The Five-Factor Model of Personality and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in United Arab Emirates

Hossam M. Abu Elanain, *University of Dubai, United Arab Emirates*

Personality traits refer to enduring patterns of thought, emotion, and behavior that are not likely to change over time and explain people's behavior across different situations (Costa and McCrae, 1989; Funder, 2001). The five-factor model of personality (FFM) or "Big Five" has influenced the field of personality during the last two decades, providing a significant degree of convergence in the trait-factor analytic psychology (Robertson and Callinan, 1998). Many studies have examined the relationship of personality traits to job performance, finding significant relationships between them (e.g., Barrick and Mount, 1991; Barrick, Mount, and Judge, 2001a; Barrick, Parks, and Mount, 2005; Hurtz and Donovan, 2000; Salgado, 1999).

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), which is described as a discretionary behavior, has emerged as a popular area for study (Organ, 1990). Citizenship behaviors are those helpful to the company but not considered core elements of the job. Citizenship behaviors are often performed by employees to support the interests of the organization even though they may not lead directly to individual benefits (Moorman and Blakely, 1995). Thus, managers often find it difficult to reward good citizenship directly as well as difficult to punish the absence of it.

Of particular relevance to the present study is that previous studies have found a substantial variance in personality-performance relationship that remains unexplained (e.g., Barrick et al., 2001a; Barrick et al., 2005; Hogan and Holland, 2003; Hough, 1992; Hurtz and Donovan, 2000; Nikolaou and Roberston, 2001; Organ and Ryan, 1995). This is significant because it indicates that other individual variables and situational conditions facilitate or constrain the influence of personality traits on performance and influence the relationship between them. Hence, the present study used four control variables — two individual factors (work locus of control and self-esteem) and two situational factors (stress at work and organizational justice) — to control their effects on OCB. Accordingly, the purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between "big five" personality traits and OCB after controlling the impact of the control variables.

- **The Five-factor model (FFM) of personality**

The FFM has achieved popular acceptance as a meaningful description of personality traits (Saucier and Ostedorf, 1999). The five factors are usually labeled extraversion (sociable vs. introverted), agreeableness (cooperative vs. competitive), conscientiousness (organized and planful vs. unorganized and careless), emotional stability (emotional stability vs. instability), and openness to experience (intellectual curiosity vs. preference for routine) (Costa and McCrae, 1989).

The FFM has provided research in personality with a clear measurement framework and is responsible for the growth of interest in personality in the field of work and organizational psychology. These five factors have been identified across a number of cultures and different languages, providing further support for the existence of the FFM and its universal application (McCare and Costa, 1997; Nikolaou and Roberston, 2001).

- **Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB)**

OCB, which is considered another form of job performance, first appeared in the literature when Organ with his colleagues (Bateman and

Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ, and Near, 1983) examined the relationship between satisfaction and performance. Organ (1988) defined OCB as "the individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization." By discretionary, Organ (1988) described OCB as the type of behavior that is not a part of the job description, but "rather a mater of personal choice, such that its omission is not generally understood as punishable."

Most of the studies examining the structure of OCB have agreed that it is a multidimensional concept (e.g., Graham1989; Moorman and Blakely, 1995; Organ, 1988; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter, 1990). Graham (1989), for example, proposed a four-dimension model of OCB consisting of interpersonal helping, individual initiative, personal industry, and loyal boosterism. Interpersonal helping involves helping co-workers in their jobs as needed. Individual initiative is communicating to others in the work place to improve individual and group performance. Personal industry includes taking on specific tasks above and beyond the call of duty. Finally, loyal boosterism involves the promotion of the organizational image to outsiders (Moorman and Blakely, 1995).

■ **Personality and OCB**
There is increasing empirical evidence that personality affects individuals' performance once they are hired (e.g., Barrick and Mount, 1991; Caldwell and Burger, 1998; Tett, Jackson, and Rothstein, 1991). Organ (1990) argued that individual differences play an important role in predicting whether an employee would exhibit OCB. Hence, it is believed that some people, because of who they are, would be more likely to show OCB.

Studies on contextual performance have suggested that personality traits are likely to be particularly good predictors of contextual performance (e.g., Borman and Motowidlo, 1993; Morgeson, Reider, and Campion, 2005; Motowidlo and Van Scotter, 1994; Van Scotter and Motowidlo, 1996). A variety of meta-analytic research studies have found that conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability are positively related to different aspects of contextual performance (e.g., Hogan and Holland, 2003; Hough, 1992, Hurtz and Donovan, 2000; Organ and Ryan, 1995).

