HUMAN PERFORMANCE, *17*(1), 1–24

Structured Interviewing for OCB: Construct Validity, Faking, and the Effects of Question Type

Tammy D. Allen
Department of Psychology
University of South Florida

Jeffrey D. Facteau and Carolyn L. Facteau
Hogan Assessment Systems

This study reports the results of an effort to develop a structured interview designed to measure the propensity to engage in organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Results indicated that participants were unable to improve their scores by attempting to fake the interview. Evidence of construct validity was provided in that we observed several meaningful relationships between scores on the interview and theoretically relevant dispositional variables such as positive affect and empathy. Additionally, regression analyses revealed that ratings obtained from the OCB interview significantly related to coworker ratings of OCB. Overall, the results of the study provide evidence that structured interviews have the potential for being a useful tool for predicting who will engage in OCB in the work environment.

Recent efforts to better understand the criterion of job performance have resulted in the idea that individuals contribute to organizational effectiveness in ways that go beyond their "jobs" (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Indeed, a great deal of research is being conducted on the distinction between in-role performance (job behaviors that are prescribed by the organization) and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB; behaviors that are discretionary but support the collective interests of the organization; Organ, 1988). Citizenship behaviors differ from task activities

Requests for reprints should be sent to Tammy D. Allen, Associate Professor, University of South Florida, Department of Psychology, 4202 East Fowler Avenue, PCD4118G, Tampa, FL 33620–7200. E-mail: tallen@luna.cas.usf.edu

in that they support the organizational, social, and psychological environment in which task performance occurs (Borman & Motowidlo).

The importance of having a workforce ready and willing to engage in OCB is underscored by the fact that recent research has linked aggregate levels of OCB to enhanced organizational effectiveness (Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994, 1997). A logical step in the progression of OCB research would be to examine whether or not valid selection techniques can be developed that predict individuals' tendencies to exhibit OCB on the job.

Some research has been published relevant to this issue. For example, Borman and Motowidlo (1997) and Organ and Ryan (1995) reviewed the literature on the relationship between personality and on-the-job ratings of OCB. In general, significant albeit modest relationships exist between several personality variables (e.g., conscientiousness, agreeableness, empathy) and ratings of OCB. A selection battery aimed at maximizing OCB might include measures of these variables. However, a more straightforward and perhaps more effective strategy would be to directly assess applicants' propensity to engage in OCB (Wernimont & Campbell, 1968).

To date, only one study has been published that assessed the validity of a structured interview designed for the purpose of assessing OCB. Latham and Skarlicki (1995) examined the validity of situational interview (SI) and patterned behavior description interview (PBDI) questions for predicting peer ratings of OCB for 46 university faculty. They found that SI questions, but not PBDI questions, predicted peer ratings on two dimensions of OCB. However, although response standards were provided for scoring the SI questions, standards were not established for scoring the PBDI questions. Moreover, interrater agreement was lower on the PBDI questions than on the SI questions. Given the importance of OCB for organizational effectiveness, and the paucity of research on selection strategies aimed at maximizing OCB to date, our purpose in this study was to extend the research began by Latham and Skarlicki. Specifically, this study examined the following questions: (a) Can interviewees fake the OCB interview? (b) What is the impact of having preinterview knowledge of the OCB dimensions being evaluated in the interview on interviewees' performance? (c) Are situational interview or PBDI questions more effective as a basis for predicting OCB? (d) Do interview scores relate to other variables that ought to covary with OCB (i.e., construct validity)? Each of these questions is addressed in subsequent sections.

FAKABILITY OF INTERVIEW

One question when considering the utility of an interview designed to assess OCB concerned if interviewees could fake responses to the questions in the interview and thereby obtain scores not reflective of their actual propensity to engage in

OCB. Although research on faking and self-presentation in the personality literature generally suggests that faking does not affect the criterion-related validity of personality measures (Barrick & Mount, 1996; Hough, Eaton, Dunnette, Kamp, & McCloy, 1990), we are unaware of any studies that have examined faking in structured interviews. It is possible that researchers have neglected this issue in the context of structured interviews because interviews often are designed to assess knowledge, skills, or abilities and it may be believed that it is difficult to fake these characteristics. However, the OCB interview in this study was designed to assess behavioral propensities, rather than abilities or skills. As such, we believed that the potential existed for interviewees to misrepresent themselves. As a result, we were interested in examining the magnitude of faking effects in the OCB interview, if any existed at all.

IMPACT OF PREINTERVIEW KNOWLEDGE

Another concern was the possible effect of informing interviewees (prior to the beginning of the interview) about the OCB dimensions assessed in the interview. We were curious whether or not such "disclosure" of the interview dimensions would make it easier for interviewees to present themselves favorably in the interview. This seemed important in that Kleinmann, Kuptsch, and Koeller (1996) found that making the dimensions measured in an assessment center transparent to participants improved the construct validity of the assessment center ratings. Presumably, disclosing the dimensions made it easier for participants to orient their behavior to what was being observed and evaluated by assessors. In this study, we were concerned with whether or not interviewees who were informed of the OCB dimensions being measured in the interview would receive higher interviewer scores than those who were not informed.

EFFECTIVENESS OF SITUATIONAL VERSUS PBD INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Two types of structured interview questions were used in this study. SI questions present interviewees with a hypothetical situation that might occur on the job. Interviewees are asked to describe how they would react to the situation posed in the question (Latham, 1989; Maurer, Sue-Chan, Latham, 1999). PBDI questions focus on past experiences. Interviewees are asked to indicate how they acted in previous situations that resemble those that might occur on the job (Janz, 1982, 1989). In the structured interviewing literature, there is some evidence that PBDI questions may outperform SI questions (cf. Campion, Campion, & Hudson, 1994; Pulakos & Schmitt, 1995). However, only a few studies have been conducted and, as a result,

the question of the relative effectiveness of these two formats remains. In the context of predicting OCB, we mentioned earlier that SI questions, but not PBDI questions, predicted peer ratings of OCB (Latham & Skarlicki, 1995). However, procedural differences between the different question types may have accounted for the differences found by Latham and Skarlicki. Given this state of affairs, another goal of this study was to examine the relative effectiveness of SI and PBDI questions for predicting OCB.

