Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behavior from The Functional Analysis and Role Identity Perspectives: Further Evidence in Spanish Employees

Mª Celeste Dávila[1] and Marcia A. Finkelstein[2]
[1]Universidad Complutense (Spain)
[2]University of South Florida (USA)

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is a prosocial activity with similarities to volunteerism. The purpose of this work is to contribute new evidence about the relevance to OCB of two models of sustained volunteerism, functional analysis and role identity theory. A total of 983 Spanish employees at 49 organizations completed surveys measuring amount of OCB, motives for engaging in citizenship behavior, and the degree to which respondents developed an organizational citizen role identity. The results showed that both motives and role identity were significant predictors of OCB, with motive partially mediating the role identity-OCB relationship. The findings suggest that similar mechanisms are involved in sustaining volunteerism and OCB.
Keywords: prosocial behavior, role identity, motives, organizational citizenship behavior.

El comportamiento ciudadano organizacional es una conducta prosocial que presenta algunas similitudes con el voluntariado. El objetivo del presente estudio es aportar nueva evidencia empírica sobre la importancia del enfoque funcional y el modelo de la identidad de rol, dos modelos del voluntariado sostenido, para explicar este tipo de comportamiento. Un total de 983 trabajadores españoles cumplimentaron un cuestionario que evaluaba la frecuencia de estos comportamientos, los motivos para ponerlos en práctica y el grado en el que habían desarrollado una identidad de ciudadano organizacional. Los resultados hallados muestran que tanto los motivos como la identidad de rol son predictores significativos del comportamiento ciudadano organizacional, y que los motivos ejercen una mediación parcial de la relación existente entre la identidad de rol y este tipo de comportamiento. Estos hallazgos sugieren que mecanismos similares permiten explicar el voluntariado sostenido y el comportamiento ciudadano organizacional.
Palabras clave: conducta prosocial, identidad de rol, motivos, comportamiento ciudadano organizacional.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Mª Celeste Dávila de León. Departamento de Psicología Social. Facultad de CC. Políticas y Sociología. Universidad Complutense. Campus de Somosaguas, s/n. 28223 Madrid. Phone: +34-913942766. Fax: +34-913943029. E-mail: mcdavila@cps.ucm.es

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) refers to employee activities that exceed the formal requirements and contribute to effective functioning of the organization (Finkelstein & Penner, 2004, Finkelstein, 2006). The study of OCB dates back several decades. Katz (1964) emphasized that helpful and cooperatives behaviors beyond formal role prescriptions are important for organizational functioning. Since the 1980s, with the introduction of the term OCB by Organ and colleagues (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983), interest in this type of activity has increased. However, a variety of labels have been used to describe behaviors that in general fit the definition of OCB. For example, Banard (1938) discussed the *informal organization* and the importance of the cooperation between its members to benefit to the organization.

Citizenship performance is a concept with many fundamental points in common with the concept of OCB. Borman, Penner, Allen and Motowidlo (2001) argued that citizenship performance contributes to organizational effectiveness because it helps create the psychological, social and organizational context necessary to carry out the formal responsibilities of the job. The organization's social machinery is lubricated, increasing effectiveness and reducing friction among employees. Despite their importance, citizenship behaviors cannot be explained by the same processes that underlie the formal requirements of the job. There is no formal system of incentives to control and reinforce the behaviors; they can be subtle and difficult to measure and can even help others to the detriment of one's own performance (Smith et al., 1983).

References to *contextual performance* or *prosocial organizational behavior* (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; 1997; Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; LePine, Erez & Johnson, 2002) emphasized the voluntary nature of these activities and distinguished them from *task performance*, the tasks that are assigned to carry out the job (Finkelstein & Penner, 2004, Finkelstein, 2006). Also embodied in *prosocial organizational behavior* (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986) is the intention to promote the welfare of an individual, group, or organization.

Finally, others terms used, although with less frequency, have been *organizational spontaneity* (George & Brief, 1992; George & Jones, 1997) and *extrarole behavior* (Van Dyne, Cummings & Parks, 1995). In general, the terms used to refer to this type of behaviors can not be considered synonymous. Although they refer to very similar concepts, these have slightly definitions different. Most of the above conceptualizations suggest two dimensions distinguished by the intended target of the behavior (Dovidio, Piliavin, Schroeder & Penner, 2006; Finkelstein & Penner, 2004; Finkelstein, 2006):

1. OCB aimed at individuals (OCBI). Prosocial behaviors that are directed at specific people and/ or groups within the organization. The help can be work-related, for example assisting a workmate with a specific task, or not, for example helping with a personal problem.

