

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW OF THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL PERSPECTIVES: NATURE OF OCB AND THEORIES OF INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCE ANTECEDENTS

Chapter Overview

I propose a theoretical and an empirical relationship linking organizational citizenship behavior and two ideological orientations defined in social contract theory. The literature review spanning these two subjects is contained in chapters two and three. This chapter introduces organizational cooperation and explains how early management theorists provided the foundation that supports the organizational citizenship behavior concept. I chronicle the research construct of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and the two major phases of OCB construct development. My recommendation and justification for utilizing the second phase of the OCB is presented. I then describe research studies examining proposed antecedents to explain OCB variation. These antecedents have included situational work attitudes and context, personality and psychological characteristics, and the cultural construct of individualism-collectivism. A summary and critique of the past fifteen years of research studies investigating proposed antecedents to OCB closes this part of the literature review.

The second half of chapter two examines the relationship between individual differences and OCB performance variation. Building directly upon my critique of

previous studies to explain antecedents to individual differences in OCB, I offer an alternative theoretical approach. I argue that variations in individualist and communitarian ideological orientation may provide a more promising research approach than previously published applications of the individualism-collectivism construct for investigating individual differences in OCB performance. I explain in this chapter's literature review the specific reasons why an ideological construct approach may possess advantages over a cross-cultural construct approach. This is a hypothesis which I will proceed to empirically test in order to either reject or tentatively corroborate.

The literature review continues in chapter three with a summary of social contract political philosophy presented in the ideas of Hobbes, Locke, and J. J. Rousseau. Social contract theory is essential for the development of this dissertation to set the stage to explain the importance of the contemporary individualist and communitarian ideological discourse. These opposite perspectives are presented and discussed in regards to an ongoing debate articulated by political theorists whose deliberations are utilized to provide the theoretical framework to explain conflicting viewpoints concerning the relative importance of an emphasis on self-interest compared to an emphasis on the common good. The two ideological orientations are depicted as polar opposites within the social contract theoretical perspective, but both are elements of that philosophical and political tradition.

Chapter three closes with a presentation of the research question, general hypothesis, and description and explanation of the theoretical model. The hypothesis essentially states that a higher level of communitarian ideological orientation is associated with a higher level of OCB. The model is designed to utilize three

ideological orientation dimensions of individualism and communitarianism—personal identity, self-respect, and duty—to embody antecedent influences bearing on the study's dependent construct—loyalty, altruism, and organizational participation. I subsequently employ this theoretical model to build the study's empirical model described in the beginning of chapter four.

PHASES OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR CONSTRUCT

Organizational citizenship behavior is defined as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988: 4). Current organizational research studying citizenship behavior theorizes that (1) individual extra-role actions can be distinguished from in-role actions and (2) these extra-role behavior distinctions are important to organizational employees and managers (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Increasing research interest in employee extra-role activities in general, and the OCB concept in particular, is justified in the following observation:

More is expected of organizations' employees as global competition continues to require greater effort and productivity. Team-based structures call out for more cooperation between organization members. Increased emphasis on customer service means employees must extend more interpersonal effort toward customers, as well as representing the organization favorably to current and potential customers. As “jobs” become a less relevant concept, replaced by fields of work or dynamic task force structures, employee adaptability and a willingness to engage in self-development to help the organization remain competitive becomes more and more important (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997: 67).

I view the concept of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as having

undergone two significant phases of development.¹ The first phase of OCB construct development research commenced with Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) utilizing a two dimensional construct consisting of (1) helping behavior and (2) generalized compliance. The concept of OCB was further developed into a five dimension theoretical (Organ, 1988) and empirical (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990) construct.

Graham (1986a, 1986b; 1991) initiated the second phase of OCB construct development by encompassing active and challenging dimensions of citizenship behavior. She emphasized a more comprehensive and socially responsible organizational citizenship behavior construct that included dimensions of loyalty and organizational participation, including employee voice and challenging dissent. Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch (1994) published the empirical commencement of the second phase of OCB construct development using a five dimensional structure. With this new OCB construct, Organ's good conscientious "organizational soldier" was transformed into Graham's highly vocal and more actively and democratically involved "organizational citizen". The good soldier or follower and the good citizen utilizing voice and democratic activities both contribute organizational citizenship behaviors that support their organization's purposes. In this regard both phases of the OCB construct represent different aspects of active organizational citizenship.

THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL PERSPECTIVES ON OCB

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is a recently developed research construct characterized by a deep foundation in the writings of early management

theorists and scholars. My presentation of OCB is organized into six sections. Sections one through five address the nature of OCB concepts and constructs. Section six examines and critiques previous theoretical and empirical research studies investigating numerous proposed antecedents to individual variation in OCB performance.

The first section examines the importance of individual cooperative behaviors for organizational performance (Barnard, 1938/1968; Katz & Kahn, 1966). The second section introduces the inception of the employee citizenship behavior concept based on social exchange theory (Blau, 1964). Section three introduces the first phase of OCB construct development discussed in the preceding section. The fourth section introduces five parallel constructs proposed by various organization researchers to compete with OCB. The constructs of (1) prosocial organizational behavior, (2) principled organizational dissent, (3) whistle-blowing, (4) contextual performance, (5) and organizational spontaneity are introduced. These constructs are critiqued in relation to OCB construct development because they do not appear to be sufficiently theoretically distinct to contend with OCB (Lamertz, 1997 and Van Dyne et al. 1995). However, Graham's (1986a) principled organizational dissent was incorporated into the second phase OCB construct and whistle-blowing remains a distinct and valid construct outside the theoretical perimeter of OCB. Section five introduces the second phase of OCB construct development (Graham, 1986a, 1995; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). I propose to employ this theoretically based OCB construct embedded in Graham's ideas concerning active citizenship. Her ideas resulted in an empirical reconceptualization of the OCB construct by Van Dyne et al. (1994). The sixth section concludes the discussion of OCB by examining and critically discussing the past fifteen

years of empirical research efforts to understand and explain antecedents to OCB performance. These six sections constitute the literature review and description of OCB—the study's dependent construct.

Organizations and Cooperative Behavior

Individual cooperative behaviors that serve to help other individuals, work groups, or an entire organization are the context for the theoretical and empirical study of OCB. In the following sections, I describe my inspection of foundational writings on management theory to provide observations and clues that directly resulted in the contemporary concept of OCB.

Contribution of Barnard and the Hawthorne Studies

In *The Functions of the Executive*, Chester Barnard claimed that economic explanations of organizational functioning were overstated and social explanations were neglected:

The relatively developed theories so effectively constructed by Adam Smith and his successors depressed the interest in the specific social processes within which economic factors are merely one phase, and greatly overemphasized economic interests (Barnard, 1938/1968: introduction).

He discussed five social factors in his description and examination of cooperation within business organizations:

- Interactions between individuals.
- Interactions between an individual and a group.
- The individual as the object of cooperative behavior influences.
- Social purpose and effectiveness of cooperation.

- Individual motives and cooperative efficiency (Barnard 1938/1968: 40).

Four of these factors served as precursors to research perspectives concerning the modern concept of OCB, while the remaining factor (number three above) referred to issues of executive influences on individual cooperation.² Social purpose will become particularly important later when the theoretical presentation of values and beliefs regarding proper social norms is introduced in the description of social contract theory in chapter three. It is interesting to note that Barnard examined ideas of human cooperation from various perspectives and considered how these views might fit into his theory of organizations.³

Barnard emphasized that his theory of formal organizations “is always *an impersonal system of coordinated human efforts*; always there is purpose as the coordinating and unifying principle” (1938/1968: 94-95). His opinion on the advantages of cooperative efforts versus competition in the context of telephone service monopolies provided an economic argument regarding the link between cooperation and business efficiency.⁴

A vigilant reading of Barnard suggests that his use of terms like cooperation and mutuality of interests within organizations may have quite different meanings for business executives versus employees.⁵ Barnard’s perspective reflected his affiliation with his intellectual colleagues at the Harvard Graduate School of Business, at that time the center of articulation regarding the newly emerging management class.⁶ Cooperation for Barnard did not mean a two-way street where the employee’s perspectives or their vocal participation were taken into account.⁷ Instead, individual employee cooperation was important in order to achieve legitimacy for management’s

leadership of organizations.⁸ Cooperation often meant indirect managerial control of employee behavior using the new ideas and techniques then being developed by the academic social sciences.⁹ Barnard's description of the new idea of the informal organization was based on his view that "Group interaction creates a network of values, perceptions, and expectations that are transmitted to group members in the form of expected behaviors through roles" (Scott, 1992: 113). These behaviors are learned through social norms and ideas. While the practice of democracy did not exist in most formal business organizations, Barnard argued that democratic behaviors would be found in the informal organization of large and small work groups.

Barnard described and discussed activities of informal organization within and between work groups. Informal organizations existed adjacent to the more formal organization directly subject to the control of executives and managers. Barnard's endeavor to comprehend the distinction between formal and informal organizations suggest a link between his observations and ideas and the research findings from the Western Electric Hawthorne Works¹⁰ studies (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939/1964).¹¹

For example, the "bank wiring room" experiment within the Hawthorne studies studied the effects of small group behavior on work productivity (Mayo, 1933). "This research was the empirical foundation for the concepts of the informal organization and group culture in management theory" (Scott, 1992: 43). From interviews with twenty thousand employees conducted by more than thirty interviewers during the 1924 through 1932 period of the Hawthorne studies (Schwartzman, 1993), the idea was developed that employee sentiments—from values, beliefs, and attitudes—were consequential to help define and understand the functioning of formal organizations.

The Hawthorne study researchers found that organizations simultaneously possess both formal and informal rules and tacit ways of accomplishing productive work.¹²

Roethlisberger & Dickson (1939/1964: 559) stated that “Much collaboration exists at an informal level, and it sometimes facilitates the functioning of the formal organization.”

The distinction is that organizations are formal when employees have explicit activities to perform; organizations are informal when employees must negotiate with one another on a continual basis to understand, interpret, and accomplish their work tasks. It is evident from early management scholars that voluntary cooperative behaviors were considered beneficial to the achievement of organizational objectives. However, they did not yet have the research tools for precise measurement of cooperative behaviors. This would first require Katz's (1964) theory of organizational role behavior to provide the necessary conceptual framework.

Katz and Kahn's Contributions

Katz (1964) described three categories of organizational behavior necessary for the effective functioning of an organization. Employees must be persuaded to enter and remain in the organization; specific role requirements must be completed in a dependable fashion; and innovative and spontaneous activity must occur that goes beyond role prescriptions. Individual behavior beyond that specified by a particular role requirement is the dependent variable concern of this research study. As Katz (1964: 132) said regarding the importance of extra-role activities: “An organization which depends solely upon its blue-prints of prescribed behavior is a very fragile social system”.

