Arabia). Their sample of 155 American and 378 Middle East employees tested the relationship between OCB and intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction, self-esteem, McClelland's (1961) need for achievement, and work stress. They reported that organization-based self-esteem, need for achievement, and intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction were related to Altruism. They also noted low work-related stress and high-based self-esteem were related to Generalized Compliance. Again, the OCB field was left with a call for more succinct measures of work motivation for the prediction of organizational citizenship behaviors.

A recently developed measure of sources of motivation may offer researchers a salient variable for predicting organizational behavior (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998).

### Sources of Motivation

Perhaps the most accepted and applied taxonomy of motivation is the trichotomy developed and operationalized by McClelland (1961; 1985). Despite its general acceptance, the trichotomy and its measures (TAT) have been widely criticized (see Barbuto & Scholl, 1998). Recently, a new typology of motivation sources was proposed by Leonard, Beauvais, and Scholl (1999) and operationalized with scales to measure the taxonomy (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998). This typology was further developed and tested to predict leaders' behaviors (Barbuto & Scholl, 1999). The five sources of motivation measured include intrinsic process, instrumental, self-concept-external, self-concept-internal, and goal internalization. A brief description of these sources of motivation follows (see Barbuto & Scholl, 1998).

Intrinsic Process Motivation. If a person is motivated to perform certain kinds of work or to engage in certain types of behavior for the sheer fun of it, then intrinsic process motivation is taking place. In this source of motivation, the work itself acts as the incentive, as workers enjoy what they are doing. Similar constructs to intrinsic process motivation can be found extensively in the literature. Developmental theorists have described this type of motivation in similar ways using the terms heteronomous morality (Kohlberg, 1976), impulsive (Loevinger, 1976; Kegan, 1982), and to a lesser extent, pre-operational (Piaget, 1972). Other need-based descriptions similar to intrinsic process include early existence needs (Alderfer, 1969), intrinsic pleasure needs (Murray, 1964) and physiological needs (Maslow, 1954). Bandura (1986) describes sensory intrinsic motivation and physiological intrinsic motivation in terms similar to those used to describe intrinsic process motivation. This motive also has been articulated as intrinsic motivation to obtain task pleasure (Deci, 1975) and as intrinsic task motivation devoid of any external controls or rewards (Staw, 1976).

Intrinsic process differs from the classic intrinsic or internal motivation in that this motive derives from immediate internal gratification, whereas the classic definitions encompass internal challenges and achievement types of motives (in this typology, these are termed self-concept-internal). If people are motivated to perform certain kinds of work or to engage in certain types of behavior for the sheer fun of it, intrinsic process motivation is the driving force. The work itself, not the task outcome, provides the incentive because workers genuinely enjoy what they are doing (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998). Past researchers have used the term intrinsic motivation to represent personal satisfaction derived from achievement of goals or tasks. Intrinsic process is distinct from the classical interpretation of intrinsic motivation because the emphasis is on immediate enjoyment or pleasure during the activity, rather than on the satisfaction that results from achievement. The classic intrinsic motivation is better represented in this motivation taxonomy as self-concept internal (upcoming).

Instrumental Motivation. Instrumental rewards motivate individuals when they perceive their behavior will lead to certain extrinsic tangible outcomes, such as pay, promotions, bonuses, etc. This source of motivation integrates Etzioni's (1961) alienative and calculative involvement,

Barnard's (1938) exchange theory, and Katz and Kahn's (1978) legal compliance and external rewards. Developmental theorists have described a similar stage as concrete operational (Piaget, 1972), instrumental (Kohlberg, 1976), imperial (Kegan, 1982), and opportunistic (Loevinger, 1976). Similar instrumental motives have been described as a need for power (Murray, 1964; McClelland, 1961), a need for safety (Maslow, 1954), or later stages of existence needs (Alderfer, 1969). Others have described extrinsic motivation (Staw, 1976; Deci, 1975; Bandura, 1986) and material inducements (Barnard, 1938) in terms similar to those used to describe instrumental motivation. Instrumental motivation is different from the classic extrinsic or external motivation in that this motive derives from tangible external rewards, whereas the classic definition focuses on social rewards and relations (in this typology, these are termed self-concept-external).

