

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

\_\_\_\_\_ Min Xu \_\_\_\_\_ for the \_\_\_\_\_ Master of Science \_\_\_\_\_

in \_\_\_\_\_ Psychology \_\_\_\_\_ presented \_\_\_\_\_ November 25, 2013 \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Cross-Cultural Differences in Person-Environment Fit and Organizational  
\_\_\_\_\_ Citizenship Behavior \_\_\_\_\_

Abstract Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

This study aimed to investigate the cultural impacts on the relationships between person-environment fit (person-organization fit and person-group fit) and different levels of organizational citizenship behavior (organization level OCB and individual level OCB). One hundred twenty eight American participants were recruited from a variety of organizations and positions in the U.S. and one hundred fifty nine Chinese participants were recruited from a variety of organizations and positions in China. The results indicated that the relationship between person-group fit and individual level OCB was moderated by culture. In Western organizations, employees who perceived they had a good fit with their working group were more likely to exhibit individual level OCB compared to employees in Eastern organizations. Additionally, exploratory studies revealed that American employees were higher than Chinese employees on both kinds of person-environment fit and on both kinds of OCB. Part of these differences might be explained by the American executives who were higher than every other group on person-group fit and individual level and organizational level OCB. The findings of this study may help organizations to develop more effective strategies for promoting employees' organizational citizenship behaviors in international settings.

*Keyword:* culture, person-environment fit, organizational citizenship behavior

Cross-Cultural Differences in Person-Environment Fit and Organizational  
Citizenship Behavior

---

A Thesis

Presented to

The Department of Psychology  
EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirement for the Degree  
Master of Science

---

by

Min Xu

November 2013

---

Approved for the Department Chair

---

Approved by the Dean of the Graduate School and  
Distance Education

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest and sincere thanks to my thesis committee members: Dr. Brian Schrader, Dr. Thomas Slocombe and Dr. George Yancey for your efforts and assistance in the preparation of this thesis. I would like to give my special appreciation to my thesis advisor Dr. Yancey. I believe I would not be able to complete my thesis without his helpful, constructive suggestion and patient guidance. Sincere thanks for my three translation team members, Miss Haiying Guo, Miss Ke Ke, Miss Siyue Liu. Their effect made a big contribution to my thesis. I would also like to thanks people who contributed to my survey. Last but not the least, I would like to express my deepest thanks to my father, Mr. Linnan Xu, my mother, Mrs. Meifang Wu, my cousin Mrs. Jingpei Ma, Mrs. Mei Song, and my friend Mike Brown. I would like to thank them for their unconditional support and encouragement that helped me to achieve my academic goals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ..... iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... iv

LIST OF TABLES ..... vi

CHAPTER

1 INTRODUCTION ..... 1

    LITERATURE REVIEW ..... 2

    Person-Environment Fit ..... 2

    Organizational Citizenship Behavior ..... 8

    The Person-Environment fit and OCB Relationship..... 19

    Culture Difference in Person-Environment Fit and OCB ..... 20

    Hypotheses ..... 23

    Hypothesis 1 ..... 23

    Hypothesis 2 ..... 23

    Hypothesis 3 ..... 23

    Hypothesis 4 ..... 24

2 METHOD ..... 25

    Participants ..... 25

    Measures..... 26

    Procedure..... 28

3 RESULTS ..... 31

    Main Hypotheses ..... 31

    Exploratory Analyses ..... 35

4 DISCUSSION .....	47
Main Hypotheses .....	47
Exploratory Findings .....	51
Implications for Organizations and Institutions .....	54
Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research.....	55
REFERENCES .....	58
APPENDICES .....	74
Appendix A: Demographics Information .....	74
Appendix B: Perceived Person Organization Fit Survey.....	76
Appendix C: Perceived Person Group Fit Survey.....	78
Appendix D: Organization Level Organizational Citizenship Behavior Survey.....	80
Appendix E: Individual level Organizational Citizenship Behavior Survey.....	82
Appendix F: IRB Approval Letter.....	84
Appendix G: Informed Consent Form and Cover Letter.....	86
Appendix H: Chinese Version Informed Consent Form and Cover Letter.....	88
Appendix I: Chinese Version Demographics Information.....	90
Appendix J: Chinese Version Perceived Person Organization Fit Survey.....	92
Appendix K: Chinese Version Perceived Person Group Fit Survey.....	94
Appendix L: Chinese Version Organization Level Organizational Citizenship Behavior Survey.....	96
Appendix M: Chinese Version Individual level Organizational Citizenship Behavior Survey.....	98
PERMISSION TO COPY.....	99

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1 Profiles of American and Chinese Participant .....	27
2 Correlations between the Main Study Variables.....	32
3 Correlations of Dependent Variables by Country.....	34
4 Cultural Comparison of Descriptive Statistics on the Main Study Variables.....	36
5 Summary of Analysis of Variance of P-O Fit and P-G Fit Variables by Gender and Culture (West and East).....	37
6 Summary of Analysis of Variance of OCB Variables by Gender and Culture (Western, Eastern).....	39
7 Summary of Analysis of Variance of P-O Fit and P-G Fit Variables by Education and Culture (Western, Eastern).....	40
8 Summary of Analysis of Variance of OCB Variables by Education and Culture (Western, Eastern).....	41
9 Summary of Analysis of Variance of P-O Fit and P-G Fit Variables by Position Level and Culture (Western, Eastern).....	43
10 Summary of Analysis of Variance of OCB Variables by Position Level and Culture (Western, Eastern).....	45
11 Correlations of Age, Tenure, and Organizational Size on the Main Study Variables .....	46

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Person-environment (P-E) fit and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) have become popular research topics within Industrial-organizational (I-O) psychology. Person-environment (P-E) fit is a central concept in organizational behavior research for the past decade. Research suggests P-E fit can mediate the relation of group-specific workplace experiences with job outcomes (Velez & Moradi, 2012). Previous studies also indicate that P-E fit is important for employee retention, commitment, job satisfaction, and well-being (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). Understanding the notion of person-work environment fit can help to predict and influence many individual and organizational outcomes. With the respect to OCB, research shows it impacts organizational effectiveness and performance (Organ, 1988).

Although P-E fit and OCB are well-research topics, most of the research focuses on the correlation of overall P-E fit and OCB (e.g., De Lara, 2008; Moorman & Blakely, 1995; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Salvaggio, 2003; Wei, 2012). Few of them have examined the relationship between specific types of P-E fit and OCB, for example, person-group fit, person-organization fit, individual-level OCB, and organizational-level OCB. There is also not much cross-cultural research on how Western and Eastern cultures affect the P-E fit and OCB relationship. The purpose of the current study is to examine whether there are cross-cultural differences between the relationships among person-group fit, person-organization fit, individual-level OCB, and organizational-level OCB.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### **Person-Environment Fit**

Person-environment fit is a complex and multidimensional concept (Sekiguchi, 2004). It is grounded in interactional behavior theory which states that both personal and situational characteristics influence behaviors, and the interaction of personal and situational variables account for the greatest variance (Chatman, 1989; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987; Sekiguchi, 2004). P-E fit is defined as the degree of congruence or match between a person and his or her environment (Holland, 1997). It also can be understood as the level of the individual and environment characteristics interaction match (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). The individual aspect includes an individual's biological or psychological needs, values, goals, abilities, or personality; the environmental aspect usually includes job demands, cultural values, rewards, or various environmental conditions (Cable & Edwards, 2004).

Person-environment fit studies are highly impacted by Schneider's (1987) attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) framework. Schneider underlined that those with similar personalities were more likely to prefer doing similar things and to behave in similar ways. This framework proposes that similar people are attracted to, selected by, and choose to remain in settings where the goals are similar to their own. However, when people believe they do not fit with the environment, attrition will result, or in other words, they will leave (Schneider, 1987). This theory highlights the notion of selection, whereby the goals of an organization influence the selection of people into the organization based on their common attributes in the work environment. High fit between personal expectations and organizational life leads to high job satisfaction.

**Dimensions of fit.** P-E fit can be conceptualized into three different dimensions (Sekiguchi, 2004). The first dimension is the supplementary and complementary distinction. Supplementary fit refers to the similarity between characteristics of a person and characteristics of the environment, or other persons within the environment (Boon & Hartog, 2011). It occurs “when a person supplements, embellishes, or possesses characteristics which are similar to other individuals in an environment” (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987, p. 269). People would perceive themselves as fitting because they are alike or similar to other people possessing these characteristics. Complementary fit occurs when a person’s characteristics make whole the environment or add to it what is missing (Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011). With complementary P-E fit, the basis for a good fit is the mutually off-setting pattern of relevant characteristics between the person and the environment (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). The thing we need to pay attention is that the definition of environment has essential differences between the supplementary and complementary models. The environment in the supplementary model is described according to the people who inhabit it. In the complementary model, the environment is defined based on its demands and requirements (Sekiguchi, 2004).

The second dimension is called the needs-supplies and demands-abilities distinction (Sekiguchi, 2004). This dimension grew from the complementary fit perspective (Kristof, 1996). Simply, needs-supplies fit occurs when environmental supplies meet an individual’s needs. Individuals usually have demands for the environment, such as financial, physical, and psychological resources as well as task related, interpersonal, and growth opportunities (Mitchell, Brigham, Walker, & Dino, 2011). If the environment supplies the right resources for individuals’ needs, the needs-

supplies fit are achieved. From another perspective, an environment may demand contributions from individuals in terms of time, effort, commitment, knowledge, skills, and abilities (Mitchell et al., 2011). Demands-abilities fit occurs when an individual has the abilities required to meet the environmental demands (Kristof, 1996).

The third dimension is between objective and subjective representations of the person and environment (Sekiguchi, 2004). Objective fit is the comparison between separately rated individual and environmental characteristics, while subjective fit is conceptualized as the person's judgment that he or she fits well in the environment (Cable & Judge, 1996; Kristof, 1996). Thus, the objective person refers to attributes of the person as these attributes exist, whereas the subjective person signifies the person's perception of his or her own attributes (i.e., the person's self-identity or self-concept). Analogously, the objective environment includes physical and social situations and events as they exist independent of the person's perceptions, whereas the subjective environment refers to situations and events as encountered and perceived by the person (Edwards & Rothbard, 1999).

According to Edwards, Caplan and Harrison (1998) study, they categorized objective and subjective dimensions and make four types of correspondence:

- (1) objective P-E fit, which refers to the fit between the objective person and the objective environment;
- (2) subjective P-E fit, or the fit between the subjective person and the subjective environment;
- (3) contact with reality, which meaning the degree to which the subjective environment corresponds to the objective environment;
- and (4) accuracy of self-assessment, which is the self-assessment of the match between the objective person and the subjective person (p.41).

For this study, I will mainly focus on examining the subjective P-E fit, which is the perception that one fits with his or her work environment.

Person–environment fit has been linked as an important predictor of work-related outcomes, such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to quit (Cable & Judge, 1996; Kristof, 1996; Kristof et al., 2005). P-E fit is usually viewed as a broad research area which contains several more specific constructs, such as person-organization fit, person-team fit, person-job fit, person-supervisor fit, etc. Among the various types of P-E fit, organization (P-O) fit, person-group (P-G) fit, and person-job (P-J) fit have been studied the most (Sekiguchi, 2004).

**Person-organization fit.** Person–organization fit (P–O fit) is the most widely studied area of person–environment fit (Sekiguchi, 2004). Chatman (1989) defined person-organization (P-O) fit as “the congruence between the norms and values of organizations and the values of persons” (p. 339). Later, it was more broadly defined as “the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when at least one entity provides what the other needs or they share similar fundamental characteristics or both” (Kristof et al., 2005, p. 282). Schneider (1987) pointed out that organizations are a situation that people are attracted to, are selected to be a part of, and remain with, if they are a good fit with the organization, or leave if they are not a good fit with the organization (Schneider, 1987). In another words, individuals are attracted to and seek to work for organizations where they perceive high levels of person–organization fit. P-O Fit can be conceptualized from either supplementary or complementary perspective (Kristoff, 1996).

