

MOTIVATION AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIORS, TAKING ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION AND PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION INTO ACCOUNT

Samuel Fernández-Salineró, Rey Juan Carlos University
Cristina García-Ael, National University for Distance Education (UNED)
Gabriela Topa, National University for Distance Education (UNED)

ABSTRACT

The current study aims to explain how motivational orientations influence organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) through organizational identification considering the moderator effect of perceived discrimination. A sample of 286 Spanish immigrants in the United Kingdom was included. Main conclusions support that learning orientation shows a significant direct relation with OCB. Both approach and avoid goal orientation show a statistically significant impact on OCB. These effects are mediated by organizational identification and moderated by perceived discrimination. Implications and future research suggestions are discussed.

Keywords: Motivational Orientations, Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, Organizational Identification, Perceived Discrimination.

INTRODUCTION

Motivation is one of the most important and extended topics in organizational psychology. Etymologically, the word comes from Latin *motus* which means “cause of the movement”. Traditionally, motivation was explained by environmental factors, such as the theories developed by Thorndike or Skinner. Nowadays, other optics have arisen and try to describe human behavior linked to personality development (Tang, et al., 2019).

In current societies, wellbeing concept is expanding and related to the optimal functioning of the individual (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Ryan and Deci (2000) developed the self-determination theory (SDT from now on), which highlighted self-realization as an important aspect related to the possibility of being autonomous, competent and related to others (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Within this optic, motivation shift from an environment determined process to a self-oriented process. Is in the organizational field where these motivations merge and individual must face to the possibility of being autonomous, competent, and of course, in relation with others.

Following Ryan & Deci (2001) SDT, individuals feel healthy due to the fulfillment of basic psychological needs and becoming ill and frustrated if these needs are not fulfilled. Specifically, when facing tasks, individual may perceive them as challenging or threatening (Vandewalle, 2017). This optic may impact in the way that an individual cope with his job and behave in the organizational field.

According to recent research, hundreds of papers have analyzed how environment affects motivation (Donald et al., 2019), but there is a lack exploring intra individual factors that may help us understanding the motivational process. Bandura theorized that goal striving requires outcome and self-efficacy expectations (Bandura, 1977; 1982). He developed self-efficacy theory to explain contingency between subject’s actions and consequences. Self-efficacy theory is important in motivation because it highlights that the way of perceiving the environment determinate how individual behaves.

In this line, Motivational Orientations' Theory (Elliot & Dweck, 1988) states that individuals may be oriented to learn or to perform. Learning orientation is characterized by search of personal development, while perform orientation is related to the attempt of appearing attractive to others (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). In addition, perform orientation has two varieties; approach orientation.

- 1) Related to make efforts to demonstrate abilities.
- 2) And avoid orientation.
- 3) Related to avoid appearing incompetent towards others.

When people perceive their environment as threatening due to discrimination processes their cognition may turn in a defensive way to cope with them (Sanders, 2006). As All port mentioned, cognition, emotion and behavior are influenced by the real, imaginary or symbolic presence of others. When facing a stressful situation such a discriminatory environment, individuals may try to adapt through behavioral responses. This is on the line of Tajfel's Social Identity Theory, which affirmed that, when social identity is unfavorable, individuals may carry out competitive or creative strategies to achieve a positive social identity. Obviously, the Brexit context is an environment where social identity factors such as nationality become more salient. Spanish workers in the UK may opt to Identify with organization instead of nationality. This is a coherent social mobility strategy useful to maintain or enhance self-stem. Organizational identification has been linked not only to performance, but also to Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in previous research. Social identity works as a bonding between the individual and the organization.

Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) are conducts that contribute to the effectiveness of the organization but are not included in the formal rewards system. OCB contributes to maintain and enhance the social and psychological context that support task performance (Organ, 1997). OCB has been related not only to motivated employees, but also with well-treatment and fair processes in organizations. OCB are related to cooperation, protection, voluntariness in ideas construction, personal training or favorable attitude towards organization (Katz, 1964). Previous research has linked OCB to dispositional and situational factors.

In this point, this research analyzed how motivational orientations impact on OCB, taking organizational identification as mediator and perceived discrimination as moderator.