Self-Concept-External Motivation. This source of motivation tends to be externally based when the individual is primarily other-directed and seeking affirmation of traits, competencies, and values. The ideal self is adopted from role expectations of reference groups. The individual behaves in ways that satisfy reference group members, first to gain acceptance, and after achieving that, to gain status. This source of motivation is 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. This source of motivation also resembles social identity theory, where the focus is on establishing and maintaining social reference and standing (Ashford & Mael, 1989). Developmental theorists have discussed a similar motivational stage as interpersonal (Kohlberg, 1976, Kegan, 1982), early formal operational (Piaget, 1972), and conformist (Loevinger, 1976). Other researchers have described similar motivation as need for affiliation (McClelland, 1961; Murray, 1964), need for love, affection, and belonging (Maslow, 1954), and relatedness needs (Alderfer, 1969). Katz and Kahn (1978) describe employees seeking membership and seniority in organizations, approval from leaders, and approval from groups in terms similar to those used to describe external self-concept motivation. Classic articulations of social rewards or social exchanges are captured by self-concept-external motivation.

Self Concept Internal Motivation. This source of motivation will be internally based when the individual is inner-directed. In this type of motivation, the individual sets internal standards of traits, competencies, and values that become the basis for the ideal self. The person is then motivated to engage in behaviors that reinforce these standards and later achieve higher levels of competency. This source is similar to McClelland's (1961) high need for achievement, Deci's (1975) internal motivation to overcome challenges, and Katz and Kahn's (1978) ideal of internalized motivation derived from role performance. Developmental theorists have described a similar stage as full formal operational (Piaget, 1972), social system (Kohlberg, 1976), institutional (Kegan, 1982), and conscientious (Loevinger, 1976). Similar motives are described as a need for achievement (McClelland, 1961; Murray, 1964), need for esteem (Maslow, 1954), motivating factors (Herzberg, 1968), and growth needs associated with developing one's potential (Alderfer, 1969). Bandura (1986) describes self-evaluative mechanisms, self-regulation, and personal standards in terms similar to those used to describe internal self-concept motivation. Katz and Kahn (1978) describe a motive similar to internalized motivation as self-expression derived from role performance. This motive also has been described as intrinsic

motivation to overcome challenges (Deci, 1975) and intrinsic motivation to pursue personal achievement (Staw, 1976).

Goal Internalization Motivation. Behavior motivated by goal internalization occurs when the individual adopts attitudes and behaviors because their content is congruent with the individual's personal value system. The worker believes in the cause and is therefore motivated to work toward the goal of the collective. This source of motivation is similar to Kelman's (1958) value system, Katz and Kahn's (1978) internalized values, Deci's internal valence for outcome (1975), and Etzioni's (1961) pure moral involvement. Developmental theorists describe a similar motivational stage as post-formal operational (Piaget, 1972), principled orientation (Kohlberg, 1976), inter-individual (Kegan, 1982), and autonomous (Loevinger, 1976). Need theorists describe a similar motive as self-actualization (Maslow, 1954).

Goal internalization is different from the previous four sources of motivation because it features the removal of self-interest (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998). Motivation from this source occurs because followers believe in the cause. With intrinsic process motivation, followers need to enjoy the work being performed. With instrumental motivation, followers need an incentive or contingent reward to perform the work. With self-concept-external motivation, followers need to believe their reputation or image will be enhanced if they comply. With self-concept-internal motivation, followers need to have a personal challenge to comply. With goal internalization, however, followers do not require any strong inducements beyond a belief that the goals of the organization can be attained with their assistance. If all workers were extremely high in goal internalization motivation and extremely low in each of the remaining four sources of motivation, leaders would need only talk about the goals of the organization and what must be done to accomplish them. If followers believe in the articulated goals (perhaps a big 'if'), they will be motivated to perform whatever tasks are necessary to achieve these goals.

