

BACHELORARBEIT AN DER WIRTSCHAFTSUNIVERSITÄT WIEN - INSTITUT FÜR
CHANGE MANAGEMENT UND MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT

The influence of personality factors on organizational citizenship behavior

verfasst von Judit Aykler
im Sommersemester 2010

Betreut und beurteilt von Dr. Ursula Loisch

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	3
1.1. The topic and its relevance	3
1.2. Research question and aim of the thesis	5
2. Organizational Citizenship Behavior.....	7
2.1. Definition of Organizational Citizenship Behavior	7
2.2. OCB in the Context of Organizational Theory	8
2.3. The development of the concept of OCB	13
2.3.1. The worker contribution.....	13
2.3.2. The term “citizenship behavior”	13
2.3.3. The definition of OCB measures	15
2.3.4. The enlargement of the initial dimensions	17
2.3.5. The new conceptualization of OCB	18
2.4. The definition of the OCB dimensions	19
2.4.1. Helping	19
2.4.2. Courtesy	19
2.4.3. Sportsmanship.....	20
2.4.4. Compliance.....	20
2.4.5. Civic Virtue.....	21
2.4.6. Organizational Loyalty	21
2.4.7. Self Development.....	22
2.5. Alternative concepts to OCB	22
2.5.1. Extra Role Behavior (ERB)	22
2.5.2. Prosocial Behavior	23
2.5.3. Contextual Performance	26
2.6. Antecedents of OCB	27
2.7. Conclusion.....	30

3. Theoretical constructs of disposition	31
3.1. The Five-Factor-Model of personality.....	31
3.2. The concept of Prosocial Personality	34
3.3. Conclusion.....	35
4. The linkage between disposition and OCB.....	36
4.1. Behavior as a function of attitudes and disposition.....	36
4.2. The link between personality factors and OCB dimensions.....	39
4.2.1. The linkage between agreeableness and OCB	39
4.2.2. The linkage between conscientiousness and OCB.....	43
4.2.3. The linkage between extraversion and OCB	46
4.2.4. The linkage between emotional stability and OCB.....	48
4.2.5. The linkage between openness to experience and OCB.....	49
4.2.6. The linkage between prosocial personality and OCB	50
4.3. Critical review of the empirical methods used	52
4.4. Conclusion.....	55
5. Concluding discussion and managerial implications	56
5.1. Discussion of the results and recommendations for managers.....	56
5.2. Conclusion, limitations of the thesis and future prospects	61
6. Annex.....	63

1. Introduction

The following thesis deals with Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), a type of organizational behavior, “that goes beyond existing role expectations” (Organ, Podsakoff, MacKenzie 2006, p.33). I have decided to write my bachelor thesis about OCB due to the fact that research on Organizational Behavior has a strong link to psychology, which is to me one of the most interesting fields of science as it deals with something behind the visible. Reviewing literature and research on OCB gives me the opportunity to work on one of the “soft components” (Kasper and Mühlbacher 2002, p. 99 In: Kasper and Mayerhofer 2002) of an organization- meaning the people, who are part of this construct- and to link economic and psychological views of one phenomenon. What I find most interesting about OCB is the question: “Why are employees so devoted to their work that they go even beyond what is required by their job descriptions?” I was wondering whether this behavior was determined by personality factors and decided to analyze the theoretical background and studies (e.g., Organ, 1994; Organ and Lingl, 1995; Chien, 2004; Comeau and Griffith 2005; Emmerik and Euwema 2007 and Wrigth and Sablinsky, 2008) on OCB and personality factors. Before providing the reader with a detailed definition of OCB in the second chapter, the first chapter will give the most prominent definition of OCB. It will then explain the concept’s relevance in order to lead the reader to the research question and to make him/her understand why I have chosen to work on this matter.

1.1. The topic and its relevance

OCB, is according to Organ (1988, p.4 cited in Podsakoff et al. 2000, p. 513) an *“individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization”* (further explanation in point 2.1.).

Referring to the definition, OCB promotes the *“efficient and effective functioning of the organization”* (Organ 1988, p.4 cited in Podsakoff et al. 2000, p. 513). This effect can only be visualized by examining a huge number of such behaviors. Usually a single occurrence of OCB is a small gesture of one person towards another one, such as helping a colleague, which is likely to remain unrecognized by others, especially by supervisors who may take it for granted. The triviality of a single occurrence is most probably the reason why it is not (or cannot) be recognized by formal reward systems. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.8-10) A formal reward system can factually not take into consideration every single altruistic action or extra-effort of each co-worker. Nevertheless, it will not remain unrecognized if some employees engage in different OCBs again and again in an extended

period of time. In this case OCB becomes part of one's behavior and can in the aggregate benefit the whole organization. So far the link to the relevance of OCB in organizational practice is obvious as OCB positively affects an organization's effectivity and efficiency. The aggregation of individual OCB leads to increased performance of an organization, as proved by several studies (e.g: Podsakoff and MacKenzie 1997). Summing up the results of different empirical findings, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997, p.10) found strong support for the hypothesis that OCB is related to organizational performance. Despite its positive influence on organizational performance OCB is, per definition, unrewarded in terms of physical return (but it might be rewarded with appreciation).

Putting the above mentioned components of OCB's definition together leads us to the following conclusion: Assuming that managers are able to influence this behavior, or to predict which personalities will most certainly engage in OCB, they will consequently hire more of OCB-favorable personalities and respectively provide the employees with OCB-favorable working conditions. Referring to the part of the definition that says that OCB has an effect on organizational effectiveness and efficiency, an organization is likely to perform even better (without any extra-expenses), if people are hired that are more likely to engage in OCB than others.

If one wants to influence OCB, it is indispensable to understand OCBs' determinants and their significance. With respect to the assumption made above, the question is what such OCB-favorable personalities and working conditions might be. Research on OCB's dispositional determinants (e.g. personality or affectivity) and contextual determinants (e.g. working conditions) has found its way into many studies conducted since the beginning of OCB research in 1983. In my paper I will examine relevant studies and consequently connect them in order to try to give an answer whether there are certain types of personalities which are more likely to engage in OCB than others. For now I would like to focus on the relevance and actuality of OCB. The question is why organizations should focus on OCB and why it is important for them to know whether OCB is influenced to a significant extent by disposition. *"Employees provide organizations with unique human resource capabilities that can create a competitive advantage, and OCB is one type of behavior that may contribute to that advantage."* (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, Bachrach 2000, p.46) As a consequence organizations have to find ways to benefit from human resources, and subsequently have to make sure that their employees contribute to their competitive advantage. OCB can be an important factor that might distinguish the employees from one organization and those of another one. In the following paragraph I would like to argue why organizations should particularly now, in times of economic difficulties, focus more on their employees generally

and on OCB in particular. Especially nowadays, in times of fast changes and economic difficulties many organizations have to cope with a decrease in revenues. As a consequence competition among similar organizations is growing even harsher. Wouldn't it be desirable to find a competitive advantage that contributes to an increase in performance without requiring any financial investment? Finding a way to making employees engaging in OCB or to choose the right personalities, who will predictably engage in OCB might represent such a competitive advantage. That is why it seems very obvious to me that a large number of managers should be interested in profiting from OCB.

Therefore I assume that it is still a very relevant field of research even though the term was first mentioned about 30 years ago.

1.2 Research question and aim of the thesis

Various studies (Organ, 1994; Organ and Lingl, 1995; Chien, 2004; Comeau and Griffith 2005; Emmerik and Euwema 2007 and Wrigth and Sablinsky, 2008) have tried to find out about OCB and its determinants. In this thesis the focus will be put on one type of determinants, which are dispositional determinants, and thereby on personality factors, which are the most important among them.

People react differently in similar situations. Very probably their dispositional factors, such as the personality, have a strong effect on their situational behavior and reaction. As a consequence, I conclude that personality factors determine behavior in any case, no matter how dominant other influences may be. No one is able to neglect the fact that personality is also predicts behavior, at least to a certain extent. Although OCB is a type of behavior in a specific context the basic assumption, that personality influences behavior, is the same as for all types of behavior. I am not questioning *if* personality factors play a certain role in the composition of determinants for OCB, indeed I want to find out about the personality factors' significance as a determinant of OCB. This leads to the following research question:

To what extent is OCB influenced by dispositional factors, especially by personality factors described in the five-factor-model?

In order to point out more precisely what will be touched by the following thesis, I will add some questions:

1. Which arguments corroborate the assumption that disposition influences behavior?
2. Which personality factor(s) is/are positively related to one or several OCB dimensions and how can this be explained?

3. What advises can be provided for managers in order to enhance the likelihood of the occurrence of OCB among their employees?

The aim of this thesis is to provide a meta-analysis of studies conducted in the field of OCB in order to find out more about the extent to which empirical evidence supports the hypothesis that personality is one of the main determinants of OCB. The thesis will not provide any new empirical research. Instead my challenge will be to provide a detailed literature and research review that sums up and logically connects existing research so that conclusions can be drawn and recommendations to managers can be proposed.

This first chapter has introduced the subject and the aim of the thesis, illustrating its relevance and posing the research question. The second chapter will include a detailed definition, the context and the theoretical development of the term OCB. The third chapter will conceptualize the term "disposition" with a focus on the Five-Factor-Model of personality (e.g., Barrick and Mount 1991, p.5) which is the model most often used in research to assess someone's personality. This chapter will thus provide the basis for the fourth chapter, which will examine in detail the link between personality factors and OCB dimensions. After having commented on empirical methods used to assess the linkage, I want to conclude and discuss the results in the fifth chapter. The last chapter will give recommendations to managers, show the limitations of this thesis and present ideas concerning the future prospects of research on OCB and personality.

2. Organizational Citizenship Behavior

In this chapter of the thesis I would like to present a detailed definition of the concept of OCB and its dimensions. Furthermore, I would like to describe OCB within the context of organizational theory. On the one hand I will give insight into theories of similar concepts that have provided a basis for OCB, and on the other hand I will compare OCB to other concepts, which should be distinguished from OCB in order to define OCB as clearly as possible. Further, the development of the concept of OCB, as well as its dimensions, will be explained.

2.1. Definition of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

OCB according to Organ (1988, p.4 cited in Podsakoff et al. 2000, p. 513) refers to an *“individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization”*.

The first research on OCB conducted by Organ in the 1980ies was influenced by the theories and research in social psychology and prosocial behavior. (Further explanation in chapter 2.5.2) Prosocial behavior includes similar facets of behavior as OCB, despite some differences in the definition of the two terms.

Prosocial behavior focuses on helping an individual without compensation, but it distinguishes itself from OCB in a way that individuals involved in prosocial behavior are often unknown to each other, whereas in OCB people involved are working together in the same organization. Furthermore, the concept of OCB includes also other, more impersonal dimensions besides helping, such as high levels of conscientiousness and involvement in work beyond the general requirements. Although OCB can express itself in the form of altruism, the two concepts are not the same, because the motives are different:

Altruism is always selfless, whereas OCB can have various motives. Even if the motives are often unconscious, OCB might be driven by ego-centric motives as well. Therefore we have to look first at the motives to decide whether a certain type of OCB is altruistic or not. (Organ, Podsakoff, MacKenzie 2006 p.4-7)

By taking a closer look on the definition some of the terms used should be described more precisely: Discretionary behavior means that it is up to oneself to behave in a specific way or not, as it is not directly required from anyone. OCB is per definition discretionary, respectively the engagement in OCB is voluntary. As a consequence one cannot be punished for not engaging in OCB. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.8-10)

According to this definition, some components of OCB are also in-role-behaviors, because a certain level of *conscientiousness*, for example, is required, but everything that goes beyond

this level is voluntary and therefore not directly recognized by the formal reward system. Even though OCB is “*not directly recognized by the formal reward system*” per definition, this shall not mean that OCB must be limited to those gestures remaining unrewarded. In some cases reward systems that are more sophisticated than others may take into consideration some sort of OCB. Depending on the context some forms of OCB might even provide some form of return in the future, the point is that benefits for such behaviors are not contractually guaranteed in advance. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.8-10)

Summing up the main points of the definition, it should be mentioned that OCB in the first place is always a type of voluntary behavior that cannot be enforced by superiors. Nevertheless this does not mean that it has to be altruistically driven per definition. There are innumerable motives for such behavior. In the second place OCB is always connected to an organizational context, meaning that it is not directed towards strangers, but colleagues. In the third place one should bear in mind that some forms of OCB might be difficult to distinguish from in-role behavior, as they are not different from the latter one in their nature itself, but in their intensity. At last it should be noted once more that OCB does not require to remain unrewarded, but a reward for OCB cannot be contractually guaranteed, per definition.

Having now presented a definition, OCB can now be put into a bigger framework- the organizational theory.

2.2. OCB in the Context of Organizational Theory

The following part of this chapter will describe the roots of OCB within organizational theory.

Some researchers described types of behavior, similar to OCBs, a long time before OCB was first mentioned in scientific articles. This fact supports the suspicion that OCB is based on the ideas of Barnard’s (1938) concept of “willingness to cooperate”, Roethlisberger and Dickson’s (1939) “informal collaboration” and Katz and Kahn’s (1967) “patterns of individual behavior”.

Research on OCB and related constructs dates back the 1980ies. Still, this does not mean that the 1980ies were the years when OCB was discovered. There are some fields of Organizational Theory that have had an influence on the phenomenon we nowadays call OCB. In this part of the paper I would like to present some concepts that provide the basis for OCB or describe similar types of behaviors.

The first concept I would like to present is Chester Barnard’s (1938) theory of the “cooperative system”. Barnard’s view of an organization was different from the theories of

other researchers at that time, who put more emphasis on the formal structure and control of organizations. Barnard defined the essence of an organization differently. He argued that the *“willingness of persons to contribute efforts to the cooperative system is indispensable”*.

(Barnard 1938 p.83)

According to Barnard the willingness to contribute went beyond the execution of specified functions in exchange for contractual compensation. In order to make the organization work, as a cooperative system, every participant is required to behave in a certain way and to show some commitment. It results in a shared understanding that these spontaneous contributions of every single member result in a benefit for the whole organization. The term “willingness” points out in a clear manner that authority cannot enforce this kind of behavior, it is up to the participants to contribute to the community or not. (Barnard 1938, cited in Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.44-48)

The essence of the term “willingness”, as well as its determinants shows similarities to the latterly developed concept of OCB and its determinants.

Barnard saw the roots of the willingness to cooperate in the general satisfaction of a person and the compatibility of the person (respectively his/her education and experience). The executive’s function was to maintain this cooperative effort. Summing up, Barnard noted that spontaneous contributions beyond contractual obligations are of vital necessity for an organization as a cooperative construct. (Barnard 1938, cited in Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.44-48)

If one compares the nature of both OCB, defined by Organ (1988), and the so called “willingness to cooperate”, defined by Barnard (1983), it is clear that both types of behavior are voluntary ones. This voluntariness, which is the essence of Barnard’s “willingness to cooperate”, was what Organ called “discretionary behavior” half a century later, when he described the concept of OCB.

Having presented one possible root of the concept of OCB, I would like to proceed by analyzing the roots of other parts of OCB’s definition.

Another concept of organizational theory similar to OCB is described in the chronicle of the Hawthorne studies by Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939).

The Hawthorne studies began in 1924 in the Hawthorne Works in Chicago, which was at that time the biggest production plant of the Western-Electric-Company. A number of researchers, among them Roethlisberger and Dickson, conducted experiments of different content between 1924 and 1932. The first experiments intended to establish a relationship between illumination and productivity. Another series of experiments should have found out

about the effects of rest, pauses and schedules of work, followed by studies, which concentrated on the factors of work-satisfaction. The last study, the so called BWOR-study examined the influence of teamwork on performance. The Hawthorne studies represented a new era, as they found out that leadership has to focus not only on efficiency and effectiveness in an economic sense, but has to take into account socio-psychological conditions of leadership as well. The results of the Hawthorne studies made clear that besides technical processes, especially social dynamics, as well as appreciation of work and acceptance doubtlessly affect productivity. (Heinrich 2002, p. 293-294 In: Kasper and Mayrhofer 2002)

Summing up the results the researchers, who conducted the Hawthorne studies, found that increases in productivity did not only depend on the arrangement of pauses, hours of work or favorable working conditions. Instead, changes in supervisory treatment and unpredictable cooperation within the working groups seemed to have a strong influence on performance too. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.48-51)

Roethlisberger and Dickson provided in their work "Management and the worker" (1939) a coherent picture of all the studies involved in the Hawthorne studies and interpreted the results with reference to behavioral science. They made a distinction between the formal and the informal organization. The first one was marked by the system of rules and policies regulating the workers' tasks, the latter one described the informal differentiation and integration of the individuals. The informal system should not be misinterpreted as a construct opposing the formal organization, it should rather be understood as a necessary condition for collaboration making the formal organization work better. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.48-51)

A similarity to the concept of OCB was found in the interpretation of the "informal collaboration", which is a system of unpredictable cooperation within individuals that ensures a better functioning of the formal organization. Another similarity of this concept of collaboration and OCB can be seen in the way job satisfaction seems to have an effect on both types of behavior. Roethlisberger and Dickson- just like researchers on OCB- concluded that the quality of collaboration is positively linked to job satisfaction. Thus, co-workers in a good mood collaborate in a way that goes beyond the formal level required. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.48-51)

Summing up, both the commitment beyond formal job requirements, described in the concept of OCB, and the so-called "informal collaboration" positively contribute to the organization's performance. Just like "the willingness to cooperate" described by Barnard

(1938), Roethlisberger and Dickson's (1939) "informal collaboration" can be seen as one possible root of OCB.

