CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

Chapter Overview

This chapter summarizes the development of the dissertation survey instrument to test the predictive relationship linking differences in individual ideological orientation with variation in OCB. The empirical model was designed utilizing the theoretical model presented in chapter three. The survey data collection instrument was constructed from previously established constructs and survey question items designed to measure differences between individualist and communitarian ideological orientation for the independent variable, and OCB performance variation for the dependent variable. Applicable demographic and organizational context control variables were included. Development of the survey instrument consisted of two pretest data collections using undergraduate business student samples. The final dissertation survey was designed after the second pretest, with additional refinements after a pretest using MBA students.

Formal research hypotheses are stated concerning the proposed predictive relationship between differences in individualist and communitarian ideological orientation and differences in OCB performance. Demographic and context control variables utilized in the survey are also specified.

The chapter closes with a description of the field sample characteristics and data collection methods. Survey respondent data was collected from 156 employees of a
high-tech aerospace and medical equipment manufacturer and from 159 full-time employees working for an assortment of companies. This second part of the field sample was composed of working adults enrolled in MBA evening programs. Assurances of data confidentiality and respondent anonymity were given and honored with all respondents. Overall response rate was 77.5 percent. The 315 responses from full-time working employees provided the survey data for testing the dissertation study’s empirical model.

**EMPIRICAL MODEL AND SURVEY INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT**

I began with an empirical model illustrating a proposed relationship between that stronger communitarian ideological orientation would predict greater amounts of OCB performance. A survey instrument was designed and developed to test the empirical model. The following table illustrates the steps involved in the design and development of the survey instrument using student samples, and the collection of the dissertation survey test data from working adults.
Steps in Survey Instrument Development and Field Test Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Testing</th>
<th>Respondent Characteristics</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Pretest Studies: (April 1996 - October 1997)</td>
<td>Pretest #1 Business Student Undergraduates</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest #2 Business Student Undergraduates</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest #3 Evening MBA Graduate Students</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pretest Respondent’s Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>639</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science-Tech Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult Employees in Evening MBA Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Field Test Respondent’s Total:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Survey Respondents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HYPOTHESES

This study proposes and tests a predictive relationship between stronger communitarian ideological orientation and greater amounts of OCB performance.

Hypotheses

_Hypothesis 1:_ There will be a significant and positive predictive relationship between stronger communitarian ideological orientation variables and greater amounts of OCB.

_Hypothesis 2:_ After controlling for (1) demographic variables and (2) organizational context variables, there will be a significant and positive predictive relationship between stronger communitarian ideological orientation variables and greater amounts of OCB.
CONTROL VARIABLES

The final dissertation survey form utilized six control variables consisting of gender, age, education, organizational tenure, job satisfaction, and organizational emphasis on teamwork. Gender was particularly important to measure because Van Dyne et al. (1995) reported that in a summary of published extra-role behavior studies approximately one-half consisted of samples where females represented more than 70% of the sample. Eagly and Crowley (1986) reported a meta-analysis study on the positive relationship of gender and helping behaviors.

Models of human development (Erickson, 1965) have proposed a relationship between age and helping behavior. Erickson suggested that people over 40 years old may be more likely to accept the role of mentor for assisting younger people. Organizational tenure and educational level were both included as control variables because they may contribute predictive influences on OCB variation.

Job satisfaction was included because the OCB concept originated with Organ’s (1977) theoretical attempts to find an explanation justifying the apparently weak empirical relationship between job satisfaction and work productivity. He proposed the concept that became OCB as a mediating variable influenced by greater levels of job satisfaction. Employer organization emphasis on teamwork was included in the survey instrument to account for organization’s teamwork orientation that could influence individual orientations toward cooperative behaviors and OCB.
SURVEY SAMPLE

Aerospace and Medical Equipment Manufacturer

The company I utilized described itself as “an advanced technology organization with unique engineering and manufacturing capabilities at each of its operations”. It designs and produces high-tech rotary motion and control devices for aerospace and avionics instruments, as well as precision military and medical equipment.