### Sources of Motivation and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Barbuto and Scholl (1999) used leaders' sources of motivation to predict leaders' influence tactics and found strong correlations. They also examined the relationship between the perceived motivation of the follower and the influence tactic used by the leader, again demonstrating strong relationships. Barbuto, Fritz, and Marx (2000) used motivation to predict transformational behaviors and also found significant relationships. The results of this study were particularly telling because McClelland's needs also were used as a predictor. The motivation sources (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998) were much stronger predictors of leaders' behavior than was McClelland's construct. This preliminary body of research demonstrated that an individual's source of motivation might account for significant variance in both leader and follower behaviors. It is with this optimism that we approached this study, to examine the relationship between sources of motivation and organizational citizenship behaviors.

This current study examines the relationship between sources of motivation and organizational citizenship behavior. Several researchers have suggested an individual's motivation will be significantly related to his or her organizational citizenship behaviors (Penner,

et al., 1997; Tang & Ibrahim, 1998). Tang and Ibrahim (1998) noted statistically significant relationships between three measures of motivation and organizational citizenship behavior. Previous research also has reported significant relationships between the sources of motivation and leaders' behaviors (Barbuto & Scholl, 1999; Barbuto, et al., 2000). These studies found significant relationships between the sources of motivation and leader-used influence tactics, transformational leadership behaviors, and follower compliance. Finally, research has shown that leaders rely on their perceptions of follows' motives to rate the employees' organizational citizenship behaviors. Thus, it can be reasonably expected that an employee's sources of motivation will share some relationship with the organizational citizenship behaviors he or she displays.

Table 1

Integrative Typology of Motivation Sources (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998)

<u>Theorist</u>	<u>Intrinsic Process</u>	<u>Instrumental</u>	<u>S.C.-External</u>	<u>S.C.-Internal</u>	<u>Goal Internalization</u>
Alderfer (1969)	Existence	N/A	Relatedness	Growth	N/A
Maslow (1954)	Physiological	Safety	Love	Esteem	Self Actualization
Herzberg (1968)	N/A	Satisfiers	Satisfiers	Motivators	N/A
Bandura (1986)	Sensory Intrinsic Physiological	Extrinsic	N/A	Personal Standards Self Regulation	N/A
Katz & Kahn (1978)	N/A	Legal Compliance	Membership Approval	Role Performance	Internalized Values
Etzioni (1975)	N/A	Calculative/ Alienative	Social Moral	N/A	Pure Moral
Deci (1975)	Task Pleasure	Extrinsic	Interpersonal Challenges	Overcoming	Outcome Valence
Piaget (1972)	Preoperational	Concrete	Formal	Full-Formal	Post-Formal
Kohlberg (1976)	Heteronomous	Instrumental	Interpersonal	Social System	Principled
Kegan (1982)	Impulsive	Imperial	Interpersonal	Institutional	Inter-Individual
Loevinger (1976)	Impulsive	Opportunistic	Conformist	Conscientious	Autonomous
McClelland (1961)	N/A	Power	Affiliation	Achievement	N/A
Murray (1964)	Intrinsic Pleasure	Power	Affiliation	Achievement	N/A
Barnard (1938)	N/A	Material Inducements	Social Inducements	N/A	N/A

Hypothesis 1: Employees' sources of motivation will relate to their organizational citizenship behaviors.

Individuals motivated by intrinsic process are motivated to participate in activities they enjoy. They exhibit behaviors that create a pleasant working environment for themselves and their co-workers. Previous studies have demonstrated, however, that this motive is not predictive of organizational behavior (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998; 1999; Barbuto, et al., 2000). We expect this trend to continue. Instrumentally motivated individuals are motivated to participate in formally rewarded activities. They perform tasks and demonstrate behaviors to gain tangible rewards such as pay increases, promotions and added benefits (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998). Since organizational citizenship behaviors are not formally rewarded, we expect that instrumental motivation will share a negative relationship with organizational citizenship behaviors.

