

A pathway proposal for organizational citizenship behaviors

David Schieler

Minnesota State University, Mankato

December 10, 2013

## **Introduction**

Today's organizations and businesses maneuver through the marketplace, adjusting internal practices in response to external pressures; this organizational maneuvering may be mediated by managerial enacted organizational development and change management, but may more readily occur through grass-roots development by member extra-role behaviors. When externalities exert pressure on organizations and organizational members respond with positive nonobligatory behaviors the organizations are often guaranteed a greater level of success (Bateman & Organ, 1983). There is little to no argument regarding the benefits to businesses and organizations of these positive behaviors, termed organizational citizenship behaviors (Katz & Kahn, 1978).

The concept of organizational citizenship behaviors was first proposed by Organ (1988), based on earlier work by Katz (1964), and while its importance has not been largely contested, the conditions that lead to such organizational advantageous behaviors have received much debate. Perhaps the most supported antecedent is satisfaction, although O'Reilly and Chatman's 1986 study of college alumni presents a strong argument for the role of person-organization fit, hereto referred to as organizational congruency. Further study of organizational congruency by O'Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991) established it as a causal factor of satisfaction.

It is here the purpose of the current study begins to take shape. Several of the currently proposed antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior have, at various times, previously been interrelated in cause and effect relationships and thus create confusion in hopes of a clear pathway. The following literature review will begin with the most basic aspect of personal organizational affinity, cultural orientation, and work toward a final co-mediated causative hypothesis for organizational citizenship behaviors, relating organizational commitment and

satisfaction. The largest amount of attention will be devoted to the development of cultural orientation as the starting point from which the pathway proposal for organizational citizenship behaviors stems.

### **Literature Review**

Understanding the importance of organizational citizenship behaviors to organizations urges researchers to identify personal characteristics as well as situational context that leads to their emergence. To establish a profile for organizationally inclined members, attention is given to Hofstede's identified cultural dimensions from his foundational 1980 intercultural communication study. While this initial study suggested four cultural dimensions, a later 1985 study expanded this to five dimensions. These five dimensions included: (1) power distance, (2) individualism (collectivism), (3) uncertainty avoidance, (4) masculinity (femininity), and (5) long-term orientation. While these were originally proposed as national cultures, their origin lies in individual preferences. The current study will limit its associative search to Hofstede's second dimension.

#### ***Personal Cultural Orientation (Individualism/Collectivism)***

Of the five dimensions, individualism/collectivism is most readily reduced to a personal frame, and much research has attempted to relate individualism/collectivism to organizational membership. The first effort to define individualism and collectivism came from Parsons & Shils (1951) and largely remains a relevant, yet partial, definition today. According to this definition individualism preferences "private interests irrespective of their bearing on the interests of others (pg. 154)," and collectivism allows "obligations toward collective well-being...to supersede the pursuit of personal gains. (pg. 154)." Triandis (1995) expands the definition of individualism and collectivism by separating the previously spectral construct.

Triandis and Gelfand (1998) posit further construct division within the separate dimensions of individualism and collectivism; Vertical and Horizontal orientation within each construct displays the role of individual preference for organizational equality or hierarchy. In the conceptual introductory article, (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) common phrases are given for each of the four dimensions; Horizontal Individualism: “I want to do my own thing.”; Vertical Individualism: “I want to be the best.”; Horizontal Collectivism: “The well-being of the group is most important.”; and Vertical Collectivism: “It is important to respect the group’s decisions.” (p. 120).

As noted above, several studies have attempted to use this definition of individualism/collectivism to discuss organizational membership. Notably, Wagner (1995) relates motives for organizational cooperation to cultural orientation (individualism v. collectivism). This correlation of cultural orientation with basic organizational function demonstrates the possibly far-reaching effects of personal cultural orientation. The same 1995 study noted that group size and organizational identifiability have greater mediating effects on individualism to affect cooperation than collectivism. Chatman and Barsade (1995) repeated these results after randomly assigning participants to collectivistic or individualistic work groups and measuring cooperation. It continues to be stated that individualistic members engage in cooperative behaviors, when doing so helps meet personal needs. Applying the Triandis and Gelfand (1995) vertical and horizontal orientations to the results of these studies, it is possible to suggest a more detailed pathway exists to predict organizational behaviors..