The few studies examining the relationship between individual differences and OCB have provided contradictory results (e.g., George, 1991; Nikolaou and Roberston, 2001; Organ and Konovsky, 1989; Smith et al., 1983). For example, Organ and Konovsky (1989) examined the influence of the personality trait of positive affectivity (PA) on OCB. They found that when PA was studied simultaneously with cognition, it did not add to the explanation of OCB variance. On the other hand, George (1991) tested the relationship between mood trait (such as PA), mood state, and OCB and found that when measured separately, mood state was related to OCB.

In another study, Organ and Lingl (1995) examined the hypothesis that agreeableness and conscientiousness accounted for commonly shared variance between job satisfaction and citizenship behaviors. Their results showed that although agreeableness and conscientiousness were significant predictors of work satisfaction — positively and negatively, respectively — it was only conscientiousness that showed a reliable connection to OCB and only in respect to the dimension of generalized compliance. In a meta-analysis published in the same year, Organ and Ryan (1995) found weak relationship between agreeableness and conscientiousness, the two dimensions included in their analyses, and OCB dimensions.

In one more study, Konovsky and Organ (1996) predicted that agreeableness would relate particularly with altruism, courtesy, and sportsmanship, whereas conscientiousness would relate with generalized compliance. However, the statistically significant correlations they came up with were quite weak: 0.12 between agreeableness and courtesy and 0.15 between conscientiousness and generalized compliance. The results of regression analyses showed that, with the exception of generalized compliance, the dispositional variables could not predict significant variance in OCB beyond that predicted by work attitudes. But, in the case of generalized compliance, the personality dimension of conscientiousness was the strongest predictor of all, accounting for unique variance on the impersonal dimension of OCB. Finally, the results of a recent study conducted in Greece did not show any significant relationship between personality and OCB (Nikolaou and Roberston, 2001).

Given theses results, the search for individual differences predictors of OCB is still unsettled. Hence, the purpose of this study is to understand an individual difference that may cause OCB dimensions.

■ Hypotheses Development

The present study examines the relationship between personality traits and OCB. Barrick, et al. (2005) described extraversion and agreeableness as key dispositional determinants of social behavior. Empirical evidence showed that these two personality traits are significantly related to interpersonal performance (Mount, Barrick and Stewart, 1998). Mount et al. (1998) also described conscientiousness and emotional stability as important predictors of interpersonal performance. Individuals who score high on conscientiousness are typically dependable and responsible, and those scoring high on emotional stability are even-tempered and tolerant of stress. Again, it seems reasonable that these traits would result in higher-quality working relationships. Therefore, it is expected that:

> *Hypothesis 1: Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability are positively related to interpersonal helping.*

> *Hypothesis 2: Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability are positively related to individual initiative.*

Conscientiousness refers to the tendency to be purposeful, determined, exacting, and attentive to detail. Conscientious individuals are dependable, achievement-oriented, and organized. In essence, conscientious individuals can perform their work with a minimum of oversight (Morgeson et al., 2005). Hence, it is expected that persons high on conscientiousness are more likely to perform tasks above and beyond the call of duty.

> *Hypothesis 3: Conscientiousness is positively related to personal industry.*

The conceptual nature of openness to experience suggests a close relationship with other dispositional traits such as creativity, inquisitiveness, unconventionality, autonomy, and change acceptance (Goldberg, 1992). These traits might benefit performance depending on the job or situation. Therefore, the study expects that persons high on openness to experience are likely to exhibit the behavior of promoting the organization in general rather than a particular group.

> *Hypothesis 4: Openness to experience is positively related to loyal boosterism.*

In summary, the study examines the relationship between individual personality and performing OCB, with a focus on whether individual personality (as measured by the "big five") predicts the four dimensions of OCB.

■ Control Variables

All behaviors are a function of the characteristics of the situation and the characteristics of the person, because both can potentially facilitate or restrict the behavioral expression of an individual's personality traits (Konovsky and Organ, 1996). Many studies have shown that situations can limit the extent to which an individual can behave in accordance with his or her personality (e.g., Barrick and Mount, 1993; Barrick, et al., 2005; Beaty, Cleveland and Murphy, 2001; Gellatly and Irving, 2001; Hochwarter, Witt and Kacmar, 2002). For example, weak situations provide individuals with considerable autonomy to engage in behaviors that are in accordance with their personality traits. Previous studies have been suggested linking OCB to some situational factors such as job satisfaction (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983), perceptions of fairness (Moorman, 1991), task characteristics (Farh, Podsakoff and Organ, 1990), and interpersonal trust (Podsakoff et al., 1990). Equally important is the idea that certain characteristics of individuals may also restrict behavior, which, in turn, constrains the expression of personality traits (Moorman and Blakely, 1995). For example, the literature showed that personality traits interact with one another to determine behavior (e.g., George and Zhou, 2001; Witt, Burke, Barrick and Mount, 2002).

