

Comparing Motives of Organizational Citizenship Behavior between Academic Staffs' Universities and Teller Staffs' Banks in Indonesia

Dorothea Wahyu Ariani

Department of Management, Economics Faculty, Atma Jaya Yogyakarta University

Jl. Babarsari 43 Yogyakarta - 55281, Indonesia

Tel: 62-274-375-664; 62-816-686-514 E-mail: dwariani@gmail.com

Received: July 11, 2011

Accepted: August 16, 2011

Published: January 1, 2012

doi:10.5539/ijbm.v7n1p161

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v7n1p161>

Abstract

This paper discussed the disparity on the state of motives of organizational citizenship behavior between academic staff in Indonesian Universities and teller staff in Indonesian Banks. It has been argued that individual bonding on organizational citizenship behavior is essential for organizational effectiveness and performance. Total useable questionnaires were 1340 with a response rate of 67 percent from both universities and banks. The results revealed that motives of organizational citizenship behavior among bank teller staff at the Indonesian banks were higher than university academic staff at Indonesian universities. This study implies to the policy makers and leaders at both banks and universities to consider enhancing staffs' motivation as the mission through ranking organizational citizenship behavior as the one priority performance appraisal of staffs. Future study should consider alternative modes of enquires such as employing the longitudinal method of data collection design and a nationwide survey covering samples from the whole population of other types institutions, manufacturing and services in Indonesia that would be more significant in making generalizations.

Keywords: Organizational citizenship behavior, Organizational concern motives, Prosocial values motives, Impression management motives

1. Introduction

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is a unique aspect in individual's activities in a workplace, however the activities are not formally required in work, independent and not stated explicitly in the formal work procedures and in the waging system. Meanwhile, individual behavior is influenced by two variables, i.e. the person him/herself and the situation which are known as dispositional and situational factors. If dispositional factors play a role in OCB, it is only to the extent that they affect thoughts and feelings about a job. Penner, Midili and Kegelmeyer (Penner, Midili, & Kegelmeyer, 1997) suggested that OCB may also be a proactive behavior, that is, people may consciously choose to engage in OCB because such behavior meet certain needs or satisfy one or more motives. Furthermore, to understand the causes of these actions, one must identify the motives that underlie them.

Amount of OCB and the strength of citizenship identity correlated with two motives for helping, concern for coworkers (prosocial values motives) and concern for the organization (organizational concern motives) (Finkelstein, 2006). These motives are the intrinsic (altruistic) motives of OCB. The other motives of OCB is extrinsic (instrumental) motives. Extrinsic motif is employees' desire to create a positive impression, to establish a favorable account for the future relationship and receive tangible or intangible rewards or benefits in return, and find an excuse fore their failures (impression management motives). (Rioux & Penner, 2001) defined these three motives. Prosocial values motives involve the need to be a helpful individual (value expression) and the need to be accepted and to interact smoothly with one's peers (social adjustment). Organizational concern motives have related components: a desire to help the organization because one identifies with and takes pride in the organization and because it is seen as being committed to one's welfare. Impression management motives appear to involve a desire to maintain a positive image and to avoid creating a negative one.

This study was driven by the premise that people often choose to engage in OCB because it meets certain needs for them. The main distinction between universities and banks has always been associated by its method of service that they give to the customers and the relationship between employees or staff and coworker, and between employees or staffs. Performance appraisal in banking industries is based on work standard and supervisors' judgment. Academic staffs are evaluated by students and they have a functional position that are evaluated with the arrangement from government, as teaching, research, and public servicing (the duty three). Past research has not been able to capture precisely the distinctions on academic staffs' motives of OCB in the banks and universities. Many of researcher said that organizational citizenship behavior in universities is difficult to measure, because of specificity of their actions. This conclusion may have been a bit premature. All of institutions need OCB to achieve organizational performance, except the works that must follow the rigid instructions to safe people that do these works. Past research also took manufacturing industries and hospitals as research setting. Therefore, the main purpose of this study is to elucidate information on the disparity between banks and universities on the staff motives of OCB in Indonesian context.

