

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Sharon Lynn Wagner entitled "An Investigation of Dispositional and Attitudinal Correlates and Self-Statement Motives of a Dimension of Organizational Citizenship Behavior." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Industrial/Organizational Psychology.

Michael C. Rush

Michael C. Rush, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

John W. Fryberg

Jayce E. A. Russell

Si M

William M. Jennings

Accepted for the Council:

Lawminkel

Vice Provost
and Dean of the Graduate School

AN INVESTIGATION OF DISPOSITIONAL AND ATTITUDINAL CORRELATES
AND SELF-STATED MOTIVES
OF A DIMENSION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Sharon Lynn Wagner

December 1989

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents, Leroy and Marcella Wagner. I will always be grateful for their love, support, and faith in my ability to succeed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to express my thanks to several individuals for their support and friendship during my years at the University of Tennessee. First, I would like to acknowledge the faculty members who gave of their time as members of my dissertation committee. In particular, thanks are due to Dr. Joyce Russell for her conscientiousness and accessibility during all stages of the dissertation process, to Dr. Eric Sundstrom for his suggestions on making the project more palatable to organizations, and to Dr. Bill Jennings for the applied perspective he brought to his position as adjunct member of the committee.

I would like to express special thanks to the last two members of my dissertation committee, Drs. Michael Rush and John Lounsbury. I consider myself fortunate to have had the opportunity to work closely with my chairperson, Dr. Mike Rush, in investigating a dissertation topic of great interest to us both. He has been extremely supportive and flexible in accommodating my schedule throughout the dissertation process. On this project and others, I have valued his emphasis on excellence, and his ability to think clearly and critically. I have also been privileged to work with Dr. John Lounsbury on several projects while completing my graduate work. I am thankful to him for being the first faculty member willing to

work with me on both academic and applied projects outside the scope of coursework, and for his continuing concern for my professional development.

In addition to the above individuals, I would like to express my thanks to Dr. Ray Noe for initially stimulating my interest in the field of I/O Psychology, to Dr. Tom Ladd, my first adviser, for welcoming me to the I/O program at UT, and for maintaining an "open door" policy throughout my years in the program, and to Drs. Pat Dyer, John Draper, Bill Jennings and Lucy Gibson, who afforded me opportunities to develop my professional skills through internship or consulting experiences. Thanks are also due to the many individuals in the organizational sample who took the time to complete my survey. At the administrative level, I would like to thank Gale Huffaker, Wayne Heatherly, and Betty and Dr. Oscar Fowler in this regard.

Due to the support and camaraderie of several friends, my graduate studies have been more enjoyable than they might have been. In particular, I have valued the friendship of Karin Fulton, whose emotional support and help with the pilot phase of the study were greatly appreciated. In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Warren Bobrow, Julie Davis, Jill George, Dee Hoffman, Charlotte Hubbard, Brad Jensen, and Doug Klippel for their friendship and support at various stages of the dissertation process.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their love and encouragement during the trials and tribulations of graduate school. I am grateful to my sister and brother, Linda and Ed, for their love and their ability to convince me not to take life so seriously, and to my parents, for providing me with a loving home in which I learned that anything is achievable.

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to examine some of the dispositional, attitudinal, and self-stated motivational correlates of Altruistic Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). It was hypothesized that individuals dispositionally characterized by a high interpersonal orientation and a high level of moral development may be more likely than their co-workers to exhibit Altruistic OCB. In addition, the attitudinal variables of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and interpersonal trust were hypothesized to have positive moderating effects on the expected relationships between the dispositional factors and Altruistic OCB. The relationships between the organizational context characteristics of job clarity and participative culture and Altruistic OCB were also examined. Motives for Altruistic OCB were inferred by statistically relating dispositional and attitudinal correlates to peer and self rated Altruistic OCB. Interviews of peer-nominated altruists were also conducted to further investigate self-stated motives for helping behaviors.

Participants were 185 individuals drawn from the personnel of two hospitals in the same southeastern city. The sample of respondents was comprised primarily of females, and was heterogeneous with respect to age, job title and

educational level. Data were collected via standardized questionnaire surveys completed by the respondents, and through structured interviews with 18 peer-nominated altruists.

