

**ARE CHAMELEONS GOOD CITIZENS?  
A LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF THE  
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF-  
MONITORING AND ORGANIZATIONAL  
CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR**

Gerald L. Blakely

*West Virginia University*

Martha C. Andrews

*University of North Carolina at Wilmington*

Jack Fuller

*West Virginia University*

**ABSTRACT:** In this study the relationship between self-monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) was examined longitudinally among professional and managerial employees of a federal government research laboratory. Supervisory ratings of subordinates' OCBs were collected and matched with 172 subordinates' self-ratings of self-monitoring, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and perceptions of job characteristics. One year later, supervisory ratings of subordinates' OCBs were again collected. Support was found for the hypothesis that individuals high in self-monitoring are more likely to perform OCBs which are other-directed. Implications for management and future research are discussed.

**KEY WORDS:** OCB; self-monitoring; job satisfaction; commitment; organizational support.

In their original conceptualization, Bateman and Organ (1983) and Smith, Organ, and Near (1983), generally defined organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as job behavior which is discretionary on the part of the individual, not formally recognized by the organizational reward

---

Address correspondence to Gerald L. Blakely, College of Business and Economics, Department of Management and Industrial Relations, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26506-6025. E-mail: gblakely@wvu.edu.

system, yet contributes to the effectiveness of the organization. Since then, researchers have focused their efforts on identifying antecedents of OCB (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Rioux & Penner, 2001). These antecedents can be generally classified as either context-relevant attitudes, motives, or dispositional. The context-relevant attitudes include job satisfaction (e.g., Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983; Williams & Anderson, 1991), perceptions of fairness (e.g., Konovsky & Folger, 1991; Moorman, 1991), organizational commitment (Becker, 1992), perceived organizational support (Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1995) and job characteristics (Farh, Podsakoff, & Organ, 1990; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). This body of research holds that the performance of OCB is reactive (Rioux & Penner, 2001). More specifically, the decision to perform OCB is in reaction to one's perceptions of organizational characteristics.

While context-relevant attitudes have received the most consistent empirical support (Organ & Ryan, 1995), researchers have also begun examining individual motives as well as dispositional characteristics that predict OCB. Research investigating motives presume the performance of OCB is proactive and that individuals engage in these activities ultimately to gain a valued outcome (Bolino, 1999; Hui, Lam, & Law, 2000; Rioux & Penner, 2001). For example, Hui et al. found that individuals perform OCB to the extent they believe these behaviors are instrumental in receiving promotions. Moorman and Harland (2002) found that temporary employees will perform more OCB when they seek a permanent position with the employing organization. Bolino (1999) suggested individuals perform OCB for impression management reasons. These studies rely on a functional approach in that they try to identify the purpose that is served by a behavior (e.g., Rioux & Penner, 2001). Under the functional approach, individuals proactively engage in OCB based on their own goals and needs rather than responding to perceptions of their jobs or the organization. However, there are difficulties with measuring and isolating motives with this approach as Rioux & Penner state "This [functional] approach . . . does not assume that if two people engage in the same behavior, they have the same motives; nor does it assume that most behaviors serve only one motive. The same behavior may have multiple motives" (p. 1306).

Given the challenges of identifying motives as a way of understanding OCB, some researchers have turned their attention to dispositional variables that may explain the performance of OCB. Dispositional predictors found to be positively related to the performance of OCB include conscientiousness (Neuman & Kickul, 1998; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Konovsky & Organ, 1996), protestant work ethic (Ryan, 2002), achievement orientation, agreeableness (Neuman & Kickul, 1998), moral judgment (Wagner & Rush, 2000) and individualism-collectivism (Moorman & Blakely, 1995; Van Dyne et al., 2000). Similarly, we follow suggestions by Organ and Ryan (1995) to identify additional dispositional variables

that predict OCB by examining an important, yet neglected variable; self monitoring (Snyder, 1974). Self monitoring pertains to one's ability to read and respond to social cues. Hence, the purpose of the present study is threefold. First, we confirm that OCB is positively related to the context-relevant attitudes of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perception of organizational support, and motivating potential of the job. Second, we examine the relationship of self monitoring and OCB. Finally, we extend past research by examining these relationships using longitudinal data gathered from a sample of professional and managerial employees of a federal government research facility.

