
PERSONALITY AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Mihaela Man, PhD Student, "Al. Ioan Cuza" University of Iași
Ticu Constantin, Prof., PhD, "Al. Ioan Cuza" University of Iași

Abstract: Within this research we analyzed on the one hand the relationship existing among the motivational persistence, seen as a personality factor, which includes three sub-factors: long term purposes pursuing, current purposes pursuing, recurrence of unattained purposes, and on the other hand the organizational citizenship behaviour. We also made a predictive model for organizational citizenship behaviour, taking into account the personality factors, model which will be followed during the hiring process.

Keywords: *personality, motivational persistence, predictive model, organizational citizenship behaviour*

1. Introduction

The interest towards employees' professional performance and organizational performance has led to an increase in the number of studies that focus on identifying employee behaviours that lead to an increased organizational performance. The increased interest manifested throughout the last three decades towards identifying behaviours that lead to higher organizational performance, other than behaviours that presume a direct involvement in tasks, has resulted in the emergence of a considerable palette, out of which we can mention: *organizational citizenship behaviour* (Smith, Organ & Near, 1983; Organ, 1988; Organ, Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 2006), *contextual performance* (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993), *citizenship performance* (Borman, Penner, Alen & Motowidlo, 2001), *organizational spontaneity* (George & Brief, 1992), *prosocial organizational behaviour* (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986), *extra-role behaviour* (Van Dyne, Cummings & Parks, 1995), *proactive behaviour in organizations* (Crant, 2000), *personal initiative* (Frese & Fay, 2001), *adaptive performance* (Pulakos, Arad, Donovan & Plamondon, 2000).

Throughout this work we will focus our attention on organizational citizenship behaviour, which has received up until now a series of ample analysis as far as antecedents are concerned (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Chiaburu, Oh, Berry, Li & Gardner, 2010), antecedents which we will insist on throughout our study, but also deepening this relationship by a detailed analysis of the relation between the factors and sub-factors of the Big Five model and the sub-factors of motivational persistence.

2. The concepts of research

2.1. Organizational citizenship behaviour

Organizational citizenship behaviour is an „individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal rewards system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988, p. 4). At the factors level of the organizational citizenship behaviour Smith et al., (1983) suggest a number of two factors, namely: altruism and generalized compliance. Throughout this paper the references to organizational citizenship behaviour will be made according to the initial model suggested by Smith et al., (1983).

2.2. Personality factors – the Big Five Model

The most widely used personality models in industrial/organizational psychology research and practice have lately been the five factor models (McCrae & Costa, 1987; Goldberg, 1999). Prior to the development of these vast five-factor models, which suggest the existence of five meta-factors, each having its attached sub-factors, a number of other models had been given attention to, such as: Fiske, 1949; Norman, 1963 or Borgatta, 1964. Throughout this paper the references to the aspects of the five personality factors will be done in accordance with the IPIP-NEO model, which was suggested by Goldberg in 1999 and finalized in 2006 by Goldberg et al.. According to the IPIP-NEO model, there are six sub-factors attached to the five personality factors, for example the factor of agreeableness has the following sub-factors attached to it: trust, morality, altruism, cooperation, modesty and sympathy.

As regards the personality factors seen as antecedents of the organizational citizenship behaviour there have been a series of studies that have presented arguments in favour of their existence (Organ, 1994; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Ilies, Fulmer, Spitzmuller & Johnson, 2009; Chiaburu, Oh, Berry, Li & Gardner, 2010) and several meta-analysis that probe the existence of significant relations between the factors of the Big Five Model and work performance for different categories of employees (Salgado, 1997; Hurtz & Donovan, 2000; Judge & Ilies, 2002; Dudley, Orvis, Lebiecki & Cortina, 2006; Morgeson & al., 2007; Judge, Klinger, Simon & Wen Fen Yang, 2008).

2.3. Motivational persistence

Motivational persistence represents another concept that we will analyze throughout this paper. We will define motivational persistence according to Constantin (2013) and namely as being the „predisposition of a person to persist in motivation concerning the effort directed to reaching an assumed goal (once the decision of motivational implication has been made), finding the necessary personal resources for overcoming obstacles and resisting routine, stress, fatigue and other distractions”, simultaneously considered a stable personality trait with three dimensions, according to the time axis, namely: long term purpose pursuing, current purpose pursuing and recurrence of unattained purposes (Constantin, Holman & Hajbotă, 2012). As concepts related to motivational persistence we can mention: perseverance (Londoner, 1972; 1999; Williams & DeSteno, 2008), grit (Duckworth, Peterson, Matthews & Kelly, 2007), tenacity (Gollwitzer, Parks Stam, Jaudas & Sheeran Paschal, 2007); industriousness (Eisenberger, 1992).