Analyses of the data did not support the hypotheses that the dispositional factors of interpersonal orientation and moral development were related to peer or self rated Altruistic OCB. No support was found for the hypothesized moderating effects of the attitudinal factors on the relationships between the dispositional factors and Altruistic OCB. Job satisfaction and job clarity, however, were found to be positively and significantly related to peer rated Altruistic OCB, while pay satisfaction was negatively and significantly related to peer rated Altruistic OCB. Theoretical and practical implications of the study are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	4
Organizational Citizenship Behavior.....	4
The Dimensionality of the Construct.....	5
The Satisfaction--Performance Relationship.....	11
Motivational Bases for Altruistic OCB.....	12
Quantitative Assessment:	
Dispositional Factors.....	14
Interpersonal Orientation.....	14
Moral Development.....	16
Quantitative Assessment:	
Attitudinal Factors.....	19
Interpersonal Trust.....	20
Organizational Commitment.....	20
Pay Equity, Pay Satisfaction and Job Satisfaction.....	21
Quantitative Assessment:	
Organizational Context Factors.....	26
Job Clarity.....	27
Participative Organizational Culture..	28
Quantitative Assessment:	
A Procedural Issue.....	29
Qualitative Assessment.....	32
Summary of Hypotheses and Research Questions...	34
Hypothesis 1.....	34
Hypothesis 2.....	34
Hypothesis 3A.....	35
Hypothesis 3B.....	35
Hypothesis 4A.....	35
Hypothesis 4B.....	35
Hypothesis 5A.....	35
Hypothesis 5B.....	36
Hypothesis 6.....	36
Research Question 1.....	36
Research Question 2.....	36
3. METHODOLOGY.....	38
Overview.....	38

Participants.....	38
Procedure.....	39
Survey.....	39
Development.....	39
Administration.....	40
Interview.....	41
Measures.....	41
Peer Nomination.....	42
Peer Self/Rating.....	44
Interpersonal Orientation.....	45
Moral Development.....	49
Interpersonal Trust.....	50
Organizational Commitment.....	51
Pay Equity.....	51
Pay Satisfaction.....	54
Overall Job Satisfaction.....	55
Organizational Context Factors.....	55
Background Information.....	56
Interview Schedule.....	57
Analyses.....	57
Survey.....	57
Interview.....	61
Descriptive Information.....	61
Return Rates.....	61
Demographic Characteristics.....	62
4. RESULTS.....	67
Development and Psychometric Properties of Scales.....	67
Criteria.....	67
Predictors.....	74
Influence of Demographic Factors.....	77
Hypothesis Testing.....	80
Supplementary Analyses.....	98
Content Analysis.....	101
5. DISCUSSION.....	105
Initial Considerations.....	106
Hypothesized Relationships.....	109

Supplementary Findings.....	116
Qualitative Findings.....	121
Limitations of the Study.....	124
Theoretical and Practical Implications.....	128
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	134
APPENDICES.....	143
A: COVER LETTERS.....	144
B: SURVEY.....	149
C: DEFINING ISSUES TEST.....	158
D: RAW SCORE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR CRITERION ITEMS.....	162
E: INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG SELF-RATED ALTRUISTIC OCB SCALES AND VARIABLES OF INTEREST, AFTER CONTROLLING FOR THE EFFECTS OF HOSPITAL (SURVEY SAMPLE).....	164
F: ZERO-ORDER INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG ALTRUISTIC OCB SCALES AND VARIABLES OF INTEREST (TARGET SAMPLE).....	166
G: ZERO-ORDER INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG SELF-RATED ALTRUISTIC OCB SCALES AND VARIABLES OF INTEREST (SURVEY SAMPLE).....	168
H: ZERO-ORDER INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG STUDY VARIABLES OF INTEREST (WITHIN HOSPITAL 1 AND HOSPITAL 2).....	170
I: ANALYSIS OF MODERATED RELATIONSHIPS FOR SELF-RATED ALTRUISTIC OCB AS A FUNCTION OF INTERPERSONAL ORIENTATION, CONTROLLING FOR HOSPITAL.....	173
J: ANALYSIS OF MODERATED RELATIONSHIPS FOR ALTRUISTIC OCB AS A FUNCTION OF MORAL DEVELOPMENT, CONTROLLING FOR HOSPITAL.....	175
K: UNIQUE EFFECTS DERIVED FROM FULL MODEL REGRESSION OF PREDICTOR VARIABLES WITH ALTRUISTIC OCB.....	177

L: CASE REPORTS.....	179
VITA.....	212

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Return Rates of Distributed (N=759) Surveys.....	63
2. Frequency Counts for Discrete Demographic Variables.....	64
3. Descriptive Statistics for Continuous Demographic Variables.....	65
4. Orthogonal Factor Loadings for Principal Components Factor Analysis of Peer Rated and Self Rated Altruistic OCB Scales.....	69
5. Internal Consistency Reliability Estimates for the Peer Rated and Self Rated Altruistic OCB Scales.....	71
6. Descriptive Statistics for Criterion Items of Altruistic OCB.....	73
7. Descriptive Statistics for Predictor Variables of Interest.....	75
8. Peer and Self Rated Altruistic OCB as a Function of Recorded Demographic Variables.....	79
9. Intercorrelations Among Altruistic OCB Scales and Variables of Interest, After Controlling for the Effects of Hospital (Target Sample).....	81
10. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB as a Function of Interpersonal Orientation, Controlling for Hospital.....	83
11. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB Which Benefits Peers, as a Function of Interpersonal Orientation, Controlling for Hospital.....	84
12. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB Which Benefits Supervisors, as a Function of Interpersonal Orientation, Controlling for Hospital.....	85
13. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB Which Benefits An Equivocal Target, as a Function of Interpersonal Orientation, Controlling for Hospital.....	86

14. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB Which Benefits Outsiders, as a Function of Interpersonal Orientation, Controlling for Hospital.....	87
15. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB as a Function of Moral Development, Controlling for Hospital.....	88
16. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB Which Benefits Peers, as a Function of Moral Development, Controlling for Hospital.....	90
17. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB Which Benefits Supervisors, as a Function of Moral Development, Controlling for Hospital.....	91
18. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB Which Benefits An Equivocal Target, as a Function of Moral Development, Controlling for Hospital.....	92
19. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB Which Benefits Outsiders, as a Function of Moral Development, Controlling for Hospital.....	93
20. Unique Effects Derived From Full Model Regression of Independent Variables with Altruistic OCB.....	100

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1. Peer Nomination Form.....	43
2. Peer/Self Rating Form.....	46
3. Interpersonal Orientation Scale.....	48
4. Interpersonal Trust at Work Scale.....	52
5. Organizational Commitment Scale.....	53
6. Background Information Form.....	58
7. Interview Schedule Items.....	59

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The importance of extra-role behaviors in effective organizational functioning has been discussed for a number of years. Katz (1964), for example, identified three types of behavior necessary for a functioning organization. First, people must be encouraged to enter and remain with the organization. Second, role requirements must be dependably completed. Third, (and relevant to the purpose for the present study), innovative and spontaneous extra-role activity must occur. Roethlisberger and Dickson (1964) similarly specified that cooperation, a product of the informal system, and typified by daily spontaneous gestures which assist others, is essential to organizational maintenance. Organ (1988a) also has suggested that even small-scale spontaneous extra-role behaviors can promote organizational effectiveness. That is, extra-role behaviors performed by organizational incumbents may serve to increase the efficiency of production or to facilitate other, more conspicuous organizational contributions.

Although interest in the area of extra-role behaviors is not new, researchers have only recently begun to formally explore a class of extra-role actions called Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983). Most of

the theoretical and empirical writings on the subject have appeared within the last five years. OCB represents extra-role behaviors which are not directly recompensed by an organization's formal reward system, and which in the aggregate, aid the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988a).

From among the many dimensions or categories of OCB which have been delineated, the present study focuses on a dimension which has been variously identified as neighborliness (Graham, 1986), prosocial behavior (Puffer, 1987), or altruism (Smith, et al., 1983). Behaviors which typify this dimension are discretionary or extra-role in nature, and serve to help another individual with an organizationally relevant task (Organ, 1988a). These actions may be referred to as Altruistic Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (Altruistic OCB).

While it has been convincingly argued by Katz (1964), Organ (1988a), and others that extra-role/citizenship behaviors are essential aspects of organizational functioning, the dispositional and attitudinal correlates and motives for these behaviors have not been well explored. These dispositions, attitudes, and motives may be viewed as important areas of inquiry, as a comprehensive understanding of organizational functioning necessitates some attention to the question of why people behave as they do on the job (Steers and Porter, 1983). That is, it may be argued that an understanding of the motives,

dispositions and attitudes which underlie extra-role actions such as altruism is essential to understanding the behavior itself.

A major premise underlying the present study is that over a period of time in an organization, some individuals emerge as more likely than others to perform Altruistic OCB. Certain self-stated motives, and dispositional and attitudinal factors may serve to differentiate these "altruists" from their more passive counterparts. Identifying these specific correlates of Altruistic OCB may add to the knowledge base concerning the nature of these extra-role behaviors.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB; Organ, 1988a), is defined as helping behavior which takes place in an organizational setting, and is targeted either at another individual, or at the organization in general. There are three primary components to Organ's definition of OCB. First, Organizational Citizenship Behaviors are extra-role behaviors -- they are not enforceable requirements of a given job role or job description, and they should not be confused with exemplary in-role performance. Second, these behaviors are not directly rewarded by an organization's formal reward system; often, they may even go unnoticed by persons who control the allocation of these formal rewards. Third, although any one instance of OCB may have negligible effects on organizational performance, multiple occurrences of OCB across persons and over time may result in more effective organizational functioning. Research on OCB to date has characteristically focused on one of two areas: investigation of the dimensionality of the construct, and attempts to resolve a hypothesized satisfaction-performance link.

The Dimensionality of the Construct

One set of investigations has focused almost exclusively on the dimensionality of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. The first attempt to empirically demonstrate the dimensionality of OCB appeared in Smith, et al.'s, (1983) study. The authors factor analyzed a sixteen item measure of OCB which produced two factors called "Altruism" and "Generalized Compliance" (later to be renamed "Conscientiousness"). The Altruism factor contained such items as "Helps others who have been absent" and "Volunteers for things that are not required". The Generalized Compliance/Conscientiousness factor included such items as "Punctuality" and "Attendance at work is above the norm". Organ and Konovsky (1989), obtained essentially the same factor structure using the same OCB measure with data provided by a different sample of participants. Graham's (1986) research also provided evidence for separate and discriminable dimensions of OCB.