Previous research has demonstrated that person-organization (P-O) fit is associated with positive outcomes for both employees (i.e., job satisfaction; job performance) and employers (i.e., job acceptance decisions, organization commitment) (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). P-O fit also was found to predict intention to quit and turnover (Chatman, 1989; O'Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell, 1991; Vancouver, Millsap & Peters, 1994), and was related to prosocial behaviors such as organizational citizenship behaviors (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986). People who perceive a strong sense of fit with their employing organization tend to be good organizational citizens (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001) by regularly engaging in discretionary behaviors that benefit both co-workers and the firm as a whole (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Kristof-Brown et al.'s (2005) meta-analysis found P-O fit to have strong correlations with job satisfaction ( $r = .44$ ) and organizational commitment ( $r = .51$ ), and a moderate negative correlations for intent to quit ( $r = -0.35$ ).

From a dynamic perspective, Sekiguchi (2004) found that during the selection phase, P-O fit is considered more important than P-J fit when an organization is looking to hire employees with relational psychological contracts. This supports research which has found that as employees' level of P-O fit increases, their satisfaction level also increase (Kristof-Brown, Jansen & Colbert, 2002).

**Person-group fit.** Person–group fit, or P–G fit, is a relatively new topic in person–environment fit study. It is one of the most under-researched areas of PE fit (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). It refers to an individual's perception of belongingness and camaraderie with a group, team, or department (Kristof-Brown et al., 2002). P-G fit occurs when at least one entity's needs are fulfilled, they share similar characteristics, or

both (Salvaggio, 2003). The similar characteristics were not based on demographic factors, but by deep-level characteristics including team or group values, personality, team climates, and abilities (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

Person-group fit is usually analyzed from the supplementary and the complementary fit perspective (Davis, 2006). From the supplementary perspective, person-group fit occurs when an individual “supplements, embellishes, or possesses characteristics which are similar to other individuals in the environment” (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987, p. 269). On the other hand, from the complementary fit perspective, “weakness or need of the environment is offset by the strength of the individual, and vice versa” (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987, p. 271).

Generally, individuals characterize a group by (a) defining themselves as members, (b) identifying with one another, (c) possessing a collective perception of unity, (d) engaging in frequent interaction, and (e) pursuing interdependent goals (Davis, 2006). Thus, if an individual shares similar values or personality dimensions with other team members, or he /she contributes a set of abilities that help the team perform its task and improve the team’s overall effectiveness, we can view him or her as having person-group fit. This study focuses on analyzing P-G fit from the perspective of how much an individual possesses similar values and personality dimensions to his/her team members and team environment, which is from the supplementary perspective.

According to Davis’ 2006 study, he pointed out that in a group with high cohesiveness, members feel a desire for the group to prosper so that it may continue to provide the satisfactions and fulfill the individual needs that initially made the group

more attractive, thus the person-group fit can affect employee commitment to the group and also their motivation to attribute to their teams, units, or departments (Davis, 2006).

**Person-job fit.** Person–job fit refers to the compatibility between a person’s characteristics and those of a specific job (Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011). Based on the needs-supplies perspective and demands-abilities perspective of person-environment fit, the fit of demand-abilities could be achieved when individuals bring sufficient knowledge, skill and abilities (KSAs) to meet the job demands. Person-job fit is achieved when an individual possesses the knowledge, skills, and abilities required to meet or exceed job demands in terms of time, effort, and commitment (Cable & DeRue, 2002). The needs-supplies fit exists when the supplies offered from jobs are compatible to the needs, preferences, and desires of individuals. Hence, individuals would be satisfied with their jobs if the organization policies or structure fulfilled the individuals’ preferences (Kristof, 1996).

Previous research has found that a high level of P-J fit has a number of positive outcomes. Researchers demonstrated that validated and structured procedures for determining P-J fit have led to more effective selection of employees in comparison to unstructured techniques (Buckley & Russell, 1997). In Edwards (1991) study, he found when P-J fit is assessed as the match between what an employee wants and receives from the person performing the job, it is correlated with improved job satisfaction, adjustment, and organizational commitment, as well as reduced intentions to quit.

### **Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has been studied for two decades since Dennis Organ (1998) and some other researchers (e.g., Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith,

Organ, & Near, 1983) first named the term in the early part of the 1980s (Podsakoff, MacKenzie & Bachrach, 2000). Based on their research, Organ (1988) originally defined OCB as:

Individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization. It is a voluntary and discretionary individual behavior that is expected to promote overall organizational efficacy (p.4).

However, there has been numerous research suggested disagreement about how OCBs are actually constructed (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). As a result, Organ (1997) modified this definition to “behavior that contributes to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance” (p. 91). The modification not only clearly distinguishes the difference between OCB and task performance (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991), it avoids some of the difficulty with viewing OCBs as discretionary behavior for which an individual might not receive formal rewards, and also makes OCB positively related to organizational performance effectiveness (Podsakoff et al., 2009). OCB also could be termed as “contextual performance” (Borman & Motowide, 1993) because OCB does not directly support the core task of the group or organization, rather it supports the external social environment of core tasks (March & Simon, 1958). Hence, in a short and simple statement, when an employee is acting as a “citizen” of the organization, or exhibits citizenship behavior, he or she would like to go above and beyond his job duties and do things that exceed his or her job description, and we can say he or she exhibits OCB (Kernodle & Noble, 2013).

There have been similar concepts suggested by other researchers, such as extra-role (Van Dyne, Cummings, & Parks, 1995), civic organizational behavior (Graham, 1991), organizational spontaneity (George & Brief, 1992), and the most common one is contextual performance, which is defined as “the aggregated value to the organization of all the behavioral episodes that have effects on the social, organizational, and psychological context of the organization's technical core” (Van Scotter, Motowidlo & Cross, 2000, p. 538). However, although these concepts are very close to OCB, there are some important differences between these constructs (Podsakoff et al., 2000). For example, Organ's (1997) modified definition of OCB is very similar to Borman and Motowidlo's (1993, 1997) definition of contextual performance, but there are some differences between the behavioral domains of OCB and contextual performance (Motowidlo, 2000). In Morrison's (1994) study, he found that OCB is not similar to extra-role behavior due to the supervisor's perception of in- role job duty and extra-role job duty, certain dimensions of OCB are even more in-role than extra-role.

**Dimensions of OCB.** In Organ's (1988) research, he initially suggested a five-factor OCB model consisting of altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, civic virtue, and sportsmanship. Later on, he expanded the five-factor OCB model into seven factors by adding two more dimensions: peacekeeping and cheerleading (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blumne, 2009). Specifically, altruism refers to the voluntary behavior that helps other co-workers with an organizationally relevant task or problem. Courtesy refers to foresightful behaviors that help others prevent a problem. Conscientiousness (often called compliance) is a behavior indicating employees who accept and follow the rules, or go well beyond minimally required levels of attendance, punctuality, housekeeping,

conserving resources, and related matters of internal maintenance. Civic virtue refers to employees taking an active interest in the life of their organization at the macro-level of the organization (Organ 1988, 1990). Sportsmanship means a citizen-like posture of tolerating the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining. Peacemaking actions help to prevent, resolve, or mitigate unconstructive interpersonal conflict. Cheerleading can be understood as the words and gestures of encouragement and reinforcement of coworkers' accomplishments and professional development (Organ, 1990, p. 96). The five-factor model has been confirmed in various studies and widely accepted (e.g., Moorman, 1991; Podsakoff et al., 1997).

However, over time, empirical research (e.g., Bachrach, Bendoly, & Podsakoff, 2001; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994) found it is hard to distinguish the seven dimensions proposed by Organ (1990). Also, numerous other studies indicate that there have been different types of citizenship-like behavior, such as helping coworker behavior, interpersonal facilitation (e.g., George & Brief, 1992; Graham, 1989; Organ, 1988, 1990; Smith et al., 1983; Van & Motowidlo, 1996). Thus, in Podsakoff et al.'s (2000) study, they reviewed the current empirical studies and reorganized the OCB dimensions into seven new categories: (1) Helping Behavior, (2) Sportsmanship, (3) Organizational Loyalty, (4) Organizational Compliance, (5) Individual Initiative, (6) Civic Virtue, and (7) Self Development (Podsakoff et al., 2000). The first dimension is helping behavior. The term comes from Podsakoff, Ahearne, and MacKenzie's (1997) study. According to Podsakoff et al., (1997), "the seven dimensions clearly involve helping others with, or preventing the occurrence of, work-related problems" (p. 263). Helping behavior includes two parts: (1) employee voluntary behavior that helps other

coworkers and (2) behavior that prevents the occurrence of work related problems (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Organ (1988, 1990)'s altruism, peacemaking, and cheerleading dimensions, Graham (1989)'s interpersonal helping, Van Scotter & Motowidlo's (1996) interpersonal facilitation can be viewed as the employee voluntarily helping others with work-related problems behaviors. For preventing the occurrence of works related problems, it can be illustrated as Organ's (1988, 1990) notion of courtesy.

The sportsmanship dimension is consistent with Organ's (1990) definition, which is an employee's ability to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining verbally or formally. However, Podsakoff et al. (2000) pointed out sportsmanship should include not only tolerance of inconvenience, but also include maintaining a positive attitude when other things do not go their way. Examples would be keeping objective when other co-workers do not take their advice or taking the group benefit/interests instead of the personal benefit/interests as the priority (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Organizational loyalty includes two parts: loyal boosterism (Blakely, Srivastava & Moorman, 2005) and organizational loyalty (Graham, 1991). Representative behavior includes voluntarily defending and promoting the organization's reputation to threats (Graham, 1991).

Organizational compliance captures the employees' internalization and acceptance of the organization's rules, regulations, and procedures. This internalization and acceptance is exhibited even when no one observes or monitors compliance (Podsakoff et al., 2000). It also can be understood as organizational obedience (Graham,

1991), OCB at the organizational level (OCB-O) by Williams and Anderson (1991), and following organizational rules and procedures by Borman and Motowidlo (1993).

Individual initiative is another term for conscientiousness. It refers to an employee being proactive in taking on responsibilities and performing tasks that are not necessarily required (Kernodle & Noble, 2013). It also can be understood as an extra role behavior, going “above and beyond” the call of duty (Podsakoff et al., 2000). When an employee exhibits the voluntary act of improving his or her job duties and job performance, or shows extra enthusiasm to accomplish his or her job, or is willing to take extra responsibilities, or communicates with others in the workplace to improve individual and group performance, we can say that he or she demonstrates individual initiative. Some similar terms in other studies include personal industry or individual initiative, persisting with enthusiasm or volunteering to carry out task activities (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997).

Civic virtue is from the macro-level of the organization, it is also named organizational participation by Graham (1989). It refers to “the employees’ willingness to participate actively in the political process of the organization” (Schnake & Dumler, 2003, p. 284). Examples are attending organizational events/meetings, engaging in policy debates, vocalizing opinions, discussing work issues on personal time, keeping up with changes in the industry that might affect the organization, protecting organizational properties and reporting suspicious activity, etc. (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

The final dimension is self-development. It refers to the voluntary behaviors employees engage in to improve their knowledge, skills, and abilities (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

LePine, Erez and Johnson (2002) conducted a meta-analysis of 137 studies examining the relationships among the OCB dimensions and between predictors. They found that there are strong relationships among most of the OCB dimensions (altruism, civic virtue, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and courtesy) and predictors, such as job satisfaction ( $r = .24$ ), organizational commitment ( $r = .20$ ), fairness ( $r = .23$ ), trait conscientiousness ( $r = .23$ ), and leader support ( $r = .32$ ), which suggest that the relationships between the OCB dimensions and the predictors are generally the same, they work equivalently.

Organ and Ryan (1995) found that job satisfaction and organizational commitment (particularly the affective component of commitment) to be equally important correlates of OCB in their meta-analysis. Podsakoff et al., (2009) conducted a meta-analysis study providing a quantitative summary of the empirical relationships between OCBs and individual and organizational outcomes. They found significant correlations between OCBs and a number of individual-level outcomes including: employee job performance rating ( $r = .60$ ), reward allocation decisions ( $r = .57$ ), and a variety of withdrawal-related criteria (e.g., employee turnover intentions, actual turnover, and absenteeism). A strong correlation was also found between OCBs and a variety of organizational effectiveness measures, for example, productivity ( $r = .39$ ), efficiency ( $r = .47$ ), profitability ( $r = .27$ ), and customer satisfaction ( $r = .19$ ). Other researchers have also found positive outcomes when employee have OCBS, for example, employees with high level of OCBs tend to have higher productivity and work effectiveness by helping their coworkers (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997).