To explain the main effect the individual personality might have on OCB, the present study has identified four control variables that could explain some of the variance in rating of OCB. These variables are classified into two personal-based groups (work locus of control and self-esteem) and two situation-based variables (stress at wok and organizational justice).

Work locus of control (WLOC). Individuals differ in terms of their beliefs about whether they control the outcomes in their lives (i.e., internal locus of control) or the outcomes are controlled by factors such as luck and other people (i.e., external locus of control) (Rotter,

1966). Considering work domain, Spector (1988) developed the WLOC scale which was considered as a strong predictor of work-related behaviors. Employees with an internal WLOC are not likely to be constrained by rigid job roles in order to retain control over events in the work place. Hence, internals are more likely to perform organization citizenship behaviors than externals (Blakely, et al., 2005).

Self-esteem. Self-esteem addresses enduring patterns in judgments of self-worth and self-regard (Williams, 1997). People with high self-esteem show better self-regulation (Baumeister, Heatherton and Tice, 1993), set appropriate goals, and perform more effectively. People with low self-esteem are easier to influence than people with high self-esteem (Brockner, 1988; Rhodes and Wood, 1992). Previous studies showed that only high self-esteem employees will have the emotional ability to perform OCB under difficult and challenging situations (e.g., Tang and Ibrahim, 1998).

Organizational justice. Previous studies in the area of organizational justice have suggested that employee perception of both distributive and procedural justice influence OCB (e.g., Farh et al., 1990; Moorman, 1991; Organ, 1988). That is, if employees perceive the outcomes of their evaluations to be fair or perceive the process by which outcome allocation decisions are made to be fair, they will be likely to perform OCB (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993).

Stress at work. Stress refers to a physical and emotional reaction to potential environmental threats (Steers, 1991). Previous studies showed that people who have experienced a high level of stress are unlikely to perform OCB. Rather, they may try to find time to relax whenever they can (Tang and Ibrahim, 1998).

Methods

■ Participants and procedures
A survey of 230 employees working in a variety of service organizations in Dubai was conducted using anonymous questionnaires. The questionnaire containing measures of FFM, OCB, WLOC, self-esteem, stress at work, and organizational justice was distributed to employees using the drop-off method. The response rate was 71 %, leading to a sample of 164 individuals. The study sample was homogeneous since all respondents were UAE citizens. Forty nine percent of the respondents were females and the average respondent age was 32.5 with a standard deviation (*S.D.*) .75. Respondents had been with the organization an average of 5.5 years (*S.D.* = 1.0) and had been in their present job 3.0 years (*S.D.* = .74).

■ Measures

Personality. The "big five" personality dimensions were assessed using the 44-item big five Inventory (BFI) (John and Srivastava, 1999). The BFI shows high convergent validity with other self-report scales and with peer ratings of the big five. The BFI items were rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*.

OCB was measured with the 21-item scale developed by Moorman and Blakely (1995). Responses were made on a five-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). The four dimensions included were: interpersonal helping (six items), individual initiative (five items), personal industry (five items), and loyal boosterism (five items).

WLOC was measured with the 16-item scale developed by Spector (1988). Responses were made on a five-point scale anchored from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*.

Self-esteem was measured using the scale developed by Rosenberg (1965). The scale is a ten item Likert scale answered on a five point from *strongly disagree* to *strongly disagree*.

Stress at work was measured with the 14-item scale developed by Parasuraman and Alutto (1981). Responses were made on a five-point scale anchored from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*.

Organizational justice was measured using the three-dimension scale developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). The scale consists of one dimension measuring perceptions of distributive justice and two dimensions measuring perceptions of procedural justice. Distributive justice was measured using five items assessing the fairness of different work outcomes. Procedural justice was measured with items designed to tap both formal procedures and interactional justice. Formal procedures (six items) measured the

degree to which job decisions included mechanisms that insured the gathering of accurate and unbiased information, employee voice, and an appeal process. Interactional justice (nine items) measured the degree to which employees felt their needs were considered in job decisions. All items used a five-point response scale anchored from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*.

