Employ Respons Rights J (2006) 18:89–109
DOI 10.1007/s10672-006-9007-x

ORIGINAL PAPER

Gathering Information and Exercising Influence: Two Forms of Civic Virtue Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Jill W. Graham · Linn Van Dyne

Published online: 25 July 2006
© Springer Science+Business Media, Inc. 2006

Abstract Political behavior at work often is disparaged as self-serving activity that undermines the efficient pursuit of organizational goals. Yet politics has a more benign meaning as well: responsible participation in decision-making processes, keeping informed, and promoting innovative ideas that serve long-term organizational interests. To date, the negative image of organizational politics among managers and scholars has limited research on the positive contributions of responsible political participation, a form of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) known as civic virtue.

This paper draws on political philosophy and organizational research to consider two forms of civic virtue OCB: gathering information and exercising influence. Both are proactive and can have beneficial results for individuals, organizations, and society. Conceptually, the two forms of civic virtue are related. Yet they also are different. Results of a field study of 245 employees and their supervisors provide support for similarities and differences in the two forms of civic virtue. We discuss theoretical and practical implications of our study, and the benefits of continued research on both aspects of civic virtue OCB.

Keywords Civic virtue · Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) · Participation

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando FL, April 2003, in a symposium entitled "New Perspectives on the Dimensionality of Organizational Citizenship Behavior."
A newer version of this paper was presented at the October 2005 International Meeting of the Association on Employment Practices and Principles (AEPP) in Baltimore, MD.

J. W. Graham (✉)
School of Business-Management, Loyola University Chicago,
1 E. Pearson, #432, Chicago, IL, 60611
e-mail: jgraham@luc.edu

L. Van Dyne
The Eli Broad Graduate School of Management, Michigan State University,
N475 Business College Complex, East Lansing, MI

Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) introduced the term *organizational citizenship behavior* to describe innovative and spontaneous behavior as a form of employee performance that goes "beyond role requirements for accomplishment of organizational functions" (Katz & Kahn, 1978: 403). Over the years, the theoretical discipline on which most OCB researchers have based their work is social psychology, where a substantial literature on prosocial behavior already exists (see Staub, 1978 for an early review). Political philosophy, which is the original source of the term *citizenship*, provides an alternative theoretical basis for studying citizenship within organizations (Graham, 1986a, 1991, 2000).

Different theoretical foundations need not be incompatible because diverse perspectives can enrich our understanding of organizational processes. The research reported here explores a form of OCB – civic virtue, which Graham initially defined as "responsible participation in the political life of the organization" (1986a: 11). Proactive behaviors such as civic virtue, which require initiative and active participation, are critical to organizational effectiveness because informed involvement contributes to sustainable competitive advantage (Crant, 2000; Frese & Fay, 2001). Engaging in civic virtue at work, moreover, develops skills and habits that can benefit individuals and the larger society. Individuals who demonstrate civic skills such as information processing and persuasive communication may advance their career prospects. In addition, utilizing such skills in one arena may lead to people using them in other arenas as well. More responsible political participation at work could help to reverse the societal trend in some western democracies of decreased political involvement in local and national governance.

Even though political participation is highly valued in the abstract and Organ's early work (1988) endorsed civic virtue as an important form of OCB, civic virtue also can be controversial and even suspect in organizational settings (Organ, 1997). Perhaps that is one reason early OCB research in the tradition of social psychology operationalized civic virtue only with uncontroversial behaviors such as the willingness to stay informed about organizational affairs through voluntary meeting attendance and reading organizational publications (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991). For example, a recent meta-analysis of nearly two decades of research on OCB (where civic virtue was typically operationalized with the social psychological emphasis on uncontroversial behaviors) demonstrated strong relationships among the most commonly studied dimensions of OCB (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). This research also demonstrated equivalent relationships between types of uncontroversial OCB and the predictors considered most often by OCB scholars.

Those findings raise important questions about the dimensionality of OCB. Perhaps the five most commonly researched dimensions "are not much more than equivalent indicators of OCB" (LePine et al., 2002: 60–61). Perhaps OCB should be redefined as a general construct representing the tendency to be cooperative and helpful in organizational settings. Alternatively, perhaps the OCB literature should return to Graham's (1986a) and Organ's (1988) original conceptualization and recognize both cooperative and change-oriented forms of civic virtue.

Including challenging behaviors as part of civic virtue has the potential of enriching our understanding of OCB by moving beyond pleasant and positive employee behaviors that are popular with management: generalized compliance (obedience), altruism (helping), courtesy, and sportsmanship (Organ, 1988). In addition, this broader conceptualization is consistent with Katz and Kahn's (1978) original emphasis on change-oriented behaviors. We draw on political philosophy to emphasize two types of responsible participation that can be referred to as gathering information and exercising influence. Political philosophy includes both the potentially challenging aspects of voice, such as advocating new ideas and encouraging others to speak up (Avery & Quinones, 2002; Graham, 1986a; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994, and others), and the uncontroversial behaviors of staying informed about organization affairs, as equally important aspects of responsible participation.

The goal of the research we report in this paper is to draw on political theory and research on responsible political participation in the public arena, as well as on existing research on civic virtue in work organizations, to examine similarities and differences in two forms of civic virtue. We also compare and contrast the two forms of civic virtue with the more commonly researched form of OCB known as altruism or helping behavior. Thus, we argue that OCB should not be limited to behaviors that managers find unambiguously positive, at the expense of citizenship behaviors that managers may sometimes find inconvenient, such as civic virtue (Graham, 1991), but which can stimulate organizational innovation and, where warranted, timely self-correction.

Research on civic virtue is important for several reasons. First, it is consistent with Organ's (1988) initial delineation of citizenship as multidimensional. It also responds to LePine and colleagues' (2002) call for theoretically-based studies that enhance our knowledge of under-researched forms of organizational citizenship. Second, differences in the fundamental conceptual nature of gathering information (affiliative) and exercising influence (change-oriented) suggest that these two forms of civic virtue OCB may have related but different nomological networks (Graham, 2000; Van Dyne, Cummings, & McLean Parks, 1995). Third, understanding predictors of civic virtue citizenship behavior is important because prosocial behaviors based on employee initiative and active participation are increasingly critical to ongoing organizational performance, given the dynamic nature of the competitive environment (Frese & Fay, 2001).

Definitions

Graham (1986a) and Organ (1988) identified two aspects of civic virtue: prosocial behaviors associated with gathering information, and exercising influence with the intent of making positive contributions to the organization. Both forms represent promotive behavior that is positively intended and proactive; it causes things to happen. In theorizing about promotive behaviors, Van Dyne and colleagues (1995) conceptualized two basic types of these positively intended proactive behaviors: affiliative and change-oriented behaviors. In developing our ideas about two forms of civic virtue as equally important forms of responsible participation, we draw on the theoretical distinctions proposed by Van Dyne and colleagues. Thus, we ground our conceptualization in an existing literature. This should facilitate comparison with prior research and should also help scholars to integrate and accumulate knowledge about different types of promotive behaviors. For example, Van Dyne and colleagues reviewed and integrated over 50 papers on extra-role behavior and related constructs, and then concluded that most promotive constructs could be described in terms of a continuum ranging from highly affiliative (behavior that solidifies and preserves relationships) to highly challenging (behavior that recommends changes to the status quo). Affiliative behavior is overtly cooperative and is generally uncontroversial. Challenging behavior is characterized by constructive suggestions for change and focuses on task performance and high standards of excellence.