Self-concept-external motivation motivates individuals through activities that reaffirm their traits, competencies, and values. These individuals pursue tasks and demonstrate behaviors that earn them social acceptance and status in reference groups. 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. We expect that individuals high in this motive will not demonstrate organizational citizenship behaviors, because they require some element of social reward for their efforts. For this reason, we expect a negative relationship with OCB.

Individuals high in self-concept-internal motivation are motivated to meet their personal standards and pursue activities that require their unique skills. These individuals may be more inclined to pursue their organizational goals, and thus exhibit organizational citizenship behaviors.

The same can be said for goal-internalized motivation, where the emphasis on the goals of the organization motivates performance (Barbuto & Scholl, 1999). Tang and Ibrahim (1998) found that organizational citizenship behavior is related to intrinsic satisfaction (similar to self-concept-internal and goal internalization), extrinsic satisfaction, and McClelland's (1961) need for achievement (similar to self-concept-internal). Tang and Ibrahim (1998) noted a significant correlation with Maslow's (1954) esteem motives (similar to self-concept-internal), and organizational citizenship behavior. Thus, we expect that both self-concept internal and goal-internalized motivation will be positively related to organizational citizenship behaviors.

Hypothesis 2a: Employees' intrinsic process motivation will share no relationship with organizational citizenship behaviors.

Hypothesis 2b: Employees' instrumental motivation will share a negative relationship with organizational citizenship behaviors.

Hypothesis 2c: Employees' self-concept-external motivation will share a negative relationship with organizational citizenship behaviors.

Hypothesis 2d: Employees' self-concept-internal motivation will be positively related to organizational citizenship behaviors.

Hypothesis 2e: Employees' goal internalized motivation will be positively related to organizational citizenship behaviors.

## Methodology

### Participants

The data for this analysis were collected from 175 employees and their supervisors from 31 branches of two agricultural cooperatives from a Midwest state in the U.S. Seventy-eight percent of the employees were men, and the average tenure with the cooperatives exceeded seven years. All were high school graduates and a small percentage (20%) had earned college degrees. The sample could be best characterized as working-middle class.

### Measures

The Motivation Sources Inventory (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998) was used to measure an employee's five sources of motivation. This instrument has been used to predict leader influence tactics (Barbuto & Scholl, 1999), transformational leadership behaviors (Barbuto, et al., 2000) and follower compliance (Barbuto, 2000). It has shown to be both reliable and valid in reported studies, producing coefficient  $\alpha$  of .83 - .92 (See Table 2 for sample items).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior. OCBs were measured using a modified version of the Smith et al. (1983) instrument measuring altruism and generalized compliance. Modifications of this instrument have been used frequently in the organizational citizenship behavior literature and have been judged reliable and valid (Aquino, 1995; Schappe, 1998; Tang & Ibrahim, 1998). Similar to Schappe's (1998) measurement of OCB, the instrument used in this study consists of three items measuring organizational citizenship behavior-individual and three items measuring organizational citizenship behavior-organization. These six items were summated to arrive at an OCB score for each employee. The six questions were scored using a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 4. (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, 4=strongly agree). Questions 2, 3 and 6 were reverse-scored. Since leader ratings were used, the questions had to be further modified to assess the frequency of organizational citizenship behaviors (See Table 3 for the complete instrument used to measure OCB).