While the above findings represent important steps in empirically delineating the component dimensions of OCB, several writers have also offered additional commentary on the nature of particular dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. These dimensions include conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue.

Organ (1988a) defined conscientiousness as "various instances in which organization members carry out certain role behaviors well beyond the minimum required levels" (p. 9). Patterns of attendance well beyond the minimum required level, and efforts to maintain cleanliness beyond minimum required standards exemplify this type of OCB. Conscientiousness thus impacts an organization in a generally impersonal manner. Conscientiousness may lead to more efficient use of existing resources (e.g., well-maintained equipment may break down less often) and may make a larger pool of energy available to the organizational system. (e.g., through low levels of absenteeism).

Some evidence suggests that conscientiousness may be multidimensional, as opposed to a global or unidimensional factor. Konovsky (1986) reported findings that indicated conscientiousness as measured with the Smith, et al. (1983) scale may be composed of two factors: one related to attendance and other uses of company time, and one related to extra-role adherence to other types of organizational rules. In addition, close examination of the conscientiousness factor derived from the Smith, et al. OCB scale reveals certain items which may legitimately fall into a category of in-role behavior (e.g., punctuality, lack of time spent with personal phone calls, lack of time spent in idle conversation). This observation suggests

that conscientiousness as typically measured may actually be composed of both extra-role and exemplary in-role components.

Organ (1988a) has also suggested that certain citizenship behaviors may be correctly classified into the categories of sportsmanship or courtesy. Graham (1986) has made a similar case for a dimension of OCB she calls civic virtue. People who demonstrate sportsmanship are described as those who avoid complaining and petty grievances. Courtesy is hypothesized as consisting of behaviors like helping someone prevent a problem from occurring, or taking steps in advance to mitigate a problem. Individuals who demonstrate civic virtue are described as taking an interest in corporate issues and policies, and becoming actively involved in them.

While inquiry into the dimensionality of OCB is by no means complete, one widely recognized dimension of citizenship behavior is Altruistic OCB. This dimension is of central interest in the present study. Organ (1988a) defined altruism as "discretionary behaviors that have the effect of helping a specific other person with an organizationally relevant task or problem" (p. 8). Although the term "altruistic" may conjure images of absolutely magnanimous behaviors which are unrewarded in any manner, it should be noted that Organ (1988a) only excludes from his definition of OCB those behaviors which are directly and formally rewarded by the organization. Thus, the definition of Altruistic OCB includes, but is not limited to

completely unrewarded behaviors. An altruistic act may be intrinsically rewarding, for example, and still qualify as Altruistic OCB. In addition, an individual may perform altruistic acts over a period of time in an organization with some vaguely defined hope that eventually his or her behavior will pay off in friendship, or recognition. Such behaviors, given the underlying motive, still qualify as OCB. Examples of altruism in an organizational setting include taking over job duties for a sick colleague, or helping a new worker "learn the ropes" -- as long as these behaviors are not explicit parts of the job role or explicitly rewarded by the formal organization.

Altruism can add to an organization's effectiveness in several ways. First, altruistic actions may increase an organization's efficiency by trading off a temporary loss of productivity for one worker in return for greater overall productivity. For example, an individual who proofreads a colleague's budget proposal will withstand a small loss of productivity on his or her own job. But if this individual discovers a potentially costly error in the proposal, the loss of individual productivity would be more than offset by the money saved.

In addition, spontaneous altruistic actions may have the effect of diverting energy from unnecessary functions to more productive ones. For example, an employment manager in a company's personnel department may answer a co-worker's

question about a recruitment issue. While answering such a question lies, in a strict sense, outside the employment manager's job domain, this helpful action can make a time-consuming search for a recruitment manager unnecessary.

Finally, altruism which is directed toward customers, vendors, prospective employees, and the community as a whole can positively influence perceptions of the organization by outsiders. A positive reputation built in this way can potentially increase the success of a business.

A relevant analog to Altruistic OCB in social psychology is a phenomenon called "prosocial behavior". Prosocial behavior exemplifies helping behavior which is not necessarily confined to the workplace. Two accepted definitions of prosocial behavior within this literature are Wispe's (1972), "the antithesis of aggressive behavior, namely, sympathy, altruism, charity, sharing, etc." (p. 3), and Bar-Tal's (1976), "voluntary behavior that is carried out to benefit another without anticipation of external rewards" (p. 4). Bar-Tal (1976) delineates two types of prosocial behavior: "altruism" (the behavior is done for its own end) and "restitution" (the behavior is done to make amends for a transgression or to repay a debt).

It has been argued that altruism is socialized in our society in at least three ways. First, major religions instruct that unselfishness is a virtue (Bohannon, 1963).

Second, basic instincts of survival lead a developing child to act in a manner designed to gratify his or her own desires, while education tends to downplay these instincts and instill values which point to the gratification of others' needs. (Freud, 1963). Finally, people who are considered selfish are often treated less positively than those who are considered unselfish (Krebs, 1970). A general consensus among researchers in the area indicates that true altruistic behavior must be carried out voluntarily, must aim to benefit another, and must be carried out without expectation of a reward (Bar-Tal, 1976; Berkowitz, 1972; Krebs, 1970).

