

Relationship Motives, Personality, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Academic Staffs in Indonesia

Dorothea Wahyu Ariani

Dept. of Management, Economic Faculty
Atma Jaya Yogyakarta University
Jl Babarsari No. 43 Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

This study addressed the role of motives and personality in organizational citizenship behavior. Three motives were identified organizational concern motive, prosocial values motive and impression management motive. I provide a framework showing these motives may motivate citizenship behavior. Because organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) may serve different needs or motives for different individual, the measurement of these motives will improve the prediction of OCB. OCB is a kind of contextual performance, a prosocial action, and personality trait involves prosocial thought, feelings, and action. It is suggested that engaging in OCB might affect a person's self-concept. A survey is conducted by using questionnaires from the previous research. The questionnaires are sent to 400 lecturers in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The samples consisted of 370 lecturers. Validity and reliability tests are used to evaluate the questionnaire contents. We employed structural equation modeling for the research framework and AMOS was used to analyze the model. This research analyzed why individual performs OCB throughout the relationship model among attribution theory, personality theory and organizational citizenship behavior. Theoretical and practical implications are discussed.

Keywords : organizational concern motive, prosocial values motive, impression management motive, the core self-evaluation personality, organizational citizenship behavior

1. Introduction

Research on personality in organization has been increasing rapidly in areas dealing with the influence of dispositions job attitudes and various types of performance, in-role performance and extra-role performance or Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). OCB is defined as extra-role work behavior that exceeds formally required work expectations. OCB is voluntary contributions that go beyond task and organizational requirements. On the basis of prior research on OCB and conceptually related phenomenon, I propose that two kinds of dispositional variables may play significant roles in OCB. Those are an individual's motives for engaging in OCB and a personality trait – the core self-evaluation.

Historically, attempts to relate personality traits to motivation have been disappointing. Personality traits are unrelated to specific motivated actions and when a relationship is found, it is usually not very strong. These weak associations may not necessarily mean a lack of true relationships between personality and work motivations. This weak relationship may be due to the fact that many researchers incorporate personality variables in their studies without justifying their inclusion on a theoretical basis. Individual behavior is affected by situational and dispositional variables. In the weak situation, individual behavior is based on his personality. Therefore, personality can affect individual work motivation and performance.

Fundamental problem in the research on dispositional effects on work motivation and performance is the lack of a unified theoretical perspective for understanding which dispositional constructs influence the motivational system and how they operate (Weiss & Adler, 1994). The core self-evaluation (CSE) research has been directly applied toward understanding and predicting work attitude and behaviors. Judge and Bono (2001) makes it clear that we can do a much better job of predicting job performance if we consider CSE personality rather than focusing on the big five personality. CSE is important predictors of job satisfaction and job performance (Bono & Judge, 2003).

Research indicates that CSE personality relates to favorable individual and organizational outcomes including employee performance. Crant (2000) urged research to develop models that include motivational constructs that might mediate the relations between personality and performance. Judge, Erez, and Bono (1998) claimed that the CSE concept would be related to performance primarily through motivation. CSE is highly related to motivational variables and affective variables. CSE should be more strongly related to achievement approach, motivational process, and associated with anxiety or avoidance affective process. The CSE construct has been shown to be related to a variety of relevant work place constructs. This construct has long been known to have a strong impact on well-being, motivation, behavior, and performance in work settings. CSE is important traits that help explain individual differences in motivation, attitudes, learning, and job performance (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2004).

Several studies have found a relationship between positive CSE and motivation (Erez & Judge, 2001) and job performance (Judge & Bono, 2001). Judge, Locke, Durham, and Kluger (1998) argued that individuals with high CSE is more motivated to perform their jobs. Motivation is a major determinant of job performance. This is because individuals with positive self-view will perform most jobs better and increased confidence in their abilities. Erez and Judge (2001) said that CSE were linked to motivation and that motivation mediated much of the relationship between CSE and job performance. It is also possible that CSE represents an ability and skill factor for certain positions.

In this study, we investigate links between individual personality attributes and motivation to perform job and citizenship. This model also begins by adopting the findings from Rioux and Penner (2001) of three motives empirically demonstrated to be distinct reasons for employee engagement on OCB. One's motivation toward performance is an indication of desire and willingness to exert effort toward organization, personal values, and impression. High job performance enhance feeling of personal competence or self-efficacy that may increase intrinsic motivation (Arnold, 1985). Social learning theory would predict that performance level will enhance intrinsic motivation. Using the guidelines state above, the purpose of this study is investigate the relationship between personality variables and job performance through motivation.

