

CURRENT RESEARCH IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Volume 9, Number 16
Submitted: February 22, 2004
First Revision: March 24, 2004
Second Revision: April 30, 2004
Third Revision: May 20, 2004
Fourth Revision: June 4, 2004
Accepted: June 7, 2004
Publication Date: June 7, 2004

EMPLOYEES' PERSONAL MOTIVES FOR ENGAGING IN CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR: THE CASE OF WORKERS IN NIGERIA'S AGRICULTURE INDUSTRY

Olugbenga Ladebo
University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

This study examined the dimensions of the citizenship behaviors of employees in the agriculture industry and the personal motives that foster the behaviors. The participants were 191 post-graduate students from the University of Agriculture in Southwestern Nigeria and surveys were employed for data collection. I employed a hierarchical regression procedure to test the hypotheses. The maximum likelihood factor analysis showed that employees' citizenship behaviors were characterized by loyalty, participation and conscientious behaviors. Conscientious behavior was influenced by age, and loyalty was related to perceived organizational support and organizational concern motive, while employee participation was associated with organizational concern motive. The implications of the results are discussed.

[220]

[221]

INTRODUCTION

Organization behavior scholars have distinguished between performance of the core technical duties of the job (in-role performance) and contextual performance that contributes indirectly to the core technical duties by maintaining the broader organizational, social and psychological environment in which the technical core operates (Vigoda, 1980; Organ, 1988; Neal & Griffin, 1999). Katz and Kahn (1978) suggested that the effective organizational performance requires workers to perform their prescribed duties, and also, engage in behaviors that go beyond these formal obligations.

Employees possess both cognition and emotions that predispose them to exercise free will in regard the choice of behaviors they want to exhibit on the job (Wright, Dunford, & Snell, 2001). Those behaviors that an employee has control over, and are outside the purview of the prescribed roles for the individual are discretionary, are referred to as organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) (Organ, 1988). Examples of an employee's citizenship behaviors in the work place may include: motivating coworkers to express their ideas and suggestions for work improvement; encouraging friends and family members to patronize the company products or services; and following work rules and regulations diligently when not being observed.

The purpose of this study was to determine the citizenship behaviors of workers in the agriculture industry, and in a cultural context different from those of the developed nations, where OCBs have been extensively studied. Further, the study investigated whether employees' inclination to engage in citizenship behaviors were due to personal motives, and the moderating role of dispositional trait on the personal motives-citizenship behaviors linkage of the employees.

Conceptual Framework: Organizational Citizenship Behavior and its Antecedents

OCBs of employees have a generalized value and significance that are applicable to different jobs and work organizations. Because of its importance, research into why employees engage in and the consequences of citizenship behavior have been of interest to organizational behavior specialists in recent times (Chen, Hui, & Sego, 1998; Bettercourt, Gwinner, & Meuter, 2001; Rioux & Penner, 2001; Coyle-Shapiro, 2002; Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin, & Lord, 2002;). As typically defined, OCBs represent an employee's behavior that is discretionary and not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988). The behavior is not an enforceable requirement of the role or the job description. Citizenship behaviors reflect the personal choice of the employee. For instance, an extension worker who is dissatisfied with his/her job or perceives unfair treatment by the organization might not be favorably disposed to assist the agency's project farmers with information on how to procure an essential chemical input during the period of high demand or scarcity of the input. In the Nigerian agricultural extension system, extension agents are not formally required to engage in input sourcing for the farmers.

The practical importance of OCBs is that the discretionary behaviors improve the efficiency and effectiveness of work teams and the organization (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). However, an employee may voluntarily withhold citizenship behaviors, because such an employee is frustrated with certain aspects of the job, and if this feeling of disenchantment persists, the employee may consider leaving the organization (Chen et al., 1998).

Scholars have identified several dimensions of OCB, and it is believed that some of the dimensions are conceptually related (Podsakoff et al., 2000). However, the service-oriented conceptualization based on the works of Bettercourt et al., (2001) is being adopted in this study. Service-oriented citizenship behavior has three facets of loyalty, which is allegiance to the organization through its promotion of interests and image to outsiders. Employee participation refers to the willingness and the need for the organization members to be involved in the development and governance of the organization. Service delivery is conscientious role performance in the organization (Bettercourt et al., 2001).

