



## GOOD SOLDIERS AND GOOD ACTORS: IS THERE ANY DIFFERENCES?

Dorothea Wahyu Ariani<sup>1</sup><sup>1</sup>Management Department of Economics Faculty - Maranatha Christian University

## ABSTRACT

*This study addressed the role of motives in organizational behavior (OCB). Organizational concern motives, prosocial values motives, and impression management motives influence individuals' OCB in banking industry in Indonesia. A survey is conducted by using questionnaires from the previous research. The samples consisted of 531 tellers. Validity and reliability tests are used to evaluate the questionnaire contents. The Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) is employed to test the relationship among the variables. Relative to the other motives, organizational concern motives are most strongly associated with two dimensions of OCB, and prosocial values motives are most strongly with OCBO dimensions. Impression management motives do not influence both dimensions of OCB, OCBI and OCBO. The results suggest that motives may play an important role in OCB.*

© 2017 AEES Publications. All Rights Reserved.

**Keywords:** Organizational concern motives, Prosocial values motives, Impression management motives, Organizational citizenship behavior towards individu, Organizational citizenship behavior towards organization.

## Contribution/ Originality

This study offer two theoretical contributions to existing understandings of OCB. First, this research results help to resolve conflicting findings about motives which influence OCB. [Organ and Ryan \(1995\)](#) and [Rioux and Penner \(2001\)](#) showed that prosocial values motives more likely to predict OCB both toward individual and organization. This research findings suggest that organizational concern motives influence OCB both toward individual and organization. Second, this research results provide a different perspective on thr debate about wheter OCB is carried out by good soldier (prosocial values motives and organizational concern motives) or good actors (impression management motives). This findings indicate that employees can be affected by the three motives because they are related.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Research on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has been developed in the last quarter century ([Smith et al., 1983](#); [Organ, 1997](#); [LePine et al., 2002](#)). OCB is an important topic for academicians and practitioners. Citizenship shows employees attempt to present formal contributions to the organization ([Smith et al., 1983](#)). [Organ \(1997\)](#) defined OCB as employee behavior that relatively deviated from the job description in the organization, but can improve organizational performance. According to the [Organ \(1997\)](#) OCB can contribute to the management of the organization and encourage social and psychological context that supports the achievement of task performance and organizational performance in the long term.

OCB concept is often found in social, psychological, and organizational contexts (Borman and Motowidlo, 1997). OCB is a behavior that benefits the organization. Such behavior is often referred to behavior outside the role to be played. Such behavior is often referred to as extra-role behavior or prosocial behavior. OCB provides benefit the organization even if the employee must perform the positive role that deviate from the job description (Morrison, 1994; Van Dyne *et al.*, 1994; Podsakoff *et al.*, 2000). At the individual level, employees are bound to the OCB will contribute to other people and organizations so as to improve its performance (MacKenzie *et al.*, 1991;1993; Motowidlo and Van Scooter, 1994). Many previous studies have examined various antecedents of OCB (Organ and Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff *et al.*, 2000). The study based on the role of social exchange as a determinant OCB has also done a lot, especially about how the citizenship motives played a role in pushing for an OCB in organizations (Bolino, 1999; Grant and Mayer, 2009; Bolino *et al.*, 2012; Bourdage *et al.*, 2012; Kim *et al.*, 2013; Takeuchi *et al.*, 2015). Individuals behave based on the presence of impulse or motives. In particular, Rioux and Penner (2001) identified three keys motives that affect individuals do OCB, the motif pays attention to the organization, help the organization, and be fully involved in the organization (organizational concern motives), helping and giving attention to the other person (prosocial values motives), and impression management motives that explain employees' desire to look good and avoid a negative assessment. Researchers had previously stated that the OCB is controlled by prosocial values motives. This suggests that citizenship is a behavior help other people and organizations, or referred to as good soldiers (Bateman and Organ, 1983). Other researchers stated that the results are less emphatic about the role of prosocial motives in the OCB (Konovsky and Organ, 1996). Bolino (1999) proposed that individuals with prosocial motives were tied to the OCB when they also had the impression management motives. Some researchers suggest that OCB is predicted by impression management motives (Eastman, 1994; Bowler and Brass, 2006; Finkelstein, 2006; Snell and Wong, 2007). Research results of Grant and Mayer (2009) which only use prosocial values motives and impression management motives indicates that impression management motives strengthen the relationship between prosocial values and OCB motives.

Meanwhile, Rioux and Penner (2001) used a combination of these motives to predict OCB. They stated that most employees use prosocial values motives to move in helping other people and organizations, while some other employees to use impression management motives that moved him to be bound by OCB. It is caused prosocial values motives and impression management motives are two separate things in influencing OCB (Grant and Mayer, 2009). Both these motives using different orientations, namely self-serving or self-interest and other-serving or other-orientation that is mutually opposite (Meglino and Korsgaard, 2004). Furthermore, Bolino (1999) stated that the self-serving and other-serving can coexist and can be used simultaneously. Rioux and Penner (2001) also showed a positive correlation between prosocial values motives and impression management motives.