Katz and Kahn (1966) emphasized a key issue for this discussion—the

distinction between various motivations that influence behaviors—that is in part dependent on the system design and application of compensation and rewards. Organizations provide specific rewards to individuals based upon membership without regard to specific in-role actions. Organizations also specifically compensate and reward individuals for performing in-role behaviors. However, there is the potential problem that the instrumental pursuit of explicit rewards can ignore, or even run counter to other, perhaps tacit, extra-role behaviors that could be indispensable for the achievement of organizational goals. Katz & Kahn (1966) suggested that system-wide compensation incentives might not lead to increases of desired in-role behaviors; however, they also made the conflicting statement that system rewards could be designed to increase cooperative behaviors among organizational members if all could benefit from cooperative accomplishments. A major problem with these ideas is that employees are assumed to respond equally to various change interventions designed around organizational motivation and compensation systems. Part of this study's contribution toward increasing understanding of cooperation within organizations will be the introduction of the antecedent effects of socially anchored ideological orientations that influence individual differences in cooperative behaviors.

Contemporary Justifications for Organizational Cooperation

The importance of cooperation within organizations can also be justified with the increasing complexity of job roles in an economy with greater demands for service orientations and escalating requirements for technological competence. It is becoming more difficult for business organizations to completely specify all work behaviors expected in formal job descriptions. One illustration involves the billion-dollar company

W. L. Gore & Associates that emphasizes product innovation and the encouragement of a creative workplace. Gore's basic corporate principles listed below are intertwined with many of the dimensions that serve to describe OCB performance:

- Fairness to each other and everyone with whom we come in contact with
- Freedom to encourage, help, and allow other associates to grow in knowledge, skill, and scope of responsibility
- The ability to make one's own commitments and keep them
- Consultation with other associates before taking actions that could impact the reputation of the company by hitting it 'below the waterline'.
(www.gore.com, 1998).

At a more theoretical level, another example would be the incomplete contract problem in economics. This problem states that an initial economic contract incompletely describes both parties' responsibilities in relation to contracts between firms (Hart, 1991; Williamson 1985, 1990). This idea could be applied to OCB in order to help understand the importance of individual extra-role behavior within organizations. Williamson (1990: 179) stated that because of bounded rationality (Simon, 1957) in organizational behavior "*all complex contracts are unavoidably incomplete*". As formal job roles and descriptions in the global and service economy become less specific and fixed, opportunities and demands for increasing organizational citizenship behavior could become more desired and consequential for business organizations (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Citizenship behavior may in fact describe one important component of "the organizational advantage" (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998: 242) that permits organizations to successfully accomplish massive and complex goals.

Organ's Initial Conception regarding Organizational Citizenship

Organ (1988) defined organizational citizenship behavior as individual discretionary actions that are not expressly rewarded but in fact promote organizational goal achievement. The concept of OCB is focused on supporting the objectives and goals of the referent organization, with a focus of intent on some collectivity other than the individual self. Organ and his associates' conceptualization of OCB used the language of the cooperative "good soldier", whose actions Barnard would have approved.

The OCB concept originated in Organ's (1977) attempt to understand the apparent failure of organizational researchers to find a significant relationship between individual job satisfaction and job performance. He insightfully asked if the definitions of work performance might have been measured too narrowly. Starting with Katz and Kahn's (1966) concept of extra-role behaviors, Organ asked about behaviors that were not required by a job, but perhaps might be important. "These behaviors include any of the gestures (often taken for granted) that lubricate the social machinery of the organization but that do not directly inhere in the usual notion of task performance" (Organ & Bateman, 1983: 588).

From another perspective, a negative way to conceptualize OCB would be to think of those beneficial actions that would no longer be performed if and when employees were to diligently 'work to rule', for example in response to work disputes between employees and management. Working to rule has been an effective worker tactic with a long history of usage by industrial unions. It could also be an illustrative counter-argument to those who argue that extra-role behaviors do not exist in business

organizations.¹³

Organ cited Adams (1966) and Blau (1964) to support the use of social exchange theory to provide a theoretical foundation for OCB. In describing Organ's theoretical development process at this point, I want to emphasize that Blau's (1964) lack of sociological perspective in exchange theory (Wilson, 1983; Salancik and Pfeffer, 1978) is counter to my theoretical approach for this study and that exchange theory is presented here for historical process description only.

Social exchange theory suggests that in certain situations, people will reciprocate helping behaviors and resources to those who benefited them. Blau suggested that ostensibly voluntary behaviors contain numerous gradations of social obligation. However, his emphasis on self-interested motivation makes him eminently individualistic (Calhoun & Scott, 1990) as he ignores more collective interests and explanations. I believe that social exchange theory does not adequately explain OCB dimensions of loyalty, participation (including voice and challenging dissent), or altruistic actions.

First Phase of OCB Construct Development

In this section I describe initial conceptualizations of OCB. The conceptualization of OCB that I utilize in the present study will be presented in the second phase OCB section. Descriptions of various OCB constructs are introduced in this section for historical comparison to better understand the second phase of OCB construct development.

OCB is a comparatively new concept in the field of organizational studies Building upon Organ's (1977) questions about what could be missing from measures of

job performance, Bateman and Organ (1983) empirically examined whether measures of job satisfaction could predict certain helping or cooperating behaviors that may support work performance. Because the direct research link between job satisfaction and job performance was empirically weak,¹⁴ they wanted to discover if some other behavior might moderate and influence the relationship between job satisfaction and work production performance. The initial description of what Bateman and Organ (1983) called employee citizenship included behaviors that were (1) outside a formal job description; (2) were not directly rewarded by a compensation system; and (3) in some way contribute to the effectiveness or productivity of other individuals, groups, or the entire organization.

Origin of OCB Construct

Smith, Organ, & Near (1983) published the first research article using the term organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). They referenced Barnard's (1938/1968: 83) *willingness* of persons to contribute efforts to the cooperative system" was what allowed individuals to work together to achieve the goals of their work organization. This first published article using the OCB construct originated from C. Ann Smith's doctoral work at Indiana University.¹⁵ She and her co-authors suggested that:

Citizenship behaviors are important because they lubricate the social machinery of the organization. They provide the flexibility needed to work through many unforeseen contingencies; they enable participants to cope with the otherwise awesome condition of interdependence on each other. ...Furthermore, much of what we call citizenship behavior is not easily governed by individual incentive schemes, because such behavior is often subtle, difficult to measure, may contribute more to others' performance than one's own, and may even have the effect of sacrificing some portion of one's immediate individual output (Smith et al., 1983: 653-654).

Citizenship and Organizational Behavior

Although the concept of citizenship was novel to organizational studies researchers, the citizenship concept has a very long scholarly history. Citizenship in the political sphere was defined as "...an interaction of obligation and rights. Citizenship is a pattern and a rough balance between rights and obligations in order to make possible the shared process of ruling and of being ruled" (Janowitz, 1980/1991: 199).¹⁶

The first phase of OCB construct development and empirical research, however, did not reference a democratic conception of citizenship participation. Citizenship in the organizational sphere was more oriented in this early phase toward following the rules and agreeing to support organizational goals, rather than shared governance. Smith et al. (1983) referenced Roethlisberger and Dickson's (1939/1964) research that for the individual employee there was interdependence between the informal organization relationships and cooperative actions. OCB was presented as a way to examine and measure individual cooperation that supported organizational goals. In the first book written about OCB, Organ formulated the previously referenced operational definition:

OCB represents individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988: 4).

OCB in Two Dimensions

This section examines the initial development of multiple dimensions of OCB. Smith et al. (1983) identified a two-factor construct for OCB: (1) altruism, or helping others, and (2) generalized compliance.¹⁷ The altruism construct measured individual helping of other people on a directly personal basis—e.g. the question "I help others who have been absent." Altruism as a dimension of OCB is often directed toward

individuals within the organization; however, altruism could also be directed to help individuals outside the organizational boundaries if there is some connection between the recipient and benefit for the organization (Graham, 1986a; 1992).

The generalized compliance construct (later termed conscientiousness) developed by Organ and associates measured a more impersonal compliance with organizational norms that supported the system. This dimension contained questions that would later be divided into several distinct OCB constructs. For example representative questions are asked such as (1) “Makes innovative suggestions to improve department” which addressed OCB issues, or (2) “Does not spend time in idle conversation”, which I propose should not be part of the OCB construct because it reflects performance of specific in-role behaviors.

Conscientiousness captures the idea of individuals carrying out role behaviors with better performance than required or expected. However, two concerns make the use of this dimension questionable for this study. First, the behavior does not need to be directed toward anyone else (e.g. individual obsessions with a neat desk or perfect attendance were included). Second, even though conscientiousness was described as going beyond specified in-role behavior, it included extra efforts within individual in-role actions. Because it does not describe a dimension of extra-role behavior, the conscientiousness dimension of OCB will not be utilized in this study.

Smith et al. (1983: 656) originally developed two OCB dimensions from structured interviews involving business managers who were “asked to identify instances of helpful, but not absolutely required job behavior”. Other organizational researchers followed up with further studies using two or more OCB construct factors to

test for possible antecedents to individual differences in OCB performance. A summary of these research studies will be discussed in section six regarding antecedents to OCB performance variation.

Alternative OCB Dimension Constructs

Organizational scholars interested in OCB construct development produced additional citizenship dimensions. Williams et al. (1986) identified three factors for OCB: altruism, plus a segmentation of the general compliance factor into an attendance and timeliness of work factor, and a third factor regarding an individual's seriousness of attending to job demands. An alternative OCB dimensional construct utilized by Williams (1988) and Williams & Anderson (1991) utilized two dimensions labeled OCB-Individual and OCB-Organization. These two dimensions characterized OCB based solely on the intended target.

Additional dimensions of obedience, loyalty, and participation were developed and utilized to describe OCB (Graham, 1986a). These dimensions subsequently became the basis of the second phase of the OCB construct. But first, the established standard five-dimensional construct from first phase OCB is discussed.

OCB Transformed into Five Dimensions

In *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*, Organ (1988) summarized prior OCB studies and identified five categories of discretionary extra-role organizational behaviors that he suggested constituted the OCB construct:

- Altruism—Helping specific people with organizationally relevant tasks.
- Conscientiousness—Behaviors that go beyond minimum role demands, with

a more impersonal orientation. Includes job attendance and diligence.

- Sportsmanship—Willingness to tolerate inconveniences without complaining, i.e. basically maintaining a positive attitude with others.
- Courtesy—Actions that serve to prevent problems with others from occurring, e.g. keeping others informed with relevant information.
- Civic Virtue—Responsible participation and involvement in the organization.¹⁸

Organ's conceptualization of the 'civic' dimension was limited to inside the organization and did not include actions that enhanced democratic participation in governance. In contrast, Graham's (1986a) ideas, upon which Organ claimed to base civic virtue, emphasized personal voice and active participation, as well as broader society issues within her concept of principled organizational dissent (1986b).

Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter (1990) incorporated these five citizenship dimensions into a survey instrument, and utilized it to study leadership (Podsakoff et al., 1990) and productivity (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991). It is interesting to notice that this five-dimension survey instrument was published by a group of influential scholars working in the hub of OCB research at Indiana University.

Because the overall fit of this OCB model was satisfactory,¹⁹ this five-dimension OCB construct promptly became the survey instrument of choice for organizational research studies referencing the first phase of OCB construct development. For detailed descriptions of first phase OCB dimensions, see recent summaries by Organ (1997); Organ & Ryan (1995); and Podsakoff & MacKenzie (1997).

Nevertheless, there are problems with both the concept definition and construct validity of OCB (Bolino, 1997; Organ, 1997; Turnipseed, 1997), and also a lack of construct clarity in OCB definitions (Van Dyne et al., 1995; Turnipseed & Murkison,

1997). Definitional and construct clarity problems probably contributed to the relative lack of statistical significance found in various studies examining the relationship of proposed antecedents that might influence individual differences in OCB.

It appears that a major barrier to OCB construct clarity has been the concurrent development of similar but competing extra-role behavior conceptualizations. The following section presents (1) a perspective for OCB construct clarity, (2) descriptions of five somewhat parallel extra-role behavior constructs, and (3) recommendations for OCB construct precision utilizing the second phase OCB construct developed and tested by Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994).

Parallel Constructs Competing with OCB

Organizational researchers have observed that there is a need for more distinct extra-role behavior concepts and their resulting constructs (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Graham, 1986a, 1991, 1995; Organ, 1988, 1997; Schnake, 1991; Van Dyne, Cummings, & McLean Parks, 1995). My perspective for evaluating OCB in relation to other extra-role behavior constructs is based on the framework initiated by Barnard and by Katz and Kahn. These management theorists stated that extra-role organizational behavior was a meaningful endeavor for management research precisely because extra-role behaviors benefited, or were intended to benefit, the achievement of organizational goals.

Accordingly, individual actions identified with the concept of organizational extra-role behaviors are characterized by the following four dimensions. (1) actions are discretionary and not part of the formal job role; (2) actions are intentional; (3) actions

must be intended by the actor (or perceived by an observer) as being positive for the organization; and (4) individual actions are disinterested from direct rewards. "It is important to note, however, the disinterest does not require an *absence* of interest on the employee's part" (Van Dyne et al., 1995: 218). The implication here is that although extra-role behaviors may lead to rewards, gaining rewards is not the individual's *sole* intention. Furthermore, there should exist no direct linkage between an individual's extra-role actions and that individual's expected organizational reward.

Description and Critique of Five Similar Constructs

"Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is probably the best known and most heavily researched extra-role concept" (Van Dyne et al., 1995: 237). Nevertheless, there are presently five overlapping constructs used to investigate aspects of extra-role organizational behavior that have been developed and utilized in organizational studies. These research constructs are described in summary form in the following three pages. They are addressed and critiqued in order to set the stage for the introduction of the second phase of OCB construct development. The five competing constructs are:

- Prosocial organizational behavior (PSOB)
- Principled organizational dissent (POD)
- Whistle-blowing (WB)
- Contextual performance (CP)
- Organizational spontaneity (OS).

Prosocial organizational behavior describes individual actions that promote organizational outcomes, while principled organizational dissent and whistle-blowing

describe actions that challenge organizational policies or behaviors. Prosocial organizational behavior (PSOB) is defined as individual actions directed toward another individual, group, or organization with whom one interacts in the course of one's job. PSOB actions are intended to help the individual, group, or organization (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; George, 1991; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986). However, PSOB has been presented as a broadly defined construct without specific distinctions between in-role and extra-role behaviors, or even if actions helped or hurt the organization.

Organ and his associates' initial presentation of OCB ignored challenging actions. Conversely, Graham's (1986a, 1986b, 1991) perspective on citizenship participation encompassed constructive disagreement and dissent. Her concept of principled organization dissent (POD) included:

effort by individuals in the workplace to protest and/or to change the organizational status quo because of a conscientious objection to current policy or practice. It can arise when an organizational member evaluates behavior in or by the organization in terms of some impersonal system of values, and finds it wanting (Graham, 1986b: 2).

POD is based on the ideas of Hirschman (1970) concerning the implications of organizational exit or voice. Graham stated:

Principled organizational dissent can take a variety of forms. Examples include constructive criticism or protest expressed to others with the organization; reports to interested audiences outside the organization; blocking actions, such as working to rule or even sabotage; and resigning in protest (Graham, 1986b: 3).

From the perspective of OCB research, there are several problems with POD. It includes actions that take place outside the organization, it sanctions behavior that can be in direct conflict with organizational performance, and it includes leaving the organization. Hirschman (1974) provided a more positive view of confrontation within organizations with his example describing corporate stockholders who used their

financial influence as shareholders to change corporate practices by expressing their voice rather than by exiting through sale of their stock.

Whistle-blowing behavior (WB) exposes illegitimate practices to outside authorities (Dozier & Miceli, 1985; Near & Jensen, 1983; Near & Miceli, 1985; 1986, 1987; Westin, 1981). It generally focuses on reporting wrongdoing, rather than improving the organization. And since self-interested rewards are included, the WB construct does not fit the extra-role behavior framework requiring no direct linkage between action and reward (Van Dyne et al, 1994).

Unlike OCB, these constructs can include both “soldierly” actions and challenging actions.²⁰ WB and POD include actions that do not benefit the organization and challenging actions may damage relationships, even though an individual’s intent may have been to help the organization’s long term survival. However, Graham’s POD concept enhances the dimension of citizenship participation within the second phase of OCB construct development. Extra-role behaviors that challenge organizational policies or actions may “have the potential to make the most significant contributions to organizational performance in the long run” (Van Dyne et al., 1995: 249). Graham’s POD served to open up the OCB construct for the inclusion of challenging actions within the sphere of supporting organizational outcomes.

The last two parallel constructs are briefly summarized. The contextual performance (CP) construct consists of five dimensions of organizational performance. These dimensions are (1) volunteer activities beyond the formal job description or expectations; (2) enthusiasm and persistence to complete important tasks; (3) helping others; (4) following rules even if inconvenient; and (5) supporting organizational

outcomes (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Motowidlo & Van Scoter, 1994). These dimensions are similar to the first phase OCB dimensions of altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship, and civic virtue. The main difference is that contextual performance does not specify whether actions are extra-role or whether actions are directly linked to rewards. What remains is a distinction between “task” and “non-task” which remains difficult to measure. Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmit’s (1997) most recent work described a model where personality variables were linked to variation in contextual performance, but essentially only offered new terminology packaging.

The construct of organizational spontaneity (OS) states that positive mood within the work context is a primary antecedent to extra-role behaviors (George, 1991; George & Brief, 1992; George & Jones, 1997). These three studies represent the sum total of research articles devoted to organizational spontaneity.

As evidenced by this discussion, the study of extra-role behavior has become more problematic by researchers engaging in construct stretching (Osigweh, 1989) and developing many competing constructs. Van Dyne et al. emphatically stated that

the extra-role literature lacks a conceptual framework (nomological network) which has resulted in overlap and ambiguity in the definitions and operationalizations of various extra-role constructs (1995: 222).

It may be time for some nomological pruning, with the caveat that multiple constructs often provide innovative ideas and enhanced understanding during periods of construct development. In order to make further progress toward a theoretical and empirical understanding of extra-role behavior, a theoretically derived construct is necessary. The justification and multiple dimensions of this new construct are presented in the next section.

The Second Phase of OCB Construct Development

The second (and current) phase of OCB construct development is based on a theoretical perspective emphasizing the rights and responsibilities of active organizational citizenship participation. These ideas were introduced by Graham's (1986a) paper exploring the essential nature and purpose of citizenship.

Graham argued that previous research regarding OCB construct development was essentially atheoretical. To gain a theoretical foundation, she referenced political studies describing citizenship characteristics with underlying theories originating in Plato's *Republic* and Aristotle's *Politics*, and then produced the following 2X3 matrix based on power and interest served:

Who rules?	The private interest of the ruler(s)	The common welfare of the people
The one	Tyranny	Monarchy
The few	Oligarchy	Aristocracy
The many	Extreme democracy	Polity

From Graham (1986a). Figure 1 Appendix, no page number.

Graham stated that Aristotle defined a citizen as a person who participates in ruling for the common good. On the other hand, Plato described a citizen as one who was obedient and loyal to the singular king. The first phase of OCB construct development followed Plato's views of citizenship behaviors. Organ subsequently incorporated Graham's ideas about citizenship (1986a, 1986b) in a conception of civic

virtue as one of his five dimensions of OCB. However, he and his associates stopped short of considering democratic or challenging participation as part of the OCB construct. In contrast to Organ's good organizational subject, Graham asserted that civic participation and citizenship behaviors entailed much more than reading organization newsletters and attending meetings—descriptions of how the civic virtue dimension was defined and measured by Organ and associates during the first phase of OCB construct development.

The second phase of OCB construct development was built upon Aristotle's theory that "citizens were those who not only obeyed the rule of law and served the state, but who also participated in creating and enforcing the law" (Graham, 1986a: 8). For Aristotle a "community of citizens is one in which speech takes the place of blood, and acts of decision take the place of acts of vengeance" (Pocock, 1995: 30). Thus citizenship requires discussion, engagement, and especially participatory behavior (Beiner, 1995; Burchell, 1995; Cohen & Fermon, 1996; Sandel, 1996a).²¹

Obedience, Loyalty, and Participation

Graham formulated a theory of citizenship that included obedience and loyalty to the state, its regulations, and its rulers, as well as participation in the discussion and creation of the statutes of the state. She made a consequential distinction between organizational servants and organizational citizens:

Civic virtue in an organizational realm involves keeping informed about issues relevant to an organization's ability to serve its stakeholders' interests, and expressing sentiments about those issues, even if that means challenging the status quo, as long as it is done in a constructive way (Graham, 1995: 1).

While her idea of civic virtue has been incorporated by both phases of OCB, it

has been conceptualized differently in the two construct phases. The first phase of OCB described civic virtue as employees keeping informed about current events, joining committees, and attending meetings. The second phase of OCB started with these behaviors, but added speaking up at meetings, encouraging others to voice their opinions, and engaging in organizational dissent within the boundaries of the organization.²²

Graham observed that other people in organizations might perceive the more vocal and active civic virtue dimension of OCB as controversial behaviors. This was because most business organizations generally do not invite or positively sanction employee critical comments or confrontational actions. She suggested that because instances of employee vocal or challenging actions are usually not welcomed by managers, the first phase of OCB used a civic virtue dimension that had no voice or activist content. Nevertheless, she also observed that organizations often derive benefits from individual critical observations and comments.