**Antecedents of OCB.** Based on two meta-analyses conducted by Organ and Ryan (1995) and Podsakoff et al., (1996), the antecedents of OCB can be categorized into employee characteristics, task characteristics, organizational characteristics, and leadership behaviors. Employee characteristics generally include employee attitude, role perception, demographic variables, and dispositional variables (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Examples for individual attitude are job satisfaction, perceived fairness, and organizational commitment. Podsakoff et al. (2000) found that individual attitude has strong significant relationships with OCB, role perception has a significant relationship with some of the organizational citizenship behavior dimensions, and demographic variables (e.g., employee gender, age) do not relate to OCBs. Freshwater (2011) conducted a study that examined individual factors that predict OCBs, such as personality, citizenship motives, attitudes toward money, organizational justice, and job satisfactions. He found that all the individual factors investigated significantly contribute to the variance of each facet of the OCBs. This indicates that innate characteristics, motivations, and organizational perceptions will predict OCBs, which is consistent with Podsakoff et al.'s (2000) findings.

Task characteristics include three parts: task feedback, task routinization, and intrinsically satisfying tasks (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Podsakoff & MacKenzie (1997) found that task characteristics have consistent relationships with citizenship behaviors. More specifically, they stated that task feedback and intrinsically satisfying tasks were positively related to citizenship behavior, while task routinization was negatively related to OCBs. Todd and Kent's (2006) study examined the relationship between task variables and OCB from both a direct and indirect (or mediated) approach. They found that task

variables have the strongest direct impact on the OCB dimension of helping behavior: task significance ( $\beta = .201, p < .05$ ), intrinsically satisfying tasks ( $\beta = .259, p < .001$ ), and job self-efficacy ( $\beta = .146, p < .001$ ). Task variables influence job satisfaction but just only a partial influence: Task autonomy ( $\beta = .419, p < .001$ ), intrinsically satisfying tasks ( $\beta = .815, p < .001$ ). Finally, they stated that job satisfaction works as a mediator of the relationships between task variables and the OCB dimensions.

Organizational characteristics were not as strong as the other antecedents in predicting OCBs. Group cohesiveness was found to be the greatest predictor of OCBs among the organizational characteristics; rewards outside the leader's control were negatively related to OCBs (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Numerous studies have investigated the relationship between leadership behavior and OCB. Leadership has a strong, positive, consistent influence on OCB. In several meta-analyses, significant links are reported between supportive leadership behavior and OCB (LePine et al., 2002; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2000). Leadership behavior usually is divided into transformational leadership behaviors and transactional leadership behaviors. The former is sometimes connected with the Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory of leadership and the latter is sometimes connected with the Path-Goal theory of leadership (role clarification behavior, specification of procedures, or supportive leader behavior). Transformational leadership behavior has consistent positive effects on all dimensions of OCBs. Leader-member exchange behavior also was strongly related to OCBs (Podsakoff et al., 2000). May, Ramayah, and Jerome (2006) stated that the relationship between leaders and members of an organization has a significant impact on motivating employees to perform OCB. Bhal (2006) found procedural interactional

justice plays a moderator role in the relationship between leader-member relations (LMX) and OCB. Farahbod, Azadehdel, Rezaei-Dizgah, and Nezhadi-Jirdehi (2012) found employees' perceptions of leader-member exchange is positively related to OCB. Meierhans, Rietmann, and Jonas (2008) pointed out that the impact of fair and supportive leadership on OCB is mediated by employees' commitment to the organization, as well as, their commitment to their supervisor. Employees who have a better relationship with their supervisor are more likely to exhibit OCBs and, as a result, are more likely to have a higher work performance (Kernodle, 2007). All of these studies demonstrated that when employees perceive their leader as being fair, which is shown in terms of the reward behavior, employees are more inclined to be satisfied with their supervisor and their organization and will remain committed to the organization and display OCBs (Sofiah & Mohd Zabid, 2012).

In summary, among all the antecedents, the above studies indicated that job attitudes, task variables, and various types of leader behaviors are strongly related to OCBs, while organizational characteristics are less strongly related (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

**Levels of OCB.** William and Anderson (1991) first conceptualized OCB into two broad levels based on the target or direction of the behavior: (1) individual level OCB (OCB-I), which means behaviors directed toward the benefit of other individuals, which indirectly contribute to the organization and (2) organizational level OCB (OCB-O), which means behaviors directed towards the benefit of the organization. For example, employees exhibit OCB-I when they help their co-workers who have been absent. OCB-O occurs when they defend the organization when other employees criticize it. Their

study also pointed out that OCB-I is distinct from OCB-O. Altruism and courtesy are behaviors that fit in OCB-I, whereas sportsmanship, civic virtue, and conscientiousness fit in OCB-O.

However, based on prior research (e.g., Coleman & Borman, 2000; Hoffman, Blair, Meriac, & Woehr, 2007), OCB-I is not only correlated with Organ (1988)'s altruism, courtesy, peacekeeping, and cheerleading behavior dimensions, but also interpersonal helping (Graham, 1989), interpersonal facilitation (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996), helping coworkers and interpersonal harmony (Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997). In another words, OCB-I captures helping behavior which is proposed by Podsakoff et al.'s (2000) study. Williams, Podsakoff, and Huber's (1992) study also pointed out that several other relationships between perceived leader behavior and employee attitudes and performance belongs to individual-level phenomena.

Similarly, OCB-O captures not only Organ's (1990) compliance, civic virtue, and sportsmanship dimensions, but also organizational loyalty; organizational participation (Graham, 1991), protecting the organization (George & Brief, 1992), Borman and Motowidlo's (1993, 1997) endorsing, supporting, and defending organizational objectives, and Van Scotter & Motowidlo's (1996) job dedication (Podsakoff et al., 2009). It also captures Podsakoff et al.'s (2000) sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, and civic virtue dimensions. In other words, OCB can be conceptualized at three levels: overall OCB at the most abstract level, OCB-I and OCB-O as mid-level constructs, and then the seven basic levels. My study will focus on OCB at the middle level.

### **The Person-Environment Fit and OCB Relationship**

Previous studies (De Lara, 2008; Moorman & Blakely, 1995; Mowday et al., 1995; Steers, 1982; Wei, 2012) have demonstrated there is a strong relationship between P-E fit and OCB. Employees who perceive they are satisfied from their work will have greater psychological attachment to their organizations, and these highly involved employees will be more likely to engage in “extra-role” behaviors (Mowday et al., 1982). Person-organization fit can elicit the positive sentiments of employees, making them trust the organizations, have higher job satisfaction and higher commitment with the organizations. This congruence will lead them to display helpful behaviors for the organization (De Lara, 2008). Cable and DeRue (2002) suggested that employees who have a good fit with their employing organization tend to be more likely to be motivated to be good organizational citizens because enhanced motivation is viewed as one important outcome of P-O fit (Mitchell, 1997). In Walumbwa, Hartnell, and Oke’s (2010) study, based on a four-dimensional OCB instrument created by Moorman and Blakely (1995), their hypothesis was that P-O fit would moderate the relationship between servant leadership and follower OCB. According to the regression analysis result, their hypothesis was partially supported. P-O fit did moderate the relationship between some servant leader behaviors and individual initiative.

Wei (2012) examined P-O fit and OCB from a time perspective. The results showed that P-O fit significantly correlated with OCB-I ( $r = .21, p < 0.01$ ) and OCB-O ( $r = .19, p < 0.01$ ). In another words, employees are more likely to be motivated to engage in both OCB-I and OCB-O if they feel they fit into their organization. In addition, Wei also found that time evaluation (e.g., present or future time orientation) moderates the relationship between P-O fit and OCB. Wei found that P-O fit correlates higher with

OCBs when the employees have more of a future time orientation than a present time orientation.

For person-group fit, Salvaggio's (2003) study pointed out that a group with high person-group fit employees would likely develop strong helping and conscientiousness norms, which result in higher levels of OCB. On the other hand, if there is person-group misfit, group members can not feel fulfilled and they will be alienated from each other, which cause a negative working atmosphere. The direct result is they are not willing to help each other, or follow a helping norm, and they may decrease group productivity and the whole group may be disinclined to exhibit OCB.

### **Cultural Difference in Person Environment Fit and OCB**

Cultural, social, or legal factors may affect the applicability of research findings to other cultures (Sekiguchi, 2004). Conceptions of organizational citizenship behavior vary across cultures, also the antecedents of OCBs vary across cultures (Gelfand, Erez, & Aycan, 2007). Thus, there is a need to examine the potential impact that the cultural context might have on citizenship behavior (Podsakoff et al., 2000). In this study, I will focus on examining the difference between a Western culture context (United States) and an Eastern culture context (China).

According to Triandis (1994), culture is shared, is adaptive or has been adaptive at some point in the past, and is transmitted across time and generations. Damen (1987) defined culture as: "Learned and shared human patterns or models for living; day- to-day living patterns. These patterns and models pervade all aspects of human social interaction. Culture is mankind's primary adaptive mechanism" (p. 367).

Western culture is usually viewed as the individualistic society, while Eastern culture is usually viewed as the collectivistic society. In individualistic societies, people tend to focus on their own self-interests and the interests of their related family. In collectivistic societies, people tend to look after the interest of their in-group, and have few other beliefs than the beliefs of their in-group. The in-group refers to their family and other forms of organization (Hofstede, 1983). The main difference between individualists and collectivists is that they follow different rationalities or norms. Chen, Chen, and Meindl (1998) proposed five sets of contrasting mechanisms for the two concepts: (1) goal interdependence versus goal sharing, (2) person identity versus affect-based trust, (3) individual accountability and social pressure control, (4) partial versus full-channel communication, and (5) equity-based versus equality-based reward distribution.

Some studies have been conducted to examine culture and OCB. Lam, Hui and Law (1999) found that the five-factor structure of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) - altruism, conscientiousness, civic virtue, courtesy, and sportsmanship - was different between Western and Eastern countries. Eastern culture employees were more likely to define some categories of OCBs (e.g., courtesy, sportsmanship) as part of “in-role” performance as compared with Western culture employees. Similarly, Cheng and Farh (1997) examined the different forms of citizenship behavior observed in Taiwan and the potential moderating effect that traditionality and modernity had on the relationship between organizational justice and citizenship behavior. They found that although three of the OCB dimensions in Taiwan were similar to those found in the United States, two other dimensions emerged that appeared to be specific to the Taiwanese culture. In addition, they found that both traditionality and modernity moderated the relationship

between perceptions of justice and OCBs (Farh & Chen, 1997). Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, and Topolnytsky (2002) found that affective commitment was important for OCBs in the United States, while normative commitment was more strongly related with OCBs in Eastern countries. Hui, Lee, and Rousseau (2004) also found that fulfillment of psychological contracts is strongly related to OCBs in Eastern countries.

Wang, Hinrichs, Prieto, and Howell's (2013) study compared five dimensions of OCB in individualistic and collectivistic cultures (the United States and China). They found Chinese respondents had a higher level of sportsmanship and courtesy, but a lower level of civic virtue than the US respondents. Perceived supervisor support was a strong predictor of all five OCB dimensions for the Chinese sample, whereas for the US sample, perceived distributive justice was strongly related to conscientiousness and sportsmanship and slightly related to altruism.

Regarding the cultural impact on person-environment fit, Turban, Lau, Ngo, Chow, and Si (2001) mentioned that in collectivistic cultures, especially in China, individuals are attracted to certain organizational characteristics (e.g., government-owned enterprises) based on their personality characteristics (e.g., risk level).

Although there has been some research that examines how culture influences P-E fit or OCB, there is limited research on the relationship between P-E fit and OCB in cross-cultural contexts. Hence, there is a need for conducting research to examine whether previous Western environment findings can be applied to other cultural contexts, such as Eastern (China, Korea, Japan, etc.) countries, to see how cultural variables influence these relationships (Sekiguchi, 2004).

## Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are proposed in this study:

H1: The relationship between person-group fit (P-G fit) and individual-level OCB (OCB-I) will be stronger than the relationship between person-organization fit (P-O fit) and OCB-I.