Another concept dated prior to OCB but dealing with similar content is Katz and Kahn's (1967) behavioral analysis of organizations based on the open system model.

The two authors argued in their book, published in 1966, that there were three types of "*patterns of individual behavior required for organizational functioning and effectiveness*" (Katz and Kahn 1967, p.337).

The first category of behavior, they focused on, was to join the organization and to stay within the system. It is obvious that in order to make an organization well functioning, a certain number of employees is needed. As high turn-over rates are costly for an organization it is desirable to bind the workers to the organization so that they "stay within the system." (Katz and Kahn 1967, p.337)

The second category of behavior refers to the role-requirements and was called "dependable behavior". "Dependable" in this sense was understood in a way that employees' behavior should be restricted to predictable patterns, depending on the working context. This type of behavior demands of each individual to fulfill its role requirements, respectively to meet or even to exceed quantitative as well as qualitative standards of performance. (Katz and Kahn 1967, p.337)

The last type of behavior was defined by the authors as "*innovative and spontaneous behavior: performance beyond role requirements for accomplishments of organizational functions.*" (Katz and Kahn 1967, p.337) It includes all those gestures that promote a positive climate for the organization in the external environment, but also cooperation with colleagues and actions to maintain a favorable working climate. (Katz and Kahn 1967, p.337)

The system of an organization would be too fragile and would break down without these spontaneous, unpredictable cooperative actions. On one hand, each action taken singularly is unimpressive and thus might be taken for granted or even neglected. On the other hand, summing up the contributions of all participants, the result can have a significant impact on the performance of the whole organization. (Katz and Kahn 1967, p. 337-339)

A similarity to OCB is the unpredictability of these contributions, thus showing parallels with the OCB feature of being discretionary. Any action that is a product of a person's intrinsic motivation, guided by his/her own willingness to do something or not to do it, is unpredictable and uncontrollable to a certain extent. Another resemblance is that both behaviors are described as going beyond role requirements and as being essential for the functioning of an organization, respectively contributing to the overall performance of an organization.

There are some more theories that share some common points with OCB. One of them is the Leader-Member Exchange Theory (LMX), which analyzes leadership types that are suggested to result in a certain kind of behavior of the group members. The members' behaviors seem to reflect the way they are managed. In contrast there are also exchange theories which describe the relation the other way round, thus the leader behavior becomes a function of subordinate behavior (e.g., Lowin and Craig 1968 and Greene 1975). In reference to OCB, the LMX theory includes also some sort of extra-role contributions offered by the employees in exchange for extra-offers from the leader. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.55-57)

Even though there might be some factors of OCB included in the extra-role contributions of the LMX theory, I argue that the motives behind are different to those behind OCB. As OCB is per definition unrewarded, the dominant motive for OCB subsequently cannot be any kind of material compensation. To me it seems that OCB is to a certain extent more voluntary and selfless than similar actions in the LMX theory, as the latter one describes behavior in the context of exchange, thus as a reaction to the behavior of someone else. As soon as there is some sort of compensation, the motives behind the extra-role behavior might change from a selfless other-oriented to a kind of "give and take" arrangement. I assume that in order to distinguish these two forms of commitments one has to look more in detail at the motives behind.

So far there has been given insight into three different organizational theories where similarities to OCB up to a certain extent can be found. The fact that other researchers, who worked separately and totally independently from research and papers on OCB that were conducted later on, came to similar conclusions is a strong support for the concept of OCB. It supports the fact that OCB is not something constructed in a person's mind and afterwards defended by empirical prove. On the contrary it is something that had been observed a long time before it was given a name. Even if there are still questions open on influences on OCB and its determination by numerous factors, there is no doubt about its relevance in organizational theory.

After having placed OCB within the context of Organizational Theory, I want to proceed with the development of the term OCB and its dimensions.

2.3. The development of the concept of OCB

2.3.1. The worker contribution

In 1977 Organ published a paper to defend the popular opinion that satisfaction had an effect on productivity, even though solid empirical evidence for this hypothesis was still missing at that time.

In his paper he distinguished between “*quantitative measures of output or productivity and other, more subtle, forms of worker contribution that often are not reflected in measures of individual output.*” (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.15) These contributions might manifest themselves by helping coworkers, contributing to the organization’s unwritten rules and its culture, as well as adapting to changes made by managers. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.15)

One can easily admit that there are similarities between the later described OCB and these kinds of contributions. That is the reason why we can see Organ’s paper from the year 1977 as the cornerstone of the theory around OCB.

His paper was not written for the purpose of developing a new concept of Organizational Behavior, nevertheless two of Organ’s doctoral students became interested in doing some research in order to justify or to disprove Organ’s ideas. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.15)

2.3.2. The term “citizenship behavior”

Bateman (Bateman and Organ 1983), one of the two students, conducted a study on the relationship between affect, respectively job satisfaction, and employee citizenship. The study tried to find empirical evidence for the link between job satisfaction and performance through taking into account not only the quantity of output but also those gestures of supra-role behavior that are often taken for granted but are necessary to make the social machinery of an organization well functioning. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.15) Examples of such behavior are: Helping colleagues with job-related problems, communicating a positive image of the organization to outsiders, accepting a temporary overload of work without complaint, avoiding interpersonal conflicts and protecting organizational resources. (Katz and Kahn 1966, cited in Bateman and Organ 1983, p. 588) Bateman named these gestures “citizenship” behaviors. According to the authors of the study, Bateman and Organ, there are two theoretical concepts which might describe why citizenship behaviors are influenced by job satisfaction. The first one is the Social Exchange Theory, which predicts that under certain conditions people try to compensate those who benefit them. If an employee, for instance, feels that he is treated in a fair manner by his

supervisory, he will try to compensate him in some way and might therefore, for example, engage in citizenship behaviors. If one claims that a person's satisfaction results from the effort of organizational officials, the person will try to reciprocate those efforts. Citizenship behaviors are a suitable way to compensate the organizational officials, when one is unable to produce more quantitative output. (Adams 1965 and Blau 1964, cited in Bateman and Organ 1983, p. 588)

Another way to justify the hypothesized linkage between satisfaction and performance is through affectivity. If it is claimed that satisfaction reflects a positive affective mood, therefore it is likely that a person, who is more satisfied, engages more in prosocial behavior, thus, performing better (because prosocial behavior is seen as one component of performance mentioned above in the description of Bateman's study). (Bateman and Organ 1983, p.587-591)

In the study the researchers measured job satisfaction, behavior and attitudes of employees at Indiana University. In addition, supervisor ratings of the subjects' behavior at work were collected. The results were surprising: Not only was the correlation between earlier job satisfaction and later citizenship behavior significantly positive, but also the correlation between earlier citizenship behavior and later job satisfaction. Furthermore, the significance between qualitative (citizenship) and quantitative performance was higher than hypothesized. (Bateman and Organ 1983, p.587-591)

Summing up the results of the study, I conclude that there is a link between OCB and job satisfaction in both ways which means that the two variables influence each other, in other words one might weaken or enforce the other one.

Assuming that job satisfaction is not fully dependent on personality and subjective assumptions, but can be influenced from the outside as well, one can consequently argue that OCB as well can be influenced by external factors, most probably through the mediator of job satisfaction, but probably even directly.

The positive results of this study might have been the reason why researchers have stucked to the topic of OCB. In the fourth chapter of my thesis I will present the results of studies aimed at finding out more about the dispositional antecedents of OCB in more detail. The conclusion of findings within these studies might give an answer to the question whether managers are able to influence the occurrence and the intensity of this behavior. With reference to the research question (chapter 1.2) the reader might now even better understand the main points of the question- the influence of personality factors among other determinants of OCB. Reading between the lines the research question raises the following matter: "Is there any combination of personality factors that definitively lead to OCB or is

OCB to a broad extent depending on the situation and external factors?” The answer will most probably be found somewhere in between.

Once we have understood the different determinants of OCB in detail we can give recommendations to organizations not only how to choose their employees in order to increase the probability of the occurrence of OCB, but also how to lead different types of personalities so that they feel motivated to engage in OCB. Furthermore, we can advise on how the working environment should be designed in a way to make it OCB-“favorable”. (see chapter 5.1) Before analyzing the antecedents of OCB and reviewing several studies conducted to find out more about the role of personality factors in the concept of OCB, we have to go one step back and proceed with the detailed analysis of the definition of OCB and give insight into the different types of OCB. The next paragraph of this chapter will introduce the first attributes to measure OCB that have been chosen by Smith, one of Organ’s students, who worked on the conceptualization of OCB in the first place.

2.3.3. The definition of OCB measures

After Bateman and Organ (1983) tried to find linkages between satisfaction and citizenship behaviors and potential influence on them through dispositional factors, another one of Organ’s students began to do research on citizenship behavior. Anna Smith (Smith, Organ and Near 1983) interviewed several supervisors in manufacturing plants in Southern Indiana asking them the following question:

“What are the things you would like your employees to do more of, but really can’t make them do, and for which you can’t guarantee any definite rewards, other than your appreciation?”

(Smith, Organ and Near 1983, cited in Organ, Podsakoff, MacKenzie 2006, p.16) The answers to this question can be found in the chart below (Chart 1: Measures of OCB).

Chart 1: Measures of OCB

1. Helps other employees with their work when they have been absent.
2. Exhibits punctuality in arriving at work on time in the morning and after lunch and breaks.
3. Volunteers to do things not formally required by the job.
4. Takes undeserved work breaks.*
5. Takes initiative to orient new employees to the department even though it is not part of his/her job description.

*item is reverse scored

(continued)

Chart 1 continued:

6. Exhibits attendance at work beyond the norm (for example, takes fewer days off than most individuals or fewer than allowed).
7. Helps others when their workload increases (assists others until they get over the hurdles).
8. Coasts toward the end of the day.*
9. Gives advance notice if unable to come to work.
10. Spends great deal of time in personal telephone conversations.*
11. Does not take unnecessary time off work.
12. Assists me with my duties.
13. Makes innovative suggestions to improve overall quality of the department.
14. Does not take extra-breaks
15. Willingly attends functions not required by the organization but that help its overall image.
16. Does not spend a great deal of time in idle conversation.

Source: Smith, C.A. / Organ, D.W. / Near, J.P. (1983): Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68. p.653-663. Cited in: Organ, Podsakoff, MacKenzie 2006, p.17-18

The sixteen actions mentioned above in the chart, are the answers that have been given most frequently. One can conclude that Smith found out that unrewarded and voluntary help respectively assistance, as well as all those actions that show that work is taken seriously and considered as important (e.g.: avoiding absence at work), obviously increase efficiency, otherwise managers would not want them to increase. Provided that all those extra-efforts contribute to an organization's efficiency and effectiveness, it seems to make sense to examine them in more detail. Smith, therefore, asked a group of evening MBA students, who were as well working managers, to think of a specific coworker and to rate the frequency with which the coworker engages in such behaviors in order to define forms of the citizenship behaviors. In her analyses she found that there were at least two different factors of OCB. The first was labeled "*altruism*". This dimension of OCB is directed at a specific individual, usually a colleague, but sometimes a supervisor or a customer. One example of this dimension of OCB is helping a new worker to get to know the job or to help a colleague with unusually large amount of work to finish it in time or to solve a problem. (Smith et al. 1983 cited in Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.18) The altruism-dimension was later often called "*helping*". (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, Bachrach 2000, p.517)

The other factor was composed by all those answers given, which were more impersonal

and generally affected the whole working group. Examples of this factor are: being punctual, not taking unnecessary breaks, avoiding absence and private conversations during working time. This factor was initially called "*generalized compliance*" and later "*conscientiousness*". The latter one led to confusions between "*conscientiousness*" as a personality factor and as a type of OCB, consequently the term "*compliance*" came into usage. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 18-19) One should note that "*compliance*" as a form of OCB does not imply to obey to strict rules. It should rather be interpreted as a voluntary obedience to the unwritten rules of a social system. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 18-19) Smith made an important effort through the definition of two forms of OCB. She set the cornerstone for further research on OCB and its antecedents. Other dimensions of OCB, which have been added later, are "*sportsmanship*", "*courtesy*" and "*civic virtue*". (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.18-24) An example of *sportsmanship* is not to complain, *courtesy* involves those actions that help to avoid problems with colleagues and *civic virtue* "*describes a posture of responsible, constructive involvement in the political or governance process of the organization*". (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.18-24) The dimensions of OCB will be defined in more detail in chapter 2.4. In order to give a complete picture of the development of the concept of OCB, I would like to point out, in the following paragraph, the discussion on the dimensionality of OCB that followed within the years after the initial definition by Organ and his students. Consecutively, I would like to define, as mentioned previously, the dimensions of OCB, especially those, which found the largest reverberation among those studies, which I reviewed in order to write my thesis.

2.3.4. The enlargement of the initial dimensions

In the following years researchers working in the field of OCB were discussing thoroughly the definitions of the various types of OCB. Podsakoff et al. (2000, p. 515) criticized that the literature had focused primarily on differentiating OCB from other constructs and disregarded to clearly define the concept of OCB itself. One of the main points in the discussion of the OCB dimensions was whether some of the forms (e.g. "*helping*" and "*compliance*") fit into the definition because they might as well be seen as in-role behavior to a certain extent. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.18-24)

Furthermore, two other forms of OCB were added, but nevertheless studies tended to go on working with the initial definition including five types of OCB.

Organ added the two other types of OCB, which were "*cheerleading*" and "*peacemaking*". "*Cheerleading*" includes those actions of employees which are intended to show respect and recognition of good work for another co-worker. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.18-24)

“*Peacemaking*” is a sort of intermediary position of one co-worker who has realized that there are interpersonal conflicts between two or more of his colleagues. The peacemaker not only recognizes the conflict but actively intervenes as a moderator. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.18-24)

2.3.5. The new conceptualization of OCB

Podsakoff et al. (2000) analyzed the broad variety of different dimensions and conceptualizations of OCB and provided in their paper an integration of different interpretations. They drew up a new structure of the previously described dimensions. Some of the dimensions have been given new names in order to embody more than one meaning, others integrated several dimensions of similar content into a single dimension. Furthermore, Podsakoff et al. added two dimensions to the concept of Organ. The dimensions listed by Podsakoff et al. are as follows: “*Helping behavior*” includes Organ’s “*altruism*”, “*peacemaking*” and “*cheerleading*”, which are all forms of citizenship behavior intending to help another person or group. Additionally it includes also “*courtesy*”, as it is interpreted a kind of helping in terms of preventing problems. (Podsakoff et al. 2000, p.517). “*Sportsmanship*”, “*organizational compliance*” (initially called “*generalized compliance*” or “*conscientiousness*”) and “*civic virtue*” do not change in denomination and interpretation. According to Podsakoff et al. (2000, p. 524) the nature of “*conscientiousness*”, should be included into the dimension they referred to as “*individual initiative*”, as it includes all engagement in task-related behavior that goes beyond minimally required levels.

The two dimensions added by Podsakoff et al. are “*organizational loyalty*” and “*self-development*”. “*Organizational loyalty*” means “*promoting the organization to outsiders, protecting and defending it against external threats, and remaining committed to it even under adverse conditions.*” (Podsakoff et al. 2000, p. 517) “*Self Development includes voluntary behaviors employees engage in to improve their knowledge, skills and abilities.*” (Podsakoff et al. 2000, p. 525)

Summing up there are seven types of OCB according to each of the authors (Organ and Podsakoff et al.), but only five of them are commonly used for empirical findings: “*altruism*” (respectively “*helping*”), “*compliance*” (respectively “*conscientiousness*”), “*sportsmanship*”, “*courtesy*”, and “*civic virtue*”. I will therefore continue to use these five most prominent types of OCB and I will use the initial as well as the new denominations synonymously (in order to summarize both the findings of recent studies, but also those of elder ones).

Having now presented the development of the dimensions of OCB, the following part of the paper will proceed with a short description of each dimension by providing a list of examples of each dimension.

2.4. The definition of the OCB dimensions

In order to avoid confusions I want to sum up in short the conceptualization of the various dimensions according to the most recent findings.