I selected service-oriented OCBs for three reasons. First, some of the agricultural employees act as representatives of their organizations to farmers or others in the community and, in this capacity, may enhance or diminish the organization's image. Employees may act as advocates of the organization by promoting not only its products and services but also that of the image of the employer. Second, extension personnel serve as a strategic link between the external environment and internal operations of the extension agency by providing information about farmers' needs and improvement on extension service delivery. Third, workers who are in contact with farmers are expected to be responsive, reliable, and courteous to their clients.

[221]

[222]

Personal Motives. Several reasons have been adduced as being responsible for the citizenship behavior of employees (Chen et al., 1998; Bettercourt et al., 2001; Coyle-Shapiro, 2002; Diefendorff et al., 2002). The works of Rioux and Penner (2001) suggested that employees might consciously engage in citizenship behaviors in the organization because such actions will yield positive outcomes for them. The works of Rioux and Penner were based on the functional approach to behavior, which assumes that an individual's behavior may be motivated by personal needs and aspirations, and a behavior can be due to multiple motives. The personal motive model developed by Rioux and Penner has three dimensions. First, organizational concern motive (OCM), refers to the willingness of the employees to offer help to the organization because the organization is perceived as being committed to its employees' welfare. Second, impression management motive relates to an employee's attempt to create a favorable image for him/herself to obtain rewards (IMM). Third, prosocial values motive are the desire of an employee to be helpful to colleagues and to interact smoothly with his/her peers (PV). Because the personal motive model assumes that employees citizenship behaviors are perhaps, contingent on the individual's goals and needs, I propose that some workers would engage in citizenship behaviors because they are willing to assist the organization or believe that there is a need to be helpful to peers. Other workers may choose to exhibit citizenship behavior because they want to build a positive self-image to coworkers and supervisors to obtain rewards.

Hypothesis 1a: Employees' organizational concern motive is significantly and positively related to loyalty behavior.

Hypothesis 1b: Employees' organizational concern motive is significantly and positively related to employees' participation.

Hypothesis 1c: Employees' organizational concern motive is significantly and positively related to conscientious behavior.

Hypothesis 2a: Employees' prosocial values are significantly and positively related to loyalty behavior.

Hypothesis 2b: Employees' prosocial values are significantly and positively related to employees' participation.

Hypothesis 2c: Employees' prosocial values are significantly and positively related to conscientious behavior.

Hypothesis 3a: Employees' impression management motive is significantly and positively related to loyalty behavior.

Hypothesis 3b: Employees' impression management motive is significantly and positively related to participation.

Hypothesis 3c: Employees' impression management motive is significantly and positively related to conscientious behavior.

Positive Affectivity. Individuals who are high in positive affectivity (PA) tend to feel enthusiastic and possess an overall sense of well-being, active and experience positive attitudes, and someone low in PA is characterized by listlessness and apathy (Luthans, 1998). Because studies have shown that employees who are high in PA find their job satisfying and are less likely to engage in counter productive work behaviors (Duffy, Ganster, & Shaw, 1998), I propose that an employee who is enthusiastic about his/her job and possesses an overall sense of well-being would find it less difficult to engage in citizenship behaviors.

Hypothesis 4a: Employees' PA is significantly and positively related to loyalty behavior.

Hypothesis 4b: Employees' PA is significantly and positively related to employees' participation.

Hypothesis 4c: Employees' PA is significantly and positively related to conscientious behavior.

Job Satisfaction. I also include an assessment of the effects of employees' attitudes on the individuals' readiness to engage in citizenship behavior. This is because research has shown that an employee who finds his/her job satisfying will engage in citizenship behaviors in the organization. Job satisfaction reflects the extent to which an employee has the opportunity to satisfy his/her needs and attain important personal work goals (Hall, Schneider, & Nygren, 1970; Maier & Brunstein, 2001). Research has shown that a satisfied worker is more likely to engage in prosocial behaviors in the organization in terms of being more cooperative, helping coworkers and customers (Luthans, 1998). Bettercourt et al., (2001) reported that a satisfied employee is more willing to represent the organization favorably to outsiders (loyalty), and be conscientious in service delivery. Thus, I propose that an employee who finds his/her job satisfying would readily engage in citizenship behaviors.

[222]

[223]

Hypothesis 5a: Employees' job satisfaction is significantly and positively related to loyalty behavior.