2. Literature Review and Hypothesis

Job performance defined as the set of behavior that are relevant to the goals of the organization on the organizational unit in which a person works is among the most important outcomes in organizational psychology (Ferris, Rosen, Johnson, Brown, Risavy, & Heller, 2011). Theoretical conceptualization of job performance suggests that it is manifested in three types of behavior, in-role performance, citizenship, and deviant behavior (Rotundo & Sacket, 2002). In-role performance represents the individual performance on the core task requirements of the job. Citizenship behavior represent behaviors that are not core of task requirement of the job but that positively contribute to the social and psychological environment of the organization. Deviant behaviors represent voluntary behaviors that negatively impact that organization. Judge and Bono (2001) linked CSE to job performance. Interestingly, Erez and Judge (2001) discovered that motivation mediated about half of relationship between CSE and job performance.

Katz (1964) identified three basic types of behavior essential for a functioning organization: (a) people must be induced to enter and remain within the system; (b) they must carry out specific role requirements in a dependable fashion; and (c) there must be innovative and spontaneous activity that goes beyond role prescriptions. OCB is a form of prosocial behavior that contains some of the elements of short-term and spontaneous. It is conceptually and operationally much more similar to volunteerism. OCB is cluster of behaviors that benefit in organization, groups, and individual within it. Citizenship behavior can take two forms, differentiated according to the intended target of the activity, that is OCB-Individual (OCBI) such as courtesy and altruism and OCB-Organizational (OCBO) such as generalized compliance, sportsmanship, and civic virtue (Organ & Ryan, 1995). OCBI comprises behaviors that are directed at individuals or group in the organization, while OCBO refers to helping that targets the organization per se (Finkelstein, 2006). The term generalized compliance, sportsmanship, and civic virtue are used to describe OCB that is directed at organization. The term of altruism and courtesy are used to describe OCB that is directed at individuals within organization. This study used civic virtue as OCBO and altruism as OCBI. LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) said that there are interrelationships between OCBI and OCBO. Therefore a hypothesis can be concluded as below:

H1: OCBI has positive relationship with OCBO

CSE refers to fundamental assessment that people make about their worthiness, competence, and capabilities (Judge, Bono, Erez, & Locke, 2005) and is posited to be the underlying latent construct that accounts for shared variance among other self-evaluative measures (Judge, Erez, Bono, Thoresen, 2003). Judge et al., 2003 conclude that these four traits shares a great deal of conceptual similarity because each represents a component of common core. CSEs are fundamental evaluations that people hold about themselves and form the basis of other self-appraisals like neuroticism or emotional stability, self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, and locus of control (Judge et al., 1998).

A more recent concept in the research on personality is the CSE model. The theory states that self-evaluation influences motivation and performance (Erez & Judge, 2001) and work satisfaction (Judge & Bono, 2001; Judge et al., 1998). The self-evaluation concept influences performance, especially through motivation in designing target and performance. A hard and special target will motivate a person to be committed to achieve it (Locke & Latham, 1996). Individuals who have positive self-evaluation will be more motivated in presenting better performance.

Then, from the empirical study, there are relations between self-evaluation and motivational variables, including self-determination, task motivation, and goal-setting behavior (Erez & Judge, 2001). From control theory perspective, when individual finds a gap between standard and the received feedback, he/she will choose to (1) put more efforts to reach the high standard, (2) pick a lower standard to reach, or (3) resign from the activity or position. Meanwhile, according to Korman, based on self-consistency theory, individual who evaluate oneself positively will be motivated to improve and fix the existing gaps (Bono & Colbert, 2005). In accordance with self consistence theory, individual will be motivated to act consistently with his/her self image. Individual will adapt to the standard performance by putting more efforts.