3. The relation between personality variables and organizational citizenship behaviour

As far as the relation between personality factors and professional performance is concerned, the results of the meta-analysis reveal the fact that the conscientiousness personality factor is a predictor of professional performance for different performance criteria: Barrick & Mount, 1991; Tett, Jackson & Rothstein, 1997; Hertz & Donovan, 2000; Dudley et al., 2006. More specifically, conscientiousness as a personality factor has been identified as being in a positive relation with organizational citizenship behaviour (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Ilies et al., 2009; Chiaburu et al., 2010). Similarly to conscientiousness, the agreeableness personality factor has been identified as a valid predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Ilies et al., 2009; Chiaburu et al., 2010).

The relation between motivational persistence and professional performance has been analysed in Romania by Țuțu and Constantin (2012). The data reveal that two of the factors of motivational persistence are correlated with performance (long term purpose pursuing and current purpose pursuing), also having a predictive force as far as performance is concerned.

4. Research methodology

4.1. Research hypothesis

Hypothesis 1

There is a significant positive relation between organizational citizenship behaviour and two of the factors of the Big Five model (conscientiousness and agreeableness);

Hypothesis 2

There is a significant positive relation between the sub-factors of motivational persistence (long term purpose pursuing, current purpose pursuing and recurrence of unattained purposes) and organizational citizenship behaviour

Hypothesis 3

There is a valid predictive model of organizational citizenship behaviour according to the personality sub-factors of the Big Five Model and the sub-factors of motivational persistence.

4.2. Measures:

a) Organizational citizenship behaviour evaluation questionnaire (Smith et al., 1983), containing a number of 16 items, the answers to the items being evaluated on a scale of 1 to 5, 5 being *very characteristic* and 1 being *not at all characteristic*.

b) The Big Five©plus personality inventory developed by Constantin et al., (2013). The questionnaire has a number of 240 items and allows the evaluation of the five meta-factors and the 30 facets/ subsumed factors of the five meta-factors.

c) The Motivational Persistence Scale (Constantin, 2013) allows the evaluation of motivational persistence, with the focus of identifying the three factors: long term purpose pursuing (LTPP), current purpose pursuing (CPP) and recurrence of unattained purposes (RUP).

4.3. Participants

The lot of subjects was made up of 102 operators of the water production and distribution system. The average age of the operators is $M=51$, ($SD=6.70$).

5. The obtained results and their interpretation

5.1. Verifying the research hypothesis

To verify the first hypothesis we have calculated the Pearson r correlation coefficient between the personality factors of the Big Five Model (conscientiousness and agreeableness)

and organizational citizenship behaviour.

According to the resulting data there is a significant positive correlation between the conscientiousness personality factor and organizational citizenship behaviour ($r = 0,19$, $p < 0,05$) of the operators. Operators with a higher level of conscientiousness tend to exhibit a higher level of organizational citizenship behaviour.

The agreeableness personality factor is in a significant positive correlation with organizational citizenship behaviour ($r = 0,20$, $p < 0,05$). We can conclude that operators with a higher level of agreeableness tend to exhibit a higher level of organizational citizenship behaviour.

Verifying the second hypothesis has also been done by calculating the Pearson r correlation coefficient between the sub-factor of motivational persistence and organizational citizenship behaviour. Based on the analysis there is a significant positive relation between the recurrence of unattained purposes sub-factor and organizational citizenship behaviour ($r = 0,23$, $p < 0,05$), but there are no significant correlations between the sub-factors of motivational persistence (long term purpose pursuing and current purpose pursuing) and organizational citizenship behaviour. Operators with a higher level of recurrence of unattained purposes tend to exhibit a higher level of organizational citizenship behaviour.

