

SEAM

by Dorothea Wahyu Ariani

FILE	SEAM.DOC (230K)	WORD COUNT	6652
TIME SUBMITTED	29-APR-2020 08:52PM (UTC+0700)	CHARACTER COUNT	38795
SUBMISSION ID	1311101766		

Social Capital Moderating Roles towards Relationship of Motives, Personality and Organizational Citizenship Behavior : Cases in Indonesian Banking Industry

Abstract

The goal of this study is to test social capital as the moderating variables of the relationship model between core self-evaluation personality, motives, and organizational citizenship behavior. The study integrates the use of attribution, social exchange, core self evaluation theories, and two raters of organizational citizenship behavior. A survey is conducted by using questionnaires from the previous research. The questionnaires are sent to 128 branches of the bank industry located in 16 major cities in Java. The samples consisted of 636 tellers and 129 head tellers. Validity and reliability tests are used to evaluate the questionnaire contents. The Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) is employed to test the relationship among the variables.

The results prove that social capital moderates the relational model between core self evaluation personality, organizational concern motives, pro-social values motives, impression management motives and organizational citizenship behavior. The results also showed that self rating and supervisor rating differ significantly with respect to organizational citizenship behavior. Both were valid and have an equal effect on the organizational citizenship behavior. A thorough discussion on the relationship among the variables as well as on self and supervisor rating is presented in this paper.

Keywords : organizational citizenship behavior, organizational concern motives, pro-social values motives, impression management motives, the core self-evaluation personality, social capital

INTRODUCTION

The research employs variables that influence individual behavior, such as personal or dispositional variables based on the personality and attribution theory and situational variables based on social exchange theory. In terms of social exchange theory, positive working experience has impacts on the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), although researchers in the field failed to show the existence of employees' rotation (Bowler & Brass, 2006). Strong friendship gives reciprocal effect and social exchange, and also drives organizational citizenship behavior. OCB is actually influenced by interdependent situation that the work setting becomes strong determinant and this influences the OCB in addition to the existence of personal characteristics such as personality (Comeau & Griffith, 2005).

Besides, judgements from different parties give different evaluation perspectives and provide valuable information that increases the validity of individual performance rating (Van der Heijden & Nijhof, 2004). Self and other ratings in the OCB give significant influence towards motives of carrying out the behavior in question (Finkelstein & Penner, 2004; Penner, Dovidio, Pillavin, &

Schroeder, 2005). Supervisor rating is employed to minimize problems related to the bias resulted from using the self rating by self reporting in judging a variable (Organ & Ryan, 1995).

The main objective of the research is to test the influence of social capital moderation towards the model of relations between core-self evaluation and three motives of organizational citizenship behavior application. The research is carried out by employing two raters in evaluating employees' OCBs. The theoretical and empirical results state that individual performance has two dimensions, role-based performance or task performance and non role-based performance or OCB (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). OCB is often mentioned as supporting factor in social and psychological environment in achieving task performance (Organ, 1997; Bergeron, 2005). Many moderating variables such as organizational, situational, and individual help understand the relations of OCB antecedents with the behavior in question.

THEORETICAL REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS BUILDING

1. 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. Because of its independence, control decreases behaviors that do not belong to the roles (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). Appreciation given to those considered as good citizens is hard to give since there has been no clear standard. However, individual bonding on these voluntary activities is essential for organizational effectiveness and performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994; Van Scotter, 2000; Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997).

Dennis W. Organ developed the term of Organizational Citizenship Behavior as stated by Bateman and Organ (1983) and Smith, Organ, and Near (1983). Their understanding is based on Chester I. Barnard concept concerning the term willingness to cooperate and Katz's concept which differentiates performance based on spontaneous and innovative roles and behaviors (Podsakoff,

MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). For more than 20 years, researches on OCB have developed rapidly. Some problematical issues are still found (Motowidlo, 2000; LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002), such as antecedence and consequences, definition and dimensions of the behavior. OCB dimensions are indeed not a robust construct and an essential requirement. OCB multidimensionality has the same antecedent and consequences. On the other hand, as a multidimensional construct, each behavior dimension has its own antecedent and consequences.

On top of OCB dimensionality, another debate takes place on who evaluates the behavior, oneself or others. According to Van der Heijden and Nijhof (2004), self rating is correct because individuals show themselves properly. In the case of OCB, there are some reasons why self rating results higher than rating done by others (Allen *et al.*, 2000; Khalid & Ali, 2005). First, the behavior is only known by oneself while others do not notice or understand. The second is because the behavior is not required so it is not widely known, such as task performance, so that other people in the organization do not realize this. The third is the absence of general standard of "abnormal" behavior or organizational citizenship behavior. The fourth is that each individual develops personal understanding and explanation concerning the performance such as OCB. OCB is not widely known or realized as task performance so that ratings by colleagues and supervisors are usually low. As a consequence, in researches, self rating is not unusual as the behavior is only recognized by oneself. The border between role-based and non role-based behaviors has become biased or insignificant. Therefore, employees, colleagues and supervisors from various working fields define the role-based and non role-based behaviors consistently different from time to time. (Morrison, 1994). The basic question in the research is whether there is a difference between self and supervisor ratings in testing the relation model between motives and personality with organizational citizenship behavior moderated by social capital.

