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ABSTRACT

Using a sample of supervisors from a Chilean retail company, we studied the effects of employees’ role perceptions on three types of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and on their motivation to perform these behaviors. We recognized four types of motives: extrinsic, intrinsic, altruistic, and institutional. Results showed that when employees are externally motivated to perform OCB (by extrinsic or institutional motives), their motivation increases when they perceive the behaviors as in-role. However, when employees are internally motivated to perform OCB (by intrinsic or altruistic motives), their motivation is mostly independent of their role perceptions.
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RESUMEN

Este estudio analiza el efecto que tiene la percepción de los empleados acerca de su rol en tres tipos de comportamiento ciudadano en la organización (OCB) y en su motivación para llevar a cabo estas conductas. Para ello, se considera una muestra de supervisores de una empresa del sector retail en Chile. Se distinguen cuatro tipos de motivos: 1) extrínsecos, 2) intrínsecos, 3) altruistas y 4) institucionales. Los resultados muestran que cuando los empleados están motivados en forma externa para llevar a cabo estos comportamientos (por motivos extrínsecos o institucionales), su motivación aumenta cuando perciben estos comportamientos como parte de su rol. Sin embargo, cuando los empleados están motivados en forma interna para llevar a cabo estos comportamientos (por motivos intrínsecos o altruistas), su motivación es en general independiente de las percepciones acerca de su rol.
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1. Introduction

The concept of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) was originally developed in 1983 as a way to link attitudes and performance (Organ, 2004). Initially, OCB was perceived as including only extra-role behaviors. However, studies starting with the one by Morrison (1994) showed that some employees may perceive one behavior as extra-role, whereas another employee may perceive the same behavior as in-role. Therefore, Organ (1997) extended the construct of OCB to include behaviors perceived as in-role or extra-role, as long as these behaviors are not enforceable and do not have systematic rewards associated with them. Although there is extensive research on OCB, there are few studies on the effect of OCB-related role perceptions (McAllister, Kamdar, Morrison & Turban, 2007) and none relating these perceptions to motives.

Several studies have shown that different employees perceive OCBs in different ways. Some think of them as part of their role, whereas others consider them to be beyond the call of duty (e.g. McAllister et al., 2007; Morrison, 1994; Van Dyne, Kamdar & Joireman, 2008). Most studies on OCB role perceptions have focused on its effect on the level of OCB performed (Morrison, 1994) and on its moderating effects on the relationships between OCB and several antecedents (Chiaburu, 2007; Coyle-Shapiro, Kessler & Purcell, 2004; McAllister et al., 2007; Van Dyne et al., 2008). We argue that these moderating effects of OCB role perceptions on the level of OCB are due to a difference in the employees’ motives for performing OCB and that the effects differ according to the type of behavior.

Although most research on OCB has disregarded the direct motives for these behaviors, recent studies show that underlying motives are important for a better understanding of OCB (Donia, Johns & Raja, 2010). Penner, Midili and Kegelmeyer (1997) were the first to propose a functional approach to OCB, seeking to answer the critical question of: “why has OCB occurred?” (p. 118). Rioux and Penner (2001) explored the effect of three types of motives on OCB. Two of these motives, organizational concern and prosocial values, came from literature on volunteerism, and reflected a desire to contribute either to the organization or to other people. These two altruistic motives were significantly related to OCB, after controlling for the effects of personality orientation and organizational justice. The third motive they studied as a possible cause of OCB was impression management (IM), i.e. the desire to enhance their image in the organization (Bolino, 1999).

Results of the study by Rioux and Penner were far from conclusive on this issue: IM motives only related to the OCB dimension of sportsmanship. Moreover, in a further study, Finkelstein and Penner (2004) found a negative effect of IM motives on OCB directed toward the organization. This negative relationship was also found by Espejo and Cardona (2005) in a study of Latin American managers. These conflicting results might be due to differences in role perceptions. For example, Yun, Takeuchi & Liu (2007) found that role ambiguity moderates the relationship between self-enhancement motives and OCB. In order to clarify the effect of role perceptions on motives, in this study we analyze how different motives to perform OCB are affected by the employee’s perception of the behavior as in-role or extra-role.