Hypothesis 5b: Employees' job satisfaction is significantly and positively related to employees' participation.

Hypothesis 5c: Employees' job satisfaction is significantly and positively related to conscientious behavior.

Perceived Organizational Support (POS). POS offers another explanation why employees may be willing to engage in citizenship behavior in the organization (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). POS assumes that employees form a generalized belief that the organization cares about their personal welfare, and values their contribution to the organization. Because of the reciprocity norm, an employee is obligated to reciprocate the organization's beneficial actions directed at him/her by engaging in voluntary contributions that will benefit the organization (Gouldner, 1960). Empirical evidence has shown that the perception of insufficient organizational support has prompted employees on international assignments to return home (Shaffer, Harrison, Gilley, & Luk, 2001). Employees reciprocate organizational support by exhibiting greater organizational commitment (Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001), enhancing their felt obligation to care about the organization's well-being and to help the firm achieve its goals (Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch, & Rhoades, 2001). Bettercourt et al., (2001) reported that a high level of support by the organization engenders loyalty and employees participation. Therefore, in this study, I hypothesize that an employee having a favorable perception of organizational support would readily engage in citizenship behaviors to help the organization.

Hypothesis 6a: Employees' POS is significantly and positively related to loyalty behavior.

Hypothesis 6b: Employees' POS is significantly and positively related to employees' participation.

Hypothesis 6c: Employees' POS is significantly and positively related to conscientious behavior.

METHODOLOGY

Sample

Surveys were administered to 207 agriculture program post-graduate students at a University of Agriculture in Southwestern Nigeria. Participation in the data gathering exercise was voluntary after the researcher had explained the importance of the study to the students. The participants returned 191 useable responses (64.9 percent male, 35.1 percent female) and 16 questionnaires either were not filled or contained missing data. Thus, the response rate was 92.27%. All the participants are in full-time employment with University and Research Institutes, Banks, Insurance, Agricultural Development Programme (ADP), ministries of agriculture, National Agricultural Land Development Agency, Feed-mill Companies, privately owned farms, and Agro-Allied companies. A total of 32 work organizations were represented, with no more than nine participants from an organization type. The significance of this heterogeneous sample is that the employees are not uniformly influenced by the contextual constraints of any single organization (Rousseau & Fried, 2001). The mean age of the participants was 36.39 years ($SD = 6.19$ years), 74.3 percent were married, and the mean tenure (years spent with employing organization) was 9.05 years ($SD = 6.47$ years).

Measures

(a) Organizational Citizenship Behavior. This is the dependent variable and was measured using a 16-item scale adaptation of Bettercourt et al., (2001) service-oriented OCB scale. The OCB scale was subjected to maximum likelihood factor analysis to determine its dimensions and the factors obtained were Varimax rotated. A three-factor solution was produced that explained 39.09 percent variance in scores. The goodness-of-fit test suggested that the three-factor solution was a good fit to the data (Chi-square (df 75) = 114.39, $p < .002$). I present in Table 1, the factors: factor I was labelled loyalty behavior (six items; Cronbach alpha = .82), factor II was designated as employee participation (six items, alpha = .72), and factor III was conscientious behavior (four items, alpha = .54). Ratings on the OCB scale were on a five-point scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Higher scores on the subscales indicated increasing levels of OCB behavior.

[223]

[224]

I performed maximum likelihood factor analysis on the independent variables to investigate their factorial independence and the results are presented in Appendix I. Six factors corresponding to each of the independent variables proposed for this study were obtained. The results were subjected to Varimax rotation and the six-factor solution accounted for 50.26 percent variance in scores. The goodness-of-fit test indicated that the six-factor solution was a good fit to the data (Chi-square (df 490) = 687.98, $p < .0001$). I computed scale scores for all the scales by summing across responses to items in a scale.

(b) Motives for OCB. The 30-item OCB motive scale developed by Rioux and Penner (2001) was adopted for use in this study. The scale has three dimensions: organizational concern motive (OCM) is employees' identification with the organization, and the desire to help the organization achieve performance. Impression management motive (IMM) involves the desire of the employee to maintain a positive image to the coworkers, supervisor, and to obtain rewards. Prosocial values (PV) are the need to build and maintain a healthy relationship with others in the organization. The three motive dimensions of OC, PV, and IM were replicated through maximum likelihood factor analysis in this study, though with fewer number of items (25) than the original scale (Appendix I). Five items were dropped because of poor face validity and irrelevance to the study. Respondents indicated the extent of their agreement with each item using a five-point Likert -type format. In this study, the internal consistency reliability for each subscale was: IMM (nine items, alpha = 0.88), PV (six items, alpha = 0.84), and OCM (10 items, alpha = 0.86).