Most behavioral research in this area has focused on potential antecedents or correlates of altruistic behavior (Krebs, 1970). Variables which have demonstrated reliable relationships with altruism include mood or affect (Cialdini & Kenrick, 1976; Isen, Clark, & Schwartz, 1976; Sherrod, et al., 1977; Underwood, et al., 1977), the interaction of self-awareness and mood (Berkowitz, 1987), threat and failure (Crandall, 1978), success (Isen, Horn, & Rosenhan, 1973), organizational identification and internalization (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986), the interaction of self-gratification and affect (Rosenhan, Underwood, & Moore, 1974), stimulus overload and perceived control (Sherrod & Downs, 1974), need for achievement, satisfaction with material rewards and low

perceived peer competition (Puffer, 1987) and rural, as opposed to urban, background (Stebly, 1987).

The Satisfaction-Performance Relationship

Historically, the notion that a positive relationship between satisfaction and performance should exist has been accepted as common sense. For example, of 168 executives surveyed by Gannon and Noon (1971), 60.7% agreed that "high job satisfaction is directly related to high productivity" (pp. 49-56). However, efforts unrelated to the study of OCB which have investigated this concept have not provided much empirical support for the hypothesized strong relationship between the two variables. Further, two comprehensive meta-analytic studies (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Petty, McGee & Cavender, 1984), have estimated the true population correlation between satisfaction and performance to be .17 and .23, respectively.

Organ (1977, 1988a, 1988b), however, has recently provided promising theoretical groundwork for research which seeks to link satisfaction and performance. First, he has suggested that in order to account for the apparent discrepancy between popular belief and research findings, performance should not be defined solely as productivity, but rather, as organizational effectiveness. He cited findings by Katzell and Yankelovich (1975) who surveyed a number of union officials and

managers. Sizeable percentages of these participants agreed that productivity consists not only of output, but includes variables like disruptions, shrinkage, absenteeism and turnover (pp 18-19). Second, Organ has defined OCB as behavior which, in the aggregate, leads to greater organizational effectiveness. Third, he has postulated that individuals are more likely to engage in OCB if they are satisfied at work. In this way, Organ has provided a theoretical bridge to link satisfaction and performance.

In support of his contention, at least seven studies, (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Graham, 1986; Motowidlo, 1984; Scholl, Cooper & McKenna, 1987; Smith, et al., 1983; Puffer, 1987; Williams, Podsakoff & Huber, 1986) have found significant, positive relationships between "satisfaction" and "performance" by relating various measures of satisfaction with various operational measures of OCB. The present study will also seek to replicate the satisfaction--OCB link as part of an investigation into inferred motivational bases for Altruistic OCB.

Motivational Bases For Altruistic OCB

OCB has been empirically studied for less than a decade. As has been summarized above, OCB researchers have typically either investigated the dimensionality of the construct or have

been concerned with a resolution to the hypothesized satisfaction-performance relationship. Organ (1988a, p. 112), has argued that the existing knowledge base surrounding citizenship behavior could be substantially augmented by a greater understanding of the motive base for such organizational behavior. Therefore, inquiry into the motivational bases for a dimension of OCB (i.e., Altruism) should prove particularly useful in augmenting the evolving nomological network surrounding this new, and relatively unexplored construct.

It is proposed in this study that factors which distinguish persons prone to demonstrating Altruistic OCB from their co-workers are differences in their basic dispositional orientations. Further, it is proposed that attitudes toward one's organization serve to either facilitate or inhibit one's predisposition towards Altruistic OCB. That is, certain dispositional factors are hypothesized to be positively associated with the expression of Altruistic OCB, and positive attitudes concerning the organization should serve to strengthen these relationships.

Specifically, it is suggested that individuals apt to demonstrate Altruistic OCB should have high interpersonal orientations and high levels of moral development. Also, it is suggested that attitudes of high interpersonal trust, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction should

facilitate the expression of Altruistic OCB by individuals dispositionally predisposed to altruism. In addition, it is predicted that positive associations may exist between organizational context/culture variables and the expression of Altruistic OCB. These relationships were examined using a quantitative assessment methodology. A qualitative assessment methodology was also used to explore the nature of Altruistic OCB and the self-stated motives associated with such extra-role behaviors.

Quantitative Assessment: Dispositional Factors

Interpersonal Orientation. Altruistic OCB, as defined by Organ (1988a), refers to behavior that helps a specific person or persons. This definition implies sensitivity to the surrounding social environment, since an individual must be able to recognize a situation which elicits altruistic behavior before he or she can respond to it. Such a sensitivity and reactivity to variations in others' behavior forms the basis of a construct known as "interpersonal orientation" (Rubin & Brown, 1975).