In the following section, we will review the relevant literature on OCB, role perceptions, and motivation, and present the hypotheses for this study. Next, we will describe the methods we use and then we will present the results of the analyses. We will end with a discussion of the results, and also identify the limitations of this study and offer avenues for further research.

2. Theory and hypotheses

2.1. OCB dimensions

Smith, Organ and Near (1983) were the first to measure OCB and to propose a set of OCB dimensions. Factor analyses on their initial questionnaire gave place to the emergence of two factors: altruism and general compliance. Later, different studies added other dimensions to the OCB measure. One of the most relevant alternative measures of OCB is the one by Van Dyne, Graham and Dienesch (1994) based on political philosophy. Using exploratory factor
analysis, they identified five factors: loyalty, obedience, and three types of participation (social, advocacy, and functional). The other scales developed are mainly variations of the original Smith et al. (1983) questionnaire.

In their review of the OCB literature, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach (2000) identified seven dimensions. Because there is considerable overlap among different OCB dimensions, Coleman and Borman (2000) tried to establish the common phenomena behind them. They suggested that dimensions in the citizenship performance domain can be grouped in three categories: interpersonal (OCBI), job/task (which we call OCBt), and organizational (OCBO). In order to come to this classification, they examined all dimensions in the literature through exploratory factor analysis, multidimensional scaling analysis, and cluster analysis. Traditional dimensions, such as altruism, conscientiousness, and loyalty fit this new classification. Altruism corresponds to behaviors directed toward specific individuals (OCBI), such as helping to orient new coworkers. Conscientiousness represents behaviors oriented toward the job or task (OCBt), such as performing duties with extreme care. Finally, loyalty represents behaviors oriented toward the organization (OCBO), such as actively defending the organization against outside threats.

2.2. OCB role perceptions
Van Dyne, Cummings and McLean Parks (1995) developed an exhaustive categorization of extra-role behaviors. Their list included organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB), prosocial organizational behaviors (PSOB), whistle-blowing (WB), and principled organizational dissent (POD). They identified organizational citizenship behaviors as promotive extra-role behaviors (as opposed to challenging or prohibitive), focused on the perceived outcomes and performed by members of an organization for the benefit of the organization.

Organ (1997) agreed in some aspects of Van Dyne et al’s (1995) conceptualization of OCB, but differed in many others. His main point of agreement was the view of OCB as affiliative (performed by members of the organization) and promotive. His main point of disagreement was the distinction between in-role and extra-role. Although the same Organ (1990) conceptualized OCB as an extra-role construct, he changed his position due to the difficulties distinguishing in-role from extra-role behaviors (Morrison, 1994). What some individuals consider extra-role others see as in-role, so some behaviors would be OCB for certain individuals and would not be OCB for others. Therefore, Organ adopted a definition of OCB based on the concept of contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Borman and Motowidlo defined contextual performance in opposition to task performance. They state that task performance “is the proficiency with which job incumbents perform activities that are formally recognized as part of their jobs, … activities that contribute to the organization’s technical core either directly by implementing a part of its technological process, or indirectly by providing it with needed materials or services” (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, p. 73). Contextual performance therefore refers to the activities which are not seen as directly impacting the organization’s technical core. It deals with those activities which “support the organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core must function” (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, p. 73).

Consequently, citizenship behaviors are defined to include behaviors which can be perceived as in-role by some individuals and as extra-role by others. This definition helps clarify the concept, but there are still issues which need to be addressed. There is little clarity on which OCB dimensions are mostly perceived as extra-role and which are mostly seen as in-role. Parks and Kidder (1994) suggested a continuum in OCB role perception, with conscientiousness (a part of OCBt) being the most passive form of extra-role (most similar to in-role) and altruism (a part of OCBI) being the most active form of extra-role. Vey and Campbell (2004), using a sample of undergraduate students with work experience, found support for that continuum. On the one hand, all items in the conscientiousness dimension were rated as in-role, with the different items ranging from 81.8% to 94.9% of in-role perception. On the other hand,
four out of six items of the altruism dimension were rated mostly as extra-role, ranging from 15.2% to 29.3% of in-role perception. However, two items were rated mostly as in-role (51.5% and 73.5% of in-role perception). The civic virtue dimension (a part of OCBO) was split; three items were rated as extra-role and three items as in-role. Studying also OCBO, Coyle-Shapiro et al. (2004) found that most employees classified these behaviors as in-role.