■ Analysis

To test the relationship between the FFM of personality and the four OCB dimensions, each of the latter was regressed separately on to the set of five personality factors. The four control variables — WLOC, self-esteem, stress at work, and organizational justice — were entered first into the regression equation. Next, the five personality factors were entered on the second step of the regression analysis to test study's hypothesis.

Results

Descriptive statistics, reliability estimates, and the inter-correlation matrix of all the study's measures are presented in Table 1. As shown, all alphas were at an acceptable level. All FFM dimensions were positively related to the three OCB dimensions of interpersonal helping, individual initiative, and personal industry. Neither extraversion ($r = .14$) nor emotional stability ($r = .08$) was significantly related to loyal boosterism. The strongest correlation with interpersonal helping was conscientiousness ($r = .43, P < .01$), individual initiative was openness to experience ($r = .53, P < .01$), personal industry was conscientiousness ($r = .38, P < .01$), and loyal boosterism was openness to experience ($r = .23, P < .01$).

Table 2 presents results of the hierarchical regression analyses. The control variables as a block contributed significant variance to the explanation of interpersonal helping scores. Entering the five personality dimensions in step 2 added significant variance ($\Delta R^2 = .24, P < .01$) over and above the control variables and main effects of the five personality traits. The b-coefficients presented in Table 2 were those derived at the second step, so the relative contribution of main effects of the predictors could be more easily compared. Accordingly, conscientiousness was the strongest predictor of variation in interpersonal helping ($\beta = .23, P < .01$). Next in sequential order were openness to experience ($\beta = .21, P < .05$) and agreeableness ($\beta = .16, P < .05$). On the other hand, neither extraversion ($\beta = .13$)

nor emotional stability ($\beta = -.02$) was significantly related to interpersonal helping. Hence, Hypothesis 1 was partially supported. The unexpected result was the significant relationship found between openness to experience and interpersonal helping. This was inconsistent with the previous studies suggesting that openness to experience would have little validity in predicting performance (e.g., Barrick, Mount and Judge, 2001b).

To test Hypothesis 2, the five personality traits were regressed on to the individual initiative. Entering the five personality dimensions in step 2 added significant variance ($\Delta R^2 = .44, P < .01$). Openness to experience was the strongest predictor of variation in individual initiative ($\beta = .46$ at $P < .01$); this was not expected, as stated in Hypothesis 2. Next in sequential order were agreeableness ($\beta = .20$ at $P < .01$) and conscientiousness ($\beta = .15$ at $P < .05$). However, extraversion and emotional stability were not significant predictors of individual initiative (see Table 2). Hence, Hypothesis 2 was partially supported. Table 2 also shows that conscientiousness was the only significant predictor of variation in personal industry ($\beta = 0.34, P < .01$). Similarly, openness to experience was the only significant predictor of variation in loyal boosterism ($\beta = .26$ at $P < .01$). Hence, Hypothesis 3 and 4 were supported.

Discussion

The study examined the relationship between personality traits, as expressed by the FFM, and the OCB four dimensions in the UAE. The results, in general, supported FFM as a predictor of OCB. Employees high in conscientiousness, openness to experience, or agreeableness achieve the highest levels of interpersonal helping performance. This result is consistent with the results of Mount et al. (1998), who reported that conscientiousness was an important predictor of interpersonal performance. Additionally, empirical evidence showed agreeableness as significantly related to measures of interpersonal performance (Konovsky and Organ, 1996; Mount et al., 1998). This makes sense given that individuals who score high on agreeableness tend to be friendly and helpful, all traits that facilitate working well with others.

It is also interesting that the study revealed an unexpected positive relationship between openness to experience and interpersonal helping. This is inconsistent with the results of Mount et al. (1998), who found no empirical evidence to

Table1. Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix for all Variables (N = 164)

