

## University of Arkansas, Fayetteville ScholarWorks@UARK

---

### Theses and Dissertations

---


5-2012

# Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Higher Education: Examining the Relationships Between Behaviors and Performance Outcomes for Individuals and Institutions

Kevin Jimmy Rose

*University of Arkansas, Fayetteville*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Rose, Kevin Jimmy, "Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Higher Education: Examining the Relationships Between Behaviors and Performance Outcomes for Individuals and Institutions" (2012). *Theses and Dissertations*. 403.  
<http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/403>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact [scholar@uark.edu](mailto:scholar@uark.edu), [ccmiddle@uark.edu](mailto:ccmiddle@uark.edu).

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIORS IN HIGHER EDUCATION:  
EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN BEHAVIORS AND PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES FOR  
INDIVIDUALS AND INSTITUTIONS

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIORS IN HIGHER EDUCATION:  
EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN BEHAVIORS AND PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES FOR  
INDIVIDUALS AND INSTITUTIONS

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Education in Workforce Development Education

By

Kevin Rose  
Oral Roberts University  
Bachelor of Science in International Business, 2004  
University of Arkansas  
Master of Public Administration, 2008

May 2012  
University of Arkansas

## **Abstract**

Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) have been described as employee behaviors that are not required by job descriptions, are not formally rewarded, and contribute positively to the organization. Previous research has shown that OCBs are related to both individual and organizational performance. Given the importance of OCBs to individual and organizational effectiveness, the purpose for conducting the study was to describe OCBs in the higher education context, describe the relationships between OCBs and various aspects of faculty and staff performance, and explore the extent to which institutional leaders should be concerned with the OCBs of both faculty and professional staff. The study utilized a survey research design to gather information about OCBs in higher education. Both faculty and staff were selected from eight institutions according to the institution's performance in research funding and graduation rates. The findings suggested that staff may exhibit higher levels of OCB than faculty, that faculty OCBs were correlated with the number of presentations given, student contact hours, and service on committees, and that staff OCBs were correlated with satisfaction, loyalty, and productivity. Further, differences in OCB levels existed between high-performing staff and low-performing faculty as well as staff in low-performing institutions when compared with staff in high-performing institutions and faculty in low-performing institutions. The results are important for institutional leaders for understanding the employment relationship for both faculty and staff as well as the relationship between OCBs and performance of both individuals and institutions.

This dissertation is approved for recommendation  
to the Graduate Council.

Dissertation Director:

---

Dr. Michael T. Miller

Dissertation Committee:

---

Dr. Kit Kacirek

---

Dr. Ketevan Mamiseishvili

### Dissertation Duplication Release

I hereby authorize the University of Arkansas Libraries to duplicate this dissertation when needed for research and/or scholarship.

Agreed \_\_\_\_\_

Kevin J. Rose

Refused \_\_\_\_\_

Kevin J. Rose

## **Acknowledgements**

Of all the sections of this dissertation, this is perhaps the most difficult to write. There have been so many individuals who have given their time, energy, and support to me during this process and I wish to thank everyone who has contributed to this accomplishment. It has been said that to achieve something great, we must stand on the shoulders of giants. To everyone who has supported me during this process: thank you for helping me see further than I could have alone.

I would like to recognize the following individuals in particular:

Dr. Michael Miller – As chair of my dissertation committee, your guidance and advice was of utmost importance to me. Thank you for your support and encouragement to complete this goal. I consider it an honor to be counted as one of your many successful doctoral students.

Dr. Kit Kacirek – You have provided me with immeasurable personal, professional, and academic support. Thank you for helping me think “big picture” and for contributing to my development. You are my mentor; but more importantly, you are my friend.

Dr. Kate Mamiseishvili – I cannot thank you enough for your advice, clarity, and input on my research design and methods. Your smile and warm personality are encouraging, even when I was most frustrated and confused.

My mother and father – Thank you for all of your love and encouragement in everything I do. My argument was successful and it was marvelous. This work is dedicated to you.

My siblings, Keith, Kristie, and Chance and my friends Robin, Brian, and Debbie – You have been supportive of me in many things, but especially in my educational endeavors. I hope this accomplishment inspires you and makes you proud.

Dr. Thérés Stiefer – You are the best boss anyone could ask for! Thank you for your consistent positivity, your calm spirit, and your uplifting nature. I truly could never have done this without you.

Skyler Barry – What is a man without his work-wife? You have always been supportive of me, especially through this process and I am eternally grateful for your friendship. Remember to include demographics in your study.

Dr. Greg Fike – You were always willing to help and advise in any way that you could. Thank you for listening and being a generous colleague.

Ryan Miller, S.P. – Thank you for teaching me that focus and brevity are skills not easily acquired. I hope when you are chancellor, you will consider hiring me.

Garrett Johannsen, Kaylin McLoud, and Reed Taylor – Without your assistance, I would never have completed on time. This dissertation is a reflection of your hard work as well, and I thank each of you for your willingness to help.



## Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b>	
Background.....	1
Purpose.....	2
Research Questions .....	3
Operational Definitions.....	3
Assumptions.....	4
Limitations and Delimitations .....	5
Significance of the Study .....	6
Conceptual Framework .....	7
Summary of the Chapter .....	7
<b>I. LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	
Introduction .....	8
Organizational Citizenship Behaviors .....	8
Defining OCBs .....	9
Predictors and Correlates .....	11
Satisfaction.....	11
Fairness .....	11
Justice .....	12
Personality and Attitude .....	13
Commitment.....	14
Leadership .....	14
Less-studied Constructs.....	15
Effects of OCBs on Performance .....	16
Performance in Higher Education .....	19
Measuring Institutional Performance.....	19
Measuring Faculty Performance .....	22

	Summary of the Chapter .....	24
<b>III.</b>	<b>RESEARCH METHODS</b>	
	Introduction .....	26
	Research Design .....	26
	Institutional Type .....	26
	Institutional Performance .....	27
	Academic Discipline .....	28
	Sample .....	28
	Data Collection .....	29
	Instrument .....	29
	Data Analysis .....	31
	Summary of the Chapter .....	33
<b>IV.</b>	<b>RESULTS</b>	
	Introduction .....	34
	Summary of the Study .....	34
	Data Results.....	36
	Data Collection.....	36
	Results .....	37
	Summary of the Chapter .....	46
<b>V.</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	
	Summary of the Study .....	48
	Conclusions.....	49
	Recommendations .....	50
	For Practice.....	50
	For Research .....	51
	Discussion.....	52
	Summary of the Chapter .....	53
	<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>54</b>

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix A: Faculty OCB and Performance Survey.....	60
Appendix B: Staff OCB and Performance Survey.....	66
Appendix C: IRB Approval Letter .....	71
Appendix D: Survey Cover Letter.....	73
Appendix E: Table 8.....	75

## Chapter 1

### Introduction

#### Background.

Organizations are continually striving to become more successful in terms of financial performance, product output, or service delivery (Goldberg & Fleming, 2010) and they turn to their human, physical, and financial capital to search for ways to become more efficient and productive. Scholars and practitioners alike have found that employees (human resources) have a significant impact on the success or failure of organizations, and that by properly motivating them to perform, organizations can see improved metrics of success (Caswell, 2009).

Organizational success, however, is defined differently for different organizations. Success for corporations may be ultimately defined by profits and shareholder value. In the early 1990s, Kaplan and Norton (1992) described a systematic method for organizations to measure success through certain performance indicators. These performance indicators measured organizational success on four levels: financial, customer, internal business processes, and learning and growth. Although this methodology of measurement is popular with business and industry, it often does not provide a good fit for higher education.

Measuring performance in higher education is a difficult endeavor because definitions of success differ (Harvey & Green, 1993). Financial performance is seldom a good fit to measure performance, as most institutions are not-for-profit; that is, they must be concerned with procuring and stewarding financial resources, but do not seek to generate a profit. Identifying customers in the higher education industry is also difficult as multiple stakeholders play a role in the institution (students, faculty, staff, administrators, governance bodies, and government agencies, for example). Measuring internal business processes may provide a slightly better fit for higher education, but institutions engage in such a variety of activities that this may also be challenging. Learning and growth may also be a better fit for higher education, but measures for this might need to focus on learning outcomes of students as well as employees.

Regardless of the type of measure used, institutions are increasingly concerned with performance and accountability (Carey, 2007). This pressure comes from funding agencies and constituents desiring effective use of scarce resources. Thus, the development of institutional performance indicators has

garnered increased attention in recent years (Harvey & Williams, 2010). Yet defining these performance indicators, especially indicators common across institutions, proves challenging. Perhaps equally challenging is determining how to effectively influence performance metrics for positive results. Among the options for carrying this out is influencing employee behavior and performance. As Nichols (2006) noted regarding for-profit organizations, “employees are like a fulcrum – they can have a tremendous effect on sales and profitability, both positive and negative” (para. 2).

Formal job descriptions are one way to guide employee behavior. However, it is also known that there is more to employee performance than simply carrying out formal job duties (Organ, 1988). Some activities are undertaken that are not part of employees’ job descriptions, are not rewarded by any formal systems, and yet still contribute positively to the organization (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). These activities, known as organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), have a profound impact on organizations, teams, and individuals, and investigating them is crucial to understanding social constructs that lead to organizational and team success (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983).

A good deal of empirical research has been conducted on OCBs in the for-profit sector examining the antecedents and predictors of such behavior (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Such predictors include employee satisfaction (Lapierre & Hackett, 2007), fairness perceptions (Williams, Pitre, & Zainuba, 2002), organizational justice (Chiaburu, 2007), personality and attitude (Penner, Midili, & Kegelmeyer, 1997), employee commitment (Schappe, 1998), and leadership (Deluga, 1994).

Examining OCBs through the lens of higher education may provide fuller understanding of the employment relationship for faculty and professional staff, as well as provide insight for institutional leaders.

**Purpose.**

Research on OCBs has largely taken place with individuals working in non-academic fields such as manufacturing, retail, and service industries. Deckop, McClendon, and Harris-Pereles (1993) examined levels of OCBs among university faculty and how unionization of those faculty might affect their OCBs. Other studies have looked at OCBs within the educational context, albeit in primary and secondary education (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005; Bragger, Rodriguez-Srednicki, Kutcher, Indovino, & Rosner, 2005). Given the importance of OCBs to individual and organizational effectiveness, the purpose for

conducting the study was to describe OCBs in the higher education context, describe the relationships between OCBs and various aspects of faculty and staff performance, and explore the extent to which institutional leaders should be concerned with the OCBs of both faculty and professional staff.

**Research questions.**

The following research questions were investigated in this study:

1. What is the OCB and performance profile of faculty and staff in select higher education institutions?
2. How do OCBs correlate with selected individual performance indicators for college faculty members?
3. How do OCBs correlate with selected individual performance indicators for professional staff members in higher education?
4. Do significant differences in OCB levels exist between high-performing and low-performing employees?
5. Do significant differences in OCB levels exist between employees in high-performing institutions and employees in low-performing institutions?
6. To what extent do the levels of OCBs differ between faculty and professional staff in higher education across all institutions sampled?
7. To what extent do the levels of OCBs for all employees differ by academic discipline and institution?

**Operational definitions.**

1. Organizational citizenship: in organizations, “innovative and spontaneous activity [of employees] that goes beyond role prescriptions” (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983).
2. Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB): “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” (Organ, 1988, p. 4). Examples include assisting colleagues who have been absent, defending and promoting one’s organization publicly, and sharing personal property with others at work.

3. Organizational citizenship behaviors – individual (OCBI): OCBs directed at individuals that indirectly benefit the organization (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Examples include helping colleagues, welcoming new employees, and listening when others have personal issues to discuss.
4. Organizational citizenship behaviors – organizational (OCBO): OCBs directed at the organization in general (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Examples include expressing loyalty to the organization, attending non-required work functions, and defending the organization from criticism.
5. Institutional performance indicators: measures that are quantifiable, discrete, and can be used in the management and evaluation of an institution's effectiveness (examples include graduation rates and total grant funding).
6. Individual performance indicators: measures that are quantifiable, discrete, and can be used in the management and evaluation of an individual's effectiveness (examples include performance ratings, number of published works, and teaching evaluation scores).
7. Professional staff (or staff): employees in higher education institutions that are not classified primarily as faculty and that typically hold salaried positions [(e.g. "The administrative/service positions range from persons performing academic support, student services and institutional support services to persons whose assignments involve primary and major responsibility for management of the institution or a department or subdivision thereof." (Kansas State University, 2011, para. 1)]
8. Faculty: employees in higher education institutions whose primary responsibilities include teaching, research, or service
9. Academic discipline: a grouping of similar subject matter and knowledge. Although several taxonomies of disciplines exist, for the purposes of this study I utilized business, education, engineering, liberal arts, and natural sciences.

### **Assumptions.**

This study accepted the following assumptions:

1. Organizational citizenship is a construct that can be measured quantitatively.
2. Employee performance affects organizational outcomes (including in higher education).

3. The questionnaire used to measure levels of OCB is a reliable instrument.
4. Variables used in this study to indicate faculty performance adequately measure the concept.
5. Variables used in this study to indicate professional staff performance adequately measure the concept.
6. Variables used in this study to indicate institutional performance adequately measure the concept.
7. The academic discipline groupings in this study reflect groups that share similar paradigmatic views regarding the nature of their work relationship.

**Limitations and delimitations.**

The study accepted the following limitations:

1. Self-report data are often biased in that respondents may report higher levels of behaviors or attitudes that they deem to be more positive. For example, respondents may underreport absenteeism and over report productivity.
2. This study only included faculty at the assistant, associate, and full professor level. Adjunct, visiting, emeritus, and other instructional employees were not included.
3. This study only included staff that were full-time and who were considered professional or administrative.
4. The final sample size may not allow for generalizability to the population.
5. The nature of staff employment created difficulty in identifying various roles of staff participants and may have produced a heterogeneous group of respondents. For example, staff titles included in the study ranged from directors to administrative assistants.
6. The academic disciplines included in this study did not represent all available disciplines in the institutions sampled, but instead were limited to business, education, engineering, liberal arts, and natural science. Furthermore, institutions organize disciplines differently which led to some overrepresentation of certain colleges.
7. The variables used to measure staff performance are not direct measures of performance. Given the research design, direct measures were not available so the closely related measures of satisfaction, loyalty, productivity, absenteeism, and turnover intention were used.



8. Measures of institutional performance used in this study (research funding and graduation rates) are not comprehensive measures of the relative success or failure of an institution.

**Significance of the study.**

With the increasing call for accountability of higher education, institutional leaders concern themselves with the effective functioning of the institution. At the highest level, chancellors, trustees, and presidents may not be concerned with the citizenship behaviors of individuals, but with the effects of aggregate citizenship behaviors over time. These behaviors have been shown to be connected with organizational success (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). Thus, although the highest-level leaders of institutions may not be concerned with the day-to-day behaviors of faculty and staff, they certainly may see the aggregate outcomes of their performance.

Provosts and academic officers similarly may not be concerned with the behaviors of individuals, but with their aggregate performance. It is not yet well understood if OCBs of faculty contribute to institutional performance given the nature of faculty work. This study may shed some light on this topic and inform leadership whether this is a construct worth paying attention to regarding faculty performance.