2. OCB aimed at the organization (OCBO). These are behaviors that target the organization per se (for example, offering ideas to improve the functioning of the organization).

Previous studies focused on the antecedents of OCB (Omar & Uribe, 2005), reporting strong correlations between the both dimensions and such attitudinal variables as job satisfaction, organizational justice, organizational commitment, and perceived supervisor support (Organ & Ryan, 1995).

Penner and colleagues (Finkelstein & Penner, 2004; Finkelstein, 2006; Rioux & Penner, 2001) adopted a different approach based on similarities between OCB and another prosocial activity, volunteerism. Volunteering and OCB share some important characteristics. For example, both involve long-term, planned and discretionary behaviors that occur in an organizational context and that benefit nonintimate others. Usually they occur over an extended period of time; they are not transitory responses to specific situations. However, there is an important difference in that individuals engaging in OCB are paid by the organization they serve. Nonetheless, Penner and colleagues proposed that the functional analysis and role identity perspectives, used to describe the volunteer process, could further clarify the antecedents of sustained OCB".

The functional perspective begins with the idea that to understand why an individual engages in a behavior, it is useful to understand the purpose or function served by the behavior for that individual (Borman & Penner, 2001). The same behavior can satisfy different motives for different people or for same person in different times. The activity continues as long as it satisfies the relevant motives. Rioux and Penner (2001) adapted the functional analysis to study of OCB and identified three motives: organizational concern (OC, pride in and positive affect toward the organization), prosocial values (PV, desire to help others and to be accepted by them) and impression management (IM, desire to maintain a positive image and avoid creating a negative one in order to obtain or retain special benefits).

Rioux and Penner (2001), Finkelstein and Penner (2004) and Finkelstein (2006) found that OCBI had the strongest correlation with PV motives and OCBO had it with OC motives. While Rioux and Penner found no relationship between IM and OCB, Finkelstein found a positive association between this motive and OCBI.

Role identity theory emphasizes the concept of role identity and the social context in which a behavior is developed (Callero, Howard & Piliavin, 1987; Grube

& Piliavin, 2000; Piliavin, Grube & Callero, 2002). Piliavin and colleagues proposed that antecedents to the development of a volunteer identity include past behavior and the perceived expectations of others. With continued volunteering, the volunteer role and the decisions associated with it are incorporated into the self-concept. This identity not only shapes how an individual views himself or herself, but also drives future behavior as the individual strives to behave consistently with the volunteer-role identity (Finkelstein & Penner, 2004).

Finkelstein and Penner (2004) and Finkelstein (2006) give empirical evidence of a positive relationship between an organizational citizen role identity and OCB. Role identity also was correlated with OCB motives, particularly OC and PV motives. The results showed indications of a possible mediator function of role identity in the relationship between motives and OCB (although some evidence also suggested that motives may mediate the relationship between role identity and OCB).

The objective of the present study was to contribute new empirical evidence, here with a sample of Spanish employees, of the relevance of functional analysis and role identity in explaining OCB. An additional aim was to clarify the relationships between motives, role identity and OCB. Based on the prior findings, we proposed the following hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1. The relationship between OCBO and the organizational concern motive (OC) is greater than between OCBO and the other motives. The relationship between OCBI and the prosocial values (PV) motive is greater than those between OCBI and other motives.

Hypothesis 2. There is a significant relationship between role identity and OCBO and OCBI.

Hypothesis 3. There is a significant relationship between role identity and PV motives and OC motives, respectively. These correlations are stronger than that between role identity and impression management (IM) motives.

Hypothesis 4.1. Role identity mediates the relationship between OCB and motives.

Hypothesis 4.2. Motives mediate the relationship between OCB and role identity.

Method

Participants

Participants were 983 employees from 49 organizations. Mean age was 36.36 (*SD* = 10.24), and 55.7% were women. They been employed in their organizations between 1 month and 42 years (*M* = 106.94 months; *SD* = 116.33 moths), and the majority worked full-time (87.2%). With regard to educational level, 8.7% had primary studies, 34.2% secondary studies, and 53.8% had university studies.