DISPOSITIONAL CORRELATES OF OCB

An important distinction between task performance and citizenship behavior is that, whereas knowledge, skills, and abilities typically covary with task proficiency, the major source of variation in citizenship behavior is thought to be individual differences in employee dispositions and motivation (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). Several recent studies have been conducted with the purpose of reviewing the dispositional antecedents of OCB (Borman & Penner, 2001; Borman, Penner, Allen, & Motowidlo, 2001; Organ & Paine, 1999; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). In an effort to provide support for the construct validity of the interview, we selected a group of variables that have been empirically or theoretically linked to OCB. If these variables relate to scores from the interview, it would provide evidence bearing on the construct validity of the OCB interview. Our selection of variables was guided by current knowledge and the relevance of the variables to our particular setting. It is not our intention to suggest that these are the only or the best dispositional correlates of OCB. In the paragraphs that follow, we briefly review the variables included in this study.

Personal Initiative

Personal initiative is the extent to which people take an active and self-starting approach to work and go beyond what is formally required in a given job (Frese & Fay, 1997). Frese and Fay found that individuals who were high in personal initiative and were unemployed found jobs faster than their counterparts who were low in personal initiative. In addition, high initiative individuals had stronger intentions of becoming self-employed than did low initiative individuals. We included this variable because of its conceptual overlap with two of the dimensions measured in the OCB interview. Specifically, both successful task completion (STC) and organizational initiative (OI) reflect engaging in behavior that goes above and beyond what is acceptable. This is conceptually congruent with the definition of personal initiative. For STC, initiative is directed at exceeding expectations for one's work or assigned tasks. For OI, initiative is directed at improving conditions with the organization or work unit. Thus, we predicted that individuals who are high in personal initiative would receive high OCB interview scores.

Empathy

Social psychology theory posits that decisions to help others result from an empathetic concern for others that is rooted in social identification processes. Research in both social psychology and organizational behavior supports the link between empathy and willingness to engage in prosocial or citizenship behaviors. In a meta-analysis, Eisenberg and Miller (1987) found an average correlation of .17 between empathy and prosocial behavior outside of work. Empathy has also been related to acts of citizenship within organizations directed toward individuals. Specifically, McNeely and Meglino (1994) found a relationship between prosocial individual behavior and empathy. Similarly, Settoon and Mossholder (2002) found a relationship between empathy and interpersonal citizenship behavior where interpersonal citizenship behavior was generally defined as social behavior that has the effect of helping a coworker in need. Other-oriented empathy is one factor identified by Penner, Craiger, Fritzsche, and Friefield (1995) as comprising the prosocial personality. Research by Penner and his colleagues has consistently found a relationship between other-oriented empathy and self-reports and peer-reports of OCB, as well with as volunteerism (Midili & Penner, 1995; Penner & Finkelstein, 1998; Rioux & Penner, 2001). In their recent review of the personality and OCB literature, Borman et al. (2001) found an average weighted mean correlation of .28 between OCB and other-oriented empathy. Based on this research, we predicted that individuals who were high in empathy would receive higher scores in the OCB interview, especially on the helping and cooperating dimension.

Helpfulness

Studies concerning the helpful or altruistic personality suggest that some individuals are consistently more generous, helpful, and kind than others (Rushton, Chrisjohn, & Fekken, 1981). Helpfulness is also a factor identified by Penner et al. (1995) as comprising the prosocial personality. Penner and colleagues have found that self-reported helpfulness is related to self-reports and peer reports of OCB and volunteerism (Midili & Penner, 1995; Penner & Finkelstein, 1998; Rioux & Penner, 2001). Borman et al. (2001) report an average weighted mean correlation of .22 between helpfulness and OCB. Most recently, Allen (2003) found that helpfulness related to a specific form of OCB, experience as a mentor to others.

Positive Affect

Positive affect refers to the propensity to approach situations in a good mood (Watson & Clark, 1984). Several studies have found that positive mood is related to OCB (George, 1991; Midili & Penner, 1995; Rioux & Penner, 2001; Smith, Organ,

& Near, 1983). Similar findings are supported in the social psychology literature that indicates people are more likely to be helpful to others when they are in a positive mood (e.g., Isen & Levin, 1972).

Conscientiousness

Of the dispositional variables studied in relation to OCB, one of the most promising has been conscientiousness. Conscientious individuals adhere to ethical principles, have high levels of aspiration, are self-disciplined, and tend to think carefully before acting. Support for the relationship between conscientiousness and OCB has been found in multiple studies (Borman, White, & Dorsey, 1995; Motowidlo & VanScotter, 1994; Neuman & Kickul, 1998; Organ & Lingl, 1995). In their meta-analysis, Organ and Ryan (1995) found that conscientiousness was positively related to altruism and to generalized compliance.

To summarize, our purpose was to examine several questions concerning a structured employment interview designed to measure interviewees' propensities to engage in OCB. In conducting the study, we asked a sample of undergraduate students to complete the OCB interview as well as a self-report measure of dispositional characteristics. We also asked them to obtain coworker ratings of their OCB. We should mention that this sample was not chosen for its convenience. Rather, it was chosen because the interview was developed within an organization that often hires recent graduates from undergraduate institutions. Moreover, we made a special effort to recruit participants who were in majors sought by the organization. Thus, we attempted to obtain a sample of participants representative of entry-level college graduates in the organization.

METHOD

Participants

Participants included 192 students attending a large southeastern university, from a variety of majors (e.g., accounting, chemistry, engineering, geology). The overall sample consisted of 115 female students and 77 male students. Ages of the participants ranged from 17 to 51 with a mean age of 23 ($SD = 5.74$). The majority of respondents were White (58%) and the average job tenure, regardless of percent of time employed (i.e., part time, full time), was 2.3 years ($SD = 3.9$). The final number of participants with scored interviews in the study is188. For 4 participants, technical difficulties (e.g., videotape and audiotape recording failures) led to the inability to score their interviews.

Procedure

Participants were recruited through several means. Specifically, an advertisement was placed in the student newspaper, flyers were placed on campus bulletin boards, and letters of invitation to participate were sent via e-mail and postal mail to student organizations across the university. Interested individuals contacted the investigators by calling a toll-free number and appointments were scheduled on an individual basis. On arriving for the interview, an experimenter provided a detailed description of the process to each participant. If they agreed to participate, participants signed a confidentiality agreement, signed an informed consent form, and completed a demographic information sheet. Participants were told that they would be asked to respond to nine interview questions. They were informed that responses to the nine questions would be videotaped and audiotaped. The experimenter read each question aloud to the participant. The participant had 4 min to prepare a response and 5 min to provide their verbal response.