### SELF-MONITORING

High self-monitors are sensitive to the requirements of a particular situation and can readily adjust their own behavior to fit that situation (Snyder, 1987). High self-monitors tend to rely more on situational verbal and non-verbal cues than on their internal feelings and attitudes to determine the appropriateness of their own behavior. High self-monitors actively monitor and regulate their own behavior in the presence of others. At the other extreme, low self-monitors are less sensitive to and less concerned with their own impact on others and are guided more by their internal feelings and attitudes than by situational cues. Low self-monitors behave according to their own internal states rather than according to external cues.

Previous research has found that high self-monitors, compared with low self-monitors, perform better in boundary spanning positions, which require sensitivity to social cues and communicating and interacting with different groups of people (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1982); perform better in jobs which require good communications skills (Larkin, 1987); are more likely to emerge as group leaders (Dobbins, Long, & Dedrick, 1990); are more likely to occupy central positions in social networks (Mehra, Kilduff, & Brass, 2001), and are more likely to resolve conflict through collaboration and compromise rather than through avoidance and competition (Baron, 1989). Finally, high self-monitors are more likely to be promoted (Kilduff & Day, 1994). In summary, it appears that high self-monitors, compared with low self-monitors, in addition to being sensitive to and adjusting their behavior to particular situations, may have better communication and interpersonal skills.

#### *Self-Monitoring and OCB*

The preceding suggests that self-monitoring may be related to OCB, but in particular to the interpersonal dimensions. Williams and Anderson's (1991) study provided support for two broad categories of OCB:

behaviors, like altruism and courtesy (Organ, 1988), directed specifically toward individuals (OCBI) and behaviors, like generalized compliance (Organ, 1988) directed toward the organization in general (OCBO). Specifically, we believe that self-monitoring is more strongly related to the interpersonal dimensions of OCB. High self-monitors are more likely to be sensitive to others' need for help, one of the dimensions of OCB, and may be better able to adjust their own behavior to provide such help. Further, high self-monitors may simply be more skilled communicators and possess better interpersonal skills and more easily engage in OCBs when necessary. Rioux and Penner (2001) found that prosocial values motives were more strongly related to OCBI than OCBO. Prosocial values include helping others, being concerned for others' feelings, and being friendly and courteous. Turnley and Bolino (2001) suggested high self-monitors can use impression management tactics more effectively than low self-monitors. We believe that it might be easier for high self-monitors to express prosocial values as well as manage impressions because of their ability to read and respond to social situations. Thus, it is likely that these individuals will be more apt to perform OCB directed at other individuals.

H1: The relationship between self-monitoring and the interpersonal dimensions of OCB is greater than the relationship between self-monitoring and the non-interpersonal dimensions of OCB.

## METHOD

### *Sample*

The sample used in this study consisted of employees of a federal government research facility. Two hundred and three professional and managerial employees were administered a questionnaire which contained measures of self-monitoring. Also included in this questionnaire were measures of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and perceptions of job characteristics. These were collected as control variables to provide a stronger test of our hypothesis. These questionnaires were administered in small groups and collected on-site. Individuals were provided a pre-addressed envelope so that the questionnaire could be mailed directly to the researchers if desired. Individuals were asked to place their name on the completed questionnaire so that responses could be matched with the supervisory ratings of OCB. The supervisors of the 203 employees were asked to complete a measure of OCB for their subordinates and mail the completed questionnaire di-

rectly to the researchers. Confidentiality of the supervisor and subordinate responses was guaranteed.