Van Dyne and colleagues' definition of promotive behaviors (proactive and positively intended) parallels the political philosophy conceptualization of responsible participation. Thus, we use their theoretical framework to further our understanding of civic virtue as a form of promotive behavior that can range along a continuum from more affiliative to more challenging. In presenting these ideas, we focus on the two ends of this continuum (primarily affiliative versus primarily challenging behaviors) to elucidate similarities and differences. In general, we suggest that *gathering information* exemplifies affiliative-promotive behavior and that *exercising influence* exemplifies change-oriented-promotive behavior. Consistent with the OCB literature, we limit our focus to prosocial behaviors and exclude behavior that is motivated by self-interest alone. Thus, we acknowledge that some forms of gathering information and exercising influence

can be self-serving and/or politically motivated (Bolino, 1999), but we exclude them from our consideration in this paper.

Affiliative-promotive behavior is cooperative. Gathering information as a form of civic virtue includes participating in meetings and organizational functions, reading newsletters and announcements, and paying attention to other sources of information that might be relevant to the organization. Responsible organizational citizens gather information so that they are knowledgeable about events and issues that might have implications for the organization, their work group, and/or their jobs. We term this aspect of civic virtue *CV-information*.

In contrast, change-oriented-promotive behavior has the goal of modifying the status quo. Exercising influence as a form of civic virtue includes speaking up and making suggestions for change. Responsible organizational citizens use critical thinking skills to identify possible problems or improvements. After careful analysis, they speak up to express their opinions, exercise influence, and recommend modifications in policies or procedures. Speaking up is change-oriented and thus a potentially controversial aspect of civic virtue. We use the term *CV-influence* for change-oriented civic virtue.

Overview of this paper

In the next section, we present a brief overview of civic virtue based on classical and contemporary political philosophy. We also describe Verba, Schlozman, and Brady's (1995) Civic Voluntarism Model of political participation in the public arena. We apply these perspectives to civic virtue in workplace organizations and develop a preliminary model of antecedents to civic virtue (responsible participation) in work organizations. We then test the model with matched field study data from employees and their supervisors and conclude by discussing implications for research and practice.

Political philosophy

Graham (2000) outlined three historical perspectives on the purpose and functioning of governance systems, each with a distinctive definition of what constitutes civic virtue for the average citizen. Contemporary political theory similarly emphasizes the role of civic virtue and includes governance approaches that place contrasting emphasis on gathering information and exercising influence (Putnam, 1993). Governance by the elite, which Graham (2000) traces back to Plato's *Republic*, entails a hierarchical division of labor that concentrates the proactive behaviors of CV-information and CV-influence in the hands of a meritocratic elite. Good citizenship for ordinary citizen-subjects in such a system is limited to obedience and loyalty, with no place for responsible political participation. A contemporary example of civic virtue based on Plato's hierarchical governance system might be Singapore, where governance is centralized and officials are highly trained, highly paid, and well respected (Keng, Jiuan, & Wirtz, 1998).

Governance based on broad citizen participation, which Graham (2000) traces back to Aristotle's *Politics*, assumes an educated middle class that can provide moderation and stability within a constitutional governance system. Aristotle recommended wide participation in legislative and judicial functions, giving rise eventually, for example, to citizen assemblies and trial-by-jury. The result is a constitutional form of government where average citizens proactively gather information (CV-information) and, when chosen to serve, express their opinions (CV-influence). In contemporary America, those who adopt republican values (note the small "r" in republican, indicating a philosophical perspective rather than affiliation with a particular political party) emphasize generalized participation by all citizens. For example, this includes the

benefits of community caucuses, newsletters, and interest group sessions that facilitate information exchange and community consensus-building (Etzioni, 1993). Here, gathering information (CV-information) is key to political involvement and citizen participation.

Governance based on structural mechanisms, which Graham (2000) traces to the eighteenth century Age of Enlightenment, highlights individual rights and the design of systems to protect rights from the abuse of power (Berlin, 1970; Sinopoli, 1987). The result is a functional division of labor, with constraints on government, that grants citizens the right to participate proactively in governance, should they choose to get involved in acquiring knowledge (CV-information) and advocating their views (CV-influence). In contemporary America, those who adopt liberal values (again, note the small "l" in liberal) stress structural checks and balances in the distribution of power, augmented by citizen responsibility to safeguard individual liberty by monitoring government conduct and proposing constructive suggestions for change (Burtt, 1993). Looking further back, Manville and Ober (2003) proposed that the obligation in classical Athenian democracy to "seek to reverse misguided policy or decisions or to call attention to misbehavior" could serve as a useful governance model for contemporary knowledge economies in which a willingness to challenge the status quo stems from the fact "that every citizen is responsible for the welfare of every other" (Manville & Ober, 2003: 140). Throughout western history, exercising influence (CV-influence) has been and continues to be an important form of political involvement and citizen participation.

Having briefly described these three perspectives on governance and the relative importance of the two forms of civic virtue in each, we now shift our attention to research and theory on political participation. Verba and colleague's (1995) Civic Voluntarism Model (CVM) of contemporary participation in the public arena proposes three basic reasons for why people don't engage in political participation: (1) *Ability*: they can't because they don't have the necessary resources (time, money, or civic skills); (2) *Motivation*: they don't want to because they are not psychologically engaged by political issues (no interest, no belief that involvement makes a difference, or no sense of membership in a group with shared political interests); and (3) *Recruitment/Opportunity*: they haven't been asked to participate. Empirical research supports this conceptualization and demonstrates that different types of political participation (e.g., voting, volunteering to support particular civic issues, raising and contributing money for civic causes, and persuading other citizens to get involved and engage in active political participation) have different antecedents (Verba et al., 1995).

Civic virtue within workplace organizations

Crant (2000) reviewed several of the existing proactive employee behavior constructs (proactive personality, personal initiative, role-breadth, self-efficacy, and taking charge) and recommended that future research should compare different types of proactive behavior within the same research design. Consistent with this, LePine and colleagues' meta-analysis (2002) noted that most prior research on OCB has focused on affiliative behaviors (e.g., altruism, courtesy, and sportsmanship). In addition, their results provided initial evidence that the nomological networks for these affiliative constructs are more similar than different. Accordingly, they recommended that future research examine other forms of OCB (such as constructive, change-oriented behaviors) that have received less attention. Applying this to our interest in civic virtue suggests the benefits of comparing the similarities and differences in the antecedents of two specific promotive and proactive behaviors: CV-information and CV-influence.

In this section, we draw on classical and contemporary political philosophy and research on participation (in the public arena and in work organizations) to develop a preliminary model of

antecedents to CV-information and CV-influence. Since both forms of civic virtue represent responsible participation in the form of positive, promotive behavior, in some cases our application of previous theory and research suggests similar antecedents for the two behaviors. In other cases, our analysis of differences in the constructs leads us to predict different antecedents because CV-information is fundamentally affiliative and CV-influence is fundamentally change-oriented (Van Dyne et al., 1995).