Research results of Rioux and Penner (2001) showed that prosocial values motives associated with individual oriented OCB (OCBI) and organizational concern motives relates to organization oriented OCB (OCBO). Meanwhile, the influence of impression management motives was less clear. Meglino and Korsgaard (2004) classified the motives of OCB as self-orientation motives and other-orientation motives. According to Meglino and Korsgaard (2004) impression management motives are self-orientation motives, whereas prosocial values motives and organizational concerns motives are other-orientation motives. Meanwhile, Bolino *et al.* (2012) states that employees are motivated by prosocial values motives tend to be rationally oriented and tied to OCBI, while employees are motivated by organizational concerns motives tend to focus on OCBO. The purpose of this study is to explore the role of organizational concern motives, prosocial values motives, and impression management motives on OCB. Based on previous research, the underlying motive OCB is not always for the benefit of individuals, but also stressed the desire to prosocial and social exchange. However, OCB is also influenced by the desire to show their impression to supervisor and co-workers. This study aims to examine the effect of third-motif conduct organizational citizenship behavior with two dimensions of OCB, namely OCB directed to individuals (OCBI) and OCB directed at the organization (OCBO). OCBI include altruism, courtesy, and sportsmanship dimensions while OCBO covers civic

virtue and generalized compliance dimensions. Based on the concept of [Katz and Kahn \(1966\)](#) regarding the internal values and self-concept, and the attribution theory, the organizational citizenship behavior is driven by motives to implement the behavior. According to the researchers, there are several motives implement organizational citizenship behavior: (1) a single undifferentiated helping motive ([Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen, 1991](#)) (2) a two-dimensional structure that is altruistic motives and instrumental motives ([Eastman, 1994; Allen and Rush, 1998](#)) and (3) other-serving and self-serving motives ([Batson and Shaw, 1991](#)); ([Tang et al., 2004](#)).

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS

OCB is an interesting topic for discussion in the literature of management and organizational behavior ([Podsakoff et al., 2009; Cloninger et al., 2011](#)). So that the organization can be successful, employees must be tied to the positive behavior that concerned him and others. This positive behavior is called OCB. OCB is the behavior beyond the roles, responsibilities, and obligations. Organ developed OCB term that has been expressed by [Bateman and Organ \(1983\)](#) and [Smith et al. \(1983\)](#). Their understanding was based on the concept of Chester I. Barnard in terms of a desire to cooperate and Katz concepts that differentiate between performance depends on the role and behavior of spontaneous and innovative ([Podsakoff et al., 2000](#)).

Citizenship behavior encompasses dimensions functions include individuals and groups who are in our thinking when they work together. This collaboration exceeds productivity gains associated with formal organizational functions such as the structure of authority, roles, and technology. Cooperation also includes prosocial attitudes of individuals who work with other people in need, such as co-workers, supervisors, colleagues from other departments, while productivity or efficiency is determined by formal structures or the economic structure of the organization ([Smith et al., 1983](#)). The behavior e.g. helping co-workers without expecting anything in return, directing a new co-worker, be polite, provide advice for the development and progress of the organization, and so on.

Empirical studies that have been carried out in general using the five dimensions, namely altruism, conscientiousness, generalized compliance, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. Altruism dimension or helping behavior and conscientiousness are often distinguished in two dimensions. This is due to altruism or helping behavior is understood as the involvement of voluntarily helping others associated with his work, while being polite tend to willingness to prevent problems in the organization. Conscientiousness dimension is often replaced by a regulatory compliance organization. This is due to compliance with the rules of the organization is more impersonal than conscientiousness and does not provide special assistance to someone, but indirectly for the whole organization ([Podsakoff et al., 2000](#)). According [Podsakoff and MacKenzie \(1994\)](#) and [MacKenzie et al. \(1993\)](#) OCB can increase the effectiveness of the organization. The effectiveness of the organization includes the maximum results, while efficiently covers the internal life of the organization related to the economic and technical aspects within the organization. The effectiveness of the organization is also often associated with organizational profitability and survival of all personnel within the organization. Moreover, when considering the efficiency of the design and the actualization of the organizations internal systems, the effectiveness of the transaction include the organization and environmental advantages. It requires organizational functions that can not be separated from the motivation of the personnel that is in it. The higher the motive of individuals to engage in activities that encourage the effectiveness of the organization, then the organization will be able to have a good performance.

Furthermore, [Katz and Kahn \(1966\)](#) classified models of motivation within the organization into four groups, namely legal compliance, instrumental satisfaction, self-expression, and internalized values. Legal compliance is an acceptance of roles and control instructions based on the organization's legitimacy. Organizations' members comply with regulations because of legal sanction that can be received. Satisfaction instrumental groups claim that if the rewards increase, the motivation to achieve performance will also increase. This second approach includes a system of rewards paid based on membership or seniority within the system; individual rewards such as incentives and promotions based on individual merit; instrumental identification with the leaders of the organization so that

employees or followers will be motivated to secure permission from the leader; and affiliation with co-workers for their social group. The third group is self-expression and self-determination underlying the identification work. In this group, the satisfaction will occur upon the achievement of something that shows talent or and ability. The fourth group is internalized values and the self-concept that led to the internalization of the organization's objectives. Target group became part of the value system of the individual or part of the conception or image of him. Therefore, the satisfaction will grow from the attitudes and behaviors that indicate cherished beliefs and self-image.

According to [Katz and Kahn \(1966\)](#) the award is not recognition of social or monetary advantage as the preparation of self-identity in accordance with his statement that he would express the values that correspond to its self-concept. Based on the opinion of [Katz and Kahn \(1966\)](#) OCB done this then the individual is not motivated by legal compliance because the OCB does not recognize sanctions or penalties if it is not implemented. In addition, individual OCB also does not because of an increase in the award, because the OCB is outside the system of formal awards. Individuals who carry the OCB can be caused by self-expression or for talent. In addition, the motivation to carry out the OCB also be caused by internalized values and self-concept. This means that the conception of the individual self is the picture of himself and the expression values in accordance with its concept.