There were 172 matched supervisor/subordinate questionnaires for a response rate of 85 percent. The matched questionnaires represented 71 supervisors, thus usable matched data consisted of two subordinates OCB ratings per supervisor, on average. The average age of the subordinates was 38.9 years with a standard deviation of 12.84. The average tenure with the organization was 10 years with a standard deviation of 7.67 years. Approximately 84 percent of the sample were males. Although data regarding education level were not collected in the questionnaire, discussions with senior management indicated that most of the employees in this sample have graduate degrees, including many with doctorates.

We also collected supervisory ratings of OCB one year after the initial data collection. For the 190 subordinate responses which we received during the initial wave, 155 matched supervisory rated OCB questionnaires were received during the second data collection.

### *Measures*

*Organizational Citizenship Behavior.* OCB was measured with the 21 item scale developed by Moorman and Blakely (1992, 1995) which was based on Graham's (1989) dimensions of OCB, but also included items which referenced Organ's (1988) dimensions. Responses were made on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). The four dimensions included interpersonal helping, individual initiative, loyal boosterism, and personal industry. Interpersonal helping (six items) focuses on helping co-workers when such help is needed. Individual initiative (five items) focuses on communications to others in the work place to improve individual and group performance. For example, one of the interpersonal helping items is "goes out of his/her way to help co-workers with work-related problems" and one of the individual initiative items is "encourages hesitant or quiet co-workers to voice their opinions when they otherwise might not speak-up." The interpersonal helping and individual initiative dimensions are both other directed and consistent with Williams and Anderson's (1991) OCBI. Loyal boosterism (five items) focuses on promoting the organization's image. Personal industry (five items) focuses on task performance above and beyond normal role expectations. For example, one of the loyal boosterism items is "shows pride when representing the organization in public" and one of the personal industry items is "never misses work even when he/she has a legitimate reason for doing so." The loyal boosterism and personal industry dimensions are both organization directed and consistent with Williams and Anderson's (1991) OCBO.

A confirmatory factor analysis (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993) of this four dimension scale was conducted for the Time 1 supervisory responses. The data fit the model adequately ( $\chi^2 = 391.02$ ,  $df = 183$ ,  $p < .0001$ ; CFI = .92; RMSEA = .085). All indicators loaded significantly on their hypothesized factors with no significant cross-loadings. Cronbach's alphas for the interpersonal helping, individual initiative, loyal boosterism, and personal industry dimensions were .91, .90, .89, and .87, respectively.

*Self-Monitoring.* In this study we used the 18 item true-false version of Snyder and Gangestad's (1986) Self-monitoring scale. Example items included "I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them" and "I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain people." In this scale, the responses are coded 0 and 1, with a 1 indicating a high self-monitor. The 18 responses were then averaged. Previous research using this scale has demonstrated acceptable psychometric properties (Kilduff & Day, 1994; Snyder & Gangestad, 1986). Cronbach's alpha was .78.

#### *Control Variables*

In order to provide a rigorous test of our hypothesis, several control variables that have been found to be related to OCBs in previous research were included in the analysis.

*Organizational Commitment.* Organizational commitment was measured with the 16 item scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1984). Responses were made on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). Previous research using this scale has demonstrated acceptable psychometric properties (e.g., Shore & Wayne, 1993). Cronbach's alpha was .77.

*Job Satisfaction.* Job satisfaction was measured with the five satisfaction items from the JDS (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Responses were made on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). Cronbach's alpha was .80.

*Perceived Organizational Support.* Perceived organizational support was measured with the 17 item scale developed by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, and Sowa (1986). Responses were made on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .94.

*Task Characteristics.* Task characteristics were measured using the JDS developed by Hackman and Oldham (1976). Responses to most items in the scale were made on a 7-point scale (1 = very inaccurate to 7 = very

accurate). The five core dimensions of skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback from the job were multiplicatively combined to form the motivating potential score (MPS). The validity of this measure of task characteristics is well established (Fried & Ferris, 1987). Cronbach's alpha was .89.