We start by describing the rationale for our model. We included work performance, job level, and organizational commitment because prior research has demonstrated relationships with OCB and we wanted to make sure that our research could be linked to and compared with prior OCB research (LePine et al., 2002; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). Moving beyond past research, we also included three additional predictors that should have special relevance to civic virtue citizenship. Experienced significance on the job heightens awareness of the importance of organizational issues and thus may increase felt responsibility to keep informed and exercise influence directed at improving organizational policies and practices (Graham, 1986b). Self-esteem is an individual's sense of positive self-worth and self-confidence (Brockner, 1988), which should be related to OCB that involves the potential risk of speaking up and making suggestions for change. Finally, justice beliefs provide a standard for evaluating organizational issues and should provide a foundation for responsible change-oriented types of OCB. In sum, our research builds on and extends past research by specifying similarities and differences in these two forms of civic virtue.

Work performance

To date, a number of studies have demonstrated relationships between supervisory evaluations of employee performance and OCB. For example, MacKenzie and colleague's (1991) field study of over 300 insurance sales agents demonstrated positive relationships between task performance, altruism OCB, and civic virtue OCB. Van Dyne and LePine's (1998) field study of over 500 employees in a wide range of jobs and organizations demonstrated positive relationships between task performance, helping OCB, and voice OCB. Skarlicki and Latham (1995) demonstrated a positive relationship between OCB by faculty members directed at their colleagues and performance as operationalized by number of publications. Thus, we include task performance as a predictor of civic virtue so that we can examine whether the other predictors in our model increase explained variance in the two forms of civic virtue OCB, over and above task performance. To summarize, based on prior theory and empirical research, we expected that prior work performance would be positively related to both forms of civic virtue.

H1: The higher the work performance (T1), the higher the CV (T2) (1a: CV-information; 1b: CV-influence).

Job level

Platonic theory provides the classic rationale for linking job level and participation: those at the top (the elite) are responsible for governance. Consistent with this, studies of political participation consistently demonstrate that socio-economic status (SES, which includes occupational stratification) predicts civic responsibility and active political participation (Milbrath & Goel, 1977; Verba & Nie, 1972). In addition, more recent political research has examined the components of SES separately and demonstrated that occupational stratification (comparable to job level) independently increased participation (Verba et al., 1995). The explanation for this enhanced opportunity to participate actively is twofold: (a) high-level jobs require and further develop communication and influence skills that are essential to political participation; and (b)

those in high status occupations are often asked to serve in leadership roles for community and political organizations.

Similarly in work organizations, those at higher job levels have more responsibility and opportunity to gather information and influence decision-making (Salancik, 1977). They also experience social pressure to participate actively in the organization (Hrebiniak, 1974). Prior research demonstrates that employees in jobs with more responsibility spend more time interacting with others, exchanging information, exhibiting initiative, and engaging in innovative or change-oriented behaviors (Scott & Bruce, 1994; Van Dyne et al., 1994; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Those in higher level positions have greater ability and opportunity to participate. This is true even though accurate and timely information may sometimes be withheld from managers by subordinates who are afraid that their information might be received as "bad news" or reflect badly on their own behavior. In fact, those at higher job levels who are aware of their subordinates' reticence are likely to try even harder to seek out information because it is vital to making good decisions (i.e., to do their job). Managers who do not take the initiative to gather information and act on it (and recent corporate scandals suggest some managers are like that) do not exemplify the form of OCB under study here. Thus, we predicted positive relationships for both forms of civic virtue.

H2: The higher the job level, the higher the CV (2a: CV-information; 2b: CV-influence).

Commitment to the organization

Psychological involvement and political engagement are terms used by political researchers to describe citizen interest and involvement in public affairs. For example, Milbrath and Goel (1977) cite thirteen studies demonstrating the importance of psychological involvement for political participation. In the civic arena, psychological involvement leads to community identification and participation in civic processes (Almond & Verba, 1963; Verba & Nie, 1972; Verba et al., 1995).

In the organizational realm, affective organizational commitment describes individual attachment to the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1984). When individuals feel strongly committed to the organization, they reciprocate with high levels of involvement (Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996) such as attending meetings, acquiring information about organizational issues (Moorman, Niehoff, & Organ, 1993), protecting company resources, and speaking up with suggestions for improvements (Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997; Van Dyne et al., 1994; Withey & Cooper, 1989). Thus, we hypothesized a positive relation between commitment and both forms of civic virtue.

H3: The higher the commitment, the higher the CV (3a: CV-information; 3b: CV-influence).

In sum and consistent with prior research on other forms of OCB, our first three hypotheses propose that the two forms of civic virtue will both be positively related to work performance, job level, and affective commitment to the organization. We now address three additional predictors with potential relevance to civic virtue.

Experienced significance

When individuals attach special meaning to an event or issue, their attention and involvement increase. For example, right before an election, even those who are not routinely involved in political affairs become psychologically engaged. This is especially relevant in high-stimulus campaigns where election outcomes are uncertain and the importance of each individual vote is

emphasized (Campbell, 1960). Psychological involvement and active participation also increase during national elections when outcomes have implications for future policy making and governance (Milbrath & Goel, 1977). In these cases, psychological involvement stimulates political behaviors (such as reading candidate position statements, discussing differences in candidate voting records, and expressing personal opinions about the suitability of candidates) in response to a heightened sense of the importance of participation.

In work settings, we suggest that the perceived importance or meaningfulness of work will enhance psychological involvement and increase civic virtue. Experienced significance is the extent to which employees feel their work is important and that their contributions make a difference to the organization (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). Experienced significance is a situation-specific function of the job and work contributions. When employees have a heightened sense of task meaningfulness, responsibility, and intrinsic motivation, they are more willing to invest time and effort to acquire information that might be relevant to their jobs (Moorman, 1993). Furthermore, when employees experience high levels of responsibility at work, they respond proactively by taking charge and suggesting improvements to the system (Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Van Dyne et al., 1994). Accordingly we hypothesized positive relationships for both forms of civic virtue.

H4: The higher the experienced significance of the work, the higher the CV (4a: CV-information; 4b: CV-influence).

Self-esteem

In contrast to experienced meaningfulness which is situation-specific, global self-esteem is a relatively stable individual difference (Coopersmith, 1967). Global self-esteem is an individual's sense of positive self-worth and self-confidence across situations, settings, and time (Brockner, 1988). Research on political behavior in civil society demonstrates a link between self-esteem and change-oriented political participation based on "political efficaciousness." People with high self-esteem feel they can influence decision-making (Almond & Verba, 1963; Lane, 1959). This leads to proactive political behavior such as engaging in political protests and persuading others to get involved in political issues (Verba & Nie, 1972).

Similarly, psychological and organizational research has demonstrated that global self-esteem predicts challenging and change-oriented behavior at work (Brockner, 1988; Parker, 1993). Those with a strong sense of self exhibit initiative and assertiveness; they conform less; they are less afraid to rock the boat (Staw & Boettger, 1990; Wells & Marwell, 1976); and they are more willing to take risks and express opinions, even if others differ (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998). By definition, CV-influence requires risk-taking and initiative because it can be viewed as a challenge to the status quo (Nemeth & Staw, 1989). Combining the evidence from political philosophy and organizational research, we proposed that self-esteem is an important antecedent of CV-influence.