(c) Positive Affectivity. Three items adapted from the works of Iverson, Olekalns and Erwin (1998) were employed to assess PA. Ratings on the scale were based on an ascending five-point format. Higher scores indicated increasing levels of PA, and lower scores reflected low level of the trait in the individual. The coefficient alpha for the scale was 0.79.

(d) Perceived Organizational Support. A six-item scale adapted from Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, and Lynch (1997) was employed to assess the construct. The extent of respondents'

agreement with each item was based on a five-point Likert-type strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The internal consistency reliability of the scale was 0.79.

(e) Job Satisfaction. Respondents' overall job satisfaction was measured using a four-item scale (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951). Respondents indicated the extent of their agreement with each item on a five-point Likert-type scale (strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)). Cronbach alpha for the scale was 0.82.

(f) Personal Factors. The number of years spent with the employing organization (tenure), age, and rank (junior officer = 1, supervisor = 2, and manager = 3) were included as control variables. Sex was coded as male = 1 and female = 2.

Statistical Analysis

I tested the hypotheses using the multiple hierarchical regression procedure. I employed a procedure recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (1989). In the analyses, loyalty, employee participation, and conscientious behavior (OCBs) in turn served as a criterion variable. Age, sex, tenure and rank (control variables) were entered in the equation at step 1. In step 2, PA, job satisfaction, and POS were entered in the model. At the third step, organizational concern motive, prosocial values, and impression management motive were included in the equation to determine their unique variance contributions to the criterion variables after controlling for the effects of the personal factors, work attitudes, and dispositional trait.

[224]

[225]

RESULTS

Dimensions of OCB and Respondents' Ratings

I present the results of the maximum likelihood factor analysis performed on the OCB scale in Table 1. Three dimensions emerged that tapped different aspects of the citizenship behavior. Loyalty behavior represented allegiance to the organization through the promotion of its interest and image to outsiders though, it contained an item measuring service delivery. Employee participation was involvement in the development and governance of the organization. Conscientious behaviour reflected an employee's diligence in the work place. The mean respondents' ratings on the loyalty ($X = 4.32$, $SD = .54$), employee participation ($X = 4.30$, $SD = .46$) and conscientious behavior subscales ($X = 4.02$, $SD = .72$) were high, which indicated that the employees exhibited high levels of citizenship behaviors.

Table 1. Results of Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis of Respondents' Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (N = 191)

Items	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III
-------	----------	-----------	------------

1. I encourage friends and family members to patronize my organization	.76		
2. I try to generate favourable goodwill for my company	.75		
3. I actively promotes my organization's products and services to people	.67		
4. I always say good things about my organization to others	.67		
5. I tell outsiders my organization is a good place to work	.65		
6. Regardless of circumstances, I am exceptionally courteous and respectful to clients	.33		
7. I sometimes make creative suggestions to coworkers about work problems	.75		
8. I tend to encourage coworkers to contribute ideas and suggestions for service improvements	.68		
9. I sometimes make constructive suggestions for work improvements	.65		
10. I regularly attend and participate in meetings regarding the organization	.44		
11. I do consult with colleagues before initiating actions	.33		
12. I conscientiously follow my organization's regulations and procedures while nobody is watching me	.32		
13. I sometimes don't bother to read the organization's memos and announcements	.73		
14. I seldom bother to keep up with development in my organization	.42		
15. I sometimes don't give thought to the quality of the product of my work#	.39		
16. I sometimes don't follow work rules and instructions while working	.37		
Eigenvalues	4.01	1.33	.90

4. Rank	.04	.54	.06	.50	.00	.46
Step II: Attitudes & Personality Trait						
5. Positive affectivity	-		.09	.12	.05	.12
6. Perceived organizational support	-		.26**	.05	.16	.04
7. Job satisfaction	-		.23*	.08	.10	.07
Step III: Motives						
8. Organizational concern motive	-		-		.46**	.05
9. Prosocial values motive	-		-		-.06	.08
10. Impression management	-		-		-.03	.02
F	1.45		6.79**		9.56**	
R	.174		.454		.589	
R(square)	.030		.206		.347	
Change in R(square)	.030		.176**		.141**	
Adjusted R(square)	.009		.176		.311	
df	4/186		3/183		3/180	
SE	3.26		2.97		2.72	

* $p < .001$; ** $p < .0001$.