After the interview, participants completed a questionnaire containing questions measuring the dispositional variables described earlier. Following the self-report questionnaire, participants were given questionnaires to be delivered to and completed by three individuals with whom they had a close working relationship (e.g., in an employment setting, in a volunteer, service, or social organization). This questionnaire was designed to provide external validation information regarding the extent to which participants typically engage in OCB. To induce participants to follow through with this aspect of the study, they were told that their name would be entered into a $100.00 drawing for each questionnaire that was completed and returned in their name. To urge others (i.e., coworkers, supervisors) to complete the questionnaire, they were informed that their name would be entered into a separate $100.00 drawing on return of the completed questionnaire. Last, participants were given the opportunity to ask any questions, were thanked, and were compensated $35.00 for their time. A code number was assigned to each participant so that responses to the interview, self-report questionnaire, and coworker questionnaires could be matched.

Faking Manipulation

Participants were randomly assigned to one of three faking conditions. In the "honest" condition, they were asked to respond as honestly as possible to each interview question. In the "realistic faking" condition (RF), participants were asked to approach the interview as if they were being interviewed for a job that they really wanted and needed. Finally, in the "realistic faking with disclosure" condition (RF + D), participants received the same instructions as those in the

RF condition *and* the specific dimensions of OCB that the interview measured were described to them.

Interview Development

Interview development proceeded in six steps. Due to space constraints, a brief summary is provided here (additional information available on request). First, subject matter experts (SMEs) were asked to generate critical incidents of OCB that they had observed (Flanagan, 1954). As part of the critical incident writing process, a general definition of OCB was reviewed with SMEs along with how to generate and write critical incidents. SMEs then generated critical incidents that were sorted into common dimensions. This sorting procedure resulted in the five dimensions targeted in the interview. Specifically, the interview was designed around the five-dimensional model of citizenship behavior or contextual performance proposed by Borman and Motowidlo (1993). The first dimension is *successful task completion* (STC), which is concerned with the extent to which individuals go above and beyond what is required on a task or project. It involves putting forth extra effort to make sure a project is done well. *Organizational initiative* (OI) is concerned with going above and beyond one's assigned duties to improve the way things are accomplished in the organization. It includes behaviors such as offering to take on assignments that are not part of one's assigned duties and identifying and implementing changes to enhance individual or unit functioning. The third dimension, *helping and cooperating with others* (helping) is concerned with altruistic-type behaviors targeted at others and includes such things as assisting and helping coworkers, volunteering to help other departments, and exercising courtesy toward others. The fourth dimension, *following organizational rules and policies* (FP), is concerned with following orders, regulations, and policies even when there are no consequences for failing to do so. It also involves seeking appropriate approval before changing a procedure. Finally, *endorsing, supporting, and defending the organization* (ESD) involves representing the organization favorably to others, avoiding gossip about one's work unit or organization, and encouraging others to view the organization in a positive light.

The incidents then served as the basis for developing SI and PBDI questions. Once questions were written, SMEs reviewed and edited them during several subsequent meetings. Fourth, SMEs worked with the interview developers to form response standards for each question. Fifth, SMEs provided item ratings for each interview question indicating what dimension(s) of OCB each question assessed as well as their evaluations of the quality of each question. Finally, the interview questions went through several additional outside expert reviews (i.e., industrial–organizational psychologists) to ensure clarity.

Dispositional Measures

Personal initiative. Personal initiative was measured with seven items developed by Frese and Fay (1997; e.g., "I take initiative immediately even when others don't"). Responses were made on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Higher scores indicated a greater degree of initiative. Coefficient alpha was .77.

Helpfulness. The 20-item measure developed by Rushton et al. (1981) was used to measure self-reported acts of helpfulness (e.g., "I have offered to help a person with a disability or an elderly stranger cross the street"). Responses were made on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*very often*). Higher scores were indicative of a greater degree of helpfulness. Coefficient alpha was .81.

Empathy. Empathy was measured using the 7-item empathetic concern scale and the 7-item perspective taking scale (e.g., "I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision") developed by Davis (1980). A sample item from the empathic concern scale is, "I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me." Coefficient alpha was .71. A sample item from the perspective taking scale is, "I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision." Coefficient alpha was .67. Responses to both scales were made on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*does not describe me well*) to 7 (*describes me very well*). Higher scores indicated a greater degree of empathy.

Positive affect. Positive affect was measured with the six-item scale suggested by Burke, Brief, George, Roberson, and Webster (1989). Participants were provided with six statements, each of which contained one adjective. Participants were asked to indicate the extent that the statement described how they had felt during the past week (e.g., "How *excited* have you felt during the past week?"). Responses were provided on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*very little or not at all*) to 7 (*very much*). Coefficient alpha was .88.

Conscientiousness. Conscientiousness was measured with a 12-item scale from the NEO Five Factor Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1991). Responses were made on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*does not describe me well*) to 5 (*describes me very well*). Higher scores indicated a greater degree of conscientiousness. Coefficient alpha was .85.

Coworker Measure

Nature of relationship. Coworkers of the participants completed several questions to help clarify the nature of the relationship they had with the participant. Specifically, coworkers indicated in what context they had worked most with the participant (e.g., currently employed or had been employed in the same organization), described their working relationship (e.g., peer in a social, student or fraternal organization), and described the length of the relationship.