H5: The higher the self-esteem, the higher the CV-influence.

The valence of a relationship between self-esteem and information-gathering, however, is less clear. Low self-esteem could dampen initiative, thereby reducing willingness to gather information and attend meetings. Alternatively, low self-esteem could increase motivation to participate in groups as a way to overcome perceived individual limitations. Given these contradictory forces and the lack of prior relevant research, we do not expect a relationship between self-esteem and CV-information.

Justice beliefs

Since the time of Plato and Aristotle, philosophers have proposed that virtue entails love of justice and that justice is a key purpose of governance. Building social capital through civic engagement and influence (Putnam, 1993) increases "the capacity to transcend narrow points of view and conceptualize the common good" (Schlozman, Verba, & Brady, 1999: 428). Promoting justice in organizations can require individuals to challenge managerial decisions, i.e., to engage in principled organizational dissent (Graham, 1986b). When policies or practices appear unfair or inconsistent with moral principles, those who value justice speak up and challenge the status quo, even when their opinions differ from the majority. In organizational settings, those with strong beliefs in the value of justice are more likely to try to influence decision making to assure fair policies and fair treatment for all stakeholders. This includes expressing supportive or change-oriented opinions about these policies (Weisband & Franck, 1975). Thus, based on theory from political philosophy and organizational studies, we predicted that those who place a high value on justice will proactively speak up and try to influence outcomes in organizations.

H6: The stronger the belief in justice, the higher the CV-influence.

The valence of a relationship between justice beliefs and information-gathering is less clear. Those who value justice might actively gather information, especially when justice issues are salient. Alternatively, they might prefer to rely on their own internal standards and might be less inclined to gather information from others. Accordingly, we do not expect a relationship between justice beliefs and CV-information.

Relationship between CV-information and CV-influence

As indicated earlier in the introduction to the paper, we focused on positively intended proactive behaviors (promotive behavior). Thus, it is important to acknowledge the similarities between the two types of civic virtue. Since both are positively intended and since both are proactive, it seems reasonable that they should be positively related. Consistent with this, some of our predictions for the two behaviors are similar (H1–H4). Both gathering information and exercising influence require employee initiative, and both illustrate responsible participation intended to promote organizational well-being. This commonality is the basis for our predictions that work performance, job level, affective commitment, and experienced significance all are associated with both CV-information and CV-influence. At the same time, we have also emphasized differences in the fundamental nature of the two types of responsible participation because CV-information is more affiliative and CV-influence is more challenging. Thus, some of our predictions differed for the two behaviors (H5–H6). Although we expect self-esteem and justice beliefs to predict CV-influence, we do not expect them to predict CV-information. In sum, we have proposed that although the nomological networks for the two forms of civic virtue are not identical, they share important similarities. This leads us to predict that although the two forms of civic virtue are distinct constructs, they will be positively related.

H7: CV-information will be positively related to CV-influence.

The primary objective of this research was to examine two forms of civic virtue (information and influence) as examples of responsible participation. At the same time, we recognize the importance of connecting our research to existing research on other positive proactive behaviors. To date, the largest amount of management research on positive proactive behaviors has occurred under the label of organizational citizenship behavior and has emphasized affiliative behaviors such as helping (altruism). Accordingly, we included helping OCB in our research

to facilitate comparisons with prior OCB findings. Since all three behaviors are forms of organizational citizenship, we expected them to be positively related. We also expected that the three forms could be differentiated conceptually and empirically. Finally, given conceptual overlaps between helping and CV-information (affiliative behaviors) and overlaps between helping and CV-influence (proactive behaviors), we expected the antecedents of helping to have both similarities and differences with the two forms of CV. More specifically, and consistent with past research, we expected work performance, affective commitment, and experienced significance to predict helping OCB (Anderson & Williams, 1996; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Van Dyne, VandeWalle, Kostova, & Cummings, 2000).

Method

We assessed our hypotheses with field data collected from employees and their supervisors. At T1, we asked 349 employees (from a wide variety of organizations who were attending a management seminar) to participate in our study. Of these, 82% (286 employees) completed questionnaires reporting their job level, commitment, experienced significance, self-esteem, justice beliefs, and supervisor contact information. We then contacted supervisors who rated employee performance. At T2 (six months later), we again contacted supervisors who rated employee civic virtue and helping. Overall, we obtained matched data on 245 of the employees (85%) who participated at T1. All participants completed questionnaires on their own time and mailed them directly to the researchers. Participation was voluntary and all were assured their responses would remain confidential. On average, employees were 37 years old, with 6.5 years tenure. The sample was 51% female, 48% had college degrees, and 82% were managers or professionals.

Measures

We used established measures to assess our constructs. Unless specified below, responses were 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree.

Dependent variables

Specific items for the dependent variables are listed in Table 1. We measured CV-information at T2 with supervisor responses to four items from the previously validated MacKenzie and colleagues' (1991) civic virtue scale ($\alpha = .74$). We measured CV-influence at T2 with supervisor responses to four items from Van Dyne and LePine's (1998) previously validated voice scale ($\alpha = .90$). Supervisors assessed helping at T2 with four items from Van Dyne and LePine's (1998) previously validated helping scale ($\alpha = .92$).

Independent variables

Supervisors rated employee performance at T1 (six months before they assessed OCB) with six items including overall effectiveness, quantity, quality, and reliability (1 = very much does not meet performance expectations; 7 = very much exceeds performance expectations; ($\alpha = .92$). They also reported employee job level (0 = support staff, 1 = supervisor, 2 = manager).

We measured *affective organizational commitment* with Meyer and Allen's (1984) previously validated 8-item scale ($\alpha = .86$). Items included "This organization has a great deal of

Table 1 Completely standardized confirmatory factor loadings for civic virtue and helping

Civic Virtue–Information: This employee . . .		
1	reads and keeps up with organization announcements, memos, and so on	.80
2	attends functions that are not required, but help the company image	.66
3	keeps abreast of changes in the organization	.68
4	attends meetings that are not mandatory, but are considered important	.63
Civic Virtue–Influence: This employee . . .		
1	speaks up with ideas for new projects or changes in procedures	.83
2	expresses his/her opinions about issues even when others in the group think differently	.88
3	makes suggestions to others in the group about changes that might improve things here	.87
4	communicates his/her opinions about work issues to others even if his/her opinion is different and others in the group disagree with him/her	.84
Helping OCB: This employee . . .		
1	volunteers to do things for this group	.83
2	helps orient new employees	.86
3	assists others with their work for the benefit of the group	.87
4	helps others learn about the work	.84

personal meaning for me" and "I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization" (r). To operationalize experienced significance, which we conceptualized as grounded in the current job and immediate work context, we used four items from the Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, and Dunham (1989) previously validated organization-based self-esteem scale to assess employee feelings of *experienced significance* ($\alpha = .90$). Items included "I count in this group," "I am a valuable part of this group," and "I make a difference in this group." We note that these items are situation-specific and that they refer explicitly to the employee's sense of experienced significance within the context of their work group.