2. Motives of Organizational Behavior

Much of the current research on the causes of OCB either explicitly or implicitly assumes that engaging in such behavior is a reaction or a response to an individuals' perceptions of his or her job and the organization for which he or she works (Rioux & Penner, 2001). OCB may also be a proactive behavior, that is, people may consciously choose to engage in OCB because such behaviors meet certain needs or satisfy one or more motives. The studies of altruism are introduced in term of "behavioral" and "intentional" approaches (Hu & Liu, 2003). These former approach is concerned with the control and production behavior. The other approach focuses on internal aspects that is basis of an individuals' subjective motives. Based on Katz and Kahn's concept (1966) on internal values and self concept, as well as attribution theory, OCB is driven by motives to conduct such behavior. The functional approach is commonly employed in researching volunteerism to find out the reasons of volunteer's behavior. In accordance with the functional approach in motivating individuals to conduct OCB for certain reasons and objectives, plan and targets that grounds and organized the psychological phenomenon, that individual and social functions are served by thoughts, feelings, and actions of the individuals (Clary et al., 1998). With such functional approach, OCB increases mainly as a result of affective and cognitive factors of working attitudes in general (Penner et al., 1997). Identifying the purpose served by a particular behavior enables one to better understand it and why the person has performed it. The same behavior may have multiple motives.

According to the functional approach, there are two motives of individual involvements in OCB, they are organizational concern motives and prosocial values motives. The two are considered as altruistic motives. The functional approach to behavior focuses on the function or purpose served by behavior (Snyder, 1993). The functional approach to behavior focuses on the function or purpose served by a behavior. This approach assumes that human behavior is motivated by persons' goals and needs. The same behaviors may have multiple motives. The functional explanation of why some people volunteer their time and energy to a service organization propose that different people can and do engage in the same behaviors for different reasons (Omoto & Snyder, 1995). Functional approach is explicitly concerned with the reasons, the purposes, the plans, and the goals that underlie and generate psychological phenomena (Clary et al., 1998).

A primary concern of the functionalist is identifying the motivational foundations of action and developing sound means of assessing three motivations. The functional approach propose that continued participation depends on the person-situation fit. Employees who serve in roles that match their own motivations will derive more satisfaction and more employment from their service and be more likely to intend to continue to serve than those whose motivations are not being addressed by that activities (Clary et al., 1998). Based on that statement, different type of work makes different motivation of OCB.

3. Types of OCBs' Motives

Altruistic motives drive a person to conduct a behavior which is not in the system of formal appreciation and formal working procedures of all time. Meanwhile, (Eastman, 1994) states that there are two big groups of motives in conducting OCB, altruistic motives or other oriented motives and instrumental motives or egoistic motives which are self-centered. Some researchers have argued that altruism and self-interest are two separate and independence motives. Others have shown that altruistic behavior can be derived from individuals acting out of narrowly self-interest goals. The possibility that behavior which appears to be based on self-interest can be generated from altruistic motivation (Schenk, 1987). When one can get benefits from others by cooperating or by avoiding actions which exploit others, there is a strong tendency for the self-interested individual to be generous toward others. Employee altruism is defined as helpful and cooperative behavior that is aimed at other

employees in the organization but that may ultimately benefit the organization (Jex, Adams, Bachrach, & Sorenson, 2003). It is difficult to distinguish real altruism from refined self-interest such as reciprocity, compliance, ingratiation, and other forms of non altruistic behavior.

Rioux and Penner (2001) show that there are three motives that drive OCB, namely organizational concern motives, prosocial values motives, and impression management motives. The motives are grounded on the functional approach which focuses on the objectives and functions of the behavior. Altruistic Motives can be identified with the role identity theory which states that individuals are always volunteering, committed to the organization, and acting on behalf of the organization (Penner & Finkelstein, 1998). Stryker states that the more centered an individual is to his/her role-identity, the higher is the probability that the individual's behavior is consistent with his/her identity (Farmer, Tierney, & Kung-McIntyre, 2003). The third which is basic for individual behavior is instrumental motives or egoistic motives. egoistic or impression management motives is a need to create or hold other people's image on oneself. The motives are important for some reasons, that impression management is a feedback seeking which is not a fully rational process. Individual will be involved in activities that influence people's feedback characteristics. Impression management states that feedback seeking faces a conflict between the need to use information and the need to show good images.