Organizational citizenship behavior. Coworkers were given a list of 31 behaviors and asked to indicate how often the target displayed each behavior relative to most people (e.g., "Willingly changes plans/priorities to cooperate with unforeseen events"). Responses were made on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*much less than most people*) to 7 (*much more than most people*). Participants were also given the response option of "unable to rate/not applicable." The items on this measure were designed to reflect and be consistent with the five OCB dimensions measured in the interview. Dimension scores were computed by averaging coworker responses to the items targeting the dimension on the rating form. Coefficient alpha ranged from .87 to .93. In addition, an overall score was computed by averaging coworkers' ratings on all of the items contained on the instrument. Then, these scores were averaged across all coworkers who provided ratings of a particular participant. These aggregated ratings were used in the analyses. To assess interrater reliability, we computed intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC). A total of 147 coworker rating forms were completed and returned. In all, 76 participants were rated by one or more coworkers. Of those 76, 28 (36.8%) were rated by a single coworker, 25 (33%) were rated by two coworkers, and 23 (30%) were rated by three coworkers. We computed a set of ICCs for ratings based on two raters, and another set for ratings based on three raters. ICC(1) for two raters ranged from .11 to .27 and ICC(2) ranged from .19 to .42. ICC(1) for three raters ranged from .16 to .33 and ICC(2) ranged from .37 to .60. Although these estimates seem somewhat smaller than those typically found in the literature (e.g., Conway & Huffcutt, 1997), we point out that our coworker ratings are unique from most in the literature in several respects. First, in some cases the coworkers for a single target may have come from different settings. That is, one coworker may have worked with the target in a traditional work setting and another could have worked with the target in a social organization setting. Second, coworkers from a single target could have shared hierarchically different relationships with the target. That is, one coworker could have been a peer, whereas another was a supervisor or a subordinate. Most studies examining the reliability of multiple raters are done in a single setting with raters of the same level. These factors may help explain the less than optimal reliability estimates.

Interview Scoring

The OCB interviews that participants completed were videotaped and scored at a subsequent time by a trained group of raters. All raters completed a training session prior to scoring any interviews. This training session lasted approximately 4 hr and covered a variety of topics. Topics included the definition of OCB, an explanation of the OCB dimensions, how to make ratings, explanation of common rating errors, and recognizing and classifying behavior. In addition to the information the raters received during the training, prior to making any formal ratings, they practiced documenting behaviors from actual interviews, distinguishing between behaviors and inferences, classifying behaviors into dimensions, and making ratings.

A two-person rating team scored each interview. These rating teams consisted of one male and one female, each of whom were a different race. Each set of raters scored one half of an interview; therefore, two sets of rating teams rated each participant's interview performance. Raters evaluated the response provided by the participant to each question. An initial rating was made for each dimension measured by a question as well as an overall question rating. Ratings were made on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*clearly unacceptable*) to 7 (*clearly superior*). Raters were also given the option of not rating a dimension if it was believed that the participant had not exhibited enough behavior to provide an accurate rating. After ratings were completed, the two raters discussed rating discrepancies greater than1 rating point and then made their final ratings independently. They were not required to come to a consensus in their final ratings.

We computed interrater reliability for the initial ratings using the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC). ICC values for initial ratings ranged from a low of .64 to a high of .93, which, we felt, justified averaging ratings across the two raters for a particular question. This resulted in scores, averaged across raters, for each of the dimensions measured by a particular question. To determine if it would be appropriate to aggregate dimension ratings across interview questions, we examined the convergent and discriminant correlations among interview question ratings. Not surprisingly, we found that the correlations among ratings of different OCB dimensions within a question were strong, whereas the correlations for the same dimension across questions were weaker. This suggested that interview raters had difficulty discriminating among the five OCB dimensions the interview was designed to measure.

As a result, we considered other possibilities for scoring the interview. Although the original interview dimensions (helping, STC, OI, FP, and ESD) were consistent with Borman and Motowidlo's (1993) initial conceptualization of the dimensions of OCB, more recently, Borman and colleagues developed a three-dimensional model of citizenship behavior (Borman, Buck, et al., 2001; Coleman & Borman, 2000). The dimensions in this model include *personal support* (which is

the same as helping and cooperating with others), *organizational support* (which is a combination of FP and ESD), and *conscientious initiative* (which is a combination of STC and OI). Because our interview raters appeared to have difficulty differentiating among the five original interview dimensions, we combined their ratings into the three-dimensional structure most recently advanced by Borman and his colleagues. To do this, interview question ratings of FP and ESD were averaged to form a rating of organizational support. Interview ratings of STC and OI were averaged to form a rating of conscientious initiative. Finally, the original helping and cooperating dimension was used as the personal support dimension. From this point on, we refer to the interview scores in terms of these three dimensions. It should be mentioned at this point that the three-dimensional model was not necessarily superior to the five-dimensional model. However, it is consistent with Borman and colleagues most recent research and is a more parsimonious approach. Intercorrelations among the five factors are available on request.

We also combined coworkers' ratings of participants OCB into the three broader dimensions so the dimensional structure of the interview and of coworkers' ratings would be congruent. The internal consistency reliabilities associated with the three broader dimensions ranged from .92 to .95. Finally, we computed interview scores for the three dimensions separately based on SI questions and based on PBDI questions. This allowed us to examine the relative effectiveness of these two types of questions for predicting OCB.

RESULTS

Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among the study variables are presented in Table 1.

Faking

One goal of the study was to evaluate the effects of faking on interview scores. Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations for the interview dimension scores and overall scores for each of the three faking conditions. As can be seen in the table, there was a small tendency for participants in the realistic faking condition to receive slightly lower organizational support, helping, and overall interview scores than participants in the honest and realistic faking with disclosure conditions. However, a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed that there were no statistically significant differences among the faking conditions on the three interview dimension scores—Wilks's $\Lambda = .96$, $F(6, 366) = 1.34$, *ns*. Moreover, a one-way univariate ANOVA revealed that there were no statistically significant differences in overall interview scores among the three faking conditions, $F(2,185) = 2.14$, *ns*.