We measured global *self-esteem* using Brockner's (1988) 18-item previously validated scale (1 = never; 7 = always). Items included "In general, how often do you feel confident about your abilities" and "How often do you have the feeling that you can do everything well" ($\alpha = .89$). We measured employee beliefs about *justice* with twelve items from Ravlin and Meglino's (1987) previously validated CES scale. This scale ranks four work values (working hard, concern for others, integrity, and fairness) and is consistent with Rokeach's (1973) position that values should be assessed relative to other values. Ranking forces comparisons and minimizes social desirability (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). In our model, we used only the fairness value (range = 0–12) to avoid problems of ranked data (McNeely & Meglino, 1994) and to allow treatment as a continuous variable in regression (Hicks, 1970). Items included "Being sure that work assignments are fair to everyone" and "Trying to bring about a fair solution to a dispute."

Analyses

Before testing our hypotheses, we used two methods to examine discriminant validity of our constructs. First, we conducted confirmatory factor analysis on the twelve citizenship items using maximum likelihood estimation (CV-information, CV-influence, Helping). Results indicated the superiority of the three-factor model ($\chi^2 = 201.72$, 51 df, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .09, CFI = .94) compared to two-factor models of helping versus civic virtue ($\chi^2 = 530.70$, 53 df, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .16, CFI = .85) and affiliative versus CV-influence ($\chi^2 = 436.29$, 53 df, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .15, CFI = .87) or a one-factor model ($\chi^2 = 919.32$, 54 df, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .22, CFI = .75). In each case, the three-factor model (CV-information, CV-influence, helping) produced a significantly better fit ($\Delta\chi^2 = 309.98$ 2 df, $p < .001$; $\Delta\chi^2 = 225.57$, 2 df, $p < .001$;

Table 2 Completely standardized confirmatory factor loadings for reflected appraisal of two forms of civic virtue

Civic Virtue–Information:		
1	In general, others would describe me as keeping up with things around here	.75
2	Others would typically describe me as attending events that are not required, but help the group or organization	.67
3	Generally, others would describe me as keeping abreast of changes around here	.73
4	In general, others would describe me as attending meetings that are not mandatory, but important	.50
Civic Virtue–Influence:		
1	Others generally would describe me as speaking up with ideas for new projects	.78
2	Generally, others would describe me as expressing my opinions about issues. even when others in the group think differently	.90
3	In general, others would describe me as making suggestions in groups about changes that might improve things	.89
4	Others would typically describe me as communicating my opinions in the group even if my opinion is different and others disagree with me	.83

$\Delta\chi^2 = 708.60$, 3 df, $p < .001$). All loadings were statistically significant and are reported in Table 1.

Second, we verified the discriminant validity of the two forms of civic virtue on a second sample of 469 undergraduate students. Here we used the reflected appraisal approach described by Farmer, Tierney, and Kung-McIntyre (2003), based on Piliavin and Callero (1991) and Stryker (1987) where individuals describe themselves as others experience them. According to self-identity theory, the reflected appraisal approach reduces positive self-presentation biases and provides a more accurate representation of behavior. Specific items for reflected appraisal of the two forms of civic virtue are listed in Table 2. Confirmatory factor analysis of these eight civic virtue items (maximum likelihood estimation) indicated the superiority of a two-factor model ($\chi^2 = 76.09$, 19 df, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .08, CFI = .98) compared to a one-factor model ($\chi^2 = 228.91$, 20 df, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .15, CFI = .92) based on a significant difference in χ^2 values ($\Delta\chi^2 = 152.82$, 1 df, $p < .001$). All loadings (see Table 2) were statistically significant.

We tested hypotheses with hierarchical regression. We entered the previously researched constructs of performance, job level, and commitment in the first three steps so we could ascertain variance explained over and above this prior research. In step four, we entered the three additional predictors: experienced significance, self-esteem, and justice. We checked for potential multicollinearity among predictors that could confound results. According to Chatterjee and Price (1977), a variance inflation factor (VIF) over 10 indicates potential multicollinearity problems. Our VIF statistics (1.00–1.19) were below 10, suggesting no multicollinearity problems. We assessed each step with the ΔF and, given our directional predictions, interpreted individual parameters with one-tailed t-values for the last-step beta coefficients.

Results

Table 3 summarizes descriptive statistics, inter-correlations, and Cronbach's alpha (.74–.92). Table 4 reports the hierarchical regression results for the three forms of OCB. Overall, our model explained 20% of the variance in CV-information ($F = 11.07$, $p < .001$), 30% of the variance in CV-influence ($F = 17.56$, $p < .001$), and 44% of the variance in helping OCB ($F = 32.44$, $p < .001$).

Table 3 Descriptive statistics and correlations

Variable	Mean	s.d	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Civic Virtue-Information	5.31	.92	(.74)[a]								
2. Civic Virtue-Influence	4.93	1.33	.49***	(.90)							
3. Helping OCB	5.27	1.15	.59***	.75***	(.92)						
4. Prior Performance	5.14	1.21	.35***	.46***	.60***	(.92)					
5. Job Level	.00	.71	.24***	.27***	.24***	.09	—				
6. Affective Commitment	4.77	1.30	.23***	.14*	.25***	.23***	.13*	(.86)			
7. Experienced Significance	4.41	1.61	.15**	.07	.13*	.10	.09	.27***	(.90)		
8. Self-Esteem	5.08	.71	.06	.23***	.25***	.19**	16**	.21***	.13*	(.89)	
9. Justice Beliefs	5.52	2.22	.09	.22***	.21***	.10	24***	.01	.08	.13*	—

[a]Numbers on the diagonal are Cronbach's alpha.

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

Results demonstrate similarities and differences across the three forms of OCB. Only prior performance predicted all the OCBs. Job level predicted CV-information and CV-influence. Affective commitment predicted only CV-information; experienced significance predicted CV-influence and helping. Self-esteem and justice beliefs predicted only CV-influence.

Results support H1, demonstrating a positive relationship between prior performance and both forms of civic virtue (CV-Information: $\beta = .35, p < .001$; CV-Influence: $\beta = .40, p < .001$). Results also support H2. Those in higher job levels were higher in CV-Information ($\beta = .17$, $p < .001$) and CV-Influence ($\beta = .18, p < .001$).

Results provide support for H3a, demonstrating a link between affective commitment and CV-information (H3a: $\beta = .12$, $p < .01$), but fail to show a significant relationship between commitment and CV-influence (H3b: $\beta = -.04, p > .05$). Similarly, results provide support for H4b, demonstrating a positive relationship between experienced significance and CV-influence (H4b: $\beta = .12, p < .01$), but not for CV-information (H4a: $\beta = .05, p > .05$).

Results support H5 and H6. Self-esteem was positively related to CV-influence ($\beta = .12$, $p < .01$), but not to CV-information ($\beta = -.05, p > .05$). Similarly, justice beliefs were related to CV-influence ($\beta = .10, p < .05$), but not to CV-information ($\beta = -.02, p > .05$).

Finally, results also support H7, demonstrating a positive relation between CV-information and CV-influence ($r = .49, p < .001$).

Turning now to helping behavior, we describe the pattern of results for that more traditionally studied form of OCB. As expected, helping was positively related to CV-information ($r = .59$, $p < .001$) and CV-influence ($r = .75, p < .001$). In addition, performance was a strong predictor of helping ($\beta = .54$, $p < .001$). As expected, job level was not significantly related to helping ($\beta = .09$, $p > .05$). Table 4, however, shows that even though commitment was significant in step three ($\beta = .10, p < .01$), it failed to reach significance in step 4 when effects of experienced significance, self-esteem, and justice beliefs were added to the model ($\beta = .05, p > .05$). Thus, contrary to expectations, commitment was not related to helping. Finally, results demonstrate a positive relationship between experienced significance and helping ($\beta = .12, p < .01$) and as expected, no relationship with self-esteem ($\beta = .08, p > .05$) or justice beliefs ($\beta = .08, p > .05$).