Measures

Participants completed a questionnaire that contains the following measures:

Organizational citizenship behavior. We used the scale of Lee and Allen (2002) adapted to a Spanish population. To do this adaptation, we translated the original scale to Spanish, with a bilingual individual evaluating the content of each item. We also adjusted some items to conform to habitual Spanish expressions.

The scale comprises 16 items with a 5-point Likert type response format, ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*). The instrument assesses two dimensions, OCBO and OCBI. Some items are *"Demostrate concern about the image of the organization", "Give up time to help others who have work or nonwork problems". A* factor analysis with maximum likelihood estimation and oblique rotation showed that each factor was made up of eight items, the same as the original scale. The two factors explain 49.81% of the variance. Coefficient alphas for each factor were .86 (OCBO) and .89 (OCBI).

OCB Motives. Motives were measured with the scale used by Finkelstein and Penner (2004), an adaptation of that developed by Rioux and Penner (2001). The instrument assesses three motives: prosocial values, organizational concern, and impression management. This instrument was adapted to a Spanish population utilizing the same procedure as that for the OCB measure. The scale comprises 30 items with a 5-point Likert type response format, ranging from 1 *(not at all important)* to 5 *(extremely important)*. Some items are "*Because I like interacting with my co-workers.", "Because I have a genuine interest in my work.", "So that others will think highly of me"*. A factor analysis with maximum likelihood estimation and oblique rotation showed that the OC factor was made up of 10 items, the IM factor nine items, and PV factor, 11 items. The organization of items into factors was very similar to the original scale's organization; the exception was one item that loaded more heavily on PV than IM. The three factors explained 53.30% of variance. Coefficient alphas were .92 (OC), .89 (PV) and .90 (IM).

Citizen role identity. This construct was measured with an adaptation of the scale developed by Callero et al. (1987) to assess role identity in blood donors. The original scale comprised 5 items, but based on the idea of two dimensions of OCB we conceptualized the organizational citizen identity as also comprising two dimensions: role identity with relation to OCBO (RIO) and role identity with relation to OCBI (RII). The adaptation to the Spanish population was carried out following the same procedure as with the two previous scales. Some items are "*Helping the company to succeed is an important part of who I am", "Helping others at work is an important part of who I am"*. A factor analysis with maximum likelihood estimation and oblique rotation showed that each factor was made up of

five items in the same way as that in the original scale. The two factors explained 42.07% of variance, and coefficient alphas were .76 (RIO) and .73 (RII).

Procedure

Students enrolled in Social Psychology of Human Resources (Sciences of Work Degree) administered the questionnaires. They were taught about all the concepts underlying the study and instructed about how to administer it so as to interfere as little as possible with the normal functioning of the organization. Each one of them applied the questionnaire in an organization and the procedure followed to select the employees was not random. We respected the anonymity of participants.

Results

To test the hypotheses, we carried out correlation and regression analyses using SPSS 15.0. Table 1 presents the correlations among variables, their means and standard deviations.

All motives correlated significantly with both OCBO and OCBI. As predicted (Hypothesis 1), OCBO showed a greater correlation with OC motives than with PV or IM motives. Also as hypothesized, OCBI showed the strongest correlation with PV motives. Regarding role identity (Hypothesis 2), both RII and RIO showed significant correlations with OCBO and OCBI: RII presented a greater correlation with OCBI and RIO with OCBO. The data also supported Hypothesis 3, with role identity correlating with all motives. RIO presented the greatest correlation with OC motives, RII with PV motives. IM motives showed a small but significant negative correlation with RII and a small positive correlation with RIO.

To individually determine the contribution of each motive to OCB, we carried out regression analyses (Hypothesis 1). The three motives were simultaneously entered as predictors of OCBO and OCBI respectively. The results (Table 2) showed that OCBO was most influenced by OC motives although all other motives had significant beta weights. Together the motives accounted for 69% of the variance in OCBO. All three motives also were significant predictors of OCBI, with PV motives showing the largest beta weight. The three motives accounted for 59% of the variance in OCBI.