This study was driven by the premise that people often choose to engage in OCB because it meets certain situation. Teller staff of the banks has different needs or goals from academic staff of the universities. I also expected that motives would account for significant amount of unique in OCB. Organizational concern motives may be a less enduring and more modifiable motives than prosocial values motives. Organizational concern motives are also influenced by an employee's thoughts and feelings about the organization. In contrast, prosocial values motives have strong correlations with an enduring personality characteristic, until these motives may be a relatively stable aspect of person's disposition and would not vary substantially from one job setting to another. Meanwhile, impression management (also called self-presentation) motives may influence OCB if employee get the good feedback from their actions. Impression management motives are influenced by job setting, performance appraisal and promotion system, and personality. Therefore, hypothesized that if such motives were measured, they would show the differences in banks and universities.

3.1 Organizational Concern Motives

Citizenship behavior result from an individuals' genuine desire to help organization or to help another individual at work on social exchange or because of their personality (Bolino, 1999). Concern for organization is a sense of social responsibility. The previous researchers said that OCB is related to concern for organization. Concern for organization promotes the effective functioning of the organization. A profitable organization may offer steady employment and good income to employees (Tang et al., 2008). Employees want the organization to run well, so they will continue to have a job in the future. Those motives may potentially lead to extrinsic rewards and intrinsic rewards. For a long period, OCB may help employees to get tangible benefits such as pay increases and promotions (Turban & Dougherty, 1994). OCB also help employees to get intangible benefits such as recognition and job satisfaction (Aryee, Wyatt, & Stone, 1996).

3.2 Prosocial Values Motives

OCB is a long term prosocial behavior that a person initiates on his or her own rather than in response to a request or demand from another person (Penner & Finkelstein, 1998). Prosocial values motives called other oriented empathy – the tendency to experience empathy for and to feel responsibility and concern about and the well being of others. In other words, prosocial values motives are prosocial thoughts and feelings. People who score high on prosocial values motives are other oriented, nurturant individuals who probably help because of their desire to benefit others and reinforce their self-image of a good and helpful person. Prosocial values motives provides satisfaction and happiness for both help provider and recipient. Prosocial values motives provide satisfaction and happiness for both help provider and recipient. Prosocial values motives are the intrinsic (altruistic) motives that have the relationship with self-serving (egoistic) motives. Intrinsic motivation is defined as performing an activity for no reward except the direct enjoyment of the activity it self. Bolino, Turnley, & Bloodgood (2002) defined intrinsic motives as employee's concern for people with whom they work and for organization of which they are a part.

3.3 Impression Management Motives

Several researchers have noted that engaging in OCB might be quite impression enhancing and self-serving (Eastman, 1994; Fandt & Ferris, 1990; Ferris, Judge, Rowland, & Fitzgibbons, 1994). People who engage in citizenship are likely to be favorably perceived by others in their organizations. Impression management refers to the process by which people attempt to influence the image others have of them (Bolino, 1999). Helping appears

to be stimulated by the desire to escape a negative state and to attain or retain a positive state (Crant, 1996). Impression management is the attempt to control images that are projected in real or imagined social interactions and reserved the term self-presentation (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Based on Leary and Kowalski's research, there are three central factors that determine impression motivation: the goal-relevance of the impressions, the value of the desired outcomes, and the discrepancy between one's desired and current social image. Impression management motives are the extrinsic motivation that is characterized by an external derive to be rewarded by others. Because motivation cannot be observed, many researchers maintain that identifying the motive underlying acts of altruism is impossible. Extrinsic motives are employees' desire to create a positive impression to establish a favorable account for the future relationship and receive tangibles or intangibles rewards or benefits in return and find an excuse for their failures (Tang et al., 2004).