Robert and Wasti (2002) successfully correlated satisfaction with organizational work to organizational individualism fit with idiocentrism (personal individualism)  $\beta=0.10$ ,  $p<0.05$ . While the current study incorporates congruency as a later antecedent of satisfaction, the

relationship discovered by Robert and Wasti, is confirmed by Wagner and Moch's (1986) definition of organic solidarity – “the complimentary satisfaction of differing interests (p. 283).” However, the word satisfaction as used by Wagner and Moch is synonymous with fulfillment, rather than personal emotional pleasure as this study uses it later. Robert and Wasti's study encourages deeper thought into the motives of organizational membership for individualistic members.

Abrams and Hogg's (1988) presentation of the self-esteem hypothesis within the context of discrimination and distinctiveness supports the motives of the Parsons & Shils (1951) definition of individualism; the seeking of conditions and memberships that enhance the self-image and promote positive global self-esteem. This view of individualism is repeated in Ashforth and Mael's (1989) report on social identity theory within organizations. The motives for collectivist members are clearly outlined in the Moorman and Blakely (1995) study, which surveyed 210 financial service employees and successfully correlated, positively, collectivism to organizational citizenship behaviors. While this study would seem to reduce or eliminate the research gap the current study tasks itself with filling, critically it can be proposed that Moorman and Blakely fail to identify and oversimplify intermediary traits of organizational membership.

Understanding then the motives and depth of individualism and collectivism, including their horizontal and vertical orientations we may begin to relate them to our next concept, organization based self-esteem.

### ***Organizational Based Self-Esteem (OBSE)***

Organizational based self-esteem as introduced by Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, and Dunham (1989) is “the degree to which organization members believe that they can satisfy their needs by participating in roles within the context of an organization (p. 625).” Van Dyne, et. al.

(2000) revisits the definition of OBSE by referring to it as, “the self-perceived value that individuals have of themselves within a specific organizational context (p. 7).”

### ***Collectivism and Self-Esteem***

The collectivistic motive of preferencing group intentions over personal intentions in the context of perceived value of membership appears, at least in face value, to be suggestibly correlated to one another. The drive for collectivists to “place value on group membership and stress group goals, cohesiveness, and group wellbeing (Van Dyne, et. al, 2000, p. 8)” should enable the development of heightened OBSE. When considering this in relation to the orientation of collectivism, it may be seen that horizontal collectivism promotes the highest levels of reported OBSE, while vertical collectivism would be further moderated by position within the organizational hierarchy. The statement, posited by Gelfand and Triandis (1998) “I must respect the decision of the group” to vertical collectivism rests on the passivity of the member, unless that member holds the ability to greatly influence the decision of the group.

*A1: Horizontal collectivism will be positively related to organization based self-esteem.*

*A2: Vertical collectivism will be positively related to organization based self-esteem and will be moderated by hierarchical position within the organization.*

### ***Individualism and Self-Esteem***

The motive for individualistic members to participate in organizations however, greatly differs from that of collectivistic members, as highlighted above. These motives may be better explained by a mediating factor, perceived organizational prestige. In Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail’s 1994 report on Identification careful attention was given to what they entitled, “construed external image”, here referred to as perceived organizational prestige, in line with Mael and Ashforth’s 1992 terminology. Construed external image “refers to a member’s beliefs

about outsiders' perceptions of the organization (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994, p. 248). Believing a particular salience of self-image in individualistic members, this perceived prestige may be utilized to enhance the self-concept (Abrams & Hogg, 1988; Ashforth & Mael, 1989, 1992; Cheney, 1983; Dutton, Dukerich, Harquail, 1994; Pierce & Gardner, 2004; Smidts, Pruyn & Van Riel, 2001). Accepting the importance of prestige to the self-concept of individualistic organizational members, it becomes possible to arrange a causative, mediating relationship.