TABLE 1
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Among Study Variables

Variable	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*13*	*14*
I–OS	—													
I–CI	.60	—												
I–PS	.57	.62	—											
Overall interview	.81	.85	.75	—										
C–OS	.31	.24	.00	.22	—									
C–CI	–.04	.27	–.06	.08	.70	—								
C–PS	.15	.32	.03	.25	.80	.84	—							
Overall coworker	.15	.30	–.02	.20	.91	.91	.95	—						
Personal initiative	.20	.25	.09	.22	.12	.20	.04	.13	—					
Helpfulness	.24	.30	.18	.25	.11	.11	.05	.10	.23	—				
Empathic concern	.08	–.01	.00	.05	–.10	.01	–.15	–.09	.07	.04	—			
Perspective taking	.18	.06	.01	.10	.26	.18	.22	.24	.21	.17	.18	—		
Positive affect	.17	.09	.07	.15	.27	.22	.18	.24	.41	.25	.02	.16	—	
Conscientiousness	.13	.06	.04	.12	.06	.09	–.04	.04	.28	.22	.19	.18	.26	—
Mean	3.69	4.11	3.77	3.86	5.61	5.71	5.87	5.73	5.58	3.16	4.28	4.66	4.88	3.56
SD	.79	.73	.84	.67	.87	.82	.78	.76	.87	.57	.49	.71	1.23	.25

Note. $N = 76$ for correlations involving coworker ratings. $N = 188$ for intercorrelations between interview scores and dispositional variables. $N = 192$ for intercorrelations among dispositional variables. I–OS, I–CI, and I–PS = interview scores for organizational support, conscientious initiative, and personal support, respectively. C–OS, C–CI, and C–PS = coworker ratings of organizational support, conscientious initiative, and personal support, respectively. Underlined values are statistically significant ($p < .05$).

TABLE 2
Interview Scores by Faking Condition

	Honest[a]		*Realistic Faking*[b]		*RF+Disclosure*[c]	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Organization support	3.68	0.78	3.66	0.76	3.73	0.83
Conscientious initiative	4.18	0.73	3.94	0.65	4.21	0.78
Personal support	3.81	0.86	3.62	0.88	3.9	0.77
Overall interview score	3.89	0.70	3.74	0.63	3.95	0.68

Note. RF = realistic faking.
[a]n = 61. [b]n = 63. [c]n = 64.

We provided participants in the RF + D condition with explanations of the five original interview dimensions (STC, OI, ESD, ESD, FPP), not the three dimensions proposed by Borman and his colleagues that have been the dependent variables up to this point. As a result, a more complete analysis of the effects of the faking manipulation on participants' interview scores should focus on the five original dimensions that were communicated to them. A one-way multivariate ANOVA on the five original interview dimensions yielded results congruent with those described earlier. The multivariate test of the faking manipulation showed that there were no statistically significant differences across the three conditions on the five original interview dimensions—Wilks's $\Lambda = .93$, $F(10, 362) = 1.16$, *ns*.

The results demonstrate that participants who were instructed to present themselves as if they were applying for a job they desired performed no differently than participants who were asked to answer the interview questions honestly. This was the case even when participants were aware of the OCB dimensions that were being evaluated in the interview. Given that the faking manipulation did not affect interview scores, participants from all three faking conditions were combined for the remaining analyses to take advantage of all the data that were available, and to increase statistical power. This was done only after further analyses showed that there were no significant differences among the faking conditions on the self-reported dispositional variables—Wilks's $\Lambda = ..88$, $F(26, 354) = .87$, *ns*, as well as the coworker ratings of OCB—Wilks's $\Lambda = .86$, $F(6, 138) = 1.81$, *ns*.[1]

[1]To assess the impact the faking manipulations may have had on the observed relationships among the study variables we conducted several additional analyses. We created dummy-coded representations of the experimental faking conditions. The dummy-coded variables were used as controls in the regression analyses predicting coworker ratings of OCB and were partialed from correlations involving interview ratings. There was minimal change in the magnitude of the observed regression coefficients and the observed correlations. Full analyses are available on request from the first author. We thank an anonymous reviewer for suggesting these analyses.

Relationships Among Interview Scores and Dispositional Variables

One goal of this study was to shed light on the validity of the OCB interview by examining the extent to which interview scores correlate in a meaningful way with theoretically relevant dispositional variables. Although previous literature suggests that several dispositional variables ought to correlate with measures of OCB, it is important to keep in mind that correlations obtained in past research typically have been small in magnitude. As can be seen in Table 1, four of the six dispositional variables studied significantly correlated with one or more of the interview dimensions. Specifically, personal initiative correlated with organizational support, conscientious initiative, and overall interview scores (*r*s = .20, .25, and .22, respectively). Helping correlated with organizational support, conscientious initiative, personal support, and overall interview scores (*r*s = .24, .30, .18, and .25, respectively). Finally, the perspective taking dimension of empathy ($r = .18$, $p < .05$) significantly correlated with organizational support and positive affect significantly correlated with organizational support ($r = .17$, $p < .05$) and overall interview scores ($r = .15$, $p < .05$). It is interesting to note that only 2 of 18 correlations between the dispositional variables and the coworker ratings of OCB were statistically significant.

Relationships Among Interview Scores and Coworker Ratings

As can be seen in Table 1, interview ratings of conscientious initiative were significantly and positively correlated with coworker ratings of organizational support ($r = .24$, $p < .05$), conscientious initiative ($r = .27$, $p < .05$), and personal support ($r = .32$, $p < .05$), as well as with overall coworker ratings ($r = .30$, $p < .05$). In addition, participants who received high organizational support scores in the interview tended to be evaluated highly by their coworkers in organizational support ($r = .31$, $p < .05$). Finally, overall interview ratings significantly correlated with coworker ratings of personal support ($r = .25$, $p < .05$).

We also conducted multiple regression analyses to assess the relationships among the interview dimensions as a set and each coworker rating dimension. The results are presented in Table 3. As can be seen in the table, as a set, the interview dimensions accounted for a statistically significant amount of variation in each coworker rating dimension. Interview scores accounted for 18% of the variance in peer ratings of organizational support ($R = .42$, $p < .05$). Interview ratings of both organizational support and conscientious initiative were significantly and positively related to coworker ratings on this dimension (βs = .36 and .28, respectively). Surprisingly, interview ratings of personal support were *negatively* related to coworker ratings of organizational support ($\beta = -.35$).

Table 3
Regression of Coworker Ratings on Interview Dimension Scores

	Dependent Variable			
	C–OS	*C–CI*	*C–PS*	*COV*
Independent variable				
Organization support	0.36	–0.12	0.09	0.13
Conscientious initiative	0.28	0.50	0.43	0.43
Personal support	–0.35	–0.29	–0.27	–0.34
R	0.42	0.40	0.38	0.40
R^2	0.18	0.16	0.15	0.16
Adj. R^2	0.14	0.12	0.11	0.12
F	4.84	4.13	3.84	4.20

Note. $N = 76$. Tabled values are standardized regression coefficients. C–OS, C–CI, and C–PS = coworker ratings of organizational support, conscientious initiative, and personal support, respectively; C–OV = overall coworker rating. Underlined values are statistically significant ($p<.05$).