[Williams and Anderson \(1991\)](#) argued that OCB can be distinguished based on the target or expediency and conceptualization, as well as measuring the OCB is used widely in the literature. OCBI explain the behavior which tends to benefit directly to other people and indirectly in the organization, such as helping co-workers who work excessive, pay attention to the welfare of other employees, and so on. Meanwhile, OCBO explain behavior that benefit the organization-wide or in general, for example, comply with regulations informal organizations, make the notification if it can not be present in the workplace, and so on. In other words, OCBI focuses on the individual, whereas OCBO focuses on the organization. Furthermore, from the attribution theory can also be deduced why people want to be tied in the OCB. If the individual has low consensus (only one individual that is bound in the OCB), high distinctiveness (only for one specific task people perform OCB), and high consistency (when engaging in OCB conducted continuously), the engagement of individuals in OCB is caused by internal factors. But if the opposite occurs, the individual obtained high consensus (everyone want to be tied in the OCB), low distinctiveness (for all individual tasks will be bound in the OCB), and low consistency (engagement in OCB only temporarily) the attachment of the individual in OCB caused by external factors. By knowing the causes of individual engagement in the OCB then the supervisor can assess whether action OCB done because of factors within the individual or from the outside. Ingratiation occurs because of factors that are within the individual. If the OCB is done all the time, then the individual who did it is regarded as a good citizen ([Eastman, 1994](#)).

Functional approach to understanding the motives is underlying the behavior of individual citizenship identified by [Rioux and Penner \(2001\)](#). The functional approach underlying purpose or motivation of individuals tied to specific behavior ([Penner et al., 1997](#)). Based on the functional approach [Rioux and Penner \(2001\)](#) identified three motives of OCB. Furthermore, [Rupp and Cropanzano \(2002\)](#) and [Maslyn and Fedor \(1998\)](#) classifies the third motive into focus on the individual (prosocial values motives and impression management motives) and focus the organization (organizational concern motives). Meanwhile, [Meglino and Korsgaard \(2004\)](#) called it self-focused (impression management motives) and other-focused (prosocial values motives and organizational concern motives).

Based on social exchange as a determinant of OCB, studies done lately understand how citizenship motives played a role in making the OCB ([Bolino, 1999](#); [Grant and Mayer, 2009](#); [Bolino et al., 2012](#)). Research results of [Rioux and Penner \(2001\)](#) showed the three motives of citizenship, i.e. prosocial values motives, organizational concern motives, and impression management motives. According to [Rioux and Penner \(2001\)](#) impression management motives are not on good terms with OCBI and OCBO. Meanwhile, according to [McNeely and Meglino \(1994\)](#); [Rioux and Penner \(2001\)](#) and [Finkelstein \(2006\)](#) prosocial values motives tend to affect OCBI motives, whereas organizational concern motives tend to motivate OCBO. Research results of [Finkelstein and Penner \(2004\)](#)

suggest that impression management motives associated with OCBI. Meanwhile, Bolino *et al.* (2006) states that impression management motives tend to motivate OCB when OCB assessed by supervisors.

Several previous studies have claimed that OCB done to improve the reputation of the employee (Bolino *et al.*, 2012). In addition, Hui *et al.* (2000) also states that OCB is done by employees towards the promotion, which is to improve the image of the employee. Therefore, Grant and Mayer (2009) stated that in fact there is integration between good soldiers and good actors by stating that impression management motives will affect prosocial values so as to motivate the individual motives. In other words, the motives that drive individuals do OCB can be positive (good soldiers) or negative (good actors). However, Bolino (1999) stated that the motive can be combined, so that both the motives could be in one individual. According to Hofstede in a collective society, individuals are more interdependent than in individualistic societies (Earley, 1994). Therefore, in the collective society, individuals are more care on the welfare of the group rather than the welfare of themselves, emphasizing relationships with others, and prioritize common goals (Earley, 1994). In a collective society, cohesiveness and teamwork is stronger (Earley, 1994). Collective society also emphasizes collective welfare of the group so that employees are motivated either by prosocial values motives and organizational concern motives that give more attention to other people. Therefore, the research about collective community as well as the research in Indonesia, feelings of dependency not only on others, but also on the organization as individuals and groups that are part of the organization. Therefore, employees will be encouraged by prosocial values motives can also be tied to OCBO and employees are motivated by organizational concern motives can also be tied to OCBI.

Meglino and Korsgaard (2004) found prosocial values motives and organizational concern motives have in common, that is other-oriented motives. The second target of the pattern is a benefit to others (in OCBI) or an organization (in OCBO). Therefore, both prosocial values motives and organizational concern motives each can affect OCBI and OCBO, especially if it was related to the community with a collective culture like Indonesia. Based on various approaches, theories, and the results of previous studies, the hypothesis that can be set are:

H1: prosocial values and motives affect OCBI OCBO

H2: organizational concerns and motives affect OCBI OCBO

H3: impression management motives affect OCBI and OCBO

### 3. METHODS

#### 3.1. Sample and Procedure

This research was conducted on a national public bank employee in major cities in Java Island, Indonesia. Selection of research setting is based on earlier research that states that more women than men participate in OCB (Farrell and Finkelstein, 2007; Vigoda-Gadot, 2007). This study aims to examine the effect of the three motives that include prosocial values motives, organizational concern motives, and impression management motives on OCBI and OCBO. In addition, this study also examines the effect of organizational concern motives, prosocial values motives, and impression management motives on OCBI and OCBO. Overall, this study aims to test the model of the relationship between the three motives of OCB with both dimensions of OCB, which OCBI and OCBO.

This study uses a survey using a questionnaire that distribution be done alone. The questionnaire was distributed to individual data collection on respondents. The sample was an employee of the national commercial banks in major cities in Java Island, Indonesia. The survey was conducted about five months. Compared with four other methods, the survey (interviews with direct face to face, a questionnaire was sent or by correspondence, questionnaires were read out via the telephone, questionnaires via electronic media, or a combination of survey methods), methods of questionnaire survey conducted themselves is the best method (Neuman, 2006; Cooper and Schindler, 2008; Sekaran and Bougie, 2010). Research on the three motives of citizenship is important because it affects the third motif OCB citizenship significantly, both OCBI and OCBO. In addition, the third motif citizenship has been identified as one of the predictors of OCB important and consistent.