Discussion

Overall, results of this study demonstrate the benefits of a multi-disciplinary focus on less-often researched forms of OCB (such as change-oriented behaviors) as recommended by LePine et al.

Table 4 Results of hierarchical regression analyses predicting civic virtue and helping

	Civic virtue–information				Civic virtue–influence				Helping			
Step	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Prior performance	.39***	.38***	.35***	.35***	.47***	.45***	.45***	.40***	.62***	.60***	.58***	.54***
Job level		.17***	.16***	.17***		.18***	.18***	.18***		.14***	.13***	.09
Organizational commitment			.13**	.12**			.01	−.04			.10**	.05
Experienced significance				.05				.12**				.12**
Self-esteem				−.05				.12**				.08
Justice beliefs				−.02				.10*				.08
ΔR^2	.15	.03	.02	.00	.22	.03	.00	.04	.38	.02	.01	.03
ΔF	48.19*	9.67**	5.26*	.42	72.97***	11.23***	.02	4.86**	156.22***	8.46**	3.41	4.41**
Overall F	48.19***	29.87***	21.87***	11.07***	72.97***	43.57***	28.94***	17.56***	156.22***	84.64***	58.10***	32.44***
Overall R^2	.15	.18	.20	.20	.22	.26	.26	.30	.38	.40	.41	.44
Overall adjusted R^2				.18				.28				.43

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

(2002). Results demonstrate empirical differences in CV-information and CV-influence based on conceptual differences (affiliative versus change-oriented behaviors), statistical differences (CFA model fit and factor loadings), and nomological network differences (different predictors – CV-information: affective commitment; CV-influence: experienced significance, self-esteem, and justice beliefs). Of the six predictors in our model, only prior work performance and job level were significant predictors of both CV-information and CV-influence. Otherwise, results suggest that the two forms of civic virtue have different antecedents and different patterns of relationships with other constructs. In sum, these findings support the conceptual differences in affiliative versus change-oriented forms of OCB and civic virtue.

In addition, results of this study show the benefits of examining the incremental validity of conceptually justified predictors over and above the effects of prior performance. For example, the overall R^2 for our three regression models ranged from .20–.44 and this is higher than the typical R^2 (5–20%) reported in most prior research on OCB that uses multiple sources of data (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998; Moorman, 1993; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996; Robinson, 1996; Stamper & Van Dyne, 2001; Turnley & Feldman, 1999; Van Dyne et al., 1994: Withey & Cooper, 1989). More important, our results demonstrate significant incremental increases in explained variance due to our predictors, over and above past performance (5% for civic virtue-information; 8% for civic virtue-influence; and 6% for helping OCB).

Finally, by augmenting traditional organizational literature with political philosophy and research, the significant findings of this study suggest practical implications that extend beyond the organization's boundaries. The following sections address theoretical issues, practical implications, and future research.

Theoretical implications

Our findings are consistent with classical and contemporary approaches to political philosophy that identify gathering information and exercising influence as different aspects of civic virtue. In addition, results support the civic voluntarism model of political participation (Verba et al., 1995) as applied to responsible employee participation in work organizations. In interpreting our findings, we draw on Van Dyne and colleagues' (1995) discussion of the differences between affiliative-promotive behaviors (such as CV-information) and change-oriented-promotive behaviors (such as CV-influence).

Both forms of civic virtue illustrate responsible participation. Both behaviors are proactive and promotive. As a consequence, it is not surprising that they are related with a moderately strong correlation (.49, $p < 001$). Given the conceptual differences in the constructs, it also is not surprising that results support the discriminant validity of the two forms of civic virtue (as shown by CFA and the differing pattern of relationships with other constructs). Interestingly, however, results demonstrated more differences than similarities in the antecedents in our models. Based on prior research, we hypothesized that commitment and experienced significance would predict both forms of civic virtue. Regression analyses, however, demonstrated that these antecedents were related to either CV-information or CV-influence, but not to both. Perhaps the social exchange orientation of affective commitment has more relevance to CV-information (being informed), and the task-oriented nature of experienced significance has more relevance to CV-influence (exercising influence).

Promotive behavior that is affiliative (e.g., gathering information) is cooperative. Our results show job level and commitment were related to proactive information gathering. Job level is an indicator of status. From a political philosophy perspective, status is consistent with Plato's view that responsibility for governance should be handled by the meritocratic elite, who are empowered to gather information proactively. In organizational settings, affective commitment emphasizes

relationships (with the organization and with co-workers) and thus has special relevance to affiliative forms of responsible participation. From a political philosophy perspective, these relationships are consistent with a "republican" perspective that emphasizes strong ties and information sharing. Strong emotional bonds among community members reinforce gathering and exchanging information as a form of active participation in the community. In sum, status and relationships seem to have special relevance to attending meetings and keeping current about organizational issues, just as they do about public issues in the larger society. Future research might examine the causal direction(s) between gathering and sharing information at work and engaging in the same behaviors in the civic arena.

Promotive behavior that is change-oriented (e.g., exercising influence) involves efforts to modify the status quo. In addition to job level, three other predictors of CV-influence (experienced significance, self-esteem, and justice beliefs) suggest that the change-oriented nature of CV-influence demands special characteristics that are not required for the more affiliative behavior of CV-information. For example, employees may be more willing to invest time and energy making innovative suggestions when they believe their efforts will make a difference to the specific situation. Global self-esteem may provide self-confidence and courage to deliver potentially controversial messages. Strong justice beliefs may legitimize rocking the boat when fairness issues are salient. From a political philosophy perspective, these relationships are consistent with a "liberal" emphasis on individual rights and responsibilities. As with the possible link between CV-information at work and in society, a similar link between CV-influence at work and political activism in the civic arena is plausible but requires further study. For example, if former student activists continue being politically active when they join the workforce, do they utilize their civic skills while at work instead of or in addition to their political activities outside of work?

The expected finding that CV-information and CV-influence are moderately related ($r = .49$) suggests that proactive and prosocial employees often use both forms of civic virtue OCB. An alternative explanation for the moderate correlation between CV-information and CV-influence is that the two behaviors are causally related. Since gathering information entails attention both to new data and to other organizational members' concerns, perhaps learning new facts and/or observing that others are concerned about an issue can motivate an information gatherer to speak up, such that CV-information leads to CV-influence. Alternatively, perhaps previous attempts at influence increase the salience of future information and/or reveal a need to find allies, such that CV-influence leads to CV-information. Longitudinal research could assess the possibility that the two forms of civic virtue OCB might be reciprocally and dynamically related.

Another way to conceptualize the relationship between CV-information and CV-influence is that both represent a higher-order construct, but that they differ in intensity. This conceptualization would be consistent with political research that rank-orders forms of political participation. For example, Milbrath and Goel (1977) described a hierarchy modeled after Roman gladiatorial contests, where some come to fight (the gladiators), some come to watch (the spectators), and some don't come at all (the apathetics). In comparably vivid but simplistic terms, civic virtue OCB could be characterized as challenging-promotive (CV-influence), affiliative-promotive (CV-information), and none (apathetic and lacking responsible participation).