CSE is based on system of beliefs which are central to an individual's personality and as CSE influences other evaluations to one's identity. CSE are fundamental evaluations that people hold about themselves and form the basis of other self-appraisals like neuroticism, generalized self-evaluation, self-esteem, and locus of control (Judge, Erez, and Bono, 1998). Previous research has posited that CSE relates to outcomes through its influence on motivation. CSE's relation with job performance should be mediated by motivational construct (Judge et al., 1998). Motivation is a process, includes a series of assessments such as whether or not to engage in a behavior, how much effort to exert, and how to regulate behavior once a person decides to engage in the chosen task. According to Locke, Shaw, Saari, and Latham (1981), motivation is determined by goal directedness, human volition on free will, and perceived need and outcomes, sustaining the actions of individuals on relation to themselves and to their environment. There are many definitions of motivation in the literature, yet none that is universally accepted and applied. Work motivation is defined as the degree to which a person wants to work well in his or her job, in order to achieve intrinsic satisfaction. Motivation is a value-based psycho biologically stimulus driven inner urge that activates and guides human behavior in response to self, other, and environment. CSE may be crucial to the formation of more specific assessment which are directly related to decisions regarding motivation.

CSE has exhibited positive relations with motivation. CSE is a valid predictor of motivation in several ways. All four individual component traits were found to be related to motivation. The higher order, latent variable of CSE displayed significantly higher correlations than the individual traits alone in predicting motivation. They also discovered that motivation mediated, on average, half of the relation ship between CSE and job performance. CSE may influence decision about whether to engage in behavior, how much effort to expand, and whether to persist in the face of set back of failure. Empirical studies have linked CSE to motivational variables, including self-determination, task motivation, and goal setting behavior (Bono & Colbert, 2005). Individuals high in CSE are likely to hold positive expectations about their ability to perform. High CSE is one of the personality trait that researchers gave named proactive personality. High CSE is theorized to positively influence employee behavior and job attitudes. Therefore a hypothesis can be concluded as below:

H2: CSE has positive relationship with OCBI

H3: CSE has positive relationship with OCBO

H4: CSE has positive relationship with organizational concern motive

H5: CSE has positive relationship with prosocial values motive

H6: CSE has positive relationship with impression management motive

Given the focus of organizational studies in examining dispositional variable that affects behavior, we use both a person approach in understanding personality and motives in understanding the factors that influence OCB. Rioux dan Penner (2001) choose involvement motives based on functional approach that focuses on goals and functions of the behavior. With the functional approach, it is found that improvement of OCBs result from affective and cognitive factors from general working ethos (Penner, Midili, & Kegelmeyer, 1997). This approach explicitly related to goals and reasons, plans and targets, that personal and social functions are results of individual thoughts, feelings, and actions (Clary, Snyder, Judge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, & Miene, 1998).

The functional perspective holds that individuals OCB in order to satisfy certain needs or motives (Clary et al., 1998; Finkelstein & Penner, 2004; Finkelstein, 2006). Based on functional analysis, they identified three motives for OCB. Two are selfless motivations and include regard for the organization (referred to as organizational concern) and desired to help others (prosocial values). Helping may also be driven by impression management motives, the desire to be perceived as helpful in order to acquire or retain specific rewards (Bolino, 1999). Finkelstein and Penner (2004) said that prosocial values, organizational concern, and impression management motives represented three distinct types of motives, and then, OCBI and OCBO are two distinct types of behaviors. All motives were highly intercorrelated to OCBI and OCBO. OCB may serve different motives for different individual, the measurement of these motives will improve the prediction of OCB.

The functional approach explained why some people can and do engage in the same behaviors for different reasons. Through organizational concern, employees are motivated because they want to organization to do well. They engage in OCB to demonstrate their pride and commitment to the organization (Penner et al., 1997). Prosocial values motive demonstrates a desire to be helpful and a need to create constructive relationships with other people (Rioux & penner, 2001). Impression management motive is based on an individual's need to establish on maintain an identity for the audience.