2. Motives of Conducting OCB

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, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, & Miene, 1998). With such functional approach, OCB increases mainly as a result of affective and cognitive factors of working attitudes in general (Penner, Midili, & Kegelmeyer, 1997).

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. 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. 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 (1980) 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.

3. Core-Self Evaluation and OCB

Individual behavior is generally influenced by one's personality. Therefore, researches on the relation between personality and OCB have been carried out for many a time (see for examples: Organ, 1994; Bettencourt, Gwinner, & Meuter, 2001; Organ & Lingl, 1995; William & Shiaw, 1999; Konovsky & Organ, 1996; Van Dyne, Vandewalle, Kostova, Latham, & Cummings, 2000; Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Moorman & Blakely, 1995; Motowidlo *et al.*, 1997; Love, Macy, & Rea, 2002; Tang & Ibrahim, 1998; Beaty *et al.*, 2001; Organ & Ryan, 1995). Personality model used in this research is the core-self-evaluation that covers four characteristics, such as neuroticism, self-esteem, locus of control, and generalized self-efficacy (Erez & Judge, 2001). core-self-evaluation theory states that personality influences motivation and performance as well as functions as a significant predictor for working and performance satisfaction (Judge & Bono, 2001). This supports the previous researches by Judge, Locke, Durham, dan Kluger (1998) who state that self-esteem, locus of control, confidence on self ability in carrying out the task in general, control base and emotional stability are significantly related to working satisfaction. Individual with positive self rating is more motivated to dedicate for higher performance, such as performance or OCB.

Core self-evaluation is a latent construct with four core characteristics as stated in various literature. Erez and Judge (2001) state that core self-evaluation personality is always more predictable than using it as individual personality. Some researchers have indeed tested the relation of self esteem, confidence on one's self ability in carrying out the task in general, control base and emotional stability with motivation, working satisfaction and higher validity performance is achieved when employed as a whole construct. Their empirical study shows the existence of relation between self rating with motivation variables, including self-determination, task motivational, and goal-setting behaviors. According to Korman (1970) with the self-consistency theory, individuals with positive self-rating are motivated to fix the existing negative gap (Bono &

Colbert, 2005). In accordance with the self-consistency theory, individuals are motivated to conduct behaviors which are consistent with the self-image. Then, with the control theory, an individual will suit his/her actual performance with his/her standards of performance by putting more efforts.

4. Social Capital and OCB

Social capital is based on social exchange theory, a theory that helps exchange dynamics. Bolino, Turnley, and Bloodgood (2002) state a conceptual exposure with a proposal that needs an empirical testing. Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) classify social capital into three clusters or dimension, namely: the structural dimensions, the relational dimensions, and the cognitive dimensions. The three dimensions within social capital do not eliminate each other. Instead, they are highly interrelated (Liao & Welsch, 2005), so that they can be measured as one dimension. For Cohen and Prusak (2001), social capital is a social relation working network that is bond by mutual trust, understanding, support, and shared values and behaviors to enable collaboration. Coleman defines social capital as social structure aspects that create values and help individual activities within the structure (Seibert, Kreimer, & Liden, 2001). Social capital theory states that the relation between individual's working network determines how far the individual can achieve information and power, and influence organizational changes. The social capital is essential for effective collective work and interpersonal coordination (Bolino et al., 2002).

Social capital is positively related to organization ability to increase individual commitment to put more efforts than required. The higher the social capital means individuals are more willing to put more efforts in their work than the formal requirements since the individuals have good ability to work with others and have value or informal norm to keep the relations with others. Good relationship drive a person to conduct behavior or activities which are not in the work requirements or known as OCB. The situation can be characterized as relative power. Researchers on personality, such as Hesley and Chernich or Stagner, state that situational power moderates the relation between personality and behavior (Weiss & Adler, 1984). The variables often used as situational factor that moderates relation model, among others, are environmental dynamics, power

of individual relation, task structure (Aldag & Stearns, 1988), and organizational setting (Weiss & Adler, 1984). This situational faktor is a variable that moderates the relation between personality and motives in conducting organizational citizenship behaviors. The hypothesis is social capital moderates the relation between personality and motives in conducting OCB.

RESEARCH METHOD

1. Data Collecting Method

The study is carried out with a survey method. Data collecting employs the criteria suggested by Sekaran (2003), which is the objectives of the research, survey method accuracy, the availability of data resources and research facility, time span needed to finish the research, and cost. Besides, the survey is developed in a positivist approach by asking questions to respondents on their belief, opinion, characteristics, and behaviors in the past and present (Neuman, 2006). Survey is also used to test the relation between variables and the ability to predict levels or variables by finding out other variables (Saks, Schmitt, & Klimoks, 2000).