[226]

[227]

Employee Participation Subscale

In the first stage of the analysis, the personal factors did not explain a significant variance in employee participation (see Table 3). The work attitudes and trait PA however, jointly explained 7.4 percent variance (change in R square, $p < .01$) in employee participation, and only job satisfaction had a significant association (beta = .16, $p < .05$) with the criterion. Thus, Hypothesis 5b was supported. Employee participation was unrelated to PA (beta = .13 ns) and POS (beta =

.10 ns) and Hypotheses 4b and 6b were not supported, respectively. At step three, the inclusion of the personal motives' dimensions to the model explained 24.8 percent variance in participation, and only organizational concern motive was positively related to participation (beta = .49, $p < .0001$), thus confirming Hypothesis 1b. However, Hypotheses 2b and 3b were not supported because employee participation was unrelated to either prosocial values (beta = .14 ns) or impression management motive (beta = -.01 ns).

Table 3. Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Employees' Participation on Control and Predictor Variables, (N = 191).

Variables	Model I		Model II		Model III	
	Beta	SE	Beta	SE	Beta	SE
Step I: Personals						
1. Sex	.00	.44	-.01	.43	-.06	.38
2. Age	.10	.05	.11	.05	.10	.04
3. Tenure	.00	.04	-.00	.04	-.05	.04
4. Rank	-.02	.46	-.01	.45	-.05	.39
Step II: Attitudes & Personality Trait						
5. Positive affectivity	-		.13	.11	.02	.10
6. Perceived organizational support	-		.10	.04	-.03	.04
7. Job satisfaction	-		.16*	.07	-.00	.06
Step III: Motives						
8. Organizational concern	-		-		.49***	.04
9. Prosocial values	-		-		.14	.07
10. Impression management	-		-		-.01	.02
F	0.459		2.39*		8.92***	
R	.099		.290		.576	
R(square)	.010		.084		.331	

Change in R(square)	.010	.074**	.248***
Adjusted R(square)	-.012	.049	.294
df	4/186	7/183	10/180
SE	2.79	2.71	2.33

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .0001.

[227]

[228]

Conscientious Behavior Subscale

I present the results of the hierarchical regression analysis in Table 4. The personal factors jointly explained 5.0 percent (change in R square, $p < .05$) variance in conscientious behavior, and age was significantly related to conscientious behavior ($\beta = .28$, $p < .05$). At the second step, PA ($\beta = .05$ ns), job satisfaction ($\beta = .02$ ns), and POS ($\beta = -.01$ ns) were unrelated to conscientious behavior thus, Hypotheses 4c, 5c, and 6c were not supported, respectively. Contrary to the hypothesized effects of personal motives on conscientious behavior, there were no significant associations between the personal motives and conscientiousness: organizational concern motive ($\beta = .17$ ns), prosocial values ($\beta = .05$ ns), and impression management motive ($\beta = -.13$ ns). Therefore, Hypotheses 1c, 2c, and 3c, were not confirmed. The positive relationship between age and conscientious behavior may imply that as a worker grows older, he/she is more likely to exhibit a heightened conscientious behavior in the organization.

Table 4. Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Conscientious Behavior on Control and Predictor Variables, (N = 191).

Variables	Model I		Model II		Model III	
	Beta	SE	Beta	SE	Beta	SE
Step I: Personals						
1. Sex	.00	.45	-.00	.46	-.01	.46
2. Age	.28*	.05	.29*	.05	.26*	.05
3. Tenure	-.20	.05	-.21	.05	-.19	.05
4. Rank	.07	.47	.07	.48	.05	.48
Step II: Attitudes & Personality Trait						

5. Positive affectivity	-	.05	.12	.04	.13
6. Perceived organizational support	-	-.01	.04	-.05	.05
7. Job satisfaction	-	.02	.07	-.04	.08
Step III: Motives					
8. Organizational concern	-	-		.17	.05
9. Prosocial values	-	-		.05	.08
10. Impression management	-	-		-.13	.03
F	2.43*	1.46		1.74	
R	.223	.230		.297	
R(square)	.050	.053		.088	
Change in R(square)	.050*	.003		.035	
Adjusted R(square)	.029	.017		.038	
df	4/186	7/183		10/180	
SE	2.85	2.87		2.84	

* p < .05.