The nature of interpersonal orientation may be illustrated by noting its associations with two related constructs: self-monitoring and Machiavellianism. Interpersonal orientation tends to correlate positively ($r=$

.20) with self-monitoring (Swap & Rubin, 1983). High self-monitors have been described as individuals who are concerned with behavioral appropriateness and are therefore sensitive to social cues that might guide expressive self-presentation (Snyder, 1987, pp. 22-23). The positive but not immoderate correlation between interpersonal orientation and self-monitoring indicates only a partial overlap between the two constructs as they are measured. This partial overlap may be explained in accordance with the conceptual bases for these two constructs. That is, while both the high self-monitor and the individual high in interpersonal orientation may be sensitive to others, the high self-monitor possesses a specific concern with social appropriateness not necessarily shared by the person high in interpersonal orientation.

Interpersonal orientation also tends to correlate negatively ($r = -.16$) with Machiavellianism (Swap & Rubin, 1983), a personal characteristic typified by a "cool detachment" which "makes...[one] less emotionally involved with people" (Robinson & Shaver, 1973, p. 592). This negative relationship suggests that individuals high in interpersonal orientation are attentive or responsive to the needs of others. In the present study, it was proposed that individuals high in interpersonal orientation, because of this sensitivity to others, would be more likely to perform altruistic helping behaviors than individuals low in interpersonal orientation.

Moral Development. It has been noted that altruistic acts may be socialized through education and reinforcement, are intended to benefit others, are not carried out with the expectation of extrinsic reward, and can actually result in a loss of individual productivity on the part of the altruist. These definitions imply an ability and willingness to place the welfare of others or of the organization as a whole above personal gain.

Rest (1986) has described a four component model of moral development in which an individual who has behaved in a morally mature manner in a particular situation has performed four basic psychological processes. First, the morally mature individual has interpreted the particular situation in terms of possible courses of action, and their effects on others. Second, the individual has made a judgment about which course of action is morally right, fair, or just, for that situation. Third, he or she has given priority to moral values above personal values; and, fourth, the individual must have sufficient perseverance, ego strength, and implementation skills to follow through with the moral action (Rest, 1986). Moral maturity appears to evolve developmentally, increasing with age, education, and general cognitive capacity (Rest, 1986).

People who have developed in moral judgment have been characterized as those who love to learn, who seek new challenges, who appreciate intellectually stimulating environments, who are reflective, who make plans, set goals, and take risks (Rest, 1986). More directly relevant to the purposes of the present study, persons characterized as high in moral judgment have also been described as those who see themselves in larger social contexts, and who take responsibility for themselves and their surroundings (Rest, 1986). Further, they typically assign greater relative importance to principled moral considerations than to conventional moral considerations in making a decision about a moral dilemma (Rest, 1979). That is, considerations of the morality of social contract, the morality of intuitive humanism, and the morality of principles of ideal social cooperation figure highly in their decisions.

The first of these principled moral considerations, the morality of social contract, refers to moral obligation which derives from a voluntary commitment of society's members to cooperate with one another for the maximization of the common good (Rest, 1979). The morality of intuitive humanism, while similar to the morality of social contract, is slightly different in its focus. It describes social cooperation which derives from a concern for basic human rights (Rest, 1979). Finally, the morality of principles of ideal social cooperation

is based on the premise that moral judgments are ultimately justified by rational principles of ideal cooperation from which all individuals have an equal claim to benefit (Rest, 1979).

These principled moral considerations appear to involve a responsiveness to the needs of others inspired by the goal of advancing the social system as a whole. Organ (1988a) has explained that altruistic acts, in the singular, aid others, and in the aggregate, aid organizational effectiveness. The apparent correspondence between the constructs of moral development and Altruistic OCB suggests that the ability and willingness to respond to a situation which elicits altruism may be related to one's level of moral development as defined by Rest (1979, 1986, 1988). Specifically, it is proposed in the present study that individuals high in moral development, due to their ability to give priority to and act upon principled moral considerations, recognize the potential social benefits of altruistic action, and therefore, should be more likely to respond to a situation which elicits Altruistic OCB than are individuals low in this orientation.

In sum, it is proposed that particular dispositional characteristics or traits may in part determine the expression of Altruistic OCB. Since interpersonal orientation and moral development have evidence of particularly close conceptual relationships with Altruistic OCB, these constructs were chosen

for specific examination in the present study. Interpersonal orientation is seen to reflect a sensitivity and reactivity to other people which logically should be antecedent to any expression of helping behaviors in a work setting. Similarly, moral development, characterized by a rational, humanistic and voluntary commitment to principles of ideal social cooperation, should predispose individuals in a work setting to manifest Altruistic OCB. Accordingly, the following hypotheses are formally set forth.

Hypothesis 1: Interpersonal orientation will be significantly and positively related to Altruistic OCB.

Hypothesis 2: Moral development will be significantly and positively related to Altruistic OCB.

Quantitative Assessment: Attitudinal Factors

In addition to the hypothesized direct relationships listed above, certain key variables are hypothesized to indirectly affect the expression of Altruistic OCB. That is, interpersonal trust, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment are expected to positively moderate the relationships between the dispositional factors and Altruistic OCB.