Research by the individual as the unit of analysis requires the sample to the criteria or specific characteristics. Characteristics of the sample were used to convey the characteristics of the sample relative to the population. Samples intended to represent the population. The sample size also affects the accuracy or the representation of the population, although a large sample will demonstrate a high degree of confidence or the greatest confidence in the study. The sampling method used in this research is non probability sampling. In this method, the elements in the population do not have the same probability to be selected as the sample (Cooper and Schindler, 2008; Sekaran and Bougie, 2010). Non probabilistic sampling technique chosen was purposive sampling. The criteria used to select the sample were women employees of national commercial bank in major cities of Java, Indonesia. In addition, this study uses self-assessment. The sample consisted of 531 women employees (with a response rate of 88.5%) of the 600 women employees. Respondents who are employees of the national commercial banks in major cities in Java Island, Indonesia accept a survey using a pen and paper. Respondents were assured anonymity and complete the survey during working hours.

### 3.2. Measurement

The instrument is designed for the unit of analysis at the individual level. Each of the respondents in this study were asked to complete five sizes, the prosocial values, motives, organizational concern motives, impression management motives, OCBI, and OCBO. Organizational concern motives, motives prosocial values, and impression management motives questionnaires were drawn from research conducted by Rioux and Penner (2001) and has been adapted to the setting of this study, namely in the national commercial banks in Java island, Indonesia. While the OCB variable used in this study took two dimensions, namely OCBI and OCBO. OCB variables were measured using questionnaires developed by some previous investigators, such as Organ and Konovsky (1989); Williams and Anderson (1991); Farh *et al.* (1990); Niehoff and Moorman (1993); Vey and Campbell (2004); Morrison (1994); Takeuchi *et al.* (2004); Van Dyne *et al.* (1994).

This study used a questionnaire developed by some previous investigators who translated and returned in its original language. No changes to the questionnaires related to prosocial values motives, organizational concern motives, impression management motives, OCBI, and OCBO. All scale measured by Likert scale with 5-point starting from the number 1. This study is also using factor analysis as a way to test the construct validity and internal consistency with Cronbach's alpha to demonstrate the reliability of measuring instruments. With varimax rotation and loading factor of at least 0.5 as suggested by Hair *et al.* (2006). Item questions that have met the construct validity was tested its internal consistency (reliability) using Cronbach's Alpha ( $\alpha$ ). Furthermore, to examine the relationship and influence between independent and dependent variables, researchers used correlation. Meanwhile, to test the model of the relationship between the variables used in this study used structural equation modeling (SEM) using AMOS program.

## 4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

### 4.1. Validity and Reliability Analysis

This study used a questionnaire developed by researchers prior to translate from the original language into Indonesian. To assess the validity of the measurement items all the variables, the researchers tested the validity of content and construct validity. Validity of the content that is used to assess measurement instruments carried at the pre-analysis by asking the opinion of experts in the field of Organizational Behavior and Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods. Measuring instrument or questionnaire is then tested on 30 respondents who is an employee of the national commercial banks which have similar characteristics to the target population as suggested by Sekaran and Bougie (2010). This was done to test the content validity.

The researchers used factor analysis to examine the construct validity. To further simplify interpretation and find a simpler structure, the researchers used a technique of orthogonal and varimax rotation. Factor analysis (FA) is also

performed on constructs studied. Extraction is executed and each Eigenvalue factor greater than one (1) will be adopted. Varimax rotation performed to reveal each variable. Loading factor loading above recorded using 0.50 as suggested by Hair *et al.* (2006) referred to as the construct validity of the test results are significant practical. Factor analysis was conducted to test the construct validity. By using varimax rotation and loading factor of at least 0.5 as suggested by Hair *et al.* (2006) can be achieved construct validity of test results that can be said to be significant. Loading factor values recorded between 0.502 and 0.809. Given all the items extracted noted above 0.5, there are eight items motif citizenship and twenty who turns removed for declared invalid. Items that have construct validity based on the results of the analysis of these factors are then tested for reliability. The number of items that are not valid in general, due to incompatibility of the item with general conditions of employees of the national bank in Indonesia.

Furthermore, to assess the reliability of the measurement items all of valid items of each variable tested the internal consistency with Cronbach alpha values. Alpha for valid statements in organizational concern motives 0.864, for valid statements in prosocial values motives 0.923, and for valid statements in impression management motives 0.820. While alpha for valid statements in OCBI 0.757 and alpha for valid statements in OCBO 0.835. Based on the results of testing the reliability of the authors stated that the reliability of measuring instruments this study is far above the cut-off line reliability as recommended by Hair *et al.* (2006).

**4.2. Descriptive Statistics**

Of the 600 questionnaires for the teller who uses self-assessment, self-assessment as much as 536 questionnaires returned, but there are 5 questionnaires were incomplete. Therefore, this study used 531 tellers as the respondent. Table 1 shows the mean of each dimension used in the OCB and each dimension of the motive. Table 1 also describes the correlation between the variables used by the Pearson product moment correlation because it is based on the assumption that all variables are metric. Correlations between variables were positive and significant research.