*A3: Horizontal individualism will be positively related to organizational based self-esteem and mediated by perceived organizational prestige.*

*A4: Vertical individualism will be positively related to organizational based self-esteem and mediated by perceived organizational prestige, while moderated by hierarchical position within the organization.*

### ***Organizational Identification***

While the Moorman and Blakely (1995) study provides evidence for a direct correlation between collectivism and organizational citizenship behavior, the demonstration of organizational citizenship behaviors by individualistic organizational members in the Robert and Wasti (2002) study of organizational cultural orientation congruency, suggests alternative pathways. Already hypothesized in the current study individualism and collectivism may both be related, in differing manners, to organizational based self-esteem.

The construct of organizational based self-esteem is closely related to social identity and self-concept, through the self enhancement and self-esteem hypotheses (Abrams & Hogg, 1988; Pierce & Gardner, 2004). These hypotheses also help explain the process of organizational members defining their self-concept by the same traits which comprise the identity of the organization. In these circumstances, the self-image and organizational-image are said to become

one as the organizational member undergoes a process known as identification (Cheney, 1983). When an organizational member is said to identify with an organization, they have a “feeling of oneness with a defined aggregate of persons, involving the perceived experience of its successes and failures (Mael & Tetrick, 1992).” This feeling of oneness, as expressed by O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) may also be related to a pride of membership in an organization. It is logical then that this study expects to test a positive relationship between organizational based self-esteem and organizational identification.

The predicted relationship between OBSE and identification has been proven in study prior to the current study. As cited in Pierce and Gardner (2004), Ragins et al. (2000) as well as Tang, Singer, et al. (2000) and Signer and Tang (1996) have all proven positive correlations between career identification and organizational based self-esteem. However tenure has also been cited in studies as a possible affecter of identification (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994; Mael & Ashforth, 1992; O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986). A possible explanation for the moderating effects of organizational tenure on identification comes is believed to stem from the latency of organizational knowledge with time; organizational members become more familiar and therefore more comfortable with identifying with an organization as time proceeds (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994).

*A5: Organizational based self-esteem will be positively related to organizational identification and moderated by organizational tenure.*

Studies by Van Dick et al. (2007) provided evidence of a positive relationship between organizational identification and extra role behaviors, eluding that the current study is progressing towards the ideal theoretical base for study. Becker (1992) also tested organizational identification as an antecedent for what he termed prosocial organization behaviors.



***Organizational Congruency/Internalization***

Where organizational identification occurs when a member aligns their social identity with that of the organization, internalization occurs when a member aligns their schema and internal value systems to that of an organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Internalization occurs as organizational members encounter ambiguous shared experiences, interpreting and responding as an organizational unit. In this sense an organization develops a value system, superficial schema for ordering stimuli (Ranson, Hinnings, & Greenwood, 1980; Liedtka, 1989). As members internalize these organizational value systems, they begin to alter their own value systems to match that of the organization, resulting in organizational homogeneity.

Since many of the affectors of identification are related to willful organizational participation, a relationship between identification and internalization may be expected. Social identity congruency, as provided through identification, may be seen as a necessary antecedent to value system congruency, a manifestation of internalization.

*A6: Organizational identification will be positively correlated to organizational congruency.*

***Organizational Commitment***

While organizational commitment research is vast, researchers have taken to the operationalized definition provided through the organizational commitment questionnaire, developed by Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979). The operationalized 1979 definition is that commitment occurs when individuals identify with and extend effort towards organizational goals and values (p.226) With the integration of social identity and value systems into the

definition of commitment it may become clear that our next hypotheses will relate the earlier discussed constructs.

This is not blindly done however; the history of commitment should be understood. Kanter (1968) is supposed to have been the originator of the affective commitment definition, one of the earliest discussions of commitment within an organizational context; “the attachment of an individual’s fund of affectivity and emotion to the group (p. 507)” (as cited in Allen & Meyer, 1990). Counter to the affective development of commitment, Becker (1960) developed what has become known as the “side-bets” model. (as cited in Reichers, 1985). Becker described commitment “as a tendency to ‘engage in consistent lines of activity (p.33)’ (as cited in Allen & Meyer, 1990).” Still important to the current study, Wiener (1982) referred to commitment “as the totality of internalized normative pressures to act in a way that meets organizational goals and interests (p. 421).” These definitions come together in the Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) definition of commitment, used for this study.