From that perspective, responsible political participation entails interest and involvement in the process of creating and promoting a blended common interest. This calls for articulate representation of one's own position, and attention to respect for other points of view (Graham, 1992: 4).²³

Graham's challenging civic virtue behaviors were incorporated into Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch's (1994) advocacy participation dimension of OCB, one of their four reconceptualized OCB dimensions described in the next section.

The Five Dimensions of the Second Phase OCB Construct

Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994) proposed a new measurement of OCB based on Graham's theoretical ideas presented in the previous section. OCB was

“conceptualized as a global concept that includes all positive organizationally relevant behaviors of individual organization members” (Van Dyne et al., 1994: 766). The empirical portion of their study represented data from 950 employees in a variety of industrial and occupational contexts that supported the construct validity of their five-dimension OCB model. The five dimensions are obedience, loyalty, social participation, advocacy participation, and functional participation. These dimensions are described in the following paragraphs.

Citizens of a community are expected to observe and obey the rules and to loyally promote and defend their communities or organizations. Active participation in social or organizational affairs is presumed of citizens.

Responsible citizens keep themselves well informed about issues affecting the community, exchange information and ideas with other citizens, contribute to the process of community self-governance, and encourage others to do likewise (Van Dyne et al., 1994: 767).

The second phase OCB construct that will be used in this dissertation consists of the dimension of loyalty and three dimensions of participation (social, advocacy, and functional). However, I found the dimension of obedience problematic with its focus on individual efforts to follow organizational rules and policies because it appears to overlap in conjunction with organizationally proscribed in-role behaviors. Even though Van Dyne et al. (1994) determined that obedience was a distinct factor with construct reliability and validity, it is the one dimension of the second phase OCB construct that I will not employ in this study.²⁴

I will utilize four of the Van Dyne et al. (1994) OCB construct dimensions in my study. The loyalty dimension is used because it captures organizational allegiance and

efforts to support and promote the image and objectives of an organizational, and includes employee identification with their employer organization.

Organizational participation was such an expansive construct that the empirical results required three dimensions to fully describe participation. Van Dyne et al. (1994) explained that the participatory category was more complex than they had initially expected. Social participation encompasses the broadest category, involving relationships and social interactions with other people that are not perceived as controversial or confrontational. This dimension overlaps with conventional political and civic behaviors involved in social events and meetings.

Advocacy participation is certainly the most controversial OCB dimension of the Van Dyne et al. (1994) OCB construct because this OCB dimension includes actions involving innovative ideas and suggestions, demanding adherence to standards, and challenging others in the organization to do the right thing (Alinsky, 1971). Graham (1986b, 1991) observed that advocacy participation actions are commonly associated with political activists or organizational change facilitators or consultants.

Functional participation is somewhat problematic for OCB because it captures behaviors where employees are not involved with other people, but rather focus on their own work and development. However this OCB dimension will be utilized in this study to identify dedicated person whose diligent efforts at hard work and job-specific self-development can contribute to the overall effectiveness and success of the organization. However, I hypothesize that ideology orientation will have no positive or negative influence on this dimension of OCB.

Advantages of the Second Phase OCB Construct

The new second phase OCB construct possesses the distinct advantage of being theoretically grounded in the literature of political citizenship. The conceptual and empirical research of Van Dyne et al. (1994) provide an OCB construct that better captures and measures organizational citizenship behavior. Second phase OCB construct is the primary dependent variable for my dissertation.

The next section briefly reviews the OCB literature regarding antecedent or predictive sources of variation in OCB performance.

Research Concerning Antecedents to Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organ (1997) discussed the past fifteen years of OCB research. He concluded that what the concept of OCB was attempting to discover and capture was the essential behaviors that provide organizations with their distinct advantage over market contracts. Organ noted that the search for antecedent predictors of OCB had been unsuccessful. A concise summary of the past fifteen years of the major antecedent categories of OCB studies follows.

Since 1983, organizational researchers have endeavored to understand and explain antecedents to OCB performance. Most research investigated work-related attitudes or general psychological characteristics. Research using various work-related or work-context attitudes have examined job satisfaction (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983; Williams and Anderson, 1990); organizational commitment (Becker, 1992; Bolon, 1993; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996; Shore

and Wayne, 1993; Williams, 1988); leadership (Deluga, 1995; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter, 1990; Schnake, Dumler, and Cochran, 1995), managerial evaluations (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Hui, 1993; individual performance (George, 1991; MacKenzie et al., 1991); perceptions of fairness (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Moorman, 1991; Moorman, Niehoff, & Organ, 1993); procedural and procedural justice (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Moorman, 1991) and interpersonal trust (Deluga, 1995; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Podsakoff et al, 1990).

Additional studies included cognitive and affective responses to work context treatment (Cardona, Lawrence, & Bentler, 1997; Fahr, Podsakoff, & Organ, 1990; Moorman, 1991; Shore & Wayne, 1993; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994); and perceived organizational support (Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996). Studies of organizational spontaneity (OS) or good mood has provided conflicting results. George (1991) and George & Brief (1992) reported a positive relationship to OCB. However, Williams (1988) and Organ & Konovsky (1989) reported that positive affectivity provided little explanation when combined with cognition measures.

Cardona et al.'s (1997) study employing a directional model with cognitive responses as antecedent predictors that influenced affective responses. These affective responses then served as antecedent predictors influencing variation in OCB. When cognitive and affective responses are combined in a regression equation with intrinsic and altruistic values, this model explained variation in OCB at approximately $R^2 = 0.25$. However, when combined in a regression equation using only extrinsic values, variation in OCB was only explained at $R^2 = 0.06$.

Cardona et al.'s (1997) work incorporated a model using three types of

motivation consisting of extrinsic, intrinsic, and altruistic dimensions (Perez-Lopez, 1993, in Spanish). I found Cardona et al.'s (1997) study and explanation interesting because their work indicated that intrinsic and altruistic values—but not extrinsic work situation derived values—may provide a research approach that could better explain and predict individual variation in OCB.

In addition to work attitudes, a study examined the relationship of OCB to task characteristics (Farh, Podsakoff, and Organ, 1990); another studied task performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997), and a third study examined organizational context issues including membership tenure, work unit size, and interpersonal interaction measures (Karambayya, 1990). All of these studies examined work context and work-related events to explain variation in OCB performance.

Studies investigating work-attitude antecedents to OCB have typically reported explanations of variation in OCB performance in a range of approximately $R^2 = 0.10$ for job satisfaction and organizational commitment, with a high range of approximately $R^2 = 0.20$ for task characteristics and cognitive and affective responses. A recent study used hierarchical multiple regression to predict the relation among job-attitude variables and first phase OCB construct dimensions and reported significant amounts of OCB variance predicted by organizational commitment at $R^2 = 0.14$, and job satisfaction at $R^2 = 0.07$ (Pond, Nacoste, Mohr, & Rodriguez, 1997). OCB variance predicted by supervisor fairness in this study was exceptionally strong with $R^2 = 0.37$. This study also reported positive relationships between supervisor fairness and OCB when supervisors were perceived to formally evaluate OCB, but when supervisors did not evaluate OCB, the OCB and fairness relationship either no longer existed or became

negative (Pond et al., 1997).

The most recent and comprehensive meta-analysis encompassed fifty-five studies using a combination of first phase OCB, the parallel construct labeled contextual performance, and the broader construct prosocial organizational behavior (Organ and Ryan, 1995). The results indicated that group and work context influences accounted for insignificant variance. Measures of work attitudes—job satisfaction, perceived fairness of supervisors and organizations, organizational commitment, and leader supportiveness—all correlated within a range of approximately $R^2 = 0.05$ to 0.20 . The meta-analysis also reported “no evidence could be found that subject group differences in age, tenure, gender composition, rank, or restriction of range in OCB exert the moderating effect” on variance in OCB (Organ and Ryan, 1995: 789).

Psychological Characteristics and Contracts

Psychological characteristics have also been the target of OCB research. Studies have linked the standard psychological dimensions of conscientiousness and agreeableness²⁵ (Konovsky and Organ, 1996; Organ and Lingl, 1995; McCrae and Costa, 1987), and service orientation (Hogan, Hogan, and Busch, 1984).

An initially attractive approach to the study of antecedents to OCB utilizes the concept of psychological contracts (Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Robinson & Morrison, 1995; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau, 1989; 1990; 1995; Rousseau & Anton, 1991; Rousseau & McLean Parks, 1993; Schein, 1987). The word psychological contract has been used to designate a person’s belief regarding the conditions of an exchange relationship of reciprocal obligations between themselves and their employer organization (Rousseau, 1989; Schein, 1965). Although the study of psychological

contract theory began with Argyris (1960), Rousseau and her colleagues have conducted most of the published research studies over the past decade. Their research for the most part focused on the employee's perspective through measuring individual perceptions of (1) transactional obligations about pay and career advancement in exchange for employee efforts; and (2) relational obligations about the employer exchange of security for employee loyalty and long tenure (Rousseau, 1990).

However, one study did examine the relationship between psychological contract violation from the employee's perspective and the civic virtue dimension of OCB (Robinson and Morrison, 1995). The main hypothesis of their study stated "Civic virtue will be reduced to the extent that employees believe that the obligations comprising their psychological contract have been unfulfilled by their employer" (Robinson and Morrison, 1995: 291). Empirical results found a significant relationship between violation of the psychological contract and variance in the civic virtue dimension of OCB at the level of $R^2 = 0.09$. But for the purposes of advancing the present study, no individual difference antecedents were examined and the significant relationship is weakly correlated.

Rousseau and McLean Parks (1993) presented a theoretical framework for psychological contracts with two major forms of contracts defined, as promissory and social. However, after defining social contracts as "normative, addressing shared, collective beliefs regarding appropriate behavior in a social unit" (1993: 3), and stating that these are essentially cultural, the authors then proceeded in a completely different direction to present their theory of promissory contracts as representing economic exchange. Psychological contract research has remained at the level of exchange between the employee and their organization and thus does not directly contribute to

the cultural and ideological normative explanation that I have developed.

The limitation with the psychological contract construct for the present study is that little investigation has been done regarding antecedents of individual differences in personal perceptions of psychological contracts with their employer organization.

Although Rousseau and McLean Parks (1993) have recognized that individual differences in values do exist, investigation into antecedents explaining individual differences have not been explicitly included in their psychological contract research studies. My present research addresses this issue, supported by Rousseau's suggestion that "Research is needed to investigate further processes under which beliefs regarding obligations are formed" (1991: 297). The present research study builds upon the substantial foundation supplied by Rousseau and her colleagues.