METHOD

To this end, we selected 286 Spanish workers residing in UK. Sample was composed by snowball convenience procedure. 197 participants (68,9%) were men, and 89 (31,1%) were women. Mean age was 26 years. Concerning educational level, 71.3% of the sample comprised people with university education, compared to 18.5% who reported professional training, 9.1% with secondary school or high school, and 1% with primary or basic studies. Regarding working conditions, 78.3% of the sample had a permanent contract versus 21.7% who were hired on a temporary basis. In relation to permanence in the United Kingdom, 36.4% of the sample had lived there less than six months, 27.9% between 7 months and one year, and 35.7% more than one year.

To assess the variables, we used reliable and validated instruments. For assessing motivational orientations, we used Motivational Orientation Inventory (Vande Walle & Cummings, 1997). To assess organizational identity, Mael & Ashford's (1992) questionnaire was used. Related to perceived discrimination, we used Identity-ethnic Minority Experience Questionnaire (Basabe, Zlobina & Páez, 2004), composed by two subscales. One related to the social status of the ethnic group, and the other related to the perception of discrimination and exclusion. Finally, we used the Spanish validation scale of the Organizational Citizenship Behavior towards Organization (OCBO) scale (Dávila & Finkestein, 2010).

RESULTS

Data analysis was conducted with the Microsoft SPSS v.24 software. Besides, Process macro (Hayes, 2013) was used to test the moderated mediation model, specifically model 7. Regarding to the direct effects, we found that learning orientation showed a significant direct effect on OCB ($B = 0.66$, $SE = 0.25$, 95% CI [0.17; 1.15], $p < 0.01$). Related to approach orientation, we found a direct significant relationship with OCB ($B = -0.26$, $SE = 0.18$, 95% CI [-0.62; 0.11], $p = 0.17$). Finally, avoid orientation was significant inverse related to OCB ($B = -0.47$, $SE = 0.17$, 95% CI [-0.80; -0.13], $p < 0.01$).

Mediation Models

According to simple mediation models, we found that learning orientation was related to OCB through organizational identification ($B = 0.10$, $SE = 0.03$, 95% CI [0.04; 0.17]). Besides, approach orientation was related to OCB through organizational identification ($B = 0.08$, $SE = 0.03$, 95% CI [0.03; 0.14]). Lastly, our results show that in the case of avoid orientation, it was not related to OCB through organizational identification ($B = -0.01$, $SE = 0.03$, 95% CI [-0.062, 0.04]).

Moderation Models

Thereupon, we tested the moderation model between motivational orientations and organizational identification. First, related to learning orientation, we found that our model was significant ($F(3, 282) = 4.63$, $p < 0.01$, $R^2 = 0.05$). The effect of learning orientation over organizational identification was significant ($B = 0.66$, $SE = 0.25$, 95% CI [0.17, 1.15], $p < 0.01$), while the effect of perceived discrimination ($B = 1.13$, $SE = 0.72$, 95% CI [-0.28, 2.53], $p = 0.12$) was not significant, as was the interaction term ($B = -0.29$, $SE = 0.16$, $p = 0.07$, $R^2 = 0.02$).

In the case of approach orientation, our model was significant as well ($F(3, 282) = 5.57$, $p < 0.01$, $R^2 = 0.06$). The effect of approach orientation over organizational identification was not significant ($B = -0.26$, $SE = 0.18$, 95% CI [-0.62, 0.11], $p = 0.17$), while the effect of perceived discrimination ($B = -1.02$, $SE = 0.39$, 95% CI [-1.8, -0.24], $p < 0.01$) was significant, as was the interaction term ($B = 0.28$, $SE = 0.12$, $p = 0.02$, $DR^2 = 0.02$). Lastly, the effect of avoid orientation our model was significant ($F(3, 282) = 3.10$, $p = 0.02$, $R^2 = 0.03$). The main effects of both avoid goal orientation ($B = -0.47$, $SE = 0.17$, 95% CI [-0.80, -0.13], $p = 0.007$) and the effect of perceived discrimination ($B = -0.83$, $SE = 0.27$, 95% CI [-1.36, -0.28], $p < 0.01$) were also significant, as was the interaction term ($B = 0.29$, $SE = 0.11$, $p < 0.01$, $DR^2 = 0.03$).