Similarly, those in leadership positions in finance, administration, human resources, and related areas (or who generally oversee the affairs of staff members) should at least understand that institutional employees engage in OCBs and that these behaviors may be contributing to the performance of their institutions. Because professional staff often serve in roles that have more in common with jobs in business and industry, OCBs may play a clearer role in effecting organizational performance for this group of employees.

At a more micro level, deans and department heads may be concerned with the behaviors of individuals and their contributions to school or departmental performance. At least one study has confirmed a positive relationship between OCBs and group-level performance (Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997). Additionally, deans and department chairs may find that their jobs are easier with faculty who exhibit higher levels of OCBs. As Organ (1997) described, OCBs may function to create a more positive work environment where employees experience less tension.

The same would hold true for professional staff leaders who are responsible for academic and non-academic units and centers. Additionally, professional staff that engage in higher levels of OCBs will

contribute positively to unit- or group-level performance, where effectiveness is often measured. High levels of OCB can indicate high levels of other positive workplace constructs, such as perceptions of fairness and positive attitude.

Lastly, individuals in higher education should be concerned with OCBs if only for the simple reason that these behaviors lead to more positive relationships with coworkers and supervisors. Again, OCBs are generally connected with other positive workplace characteristics and may play a role in fostering positive work environments.

### **Conceptual framework.**

The basis for this study is the understanding that employee behaviors impact organizational performance in some way. This notion is grounded in social-exchange theory, which posits that individuals contribute more effort to relationships they deem as positive, and withdraw or withhold effort from negative relationships (Deluga, 1994). In organizations, this means that employees may work harder or exhibit more positive behaviors (such as organizational citizenship) in workplaces in which they are more satisfied. This includes both in-role and extra-role behaviors. Employee efforts or behaviors (both formal and extra-role) then contribute to organizational performance. Birnbaum (1988) described social-exchange theory as “one orientation to leadership particularly suited to higher education” (p. 23). The focus of this study is the behaviors that are not a part of the formal employee role and are not formally rewarded as such.

### **Summary of the chapter.**

This chapter introduces various aspects of the current study including the research questions, purpose of the study, limitations and delimitations, and conceptual framework. Organizational citizenship behaviors have been forwarded as a way of explaining employee extra-role behavior as it relates to individual and organizational performance. This study seeks to examine this concept further within the context of higher education. Though there may be certain limitations to the study, the results may still prove useful for administrators and other leaders in higher education.

## Chapter 2

### Literature Review

#### Introduction.

The current study focuses on organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) within the context of higher education and how the behaviors of both faculty and administrators relate to organizational and individual performance outcomes. The literature review is divided into two primary components: an examination of research on OCBs and a review of the literature pertaining to performance in higher education. The review of OCB literature includes a discussion about both the predictors and impacts of OCBs in organizations. The review of literature on performance in higher education covers how performance can be defined for institutions as well as individual faculty and individual administrators.

#### Organizational citizenship behaviors.

Organizations are continually striving to become more successful in terms of financial performance, product output, or service delivery (Goldberg & Fleming, 2010). Thus, they turn to their human, physical, and financial capital searching for ways to become more efficient and productive. Scholars and practitioners alike have known that employees (human resources) have a significant impact on the success or failure of organizations, and that by properly motivating them to perform, organizations can see improved metrics of success (Caswell, 2009). The notion of improving organizational success through employee performance was studied early on by Frederick Taylor who proposed a system “to increase output by discovering the fastest, most efficient, and least fatiguing production methods” (Shafritz, Hyde, & Parkes, 2004, p. 4). His theory of how organizations ought to think of employees became known as scientific management and viewed employees as “cog[s] in the machinery,” (Rosen, 1993, p. 139) efficiently performing their prescribed job duties.

However, there is more to employee performance than simply carrying out formal job duties (Organ, 1988). Some activities are undertaken that are not part of employees’ job descriptions, are not rewarded by any formal systems, and yet still contribute positively to the organization (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). These activities, known as organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), have a profound impact on organizations and teams, and investigating them is crucial to understanding social constructs that lead to organizational and team success (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983).

The construct of OCBs is a recent field of inquiry, taking root with Dennis Organ's (1988) work, *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Since then, researchers have begun to expand the body of knowledge around OCBs and a great deal of empirical research has been devoted to examining the antecedents and predictors of OCBs (Konovsky & Organ, 1996; Moorman, 1991; Organ, 1997; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983).

Though the majority of research examining OCBs has focused on employees in the private sector, a handful of studies have given attention to OCBs in the educational context, particularly among secondary teachers and students (see for example, Allison, Voss, & Dryer, 2001; DiPaola & Hoy, 2005; Jimmieson, Hannam, & Yeo, 2010). However, little research has been conducted regarding OCBs in the higher education context. Even though some studies have included samples from higher education employees, these studies have been undertaken to understand the linkages between OCBs and other constructs rather than understanding OCBs in the work context of higher education.

### ***Defining OCBs.***

Organ (1988) defined OCBs as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization" (p. 4). His original definition of the concept included three characteristics: OCBs are a) discretionary, b) not formally rewarded, and c) have a positive impact on the organization. Other terms used to describe these types of behaviors among employees have included extra-role behaviors and pro-social organizational behavior.

Although scholars have debated the issue, OCBs are generally divided into five dimensions: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). Consensus, however, has not been reached regarding these dimensions and others have described OCB dimensions as helping behavior, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and self-development (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Further, Williams and Anderson (1991) found operational differences in the dimensions and described OCBs as consisting of behaviors that focus on the organization (OCB-O) and the individual (OCB-I). Several years after his book was published, Organ (1997) addressed the issue of construct ambiguity and

many of the questions that scholars had posed about OCBs, including the use of terms and the notion that no behaviors in the organization go unrewarded (or unpunished) in some way. He wrote:

First, I would suggest that compared to task performance, OCB (now conceived as synonymous with contextual performance) is less likely to be considered an enforceable job requirement, to the extent that such requirements continue to exist in organizations. Second, I would suggest that OCB in its revised definition is less likely than task performance to be regarded by the performer as leading confidently to systemic rewards. (Organ, 1997, p. 91)

There are yet others who will debate whether or not OCBs can be as expressly defined as they are (i.e. extra-role, not formally rewarded, and contribute positively to the organization). OCBs may be considered by some to be in-role behaviors (i.e. intrinsically part of an individual's job). Vey and Campbell (2004) found that employees classified most OCBs as being part of their jobs, rather than as voluntary, extra-role behaviors. Vigoda-Gadot (2006) also hypothesized that managers and supervisors could potentially turn OCBs into "compulsory citizenship behaviors" (p. 78) by requiring those behaviors of subordinates and later supported this theory by showing that some employees felt pressured to engage in behaviors traditionally thought of as OCBs (Vigoda-Gadot, 2007). Although further research is needed on the topic, the notion that OCBs may not be considered by some employees to be "extra-role" could potentially change the construct entirely. Yet, most researchers do consider OCBs as discretionary (Williams & Anderson, 1991).

Most scholars believe that OCBs fall into the category of "extra-role" behaviors, or those behaviors that are not part of a formal job description or work role (Chughtai, 2008). Extra-role behaviors include both OCBs and those behaviors employees engage in that are counterproductive and negatively impact the organization, such as retaliation, revenge, and aggression (Miles, Borman, Spector, & Fox, 2002). Although some may argue that counterproductive behaviors exist on a continuum (with OCBs at the opposite end), empirical evidence indicates that OCBs are a separate and distinct construct from negative workplace behaviors (Kelloway, Loughlin, Barling, & Nault, 2002). These two concepts are related, but correlates and predictors differ. For example, Miles, Borman, Spector, and Fox (2002) found that positive emotions in the workplace tend to produce more OCBs while negative emotions are associated with counterproductive behavior. Further research has strengthened the claim that these two sets of behaviors are separate constructs with differing predictors, and even indicate that these behaviors can be simultaneously exhibited by the same individual (Sackett, Berry, Wiemann, & Laczko, 2006).

### ***Predictors and correlates.***

#### *Satisfaction.*

A great deal of research has been devoted to both the predictors and correlates of OCBs, primarily using correlational studies. One of the primary fields of investigation has been that of job satisfaction. Williams and Anderson (1991) found support for job satisfaction as a predictor of OCBs, and it has also been shown that positive relationships with supervisors can increase job satisfaction, which in turn increases the prevalence of OCBs (Lapierre & Hackett, 2007). Personality may also play a role, albeit limited, in predicting both job satisfaction and OCBs (Organ & Lingl, 1995). In a study of military personnel, Turnipseed and Murkison (2000) found that satisfaction specifically with the organization (rather than pay, the job, or other employees) contributed to higher instances of OCBs. Industrial workers who engage in OCBs also tend to have greater job satisfaction, indicating a reciprocal relationship between OCBs and satisfaction (Gyekye & Salminen, 2005). Job satisfaction has also been found to be a mediating variable between job variety, job significance, and OCBs (Chiu & Chen, 2005). Other research points in the same direction: that there is a positive link between job satisfaction and OCBs (Bragger, Rodriguez-Srednicki, Kutcher, Indovino, & Rosner, 2005; Todd & Kent, 2006). However, contrary evidence is available as others have shown that job satisfaction is not a significant predictor of OCBs when measured with justice and organizational commitment (Schappe, 1998). This indicated that OCBs ought to be viewed as being influenced by many different factors at once, including both internal and external forces.

#### *Fairness.*

Research has focused on correlating the various dimensions of OCBs with other constructs. Deluga (1994) found that supervisor fairness (as a dimension of supervisor trust) significantly correlates with the OCB dimensions of conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and altruism, but not civic virtue. In a survey of 154 healthcare workers, Johnson, Truxillo, Erdogan, Bauer, and Hammer (2009) found that organizational fairness correlated with higher OCB-Is (behaviors directed at individuals) while departmental fairness correlated with higher OCB-Os (behaviors directed at the organization). Further, their study also showed that high quality (positive) leader-member exchanges increased the likelihood of courtesy, conscientiousness, altruism, and sportsmanship behaviors (Johnson, Truxillo, Erdogan, Bauer,

& Hammer, 2009). To show these connections, a survey instrument that measured perceptions of organizational fairness, departmental fairness, and leader-member exchange quality was distributed to employees. Employee OCB levels were measured using surveys distributed to supervisors throughout the organization.

Although fairness is an important antecedent of OCBs, the type of fairness perception is important to consider. Employees may judge fairness at the organizational level, with other employees, with processes of the organization, or with their supervisors. In their study of distributive fairness, formal procedural fairness, and interactional fairness, Williams, Pitre, and Zainuba (2002) surveyed 114 employees from a variety of industries and found that “employees who believed that they personally were treated fairly by their supervisors also reported that they were significantly more likely to exhibit citizenship behaviors” (p. 41). Their study showed statistically significant, positive correlations between all three types of fairness perceptions studied and OCBs. Moore and Love compared levels of fairness perceptions, trust, and OCBs among different work groups and found that lower levels of trust and fairness correlated with lower levels of OCBs. Specifically, they found that

in sum, the IT [information technology] workers in this sample had significantly lower perceptions than non-IT counterparts of management trust, and of how fairly and respectfully policies and procedures were enacted. These lower perceptions contributed to lower levels of citizenship behaviors (Moore & Love, 2005, p. 91).

*Justice.*

A highly related theme that has also been studied is justice and equity in the workplace context and its effects on OCBs. Justice takes many forms in an organization, such as interactional justice. Interactional justice, when supervisors treat subordinates fairly, is “an important precursor of citizenship behaviors” (Chiaburu, 2007, p. 219). Such perceptions of justice are important to employees and these perceptions can increase the quality of relationships between supervisors and subordinates. Because these relationships improve in quality, employees are more likely to exhibit OCBs, even behaviors targeted at the organization (OCBOs) (Burton, Sablinski, & Sekiguchi, 2008). Previous research has also found that although individuals react differently to perceptions of justice within an organization, overall higher prevalence of justice increases employee OCBs (Blakely, Andrews, & Moorman, 2005). To determine these findings, surveys that measured OCBs, equity sensitivity, and justice perceptions were distributed to full time employees enrolled in an MBA program. The sample of 114 respondents indicated

a significant and positive ( $r=.26$ ) correlation between OCBs and justice perceptions. A related construct, equity sensitivity (how individuals react to unplanned or unfair events), can determine how an employee might react to a sense of psychological contract breach by the organization (an injustice). When an injustice was perceived, employees typically responded by withdrawing OCBs (Blakely, Andrews, & Moorman, 2005; Kickul & Lester, 2001).

*Personality and attitude.*

Employees' beliefs about themselves, their personalities, and their attitudes towards the organization naturally have an impact on the display of OCBs. Early theoretical models were built around the idea that both attitude and personality as well as organizational factors contribute to OCBs. Further, Penner, Midili, and Kegelmeyer (1997) theorized that these concepts can lead to high levels of OCBs that eventually give rise to the creation of a "citizen role identity" (p. 127). Employee perceptions of fairness, justice, trust, leadership capability, and a host of other environmental factors contribute to employees' positive or negative attitudes and emotions. These emotions are then manifest, at least in part, through the display of either OCBs (associated with positive attitude) or counterproductive behaviors (associated with negative attitude) (Miles, Borman, Spector, & Fox, 2002). In a study that surveyed 117 temporary employees' OCBs, their attitudes towards their staffing organization, and their attitudes towards their client organization, Moorman and Harland (2002) found that positive employee attitudes towards both the staffing organization and the client organization correlated positively (at  $r=.20$  or higher) with higher instances of OCBs for those employees as measured by their supervisors. In a similar, but more specific study, employees with attitudes or personalities that included pro-social values and organizational concern contributed to both OCBs and OCBOs. Conversely, attitudes of self-enhancement showed little relation to OCBs in general (Finkelstein & Penner, 2004).

Organizational members who are high self-monitors, that is, they modify their behavior based on social cues from others, tend to exhibit higher OCBs directed at individuals, but not toward the organization (Blakely, Andrews, & Fuller, 2003). Blakely, Andrews, and Fuller's longitudinal study provided evidence that these attitude-OCB interactions persist over time. A similar study indicated that an individual with a conscientious personality, defined as someone who is concerned with dependability, reliability, and carefulness for example, was a positive predictor of the compliance dimension of OCBs



(Organ & Lingl, 1995). In looking at what psychologists call the “big five” personality dimensions (openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability), Sackett, Berry, Wiemann, and Laczko (2006) found evidence that OCBs can be predicted by the agreeableness, openness, extraversion, and conscientiousness personalities. Related to this, Vey and Campbell's (2004) study regarding the in-role versus extra-role nature of OCBs showed that those with emotional stability personalities regarded OCBs as truly extra-role behavior. Other research has shown a connection between conscientiousness, agreeableness, and value for achievement (an additional personality dimension) to be strongly correlated with all five OCB dimensions (Neuman & Kickul, 1998). Thus, there is strong evidence to support connections between certain personality dispositions, attitudes, and OCBs.