OCB is affected by factors that are essentially motivational (Liden, Wayne, Jaworski, & Bennett, 2004; Rioux & Penner, 2001). OCB is strongly related to motives such as organizational concern and prosocial values (Finkelstein & Penner, 2001; Rioux & Penner, 2001; George, 1991). Previous studies have provided evidence that motives, particularly organizational concern and prosocial values account for a unique amount of variance in OCB. Prosocial values motives are those concerned with the desire to be helpful toward peers and be socially accepted, these have a strong positive relation with OCB toward individuals (OCBI). Organizational concern motives are related to a desire to help the organization that stems from pride and have a strong positive association with OCB toward the organization (OCBO). Given the aforementioned information, we propose that motives will influence the degree of OCB by employee:

- H7: Organizational concern motive has positive relationship with OCBI
- H8: Prosocial values motive has positive relationship with OCBI
- H9: Impression management motive has positive relationship with OCBI
- H10: Organizational concern motive has positive relationship with OCBO
- H11: Prosocial values motive has positive relationship with OCBO
- H12: Impression management motive has positive relationship with OCBO

3. Research Method

Based on exploratory study by in-depth interviews with lecturers in universities in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, the research focuses on all universities in this city. After deciding the research locations, based on the data taken from these universities in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, letters asking for permission be sent. Getting the permission to carry out the research, lecturers are chosen (they are only taken out of permanent, full time lecturers) with more than one year experience. Permission are granted by seven universities throughout Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Zikmund, Babin, Carr, and Griffin (2010) states that sampling size is based on the researcher's consideration. In reality, all lecturers which meet the requirement can act as the research sampling.

Questionnaires on the OCB are taken from those developed by previous researchers, such as Konovsky and Organ (1996); Williams and Anderson (1991); Farh, Podsakoff, and Organ (1990); Niehoff and Moorman (1993); Vey and Campbell (2004); Morrison, (1994); Takeuchi, Mrinova, Lepak, and Moon (2004); Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch. (1994).

Organizational concern, prosocial values, and impression management motives variables are taken from questionnaire developed by Rioux and Penner (2001). Individual personality variables that uses personal core self-evaluations are taken from Judge, Erez, Bono and Thorensen (2003).

After being translated to Indonesian and retranslated into English by two different linguists, factor analysis to test construct validity is done. Questionnaire items are extracted based on the theories implemented in the study. Then, with varimax rotation and factor loading of minimum 0,5 as suggested by Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham (2006) the results of construct validity testing are practically significant. The result of the factor analysis shows that social values and impressive management motives belong to one factor loading, while concerns to organization motives belong to the other factor loading. Content validity testing on the statement items show that organizational concerns are motives to implement OCB which is meant to develop the organization or to express individual concerns towards the organization. Hence, altruistic organizational concerns belong to one strong factor loading, that it is named organizational motives.

Statement items that have passed the construct validity by using the factor analysis go through a reliability test. Table 1 explains the number of valid questions and the result of the reliability internal consistency test with α . The value of α between 0,6 to 0,7 still meets the minimum requirement of internal consistency reliability (Hair *et al.*, 2006). Table 1 also shows reliability using Cronbach alpha to test internal consistency of the constructs. The valid questionnaire items are quite reliable.

Table 1. Validity and Reliability using Internal Consistency

| | Items in the Kuesioner | Cronbach Alpha |
|---|------------------------|----------------|
| Organizational Concern Motive | 8 | 0.8405 |
| Prosocial Values Motive | 9 | 0.8931 |
| Impression Management Motive | 9 | 0.8276 |
| Core Self-Evaluation Personality | 8 | 0.7659 |
| Organizational Citizenship Behavior Individual (OCBI) | 7 | 0.7613 |
| Organizational (OCBO) | 8 | 0.8329 |

The questionnaire is directly distributed to respondents right after the permission to carry out the research is issued by the universities. The respondents are lecturers of the seven universities in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Research questionnaires are distributed to 400 lecturers. Therefore the research uses 370 lecturers as respondents (response rate 92.5 %). The limited number of lecturers willing to become respondents is as a result of the high work load of lecturers. Table 2 shows the average and relation between variables used in the research.

Table 2. Correlation among Research Variables (N=370)

| | | Mean | Std. Dev. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|------------|--------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 1 | OC Motive | 4.4039 | 0.4642 | 1.000 | | | | |
| 2 | PV Motive | 4.3432 | 0.4093 | 0.515** | 1.000 | | | |
| 3 | IMM Motive | 3.4399 | 0.6062 | 0.238** | 0.312** | 1.000 | | |
| 4 | CSE Motive | 3.7851 | 0.4283 | 0.450** | 0.430** | 0.204** | 1.000 | |
| 5 | OCBI | 4.3236 | 0.3675 | 0.424** | 0.546** | 0.187** | 0.306** | 1.000 |
| 6 | OCBO | 4.0686 | 0.4033 | 0.548** | 0.531** | 0.250** | 0.461** | 0.604** |

** $p \leq 0,01$

Table 2 also shows the correlation between variables. It uses the Pearson product moment on the assumption that all variables are metric. Inter variable correlation is positive and significant. Correlations between independent variables used are significant although there is no indication of multicollinearity.