**Table-1.** Correlations Between Research Variables (N=531)

		Mean	Std. Dev.	1	2	3	4	5
1	OCBI	3.467	0.573	1				
2	OCBO	4.691	0.344	0.286**	1			
3	Prosocial Values Motives	4.568	0.396	0.256**	0.356**	1		
4	Organizational Concern Motives	4.247	0.446	0.436**	0.426**	0.487**	1	
5	Impression Management Motives	4.271	0.554	0.116**	0.152**	0.577**	0.264**	1

\* p ≤ 0,05 \*\*p ≤ 0,01

Based on Table 1, mean of OCBO is 4.691 and OCBI is 3.467. These score are high, as well as average organizational concern motives, prosocial values motives, and impression management motives. The average of three motives is also considered high. OCB average is height, especially OCBO. This is shows that indeed the female employees who are the respondents of this study are more tied to the OCB. This is consistent with research results of Allen and Rusch (2001) and Cameron and Nadler (2013). Furthermore, correlation between OCBI and OCBO is significant but not too strong (0.286). Correlation between organizational concern motives and OCBI is significant but not too strong (0.436), correlation between organizational concern motives and OCBO is significant but not too strong (0.426). Correlation between prosocial values motives and OCBI is significant but weak (0.256), correlation between prosocial values motives and OCBO is also significant but weak (0.356). Correlation between impression management motives and OCBI and OCBO is also significant but very weak, each is 0.116 and 0,152. Meanwhile, correlation between three motives is also significant but not too strong. The strongest correlation is correlation between impression management motives and prosocial values motives.

Furthermore, the method of analysis used in this research is Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). SEM is an analytical tool that fits the paradigm adopted in this study, namely scientific realism. The use of SEM in research

more and more felt in psychology and social sciences. One reason for the importance of confirmatory methods is providing a comprehensive tool for assessment and modification of theoretical models for the purpose of development theory [Anderson and Gerbing \(1988\)](#). SEM is a method for finding the real best-fitting model ([Cheng, 2001](#)) to enable the development of the strongest models by testing the theory ([Rubio et al., 2001](#)). According to them, researchers can adjust the confirmatory factor analysis and assess the validity and reliability of measuring instruments. According to [Anderson and Gerbing \(1988\)](#) in SEM, constructs allowed to correlate freely because they measure a higher order construct. Furthermore, SEM is applied when the condition of the model is nonrecursive or reciprocal relations, the model has correlated residuals or notice any errors in measurement or indicator models have many variables for unobserved (or latent) variables ([Kim et al., 2001](#)).

#### 4.3. Hypothesis Testing Results

Table 2 presents the construct alpha, lambda, error, and standard deviation of each indicator used to compile structural equation model in AMOS Basic.

**Table-2.** Alpha, Lambda, Error, and Standard Deviation Construct Indicator

Construct	$\alpha$	$\lambda$	$\varepsilon$	$\sigma$
OCBI	0.763	0.288	0.026	0.330
OCBO	0.840	0.267	0.014	0.291
Prosocial Values Motives	0.924	0.283	0.007	0.295
Organizational Concern Motives	0.866	0.259	0.010	0.278
Impression Management Motives	0.837	0.370	0.027	0.405

Source: primary data processed

Furthermore, the relationship model testing conducted using structural equation modeling with AMOS program. The approach used is a two-step approach. Two-step approach is used to increase the value of GFI using a composite score on a variety of variables. It is also intended existing data can support model based on theory. Results of structural equation modeling three motives and two-dimensional OCB with self-assessment using AMOS program presented in Table 3.

**Table-3.** The Results of Structural Equation

	Standardized Regression Weight	Critical Ratio
OCBI $\leftarrow$ Prosocial Value Motives	0.051	0.610
OCBI $\leftarrow$ Organizational Concern Motives	0.530	8.804
OCBI $\leftarrow$ Impression Management Motives	- 0.080	- 1.045
OCBO $\leftarrow$ Prosocial Value Motives	0.270	3.438
OCBO $\leftarrow$ Organizational Concern Motives	0.388	6.886
OCBO $\leftarrow$ Impression Management Motives	- 0.104	- 1.444
Goodness of Fit		
Chi Square	5.546	
Degree of Freedom	1	
Probability	0.019	
GFI	0.996	
CFI	0.993	
AGFI	0.938	
RMR	0.002	
RMSEA	0.093	

Source: primary data processed

Table 3 shows the results of structural equation models using AMOS as a way to test the hypothesis. Organizational concern motive encourages both OCBI and OCBO. Hypothesis 1 is supported. In other words, the



higher the organizational concern motives, then employees are more motivated to do well OCBO and OCBI. Meanwhile, prosocial values motives affect OCBO, so the hypothesis 2 is partially supported. Impression management motives are not able to affect OCBI and OCBO. Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

## 5. DISCUSSION

Results of research on the motives of citizenship are increasingly clearly shows that the motive of citizenship plays an important role in understanding the OCB. This is in line with the research results of [Bolino et al. \(2012\)](#); [Grant and Mayer \(2009\)](#); [Rioux and Penner \(2001\)](#) and [Kim et al. \(2013\)](#). Most previous studies stated that employees were motivated do OCB for organizational concern motives and prosocial values motives ([Halbesleben et al., 2010](#)). This research results showed that both OCBI and OCBO influenced by organizational concern motives. This shows that the national public banking employee study who tend to have collective self-concept and focusing on OCB which lead to the interests of the organization. However, OCBO was also influenced by prosocial values motives. According to [Bolino et al. \(2012\)](#) employees who are motivated by prosocial values motives tend to be more oriented relationships with others and are bound in the OCB to help others. In this case, an employee who is the respondents of this research will do OCBO to help others in the workplace.

This research was conducted in Indonesia which has a culture that tends collectivist. Therefore, the common welfare takes precedence, so that both of prosocial values motives and organizational concerns motives may affect individual tied to OCBO and OCBI. Moreover, organizational concern motives also motivate individuals to be bound by OCBI. This is not in accordance with the research result of [Rioux and Penner \(2001\)](#) which stated that OCBI motivated by prosocial values motives and OCBO motivated by organizational concern motives. Meanwhile, according to the research results of [Rioux and Penner \(2001\)](#) impression management motives did not encourage OCBO and OCBI. However, when seen from the results of the correlation between variables in Table 2, it appears that the relationship between impression management motives and prosocial values motives are strong enough ( $r = 577, p \leq 0.01$ ). This shows that individuals who have a high impression management motives would have high prosocial values motives anyway. In other words, there are no differences between good soldiers and good actors. Between the two motives, there is a significant relationship.