Regarding coworker ratings of conscientious initiative, only the conscientious initiative dimension from the interview had a significant regression coefficient ($\beta = .50$). Again, the personal support dimension from the interview had a negative, albeit nonsignificant regression coefficient for this coworker rating dimension. Similar results were obtained for the coworker rating dimension of personal support. The conscientious initiative dimension from the interview had a strong positive relationship with this coworker rating dimension ($\beta = .43$), whereas the personal support dimension had a moderately negative relationship (although it was nonsignificant). Moreover, as a set, the interview dimensions accounted for 15% of the variation in coworker ratings on this dimension ($R = .38, p < .05$). Finally, the same pattern of results was obtained for overall coworker ratings. The interview dimensions as a set accounted for a significant amount of variation in overall coworker ratings ($R = .40, p < .05$). However, only the conscientious initiative dimension from the interview was positively related to overall coworker ratings ($\beta = .43, p < .05$). Once again, the personal support dimension displayed a negative relationship ($\beta = –.34, p < .05$).

Taken together, the results of the regression analyses suggest that the OCB dimensions from the structured interview accounted for a significant amount of variation in coworker ratings of OCB. Controlling for the effects of the other two interview dimensions, the conscientious initiative dimension was consistently and positively related to coworker ratings. Interview ratings of personal support were negatively related to the coworker ratings in all four of the analyses, although the relationship was significant in only two of them. This is surprising given the fact that the zero-order correlations between interview ratings of personal support and coworker ratings of OCB were nearly zero for all four dimensions. This suggests that personal support scores from the interview acted as a suppressor variable in the regression equations predicting coworker ratings. Classically defined, a suppressor variable is one that has a zero, or near zero, correlation with the criterion

variable and a negative regression weight (Pedhazur, 1997). Suppressor variables, when included in a regression equation, improve the prediction afforded by another predictor in the absence of the suppressor. Examining the correlations in Table 1 and the beta weights in Table 3, it can be seen that the regression coefficients for personal support in each of the four analyses predicting coworker ratings (βs = –.35, –.29, –.27, –.34) were larger than the corresponding zero-order correlations (*r*s = .00, –.06, .03, –.02, respectively). Pedhazur notes that suppressor variables remind researchers of the limitations of zero-order correlations in the context of prediction. This certainly applies here as the interview dimensions appear to be much more strongly related to coworker ratings when they are considered as a set than when they are considered independently.

Effects of Question Type

The next issue we examined was whether or not the format of the questions asked in the OCB interview had any influence on validity. To examine this issue, we computed scores for each of the three interview dimensions based on participants' responses to SI questions. We also computed the interview dimension scores based solely on participants' responses to the PBDI questions. Next, to examine the relative effectiveness of each type of question format, we regressed coworker ratings on the SI dimension scores in one analysis, and on the PBDI dimension scores in another. We did this for each coworker rating dimension, resulting in a total of eight regression analyses.

The results are presented in Tables 4 and 5. As shown in these tables, computing interview scores based on the two different formats adversely affected prediction

Table 4
Regression of Coworker Ratings on Interview Dimension Scores—SI Questions Only

	Dependent Variable			
	C–OS	*C–CI*	*C–PS*	*C–OV*
Independent variable				
Organization support	.26	–.08	.08	.10
Conscientious initiative	.20	.33	.32	.31
Personal support	–.17	–.13	–.15	–.17
R	.35	.26	.31	.31
R^2	.12	.07	.10	.10
Adj. R^2	.09	.03	.06	.06
F	3.12	1.66	2.46	2.48

Note. *N* = 76. Tabled values are standardized regression coefficients. S = situational interview; C–OS, C–CI, and C–PS = coworker ratings of organizational support, conscientious initiative, and personal support, respectively; C–OV = overall coworker rating. Underlined values are statistically significant ($p \leq .05$).

Table 5
Regression of Coworker Ratings on Interview Dimension Scores—PBDI Questions Only

	Dependent Variable			
	C–OS	*C–CI*	*C–PS*	*C–OV*
Independent variable				
Organization support	.38	.05	.22	.24
Conscientious initiative	.16	.20	.19	.20
Personal support	–.29	–.21	–.18	–.25
R	.36	.24	.26	.29
R^2	.13	.06	.07	.08
Adj. R^2	.09	.01	.02	.04
F	3.21	1.34	1.57	2.01

Note. $N = 76$. Tabled values are standardized regression coefficients. PBDI = patterned behavior description interview; C–OS, C–CI, and C–PS=coworker ratings of organizational support, conscientious initiative, and personal support, respectively. C–OV=Overall coworker rating. Underlined values are statistically significant ($p < .05$).

of the coworker rating dimensions. For both question types, the interview dimensions accounted for significant variation in only one coworker rating dimension (coworker ratings of organizational support). Interestingly, the results for this coworker rating dimension were fairly consistent for the two question types. In both, the interview dimensions accounted for approximately 13% of the variance. In both, the regression coefficient for organizational support was positive (although it was only marginally significant for SI questions [$p = .05$]), whereas it was negative for personal support (but not significant for SI questions). For the remaining coworker rating dimensions, as well as overall coworker ratings, neither the SI nor the PBDI dimensions accounted for significant variation. However, it should be noted that the conscientious initiative dimension of the interview accounted for unique variance associated with several dimensions of the coworker ratings. Thus, taken together, the pattern of results does not provide much evidence that one question format is superior to the other. In fact, the results suggest that breaking down the interview into smaller units (i.e., dimensions scores based on one type of question rather than both types of questions combined) has a detrimental effect on validity. This is probably due to a reduction in the reliability of the predictors because they are based on less information than dimension scores based on the entire interview. To assess the effect of measurement error on the results, we conducted the same set of hierarchical regression analyses using correlations corrected based on estimates of internal consistency (alpha coefficient) reliability for the interview scores. The average increase in *R* across all dimensions was .17 for the entire interview, .13 for SI questions only, and .19 for PBDI questions only. These results further support the notion that the combined question format demonstrates the stron-

gest validity with one exception. Specifically, coworker ratings of organizational support were better predicted by both single question type formats than by the combined format. Full regression results are available by request.