The next section will conclude the OCB discussion with a summary of theoretical and empirical OCB research studies.

Summary of OCB Studies

Table 1 consists of a compendium of seventy OCB research studies consisting of fifty-four published articles and book chapters (including Organ's 1988 book) and sixteen conference papers or privately circulated manuscripts. These seventy articles comprehensively represent the extent of theoretical and empirical work on the first and the second phases of OCB research. Moreover, they illustrate a trajectory over the past 15 years in the direction that I have proposed in this dissertation.

Introduction of Social, Cultural, and Ideological Influences

The Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) construct is currently well developed. (See Graham (1995), Organ (1997), and Van Dyne, Cummings, and McLean Parks (1995) for reviews). However, prior research streams aimed at discovering antecedents to OCB have proven problematic.

Fifteen years of empirical research investigating antecedents to OCB have emphasized the presumed importance of individual work attitudes developed within the job context, or alternatively, individual personality or psychological characteristics as the antecedents that would explain and predict individual variation in amounts and types of OCB performance. Fifteen years of organizational research have accomplished neither.

Although research studies hypothesizing relationships between psychological dimensions and differences in OCB have not achieved predictive statistical significance, these studies have suggested a more promising direction for future research concerning antecedents to OCB. At the conclusion of their meta-analytic study, Organ and Ryan (1995) suggested individualism-collectivism as a promising approach for future research into the relationship between individual differences and variation in OCB. I provide a summary of the argument for utilizing individualism-collectivism as an antecedent for OCB variation, and an explanation as to why this approach, although a move in the right direction, also has not achieved sufficient predictive success.

The second half of this chapter provides a framework to explore socially anchored individual differences influenced by culture and by ideology. Cultural and ideological factors are hypothesized to influence individual variation in OCB performance, variations not adequately explained by the past fifteen years of published and circulated manuscript OCB antecedent research studies.

THEORIES OF CULTURAL AND IDEOLOGICAL INFLUENCE ANTECEDENTS

A more promising approach for investigating individual variation in organizational citizenship behavior will be to examine socially anchored predispositions that serve as antecedent influences on OCB. I suggest that individual differences people bring when they enter work organizations are consequential for explaining OCB performance variation. Specific antecedent influences are described utilizing cultural and ideological orientations.

My use of the concept of ideological orientation are derived from Kohn and Schooler's (1983) work on job-related conditions, "particularly those that are determinative of self-direction in one's work, as basic to understanding the relationship between social structure and adult personality" (1983: ix). They emphasized that job conditions affect social position that influences an individual's perceptions of social relations. Kohn & Schooler (1983) contributed to this study with their emphasis of the impact social structure has on personality and how social stratification relates to values of parents and their children. They explain "Implicit in fathers' values for their children are values for themselves. . . . Moreover, values imply a great deal about conceptions of

reality. . . . We therefore expect social stratification to be related, not only to men's values, but also to their conception of the external world and of self. We call these conceptions "orientations," thereby emphasizing that they serve to define men's stance toward reality" (Kohn & Schooler, 1983: 6). My use of the term orientations reflects their usage.

Cultural and Ideological Influences on Individual Differences

Individual differences in general, and individualism-collectivism in particular, have been introduced as probable antecedents for influencing individual variation in OCB. Four studies are described below that utilized the individualism-collectivism construct as an antecedent for organizational cooperation and citizenship. Advantages and shortcomings are also described. The origin of the individualism-collectivism construct in the concept of culture derived from anthropology is presented to provide context for using this construct to study OCB variation, and also for developing my critique of utilizing it to study antecedents to OCB. I offer specific reasons why I think this construct has not lived up to its initial promise for understanding and predicting OCB differences.

Even though the application of a cultural frame using individualism-collectivism between two or more national cultures (or micro-cultures) is common practice in cross-cultural psychological studies, the application of this construct in a same-culture frame, within a single national culture (or micro-culture) has proven problematic for organizational research. I describe and critique published individualism-collectivism studies in some detail to make my point that the way this construct was operationalized

placed too much emphasis on relations with family members, neighbors, and close friends to be effectively employed in organizational studies.

Next I explore and illustrate the interrelationship between concepts of culture and ideology. My assessment regarding the general relationship of culture and ideology is grounded in ideas from cultural anthropology (Geertz, 1973, 1978/1992, 1988; Levi-Strauss, 1953/1963, 1961), cross-cultural psychology (Bond & Smith, 1996; Hofstede, 1980/1984, 1991; Hui & Triandis, 1986; Triandis, 1995), and ideology (Boudon, 1989; Eagleton, 1994; Guess, 1981; Thompson, 1984).

The chapter closes with a justification for the utilization of a more refined measure of individualist versus communitarian ideology as the antecedent construct to investigate individual variation in OCB. Ideological orientation is argued to be superior because it directly relates to workplace values, whereas individualism versus collectivism does not.

The Case for Individual Difference Influences on OCB

Barnard (1938/1968) described the advantages for an organization to employ people with a 'willingness to cooperate'. He also suggested that cooperative behavior may be influenced by individual differences. Given that extra role behaviors entail discretionary actions, individual differences could influence observed variation in OCB (Organ, 1990). My study adopts the perspective that investigation of individual differences presumes that "objective situations are filtered through the attitudes, beliefs, norms, and values which workers have acquired through prior socialization in nonwork settings" (Hougland, Shepard, & Wood, 1979). This statement represents the crucial

proposition that justified my rationale to initially commence a cultural approach to the study of variation in OCB, and subsequently provided the logic and support to commence an ideological approach based on social contract theory.

The Cultural Construct of Individualism-Collectivism as an Antecedent for OCB

Individualism-collectivism represents the relative priority that people place on self-interest and family concerns versus shared purposes with others in their groups and community. “Individualists look after themselves and tend to ignore group interests if they conflict with personal desires. ...Collectivist look out for the well-being of the groups to which they belong, even if such actions sometimes require that personal interests be disregarded” (Wagner, 1995: 153).

Individualism-collectivism is a polar opposite construct. However there can exist opposites within measures of individualism or collectivism. For example, the individualist idea of self-reliance can present quite different meanings in different cultural contexts. In an individualistic culture self-reliance signifies living an independent life—standing on one’s own feet. This corresponds to Western ideas of this concept. Yet self-reliance in a collectivistic culture can be linked to the idea “I want to be responsible, and not be a burden on my collective” (Triandis et al., 1993: 368).

Earley (1989) found in his studies of individualism-collectivism within organization contexts that increasing individual accountability fostered cooperation by individualists, but had no effect on collectivists. Earley (1993) also found that collectivists’ performance improved working with an in-group, but their performance did not improve working with an out-group. Cox (1993) reported that collectivists were more likely to

reciprocate cooperative actions with additional cooperation than were individualists under the same conditions.

It would appear simple common sense to suggest that the individualism-collectivism construct should be able to conceptualize and measure within culture differences between individuals, in addition to its original application to examine differences between national cultures. It would then be just one more logical step to propose that individualism-collectivism could be an antecedent influence for variation in OCB. I describe two studies published in 1995 that hypothesized this relationship, along with reasons why I think the individualism-collectivism construct has limited use in the study of antecedents to OCB. My observation is additionally strengthened by two subsequent studies (Miller and Weiss, 1997; Chen, Chen and Meindl, 1998) that also proposed a relationship between individualism-collectivism and OCB or cooperative behaviors.

Four Studies Utilizing a Culture Approach to OCB

The two empirical studies published in 1995 by Wagner and by Moorman and Blakely originally inspired my socially anchored approach to Wagner (1995) employed the cross-culture psychology construct of individualism-collectivism as a moderator in a laboratory study of student group cooperation. His study found that high identifiability of individual contributions to the larger group tasks corresponded with greater cooperation effort, and furthermore “the aspect of individualism-collectivism that concerns differences in personal independence and self-reliance has a direct effect” (Wagner, 1995: 166-67). Although his findings suggested some explanation for individualistic

cooperation, it provided limited ability to explain collectivists' cooperation, though he did find that collectivists who were more interdependent with their work groups were more likely to engage in cooperative behavior. None of his five individualism-collectivism dimensions had a statistically significant interaction relationship with cooperative behavior, but "high levels of collectivism attenuated the effects of group size and identifiability on cooperation" (Wagner, 1995: 165).

The second study examined individualism-collectivism as an individual difference antecedent for predicting performance of OCB (Moorman and Blakely, 1995). Individualism-collectivism was measured in a financial service organization using a scale developed by Wagner & Moch²⁶ (1986) consisting of three dimensions: (1) beliefs of individual or collective efficiency, (2) values of working either alone or with others, and (3) norms regarding the degree of individual sacrifice necessary for ones work group. Results indicated statistically significant findings for the relationship between the values dimension and the second phase OCB construct dimensions of altruism, loyalty, and participation (Van Dyne et al., 1994), and for the relationship between norms and altruism. Statistically significant R^2 levels of 0.20 to 0.28 were reported. These results suggest higher correlation and thus were more encouraging than the usual R^2 results of 0.10 to 0.20 reported in most published studies of OCB antecedents. (See the recent meta-analysis study by Organ and Ryan, 1995.)

Moorman and Blakely (1995) concluded that collectivists would engage in higher levels of OCB because their actions helped the group and that collectivists would place the good of the group over their own self-interest (Earley, 1989).

Miller and Weiss (1997) conducted a survey study of Bulgarian graduate

business students and their coworkers. This is only the second study (published, conference paper, or working draft) to directly link individualism-collectivism and OCB. Miller and Weiss (1997) measured individualism-collectivism using Wagner's (1995) first dimension of personal independence and self-reliance. OCB was measured using the five-item functional participation dimension index of Van Dyne et al. (1994). Miller and Weiss (1997) found individualism-collectivism moderated the measured effects of social norms on OCB for collectivists, and moderated the positive effect of job satisfaction on OCB for individualists.

Chen, Chen, & Meindl (1998) published a theoretical article using a culturally contingent perspective on the effects of individualism-collectivism on organizational cooperation and certain dimensions of OCB. They adopted a specific four-dimensional perspective on cooperation that utilized a behavioral pattern frame (Agyle, 1991; Tjosvold, 1986) with the following individual behaviors:

- Exchange and combine information, ideas, and other resources
- Assist others
- Engage in constructive discussion
- Support and encourage others

There is considerable overlap between this four-dimensional cooperation construct and the second phase OCB dimension of social participation and the first phase dimension of altruism, all regarding interpersonal interaction. But Chen et al.'s (1998) behavioral pattern perspective is quite limited compared to the more comprehensive scope of second phase OCB. Second phase OCB construct dimensions also include actions that could benefit the organization as a whole, including

loyalty, advocacy participation, and functional participation that are not included in Chen et al's (1998) contingent perspective construct. Furthermore the distinction between in-role and extra-role interpersonal behaviors was not addressed in their behavioral pattern frame. Nevertheless, the reason I included this fourth study is because it indicates an emerging interest in investigating theoretical linkages between socially anchored antecedents to individual behavior, and cooperative and citizenship behaviors in organizations.