#### *Commitment.*

A useful definition of organizational commitment is “the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in an organization” (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979, p. 226 as cited in Schappe, 1998). Schappe (1998) examined organizational commitment along with job satisfaction and justice as predictors of OCBs and found that only organizational commitment is a significant predictor of OCBs. Conversely, Williams and Anderson (1991) found little support for commitment as a strong predictor of OCBs. In a study of school teachers, contradictory evidence was presented that showed that permanently employed teachers had higher organizational commitment that led to increased OCBs (Feather & Rauter, 2004). In a holistic study of military personnel, commitment was also found to contribute positively to the engagement of OCBs (Turnipseed & Murkison, 2000). In yet another study of teachers, Bragger, Rodriguez-Srednicki, Kutcher, Indovino, and Rosner (2005) found that OCBs were positively correlated with organizational commitment. Though contradictory evidence exists, a greater amount of empirical data have shown that organizational commitment and OCBs are significantly and positively related.

#### *Leadership.*

A few investigations have looked into the relationship between OCBs and the concept of leader-member exchange with emphasis on its mediational nature. Leader-member exchange theory postulates that the relationship between a supervisor and subordinate is negotiated over time and can either be high quality (typified by trust, loyalty, influence, and support) or low quality (adequate performance by

subordinates with standard benefits of employment) (Deluga, 1994). Deluga (1994) found evidence for a positive relationship between high quality leader-subordinate relationships and OCBs. Lapierre and Hackett (2007) refined this relationship between high quality leader-member exchanges and OCB showing that the relationship is more reciprocal. That is, high-quality leader-member exchanges influence OCBs and OCBs also create higher quality leader-member exchanges. In a study examining OCBs and these supervisor-employee relationships, it was found that “when an individual perceives a good quality relationship with his/her supervisor and sees the formal procedures of the organization as fair, he/she goes above and beyond his/her ‘normal’ duties by helping the organization in any way he/she can” (Burton, Sablynski, & Sekiguchi, 2008, p. 57). A high quality relationship between the supervisor and employee has also been shown to mitigate feelings of uncertainty and unfairness and helps maintain higher levels of OCB-O (Johnson, Truxillo, Erdogan, Bauer, & Hammer, 2009). While studying a major collegiate athletic department, Kent and Chelladurai (2001) also found a positive relationship between OCBs and leader-member exchanges.

*Less-studied constructs.*

Aside from the major areas of research for OCBs, a handful of studies have focused on other constructs such as altruism, feedback, or mood. For example, one study linked altruism (concern for the wellbeing of others and acting to benefit them) with OCBs, but showed little significant connection between OCBs and all but one aspect of employee burnout (diminished personal accomplishment), despite significant past research that supported the opposite hypothesis (Emmerik, Jawahar, & Stone, 2005). These findings were somewhat consistent with the findings of Chiu and Miao-Ching (2006) who showed that OCBs have a negative relationship with the burnout dimensions of emotional exhaustion and diminished personal accomplishment, but not depersonalization. Employee emotional strain, which may include aspects of burnout, also has a negative relationship with OCBs (Chang, Johnson, & Yang, 2007).

Although most research has been conducted between one and three constructs in relation to OCBs, one study (Turnipseed & Murkison, 2000) focused on several more issues in relation to OCBs. The results of this study showed a positive connection between OCBs and autonomy, job clarity, supervisor support, relationships with peers, and even a pleasant physical environment among other variables already discussed. Chiu and Chen (2005) found a positive relationship between job significance,

job variety and OCBs, but contrary to others found no significant relationships between OCBs and autonomy, feedback, and job interdependence. Contrary evidence was found to support a positive connection between OCBs and job feedback (Vigoda-Gadot & Angert, 2007).

***Effects of OCBs on performance.***

In Organ's (1988) original theoretical construct, he proposed that OCBs, when considered over time, impact organizational success. However, the bulk of empirical research on the topic of OCBs has focused on their predictors and correlates rather than their consequences (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). As the OCB concept has become more well-understood, recent inquiry has attempted to examine correlations between OCBs and organizational performance. For example, Podsakoff, Ahearne, and MacKenzie (1997) postulated that OCBs enhance organizational productivity by

- reducing the need to devote resources to maintenance functions and freeing up these resources for more productive purposes
- enhancing coworker or managerial productivity
- serving as a way to coordinate activities between team members and groups
- enhancing the organization's employee retention by making it a more attractive place to work.

Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997) conducted a meta-analysis of the research available at that time regarding OCBs and organizational performance. Their review only included four articles, but generally reported support for the notion that OCBs positively effect organizational performance. For example, in one of the articles included in their analysis, a study was conducted with employees in a limited-menu restaurant (Walz & Niehoff, 1996). Results from this study show a significant, positive relationship between helping behavior and several objective measures of performance (e.g. efficiency, reduced costs) as well as significant, negative relationships between sportsmanship and civic virtue with other measures of performance (e.g. percentage of waste, number of complaints). In another study in this analysis, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994) found positive correlations between the unit-level effectiveness of sales teams and most forms of citizenship behaviors. Helping behavior, in this context, was found to be negatively associated with unit-level performance.

Chahal and Mehta (2010) summarized the findings of other studies in framing OCBs as an important consideration for the healthcare industry. Their synopsis stressed the importance of OCBs'

impact on reduced absenteeism, reduced turnover, and employee satisfaction and loyalty. Noting the relationship between OCB and these performance factors, Chahal and Mehta (2010) said that “organizational citizenship behavior has been recognized as a key factor to organizational performance” (p. 29). Specific examples of research linking performance and OCBs follows.

Messersmith, Patel, and Lepak (2011) conducted a study examining the effects of high performance work systems on organizational performance. The sample included 1,755 subjects working in governmental offices in the United Kingdom. Included in this study were measures of OCB. Their findings indicated that work systems “enhanced citizenship-related behavior that in turn work to enhance performance” (Messersmith, Patel, & Lepak, 2011, p. 9). While the correlation coefficient for OCBs and performance in this study was fairly weak ( $\beta=.318$ ), it still indicated a positive relationship between OCBs and organizational performance outcomes.

Other researchers have attempted to clarify this relationship. Ozer (2011) tested the relationship between OCBs and performance by positing that the quality of team members’ social exchanges (called TMX) mediated the relationship between OCBs and performance. He also hypothesized that autonomy would moderate the relationships between OCBs and team member exchange. His findings indicated that team member exchanges mediated the relationship between OCBs and performance but not OCBs and performance (Ozer, 2011). This study provided further evidence that OCBs indeed impact organizational performance outcomes.

Another meta-analysis conducted by Whitman, Van Rooy, and Viswesvara (2010) looked at the relationship between job satisfaction, OCBs, and organizational performance. The analysis included 60 studies for a total of 5,849 work units that were surveyed. The authors found that “OCB significantly predicted performance even after controlling for job satisfaction” (Whitman, Van Rooy, & Viswesvaran, 2010, p. 62). However, contrary to other research, little evidence was found that OCBs had a mediating effect on the relationship between job satisfaction and performance. Again, evidence shows that the positive relationship between OCBs and organizational performance may be more than intuitive.

Organizations measure effectiveness and success in different ways. In the service industry, performance can be measured by levels of customer satisfaction. To test the relationship between customer satisfaction and OCBs, Nishii, Lepak, and Schneider (2008) surveyed 4,208 employees in 95

supermarket stores (all from the same company). Although their study divided OCBs into somewhat different constructs as other studies (OCB-helping and OCB-conscientiousness), they found a significant, positive relationship ( $\beta=.54$ ) between OCB-helping behaviors and customer satisfaction. The relationship between OCB-conscientiousness and customer satisfaction was non-significant. This supports the notion that OCBs may impact organizational effectiveness as measured by customer satisfaction levels.

Several studies have narrowed the scope of their research to specific work contexts. For example, Podsakoff, Ahearne, and MacKenzie (1997) surveyed 218 employees in a paper mill regarding their helping behavior, sportsmanship, and civic virtue. They then compared these ratings to the quality and quantity of work groups' production output. Their results showed positive and significant relationships between the OCB dimensions of sportsmanship and helping behavior and the performance indicator of quantity of paper produced. The helping behavior dimension was negatively and significantly correlated with the amount of paper rejected because of defects. The civic virtue dimension was not significantly related to either quantity or quality of production.

Finally, a recent meta-analysis of research on the consequences of OCBs looked at the relationship between citizenship behaviors and individual as well as organizational performance outcomes. Most of the research included in the analysis focused on individual-level performance outcomes (168 samples). Unit-level outcomes received slightly less attention with 38 samples included (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). They hypothesized that OCBs were related to both individual performance indicators and organizational performance indicators. A summary of their findings is included in Table 1. Overall, support was found for the notion that OCBs are related to both individual and organizational outcomes. Further, as the authors noted, "Thus, it appears that one concrete way for managers to enhance organizational performance is by encouraging employees to exhibit OCBs" Podsakoff et. al (2009, p. 132).

**Table 1***Summary of findings from Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, and Blume (2009)*

Individual-Level Outcomes	$r_c$
Managers' Ratings of Employee Performance	.60
Rewards Allocated to Employees	.57
Employee Turnover	-.14
Employee Turnover Intentions	-.22
Employee Absenteeism	-.16
Organizational-Level Outcomes	
Overall Effectiveness	.37
Productivity	.37
Efficiency	.40
Costs	-.52
Profitability	.15
Customer Satisfaction	.23
Group- or Unit-Level Turnover	-.22

*Note.*  $R_c$  = average correlation coefficient corrected for measurement and sampling error

### **Performance in higher education**

Over the past two to three decades, increased emphasis has been given to ensuring the accountability of higher education, especially for public institutions. The impetus for this stems from the need for governments to allocate scarce resources effectively (Liefner, 2003). Additionally, policymakers struggle for ways to equitably distribute allocated funds to the various higher education institutions in a particular state. These issues inevitably lead to a discussion around accountability and performance indicators for higher education.

#### ***Measuring institutional performance.***

Defining what quality and performance mean is a difficult endeavor. As Harvey and Lee commented, "quality is relative to the user of the term and the circumstances in which it is invoked" (Harvey & Green, 1993, p. 10). The quality of an institution will be determined differently by its various stakeholders including its students, faculty and staff, the public, accrediting bodies, and government agencies to name a few. Further, quality is contextual and will vary by institutional mission (e.g. community college versus a research institution) and other factors (Alexander, 2000). A consequence of the debate over the definition and meaning of quality is that the mechanisms by which quality are measured also largely go undefined (Liefner, 2003). These performance indicators may also differ by institutional characteristic, but may typically include such factors as graduation rates, enrollment, diversity

of student and employee body, graduate employment, research productivity, and level of grant and private funding (Harvey & Green, 1993; McLendon & Hearn, 2006).

Over time, there has been an evolution in the meaning of accountability for colleges and universities (Harvey & Green, 1993). Traditionally, institutions had self-monitored issues of quality and accountability with little involvement from external agencies. Accountability in recent decades has shifted to an externally monitored control mechanism (Huisman & Currie, 2004). Performance indicators have also shifted in many cases from inputs (e.g. enrollment) and efficiencies (e.g. student-teacher ratios) to include outcomes as well (e.g. graduation rates) (McLendon & Hearn, 2006). Yet there is still no consistent definition of quality in higher education and as Harvey and Williams (2010) noted, “national performance indicators are viewed with suspicion especially when they simply measure the easily measurable, rather than being carefully designed to evaluate the underlying issue” (p. 25).

A simultaneous and related discussion has taken place in higher education regarding what some scholars refer to as the “corporate university” (p. 5) whereby educational interests are being supplanted by corporate ideologies of efficiency, performance, and the bottom line (Giroux & Myrsiades, 2001). This has a heavy bearing on issues of accountability and performance and what measures of performance are rewarded and encouraged (Giroux, 2001). These scholars argue that forcing business values onto higher education strips the institution of its inherent purpose and meaning, leaving behind such notions as teaching civic and social responsibility for teaching job skills alone. The issue of the corporatization of higher education merits consideration as many colleges and universities have increasingly turned to the private sector for funding. The business world, in turn, looks for “good investments” of their resources in quality institutions (Washburn, 2005).

Thus, a discussion around defining and measuring the quality of higher education has taken place not only in academic circles, but also in the public and private arena. Public institutions of higher education must compete against secondary and post-secondary education, social welfare programs, and health care for public funding provided by the government (Serban, 1998). This competition necessitates a process by which government officials can effectively allocate scarce resources to bring the greatest value. This brings about the need for performance indicators and performance funding (Serban, 1998). Moreover, as Bogue (1998) noted,

...a well-conceived profile of performance indicators allows an educational program, an institution, or a system of institutions to offer an operational expression of its quality, to satisfy simultaneously the calls of improvement and accountability, and to enhance its decision capacity (p. 14).

The question still remains, however, as to what performance indicators are appropriate for higher education and if, indeed, those indicators are a true measure of institutional quality. Some indicators are mandated of universities while others are voluntarily given and these indicators can range from graduate job placement rates to student satisfaction to funding amounts for research (Burke, 2003). Many states have now mandated performance reporting for institutions, but criteria vary from state to state. In many states, performance indicators are becoming linked to funding levels. Several different views of potential performance indicators for higher education are listed below.

**Table 2**  
*Suggested Performance Indicators for Higher Education Institutions*

Bogue (1998)	Umayal and Suganthi (2010)	Burke (2003)	McLendon and Hearn (2006)
Enrollment trends	Pedagogy enhancement	Funding	Student retention and graduation rates
Student performance on admissions exams	Technology leadership	Affordability	Undergraduate access
Retention and graduation rates	Quality-driven process	College/school collaboration	Measures of institutional efficiency
Student and alumni satisfaction	Upgrading curriculum	Participation	Student scores on licensure exams
	Teaching and learning skills	Articulation	Job placement rates
	Enhancing facilities	Completion	Faculty productivity
	Reputation of the institution among the public	Degree attainment	Campus diversity
	Placement of students	Job placement	
	Quality of faculty	Sponsored research	
	Good citizenship	Student development	
	Increased grants and contracts		
	Resource accountability		
	Increased revenue streams		
	Budgeting		

Shin (2010), on the other hand, argued that institutional performance could be measured by two main criteria: teaching and research. Teaching is comprised of measures such as graduation rates, alumni satisfaction, transfer rates, and licensure test scores with graduation rates as “the most widely



adopted performance indicator” (Shin, 2010, p. 52). Research can be measured by total number of publications, total number of citations, and total amounts of external grant funding with grant funding as the most accepted indicator of research productivity (Shin, 2010).

### ***Measuring faculty performance.***

The concept of faculty work performance has received considerable attention in the literature and rightly so. Hardre and Cox (2009) described faculty performance as “critical to the health of institutions of higher education and to the education of citizens” (p. 383). Indeed, employee performance in any organization contributes to the success or failure of that organization (Yu, Hamid, Ijab, & Soo, 2009). However, there is disagreement regarding what measures should be used to evaluate faculty performance and these measures may differ based on institutional mission and control (public versus private) (Rosenfeld & Long, 1992).