Contextual Influence

Recall that coworkers from various contexts provided ratings of OCB. Because it is possible that the relevance of OCB may vary across different environments, we conducted several analyses to determine the impact of context on the ratings.[2] We first conducted *t* tests to determine if there were mean differences in ratings provided by raters from business settings versus ratings provided by raters in social settings. These analyses were conducted on the disaggregated ratings for each participant because we were merely interested in the extent to which the rating context impacted ratings. A *t* test was computed for each of the three OCB dimensions, as well as the overall rating. No significant differences emerged. The means were highly similar and each *t* value was less than one. We next examined the correlation between the context variable (1 = business setting; 2 = social setting) with each of the OCB variables. The correlations ranged from .02 to .06. This suggests that OCB responses did not covary with the context within which raters made their ratings.

DISCUSSION

Borman and Penner (2001) suggested that current trends such as global competition, the popularity of team-based organizations, and greater emphasis on customer service and client satisfaction are likely to make OCB increasingly important in organizations in the coming years. Our goal in this study was to examine the potential effectiveness of a structured employment interview designed to predict who is likely to engage in these increasingly important behaviors. Our focus was on certain operational issues surrounding the interview, such as the potential for faking, as well as more traditional questions of construct validity.

Overall, our results allow us to be cautiously optimistic about the potential of an interview designed to assess propensity to engage in OCB. On one hand, we found that participants in the interview were unable to improve their scores by attempting to fake the interview. We also observed several meaningful relationships between interview scores and theoretically relevant dispositional variables. For example, we found that individuals who received high scores on dimensions assessed in the interview described themselves as the type of people who take initiative, and who are helpful, happy (i.e., positive affect), and able to understand the psychological

[2]We thank an anonymous reviewer for this suggestion.

viewpoints of others. These findings are consistent with prior research on the personality correlates of OCB. We should also point out that the magnitude of these correlations rival those typically obtained between self-reported dispositional tendencies and measures of OCB (cf. Borman et al., 2001). Finally, the results of our regression analyses revealed that ratings obtained from the OCB interview, as a set, significantly related to coworker ratings of OCB. A critic might argue that these relationships simply reflect capitalization on chance features of our relatively small samples. However, in response to this, we would point out that the adjusted R^2 values that we obtained indicated that our models accounted for 11% to 16% of criterion variance after adjusting for validity shrinkage.

On the other hand, there is evidence in our data to suggest that the interview may not be working as it was designed, even if it is predictive of OCB. Fundamentally, we are concerned here with the issue of construct validity. First, the convergent and discriminant validity coefficients for the question level dimension ratings suggested interview raters were not discriminating among the five dimensions the interview was initially intended to assess. Second, although several zero-order correlations between interview scores and self-reports of dispositional tendencies were significant, others were not. Most surprising was that conscientiousness did not relate to interview ratings of OCB or to coworker ratings of OCB. Although we cannot identify with confidence why this was the case, we can point to several possible explanations. First, many of the dispositional variables had small standard deviations (i.e., the standard deviation for conscientiousness was .25), suggesting range restriction might be responsible for the weak relationships. Second, although some research shows that others' ratings of a person's personality are predictive of his or her OCB (Brown, Diefendorff, Kamin, & Lord, 1999), our self-reports of personality were context free. Based on the theoretical argument advanced by Mischel and Shoda (1995), suggesting that personality is context specific and to predict behavior based on personality, one must assess it within the context of a particular situation; we might have obtained stronger relationships had we obtained personality ratings from coworkers instead of from participants themselves.

Also raising questions about the construct validity of the OCB interview is the fact that in our regression analyses we did not see interview ratings on one OCB dimension consistently relating to the same OCB dimension as rated by coworkers (convergent validity). For example, interview ratings of conscientious initiative predicted each of the coworker rating dimensions, as well as overall coworker ratings of OCB. We would be more encouraged about construct validity if ratings of conscientious initiative in the interview were strongly related to coworker ratings conscientious initiative (and perhaps overall ratings), and less strongly related to the other coworker rating dimensions. These findings may not be too surprising in light of recent research. Specifically, LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) meta-analytically examined the dimensionality of OCB. Using Organ's five-dimension framework, the authors found that the average uncorrected correlation among the five dimensions was .53 (corrected correlations averaged .67). The authors also

found that there were no differences in the relationships with the most common set of predictors associated with OCB (satisfaction, commitment, fairness, leader support, and conscientiousness) across OCB dimensions. In other words, the relationship between OCB predictors and OCB does not depend on how OCB is defined. The authors also tested this hypothesis using the broader OCBO and OCBI dimensions of OCB and found the same result. There were no differential relationships with the predictors across the two dimensions. Finally, the authors contrasted overall OCB with dimensional measures. Generally, the authors found relationships were just as strong or better using the broader OCB overall measure of OCB than a dimensional measure. The authors concluded that "the five dimensions of OCB are not much more than equivalent indicators of OCB" (pp. 60–61). Hence, our construct validity concerns may be more a function of the latent variable nature of OCB than the limitations of the interview itself.

We found little evidence for the superiority of one question type over another. Although Latham and Skarlicki (1995) found that SI questions were more effective at predicting OCB than were questions focusing on past behavior, other research shows a slight advantage for questions focusing on past behavior (Campion et al., 1994; Pulakos & Schmitt, 1995). Our study does not tip the balance of evidence in either direction; it simply shows that a structured interview consisting of both types of questions can be predictive of others' ratings of OCB. In fact, the relationships we observed compare favorably with those found in meta-analytic investigations of the criterion-related validity of structured employment interviews (e.g., McDaniel, Whetzel, Schmidt, & Maurer, 1994).

In closing, we believe that the results of this study suggest that structured interviews have the potential for being a useful tool for predicting who will engage in OCB in the work environment. Clearly, more research is needed that examines the validity of such interviews in actual work settings. Nonetheless, we are optimistic. However, our optimism is tempered by the questions this study raises about the constructs that are being measured by the interview. Although this is not a unique problem in industrial and organizational psychology (cf. Klimoski & Brickner, 1987), it does suggest that more research on the interview is needed before we truly understand why it is predictive of OCB. On this issue, we have to agree with Guion (1998), who lamented that, "at this point in the history of employment psychology, we should be getting tired of not knowing what we are doing, no matter how [well] we are doing it" (p. 618).