2.4.1. Helping

This dimension was initially labeled “*altruism*”. It was given a new name, because “*altruism*” was criticized to imply selflessness as a motive behind the behavior and limited the dimension thereby to those gestures which were driven by selfless motivators. (Organ, Podsakoff, MacKenzie 2006, p. 18)

The new conceptualization is defined as “*voluntarily helping others with, or preventing the occurrence of, work related problems*”. (Podsakoff et al. 2000, p. 516) Regardless of its denomination (*helping* or *altruism*) this type of OCB is in its nature “...*directed at a specific individual- usually a coworker, but sometimes the supervisor or a customer. In other words, the target of the behavior, the immediate beneficiary, is a person. This factor includes items such as helping a new worker learn the job or helping an overloaded worker catch up with the workflow or solve a problem.*” (Organ, Podsakoff, MacKenzie 2006, p.18)

Podsakoff et al. (2000, p. 517) argued that Organ’s dimensions of “*peacemaking*” and “*cheerleading*” (definition in chapter 2.3.) were also included in “*helping*”. Furthermore, those behaviors of “*courtesy*” intended to avoid problems were also included, according to Podsakoff et al., as they also constituted some sort of helping-behavior.

2.4.2. Courtesy

Although this dimension is according to the most recent conceptualization included in the dimension of “*helping*” (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 2006, p. 297), I will treat it within my thesis as a separate dimension. I will do so due to the fact that earlier dated studies will as well treat it separately from other dimensions as the linkage to certain factors of personality might differ from other dimensions of OCB. I therefore find it not reasonable to summarize several different facets of OCB under one dimension.

Organ (1988) initially labeled “*courtesy*” as a specific form of OCB, whereas Podsakoff et al. later argued that it was included within the dimension of “*helping*” (as mentioned in the description of “*helping*”).

“Whereas helping pertains to mitigating or solving a problem confronted by a colleague, courtesy consists of actions that help prevent those problems from occurring. The basic idea is to avoid practices that make other people’s work harder and, when you have to add to their load, to give them enough notice that they’ll be prepared to deal with it.” (Organ, Podsakoff, MacKenzie 2006, p.24)

Items to measure courtesy are (Konovsky and Organ 1996, p. 253-266. Cited in: Organ, Podsakoff, MacKenzie 2006, p.22-23):

1. Tries to avoid creating problems for others.
2. Considers the effects of his/her actions.
3. Consults with me or other people who might be affected by his/her actions or decisions.
4. Informs me before taking any important actions.

2.4.3. Sportsmanship

Employees who engage in sportsmanship are described as *“...people who not only do not complain when they are inconvenienced by others, but also maintain a positive attitude even when things do not go their way...”* (Podsakoff et al. 2000, p. 517)

Konovsky and Organ (1996, p. 253-266. Cited in: Organ, Podsakoff, MacKenzie 2006, p.22-23) list the following items as measures of sportsmanship:

1. Complains a lot about trivial matters.*
2. Always finds fault with what the organization is doing.*
3. Expresses resentment with any changes introduced by management.*
4. Thinks only about his/her work problems, not others’.*
5. Tries to make the best of the situation, even when there are problems.
6. Is able to tolerate occasional inconveniences when they arise.
7. Does not complain about work assignments.

* item reverse scored

2.4.4. Compliance

This dimension consisted, according to its initial definition, of *“...items that did not have the immediate effect of helping a specific person but rather contributed in a more impersonal and generalized fashion to the group, department, or organization. For example, punctuality in arriving at work or at meetings, exemplary attendance (i.e., very low absenteeism), and*

refraining from unnecessary breaks and idle conversation do not appear to help any specific individual (although one could make the case that such behavior does, at least indirectly, help the supervisor or manager). What these behaviors exemplify is a particularly high order of compliance with constraints upon individuals necessary to make a cooperative system." (Organ, Podsakoff, MacKenzie 2006, p.19) Although this dimension was initially labeled "*conscientiousness*", it was later renamed "*compliance*" in order to avoid confusions with the personality factor labeled "*conscientiousness*". (Organ, Podsakoff, MacKenzie 2006, p.19) A shorter definition is provided by Podsakoff et al. (2000, p. 524) who described an employee engaging in "*compliance*" as: "...an employee who religiously obeys all rules and regulations, even when no one is watching..."

The dimension of "*conscientiousness*" is included in the dimension of "*individual initiative*" described by Podsakoff et al. (2000, p.524), which are "...task-related behaviors at a level that is far beyond minimally required or generally expected levels..."

In this paper I will sum up all the task-related, impersonal types of OCB that are defined as extra-role according to the level of engagement within the category of "*compliance*" rather than as a matter of nature. I will continue to use the terms "*compliance*" and "*individual initiative*" synonymously. In contrast I will avoid the term "*conscientiousness*" in order to prevent confusions with the personality factor named "*conscientiousness*".

2.4.5. Civic Virtue

Podsakoff et al. (2000, p. 525) describe civic virtue as "...a person's recognition of being part of a larger whole in the same way that citizens are members of a country and accept the responsibilities."

Items to measure civic virtue are (Konovsky and Organ 1996, p. 253-266. Cited in: Organ, Podsakoff, MacKenzie 2006, p.22-23):

1. Stays informed about developments in the company.
2. Attends and participates in meetings regarding the company.
3. Offers suggestions for ways to improve operations.

2.4.6. Organizational Loyalty

This dimension of OCB, which consist - according to Podsakoff et al. (2000, p. 521) - of behaviors that protect and defend the image and good reputation of the organization towards the external environment is of minor importance in the research of personality factors and their linkage to OCB.

2.4.7. Self Development

Self development is characterized as "... *voluntary behaviors employees engage in to improve their knowledge, skills, and abilities.*" (Podsakoff et al. 2000, p. 525) This dimension will not be further mentioned in my work, as empirical research on this dimension of OCB in reference to its link to personality traits is rare up to now.

So far I have defined in a detailed manner those dimensions of OCB that will be of relevance for this thesis (altruism, compliance, civic virtue, sportsmanship and courtesy) and additionally have provided a short definition those dimensions that have been added later and are consequently less often mentioned in studies on OCB and personality. I would like to present in chapter 2.5 alternative concepts to the concept of OCB, which describe similar behaviors to OCB, but are nevertheless defined slightly differently.

2.5. Alternative concepts to OCB

The following part of my thesis aims at distinguishing organizational citizenship behavior from related, but nevertheless different concepts. Even though OCB, ERB, prosocial behavior and contextual performance are often used synonymously and in the same sense within research papers, one must insist that the concepts are per definition not exactly the same. As my thesis is focusing on OCB, I want to draw a line between OCB and alternative concepts of similar phenomena in order to point out clearly the topic of my thesis.

2.5.1. Extra Role Behavior (ERB)

Extra Role Behavior, as opposed to in-role behavior, is per definition a behavior that tries to benefit the organization and that "*goes beyond existing role requirements.*" (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 33)

Whereas failing to perform the required in-role behavior that serves as basis for continuing job performance (Katz 1964, cited in Van Dyne and Le Pine 1998, p.108), will have financial consequences and bear the risk of losing the job, extra-role behavior is discretionary. If one takes a closer look on the definition of extra-role behavior, one can see the resemblances with OCB as well as the differences. Extra role behavior is: "*(1) not specified in advance by role prescriptions, (2) not recognized by formal reward systems and (3) not a source of punitive consequences when not performed by job incumbents.*" (Van Dyne and Le Pine 1998, p.108) Extra-role behavior and related concepts (such as OCB for example), according to Van Dyne and Le Pine (1998, p.108) include *promotive, prohibitive, affiliative* and *challenging* behaviors. *Promotive* behaviors are promoting changes in the system, *prohibitive* behaviors sustain and protect against unfavorable conditions, *affiliative* behavior describes cooperation with others and is oriented towards other members of the community and

challenging behavior promotes new concepts and changes and can therefore have a negative impact on relationships. The four main types of extra-role behavior, “*helping*”, “*voice*”, “*stewardship*” and “*whistle-blowing*”, each embody two different behaviors described above. (Van Dyne and Le Pine 1998, p.108-109) “*Helping is an example of affiliative promotive behavior. Voice is an example of challenging promotive behavior. Stewardship is an example of affiliative prohibitive behavior, and whistle-blowing is an example of challenging prohibitive behavior.*” (Van Dyne and Le Pine 1998, p.108-109) “*Helping*” is voluntary cooperation that strengthens the social boundaries between individuals. “*Voice*” is to encourage and suggest ideas for innovative changes, it “*constructively challenges the status-quo*”. (Van Dyne and Le Pine 1998, p.109) This type of extra-role behavior is particularly important when an organization is confronted with fast changing environments and therefore has to adapt as quickly as possible. The authors emphasize that these types of “*helping*” and “*voice*” should not be confused with behavior that is required in some jobs. For example “*helping*” is required in a nurse’s job description. (Van Dyne and Le Pine 1998, p.108-109) The last type of extra-role behavior is whistle-blowing. “*Whistle-blowing brings to light unethical or illegal practices occurring within the organization and initiates actions by authorities who can terminate such practices.*” (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.33)

Referring to the definitions of each type of ERB mentioned above one can see that there are some similarities between the ERB dimension of “*helping*” and some OCB behaviors- especially the “*altruism*” dimension. Nevertheless the definition of ERB tends to exclude those types of OCB which are not explicitly beyond role requirements, but fit into the definition of OCB as soon as the level of engagement in a certain behavior, such as “*compliance*”, exceeds the minimum standards required by the job description. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.33)

Referring to the challenging forms of ERB, the distinction between OCB and ERB is more obvious: Both the antecedents and the immediate consequences are quite different. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.33)

2.5.2. Prosocial Behavior

“*Acts such as helping, sharing, donating, cooperating, and volunteering are forms of prosocial behavior*” according to Brief and Motowidlo. (1986, p. 710)

Although a consensus upon the definition of prosocial behavior has not been reached, it has generally been described as a type of action “*which the actor expects will benefit the person or persons to whom it is directed.*” (Brief and Motowidlo 1986, p. 711) The two authors point

out that these positive acts are other- oriented “*carried out to produce and maintain the well-being and integrity of others*”. (Brief and Motowidlo 1986, p.710)

Prosocial behavior, synonymously to extra-role behavior or OCB, is thought to have an impact on the overall performance of an organization. Brief and Motowidlo (1986, p.710) use the description of the different types of behaviors that are necessary to make an organization function provided by Katz and Kahn (1967, p.337) in order to complete what is meant with prosocial behavior.

According to Katz and Kahn (1967, p.337) the three types of behavior include first to join the system and to stay within it, second to fulfill the in-role requirements and quantitative as well as qualitative performance requirements and third to go beyond these role requirements. (detailed description chapter 2.2.)

Brief and Motowidlo argue that the meaning of prosocial behavior is partly covered by the third type of behavior within the typology made by Katz and Kahn. It includes actions such as cooperation with colleagues, protection of the organization, suggestions for improvement, “*self development and preparation for higher levels of organizational responsibility*” (Brief and Motowidlo 1986, p.710) and to communicate a positive image of the organization to the external environment. These spontaneous, voluntary actions on behalf of the interests of the organization are only one part of prosocial behavior. The concept of prosocial behavior goes beyond these spontaneous actions. One can distinguish the various types according to the motives behind. For example “*altruism*” is, as mentioned above in the general definition, a type of behavior that will benefit the person to whom it is addressed, but additionally altruistic prosocial behavior is selfless without expecting any reward in return. (Brief and Motowidlo 1986, p.710-712)

To include the variety of different types of prosocial behavior, Brief and Motowidlo propose the following definition: “*Prosocial organizational behavior is behavior which is a) performed by a member of an organization, b) directed toward an individual, group or organization with whom he or she interacts while carrying out his or her organizational role, and c) performed with the intention of promoting the welfare of the individual, group or organization toward which it is directed.*” (Brief and Motowidlo 1986, p. 711)

The various types of prosocial behavior can be distinguished according to some features. First, some types of prosocial behavior are organizationally functional, others are dysfunctional. Organizationally functional behaviors include all types of behaviors described by Katz and Kahn within the third category of necessary behaviors within an organization: Cooperation between co-workers, creating and supporting a positive image of the

organization in the external environment and protection of the organization are all beneficial behaviors to the organization. In contrast there are organizationally dysfunctional behaviors, such as helping a colleague to reach a personal aim that is opposing organizational interests or providing customers with services inconsistent with organizational aims. These types of behavior are also considered prosocial, but do not contribute to organizational performance. The second distinction can be made between role-prescribed types of prosocial behavior and those types which are extra-role. (Brief and Motowidlo 1986, p.710-712) Many job descriptions include being helpful for instance. Organ emphasizes the importance of behaviors beyond requirements: "*In numerous situations, outstanding performance or productivity, beyond some minimally acceptable level, is of relatively little interest to organizational officials. They may be more desirous of such things as regular attendance, predictability, following the rules, 'not making waves', avoidance of hassles, cooperation, and generalized tendencies toward compliance.*" (Organ 1977, p.50) In-role behaviors are usually organizationally functional, while extra-role behaviors can be either functional or dysfunctional. (Brief and Motowidlo 1986, p.710-712)

A third distinction can be made concerning the diverse targets to which prosocial behavior is directed. Targets might be co-workers, customers or clients or the whole organization. Prosocial behaviors directed toward the whole organization are, for example, when an employee expresses his or her loyalty toward the organization or offers extra efforts. Prosocial acts toward individuals can be either functional or dysfunctional, prosocial behavior directed toward the organization, in contrast, is in general functional. (Brief and Motowidlo 1986, p.710-712) Brief and Motowidlo (1986, p.710-712) describe thirteen different types of prosocial behavior. I want to list some of them and compare them with the concept of OCB.

One type of prosocial behavior is "*assisting co-workers with job-related matters*". (Brief and Motowidlo 1986, p.712) The OCB dimension of "*altruism*" includes these prosocial behaviors directed towards individuals. According to Smith, Organ and Near (1983) "*altruism*" includes helping co-workers, who have been absent, offering help to new colleagues without being required to do so and helping co-workers with temporary extra amounts of work (p.657). Primarily they are both behaviors beyond role requirements intended to benefit subordinates, co-workers or supervisors. Some of these prosocial behaviors might be role-prescribed as well. (Brief and Motowidlo 1986, p.713)

Another component of prosocial behavior, which is *helping co-workers in focusing on solving their personal problems*, can be dysfunctional and is therefore not included in the general definition of OCB. OCB per definition has a positive effect on the organization's performance,

respectively behaviors included in OCB must be functional to the organization. (Brief and Motowidlo 1986, p.713)

Another facet of prosocial behavior is to provide customers with services in a way that the organization's interests are protected. (Brief and Motowidlo 1986, p.713) I would compare this type of prosocial behavior to the "*conscientiousness*" or "*compliance*" dimension of OCB, assuming that *conscientiousness* is interpreted as fulfilling one's duties as precisely and conscientiously as possible.

Brief and Motowidlo list "*providing services or products to consumers in organizationally inconsistent ways*", which is the opposite of the behavior mentioned previously, as well as one type of prosocial behavior. (1986, p.713) This may sound like a contradiction, but in fact both behaviors can be prosocial, as they benefit the person to whom it is addressed, with or without respect to the interests of another party (in this case the organization).

To point it out in a clear manner this is, according to my point of view, the biggest difference between prosocial and organizational citizenship behavior. The first one includes any type of behavior that benefits another person or group within an organizational context, but does not necessarily require respecting the interests of the organization (as we can see in the list of types mentioned above). The latter one, indeed, does not require respecting the interest of the organization per definition, either, but does include the term "*promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization*" (Organ 1988, p.4), and consequently excludes any behavior that will harm the effective and efficient functioning of the organization.

The last concept, which I would like to compare to OCB, is contextual performance.

2.5.3. Contextual Performance

A group of industrial psychologists (e.g. Borman and Motowidlo, 1993 among others) tried to find empirical evidence for the assumption that personality affected a person's dedication to work and therefore influenced his or her productivity in work. The researchers differentiated between workers' performance into "task performance" and "contextual performance" in order to increase the probability to find a linkage between personality factors and at least one of the two components of performance. They found out that "*the best predictors of individual task performance are knowledge, skills and abilities...researchers argued that personality or dispositional variables, on the other hand, better predict those contributions that individuals make to the social and psychological context in which technical or task performance occurs.*" (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 31)

"Contextual performance is defined by those contributions that sustain an ethos of cooperation and interpersonal supportiveness of the group. Contextual performance can take

the form of interpersonal facilitation (such as helping and good collegueship) or job dedication, which has much in common with the OCB compliance factor because it encompasses self-disciplined behaviors with respect to rules and use of time.” (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.31)

Contextual performance is in its nature very similar to OCB, as it includes not only forms of helping and supporting one’s colleagues, but also more impersonal forms of contribution to the social spirit of the organization in form of job dedication. Nevertheless OCB seems to be more specified as it includes in its definition that those behaviors are unrewarded and not included in the job-description.

The concept of contextual performance, in contrast to OCB, does not make reference to the expectations according to the job description or the prospect of formal rewards. (Organ, Podsakoff, MacKenzie 2006, p. 32) Consequently it remains open whether contextual performance includes all types of dedication to work and helping without questioning whether this behavior is voluntary or required. As a consequence it can be argued that the motives behind contextual performance might vary from being totally selfless and other-oriented to egocentric ones that motivate to behave socially in order to fulfill all the job-requirements in the best possible way.