A second regression analysis determined the influence of each type of role identity on OCBO and OCBI (Hypothesis 2). Although in each case both types of role identity were significant predictors, the pattern of results was similar to that observed for the correlations: RIO was the main predictor of OCBO and RII of OCBI. Both types of citizen identity account for 44% of OCBO variance and 38% of OCBI variance (see Table 2).

The final set of regression equations examined the relationship between motives and role identity (Hypothesis 3). First, motives were simultaneously entered as predictors of role identities and in a subsequent analyses, identities were entered as predictors of motives. With regard to RIO, OC and IM motives had significant beta weights, with OC the most relevant predictor. The two motives accounted for 46% of RIO variance. In the prediction of RII, all motives played a significant role, but PV motives proved the most significant predictor. The three motives accounted for 47% of RII variance (see Table 2).

In relation to prediction of motives, the results showed that in all cases both RIO and RII had a significant beta weights. In the prediction of OC motives, RIO had the largest weight; in the prediction of PV motive, RII was the main factor. RIO and RII showed similar influence in the prediction of IM motives. The variance accounted for was: 44% (OC), 42% (PV), and 2% (IM) (see Table 2).

We next asked whether role identity mediated the relationship between motives and OCB or, alternatively,

Table 1

Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for role identity, motives and OCB

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. OCBO	-----						
2. OCBI	.59**						
3. OC	.82**	.51**					
4. PV	.42**	.74**	.46**				
5. IM	.14**	.08*	.30**	.24**			
6. RIO	.65**	.37**	.66**	.31**	.10**		
7. RII	.32**	.57**	.28**	.64**	-.07*	.33**	
Mean	3.40	3.80	3.36	3.75	2.79	3.15	3.69
Standard Deviation	.80	.68	.79	.66	.91	.81	.72

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. OCBO: OCB aimed at the organization; OCBI: OCB aimed at people; OC: organizational concern; PV: prosocial values; IM: impression management; RIO: role identity with relation to OCBO; RII: role identity with relation to OCBI.

if motives served as a mediator between role identity and OCB (Hypothesis 4). We used the mediational test of Baron and Kenny (1986). To conclude that a variable serves as a mediator, four conditions must be met: (a) A significant relationship between independent variable and presumed mediator; (b) a significant relationship between mediator variable and dependent variable; (c) a significant relationship among independent and dependent variables; and (d) the relationship between the independent and dependent variables decreases or disappears when the mediator is added to the regression equation. If the relationship between independent and dependent variables is decreased to zero, the mediation is total; a small decrease signifies partial mediation. We carried out this mediational test with the main predictors of OCBO (OC and RIO) and OCBI (PV and RII). The results are summarized in Table 3.

With RIO as mediator between OC and OCBO, the standardized regression weight remained great ($\Delta B = .11$, $p < .001$), and the variance changed very little ($\Delta R^2 = .1\%$). The results were very different with OC as mediator between RIO and OCBO. Both the standardized regression weight ($\Delta B = .47$, $p < .001$) and variance accounted for ($\Delta R^2 = 40.3\%$) decreased considerably.

The results for OCBI were similar. With RII as a mediator in the relationship between PV and OCBO, there was little change in the standardized regression weights ($\Delta B = .12$, $p < .001$) and amount of variance explained ($\Delta R^2 = .4\%$). However, when we analyzed PV as a mediator, we found that both B ($\Delta B = .39$, $p < .001$) and variance accounted for ($\Delta R^2 = 31\%$) were greatly reduced. In all cases, it is possible to detect a partial mediation, but the mediation is clearer when the two motives are the mediators in the relationship between role identity and OCB.

Discussion

The current results replicated the major findings of previous studies. Although the three motives all had a significant role in the prediction of OCB, the most important motive to predict OCBO was the wish to show respect for and to feel committed to the organization. In the case of OCBI, the main predictor was the desire to help others and to be accepted by them (Hypothesis 1). If we use the same terminology as in volunteerism research, we can say that these types of behaviors are mainly managed by other-oriented, rather than self-centered, motives. The

Table 2

Summary of regression analysis for predicting OCB, role identity and motives

	OCBO			OCBI		
Variable	B	SE	*B*	B	SE	*B*
OC	.85	.02	.83***	.22	.02	.25***
PV	.071	.03	.06**	.67	.02	.65***
IM	-.11	.02	-.12***	-.11	.02	-.15***
R^2			.69			.59