Interpersonal Trust. Interpersonal trust has been defined as "the extent to which one is willing to ascribe good intentions to and have confidence in the words and actions of other people" (Cook & Wall, 1980). Extra-role helping behaviors can hardly be expected to flourish in an organization characterized by a lack of trust among its members. Conversely, it appears logical to expect that a high degree of faith and confidence in and among organizational members (peers and supervisors) would facilitate the expression of Altruistic OCB. Thus, it is proposed that the relationships between interpersonal orientation and Altruistic OCB, and between moral development and Altruistic OCB should be positively moderated by interpersonal trust.

Organizational Commitment. Commitment is defined as a general affective reaction to the organization indicated by a willingness to give of oneself in order to contribute to organizational functioning (Porter & Smith, 1970). Further, commitment represents the strength of an individual's identification with an organization characterized by a strong belief in, and acceptance of, the organization's goals and values, a readiness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and a strong desire to remain a member of the organization (Porter & Smith, 1970).

Organ (1988a, p. 105) has noted the conceptual similarity between organizational commitment and citizenship behavior, describing these concepts as analogous, but not redundant with one another. Further, O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) have characterized organizational commitment as a psychological state, and extra-role behavior as one of its behavioral outcomes. In accordance with this conceptual development, it is suggested in the present study that commitment to an organization's goals and a willingness to contribute to its functioning should facilitate the expression of Altruistic OCB. That is, it is hypothesized that organizational commitment should positively moderate the relationships between interpersonal orientation and Altruistic OCB and between moral development and Altruistic OCB.

Pay Equity, Pay Satisfaction, and Job Satisfaction. Organ (1988a, 1988b) has provided a motivational interpretation for OCB which is rooted in the idea of equity as job satisfaction. Organ (1988a, 1988b) has suggested that a satisfaction-performance relationship can be supported empirically when performance is broadly defined to include extra-role or citizenship behaviors. In addition, he has specified that satisfaction may be determined in large part by equity, or fairness considerations (Organ, 1988a, 1988b). In sum, Organ has viewed OCB as varying positively with the extent to which a

person believes that fairness has been obtained in his or her relationship with the organization.

Specifically, it is argued (Organ, 1988a), that a salient means of redefining one's social contract when one has a chronic sense of unfairness with regard to the organization is to withhold OCB contributions. This premise has received some support in a study by Scholl, Cooper, and McKenna, (1987). They found that the use of job equity as a referent (comparing one's pay with that of others doing the same job within the same organization) was associated with the frequency of extra-role behavior. That is, it appears that as others in the same job earn more (relative to oneself) one tends to reduce his or her inputs. In this way, an individual redefines his or her social contract with the organization. Extra-role behavior was portrayed by Scholl, et al. as the easiest type of input for the individual to manipulate.

While it is reasonable to assume that perceived pay inequity may be associated with lower job satisfaction, which in turn may inhibit the expression of extra-role behaviors, it does not follow necessarily, as Organ (1988a) intimates, that a strict linear relationship exists between equity and OCB. That is, while inequity may lead to the withholding of extra-role behaviors, it does not necessarily follow that as the amount of perceived equity increases, the likelihood of extra-role behavior also increases.

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, for example, it may be equally plausible to suggest that each individual may have his or her own "level of equilibrium" regarding equity considerations. At and above that point, the individual would experience satisfaction with the perceived ratio of organizational outcomes to organizational inputs, relative to the ratio of outcomes to inputs for some referent(s). Also at and above this point of equilibrium, in-role behaviors would be performed adequately, and the "normal" level of extra-role performance for that individual, given his or her dispositional characteristics, would also be performed. Higher levels of perceived equity would not increase the frequency of extra-role behavior beyond that normal level. However, below the point of equilibrium, (at lower levels of perceived equity), the individual would decrease the frequency of extra-role behaviors relative to their characteristic level. In other words, it is proposed that equity considerations should moderate the relationship between dispositional characteristics and extra-role behavior such that the strength of the relationship decreases as inequity increases.

Additionally, it is suggested that characterizing job satisfaction solely as perceived pay equity may be an unduly narrow focus for the underlying construct. Therefore, both perceived pay equity and pay satisfaction were assessed for their relationships with Altruistic OCB in the present study.

These variables were measured in an effort to partially replicate of the work of Scholl, et al. (1987) and Organ's (1988a) proposition concerning equity and OCB. Job satisfaction as a global construct was also assessed. In the present study it is hypothesized that job satisfaction (broadly defined to include equity, pay satisfaction, and overall satisfaction) would facilitate the likelihood of Altruistic OCB in the same way as perceived interpersonal trust or organizational commitment (i.e., as a moderator of the relationship between dispositional factors and the expression of altruism).

In sum, it is proposed in the present study that attitudinal characteristics may be indirectly associated with the expression of Altruistic OCB. Although one's dispositional characteristics or personality may be expected to more directly affect the expression of Altruistic OCB, it also appears logical to assume that particular attitudes toward one's organization or job could affect the expression of such behaviors. It is specifically hypothesized that the attitudinal variables of interpersonal trust, organizational commitment and job satisfaction positively moderate the relationships between dispositions and Altruistic OCB. Formally, the following hypotheses are set forth.