The third hypothesis has been verified through a multiple regression analysis. We preliminarily checked the existing linearity between the dependent variables and the independent variables and the orthogonality of the predictor variables. Potential predictors being associated in blocks, three sub-factors of conscientiousness forming the first block, factor identified in speciality literature as being a predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour. The factors included in the first block have obtained during the preliminary analysis the highest correlation coefficient at the level of conscientiousness personality factor and organizational citizenship behaviour: cautiousness, dutifulness and self-efficacy. Into the second block we have also introduced two other sub-factors of conscientiousness: orderliness and self-discipline, and in the third block we have introduced the sub-factor of motivational persistence that has a significant positive relation with organizational citizenship behaviour, which is recurrence of unattained purposes (RUP). The results show that model 1, which contains the variables: cautiousness, dutifulness and self-efficacy, explains best the organizational citizenship behaviour identified at the level of operators; as such, operators with higher scores at dutifulness and cautiousness sub-factors, and who also have lower scores at the self-efficacy sub-factor; tend to manifest a higher organizational citizenship

behaviour. Model 1 reached an adjusted value of $R^2_{ajustat} = .203$, which means that the model explains 20.3 % of the variation of organizational citizenship behaviour (table 1).

Organizational citizenship behaviour tends to be higher if operators are: extremely fair people, with a very well-developed sense of duty and moral obligations, for whom all rules are made to be unconditionally respected, being very demanding when it comes to principles, norms and promises; who are very preoccupied by obligations and responsibilities; who always allow themselves time to think before making a decision and carefully weigh all the consequences; who prefer to have all the available data and analyze them in detail when making decisions and who consider that they are not in control of their lives and believe in a present destiny, doubting their professional competences and sometimes having the impression that things are out of their control, and who generally only feel capable and ready in situations that are clear and that have been experienced by them and are not convinced that they can accomplish everything they set out to.

	Variables	B	Standard error B	BETA
MODEL 1	dutifulness	,785	,201	,382*
	self-efficacy	-,552	,216	-,256**
	cautiousness	,555	,245	,224**
MODEL 2	dutifulness	570	,234	,277**
	self-efficacy	-,596	,217	-,275*
	cautiousness	,404	,273	,163
	self-discipline	,375	,221	,189
	orderliness	,145	,219	,070
MODEL 3	dutifulness	,563	,229	,274**
	self-efficacy	-,578	,212	-,266*
	cautiousness	,448	,268	,181
	self-discipline	,404	,217	,204
	orderliness	-,024	,227	-,011
	recurrence of unattained purposes (RUP)	,121	,056	,218**
*significant at level 0,01				
** significant at level 0,05				

Table 1. The data resulting from the multiple hierarchic regression of the predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour

6. Discussions

The results obtained through this study regarding the existing correlation between

personality factors and organizational citizenship behaviour have revealed that there is a connection between personality factors: conscientiousness and agreeableness and organizational citizenship behaviour; the results were in accordance with the data obtained in previous studies: Organ and Ryan, 1995; Ilies et al., 2009; Chiaburu et al., 2010. The prepared predictive model has revealed the fact that the predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour are the sub-factors of conscientiousness: dutifulness, self-efficacy and cautiousness. In the organizational citizenship behaviour model that we have created there are three conscientiousness sub-factors, but with a positive relation between the sub-factor of cautiousness and organizational citizenship behaviour, which contradicts the meta-analysis of Dudley et al., (2006). The results we have obtained confirm the necessity of focusing our attention from the analysis of the five personality meta-factors to the level of their sub-factors, just as in the case of the other elements embedded at the level of the employees' professional performance.

The results regarding the relation between organizational citizenship behaviour (aspect of professional performance) and motivational persistence have revealed the fact that the sub-factors of motivational persistence (long term purpose pursuing and current purpose pursuing) show no significant relation. On the other hand, the recurrence of unattained purposes sub-factor of motivational persistence is in a significant positive correlation with the display of organizational citizenship behaviour, data which differs from the result of the research done by ȚuȚu and Constantin (2012) who took into account task performance (aspect of professional performance).

Conclusions

We can conclude that the factors conscientiousness and agreeableness have been identified as being in a significant positive relation with organizational citizenship behaviour, the results being enrolled in the data provided by studies aimed at the analysis of this relation. At the level of the relation between the sub-factors of motivational persistence and organizational citizenship behaviour we have identified a significant positive relation only with the recurrence of unattained purposes sub-factor. The resulting predictive model for organizational citizenship behaviour has as predictors: dutifulness, self-efficacy and cautiousness.