REFERENCES

Allen, T. D. (2003). Mentoring others: A dispositional and motivational approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 62,* 134–154.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1996). Effects of impression management and self-deception on the predictive validity of personality constructs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 261–272.

Borman, W. C., Buck, D. E., Hanson, M. A., Motowidlo, S. J., Stark, S., & Drasgow, F. (2001). An examination of the comparative reliability, validity, and accuracy of performance ratings made using computerized adaptive rating scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 965–973.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of extrarole performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Borman, W. B., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance, 10,* 99–109.

Borman, W. C., & Penner, L. A. (2001). Citizenship performance: Its nature, antecedents, and motives. In B. R. Roberts & R. T. Hogan (Eds.), *The interface of personality and industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 45–61). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T. D., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2001). Personality predictors of citizenship performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9,* 52–69.

Borman, W. C., White, L. A., & Dorsey, D. W. (1995). Effects of ratee task performance and interpersonal factors on supervisor and peer ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80,* 168–177.

Brown, D. J., Diefendorff, J. M., Kamin, A. M., & Lord, R. G. (1999, April). *Predicting organizational citizenship with the big five: The source matters*. Paper presented at the 14th annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA.

Burke, M. J., Brief, A. P., George, J. M., Roberson, L., & Webster, J. (1989). Measuring affect at work: Confirmatory analyses of competing mood structures with conceptual linkage to cortical regulatory systems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57,* 1091–1102.

Campion, M. A., Campion, J. E., & Hudson, J. P., Jr. (1994). Structured interviewing: A note on incremental validity and alternative question types. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79,* 998–1002.

Coleman, V. I., & Borman, W. C. (2000). Investigating the underlying structure of the citizenship performance domain. *Human Resource Management Review, 10,* 25–44.

Conway, & Huffcutt (1997). Human Performance

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1991). *NEO Five-factor Inventory.* PAR Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.

Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44,* 113–126.

Eisenberg, N., & Miller, P. A. (1987). The relation of empathy to prosocial and related behaviors. *Psychological Bulletin, 101,* 91–119.

Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incidents technique. *Psychological Bulletin, 51,* 327–358.

Frese, M., & Fay, D. (1997). The concept of personal initiative: Operationalization, reliability and validity in two German samples. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 70,* 139–16.

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

Guion, R. M. (1998). *Assessment, measurement, and prediction for personnel decisions*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Hough, L. M., Eaton, N. K., Dunnette, M. D., Kamp, J. D., & McCloy, R. A. (1990). Criterion-related validities of personality constructs and the effect of response distortion on those validities. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75,* 581–595.

Isen, A. M., & Levin, A. F. (1972). Effects of feeling good on helping: Cookies and kindness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34,* 385–393.

Janz, J. T. (1982). Initial comparisons of patterned behavior description interviews versus unstructured interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67,* 577–580.

Janz, J. T. (1989). The patterned behavior description interview: The best prophet of the future is the past. In R. W. Eder & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *The employment interview: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 158–168). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kleinmann, M., Kuptsch, C., & Koeller, O. (1996). Transparency: A necessary requirement for construct validity of assessment centres. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 45,* 67–84.

Klimoski, R., & Brickner, M. (1987). Why do assessment centers work? The puzzle of assessment center validity. *Personnel Psychology, 40,* 243–260.

Latham, G. P. (1989). The reliability, validity, and practicality of the situational interview. In R. W. Eder & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *The employment interview: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 169–182). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Latham, G. P., & Skarlicki, D. P. (1995). Criterion-related validity of the situational and patterned behavior description interviews with organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Performance, 8,* 67–80.

LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 52–65.

Maurer, S. D., Sue-Chan, C., & Latham, G. P. (1999). The situational interview. In R. W. Eder & M. M. Harris (Eds.), *The employment interview handbook* (pp. 143–158). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McDaniel, M. A., Whetzel, D. L., Schmidt, F. L., & Maurer, S. (1994). The validity of employment interviews: A comprehensive review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79,* 599–616.

McNeely, B. L., & Meglino, B. M. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial organizational behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79,* 836–844.

Midili, A. R., & Penner, L. A. (1995, August). *Dispositional and environmental influences on Organizational Citizenship Behavior.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York.

Mischel, W., & Shoda, Y. (1995). A cognitive-affective system theory of personality: Reconceptualizing situations, dispositions, dynamics, and invariance in personality structure. *Psychological Review, 102,* 246–268.

Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from extrarole performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79,* 475–480.

Neuman, G. A., & Kickul, J. R. (1998). Organizational citizenship behaviors: Achievement orientation and personality. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 13,* 263–279.

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

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

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

Organ, D. W., & Paine, J. B. (1999). A new kind of performance for industrial and organizational psychology: Recent contributions to the study of organizational citizenship behavior. In C. L. Cooper, & I. T. Robertson, et al. (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 337–368). Chichester, England: American Ethnological Press.

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

Pedhazur, E. J. (1997). *Multiple regression in behavioral research: Explanation and Prediction.* Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Penner, L. A., Craiger, J. P., Fritzsche, B. A., & Friefield, T. R. (1995). Measuring the prosocial personality. In J. Butcher & C. D. Spielberger (Eds.), *Advances in personality assessment* (Vol. 10, pp. 147–163). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Penner, L. A., & Finkelstein, M. A. (1998). Dispositional and structural determinants of volunteerism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74,* 525–537.

Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 262–270.

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research, 31,* 351–363.

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance, 10,* 133–152.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management, 26,* 513–563.

Pulakos, E. D., & Schmitt, N. (1995). Experience-based and situational interview questions: Studies of validity. *Personnel Psychology, 48,* 289–308.

Rioux, S. M., & Penner, L. A. (2001). The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A motivational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 1306–1314.

Settoon, R. P., & Mossholder, K. W. (2002). Relationship quality and relationship context as antecedents of person- and task-focused interpersonal citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 255–267.

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

Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1984). Negative affectivity: The disposition to experience aversive emotional states. *Psychological Bulletin, 96,* 465–490.

Wernimont, P. F., & Campbell, J. P. (1968). Signs, samples, and criteria. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 52,* 372–376.