Survey is often used to find out attitudes and study the relation between working attitudes, such as work satisfaction and employees' behaviors. Survey gives accurate, scientific, fast, efficient results and covers large number of samples (Zikmund, 1991). Data gained from the survey are reliable (Saks *et al.*, 2000). The study uses independent survey method. Compared to the other four survey methods (interview, or mail, phone and electronic media questionnaires), independent survey is the best method (Cooper & Schindler, 2001; Neuman, 2006; Sekaran, 2003). The strength of the method are, among others, in the level of respond, respondents' collaboration, respondents' secret, getting answer for sensitive questions, the amount of date collected, data collection flexibility, the use of physical stimuli, the availability of sample control, and minimizing unanswered questions. However, there are some mistakes or weaknesses which are related to non-respond as a result of bias and administrative mistakes. In this case, it has been minimalized. Non-respond mistakes are reduced by giving early notice to respondents, motivating respondents and

making a good and interesting questionnaire, giving incentives in the forms of prizes and souvenirs to respondents, and checking whether the questionnaire is complete at the time of arrival.

2. Sampling Method

Based on exploratory study with an in-depth interview with officials from Bank Indonesia as the national bank controller, it is concluded that big cities or towns with a high GDP per capita (Rp. 3,000,000.00 or more) have a higher demand. Branch offices of general banks in those places have more clients than those in cities or town with lower GDP per capita. Therefore, it is decided that there are 18 big cities and towns in Java which population is more than half of the Indonesia population. After finding the research locations, letters to request permission are sent to branch offices of general banks in the cities and towns. Then, tellers are sorted out based on the criteria (excluding part timer, non-permanent and contracted employees) with more than one year experience. 128 branch offices of general banks in 16 cities and towns in Java give their permission to carry out the research.

Based on some considerations the research employs self rating and supervisor rating. First of all, OCB are not evaluation focusing on certain people, so that in the two decades of the development of the OCBs, there has been no consensus achieved on the best source of ratings (Moorman, 1991; Allen, Barnard, Rush, & Russell, 2000). The second is that both self and supervisor ratings have their own biases. Self rating faces common method variance, consistency motif, or leniency biases. While supervisor rating faces the problems of halo effect, memory distortion, or selective memory. The third is that both self and supervisor ratings cannot be unified or correlate as the OCBs are seen from different perspectives both by the supervisors or the subordinates (Morrison, 1994; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998; Allen et al., 2000; Cardona & Espejo, 2002; Khalid & Ali, 2005). The gap results from different definitions of roles, interpersonal interaction, level of task-independence, organizational culture, management styles, and leadership characteristics.

3. Validity and Reliability Testing

The research makes use of a questionnaire developed by some previous researchers by translating from and retranslating it to the original language. Factor analysis is carried out to test construct validity. Then, with varimax rotation and factor loading the minimum of 0.5 as suggested by Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham (1998) is achieved as a result of construct validity test which is practically significant. Organizational concern motives and social value motives are altruistic. While impression management motives belong to a strong factor loading and is considered as egoistic. Then the statement items that have the construct validity with the use of factor analysis are tested for their reliability. Table 1 concludes the number of valid questionnaire and the results of reliability test with internal consistency of α .

Table 1
Validity and Reliability with Internal Consistency

Notes	number of employed questionnaires	Cronbach Alpha
Organisational Motives	9	0.8721
Prosocial Value Motives	10	0.9233
Impression Mgmt Motives	8	0.8457
Personality	10	0.6333
Social Capital	15	0.8719
OCB-I-Self-Rating	14	0.7640
OCB-I-Supervisor-Rating	14	0.8487
OCB-O-Self-Rating	14	0.7717
OCB-O-Supervisor-Rating	14	0.8291

Source: processed primary data

Table 1 shows that the OCBs reliability of the supervisor rating are good both for the individual and organizational dimensions are higher than the self rating. This is consistent with the research results carried out by Van der Heijden dan Nijhof (2004). According to them, the results do not show that employees' self rating is not valid, it is more because there is a difference in perceiving the self image between the two raters.

4. Statistical Description and Correlation Between Research Variables

From 655 questionnaires distributed to cashiers (self rating) and 131 to chief cashiers (supervisor rating), 647 self rating questionnaires return. However, 11 of them are incomplete. Therefore, the research uses the complete 636 self-rating and 129 supervisor rating questionnaire. Table 2 shows the average of individual dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviors of the

self rating is 4,1472 which is higher than supervisor rating 3,9863 and the deviation standard of individual dimensions of OCBs of the self rating is 0,3779 which is lower than that of supervisor rating (0,5080) that results in index number of 10,9743 for self rating and 7,8470 for supervisor rating. Meanwhile, the average of organizational dimension of OCBs is 4,2819 which is higher than supervisor rating (4,2721) and deviation standard of the organizational dimension of OCBs is 0,3638 which is lower than supervisor rating (0,4146) that results in index value of 11,7686 for self rating and 10,3041 for supervisor rating. This shows the existence of leniency bias in OCBs when self rating is employed. Supervisor rating has higher deviation standard and lower average that show the objectivity of the evaluation towards the subordinates. By using t-test 7,168 for individual dimension of OCBs, it shows that the evaluation carried out by the two raters are significantly different. However, for the organizational dimensions, the difference is not that significant. Then, the variance of supervisor rating is 0,258 for individual dimension and 0,172 for the organizational dimensions, higher than self-rating which is 0,143 for individual dimension and 0,132 for organizational dimensions. It means that supervisors, indeed, can identify the OCBs of their subordinates, since they are only ask to evaluate five cashiers. Table 2 also illustrate the correlation between variables by employing *pearson product moment* correlation, assuming that all variables are matrix. The correlation between research variables is positive and significant, except the correlation between OCBs of the supervisor rating with organizational motive variables.