Furthermore, the results of this study also showed that impression management motives correlated with prosocial values motives. This is consistent with the results of research [Grant and Mayer \(2009\)](#) which stated that impression management motives will encourage employees to express prosocial values motives in the OCB. In addition, [Grant and Mayer \(2009\)](#) also stated that employees with strong prosocial values motives and impression management motives are likely tied to the OCB that provide benefits to other people and organizations. In other words, these motives will simultaneously do the best and looks good in others and may provide benefit to others and himself ([Grant, 2008](#)). Furthermore, research of [Grant and Mayer \(2009\)](#) also found that the interaction between prosocial values motives and impression management motives become predictors for interpersonal OCB. In other words, organizational concern motives motivating OCB, while the impression management motives encourage prosocial values motives to influence OCB ([Grant and Mayer, 2009](#)).

Meanwhile, the results of this study support the research of [Rioux and Penner \(2001\)](#); [Finkelstein and Penner \(2004\)](#); and [Finkelstein \(2006\)](#). Their research results stated that impression management motives can not predict OCB for any dimension. Only prosocial values motives, both prosocial values for organizations and for individuals who are able to predict the dimensions of OCB. According to [Finkelstein and Penner \(2004\)](#) there are two theories that explain the OCB, the Snyder's Functional Approach and social structure approach or related to identity theory. Snyder's Functional Approach derived from the principles that individual behavior is motivated by the goals and desires, so that there is a relationship between the motive and the quality or quantity of volunteer activities. Snyder's Functional Approach states that people can perform the same action in meeting the different psychological functions. Meanwhile, the social structure approach states that the more people identify a special role people internalize his role

in the self-concept. The concept of a person's identity contains a hierarchy of social roles that drive behavior. This is due to a direct effect of self-concept in future activities.

This study used impression management motives as independent variables. According [Viswesvaran et al. \(2001\)](#) there are two types of properties are appreciated by the social desirability, the impression management and self-deception. Impression management is other deception component which is a component of the preferred nature of the public that have criterion-related validity for predicting the performance of a task. Therefore, the effect of impression management motives on extra-role performance which in this case is OCB not significant. Berkowitz stated that attention to oneself or self-concern will push perform altruistic behavior because people who perform altruistic behavior such as helping others to increase "good value" in the eyes of others and will maintain consistency as a "helper" ([Hu and Liu, 2003](#)). In addition, studies on both of these motives have to do with time series or longitudinal study, because it is difficult to know what is actually being targeted end of a person. [Pillivain and Charng \(1990\)](#) proposed to conduct experimental studies on the behavior of helping someone in order to know exactly what the motive of the person.

The results showed that to distinguish whether the OCB is driven by the desire of individuals become good soldiers or good actors are difficult to separate. This is due to good soldiers caused by prosocial values motives were also influenced by impression management motives. While employees do OCBI be due in addition to prosocial values motives also caused by organizational concern motives. The research result of [Schenk \(1987\)](#) stated that altruistic cause visible behavior based on self-interest, so the altruistic motivation for others can lead to self-interest behavior. While [Frohlich \(1974\)](#) suggested that altruistic behavior and self-interest is a field which overlap and are relatively easy to manipulate. Both altruistic and egoistic done only to achieve certain goals, though not aware of.

Furthermore, the motive can only be observed from the individuals' behavior that indicated that individual to the person of the same type with him ([Schlenker et al., 2004](#)) so that people who do not have a close relationship with these individuals do not recognize the motive. This is consistent with the social identity theory and the self-categorization theory. According to the second theory, the individual would classify themselves with the same category with him, maximizing the differences among groups to make out a group and interact more frequently with the same with him, to share experiences and have the same value to him ([Hogg and Terry, 2000](#)). Motive is only recognized by oneself or others close to him.

Impression that shown by individuals are generally aimed at certain people who type with himself because these people have social needs to make a good impression because it will give him feedback ([Schlenker et al., 2004](#)). Additionally, [Schlenker et al. \(2004\)](#) also stated that the impression will be higher in individuals with high empathy or paying attention to another person. Prosocial values motives and impression management motives are actually forms of impression that focus on others (i.e. social values motives) and focus on themselves or for promotional work (impression management motives). The only difference between the two motives are their antecedent that is sentiments such as empathy, sympathy, kindness, and the intrinsic values such as social norms, moral norms, fairness, reciprocity, and so on.

Results of this study are consistent with [Wayne and Green \(1993\)](#) and [Leary and Kowalski \(1990\)](#) which stated that the motive is a combination, as well as [Peloza and Hassay \(2006\)](#) which used altruistic motive to form good soldiers and motives egoistic to establish good politics. While the research results of [Schenk \(1987\)](#) suggested that altruism lead to behavior that appears to be based on self-interest, so the altruistic motivation for others cause the behavior to self-interest. This is due to both the motive is difficult to know its position, whether as a final target or not because it is only inferred from behavior. The real final target is not always visible, even individuals concerned are not aware of it. Therefore, the results [Schenk \(1987\)](#) also stated that altruistic motivations can lead to selfish behavior. Based on social exchange approach, organizational concern motives stated that people tend to be tied to OCB because organization has satisfied them, has inspiring leadership, has treated fairly, has given an interesting job.

## 6. CONCLUSION

The results showed that, OCB employee perceived primarily influenced by organizational concern motives and prosocial values motives. This is consistent with the theory of attribution, so that can know a person carrying out OCB mainly motive is for the betterment of the organization where the person works according to the identity of the role to be played by individuals. Therefore, employees will perceive implement OCB motive for his role as a member of the organization, so that their assessment of the true motives he did not realize that would lead to good soldiers. Impression management motives not directly affect the OCB, both OCBI and OCBO. However, the motive is influencing prosocial values motives that drive OCBO. Good soldiers and good actors are two things that are difficult to distinguish. There is a significant relationship between prosocial values motives (good soldiers) and impression management motives (good actors).