4. Research Results and Analysis

The results of confirmatory factor analysis AMOS show the score to reach composite indicators measurement from latent constructs. Table 3 shows construct reliability, lambda, error, and deviation standard of each indicator.

Table 3. Reliability, Lambda, Error, and Deviation Standard Construct Indicator Constructs

| Construct | Construct Indicator | A | λ | ϵ | σ |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|-------|-----------|------------|----------|
| Organizational Concern Motive | OC | 0.866 | 0.246 | 0.009 | 0.264 |
| Prosocial Values Motive | PV | 0.909 | 0.297 | 0.009 | 0.311 |
| Impression Management Motive | IMM | 0.830 | 0.464 | 0.044 | 0.509 |
| Core Self-Evaluation Personality | CSE | 0.750 | 0.110 | 0.004 | 0.126 |
| Organizational Citizenship Behavior | | | | | |
| Individual | OCBI | 0.821 | 0.206 | 0.009 | 0.227 |
| Organizational | OCBO | 0.879 | 0.341 | 0.016 | 0.363 |

Composite reliability is internal consistency measurement of construct indicators that illustrates the invisible latent construct indicator degree. Composite reliability for each latent construct (α) is meant to measure internal consistency of construct indicator. The value of reliability indicator should be more than 0.6. Table 3 indicates that the composite reliability of each latent construct (α) meets the requirement, which is more than 0.6. The values in lambda (λ) and epsilon (ϵ) columns are used to arrange structural equation model in AMOS Basic program. The results of the structural equality model in relations with motives, personality and organizational citizenship behavior by using AMOS program are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. The Results of Structural Equation Model

| Structural Relationship | Critical Ratio | β |
|-----------------------------|----------------|---------|
| OC Motive \leftarrow CSE | 14.290 | 0.757** |
| PV Motive \leftarrow CSE | 12.865 | 0.682** |
| IM Motive \leftarrow CSE | 5.851 | 0.357** |
| OCBI \leftarrow CSE | 0.237 | 0.032 |
| OCBO \leftarrow CSE | 3.003 | 0.329** |
| OCBI \leftarrow OC Motive | 2.612 | 0.258** |
| OCBI \leftarrow PV Motive | 5.201 | 0.417** |
| OCBI \leftarrow IM Motive | 0.853 | 0.049 |
| OCBO \leftarrow OC Motive | 1.870 | 0.153 |
| OCBO \leftarrow PV Motive | - 0.258 | -0.018 |
| OCBO \leftarrow IM Motive | 0.876 | 0.041 |
| OCBO \leftarrow OCBI | 7.986 | 0.479** |

**p \leq 0,05

Structural Equation Models in the present study were designed and tested using AMOS 4.0 software (Byrne, 2001). The structural model was specified by allowing the individual items of each measure to load on a latent factor. The coefficient and critical ratio for each dependent constructs are shown in Table 4. Based on the structure model, this study performed hypothesis testing. As indicated in Table 4, the results show that OCBI have statistically impact on OCBO. Thus, hypothesis H1 is supported. In the hypotheses to test CSE personality has statistically impact on OCBO (H3 is supported) but CSE personality doesn't have statistically impact on OCBI (H2 is not supported). CSE personality has statistically impact on three motives (organizational concern, prosocial values, and impression management motives). Thus, hypotheses H4, H5, and H6 are supported. Organizational concern motive and prosocial values motive have statistically impact on OCBI, but this motive doesn't have statistically impact on OCBO. Thus, hypotheses H7 and H8 are supported, but hypotheses H10 and H11 are not supported. Impression management motive has not statistically impact on OCBI and OCBO. Thus, hypotheses H9 and H12 are not supported.