Having now given insight into the concepts of extra-role behavior, prosocial behavior and contextual performance, and having outlined the main differences between OCB and three other types of similar organizational behaviors, I want to conclude this chapter by listing several antecedents of OCB in order to provide a linkage to the third chapter which will describe in detail the theoretical background of one possible antecedent of OCB, which is disposition.

2.6. Antecedents of OCB

This chapter will include a representative, but not a complete selection of possible antecedents of OCB, examined within different studies, and put together by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach (2000). My aim is not to provide the reader with a complete, detailed examination of all antecedents and their intensity of influence on OCB, I rather would aim at giving a general overview of possible antecedents, with short explanations on their significance in order to subsequently concentrate on the significance of one category of them- namely dispositional antecedents- within the network of different determinants.

According to Podsakoff et al. (2000, p. 526) Organizational Citizenship Behavior has four major categories of antecedents, which are the following:

- Individual (or employee) characteristics
- Task characteristics
- Organizational characteristics
- Leadership behaviors

The earliest research on OCB's antecedents focused on attitudes, disposition and leader supportiveness (for example: Bateman and Organ, 1983). Studies analyzing leadership, as well as task and organizational characteristics as possible antecedents of OCB followed later. (Podsakoff et al. 2000, p.526)

Podsakoff et al. listed several subordinated types for each category of antecedents that had been examined within other studies and had proved to have linkages with one, several or all types of OCB. They focused only on those types of OCB that had received the most attention in research literature, namely altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, civic virtue, sportsmanship, generalized compliance. They measured the average impact of the various variables on the sum of all dimensions and called it "overall OCB". (For further information on the dimensions see chapter 2.4.)

Among individual characteristics one can find employee attitudes, including traits such as satisfaction, fairness, and commitment. Furthermore, there are dispositional variables, including two dimensions of the big five personality factors (namely conscientiousness and agreeableness) and affectivity. Additionally role perceptions and demographic variables are also part of employee attitudes. (Podsakoff et al. 2000, p. 526-527)

In the following chapters of my thesis I will focus on one category of individual antecedents- namely the dispositional variables measured as factors of personality.

It is more likely that dispositional antecedents influence OCB in an indirect rather than direct way. This is due to the fact that dispositional factors, such as the personality factors of conscientiousness and agreeability, as well as positive or negative affectivity "*predispose people to certain orientations vis-à-vis coworkers and managers.*" As a consequence those orientations might increase the probability of feeling treated in a fair, supporting and satisfying way that is worth being reciprocated and therefore increases and intensifies OCB (Organ and Ryan 1995, p. 794, cited in: Podsakoff et al. 2000, p. 530). Certain dispositional factors can provide an explanation why some people might be more likely to engage in OCB than others.

Even though my work is dedicated to dispositional antecedents of OCB I will proceed by

listing several other representative categories of antecedents as well, in order to provide the reader with some general overview of the most important antecedents of OCB.

The second category- task characteristics- include, for example, task routinization and task feedback. The category of organizational characteristics includes, for example, formalization, organizational support, and inflexibility. The last category, referred to as “leadership behaviors” lists, for example, transformational leadership, articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model and leader-member exchange. (Podsakoff et al. 2000, p. 527- 528) While some of the variables mentioned above have proved to be significantly correlated with OCB, others have not. Employee satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceptions of fairness, and perceptions of leader supportiveness all have proved as being significantly linked to OCB and thus “*appear to be important determinants of citizenship behaviors.*” Among dispositional factors agreeableness, conscientiousness and positive affectivity seemed to have the strongest effects, according to Podsakoff et al. (2000, p. 530-532). Whether this might be supported, shall be analyzed in the fourth chapter of my thesis.

Furthermore, studies have proved a significant correlation between role perceptions and at least some factors of OCB, which is not the case for demographic variables- for example no evidence has been found to prove a correlation between gender and OCB. Nevertheless, Podsakoff et al. pointed out that additional evidence was needed in order to totally exclude a relationship between demographic variables and OCB. Almost no employee characteristic (including ability, experience, knowledge and professional orientation) has a strong relation to OCB. On the contrary task characteristics have a significant correlation with OCB. Among the last category of antecedents transformational leadership behaviors and some forms of transactional leadership behaviors have proved to be consistently and significantly correlated to OCB (or at least to some forms of OCB). (Podsakoff et al. 2000, p. 530-532)

“In summary, job attitudes, task variables, and various types of leader behaviors appear to be more strongly related to OCBs than the other antecedents.” (Podsakoff et al. 2000, p. 532) Nevertheless, the relation between OCB and its dispositional antecedents was examined in various studies even after the above mentioned study of Podsakoff et al. and will therefore be analyzed in detail in the fourth chapter of my work. Additionally, conclusions in accordance to these findings will be drawn, as I assume that Podsakoff et al. did not take all the findings on dispositional antecedents into account when they conducted their study.

2.7. Conclusion

So far, there has been presented a detailed definition of the concept of OCB and its dimensions. Furthermore, I have placed OCB within the context of organizational theory. Within this second chapter theories of similar concepts, that provided a basis for OCB, have been analyzed in order to show that the roots of OCB were established half a decade before the concept of OCB, as we call it today, was developed. It is reasonable to assume that Barnard's (1938, p.83) concept of "*willingness to cooperate*", Roethlisberger and Dickson's (1939) "*informal collaboration*" and Katz and Kahn's (1967, p. 337) "*patterns of individual behavior*" are the roots of the phenomenon later labeled organizational citizenship behavior.

I have proceeded with comparing OCB to other concepts. These similar, but slightly different concepts are extra-role behavior, prosocial behavior and contextual performance. Finally I have listed and shortly described several categories of antecedents of OCB and their subordinated traits. Chapter 2.6 (antecedents of OCB) has established a linkage to the following two main chapters of the thesis, as they will focus on one category of antecedents- the dispositional one- and its significance for predicting individual OCB behavior.

The following chapter will in short assess the theory behind the term "disposition". I will describe the five-factor-model of personality, as well as the concept of prosocial personality, in order to assess the linkage between personality and OCB in chapter number four. I have chosen to focus on the five-factor-model, as far as the measurement of personality is concerned, as it is one of the most important empirically relevant tools to measure disposition. After having given some theoretical input on disposition in chapter three, I will focus on assessing the linkage between the various dispositional factors and OCB dimensions in the fourth chapter of my work.

3. Theoretical constructs of disposition

The third chapter of my thesis represents, together with the second one, the basis for the fourth chapter, which will establish the linkage between OCB (described in the second chapter) and disposition (defined in the third chapter). Before arguing why it is reasonable to assume that dispositional factors, respectively one's personality and affectivity, influence behavior, I will present a tool to assess dispositional factors. I have chosen the most famous personality model- the *Five-Factor-Model* - and another one that has been examined in respect to its link to OCB- the concept of *Prosocial Personality*.

I want to point out that the constructs of disposition mentioned in the following chapter are only chosen in reference to their link to OCB. The two concepts of personality mentioned above have been examined within studies focusing on potential dispositional antecedents of OCB. I have therefore chosen those concepts to work with in my thesis as well, even though there might be other dispositional antecedents of OCB as well and respectively other concepts of disposition too. Nevertheless without any doubt most research on OCBs' dispositional antecedents was conducted using the five-factor-model of personality that is why I will also put the focus on this concept in the first place.

3.1. The Five-Factor-Model of personality

The five factor model of personality traits is a concept that has been developed, interpreted and changed within a period of about 50 years. Due to the differences concerning the interpretation of the five main factors of personality I first want to give a short definition of the essence of personality traits, then present diverging views of different researchers and afterwards link the various personality factors to the concept of OCB.

"Personality traits refer to enduring patterns of thought, emotion and behavior that are not likely to change over time and explain people's behavior across different situations." (Costa and McCrae 1989, cited in: Singh and Singh 2009, p.291)

McDougall (1932) was the first to mention that, *"Personality may to advantage be broadly analyzed into five distinguishable but separate factors namely "Intellect", "Character", "Temperament", "Disposition" and "Temper"..."* (McDougall 1932, p.15)

In the following decade other researchers tried to develop more complex systems to assess people's personalities, but a tendency to refocus on five factors could be seen in the studies of Tupes and Christal for example. In the 1960ies they reanalyzed the results of other researchers (Cattell and Fiske) and found that there was support for five factors: *"Surgency", "Emotional Stability", "Agreeableness", "Dependability" and "Culture"*. Later it turned out that

these factors were quite similar to those accepted by researchers today. (Barrick and Mount 1991, p.2) Even though Tupes and Christal found similar factors to describe personalities as the five factors commonly used nowadays, their work had little impact on personality research as it was published in an insignificant Air Force technical report. (Digman 1990, p.419)

The five factor model was confirmed by several studies, the most important among them conducted by Norman. Norman named the personality factors as follows: “*Extraversion*”, “*Emotional Stability*”, “*Agreeableness*”, “*Conscientiousness*” and “*Culture*”. His factors are commonly used and therefore are named “*Norman’s big five*” or simply the “*Big Five*”.

The five-factor-model became a standard model for assessing personality in research, thus confirming its robustness. Nevertheless there are non-supporters too, one of them, Hogan (1986), lists six main factors of personality. The main difference to the common five-factor concept is the splitting of the “*Extraversion*” dimension into “*Sociability*” and “*Ambition*”. While the majority of researchers agree on the number of factors, their interpretation has led to disagreement among researchers. (Barrick and Mount 1991, p.2-4)

There is a general agreement on two dimensions “*Extraversion*” and “*Emotional Stability*” (respectively “*Neuroticism*”). The interpretation of these two dimensions can be ascribed to Eysenck.

“*Extraversion*”, also referred to as “*Surgency*”, is associated with “*being sociable, gregarious, assertive, talkative and active*”. (Barrick and Mount 1991, p.3)

According to Hogan, who has split “*Extraversion*” into “*Sociability*” and “*Ambition*”, the latter one includes components such as initiative and impetuous, while expressiveness and exhibitionism are included in “*Sociability*”. (Barrick and Mount 1991, p.2-4)

The second dimension “*Emotional Stability*” is also called “*Neuroticism*” and includes traits such as anxiety, depression, anger, embarrassment, emotionality, insecurity and worries. (Barrick and Mount 1991, p.2-4)

The third dimension is most commonly referred to as “*Agreeableness*” or “*Likeability*” and includes traits such as “*courteous, flexible, trusting, good-natured, cooperative, forgiving, soft-hearted, and tolerant.*” (Barrick and Mount 1991, p.4)

The fourth dimension has been given very diverging names and has been interpreted quite differently. It is most commonly called “*Conscientiousness*” or “*Conscience*” (Norman 1963, Costa and McCrae, 1985). Some researchers (e.g: Digman, 1989; Smith, 1967) think that this dimension has a close link to educational achievements and therefore call it “*Will to*

achieve” or “*Will*”. The essence of this dimension has not been agreed upon. It is sometimes understood to be linked to dependability and thus includes being careful, responsible and organized. Others interpret it more in the direction of volition and describe it through traits like “*hardworking, achievement-oriented, and persevering*”. (Barrick and Mount 1991, p.4)

The most difficult definition to agree upon was the one of the last dimension. It has most frequently been called “*Intellect*” or “*Intelligence*”. Others label it “*Openness to experience*” (McCrae and Costa, 1985) or “*Culture*” (Norman, 1963). Traits commonly associated with this dimension are imagination, curiosity, broad-mindedness, intelligence and artistic sensitivity. (Barrick and Mount 1991, p.4-5)

The development of the five-factor model of personality was of high significance for further research in the field of personnel psychology as the model provides a common taxonomy for studying differences between personalities. (Barrick and Mount 1991, p.4-5)

For the assessment of linkages between OCB dimensions and personality factors I will choose the following five factors: “***Extraversion***”, “***Emotional Stability***”, “***Agreeableness***”, “***Conscientiousness***” and “***Openness to Experience***”. (Barrick and Mount 1991, p.5)

Note that all factors include specific traits- subordinated personality variables- that altogether characterize the specific personality factor. Personalities are different not only in respect to the occurrence of one trait or the absence of the same trait, but they also differ in intensity of one trait. All the factors include their exact opposites within their definition. Meaning that for example extraversion includes its opposite meaning- introversion- as well. I will only provide one list of certain traits for each dimension, and not assess the same traits twice for the other extreme value. Metaphorically speaking this means that the degree to which extent a specific trait occurs marks the position of an individual on the line between the two extreme values of one dimension (for example between introversion and extraversion) and thereby leads to the conclusion whether a person is introvert or extrovert.

The table on the following page will conclude this chapter by providing an overview of all the five factors including their most common traits. The next chapter provides the reader with a description of the concept of prosocial personality. This concept of disposition will be presented in my thesis as basis for an alternative way to link personality and OCB.

Extraversion	Emotional Stability	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Openness to Experience
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sociable • gregarious • assertive • talkative • active 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • anxious • depressive • angry • embarrassed • emotional • insecure • worried 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • courteous • flexible • trusting • good-natured • cooperative • forgiving • soft-hearted • tolerant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • careful • responsible • organized • hardworking • achievement-oriented • persevering 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • imaginative • curious • broad-minded • intelligent • artistically sensitive

Table 1: The big five personality factors (summarizing Barrick and Mount 1991, p.3-5)

3.2. The concept of Prosocial Personality

Although Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (2006, p.5) argue that it is unclear whether a “prosocial personality” exists or not, they do make a point that some research indicates that *“...a somewhat greater tendency toward helping exists among those who are socially well adjusted and generally lacking in neurotic symptoms, and extroverted.”*

Nevertheless other researchers used the term “prosocial personality” and developed a certain scale to measure it.

“In the early 1990s, Penner and his colleagues began to develop a scale that measured a prosocial personality orientation- an enduring predisposition to feel concern about the welfare of other people, to think about their best interests, and to engage in actions on their behalf.” (Penner, Midili and Kegelmeyer, 1997, p. 121)

Their initial model of measurement was a 128-item scale. It was a composition of variables from many other personality measure scales. They chose only those items that had been confirmed by other models or theories of helping to be associated with prosocial tendencies. One example of such an item is empathy, because innumerable theories that explain why people offer help, include empathy as a main reason for helping behavior. The scale to measure prosocial tendencies in personalities was called *Prosocial Personality Battery (PSB)*. The final version of the PSB consists of 56 items only. (Penner, Midili and Kegelmeyer, 1997, p. 121)

The scales included in the PSB assess the affinity to “*experience affective empathy (Empathetic Concern), cognitive empathy (Perspective Taking), and egocentric or self-oriented empathy (Personnel Distress...), feel responsibility for one's own actions and the welfare of others (..), use certain rules when making moral decisions (..), and offer help to needy individuals and groups (..).*” (Penner, Midili and Kegelmeyer, 1997, p. 121)

The items have finally been summarized to two distinguishable factors of a prosocial personality. Those factors are firstly the *Other-Oriented Empathy* and secondly *Helpfulness*. The first one means “the tendency to experience empathy for, and *to feel responsibility and concern about, the well-being of others, in other words prosocial thoughts and feelings.*” The latter one is “*a self-reported history of engaging in helpful actions and an absence of egocentric physical reactions to other's distress, in other words prosocial behavior.*” (Penner, Midili and Kegelmeyer, 1997, p. 121)

Having now defined the so-called prosocial personality, the linkage to OCB will be examined in detail in chapter 4.2 of the thesis.

3.3. Conclusion

So far the third chapter has provided a description of dispositional constructs that have found their way into research on the dispositional antecedents of OCB. The five-factor-model of personality is the most prominent among them, it is very often used for assessing personality and linking it to other fields of research. The concept of prosocial personality is less often used, but there are some studies on OCB that have tried to establish a link between prosocial personality and OCB.

The fourth chapter will present the analysis and interpretation of different findings on the linkage between OCB and dispositional factors. It will provide an answer to my research questions posed in the first chapter (see chapter 1.2). In addition to this I would like to finish the fourth chapter by critically commenting on the research methods used.

4. The linkage between disposition and OCB

This chapter will provide a meta-analysis of numerous studies conducted in order to assess the linkage between dispositional factors and OCB. I first want to provide the reader with some reasonable arguments why it is justifiable to suspect that disposition influences OCB and thereby answer my first research question, which is: Which arguments support the assumption that disposition influences behavior? (see chapter 1.2) I will then proceed by listing the big five factors of personality and assess the linkage between each of them and OCB. Additionally the concept of prosocial personality should be as well examined in reference to its linkage to OCB. This part of the chapter will give an answer to the second research question, which is: Which personality factor(s) is/are positively related to one or several OCB dimensions and how can this be explained? Finally, I would like to provide the reader with a critical review on the empirical methods used within the studies.

4.1. Behavior as a function of attitudes and disposition

This chapter is devoted to explaining why it is justifiable to assume that there is a linkage between attitudes/disposition and behavior, in general, and OCB specifically. In this part of my work I would like to find reasonable arguments to corroborate the assumption that OCB is significantly influenced by dispositional factors, such as one's personality and answer the first research question posed in chapter 1.2. After having hypothesized the assumed linkage, I will proceed with the analysis of empirical results to prove the assumption.