	M	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Interpersonal helping	3.7	.64	(.81)												
2. Individual initiative	3.7	.63	.61**	(.82)											
3. Personal industry	3.8	.63	.50**	.30**	(.73)										
4. Loyal boosterism	3.7	.70	.38**	.32**	.37**	(.84)									
5. Extraversion	3.3	.48	.25**	.28**	.28**	.14	(.72)								
6. Agreeableness	3.8	.54	.37**	.28**	.34**	.18*	.26**	(.79)							
7. Conscientiousness	3.7	.52	.43**	.41**	.38**	.18*	.31**	.29**	(.75)						
8. Emotional stability	3.2	.56	.23**	.19*	.20**	.08	.24**	.19*	.29**	(.70)					
9. Openness to experience	3.7	.52	.42**	.53**	.29**	.23**	.32**	.24**	.23**	.16*	(.74)				
10. Work locus of control	3.3	.43	.37**	.22**	.30**	.41**	.23**	.37**	.27**	.21**	.27**	(.72)			
11. Stress at work	3.1	.58	.15	.01	.10	.19*	.18*	.24**	.28**	.25**	.02	.24**	(.86)		
12. Self-esteem	3.8	.59	.27**	.28**	.22**	.27**	.30**	.46**	.48**	.21**	.44**	.31**	.25**	(.76)	
13. Organizational justice	3.4	.63	.23**	.21**	.09	.43**	-.03	.10	.04	.09	.04	.26**	.26**	.10	(.93)

Note: Reliability estimates (Cronbach's α) from our sample are presented in the diagonal in brackets
  * P< .05, ** P< .01

Table 2. Hierarchical Regression Results Testing the Relationship between the Five Personality Traits and the Four Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (N = 164)

	β Values for dependent variables			
Predictors	Interpersonal helping	Individual initiative	Personal industry	Loyal boosterism
Step 1: Control variables				
Work locus of control	.27**	.06	.28**	.29**
Stress at work	-.07	-.19	-.01	.04
Self-esteem	-.11	-.07	-.08	.07
Organizational justice	.12	.12*	-.03	.32**
Adjusted R^2	.17	.14	.10	.28
Step 2: The five personality traits				
Extraversion	.13	.11	.03	-.01
Agreeableness	.16*	.20**	.06	.03
Conscientiousness	.23**	.15*	.34**	-.07
Emotional stability	-.02	.09	.01	.01
Openness to experience	.21*	.46**	.09	.26**
Adjusted R^2	.41	.58	.27	.42
ΔR^2	.24**	.44**	.17**	.14**

Note: The β's presented are those derived at the second step.
  * P< .05, ** P< .01

associate openness to experience with the ability to work well with others. One possible explanation is that individual who score high on openness to experience tend to be imaginative, curious and creative, all traits that would result in higher-quality working relationships.

Therefore, the findings of this study suggest that when assessing how effective a person is in performing the social requirements at work — communication, interpersonal skills, and facilitating peer or team performance — conscientiousness, openness to experience, or agree-ableness will be important predictors. Among these three traits, the present study suggests that conscientiousness is the most important predic-tor of interpersonal helping.

As regards individual initiative, the study revealed that openness to experience, agreeable-ness, and conscientiousness are valid predictors of individual initiative. Employees high in open-ness to experience, agreeableness, or conscien-tiousness are also high in performing the OCB role of individual initiative (communicating to others in the work place to improve individual

and group performance). It is worth mentioning that these three personality traits are the same ones that predicted the OCB dimension of interpersonal helping. This reflects the interpersonal nature of both interpersonal helping and individual initiative. The findings of the study also suggest that openness to experience is the most important personality trait in predicting individual initiative.

Testing the relationship between personality traits and personal industry, which describes the performance of specific tasks above and beyond normal role expectations, shows that conscientiousness is the only valid predictor. This is consistent with the previous studies suggesting a positive relationship between conscientiousness and performance across all jobs and tasks (e.g., Barrick and Mount, 1991; Hurtz and Donovan, 2000). This is also consistent with Moorman and Blakely's (1995) argument that conscientiousness could easily be related to personal industry since conscientious individuals can be relied upon to perform their part of the work with a minimum of oversight. Conscientious individuals are also willing to handle any role within the team and thus contribute to team performance regardless of their specific assigned role (Barrick, Stewart, Neubert and Mount, 1998). In addition, conscientious individuals are task-focused and will be particularly concerned with performing their required behaviors and accomplishing the assigned goals (LePine, Hollenbeck, Ilgen and Hedlund, 1997).

Contrary to previous studies suggesting that openness to experience has little validity in predicting performance (e.g., Barrick et al., 2001a), the present study showed it as the only valid predictor of loyal boosterism (focusing on promoting the organization's image). A possible explanation for this result is that persons high on openness are likely to exhibit certain tendencies of particular value in contemporary work environments, such as positively viewing work place transitions and changes, creative thinking, and remaining open to new alternatives (Wanberg and Banas, 2000). Thus, the person who is high in openness to experience is expected to be willing to promote the organization's image.