Implications for My Theoretical Approach

Moorman and Blakely's study was particularly important for the development of my study for three reasons. First, it was the initial study to directly investigate the relationship between individualism-collectivism and OCB. Second, it suggested that

What is especially encouraging about these results is that we have found evidence supporting an individual difference correlate to citizenship behavior. Employees who have a tendency to support the welfare of the collective appear more likely to perform the small, discretionary, yet helpful acts which in the aggregate promote the effective functioning of the work group or organization. (Moorman and Blakely, 1995: 139)

Moorman and Blakely thus supported Organ's (1990) statement that differences in individual dispositions could relate to OCB variation. Third, their values dimension, and to a lesser extend their norms dimension, provided a higher level of statistical correlation than most previous studies of antecedents to OCB.

However, my critical evaluation of both the Wagner (1995) and the Moorman and Blakely (1995) research studies suggest that the individualistic-collectivism construct contains notable problems that will limit its success as a predictive antecedent for differences in OCB. As stated previously, Wagner's study reported statistical

significance with one dimension (out of five tested) that consisted of an index of personal independence and self-reliance. Moorman and Blakely (1995) found significance with their value dimension (preferences for working alone) and with their norms dimension (willingness to make sacrifices to the work group).

Anthropological Origin of the Concept of Culture

The concept of culture is presented from the three perspectives of anthropology, psychology, and organizational behavior. Although the concept of culture had its foundation in the academic discipline of anthropology, this concept has metamorphosed through the perceptual lens of psychologists, organizational researchers, and management consultants.

Pettigrew introduced “organizational culture” into the management and organization literature with his 1979 article in *Administrative Science Quarterly*. Corporate culture rapidly became a wildly popular concept through the books of Deal and Kennedy (1982) and Peters and Waterman (1982).²⁷ Management professors and practitioners are all now familiar with the idea that organizations have cultures that can be described and analyzed. Astute contemporary senior managers know they should reengineer their corporate culture immediately—preferably in time to improve next quarter’s earnings report. They are not using the concept of culture in an anthropological sense.

What is culture? Culture exists in tools, technology, shared beliefs, values, norms, roles, and language. Culture implies locality, position, and time. Culture does not depend on a totality of particular individuals. Culture is unstated assumptions.

Culture is structures of communication, “like language, but also (and perhaps mostly) of *rules* stating how the ‘games of communication’ should be played both on the natural and on the cultural levels” (Levi-Strauss, 1954/1963: 289). “Culture is to society what memory is to individuals. It includes the things that have ‘worked’ in the past” (Triandis, 1995: 4). Furthermore, it is about knowledge. “To be part of a culture, to be socialized or acculturated, is to possess a certain kind of information—cultural know-how” (Balkin, 1998). Culture can also be viewed as the operating software that actually runs a business corporation. Anthropologists, cross-cultural psychologists, and organizational researchers use the same word, but reference different aspects of the concept.

Nevertheless, the starting point for the concept of culture came from anthropology.

Culture consists in patterned ways of thinking, feeling and reacting, acquired and transmitted mainly by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e. historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values. (Kluckhohn, 1951: 86).

Kluckhohn’s notable definition of culture represents a synthesis of traditional anthropological thinking. Culture can also be viewed as institutionalized scripts with rules “that constrain choice by shaping the menu of possible options people consider, making some choices viable and precluding others” (Vaughan, 1996: 197). Hofstede (1980/1984: 13) presented a more high-tech perspective on culture by stating “Culture is defined as collective programming of the mind.”

Cross-Cultural Psychology and Individualism-Collectivism

Cross-cultural psychology followed contemporary developments in cultural anthropology with a perspective on the concept of culture involving more interactive

relationships between individuals and their social settings (Berry, 1997: xi).²⁸ The majority of cross-culture psychologists “assumed explicitly that culture—however defined—is an antecedent to human thought and behavior” (Lonner & Adamopoulos, 1997: 61). Suggesting a link with earlier comments on social exchange theory, cross-cultural psychology also “attempts to describe culture in terms of the constraints that ‘limit’, rather than ‘determine’, a group’s behavioral repertoire”, and provided a more plastic and less deterministic perspective on cultural influences (Lonner & Adamopoulos, 1997: 61).

Individualism-Collectivism and National Cultures

Individualism-collectivism was originally developed through Hofstede’s massive study of national values in 66 countries utilizing 117,000 questionnaires administered to employees of a single global company (IBM). His research findings were summarized using four broad dimensions of culture. These dimensions have been utilized to frame numerous cross-culture studies. Researchers agree that the most well known and influential dimension in cross-cultural studies is individualism-collectivism.

It is important to note that the anchors of the individualism-collectivism construct illustrate extreme positions—isolation and alienation of the private individual versus the collective tyranny of an oppressive group or community or nation. Most national cultures register somewhere between these polar anchors. In contrast, the individualist versus communitarian ideological orientation is rooted in the social contract tradition which is opposed to tyranny and presumes democratic participation and authority. All the more reason individualist versus communitarian ideology is relevant in studying work organizations in the United States, which does not legitimate authoritarianism.

An interesting culture insight is illustrated by a challenge to western norms of academic authorship that involved a group of cross-cultural psychology researchers who published an academic journal article listing the author as the 'Chinese Culture Connection' (1987) rather than their individual names. This group criticized the western orientation of Hofstede's cultural values by stating that his reported universal cultural values overlooked an important Chinese value involving 'Confucian work-dynamism'. Hofstede accepted their criticism and their research findings, and subsequently incorporated a fifth cultural dimension—Confucian dynamism—that captured the relative merits of long-term compared to short term orientation in a person's life and work (Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, & Sanders, 1990).

Wagner provided a heuristic that illustrates a collectivism orientation:

An individualist acts as though he or she defines self as an entity consisting of a single person, bounded by his or her skin, but a collectivist acts as if he or she defines self as an entity extending beyond the individual to include a particular group of others, bounded by the social perimeter of that group. Thus, selfishness for an individualist implies attention to personal pursuits, and inattention to group interests, but selfishness defined in the manner of a collectivist connotes attention to group interests and inattention to personal desires (1995: 154).

Numerous studies have reported that the individualism-collectivism dimension contributed the most to explaining national culture influences on differences in organizational behavior (Triandis, 1995). This construct "describes the relationship between the individual and the collectivity which prevails in a given society." (Hofstede, 1980/1984: 148). He proposed that person and organization fit, as well as individual levels of compliance with organizational rules and procedures was influenced by the prevalence of social norms of individualism or collectivism. If individualism-collectivism can influence organizational in-role behavior, it does seem logical to utilize this

construct to study organizational extra-role behavior.

Hofstede was certainly not the first scholar to examine self-interest versus concern for others. For example, individualistic societies tend toward more formal and universal rules and legal codes. In contrast, collectivistic societies hold values that place more importance in family or social relationships that result in weakening the equitable and universal application of rules and policies. Essentially, researchers utilizing this perspective ask if a society place more emphasize on rules or relationships.

Discussing individual compliance with organizational stipulations, Etzioni (1975) contrasted a type of “moral” involvement in organizations possessing more collectivist societal values in contrast to a more “calculative” involvement by those with individualistic values. However he did not developed a theory of conflict. Rather he developed a theory of codetermination that included dimensions of society and personality, in addition to markets and rational decision-making. He described individuals’ “internalization of their social context, the *partial* overlap between the I’s and the commons” (Etzioni, 1988: 5). Furthermore he stressed

The assumption that individuals act within a social context, that this context is not reducible to individual acts, and, most significantly, that the social context is not necessarily or wholly imposed. Instead, the social context is, to a significant extent, perceived as a legitimate and integral part of one’s existence. (Etzioni, 1988: 5).

Language and Cultural Perceptions

Differences in the conceptualization of independence versus interdependence can influence how people define their self-identity. “The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different words attached” (Sapir, 1929: 209). Language is both an instrument and an object of cross-

cultural research studies, for language and culture are intertwined and exert strong influences on a person's identity. "Language is the most clearly recognizable part of culture and the part that has lent itself most readily to systematical study and theory-building." (Hofstede, 1980/1984: 27).²⁹

Words structure categories available to people within a culture. A linguistic researcher claimed "observers are not led by the same picture of the universe, unless their linguistic backgrounds are similar or can in some way be calibrated" (Fishman, 1974: 65). Making a similar point, Hofstede (1980/1984) claimed that ways of thinking and categorizing the world are farther apart between languages that are also structurally distant. For example, the Chinese word *jen* (Japanese *jin*) for man

describes a "human constant" which includes the person himself plus his intimate societal and cultural environment which makes his existence meaningful (Hofstede 1980/1984: 150).

Note the vast distance—linguistically and conceptually—between this north Asian perspective and the individualist American conception of nineteenth century hunters, trappers, and frontier settlers, or later in that century, images of the fiercely independent Western cowboy riding and drifting across the open range. National culture images and language do influence and shape organizational behavior expectations and norms.

The Case against Individualism-Collectivism as an Antecedent for OCB

Individualism-collectivism is essentially a cross-culture psychology construct originally designed to study the impact of national culture characteristics on values and attitudes and behavior (Hofstede, 1980; Hui and Triandis, 1986; Earley, 1989, 1993; Triandis, 1995; Triandis, McCusker, & Hui, 1990). I argue that the individualism-

collectivism construct—rooted as it is in cross-cultural differences—is fundamentally deficient for the study of antecedents to OCB in organizations within a single national culture.

The individualism-collectivism construct did not successfully predict differences in individual OCB. When I examined the established individualism-collectivism survey instruments and analyzed the specific wording of their questions with OCB as the dependent construct in mind, problems emerged.

Problems with the Focus on Family and Neighbors

Items comprising individualism-collectivism surveys focus on opinions regarding a person's rights and obligations to their immediate and extended family members, and, to a lesser extent, to neighbors and close friends. Reviewing earlier individualism-collectivism research, Triandis, McCusker, and Hui (1990) observed that individualism is highest in the United States and British-influenced nations and that collectivism is higher in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Their investigation identified four dimensions. Family integrity and distance from in-groups best identified the construct where the culture was the unit of analysis. However, the dimensions of interdependence (e.g. "I like to live close to my good friends") and self-reliance (e.g. "It is best to work alone than in a group") accounted for more variance "where the individual was the unit of analysis" (Triandis et al., 1990: 1007).