4. Research Methods

4.1 Population

The target population for this study consisted of academic staff and teller staff from 150 universities and 128 banks in Indonesia. The survey took approximately six (6) months with a total of 1340 responses. This study use self administered questionnaires were distributed to collect individual data on the respondents. Overall the response rate was 67 percent which was slightly better than what was reported generally in the Indonesian context (Othman et al., 2001).

4.2 Measurement of Study Variable

The instruments were designed for individual level unit of analysis based on one respondent group. consists of a list of 10 items to measure the variable related to organizational values motives to OCB, 10 items to measure prosocial values motives, and 10 items to measure impression management motives. The original instrument for three motives mainly from three motives scale by Rioux and Penner (2001). Using a 5-Point Likert-type scale, the respondent indicated their intensity of agreement anchored by 1, "strongly disagree" through to 5, "strongly agree" with items phrased.

5. The Analysis of Research Data

5.1 Profile of Respondents

The demographic profile characteristics under investigation include the gender and tenure. The sample also indicates that female respondents represented a slightly higher percentage of total samples (55.45%) when compared to the male respondents (44.55%). The majority of the universities respondents possessed master degrees or others of similar level (57%) while 31 percent had completed under graduated degree, and 12 percent had completed the doctoral degree. Meanwhile, the majority of the banks respondents possessed under graduated degree (61%) while 37 percent possessed diploma degree, and 2 percent had completed the master degree. Majority of the respondents had experience 3 to 6 years (55.7%). 27.5 percent had experience between 6 to 12 years and 16.8 percent had experience above 12 years.

5.2 Reliability and Validity Analysis

To assess the reliability of the measurement items of all the variables, an internal consistency check was carried out. The Cronbach alpha from the test yielded a record of 0.8875 for organizational concern motives, 0.9210 for prosocial values motives, and 0.8603 for impression management motives, which is far above the cut-off line of reliability as recommended by Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black (1998). Content validity that is used to assess for the measurement instruments was done in the pre-tested stage by soliciting the expert opinions of two professors from a university who are research specialists in quantitative methodology and organizational behavior disciplines. The scale was then pre-tested on 30 respondents who were the academic staff and teller staff that have similar characteristics to the target population as suggested by Sekaran and Bougie (2010). Factor analysis (FA) was also performed on the construct under study. Factor extraction was executed and any Eigenvalue that is greater than one (1) will be adopted. To further simplify the interpretation and seek a simpler structure, the Orthogonal technique and the Varimax rotation was then performed. The varimax rotated principal components factor revealed one structure factor that resulted in a total variance of 56.636 percent. The factor loading recorded loading of between 0.515 and 0.806. Given all the items extracted were recorded above 0.5, three (3) items were deleted. With varimax rotation and factor loading of minimum 0,5 as suggested by Hair et al. (1998) the results of construct validity testing are practically significant.

5.3 Descriptive Statistic

An independent sample t-test was conducted to determine whether there are any significant differences in the mean scores of the respondents' motives of OCB in three dimensions, organizational concern motives, prosocial

values motives, and impression management motives. As shown in Table 1 below the overall result of the test indicated that there are significant difference in the scores between the banks ($M = 4.2987$, $SD = 0.41994$) and universities ($M = 3.9878$; $SD = 0.49836$) in organizational concern motives, the scores between the banks ($M = 4.5517$, $SD = 0.39800$) and universities ($M = 4.1127$; $SD = 0.45962$) in prosocial values motives, and the scores between the banks ($M = 4.1832$, $SD = 0.51599$) and universities ($M = 3.4625$; $SD = 0.63606$) in impression management motives. The computed t value was at 11.276 and was significant at 0.000 level in organizational concern motives, at 17.800 and was significant at 0.000 level in prosocial values motives, and at 22.549 and was significant at 0.000 level in impression management motives. The overall motives of the academic staff is different from the teller staff ($t = 22.342$ and significant at 0.000). The mean of teller staff motives ($M = 4.3445$, $SD = 0.35391$) is higher than academic staff motives ($M = 3.8543$, $SD = 0.39350$). Therefore, the banks teller staff were more motivated to OCB than the universities academic staff.