Table 2
Correlation Between Research Variables (N=636)

Notes	Mean	Std. Dev.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 Ocg.Concern M	4,2514	0,4428	1,000							
2 Prosocial Val.M	4,5446	0,3990	0,607**	1,000						
3 Imp. Mgmt M	4,1832	0,5160	0,283**	0,518**	1,000					
4 Personality	3,6890	0,3820	0,461**	0,349**	0,169**	1,000				
5 OCB-I-Self	4,1472	0,3779	0,425**	0,379**	0,208**	0,360**	1,000			
6 OCB-O-Self	4,2819	0,3838	0,518**	0,325**	0,166**	0,449**	0,533**	1,000		
7 OCB-I-Super	3,9863	0,5080	0,028	0,103**	0,067	0,153**	0,208**	0,101*	1,000	
8 OCB-O-Super	4,2721	0,4146	0,101*	0,176**	0,109**	0,159**	0,151**	0,181**	0,657**	1,000

**p ≤ 0,01

Source: processed primary data

RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Measurement Model

Table 3 shows reliability, lambda, error, and standard deviation constructs of each indicator to form structural equation model in AMOS Basic program.

Table 3
Reliability, Lambda, Error, and Standard Deviation of Construct Indicator

Construct	Construct Indicator	α	λ	ϵ	σ
Org. Concern Motives	MAOC	0,867	0,277	0,012	0,297
Prosocial Value Motives	MAPV	0,899	0,274	0,008	0,289
Impression Mgmt Motives	MMI	0,799	0,359	0,032	0,402
Personality	CSE	0,613	0,112	0,008	0,143
OCB-I-Self-Rating	OCBI	0,774	0,201	0,012	0,228
OCB-O-Self-Rating	OCBO	0,801	0,225	0,013	0,251
OCB-I-Supervisor-Rating	OCBIHT	0,913	0,672	0,043	0,704
OCB-O-Supervisor-Rating	OCBOHT	0,910	0,882	0,077	0,924


Source: processed primary data

2. Results of Structural Equation Model

The results of the structural equation model of relation, personality and organizational citizenship behaviors motives moderated by social capital employing self-rating with the use of AMOS program show the need of model modification. In early testing, the GFI is high but the AGFI value is low, and the Chi-square value is high. tinggi. Modification index value shows the probability of model modification that reduces the Chi-square value. Model modification is carried out to lower the Chi-square value and increase GFI by relating impression management motives with social value motives if the relation is supported by previous theories and researches. This is consistent with a research by Wayne and Liden (1993) that finds supervisor-focused impression management and job-focused impression management that drive self promotion. Impression management can focus on supervisor, by ingratiating of the supervisor or on the jobs, by showing one's competence which is needed for his/her promotion (Barsness, Dickmann, & Siedel, 2005). In accordance with social identity theory and self categorization theory, high exchange quality with the supervisor influences the impressions if the two foci, and increases trust and frequent interaction. Role identity is related to volunteerism (Grube & Piliavin, 2000) and organizational citizenship behaviors (Finkelstein & Penner, 2004).

Impression is usually directed to people of the same type because people have a social need to give good impression to others who will response (Schlenker, Lifka, & Wowra 2004). Besides,

Schlenker *et al.* (2004) also state that individuals with empathy or care to others produce more impressions. Therefore, the combination of social value and impression management motives is conceptually acceptable. Impression management motives influence individual's social value motives. The two motives above are, actually, forms of impression that focus on others, which are social value motives, and on one's self or for work promotion, known as impression management motives. The difference between the two lies on the antecedent which is sentiments, such as empathy, sympathy, kindness, and intrinsic values, such as social norms, moral norms, reciprocity, fairness, and so on. The results of the model modification are illustrated follow:



Further, social capital is situational factors that become moderating variables for the relation between all antecedents with the OCBs. The three motives mediate the relation of personality and OCB, and there is a direct relation between the two. Table 4 illustrates the result of the moderated structural equation model by social capital with fully constrained parameters, while table 5 illustrates the moderated structural equation model by social capital with unconstrained parameters.

Next, goodness-of-fit for constrained parameter compared with goodness-of-fit unconstrained parameters to achieve χ^2 -test so that the probability is known. Table 6 shows the comparison of the

goodness-of-fit between the basic and alternative models for structural relation with colleagues as moderators. The gap of χ^2 value of 47,092 and the probability of $\leq 0,001$ show that social capital moderates the relation of the three motives and personality with OCBs as a result of self rating.