This study used structural equation modeling (SEM) to identify both direct and indirect relationships between dependent, independent, and mediating variable. SEM also used to the research model. Relationships between dependent and independent variable were approved in the hypothesis (H1 – H12). Based on Figure 1, we can conclude that relationship between CSE personality and OCB is partially mediated by three motives. OCBO is not influenced by these motives, but OCBO is influenced by CSE personality and OCBI. This research model is quite fit (GFI = 0.95; CFI = 0.936; $\chi^2 = 52.686$).

5. Discussion

The main goal of this research is to evaluate the relation models between motives, CSE personality and OCB. A more recent concept in the research on personality is the CSE model. The theory states that CSE influences motivation and performance (Erez & Judge, 2001). The CSE concept influences performance, especially through motivation in designing target and performance. A hard and special target will motivate a person to be committed to achieve it (Locke & Latham, 1996). Various explanation have been offered for the low correlations between individual differences and OCBs. The effects on OCBs of individual differences may be indirect and occurs via their effect on job attitudes, especially job satisfaction. Individuals who have positive self-evaluation will be more motivated in presenting better performance. The higher is the CSE personality, completed with social system, inter individual or unit work station, relation model, knowing colleagues, bonding within the network, harmony within and structure of the network, the existence of social interaction and network will better drive the implementation of individual OCB in his/her network. The individual is able to motivate his/her colleagues to implement spontaneous behavior in helping others. There are reasons why individuals with high core self-evaluation personality hopefully have positive results by being motivated and building network in implementing OCB (Bono & Colbert, 2005). The first is that two out of four core personality principles are related to general believes that he/she is able to implement the OCB. Besides, individuals with internal control feels convinced that they are responsible for the achievements they make. Therefore, individuals with high core self-evaluation personality have positive hopes on their ability. The core self-evaluation personality relates with target commitment. High core self-evaluation personality makes individuals committed to reach the targets, so that the person is motivated to implement OCB.

Organizational concern motives be motivating if OCB yield organizational level results that are visible for the employees to monitor and if OCB is organizationally reinforced. Prosocial value motives will enacted in interdependent environments where helping one another (as dyadic relationship or group) yields as visible positive outcome for both the helper and helpee. Impression management motives will also be a strong motivator in a strong performance oriented context if helping is a role expectation, such as the 'lead' or 'senior' ranked employee. The results of the research shows that the organizational concern and prosocial values motives positively and significantly influence the OCBI while, they do not influence OCBO. Impression management motive does not significantly influence OCBI and OCBO. This is consistent with previous research (see among others Rioux & Penner, 2001; Finkelstein & Penner, 2001; Krueger, 2004) that OCB motives are significantly related with the evaluation on the OCB by workers. The results are also in consistence with the role identity theory that states that the role identity played in the OCB is significantly related to the evaluation given by oneself, colleagues, and supervisor towards the target person's level in the OCB (Penner *et al.*, 2005). The role identity theory admits that organizational motives makes individuals are willing to volunteer, to be committed towards the organization, and to act on behalf of the organization, that directly drive the volunteers' behavior in accordance with their roles (Penner & Finkelstein, 1998).

The result is also consistent with Erez and Judge (2001) who state that CSE personality influences more on the motivation and performance. It directly affects the OCB, especially OCBO and it also affects the workers' motivation. Two motives are selfless motivations and include regard for the organization (organizational concern motives) and the desire to help others (prosocial values motives). Helping may also be driven by impression management motives, the desired to be perceived as helpful in order to acquire or retain specifics reward (Bolino, 1999; Finkelstein, 2006). Altruism or OCBI is a readiness to provide help to other employees for improving organizational performance. According to Penner *et al.* (1997), organizational having altruism or OCBI in their employee perform well. Performance level by altruism can be increased because when employee are willing to help other employees, organizational performance will be increased.

According to Podsakoff et al. (1997), employees who are involved in altruism may be more successful than those who don't like to help others and this may arise conflict. Civic virtue or OCBO is behavior in which employee is more concerned about performance of an organization. When employee are more concerned about organizational goal achievement, so they contribute in activities which are required for organizational existence. According to Bateman and Organ (1987), organization must reward this employees having civic virtue or OCBO so that performance of organization increased. According to George (1991), organizations must try to manage conflict among employees having civic virtue or OCBO and those who do not have civic virtue or OCBO.