Table 2

### Sample Items for the Motivation Sources Inventory (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998)

Source of Motivation	Sample Question
Intrinsic Process	I would prefer to do things that are fun
Instrumental	Job requirements will determine how hard I will work
Self-concept-External	It is important to me that others approve of my behavior
Self-concept-Internal	Decisions I make will reflect high standards that I set for myself
Goal Internalization	I would not work for a company if I didn't agree with its mission

Table 3

The Complete Organizational Citizenship Behavior Questionnaire (2001)

- 
1. (This Person) helps others who have been absent.
  2. (This Person) misses work often.
  3. (This Person) performs only required tasks.
  4. (This Person) misses work only when necessary.
  5. (This Person) helps others who have heavy workloads.
  6. (This Person) takes extra breaks while at work.
- 

Procedures

Cooperative supervisors distributed the motivation sources inventory to employees and the data were collected in person by the researchers. Participation in this research was voluntary, and participants were given the opportunity to withdraw from the study at any time during or after data collection. A strong response rate (86.1%) was achieved.

Information about the employees' organizational citizenship behaviors was collected from their supervisors via phone interviews. The researchers contacted the supervisor of each employee who completed the Motivation Sources Inventory to schedule a time to conduct the survey. At the scheduled time, the interviewer phoned the leader and conducted the six-item questionnaire of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. A structured script was used to ensure uniformity of the data collection procedures. Leaders were guaranteed full confidentiality and were encouraged to ask questions and add comments. Ultimately, an executive summary outlining the results of this study was provided for the presidents of the companies who had given permission for the study.

Analysis and Results

Results of Reliability Testing

The means, standard deviations, coefficient alphas, and correlations were calculated for the variables of interest (See Table 1). Both Organizational Citizenship Behavior subscales (Organizational Citizenship Behavior -Individual  $\alpha = .89$ , Organizational Citizenship Behavior - Organization  $\alpha = .79$ ) had reliabilities above or close to the desired alpha level of .80. The motivation sub-scales of the motivation sources inventory were adequate, but not impressive, with reliabilities ranging from .62 to .80. (Intrinsic Process  $\alpha = .74$ , Instrumental  $\alpha = .62$ , Self-Concept-External  $\alpha = .71$ , Self-Concept-Internal  $\alpha = .80$ , Goal Internalization  $\alpha = .66$ ). These coefficients were lower than those found in previously reported studies (Barbuto & Scholl; 1998; 1999; Barbuto, et al., 2000).

## Results of Simple Statistics and Zero-Order Correlation Testing

Hypothesis 1 was supported, as several relationships were found between motivation and OCB. The specific hypotheses (2a-e) revealed some intriguing results. Hypothesis 2a was supported, as no relationship was found between employees' intrinsic process motivation and the organizational citizenship behaviors they displayed. Hypothesis 2b was strongly supported, as significant negative correlations were found between employees' instrumental motivation and OCB-total ( $r=-.15$ ,  $p<.05$ ), OCB-individual ( $r=-.15$ ,  $p<.05$ ), and OCB-organization ( $r=-.13$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Hypothesis 2c was marginally supported, as self-concept-external motivation shared a negative relationship with OCB-organization ( $r=-.15$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Hypothesis 2d was strongly supported as self-concept-internal motivation was positively related to OCB-total ( $r=.15^*$ ,  $p<.05$ ), OCB-individual ( $r=.20$ ,  $p<.01$ ), and OCB-organization ( $r=.15$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Contrary to expectations, goal internalization was not significantly correlated to any of the organizational citizenship behavior measures. No hypotheses were developed relating to gender; however, male gender was negatively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior -organization ( $r=-.15$ ,  $p<.05$ ). While many of the hypothesized relationships were supported by significant relationships in the predicted direction, these relationships were small.