This study uses motives variable, which certainly can not be separated from the problem of social desirability bias. However, research on this motive is still needed to determine why the behavior is performed. The high OCB would create conditions of full participation with common values, create concrete results, impact on the individual's role as a citizen organization that affect the dynamics of relationships within the organization, and is able to classify the organization's role in infrastructure that affect residents on improving the commitment of members of the organization. Therefore, the weakness in this study is the common method bias that occurs due to the use of self-assessment. In addition, the use of longitudinal data would be more appropriate for testing the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable compared with when examined with a cross-section data.

Contributions managerial obtained in this study is the OCB as behavior beyond the actual role that can not be separated from the work habits required in the job or in accordance with the role that should be played. Employees carry out such behavior for the sake of the organization or company they work for, not entirely for the benefit of co-workers or for himself. There are things that must be observed in the OCB, because such behavior is driven by organizational concern motives and prosocial values motives. In fact, OCBO and OCBI are driven by organizational concern motives. Motive of these behaviors does need to be recognized in order to understand why employees would behave beyond his job description. In addition, to be considered is the consequence of OCB that still requires further research is the impact on individual performance.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, T.D. and M.C. Rusch, 2001. The influence of rater gender on ratings of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31(12): 2561-2582.
- Allen, T.D. and M.C. Rush, 1998. The effects of organizational citizenship behavior on performance judgment: A field study and laboratory experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2): 247-260.
- Anderson, J.C. and D.W. Gerbing, 1988. Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(3): 411-423.
- Bateman, T.S. and D.W. Organ, 1983. Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employees citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4): 587- 595.
- Batson, C.D. and L.L. Shaw, 1991. Evidence for altruism: Toward a pluralism of prosocial motives. *Psychological Inquiry*, 2(2): 107-122.
- Bolino, M.C., 1999. Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors? *Academy of Management Review*, 24(1): 82-98.
- Bolino, M.C., J. Harvey and D.G. Bachrach, 2012. A self-regulation approach to understanding citizenship behavior in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 119(1): 126-139.
- Bolino, M.C., A.C. Klotz, W.H. Turnley and J. Harvey, 2012. Exploring the dark side of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(4): 542-559.

- Bolino, M.C., J.A. Varela, B. Bande and W.H. Turnley, 2006. The impact of impression management factors on supervisor ratings of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(3): 281-297.
- Borman, W.C. and S.J. Motowidlo, 1997. Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10(2): 99-109.
- Bourdage, J.S., K. Lee, J.-H. Lee and K.-H. Shin, 2012. Motives for organizational citizenship behavior: Personality correlations and coworker ratings of OCB. *Human Performance*, 25(1): 179-200.
- Bowler, W.M. and D.J. Brass, 2006. Relational correlates interpersonal citizenship behavior: A social network perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1): 70-82.
- Cameron, S.M. and J.T. Nadler, 2013. Gender roles and organizational citizenship behaviors: Effects on managerial evaluation. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 28(7): 380-399.
- Cheng, E.W.L., 2001. SEM being more effective than multiple regression in parsimonious model testing for management development research. *Journal of Management Development*, 20(7): 650-667.
- Cloninger, P.A., N. Ramamoorthy and P.C. Flood, 2011. The influence of equity, equality, and gender on organizational citizenship behaviors. *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal*, 76(4): 37-47.
- Cnaan, R.A. and R.S. Goldberg-Glen, 1991. Measuring motivation volunteer in human service. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 27(3): 269-284.
- Cooper, D.R. and P.S. Schindler, 2008. *Business research methods*. 10th Edn., Boston: McGraw – Hill.
- Earley, P.C., 1994. Self or group? Cultural effects of training on self-efficacy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(1): 89-117.
- Eastman, K.K., 1994. The eyes of the beholder: An attributional approach to ingratiation and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(5): 1379-1391.
- Farh, J.L., P.M. Podsakoff and D.W. Organ, 1990. Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, 16(4): 705-721.
- Farrell, S. and L. Finkelstein, 2007. Organizational citizenship behavior and gender: Expectations and attributions for performance. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 9(1): 81-96.
- 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 L.A. Penner, 2004. Predicting organizational citizenship behavior: Integrating the functional and role identity approach. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 32(4): 383-398.
- Finkelstein, M.A. and L.A. Pennner, 2004. Predicting organizational citizenship behavior: Integrating the functional and role identity approaches. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 32(4): 383-398.
- Frohlich, N., 1974. Self-interest or altruism, what difference? *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 18(1): 55-73.
- Grant, A.M., 2008. Does intrinsic motivation fuel the prosocial fire? Motivational synergy in predicting persistence, performance, and productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1): 48-58.
- Grant, A.M. and D.M. Mayer, 2009. Good soldiers and good actors: Prosocial and impression management motives as interactive predictors of affiliative citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4): 900-912.
- Hair, J.E., B. Black, B.J. Babin, R.E. Anderson and R.L. Tatham, 2006. *Multivariate data analysis*. 6th Edn., New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International Inc.
- Halbesleben, J.R.B., M.W.M. Bowler, M.C. Bolino and W.H. Turnley, 2010. Organizational concern, prosocial values, or impression management? How supervisors attribute motives to organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 40(6): 1450-1489.
- Hogg, M.A. and D.J. Terry, 2000. Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25(1): 121-140.
- Hu, Y.-A. and D.-Y. Liu, 2003. Altruism versus egoism in human behavior of mixed motives. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 62(4): 677-705.