Each of these definitions sought to explain observed or tested antecedents or outcomes of commitment. Intent to leave an organization has been perhaps the greatest tested outcome of commitment, being tested by many different researchers, most notably: O’Reilly and Chatman (1986), O’Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991), Reichers (1985), Becker (1992), Ashforth and Mael, (1989), Sims and Kroeck, (1994), and Riketta and Van Dick (2005) as well as many others. Within the study of the antecedents of commitment, perception of support (POS) has received considerable attention, including organizational feedback and trust. (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Wiener, 1982; Eisenberger et al., 1986). Again the current study utilizes each of these bolters support for the hypotheses that organizational identification, with suggested antecedents such as trust (Sluss, Klimchak, & Holmes, 2008), as well as internalization with such outcomes

such as reduced intent to leave (O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991) are positively correlated to organizational commitment. However, due to the lack of research utilizing both identification and internalization (organizational congruency), their effects as co-mediators on the relationship with commitment poses as the first research question.

*Q1: Do organizational identification and organizational congruency co-mediate a positive relationship with organizational commitment?*

*A7: Organizational identification will be positively correlated to organizational commitment.*

*A8: Organizational congruency will be positively correlated to organizational commitment.*

### ***Organizational Satisfaction***

Much of the current literature on organizational satisfaction suggests it's close relationship to organizational commitment. Williams & Anderson (1991) discuss the shared variance between commitment and satisfaction in several previous studies. For the sake of this study the 1969 causative definition of satisfaction from Lofquist and Dawis will be used, "a harmonious relationship between the individual and his environment, suitability of the individual to the environment and vice versa (p. 45)."

Special attention will be given in this study to the idea of emotional pleasure, which may also be seen as congruent with the working definition of organizational satisfaction, more specifically affective organizational identification. This last definition is also inline with Locke's (1969) definition.

The antecedents of satisfaction then perhaps are as clear as the definition, especially when discussing the distinctiveness from organizational commitment. However, far less research

supports the notion that organizational identification results in organizational satisfaction, than research supporting that notion of internalization and congruency (O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1989). And while a less assured case may be made for the ninth axiom, its result is still expected.

*A9: Organizational congruency will be positively related to organizational satisfaction.*

### ***Organizational Citizenship Behaviors***

Having fully defined the predicted pathway, attention may now be turned to the product definition, organizational citizenship behaviors. Some attention has already been given to this topic in the study's introduction. Repeating, Organ (1988) has been noted as the father of the concept, in which organizational members act in organizationally advantageous ways outside of formally structured roles (extra-role).

And while previous research (Van Dick et al., 2008; Van Dyne et al., 2000; Williams & Anderson, 1991) have proven positive correlations between identification, collectivism, and commitment to extra-role behaviors respectively, no research fully synthesizes these studies to provide a comprehensive pathway proposal for OCB.

Building upon the work of William and Anderson (1991) we reach our last research question and hypotheses. William and Anderson's study of MBA students at a midwestern university established both job satisfaction and job commitment to be positively related to extra-role behaviors. The current study expects to repeat those results as the final steps in the proposed pathway. The study however, did not evaluate the co-mediating effects of commitment and satisfaction.

*Q2: Do organizational commitment and organizational satisfaction co-mediate a positive relationship to organizational citizenship behaviors?*

*A10: Organizational commitment will be positive correlated to organizational citizenship behaviors.*

*A11: Organizational satisfaction will be positively correlated to organizational citizenship behaviors.*

## **Method**

In order to assure the study survey was reliable and valid previously established scales were used. Each of these scales were adapted to fit a uniform likert rating form; 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=neutral, 5=slightly agree, 6=agree, 7=strongly agree. In the following section each scale is described as well as previous application. At the end of this section is an explanation of participant selection.