Criteria for measuring faculty productivity or performance typically fall into three categories: research, teaching, and service. Different institutions will put more or less emphasis on a given category depending on the institution’s mission and goals. Hardre and Cox (2009) examined the evaluation policies of 62 academic departments in research universities in the United States. Their aim was to determine the relative weights that departments assign the three categories of evaluation (research, teaching, and service). Although not all departments quantify the weightings, Hardre and Cox found that 71% of the departments they surveyed give research higher priority than teaching. Additionally, 98% of departments placed service as least critical in faculty evaluations.

Rosenfeld and Long (1992) described a detailed system of faculty evaluation used in a research university. The rubric they outlined was developed and adopted by a department of 15 faculty members and was used to determine merit pay adjustments for faculty. A partial listing of the criteria is included in Table 3.

**Table 3**  
*Faculty Performance Criteria (Rosenfeld and Long, 1992)*

Criteria	Examples	Assigned Weight
Research		0.45
Publications and papers	Scholarly books Articles in journals Chapter in edited book Book review Research award Editor of a journal	
Festival, production, and performance work	Festival production Production tour Performances Script adaptations	
Grants	Federal grant State or local grant University grant Multi-year funding	
Teaching		0.35
Textbooks and related works	Advanced-level text Beginning-level text Edited book Workbook Editor of a journal	
Class-related activity	Teaching fellowship/chair Teaching awards Class evaluation New course development TA supervision	
Thesis work	Thesis director Thesis committee member	
Critical work	Major or minor critic	
Other activities	Invited visiting professor Conference attendance	
Service		0.20
National, regional, or state organizations	Officer Chairperson Member Program planner	
Departmental service	Associate chairperson Committee chairperson Member of a committee Director of graduate or undergraduate studies	
University service	Committee chair or member Sponsor of campus organization Invited, on-campus lecture	
Production work	Festival director Conference director	
Other service	Program reviewer Service award Workshop conductor Unpaid consultation	

Evaluation of faculty performance has particular import for the tenure and promotion process. In his study on criteria to measure faculty productivity, Fairweather (2002) noted:

Other than hiring new faculty members, the principal expression of academic values about faculty work lies in the promotion and tenure decision. It is here rather than in institutional rhetoric that the faculty seek clues about the value of different aspects of their work. It is here that productivity is most meaningfully defined and evaluated. (p. 27).

His framework for assessing faculty performance consisted of several criteria in the areas of research and teaching and included:

- Research productivity
  - Number of refereed publications during the last two years
  - Principal investigator on an externally-funded research project
  - Total research funds generated
  - Number of conference presentations or workshops during the last two years
  - Number of exhibitions or performances during the last two years
- Instructional productivity
  - Student classroom contact hours per semester
  - Independent study contact hours per week
  - Number of thesis or dissertation committees served on
  - Use of collaborative or active learning as the primary instructional approach in any course taught over the previous year

In his study, he compared mean scores in each of the areas above for faculty across different four-year institutions and different academic disciplines. His data were gathered from the National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty, which yielded a sample of 7,835 tenure-track faculty from various four-year institutions (Fairweather, 2002).

### **Summary of the chapter.**

Organizational citizenship behaviors include behaviors that are not included in an employee's job description, go formally unrewarded, and contribute positively to the organization. Other studies have shown that OCBs may be positively related to employee and organizational performance. Although it is difficult to define performance for faculty, staff, and institutions, some measures may provide good

indicators of the relative impact of an individual or an organization. For faculty, these include research productivity, teaching load, and amount of service. Staff performance measures are more difficult to pinpoint, but like employees in other industries, may include measures such as satisfaction, loyalty, productivity, absenteeism, and turnover intention. Finally, institutional performance indicators are varied, but two commonly used measures of performance are graduation rates and total research funding (Shin, 2010).

## Chapter 3

### Research Methods

#### **Introduction.**

The purpose for conducting the study was to describe OCBs in the higher education context, describe the relationships between OCBs and various aspects of faculty and staff performance, and explore the extent to which institutional leaders should be concerned with the OCBs of both faculty and professional staff. Research on OCBs has typically focused on predictors of behaviors using samples from business and industry, not higher education. Recent research on OCBs has also examined the connection between these behaviors and individual and organizational performance. Utilizing the literature on both OCBs and higher education, an instrument was developed to measure levels of OCB among faculty and professional staff in both high-performing and low-performing institutions, as defined in this study.

Non-experimental, quantitative methods were used to answer each of the research questions. This chapter discusses the sample that was chosen, explains the research design, and explains data collection and analysis.

#### **Research design.**

Non-experimental, quantitative methods were used to gather data about the OCB levels of faculty and staff in various disciplines in high-performing and low-performing institutions. According to Creswell (2008), quantitative methods are useful for research “in which trends or explanations need to be made” (p. 62) and are ideal for comparing groups of individuals to each other. Furthermore, past research on OCBs has largely tended to be quantitative. Thus, utilizing quantitative methods for this study would allow the results to be compared more easily to previous studies.

#### ***Institutional type.***

The first stage of stratification included identifying the type of institution to be included in the study. In order to allow for better comparison of results, only universities classified as doctoral-granting institutions by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching were included in the study. Carnegie classifications are a widely used system of classifying institutions based on a variety of

characteristics (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2011). Doctoral-granting universities are defined by the Carnegie Foundation as including:

institutions that awarded at least 20 research doctoral degrees during the update year (excluding doctoral-level degrees that qualify recipients for entry into professional practice, such as the JD, MD, PharmD, DPT, etc.). Excludes Special Focus Institutions and Tribal Colleges (p. 1).

Institutions were narrowed down even further within this stratum to include only doctoral institutions with very high research activity (RU/VH). From this list, I selected eight universities classified as RU/VH. The method for selecting the specific institutions is described below.

***Institutional performance differences.***

Institutions were also divided into high-performing and low-performing categories based on two criteria: total amount of research funding received and graduation rates. Four universities were considered high-performing and four universities were considered low-performing. Data for research funding were gathered from the National Science Foundation WebCASPAR database (National Science Foundation, 2010). WebCASPAR is a useful source of data because the resource “emphasizes S&E [science and engineering], but its data resources also provide information on non-S&E fields and higher education in general” (National Science Foundation, 2010). The specific data source utilized to gather information about research funding was the NSF Survey of Research and Development Expenditures at Universities and Colleges for the 2009 reporting year. Variables included in the requested database were the name of the institution, institutional control, total academic R&D expenditures, and total non-S&E academic R&D expenditures.

After removing all private institutions, a total of 400 public institutions remained in the data set. Then, the total academic expenditures and total non-S&E academic expenditures were summed for each institution to create a new variable called total research funding. Mean total research funding for institutions included in this data set was \$98,362,920 per institution. According to Shin (2010), institutions with higher than average research funding may be considered high-performing. Institutions were ordered according to total research funding. Of the 400 institutions in the data set, 98 received greater than average funding.

Institutions were also ranked according to graduation rates as reported in IPEDS. The mean graduation rate was calculated. Again, Shin (2010) indicated that institutions with higher than average graduation rates may be considered high-performing.

#### ***Differences in academic discipline.***

To test for differences among different academic disciplines across institutions, subjects were also categorized by generic academic areas. The following disciplines were selected, as they were common across the universities involved in the study: business, education, engineering, liberal arts, and natural sciences. Because institutions organize disciplines somewhat differently, some faculty and staff were sampled from the same college at one institution but resided in different colleges at another institution. For example, universities often housed both liberal arts disciplines and natural sciences disciplines in one college of arts and sciences. This was not true across the board, however, as other institutions maintained different colleges or schools for each.

#### **Sample.**

This study utilized a multi-stage, stratified sampling level at the individual level of measurement. According to Creswell (2008), stratified sampling can be useful for researchers who wish to include certain characteristics in the sample. Thus, from the entire population of higher education employees, individuals were selected for certain characteristics according to the aims of the research questions. The first stage of stratification included identifying the type of institution to be included in the study. In this case, only public universities classified as having very high research activity were included. The second stage involved selecting institutions based on institutional performance. Four high-performing and four low-performing universities were selected for inclusion in the study. The third stage of stratification was to select participants based on academic discipline. The fourth stage of stratification classified respondents by type of employment (faculty or staff).

Participants were selected from research universities with a status of RU/VH according to the Carnegie Classification system. Specific institutions were chosen based on two factors: total research funding and graduation rates. According to Shin (2010), both of these factors are useful, albeit not comprehensive, in determining the performance of an institution. Four universities considered high-performing and four universities considered low-performing were selected for inclusion in the study. To

test for possible differences between academic disciplines, participants were grouped according to college, school, or discipline. Academic disciplines not represented at all institutions (agriculture, for example) were excluded from this study. Five academic disciplines were chosen for inclusion in the study: business, education, engineering, liberal arts, and natural sciences. Publicly available faculty and staff email addresses were collected from each institution's website. A total of 15 faculty addresses and 15 staff addresses were collected within each discipline at each institution. If more than 15 email addresses were available, only the first 15 (when sorted alphabetically) were collected.

#### **Data collection.**

Surveys were distributed electronically to each of the participants selected for the study. The distribution occurred in three phases to account for periods of time when faculty and staff may be absent from the office (e.g. spring break). An email was sent to one-third of the list with a reminder email one week after the initial contact. A week later, the second-third of the email list was contacted with a reminder one week later. The last-third of the list was then emailed the survey with a final reminder one week afterwards.

#### **Instrument.**

*Research Question One: What is the OCB and performance profile of faculty and staff in select higher education institutions?*

OCB Level – OCB level was measured using Lee and Allen's (2002) OCB Measures Survey. This survey consisted of eight questions measuring OCBs directed towards individuals (OCBIs) and eight questions measuring OCBs directed at the organization (OCBOs). The authors reported reliability levels of .83 for the OCB-I scale and .88 for the OCB-O scale.

Institutional Performance – This variable was calculated based on the institution's graduation rate as well as the institution's total research funding. Data on federal grant funding for 2010 was obtained from the National Science Foundation Survey of Federal Funds for Research and Development on the WebCASPARE website. Only funding data from institutions in the classifications described in the study were included. Mean research funding was calculated and institutions with grant funding greater than the mean were considered high performing. Graduation rates were obtained from the National Center for Education Statistics. Mean graduation rates were calculated and a school was considered high



performing if total federal research funding and graduation rates were above the mean. Conversely, a school was considered below-average performing if both its research funding and graduation rates were below the mean. Table 4 depicts the decision matrix for this variable.

**Table 4**  
*Institutional Performance Matrix*

	Below average graduation rate	Above average graduation rate
Below average research funding	Low-performing	Average-performing
Above average research funding	Average-performing	High-performing

College or school – Disciplines are organized differently at different institutions, so only the most common colleges or schools were included in the study. Those common to all institutions in this study were: business, education, engineering, liberal arts, and natural sciences.

Faculty performance – Faculty performance was measured by twelve variables take from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (U.S. Department of Education, 1999). Research productivity was made up of variables such as number of refereed journal articles published in the past year, total research funds generated over the past year, and number of conference presentations or workshops in the past year. Instructional productivity consisted of measures such as student classroom contact hours over the past year and number of theses or dissertations chaired over the past year. Service was measured by items addressing the number of personnel, governance, and other committees served on which an individual served.

Staff performance – Performance of professional staff was more difficult to measure because of the variability of staff roles, job duties, and success indicators. Thus, a collection of variables were chosen from the literature that represent easily measurable but still relevant characteristics of performance. These variables included self-report measures such as satisfaction, loyalty, productivity, and absenteeism. Messersmith, Patel and Lepak (2011) reported reliability of .83 for measures of satisfaction which included questions such as “in general, I like working here” and “all things considered, I feel pretty good about this job.” They also reported reliability of .84 for the loyalty scale which included questions like “I would be happy to spend the rest of my career in this department” (Messersmith, Patel, & Lepak, 2011). Productivity was measured by four items which included statements such as “the quality of my work is top-notch” and this scale had a reliability of .74 (Kuvaas, 2006). Absenteeism was measured

by the question "How many days were you absent from work in the past year? This refers to absenteeism for any reason excluding vacations and scheduled days off" (Johns, 2011).

Research Question Two: How do OCBs correlate with selected individual performance indicators for college faculty members? The variables of OCB level and faculty performance variables were utilized to answer this research question.

Research Question Three: How do OCBs correlate with selected individual performance indicators for professional staff members in higher education? The variables of OCB level and satisfaction, loyalty, productivity, absenteeism, and turnover intention were utilized to answer this research question.

Research Question Four: Do significant differences in OCB levels exist between high-performing and low-performing employees? Performance indicator variables were aggregated for each respondent to determine a new variable of overall performance. OCB scores of low-performing employees were compared to OCB scores of high-performing employees.

Research Question Five: Do significant differences in OCB levels exist between employees in high-performing institutions and employees in low-performing institutions? Institutions were classified as either high-performing or low-performing based on the variables of total funded research and graduation rate. OCB rates for all employees were compared between these institutions.

Research Question Six: To what extent do the levels of OCBs differ between faculty and professional staff in higher education across all institutions sampled? No new data were needed for this comparison.

Research Question Seven: To what extent do the levels of OCBs for all employees differ by academic discipline and institution? Again, no new data were needed for this comparison.

### **Data analysis.**

Research Question One: What is the OCB and performance profile of faculty and staff in select higher education institutions? Mean OCB scores and standard deviations were calculated for all faculty and staff groups in each academic unit in each institution. These data provide a general view of the OCB profile for employees in select institutions. Responses to survey questions 1-16 (OCB scores), 19-27 (faculty performance), and 28-35 (staff performance) were used to answer this research question.

Research Question Two: How do OCBs correlate with selected individual performance indicators for college faculty members? Pearson product moment correlations were performed for faculty OCB scores and each of the faculty performance variables. Responses to survey questions 1-16 (OCB scores) and 19-27 (faculty performance) were used to answer this research question.

Research Question Three: How do OCBs correlate with selected individual performance indicators for professional staff members in higher education? Similar to research question two, Pearson correlations were calculated for professional staff OCB scores and each of their respective performance indicators. Responses to survey questions 1-16 (OCB scores) and 28-35 (staff performance) were used to answer this research question.

Research Question Four: Do significant differences in OCB levels exist between high-performing and low-performing employees? Means were calculated for faculty performance measure scores as well as professional staff performance measure scores. Individual scores falling below the mean for each group were considered low-performing while those above the mean were considered high-performing. After grouping both faculty and staff as either high or low performing, an ANOVA was performed to compare the mean OCB scores for each group. Responses to survey questions 1-16 (OCB scores), 19-27 (faculty performance), and 28-35 (staff performance) were used to answer this research question.

Research Question Five: Do significant differences in OCB levels exist between employees in high-performing institutions and employees in low-performing institutions? To answer this question, employees were grouped by their respective institutional position according to the criteria in Table 4 (either high or low performing). An ANOVA performed to compare the mean OCB scores for each group. Responses to survey questions 1-16 (OCB scores) and 17-18 (institutional performance) were used to answer this research question.

Research Question Six: To what extent do the levels of OCBs differ between faculty and professional staff in higher education across all institutions sampled? All OCB scores obtained were grouped according to employee status (faculty or professional staff). Descriptive statistics were utilized to compare groupings. Responses to survey questions 1-16 (OCB scores) were used to answer this research question.