The company had 621 employees working in two locations approximately eight miles apart. Male and female employees were approximately equally distributed (303/318). Employee average age was 42 and average tenure was 14 years. This firm has had no employee layoffs and long history of stable employment.

The respondent sample of 156 employees out of the total 621 employees represented a 25.1 percent sample of the target population. Representative sampling was conducted at both company locations, and survey responses were requested from a normal range of employees including production workers, highly trained technicians, and personnel from company sales, engineering, and administration. Confidentiality of employee identity and data was emphasized and respected. The response rate was 80.8 percent.

Adult Employees Enrolled in Evening MBA Programs

Given that the respondents were all employed by an organization that strongly emphasized teamwork, I wanted to control for this moderating variable with a sample of respondents that included employees working in a range of organizations with a variety
of team emphasis environments. Survey were administered and responses received from working adult employees enrolled in evening MBA programs at the Washington D.C. campuses of Virginia Tech and American University, and at the Penn State University’s Great Valley campus near Philadelphia. The response rate from these organizational employees enrolled in evening MBA programs was 74.3 percent. Students who were not full-time employees were instructed not to respond to the survey. Total response rate for the field study survey was 77.5 percent.

SUMMARY

A total of 954 respondents contributed to this research study during the course of three pretests and the field study. Statistical analysis and results from the 315 survey respondents are presented in chapter five.
Chapter Overview

Psychometric properties of the ideological orientation and OCB survey scales are examined. Descriptive statistics and correlation coefficients for independent, dependent, and control variables are presented. Regression analysis calculations are performed to test the prediction that stronger communitarian ideological orientation variables are related to greater amount of OCB (Stevens, 1992). Hierarchical regression analysis is utilized in order to systematically control for demographic and organizational context variables (Van Dyne and Ang, 1998; Wagner, 1995). Statistically significant results are reported.

PSYCHOMETRIC CHARACTERISTICS OF VARIABLES

Ideological Orientation and OCB Scale Psychometric Analysis

Survey responses to the ideological orientation scale questions from 315 organizational employees were analyzed with exploratory factor analysis. The general purpose of factor analysis is to reduce and summarize study data into a smaller number of dimensions through explaining interrelationships among survey items (Hair et al, 1992). I employed factor analysis to discover to what extent the empirical study data fit
the expected theoretical and empirical model construct dimensions for ideological orientation.

The factor loadings presented in the factor matrix table describe the correlation between each factor and the variable items that constitute that factor. Hair et al. (1992: 224) stated that: “Squared factor loadings indicate what percentage of the variance in an original variable is explained by a factor”. Pedhazur and Schmelkin’s (1991) emphasized that factor analysis calculations should only be performed in pursuit of a clear theoretical perspective and model. The factor analysis calculations employed an orthogonal factor rotation.

Statistical Table 1: Ideological Orientation Factor Structure Matrix

Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideological Orientation Items</th>
<th>Self Fulfillment</th>
<th>Government Welfare Role</th>
<th>Deleted 3rd Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideology12</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology5</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td></td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology4</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td></td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology3</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td></td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology6</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>-.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology7</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Cross-loadings shown if > .10
2. Items deleted if factor cross-loadings > .30
3. The third ideological factor labeled consideration deleted because only two items possessed cross-loadings < .30.
Factor reliability refers to the degree that factor scale scores are free of item or component measurement errors. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient calculation is used to estimate the internal consistency factor reliability, which estimates the reliability of each item in relation to its underlying factor (Pedhazur and Schmelkin, 1991). Results of these calculations are presented in Statistical Table 2 below.

**Statistical Table 2: Cronbach’s alpha Reliability Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Item N</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideological Orientation Factors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Fulfillment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Role in Welfare</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND CORRELATIONS**

Statistical Table 3 reports the descriptive statistics of the field sample data consisting of the variable means, standard deviations, and correlations.
### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. OCB</td>
<td>101.69</td>
<td>10.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self Fulfillment</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Government role</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gender</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Age</td>
<td>34.57</td>
<td>9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Education</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tenure</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Team Emphasis</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. OCB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self Fulfillment</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Government role</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gender</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Age</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Education</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.31***</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tenure</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.22***</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Team Emphasis</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* p < .05  
**p < .01
***p < .001
Multiple linear regression analysis calculations were performed to test the two hypotheses. Results are presented in the next section.