Table 4

### Means, Standard Deviations, Scale Reliabilities and Inter-correlations (N=175)

Variables	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 Total OCB	18.48	3.37	-							
2 OCB-I	8.99	2.00	.59**	<b>.89</b>						
3 OCB-O	9.49	1.88	.55**	.49**	<b>.79</b>					
4 Intrinsic Proc	19.32	5.49	-.07	.06	-.05	<b>.74</b>				
5 Instrumental	19.18	5.31	-.15*	-.16*	-.13*	.54**	<b>.62</b>			
6 SCE	16.74	5.87	-.05	.03	-.15*	.40**	.54**	<b>.71</b>		
7 SCI	28.03	4.17	.15*	.20**	.15*	.07	.05	.18*	<b>.80</b>	
8 Goal Internal	19.27	5.14	.05	.01	-.03	.51**	.38**	.35**	.31**	<b>.66</b>
9 Gender (male)	.80	.40	-.05	-.07	-.15*	-.00	.08	.01	.03	.01

Note. Total OCB = Total Organizational Behavior Score; OCB-I = Organizational Citizenship Behavior-Individual; OCB-O = Organizational Citizenship Behavior - Organization; SCE = Self-concept External; SCI = Self-concept Internal; Goal = Goal Internalization.

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$  (one-tailed test)

## Discussion

Several theoretical implications arise from this study. A great deal of research in the organizational citizenship behavior literature has focused on the ability of dispositional variables to predict organizational citizenship behavior (Organ, 1990, Organ & Lingl, 1995; Tang & Ibrahim, 1998). This study aimed to contribute to this knowledge base, and the findings support the continued use of dispositional variables for predicting organizational citizenship behavior, for several reasons. First, significant (but relatively weak) relationships were found between specific sources of motivation and organizational citizenship behavior. Also, this study found significant relationships between the sources of motivation and specific items on the

organizational citizenship behavior questionnaire. These findings are similar to those supported by previous research using motivation to predict organizational citizenship behavior (Tang & Ibrahim, 1998; Penner et al., 1997).

Second, the results of this study support previous research findings that individuals in Midwestern agriculturally related businesses report higher levels of self-concept-internal motivation than any of the other sources (Barbuto, et al., 2000). This finding is important: Because self-concept-internal motivation is based on personal challenge and self-authorship, organizational policies and procedures will not affect these individuals' motivation.

Finally, since all levels of management were treated the same in this study, the results may have overlooked a salient situational factor. No research has examined the impact of an individual's management level on organizational citizenship behavior. Theoretically, as the leader obtains a higher level within the organization, the opportunity to assist others with their work may be limited and the amount of time spent at work may increase. As a result, organizational citizenship behavior may naturally decrease as individuals progress upward in an organization. Management level of employees was not identified in this study, but this variable may be a valuable one for future inquiries.

### Implications for Practice

Based on the findings of this study, there may be several cautious implications for the practices of business and leadership. First, managers are cautioned that the relationships found in this study, while statistically significant, were relatively low, accounting for little variance. Further research of these variables is necessary to ascertain, with confidence, these relationships. One general implication is the realization that an individual's sources of motivation can have an impact on his or her level of organizational citizenship behavior. Specifically, individuals high in instrumental and self-concept-external motivation demonstrated low levels of organizational citizenship behaviors. Also, individuals' self-concept-internal motivation was positively correlated with organizational citizenship behaviors. Better assessment of their followers' source of motivation may allow leaders to develop better techniques and strategies to motivate followers and persuade them to exhibit more organizational citizenship behaviors (Barbuto, 2000).

Next, even though the relationships were significant, the amount of variance they accounted for was low. For practitioners, this suggests that situational factors tend to account for more variance in organizational citizenship behavior than dispositional factors (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Organ & Lingl, 1995). Managers often report that they are searching for self-motivated employees, assuming these individuals will be most productive. Findings in this study suggest that, while there is a relationship between an individual's self-concept-internal motivation and his or her organizational citizenship behavior, the low variance indicates that factors other than motivation sources alone will be more salient predictors of employee performance.

Finally, qualitative responses from leaders support previous research suggesting that leaders use observations of organizational citizenship behavior to rate follower performance (MacKenzie, Podsakoff & Fetter, 1993; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994). One leader responded

that this test explained why a particular employee was no longer with the organization, and another leader said he wished he could have had this test to assess a former employee's behavior before he employed the individual. These findings support the Pond, et al. (1997) conclusion that organizational citizenship behaviors are contextual and situational.