Insert Table 1 here

The results of the research shows that based on the types of the organization, motives of organizational citizenship behavior in banks and universities is different. The difference mainly happens because of the differences between raters. This is consistent with previous research (Finkelstein & Penner, 2004; Rioux & Penner, 2001) that organizational citizenship behavior motives are significantly related with the evaluation on the organizational citizenship behavior by workers. The results are also in consistence with the role identity theory that states that the role identity played in the organizational citizenship behavior is significantly related to the evaluation given by oneself towards the target person's level in the organizational citizenship behavior (Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder, 2005).

5.4 Correlation Analysis

Three motives of organizational citizenship behavior of each institutions is corelated. Table 2 illustrate the correlation between motives by employing *pearson product moment* correlation, assuming that all variables are matrix. The correlation between motives is positive and significant, except the correlation between motives of OCBs of the different institution. Prosocial values motives and impression management motives of the academic staff are significantly correlated, but is not significantly correlated with these three dimensions of the teller staffs' motives. The other side, prosocial values motives and impression management motives of the teller staff are significantly correlated, but is not significantly correlated with these three dimensions of the academic staffs' motives. However, organizational concern motives of the academic staffs is correlated with these motives of the teller staffs.

Insert Table 2 here

6. Discussion and Conclusion

Motives can only be monitored from when an individual relates with others of the same type. Someone who is not close to the individual does not understand the motives. This is in accordance with social identity and self categorization theories. The two theory state that individuals classify themselves based the category that they have by maximizing differences to out-group an individual, interacting more frequently with those of the same kind, and sharing the same experience and values (Hogg & Terry, 2000). In the banks, teller staffs have the same types of works and they have no special creativity to do their works. They know what to do their works each other and day by day their works is routine. Meanwhile, the academic staffs, especially the lecturers have many types of the way to do their works. They always have much creativities in teaching, research, and public service (duty three). The difference of work types makes the difference motives of organizational citizenship behavior. The motives can only be identified by oneself or others who are close to him/her. In this case, the tellers knows what to do each other, but the academic staff or lecturer don't. This makes the two parties keep their distance and do no categorize the others into their groups. This situation does not allow academic staffs to understand other's organizational citizenship behavior motives.

The role identity theory admits that organizational motives makes individuals are willing to volunteer, to be committed towards the organization, and to act on behalf of the organization, that directly drive the volunteers' behavior in accordance with their roles (Penner & Finkelstein, 1998). Organizational concern motives and prosocial value motives actually are altruistic motives (Finkelstein, 2006; Finkelstein & Penner, 2004; Penner et al., 1997; Rioux & Penner, 2001). However, the motives have strong loading factors as those of the impression management motives. This is consistent with the results of Wayne and Liden's research (1995) that states that the impression management can focus more on the supervisors or work that leads to self promotion. The impression shown by individuals is directed to certain people who are of the same type. Those people have social needs to make good impression because that will give them feedback. Organizational concern motives of

academic staffs is lower than organizational concern motives of teller staffs. This difference because of the academic staff is more concern to the works. Their responsibility is educating their student with the hard skills and soft skills. Organizational performance will be increased if the academic staffs bring about this responsibility. Organizational performance is not been influenced directly. Meanwhile, teller staffs have more organizational concern motives because of their task is just for organization. Prosocial values motives of the academic staffs and the teller staffs is difference, but both of mean is high. This reveal the high social values of the research respondents. Impression management motives of teller staffs are more than the academic staffs. It is because of hierarchical authority of bank staffs. Promotion of the bank staffs is depend on their supervisor, so they need to make good impression because that will give them good feedback. Promotion of the academic staffs doesn't depend on their supervisor (rector, dean, or chairman of department), but depends on their achievement of teaching, research or publishing articles, and public servicing. It makes the academic staffs don't have to make good impression.