### ***Cultural Orientation***

To measure participant placement along the four dimensions of cultural orientation (Horizontal Collectivism, Vertical Collectivism, Horizontal Individualism, Vertical Individualism) participants were administered the Cultural Orientation scale (Singelis et al., 1995). The original scale consisted of 32 items, while the current used a condensed 16-item version developed following examination of a 27-item scale by Triandis and Gelfand (1998). The shortened scale tests the four domains using four items each, these are the four items within each domain that had the highest factor loading coefficients in the 1998 study. The 1995 subscales reported alpha values HI=0.67, VI=0.74, HC=0.74, and VC=0.68. The factor loadings reported in the 1998 study are listed below, adapted from Triandis and Gelfand (1998).

Table 1

*Factor Loadings for Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism*

Item	Factor Loading
Horizontal Individualism	
1. I'd rather depend on myself than others.	.68
2. I rely on myself most of the time; I rarely rely on others.	.66
3. I often do "my own thing."	.55
4. My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me.	.40
Vertical Individualism	
1. It is important that I do my job better than others.	.59
2. Winning is everything.	.56
3. Competition is the law of nature.	.53
4. When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused.	.45
Horizontal Collectivism	
1. If a coworker gets a prize, I would feel proud.	.67
2. The well-being of my coworkers is important to me.	.64
3. To me, pleasure is spending time with others.	.61
4. I feel good when I cooperate with others.	.49
Vertical Collectivism	
1. Parents and children must stay together as much as possible.	.61
2. It is my duty to take care of my family, even when I have to sacrifice what I want.	.60
3. Family members should stick together, no matter what sacrifices are required.	.52
4. It is important to me that I respect the decisions made by my groups.	.45

***Perceived External Prestige***

In line with the 1992 Mael and Ashforth study of University alumni identification, the eight item perceived external organizational prestige scale measures the regard to which members believe an organization is held by non-members, both isolated and compared to other organizations. The scale was developed in by Fred Mael (1988) and reported an alpha value of 0.79.

***Organizational Based Self-Esteem***

The level of self perceived organizational value was measured using the 1989 Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, and Dunham scale of the same name. Pierce and Gardner revisited the scale and related literature (2004) and reported reliability alpha values ranging from 0.82 to 0.95. Van Dyne et. al (2000) confirmed the 1989 construct definition prediction of a single factor and positively correlated the construct to the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. The original 10-item scale developed by Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, and Dunham was used in the current study with no alteration.

### ***Organizational Identification***

Tajfel's (1982) terminology of identification with a psychological group, was used by Mael and Tetrick for the creation of a scale which measures the "tendency of individuals to perceive themselves and their groups or organizations as intertwined, sharing common qualities and faults, successes and failures, and common destinies (1992, p. 813)." The resulting 10-item scale was piloted with 161 undergraduate students and produced an alpha value of 0.76. The 1992 study by Mael and Tetrick of Midwestern psychology and business students demonstrated two factors. Both factors were measured for reliability and produced alpha values of 0.81 for the shared experiences subscale and 0.66 for the shared characteristics subscale. The subscale factor loadings are reported below from the 1992 scale definition study by Mael and Tetrick.

Table 2

*Factor loadings for identification with a psychological group scale*

Item	Factors	
	IDPG-SE	IDPG-SC
1. When someone criticizes (this organization), it feels like a personal insult.	.785	
2. I'm very interested in what others think about (this organization).	.676	
3. When I talk about this organization, I usually say "we" rather than "they"	.545	

4. This organization's successes are my successes.	.643
5. When someone praises this organization, it feels like a personal compliment.	.663
6. I act like (name of organization) person to a great extent.	.571
7. If a story in the media criticized the organization, I would feel embarrassed.	.843
8. I don't act like a typical (name of organization) person. (R)	.704
9. I have a number of qualities typical of (name of organization) people.	.549
10. The limitations associated with (name of organization) people apply to me also.	.190

---

### ***Organizational Internalization/Congruency***

Participant-Organizational congruency was measured using a value statement q-sort, a method first suggested by Chatman (1989), and operationalized by O'Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991). The importance of values, and their ability to be used nomothetically as well as ideographically was inspired by Katz and Kahn's 1978 discipline establishing book, *The Psychology of Organizations*. Each of the value statements were selected following a review of literature by O'Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell, and were fit to four criterion: (1) generality, (2) discriminability, (3) readability, and (4) non-redundancy. The 54 value statements are included in an appendix to this study.