Table 4
Results of MSEM Social Capital – Constrained Parameters
(Self Rating)

Structural Relationship	High Structural Relations		Low Structural Relations	
	Stand. Regr. Weights	Critical Ratio	Stand. Regr. Weights	Critical Ratio
Organizational Motives \leftrightarrow Personality	0,920	16,480*	0,906	16,480*
Prosocial Value Motives \leftrightarrow Personality	0,444	10,961*	0,448	10,961*
Impression Management Motives \leftrightarrow Personality	0,300	13,145*	0,301	13,145*
Prosocial Value Motives \leftrightarrow Motiv. Management Impress	0,480	12,339*	0,483	12,339*
PKO - Individual \leftrightarrow Organizational Motives	0,030	-3,270*	-0,936	-3,270*
PKO - Individual \leftrightarrow Prosocial Value Motives	0,020	0,226	0,017	0,226
PKO - Individual \leftrightarrow Impression Management Motives	0,012	0,188	0,011	0,188
PKO - Individual \leftrightarrow Personality	1,716	5,534*	1,534	5,534*
PKO - Organization \leftrightarrow Organizational Motives	-0,781	-2,655*	-0,741	-2,655*
PKO - Organization \leftrightarrow Prosocial Value Motives	-0,255	-2,983*	-0,236	-2,983*
PKO - Organization \leftrightarrow Impression Management Motives	0,026	0,418	0,024	0,418
PKO - Organization \leftrightarrow Personality	1,691	5,746*	1,578	5,746*
Goodness-of-Fit				
Chi Square	90,708			
Degree of Freedom	18			
Probability	0,000			
Chi Square / Degree of Freedom	5,039			
χ^2/df	0,952			
AGFI	0,887			
RMR	0,005			
RMSEA	0,080			

Source: processed primary data

Table 5
Results of MSEM Social Capital – Unconstrained Parameter
(Self Rating)

Structural Relationship	Low Social Capital		High Social Capital	
	Stand. Regr. Weights	Critical Ratio	Stand. Regr. Weights	Critical Ratio
Organizational Motives \leftrightarrow Personality	0,763	7,681*	0,960	15,169*
Prosocial Value Motives \leftrightarrow Personality	0,458	6,375*	0,474	8,120*
Impression Management Motives \leftrightarrow Personality	0,278	3,321*	0,321	5,005*
Prosocial Value Motives \leftrightarrow Motiv. Management Impress	0,562	10,462*	0,390	7,887*
PKO - Individual \leftrightarrow Organizational Motives	-0,173	-1,037	-2,603	-1,800
PKO - Individual \leftrightarrow prosocial Value Motives	-0,157	-1,037	0,662	0,593
PKO - Individual \leftrightarrow Impression Management Motives	0,156	1,385	-0,034	-0,446
PKO - Individual \leftrightarrow Personality	0,958	5,406*	3,219	2,264*
PKO - Organization \leftrightarrow Organizational Motives	-0,157	-0,796	-1,377	-1,972*
PKO - Organization \leftrightarrow Prosocial Value Motives	-0,406	-2,356*	-0,274	-2,218*
PKO - Organization \leftrightarrow Impression Management Motives	0,103	0,850	0,030	0,414
PKO - Organization \leftrightarrow Personality	1,231	5,251*	2,190*	3,228*
Goodness-of-Fit				
Chi Square	43,616			
Degree of Freedom	8			
Probability	0,000			
Chi Square / Degree of Freedom	7,269			
χ^2/df	0,975			
AGFI	0,823			
RMR	0,005			
RMSEA	0,099			

Source: processed primary data

Table 6
Comparison of Goodness-of-Fit Basic and Alternative Models
(Self Rating)

	Basic Model	Alternative Model
--	-------------	-------------------

	(Constrained Parameters)	(Unconstrained Parameter)
Chi Square	90,708	43,616
Degree of Freedom	18	6
Probability	0,000	0,000
Chi Square / Degree of Freedom	5,039	7,269
GFI	0,952	0,975
AGFI	0,847	0,823
RMR	0,003	0,001
RMSEA	0,080	0,099
The gap of Goodness-of-Fit		
Chi Square	90,708 - 43,616 = 47,092	
Degree of Freedom	18 - 6 = 12	
Probability	≤ 0,001	

Sumber : data primer diolah

Then, when OCBs are rated by supervisors, Table 7 shows the results of the moderated structural equation modeling by social capital with fully constrained parameters, and table 8 shows the moderated structural equation modeling by social capital unconstrained parameters for supervisor rating.