## RESULTS

Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the study variables are presented in Table 1. An inspection of Table 1 reveals that the four OCB dimensions, at Time 1 and Time 2, are significantly correlated, which is consistent with previous studies of OCB.

Self-monitoring is significantly correlated with the interpersonal helping OCB dimension at Time 1 ( $r = .24, p < .01$ ) and at Time 2 ( $r = .18, p < .05$ ) and also with the individual initiative OCB dimension at Time 1 ( $r = .20, p < .01$ ) and at Time 2 ( $r = .20, p < .05$ ). Self-monitoring is not significantly correlated with loyal boosterism or personal industry at either Time 1 or Time 2.

To provide a stronger test of our hypothesis, the regression models in which the four OCB dimensions, at both Time 1 and Time 2, were regressed on self-monitoring and the control variables. The results of these regressions are presented in Table 2.

The change in  $F$  and  $r^2$ , by including self-monitoring in the regression models, after the control variables have been entered, is presented in Table 3.

An examination of the initial Time 1 model, in which interpersonal helping is regressed on self-monitoring and the four control variables, reveals that the model is statistically significant and that the relationship between interpersonal helping and self-monitoring remains statistically significant, after controlling for organizational commitment, job satisfaction, perceived organizational support, and the motivating potential score. The identical regression model with interpersonal helping collected at Time 2 is not statistically significant, although as demonstrated in Table 3, self-monitoring significantly predicts interpersonal helping even after taking into account the four control variables.

In the second model, in which Time 1 individual initiative is regressed on self-monitoring and the four control variables, self-monitoring remains statistically significant. With Time 2 individual initiative, the model is not statistically significant, although as demonstrated in Table 3, self-monitoring significantly predicts individual initiative even after taking into account the four control variables. In the third and fourth models, self-monitoring is not related to either loyal boosterism or per-

**Table 1**  
**Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations of Study Variables**

Variables	Mean	s.d.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Interpersonal helping-Time1	5.11	1.03												
2. Interpersonal helping-Time2	5.15	0.99	.77***											
3. Individual initiative-Time1	5.04	1.06	.79***	.62***										
4. Individual initiative-Time2	5.20	0.96	.60***	.74***	.68***									
5. Loyal boosterism-Time1	4.89	1.00	.69***	.59***	.62***	.52***								
6. Loyal boosterism-Time2	4.81	1.04	.55***	.66***	.51***	.63***	.71***							
7. Personal industry-Time1	5.27	1.08	.69***	.54***	.66***	.46***	.62***	.57***						
8. Personal industry-Time2	5.25	0.99	.53***	.58***	.54***	.57***	.54***	.64***	.75***					
9. Organizational commitment	4.37	0.78	.16*	.14	.08	-.01	.26**	.17*	.18*	.13				
10. Job satisfaction	3.88	1.16	.05	.03	.05	.03	.34***	.17*	.17*	.14	.60***			
11. Perceived organizational support	4.09	0.91	-.04	.07	-.01	-.07	.34***	.24**	.16*	.07	.46***	.55***		
12. Motivating potential score	148.31	63.52	.16	.08	.12	.08	.29***	.09	.13	.05	.46***	.64***	.49***	
13. Self-monitoring	0.37	0.21	.24**	.18*	.20**	.20*	.10	.05	.01	-.10	-.06	-.06	.04	.08

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

**Table 2**  
**OCB Dimensions (collected at Time 1 and at Time 2) Regressed on Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, Perceived Organizational Support, Motivating Potential Score, and Self-Monitoring, collected at Time 1<sup>a</sup>**