An additional finding that deserves mentioning is the lack of any significant relationship between both emotional stability and extraversion and OCB dimensions. Similar results were reported in previous studies (e.g., Nikolaou and Roberston, 2001). However, previous studies, such as Hormann and Maschke (1996), found

that neuroticism (the opposite of emotional stability) predicted performance in various occupations. Moreover, extraversion was reported as a valid predictor of performance in jobs characterized by social interaction, such as sales personnel and managers (e.g., Barrick and Mount, 1991; Vinchur et al. 1998). Thus, the present study recommends that the relationship between OCB and both emotional stability and extraversion merit further examination in the same culture.

The interaction of openness to experience with the three OCB dimensions of interpersonal helping, individual initiative, and loyal boosterism is one of the main contributions of the current study. This is contrary to previous studies reporting a weak relationship between that personality trait and performance (e.g., Barrick et al., 2001a; Hogan and Holland, 2003; Hough, 1992; Hurtz and Donovan, 2000; Organ and Ryan, 1995). Thus, this research suggests that openness to experience is an important personality trait in predicting OCB, especially performing the social requirements at work and promoting the organization's image internally and externally.

Finally, the results from this study have important practical implications in the employee selection process. The results show that both consciousness and openness to experience are the most important personality traits in predicting OCB. Hence, the study suggests that the employee selection process could target applicants who are high on conscientiousness and openness to experience, especially to improve staff OCB.

■ **Limitations, strengths, and future research**
As with any research, the study has limitations. The first involves the impact of culture on OCB, which was not controlled in this study and may have influenced personality-OCB relationship. The literature has supported the idea that national culture affects the performing of OCB. Previous studies (e.g., Blakely et al., 2005; Moorman and Blakely, 1995; Van Dyne, Vandewalle, Kostova, Latham, Cummings, 2000) showed that respondents who were in more collectivistic, higher-power distance nations performed more OCB than those who were in more individualistic, lower-power distance nations. Thus, future researches need to measure and control the impact of culture on personality-OCB relationship.

Second, OCB was measured subjectively

by staff not by their managers. Ratings were obtained from the same source: employees contributed ratings of personality and OCB dimensions. Finally, common variance problems cannot be ruled out since data on both independent and dependent variables were collected at the same time using the same questionnaire. This potential bias could be prevented with longitudinal approaches.

Despite the limitations, the study has strengths. It used four control variables to determine the main effect of the FFM on OCB. In addition, it examined the relationship between the five personality dimensions and each of the OCB dimensions, not the overall score of OCB, to better understand the relationship between personality and OCB.

There are several areas for possible future research. First, replication is needed to determine how the findings reported here correspond to the results of studies conducted in other work environments to ensure proper generalizability. Second, future researches need to consider the moderating influences of person and situation-based factors on the relationship between FFM and OCB. Third, researchers may consider the respondents' position in future studies as findings may differ across jobs and contexts. Finally, future researches could measure the impact of culture on personality-OCB relationship.

Conclusion

This study examined the relationship between individual personality and dimensions of OCB. In general, it has found evidence that individual differences correlate with citizenship behavior. The personality trait of conscientiousness was found to play a critical role in the prediction of OCB dimensions of interpersonal helping, individual initiative, and personal industry. Further, openness to experience was found to play a critical role in the prediction of interpersonal helping, individual initiative, and loyal boosterism.

The results have two notable implications in personnel assessment and selection. First, an individual's personality plays a significant role in workplace behaviors. Jenkins and Griffith (2004) argued that using a personality-based job analysis when choosing a personality measure is as important as using a traditional job analysis when choosing a content-valid selection tests. Accordingly, researching personality traits and conducting a personality-based job analysis will improve the prediction of applicants' OCB performance. Second, OCB and personality are

multifaceted. To predict narrow aspects of OCB, narrow personality traits should be chosen. Hence, this study suggests that measuring conscientiousness is important in predicting the applicant's performance of interpersonal helping, individual initiatives, and personal industry. Similarly, measuring an applicant's openness to experience is important in predicting the performance of interpersonal helping, individual initiative, and loyal boosterism.

Dr. Abu Elanain, an assistant professor of management, focuses his research on personality and performance, job design and performance, culture and performance management, and strategic human resource management.

REFERENCES

Barrick, M.R., and Mount, M.K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44,* 1–26.

Barrick, M.R., and Mount, M.K. (1993). Autonomy as a moderator of the relationships between the Big Five personality dimensions and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*(1), 111–118.