[228]

[229]

DISCUSSION

The maximum likelihood factor analysis showed that employees' citizenship behaviors were characterized by loyalty behavior, participation in organizationally related activities, and being conscientious in service delivery. The OCBs were differentially affected by the antecedent variables. Based on the regression analyses, PA was unrelated to the OCB dimensions, which suggests that trait PA does not have much influence on the willingness of an employee to engage in extra-role behaviors that are beneficial to the organization. Conscientious behavior was influenced by age, implying that with increasing age, the employee is more likely to internalise the rules and procedures governing task performance in the organization. Thus, the employee will tend to become more reliable in task performance and service delivery to clients (i.e. good

citizens syndrome). Therefore, organizations could induce their employees to remain with their jobs with positive implications for the production of efficient and effective services or quality products.

The significant relationships between loyalty behaviors and POS and job satisfaction receive support from the social exchange theory that treats employment as a reciprocal exchange relationship between the employee and employer (Bettercourt et al., 2001; Coyle-Shapiro, 2002; Eisenberger et al., 2001). An employee who has favourable perceptions of the supportive actions of the employer is likely to feel job satisfied, and this would provide the motivation for the individual to seek to promote the activities and services of the employing organization to clients and members of the community. Graham (1991) suggested that socio-economic rewards in terms of salaries, fringe benefits and trainings could be employed to induce loyal behaviors from the employees. Furthermore, Maier and Brunstein (2001) and Coyle-Shapiro (2002) suggested that employees' commitment to the employer-employee relationship is facilitated when supportive organizations make conscious effort to engender workers' trust in the organization and facilitates the realization of the personal goals of members. However, an employing organization will benefit from a balanced employee-employer relationship through low turnover of employees and high productivity (Tsui et al., 1997).

The relationships between organizational concern motive and loyalty and employee participation make conceptual sense, because organizational concern motive is defined as the extent to which the employees are willing to offer help to, and identify with the organization. This personal motive reflects a concern for the welfare of the employer, and this type of an employee's emotional attachment to the organization has been considered an important determinant of employee involvement in organizational activities and loyalty (or affective commitment) (Mowday et al., 1982). When an employee exhibits strong identification with or attachment to the organization, he/she is more likely to engage in behaviors that will promote organizational performance, exhibit higher levels of satisfaction, and will be less prone to absenteeism and tardiness on the job or consider leaving the organization with positive implication for productivity (Luthans, 1998; Sagie, 1998). The implication of this result is that employees' emotional attachment to and identification with the employing organizations could be encouraged and developed through (a) the enactment of a fair and equitable organizational policies and actions (Koys, 1991); (b) encouraging employee participation in decision-making; and (c) socialization of employees. Socialization of employees helps bring about an alignment in the employees values and those of the organization. New employees are to be subjected to socialization immediately they come into the organization, and old members are socialized when they change roles within the organization (Robertson & Tang, 1995).

Finally, it should be noted that the variance explained by the personal motives' dimensions in participation (24.8 percent) was twice as much as that in loyalty behavior (14.1 percent), which may imply that employee participation may be a more tangible beneficial behavior than loyalty behavior. The employee participation sub-scale contains items as:

- (a) Making creative suggestions to coworkers about work problems;
- (b) Encouraging coworkers to contribute ideas and suggestions for service improvements;

(c) Making constructive suggestions for work improvements; and

(d) Following the organization's rules and regulation. These items deal with work improvement and the attainment of efficiency, which are germane to achieving organizational well-being and performance.

[229]

[230]

The study has some limitations. First is the cross-sectional design of the study, which prevents causal inferences, to be made concerning the observed relationships between predictor variables and OCB dimensions. Future investigations need to consider the extent to which citizenship behaviors of employees change overtime and how the behavioral motives trigger the changes in OCB dimensions.