There are reasons to believe that cultural factors, in particular collectivism, can affect role perceptions. Collectivism is the most widely studied cultural variable in management research (Hofstede, 2001; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman & Gupta, 2004; Triandis, 2002). The dimensions of collectivism identified by Triandis (2002) might have an effect on how individuals perceive OCB across cultures. The first dimension is the way in which people define the self. According to Triandis, individualists see themselves as autonomous and independent. Collectivists, on the other side, see themselves as interdependent with others, like a family. Individualists analyze behavior using individuals as the unit of analysis, whereas collectivists use groups. Another dimension identified by Triandis is the collectivists’ emphasis on relatedness versus rationality, taking into account the needs of others. Therefore, taking into account these two dimensions, in a more collectivistic culture, like Chile (Hofstede, 2001), employees might perceive behaviors directed toward other employees (OCBI) as part of their role, and perform more OCBI than in individualistic cultures. A third dimension identified by Triandis is the way people structure their goals. Individualists give priority to individual goals, whereas collectivists give priority to group goals, although often for collectivists group goals will be compatible with personal goals. Therefore, it is plausible that employees in Chile might perceive organizational goals as their own, thus viewing OCBO as part of their role. The final dimension is the emphasis collectivists put on duties and obligations over individual preferences. This can also make employees view a broad array of behaviors as part of their duty, in particular those related to their job (OCBT).

Based on the research reviewed above, the first question we ask is: Are all OCB dimensions equally perceived as extra-role or in-role? In order to answer this, we will analyze whether Vey and Campbell’s (2004) findings are also observed in a supervisory sample in a more collectivistic cultural context.

Thus, we propose the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1: Individuals’ categorization of behaviors as in-role or extra-role will depend on the OCB dimension being evaluated. The frequency of in-role categorization will be the highest for the OCBI dimension and will be the lowest for the OCBt dimension.

The second question we ask is: do employee role perceptions affect their level of OCB in every dimension? Morrison (1994) argues that employees who see these behaviors as in-role perform more OCB. However, the three-dimensional framework of OCB has not been tested for role perception differences. This leads us to our second hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2a: Employees who perceive OCBI as part of their role will perform more of these behaviors than employees who perceive OCBI as beyond their role.

Hypothesis 2b: Employees who perceive OCBO as part of their role will perform more of these behaviors than employees who perceive OCBO as beyond their role.

Hypothesis 2c: Employees who perceive OCBt as part of their role will perform more of these behaviors than employees who perceive OCBt as beyond their role.

Even if the levels of OCB performed do not depend on employee role perceptions, the reasons behind employees’ behaviors may vary depending on their views. Next, we will present a motivational framework for OCB and propose hypotheses for its relationship with employee role perceptions.

2.3. Motivational framework

Traditional motivation theories, with the exception of studies on altruism (Batson, 1991) have disregarded other serving motives, and have assumed that individuals act on the basis of their self-interest. In this context, they distinguish between motives that arise internally and motives that come from external sources. The
most complete theory in this sense is self-determination theory (SDT), developed by Deci and Ryan (1985). SDT distinguishes between internal and external locus of causality, although they present a continuum meaning that many actions are not purely internally or externally caused. In this theory, a particular action has an internal perceived locus of causality when the individual feels like the agent of his or her behavior. On the other hand, an action has an external perceived locus of causality when the individual’s behavior is determined by outside forces that do not feel like his or her own (Gagne & Deci, 2002).