Barrick, M.R., Mount, M.K., and Judge, T.A. (2001a). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *Personality and Performance, 9,* 9–30.

Barrick, M.R., Mount, M.K., and Judge, T.A. (2001b). The FFM personality dimensions and job performance: Meta-Analysis of meta-analyses. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9,* 9–30.

Barrick, M.R., Parks, L., and Mount, M.K. (2005). Self-Monitoring as a moderator of the relationship between personality traits and performance. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(3), 745–767.

Barrick, M.R., Stewart, G.L., Neubert, M.J., and Mount, M.K. (1998). Relating member ability and personality to work-team processes and team effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83,* 377–391.

Bateman, T.S., and Organ, D.W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good solider: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal, 26,* 587–595.

Baumeister, R.F., Heatherton, T.F., and Tice, D.M. (1993). When ego threats lead to self-regulation failure: Negative consequences of high self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*(1), 141–156.

Beaty, J.C., Cleveland, J.N., and Murphy, K.R. (2001). The relation between personality and contextual performance in "strong" versus "weak" situations. *Human Performance, 14*(2), 125–148.

Blakely, G.L., Srivastava, A., and Moorman, R.H. (2005). The effects of nationality, work role centrality, and work locus of control on role definitions of OCB. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 12*(1), 103–117.

Borman, W.C., and Motowidlo, S.J. (1993). Expanding the

criterion domain to include elements to contextual performance. In N. Schmitt and W.C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). San Francisco: Jossy-Bass.

Brockner, J. (1988). *Self-esteem at work: Research, theory, and practice.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Caldwell, D.F., and Burger, J.M. (1998). Personality characteristics of job applicants and success in screening interviews. *Personnel Psychology, 51*(1), 119–136.

Costa, P.T., and McCrae, R.R. (1989). *NEO-PI professional manual.* Odessa. FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Farh, J., Podsakoff, P.M., and Organ, D.W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management, 16,* 705–721.

Funder, D.C., (2001). *The Personality Puzzle.* (2nd ed.). New York: Norton.

Gellatly, I.R., and Irving, P.G. (2001). Personality, autonomy, and contextual performance of managers. *Human Performance, 14*(3), 232–245.

George, J.M. (1991). State or trait: Effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76,* 299–307.

George, J.M., and Zhou, J. (2001). When openness to experience and conscientiousness are related to creative behavior an interactional approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 513–514.

Goldberg, L.R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment, 4,* 26–42.

Graham, J.W. (1989). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, operationalization, and validation.* Unpublished working paper, Loyola University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.

Hochwarter, W.A., Witt, L.A, and Kacmar, K.M. (2002). Perceptions of organizational politics as a moderator of the relationship between conscientiousness and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(3), 472–478.

Hogan, J., and Holland, B. (2003). Using theory to evaluate personality and job-performance relations: A socioanalytic perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* 100–112.

Hormann, H., and Maschke, P. (1996). On the relation between personality and job performance of airline pilots. *International Journal of Aviation Psychology, 6*(2), 171–178.

Hough, L.M. (1992). The "Big Five" personality variables-construct confusion: Description versus prediction. *Human Performance, 5,* 139–155.

Hurtz, G.M., and Donovan, J.J. (2000). Personality and job performance: The Big Five revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85* (6), 869–879.

Jenkins, M., and Griffith, R. (2004). Using personality constructs to predict performance: Narrow or broad bandwidth. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 19* (2), 225–269.

John, O.P., and Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Trait Taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspective. In L.A. Pervin and O.P. John (Eds), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., PP. 102–138). New York:

Guilford.

Konovsky, M.A., and Organ, D.W (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17,* 253–266.

LePine, J.A., Hollenbeck, J.R., Ilgen, D.R., and Hedlund, J. (1997). Effects on individual differences on the performance of hierarchical decision-making teams: Much more than g. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 803–811.

MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M., and Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluation of salesperson performance. *Journal of Marketing, 57,* 70–80.

McCrae, R.R. and Costa, P.T. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist, 52,* 509–516.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationships between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76,* 845–855.

Moorman, R.H., and Blakely, G.L., (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*(2), 127–142.

Morgeson, F.P., Reider, M.H., and Campion, M.A. (2005). Selecting individuals in team settings: The importance of social skills, personality characteristics, and teamwork knowledge. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(3), 583–611.

Motowidlo, S.J., and Van Scotter, J.R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79,* 457–480.