Second, another possible limitation of the study is the common method bias, because the surveys employed self-report measures. This may not be a problem because research has shown that the concern about common method bias has no empirical basis (Spector, 1987). And Bettercourt et al., (2001) suggested that the relationship between workers' attitudes and citizenship behaviors is not a function of common method bias. However, similar studies on citizenship behaviors were based on self-report data (e.g. Bettercourt et al., 2001; Chen et al., 1998; Rioux & Penner, 2001), and the reliabilities of the measures except that of the conscientious behavior subscale were within acceptable norm, which supports the validity of the data and the results. The low reliability of the conscientious behavior subscale could have been due to the cultural context in which the study was undertaken.

Third, the use of post-graduate students employed in diverse agricultural organizations as the study sample may constrain the generalizability of the results to specific organizations in some other vocations. As the sample size was not large enough, the results may be considered as tentative and exploratory. Future investigations would benefit from the use of larger and more heterogeneous samples. Despite the limitations, the results still contribute towards the theory on citizenship behaviors of employees.

REFERENCES

Bettercourt, L. A., Gwinner, K. P., & Meuter, M. L. 2001. "A comparison of attitude, personality, and knowledge predictors of service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1): 29-41.

Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F. 1951. "An index of job satisfaction". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35:307-311.

Chen, X., Hui, C., & Segó, D. J. 1998. "The role of organizational citizenship behavior in turnover: Conceptualization and preliminary tests of key hypotheses". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(6): 922-931.

Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. 1983. *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. (2ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum.

Coyle-Shapiro, J. A-M. 2002. "A psychological contract perspective on organizational citizenship behavior". *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23: 927-946.

Diefendorff, J. M., Brown, D. J., Kamin, & Lord, R. G. 2002. "Examining the roles of job involvement and work centrality in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors and job performance". *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(1): 93-108.

Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Shaw, J. D. 1998. "Positive affectivity and negative outcomes: The role of tenure and job satisfaction". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(6): 950-959.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). "Perceived organizational support". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71: 500-507.

Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Armeli, S., & Lynch, P. 1997. "Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(5): 812-820.

[230]

[231]

Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D., & Rhoades, L. 2001. "Reciprocation of perceived organizational support". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1): 42-51.

Gouldner, A. W. 1960. "The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement". *American Sociological Review*, 25: 161-178.

Graham, J. W. 1991. "An essay on organizational citizenship behavior". *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4: 249-270.

Hall, D. T., Schneider, B., & Nygren, H. T. 1970. "Personal factors in organizational identification". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15: 179-190.

Iverson, R. D., Olekalns, M., & Erwin, P. J. 1998. "Affectivity, organizational stressors, and absenteeism: A causal model of burnout and its consequences". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 52(1): 1-23.

Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. 1978. *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley Publishers.

Koys, D. J. 1991. "Fairness, legal compliance, and organizational commitment". *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4(4): 283-291.

Luthans, F. 1998. *Organizational behavior*. Eighth edition. Irwin McGraw-Hill international edition.

Maier, G. W. & Brunstein, J. C. 2001. "The role of personal work goals in newcomers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A longitudinal analysis". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5): 1034-042.

Mowday, R. T., porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. 1982. *Organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Neal, A., & Griffin, M. A. (1999). Developing a model of individual performance for human resource management. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 37, 44-59.

Organ, D. W. 1988. *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. 2000. "Organizational citizenship Behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research". *Journal of Management*, 26: 513-563.

Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. 2001. 'Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5): 825-836.

Rioux, S. M., & Penner, L. A. 2001. "The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A motivational analysis". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6): 1306-1314.

Robertson, P. J., & Tang, S. 1995. "The role of commitment in collective action: Comparing the organizational behavior and rational choice perspectives". *Public Administration Review*, 55(1): 67-80.

Rousseau, D. M., & Fried, Y. 2001. "Location, location, location: Contextualizing organizational research". *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22: 1-13.

Sagie, A. 1998. "Employee absenteeism, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction: Another look". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 52: 156-171.

[231]

[232]

Shaffer, M. A., Harrison, D. A., Gilley, K. M., & Luk, D. M. 2001. "Struggling for balance amid turbulence on international assignments: Work-family conflict, support and commitment". *Journal of Management*, 27(1): 99-121.

Spector, P. E. 1987. "Method variance as an artifact in self-reported affect and perceptions at work: Myth or significant problem". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72: 438-443.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1989). *Using multivariate statistics*. Second edition. Harper-Collins Publishers.