Since the first studies about OCB were conducted (Smith et al., 1983), literature has implicitly assumed that citizenship behaviors are related to altruistic motives. In order to study this assumption, we need to analyze not only the origin of the action (locus of causality), but also its beneficiary. For this purpose, we use the concept of locus of consequence (Cardona, Lawrence & Espejo, 2003). An action has an internal locus of consequence when the individual expects that consequences of the action will have a direct impact on him or herself. Conversely, an action has an external locus of consequence when the individual expects that consequences of the action will have an impact on others. In most cases, actions have consequences both in the individual and in the environment. The individual will be motivated by different types of motives when he or she considers these different expected consequences in the decision to perform the action.

If we consider locus of causality together with locus of consequence, we can classify different motives in a four-category typology of work motivation (see Figure 1). We identify four possible motives for action which we call: extrinsic, intrinsic, altruistic, and institutional.

Extrinsic motives are characterized by an external locus of causality and an internal locus of consequence. Extrinsic motives are the rewards an individual expects to receive from others in exchange for that behavior. An example of behavior caused by extrinsic motives is an employee who works overtime because he or she expects to receive an overtime payment.

Intrinsic motives are characterized by an internal locus of causality and an internal locus of consequence. Intrinsic motives appeal to the satisfaction an individual expects to experience from performing a certain behavior. In other words, the experience of learning or pleasure that results from performing that specific task is what motivates the individual. An example of behavior caused by intrinsic motives is when an employee works overtime because he or she likes to work in that project and feels it is a professional challenge.

Altruistic motives are characterized by an internal locus of causality and an external locus of consequence. Altruistic motives appeal to the benefits the individual expects others to experience as a consequence of the behavior. An example of behavior caused by altruistic motives is when an employee works overtime because he or she wants to contribute to the goals of the organization.

Institutional motives are characterized by an external locus of causality and an external locus of consequence. Institutional motives appeal to compliance to institutional norms and rules. People acting by institutional motives engage in activities which are coherent with their roles and the institution they belong to, such as impression management behaviors. An example of this motivation is when an employee does some extra effort because he or she fears that otherwise he or she may be seen as deviant.

**Figure 1.** Typology of motives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived locus of causality</th>
<th>Perceived locus of consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic motives</td>
<td>Altruistic motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional motives</td>
<td>Institutional motives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These four types of motives are not mutually exclusive but complementary. In general, people act on the basis of a combination of motives (Amabile, 1993). Hennessey and Zbikowski (1993) showed that in many cases extrinsic motives can reinforce intrinsic motivation. Using an exchange perspective, Cardona, Lawrence and Bentler (2004) present evidence that individuals’ relationships with their organizations depend on a combination of perceived economic rewards, perceived job characteristics, and perceived organizational support. Perceptions of high economic rewards tend to foster extrinsic motivation, perceptions of a job with interesting characteristics (such as variety or autonomy) tend to foster intrinsic motivation, and perceptions of a supportive organization tend to foster altruistic motivation through the internalization of the norm of reciprocity. The results of this study suggest that not only these motivations coexist together but also that they are positively correlated.

2.4. Motives, OCB, and role perceptions

2.4.1. Externally caused motives: Extrinsic and institutional

Traditionally, literature has excluded extrinsic motives as determinants of citizenship behaviors (Cardona et al., 2004). Espejo and Cardona (2005) found no effect of these types of motives on the different OCB dimensions. However, Morrison (1994, p.1545) suggests that “a critical difference between an in-role and an extra-role behavior is the extent to which others reward the behavior and impose sanctions if it is absent.” As a result, in-role behavior is more likely to be linked to extrinsic rewards and sanctions. Therefore, employees who perceive OCB-type behaviors as in-role may tend to be more extrinsically motivated than employees who perceive these behaviors as extra-role.

Hypothesis 3: Extrinsic motives will be more important for employees who perceive OCB as part of their role than for employees who perceive OCB as beyond their role.