	OCBO			OCBI		
Variable	B	SE	*B*	B	SE	*B*
RIO	.61	.03	.61***	.16	.02	.20***
RII	.14	.03	.12***	.48	.03	.52***
R^2			.44			.38

	RIO			RII		
Variable	B	SE	*B*	B	SE	*B*
OC	.72	.03	.70***	.07	.03	.07*
PV	.02	.04	.02	.74	.03	.67***
IM	-.11	.02	-.12***	-.21	.02	-.26***
R^2			.46			.47

	OC			PV			IM		
Variable	B	SE	*B*	B	SE	*B*	B	SE	*B*
RIO	.62	.03	.64***	.09	.02	.11***	.15	.04	.14***
RII	.08	.03	.08**	.55	.02	.61***	-.149	.04	-.12***
R^2			.44			.42			.02

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. OCBO: OCB aimed at the organization; OCBI: OCB aimed at people; OC: organizational concern; PV: prosocial values; IM: impression management; RIO: role identity with relation to OCBO; RII: role identity with relation to OCBI.

Table 3

Summary of mediation results

Mediation of RIO for predicting OCBO by OC					Mediation of OC for predicting OCBO by RIO				
Conditions	B	SE	*B*	*R²*	Conditions	B	SE	*B*	*R²*
(a)	.68	.03	.66***	43.7%	(a)	.65	.02	.66***	43.7%
(b)	.65	.02	.65***	42%	(b)	.84	.02	.82***	67.7%
(c)	.84	.02	.82***	67.7%	(c)	.65	.02	.65***	42%
(d) OC	.72	.03	.71***	67.8%	(d) RIO	.18	.02	.18***	1.7%
RIO	.18	.02	.18***	1.7%	OC	.72	.03	.71***	67.9%

Mediation of RII for prediction OCBI by PV					Mediation of PV for prediction OCBI by RII				
Conditions	B	SE	*B*	*R²*	Conditions	B	SE	*B*	*R²*
(a)	.71	.03	.64***	40.7%	(a)	.58	.02	.64***	40.7%
(b)	.53	.02	.57***	32.8%	(b)	.76	.02	.74***	54.1%
(c)	.76	.02	.74***	54.1%	(c)	.53	.02	.57***	32.8%
(d) PV	.63	.03	.62***	53.7%	(d) RII	.16	.03	.18***	1.8%
RII	.16	.023	.18***	1.8%	PV	.63	.03	.62***	53.7%

Note. $* p < .05$, $** p < .01$, $*** p < .001$. Conditions: (a) prediction of presumed mediator by independent variable; (b) prediction of dependent variable by presumed mediator, (c) prediction of dependent variable by independent variable; (d) prediction of dependent variable by independent variable and presumed mediator.
OCBO: OCB aimed at the organization; OCBI: OCB aimed at people; OC: organizational concern; PV: prosocial values; IM: impression management; RIO: role identity with relation to OCBO; RII: role identity with relation to OCBI.

search for self-interest, represented by IM motive, has a reduced impact on these prosocial activities.

Rioux and Penner (2001) proposed that both OC and PV motives are, at least in part, "value-expressive" motives. Therefore if an organization wants to promote the development of citizenship behavior, it should promote a culture that values such traits as cooperation, mutual help and respect, and organizational loyalty. This will help ensure that employees acquire or strengthen those values in the socialization process.

Previous studies (see Rioux & Penner, 2001) found strong correlations between PV motives and several personality characteristics, suggesting that PV motives may reflect an enduring disposition and that to promote OCBI, companies should select employees who are motivated to help their workmates. However, motives also can represent less enduring and more modifiable, transitory reactions to organizational practices. OC motives in particular may be more dependent on organizational management. Correlations between OC motives and attitudinal variables such as organizational justice, organizational commitment, and organizational support have been found (Rioux & Penner, 2001). If the organization wishes to increase OC motives, it must develop a management capable of promoting concern for the company.