Motivation based on self-concept is not extrinsic because it does not stem from the expectancy that an external reward will result from the behavior, nor is it intrinsic since it does not stem from pleasure the behavior itself (Mayfield & Taber, 2010). The associations observed here between motives, personality, and OCB indicate that OCB is most likely to persist when employees are able to satisfy their specific motivations for helping. This research finding suggest that to encourage OCB effectively, organizational would do well to offer diverse citizenship opportunity, allowing individuals to choose those that are most personally satisfying and thus fulfill relevant motives. The result is also showed evidence of motives as a mediator of the personality and OCB relationship.

6. Conclusion

The results of the study show that organizational concern and prosocial values motives are two powerful variables that drive OCBI and CSE personality is a powerful variable that drive OCBO. The variable of CSE personality, which has been claimed to influence task motivation and performance and which has not been proven as related to the OCB, is actually a strong antecedent that drives a person to play a role which is not his/hers. The variable of CSE personality, which has been claimed to influence task motivation and performance and which has not been proven as related to the OCBI, is actually a strong antecedent that drives a person to play a role which is not his/hers. The results also show that self-evaluation and supervisor evaluation towards the organizational citizenship behavior differ significantly. The theoretical contribution of the research is the different strength of the two theories on driving the OCB antecedent. The research managerial contribution is the practical benefits from evaluating performance or unexpected behavior required by the role in evaluating workers' performance. Even though further study is still needed, the OCB gives positive influence that supports individual performance and organizational effectiveness. It shows that behavior which is not expected by the role is actually a standard requirement for lecturers to evaluate their performance.

References

- Arnold, H.J. (1985). Task Performance, Perceived Competence Attributed Causes of Performance As Determinants of Intrinsic Motivation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26 (4), 876-888
- Bolino, M.C. (1999). Citizenship and Impression Management : Good Soldiers or Good Actors ?. *Academy of Management Review*, 24 (1), 82-98
- Bono, J.E. and Colbert, A.E. (2005). Understanding Responses to Multi-Source Feedback : The Role of Core Self-Evaluations. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 171-203
- Bono, J.E. and Judge, T.A. (2003). Core Self-Evaluations : A Review of The Trait and Its Role in Job Satisfaction and Job Performance. *European Journal of Personality*, 17, 5-18
- Bono, J.E. and Colbert, A.E. (2005). Understanding Responses to Multi-Source Feedback : The Role of Core Self-Evaluations. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 171-203
- Chen, G.; Gully, S.M ; and Eden, D. (2004). General Self-Efficacy and Self-Esteem : Toward Theoretical and Empirical Distinction Between Correlated Self-Evaluation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 375-388
- Clary, E.G. ; Snyder, M. ; Ridge, R.D.; Copeland, J.; Stukas, A.A. ; Haugen, J. ; and Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and Assessing the Motivations of Volunteers : A Functional Approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74 (6), 1516-1530
- Crant, J.M. (2000). Proactive Behavior in Organization. *Journal of Management*, 26, 435-462
- Erez, A. and Judge, T.A. (2001). Relationship of Core Self-Evaluation to Goal Setting, Motivation, and Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (6), 1230-1279
- Farh, J.L. ; Podsakoff, P.M. ; and Organ, D.W. (1990). Accounting for Organizational Citizenship Behavior : Leader Fairness and Task Scope versus Satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, 16 (4), 705-721
- Ferris, D.L.; Rosen, C.R.; Johnson, R.E.; Brown, D.J.; Risavy, S.D.; and Heller, D. (2011). Approach or Avoidance (or Both?): Integrating Core Self-Evaluations within An Approach/ A Framework. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 137-161