Impression management (IM) motives (Bolino, 1999; Bolino, Turnley & Niehoff, 2004) might also vary according to role perceptions. The employee who wants to avoid looking bad in front of the organization, or may even risk losing their job, engages in observable behaviors, if they feel it is part of their role. In this case, we talk about institutional motives, because the reason for performing the behaviors is to strengthen (or at least not weaken) the relationship with the organization. Empirical results relating these motives to OCB are mixed. Whereas Rioux and Penner (2001) found a positive effect of impression management on the sportsmanship dimension, Finkelstein and Penner (2004), and Espejo and Cardona (2005) found a negative effect of IM motives on OCB. However, in line with Bolino and his colleagues’ ideas, we expect that employees who perceive OCB as part of their role will perform more OCB due to IM or institutional motives.

Hypothesis 4: Institutional motives will be more important for employees who perceive OCB as part of their role than for employees who perceive OCB as beyond their role.

2.4.2. Internally caused motives: Intrinsic and altruistic

Literature in OCB has mainly assumed that altruistic motives cause OCB. Initial evidence on this relationship was provided by McNeely and Meglino (1994), who found that individuals who scored high in concern and empathy tended to perform prosocial behaviors directed toward other individuals. Later, Rioux and Penner (2001), and Finkelstein and Penner (2004), found strong effects of one altruistic motive (prosocial values) on interpersonal citizenship behaviors, whereas impression management did not have any significant effect. Espejo and Cardona (2005) showed that, together with altruistic motives, intrinsic motives are also related to OCB, especially with task-directed behaviors. Employees who perform OCB based on intrinsic or altruistic motives (both internal motivations) will probably not change their
behaviors if they perceive them as in-role or extra-role. Therefore, we do not expect differences in these motives due to role perceptions.

3. Method

3.1. Participants and procedure
We collected data from supervisory-level employees from a Chilean company in the retail sector, who were enrolled in an online course. We guaranteed confidentiality to all participants. All surveys were internet-based and stored on the university’s server. Evans and Mathur (2005) described a series of advantages and disadvantages of web-based surveys. Most advantages relate to ease and cost, whereas most disadvantages relate to the participants’ internet access. Since all participants in our study were currently enrolled in an online course, all of them had internet access. This could help explain the high response rate we obtained. We asked 503 employees at a supervisory-level to complete the questionnaire, and we obtained 299 responses, giving a 59% response rate. In a meta-analysis considering 68 surveys in 49 studies, Deutskens, De Ruyter, Wetzels and Oosterveld (2004) found a mean response rate for online surveys of 39.6%. Although the response rate in this study is high, as in all voluntary studies we cannot rule out the possibility of a self-selection bias (Heckman, 1979). We discuss this issue in more depth in the discussion section. Most employees, 68%, were sales supervisors and 32% were supervisors in administrative functions. The sample came from stores distributed throughout the country. 45% of the sample came from the capital of Chile, Santiago, and a 55% came from other regions.

In the questionnaire, we asked respondents to first rate one dimension of OCB and then to evaluate the motives for engaging in those specific behaviors. Then we repeated the same procedure for the other OCB dimensions. Participants answered a five-point Likert scale, ranging from absolutely disagree to absolutely agree.

4. Measures

4.1. Motives
We used the OCB Motives Inventory by Espejo and Cardona (2005). For each OCB dimension we asked participants to rate their motives for performing that specific behavior. We introduced the scale by asking “when I perform this type of behavior, I do it because…” and then we presented the 8-item scale. Therefore, each participant answered the motives’ scale three times; one time for each OCB dimension.

We included the same items used by Espejo and Cardona (2005) in Latin American nations, who reported reliabilities ranging from .69 to .96 for the different motives. The original questionnaire was written in English and then translated into Spanish, using a back-translation method (Brislin, 1986). During the translation process, the wording of some items was adapted to achieve a meaning in Spanish closer to the original meaning in English.

4.2. Organizational citizenship behavior
We measured the three OCB dimensions suggested by Coleman and Borman (2000). To measure OCBI, we used 5 items from Lee and Allen’s (2002) OCBI scale. They reported a reliability of .83 for peer ratings of this dimension. To measure OCBO, we used 5 items from Lee and Allen’ (2002) OCBO scale. They reported a reliability of .88 for peer ratings of this dimension. To measure OCBt we used Moorman and Blakely’s (1995) 4-item personal industry scale. Moorman and Blakely reported a reliability of .61 for self-rated personal industry. Cardona and Espejo (2003) used Moorman and Blakely’s personal industry scale in Spain and reported reliabilities ranging from .78 (self-rating) to .89 (supervisor and peers rating). Since Espejo and Cardona (2005) already used this scale in Spanish, we used their translation.