Research Question Seven: To what extent do the levels of OCBs for all employees differ by academic discipline and institution? All OCB scores were grouped according to academic discipline. Descriptive statistics were utilized to compare groupings. Responses to survey questions 1-16 (OCB scores) were used to answer this research question.

**Summary of the chapter.**

This chapter detailed the research methodology used in this study. The sample was described along with the data collection instrument and the way in which data analysis was performed. Further, a description of how each research question was answered using specific data and analysis techniques was provided.

## Chapter 4

### Results

#### Introduction.

Organizational citizenship behaviors are an important aspect of employee behavior in the workplace. The purpose for conducting the study was to describe OCBs in the higher education context, describe the relationships between OCBs and various aspects of faculty and staff performance, and explore the extent to which institutional leaders should be concerned with the OCBs of both faculty and professional staff. This chapter discusses the results of the study and provides answers to each of the research questions posed. It begins with a summary of the study, outlining the basis for the research and providing a synopsis of the literature. Following is information regarding the distribution of the survey instrument. Lastly, the data results are presented according to each research question.

#### Summary of the study.

All organizations have goals and performance measures that allow them to understand if they are achieving their intended goals. Each member of the organization contributes in his or her own way to the organizational goals (Caswell, 2009). Some behaviors that employees engage in contribute positively while others have negative consequences for the organization. One set of positive workplace behaviors that was first described by Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) are known as organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs).

OCBs are distinguished from other types of workplace behaviors by three characteristics: they are extra-role, they are unenforceable, and they contribute positively to the organization (Organ, 1997). By extra-role it is meant that these behaviors are not part of employees' formal job descriptions. OCBs are also unenforceable in that managers and supervisors neither reward nor punish employees who exhibit or withhold these behaviors, respectively. Over time, it is argued, OCBs contribute positively to the organization by creating more positive workplace environments (Turnipseed & Murkison, 2000). Research has also shown that OCBs are linked with both individual and organizational performance (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). The relationship between OCBs and performance is not fully understood, but it is often suggested that OCBs promote the effective functioning of the

organization through various means including increased employee satisfaction, improved workplace relationships, and increased efficiencies (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997).

Although much research has been done on OCBs in general, studies of specific industries or in specific work contexts are lacking. For that reason, the current study focused on obtaining a better understanding of OCBs in the higher education employment context. Specifically, the study was designed to better understand any possible relationships between employee OCBs, individual productivity, and institutional productivity by surveying various employees in higher education institutions.

To understand the relationship between OCBs and productivity, the concept of productivity must first be explored. From an organizational standpoint, productivity can be measured in a variety of ways including alumni satisfaction, economic impact, research funding, and reputation among others (Bogue, 1998; McLendon & Hearn, 2006). Shin (2010) argued that two of the most common ways to measure institutional effectiveness are through research funding and graduation rates. Though there are many other ways to define institutional performance, these two characteristics provide a common starting point to begin examining the concept.

Institutional performance, however, is a product of the behaviors of the individuals who comprise the organization (Deluga, 1994). Therefore, individual performance should also be considered when looking at institutional performance and OCBs. For faculty in higher education, performance is often defined by three criteria: research, teaching, and service (Hardre & Cox, 2009). Institutions define these categories differently depending on the mission and control of the institution (public or private), but most faculty work activity falls into one or concurrently into all of the three categories. Staff performance is more difficult to characterize and is much more subjective. Like employees in any other organization, staff members perform jobs that may be very different from one another even in the same institution. For this reason, it is difficult to objectively measure staff productivity in a way that allows direct comparison with others. Some research has pointed to surrogate information for direct measures of staff performance. These indicators include absenteeism (Johns, 2011), satisfaction and loyalty (Messersmith, Patel, & Lepak, 2011), and self-report productivity (Kuvaas, 2006).

This study was designed to attempt to understand each of these three aspects (institutional performance, individual performance, and OCB) for employees in higher education. To do that, a survey

was constructed that included questions regarding OCB levels as well as certain performance measures according to employment status (faculty or staff). The OCB questionnaire contained 16 items, 8 of which pertained to behaviors directed at individuals and 8 regarding behaviors directed at the organization. For faculty members, 12 items inquired about specific productivity measures such as number of classes taught, number of grants funded, and number of committees served on. Staff members received the same OCB items, but received items measuring satisfaction, loyalty, productivity, absenteeism, and turnover intention. Several statistical analyses were used to answer each of the research questions presented in this study.

### **Data results.**

#### ***Data collection***

The survey was distributed to a list of faculty and staff from eight higher education institutions. These institutions were selected based on their respective graduation rates and research funding. Four institutions were considered low-performing and four were considered high-performing. Additionally, faculty and staff were categorized in five disciplines: business, education, engineering, liberal arts, and natural science. The survey was distributed to 1,168 individuals using an online survey tool, Qualtrics. Of the total distribution, 179 responses were received for a response rate of 15.3%. Some of the survey responses were incomplete, but usable responses were kept in the data set. Incomplete responses were not included in statistical analysis where necessary and the sample size is noted in the reporting for each analysis. The response rate was determined to be acceptable based on Alreck and Settle's (1985) findings that respondent variance is minimal in sample responses over 100; the low response rate does, however, suggest a caution in generalizing study findings.

The survey was distributed in three waves. Wave one was sent to approximately the first one-third of the target sample in early February. A reminder to this list was sent one week after the initial email. The second wave was sent in mid-February and the third wave in early March with reminders following one week afterwards. A third, final reminder was sent approximately three weeks after each initial contact. Approximately 29% of the survey responses were received in the first wave, 23% in the second wave, and 48% in the third wave.

## Results

*Research Question One: What is the OCB and performance profile of faculty and staff in select higher education institutions?*

Table 5 displays the OCB scores for faculty in the study. Respondent OCBs were made up of three scores: overall OCB, OCBs directed towards individuals (OCB-I) and OCBs directed at the organization (OCB-O). OCB scores and turnover intention were measured on 7-point scales, while all other performance variables were measured on a 5-point scale. On average, OCB-O scores tended to be higher than OCB-I scores for all faculty sampled.

**Table 5**  
*Faculty OCB Profile*

Variable	Sample Size (n)	Mean ( $\bar{x}$ )	Median	Mode	Standard deviation (s)
OCB	74	5.058	5.0625	5.31	.851
OCB-I	75	4.8617	5.0000	5.38	1.00790
OCB-O	79	5.2073	5.2500	4.63	1.01252

Faculty performance indicators are reported in Table 6. Indicators were measured according to the following scale: 0 items (1 point), 1-2 items (2 points), 3-4 items (3 points), 5-6 items (4 points), 7 or more items (5 points). For example, if a respondent reported serving on 3-4 graduate committees, that response was given a scale point value of 3. A majority of respondents (54.4%) reported having 1-2 publications over the past year and a majority (51.9%) also reported teaching 3-4 classes over that same time period. The highest committee participation was on "other committees" where 58.5% of respondents reported serving on 3-4 committees. However, this item also received the lowest response rate of all the faculty variables reported (n=65). This may be due to the ambiguity of the term or misunderstanding of the question. Most faculty (59.5%) reported serving on no undergraduate committees, but 24.1% reported serving on 3-4 graduate committees.



**Table 6**  
*Faculty Performance Profile*

Variable	Sample Size (n)	Most Common Response (% of responses)	Median	Mode	Standard deviation (s)
Publications	79	1-2 (54.4%)	2	2	1.031
Presentations	79	1-2 (40.5%)	2	2	1.031
Undergraduate Committees	74	0 (59.5%)	1	1	.934
Graduate Committees	79	3-4 (24.1%)	3	3	1.358
Classes Taught	79	3-4 (51.9%)	3	3	.774
Contact Hours	78	1-2 (43.6%)	2	2	1.217
Principal Investigator	78	0 (44.9%)	2	1	.954
Grants	79	1-2 (49.4%)	2	2	1.028
Curriculum Committees	76	1-2 (55.3%)	2	2	.544
Governance Committees	75	0 (47.2%)	2	1	.783
Personnel Committees	72	1-2 (50.7%)	2	2	.784
Other Committees	65	1-2 (58.5%)	2	2	.704
Turnover Intention	79	Very unlikely (33%)	2	1	1.955

Table 7 summarizes the OCB and performance data for staff included in the study. Average OCB scores and the subscales of OCB-I and OCB-O for staff were very similar to each other. The performance indicators of satisfaction and productivity were higher when compared with the loyalty variable. Absenteeism was measured on a 5-point scale, so the raw mean cannot be directly compared to the other performance indicators. Of the staff that responded to the survey, 70.2% reported being absent from work 4 or fewer days over the most recent calendar year. Average turnover intention was higher for staff ( $\bar{x}$ =3.45) than for faculty ( $\bar{x}$ =2.81).

**Table 7**  
*Staff OCB and Performance Profile*

Variable	Sample Size (n)	Mean ( $\bar{x}$ )	Median	Mode	Standard Deviation (s)
OCB	92	5.3485	5.4375	5.44	.89118
OCB-I	93	5.2782	5.3750	5.13	.97856
OCB-O	95	5.3855	5.6250	5.75	1.04259
Satisfaction	92	5.8297	6.0000	7.00	1.18445
Loyalty	94	5.0505	5.3750	5.75	1.32317
Productivity	93	5.9211	6.0000	6.33	.79612
Absenteeism <sup>a</sup>	94	2.94	3.00	2	1.326
Turnover Intention	95	3.45	3.00	1	2.240

Note. <sup>a</sup> Absenteeism was reported on a 5-point scale.

In short, faculty reported lower scores for overall OCBs, OCB-I (behaviors directed individuals), and OCB-O (behaviors directed at the organization) than staff. However, faculty reported a lower turnover intention than staff. Faculty reported relatively high committee participation (except governance and undergraduate committees) and publication activity when compared with the other performance variables. Staff reported high levels of both satisfaction and productivity when compared with other staff performance variables.

*Research Question Two: How do OCBs correlate with selected individual performance indicators for college faculty members?*

To address this research question, Pearson product-moment correlations were computed for each of the variables measured in this study for faculty across all disciplines and institutions. The faculty correlation matrix is presented in Table 8 in Appendix A. Although all correlations are shown between variables, this research question specifically addresses the correlations between OCBs and the measured performance indicators.

Overall OCB scores were correlated at a statistically significant level after performing a two-tailed test at  $\alpha=.05$  with only two performance indicators, presentations and other committees. There was a weak positive correlation between OCB scores and presentations,  $r=.255$ ,  $n=73$ ,  $p=.030$ . Likewise, a weak positive correlation was found between OCB and other committees,  $r=.261$ ,  $n=61$ ,  $p=.042$ .

Correlations for the subscales of OCB-I and OCB-O and the performance variables were also calculated. OCB-I correlated at a significant level with only one performance variable, student contact hours ( $r=.374$ ,  $n=73$ ,  $p=.001$ ). This correlation was slightly stronger than correlations for overall OCB scores and at a greater significance level. OCB-O scores, in contrast, were correlated at a statistically significant level with four performance variables: presentations ( $r=.225$ ,  $n=77$ ,  $p=.049$ ), governance committees ( $r=.240$ ,  $n=71$ ,  $p=.044$ ), personnel committees ( $r=.288$ ,  $n=73$ ,  $p=.013$ ), and other committees ( $r=.355$ ,  $n=63$ ,  $p=.004$ ). Each of these variables showed only weak positive correlations with the OCB-O construct.

The results of this analysis indicate that faculty with higher overall OCB scores also have higher numbers of presentations and serve on other committees at a higher rate. Faculty who exhibit more OCB-I behaviors also tend to report more student contact hours. Finally, faculty members with higher

OCB-O scores report more presentations as well as more service on governance, personnel, and other committees.

*Research Question Three: How do OCBs correlate with selected individual performance indicators for professional staff members in higher education?*

Similar to research question two, question three addressed possible correlations between OCBs and performance indicators for staff. Pearson product-moment correlations were computed for each of the variables included in the staff survey instrument. To answer the research question, only correlations between overall OCB, OCB-I, and OCB-O with the other variables were examined.

Table 9 shows the correlation matrix for staff OCB and performance variables. Overall OCB scores were significantly correlated with the satisfaction, loyalty, and productivity measures. The strongest correlation occurred with the productivity scale ( $r=.386$ ,  $n=90$ ,  $p=.000$ ). Satisfaction and loyalty were still positively correlated, but less strongly. OCB-I showed a statistically significant, positive correlation only with productivity ( $r=.301$ ,  $n=91$ ,  $p=.004$ ). OCB-O, on the other hand, was correlated with satisfaction, loyalty, and productivity. The strongest correlation between any OCB construct and performance variable among staff or faculty was found to be between OCB-O and productivity ( $r=.402$ ,  $n=93$ ,  $p=.000$ ). No significant relationships were revealed to exist between OCB and either absenteeism or turnover.

**Table 9**  
*Correlations of OCB and Performance Indicators for Staff*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. OCB	1							
	92							
2. OCBI	.884**	1						
	.000	-						
	92	93						
3. OCBO	.894**	.572**	1					
	.000	.000	-					
	92	93	95					
4. Absenteeism	-.119	.013	-.180	1				
	.267	.903	.086	-				
	89	90	92	94				
5. Turnover	-.046	-.021	-.038	.166	1			
	.666	.842	.713	.111	-			
	91	92	94	93	95			
6. Satisfaction	.213*	.135	.238*	-.178	-.514**	1		
	.045	.206	.022	.094	.000	-		
	89	90	92	90	92	92		
7. Loyalty	.271**	.174	.282**	-.148	-.411**	.713**	1	
	.009	.096	.006	.159	.000	.000	-	
	91	92	94	92	94	92	94	
8. Productivity	.386**	.301**	.402**	-.007	-.048	.239*	.119	1
	.000	.004	.000	.950	.646	.023	.255	-
	90	91	93	91	93	91	93	93

These data show that staff that report higher levels of satisfaction, loyalty, and productivity will also report higher levels of both OCB and OCB-O. This is particularly true for self-reported productivity. Staff with high levels of OCB-I also tend to report higher productivity.

*Research Question Four: Do significant differences in OCB levels exist between high-performing and low-performing employees?*

To compare high-performing employees and low-performing employees, a new variable called “performance score” was calculated. For faculty, each of the 12 surveyed indicators was averaged to determine an overall performance score. Turnover intention was not included in this score as this variable was measured on a different scale. The mean for the new performance score variable was  $\bar{x}=2.17$ ,  $s=.513$ ,  $n=55$ . Because an objective measure of faculty performance does not exist, for the purposes of this study, high- and low-performance was determined by comparing cases with a performance score below the mean (low-performing) to those with performance scores above the mean (high-performing).

Similarly, a performance score was calculated for staff using the questionnaire items measuring satisfaction, loyalty, productivity, and turnover intention. Each of these four variables was averaged to determine a new performance score for each case. Absenteeism was not included in this analysis as it was measured on a different scale. The new variable for staff performance had a mean of  $\bar{x}=5.35$ ,  $s=1.04$ ,  $n=91$ . Like faculty, staff cases with performance scores below the mean were considered low-performing while scores above the mean were considered high-performing. Because faculty performance and staff performance were measured using different variables and scales, standardized z-scores were computed for each. A one-way ANOVA was completed to test for differences in OCB ratings between four groups: high-performing faculty, low-performing faculty, high-performing staff, and low-performing staff. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 10.