RESULTS OF LINEAR REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF HYPOTHESIZED RELATIONSHIPS

The prevalent approach to multiple linear regression analysis consists of “primarily a generalized search process across all possible combinations of independent variables” (Hair et al., 1992:58). Using this method of regression analysis in support of Hypothesis 1, the two communitarian ideological dimensions of self fulfillment and proper government role in welfare demonstrated a statistically significant (F = 3.42, p < .034) coefficient of determination or $R^2$ of 2.5 percent predictive variance for OCB.

Utilizing a one-step regression analysis method, as in the model supporting Hypothesis 1, does not adequately partition the control variable influences on the dependent variables. Finer-grained partitioning of multiple linear regression models can more specifically explain the effects of independent and control variable influences on dependent variables. A multiple step hierarchical regression analysis provides more specific regression information that can result in increased understanding of the predictive relationships between the independent and control variables on the dependent variables (Chatman, Plzer, Barsade, and Neale, 1998; Van Dyne and Ang, 1998; Wagner, 1995).
Description of Hierarchical Regression Analysis Method

I tested the study’s hypotheses with a multiple linear hierarchical regression analysis method employing a three-step calculation model. Demographic control variables were entered in step 1, organization context control variables were entered in step 2, and communitarian ideological orientation independent variables were entered in step 3. Multiple regression testing was performed at each hierarchical step.

Step one controlled for the effects of exogenous demographic variables consisting of gender, age, and education. Step two of the hierarchical regression calculations controlled for the effects of the organizational context variables of organization tenure, job satisfaction, and organization emphasis on teamwork over emphasis on individualist efforts. Ideological orientation was directly tested in the third step with the two empirical ideology dimensions of self fulfillment sources and proper government role in welfare role calculated.
Hypothesis 2 was supported by hierarchical regression results summarized in Table 4. The exogenous demographic variables and organization context variables were controlled in the first two steps. Demographic variables results were at a significant level (F = 2.92, p < .05) with a $R^2$ value of 3.2 percent in step one. Organization context variables contributed an additional $R^2$ value of 19.4 percent in step two, resulting in total $R^2$ value of 22.6 percent at a level of significance of $F = 12.40, p < .001$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.92*</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender, Age, Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.40***</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>Organization tenure, Job satisfaction, Organization team emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.75***</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>Self fulfillment, Government role in welfare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  
* $p < .05$  
** $p < .01$  
*** $p < .001$
The addition of communitarian ideological variables at step 3 of the regression analysis for OCB demonstrated significance ($F = 9.75, p < .001$). The increase in the $R^2$ value with the ideological orientation variables entered in step 3 predicted 1.3 percent of the variance in OCB. Overall, all three steps of the regression model represented a total of 23.9 percent predictive variance for OCB performance. Both Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 were supported by the data analysis.

**SUMMARY**

This chapter presented statistical results of the empirical study data. Psychometric characteristics of the ideological and OCB variables were presented in both text and statistical tables. Factor analysis and reliability analysis results were reported. Descriptive statistics with means, standard deviations, and correlations were presented. Justification and explanation of a simple one-step linear regression model was presented, as well as the results of a three-step hierarchical regression model. Further discussion of the regression model results will be presented in chapter six. The final chapter will examine and discuss the study’s purpose and empirical results, study conclusions, implications for theory building and managerial applications, limitations of the study, and close with recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter Overview

The study’s theoretical perspective, justification and purpose are stated and results from regression analysis calculations are discussed. Study findings support the existence of communitarian ideological orientations in the values and beliefs of organizational employees. Limitations of the study are discussed, including difficulties in the specification of constructs and in measuring organizational citizenship and communitarian compared to individualist ideological orientation. Implications for organizational citizenship theory and managerial applications are considered. The dissertation closes with specific recommendations for future research.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

This study was designed to investigate the predictive relationship stronger communitarian ideological orientation on greater amounts of OCB. The study explores new theoretical and empirical research topics with explicit linkages examined and discussed concerning relationships between political, social, and organizational citizenship activities.