While an individual's cultural profile is established independently, the organizational cultural profile is established by averaging the participant rating of each value statement. The level of congruency is then found by correlating matching value statements between personal and organizational cultural profiles.

The q-sort procedure follows common research practice; 2-4-6-9-12-9-6-4-2 and is anchored from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Participants were asked to sort the values based on "how well they represent your (personal/organizational) values."



***Organizational Commitment***

The well-tested Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1979) was used to measure effort exerted on behalf of the organization and affective attachment to membership. The OCQ was chosen for its affordance of brevity (15-items) while also being the principle measure of organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Reichers, 1985). Tetrick and Farkas (1988) provide elaboration on the scale, establishing two factors, first suggested by Angle and Perry (1981). According the Tetrick and Farkas these factors include value commitment, measured by the nine positively worded items, and commitment to stay, measured by the six negatively worded items. The OCQ scale as it was used is presented in an appendix.

***Organizational Satisfaction***

Satisfaction, positive affective response to membership (Locke, 1969), was measured using a single item response. The decision to use a single item measure was inspired based on the low face validity and low construct distinctiveness between established satisfaction scales, such as the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967). The notion of using a single item measure for organizational satisfaction has received a reasonable amount of research attention and has proved reliable, reporting correlates to multiple measure satisfaction scales ranging from 0.67 to 0.82 (Dolbier et al., 2005; Wanous, Reichers, & Hudy, 1997). Participants were asked “How satisfied are you as an organizational member?” and given a 7-item likert response scale.

***Organizational Citizenship Behavior***

In order to be prudent in our measurement and to target specifically helping organizational behaviors, the seven-item helping behavior scale of organizational citizenship

behavior (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998) was used. Self-reported measures of helping behavior during the construct definition study reported alpha values of .95 and .88 across two testing periods, separated by six months. The construct was validated through further study, using a test-retest check, providing an alpha value of 0.87 (Van Dyne et al., 2000). The seven helping items represent a single citizenship behavior factor, defined by Williams and Anderson (1991) as OCB-O, targeted toward the general wellbeing of the organization.

### ***Participant Selection***

Participants were selected based on membership in organizations with predicted highly crystallized value systems (Chatman, 1989). Collegiate social fraternal organizations are known to use effective socialization tactics, and emic ethnographic observation foretells the emphasis on symbolic identification and an elevated commitment to stay. **THE REST OF THIS SECTION WILL HAVE TO BE FILLED IN FOLLOWING PARTICIPANT SURVEYING.**

### References

- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (1988). Comments on the motivational status of self-esteem in social identity and intergroup discrimination. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 18*: 317-334
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*: 1-18
- Angle, H. L. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 26*: 1-14
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *The Academy of Management Review, 14*(1): 20-39
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *The Academy of Management Journal, 26*(4): 587-595
- Becker, T. E. (1992). Foci and based of commitment: Are they distinctions worth making? *The Academy of Management Journal, 35*(1): 232-244
- Chatman, J. A., & Barsade, S. G. (1995). Personality, organizational culture, and cooperation: Evidence from a business simulation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40*(3): 423-443
- Chatman, J. A. (1989). Improving organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *The Academy of Management Review, 14*(3): 333-349
- Cheney, G. (1983). On the various and changing meanings of organizational membership: A field study of organizational identification. *Communication Monographs, 50*: 342-362

- Dolbier, C. L., Webster, J. A., McCalister, K. T., Mallon, M. W., & Steinhardt, M. A. (2005). Reliability and validity of single-item measure of job satisfaction. *American Journal of Health Promotion, 19*(3): 194-198
- Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 39*(2): 239-263
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchinson, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*: 500-507
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage
- Hofstede, G. (1985). The interaction between national and organizational value systems. *Journal of Management Studies, 22*(4): 347-357
- Kanter, R. M. (1968). Commitment and social organization: A study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities. *American Sociological Review, 33*(4): 499-517
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science, 9*(2): 131-146. DOI: 10.1002/bs.3830090206
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York City, NY: Wiley
- Liedtka, J. M. (1989). Value congruence: The interplay of individual and organizational value systems. *Journal of Business Ethics, 8*(10): 805-815
- Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 4*: 309-336
- Lofquist, L., & Dawis, R. (1969). *Adjustment to Work*. New York City, NY: Appleton-