This hypothesis is based on Boon and Hartog's (2011) study. They revealed that P-G fit is most strongly related to group-oriented outcomes like co-worker satisfaction and feelings of cohesion. Thus, if a person feels connected to his work group, he or she will want to engage in individual OCBs directed towards his or her co-workers.

H2: The relationship between P-O fit and organizational-level OCB (OCB-O) will be stronger than the relationship between P-G fit and OCB-O.

This hypothesis is based on the study of Cable and DeRue (2002), who found that P-G fit was a better predictor of OCB ( $r = .22, p < .01$ ) than needs-supplies fit or demands-abilities fit. My thinking is when an employee shares a similar value with his or her organization, he or she will be more likely to identify with the organizations, more willing to engage in organizational level OCBs directed towards his or her organization.

H3 (a): The P-G fit and OCB-I relationship in Western organizations will be stronger than the relationship between P-G fit and OCB-I in Eastern organizations.

H3 (b): The P-G fit and OCB-O relationship in Western organizations will be stronger than the relationship between P-G fit and OCB-O in Eastern organizations.

Farh, Zhong and Organ (2004) found that OCB is a different concept in China than it is in the US, with more dimensions and more imbedded into the societal culture. Related to their findings, Blakely et al., (2005) found that "Chinese managers were more

likely to define OCB as part of their job than were the American managers” (p. 103). Also, Moorman and Blakely (1995) pointed out that when an individual holds collectivistic values or norms, he or she would be more likely to perform citizenship behaviors. My thinking is that in individualistic Western organizations, an employee with low person-group fit will simply choose to be less engaged with his or her team or organization, and an employee with high person-group fit will choose to be more engaged with his or her team or organization. Thus, the relationship will be strong. However, in a collectivistic Eastern organization, all employees will have the societal expectation to engage in high OCBs, regardless of their level of person-group fit. Thus, the relationship will be weaker.

H4 (a): P-G fit will have a stronger relationship with OCB-I in Western organizations than the P-G fit and OCB-I relationship in Eastern organizations.

H4 (b): P-O fit will have a stronger relationship with OCB-O in Western organizations than the P-O fit and OCB-O relationship in Eastern organizations.

For this hypothesis, as with the one preceding it, my logic would be the same as above.

## CHAPTER 2

### METHOD

#### **Participants**

The participants for this study were recruited from Western and Eastern organizations by contacting Mid-West regional Industrial Organizational Psychology alumni, company professionals, professors, friends, and family members. The Western organizations were American companies/institutions. The Eastern companies/institutions were from China (including Mainland China, Hong Kong, and Macau). Online surveys were distributed to 500 potential American participants and 1,000 potential Chinese participants. I also conducted 50 face-to-face surveys from different American organizations located in Mid-West suburban areas. I augmented the American sample with the 50 face-to-face surveys so that the American sample equaled the Chinese sample. The participants I surveyed were employees whose jobs ranged from entry level to executive level and whose organizational affiliations varied (e.g., for-profit, non-profit, service, manufacturing, government, etc.).

In the present study, I had 287 participants. Forty five percent were from the U.S. and fifty five percent were from China. Of the 128 American participants, 108 were collected from the online survey (a 21.6% response rate), and 20 were collected from face-to-face surveys (a 40% response rate). For the Chinese participants, 159 out of 1,000 responded to the online survey (a response rate of 15.9%).

Table 1 provides a comparison of the American and Chinese participants' key demographic statistics in this study. For the U.S sample, 35% were men and 65% were women. For China, 45.3 % were men and 54.7% were women. Both of the groups had more women than men. Most of American participants were 26-35 years old with the

average tenure being 8.3 years. Most of Chinese participants were 26-45 years old, and their average work tenure was 9.6 years, which was slightly higher than the American group. The American group had a higher percentage of college graduates with a Bachelor's or Master's degree than the Chinese group.

In examining the approximate size of the participants' organizations, 36% had 1-50 employees, 3% had 51-100 employees, 19% had 101-500 employees, 20% had 501-1,000 employees, 12% had 1,001-5,000 employees, 6% had 5,001-10,000 employees, 3% had 10,001-50,000 employees and 2% had more than 50,001 employees.

### **Measures**

The independent variable for this study was the organization's nationality, either an American organization or a Chinese organization. The dependent variables were the participants' responses to the items on the perceived person-organization fit, person-group fit, individual-level OCB, and organizational-level OCB measures.

**Demographics.** The demographic part of the survey (see Appendix A) captured the following variables: gender, age group, education, organizational tenure, level of organization, organizational size, and country (see table 1).

**Perceived person-organization fit.** The current study used the Perceived Person-Organization Fit Scale (see Appendix B). It was developed by Cable and DeRue (2002) to assess how well employees perceive they fit within their organization. The measure consists of three items, which use a five-point Likert scale that ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Coefficient alpha for this scale was .91 for a single firm study and .92 for a multiple-firm study in Cable and DeRue's article. I found the coefficient alpha for this scale was .89 in this study.

Table 1

*Profiles of American and Chinese Participants*

	American Participants	Chinese Participants
Number of Participants	128	159
Sex		
Male	45 (35.2%)	72 (45.3%)
Female	83 (64.8%)	87 (54.7%)
Education		
High school	1	39
Associate's degree or Some college	11	46
Bachelor's degree	38	60
Master's degree	59	10
Advanced degree	19	4
Mean Tenure in Years	8.3	9.6
Level of Organization		
Staff	82	90
Middle Management	33	50
Executive	13	19

**Perceived Person-group fit.** The measurement of this variable was based on Kristof-Brown et al., (2002)'s study, which depicted high, medium, and low levels of person-group fit. This scale consists of eight items. Participants were asked to indicate how much they think they are fitting with their team by using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) (see Appendix C). According to Kristof-Brown et al. (2002), the average coefficient alpha for this Scale is .94 (Kristof-Brown et al., 2002), which indicated high internal consistency. I found the coefficient alpha for this scale was .68 in this study.

**Individual-level OCB.** This variable was measured with William & Anderson's (1991) measure of organizational citizenship behaviors. Their scale has seven items that measure individual level OCB with a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree ) (see Appendix D). They report coefficient alphas ranging from .61 to .88 in various studies. The coefficient alphas in this study were .76, consistent with William & Anderson's study.

**Organizational-level OCB.** This variable was measured with William & Anderson's (1991) measure of organizational citizenship behaviors. Their scale has seven items that measure organizational level OCB with a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree ) (see Appendix E). They report coefficient alphas ranging from .70 to .75 in various studies. In this study, I found the coefficient alphas were .72, which is consistent with previous research.

## **Procedures**

Before carrying out my study and collecting any data, I applied for IRB approval to make sure my study met ethical requirements (see Appendix F). A cover letter that

asks participants for their informed consent (see Appendix G) was given to face-to-face survey participants before they completed any part of the survey. The surveys were conducted anonymously. Accordingly, no participants were instructed to put any identifiable information on the survey.

I used SurveyMonkey.com to design my online survey. The survey included six parts: the cover letter which explains the study's objectives and informed consent, demographic information, perceived person-organization fit, perceived person-group fit, individual level OCB, and organizational level OCB. For the last four parts, the survey used a five-point Likert scale (strongly disagree, disagree, neither disagree nor agree, agree, strongly agree) to ask for the participants' opinion on their fit level and OCBs.

Because this study included English speaking participants who were working for United States' organizations, and Chinese speaking participants who work for Chinese organizations, there was a need to create the survey in an English version and a Chinese version. According to Gandek, Alacoque, Uzun, Andrew-Hobbs, and Davis (2003), the standard forward-backward translation process is widely used in cross-cultural psychology. Thus, I used the standard forward-backward translation process to translate the survey. For this study, I created a translation team including four translation members. All the translators were native Chinese speakers who were born and raised in China. They were also fluent in written English and previously unfamiliar with the survey. First, I carefully translated the English version survey into Chinese (Mandarin). Second, another translator translated the reconciled form back into English. This backward translation was compared to the original English version survey and we made the necessary modifications. In order to minimize the translation gap, the third and the

fourth translator repeated the previous process. Finally, the four members had a discussion meeting comparing the back translated version of the survey with the original one to ensure equivalence (Gandek et al., 2003) (see Appendices H-K).

Most of my participants received the survey invitation via email. To develop the email list of Chinese and American participants, I mainly relied on Industrial Organizational Psychology alumni, university alumni, friends, co-workers, and family members to ask their employers if I could send a group email inside their organizations. I also gathered public contact email address from various websites, including local governments, non-profit organization, etc. The participants were collected from multiple states/provinces in the United States and China. The email contained the briefing introduction of the survey and the survey link. After completing the survey, the data were downloaded into a spreadsheet. Thus, the surveys were completely anonymous.

For the face-to-face surveys, I visited the local companies which most of them were located in an urban Midwestern town by friends and coworkers' introductions. I asked the employees at their place of business if they would agree to participate in my study. I first asked them to read the cover letter. After reading it, if they are still interested in participating, I asked them to complete the survey while I waited. I also provided them with an envelope to put the survey in before I collected it. They were instructed to seal the envelope before returning it to me.

## CHAPTER 3

## RESULTS

**Main Hypotheses**

Hypothesis 1 proposed that P-G fit would have a stronger positive relationship with individual-level OCB than would P-O fit. To examine the first hypothesis, I first calculated the correlation coefficients between the variables. Then I used Fisher's  $r$  to  $Z$  test to examine whether the first correlation was significantly greater than the second correlation. All of the correlations between the four main variables for each country are depicted in Table 2. The results showed the correlation between P-G fit and individual-level OCB ( $r = .46$ ) was not significantly greater than the correlation between P-G fit and individual-level OCB ( $r = .39$ ) by using Fisher's  $r$  to  $Z$  test transformation ( $Z = 1.00$ ,  $p > .05$ ). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was not supported.

For Hypotheses 2, 3(a), 3(b), 4(a), and 4(b), I performed the same analytical method. I first calculated the correlation coefficients between the variables, then used Fisher's  $r$  to  $Z$  test to examine whether the first correlation is significantly different from the second correlation.

Hypothesis 2 indicated that P-O fit and organizational level OCB would have a stronger relationship than person-group fit and OCB-O. However, the result suggested that it was not the case because the correlation between person-organization fit and OCB-O ( $r = .39$ ) was not significantly greater than the correlation between person-group fit and OCB-O ( $r = .29$ ) by using Fisher's  $r$  to  $Z$  test transformation ( $Z = 1.33$ ,  $p > .05$ ). Thus, Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Table 2

*Correlations between the Main Study Variables*

Variable	1	2	3
1. P-O Fit			
2. P-G Fit	.43**		
3. OCB-I	.39**	.46**	
4. OCB-O	.39**	.29**	.42**

*Note.* P-O Fit = Person- Organization Fit; P-G Fit = Person –Group Fit;

OCB-I = Individual Level OCB; OCB-O = Organizational Level OCB

\*\* $p < .001$

Hypothesis 3(a) stated that P-G fit would have a stronger relationship with individual level OCB in Western organizations than in Eastern organizations. I found that the correlation ( $r = .57$ ) between P-G fit and individual-level OCB in American organizations was stronger than the correlation ( $r = .32$ ) between P-G fit and individual-level OCB in Chinese organizations ( $Z = 2.58, p < .01$ ). Thus, Hypothesis 3(a) was supported. See Table 3 for a comparison of the American and Chinese correlations.

However, Hypothesis 3(b) was not supported. There was not a significant difference between the P-G fit and organizational level OCB correlation ( $r = .25$ ) in Western organizations and the same relationship ( $r = .29$ ) in Eastern organizations ( $Z = -0.35, p > .05$ ). These results were not even in the expected direction (see Table 3).

Hypothesis 4(a) stated that P-G fit would have a stronger relationship with individual level OCB in Western organizations than in Eastern organizations. This hypothesis was also not supported. The correlation ( $r = .27$ ) between P-G fit and individual level OCB in the West was not significantly greater the correlation ( $r = .34$ ) between these variables in the Eastern organizations ( $Z = -0.63, p > .05$ ). The results were not even in the expected direction (see Table 3).