Results of the empirical field study indicate that some American employees hold communitarian ideological orientations. In the methods chapter I explained that the
survey utilized a semantic differential response format for distinguishing a respondent’s ideological orientation along a continuum of strong individualists to strong communitarians. This method was employed because American’s tend to support ideas that are both individualist and communitarian, tending to result in a lack of clear variations in values and beliefs. My study was intentionally designed to require survey respondents to make a series of normative value and belief decisions between alternatives along an ideological continuum. The six-point range included responses of strongly agree (6) with communitarian statements; agree (5) with communitarian statements; agree more with the communitarian statements (4) than the individualist statements; agree more with the individualist (3) statement than the communitarian one; agree (2) and strongly agree (1) with the individualist statements. I have illustrated in some detail the ideological orientation survey format in order to make clear the significance of the following statement about the survey results.

The mean survey responses regarding the three ideological orientation dimensions found the following results: Self fulfillment was reported with an item mean of 3.05 (agree more with the individualist ideological statement). Normative government role in welfare was reported with a mean of 3.28. Although the sample mean tended toward individualist ideological orientation responses, there were also responses that tended toward more communitarian ideological orientation responses.
Statistical results from the single-step linear regression analysis and the three-step hierarchical regression analysis calculations supported the study’s two hypotheses. The Hypothesis 1 model used a combination of ideological variables regressed on OCB variables. Results found a statistically significant $R^2$ of 2.5 percent ($p < .034$) between greater communitarian ideological orientations and increased amounts of OCB.

One could have concluded the statistical analysis at this point and declare that the study findings indicated significant and positive predictive results for a relationship between greater communitarian ideology and higher levels of OCB. However the demographic and organizational context variables also contributed to the OCB variance and needed to be controlled for. Hypothesis 2 used a three-step hierarchical regression analysis controlling for these variables. Results at step three reported in statistical table 4 found that ideological orientation contributed a $R^2$ of 1.3 percent ($p < .001$) to the OCB variance. It is important to note that communitarian ideological orientations do exist in contemporary American business organizations and that stronger communitarian values and beliefs do have a significant and positive predictive relationship with greater amounts of OCB performance.

**LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

All research studies have design and implementation limitations that attenuate their reliability, validity, and ability to engage in making generalizing statements. I discuss theoretical and empirical limitations of the present study in regards to problems
regarding OCB construct specificity and measurement, and the difficulties of measuring people’s communitarian compared to individualist ideological orientation.

**Concerns that Citizenship Behavior are Performed for External Rewards**

Some theorists argue that people who engage in extra-role actions in organizations do so for their own selfish reasons and objectives. The behavior may appear to be OCB, but the motivations are instrumental. For example, employees may reciprocate another’s help in ways that cause the recipient or manager to notice (Gouldner, 1960; Johnson, 1994). Blau suggested that “A worker may kindly help a newcomer and refuse any return offered because he wants to impress his supervisors or senior colleagues” (1964: 105). Furthermore, linking OCB and specific individual rewards is a complex issue because

Over time, a steady stream of OCB of different types…could well determine the impression that an individual makes on a supervisor or on coworkers. That impression, in turn, could influence the recommendation by the boss for a salary increase or promotion. The important issue here is that such returns not be contractually guaranteed by any specific policies and procedures, that they be at best probabilistic in nature, uncertain of attainment, and at most an inference on the part of the individual who contemplates such returns (Organ, 1988: 5).