Moderated Mediation

First, for learning orientation, the model was not significant ($B = -0.12$, $SE = 0.07$, 95% CI [-0.27, 0.01]). For approach orientation dimension, the index of moderated mediation was significant ($B = 0.12$, $SE = 0.05$, 95% CI [0.02, 0.22]). Specifically, the model was significant at high levels of perceived discrimination ($B = 0.13$, $SE = 0.03$, 95% CI [0.07, 0.19]). For avoid goal orientation dimension, the index of moderated mediation was significant ($B = 0.13$, $SE = 0.05$, 95% CI [0.04, 0.24]), with the indirect effect being significant at low levels of perceived discrimination ($B = -0.08$, $SE = 0.04$, 95% CI [-0.15, -0.02]).

Discussion

The main purpose of this research is to explore the relationship between motivational orientations and organizational citizenship behaviors. Due the complexity of this phenomenon, we purposed two additional factors to enrich the approach to the object of study. These variables

were organizational identification in the role of mediator, and perceived discrimination in the role of moderator.

The most important findings of our study were that every single motivational orientation was significant related to OCB. As we expected, motivational orientations may be described as personality traits that disposes to the individual to cope with the environment. This is on the line of sociocognitive theories contributions (Mischel, 1993).

On the other hand, we found that contextual factors modulate the expression of the abovementioned relations. Organizational identity acted as a vehicle through which, subjects behave in the organizations. This may explain how organizational identification impact over OCB as previous research have shown (Christ et al., 2003).

Lastly, perceived discrimination acts as a moderator of these relationships. This variable generates the environment where organizations operate. Our research reveals that in learning-oriented subjects, this impact is less determinant than in performance-oriented individuals. Future research should explore the long-term effects derivatives of striving in a discriminatory stressful context. In our sample, avoid oriented individuals tends to commit more OCBs when perceiving discrimination. Future research should investigate if maintaining these efforts could lead to some undesirable processes such as burnout.

REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37(2), 122–147.
- Basabe, N., Zlobina, A., & Páez, D. (2004). Socio-cultural integration and psychological adaptation of foreign immigrants in the Basque Country. *General Publication Service of the Basque Government*.
- Christ, O., Van Dick, R., Wagner, U., & Stellmacher, J. (2003). When teachers go the extramile: Foci of organizational identification as determinants of different forms of organizational citizenship behavior among schoolteachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73, 329- 341.
- Davila, M.C., & Finkelstein, M.A. (2010). Predicting organizational citizenship behavior from functional analysis and role identity perspectives: Further evidence in Spanish Employees. *Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 13 (1), 276-282.
- Donald, J.N., Bradshaw, E.L., Ryan, R.M., Basarkod, G., Ciarrochi, J., Duineveld, J.J., & Sahdra, B.K. (2019). Mindfulness and its association with varied types of motivation within self-determination Theory: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 46(7), 1121-1138.
- Elliot, A., & Trash, T. (2002) Approach-avoidance motivation in personality: Approach and avoidance temperaments and goals. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 82(5), 804-818.
- Hayes, A.F. (2013). Mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis. *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: A Regression-Based Approach edn. New York: Guilford Publications*, 1-20.
- Katz, M. (1974). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavior Science*, 9(2), 131-33.
- Mael, F., & Ashforth, B.E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 103–123.
- Mischel, W. (1993). *Introduction to personality*. California: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Organ, D.W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human performance*, 10(2), 85-97.
- Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American psychologist*, 55(1), 68.
- Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual review of psychology*, 52(1), 141-166.
- Sanders, T.V.L. (2006). Coping responses and the experience of discrimination. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(5), 1198-1214.
- Tang, M., Wang, D., & Guerrien, A. (2020). A systematic review and meta-analysis on basic psychological need satisfaction, motivation, and well-being in later life: Contributions of self-determination theory. *PsyCh journal*, 9(1), 5-33.
- VandeWalle, D. (1997). Development and validation of a work domain goal orientation instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57(6), 995-1015.