Tsui, A. S., Pearce, J. L., Porter, L. W., & Tripoli, A. M. 1997. "Alternative approaches to the employee-organization relationship: does investment in employees pay off?", *Academy of Management Journal*, 40:1089-1121.

Vigoda, E. (1980). Performance in the third sector: A micro-level framework and some lessons from Israel. Retrieved December 3, 2003 from <http://poli.haifa.ac.il/~eranv/>

Wright, P. M., Dunford, B. B., & Snell, S. A. 2001. "Human resources and the resource based view of the firm". *Journal of Management*, 27(6): 701-721.

APPENDIX I. RESULTS OF MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD FACTOR ANALYSIS OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES OF THE STUDY (N = 191)

Factor I (Organizational Concern Motive)	Loadings
1. I care about the organisation	.73
2. I have a genuine interest in my work	.67
3. I want to be fully involved in the company	.65
4. I am committed to the organisation	.60
5. To keep up with the latest development in the organisation	.59
6. The organisation values my work	.57
7. I want to understand how the organisation works	.57
8. I feel pride in the organisation	.57
9. I want to be well-informed employee	.55
10. The organisation treats me fairly	.38
Eigenvalue = 4.42. Percent variance = 11.64	
Factor II (Impression Management Motive)	
1. To avoid looking lazy	.74
2. To stay out of trouble	.71
3. To avoid looking bad in front of others	.71

4. To look better than my colleagues	.71
5. To avoid a reprimand from my boss	.65
6. To impress my colleagues	.63
7. I fear appearing irresponsible	.62
8. Because rewards are important to me	.59
9. To look like I am busy	.48

Eigenvalue = 4.28. Percent variance = 11.26.

Factor III (Prosocial Values)

1. I believe in being courteous to others	.77
2. I am concerned about other people's feelings	.74
3. I feel it is important to help those in need	.64
4. I want to help my co-workers in any way I can	.60
5. I like interacting with my co-workers	.46
6. It is easy for me to be helpful	.42

Eigenvalue = 3.12. Percent variance = 8.21.

Factor IV (Perceived Organizational Support)

1. My organization really cares about staff well-being	.90
2. My organization cares about staff opinions	.80
3. Help is available from my organization when any staff	.58

has a problem

4. My organization shows very little concern for its staff#	.51
5. My organization is always willing to help its staff if they need special help	.44
6. My organization would forgive an honest mistake	.34

on the part of the staff

POS	-	.09	-.08	-.12	-.04	-.03	(.79)							
Job satis.	.02		.10	.12	.01	.16	.31	(.82)						
O. concer	.05		.12	.13	.11	.17	.30	.40	(.86)					
P. V.	.20		-.05	.05	-.10	.31	.19	.28	.56	(.84)				
Imp. Mgt	.15		-.04	.10	-.05	.24	.01	.06	.26	.38	(.88)			
Loyalty	-.06		.04	-.07	.05	.10	.34	.32	.51	.23	.05	(.82)		
Consci.	-.04		.17	.04	.13	.03	-.01	.02	.15	.05	-.09	.12	(.54)	
Particip.	.00		.09	.07	.03	.14	.14	.23	.55	.39	.16	.42	.23	(.72)
Mean	-		36.39	9.05	1.97	13.08	20.66	15.06	42.27	26.32	31.69	25.97	16.08	25.83
SD	-		6.19	6.47	.52	1.73	4.56	2.94	5.25	3.19	7.76	3.28	2.89	2.78

Note: Values greater than .14 are significant at $p < .05$; Values greater than .19 are significant at $p < .01$. Alpha reliabilities are in parenthesis in the diagonal. Job satis. = Job satisfaction; P. V. = Prosocial values; Imp. Mgt. = Impression management motive; Consci. = Conscientious behavior; Particip. = Participation; O. concer = Organizational concern motive.

AUTHOR'S NOTE

I wish to thank Lisa Troyer (Editor) for her patience and suggestions during the editorial review of this paper. The contributions of the CRISP's anonymous reviewers to this paper are gratefully acknowledged.

AUTHOR'S BIOGRAPHY

Ladebo Olugbenga. J. (lolugbenga@yahoo.com) is a lecturer at the University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Nigeria, Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural development. His main

research interests are organizational commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, stress, and institutional performance.

[233]

[234]