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables											
	Time 1		Time 2		Time 1		Time 2		Time 1		Time 2	
	Interpersonal Helping	Individual Initiative	Interpersonal Helping	Individual Initiative	Loyal Boosterism	Individual Initiative	Loyal Boosterism	Individual Initiative	Loyal Boosterism	Personal Industry	Individual Initiative	Personal Industry
Organizational commitment	.16 (1.23)	.15 (1.08)	.06 (0.42)	-.09 (-0.65)	.002 (0.01)	.00 (0.03)	.07 (0.51)	-.02 (-.17)	.00 (0.03)	.12 (0.97)	.13 (1.19)	.17 (1.54)
Job satisfaction	.01 (0.05)	-.06 (-0.50)	.04 (0.40)	.10 (0.95)	.19 (1.84)	.12 (0.97)	.03 (0.27)	.17 (1.54)	.27 (2.21)*	.03 (0.27)	.03 (0.27)	-.03 (-.27)
Perceived organizational support	-.19 (-1.76)	-.004 (-0.03)	-.13 (-1.18)	-.12 (-1.13)	.22 (2.04)*	.27 (2.21)*	.03 (0.27)	-.03 (-.27)	.03 (0.27)	.03 (0.27)	.03 (0.27)	-.03 (-.27)
Motivating potential score	.003 (1.88)	.001 (0.69)	.002 (1.33)	.001 (0.88)	.001 (0.78)	-.00 (-0.67)	.0003 (0.19)	.00 (-.10)	-.00 (-0.67)	.0003 (0.19)	-.003 (-0.24)	-.03 (-.82)
Self-monitoring	1.05 (2.73)**	.85 (2.19)*	1.02 (2.60)**	.99 (2.68)**	.54 (1.46)	.30 (0.75)	-.02 (-.04)	-.31 (-.82)	.30 (0.75)	-.02 (-.04)	-.02 (-.04)	-.31 (-.82)
F ratio	3.53**	1.53	2.31*	2.15	6.24***	2.27*	1.42	.96	2.27*	1.42	1.50	.03
N	140	138	148	139	140	138	150	139	138	150	150	139
R <sup>2</sup>	.12	.05	.08	.07	.19	.08	.05	.03	.08	.05	.05	.03

<sup>a</sup>t statistics in parenthesis.

\*p < .05, \*\*p < .01, \*\*\*p < .001.

**Table 3**  
**Change in F and R<sup>2</sup> by Including Self-Monitoring in Models, After Control Variables are Entered, at Time 1 and Time 2**

	<i>OCB Dimension</i>			
	Interpersonal Helping	Individual Initiative	Loyal Boosterism	Personal Industry
With Time 1 OCB				
Change in F	+1.104**	+1.16*	-.97	-.37
Change in R <sup>2</sup>	+.049**	+.044*	+.01	+.001
With Time 2 OCB:				
Change in F	+.84*	+1.29**	-.43	-.08
Change in R <sup>2</sup>	+.035*	+.049**	+.04	+.004

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ .

sonal industry, the OBCO dimensions at either Time 1 or Time 2. These results provide additional evidence in support of our hypothesis that self-monitoring is related to the interpersonal dimensions of OCB.

## DISCUSSION

In this study we found support for the hypothesis that the dispositional variable, self-monitoring, is positively related to the interpersonal dimensions of OCB. High self-monitors were more likely to help co-workers and communicate with them to improve individual and group performance. Self monitoring was not related to OCB directed at the organization at either Time 1 or Time 2. Hence, these results provide support for the notion that individuals may bring with them a predisposition to perform OCB directed at others and the organization has the ability to either enhance or limit these behaviors. This relationship held after controlling for job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceptions of organizational support, and the motivating potential of the job. Moreover, this study provided evidence of the temporal stability of these relationships and illustrate the importance of self monitoring in predicting OCBI.

Additionally, these results provide partial confirmation of past research indicating positive relationships between context-relevant attitudes and OCB. Specifically, the organization directed dimension of loyal boosterism was related to organizational commitment, job satisfaction, motivating potential, and perceived organizational support at Time 1. At Time 2, all of these relationships held except for motivating potential. The organization directed dimension of personal industry also was re-

lated to the context-relevant attitudes except for motivating potential at Time 1. However, none of these relationships held at Time 2. The other directed dimensions of interpersonal helping and individual initiative were generally not related to the context-relevant attitudes. Two exceptions were the relationships between organizational commitment and motivating potential with interpersonal helping at Time 1. This pattern of findings, that context-relevant attitudes are related to OCBO and not OCBI, is consistent with theories of social exchange (Blau, 1964) and reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960) that suggest reciprocation efforts by employees are directed at the source of benefits (Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996).