- Finkelstein, M.A. (2006). Dispositional Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior : Motives, Motive Fulfillment, and Role Identity. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 34 (6), 603-616
- Finkelstein, M.A. (2006). Dispositional Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior : Motives, Motive Fulfillment, and Role Identity. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 34 (6), 603-616
- Finkelstein, M.A. and Penner, L.A. (2004). Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behavior : Integrating The Functional and Role Identity Approaches. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 32 (4), 383-398
- George, J.M. (1991). State or Trait : Effects of Positive Mood on Prosocial Behaviors at Work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76 (2), 299-307
- Hair, J.E.; Black, W.C. ; Babin, B.J. ; Anderson, R.E. ; and Tatham, R.L. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 6th edition. New Jersey : Prentice-Hall International Inc.
- Judge, T.A. ; Erez, A. ; Bono, J.E. ; and Thoresen, C.J (2003). The Core Self-Evaluation Scale : Development of A Measure. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 303-331
- Judge, T.A. and Bono, J.E. (2001). Relationship of Core Self-Evaluation Traits – Self-Esteem, Generalized Self-Efficacy, Locus Of Control, and Emotional Stability – With Job Satisfaction and Job Performance : A Meta Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (1), 80-92
- Judge, T.A.; Bono, J.E.; Erez, A.; and Locke, E.A. (2005). Core Self-Evaluations and Job and Life satisfaction: The Role of Self-Concordance and Goal Attainment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90 (2), 257-268
- Judge, T.A.; Erez, A.; and Bono, J.E. (1998). The Power of Being Positive: The Relationship Between Positive Self-Concept and Job Performance. *Human Performance*, 11, 167-187
- Judge, T.A.; Locke, E.A.; Durham, C.C.; and Kluger, A.N. (1998). Dispositional Effects on Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Core Evaluation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83 (1), 17-34
- Konovsky, M.A. and Organ, D.W. (1996). Dispositional and Contextual Determinant of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17 (3), 253-266
- LePine, J.A. ; Erez, A. ; and Johnson, D.E. (2002). The Nature and Dimensionality of Organizational Citizenship Behavior : A Critical Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87 (1), 52-65
- Locke, E.A. dan Latham, G.P. (1996). Goal Setting Theory : An Introduction. Dalam Steers, Porter, dan Bigley, *Motivation and Leadership at Work*, 95-121. New York : McGraw-Hill Companies. Inc.
- Locke, E.A.; Shaw, K.N.; Saari, L.M.; and Latham, G.P. (1981). Goal Setting and Task Performance : 1969 -1980. *Psychological Bulletin*, 90 (1), 125-152
- Mayfield, C.O. and Taber, T.D. (2010). A Prosocial Self-concept Approach to Understanding Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25 (7), 741-763
- Morrison, E.W. (1994). Role Definition and Organizational Citizenship Behavior : The Importance of The Employee Perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37 (6), 1543-1567
- Niehoff, B.P. and Moorman, R.H. (1993). Justice as a Mediator of The Relationship Between Methods of Monitoring and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36 (3), 527-556
- Organ, D.W. and Ryan, K. (1995). A Meta-Analytic Review of Attitudinal and Dispositional Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 775-802
- Penner, L.A. ; Dovidio, J.F. ; Piliavin, J.A. ; and Schroeder, D.A. (2005). Prosocial Behavior : Multilevel Perspectives. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, 56, 365-392
- Penner, L.A. and Finkelstein, M.A. (1998). Dispositional and Structural Determinants of Volunteerism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74 (2), 525-537
- Penner, L.A. ; Midili, A.R. ; and Kegelmeyer, J. (1997). Beyond Job Attitudes : A Personality and Social Psychology Perspective on The Causes of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Human Performance*, 10 (2), 111-131
- Rioux, S.M. and Penner, L.A. (2001). The Causes of Organizational Citizenship Behavior : A Motivational Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, (6), 1306-1314
- Rotundo, M. and Sackett, P.R. (2002). The Relative Importance of Task, Citizenship, and Counterproductive Performance to Global, Ratings of Job Performance: A Policy Capturing Approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 66-80
- Takeuchi, R. ; Mrinova, S.V. ; Lepak, S.V. ; and Moon, H.K. (2004). Justice Climate As A Missing Link for The Relationship Between High Investment HRM Systems and OCBS. *Academy of Management Best Conference Paper*
- Van Dyne, L. ; Graham, J.W. ; and Dienesch, R.M. (1994). Organizational Citizenship Behavior : Construct Redefinition, Measurement, and Validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37 (4), 765-802
- Vey, M.A. and Campbell, J.P. (2004). In-Role or Extra-Role Organizational Citizenship Behavior : Which Are We Measuring ?. *Human Performance*, 17 (1), 119-135
- Williams, L.J. and Anderson, S.E. (1991). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and In-Role Behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17 (3), 601-617
- Zikmund, W.G.; Babin, B.J.; Carr, J.C.; dan Griffin, M. (2010). *Business Research Methods*, 8th edition. Australia: South-Western Cengage Learning