Mount, M.K., Barrick, M.R., and Stewart, G.L. (1998). The five factor model of personality and performance in jobs that involve interpersonal interaction. *Human Performance, 11*(2/3), 145–165.

Niehoff, B.P., and Moorman, R.H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal, 36,* 527–556.

Nikolaou, I., and Robertson, I.T., (2001). The Five-Factor Model of personality and work behavior in Greece. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10* (2), 161–186.

Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Organ, D.W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In B.M. Staw and L.L. Cummings (Eds.) *Research in organizational behavior,* Vol. 12 (PP.43–72), JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.

Organ, D.W., and Konovsky, M.A. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,* 157–164.

Organ, D.W., and Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology, 135,* 339–350.

Organ, D.W., and Ryan. K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48,* 775–802.

Parasuraman, S., and Alutto, J. (1981). An examination of the organizational antecedents of stressors at work. *Acad-*

emy of Management Journal, 24(1), 48–67.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., and Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on trust, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly, 1,* 107–142.

Rhodes, N., and Wood, W. (1992). Self-esteem and intelligence affect influenceability: The mediating role of message reception. *Psychological Bulletin, 11*(1), 156–171.

Robertson, I.T., and Callinan, M. (1998). Personality and work behavior. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 7,* 317–336.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs,* 80, 609.

Salgado, J.F. (1997). The five factor model of personality and job performance in the European community. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 30–43.

Salgado, J.F. (1999). Personnel selection methods. In C.L., Cooper and I.T., Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology,* Vol. 14 (pp. 1–54). Chichester, NY: Wiley.

Saucier, G., and Ostendorf, F. (1999). Hierarchical subcomponents of the Big Five personality factors: A cross-language replication. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*(4), 613–627.

Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W., and Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68,* 653–663.

Spector, P.E. (1988). Development of the work locus of control scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 61,* 335–340.

Steers, R.M. (1991). *Introduction to organizational behavior.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Co.

Tang, T.L., and Ibrahim, A.S. (1998). Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior revisited: Public personnel in the United States and in the Middle East. *Public Personnel Management, 27*(4), 529–550.

Tett, R.P., Jackson, D.N., and Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology, 44,* 703–742.

Van Dyne, L., Vandewalle, D., Kostova, T., Latham, M.E., and 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.

Van Scotter, J.R., and Motowidlo, S.J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81,* 525–531.

Vinchur, A., Schippmann, J., Switzer, F., and Roth, P. (1998). A meta-analytic review of predictors of job performance for salespeople. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 4,* 586–597.

Wanberg, C.R., and Banas, J.T. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of openness to changes in a reorganizing workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85,* 132–142.

Williams, S. (1997). Personality and self-leadership. *Human Resource Management Review, 7*(2), 139–155.

Witt, L.A., Burke, L.A., Barrick, M.R., and Mount, M. K. (2002). The interactive effects of conscientiousness and agreeableness on job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 164–169.

(References continued from page 34)

Russell, A. (2005, August). Editorial: exploring digital resistance. *New Media and Society, 7(4),* 513–515.

Shaw, K. (2003, December 9). How wireless changed the work behavior of Intel employees. *Wireless Computing Devices Newsletter.* Retrieved June 5, 2006, from http://www.networkworld.com/newsletters/mobile/2003/1208mobile.htm

Simard, C. (2005). From weapons to cell phones: knowledge networks in San Diego's wireless valley. *Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences,* 4369-A.

Sommerville, L. (2001). Buying mobile technology for workers often makes 'cents.' Retrieved June 5, 2006, from http://www.bizjournals.com/triad/stories/2001/10/08/focus1.html

Snyder, R. A. (2004, April 15). What workers want from wireless. Retrieved June 5, 2006, from http://www.americasnetwork.com/americasnetwork/article/articleDeta/

Stahl, S. (2003, March 31). Wireless advice: let's get on with it. *Information Week,* Issue 933, 6.

SNH. (2006). Pocket-sized home wrecker. *Prevention, 58(5),* 34.

Turel, O. (2006). Contextual effects on the usability dimensions of mobile value-added services: a conceptual framework. *International Journal of Mobile Communications, 4(3),* 1.

Varshney, U. (2006). Using wireless technologies in healthcare. *International Journal of Mobile Communications, 4(3),* 1.

Zdnet. (2006). Mobile working: a buyer's guide for SME's. Retrieved June 5, 2006, from http://reviews.zdnet.co.uk/buyersguides/mobileworking/0,39030900.htm