### Limitations and Future Research

One limitation of this study is that it focused on only one type of business. The target organizations share the same geographic location and are similar in the services they provide. The homogeneity of the sample limits the generalizability of results. However, since organizational citizenship behavior must be examined within a given context, the sample was useful for examining agriculturally based industry trends in organizational citizenship behavior.

Future research needs to further examine the relationship between motivation and organizational citizenship behavior. The findings of this study are consistent with those of Tang and Ibrahim (1998) in explaining relationships between these variables. Future research needs to examine different samples of individuals who may be motivated differently than those in service-based businesses (non-profit directors and board members, stockbrokers, and students) to further understand this relationship.

The motivation sources inventory, which was used to measure sources of motivation in this study, demonstrated poorer psychometric properties in this study than it had in previous work (Barbuto & Scholl; 1998, 1999). One explanation for this difference is the education level of the subjects in this study, which was lower (20% had bachelors) than in previous studies (60%+ had bachelor's degrees). The instrument may be less suited for individuals with lower education levels. We recommend further development of the motivation subscales to improve future studies.

Research is still needed on the antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior. Although many studies suggest these behaviors are important to the success of individuals and organizations (MacKenzie, et al., 1993; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994), after almost 17 years of research, the antecedents of these behaviors are still relatively undetermined. When the antecedents of these behaviors are discovered, leaders may be able to effectively increase the organizational citizenship behavior in their followers.

Finally, the results of this study should encourage further examination of the relationship between motivation and organizational citizenship behavior, inspire future research examining the impact of the sources of motivation in predicting follower and leader behaviors, and add to the research literature on organizational citizenship behavior and motivation.

### References

Alderfer, C.P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 4, 142-175.

Aquino, K. (1995). Relationships between pay inequity, perceptions of procedural justice, and organizational citizenship. Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 8, 21-33.

Ashforth, B., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. Academy of Management Review, 14, 20-39.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Barbuto, J. E. (2000). Influence triggers: A framework for understanding follower compliance. Leadership Quarterly, 11, 365-387.

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). Leader's motivation and perception of follower's motivation as predictors of influence tactics used. Psychological Report, 84, 1087-1098.

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.

Barnard, C. (1938). The functions of the executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard 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.

Beed, T. W., & Stimson, R. J. (1985). Survey interviewing. Sydney: George Allen & Unwin.

Deci, E.L. (1975). Intrinsic Motivation. New York: Plenum Press.

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.

- Herzberg, F.W. (1968). One more time, how do you motivate employees? Harvard Business Review, 46(1), 53-62.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley.
- Kegan, R. (1982). The evolving self. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press.
- Kelman, H.C. (1958). Compliance, identification, and internalization: three processes of attitude change. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 2, 51-56.
- Kohlberg, L. (1976). Collected papers on moral development and moral education. Cambridge, MA: Center for Moral Education.
- 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., & Skarlickli, 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.
- Loevinger, J. (1976). Ego development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- 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: Harper & Row.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). The achieving society. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- McClelland, D. C. (1985). Human motivation. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 81-90.
- 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.
- Murray, E. J. (1964). Motivation and emotion. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- 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., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. Personnel Psychology, 48, 775-802.

Organ, D. W., & Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. Journal of Social Psychology, 135(3), 339-350.

Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. Human Performance, 10(2), 85-97.

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.

Piaget, J. (1972). Intellectual evolution from adolescence to adulthood. Human Development, 15, 1-12.

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., III, Nacoste, R. W., Mohr, M. F., & Rodriguez, C. M. (1997). The measurement of organizational citizenship behavior: are we assuming too much? Journal of Applied Psychology, 27, 1527-1544.

Schappe, S. P. (1998). The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behavior. The 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.

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.