The result of the test found that there was a significant difference in the scores of the overall motives of OCB between banks and universities. The overall findings reveal that the academic staff at the banks have a higher level of motives of OCB. The comparative data on the motives of of the banks teller staff and universities academic staff to OCB also found that the bank staff's motives of OCB is significantly different. They were significantly different in the three aspects; organizational concern motives, prosocial values motives, and impression management motives. There are a number of possible explanations. Firstly, universities in total motives of organizational citizenship behavior agreement with motives of OCB may link this to their intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of their job which leads to the achievement of overall job satisfaction because of the inclusion of the teaching, research, and public servicing. The perks and job security may also be the possible reasons for the academic staff at the universities to have a high sense of motives. Secondly, the scenario at the universities is quite different. The achievement of universities academic staff is in teaching, research, and public servicing, not to make good impression to the supervisor as in the banks. Thirdly, since this study is based on self assessment, the possibility of a common method bias may have cause the direction to be in favor with the universities' academic staff and the bank's teller staff.

It is interesting to note that a high percentage (over 66.2 percent) of the academic staff of the universities were in agreement that they care about OCB in their universities and over 82.5 percent of the teller staff of the banks were in agreement that they care about OCB in their banks. This may indicate that the academic staff from universities and the teller staff from banks in Indonesia were not only aware but were fully concerned about the importance of OCB. Thus, policy makers and the academic leaders at the universities should consider embracing service quality as the universities' mission and place it in ranking as priority one.

This research has its theoretical implications on the key area related to addition of new knowledge in the literature of academic staff's and teller staff's motives of organizational citizenship behavior. This study also examines empirically the role of the academic staff's and teller staff's motives in enhancing performance in these institution if all staff bring about OCB in both the banks and universities. From the managerial perspective, this study provides invaluable inputs for academic leaders and policy makers at the universities and banks in Indonesia by building motives of *organizational citizenship behavior* as the voluntarism activity to increased organizational performance. This study also has its share of limitation in the sampling frame which only considers a particular group of institutions of higher education (selected universities only) and selected banks in Indonesia, especially in Java island, therefore the results cannot be generalized to the whole industry. Future studies should also consider alternative modes of enquires such as employing the longitudinal method of data collection design (e.g. experiments, archival data, observations or interviews) and a nationwide survey covering samples from the whole population of the institutions in Indonesia.

References

- Aryee, S., Wyatt, T., & Stone, R. (1996). Early Career Outcomes of Graduate Employee: The Effect of Mentoring and Ingratiation. *Journal of Management Studies*, 33(1), 95-118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1996.tb00800.x>
- Bolino, M. C. (1999). Citizenship and Impression Management: Good Soldiers or Good Actors? *Academy of Management Review*, 24(1), 82-98.
- Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Bloodgood, J. M. (2002). Citizenship Behavior and the Creation of Social Capital. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(4), 505-522.