The above perceptions suggest more instrumental and certainly individualist reasons for engaging in OCB. Nevertheless, while supervisors and managers would notice certain specific citizenship behaviors that were performed as impression
influence behaviors (Bolino, 1997; Johnson, 1994), OCB researchers have argued that
other OCB activities are performed without supervisory notice, though perhaps for
individual intrinsic reasons (Cardona, Lawrence, & Bentler, 1997; Penner, Midili, &
Kegelmeyer, 1997; Pond, Nacoste, Mohr, & Rodriguez, 1997). Intrinsic reasons for
performing OCB may include alignment with an individual's normative ideology.

Bolino (1999) recently proposed a theoretical framework where OCB may
constitute self-serving impression management activities for selfish reasons. He argues
that some OCB may be more 'looking good' rather than 'doing good' for the
organization. Bolino (1999: 83) re-evaluated OCB from the perspective of impression
management researchers, suggesting that “unless the motive behind citizenship is
revealed, in some cases impression-management behaviors may mistakenly be coded
as citizenship (Schnake, 1991). Bolino (1999) argued for investigating the personal
motivations underlying OCB.

The present study did examine underlying motivations by investigating normative
values and beliefs that may predict greater or less amounts of OCB. Furthermore,
Bolino (1999) suggested that there is also exists the possibility that organizational
researchers may reverse the motivation attribution process and mis-code OCB as
impression management activities.

Calculated anticipation of individual rewards does not appear to be a sufficient
explanation for the range and depth of observed multi-dimensional OCB performance.
There are a number of possible explanations for an individual to act in a generous or
helpful manner in an organizational work environment. These could include the
influence of social transactions, either with a direct return expected, or a form of indirect
return, or in fact no direct return anticipated or desired. For example, Monroe described the altruism dimension of OCB with her definition of “altruism as behavior intended to benefit another, even when this risks possible sacrifice to the welfare of the actor” (1996: 6). There is need for additional research studies to investigate underlying motivations for OCB.

Concerns that People Combine Individualist and Communitarian Ideas

One of the most problematic issues in this dissertation is that Americans simultaneously possess ideological values and beliefs that combine in varying amounts the basic premises of individualist and communitarian ideological orientations. This observation echoes Tocqueville’s observations that there existed in America two political and social languages. The primary dominate rhetoric of individualism, and the second vital language and rhetoric of community and the collective good. Thus it is difficult for researchers to pin people down on the individualism versus communitarian continuum of normative values and beliefs.

An example of this issue was reported in the Washington Post on September 11 and October 4-5, 1998. A study conducted for the Washington Post, the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, and Harvard University was based on random telephone interviews with 2,025 adults between July 29-August 18, 1998, with a margin of error of plus or minus 2.18 percent. This survey found “Americans often hold what may seem like conflicting views on values-based issues” (Balz, October 5, 1998: A1). The article went on to state that the survey revealed: the clash of values that confronts politicians at every level of government, often leading to seemingly conflicting messages, …Politicians bash big government as they align themselves with popular spending programs. They prize rugged individualism while holding that people should look out for one another. They assert a right of privacy while defending community standards of decency.


Directly addressing the individualist and communitarian ideological orientation issues that are examined and analyzed in my dissertation study, the Washington Post/Kaiser/Harvard survey summed up their study’s results about value issues by stating:
Americans believe simultaneously in compassion and in the power of the individual. More than two in three [72 percent] agreed that “most people who don’t get ahead should not blame the system, they have only themselves to blame”. But two in three [66 percent] also said they agreed that most people are poor “because circumstances beyond their control”, not because they don’t work hard enough (Balz, 1998:A1).

The quotes from this survey help bring into focus the intense difficulties for research studies such as mine that probe people’s values and beliefs regarding individualist and communitarian priorities. Well-designed research must maneuver through the reality of American value conflicts. The Washington Post/Kaiser/Harvard survey report concluded with the observation that politicians and social commentators often state “one set of values against another set as if the twain shall never meet, when for regular people, the twain meet all the time” (Balz, 1998: A1).