Similarly, Hypothesis 4(b) was not supported. Significant differences between the correlation ( $r = .34$ ) of P-G fit and organizational level OCB in Western organizations and the correlation ( $r = .28$ ) in Eastern organizations failed to emerge ( $Z = 0.55, P > .05$ ). Although, at least the small difference was in the expected direction (see Table 3).

Table 3

*Correlations of dependent variables by Country*

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Person-organization fit (U.S.)	--						
2. Person-group fit(U.S.)	.42	--					
3. OCB-I (U.S.)	.27	.57	--				
4. OCB-O (U.S)	.34	.25*	.29	--			
5. Person-organization fit (China)					--		
6. Person-group fit (China)					.40	--	
7. OCB-I (China)					.34	.32	--
8. OCB-O (China)					.28	.29	.44

*Note.* OCB-I = Individual Level OCB; OCB-O = Organizational Level OCB

\* $p < .01$ , all the other correlations were significant at  $p < .001$

## Exploratory Hypotheses

I first explored the cultural differences on my four main variables. To examine the cultural impact, I used independent samples t-tests. According to the t-tests results, I found the Americans had higher scores on all four of my variables: P-O fit, P-G fit, individual level OCB, and organization level OCB. These differences are depicted in Table 4.

The second type of analyses I conducted was examining the demographic differences on the four main variables. I was especially interested in exploring interactions between country and demographic variables. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare my main four study variables for gender, education, and position level by culture.

I first explored how gender and country interacted on P-O fit. While I found a main effect for country ( $F(1, 283) = 59.62, p < .001$ ) (see Table 4), the result showed that there was no main effect for gender ( $F(1, 283) = .02, p > .05$ ) and no interaction for gender by country ( $F(1, 283) = .01, p > .05$ ) (see Table 5).

Next, I explored how gender and country interacted on P-G fit. While I found no main effect for country ( $F(1, 281) = 2.70, p > .05$ ) or gender ( $F(1, 281) = 1.71, p > .05$ ), there was a significant interaction for gender by country ( $F(1, 281) = 4.99, p < .05$ ) (see Table 5). In America, women had higher P-G fit ( $M = 3.69$ ) than the men ( $M = 3.49$ ), but in China men had higher P-G fit ( $M = 3.52$ ) than the women ( $M = 3.47$ ).

Next, I explored how gender and country interacted on individual level OCB. While I found a main effect for country ( $F(1, 276) = 21.11, p < .001$ ) (see Table 4), I found no main effect for gender ( $F(1, 276) = 2.87, p > .05$ ). However, there

Table 4

*Cultural Comparison of Descriptive Statistics on the Main Study Variables*

	U.S.			China		
	<i>n</i>	M	SD	<i>n</i>	M	SD
Person-Organization Fit **	128	3.94	0.71	159	3.26	0.73
Person-Group Fit *	126	3.62	0.51	159	3.50	0.41
OCB-Individual Level **	124	3.91	0.44	156	3.64	0.40
OCB-Organizational Level **	124	4.19	0.45	156	3.92	0.40

\* $p < .05$ \*\* $p < .01$

Table 5

*Summary of Analysis of Variance of P-O Fit and P-G Fit Variables by Gender and Culture (West and East)*

Source	P-O Fit				P-G Fit			
	SS	df	MS	F	SS	df	MS	F
Country	31.52	1	31.52	59.62**	.56	1	.56	2.70
Gender	.01	1	.01	.02	.35	1	.35	1.71
Country x Gender	.01	1	.01	.01	1.03	1	1.03	4.99*
Error	149.62	283	.53		57.96	281	.21	

*Note.* P-O Fit = Person- Organization Fit; P-G Fit = Person –Group Fit.

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .001$

was a significant interaction for gender by country ( $F(1,276) = 5.30, p < .001$ ) (see Table 6). In America, women had higher individual level OCB ( $M = 3.98$ ) than the men ( $M = 3.78$ ), but in China men had higher individual level OCB ( $M = 3.66$ ) than the women ( $M = 3.63$ ). This interaction is consistent with P-G fit findings.

Finally, I explored how gender and country interacted on organizational level OCB. While I found a main effect for country ( $F(1,276) = 26.27, p < .001$ ) (see Table 4), I found no main effect for gender ( $F(1,276) = 2.92, p > .05$ ) and no significant interaction ( $F(1,276) = 1.27, p > .05$ ) (see Table 6).

After examining gender, I explored education, starting with P-G fit as my dependent variable. While I found a main effect for country ( $F(4,277) = 7.06, p < .05$ ) (see Table 4), I found no main effect for education ( $F(4,277) = 2.08, p > .05$ ) nor an interaction for education by country ( $F(4,277) = 1.43, p > .05$ ) (see Table 7).

Next, I explored how education and country interacted on P-O fit. I found no main effect for country ( $F(4,275) = 0.33, p > .05$ ), or education ( $F(4,275) = 0.14, p > .05$ ), and no interaction for education by country ( $F(4,277) = 0.27, p > .05$ ) (see Table 7).

Then I explored how education and country interacted on individual level OCB. I found no main effect for country ( $F(4,270) = 2.00, p > .05$ ), or education ( $F(4,275) = 0.26, p > .05$ ), and no interaction for education by country ( $F(4,277) = 0.10, p > .05$ ) (see Table 8).

Finally, I explored how education and country interacted on organizational level OCB. I found a main effect for country ( $F(4,270) = 5.26, p < .05$ ), but not for education

Table 6

*Summary of Analysis of Variance of OCB-I and OCB-O Variables by Gender and Culture (Western, Eastern)*

Source	OCB-I				OCB-O			
	SS	df	MS	F	SS	df	MS	F
Country	3.62	1	3.62	21.11**	4.73	1	4.73	26.27**
Gender	.49	1	.49	2.87	.53	1	.53	2.92
Country x Gender	.91	1	.91	5.30*	.23	1	.23	1.27
Error	47.34	276	.17		49.74	276	.18	

*Note.* OCB-I = Individual Level OCB; OCB-O = Organizational Level OCB

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .001$

Table 7

*Summary of Analysis of Variance of P-O Fit and P-G fit Variables by Education and Culture (Western, Eastern)*

Source	P-O Fit				P-G Fit			
	SS	df	MS	F	SS	df	MS	F
Country	3.69	1	3.69	7.06*	.20	1	.20	.94
Education	4.33	4	1.08	2.08	.12	4	.03	.14
Country x Education	2.99	4	.75	1.43	.23	4	.06	.27
Error	144.58	277	.52		58.29	275	.21	

*Note.* P-O Fit = Person- Organization Fit; P-G Fit = Person –Group Fit

\* $p < .05$

Table 8

*Summary of Analysis of Variance of OCB-I and OCB-O Variables by Education and Culture (Western, Eastern)*

Source	OCB-I				OCB-O			
	SS	df	MS	F	SS	df	MS	F
Country	.35	1	.35	2.00	.93	1	.93	5.26*
Education	1.05	4	.26	1.51	1.06	4	.27	1.51
Country x Education	.41	4	.10	.59	.77	4	.19	1.09
Error	46.94	270	.17		47.46	270	.18	

*Note.* OCB-I = Individual Level OCB; OCB-O = Organizational Level OCB

\* $p < .05$

( $F(4,270) = 1.51, p > .05$ ), nor an interaction for education by country ( $F(4,270) = 1.10, p > .05$ ) (see Table 8).

Next, I explored position level, starting with P-O fit as my dependent variable. I first explored how position and country interacted on P-O fit. I found a main effect for country ( $F(2,281) = 56.78, p < .001$ ) (see Table 4) and a significant impact for position level ( $F(2,281) = 7.26, p < .05$ ), but not a significant interaction for position level by country ( $F(1,283) = .01, p > .05$ ) (see Table 9). Using a Tukey's Post Hoc test, I found that executive employees are significantly different from the staff groups and middle management groups ( $p < .05$  for each comparison). The employees in executive positions had much higher person- organization fit ( $M = 4.05$ ) than middle management ( $M = 3.60$ ) and staff ( $M = 3.52$ )

Next, I explored how position level and country interacted on P-G fit. I found there is a main effect for country ( $F(2,279) = 11.1, p < .05$ ), a significant main effect for position level ( $F(2,279) = 9.26, p < .001$ ), and a main effect for the interaction of position level by country ( $F(2,279) = 3.55, p < .05$ ) (see Table 9). In general, executive-position employees had higher person-group fit ( $M = 3.88$ ) than middle management level employees ( $M = 3.50$ ) and staff ( $M = 3.52$ ). In terms of country, in American organizations, executives ( $M = 4.14$ ) are much higher than staff ( $M = 3.57$ ) and middle management ( $M = 3.53$ ), large differences are not seen in China because American executives ( $M = 4.14$ ) are much higher than Chinese executives ( $M = 3.62$ ). In short, the American executives stuck out as the highest on person-group fit.

Then, I explored how position level and country interacted on individual level OCB. I found a significant effect for country ( $F(2,274) = 34.96, p < .001$ ) (see

Table 9

*Summary of Analysis of Variance of P-O Fit and P-G fit Variables by Position Level and Culture (Western, Eastern)*

Source	P-O Fit				P-G Fit			
	SS	df	MS	F	SS	df	MS	F
Country	28.64	1	28.64	56.78**	2.18	1	2.18	11.10**
Position Level	7.33	2	3.67	7.26*	3.64	2	1.82	9.26**
Country x Position Level	1.41	2	.71	1.40	1.40	2	.70	3.95*
Error	141.73	281	.50		54.82	279	.20	

*Note.* P-O Fit = Person- Organization Fit; P-G Fit = Person –Group Fit

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .001$

Table 4), and for position level ( $F(2,274) = 5.95, p < .05$ ), and there was a significant interaction for position level by country ( $F(2,274) = 3.95, p < .05$ ) (see Table 10).

Executive-position employees had higher Individual level OCB ( $M = 4.02$ ) than middle management level employees ( $M = 3.76$ ) and staff ( $M = 3.74$ ). In terms of country, in American organizations, executives ( $M = 4.36$ ) were much higher than staff ( $M = 3.86$ ) and middle management ( $M = 3.87$ ). Also, American executives ( $M = 4.36$ ) were much higher than Chinese executives ( $M = 3.69$ ). Thus, again the American executives stuck out as the highest on OCB-I.

Then I explored how position level and country interacted on organizational level OCB. While I found a significant effect for country ( $F(2,274) = 40.24, p < .001$ ) (see Table 4), I found no main effect for position level ( $F(2,274) = 2.02, p > .05$ ), but there was an interaction for position level by country ( $F(2,274) = 5.88, p < .05$ ) (see Table 10). In American organizations, executives ( $M = 4.57$ ) were much higher in OCB-O level than middle management ( $M = 4.22$ ) and staff ( $M = 4.12$ ). However, Chinese employees were in the exact opposite direction, executives ( $M = 3.84$ ) were lower in OCB-O level than middle management ( $M = 3.89$ ) and staff ( $M = 3.95$ ), although not significantly lower.

Finally, I explored how age, tenure, and organizational size correlated with my main four variables within each country. As can be seen in Table 11, these three demographic variables did not correlate very strongly with my main four variables in either country. Only one significant result emerged. In America, the older workers had higher organizational level OCB than the younger workers ( $r = .28$ ).

Table 10

*Summary of Analysis of Variance of OCB-I and OCB-O Variables by Position Level and Culture (Western, Eastern)*

Source	OCB-I				OCB-O			
	SS	df	MS	F	SS	df	MS	F
Country	5.84	1	5.84	34.96**	7.08	1	7.08	40.24**
Position Level	1.99	2	.99	5.95*	.71	2	.36	2.02
Country x Position Level	1.32	2	.66	3.95*	2.07	2	1.03	5.89*
Error	45.80	274	.17		48.21	274	.18	

*Note.* OCB-I = Individual Level OCB; OCB-O = Organizational Level OCB

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .001$

Table 11

*Correlations of Age, Tenure, and Organizational Size on the Main Study Variables*

	U.S.			China		
	Age	Tenure	Organization Size	Age	Tenure	Organization Size
1. P-G Fit	.16	.11	-0.04	.09	-0.01	.09
2. P-O Fit	.02	-0.01	-0.03	.02	.07	-0.01
3. OCB-I	.07	-0.13	-0.05	-0.07	-0.09	.05
4. OCB-O	.28*	.13	.15	-0.02	-0.14	.04

*Note.* P-O Fit = Person - Organization Fit; P-G Fit = Person -Group Fit;  
OCB-I = Individual Level OCB; OCB- O = Organizational Level OCB

\*  $p < .01$

## CHAPTER 4

### DISCUSSION

#### **Main Hypotheses**

The present study aimed to explore the cultural impact on the relationships between person-group fit, person-organization fit, individual level OCB, and organizational level OCB. The results were mixed regarding the proposed hypotheses. My first two hypotheses were not supported. Work group fit was not a better predictor of individual level OCB than person-organization fit, and person-organization fit was not a better predictor of organization level OCB than person-group fit. For each hypothesis, both types of fit correlated with both types of OCB. My first result did not conform with Boon and Hartog's (2011) study which revealed person-group fit was most strongly related to group-oriented outcomes nor with Salvaggio's (2003) finding that person-group fit was a good predictor of individual level OCB. My second result did not conform to Cable and Derue's (2002) study, which found that person-organization fit was the best predictor of OCB, especially organizational level OCB.