**Table 10**  
*ANOVA Test for Faculty and Staff Performance Groups*

		Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Value	Significance
OCB	Between Groups	6.194	3	2.065	2.739	.046
	Within Groups	102.506	136	.754		
	Total	108.701	139			
OCB-I	Between Groups	8.913	3	2.971	3.218	.025
	Within Groups	127.409	138	.923		
	Total	108.701	139			
OCB-O	Between Groups	4.125	3	1.375	1.278	.284
	Within Groups	151.759	141	1.076		
	Total	155.884	144			

The ANOVA test showed significant differences in group means for the variables OCB and OCB-I. A Tukey HSD post-hoc analysis was performed to further examine these differences. This analysis was not performed for OCB-O as no significant differences arose from the ANOVA test. The Tukey post-hoc test revealed a mean difference of .569 between the group means of high-performing staff and low-performing faculty at a significance level of  $p=.03$  on the OCB variable. Further, this test also showed a mean difference of .696 ( $p=.012$ ) between high-performing staff and low-performing faculty for the OCB-I variable. These tests showed that significant differences in OCB and OCB-I levels do exist between high-performing staff and low-performing faculty and that high-performing staff tend to exhibit higher OCB and

OCB-I scores. No other groups showed significant differences in mean OCB scores.

*Research Question Five: Do significant differences in OCB levels exist between employees in high-performing institutions and employees in low-performing institutions?*

To address this question, subjects were labeled according to their employment status (faculty or staff) and institutional performance (high-performing or low-performing). Thus, four groups were created: faculty in high-performing institutions, faculty in low-performing institutions, staff in high-performing institutions, and staff in low-performing institutions. An ANOVA was used to test for differences in group means for the four groups on the OCB, OCB-I, and OCB-O variables. The results of this test are presented in Table 11.

**Table 11**  
*ANOVA Test for Institutional Performance Groups*

		Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Value	Significance
OCB	Between Groups	8.702	3	2.901	3.903	.010
	Within Groups	120.398	162	.743		
	Total	129.099	165			
OCB-I	Between Groups	16.614	3	5.538	5.903	.001
	Within Groups	153.862	164	.938		
	Total	170.476	167			
OCB-O	Between Groups	6.089	3	2.030	1.945	.124
	Within Groups	177.423	170	1.044		
	Total	183.513	173			

Because the ANOVA test showed significant differences in group means on the OCB and OCB-I variables, a Tukey HSD post-hoc test was performed to further explain these differences. This test revealed significant mean differences between staff in low-performing institutions when compared with faculty in low-performing institutions and staff in high-performing institutions. This was true for both the overall OCB variable and the OCB-I variable. Table 12 summarizes the findings from the Tukey post-hoc test for institutional performance groups. Only mean differences that were statistically significant were reported in the table.

**Table 12**  
Tukey HSD Post-hoc Test for Institutional Groups

	Faculty in Low-Performing Institutions (B)	Staff in High- Performing Institutions (B)
OCB Mean Differences (A-B)		
Staff in Low-Performing Institutions (A)	.49166 (p=.018)	.48618 (p=.041)
OCB-I Mean Differences (A-B)		
Staff in Low-Performing Institutions (A)	.74823 (p=.000)	.59509 (p=.020)

The largest mean difference (.74823) was found between staff in low-performing institutions and faculty in low-performing institutions on the OCB-I variable. That is, staff in low-performing institutions reported higher OCB-I scores, on average, than faculty in low-performing institutions. Staff in low-performing institutions also reported higher mean overall OCB scores than both faculty in low-performing institutions and staff in high-performing institutions.

*Research Question Six: To what extent do the levels of OCBs differ between faculty and professional staff in higher education across all institutions sampled?*

The sample sizes, means, and standard deviations for all OCB variables were computed for faculty and staff across all institutions. These data are presented in Table 13. The highest mean OCB was for staff OCB-I ( $\bar{x}$ =5.3855). The lowest mean OCB score occurred for faculty in the OCB-I variable ( $\bar{x}$ =4.8617). All OCB mean scores for staff were at similar levels to each other and were all higher than respective faculty scores. Other than OCB-I scores, faculty and staff did not differ greatly on other variables.

**Table 13**  
*Faculty and Staff OCB Levels*

	Faculty			Staff		
	Sample size (n)	Mean ( $\bar{x}$ )	Standard Deviation (s)	Sample size (n)	Mean ( $\bar{x}$ )	Standard Deviation (s)
OCB	74	5.0583	.85146	92	5.3458	.89433
OCB-I	75	4.8617	1.00790	93	5.2782	.97856
OCB-O	79	5.2073	1.01252	95	5.3855	1.04259

*Research Question Seven: To what extent do the levels of OCBs differ by academic institution and discipline?*

Mean OCB scores were first grouped by institution. Table 14 shows the means, standard deviations, and sample size for each of the institutions in the study. To protect respondent anonymity, institutions' names were replaced with pseudonyms according to performance category. The lowest overall OCB score was found at institution Hi1 ( $\bar{x}=4.8828$ ). The highest OCB mean occurred at Lo2 ( $\bar{x}=5.4824$ ). This represents just over half a scale point difference between these two institutions. The number of cases for the OCB variable at each institution should also be noted with the most cases coming from Lo3 ( $n=33$ ). The least amount of cases came from institution Hi2 ( $n=9$ ). Each of the means is above the scale midpoint of 4 (7-point Likert scale), but large differences were not found between each of the targeted institutions.

The highest OCB-I mean was found at Lo4 ( $\bar{x}=5.4779$ ) and the lowest at Lo3 ( $\bar{x}=4.8144$ ). Similar to overall OCB means, OCB-O scores tended to be higher at Lo2 ( $\bar{x}=5.5846$ ) and lowest at Hi1 ( $\bar{x}=4.8750$ ). The highest standard deviation was found at institution Hi2 in the OCB-O variable suggesting that responses from this institution varied more than at other institutions.

**Table 14**  
*Faculty and Staff OCB Levels by Institution*

School	OCB			OCB-I			OCB-O		
	n	$\bar{x}$	s	n	$\bar{x}$	s	n	$\bar{x}$	s
Lo1	26	5.1442	.88314	26	5.1106	.88199	26	5.1779	1.14901
Lo2	32	5.4824	.68414	33	5.3485	.84477	34	5.5846	.78258
Lo3	33	5.1951	.82499	33	4.8144	.99664	34	5.5386	.85199
Lo4	17	5.4081	.92098	17	5.4779	1.06547	19	5.2171	1.14704
Hi1	16	4.8828	1.13626	16	4.9062	1.27516	17	4.8750	1.28847
Hi2	9	5.2639	1.26313	10	5.1750	1.09640	9	5.2361	1.56181
Hi3	17	4.9669	.89544	17	4.9632	1.14117	19	4.9145	.90720
Hi4	16	5.2266	.76949	16	4.9688	.95906	16	5.4844	.82143
Total	166	5.2176	.88455	168	5.0923	1.01035	174	5.3046	1.02994

Means for OCB, OCB-I, and OCB-O were then grouped by academic discipline and are displayed in Table 15. The highest mean OCB score was found in the engineering discipline ( $\bar{x}=5.396$ ,  $n=27$ ) and the lowest occurred in education ( $\bar{x}=5.0977$ ,  $n=44$ ). However, the number of samples in both of these groups represented the largest and smallest response groups, respectively. While large differences do



not exist between these means, the data indicate that a larger sample size may tend to have means closer to the scale midpoint.

On average, OCB-I scores tended to be lower in the education discipline ( $\bar{x}=4.8872$ ) and higher in the engineering discipline ( $\bar{x}=5.2930$ ). In contrast, OCB-O scores were, on average, lowest for the natural sciences ( $\bar{x}=5.0500$ ) and highest in engineering ( $\bar{x}=5.5000$ ). In all but one discipline, the mean of OCB-I scores was higher than mean of OCB-O scores. In the natural science discipline, the OCB-O mean score ( $\bar{x}=5.0500$ ) was higher than the mean OCB-I score ( $\bar{x}=5.1865$ ). Overall, employees in the engineering discipline had higher OCB scores in all three categories when compared with the other disciplines. Education had the lowest mean OCB and OCB-I scores, while Natural Science had the lowest OCB-O score.

**Table 15**  
*Faculty and Staff OCB Levels by Discipline*

Discipline	OCB			OCB-I			OCB-O		
	n	$\bar{x}$	s	n	$\bar{x}$	s	n	$\bar{x}$	s
Business	39	5.1982	.96662	39	5.0810	1.0559	39	5.3141	1.0327
Education	47	5.0977	.79186	44	4.8872	.89490	44	5.2999	1.0321
Engineering	27	5.3960	.84330	27	5.2930	1.0648	27	5.5000	.88320
Liberal Arts	31	5.2056	1.0012	31	4.9942	1.2240	31	5.4153	.95164
Natural Science	36	5.1136	.79816	36	5.1865	.85802	35	5.0500	1.1766

While levels of OCB do not vary a great deal among disciplines and institutions, there were small differences found among respondents of the study. The institution labeled as Hi1 had the lowest overall OCB and OCB-O scores, while Lo3 had the lowest OCB-I scores. Engineering faculty and staff reported the highest levels of citizenship behaviors of all types. Education, on the other hand, reported the lowest overall OCB and OCB-I scores, while personnel in the natural science discipline reported the lowest OCB-O scores.

#### **Summary of the chapter.**

This chapter discussed the distribution of the survey and results of data analysis. Each research question was answered according to results of specific statistical tests. In research question one, it was found that faculty tended to exhibit more OCB-O behaviors than OCB-I behaviors. The most commonly cited performance indicator was the number of graduate committees served on while number of

undergraduate committees and curriculum committees received the least participation. Staff data showed that they exhibited higher levels of productivity and satisfaction than loyalty. Similar to faculty, staff had higher levels of OCB-O than OCB-I, albeit the differences were not as pronounced as with faculty. Correlations were calculated and significant relationships found between OCBs and number of presentations and number of other committees served on for faculty. Correlations for staff performance indicators revealed that OCBs are correlated with levels of satisfaction, loyalty, and productivity. ANOVA tests revealed that high-performing staff tended to report higher OCBs than low-performing faculty. Additional analysis showed that staff in low-performing institutions had higher OCB scores, on average, than faculty in low-performing institutions and staff in high-performing institutions. Finally, employees at institution Lo2 and employees in the engineering discipline across all institutions reported the highest levels of OCBs, respectively.

## Chapter 5

### Conclusion and Recommendations

#### Summary of the study.

The purpose for conducting the study was to describe OCBs in the higher education context, describe the relationships between OCBs and various aspects of faculty and staff performance, and explore the extent to which institutional leaders should be concerned with the OCBs of both faculty and professional staff. To address the purpose of the study, seven research questions were put forward that dealt with various aspects of the nature of the OCB and performance relationship. These questions were influenced by the organizational context of the study, that is, higher education. To this end, the questions on the survey that was distributed as well as the groupings of the responses received were done in such a way as to inform the practice of higher education and further understanding of the employment relationship for both faculty and staff.

Though higher education institutions have very unique characteristics that distinguish them from other types of organizations, at the core they are still groups of individuals coming together for a common purpose. The literature on industrial psychology and employee behavior speaks to a construct called organizational citizenship behaviors that furthers understanding of the employer/employee relationship (Organ, 1988). This concept has been studied to a great degree, but seldom examined within the context of higher education. OCBs have been shown to be linked with higher departmental performance (Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997), greater organizational performance (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Podsakoff, 2011), and individual performance (Ozer, 2011). Thus, value should be placed on understanding these behaviors further.

This study was an exploratory study in that the focus was on garnering a greater understanding on the prevalence of OCBs in higher education, their connection with various performance outcomes, and variances of OCB levels between differing groups. To accomplish this, the study utilized a quantitative approach with various statistical tests to determine significant findings. Eight institutions were included in the study (four high-performing and four low-performing) so that subjects could be grouped according to institutional performance. Subjects were also selected based on academic discipline. Although different

classifications of discipline exist, I utilized five categories: business, education, engineering, liberal arts, and natural science. From each of these disciplines, both faculty and staff were selected to participate.

The survey instrument was composed of various items regarding OCBs as well as performance indicators for both faculty and staff. The OCB items were the same for both faculty and staff and were taken from Lee and Allen's (2002) study. Measures of faculty performance were taken from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (U.S. Department of Education, 1999) and focused on areas of teaching, research, and service. The staff survey utilized different performance measures because of the nature of their work. These items were absenteeism (Johns, 2011), turnover intention (NSOPF), satisfaction (Messersmith, Patel, & Lepak, 2011), loyalty (Messersmith, Patel, & Lepak, 2011), and productivity (Kuvaas, 2006).

### **Conclusions.**

Based on the analysis of the data, several conclusions can be made regarding the nature of organizational citizenship behaviors in higher education:

1. Both faculty and staff tend to exhibit higher levels of citizenship behaviors directed toward the organization than behaviors directed towards individuals.
2. Correlation analyses revealed that, for faculty, overall OCB scores are positively correlated with the number of presentations given. OCB-Is are positively correlated with the number of student contact hours and OCB-Os are positively correlated with service on various committees. This also provides further evidence that OCB-I and OCB-O are highly related, but distinct facets of the OCB construct.
3. For staff, overall OCB levels are significantly, positively correlated with levels of satisfaction, loyalty, and productivity. OCB-I is positively correlated with productivity only and OCB-O is positively correlated with satisfaction, loyalty, and productivity.
4. High-performing staff exhibit higher levels of OCB and OCB-I than low-performing faculty. No statistically significant results arose from analyses of other groups.
5. Staff in low-performing institutions exhibit higher levels of OCB than both faculty in low-performing institutions and staff in high-performing institutions.
6. On average, staff tend to exhibit higher levels of OCBs than faculty.

7. Levels of OCB tend to vary across discipline and institution, regardless of institutional performance.

### **Recommendations.**

#### ***For practice***

Organizational citizenship behaviors are typically not overtly measured and tracked in organizations like other concepts such as loyalty or employee engagement. Yet, employees both exhibit and experience these behaviors on a frequent basis. It is also now understood that OCBs do have an impact on individuals, work groups, and organizations, albeit sometimes indirectly. Given this relative importance to organizational performance, more attention should be given to understanding OCBs and their role in organizational effectiveness. Knowing how much (or how little) employees exhibit these behaviors can help administrators and staff leaders better understand the people that work for and with them.

This study has shown that OCBs often correlate positively with certain performance indicators for both faculty and staff. Much attention is given to motivating employees with the end goal of increasing output or performance. However, little attention is paid to the ancillary behaviors that lead to greater performance. Although OCBs do not directly contribute to performance measures, they can help provide a more productive environment where employees can thrive and feel connected. Certainly, leaders should have a firm grasp of their work cultures and environments as well as the behaviors that help build and maintain those environments. Knowing more about levels of OCBs in an organization, either through quantitative means or through anecdotal means, provides leaders with unspoken indicators of positive or negative trajectory.