Table 7
Hasil MSEM Social Capital – Constrained Parameters
(Supervisor Rating)

Structural Relationship	High Social Capital		Low Social Capital	
	Stand. Regr. Weights	Critical Ratio	Stand. Regr. Weights	Critical Ratio
Organizational Motives ← Personality	0,978	18,165*	0,472	18,165*
Prosocial Value Motives ← Personality	0,441	10,009*	0,400	10,009*
Impression Management Motives ← Personality	0,305	6,042*	0,267	6,042*
Prosocial Value Motives ← Personality	0,484	13,691*	0,501	13,691*
PKO - Individual ← Organizational Motives	-4,447	-3,341*	-3,851	-3,341*
PKO - Individual ← Prosocial Value Motives	-0,066	-0,781*	-0,063	-0,787*
PKO - Individual ← Impression Management Motives	0,035	0,568	0,034	0,568
PKO - Individual ← Personality	3,607	3,490*	3,066	3,490*
PKO - Organization ← Organizational Motives	-3,743	-3,851*	-3,851	-3,858*
PKO - Organization ← Prosocial Value Motives	0,001	0,016	-0,063	0,016
PKO - Organization ← Impression Management Motives	0,015	0,237	0,014	0,237
PKO - Organization ← Personality	3,011	4,095*	3,303	4,095*
Goodness-of-Fit				
Chi Square	89,926			
Degree of Freedom	18			
Probability	0,000			
Chi Square / Degree of Freedom	4,996			
GFI	0,951			
AGFI	0,835			
RMR	0,009			
RMSEA	0,079			

Source : processed primary data

Table 8
Hasil MSEM Social Capital – Unconstrained Parameter
(Supervisor Rating)

Structural Relationship	High Social Capital		Low Social Capital	
	Stand. Regr. Weights	Critical Ratio	Stand. Regr. Weights	Critical Ratio
Organizational Motives ← Personality	0,988	15,541*	0,943	9,335*
Prosocial Value Motives ← Personality	0,469	8,131*	0,401	6,070*
Impression Management Motives ← Personality	0,319	5,108*	0,248	3,265*
Prosocial Value Motives ← Personality	0,402	8,005*	0,589	11,684*
PKO - Individual ← Organizational Motives	6,184	-1,958*	-2,613	-2,765*
PKO - Individual ← Prosocial Value Motives	-0,059	-0,576	-0,116	-0,763
PKO - Individual ← Impression Management Motives	0,048	0,651	0,031	0,277
PKO - Individual ← Personality	6,348	2,028*	9,251*	2,884
PKO - Organization ← Organizational Motives	-5,130	-2,291*	-2,188	-2,068
PKO - Organization ← Prosocial Value Motives	-0,075	-0,725	0,052	0,347
PKO - Organization ← Impression Management Motives	0,012	0,158	0,026	0,242
PKO - Organization ← Personality	5,345	2,426*	2,295*	3,323*
Goodness-of-Fit				
Chi Square	60,188			
Degree of Freedom	6			
Probability	0,000			
Chi Square / Degree of Freedom	10,031			
GFI	0,964			
AGFI	0,750			
RMR	0,002			
RMSEA	0,119			

Resource : processed primary data

Next is the goodness-of-fit for constrained parameter compared to the goodness-of-fit for unconstrained parameter to achieve χ^2 -test, so that probability level can be reached. Table 9 illustrates the comparison of goodness-of-fit between basic and alternative models of the structural relation with colleagues as moderators.

Table 9
Comparison of Goodness-of-Fit Between Basic and Alternative Models
(Supervisor Rating)

	Model Dasar (Parameter Terkendala)	Model Alternatif (Parameter Tak Terkendala)
Chi Square	89,926	60,188
Degree of Freedom	18	6
Probability	0,000	0,000
Chi Square / Degree of Freedom	4,996	10,031
GFI	0,951	0,964
AGFI	0,835	0,750
RMR	0,009	0,002
RMSEA	0,079	0,119
Perbedaan Goodness-of-Fit		
Chi Square	89,926 – 60,188 = 29,738	
Degree of Freedom	18 – 6 = 12	
Probability	0,049 atau ≤ 0,005	

Resource : processed primary data

Table 6 and 9 show significant difference of the alternative model from the basic model as the probability is $\leq 0,005$. It means that social capital moderates the relation between organizational concern, social value and impression management motives and personality with OCBs. Hypthesis 6 is supported.

3. Discussion

a. Moderating Influence of Social Capital

Organizational citizenship behaviors are excluded in the job description. The behaviors are influenced by some factors, dispositional or situational. Dulebohn, Shore, Kunze, and Dookeran (2005) state that the behaviors happen because of personality characteristics and obligations based on social exchange theory. Blau state that the relations between employees create personal obligation when the employees think that they are treated well by the supervisors, therefore they are obliged to pay back (Dulebohn *et al.*, 2005). Social exchange theory state that when a supervisor gives a positive experience, the employees pay it back through organizational citizenship behaviors (Bowler & Brass, 2006).

Organ also proposes social exchange for organizational citizenship behaviors so that employees feel obliged to do something good for the supervisor or organization to pay back (Dulebohn *et al.*, 2005). According to Organ, the behavior is used by the employees to create positive impression to the supervisor and colleagues. The social exchange interaction is symbolized by the need to make others happy more than him/herself (Sparrowe & Liden, 1997). However, researchers focusing on social exchange theory to explain organizational citizenship behaviors often fail in showing the exchange among employees, and focusing more in attitude variables such as work satisfaction within which has exchanges between supervisor and organisation (Bowler & Brass, 2006).