Table 1 presents an exploratory factor analysis on the OCB scale. Reliabilities are shown in Table 2.
Table 1. Exploratory factor analysis on OCB scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>OCBI</th>
<th>OCBO</th>
<th>OCBt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Results

Table 2 presents correlations and scale reliabilities for the main variables in this study. Consistent with previous research by Espejo and Cardona (2005), in general, OCB dimensions relate to intrinsic and altruistic motives, whereas extrinsic and institutional motives are not significantly related to OCB. There is a high correlation among several dependent variables in our study (motives to perform citizenship behaviors). First, the same type of motive is correlated across OCB dimensions. For example, there is a .80 correlation between extrinsic motives to perform OCBO and extrinsic motives to perform OCBT. This result is according to expectations due to conceptual and methodological issues. Conceptually, an employee can be motivated for the same factors to perform different behaviors (Cardona, Lawrence & Espejo, 2003). Methodologically, we used the same scale to measure the same type of motives, only changing the initial description of the behavior. Second, there are some high correlations between the two external motives (extrinsic and institutional). These results suggest that the scales for these behaviors should be further developed in order to better capture the distinctiveness of these motives.

Scale reliabilities for OCBI, OCBO, and motives for these behaviors are all over .75. However, in the case of OCBT, scales are less reliable. The alpha for the OCBT scale is .50 and the scales for intrinsic and altruistic motives to perform OCBT are .69 and .52. Because of this, results regarding OCBT should be interpreted with caution.

Table 3 shows the percentage of the sample that classifies each citizenship dimension as in-role. Results do not support Hypothesis 1: "Individuals’ categorization of behaviors as in-role or extra-role will depend on the OCB dimension being evaluated. The frequency of

Table 2. Correlations and reliabilities* for main variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motives for OCB</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>.69** .54** .05 .07 (94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>.49** .76** .05 .01 .65** (93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>-.05 -.02 .26** .30** .03 .03 (.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic</td>
<td>-.08 .00 .33** .48** -.03 .04 .58** (.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motives for OCBO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>.63** .54** -.02 .03 .69** .57** .03 -.04 (.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>.49** .73** -.02 .05 .57** .80** -.02 -.02 .67** (.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>.03 .07 .30** .33** .06 .07 .43** .46** .05 .05 (.52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic</td>
<td>-.03 -.03 .30** .49** .02 .05 .39** .67** .02 .03 .51** (.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motives for OCBT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBI</td>
<td>.01 -.08 .36** .48** .07 -.02 .33** .36** -.02 .00 .29** .34** (.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBO</td>
<td>.05 .02 .32** .46** .04 .03 .34** .50** .01 .02 .42** .38** .25** (.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBT</td>
<td>.02 .01 .21** .24** .08 .08 .18** .25** -.02 .04 .31** .29** .27** .36** (.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reliabilities are presented in the diagonal.
in-role categorization will be the highest for the OCBI dimension and will be the lowest for the OCBT dimension. Although, as we expected, the OCB dimension with higher in-role perception was OCBT (90.0%), the dimension with the lowest in-role perception was OCBO and not OCBI (see Table 3). All three dimensions were perceived by the employees mainly as part of their job requirements. As discussed before, the higher level of collectivism in Latin America, compared to the United States, can help explain why many employees view helping behaviors as part of their role.

**Table 3. In-role classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCB dimension</th>
<th>Percentage of sample classifying behavior as in-role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCBI</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBO</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBT</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows mean comparisons both for OCB and for motives to perform OCB. We found support for Hypothesis 2: “Employees who perceive OCB as part of their role will perform more of these behaviors than employees who perceive OCB as beyond their role”, only for the organization-directed dimension (p = .01). We also found some support (p = .10) for the interpersonal dimension. However, we found no differences for OCBT. This result might be affected by the low sample size in the extra-role group for OCBT (N = 30, 10.0% of the sample).