The interdependence dimension consists of five questions, two about relatives, and one each about neighbors, friends, and friendly coworkers. The self-reliance dimension, with ten questions, produced the highest variance between individualists and collectivists with the question "I would rather struggle through a personal problem

by myself than discuss it with my friend” (Triandis et al., 1990: 1013—Table 4).

However, the following problem was discussed at the study’s conclusion.

Self-reliance can serve the group (by the individual not being a burden on the group) or the individual (freedom to do own thing). Thus, self-reliance is not a good indicator of the construct of individualism . . . Our data show that the Hong Kong and PRC samples are extremely self-reliant (Triandis et al., 1990: 1018).

To illustrate researchers’ usage of the self-reliance index, note that the laboratory experiment and field experiment reported by Earley (1994) on the effect of individualism-collectivism on cross-cultural business training (Hong Kong, PRC, and USA) utilized almost the same survey index (five out of eight questions were identical).

A multimethod multinational study of nine measures investigating the “common core” of individualism-collectivism measured at the individual level recommended combining the following three best methods: (1) A “social content of self” sentence completion index (I am ... subject fills in the blank with twenty responses). (2) An index with thirteen family relationship and priority questions. (3) A thirteen question index with five questions about family, seven about friendships, and one about work—“show resentment toward visitors who interrupt your work” (Triandis, Chan, Bhawuk, Iwao, and Sinha, 1995: 466, 479-80). Family, neighbors, and friends are the primary reference, rather than work groups or the larger community or society.

Triandis’ Individualism-collectivism Survey Instruments

In his 1995 book, *Individualism & Collectivism* Triandis recommended two survey index instruments to measure the individualism-collectivism construct. Of the thirty-two questions in Instrument One (1995), eight questions referred to family or neighbor issues. Of the twenty-four questions in Instrument Two (1995), there were seven

references to family and neighbors, and four questions about educational experiences.

Both these instruments combined issues of family influence with issues of preference for being alone versus considering the needs of other people.

The measurements showed that individualism included ideas such as “independence and self-reliance,” “distance from in-groups,” “competition,” and “hedonism”; collectivism included ideas such as “interdependence,” “sociability,” and “family integrity” (e.g., children should live at home until they get married; old parents should live with their children until they die)” (Triandis, 1995: 31).

The above seven-dimensional construct for individualism-collectivism was designed to measure cross-national differences, with a focus on differences involving family relationships. Because of this, I have concluded that individualism-collectivism indexes do not make the successful leap to measuring socially anchored difference among people within the same national culture, much less the same economic organization.

Ideology in Relationship to Culture

This section presents the case for a research approach employing ideology to explain differences in OCB. Ideas from Wilson (1992), Balkin (1998), and Lodge and Vogel (1987) are used to explore proposed relationships between culture, ideology and economic behavior. My choice to utilize ideology rather than culture to investigate antecedents to OCB variation in business organizations is explained. I will begin with political culture.

Political culture, as it was traditionally formulated, had at its core the assumption that every collectivity has a set of orientations that are used by its members in authority contexts to make choices, resolve dilemmas, and accept particular resolutions as valid. (Wilson, 1992: 11)

Wilson (1992) argued that studies of political culture usually did not emphasize enough how social groups and particular organizations interact with people's beliefs and values. Beliefs and values are viewed in the context of organizations as forms of "compliance ideology" (Wilson, 1992: 18) that serve to maintain social relationships and organizations. Wilson situated ideology as beliefs and values residing within a cultural system.

For the present study, ideology describes normative and nurture-dependent (not genetic) ideas, beliefs, values, and categories of thought and communication using language.³⁰ Ideologies are viewed as "the framework by which a community defines and applies values" (Lodge, 1975: 7). Ideology is seen here as more specific and more explicit than culture, and at the same time, allowing for more discussion than is generally possible within the concept of culture.

Wilson stated that "ideology can be termed an economizing device that incorporates a world view that legitimizes the existing order and provides a framework for a consensus on the general purposes of community life" (1992: 19). This view of compliance ideologies clearly suggests a direct linkage with OCB:

Compliance ideologies are important because they function to meet ends deemed desirable by a large cross section of a society. ...By connecting values with the context of an institutional setting, a compliance ideology gives values meaning. ...Compliance ideologies thus help mobilize people to participate in institutional activities; they tap energies, check free riders, and channel behavior in the direction of fulfilling institutional goals (Wilson, 1992: 20).

Ideology is clearly suggested here as an effective means of social control. "Sanctions alone are not normally the most effective way to enforce authority. Control, after all, is costly in the absence of trust and cooperation" (Wilson, 1992: 20). Ideology

incorporates normative values and beliefs about desirable conditions of social structure, however, ideology can be either used to support this structure (Wilson, 1992) or to contest or even overthrow a social structure.

Ideology and Economic Behavior

I support the preceding statement with linkages between ideology in a cultural context and its subsequent influence on economic behavior. Ideology appears to help explain relationships between comparative values and economic performance in a cross-national context. Lodge and Vogel (1987) suggested that people with either stronger individualist or communitarian ideological orientations may live in different perceptual communities. Yet nations can have multiple ideologies.

The fact is that every community has an ideology, perhaps two or three. If the community is to function effectively, its ideology requires scrutiny from time to time so that beliefs and practice can be made more coherent with one another. (Lodge and Vogel, 1987: 5)

Furthermore, Lodge and Vogel (1987: 7) asserted that the study of ideology is important to business managers because ideology “justifies their power, role, and behavior. It is the set of beliefs and assumptions that constitute the source of their authority”. This observation directly links back to Wilson’s (1992) description of ideology as a way to provide compliance with organization demands, including enhanced performance of OCB.

SUMMARY

I make the case that an ideologically anchored approach for investigating

variance in OCB may provide better predictive results than job-related attitudes, psychological characteristics, or broad cultural dimensions. I suggest turning to normative factors people bring from the social environment into business organizations (Kohn and Schooler, 1983). These factors come from socialization experiences outside the workplace. They are broad socially embedded predispositions that transcend the work environment. Although these socially anchored predispositions may be affected by work experience, they are more fundamentally shaped by socialization experiences that may have begun quite early in life³¹. For this reason, socially embedded predispositions may be more resistant to being reshaped by organizational influences. Thus this approach may better explain persistent individual differences in an organizational context. Individualist and communitarian ideological orientation—the specific socially anchored factors I propose for studying antecedents to individual variation in OCB—are grounded in social contract theory. The ideas constituting social contract theory were developed and articulated in political philosophy and theory. I turn to this tradition in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 2 ENDNOTES

¹ First and second phases of OCB construct development are my own terminology for distinguishing the major categorical shift to the incorporation of loyalty, social participation, and challenging participatory voice into the theoretical and empirical construct of OCB.

² Barnard's business CEO perspective can be illustrated with his focus on management's capacity for preserving social order. "The distinguishing mark of executive responsibility is that it requires not merely conformance to a complex code of morals but also the creation of moral codes for others. . . . This is the process of inculcating points of view, fundamental attitudes, loyalties, to the organization or cooperative system, and to the system of objective authority, that will result in subordinating individual interest and the minor dictates of personal codes to the good of the cooperative whole" (Barnard, 1938/1968: 279).

³ Barnard discussed how the concept of an individual could be viewed differently when the context moves from particular individuals to cooperation and the functioning of organizations. He stated that when attention is given "to the integration of efforts accomplished by cooperation, or to persons regarded in groups . . . in such situations we ask 'What is an individual?' 'What is his nature?' 'What is the character of his participation in this situation?' we find wide disagreement and uncertainty. Much of the conflict of dogmas and of stated interests to be observed in the political field. . . . and some of the disorder in the industrial field, I think, result from inability either intuitively or by other processes to reconcile conceptions of the social and the personal positions of individuals in concrete situations" (Barnard, 1938/1968:8-9). The importance of examining differing perspectives on human nature and their respective influence on individual and organizational actions will be taken up in greater detail later in the section on ideological orientations.

⁴ Talking about his work as general manager of the Bell Telephone Company of Pennsylvania, Barnard said "At that time the state was ridden with duplicate telephone systems, most of which were in very bad shape. It became my job to buy and sell properties to effect consolidations and to create monopolistic service in each of these communities, very much to the public's relief. It's just a false idea to have competition in a thing like telephone" (Quoted in W. B. Wolf's *Conversations with Chester I. Barnard*, 1972: 6).

⁵ Barnard reported an eccentric instructional story about a telephone exchange operator's devotion to her duty. This operator remained at her job even though she could literally see in the distance that her own house was on fire. The house was burning with her bedridden mother inside, yet the operator stayed at her post. Barnard's justification for the operator's action (or non-action) was what he called her "moral courage" in living up to the telephone company's *moral* necessity of uninterrupted service" (Barnard, 1968/1938: 269). (A footnote informed Barnard's readers that the mother was rescued) He stated that this story illustrated the usefulness of norms developed by informal organizations in contrast to the specific rewards or sanctions of formal organizations. Barnard continued with the fascinating observation that "In practice, it is often, perhaps usually, impossible to distinguish the reasons for compliance; but it is quite well understood that good citizenship, for example, is not obtainable by such specific inducements. Only the deep convictions that operate regardless of either specific penalties or

specific rewards are the stuff of high responsibility” Barnard, 1938/1968: 269-270). His ideas and language are direct precursors to the OCB construct. Barnard clearly anticipated the concepts proposed by Smith et al.’s (1983) foundational OCB study forty-five years latter.

⁶ The quip that Harvard Business School was the West Point of capitalism was out of date by 1933. By then Dean W. B. Donham had repositioned the school to become the “Annapolis of managerialism” (Scott, 1992: 49). This repositioning was necessary to create and educate the newly emerging professional managerial class that was replacing the outdated owner-managers of an earlier industrial capitalist era.

⁷ The literature of political science has more to say about the influence of authority figures on political participation. See Almond & Verba (1963, 1980); Dahl (1961); Pateman (1980). Constructing a relationship between the political and the business organization, Pateman (1980: 88-89) states “It is particularly noteworthy that Almond and Verba’s workplace “participation” took place within the existing non-democratic authority structure of capitalist enterprises (although they imply that the workplace can be regarded as a “democratic substructure”). Their respondents were asked whether or not they were “consulted” about decisions concerning their jobs, and whether or not they felt free to protest about such decisions. This is a very weak and minimal sense of participation, at best amounting to no more than pseudo-participation”. The impact of this statement will become apparent in the discussion of Graham’s concept of civic virtue. Her concept was utilized in very different ways during the first phase of OCB construct development by Organ (1988), and in the second phase of OCB construct development by Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch (1994).