#### *Strengths and Limitations*

Although there are limitations with this study, we believe that the results of the present study are particularly strong for several reasons. First, the OCB ratings were obtained from the supervisor and were not subordinate self-ratings, which is characteristic of many studies of OCB. Thus, the common source problem of inflated relationships between OCB and other variables of interest was avoided. Organ and Ryan's (1995) meta-analysis of OCB studies found that relationships were greater when the subordinates rated their own OCBs than when the OCBs were rated by their supervisors. Second, this sample consisted entirely of professionals, for whom OCBs are more difficult to differentiate from normal, in-role job performance. For blue collar workers, who comprise the samples for much of OCB research, extra-role job behaviors are more easily identified (Organ & Ryan, 1995). Further, one might argue that a government facility would be a strong situation (Mischel, 1977), with rules, regulations, and numerous other constraints on behavior that would diminish the importance of individual dispositions in influencing behavior, thereby making the results of the current study particularly interesting. Third, the relationships between self-monitoring and the OCB dimensions were relatively stable one year after the initial data collection, thereby overcoming problems of causation and third variables (Zapf, Dormann, Frese, 1996). Finally, the relationship between self-monitoring and the two OCBI dimensions of interpersonal helping and individual initiative remained significant after controlling for job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and the motivating potential score.

There also are limitations which should be noted. First, the OCB scale used in this study has been used in previous research and has demonstrated acceptable psychometric properties; however, the validity of this scale is not yet established. Further, the results may simply be

due to the nature of the sample rather than widely generalizable to other work settings. The sample in this study consisted of educated professionals who were predominantly male.

### *Future Research and Managerial Implications*

While we have argued that individuals who are high self-monitors perform more citizenship behaviors, we have assumed that the cues sensed by the high self-monitor and not sensed by the low self-monitor are for the individual to be helpful to co-workers. It is possible, perhaps even likely, that in some organizations such norms and cues would not only be lacking but counter to our assumptions. In some organizations high self-monitors may be responsive to cues to not help co-workers (e.g., it's every woman for herself). Thus, in organizations which foster a spirit of cooperativeness, high self-monitors may exhibit greater citizenship while in organizations which foster individual competitiveness high self-monitors may exhibit less citizenship. Conceivably such differences could exist within a single organization, depending on the particular organizational subunit or level of the hierarchy. OCB research at the group level, as has been suggested by Organ and Ryan (1995), would be helpful in furthering our understanding of the self-monitoring OCB relationship. A second area of potential research pertains to other possible moderators of the self-monitoring-OCB relationship. Other than the potential moderating effect of organizational or sub-group norms, other potential moderators include leader behaviors and the extent, if any, to which the organization attempts to incorporate OCBs into its formal appraisal system.

Finally, these results suggest several implications for managers. First, by identifying the dispositional characteristic of self monitoring as a predictor of OCBI, managers and organizations may wish to actively seek out individuals high in self monitoring. These individuals may effectively aid and support efforts to build effective work teams. Second, managers who are interested in actively promoting the performance of OCBO may need to concentrate their efforts on improving certain organizational characteristics. For example, the significant relationship between job satisfaction and motivating potential with loyal boosterism and personal industry suggest efforts be made on improving job design. Identifying other stable dispositional characteristics linked with both OCBI and OCBO may also aid managers in promoting organizational effectiveness.

## REFERENCES

- Baron, R. A. (1989). Personality and organizational conflict: Effects of the Type A behavior pattern and self-monitoring. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 44, 281–296.

- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal*, *26*, 587–595.
- Becker, T. E. (1992). Foci and bases of commitment: Are they distinctions worth making? *Academy of Management Journal*, *35*, 232–244.
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Bolino, M. C. (1999). Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors? *Academy of Management Review*, *24*, 82–98.
- Caldwell, D. F., & O'Reilly, C. A., III. (1982). Boundary spanning and individual performance: The impact of self-monitoring. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *67*, 124–127.
- Dobbins, G. H., Long, W. S., & Dedrick, E. J. (1990). The role of self-monitoring and gender on leader emergence: A laboratory and field study. *Journal of Management*, *16*, 609–618.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hitchinson, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*, 500–507.
- Farh, J. L., Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for Organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, *16*, 705–721.
- Gouldner, A. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: a preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, *47*, 73–80.
- Graham, J. W. (1989). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, operationalization, and validation*. Unpublished manuscript, Loyola University of Chicago.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *16*, 250–279.
- Hui, C., Lam, S.K., & Law, K.S. (2000). Instrumental values of organizational citizenship behavior for promotion: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*, 822–828.
- Joreskog, K. G., & Sorbom, D. (1993). *LISREL 8: Structural equation modeling with the SIMPLIS command language*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Kilduff, M., & Day, D. V. (1994). Do chameleons get ahead? The effects of self-monitoring on managerial careers. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*, 1047–1060.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Folger, R. (1991). The effects of procedures, social accounts, and benefits level on victims' layoff reactions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *21*, 630–650.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of Organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *17*, 253–266.
- Larkin, J. E. (1987). Are good teachers perceived as high self-monitors? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*, 64–72.
- Mehra, A., Kilduff, M., & Brass, D. J. (2001). The social networks of high and low self-monitors: Implications for workplace performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *46*, 121–146.
- Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the "side bet theory" of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *69*, 372–378.
- Mischel, W. (1977). The interaction of person and situation. In: Magnusson, D. and Endler, N. S. (Eds.), *Personality at the Crossroads: Current Issues in Interactional Psychology*, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey, pp. 333–352.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and Organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *76*, 845–855.
- 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.
- Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (1992). A preliminary report on a new measure of Organizational citizenship behavior. In: *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Southern Management Association*, Valdosta, GA, pp. 185–187.
- Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and Organizational citizenship behavior? A group value model explanation. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*, 351–357.

- Moorman, R.H., & Harland, L.K. (2002). Temporary employees as good citizens: Factors influencing their OCB performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 17*, 171–187.
- Neuman, G.A., & Kickul, J.R. (1998). Organizational citizenship behaviors: Achievement orientation and personality. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 13*, 263–279.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of Organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 775–802.
- Rioux, S.M., & Penner, L.A. (2001). The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A motivational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 1306–1314.
- Ryan, J.R. (2002). Work values and organizational citizenship behaviors: Values that work for employees and organizations. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 17*, 123–132.
- Settoon, R.P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R.C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 219–227.
- Shore, L. M., & Wayne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and employee behavior: Comparison of affective commitment and continuance commitment with perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 774–780.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*, 653–663.
- Snyder, M. (1974). The self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*, 526–537.
- Snyder, M. (1987). *Public appearances / private realities: The psychology of self-monitoring*. New York: Freeman.
- Snyder, M., & Gangestad, S. (1986). On the nature of self-monitoring: Matters of assessment, matters of validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 125–139.
- Turnley, W. H., & Bolino, M. C. (2001). Achieving desired images while avoiding undesired images: Exploring the role of self-monitoring in impression management. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 351–360.
- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 765–802.
- 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, S.L., & Rush, M.C. (2000). Altruistic organizational citizenship behavior: Context, disposition, and age. *Journal of Social Psychology, 140*, 379–391.
- 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*, 601–617.
- Zapf, D., Dormann, C., & Frese, M. (1996). Longitudinal studies in organizational stress research: A review of the literature with reference to methodological issues. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1*: 145–169.