One possible reason for my non-significant findings might be because of anomia, which refers to pessimistic feelings such as social detachment, or little faith in relations with others. In De Lara's (2008) study, the relationship between person-organization fit and organizational level OCB was mediated by anomia. P-O misfit elicited employees' anomic feeling, and led to a lower organizational level OCB level. Perhaps, any type of misfit, person-group or person-organization, can lead to anomia and a drop in all OCB, individual or organizational. At the measurement level, the person-group fit measure in my study did not have high reliability. Its coefficient alpha was .68. The person-

organization fit measure had a coefficient alpha of .89. Perhaps the differences in instrument quality impacted the findings.

My third and fourth hypotheses, examined culture as a possible moderator of these relations. Hypothesis 3 examined the cultural impact on the relationships between person-group fit and the two OCBs. Hypothesis 3(a) was supported. The relationship between person-group fit and individual OCB was stronger in Western employees (.57) than it was in Eastern employees (.32). Blakely et al. (2005) found that managers in Eastern organizations were more likely to define OCB as part of their job than were managers in Western organizations. Similarly, Lam et al. (1999) found that Japanese and Hong Kong employees were more likely to define some OCB structures (e.g., courtesy and sportsmanship) as part of “in-role” performance compared to Australian and U.S. employees. If OCB is seen as part of one’s job duty, especially individual level OCB (courtesy), Eastern organization employees may be more likely to exhibit individual level OCB regardless of their fit with their group or organization, thus, the relationship between person-group fit and individual- level OCB would be weaker than in the Western context.

However, that logic would lead one to also expect a stronger correlation between person-group fit and organizational level OCB in Western employees, but Hypothesis 3(b) was not supported. The relationship between person-group fit and organizational level OCB was not significantly stronger in Western employees (.25) than it was in Eastern employees (.29). This finding was not consistent with Paine and Organ’s (2000) cultural matrix of OCB study, which revealed that in collectivist cultures OCBs was viewed as part of job duty regardless of job description, organization honor is the most

important thing. OCB was part and parcel of loyalty to, and identification with the organization. Thus, no matter whether they fit with their group, they will still display high OCB directed towards benefiting their organization. But I found equally positive correlations between person-group fit and organizational level OCB in America and China. So it seems that in both countries, not fitting into a person's group is related to lower organizational OCBs and fitting into a person's group is related to higher organizational OCBs. Also in both countries, not fitting into a group is not related to lower individual OCBs and fitting into a group is not related to higher individual OCBs. An examination of the four correlations reveals that the biggest difference is between person-group fit and individual level OCB for the Americans (.57) and the other three correlations which hovered around .30. Why would person-group fit predict individual-level OCB so much more powerfully for Westerners?

Perhaps it may be explained by collectivistic and individualistic perspectives. In collectivist Eastern cultures, OCB is more likely to be shown towards the organization as a whole than to other employees (Paine & Organ, 2000). Also, Gudykunst and Nishida (1987) indicated that collectivistic Eastern cultures tend to use the equality norm with in-group members and even with out-group members, while in individualistic cultures equity is the norm. Therefore, if an American does not feel he or she is receiving his or her fair share of social and emotional group rewards, he or she will be more inclined to remove individual OCBs, but a Chinese employee will be less inclined to use quid pro quo decisions about his or her individual OCBs.

The Hypothesis 4 continued examining how the culture factor influenced the relationships between person-organization fit and the two OCBs. Hypothesis 4(a)

proposed that person-organization fit would have a stronger relationship with individual level OCB in Western organizations than in Eastern organizations. This hypothesis was not supported. In the West the correlation was .27 and in the East the correlation was .34. Hypothesis 4(b) proposed person-organization fit would have a stronger relationship with organizational level OCB in Western organizations than in Eastern organizations. This hypothesis was not supported either. There was not a big difference between the West (.34) and the East (.28). In another words, culture did not moderate the relationship between person-organization fit and the two OCBs. Person-organization fit predicted both OCBs in the same amount in both countries. All of the correlations hovered around .30.

Because China's formulation of OCB differs from that in the West, I was surprised at the similarity in the findings. OCB in the East is embedded in its unique social and cultural context (Farh et al., 2004). In Farh et al.'s (2004) study on China's OCB, they identified 10 major OCB dimensions, and divided them into two groups: (a) common dimensions, those whose content domain resembled the major OCB dimensions in the Western OCB dimensions and (b) extended dimensions. The common dimensions included taking initiative, helping coworkers, voice, group activity participation which similar to civic virtue, promoting company image which is similar to loyalty and loyal boosterism. The extended dimensions included self-training, social welfare participation, protecting and saving company resources, keeping the work-place clean and interpersonal harmony. In my study, OCB measurement was adapted from William & Anderson's (1991) study which built OCB measures based on Western culture OCB dimensions. Maybe some important Eastern elements of OCB were not measured. Subsequently,

perhaps the measures I used were unable to uncover the East-West differences I had predicted.

### **Exploratory Findings**

I found that culture affected the employee's perception of his/her person-group fit, person-organization fit, individual OCB, and organizational OCB. Western employees were significantly higher on all four variables than their Eastern counterparts. These findings completely surprised me because I thought if there were any differences, they would be in the opposite direction, especially for the two OCBs. As Blakely et al. (2005) and Lam et al. (1999) found, managers in Eastern organizations are more likely to define OCB as part of their job than managers in Western organizations. Subsequently, would Eastern managers not be expected to report a higher level of engaging in the citizenship behaviors? This finding somewhat undermines my rationale for the significant result in Hypothesis 3(a). Perhaps, as I just mentioned at the end of the previous paragraph, some important Eastern elements of OCB were not measured and this led to lower scores among Eastern managers. Or perhaps some of the items lost something in translation from English to Chinese. Or perhaps the Chinese participants have less of a self-serving bias when they answer surveys (Kashima & Triandis, 1986). As will be seen in the demographic analyses, it is not so much American and Chinese participants in general who differ, but American and Chinese executives.

Regarding gender, I found that gender and country did not interact to predict person-organization fit or organization level OCB, but for person-group fit, women had higher person-group fit than the men in America, but in China men had higher person-group fit than the women. Also, in America women had higher individual level

citizenship behavior than the men, but in China men had higher individual level citizenship behavior than the women. One explanation why American women are higher group fit than their male counterparts may be that women are more socially skilled and/or oriented than men (Margalit & Eysenck, 1990). Another explanation why American women engage in more individual level OCB than their male counterparts is that women are more nurturing than men (Mercadillo, Díaz, Pasaye, & Barrios, 2011). However, this does not explain why the Chinese side of the equation is the exact opposite, with the men having higher group fit and individual level citizenship behaviors. It is a bit of a mystery.

Another important exploratory finding was the impact of the employees' position level. In both China and America, executives had higher person-organization fit. However, for person-group fit, there was an interaction. In American organizations, executives were much higher than staff and middle management, but in China I did not find large differences between the Chinese executives and the Chinese staff and middle management. I also found interactions for the two OCBs. American executives again were much higher than everyone else on both OCBs.

One would expect executives to be higher on all four variables because their embrace of company values plays a role in their rise to the top. But the Chinese executives get lower scores than the American executives except for person-group fit. The lack of a difference between the executives on person-group fit can perhaps be explained by "guanxi." Farh, Tsui, Xin, and Cheng (1998) investigated the influence of relational demography and "guanxi" in Taiwan and China. Guanxi refers to the existence of direct particularistic ties between an individual and others, which is similar to the person-group fit concept. It can be traced back to Confucian philosophy which permeates

Chinese society and emphasizes relationships of benevolence toward others and order in the relationships with the state (Zyglidopoulos & David, 2006). Relational demography includes age, gender, race, religion, education, and occupation. They found that guanxi and relational demography is a good predictor of subordinate relationships with supervisors. Guanxi is found to be extremely important for executives' trust in their connections, they are likely to rely on "guanxi" to select key group members. In other words, in Eastern culture, employees' position level is greatly impacted by their connection with their group, or how much they fit with the group, especially for the executive level. This may explain why Chinese executives are almost as high as the American executives on person-group fit.

To explain the differences on between American and Chinese executives on the other three variables, I believe that individualistic and collectivistic values may explain the difference. Yan and Hunt (2005) proposed that in individualistic cultures, leaders often take credit for their organization's success, whereas in collective cultures, where self-effacement is valued, leaders often keep a low profile when their organizations succeed. Thus, most of the Chinese executives in my study probably do not see themselves in the same masters-of-the-universe perspective as some of the American executives probably do. These American executives are more likely to grade themselves highly on fitting into their organization and helping their coworkers and organization succeed.

Finally, my exploratory finding suggested that education, age, tenure, and organizational size were not strongly related to the four variables in either country.

## **Implications for Organizations and Institutions**

The results of this study are important for organizations and their human resource management in many respects. First, although there may be a cultural bias in the instrument, the results indicated that the two cultures of individualism and collectivism did affect employees' self-perceived fit with their organization and work group and their OCB levels. The American employees, especially the executives, were higher in all of the measures compared to the Chinese employees. Also, the correlation between person-group fit and individual-level OCB was significantly higher for the American sample. Hence, Western organizations might keep in mind that it is important to foster perceptions of person-group fit among team members. Although I do not want to imply that the relationship between person-group fit and individual-level OCB is causal. Because an employee's person-group fit is determined by similar deep-level characteristics, including team or group values, personality, team climates, and abilities (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005), team leaders or managers could use some strategies to build a good team-oriented work environment. For example, they could make each team member's roles for his or her position clear, stimulate team members' feelings of compatibility by organizing meetings that let team members share their work experiences so they get to know and trust each other more and also understand each other's value and ability, and conduct team effectiveness assessment by professional assessment tools and collect feedback.

On the other hand, from the organization perspective, it would be important for international companies to learn about local norms regarding OCB. For those expatriates who relocated from Western culture to Eastern culture organizations or from Eastern

culture to Western culture organizations, becoming knowledgeable about the change in expectations of OCB from their own culture to the local culture will improve their chances for success and adaptation. For example, Western expatriates should be aware that Eastern employees view conflict as harmful to organizations because interpersonal harmony is a major form of OCB in the East. Also, Eastern employees may view self-training as a very productive way to contribute to organizational effectiveness. Of course, this suggestion is based on making a causal implication from correlational data, something that will be addressed in the next section.

Additionally, this study found that in both cultures executives perceived higher fit with their working organization. This is not surprising. However, employee position level and culture interacted to explain differences in person-group fit and the two levels of OCBs because the American executives had higher scores than the Chinese executives, and everyone else in both countries, on all three of these variables. As discussed earlier, collectivism culture employees have different engagement levels towards organization commitment and group commitment compared to individualism culture employees. Therefore, with the increasing globalization of the economy, it will be beneficial for organizations be aware of other culture norms and standards, such as how “guanxi” is related with employees position level in Chinese organizations.