The first attitudinal factors, which were assumed to have an impact on specific behaviors, were job attitudes, in the aggregate called job satisfaction. The assumed linkage between personality traits and OCB derived from the assumptions made on the link between attitudes and behavior.

According to Weiss and Adler (1990, cited in Organ, Podsakoff and Mackenzie 2006, p.65) behavior is different in "strong" and "weak" situations. They describe "strong" situations as those *"that are uniformly encoded, generate uniform expectancies, and offer compelling incentives for performance"*, in contrast to that, "weak" situations are characterized by the opposite features.

OCB is described as behavior that occurs in "weak" situations, where attitudes and dispositions, in the form of personality traits, are likely to appear and manifest themselves within the behavior, whereas in "strong" situations the individual's behavior is restricted by rules and therefore can be in contrast to disposition and attitudes. *"Neither attitudes nor personality variables predict behavior well in situations marked by strong incentives, societal norms, or pressure to behave in a particular fashion."* (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie

2006, p.66)

What is more, attitudes or personality traits tend to be more influential regarding “*cumulative patterns or trends of behavior*” in a longer period of time in situations marked by moderate external influences on behavior, in contrast to “*specific behavior in a single time and place*”. These tendencies support the assumption that attitudes and personality do have an influence on OCB, regarding OCB as tendencies of behaviors that are discretionary and spontaneously in occurrence rather than a precisely specified behavior towards a certain circumstance. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 66)

The “*satisfaction causes performance*” hypothesis was defended for a long time, even though empirical evidence did not support the hypothesis. It seems to be justifiable to claim that positive job attitudes and job satisfaction may lead to positive behavior in the job as there are many examples in every-day-life supporting this assumption. For example, people perform better in things they like, than in others they do not favor as much. Thus one naturally tends to assume that someone who likes his/her job will perform well in it, and the other way around. “*Therefore, it would seem to make sense that the greater the overall job satisfaction (...), the more productive and the better the performance of the individual.*” (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.67)

Nevertheless, as mentioned above, the empirical evidence found to support this hypothesis, has remained weak unless one distinguishes between different forms of performance. If performance is seen as a conglomerate of task performance and contributions to the organization or “*patterns of cooperation and commitment*”, the “*satisfaction causes performance*” hypothesis can be analyzed in light of the above mentioned facets of performance. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p.67-70)

The question I would like to answer now is why OCB and other forms of commitment could be predicted in a better way by attitudes and personality factors than task performance.

Task performance is very dependent on ability and technology, in contrast OCB is much less influenced by one’s ability (even though offering help in specific situations does require some sort of ability). (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 70-71) For example, sticking to the rules of an organization, supporting its image and not complaining about trivial matters do not require specific abilities.

“*The fact that OCB- this generalized willingness to cooperate- can take so many varied forms and be suited to a variety of situations... renders it eminently viable as a means of expressing positive job attitudes.*” (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 71)

Assuming that OCB is not significantly depending on one's ability, theoretically everyone is able to engage in OCB, but in fact not every person (even in face of similar working conditions and job environment) shows the same sort and level of commitment as his/ her colleagues. As a consequence I would like to point out that there must be other factors (than ability) that determine and influence the occurrence of OCB. That is why it is reasonable to think that OCB is determined to a broad extent by attitudes, such as job satisfaction, and disposition, explained through personality factors.

In general the conclusion for the "*personality- performance proposition*" is very similar to the satisfaction- performance hypothesis. Empirical studies have also missed to prove the potential linkage between personality traits and performance just like they have done in the case of satisfaction and performance. What is more, "*the same arguments for why job satisfaction should predict OCB better than task performance also apply to personality.*" (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 81) Similar to job attitudes personality factors predict patterns of behavior better during a longer period of time within "weak" situations, where pressures, norms and rules are less restrictive and leave personality traits find their way into behavior. Each of the big five personality factors is supposed to influence different dimensions of OCB in varying intensity. *Agreeableness* that consists of a friendly and pleasant manner towards the others, is supposed to correlate positively with the OCB dimensions of helping, courtesy and sportsmanship, as such people are hypothesized to offer help voluntarily in order to react to the needs of others and thereby avoid to offend them. Another personality factor that is supposed to predict OCB is *conscientiousness*. This dimension includes traits such as being dependent, organized, self-disciplined and persevering and is therefore claimed to have a link to compliance, which represents more impersonal forms of OCB directed to the job itself and the organization. *Conscientiousness* is likely to have an impact on civic virtue, including being punctual and following the rules of the organization even if one is not monitored. *Neuroticism* (respectively *emotional stability*) is also supposed to have connections to OCB, because emotionally stable people are more open to problems of others than emotionally instable people who are often overstrained with their own problems and are, consequently, less likely to engage in helping behavior. One can also claim that the personality factor of *extraversion* might have a link to OCB, because extroverts generally respond more to their social surroundings than introverts do. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 81-82)

Having now provided the reader with reasonable arguments for the assumption that behavior, especially in "weak situations", is influenced by attitudes and disposition, I would

like to underlay these assumptions with empirical proves provided by researchers working on the construct of OCB and its dispositional antecedents.

4.2. The link between personality factors and OCB dimensions

Referring to the potential explanations why personality could have an effect on OCB, I would like to proceed with the presentation of several research results that provide support for the assumptions made above. I will do so by listing each of the big five personality factors and assess their linkage to the OCB dimensions separately.

4.2.1. The linkage between agreeableness and OCB

As mentioned before (in chapter 3.1) people scoring high on the personality factor of *agreeableness*, also referred to as *likeability*, are described as being “*courteous, flexible, trusting, good-natured, cooperative, forgiving, soft-hearted, and tolerant.*” (Barrick and Mount 1991, p.4) As a consequence of the friendly and pleasant manner towards the others, which is associated with being agreeable, this personality factor is suspected to correlate positively with the OCB dimensions of helping, courtesy and sportsmanship, as such people are hypothesized to offer help voluntarily in order to react to the needs of others and thereby avoid to offend them. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 81-82)

In the following paragraph I would like to present the results of four study papers issued one after the other within a short period of time. I have chosen those four papers, because they are worth mentioning in respect to the supposed linkage between agreeableness and OCB. Two of them represent a summary of various resembling studies conducted up to the year 1995. What is more all of them presented not very promising results for proving a positive linkage between agreeableness and OCB.

The first paper is not very promising in terms of supporting an assumed linkage between the personality dimension of agreeableness and OCB. Nonetheless, it should be mentioned here as it most certainly provided a good summary of the results of studies analyzing the linkage between personality and OCB up to the year of 1994. In the same year Organ published a research paper aiming at assessing the influence of personality dimensions on OCB. He tried to establish a linkage between personality and OCB synonymously to the linkage between job attitudes and OCB. His work showed no meta-analytical character, it was rather a discussion paper giving explanations that support the idea of a potential linkage between OCB and personality. (Organ 1994, p. 465-469) This paper represents the second one that should be mentioned in this context. As far as agreeableness is concerned Organ assumes that this factor of personality seems to be the perfect counterpart of the OCB dimension of

“altruism”, as agreeableness measures one’s generosity, friendliness, helpfulness and courtesy. (Organ 1994, p. 471) Despite the supposed logical linkage between agreeableness and OCB mentioned in the sentence above, Organ (1994) could not provide a sufficient number of studies that confirmed his assumptions. On the contrary, most of the studies conducted in this field before 1994 provided little basis to think that OCB is significantly influenced by dispositional factors. Barrick, Mount and Strauss (1992), for instance, found no significant correlation between agreeableness and compliance, altruism and other OCB dimensions. Konovsky and Organ (1993) found correlations below 0.10 for agreeableness and compliance, altruism and other OCB dimensions. Slightly more promising results were provided by Moorman (1990). His results proved a correlation of 0.12 between agreeableness and altruism, 0.11 between agreeableness and compliance and 0.13 between agreeableness and other OCB dimensions. (Organ 1994, p. 465-469) Although Organ concludes that the linkage between personality factors and OCB dimensions seems so far unsupported, he criticizes the methods used (mostly self- or other-ratings) and suggests further research. (Organ 1994, p. 474)

Organ and his colleagues conducted two studies in the following year to retest the influence of dispositional factors on OCB. The first one conducted by Organ and Ryan (1995) was a meta-analytic review of 55 studies examining attitudinal and dispositional predictors of OCB. Organ and Ryan analyzed four major journals within the period of 1983 to 1994 and summarized the results of articles dealing with OCB and its dispositional and attitudinal antecedents. (Organ and Ryan 1995, p. 775-780)

As far as dispositional antecedents were concerned the two authors only took into account two factors of the big five personality factors- namely agreeableness and conscientiousness. Additionally they examined two other factors of disposition- negative and positive affectivity. The two authors found no significant correlation between dispositional antecedents and OCB (with the exception of conscientiousness) and admitted that the most important moderator of these correlations were self- versus other- ratings. “*Self-ratings are associated with higher correlations, ..., and much greater variance in correlation.*” (Organ and Ryan 1995, p. 775) Organ and Ryan listed each dimension of OCB and compared separately the correlation of each of them with the dispositional and attitudinal antecedents. In comparison to the correlation between satisfaction and altruism, the correlation between dispositional variables (agreeableness, conscientiousness, negative and positive affectivity) was very weak. The only significant correlation of any dispositional variable and altruism was between conscientiousness and altruism, but only in the case when altruism was measured by self-ratings. The analysis of compliance and other OCB dimensions showed approximately the same correlations, although it has to be noted that Organ and Ryan found no studies that

examined a potential linkage between sportsmanship, civic virtue or courtesy and any dispositional factor. The studies they found, which examined other OCB dimensions as compliance or altruism, focused only on their linkage to satisfaction. (Organ and Ryan 1995, p. 788-791)

Within the same year Organ and one of his colleagues conducted another study of similar content. It was titled "Personality, satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior" (Organ and Lingl, 1995). This is the third article I would like to mention in reference to the linkage between agreeableness and OCB. Organ and Lingl again examined the two personality factors- agreeableness and conscientiousness- and their influence on variance between job satisfaction and OCB. Although the results supported the assumption that personality influences job satisfaction, they did not support the assumption that personality influences OCB in the same way. Organ and Lingl found no correlation between agreeableness and OCB, but a significant correlation between agreeableness and satisfaction. The two authors nevertheless admitted that: "*Although agreeableness did not here exhibit a statistically reliable prediction of altruism, the coefficient was larger and positive in magnitude than its coefficient with respect to compliance.*" (Organ and Lingl 1995, p. 339)

Finally I would like to present the results of the study conducted by Organ and Konovsky in 1996. The authors tried to find an answer to the question whether certain dispositional factors, such as agreeableness and conscientiousness, could determine the relation between contextual work attitudes and OCB. Organ and Konovsky predicted a significant correlation between agreeableness and three OCB dimensions, namely altruism, courtesy and sportsmanship. But the data collected could not confirm a positive relation as supposed. (Organ and Konovsky 1996, p. 253, 261)

Summing up those four studies mentioned above (Organ 1994, Organ and Ryan 1995, Organ and Lingl 1995, Organ and Konovsky 1996) I have to admit that all of them disproved the fact that agreeableness has a significant influence on OCB. Nevertheless I have found one study that came to the opposite conclusion. It was a study titled "Does personality predict organizational citizenship behavior among managerial personnel" (Singh and Singh, 2009) conducted and published in India. The researchers used the NEO five-factor inventory to assess the personality, as well as self- and other-ratings of OCB. They came to the conclusion that agreeableness was significantly positively correlating with all the five OCB dimensions, except civic virtue ($p < 0.01$). The correlation between agreeableness and altruism was 0.46, the correlation between agreeableness and compliance amounted to 0.26, the correlation between agreeableness and sportsmanship made up 0.44 and the one with courtesy 0.43. (Singh and Singh 2009, p. 293) The study also included another scale

measuring personality as a potential predictor of OCB. That scale, which represented the result of a hierarchical regression analysis, showed the percentage of variance in OCB that is caused by personality factors. (Singh and Singh 2009, p. 291-294) The results showed that personality factors were "... explaining 12% of the total variance in conscientiousness, 9% of the total variance in sportsmanship, 13% of the total variance in civic virtue, 16% of the total variance in courtesy and 18% of the total variance in the altruism dimension of OCB" (Singh and Singh, 2009, p. 296). When considering the personality dimension of agreeableness separately, it explained 30% of variance in altruism, 19 % of variance in sportsmanship and 10% of variance in courtesy. The variance in courtesy, caused by agreeableness, nevertheless remained insignificant as it made up only 10%. (Singh and Singh 2009, p. 294) The regression analysis proves that personality dimensions are not the only predictors of OCB, but in some cases personality dimensions are responsible for significant variance in certain dimensions of OCB. Agreeableness, in this case, proved the strongest influence on altruistic forms of OCB and consequently confirmed the assumption that people, who are generally friendly and good-natured are more open for the concerns of others and are more likely to behave in a helpful way. Even more it is quite likely that these people not only help others more often to solve their problems, but they might as well try to avoid creating problems for others, as can be seen in the 10% variance in the dimension of courtesy, caused by agreeableness. What is more, agreeableness also accounted for almost 20% of variance in sportsmanship. This leads to the conclusion that people scoring high on agreeableness, are more willing to accept inconveniences without complaining. This might be due to the generally positive attitude that such people might have.

Summing up the results of this study, agreeableness is positively related to all dimensions of OCB, except civic virtue. Furthermore the regression analysis proved significant positive associations with sportsmanship and altruism. Konovsky and Organ (1996) as well predicted positive correlations between agreeableness and three OCB dimensions (altruism, courtesy and sportsmanship), but the correlations they found were very weak. (Singh and Singh 2009, p. 295) Furthermore, Elanain (2007, p. 37, 38) also came to the conclusion that agreeableness was positively related to overall OCB (correlation of 0.36, $p < .01$), but in the second step the hierarchical regression analysis proved no significant relation between agreeableness and OCB.

Singh and Singh sum up that it is not very surprising that agreeableness has a significant influence on OCB, as "... agreeable employees show higher levels of interpersonal competence". (Witt et al. 2002 cited in: Singh and Singh 2009, p. 295)

In conclusion one can say that a larger number of studies have disproved the hypothesized linkage between agreeableness and OCB, compared to a few ones that have been able to confirm positive correlations. Nevertheless the arguments found within most of the studies support the assumed linkage. One shall not forget that most of the studies use similar scales to measure agreeableness, therefore it is not surprising at all that there is not much difference in outcome. That means that different types of measurement might possibly lead to different results.

4.2.2. The linkage between conscientiousness and OCB

Numerous studies have proved that conscientiousness is positively linked to OCB. The correlation between this personality factor and various OCB dimensions is much stronger than the correlation of the previously mentioned personality dimension- agreeableness- and OCB.

Conscientiousness includes traits such as being dependent, organized, self-disciplined and persevering and is therefore claimed to have a link to more impersonal forms of OCB, such as compliance and civic virtue, directed to the job itself and the organization. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 81-82) Surprisingly researchers also observed correlations with other dimensions of OCB to which the linkage was not foreseen in contrast to the two dimensions mentioned above. The examination of various studies assessing the linkage of personality and OCB has drawn a clear picture. Conscientiousness is among all five personality dimensions without any doubt the one that showed the strongest influence on OCB as can be seen from the results listed in the following paragraph.

Although Organ (1994, p. 465) argued that OCB was not best predicted by the traits of one personality factor only, but rather by a personality profile comprising different factors of the big five, conscientiousness, or at least some facets of it, doubtlessly directly influence the occurrence of OCB directly. Organ (1994) summarized results confirming the importance of conscientiousness in this context. For instance Barrick, Mount and Strauss (1992) found a 0.23 correlation between conscientiousness and altruism and 0.30 between conscientiousness and compliance (Barrick, Mount and Strauss 1992, cited in: Organ 1994, p. 469). This significant correlation was also confirmed by Organ and Lingl (1995, p. 339). Another study that observed the linkage between disposition and OCB offered some interesting results. By analyzing the influence of agreeableness, conscientiousness, as well as positive and negative affectivity on various OCB dimensions Organ and Ryan (1996, p. 788) came to the conclusion that altruism was better predicted by attitudinal factors in comparison to dispositional factors. In contrast to this, conscientiousness is almost as

reliable in predicting altruism as work attitudes are, but only when self-ratings of altruism are included. As opposed to the dimension of altruism compliance is as well predicted by disposition as it is by attitudes. In this case conscientiousness predicts compliance at the same level as attitudinal variables do even if only other-ratings of OCB and conscientiousness are taken into consideration. Still, it should be noticed that the use of other-ratings for assessing the OCB dimensions and the personality factors is most probably the strongest moderator within this relationship, as can clearly be seen in the following results. When studies with self-ratings were included the correlation between conscientiousness and compliance amounted to 0.467, in comparison to 0.228, when only other-ratings were used. Although conscientiousness proved to be a solid predictor of compliance this was not the case for any other dimension of OCB. Conscientiousness did not significantly correlate neither with sportsmanship, nor civic virtue, nor courtesy. (Organ and Ryan, 1996, p. 788-789, 791) Organ and one of his colleagues conducted another study with similar content within the same year. The authors tried to find out whether the dispositional factors of agreeableness, conscientiousness and equity sensitivity could determine the relationship between work attitudes and OCB. They once again confirmed that conscientiousness was (among those three dispositional factors) the only personality trait, which significantly influenced some forms of OCB. The results were quite similar to those found out by Organ and Ryan. While job attitudes influenced almost all factors of OCB (except compliance) more heavily than dispositional variables, compliance was significantly and most strongly influenced by conscientiousness. Additionally, this study proved that conscientiousness predicted compliance even better than general satisfaction or organizational fairness did. Furthermore, conscientiousness was also significantly related to civic virtue and altruism. Summing up the results of this study the authors pointed out that in reference to the fact that conscientiousness accounted for an outstanding amount of variance in compliance, civic virtue and altruism, this personality dimension had to be considered as an important predictor of some forms of OCB. (Organ and Konovsky 1996, p. 259, 261)

Although the above mentioned studies all strongly support the assumption that the personality factor of conscientiousness is an important predictor of at least some facets of OCB, I would like to mention some other, more recent, studies in this context as well.