Sustaining OCB also involves the acquisition of an identity of "organizational citizen" as part of self-concept (Hypothesis 2). To foster this role identity, organizations must take actions such as not penalizing employees whose work is negatively affected because they have

helped others. Also, compelling citizenship behaviors can backfire by inhibiting the development of a role identity. Such inhibition has been found in studies of volunteerism, where the perception of extrinsic controls reduces the intentions of helping in the future (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Stukas, Snyder, & Clary, 1999).

The results confirm partially the Hypothesis 3 because the IM motive was a significant predictor and it was not the smallest predictor of two types of role identity. The results highlighted the existence of a relationship between motives and role identity, but they did not clarify aspects about causality, modulation or mediation of that relationship.

With regard to Hypothesis 4, while some studies suggest that role identity mediates the relationship between volunteering and other antecedent variables (Penner, 2002), the present results are more consistent with the idea that motives act as mediators in the relationship between role identity and OCB. Thus, the influence of identity on OCB will be mediated partially by the reasons for engaging in the behavior, for example, by wanting to be a part of an organization or to help one's co-workers.

The results support the idea that motives and role identity are important components of OCB. However, the present results do not allow us to make definitive conclusions about process. That is, does motive lead to identity, or does a citizenship identity influence motives? Both are possible (e.g., Finkelstein & Penner, 2004).

One of the study's main limitations was its cross-sectional design. Collecting all measures at one moment in time precludes examining the development of motives and

identity and the changes in relationships that occur over time (e.g., Finkelstein, 2008). Additionally the data consist of employee self-reports. Typically, measures of OCB are supplemented with ratings by peers and supervisors. However, our interest was less in obtaining a precise measure of OCB than in discerning individuals' perceptions of how much they help and why. The data also may be affected by the diversity of characteristics and management practices at the many participant organizations.

In short, the present results highlight the importance of both the functional analysis and role identity perspectives to understand the antecedents not only of volunteerism, but also of OCB. Future studies will include analyzing the relationships of motives and identity to other constructs, such as organizational justice that have been found to predict OCB.

References

Banard, C. (1938). *The functions of the executive.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic y statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 1173-1182.

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal, 26,* 587-595.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt y W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp.71-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance, 10,* 99-109.

Borman, W. C., & Penner, L. A. (2001). Citizenship performance: Its nature, antecedents, and motives. In B. W. Roberts & R. Hogan (Eds.), *Personality psychology in the workplace* (pp. 45-61). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T. D., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2001). Personality Predictors of Citizenship Performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *9*(1/2), 52- 69.

Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review, 11,* 710-725.

Callero, P., Howard, J. A., & Piliavin, J. A. (1987). Helping behavior as role behavior: disclosing social structure and history in the analysis of prosocial action. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 50*(3), 247-256.

Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., Schroeder, D. A., & Penner, L. A. (2006). *The social psychology of prosocial behavior*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

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. (2008). Predictors of volunteer time: The changing contributions of motive fulfillment and role identity. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *36*, 1353-1364.

Finkelstein, M. A. & Penner, L. A. (2004). Predicting organizational citizenship behavior: integrating the functional and role identity approaches. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *32*(4), 383-398.

George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good-doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin, 112,* 310-329.

George, J., M. & Jones, G. R. (1997). Organizational spontaneity in context. *Human Performance, 10,* 153-170.

Grube, J., & Piliavin, J. A. (2000). Role identity, organizational experiences, and volunteer experiences. *Personality and social Psychology Bulletin, 26,* 1108-1120.

Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science, 9,* 131-146.

Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: the role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 131-142.

LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 52-65.

Omar, A., & Uribe, H. (2005). Las dimensiones de personalidad como predictores de los comportamientos de ciudadanía organizacional. *Estudios de Psicología, 10*(2), 157-166.

Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*(4), 775-802.

Penner, L. A. (2002). Dispositional and organizational influences on sustained volunteerism: an interactionist perspective. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*, 447-467.

Piliavin, J. A., Grube, J. A., & Callero, P. L. (2002). Role as resource for action in public service. *Journal of Social Issues*, *58*, 469-485.

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

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25,* 54-67.

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68*(4), 653-663.

Stukas, A. A., Snyder, M., & Clary, E. G. (1999). The effects of "mandatory volunteerism" on intentions to volunteer. *Psychological Science*, *10*, 59-64.

Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & Parks, J. M. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (A bridge of muddied waters). *Research in Organizational Behavior, 17,* 215-285.