### **Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research**

Regarding internal validity, my biggest limitation was the correlational nature of my study. I was unable to make any causal inferences from the data. I also had some potential measurement issues. I did not include aspects of Eastern OCB in my OCB measures. Measuring the unique social and cultural context for Eastern OCB would offer

more direct evidence on how culture impacts on person-environment fit and OCB relationships. However, Venhemert, Baerveldt, and Vermnde's (2001) study argued that it was almost impossible to eliminate cross cultural bias in the instrument, and the measurement of OCB in my study still captured the majority of the OCB dimensions in China. But for future research, I would conduct pilot studies to reduce the bias. Also, my person-group fit measure had unacceptable internal consistency, which may have impacted my results. The translated version of OCB may not have been equivalent to the English version. The data in my study were collected by self-report assessment, which may lead to possible bias and inflated measures (Crampton & Wagner, 1994). Thus, for future study, I would like to explore the relationships with more objective assessment tools.

Regarding external validity, a limitation of this study was the homogeneity of the participants. The Chinese participants were nationwide, living in different provinces and working for various organizations and in various positions. However, the majority of the America participants were recruited from an industrial-organizational psychology program's alumni, and most of them were from organizations located in the American Middle West. Thus, the sample may not accurately represent the entire American population. Also, I used China and American to represent Eastern and Western culture, which may not accurately represent the entire culture either.

For future study, I would like to continue to examine additional factors that may moderate the relationship between person-environment fit and OCBs, such as job commitment and job satisfaction. Also, I found there were very limited study regarding examining how the employees position level moderate the person-environment fit and

OCB relationship, thus future study should attempt to conduct more empirical research to explore their interacted relationship, especially in cross-culture settings.

Additionally, future study could focus on examining the differences between the in-group and outsider perception of person-group fit. At last, just as Sekiguchi, 2004 pointed out, future research on person-group fit and person-organization fit is expected to extend from Western context to or Eastern context to cross cultural study, especially those expatriate studies in other cultural contexts needs to be done in the future.

## References

- Bachrach, D. G., Bendoly, E., & Podsakoff, P. M. (1999). *Attributions of the “causes” of performance as an alternative explanation of the organizational citizenship behavior/organizational performance relationship*. National Academy of Management Meetings, Chicago.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587–595.
- Bhal, K. T. (2006). LMX-citizenship behavior relationship: Justice as a mediator. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 27(2), 106-117.  
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437730610646615>
- Blakely, G. L., Srivastava, A., & Moorman, R. H. (2005). The effects of nationality Work Role Centrality, and Work Locus of Control on Role Definitions of OCB. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 12(1), 103-117.
- Boon, C.T. & Den Hartog, D.N. (2011). Human resource management, person-environment fit, and trust. In R.H. Searle & D. Skinner (Eds.), *Trust in HRM*. (pp. 109-121). Edward Elger.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt, W. C. Borman, & Associates (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance, 10*, 99–109.
- Buckley, M. R., & Russell, C. C. (1997). Meta-analytic estimates of interview criterion-related validity: A qualitative assessment. In R. W. Eder and M. M. Harris (Eds.), *The employment interview: Theory, research, and practice*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Cable, D.M., & DeRue, D. S. (2002). The convergent and discriminant validity of subjective fit perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 875-884.  
doi:10.1037/00219010.87.5.875.
- Cable, D.M., & Edwards, J.R. (2004). Complementary and supplementary fit: A theoretical and empirical integration. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 822–834.
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 67*(3), 294-311. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1996.0081>
- Chatman, J. A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal, 14*(3), 333-349.
- Chen, C.C., Chen, X.P., & Meindl, J.R. (1998). How can cooperation be fostered? The cultural effects of individualism-collectivism. *Academy of Management Review, 23*, 285-304.

- Coleman, V. I., & Borman, W. C. (2000). Investigating the underlying structure of the citizenship performance domain. *Human Resource Management Review, 10*, 25–44.
- Crampton, S. M., & Wagner, J. A. (1994). Percept-percept inflation in Micro-organizational research: An investigation of prevalence and effect. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(1), 67-76.
- Davis, V. A. (2006). *Relationships among subjective workplace fit perceptions, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions*. (Order No. AAI3209951, Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 1738. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/621577729?accountid=27180>. (621577729; 2006-99018-039).
- Damen, L. (1987). *Culture Learning: The Fifth Dimension on the Language Classroom* (p. 367). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- De Lara, P. Z. (2008). Should faith and hope be included in the employees' agenda? Linking P-O fit and citizenship behavior. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 23*(1), 73-88. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940810849675>
- Edwards, J. R., Caplan, R. D., & Harrison, R. V. (1998). Person-environment fit theory: Conceptual foundations, empirical evidence, and directions for future research. In C. L. Cooper (Ed.), *Theories of Organizational Stress* (pp. 28-67). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (1999). Work and family stress and well-being: An

examination of person-environment fit in the work and family domains.

*Organizational Behavior and Human Development Process*, 77(2), 85-129.

- Farahbod, F., Azadehdel, M., Rezaei-Dizgah, M., & Nezhadi-Jirdehi, M. (2012). Organizational citizenship behavior: The role of organizational justice and leader-member exchange. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(9), 893-903. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/964018812?accountid=27180>
- Farh, J. L., & Cheng, B. S. (1997). Modesty bias in self-ratings in Taiwan: Impact of item wording, modesty values, and self-esteem. *Chinese Journal of Psychology*, 39(2), 103-118.
- 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(3), 421-444. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2393733>
- Farh, J.L., Tsui, A. S., Xin, K., & Cheng, B. (1998). The influence of relational demography and guanxi: The Chinese case. *Organization Science*, 9(4), 471-488. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/619369406?accountid=27180>
- Farh, J. L., Zhong, C. B., & Organ, D. W. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior in the People's Republic of China. *Organization Science*, 15(2), 241-253.
- Freshwater, E. K. (2011). *Individual predictors of service organizational citizenship behaviors*. (Order No. 3469396, Walden University). Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/893121556?accountid=27180>. (893121556).

- Gandek, B., Alacoque, J., Uzun, V., Andrew-Hobbs, M., & Davis, K. (2003). Translating the short-form headache impact test (HIT-6) in 27 countries: Methodological and conceptual issues. *Quality of Life Research, 12*(8), 975-981.  
doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1026171315263>
- Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M., & Aycan, Z. (2007). Cross-cultural organizational behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 479-514.  
doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085559>
- George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good, doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work—organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*, 310–329.
- Graham, J. W. (1989). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, operationalization, and validation*. Unpublished working paper, Loyola University of Chicago.
- Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 4*, 249–270.
- Gudykunst, W. B., Nishida, T., & Chua, E. (1987). Perceptions of social penetration in japanese-north american dyads. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 11*(2), 171-189. Retrieved from  
<http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/617590628?accountid=27180>
- Hofstede, G (1983). The culture relativity of organizational practices and theories. *Journal of International Business Studies, 14*, 75-89.

- Hoffman, B. J., Blair, C. A., Meriac, J. P., & Woehr, D. J. (2007). Expanding the criterion domain? A quantitative review of the OCB literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 555–566.
- Holland, J. L. (1997). *Making vocational choices (3rd edition): A theory of vocational personalities and work environments*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
- Hui C, Lee C, & Rousseau D.M. (2004). Psychological contract and organizational citizenship behavior in China: Investigating generalizability and instrumentality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 311–321.
- Kashima, Y, & Triandis, H. C. (1986). The self-serving bias in attributions as a coping strategy: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology, 17*, 83-97.
- Kernodle, T. A. (1996). *Antecedents and consequences of organizational citizenship behavior: A hierarchical linear modeling study*. (Order No. AAI3256150, Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 1069. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/622029413?accountid=27180>. (622029413; 2007-99017-804).
- Kernodle, T. A., & Noble, D. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's importance in academics. *American Journal of Business Education (Online), 6*(2), 235. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/1418449889?accountid=27180>

- Kristof, A. (1996). Person-organisation fit: An integrative review of it's conceptualisations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49*, 1-49. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01790.x>
- Kristof-Brown, A., & Guay, R. P. (2011). Person–environment fit. *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 3*, 3-50. doi:10.1037/12171-001
- Kristof-Brown, A., Jansen, K. J., & Colbert, A. E. (2002). A policy-capturing study of the simultaneous effects of fit with jobs, groups, and organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(5), 985-993. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.5.985>
- Kristof, A., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology, 58*, 281-342. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x>
- Lam, S. S. K., Hui, C., & Law, K.S. (1999). Organizational citizenship behavior: Comparing perspectives of supervisors and subordinates across four international samples. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 594–601.
- Lauver, K. I. J., & Kristof-Brown, A. (2001). Distinguishing between employees' perceptions of person-job and person-organization fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59*, 454-470.
- 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.

- 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.
- Margalit, M., & Eysenck, S. (1990). Prediction of coherence in adolescence: Gender differences in social skills, personality, and family climate. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 24(4), 510-521.
- March, J. & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: John Wiley.
- May, C. L., Ramayah, T., & Jerome Kueh, S. H. (2006). An investigation of leader member exchange effects on organizational citizenship behavior in Malaysia. *Journal of Business and Management*, 12(1), 5-23. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/211508817?accountid=27180>
- Meierhans, D., Rietmann, B., & Jonas, K. (2008). Influence of fair and supportive leadership behavior on commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Swiss Journal of Psychology/Schweizerische Zeitschrift Für Psychologie/Revue Suisse De Psychologie*, 67(3), 131-141. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1024/1421-0185.67.3.131>
- Mercadillo, R. E., Díaz, J. L., Pasaye, E. H., & Barrios, F. A. (2011). Perception of suffering and compassion experience: Brain gender disparities. *Brain and Cognition*, 76(1), 5-14. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2011.03.019>

- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*, 20–52.
- Mitchell, S. A. (1997). *Influence and autonomy in psychoanalysis Analytic*. Press, Mahwah, NJ. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/619163447?accountid=27180>
- Mitchell, R. K., Brigham, K. H., Walker, H. J., & Dino, R. N. (2011). In search of entrepreneurship research excellence: A person–environment fit approach. *In Search of Research Excellence: Exemplars in Entrepreneurship*. MA: Edward Elgar.
- Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Academy of Management Journal, 37*(6), 1543. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/199836755?accountid=27180>
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 845–855.
- Motowidlo, S. J. (2000). Some basic issues related to contextual performance and organizational citizenship behavior in human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review, 10*(1), 115-126.  
doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(99\)00042-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(99)00042-X)

- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York: Academic Press.
- Muchinsky, P. M., & Monahan, C. J. (1987). What is person-environment congruence? Supplementary versus complementary models of fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 31*, 268-277.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 12, pp. 43–72). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Organ, D. W. & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 775-802.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance, 10*, 85–97.
- O'Reilly, C. A. III, & Chatman, J. (1986). Organization commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification and internalization on prosocial behavior, *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 492-499.
- O'Reilly III, C. A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*(3), 487-516.

- Paine, J. B., & Organ, D. W. (2000). The cultural matrix of organizational citizenship behavior: Some preliminary conceptual and empirical observations. *Human Resource Management Review, 10*(1), 45-59.  
doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(99\)00038-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(99)00038-8)
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance, 10*, 133–151.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 262–270.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., 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*(3), 513-563. Retrieved from  
<http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/197136069?accountid=27180>
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(1), 122-141.  
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013079>
- Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (1997). Organizational socialization: Making sense of the past and present as a prologue for the future. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*, 234-279.