Practical implications

Our research strongly suggests that studying CV-information to the exclusion of CV-influence is a deficient approach to examining civic virtue OCB. The moderate correlation of past job performance with CV-information (.35***) and the even higher correlation with CV-influence (.46***) suggests that the organization's best performers engage in responsible political participation at

work, and thus that both forms of civic virtue make a positive contribution to the organization. Ignoring either form of civic virtue would likely be to an organization's detriment.

If performance and civic virtue are causally linked (a question that was not specifically addressed by this study), the causal arrow could go either way (or both ways). With regard to CV-information, organizations that make information widely available (and thus easy to gather and share) may be facilitating superior performance. In addition, high performers (especially those who are highly committed to the organization and who occupy high-level positions) may be more motivated and able to seek out and share information than those who are struggling just to do their jobs. With regard to CV-influence, perhaps managers are favorably impressed by subordinates who advocate new ideas and changes to benefit the organization in the long run (high performance ratings). In addition, high performers, especially those at high job levels, who are confident in their abilities (high global self-esteem), sensitive to justice issues (justice judgments), and feel their ideas can make a significant difference in a specific situation (experienced significance) have multiple motivating factors leading them to be strong advocates for change.

Results also have important practical implications since they suggest ways to manage the level and type of employee civic virtue. In some organizations or in some groups, managers may think that employees are not adequately involved in responsible participation. They may not read company announcements or fail to attend information sessions on new strategic directions (low CV-information). Alternatively, they may not speak up to express their constructive ideas or remain silent if they think others in the group might have different opinions (low CV-influence). If managers want better-informed employees, they can redesign work so that jobs qualify for higher level classifications and/or emphasize the long-term benefits of working for the organization to increase employee commitment. If managers value employees who speak up, they could select for high self-esteem and justice beliefs in the hiring process. Once on the job, managers could emphasize the importance of each employee's job and the value of their contributions, thereby enhancing experienced significance.

In thinking about the contrasting pattern of predictors for information and influence, we were reminded of the local/cosmopolitan distinction introduced by early organizational sociologists (Merton, 1968 (orig. 1949); Gouldner, 1957–1958). That conceptualization characterizes locals as focused on personal relationships and proximal reference groups. It is plausible, therefore, that locals emphasize the relationship and status aspects of information gathering. In contrast, cosmopolitans tend to focus on professional standards and external reference groups. It is plausible that cosmopolitans have higher global self-esteem and stress principled beliefs that facilitate exercising influence. Both locals and cosmopolitans are valuable organizational members. Locals help create and maintain cooperative relations; cosmopolitans help the organization innovate and respond to dynamic environments. Both exhibit positive proactive behaviors and both engage in responsible participation.

Building on the parallel between the two forms of civic virtue and the local-cosmopolitan distinction suggests practical implications for managers because organizations can use different human resource policies to encourage each form of civic virtue. For CV-information, managers could follow recommendations of London, Cheney, and Tavis (1977) for promoting a local orientation by providing "attractive fringe benefits, . . . frequent pay increases not associated with performance, . . . pleasant physical surroundings, and other job outcomes that tie employees to the organization." For CV-influence, managers could enhance a cosmopolitan orientation by "encouraging participation in professional societies, maintaining company subscriptions to journals, providing funds for educational advancement, and the like" (p. 194). Graham's (2000) political theory-based essay suggests additional human resource practices that could enhance civic virtue such as job designs with high motivating potential that emphasize information processing and communication skills; selection procedures that identify candidates' civic orientation and

civic skills; training programs that facilitate thoughtful and timely suggestions for change; and leadership development programs that emphasize responsible and proactive participation.

Limitations, future research, and conclusion

As with all research, there are limitations to our approach. Although we based our predictors on political philosophy and on the organizational literature, our model is not comprehensive and it did not test causal relations. Thus, it is possible that the causal arrow operates in the opposite direction. For example, Bolino, Turnley, and Bloodgood (2002) proposed a theoretical model in which specific OCB behaviors enhance particular types of social capital (structural, relational, and cognitive), with implications for employee attitudes. If their framework is supported by empirical research, this would suggest the benefits of longitudinal research and/or experimental designs to assess the direction of causality in the relationships proposed in this and in most other OCB papers.

We recommend that future research examine additional antecedents and correlates of information gathering and exercising influence. For example, the individual characteristic of need for affiliation may lead to CV-information, while need for autonomy and need for power may enhance CV-influence. Willingness to take potentially risky initiatives may increase not only CV-influence but also other forms of citizenship behavior such as helping. Other individual beliefs and attitudes are most likely relevant as well. For example, perceived organizational support may be especially salient to CV-information while felt autonomy and self-efficacy may be important to CV-influence. Personal and situational factors may limit the opportunity to engage in civic virtue. For example, poor health, family responsibilities, multiple jobs, or job-related travel might reduce time, energy, and attention available for civic virtue.

We also recommend that contextual factors be included in future research on civic virtue. Organizational norms regarding interaction, openness, critical analysis, and speaking up may influence employee willingness to gather information and/or express alternative viewpoints. Organizational structure and governance system are potentially important factors that can enhance or constrain opportunities for responsible employee participation. In addition, a similar range of contextual factors outside the organization may influence civic virtue within workplace organizations. Totalitarian societies, for example, are unlikely to foster civic virtue at work, and one might hope that the reverse also is true. A provocative area for empirical exploration is the reciprocal relationship between organizational and societal factors that influence civic virtue in each realm. If organizations in a modern knowledge economy are becoming more open to political participation by their members (Manville & Ober, 2003), that could have a beneficial impact on responsible political participation in the public arena.

In conclusion, based on classical and contemporary political philosophy, we identified and differentiated two forms of responsible participation (CV-information and CV-influence). Drawing on diverse literatures in the behavioral sciences as well as political philosophy, we developed a model of antecedents to these two forms of civic virtue and tested the model with matched employee and supervisor field data. Results of our research emphasize similarities and differences in the predictors of these two forms of proactive participation, based on fundamental conceptual differences in the two constructs. We conclude that both forms of civic virtue are important and recommend that future research continue to focus on antecedents and consequences of these prosocial and proactive forms of responsible political participation in work organizations and in society at large.

Acknowledgment We thank C.S.K. Koh for data analysis assistance, and Dennis W. Organ for his helpful comments on an earlier version of the paper.

References

Almond, G. A., & Verba, S. (1963). *The civic culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Anderson, S. E., & Williams, L. J. (1996). Interpersonal, job, and individual factors related to helping processes at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81,* 282–296.

Aristotle (1966). Politics. In R. McKeon (Ed.), *The basic works of Aristotle* (B. Jowett, Trans., pp. 1127–1316). New York: Random House. (Orig. composed between 335 and 322, B.C.).

Avery, D. R., & Quinones, M. A. (2002). Disentangling the effects of voice: The incremental roles of opportunity, behavior, and instrumentality in predicting procedural fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87,* 81–86.

Berlin, I. (1970). *The Age of Enlightenment: The Eighteenth Century Philosophers*. Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press.