Given the proceeding concerns and limitations in the investigation of OCB and individualist versus communitarian ideological orientations, there exists much to commend in the present dissertation study. New theoretical and empirical relationships were inaugurated, a study was designed, a survey instrument constructed, data was gathered in the field, and statistically significant and positive results were found utilizing multiple regression analysis calculations.

IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT THEORY AND APPLICATION

This study provided a first step in the development of a theoretical and empirical approach to utilizing ideological orientation to explain and predict OCB. The study moves OCB research investigations beyond demographic, psychological, and organizational attitude variables to a closer examination of people’s individualist compared to communitarian values and beliefs concerning the normative social contract.
Implications for further theoretical development include the realization that organizational employees may bring substantial normative values and beliefs that effect their behavior in cooperative and extra-role situations. Some implications for broader social theory were suggested by Sampson’s (1978) criticism regarding the taken-for-granted individualist presumptions of most social psychology and organizational behavior research. He asserted that an entirely individualist view results in ignoring or deleting from ‘normal science’ research those human behavior that are more cooperative and communitarian. The present study serves to underscore the importance of allowing more cooperative and communitarian values, beliefs, and behaviors into social science research designs and studies. Wagner suggested the need for “the development of a more balanced stream of research on cooperation” (1995: 168) that would include the effects and consequences of a more communitarian perspective on organizational cooperation, OCB, and teamwork issues.

Practical managerial applications from the statistical results and findings of this study include potential contributions to human resource selection and hiring, orientation, training, performance evaluation, compensation and rewards, and decisions regarding position promotion or termination. Further implications include considering the effects of greater amounts of individualist or communitarian ideological orientation on issues of developing and maintaining organizational environments that promote teamwork, in particular the management and support of self-managed work teams. Also issues of employee-employee and employee-manager ‘fit’ may be reconsidered in terms of distinctions in individualist compared to communitarian normative values and beliefs regarding the social contract that influence organizational work performance. These
issues may become more important as organizations demand more employee teamwork and cooperative activities to help attain competitive advantage.

**STUDY CONCLUSION**

This dissertation study endeavored to develop a theoretical and empirical framework for constructing a viable perspective to understand how greater amounts and types of OCB performance could be based on a social contract perspective utilizing political philosophy and theory. I empirically tested whether differences in organizational employees’ ideological orientation perspectives have direct and interaction effects on variation in OCB.

There are several notable strengths of this study. Conceptualization of the study’s relationships is based on established theoretical foundations concerning cooperation and social contract theory. The proposed construct dimensions for ideological orientation and OCB are based on theory rather than ad hoc empirical findings.

Another strength of the study is the extensive developmental work performed on the survey question items and dimensions in preparation for conducting a field study with business organizations. Development testing data from 639 students and cross-validation field data from 315 employee respondents served to support the reliability and convergent validity characteristics of the statistical results and study conclusions.

A third strength of this dissertation study is that the turn to social contract theory and the normative values and beliefs embedded in individualist compared to communitarian ideological orientation produce a vigorous and more diverse perspective
concerning the presumptions and antecedents to organizational citizenship behavior. What emerges from the rather sterile ‘good soldier’ orientation of the first OCB developmental phase construct research is a more interesting construct based on political theory. The combination of Van Dyne et al.’s (1994) second phase OCB constructs and the social contract perspective together provide a basis to design subsequent studies to explore and further understand antecedents and organizational performance consequences of OCB.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

My suggestions concerning future research projects consist of two paths. The first involves ideas for improving the present study regarding the relationship between communitarian ideology and increased amounts and types of OCB. The second recommendation concerns the application of social capital theory to better understand relationships between ideological orientation, OCB, and the ideas and premises embedded in social capital theory.

Recommendations for Improvement of Current Study

Several improvements in the survey instrument and research design would help subsequent empirical research on the study’s relationships. Development work is necessary to write and pretest new question items to increase the factor analysis results with greater factor eigenvalues, item component variance explained, factor loading values, and factor reliability. I would suggest that the ideological and the OCB constructs should have additional valid and reliable question items, which would
improve the psychometric characteristics of the survey instrument and help increase regression analysis statistical significance and predictive effects.