- Hui, C., S.S.K. Lam and K.K.S. Law, 2000. Instrumental values of organizational citizenship behavior for promotion: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5): 822-828.
- Katz, D. and R.L. Kahn, 1966. *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Kim, J.-S., J. Kaye and L.K. Wright, 2001. Moderating and mediating effects in causal models. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 22(1): 63-75.
- Kim, Y.-J., D.L. Van, D. Kamdar and R.E. Johnson, 2013. Why and when do motives matter? An integrative model of motives, role cognitions, and social support as predictors of OCB. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 121(2013): 231-245.
- Konovsky, M.A. and D.W. Organ, 1996. Dispositional and contextual determinant of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17(3): 253-266.
- Leary, M.R. and R.M. Kowalski, 1990. Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107(1): 34-47.
- LePine, J.A., A. Erez and D.E. Johnson, 2002. The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1): 52-65.
- MacKenzie, S.B., P.M. Podsakoff and R. Fetter, 1991;1993. Organizational citizenship behaviour and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(1): 123-150.
- MacKenzie, S.B., P.M. Podsakoff and R. Fetter, 1993. The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1): 70-80.
- Maslyn, J.M. and D.B. Fedor, 1998. Perceptions of politics: Does measuring different foci matter? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(4): 646-653.
- McNeely, B.L. and B.M. Meglino, 1994. The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial organizational behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(6): 836-844.
- Meglino, B.M. and A.M. Korsgaard, 2004. The effect of other orientation on self-supervisor rating agreement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(7): 873-891.
- Morrison, E.W., 1994. Role definition and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(6): 1543-1567.
- Motowidlo, S.J. and J.R. Van Scooter, 1994. Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(4): 475-480.
- Neuman, W.L., 2006. *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. 6th Edn., New York: Allyn and Bacon.
- Niehoff, B.P. and R.H. Moorman, 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., 1997. Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct and clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(1): 85-97.
- Organ, D.W. and M.A. Konovsky, 1989. Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1): 157-164.
- Organ, D.W. and K. Ryan, 1995. A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4): 775-802.
- Pelozo, J. and D.N. Hassay, 2006. Intra-organizational voluntarism: Good soldiers, good deeds, and good politics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 64(4): 357-379.
- Penner, L.A., A.R. Midili and J. Kegelmeyer, 1997. Beyond job attitudes: A personality and social psychology perspective on the causes of organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Performance*, 10(2): 111-131.
- Pillivain, J.A. and H.-W. Charng, 1990. Altruism: A review of recent theory and research. *Annual Review Sociology*, 16(1): 27-65.
- Podsakoff, N.P., S.W. Whiting, P.M. Podsakoff and B.D. Blume, 2009. Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1): 122-141.

- Podsakoff, P.M. and S.B. MacKenzie, 1994. Organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(August): 351-363.
- Podsakoff, P.M., S.B. MacKenzie, J.B. Paine and D.G. Bachrach, 2000. Organizational citizenship behavior: Critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3): 513- 563.
- Rioux, S.M. and L.A. Penner, 2001. The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A motivational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6): 1306-1314.
- Rubio, D.M., M. Berg-Weger and S.S. Tebb, 2001. Using structural equation modeling to test for multidimensionality. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 8(4): 613-626.
- Rupp, D.E. and R. Cropanzano, 2002. The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1): 925–946.
- Schenk, R.E., 1987. Altruism as a source of self-interested behavior. *Public Choice*, 53(2): 187-192.
- Schlenker, B.R., A. Lifka and S.A. Wowra, 2004. Helping new acquaintances make the right impression: Balancing image concerns of others and self. *Self and Identity*, 3(3): 191-206.
- Sekaran, U. and R. Bougie, 2010. *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. 5th Edn., Singapore: A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Smith, A.C., D.W. Organ and J.P. Near, 1983. Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4): 653-663.
- Snell, R.S. and Y.L. Wong, 2007. Differentiating good soldiers from good actors. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(6): 883-909.
- Takeuchi, R., M.C. Bolino and C.-C. Lin, 2015. Too many motives? The interactive effects of multiple motives on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(4): 1239-1248.
- Takeuchi, R., S.V. Mrinova, S.V. Lepak and H.K. Moon, 2004. Justice climate as a missing link for the relationship between high investment HRM systems and OCBS. *Academy of Management Best Conference Paper*.
- Tang, T.L.-P., T. Sutarso, G.M.-T. Davis, D. Dolinski, A.H.S. Ibrahim and S.L. Wagner, 2004. To help or not help ? The good samaritan effect and the mediating effect of the love of money on extrinsic motives and self-reported helping behavior. Available from [www.raptor.bizlab.mtsu.edu/s-drive/Ttang/MGMT%203810/OCBm](http://www.raptor.bizlab.mtsu.edu/s-drive/Ttang/MGMT%203810/OCBm) [Accessed July, 20th 2007].
- Van Dyne, L., J.W. Graham and R.M. Dienesch, 1994. Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4): 765-802.
- Vey, M.A. and J.P. Campbell, 2004. In-role or extra-role organizational citizenship behavior: Which are we measuring? *Human Performance*, 17(1): 119-135.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E., 2007. Leadership style, organizational politics, and employees' performance: An empirical examination of two competing models. *Personnel Review*, 36(5): 661 - 683.
- Viswesvaran, C., D.S. Ones and L.M. Hough, 2001. Do impression management scale in personality inventories predict managerial job performance ratings? *International Journal of Selection and assessment*, 9(4): 277-289.
- Wayne, S.J. and S.A. Green, 1993. The effects of leader-member exchange on employee citizenship and impression management behavior. *Human Relations*, 46(12): 1431-1440.
- Williams, L.J. and S.E. Anderson, 1991. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3): 601-617.

*Views and opinions expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the authors, International Journal of Asian Social Science shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content.*