- Salvaggio, A. N. (2003). *To help or to leave: Person-group fit as a correlate of aggregate organizational citizenship behavior and turnover*. (Order No. 3112567, University of Maryland, College Park). ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, p.144. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/305320073?accountid=27180>. (305320073).
- Schnake, M. E., & Dumler, M. P. (2003). Levels of measurement and analysis issues in organizational citizenship behavior research. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76(3), 283-301. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/096317903769647184>
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 437-454.
- Segikuchi, T. (2004). Person-organization fit and person-job fit in employee selection: A review of the literature. *Osaka Keidai Ronshu*, 54(6), 179-196.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 655–663.
- Sofiah, K. K., & Mohd Zabid, A. R. (2012). The mediating effect of organizational commitment in the organizational culture, leadership and organizational justice relationship with organizational citizenship behavior: A study of academicians in private higher learning institutions in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(8) Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/1010404232?accountid=27180>

- Todd, S. Y., & Kent, A. (2006). Direct and indirect effects of task characteristics on organizational citizenship behavior. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 8(2), 253-268. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/198021963?accountid=27180>
- Triandis, H. C. (1994). *Culture and social behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Turban, D. B., Lau, C. M., Ngo, H. Y., Chow, I. H. S & Si, S. X. (2001). Organizational attractiveness of firms in the People's Republic of China: A person-organization fit perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 194–206.
- Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & Parks, J. M. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (A bridge over muddied waters). In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior (Vol. 17)* 215–285. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Van Hemert, D. A., Baerveldt, C., & Vermande, M. (2001). Assessing cross-cultural item bias in questionnaires: Acculturation and the measurement of social support and family cohesion for adolescents. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(4), 381-390.
- Van Scotter, J. R., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 525–531.
- Van Scotter, J., Motowidlo, S. J., & Cross, T. C. (2000). Effects of task performance and contextual performance on systemic rewards. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(4), 526-535. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.4.526>

- Vancouver, J. B., Millsap, R. E., & Peters P. A. (1994). Multilevel analysis of organizational goal congruence. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 666-679.
- Velez, B. L., & Moradi, B. (2012). Workplace support, discrimination, and person-organization fit: Tests of the theory of work adjustment with LGB individuals. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 59*(3), 399. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/1024716079?accountid=27180>
- Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Oke, A. (2010). Servant leadership, procedural justice climate, service climate, employee attitudes, and organizational citizenship behavior: A cross-level investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(3), 517-529. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018867>
- Wang, L., Hinrichs, K. T., Prieto, L., & Howell, J. P. (2013). Five dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior: Comparing antecedents and levels of engagement in china and the US. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 30*(1), 115-147. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10490-010-9237-1>
- Wei, Y. (2012). Person-organization fit and organizational citizenship behavior: Time perspective. *Journal of Management and Organization, 18*(6), 833-844. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/1314304675?accountid=27180>
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17*, 601-617.

Williams, M. L., Podsakoff, P. M., & Huber, V. (1992). Effects of group-level and individual-level variation in leader behaviours on subordinate attitudes and performance. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65(2), 115-129. Retrieved from

<http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/618181727?accountid=27180>

Yan, J., & Hunt, J. G. (2005). A cross cultural perspective on perceived leadership effectiveness. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 5(1), 49–66.

Zyglidopoulos, S. C., & David, M. R. (2006). Managing corporate reputation within the Chinese context: Future research directions. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 9(3), 155-161. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.crr.1550028>

Appendix A  
Demographic Information

PLEASE DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ANYWHERE ON THIS PAPER

**Direction:** Please provide the following demographic information by checking the appropriate box below.

1. **Sex:**    Male    Female

2. **Age:**    18-25    26-35    36-45    46-55    56-65    over 65

**3. Education**

High School degree                       Associate's degree or some college  
 Bachelor's degree                         Graduate degree

**4. How long have you been at your current job?** \_\_\_\_\_ year(s).

**5. At what level of the organization are you?**

Staff                       Middle Management                       Executive

**6. What is the approximate size of your organization?**

1 – 50 employees                       501-1,000 employees                       10,001– 50,000 employees  
 51 – 100 employees                       1,001-5,000 employees                       more than 50,000 employees  
 101-500 employees                       5,001-10,000 employees

**7. Where is your organization located?**

The United States  
 China (Mainland China, Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan)  
 Other

Appendix B

Perceived Person Organization Fit Survey

**Directions:** In your current job, please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with the following statements about your organization and you by circling one of the numbers between 1 (Strongly Disagree) and 5 (Strongly Agree).

	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>
<b>1.</b> The things that I value in life are very similar to the things that my organization values.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.</b> My personal values match my organization's values and culture.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.</b> My organization's values and culture provide a good fit with the things that I value in life.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>

## Appendix C

### Perceived Person Group Fit Survey

**Directions:** In your current job, please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with the following statements by circling one of the numbers between 1 (Strongly Disagree) and 5 (Strongly Agree).

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
<b>1.</b> Most of my coworkers are about my age.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.</b> I don't have much in common with my coworkers.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.</b> In general, I have a good working relationship with my coworkers.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4.</b> My coworkers' ethic is very different from mine.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5.</b> I don't usually socialize with my coworkers outside of work.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>6.</b> My coworkers and I work well together to accomplish tasks.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>7.</b> My coworkers are competitive and talk behind each other's back.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>8.</b> My coworkers and I structure our tasks to make the best use of each individual's strengths and abilities.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>

Appendix D

Individual Level Organizational Citizenship Behavior Survey

**Directions:** In your current job, please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with the following statements about yourself by circling one of the numbers between 1 (Strongly Disagree) and 5 (Strongly Agree).

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
<b>1.</b> I like to help my coworkers who have been absent.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.</b> I like to help my coworkers who have heavy work loads.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.</b> I assist my supervisor with his or her work when not asked.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4.</b> I like to take time to listen to my coworkers' problems and worries.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5.</b> I like to go out of my way to help new employees.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>6.</b> I have a personal interest in other employees.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>7.</b> I like to pass along information to my coworkers.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>

Appendix E

Organization Level Organizational Citizenship Behavior Survey

**Directions:** In your current job, please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with the following statements about yourself by circling one of the numbers between 1 (Strongly Disagree) and 5 (Strongly Agree).

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. My attendance at work is above the norm.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I give advance notice when unable to come to work.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I take undeserved work breaks.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I spend a great deal of time with personal phone conversations.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I complain about insignificant things at work.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I conserve and protect the property which belongs to my organization.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I adhere to informal rules devised to maintain order.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix F

IRB Approval Letter



Appendix G

Informed Consent Form and Cover Letter

Dear friends,

Hello, my name is Min Xu and I am a graduate student at Emporia State University in Kansas. I would like to ask you to complete a short survey (no more than ten minutes to complete!) about cross-cultural differences in person-environment fit and organizational citizenship behavior. By participating in this research project, you will help me complete my Master's thesis, so your participation would be very much appreciated on my part!

You are under no obligation to participate, and if you agree to participate, you can withdraw at any time. To maintain your confidentiality, no one will see your individual data except for me and my thesis advisor. I will keep the data in a protected location and the data will be destroyed after three years. The results will be used for research purposes only. Only summarized results of the data will be reported.

If you are interested in receiving a copy of the findings, you can email me at the email address listed below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me. Again, thank you very much for your help!

Sincerely,

Min Xu  
[mxu@g.emporia.edu](mailto:mxu@g.emporia.edu)

*"I have read the above statement and have been fully advised of the procedures to be used in this project. I have been given sufficient opportunity to ask any questions I had concerning the procedures and possible risks involved. I understand the potential risks involved and I assume them voluntarily. I likewise understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time without being subjected to reproach."*

---

Subject

---

Date

Appendix H

Chinese Version Informed Consent Form and Cover Letter

亲爱的朋友：

您好！我在做一份关于《跨文化差异条件下企业员工与组织匹配程度以及相关组织公民行为》的调查。简单来说，就是研究比较在不同国家企业文化的影响下，企业员工对公司、同事的关系和他们在企业中工作表现的联系。比如说，如果您觉得您和现在所处企业的文化很合拍，跟同事相处关系很好，您可能就会更加积极的工作，愿意帮助新来的同事。但是在西方国家个人主义文化影响下，员工即使觉得跟公司很不合拍，跟同事相处很不好，但是不会影响他的工作水平与效率。当然这些只是设想。您的调查反馈将会真正帮助我证实这些论点。所以我诚挚的邀请你帮助我完成这份论文报告。

完成这份问卷将会花费您短于 5 分钟的时间。但是您的参与，对我能否顺利完成硕士论文至关重要。非常感谢！

此次调查会充分保护您的个人隐私，调查数据仅用于学术之用，不作商业用途。我将会把这些数据放在安全的地方保存，并且会在三年之后进行销毁。报告时只对分析之后的结果进行报告。这份调查主要在美国和中国企业中进行。

如果您对最后的报告成果感兴趣，您可以按照下方的邮箱地址给我发邮件。如果您有任何问题，请随时联系我。再次感谢您的协助！

Min Xu

mxu@g.emporium.edu

## Appendix I

## Chinese Version Demographic Information

填写指导：请在下列选项中选择或者填写与您相符的个人信息

1. 性别： 男 女

2. 年龄：  18-25  26-35  36-45  46-55  56-65  over 65

3. 教育程度

高中  大专  
 本科  研究生  更高学历

4. 您在您现在的岗位上工作了多久？ \_\_\_\_\_ 年

5. 您在您所在企业的职位是？

普通职员

中层管理者

高级管理者

6. 您所处的企业的企业规模有多大？

1 – 50 员工  501-1,000 员工  10,001– 50,000 员工  
 51 – 100 员工  1,001-5,000 员工  超过 50,000  
 101-500 员工  5,001-10,000 员工

7. 您工作的企业所在地在？

美国

中国 (包含中国大陆，香港，澳门等特别行政区)

其他国家以及地区

Appendix J

Chinese Version Perceived Person Organization Fit Survey

填表指导：根据您现在的工作情况，请在下面的选项中填写您对前面称述的认同程度，从1到5分别表示极度不同意到非常同意。

	极度不同意	不同意	中立	同意	极度同意
1. 我所处企业的价值观和文化提供了和我的生活价值观很一致的东西。	1	2	3	4	5
2. 我个人的价值观，和我所处企业的价值观以及企业文化相匹配。	1	2	3	4	5
3. 我对生活的价值观和我所处企业的价值观非常相近。	1	2	3	4	5

## Appendix K

## Chinese Version Perceived Person Group Fit Survey

填表指导：根据您现在的工作情况，请在下面的选项中填写您对前面称述的认同程度，从1到5分别表示极度不同意到非常同意。

	极度不同意	不同意	中立	同意	极度同意
<b>1.</b> 我的大多数同事和我年龄相仿。	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.</b> 我和我的同事们没有很多共同点。	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.</b> 基本上而言，我和我的同事们有着很好的工作关系。	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4.</b> 我同事们的道德观念和我的很不同。	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5.</b> 下班之后我不常和我的同事社交。	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>6.</b> 我和我的同事能很好合作完成工作任务。	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>7.</b> 我的同事有很强的的的竞争意识，会在背后议论别人。	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>8.</b> 我和我的同事能够很好地分工，并且能够各自发挥特长完成任务。	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>

## Appendix L

Chinese Version Individual level Organizational Citizenship Behavior Survey

填表指导：根据您现在的工作情况，请在下面的选项中填写您对前面称述的认同程度，从1到5分别表示极度不同意到非常同意。

	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
<b>1.</b> 我会帮助因为缺席而落下工作的同事。	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.</b> 我会帮助那些有着繁重工作任务和同事。	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.</b> 在没有被要求的情况下，我会主动帮助我的主管分担工作。	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4.</b> 我会花时间去聆听同事所遇到的问题 and 烦恼。	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5.</b> 我会不嫌麻烦的帮助新来的同事。	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>6.</b> 我对公司其他的员工有个人兴趣。	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>7.</b> 我不介意给我的同事传递相关的工作信息。	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>

Appendix M

Chinese Version Organization Level Organizational Citizenship Behavior Survey

填表指导：根据您现在的工作情况，请在下面的选项中填写您对前面称述的认同程度，从 1 到 5 分别表示极度不同意到非常同意。

	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
<b>1. 我有良好的出勤率。</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. 如果我不能上班，我会提前告知主管或者老板。</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. 我会休不应得的假。</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. 我上班的时候会花大量的时间讲个人电话。</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5. 我会抱怨工作中的琐碎事。</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>6. 我会爱惜保护所处企业的财物。</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>7. 我会遵守所处企业为了维护秩序但却没有明确规定的规则。</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>

## PERMISSION TO COPY

I, Min Xu, hereby submit this thesis to Emporia State University as partial fulfillment of the requirement for an advanced degree. I agree that the Library of the University may make it available for use in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I further agree that quoting, photocopying, or other reproduction of this document is allowed for private study, scholarship (including teaching) and research purposes of a nonprofit nature. No copying which involves potential gain will be allowed without written permission of the author. I also agree to permit the Graduate School at Emporia State University to digitize and place this thesis in the ESU institutional repository.



---

Signature of Author

November 25, 2013

---

Date

Cross-Cultural Differences in Person

Environment Fit and Organizational

Citizenship Behavior

---

Title of Thesis

---

Signature of Graduate Office Staff Member

---

Date Received