Extrinsic motives gain relevance when employees perceive the behaviors as in-role. Our results support hypothesis 3: “Extrinsic motives will be more important for employees who perceive OCB as part of their role than for employees who perceive OCB as beyond their role” for all types of OCB.

Institutional (or impression management) motives also vary with role perceptions, as suggested by hypothesis 4: “Institutional motives will be more important for employees who perceive OCB as part of their role than for employees who perceive OCB as beyond their role.” However, this difference is significant for OCBI and OCBO, but not for OCBT. Again, the small number of participants who classify OCBT as extra-role behaviors might affect this comparison.

As expected, there was little effect of role perceptions on intrinsic and altruistic motives to perform OCB. The only significant difference we found was that employees who perceive OCBO-type behaviors as in-role, perform at a higher level of these behaviors than for altru-

**Table 4. Mean comparisons for OCB and motives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean OCB for in-role group</th>
<th>Mean OCB for extra-role group</th>
<th>p-value for Levene’s Test</th>
<th>t-student</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>OCBI 4.71</td>
<td>OCBI 4.58</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCBO 4.64</td>
<td>OCBO 4.45</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>121.55</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCBT 4.51</td>
<td>OCBT 4.54</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-3.36</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic motives</td>
<td>OCBI 2.44</td>
<td>OCBI 1.93</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCBO 2.31</td>
<td>OCBO 1.93</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>168.59</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCBT 2.31</td>
<td>OCBT 1.80</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>39.96</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional motives</td>
<td>OCBI 2.23</td>
<td>OCBI 1.79</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCBO 2.10</td>
<td>OCBO 1.80</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>172.38</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCBT 2.35</td>
<td>OCBT 1.95</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motives</td>
<td>OCBI 4.75</td>
<td>OCBI 4.85</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCBO 4.79</td>
<td>OCBO 4.66</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>127.75</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCBT 4.78</td>
<td>OCBT 4.72</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic motives</td>
<td>OCBI 4.72</td>
<td>OCBI 4.64</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCBO 4.77</td>
<td>OCBO 4.61</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>133.19</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCBT 4.70</td>
<td>OCBT 4.70</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Sample sizes are the following: N_{OCBI-IR}=253, N_{OCBI-ER}=46; N_{OCBO-IR}=218, N_{OCBO-ER}=81; N_{OCBT-IR}=269, N_{OCBT-ER}=30

*b In cases where F statistic for Levene’s test is significant, homogeneity of variances is not assumed.
istic motives. One explanation for this finding could be that employees with higher altruistic motives are more committed to the organization due to normative reasons, and therefore might consider the defense and loyalty to their company as one of their duties.

6. Discussion

This study contributes to the growing literature about the importance of employees’ role perceptions and their effects on performance (e.g., Chiaburu, 2007; Coyle-Shapiro et al., 2004; McAllister et al., 2007; Morrison, 1994; Pond, Nacoste, Mohr & Rodriguez, 1997; Van Dyne & Ellis, 2004; Van Dyne et al., 2008; Vey & Campbell, 2004). We analyzed how employees in a Chilean sample classify their behaviors in terms of in-role or extra-role. Additionally, we studied the effect of this classification in their reported level of OCB. Finally, we presented a motivational framework and studied the effect of employees’ role perceptions in four different motives to perform OCB. These results go beyond current literature by adding the study of motives and role perceptions, by studying separately three dimensions of OCB, and by conducting the study in a Latin American country.

Literature on OCB and role perceptions had previously established that perceiving OCB as in-role increases its incidence. Although our results in general support that conclusion, they show that role perceptions only have an influence on external motivation to perform OCB. In particular, in this study we found that when employees are externally motivated to perform OCB, their motivation increases when they perceive the behaviors as in-role. However, when employees are internally motivated to perform OCB, their motivation will not dramatically change whether they perceive the behaviors as in-role or as extra-role. We believe that both researchers and managers can benefit by understanding how motivation to perform OCB is affected by the employees’ role perceptions. According to these results, in order to foster extra-role behaviors in employees, managers have two options. They can either increase role breadth in order to include the behaviors they want to encourage, or they can look for sources of internal motivation, such as sense of autonomy, meaning, or identification with the company.