References

- Barrick, M. R. & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1), 1-26.
- Borgatta, E. F. (1964). The structure of personality characteristics. *Behavioral Science*, 9(1), 8-17.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In Schmitt, N. & Borman, W. C. (Eds). *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- 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(4), 710-725.
- Chiaburu, D. S., Oh, I. S., Berry, C. M., Li, N., & Gardner, R. G. (2010). The five-factor model of personality traits and organizational citizenship behaviors: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(6), 1-27.
- Constantin, T. (2013). *Manualul scalei de persistență motivațională. Probă standardizată de evaluare a persistenței motivaționale* (unpublished manuscript).
- Constantin, T., Holman A., & Hojbotă, A. M. (2012). Development and validation of a motivational persistence scale. *Psihologija*, 2011, 45 (2), 99–120.
- Constantin, T., Macarie, A.E., Gheorghiu, A., Căldare, L., Fodorea, A., Iliescu, M., Hajbotă, A.M., Iordache, A., Tudose, O., Potlog, M. C., Urzică, A., & Gavriiloaiei. (2013). *The Big Five^{®plus} Inventory* (unpublished manuscript).
- Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management*. 26(3), 435-462.
- Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D.R. (2007). Grit: Perseverance and Passion for Long – Term Goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92 (6), 1087-1101.
- Dudley, N. M., Orvis, K. A., Lebiecki, J. E., & Cortina, J. M. (2006). A meta-analytic investigation of conscientiousness in the prediction of job performance: Examining the intercorrelation and the incremental validity of narrow traits. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 19(1), 40-57.
- Eisenberger, R. (1992). Learned Industriousness. *Psychological Review*, 99 (2), 248-267.
- Fiske, D. W. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structures of personality ratings from different sources. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 44, 329- 344.

- Frese, M., & Fay, D. (2001). Personal initiative (PI): An active performance concept for work in the 21st century. In B.M. Staw & R.M. Sutton (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 23, pp. 133-187). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good- doing good: a conceptual analysis of the mood of work - organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(2), 310-329.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public-domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several Five – Factor models. In Mervielde, I., Deary, I. J., De Fruyt, F. & Ostendorf, F. (Eds), *Personality Psychology in Europe*, (vol. 7, pp. 7-28). Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.
- Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., & Gough, H. G. (2006). The international personality item pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 84-96.
- Gollwitzer, P., Parks Stam, E., Jaudas, A. & Sherran, P. (2007). Flexible tenacity in goal pursuit. In James, Y. (Eds), *Handbook of motivation science*. New York: Guilford Press, (pp.325-341).
- Hurtz G. M., & Donovan J. J. (2000). Personality and Job Performance: The Big Five Revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(6), 869-879.
- Ilies, R., I. S. Fulmer, M. Spitzmuller & M. D. Johnson (2009). Personality and citizenship behavior: the mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4), 945-959.
- Judge, T. A., & Ilies, R. (2002). Relationship of personality to performance motivation: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87(4),797-807.
- Judge, T. A., Klinger, R., Simon, L. S., & Yang, W. F. (2008). The contributions of personality to organizational behavior and psychology: findings, criticisms, and future research directions. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(5), 1982-2000.
- Londoner, C. (1972). Perseverance versus nonperseverance patterns among adult high school students. *Adult Education*, 22.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 81-90.
- Morgeson, F. P., Campion, M. A., Dipbooy, R. L., Hollenbeek, J. R., Murphy, K., & Schmitt, N. (2007). Reconsidering the use of personality tests in personnel selection context. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(3), 683-729.
- Norman, W. T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66(6), 574-583.

- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA : Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. (1994). Personality and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management*, 20(2), 465-478.
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior. Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- 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.
- Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. A., & Plamondon, K.E. (2000). Adaptability in the workplace: development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(4), 612-624.
- Salgado, J. F. (1997). The five factor model of personality and job performance in the European community. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 30-43.
- 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.
- Tett, R. P., Jackson, D.N., & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(4),703-742.
- Țuțu, A., & Constantin, T. (2012). Understanding job performance through persistence and job competency. *Procedias. Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 33, 612-616.
- Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & Parks, J. M. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: in pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). In Cummings, L. L., & Staw, B.M. (Eds), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, (Vol. 17, pp. 215- 285). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Williams, L., & DeSteno, D. (2008). Pride and perseverance: the motivational rol of pride. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(6), 1007-1017.