Bolino, M. C. (1999). Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors. *Academy of Management Review*, *24,* 82–89.

Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Bloodgood, J. M. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *27,* 505–522.

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

Burtt, S. (1993). The politics of virtue today: A critique and a proposal. *American Political Science Review*, *87,* 360–368.

Campbell, A. (1960). Surge and decline: A study of electoral change. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *24,* 397–418.

Chatterjee, S., & Price, B. (1977). *Regression Analysis by Example*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Coopersmith, J. (1967). *The antecedents of self-esteeem*. San Francisco, CA: Freeman.

Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management*, *26,* 435–462.

Etzioni, A. (1993). *The spirit of community: Rights, responsibilities, and the communitarian agenda*. New York: Crown Publishers.

Farh, J. L., Earley, P. C., & Lin, S. (1997). Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *42,* 421–444.

Farmer, S. M., Tierney, P., & Kung-McIntyre, K. (2003). Employee creativity in Taiwan: An application of role identity theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, *46,* 618–631.

Frese, M., & Fay, D. (2001). Personal initiative: An active performance concept for work in the 21st century. In B. M. Staw & R. I. Sutton (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (vol. 23, pp. 133–187). NY: JAI Press.

Gouldner, A. W. (1957–1958). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles I & II. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *2,* 281–304, 444–480.

Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, *4,* 249–270.

Graham, J. W. (1986a, August). *Organizational citizenship behavior informed by political theory*. Chicago, IL: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management.

Graham, J. W. (1986b). Principled organizational dissent: A theoretical essay. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (vol. 8, pp. 1–52). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Graham, J. W. (2000). Promoting civic virtue organizational citizenship behavior: Contemporary questions rooted in classical quandaries from political philosophy. *Human Resources Management Review*, *10,* 61–77.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison – Wesley.

Hicks, L. E. (1970). Some properties of ipsative, normative, and forces – choice normative measures. *Psychological Bulletin*, *74,* 167–184.

Hrebiniak, L. G. (1974). Effects of job level and participation on employee attitudes and perceptions of influence. *Academy of Management Journal*, *17,* 649–662.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Keng, K. A., Jiuan, T. S., & Wirtz, J. (1998). *Seven faces of Singaporeans*. NY: Prentice-Hall.

Lane, R. E. (1959). *Political life: Why people get involved in politics*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

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.

LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (1998). Predicting voice behavior in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83,* 853–868.

London, M., Cheney, L. A., & Tavis, R. L. (1977). The relationship between cosmopolitan-local orientation and job performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *11,* 182–195.

MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1991). Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *50,* 123–150.

Manville, B., & Ober, J. (2003). *A company of citizens: What the world's first democracy teaches leaders about creating great organizations*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

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.

Meglino, B. M., & Ravlin, E. C. (1998). Individual values in organizations: Concepts, controversies, and research. *Journal of Management*, *24,* 351–389.

Merton, R. K. (1968). Patterns of influence: Local and cosmopolitan influentials. In R. K. Merton (Ed.), *Social theory and social structure* (Chapter XII, 441–474, in the 1968 Enlarged Edition; originally published in 1949).

Meyer, J. P., & Allen N. J. (1984). Testing the "side-bet" theory of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *69,* 372–378.

Milbrath, L. W., & Goel, M. L. (1977). *Political participation: How and why do people get involved in politics?* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Moorman, R. H. (1993). The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Relations*, *46,* 759–776.

Moorman, R. H., Niehoff, B. P., & Organ, D. W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: Sorting the effects of jobs satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, *6,* 209–255.

Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extrarole efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal*, *42,* 403–419.

Nemeth, C. J., & Staw, B. M. (1989). The tradeoffs of social control and innovation in groups and organizations. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (vol. 22, pp. 175–210). New York: Academic Press.

Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, *10*(2), 85–97.

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

Parker, L. E. (1993). When to fix it and when to leave: Relationships among perceived control, self-efficacy, dissent, and exit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78,* 949–959.

Pierce, J. L., Gardner, D. G., Cummings, L. L., & Dunham, R. B. (1989). Organization-based self-esteem: Construct definition, operationalization, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, *32,* 622–648.

Piliavin, J. A., & Callero, P. L. (1991). *Giving blood: The development of an altruistic identity*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins.

Plato (1937). *The Republic*. In B. Jowett (Trans.), *The Dialogues of Plato* (vol. 1, pp. 591–879). New York: Random House. (Original work composed between 400 and 347, B.C.).

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Meta-analysis of the relationships between Kerr and Jermier's substitutes for leadership and employee job attitudes, role perceptions, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81,* 380–399.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, *26,* 513–563.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ravlin, E. C., & Meglino, B. M. (1987). Effects of values on perception and decision making: A study of alternative work value measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *72,* 666–673.

Robinson, S. L. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *41,* 574–599.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Salancik, G. R. (1977). Commitment and the control of organizational behavior and belief. In B. M. Staw & G. R. Salancik (Eds.), *New directions in organizational behavior* (pp. 1–54). Chicago, IL: St. Clair Press.

Schlozman, K. L., Verba, S., & Brady, H. E. (1999). Civic participation and the equality problem. In T. Skocpol & M. P. Fiorina (Eds.), *Civic engagement in American democracy* (pp. 427–459). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37,* 580–607.

Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81,* 219–227.

Sinopoli, R. C. (1987). Liberalism, republicanism and the constitution. *Polity*, *19,* 331–352.

Skarlicki, D. P., & Latham, G. P. (1995). Organizational citizenship behavior and performance in a university setting. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Science*, *12,* 175–181.

Smith, C. A., Organ, R. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68*(4), 653–663.

Stamper, C. L., & Van Dyne, L. (2001). Work status and organizational citizenship behavior: A field study of restaurant employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *22,* 517–536.

Staub, E. (1978). *Positive social behavior and morality*. New York: Academic Press.

Staw, B. M., & Boettger, R. D. (1990). Task revision: A neglected form of work performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *33,* 534–559.

Stryker, S. (1987). Identity theory: Developments and extensions. In K. Yardley & T. Honess (Eds.), *Self and identity: Psychosocial perspectives* (pp. 89–103). Chichester: Wiley.

Turnley, W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (1999). The impact of psychological contract violations on exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect. *Human Relations*, *52,* 895–912.

Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & McLean Parks, J. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (vol. 17, pp. 215–285). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, operationalization, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37,* 765–802.

Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behavior: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41,* 108–119.

Van Dyne, L., VandeWalle, D., Kostova, T., & Cummings, L. L. (2000). Collectivism, propensity to trust, and self-esteem as predictors of organizational citizenship behavior in a non-work setting. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21,* 3–23.

Verba, S., & Nie, N. H. (1972). *Participation in America*. New York: Harper & Row.

Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic volunteerism in American politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Weisband, E., & Franck, T. M. (1975). *Resignation in protest*. New York: Grossman.

Wells, L. E., & Marwell, G. (1976). *Self-esteem*. London: Sage Publications.

Werner, J. M. (1994). Dimensions that make a difference: Examining the impact of in-role and extra-role behaviors on supervisory ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79,* 98–107.

Withey, M. J., & Cooper, W. H. (1989). Predicting exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *34,* 521–539.