A substantial thesis about the big five personality factors and their influence on organizational outcomes was written in 2004. Within this thesis personality factors were examined in order to assess their linkage to forms of organizational performance, among them OCB, which was divided into two dimensions within this study. The first dimension,

OCBI, summed up all the citizenship behaviors directed toward individuals, such as altruistic behavior for example. The other dimension, OCBO, included all the impersonal variations of OCB, including compliance. Conscientiousness was positively correlating with OCBO within this study. (Usman 2004, p. 79)

A recent study, hypothesizing the positive linkage of conscientiousness and overall OCB, also confirmed a significant correlation of the two variables, although the measurement of OCB was slightly different to the one that is commonly used. It was in this case composed of interpersonal helping, individual initiative, personal industry and loyal boosterism. (Elenain 2007, p. 36, 37)

Within the same year another author conducted a study where the citizenship behavior of teachers towards the school, towards students and towards colleagues was tested. Although OCB was in this case observed in a slightly different context than traditionally (as it is commonly observed in profit-oriented organizations) the results might be interesting for a business context too, regarding students as customers and the school as an organization in its broader sense. The results showed that conscientiousness was significantly correlating with OCB towards the students, and not as might be supposed with OCB towards the school. This means that careful and responsible people, scoring high on conscientiousness, are obviously more concerned about people affected by their work, than the organization itself. (Van Emmerik and Euwema 2007, p. 530) If we synonymously transfer these results to a profit seeking organization one might expect that conscientious employees are more concerned about the customers than dedicating extra efforts to the organization itself. In order to prove these assumptions further research will be needed in a profit-seeking organization.

Additional research in this field was later provided by Singh and Singh, two authors who conducted a study analyzing OCB among 188 front-level managers in India. The two authors found out that conscientiousness was significantly correlating with all five OCB dimensions. The table with results of the correlation analysis showed: 0.37 correlation between conscientiousness and compliance¹, 0.41 correlation between conscientiousness and sportsmanship, 0.25 correlation between conscientiousness and civic virtue, 0.48 between conscientiousness and courtesy and 0.37 between conscientiousness and altruism (with $p < 0.01$ in all five cases). (Singh and Singh 2009, p. 293) In a second step a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted in order to test whether certain personality factors were able to predict one or several OCB dimensions. The result concerning the personality factor

¹ in the sample the name conscientiousness was used as for both the personality dimension and OCB dimension, it was replaced by compliance in order to avoid confusions

of conscientiousness, was the following: “*The conscientiousness dimension of personality was significantly positively associated with (the) conscientiousness (respectively compliance) factor of OCB ($a=0.25$, $p<0.01$), sportsmanship ($a=0.20$, $p<0.05$), civic virtue ($a=0.27$, $p<0.01$), and courtesy ($a=0.28$, $p<0.01$).*” (Singh and Singh 2009, p. 294) In other words this result showed that conscientiousness was responsible for 25% of the variance in compliance, 20% of the variance in sportsmanship, 27% in civic virtue and 28% of the variance in courtesy.

If we consider the fact that conscientiousness proved to be positively linked to OCB, and even more to account for significant variance in OCB, in at least those seven studies mentioned above, one can doubtlessly conclude that the personality factor of conscientiousness is a main predictor of OCB.

4.2.3. The linkage between extraversion and OCB

The previous two chapters have given a quite detailed insight into different findings connecting agreeableness and OCB, respectively conscientiousness and OCB. As far as the three remaining factors of the big five model are concerned, there is a clear tendency that studies taking those personality factors into consideration are fewer in number. At the beginning of research on personality factors as possible predictors of OCB an emphasis was put on agreeableness and conscientiousness, as can be seen, for instance, in Organ and Ryan (1995) and Organ and Konovsky (1996). For this reason I will also mention more recent studies, which included the personality factor of extraversion as a possible antecedent of OCB.

As mentioned in the paragraph above some of the studies taken into consideration in order to assess the linkage between personality and OCB did not even include the dimension of extraversion. One reason for that might be that the theoretical analysis that had been conducted previously to the studies did not suppose any linkage between extraversion and OCB as there did not seem to be any parallels in any dimension of OCB and the nature of the personality dimension named extraversion. It seemed obvious to the researchers that the connection between conscientiousness and impersonal aspects of OCB had to be stronger in comparison to OCB as similar traits such as being punctual, disciplined and organized were shared. On the contrary the concept of OCB, may it be directed toward individuals or toward organizations, does not necessarily need to be linked to a personality factor, that assesses whether a person is more open to others, especially unfamiliar people, or not. Nevertheless there are certain arguments that do support the assumption that there is a linkage between extraversion and OCB.

"Extraversion", also referred to as "Surgency", is associated with "being sociable, gregarious, assertive, talkative and active". (Barrick and Mount 1991, p.3) In respect to the social component of being extrovert it is likely that extrovert people engage more in OCB as they are more responsive to their social surroundings and might therefore be more open to the claims of others. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 81-82)

Although one can find studies that assume that extraversion influences variability in OCB, I would like to list two studies that did not support this assumption. The first one analyzed the big fives' influence on organizational outcome. Although the dimension of extraversion was hypothesized within this study to correlate positively with the personal components of OCB (in this case referred to as "OCBI"), the correlation proved to be insignificant. (Usman 2004, p. 79) Elanain (2007, p. 37) did not observe any significant correlation either between extraversion and OCB within the hierarchical regression analysis used to measure the variance in each OCB dimension caused by a specific personality factor. In contrast to those findings, Singh and Singh (2009, p. 294) came to the following result: "*The extraversion dimension was significantly positively associated with conscientiousness² (a=0.24, p<0.01), civic virtue (a=0.23, p<0.01), courtesy (a=0.19, p<0.05), and altruism (a=0.19, p<0.05).*"

At this point I would like to mention again the study conducted by Emmerik and Euwema focusing on the occurrence of OCB among teachers at schools. The two authors argued that scoring high on introversion (the opposite of extraversion) meant that one was shy and therefore might not take an active role in social interactions, thus withdrawing from those situations. Furthermore those people were limited in their social skills. They pointed out that introversion measured one's degree of involvement with others and consequently they assumed that introversion was negatively related to OCB towards the school, towards students and towards colleagues. (Emmerik and Euwema 2007, p. 530) The results of this study "... indicate that extroverts and teachers open for experiences engaged more in OCB towards their school, than introverts and less open for experiences do." (Emmerik and Euwema 2007, p. 530) Additionally the two authors found out that extrovert people were less influenced by team leader effectiveness, while introverts were more sensitive concerning the relation to their team leader. That leads to the conclusion that an effective team leader is able to buffer the negative effects of introversion on the occurrence of OCB. (Emmerik and Euwema 2007, p. 530)

Given that these results, collected within the context of an organization not seeking to make a profit, might be observed also in a traditionally profit oriented organization, one can draw

² In this study the authors used the initially used name for the OCB dimension of compliance

important conclusions. If the effectiveness of team leaders does not only affect the extraversion factor of personality, but also other ones, we can assume that it is probably not essential to hire the person most likely to engage in OCB, but to lead him in a way that compensates negative influences of certain personality dimensions so that citizenship behaviors will occur naturally.

4.2.4 The linkage between emotional stability and OCB

Similarly to the previously mentioned personality dimension (extraversion) the first studies that analyzed influence of personality factors on OCB did not include the factor of emotional stability either, they only considered agreeableness and conscientiousness as possible dispositional predictors of OCB. More recent studies on the contrary have included emotional stability as a possible predictor of OCB as well and have provided interesting results.

“Emotional Stability” is also called *“Neuroticism”* and includes traits such as anxiety, depression, anger, embarrassment, emotionality, insecurity and worries. (Barrick and Mount 1991, p.2-4) Emotionally stable people who score high on emotional stability (or low at neuroticism if we put it the other way around), are more likely to perform OCB in comparison to neurotic personalities. This is due to the fact that emotionally stable people are more open to problems of others. Whereas emotionally instable people, in contrast to emotionally stable people, are often overstrained with their own problems and are, consequently, less likely to engage in helping behavior. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 81-82) Elanain, for instance, argues that emotional stability was considered as a *“... key dispositional determinant of social behavior”* (Barrick et al 2005 cited in Elanain 2007, p. 34) and therefore will be positively related to OCB. The hierarchical regression analysis confirmed the hypothesized linkage with a beta-coefficient of 0.13 ($p < 0.05$). As a consequence Elanain considered emotional stability as an important predictor when trying to assess how effective people were in performing OCB. (Elanain 2007, p. 38-39) In comparison to the results that Elanain (2007) found, Emmerik and Euwema (2007, p. 530) did not find support for their hypothesis that neuroticism was negatively related to OCB. On the other hand they found out about *“... the buffering effects of team leader effectiveness for introversion and emotional instability.”* It seems that *“... the engagement in OCB of emotionally instable persons deteriorates without an effective team leader...”* On the other hand an effective team leader can outweigh the negative effects of emotional instability. (Emmerik and Euwema 2007, p. 530)

This result leads me to the conclusion that if one employee scores low on emotional stability, he or she is not necessarily unable to perform OCB, but this employee needs more encouragement from an effective team leader in order to engage in OCB.

Interestingly there is also a study that disproved a supposed negative linkage between neuroticism and OCB by measuring an unexpected positive relation between the two variables. Although the correlation between neuroticism and OCBO (a measure of the impersonal components of OCB) was rather small ($\beta = 0.10$, $p < 0.06$), still it was considered as significant. (Usman 2004, p. 79) It is, nevertheless, very surprising that high scores on neuroticism, respectively low scores on emotional stability, predict higher engagement in the impersonal forms of OCB, such as compliance for example.

The results of the above mentioned study conflict with the results of a later conducted study proving a significantly negative correlation between neuroticism and sportsmanship, courtesy and altruism. (Singh and Singh 2009, p. 294) In other words high emotional stability is positively related to sportsmanship, courtesy and altruism.

According to my point of view a positive linkage between emotional stability and various forms of helping (altruism and courtesy), as well as avoiding problems and not complaining about inconveniences (sportsmanship), sounds far more plausible than a negative correlation between the same variables. One would naturally assume that a neurotic person complains more about trivial matters and offers less help to others, as such a person might focus more on his or her personal problems. On the contrary, as mentioned above, an emotionally stable person feels freer to help others, as he or she might be more efficient in solving his or her own problems and will not spend a lot of time focusing on trivial, insignificant problems.

Nevertheless, I would like to point out that, as far as the personality dimension of emotional stability is concerned, there is still need for further research in order to draw reliable conclusions. A relatively small number of findings, partly offering divergent and contradictory results, are not adequate to draw general conclusions.

4.2.5. The linkage between openness to experience and OCB

This personality dimension is very broadly and differently interpreted. Traits commonly associated with this dimension are imagination, curiosity, broad-mindedness, intelligence and artistic sensitivity. (Barrick and Mount 1991, p.4-5)

According to Elanain (2007, p. 35), who found strong support for the hypothesized positive linkage between openness to experience and OCB, gave the following explanation leading to his hypothesis: "*Open individuals also differ from more closed individuals in social attitudes, and attitudes toward accepted values and assumptions. Importantly, open individuals display a preference for variety, they enjoy grasping new ideas, and they have an intrinsic interest in and appreciation for novelty. Thus, the study expects that persons high on openness to experience are more likely to show OCB.*" The hierarchical regression analysis used in that

study to measure the percentage of variance that each personality factor exercises on the various OCB dimensions strongly supported the author's hypothesis. "...*Openness to experience was the strongest predictor of variation in OCB ($\beta= 0.35, p<0.01$).*" (Elanain 2007, p. 37) Specifically the connection to impersonal forms of OCB seemed to be strong. The research conducted on OCB among teachers confirmed that: "... *extroverts and teachers open for experience engaged more in OCBs towards their school than introverts and teachers less open for experience do.*" (Emmerik and Euwema 2007, p. 530) Although the correlation between openness to experience and OCB towards the school was stronger ($\beta= 0.22, p<0.01$) than the relation between openness to experience and OCB towards students ($\beta= 0.12, p<0.01$), both relations were significant in amount. (Emmerik and Euwema 2007, p. 530) The positive relation between openness to experience and impersonal forms of OCB was also confirmed by Usman (2004, p. 79). The same study found as well, though not hypothesized, a positive linkage between openness to experience and OCBI (forms of OCB directed towards individuals). (Usman 2004, p. 80)

Summing up the promising results of those three studies mentioned above there is a strong support to assume a positive correlation between OCB and openness to experience. The linkage to impersonal forms of OCB, such as compliance, sportsmanship, and civic virtue seems to be slightly stronger than the influence of openness to experience on forms of OCB directed towards individuals, such as altruism and courtesy. Despite the fact that there is strong support for the linkage between openness to experience and OCB, I would propose further research in order to provide a solid empirical evidence for this relationship, as findings up to now are quite rare in this respect.

4.2.6 The linkage between prosocial personality and OCB

Penner, Midili and Kegelmeyer (1997, p. 111) argue that the concept of prosocial personality (see chapter 3.3) might be more reliable in predicting OCB than any other personality trait, as it includes prosocial thoughts and actions.

Studies have analyzed the linkage between prosocial personality, including two different factors of prosocial personality, and OCB. Those factors of prosocial personality are firstly the "Other-Oriented Empathy" and secondly "Helpfulness". The first one means "the tendency to experience empathy for, and *to feel responsibility and concern about, the well-being of others, in other words prosocial thoughts and feelings.*" The latter one is "*a self-reported history of engaging in helpful actions and an absence of egocentric physical reactions to other's distress, in other words prosocial behavior.*" (Penner et al 1997, p. 121)

Midili conducted a study in 1995 where employees of a large retail store had to fill out questionnaires that assessed both types of prosocial behavior and two dimensions of OCB, altruism and conscientiousness, respectively compliance. The author found a positive correlation between other-oriented empathy and both OCB-dimensions, as well as between helpfulness and compliance. In addition Midili and Penner (1997) conducted a study including a hierarchical regression analysis including the same variables. The two authors found out that each dimension of the prosocial personality battery (PSB) accounted for significant unique variance in the prediction of altruism. Additionally other-oriented empathy also accounted for significant unique variance in the compliance dimension. Nevertheless it should be mentioned that both studies used self-reports of OCB only. (Penner et al 1997, p. 122)

When peer-ratings of OCB were used, both factors of the PSB positively correlated with altruism and compliance. The hierarchical regression analysis including peer-ratings of OCB showed that other-oriented empathy and helping were the only variables that accounted for significant variance in altruism, additionally they also accounted for variance in compliance beside other variables. These positive results, however, did not occur when supervisor-ratings were used. When supervisors rated the occurrence of OCB the correlation between the PSB and OCB remained insignificant. (Penner et al 1997, p. 123)

Penner et al (1997) could not give comprehensible reasons for the big difference in results when self- or peer-ratings had been used in comparison to supervisor-ratings. They, however, emphasized that this should not undermine the general conclusion that could be drawn from the studies mentioned above. The studies showed “... *substantial and replicable relations between personality measures and OCB*”. (Penner et al 1997, p. 123)

The results of various studies conducted by Penner and Midili were retested by Wright and Sablinski (2008). They analyzed the relationship between procedural justice, mood and prosocial personality and their influence on an extra-role citizenship behavior. The authors previously assessed each participant's personality with the PSB. Two weeks later the participants were invited to a laboratory session where they were given the opportunity to engage in an extra-role behavior without knowing the real purpose of the study. The correlational analysis to test whether both factors of the PSB were influencing the occurrence of the extra-role citizenship behavior showed that neither dimension was significantly correlated with the extra-role citizenship behavior. The multiple regression analysis conducted afterwards showed that only perceptions of fairness could significantly influence the variance in the extra-role citizenship behavior. The beta-coefficient of the helpfulness dimension of the PSB, on the other hand, was only marginally significant, which means that

helpfulness could only marginally influence extra-role citizenship behavior. (Wright and Sablinski 2008, p. 397-402)

Concluding I would like to point out that the second study tested the influence of prosocial personality on one specific citizenship behavior only. In this case only helpfulness could account for a marginal proportion of variance in the citizenship behavior. One should be aware of the fact that this test, conducted in a laboratory setting, is not suitable to be generalized as does not reflect the multiplicity of OCB. On the other hand, Penner and Midili (1997) found significant correlations between both factors of the PSB and OCB, at least for those cases when OCB was assessed by self- or peer-ratings. Nonetheless, further research is needed in order to answer the question why there are differences in the results when supervisor-ratings of OCB are used. Additionally further research is also advisable to find stronger support for the hypothesized positive linkage between prosocial personality and OCB dimensions.