An improved research instrument and design would be applied to a larger number of employees in a diverse variety of organizations to test how well one can generalize the present study’s results. My study was a preliminary investigation into the relationship between ideological orientation and OCB performance.

**Recommendations for Investigating Social Capital Theory and OCB**

Recently published ideas concerning social capital theory suggest a promising conceptual direction for future research on OCB. I think that ideas regarding the concept of social capital may be more comprehensible when viewed as embedded within the broader domain of the dialog between individualist and communitarian social contract theory. Also social capital utilizes a more contemporary sociological and economic language that might be more acceptable to organizational theorists and practicing managers.

The concept of social capital – networks of social relationships and norms that influence the success of organizational entities through the behavior of individuals (Putman, 1993, 1995) captures an empirical sense of the importance of community attachments for economic success. In addition, the concept of social capital reflects networks of civic participation that allow people to work and cooperate for mutual benefit (Coleman, 1988, 1990; Portes, 1995) and includes “the ability to command scarce resources by virtue of membership in networks or broader social structures” (Portes, 1995: 257).
Given that the concept of social capital is ill defined at present, utilization of a social contract framework may help clarify the various strands of social capital theory as described by sociology, economics, and political science. Current conceptions of social capital theory include a range of perspectives from rational choice individualism (Coleman, 1990, 1996) to a more communitarian perspective (Granovetter, 1988/1992; Portes & Landolt, 1996). Coleman is generally viewed as the creator of social capital, providing a rational choice individualist foundation. Yet Granovetter (1985) suggested a more communitarian perspective when he said that by understanding how economic activities are embedded in social structures, these activities might be better understood rather than by using traditional individualist economic perspectives.

I propose that social capital theory can be incorporated in future research on variation in OCB performance within the larger conceptual framework of social contract theory presented previously in chapter three of this dissertation. Theoretical and empirical relationships could be explored concerning relationships between individuals with access to greater amounts of social capital and their levels of OCB performance.

SUMMARY

The relationship of organizational citizenship behavior to normative values and beliefs about priorities between individual pursuits compared to pursuits for the common good are at the foundation of many of our contemporary problems and opportunities in politics, society, and organizations. I believe that this dissertation study and future organizational research building on this study’s perspective can help people working within organizations understand the tensions between the integrity and creativity of the individualist ideological orientation combined with the integration and humanity of the
communitarian ideological orientation. Perhaps there is a need for stronger communitarian connections in order for people to be fully independent individuals. Through understanding the positive characteristics of both individualist and communitarian ideological orientations, we may improve the probabilities of our political, social, and organizational survival.
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Table 1: Organizational Citizenship Behavior Research Studies
—Nature and Antecedents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHORS</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>ANTECEDENTS</th>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Organ, &amp; Near</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bateman &amp; Organ</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams et al.</td>
<td>1986*</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>1986*</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosier &amp; Dalton</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avila et al.</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ &amp; Konovsky</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podsakoff et al.</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham &amp; Verma</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karambayya</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorman</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie et al.</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearce &amp; Gregersen</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schnake</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witt</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>1992*</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podsakoff &amp; MacKenzie</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorman</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podsakoff et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shore &amp; Wayne</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Year** * = Unpublished paper  
**#** = Sample size  
**Meta** = Meta-Analysis of Previous Studies and Theoretical Comments and Proposals

**Description of the 10 OCB Factors:** Study Used Factor If Indicated by “X”

1. Conscientiousness
2. Sportsmanship
3. Courtesy
4. Civic Virtue
5. Obedience
6. Altruism
7. Loyalty
8. Social Participation
9. Advocacy Participation
10. Functional Participation
Table 1 (Page 2): Organizational Citizenship Behavior Research Studies —Nature and Antecedents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHORS</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>ANTECEDENTS</th>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolon</td>
<td>1993*</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eskew</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tansky</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorman et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bies et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folger</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenberg</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidder &amp; McLean Parks</td>
<td>1993*</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podsakoff &amp; MacKenzie</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schnake et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becker &amp; Randall</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deluga</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastman</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui, Organ, &amp; Crooker</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>1994*</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konovsky &amp; Pugh</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manogran et al.</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Dyne, Graham, &amp; Dienesch</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barr &amp; Pawar</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ &amp; Ryan</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Year** * = Unpublished paper  
**#** = Sample size  
**Meta** = Meta-Analysis of Previous Studies and Theoretical Comments and Proposals