Social capital is a situational indicator based on the interpretation of individual relations within an organization which, hopefully, influences employees' behaviors and supervisors' interpretation on the behaviors. The research employs social capital in the mikro level that puts more stress on individual interpretation on organization situational factors, such as recognition, collaboration, mutual trust, common values and norms, and solidarity and loyalty.

So far, researches on social capital have been using group, organization, or nation analytical levels, but never the individual level. In the individual level, social capital means the ability to make

use of the resources through local professional network to build mutual trust and norms (Akdere, 2005). In this case, social capital is not a situational factor that totally influences individual's behaviors, even though in management and organizational researches social capital is based on social exchange with other people being involved. In other words, the research is being displaced from the concepts originally used by psychologists and sociologists towards management and organizational concept. The switch from one field of science to another shows the development of knowledge and is an important method, despite its complexity as a multidiscipline (Morey & Luthans, 1985). The switch is applied by treating the new concept as an old one.

Task interdependence is an important interaction level between individuals as members of work groups, so that interaction is needed in completing their tasks (Comeau & Griffith, 2005). Coordination, cooperation and efforts are essential. In accordance with self-identity and self-categorization theories, individuals classify themselves and others in certain social groups based on shared characteristics to maintain positive social identity, to maximize differences between groups and to interact more frequently with people of the same groups (Barsness, *et al.*, 2005). This drives the emergence of the individuals' OCBs.

Meanwhile, the existence of exchanges between individuals and trust between employees does not directly result in employees' OCBs. The relation of social capital with OCBs, based on social exchange theory, are transfer process of psychological and social resources. That fair and positive social exchange increases OCB has been known. However, the influence of work exchange relationship towards behavior has not been sufficiently studied. Cardona, Lawrence, and Bentler (2003) state that activities related to work, indeed, influence OCBs. This is because reciprocal and shared expectations towards the job drive individuals to behave. Therefore, trust dimension is needed within the social capital. Relational dimension of the social capital is a requirement for OCBs or known as a moderator.

The results of this study are consistent with Mayer and Gavin (2005). Their hypothesis states that trust influences role-based performance and OCBs are not supported as the border

between role-based and OCB is vague. Trust is actually significantly related to the quality of communication, organizational citizenship behaviors, problem solving, and collaboration (Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, & Werner, 1998). Deluga (1995) testing the influence of trust for the supervisor from the subordinates' perspective towards OCBs from the supervisors' perspective show that supervisors' trust positively and significantly influences OCBs. Deluga defines trust as trust towards the supervisor not colleagues as individuals behave in accordance with the supervisors, known as *vicarious learning*. Meanwhile, from the perspective of OCBs, trust towards supervisors influences OCBs because the behaviors get some responds from the supervisors (Deluga, 1995).

Further, shared language, expressions, and values do not directly promote individuals' OCB, but they are required to practice OCBs. According to Van der Veegt and Janssen (2003), employees depend on other employees or group members to work effectively. Recently, researches on organizational citizenship behaviors are carried out in collective culture context which sees the behavior as existing parts compared to that in individualist context (Morrison, 1994). This is because in collectivist context there is normative hope to work together. OCBs more often occur in group tasks rather than individual tasks. Since the behaviors are strongly influenced by interdependence which is manipulated by *workflow design*, organizations can create the behaviors through task design. Besides, they are not abnormal behaviors, they, on the contrary, help individuals complete their tasks, especially group tasks. Interdependent task can promote communication, *information sharing*, and employees' OCBs (Bacharach Powell, Bandoly, & Richey, 2006).

b. Self and Supervisor Ratings

The results of the research show a significant difference between the evaluation on the OCBs with the use of self rating and supervisor rating. The inconvergent evaluation by the two raters' is supported by some theories. Wheery's theory of rating identifies three factors that influence performance evaluation, namely the ratee's actual job performance, various rater bias in the perception and recall of the performance, and measurement error (Wheery & Bartlett, 1982). The

gap between self rating and supervisor rating results from the existence of perception bias towards OCBs. Borman's (1997) research also shows the same results. The causes of the gap are, among others: raters' different perspectives in looking at similar performance aspects but they use different weight; and different perspectives in observing samples of different behaviors.

Performance evaluation by self rating has certain weakness, such as *true halo*, which means that there is an error or bias in evaluating each or the work dimensions (Scullen, Mount, & Goff, 2000), there is raters' bias and error as a result of interactions between raters and ratees, and there is a tendency to over or under value. The correlation between self and supervisor rating is considered low (see for example Harris & Schaubroeck, 1988; Suliman, 2003; Korsgaard, Meglino, & Lester, 2003). The low correlation results from egocentric bias, level gaps within the organization, and opportunities to observe. egocentric bias or freedom results from the high level of self esteem (Baird, 1977; Conway & Huffcutt, 1997). Self-perception and self-enhancement approaches also state that individuals with positive self perception judge themselves as *good performers*. Balance and dissonance theories state that there is one factor that influences self perception, self image. In balance theory, there is a need to keep stable and consistent orientation towards oneself, others and environment.