This study also contributes to the study of OCB role perceptions and motives in a different cultural context. In fact, this might be a possible cause for the difference in the classification of OCB dimensions with respect to previous studies. Cross-cultural research shows that Latin American nations are more diffuse than United States in terms of job descriptions and roles (Trompenaars, 1994). Additionally, Latin American cultures are more collectivistic than the United States (House et al., 2004). Our results show that almost 85% of the participants described OCB as in-role. As we discussed before, this might relate to the definition of the self in collectivistic contexts, where people view goals of others in their in-groups as their own goals. This cultural variable can also affect how motives relate to OCB. In the GLOBE study, House et al. (2004) identify two dimensions of collectivism: in-group and institutional (Gelfand, Bhawuk, Nishii & Bechtold, 2004). Whereas the former relates more to family and interpersonal relationships, the latter targets behavior in organizations (Brewer & Venaik, 2011). Institutional collectivism is defined by House and Javidan (2004, p.12) as “the degree to which organizational and societal institutional practices encourage and reward collective distribution of resources and collective action”. Thus, employees in collectivistic nations can give different values to different rewards than employees in individualistic nations. In fact, research has shown that motives related to fulfilling obligations and to contributing to other members of the group, are more important in collectivistic cultures than in individualistic cultures (Gelfand et al., 2004). In our study, altruistic and institutional motives might be more salient to participant employees than if the same study had been done in an individualistic culture.

One limitation of our study is that our sample comes from a specific context: supervisors from a retail company in one Latin American nation. Therefore, further studies are needed before we can generalize these findings. How-
ever, although a limitation, as mentioned previously, the context of the study gives us the opportunity to understand OCB in a different culture, where only few studies have been made (O’Connell, Dooverspike, Norris-Watts & Hat-trup, 2001; Espejo & Cardona, 2004). While the results could be limited because they are based on measures provided by only one source, since the main point of this research is to study differences in individual motives due to individual perceptions, we believe that self-ratings provide a unique source of data. Recently, Conway and Lace (2010) showed that a common method does not necessarily inflate relationships and that source selection should be made according to the particular research question.

As we mentioned earlier in the paper, since this is a voluntary study, there is a possible self-selection bias in respondents to our questionnaire. One particular bias in this research might be that more employees who perceive the action of completing the questionnaire as part of their role and who are willing to perform OCB could have answered, whereas other employees who do not see this as part of their role could have decided not to answer. This bias might have an effect on hypotheses 1 and 2 and can help understand the high percentage of employees who classify citizenship behaviors as in-role. We believe, however, that this possible bias does not affect the other hypotheses; only reducing the size of the group who perceive the behaviors as extra-role. We are confident also that the high response rate in our study helps reduce this bias, although it does not prevent it (Bootsma-van der Wiel, van Exel, de Craen, Gusssekloo, Lagaay, Knook & Westendorp, 2002). Finally, the scales for OCBT and motives for OCBT did not show the expected reliability. OCBT also was classified as extra-role by a small percentage of the sample. Therefore, results for OCBT in this study are not as reliable as results for OCBI and OCBO. Further research should replicate these findings in different cultures, and in case they find differences, look for cultural variables, such as collectivism, which may help explain the variations. Experimental research could also be useful to better figure out the relationship between motives and OCB. A design which changes job characteristics, expected rewards, or in-role requirements, may allow for the observation of changes in motives and in citizenship behaviors. Further research should also expand and refine the measurements for OCB motives.

We believe that by providing a map of motives for performing OCB, and by testing the effects of role perceptions on these motives, we are contributing to a better understanding of citizenship behaviors. Managers may also benefit from these findings if they want to promote these behaviors. On the one hand, they should know that by encouraging intrinsic and altruistic motivation they can achieve these behaviors from employees with different role perceptions. On the other hand, if they want to use extrinsic or institutional incentives, these are especially important when employees perceive behaviors as part of their role.
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