**Description of the 10 OCB Factors:** Study Used Factor If Indicated by “X”

1. Conscientiousness  
2. Sportsmanship  
3. Courtesy  
4. Civic Virtue  
5. Obedience  
6. Altruism  
7. Loyalty  
8. Social Participation  
9. Advocacy Participation  
10. Functional Participation
Table 1 (Page 3): Organizational Citizenship Behavior Research Studies —Nature and Antecedents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHORS</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>ANTECEDENTS</th>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organ &amp; Lingl</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorman &amp; Blakely</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deluga</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris et al.</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>1995*</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson &amp; Williams</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirka &amp; Deckop</td>
<td>1996*</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konovsky &amp; Organ</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podsakoff et al.</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settoon &amp; Mossholder</td>
<td>1996*</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skarlicki &amp; Latham</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Dyne &amp; Ang</td>
<td>1996*</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltz &amp; Niehoff</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolino</td>
<td>1997*</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borman &amp; Motowido</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardona et al.</td>
<td>1997*</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crant &amp; Bateman</td>
<td>1997*</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamertz</td>
<td>1997*</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller &amp; Weiss</td>
<td>1997*</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motowido et al.</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Year * = Unpublished paper**  **# = Sample size**  **Meta = Meta-Analysis of Previous Studies and Theoretical Comments and Proposals**

**Description of the 10 OCB Factors:** Study Used Factor If Indicated by “X”

1. Conscientiousness
2. Sportsmanship
3. Courtesy
4. Civic Virtue
5. Obedience
6. Altruism
7. Loyalty
8. Social Participation
9. Advocacy Participation
10. Functional Participation
### Table 1 (Page 4): Organizational Citizenship Behavior Research Studies —Nature and Antecedents

#### Study Focuses on OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHORS</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>ANTECEDENTS</th>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organ</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penner et al.</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podsakoff &amp; MacKensie</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farh, Earley, &amp; Lin</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond et al.</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settoon &amp; Mossholder</td>
<td>1997*</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tompson &amp; Werner</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandenberg &amp; Taylor</td>
<td>1997*</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werner</td>
<td>1997*</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, Chen, &amp; Meindl</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Dyne &amp; LePine</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Dyne &amp; Ang</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’Intino</td>
<td>1999*</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Year ** = Unpublished paper  
**#** = Sample size  
**Meta** = Meta-Analysis of Previous Studies and Theoretical Comments and Proposals

#### Description of the 10 OCB Factors:

Study Used Factor If Indicated by “X”

1. Conscientiousness  
2. Sportsmanship  
3. Courtesy  
4. Civic Virtue  
5. Obedience  
6. Altruism  
7. Loyalty  
8. Social Participation  
9. Advocacy Participation  
10. Functional Participation
Robert S. D’Intino

Pennsylvania State University
Capital College
School of Business Administration
200 University Drive
Schuylkill Haven PA 17972-2208
Tel: (570) 385-6265

Home Address:
123 West Market Street
Orwigsburg PA 17961
(570) 366-6432
Email: rsd6@psu.edu

EDUCATION

Ph.D. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Management. May 1999

MBA University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Finance

A.B. University of California, Santa Cruz
Anthropology

DISSERTATION

A Social Contract Perspective on Organizational Citizenship Behavior
Chair: Jon M. Shepard. Pamplin Professor and Head, Department of Management

PUBLICATIONS


REFEREED PROCEEDINGS


REFEREED CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS


MANUSCRIPTS IN PROCESS


Analysis of Three Measures of Individualism in Relation to Organizational Citizenship.