⁸ “For its legitimacy to be realized, . . . (Barnard) wrote extensively about the technical, social, and cooperative skills that management had to have in order to merit the people’s trust, and their consent to its leadership” (Scott, 1992: 89). Barnard was part of the vanguard of Harvard Business School’s intellectual efforts to transform organizational domination into organizational leadership.

⁹ Barnard’s main theme was that managerial practice could be improved through social science and engineering. “By his own admission, behavioral control is manipulative, and even in Barnard’s time questions were raised about the moral right of people with power to alter the attitudes of others without their awareness. Nevertheless, the applied social sciences, as Barnard assessed them, give management the means to enter the realm of the employee’s subconscious in order to inculcate attitudes, motives, and values that are organizationally favorable” (Scott, 1992: 116). For further critical discussion on this issue, see Collins (1997)

¹⁰ The Hawthorne Works was one of the major manufacturing divisions of the Western Electric Company, which was a division of the Bell Telephone System. During the years of the studies, approximately 29,000 people were employed at the works. The Hawthorne studies are perhaps best known as responsible for discovering the influence of informal worker groups on organizational productivity.

¹¹ Evidently this is a principal point of disagreement. Andrews (1968: xi) in his “Introduction to the 30th Anniversary Edition” of *The Functions of the Executive* stated that Barnard had access to the early results of the Hawthorne studies and “took into account the dramatic discoveries in the Bank Wiring Observation and Relay Assembly Test rooms”. However, Barnard disagreed. When Wolf asked Barnard on April 5, 1961 if he had read an advance copy of *Management and*

the Worker (1939) Barnard replied: "No. That's one subject in which there is some misapprehension. It's assumed that the ideas in my book were to a large extent based on the Western Electric studies; but I didn't know anything about the Western Electric studies" (Wolf, 1972: 16). In discussing this specific point with Wolf on August 8, 1998, Bill told me this was one more example of business professors who published without first doing their scholarly homework.

¹² Tacit, in Polanyi's (1966) sense that human beings know far more than they can conceptualize or articulate. Polanyi used tacit in the context of scientific knowledge. "But suppose that tacit thought forms an indispensable part of all knowledge, then the idea of eliminating all personal elements of knowledge would, in effect, aim at the destruction of all knowledge. The idea of exact science would turn out to be fundamentally misleading and possibly a source of devastating fallacies" (Polanyi, 1966: 20). The thrust of this statement could be applied to the validity of organizational attempts at fully explaining job knowledge through job analysis and job descriptions that excluded extra-role behaviors. If I link tacit knowledge with arguments regarding political ideological orientations, the following comment is suggestive. "It appears that traditionalism, which requires us to believe before we know, and in order that we may know, is based on a deeper insight into the nature of knowledge and of the communication of knowledge than is a scientific rationalism" (Polanyi, 1966: 62). His criticism here implied profound skepticism regarding arguments for intellectual self-determination as proposed by various eighteenth century rational enlightenment advocates.

¹³ I want to thank Robert Madigan for diligently and relentlessly challenging the legitimacy of the concept of OCB through his skeptical perspective regarding the existence of extra-role work behaviors. And furthermore, I thank Bob for his good citizenship in helping me prepare the Spring 1997 graduate course at Virginia Tech in Compensation and Reward Systems and for co-teaching two of the night classes with me.

¹⁴ Meta-analysis studies report R^2 statistical correlation of approximately .13 to .17 between survey measures of job satisfaction and measures of job performance.

¹⁵ In an ironic parallel of the conscientious good soldier syndrome, C. Ann Smith –the originator of the organizational citizenship behavior construct and survey index –completed her OCB dissertation research while she was dying of cancer. During that time Smith's doctoral student officemate at Indiana University was James Flynn. Professor Flynn emphasized to me during a long telephone conversation in July 1997 that Ann Smith had completed her dissertation text and statistics –that the OCB construct was her work and she had finished the entire doctoral program. Indiana University posthumously awarded Smith the DBA degree.

¹⁶ Janowitz stated in a 1991 footnote that "If one asserts that citizenship in a political democracy involves a balance or an interplay between rights and obligations, then exchange theory and role theory, and especially the analysis of reciprocity, would be relevant" (1991: 197). In direct contrast, covenantal relationships –those emphasizing shared values and trust and commitments that are less dependent on reciprocity and more open-ended –present a viable alternative explanation to exchange relationships (see Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). Etzioni (1988) stated that covenants suggest internalization of organizational norms and values.

¹⁷ Smith et al. (1983: 662) commented "The citizenship behavior measure used was rather simplistic, and the dimensionality of citizenship behavior based on the measure can scarcely be

regarded as definitive". The subsequent fifteen years of research into OCB construct development and antecedents suggest that while she and her colleagues were correct in this point, at the same time their work commenced an important organizational behavior research stream for helping to understand how individual extra-role behaviors support organizational outcomes.

¹⁸ Organ cited Graham's (1986a) unpublished conference paper on OCB where she developed new dimensions of civic virtue and loyalty to the organization. Note that Graham's extensive theoretical work is the key to the second phase of OCB construct development for both theoretical and empirical OCB dimensions.

¹⁹ The psychometric properties of the five dimensional OCB survey instruments were good, in so far as the scale items loaded significantly on each of the five factors. "Moreover, the internal consistency reliability of all five subscales exceeded .80, except for civic virtue ($\alpha=.70$), and evidenced an adequate level of discriminant validity" Podsakoff et al. 1990: 134).

²⁰ Staw & Boettger (1990) went so far to suggest the term counter-role behavior to describe work behavior not included in job descriptions and performance evaluations.

²¹ The relationship between individuals and their respective communities has been discussed for over twenty-five hundred years of Western tradition thought. The Greek city-states (polis) valued the idea of a civic or community life. For example, the Cleisthenian constitutional reforms were established in 507 BC as an attempt to break existing tribal bonds and loyalties, "initiating a new set of bonds based on locality rather than kinship. Individuals were now citizens on the basis of the *deme* (district) they belonged to, reducing the distinctions that had existed between citizens on the basis of blood ties. The community became more powerful through the gradual process of elevating individual citizen democrats, and the civic community, at the expense of the aristocracy and its interests" (Cohen & Fermon, 1996: 10).

But the question was, how was this new civic community to be governed, and governed by whom? Plato, and his teacher Socrates, advocated an antidemocratic government with a Spartan functional specialization of governing roles. In contrast, the Greek city-state of Athens practiced direct democracy where all citizens could meet and discuss political issues with direct personal interactions. However, only one-tenth of the Athenian population was classified as legitimate citizens. Therefore 90% of the population were legally denied access to the democratic political process. For the ancient Greeks, democracy was an ideal, certainly not a reality. Only city-born men were granted the rights of citizenship. Even Aristotle, who advocated the ideal of an oligarchic-democratic state because he believed that men were naturally political beings, was denied citizenship because of his birthplace. Aristotle was born within a Greek colony in Stagira in Thrace (Thorson, 1973), and consequently was never granted the political rights and responsibilities given to native-born Athenian citizens, although he lived in the city for over thirty-two years. Nevertheless, the Greek ideal of democratic government continues to profoundly influence modern political thought, and -as this study proposes -contributes to our understanding of organizational citizenship behavior.

²² Graham (1986a) suggested that delivering dissenting opinions required such courage that is rare even if required by a job description as in-role behavior.

²³ Unpublished discussant's notes from the 1992 Industrial-Organizational Psychology annual meeting in Toronto. Personal correspondence with Jill Graham.

²⁴ I explained my decision on this point with Graham and Van Dyne at a meeting I had with the two of them in Chicago in October 1996. They concurred with my decision to exclude the OCB obedience dimension given this study's primary focus on individualist and communitarian antecedent influences on OCB performance.

²⁵ These studies referenced two of the "Big Five" personality dimensions of psychology. This standard framework refers to aspects of personality in five primary dimensions: extroversion, emotional stability, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience (Behling, 1998).

²⁶ Wagner & Mock (1986) and Wagner (1995) utilized individualism-collectivism items from standard cross-cultural psychology scales developed by Erez and Earley (1987) and Triandis et al. (1988). Interestingly, the one I-C dimension (out of five dimensions) that was statistically significant for Wagner's (1995) study consisted of five items taken from these two previously cited sources (Wagner, 1995: footnote on page 162).

²⁷ The ideas presented in these two 1982 books were related to their authors professional consulting experiences in a similar McKinsey Consulting Group -Harvard Business School environment. Dean Donham would have been pleased with how influential his 'Annapolis of managerialism' graduates and their colleagues remained a half-century after he championed academic managerial education.

²⁸ Cross-cultural psychology provides a broader view of human behavior than most social science fields, with the manifest exception of cultural and social anthropology. "What started as a Western-based attempt to understand the "others" is now a field well-populated by these "others" (Berry, 1997: xv). Representative examples include Bond (1988); Bond & Smith (1996); Chinese Cultural Connection (1987); Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, & Sanders (1990); Hui & Triandis (1986); Kim & Berry (1983); Kim, Triandis, Kagitcibasi, Choi, & Yoon (1994); Kitayama (1992); Shweder, 1993; Triandis, Bontempo, Betancourt, Bond, Leung, Brenes, Georgas, Hui, Marin, Setiadi, Sinha, Verma, Spangenberg, Touzard, & de Montmollin (1986).

²⁹ My spring 1996 original plan for this dissertation study included an inter-woven second voice commenting throughout the first three chapters on the language implications illustrated by the theoreticians and empirical researchers presented. In the interest of finishing this project before the old millennium ends, (and prior to the Y2K bug disabling my 1993 computer) further commentary on the implications and consequences of the language of individualism and communitarianism will be included in the future.

I must admit, however, some regret with this decision. I thus found it fascinating (and dangerous) to read Daniel Bell's book *Communitarianism and its Critics* (1993). It is a revised 1991 Oxford University D.Phil. thesis in political philosophy written in dialogue form. His communitarian critique of liberal-individualistic philosophical foundations takes place in conversational debate (in English and French) between two friends eating and drinking in a Paris café. The dialogue is written within a complete five-act play. There are also two appendixes written as additional sixth and seventh acts of the play. In his role as Oxford thesis reader, Will Kymlicka wrote the first appendix act. Daniel Bell wrote the second appendix act as a reply to Kymlicka's critique.

³⁰ Balkin (1998: 2) suggests that social theorists "prefer instead to talk about *discourse*, *episteme*, *habitus*, *tradition*, *language game*, *interpretive community*, and a host of other terms

for characterizing the social nature of human thought". He further maintained that each of these terms point to similar ideological issues about how people understand and construct their social world.

³¹ For a contrasting perspective, see Kohn & Schooler's book where they viewed job conditions, "particularly those that are determinative of self-direction in one's work, as basic to understanding the relationship between social structure and adult personality" (1983: ix).