- Clary, E. G., Ridge, R. D., Stukas, A. A., Snyder, M., Copeland, J., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and Assessing the Motivations of Volunteers: A Functional Approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(6), 1516-1530. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1516>
- Crant, J. M. (1996). Doing More Harm Than Good: When is Impression Management Likely to Evoke A Negative Response? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26*(16), 1454-1471. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1996.tb00080.x>
- Eastman, K. K. (1994). In The Eyes of The Beholder: An Attributional Approach to Ingratiation and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(4), 1379-1391. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256678>
- Fandt, P. M., & Ferris, G. R. (1990). The Management of Information and Impressions: When Employee Behave Opportunistically. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process, 45*(1), 140-158. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(90\)90008-W](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(90)90008-W)
- Farmer, S. M., Tierney, P., & Kung-McIntyre, K. (2003). Employee Creativity in Taiwan: An Application of Role Identity Theory. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(5), 618-630. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/30040653>
- Ferris, G. R., Judge, T. A., Rowland, K. M., & Fitzgibbons, D. E. (1994). Subordinate Influence and The Performance Evaluation Process: Test of A Model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process, 58*(1), 101-135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1994.1030>
- Finkelstein, M. A. (2006). Dispositional Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Motives, Motive Fulfillment, and Role Identity. *Social Behavior and Personality, 34*(6), 603-616. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2006.34.6.603>
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2004.32.4.383>
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis with Readings*, (5nd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International, Inc.
- Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. (2000). Social Identity and Self-Categorization Processes in Organizational Contexts. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(1), 121-140.
- Hu, Y.-A., & Liu, D.-Y. (2003). Altruism versus Egoism in Human Behavior of Mixed Motives. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 62*(4), 677-705. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1536-7150.00240>
- Jex, S. M., Adams, G. A., Bachrach, D. G., & Sorenson, S. (2003). The Impact of Situational Constraints, Role Stressors, and Commitment on Employee Altruism. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 8*(3), 171-180. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.8.3.171>
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The Social Psychology of Organization*, (1nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression Management: A Literature Review and Two-Component Model. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*(1), 34-47. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.1.34>
- Omoto, A. M., & Snyder, M. (1995). Sustained Helping without Obligation: Motivation, Longevity of Service, and Perceived Attitude Change among AIDS Volunteers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*(4), 671-686. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.68.4.671>
- Penner, L. A., & Finkelstein, M. A. (1998). Dispositional and Structural Determinants of Volunteerism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(2), 525-537. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.2.525>
- Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., & Schroeder, D. A. (2005). Prosocial Behavior: Multilevel Perspectives. *Annu. Rev. Psychol, 56*, 365-392. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070141>
- Penner, L. A., Midili, A. R., & Kegelmeyer, J. (1997). Beyond Job Attitudes: A Personality and Social Psychology Perspective on The Causes of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 111-131. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_4
- Rioux, S. M., & Penner, L. A. (2001). The Causes of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Motivational Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(6), 1306-1314. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.6.1306>
- Schenk, R. E. (1987). Altruism as A Source of Self-Interested Behavior. *Public Choice, 53*(2), 187-192. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00125850>

Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2010). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach*, (5nd ed.). New York: A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Publication.

Snyder, M. (1993). Basic Research and Practice Problems: The Promise of a Functional Personality and Social Psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19(3), 251-264. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167293193001>

Tang, T. L.-P., Sutarso, T., Davis, G. M.-T. W., Dolinski, D., Ibrahim, A. H. S., & Wagner, S. L. (2008). To Help or Not Help ? The Good Samaritan Effect and The Love of Money on Helping Behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82(4), 865-887. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9598-7>

Turban, D. B., & Dougherty, T. W. (1994). Role of Protégé Personality in Receipt of Mentoring and Career Success. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 688-702. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256706>

Wayne, S. J., & Liden, R. C. (1995). Effects of Impression Management on Performance Ratings: A Longitudinal Study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 232-260. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256734>

Othman, R., Ghani, R.A., and Arshad, R. (2001). Great Expectations-CEO's Perception of The Performance Gap of The HRM Function in The Malaysian Manufacturing. *Personnel Review*, 30, 61-80. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00483480110380145>

Tabel 1. Types of Organizations and Motives of OCB

Types Organization and Motives	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error of Mean	t	Sign.
Organizational Concern Motives – Banks	4.2987	0.41994	0.01665	11.276	0.000
Organizational Concern Motives – Universities	3.9878	0.49836	0.01976		
Prosocial Values Motives – Banks	4.5517	0.39800	0.01578	17.800	0.000
Prosocial Values Motives – Universities	4.1127	0.45962	0.01823		
Impression Management Motives – Banks	4.1832	0.51599	0.02046	22.549	0.000
Impression Management Motives – Universities	3.4625	0.63606	0.02522		
All Motives – Banks	3.8543	0.39350	0.01560	22.342	0.000
All Motives – Universities	4.3445	0.35391	0.01403		

Table 2. Correlation between Research Variables

Notes	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Org. Concern Motives – Banks	1,000					
2 Prosocial Val. Motives – Banks	0,532**	1,000				
3 Imp. Mgmt Motives – Banks	0,303**	0,529**	1,000			
4 Org. Concern Motives – Universities	-0,141**	-0,049	-0,062	1,000		
5 Prosocial Val. Motives – Universities	-0,107**	-0,047	-0,101*	0,663**	1,000	
6 Imp. Mgmt Motives – Universities	-0,065	-0,009	0,032	0,194**	0,173*	1,000

**p ≤ 0,01

*p ≤ 0,05