As with any performance influencer, managers may be tempted to manipulate or encourage exhibition of OCBs with the end goal of increasing performance. However, this violates the very definition of the OCB construct. Knowing more about employee behaviors in the workplace is important, but attempting to control citizenship behaviors can be counterproductive. Instead, managers should focus on promoting higher levels of citizenship behaviors through other means such as increasing employee satisfaction or improving the quality of the leader-employee relationship.

For leaders in higher education, this study provides specific insights that may be helpful. First, it is important to note that this study shows that the employment relationship is clearly different for faculty and staff. Staff tend to have higher OCB levels than faculty, but this may be because of the nature of their work and how they accomplish goals. Yet, this difference should not go unnoticed. In fact, faculty and staff leaders alike should pay more attention to the various micro-cultures that may exist within their institution or college and how those may be impacting performance. Second, although an institution may be considered low-performing, its employees (specifically staff from this study's results) may still exhibit high levels of OCB. For institutional leaders, this indicates that there may be other ways in which OCB contributes to organizational success. However, caution should be taken in interpreting the relationship between OCBs and institutional performance as this study included only two specific indicators of institutional performance. Lastly, leaders should be aware that individuals might differ in their behaviors towards individuals versus their behaviors towards the organization.

#### ***For research***

OCBs have almost always been studied using quantitative methods. A recommendation for further exploration of the topic, especially as it pertains to higher education, is to conduct a study using qualitative methods. This would help provide rich information on how OCBs fit within the institutional environment and the view employees have of these behaviors in practice. Further, a qualitative study may help to tease out nuances of OCBs that may be different for higher education employees.

A second area of possible research may include replicating the study with other institutional types, according to mission and control. This study included only public universities that were considered top research schools. Further research may find differences in OCB levels depending upon institutional mission (such as a master's comprehensive university or community college) or institutional control (public versus private). Similarly, although this study examined differences in OCBs between specific institutions, to protect respondent anonymity, institutions were given pseudonyms. Because of this, specific conclusions could not be reached regarding possible reasons for institutional differences. However, institutions may vary by geographic region, size, and other factors that could make direct institutional comparisons important.

Another area of possible study would include analyzing OCB levels according to demographic data that may be specialized to higher education. For example, many studies have looked at differences between genders and race. However, a study on the higher education environment could examine differences between tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty. Length of employment or educational background may also be other variables to consider for further research. In that same vein, regression studies could be undertaken to select certain predictors of higher levels of OCBs.

Lastly, OCBs could be measured longitudinally to get a better understanding of whether these behaviors change over time and how. This may prove very useful for institutions that may be going through very difficult or large change processes or enrollment growth (or decline). Further, researchers may be interested in performing more experimental type studies with OCB levels. Although this might take considerable time and effort, the results could be very interesting.

### **Discussion.**

Organizational citizenship behaviors were described by Organ (1988) as one way of understanding the employer/employee relationship. Their impact on the organization has been seen time and time again in a variety of settings. Yet, managers often fail to recognize their significance (if they are even aware of the concept at all) to organizational development and effectiveness. Those responsible for organizational results should attempt a better understanding of these behaviors and how they relate to overall effectiveness.

Increased calls for higher education accountability put greater pressure on institutional leaders to ensure that the organization is performing as it should be. As this study has indicated, OCBs may play a role in helping individuals and organizations meet these performance expectations. By “lubricating the social machinery of the organization, reducing friction, and/or increasing efficiency,” (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997, p. 135) institutions begin to meet the higher expectations of the public, governments, and other stakeholders.

A theme furthered by this study is the notion that workplace behaviors differ for different groups of employees. Faculty and staff differ in their levels of OCBs. Disciplines and certain institutions also differ somewhat in this regard. The crux of the issue is that employees across the board are engaging in positive behaviors in different ways. While the present research does not predict whether certain

employees will engage in these behaviors, it does show that higher education employees indeed engage in them and levels of engagement vary.

In summary, the theoretical framework of the study suggested that employees contribute more to organizations that they feel also contributes to them. Social-exchange theory explains this interaction as taking place through various means, including extra-role contributions of employees like organizational citizenship behaviors. The behaviors that employees exhibit, in turn, contribute to the overall success of the organization. The findings of this study seem to support the notion that for higher education, OCBs do play a role in individual performance to some extent. However, higher OCBs may not directly contribute to the organization's perceived success. This suggests that, like in any organization, there are many other variables to consider when attributing success. Further, the difficulty in quantifying performance for a higher education institution may have bearing when measuring constructs such as OCBs.

#### **Summary of the chapter.**

This chapter provided several conclusions regarding the concept of organizational citizenship behavior in higher education, including the notion that OCB levels vary by institution, employment status, and discipline. Several recommendations were made both for practice and for further research. Lastly, this chapter included a discussion around OCBs in higher education.



## References

- Alexander, F. K. (2000). The changing face of accountability. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71 (4), 411-431.
- Allison, B. J., Voss, R. S., & Dryer, S. (2001). Student classroom and career success: The role of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Education for Business*, 76(5), 282-289.
- Alreck, P. L., & Settle, R. B. (1985). *The Survey Research Handbook*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How Colleges Work: The Cybernetics of Academic Organization and Leadership*. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Blakely, G. L., Andrews, M. C., & Moorman, R. H. (2005). The moderating effects of equity sensitivity on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 20(2), 259-273.
- Blakely, G., Andrews, M., & Fuller, J. (2003). Are chameleons good citizens? A longitudinal study of the relationship between self-monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 18(2), 131-144.
- Bogue, E. G. (1998). Quality assurance in higher education: The evolution of systems and design ideals. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 25(3), 7-18.
- Bragger, J., Rodriguez-Srednicki, O., Kutcher, E., Indovino, L., & Rosner, E. (2005). Work-family conflict, work-family culture, and organizational citizenship behavior among teachers. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 20(2), 303-324.
- Burke, J. (2003). Trends in higher education performance. *Journal of State Government*, 76(2), 23-24.
- Burton, J., Sablinski, C., & Sekiguchi, T. (2008). Linking justice, performance, and citizenship via leader-member exchange. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 23(1), 51-61.
- Carey, K. (2007, September-October). Truth without action: The myth of higher education accountability. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 39(5), pp. 24-29.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2011, December 1). *Classification Descriptions*. Retrieved from Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Website: <http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/>
- Caswell, B. (2009). Stimulating 'Lazy' Employees. *Canadian HR Reporter*, 22(2), 21.
- Chahal, H., & Mehta, S. (2010). Antecedents and consequences of organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB): A conceptual framework in reference to health care sector. *Journal of Services Research*, 10(2), 25-44.
- Chang, C., Johnson, R. E., & Yang, L. (2007). Emotional strain and organizational citizenship behaviours: A meta-analysis and review. *Work & Stress*, 21(4), 312-332.
- Chiaburu, D. S. (2007). From interactional justice to citizenship behaviors: Role enlargement or role discretion? *Social Justice Research*, 20(2), 207-227.
- Chiu, S., & Chen, H. (2005). Relationship between job characteristics and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediational role of job satisfaction. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 33(6), 523-540.
- Chiu, S., & Miao-Ching, T. (2006). Relationships among burnout, job involvement, and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Psychology*, 140(6), 517-530.

- Chughtai, A. A. (2008). Impact of job involvement on in-role job performance and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 9(2), 169-183.
- Creswell, J. (2008). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Deckop, J. R., McClendon, J. A., & Harris-Pereles, K. L. (1993). The effect of strike militancy intentions and general union attitudes on the organizational citizenship behavior of university faculty. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6(2), 85-97.
- Deluga, R. (1994). Supervisor trust building, leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67(4), 315-326.
- DiPaola, M. F., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). Organizational citizenship of faculty and achievement of high school students. *High School Journal*, 88(3), 35-44.
- Emmerik, I. H., Jawahar, I. M., & Stone, T. (2005). Associations among altruism, burnout dimensions, and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Work & Stress*, 19(1), 93-100.
- Fairweather, J. S. (2002). The mythologies of faculty productivity: Implications for institutional policy and decision making. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 26-48.
- Feather, N. T., & Rauter, K. A. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviours in relation to job status, job insecurity, organizational commitment and identification, job satisfaction and work values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(1), 81-94.
- Finkelstein, M. A., & Penner, L. A. (2004). Predicting organizational citizenship behavior: Integrating the functional and role identity approaches. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 32(4), 383-398.
- Giroux, H. A. (2001). Vocationalizing higher education: Schooling and the politics of corporate culture. In H. A. Giroux, & K. Myrsiades, *Beyond the Corporate University* (pp. 29-44). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Giroux, H. A., & Myrsiades, K. (2001). *Beyond the Corporate University*. (H. A. Giroux, & K. Myrsiades, Eds.) Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Goldberg, A. J., & Fleming, W. P. (2010). Cost-containment and cost-management strategies. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 55(5), 308-311.
- Gyekye, S. A., & Salminen, S. (2005). Are "good soldiers" safety conscious? An examination of the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and perception of workplace safety. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 33(8), 805-820.
- Hardre, P., & Cox, M. (2009). Evaluating faculty work: Expectations and standards of faculty performance in research universities. *Research Papers in Education*, 24(4), 383-419.
- Harvey, L., & Green, D. (1993). Defining quality. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 18(1), 9-26.
- Harvey, L., & Williams, J. (2010). Fifteen years of Quality in Higher Education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 16(1), 3-36.
- Huisman, J., & Currie, J. (2004). Accountability in higher education: Bridge over troubled water? *Higher Education*, 48(4), 529-551.
- Jimmieson, N. L., Hannam, R. L., & Yeo, G. B. (2010). Teacher organizational citizenship behaviours and job efficacy: Implications for student quality of school life. *British Journal of Psychology*, 101(3), 453-479.

- Johns, G. (2011). Attendance dynamics at work: The antecedents and correlates of presenteeism, absenteeism, and productivity loss. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16*(4), 483-500.
- Johnson, J., Truxillo, D. M., Erdogan, B., Bauer, T., & Hammer, L. (2009). Perceptions of overall fairness: Are effects on job performance moderated by leader-member exchange? *Human Performance, 22*(5), 432-449.
- Kansas State University. (2011, November 2). *Office of Affirmative Action*. Retrieved November 2, 2011 from Kansas State University web site: <http://www.k-state.edu/affact/Opportunities/unclass.htm>
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1992). The balanced scorecard: Measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review, 71*-79.
- Kelloway, E. K., Loughlin, C., Barling, J., & Nault, A. (2002). Self-reported counterproductive behaviors and organizational citizenship behaviors: Separate but related constructs. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment, 10*(1/2), 143-152.
- Kent, A., & Chelladurai, P. (2001). Perceived transformational leadership, organizational commitment and citizenship behavior: A case study in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sports Management, 15*(2), 135-160.
- Kickul, J., & Lester, S. W. (2001). Broken promises: Equity sensitivity as a moderator between psychological contract breach and employee attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 16*(2), 191-217.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17*(3), 253-266.
- Kuvaas, B. (2006). Work performance, affective commitment, and work motivation: The roles of pay administration and pay level. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 27*(3), 365-385.
- Lapierre, L. M., & Hackett, R. D. (2007). Trait conscientiousness, leader-member exchange, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour: A test of an integrative model. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 60*(3), 539-554.
- Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 131-142.
- 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*(1), 52-65.
- Liefner, I. (2003). Funding, resource allocation, and performance in higher education systems. *Higher Education, 46* (4), 469-489.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2011). Challenge-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational effectiveness: Do challenge-oriented behaviors really have an impact on the organization's bottom line? *Personnel Psychology (64)*, 559-592.
- McLendon, M. K., & Hearn, J. C. (2006). Called to account: Analyzing the origins and spread of the state performance-accountability policies for higher education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 28*(1), 1-24.
- Messersmith, J. G., Patel, P. C., & Lepak, D. P. (2011, July 25). Unlocking the black box: Exploring the link between high-performance work systems and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 1*-14.

- Miles, D. E., Borman, W. E., Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). Building an integrative model of extra role work behaviors: A comparison of counterproductive work behavior with organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, 10(1/2), 51-58.
- Moore, J. E., & Love, M. S. (2005). IT professionals as organizational citizens. *Communications of the ACM*, 48(6), 88-93.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-855.
- Moorman, R. H., & Harland, L. K. (2002). Temporary employees as good citizens: Factors influencing their OCB performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(2), 171-187.
- National Science Foundation. (2010, October 12). *WebCASPAR*. Retrieved from WebCASPAR: Integrated Science and Engineering Resource Data System: <https://webcaspar.nsf.gov>
- Neuman, G. A., & Kickul, J. R. (1998). Organizational citizenship behaviors: Achievement orientation and personality. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 13(2), 263-279.
- Nichols, M. (2006, March). *Great employees make a great business*. Retrieved 2011 from Business Week Online: [http://www.businessweek.com/smallbiz/content/mar2006/sb20060331\\_447002.htm](http://www.businessweek.com/smallbiz/content/mar2006/sb20060331_447002.htm)
- Nishii, L. H., Lepak, D. P., & Schneider, B. (2008). Employee attributions of the "why" of HR practices: Their effects on employee attitudes and behaviors, and customer satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 61, 503-545.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85-97.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W., & Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 135(3), 339-350.
- Ozer, M. (2011). A moderated mediation model of the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(6), 1328-1336.
- Penner, L. A., Midili, A. R., & Kegelmeyer, J. (1997). Beyond job attitudes: A personality and social psychology perspective on the causes of organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 111-131.
- 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.
- 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(2), 133-151.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31, 351-363.
- 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(2), 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.
- Rosen, E. D. (1993). *Improving Public Sector Productivity: Concepts and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rosenfeld, L. B., & Long, B. W. (1992). An evaluation system for measuring faculty performance. *Association Communication Administration Bulletin*, 79, 36-44.
- Sackett, P. R., Berry, C. M., Wiemann, S. A., & Laczo, R. M. (2006). Citizenship and counterproductive behavior: Clarifying relations between the two domains. *Human Performance*, 19(4), 441-464.
- Schappe, S. P. (1998). The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Psychology*, 132(3), 277-290.
- Serban, A. M. (1998). Precursors of performance funding. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 25(97), 15-24.
- Shafritz, J. M., Hyde, A. C., & Parkes, S. J. (2004). *Classics of Public Administration* (5th Edition ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Shin, J. C. (2010). Impacts of performance-based accountability on institutional performance in the U.S. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, 60(1), 47-68.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653-663.
- 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.
- Turnipseed, D., & Murkison, G. (2000). Good soldiers and their syndrome: Organizational citizenship behavior and the work environment. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 2(2), 281-303.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1999). *National Study of Postsecondary Faculty*. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Washington D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Umayal, K. P., & Suganthi, L. (2010). A strategic framework for managing higher educational institutions. *Advances in Management*, 3(10), 15-21.
- Vey, M. A., & Campbell, J. P. (2004). In-role or extra-role organizational citizenship behavior: Which are we measuring? *Human Performance*, 17(1), 119-135.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2006). Compulsory citizenship behavior: Theorizing some dark sides of the good soldier syndrome in organizations. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 36(1), 77-93.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2007). Redrawing the boundaries of OCB? An empirical examination of compulsory extra-role behavior in the workplace. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 21(3), 377-405.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E., & Angert, L. (2007). Goal setting theory, job feedback, and OCB: Lessons from a longitudinal study. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 29(2), 119-128.
- Walz, S. M., & Niehoff, B. P. (1996). Organizational citizenship behaviors and their effect on organizational effectiveness in limited-menu restaurants. *Academy of Management best papers proceedings* (pp. 307-311). Briarcliff Manor, NY: Academy of Management.