Century-Crofts

- Mael, F. A. (1988). *Organizational identification: Construct redefinition and a field application with organizational alumni*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, Detroit
- Mael, F. A., & Tetrick, L. E. (1992). Identifying organizational identification. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 52*: 813-824
- Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*(2): 103-123
- Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*: 127-142
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14*(2): 224-247
- O'Reilly, C. III, & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(3): 492-499
- O'Reilly, C. III., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *The Academy of Management Journal, 34*(3): 487-516
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington
- Parsons, T., & Shils, E. (1951). *Toward a General Theory of Action*. Cambridge, MA:

Harvard University Press

Pierce, J. L., & Gardner, D. G. (2004). Self-esteem within the work and organizational context: A review of the organization-based self-esteem literature. *Journal of Management, 30*(5): 591-622

Pierce, J. L., Gardner, D. G., Cummings, L. L., & Dunham, R. B. (1989). Organization-based self-esteem: Construct definition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal, 32*(3): 622-648

Ragins, B. R., Cotton, J. L., & Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal mentoring: the effects of type of mentoring and quality of relationship, and program design on work and career attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*: 1177-1194

Ranson, S., Hinings, B., & Greenwood, R. (1980). The structuring of organizational structures. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 25*(1): 1-17

Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review, 10*(3): 465-476

Riketta, M., & Van Dick, R. (2005). Foci of attachment in organizations: A meta-analytic comparison of the strength and correlates of workgroup versus organizational identification and commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67*(3): 490-510

Robert, C., & Wasti, S. A. (2002). Organizational individualism and collectivism: Theoretical development and an empirical test of a measure. *Journal of Management, 28*(4): 544-566

Sims, R. L., Kroeck, K. G. (1994). The influence of ethical fit on employee satisfaction, commitment and turnover. *Journal of Business Ethics, 13*(12):

939-947

- Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D., & Gelfand, M. J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research, 29*: 240-275
- Singer, M. G., & Tang, T. L. (1996). Factors related to perceived organizational instrumentality. *Collective Negotiations, 25*(3): 271-286
- Sluss, D. M., Klimchak, M., & Holmes, J. J. (2008). Perceived organizational support as a mediator between relational exchange and organizational identification. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 73*: 457-464
- Smidts, A., Pruyn, A. H., & Van Riel, C. M. (2001). The impact of employee communication and perceived external prestige on organizational identification. *The Academy of Management Journal, 44*(5), 1051-1062
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Instrumentality, identity and social comparisons. In H. Tajfel (Ed.) *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations* (pp. 483-507). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press
- Tang, T. L., Singer, M. G., & Roberts, S. (2000). Employees' perceived organizational instrumentality: An examination of the gender differences. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 15*(5): 378-406
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and Collectivism*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press
- Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(1): 118-128
- Van Dick, R., Van Knippenberg, D., Kerschreiter, R., Hertel, G., & Wieseke, J. (2008).

- Interactive effects of work group and organizational identification on job satisfaction and extra-role behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72: 388-399
- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1): 108-119
- Van Dyne, L., Vandewalle, D., Kostova, T., Latham, M. E., & Cummings, L. L. (2000). Collectivism, propensity to trust and self-esteem as predictors of organizational citizenship in a non-work setting. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21: 3-23
- Wagner, J. A. III. (1995). Studies of individualism-collectivism: Effects on cooperation in groups. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1): 152-172
- Wagner, J. A., & Moch, M. K. (1986). Individualism-collectivism: Concept and measure. *Group & Organization Management*, 11(3): 280-304
- Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., & Hudy, M. J. (1997). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(2): 247-252
- Weiss, D. J., Davis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minneapolis, MN: Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review*, 7(3): 418-428
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational



commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3): 601-617