4.3. Critical review of the empirical methods used

In this part of the thesis I would like to conclude the empirical review by commenting on and discussing the research methods used in the study on the linkage between personality factors, especially the five factor model, and OCB. In general there are three main points of criticism that are worth mentioning in this respect. The first one is criticism concerning the use of the five-factor model of personality to assess dispositional factors. The second main point of criticism concerns the method of data-collection, in this case mainly the use of self-reports. Thirdly, I would like to critically comment on the organizational settings of research and their consequence on empirical results.

Organ (1994) already mentioned, after having conducted a review on different studies about personality factors and their linkage to OCB, the problem with the five-factor model of personality. Among the studies Organ reviewed, he found out that the most disappointing results (referring to the supposed link between OCB and personality) came from those studies that adopted the personality factors unmodified from the five-factor model of personality. (Organ 1994, p. 474) Organ and Konovsky (1996, p. 262) pointed out that *"...there is now evidence (...) that the Big Five rendering of traits, while useful at a globally descriptive level of personality, is not the most promising approach to predicting workplace contributions."* They further argued that the big five personality factors were too complex and heterogeneous. (Organ and Konovsky 1996, p. 262) That complexity was a result of the fact that one factor included a number of different traits, which were often not close enough to each other in their very nature. Organ argued that *"some aspects of Conscientiousness*

might relate to OCB, others might not; the same could be true for other dimensions of the Big Five, such as Agreeableness." (Organ 1994, p. 474) In order to avoid watering down the influence of one specific trait by the influence of another trait the analysis of the influence of single traits on certain types of OCB was worth being suggested. Organ (1994) even came up with the idea that certain types of OCB might be better predicted by personality dimensions composed of certain traits from different factors of the "big five". He pointed out: "*Perhaps in our study of the chemistry of personality in the workplace we are too hung up on single elements and underappreciate the richness of the compounds derived therefrom.*" (Organ 1994, p. 476) Hugh (1992) confirmed this view in her empirical work where she found out that "*the best dispositional predictors cut across some of the Big Five dimensions...*" (Organ and Konovsky 1996, p. 262) Although a mixture of traits belonging to different factors of the big five, as well as the analysis of single traits and their influence on OCB might provide a more suitable basis for promising results, the use of the traditional big five personality factors provides several advantages. According to my point of view one of the main advantages of the big five dimensions is that they provide comparability of the results of different findings. As soon as researchers start to use individually defined or combined factors (respectively traits) of personality, it will be almost impossible to compare the results of one study with another one conducted by someone else. As a consequence I assume that although one study might, for instance, prove a high correlation between a certain personality trait and OCB, the linkage to other studies in this field would not be as strong anymore (due to differences in measurement of personality) and the study would lose its reliability. Nevertheless, I do share the doubts concerning the five factor model, but I also have to admit that it is, still, the most commonly used model of personality and therefore most probably a very good one that has proved its usefulness for decades.

The second major point of criticism, concerning the measurement of dispositional influence on OCB, deals with the assessment of the variables. Organ (1994, p. 474) argues that "*...the prototypical study of personality and OCB uses self-ratings to measure personality and supervisor ratings to assess OCB.*" "*This approach implicitly treats "personality" as the structures and dynamics within the person and assumes that people can reliably and accurately describe these structures and dynamics.*" (Organ and Ryan 1995, p. 795) In contrast to the strongly subjective self-ratings of personality, Hogan (1991) suggests that alternatively to this approach personality could be seen as social reputation, and thus should be rated by others than oneself. (Hogan 1991 cited in Organ and Ryan 1995, p. 795) Organ and Ryan (1995, p. 788-791) proved that in some cases the correlation between a specific personality dimension and a certain form of OCB was insignificant, unless the personality

factor was assessed by self-ratings (see chapter 4.2.1). What is more, researchers observed low variance within the self-rated personality factors. Organ and Konovsky (1996, p. 262) argue that “...*this restriction of range is due to a social desirability artifact in self-report measures of traits such as Agreeableness and Conscientiousness.*” This means that it is quite likely that people (although unconsciously) tend to rate their personalities with respect to a certain social desirability they have in mind, and are therefore less aware of their “true” personalities. Nevertheless it is still not clarified whether other people, such as colleagues, would provide more “realistic” ratings of personalities, as their evaluation might be modified by sympathy or dislike, for instance.

The third point of criticism concerns the organizational setting, in which research on personality and OCB is conducted. In some cases there might be problems to differentiate in-role job characteristics from OCB, depending on the type of organization in which research on OCB is conducted. In health-care organizations, such as hospitals, for instance, certain types of OCB are part of the job, whereas in other organizations the difference of in-role and extra-role performance is more obvious and, thus, the occurrence of OCB is more visible. Beside the fact that working in a health-care institution, for example, might put a sort of pressure on the employees to behave in a more socially accepted way and thereby makes the distinction between in-role performance and OCB more difficult, there are other drawbacks for research depending on the organizational setting as well. For instance, it may be possible that low variance in personalities among employees is due to the selection of a certain type of personality, which is best suitable to work in a certain business, for example the health-care business. (Organ and Konovsky 1996, p. 262) This low variance in personalities among the employees makes it difficult for the researcher to reliably prove the influence of certain patterns of personality on OCB, as there is generally a lack of divergent personalities and consequently low variance in the outcome as well.

Finally I would like to point out once again, what Organ and Konovsky (1996, p. 263) have already emphasized. “*Clearly, no single study or small group of study can settle such a large issue as the general importance of disposition in explaining OCB or the comparative importance of disposition and context.*” This is a far too complex question to be answered in single analysis, thus there is, to my point of view, a need for further research on this issue and increased cooperation of researchers to gain promising results.

The above mentioned points of criticism are not complete, they indeed represent the main criticism which I found in the studies taken into consideration for this work. Still, they very clearly point out that the results are often not as promising as suggested due to inappropriate

measurement. This, nonetheless, should not give the impression that studies have not been carefully conducted, using the best models to assess personality and OCB available up to now. On the contrary, the criticism should rather show the limitations that empirical work is always facing and should motivate to further research without questioning the quality of results gained up to now.

4.4. Conclusion

So far the fourth chapter of my thesis has given answers to the research questions. (See chapter 1.2) It has answered the main research question, which focuses on the influence of dispositional factors on OCB in chapter 4.2, and the more detailed research questions concerning potential reasons for this linkage (chapter 4.1), as well as differences in intensity of influence between the personality factors (chapter 4.2). In sum, I have found, on the one hand, empirical proof for a strong linkage between conscientiousness and OCB (e.g.: Organ and Lingl 1995, p. 339; Organ and Ryan 1996, p. 788; Usman 2004, p. 79; Van Emmerik and Euwema 2007, p. 530; see chapter 4.2.2), respectively openness to experience and OCB (e.g.: Elenain 2007, p. 37; Emmerik and Euwema 2007, p. 530; Usman 2004, p. 79; see chapter 4.2.5). On the other hand there are personality factors, for example agreeableness, that have showed no or very weak correlations with OCB in most of the studies reviewed. Although a logical linkage was supposed, as it seemed to be the perfect counterpart of the OCB dimension named altruism (Organ 1994, p. 471), no significant correlation between agreeableness and OCB has been found in most cases (e.g.: Organ and Lingl 1995, p. 339; Organ and Konovsky 1996, p. 261). Only one recently conducted study (Singh and Singh 2009, p. 293) has proved a strong correlation between agreeableness and OCB. (See chapter 4.2.1) In the case of extraversion and OCB (see chapter 4.2.3) and emotional stability and OCB (see chapter 4.2.4) the results of the various empirical studies have been contradictory. Additionally, also the prosocial personality battery (described in chapter 3.2) has proved to be positively related to OCB. (See chapter 4.2.6)

In the fifth chapter of my thesis I would like to conclude the discussion on the linkage between personality and OCB by commenting on the results concerning the occurrence of OCB in reference to a manager's position within the network of different influences.

5. Concluding discussion and managerial implications

This chapter of my thesis is devoted to provide the reader with reasonable recommendations for managers on how to influence employees to engage in OCB. After having given recommendations, I will finally present the conclusions and limitations of my thesis. The fifth chapter will as well include some future prospects for research in this area.

5.1. Discussion of the results and recommendations for managers

In this part of my thesis I would like to discuss the role of managers concerning the occurrence of OCB and consequently provide suggestions to increase the probability of OCB among employees.

„The extent to which an employee exhibits organizational citizenship behaviors, or any behavior, is a function of the employee's ability, motivation, and opportunity... Motivation determines how hard an employee will try to engage in the behavior, and the combination of ability and opportunity determine whether the employee can successfully exhibit the behavior.“ (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 93)

Two of these three categories, namely ability and motivation, are in part determined by dispositional factors. (Chapter 4 provides further information on the influence of dispositional factors on OCB) Considering the role of managers within the network of influences on OCB, there are a number of steps, which a manager can take to increase the probability that his or her employees engage in OCB.

Firstly, in reference to an employee's dispositional features, leaders *“can select employees who have a greater ability to exhibit OCB, because of their dispositional characteristics (e.g., they are naturally conscientious, altruistic, and so on).”* (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 94) Referring to the results examined within this study (see chapter 4.2), notably people scoring high on conscientiousness and openness to experiences, as well as pro-socially oriented people, are very likely to engage further in OCB than people who show lower levels in these categories. With respect, these people could be considered less pro-socially oriented. Subsequently, I would advise managers to consider those “OCB- favorable” personality factors within job-interviews, for instance.

Secondly, managers can refer to an employee's motivation and consequently try to influence it. Still, I have to admit that being motivated is a necessary, however insufficient, condition for the exhibition of OCB. Even highly motivated employees may find themselves unable to exhibit OCB unless they have the skills to do so. It is up to the supervisor to take steps to enhance the employee's ability to exhibit OCB through training and intentionally influencing the employee's behavior. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 94) This part of the

thesis will focus on the influence that a manager is able to exercise in reference to an employee's ability, motivation and above all on an employee's opportunity to engage in OCB. The leader can influence the employee's behavior through his own behavior or through shaping the structural factors, respectively the working environment. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 93) The following recommendations for managers will first of all include those actions of managers that increase the ability of an employee to engage in OCB. This can be achieved through the hiring of appropriate employees, as well as aid in the form of supportable leadership. Following this I would like to describe some structural factors, which will most certainly increase the opportunity of an employee to exhibit OCB.

As far as the impact of leadership on OCB is concerned, one can find a large number of leadership behaviors that in theory, as well as empirically, proved to influence OCB positively. As my thesis is dedicated to assess the linkage between personality factors and OCB, I find it reasonable to mention only a few leadership behaviors that are able to influence OCB in a positive way. To provide a complete list of leadership behaviors that are theoretically able to have an influence on OCB is not my purpose as it would mislead the reader too far away from the main focus, respectively the content of this thesis. My main intention is to make it perfectly clear that although some OCB dimensions are partly denominated by one's personality, I do not think that leaders are unable to influence the occurrence of OCB to a significant extent as well. On the contrary, I want to point out that employees with different personalities are, in some situations, able to engage in the same intensity in certain types of OCB. However, whereas one might not need a supportable leader, another might call for support from the manager's side in order to feel enabled to engage in OCB. Consequently, it might, up to a certain extent, be part of the leader's responsibility whether a certain employee will engage in OCB or not.

In the following paragraph I would like to take a closer look on the effects of leadership on OCB and consequently draw some conclusions for managers. I would like to explain three types of leadership behavior that are able to positively influence the occurrence of OCB. Those leadership behaviors are the following: instrumental and supportive leader behaviors, transformational leadership and leadership empowerment behavior. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 95-107) The instrumental and supportive leadership behaviors are based on the expectancy theory. According to the expectancy theory employees choose their level of effort in accordance with their expected increase in performance, due to their enhanced effort, resulting in a raise in bonuses. According to this theory, effective leaders are those who motivate subordinates by clarifying how a specific goal can be reached, thereby reducing uncertainty. Additionally, they increase benefits for the employees when

they have reached the goals set by the supervisor. Whereas instrumental leadership focuses more on the clarification of what is expected from an employee, supportive leadership means that the supervisor shows concern for his or her employees in terms of their personal requests. As both behaviors are considered by employees as being helpful, they might wish to reciprocate those gestures and, thus are more likely to engage in OCB. Empirical support was found for the assumption that both instrumental and supportive leadership are positively related to altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, civic virtue and sportsmanship. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 95-96) One can consequently argue that in order to increase the probability that one's employees engage in OCB, a manager should choose instrumental and supportive leadership behaviors vis-à-vis his or her employees.

The second category of leadership behaviors I would like to mention in this context is transformational leadership behavior. According to its definition "*...transformational leadership involves fundamentally changing the values, goals, and aspirations of employees so that they are intrinsically motivated to perform their work because it is consistent with their values, rather than because it is externally motivated by the expectation that they will be rewarded for their efforts.*" (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 98) Transformational leaders are likely to increase their employees' performance beyond expectations due to the articulation of a vision, through acting as a role model, providing intellectual stimulation as well as individual support. (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter 1990 cited in: Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 98) All the above mentioned features included in transformational leadership are able to increase OCB. Leaders, who want their employees to engage in certain types of behaviors, for example OCB, should themselves demonstrate such behavior. As a result, the fact that their modeling creates norms of appropriate work behavior, the employees will most certainly feel motivated to engage in OCB as well. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 99-100) This is only one among several examples how transformational leadership can increase OCB. I would therefore argue that by providing a vision and acting as a role model, as well as offering individual support (as mentioned before in the category of supportive leadership behaviors) will without any doubt at the least increase the probability of commitment in citizenship behaviors among employees.

The last leadership behavior I would like to mention in this place is leadership empowerment behavior. "*..Leadership empowerment behaviors include enhancing the meaningfulness of the work, fostering participation in decision making, expressing confidence in high performance, and encouraging autonomy.*" (Conger and Kanungo 1988 / Hui 1994 cited in: Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 107) There are a number of explanations for a positive linkage between empowerment behaviors and OCB. One of them is the following: If

an employee is empowered by gaining more autonomy and participation in decision making processes, he or she will feel personally responsible for organizational outcomes (and not only for producing a specific output). This will, consequently, increase the likelihood that the employee will invest much more personally (including OCB) in order to make the organization successful. In the best case scenario, the employee will do whatever seems to be necessary in order to make the organization perform well. Additionally, another facet of empowerment, namely enhancing the meaningfulness of work, will lead to higher levels of job satisfaction. This will most certainly positively influence the occurrence of OCB. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 108)

So far, I have provided in short some suggestions to managers on how to increase the likelihood of OCB among employees through their own behavior- namely leadership behaviors. The explanations provided have been in a general sense, but still they have made a clear point on the fact that managers are able to influence OCB regardless if it might be determined to a broad extent, by personality factors for instance. I would like to mention again that this thesis cannot provide detailed and concrete explanations on how different leadership behaviors will influence different types of OCB. Its purpose is to show at this place that managers can and should try to influence OCB as well, as OCB is not fully limited by dispositional factors. Disposition is only one antecedent of OCB among others. Beside leadership behaviors, job characteristics play as well a certain role within the network of antecedents of OCB. The following paragraph will list some structural factors that are able to increase an employee's opportunity to engage in OCB. We should however remember the following: „*The extent to which an employee exhibits organizational citizenship behaviors, or any behavior, is a function of the employee's ability, motivation, and opportunity.*” (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 93)

Although there are a number of task characteristics that proved to positively influence the occurrence of OCB, theoretical explanations to assess why this is the case are rather rare. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 109) However, I would like to mention some of them as I am assuming that managers can shape the task characteristics, so that they are more likely to enhance OCB, in addition to the choice of an appropriate leading behavior that positively influences OCB. In general, it is remarkable that job characteristics which increase job satisfaction and the feeling of being responsible for outcomes, as well as the perceptions of meaningfulness of the work, are able to positively influence the occurrence of OCB. Task characteristics that fulfill the above mentioned criteria are: task autonomy, task identity, task variety and task significance, for instance. The more autonomously an employee can schedule his work, the more he will feel responsible for the outcomes, thus he or she will be

more willing to engage in OCB in order to positively influence the work outcomes. Additionally, the more visible those outcomes are to an employee, the greater the effort (in the form of OCB, for example) he or she will be willing to exercise. Moreover, a job that includes a broad variety of tasks will increase job satisfaction and thus lead to higher levels of OCB. Finally, it should be mentioned that a task, which is considered by an employee as being significant to the environment is more likely to motivate to engage in OCB. Another task characteristic that is able to increase OCB is task interdependence. Task interdependence is described as the intensity of interconnection between the tasks of several employees, which are all working together on a common outcome. In the case where employees work closer together and thus the responsibilities of each employee are dependent on the outcome produced by his or her colleagues, they are more willing, for instance, to engage in altruistic behaviors in order to ensure that the aims are achieved. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 109-110) There are some other task characteristics that have proved to positively influence OCB and perhaps there are even some that have not yet been analyzed in reference to their influence on OCB. Still, I would like to mention one more factor. Intrinsically satisfying tasks, meaning tasks that lead to an increase in job satisfaction and to higher levels of task involvement, are also able to stimulate the occurrence of OCB through their influence on job satisfaction. (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 110)

Concluding from the previously described methods (leadership behaviors and task characteristics) that represent tools for managers to increase the probability of OCB among their employees, one can assume that the manager's influence on OCB is a remarkable one as it offers a broad range of activities that managers can take in order to increase OCB. Although this thesis is not focused on the comparison between the intensity of influence of personality factors on OCB and the one that managers are able to exercise, it can be said that a manager can influence the occurrence of OCB at least in addition to dispositional adequacy of certain employees. To do so a manager can engage in certain leadership behaviors, such as empowerment behaviors, and/or shape the task characteristics in such a way that the employee feels enabled and motivated to engage in OCB.