- Washburn, J. (2005). *University Inc.: The Corporate Corruption of Higher Education*. New York: Basic Books.
- Whitman, D. S., Van Rooy, D. L., & Viswesvaran, C. (2010). Satisfaction, citizenship behaviors, and performance in work units: A meta-analysis of collective construct relations. *Personnel Psychology, 63*(1), 41-81.
- 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*(3), 601-618.
- Williams, S., Pitre, R., & Zainuba, M. (2002). Justice and organizational citizenship behavior intentions: Fair rewards versus fair treatment. *Journal of Social Psychology, 142*(1), 33-44.
- Yu, M. L., Hamid, S., Ijab, M. T., & Soo, H. P. (2009). The e-balanced scorecard (e-BSC) for measuring academic staff performance excellence. *Higher Education, 57*(6), 813-828.

**APPENDIX A**  
**FACULTY OCB AND PERFORMANCE SURVEY**

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

The purpose for conducting the study is to describe organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) in the higher education context, describe the relationships between OCBs and various aspects of faculty and staff performance, and explore the extent to which institutional leaders should be concerned with the OCBs of both faculty and professional staff.

The results of the study may help leaders and administrators in higher education further understand the nature of the employment relationship for faculty and staff. There are no risks associated with participating in this study.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you maintain the right to withdraw at any time. Only group data will be reported, and all individual responses will be held in strictest confidence. This survey should take you approximately ten minutes to complete.

Should you have questions about the study, please feel free to contact either Kevin Rose (XXXX@uark.edu; XXX-XXX-XXXX) or Dr. Michael Miller (mtmille@uark.edu; 479-575-3582) at the University of Arkansas. Questions may also be directed to the University of Arkansas Institutional Review Board Compliance Coordinator, Ro Windwalker (irb@uark.edu; 479-575-2208).

By clicking the 'proceed' button, you consent to participate in this study.



Below are a number of statements that describe behaviors individuals may engage in at work. Please indicate how often you engage in the following behaviors.

	Very seldom	Seldom	Somewhat seldom	The same	Somewhat often	Often	Very often
Help other who have been absent							
Willingly give your time to help others who have work-related problems							
Adjust your work schedule to accommodate other employees' requests for time off							
Go out of the way to make newer employees feel welcome in the work group							
Show genuine concern and courtesy toward coworkers, even under the most trying business or personal situations							
Give up time to help others who have work or non-work problems							
Assist others with their duties							
Share personal property with others to help their work							
Attend functions that are not required but that help the organizational image							
Keep up with developments in the organization							
Defend the organization when other employees criticize it							
Show pride when representing the organization in public							
Offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization							
Express loyalty toward the organization							
Take action to protect the organization from potential problems							
Demonstrate concern about the image of the organization							

The following questions ask about specific work activities. Please answer each question for the most recent calendar year. This would include the spring 2011, summer 2011, and fall 2011 academic terms.

How many refereed journal publications have had in the past year?

0

1-2

3-4

5-6

7 or more

How many conference presentations or workshops OR exhibitions or performances have you had in the past year?

0

1-2

3-4

5-6

7 or more

During the past year, how many undergraduate or graduate thesis or dissertation committees, comprehensive exams or orals committees, or examination or certification committees did you serve on or chair at your institution?

	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7 or more
Undergraduate thesis honors committees; comprehensive exams or orals committees; examination/certification committees					
<b>Graduate</b> thesis or dissertation committees; comprehensive exams or orals committees (other than as part of thesis/ dissertation committees); examination/certification committees					

During the past year, what was the total number of classes or sections you taught at your institution (not counting overload course instruction)?

- Do not include individualized instruction, such as independent study, individual performance classes, or working with individual students in a clinical or research setting.
- Count multiple sections of the same course as a separate class (e.g., if you taught Sociology 101 to two different groups of students during the term, count this as two separate classes).
- Count lab or discussion sections of a class as the same class (e.g., if you taught Biology 202 to a group of students during the term and the class consisted of a lecture two times a week, a lab one day a week, and a discussion section one day a week, count this work as one class).

0

1-2

3-4

5-6

7 or more

On average, how many contact hours per week did you spend with students you were assigned to advise?

0

1-2

3-4

5-6

7 or more

During the past year, how many times did you serve as a principal investigator (PI) or co-principal investigator (Co-PI) for any grants or contracts?

0

1-2

3-4

5-6

7 or more

What were the total number of grants/contracts from all sources over the previous year?

0

1-2

3-4

5-6

7 or more

During the past year, how many of the following types of administrative committees did you serve on at this institution? Include committees at the department or division level, the school or college level, and institution- and system-wide committees.

	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7 or more
Curriculum Committees					
Personnel Committees (e.g., search or recruitment committees)					
Governance Committees (e.g., faculty senate, student retention, budget, or admissions)					
Other					

During the next three years, how likely is it that you will leave this job either for employment at another institution, employment outside of higher education, or retirement from the labor force?

Very Unlikely

Unlikely

Somewhat Unlikely

Undecided

Somewhat Likely

Likely

Very Likely

**APPENDIX B**  
**STAFF OCB AND PERFORMANCE SURVEY**

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

The purpose for conducting the study is to describe organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) in the higher education context, describe the relationships between OCBs and various aspects of faculty and staff performance, and explore the extent to which institutional leaders should be concerned with the OCBs of both faculty and professional staff.

The results of the study may help leaders and administrators in higher education further understand the nature of the employment relationship for faculty and staff. There are no risks associated with participating in this study.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you maintain the right to withdraw at any time. Only group data will be reported, and all individual responses will be held in strictest confidence. This survey should take you approximately ten minutes to complete.

Should you have questions about the study, please feel free to contact either Kevin Rose (XXXX@uark.edu; XXX-XXX-XXXX) or Dr. Michael Miller (mtmille@uark.edu; 479-575-3582) at the University of Arkansas. Questions may also be directed to the University of Arkansas Institutional Review Board Compliance Coordinator, Ro Windwalker (irb@uark.edu; 479-575-2208).

By clicking the 'proceed' button, you consent to participate in this study.

Below are a number of statements that describe behaviors individuals may engage in at work. Please indicate how often you engage in the following behaviors.

	Very seldom	Seldom	Somewhat seldom	The same	Somewhat often	Often	Very often
Help other who have been absent							
Willingly give your time to help others who have work-related problems							
Adjust your work schedule to accommodate other employees' requests for time off							
Go out of the way to make newer employees feel welcome in the work group							
Show genuine concern and courtesy toward coworkers, even under the most trying business or personal situations							
Give up time to help others who have work or non-work problems							
Assist others with their duties							
Share personal property with others to help their work							
Attend functions that are not required but that help the organizational image							
Keep up with developments in the organization							
Defend the organization when other employees criticize it							
Show pride when representing the organization in public							
Offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization							
Express loyalty toward the organization							
Take action to protect the organization from potential problems							
Demonstrate concern about the image of the organization							

The following questions ask about specific work activities and attitudes. Please answer each question for the most recent calendar year. This would include the spring 2011, summer 2011, and fall 2011 academic terms.

How many days were you absent from work in the past year? This refers to absenteeism for any reason excluding vacations and scheduled days off.

0

1-2

3-4

5-6

7 or more

Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my department.							
I often put in extra effort in my work.							
In general, I don't like my job.							
I try to work as hard as possible.							
In general, I like working here.							
I give up time to help others who have work or non-work problems.							
The quality of my work is top-notch.							
I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this department.							
I often perform better than can be expected from me.							
I show genuine concern and courtesy toward coworkers, even under the most trying business or personal situations.							
All things considered, I feel pretty good about this job.							



I intentionally expend a great deal of effort.							
I almost always perform better than an acceptable level.							
This department has a great deal of personal meaning for me.							
I would be happy to spend the rest of my career in this department.							

During the next three years, how likely is it that you will leave this job either for employment at another institution, employment outside of higher education, or retirement from the labor force?

Very Unlikely

Unlikely

Somewhat Unlikely

Undecided

Somewhat Likely

Likely

Very Likely

**APPENDIX C**  
**IRB APPROVAL LETTER**



*Office of Research Compliance  
Institutional Review Board*

February 14, 2012

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Kevin Rose  
Michael Miller

**FROM:** Ro Windwalker  
IRB Coordinator

**RE:** New Protocol Approval

**IRB Protocol #:** 12-02-467

**Protocol Title:** *Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Higher Education:  
Examining the Relationships between OCB and Performance  
Outcomes for Individuals and Institutions*

**Review Type:**  EXEMPT  EXPEDITED  FULL IRB

**Approved Project Period:** Start Date: 02/14/2012 Expiration Date: 02/13/2012

Your protocol has been approved by the IRB. Protocols are approved for a maximum period of one year. If you wish to continue the project past the approved project period (see above), you must submit a request, using the form *Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects*, prior to the expiration date. This form is available from the IRB Coordinator or on the Research Compliance website (<http://vpred.uark.edu/210.php>). As a courtesy, you will be sent a reminder two months in advance of that date. However, failure to receive a reminder does not negate your obligation to make the request in sufficient time for review and approval. Federal regulations prohibit retroactive approval of continuation. Failure to receive approval to continue the project prior to the expiration date will result in Termination of the protocol approval. The IRB Coordinator can give you guidance on submission times.

This protocol has been approved for 400 participants. If you wish to make any modifications in the approved protocol, including enrolling more than this number, you must seek approval *prior to* implementing those changes. All modifications should be requested in writing (email is acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact me at 210 Administration Building, 5-2208, or [irb@uark.edu](mailto:irb@uark.edu).

210 Administration Building • 1 University of Arkansas • Fayetteville, AR 72701  
Voice (479) 575-2208 • Fax (479) 575-3846 • Email [irb@uark.edu](mailto:irb@uark.edu)

*The University of Arkansas is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution.*

**APPENDIX D**  
**SURVEY COVER LETTER**

Hello:

My name is Kevin Rose and I am a current doctoral student at the University of Arkansas. I am completing my dissertation in Workforce Development Education.

You have been selected as a participant for my research study. If you are willing to complete this survey, please click here or copy and paste this URL into your browser:  
[https://uark.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV\\_1LEiZX01117GoCw&](https://uark.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_1LEiZX01117GoCw&)

The purpose for conducting the study is to describe organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) in the higher education context, describe the relationships between OCBs and various aspects of faculty and staff performance, and explore the extent to which institutional leaders should be concerned with the OCBs of both faculty and professional staff.

The results of the study may help leaders and administrators in higher education further understand the nature of the employment relationship for faculty and staff. There are no risks associated with participating in this study.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you maintain the right to withdraw at any time. Only group data will be reported, and all individual responses will be held in strictest confidence. This survey should take you approximately ten minutes to complete.

Please respond by February 29, 2012.

Should you have questions about the study, please feel free to contact either Kevin Rose (XXXX@uark.edu; XXX-XXX-XXXX) or Dr. Michael Miller (mtmille@uark.edu; 479-575-3582) at the University of Arkansas. Questions may also be directed to the University of Arkansas Institutional Review Board Compliance Coordinator, Ro Windwalker (irb@uark.edu; 479-575-2208).

Thank you in advance for your help in completing my study.

Sincerely,

Kevin Rose

**APPENDIX E****TABLE 8: VARIABLE CORRELATIONS FOR FACULTY**

**Table 8***Variable Correlations for Faculty*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. OCB	1															
	-															
	74															
2. OCB-I	.835**	1														
	.000	-														
	74	75														
3. OCB-O	.839**	.402**	1													
	.000	.000	-													
	74	74	79													
4. Pubs.	.033	.081	-.044	1												
	.785	.495	.976	-												
	73	74	77	79												
5. Pres.	.255*	.164	.225*	.384**	1											
	.030	.162	.049	.000	-											
	73	74	77	79	79											
6. UComm.	.025	.173	-.135	.188	-.055	1										
	.843	.155	.260	.108	.640	-										
	68	69	72	74	74	74										
7. GComm.	.226	.161	.197	.407**	.392**	.191	1									
	.055	.169	.086	.000	.000	.103	-									
	73	74	77	79	79	74	79									
8. Classes	.100	-.008	.201	-.092	-.112	-.025	-.084	1								
	.398	.948	.080	.419	.326	.832	.463	-								
	73	74	77	79	79	74	79	79								
9. Hours	.226	.374**	.003	.276*	.381**	.301**	.394**	-.068	1							
	.056	.001	.977	.014	.001	.010	.000	.554	-							
	72	73	76	78	78	73	78	78	79							
10. PI	.014	-.029	.047	.378**	.250*	.147	.461**	-.261*	.269*	1						
	.909	.809	.687	.001	.027	.214	.000	.021	.018	-						
	72	73	76	78	78	73	78	78	77	79						

11. Grants	.087	.052	.091	.409**	.306**	.153	.433**	-.168	.182	.785**	1					
	.466	.658	.430	.000	.006	.194	.000	.138	.111	.000	-					
	73	74	77	79	79	74	79	79	78	78	79					
10. CComm.	.210	.144	.225	-.040	.130	-.061	.171	.240*	-.050	-.031	.006	1				
	.079	.228	.054	.729	.262	.610	.140	.037	.668	.793	.962	-				
	71	72	74	76	76	72	76	76	75	75	76	79				
11. GovComm	.229	.144	.240*	.121	.112	.153	.308**	.025	.227	.136	.165	-.007	1			
	.062	.242	.044	.310	.351	.209	.009	.836	.057	.257	.167	.956	-			
	67	68	71	72	72	69	72	72	71	71	72	70	79			
12. PComm.	.234	.108	.288*	.023	.046	.104	.188	.073	.145	.139	.162	.108	.185	1		
	.053	.373	.013	.847	.698	.387	.107	.534	.217	.238	.164	.366	.126	-		
	69	70	73	75	75	71	75	75	74	74	75	72	70	79		
13. OComm.	.261*	.100	.355**	.173	.063	.184	.486**	.029	.302*	.255*	.275*	-.006	.091	.284*	1	
	.042	.440	.004	.169	.619	.156	.000	.821	.014	.040	.027	.964	.484	.024	-	
	61	62	63	65	65	61	65	65	65	65	65	63	61	63	79	
14. Turnover	-.072	-.066	-.029	-.249*	-.082	-.135	-.095	.026	-.124	-.103	-.053	-.110	-.214	-.062	-.201	1
	.545	.574	.803	.027	.473	.251	.406	.821	.280	.370	.642	.344	.071	.595	.109	-
	73	74	77	79	79	74	79	79	78	78	79	76	72	75	65	79