CONCLUSION

The study integrates three theories that influence the employees' OCB, they are: attribution, social exchange and core self evaluation personality theories, as well as employing two parties in rating the employees' OCB. The results of the study show that self and supervisor ratings differ significantly. Besides, social capital as a situational factor based on social exchange theory moderates the relation between the three motives and personality with the OCB. OCBs are carried out on the condition that there is a social capital within the organization. Williams and Anderson (1991) confirms differences between role-based behaviors, individual dimension OCB, and organizational dimension OCB propose the importance of *higher order factor models* for the three

dimensions. One method to evaluate differences between role-based and non role-based behaviors is by testing personality contribution on OCBs and role-based work experience (Bott *et al.*, 2003). Besides, Morrison (1994), Vey and Campbell (2004), and Lam, Hui, and Law (1999) point at the problem in defining OCBs, whether the items on the behavior really measure the OCBs or, on the contrary, measure the role-based behaviors. Moreover, dimensions in the OCBs, especially the organizational dimensions, can be categorized as role-based behaviors. The results of the research show that OCBs carries requirements to fulfill just as the role-based behaviors.

The theoretical contribution of the research is the existence of unequal power of the relations between the three theories grounding the antecedent of the OCBs. The methodological contribution is the inconvegent use of two raters in evaluating the OCBs. The independent and dependent variables evaluation by using self and supervisor ratings are better than using self rating as they reduce leniency bias and common method bias. Even though further studies on the matter are still needed, the OCBs are considered as positive the work-place as they promote individual performance and organizational effectiveness. It shows that non role-based behaviors should actually be taken as a standard to evaluate employees' performance. Besides, OCB construct is a weak and ambiguous construct, so that personality variables positively influence the behaviors. The OCBs is also attached to the employees' performance as stated in the job description, so that social capitals do not influence the behaviors. In accordance with the social exchange theory, social capitals can only strengthen OCBs when there is task interdependence. The weakness of the OCBs makes the construct hard to predict by using antecedents, even when grounded by a strong theory.

SEAM

ORIGINALITY REPORT

%**20**

SIMILARITY INDEX

%**19**

INTERNET SOURCES

%**13**

PUBLICATIONS

%**0**

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	ccsenet.org Internet Source	% 8
2	www.sciedu.ca Internet Source	% 3
3	www.aessweb.com Internet Source	% 3
4	journal.ugm.ac.id Internet Source	% 3
5	www.macrothink.org Internet Source	% 1
6	Dorothea Wahyu Ariani. "Relationship Personality, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Service Industries in Indonesia", Research Journal of Business Management, 2014 Publication	<% 1
7	Khar Kheng, Yeoh, Sethela June, and Rosli Mahmood. "The Determinants of Innovative	<% 1

Work Behavior in the Knowledge Intensive Business Services Sector in Malaysia", Asian Social Science, 2013.

Publication

8

www.scienpress.com

Internet Source

<% 1

9

Steven E. Scullen. "Understanding the latent structure of job performance ratings.", Journal of Applied Psychology, 2000

Publication

<% 1

10

ijbssnet.com

Internet Source

<% 1

11

www.ijmbr.org

Internet Source

<% 1

12

FEINIAN CHEN, LUOMAN BAO, ZHIYONG LIN, ZACHARY ZIMMER, SOCORRO GULTIANO, JUDITH B. BORJA. "Double burden for women in mid- and later life: evidence from time-use profiles in Cebu, the Philippines", Ageing and Society, 2017

Publication

<% 1

13

Dorothea Wahyu Ariani. "Comparing Motives of Organizational Citizenship Behavior between Academic Staffs' Universities and Teller Staffs' Banks in Indonesia", International Journal of Business and Management, 12/30/2011

Publication

<% 1

14

Sylvie F. Richer. "A Motivational Model of Work Turnover", Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 10/2002

Publication

<% 1

15

Gary Klein, Peggy Beranek, Ben Martz, James Jiang. "THE RELATIONSHIP OF CONTROL AND LEARNING TO PROJECT PERFORMANCE", Cybernetics and Systems, 2006

Publication

<% 1

16

www.timothy-judge.com

Internet Source

<% 1

17

M. Audrey Korsgaard. "The effect of other orientation on self-supervisor rating agreement", Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11/2004

Publication

<% 1

18

Ariani, Dorothea Wahyu. "The Relationship between Social Capital, Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, and Individual Performance: An Empirical Study from Banking Industry in Indonesia", Journal of Management Research, 2012.

Publication

<% 1

19

You-Jin Kim, Linn Van Dyne, Dishan Kamdar, Russell E. Johnson. "Why and when do motives

<% 1

matter? An integrative model of motives, role cognitions, and social support as predictors of OCB", Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 2013

Publication

EXCLUDE QUOTES ON

EXCLUDE MATCHES OFF

EXCLUDE
BIBLIOGRAPHY ON