All in all, I would like to emphasize that, in my personal opinion, managers should not primarily focus on hiring the adequate employees, respectively people, who are, according to their personalities, more likely to engage in OCB. On the contrary, they should in the first place try to adapt task characteristics and their leadership behavior so that employees feel motivated to engage in OCB. Following this, it might be advisable to focus on OCB-adequate personalities in hiring processes as well. Nevertheless, I think that relying too strongly on

certain personality factors in order to enhance OCB, particularly focusing on hiring “the right person”, is risky and may have serious drawbacks that should not be underestimated. One reason that makes me think in this way is that it seems, as at least in the case of some forms of OCB, a huge part of ascendancy has remained empirically unexplained up to now. Furthermore, for other OCB variables there are contradictory results in respect to their determinants. (see chapter 4.2) That is why I do not consider it advisable to focus only on hiring certain types of personalities in order to increase OCB among employees. The first steps that a manager should take, in order to increase OCB, are to be aware of the certain types of OCB that are especially important for a specific working context, and consequently enhancing the ability to adapt leadership behaviors and to shape task characteristics towards an OCB-favorable working environment.

5.2. Conclusion, limitations of the thesis and future prospects

I would like to conclude this thesis by summarizing once more the answer to the main research question raised in chapter 1.2. Furthermore, I would like to comment on the limitations of the thesis, leaving additional points of the research question that are left unresolved to be explained by future articles focusing on this field of research. The last part of my thesis will provide some suggestions for future research on the linkage between personality factors and their influence on OCB.

The main research question was focused on explaining the extent of influence that dispositional factors, especially the personality factors of the five-factor-model, exercise on OCB. In chapter 4.2 I have provided a detailed meta-analysis of several studies conducted with the purpose of assessing this relationship. Whereas most of the studies I reviewed supported the assumption that conscientiousness and openness to experiences influence OCB to a relatively high extent (e.g.: Emmerik and Euwema 2007, p. 530; Usman 2004, p. 79, see chapter 4.2.2. and 4.2.5), agreeableness did not proved to determine OCB significantly in most of the studies reviewed (e.g.: Organ and Lingl 1995, p. 339; Organ and Konovsky 1996, p. 261). A generally prosocially-oriented personality also proved to increase the probability of engaging in OCB (Penner et al 1997, p. 122, see chapter 4.2.6). The results concerning emotional stability and extraversion as potential determinants of OCB have been contradictory, as I found on one hand results that confirmed a significant positive influence (e.g.: Elanain 2007, p. 38-39, respectively Singh and Singh 2009, p. 294), but on the other hand researched studies that disproved a significant linkage (e.g.: Emmerik and Euwema 2007, p. 530, respectively Usman 2004, p. 79). (For further explanation see chapter 4.2)

In reference to the first research question, I have given an insight into empirical studies aimed at drawing a picture of the extent of influence that personality factors are able to exercise on different types of citizenship behaviors. This thesis mainly focused on summarizing the results that have been conducted up to now, and thus is drawing general conclusions. This thesis was, nevertheless, limited by several circumstances. Firstly, one single study, especially one of limited length, can certainly not provide a complete picture of all empirical results conducted in this field, not only due to limited access to unpublished articles, but also, because it is factually an unrealistic attempt. Moreover, the expressiveness was limited by the fact that this thesis did not aim at comparing the influence of personality factors on OCB to other potential influences and determinants. The fact that determination, in the form of personality factors, was reviewed separately and not in comparison to other influences sets clear limitations to the conclusion that can be drawn from this meta-analysis. Finally, the thesis was limited by the fact that it provides no empirical part, but focuses on the collection of different empirical results conducted by other authors. The limitations, however, provide a basis for future research on which I would like to comment on now. The first suggestion for potential future research, I would like to highlight is based on an interesting result, which Emmerik and Euwema (2007, p. 530) found whilst empirically testing the influence of certain personality traits and other factors on OCB. Their results showed that team leader effectiveness is affecting the influence of introversion and emotional stability on OCB. While it was proved, on one hand, that generally emotionally unstable people and introverts tend to engage less in OCB, the results showed, on the other hand, that an effective team leader can change this general tendency. An effective team leader can outweigh the negative effects of emotional instability and introversion on OCB. (Emmerik and Euwema 2007, p. 530) I, subsequently, conclude that if a team leader would be able to outweigh, through his behavior, a negative influence of a certain personality trait on the occurrence of OCB, then it is obvious that leadership has an influence on OCB beyond the one that is determined by one's personality. I would suggest for future research to analyze whether leadership behaviors are able to influence employees in such a way that their personal predisposition to exercise OCB becomes less important. Results of such empirical research would have an important impact on employee selection processes. Given that one empirically proves that there are certain leadership behaviors to outweigh those personality traits, which are obstacles to a high level of commitment to OCB, organizations will be less dependent on choosing the "right" employees in order to ensure high levels of OCB. On the contrary, it will be the supervisor's task to lead each employee in a way that potential negative personality traits (in respect to OCB-adequacy) are outweighed and, thus, each employee is motivated to engage in OCB in order to increase organizational efficiency and

effectiveness, referring to the OCB definition provided by Organ (1988, p.4 cited in Podsakoff et al. 2000, p. 513).

My second suggestion for future research in the field of OCB ties in with a suggestion proposed by Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (2006). In arguing for human resource practices that are able to influence OCB, the three authors concluded that the effort to encourage OCB is mostly focusing on selecting the “right” person and much less on training and development of the employees to increase their ability and awareness to engage in OCB. “..*There is no reason to assume that people cannot be trained to perform OCBs, just as they can be taught any other form of work behavior.*” (Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 226) Additionally, they advise to use mentoring in order to increase OCB. Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie 2006, p. 226-227) Subsequently, I would suggest that research should less focus on trying to measure precisely the percentage of influence that a certain personality factor is able to exercise, but should rather focus on developing instruments and trainings to increase the employee’s ability to exercise OCB. The development of such trainings would, previously, call for several steps in preparation. The first step would be to analyze the forms of OCB, which are the most important for a certain job. The ensuing stage of preparation would focus on personality factors and behavioral characteristics which influence OCB. The third step will establish special trainings for those personality factors and behavioral characteristics in order to increase OCB. Finally, one could empirically test whether the trainings lead to the desired result or not.

The suggestion made in the paragraph above, points out that research on personality traits and their influence on OCB should, according to my point of view, in the future be regarded as basis for further research on OCB, but not as the final stage of the research itself. On one hand, the extent to which predisposition determines OCB is important to be analyzed in order to make it clear where the roots of such a behavior are. On the other hand, research concerning OCB should not end by claiming that only certain personalities are able to exercise OCB. I am confident that, provided that the focus is shifted on empirically proving how OCB can be increased through personality trainings, leadership behaviors and task characteristics, OCB can emerge into a competitive advantage in the field of human resources. I feel personally that research on OCB in the future should primarily focus on giving concrete proof and suggestions for managers how to encourage concrete forms of job-relevant OCBs for specific types of jobs, so that OCB can emerge into a relatively cheap, but efficient and effective organizational resource that is able to increase an organization’s overall performance and, thus, is part of its competitive advantage.

6. Annex

REFERENCES

Books:

Adams, J. A. (1965): Inequity in social exchange. In: Berkowitz, L. (Ed.) *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Second printing. New York: Academic Press, p. 267-299.

Barnard, Chester I. (2002): *The functions of the executive*. Thirty-ninth printing. Cambridge (Massachusetts), London: Harvard University Press.

Blau, P. (1964): *Exchange and Power in social life*. New York: Wiley Inc.

Eagly, A. H. / Chaiken, S. (1993): *The psychology of attitudes*. Forth Worth, Texas: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Heinrich, Monika (2002): Gruppenarbeit: theoretische Hintergründe und praktische Anwendungen. In: Kasper, Helmut / Mayerhofer, Wolfgang (Ed.): *Personalmanagement, Führung, Organisation*. Wien: Linde Verlag, p. 289-333.

Hogan, R. (1991): Personality and personality measurement. In: Dunnette, M. D. / Hough, L. M. (Ed.): *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Vol 2 California: Consulting Psychologists Press, p. 873-919.

Isen, A. (1993): Positive affect and decision making. In: Lewis, M. / Haviland, M. (Ed.): *Handbook of emotion*. New York: Guilford.

Kasper, Helmut / Mühlbacher, Jürgen (2002): Von Organisationskulturen zu lernenden Organisationen. In: Kasper, Helmut / Mayerhofer, Wolfgang (Ed.): *Personalmanagement, Führung, Organisation*. Wien: Linde Verlag, p. 95-156.

Katz, Daniel / Kahn, Robert L. (1967): *The social psychology of organizations*. Third printing. New York, London, Sydney: John Wiley and Sons Inc.

Organ, Dennis W. (1988): *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.

Organ, Dennis W. / Podsakoff, Philip M. / MacKenzie, Scott B. (2006): *Organizational Citizenship Behavior. It's nature, antecedents and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Roethlisberger, F. J. / Dickson, William J. (1964): *Management and the worker. An account of a research program conducted by the Western Electric Company, Hawthorne Works, Chicago*. Thirteenth printing. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Articles:

Barrick, Murray R. / Mount, Michael K. (1991): The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. In: *Personnel Psychology* 44 (1), 1-26.

Bateman, Thomas S. / Organ, Dennis W. (1983): Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". In: *Academy of Management Journal* 26 (4), 587-599.

Carlson, M. / Charlin, V. / Miller, N. (1988): Positive mood and helping behavior: A test of six hypotheses. In: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 55, 211-229.

Catell, R.B. (1943): The description of personality: basic traits resolved into clusters. In: *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology* 38, 476-506.

Chien, Min-Huei (2004): An investigation of the relationship of organizational structure, employee's personality and organizational citizenship behaviors. In: *Journal of American Academy of Business* 5 (1/2), 428-431.

Comeau, Daniel J. / Griffith, Richard L. (2005): Structural independence, personality, and organizational citizenship behavior: An examination of person-environment interaction. In: *Personnel Review* 35 (3), 310-321.

Conger, J. / Kanungo, R. N. (1988): The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. In: *Academy of Management Review* 13, 471-482.

Costa, Paul T. Jr. / McCrae, Robert R. (1985): Updating Norman's "adequate taxonomy": Intelligence and personality dimensions in natural language and questionnaires. In: *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology* 49, 710-721.

Digman, John M. (1989): Five robust trait dimensions: Development, stability and utility. In: *Journal of personality* 57, 195-214.

Digman, John M. (1990): Personality Structure: The emergence of the five-factor model. In: *the annual review of the department of psychology of the University of Hawaii* 41, 417-440.

Elenain, Hossam A. (2007): Relationship between personality and organizational citizenship behavior: Does personality influence employee citizenship? In: *international research of business research papers* 3, 31-43.

Van Emmerik, Hetty Ij. / Euwema, Martin C. (2007): Who is offering a helping hand?; Associations between personality and OCBs, and the moderating role of team leader effectiveness. In: *Journal of managerial Psychology* 22 (6), 530.

Fiske, D. W. (1949): Consistency of the factorial structures of personality ratings from different sources. In: *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology* 44, 329-344.

George, J. M. / Brief, A. P. (1992): Feeling good- doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. In: *Psychological bulletin* 112, 310-329.

Greene, C. N. (1975): The reciprocal nature of influence between leader and subordinate. In: *Journal of Applied Psychology* 60, 187-193.

Hough, L. M. (1992): The "Big Five" personality variables- construct confusion: Description versus prediction. In: *Human Performance* 5, 139-155.

Konovsky, M. A. / Organ, Dennis W. (1993): Dispositional versus contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. Unpublished manuscript, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA.

Konovsky, M.A. / Organ, Dennis W. (1996): Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17, 253-266.

Lowin, A. / Graig, J. R. (1968): The influence of level of performance on managerial style: An experimental object lesson in the ambiguity of correlational data. In: *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 3, 440-458.

McDougall, W. (1932): Of the words character and personality. In: *Character Personality* 1, 3-16.

Norman, W. T. (1963): Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. In: *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology* 66, 574-583.

Organ, Dennis W. (1977): A reappraisal and reinterpretation of the satisfaction-causes-performance hypothesis. In: *Academy of Management Review* (2), 46-53.

Organ, Dennis W. (1994): Personality and organizational citizenship behavior. In: *Journal of Management* (20), 465-478.

Organ, Dennis W. / Lingl, Andreas (1995): Personality, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. In: *The Journal of Social psychology* (135), 339.

Organ, Dennis W. / Ryan, K. (1995): A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. In: *Personnel Psychology* 48, 775-802.

Penner, Louis A. / Medili, Alison R. (1997): Beyond job attitudes: A personality and social psychology perspective on the causes of organizational citizenship behavior. In: *Human Performance* 10 (2), 111-131.

Podsakoff, Philip M. / MacKenzie, Scott B. / Moorman, R. H. / Fetter, R. (1990): Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. In: *Leadership Quarterly* 1, 107-142.

Podsakoff, Philip M. / MacKenzie, Scott B. (1997): Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Organizational Performance: A review and suggestions for future research. In: *Human Performance* 10 (2), 133-151.

Podsakoff, Philip M. / MacKenzie, Scott B. / Paine, Julie B. / Bachrach, Daniel G. (2000): Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. In: *Journal of Management* 26 (3), 513-563.

Singh, Akhilendra K. / Singh, A. P.: Does personality predict Organizational Citizenship Behavior among managerial personnel? In: *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology* 35 (2), 291-298.

Smith, G. M. (1967): Usefulness of peer ratings of personality in educational research. In: *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 27, 967-984.

Smith, C. A. / Organ, Dennis W. / Near, J.P. (1983): Organizational citizenship behavior. Its nature and antecedents. In: *Journal of Applied Psychology* (68), 653-663.

Van Dyne, Linn / Le Pine, Jeffrey A. (1998): Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. In: *Academy of Management Journal* 41 (1), 108-119.

Witt, L. A. / Burke, L. A. / Barrick, M. R. / Mount, M. K. (2002): The interactive effects of conscientiousness and agreeableness on job performance. In: *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87, 161-169.

Wright, Chris W. / Sablinsky, Chris J. (2008): Procedural justice, mood, and prosocial personality influence on organizational citizenship behavior. In: *North American Journal of Psychology* 10 (2), 397-411.

Other References:

Barrick, M. R. / Mount, M. K. / Strauss, J. P. (1992): The big five and ability predictors of citizenship delinquency, and sales performance. Paper presented at seventh annual conference of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Montreal.

Costa, Paul T. Jr. / McCrae, Robert R. (1989): NEO-PI. Professional Manual. Odessa, Florida: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Hogan, R. (1986): Manual for the Hogan personality inventory. Minneapolis: National Computer Systems.

Hui, C. (1994): 'Effects of leadership empowerment behaviors and followers' personal control, voice, and self-efficacy on in-role and extra-role performance: An extension and empirical test of Conger and Kanungo's empowerment process model. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Moorman, R. H. (1990): The role of cognition and disposition as predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors: A study of personality and perceived fairness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Tupes, E. C. / Christal, R. E. (1961): Recurrent personality factors based on trait ratings (ASD-TR- 61-97). Lackland Airforce Base, TX: Aeronautical System Division, Personnel Laboratory.

Usman, Raja (2004): The relationship of the big five personality dimensions to personal and organizational outcomes. Answering the questions Who? and When?. A Doctoral thesis in the Department of Management at Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.