Hypothesis 3A: Interpersonal trust will positively moderate the relationship between interpersonal orientation and Altruistic OCB, such that the relationship is strengthened under conditions of high trust.

Hypothesis 3B: Interpersonal trust will positively moderate the relationship between moral development and Altruistic OCB, such that the relationship is strengthened under conditions of high trust.

Hypothesis 4A: Organizational commitment will positively moderate the relationship between interpersonal orientation and Altruistic OCB, such that the relationship is strengthened under conditions of high commitment.

Hypothesis 4B: Organizational commitment will positively moderate the relationship between moral development and Altruistic OCB, such that the relationship is strengthened under conditions of high commitment.

Hypothesis 5A: Job satisfaction (pay equity, pay satisfaction, general satisfaction) will positively moderate the relationship between interpersonal orientation and Altruistic OCB, such that the relationship is strengthened under conditions of high

satisfaction (pay equity, pay satisfaction, general satisfaction).

Hypothesis 5B: Job satisfaction (pay equity, pay satisfaction, general satisfaction) will positively moderate the relationship between moral development and Altruistic OCB, such that the relationship is strengthened under conditions of high satisfaction (pay equity, pay satisfaction, general satisfaction).

Quantitative Assessment: Organizational Context Factors

In addition to the dispositional and attitudinal factors noted above, certain organizational context variables were also examined for their relationships with Altruistic OCB. Many models of organizational effectiveness (Cummings, 1981; Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Likert, 1961; Sundstrom, DeMeuse & Futrell, in press) specify such context variables as role clarity, supportive leadership, and performance feedback as important to effective organizational functioning. Brief and Motowidlo (1986) have also suggested that such contextual variables may covary with the expression of prosocial organizational behavior. In the present study, the relationships between Altruistic OCB and two categories of contextual variables

(i.e., job clarity and participative culture) were investigated.

Job Clarity. Job clarity may be operationalized as reflecting degrees of role clarity and feedback. Some evidence (Bernardin, 1982; Keller, 1975; Schuler, Aldag & Brief, 1977) suggests that the absence of role clarity may lead to dissatisfaction and inappropriate organizational behavior, and conversely, the presence of role clarity may facilitate the expression of appropriate organizational behaviors. Similarly, feedback, or the degree to which one is provided with information about one's work effectiveness in a specific, accurate and timely manner, has also been linked to performance (Beatty, Schneier & Beatty, 1977; Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Hackman & Oldham, 1980), and may be logically linked to extra-role behavior.

Role clarity and feedback may be particularly important variables with regard to the expression of Altruistic OCB. By implication, an extra-role performer is one who has already successfully understood and completed his or her in-role behaviors. If individuals work in an environment where role expectations are clear and feedback is accurate, specific and timely, they may be able to expediently complete their in-role job requirements, leaving more time for discretionary extra-role behaviors. Therefore, it may be argued that effective

extra-role performance requires an understanding of acceptable in-role behavior, as enabled by role clarity and feedback.

Participative Organizational Culture. Participative organizational culture variables comprised the second set of organizational context variables examined for their impact on Altruistic OCB. Important aspects of participative organizational culture for the purposes of this study were considerate and participative leadership, subordinate involvement in informed decision-making, and overall organizational concern for the individual worker. An organizational leadership which fosters the empowerment of subordinates has been empirically related to greater organizational effectiveness (Likert, 1961). Other researchers (Vroom & Yetton, 1973) have highlighted the importance of optimal decision making on organizational effectiveness. In addition, a belief in the importance of people as individuals has been depicted as an important component of effective organizations (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Peters & Waterman, 1982).

An organization high in these participative culture variables may be depicted as one which empowers its members to make decisions which impact the organization, recognizes the importance of their individual contributions and treats them with consideration and respect. It is proposed in the present study that individuals who perceive that they are treated in

this manner may have a vested interest in the functioning of their department or organization. It follows that these individuals may be more likely than others to engage in extra-role behaviors to further the goals of the department or the organization.

As outlined above, it is proposed in the present study that organizational context factors may be directly associated with the expression of Altruistic OCB. Specifically, it is proposed that the organizational context variables of job clarity and participative organizational culture are positively related to the expression of Altruistic OCB. Extant theory suggests the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 6: The organizational context variables of job clarity and participative culture are significantly and positively related to Altruistic OCB.

Quantitative Assessment: A Procedural Issue

An important procedural issue germane to this study of OCB concerns the source(s) of assessment of Altruistic OCB. When assessing job performance, three types of evaluations -- supervisory assessment, self assessment, and peer assessment -- have most often been studied (Landy & Farr, 1983). Of these, supervisory ratings have been most often used for

organizational appraisals (Jacobs, 1986). This is likewise the case for investigations of OCB (Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Puffer, 1987; Smith, et al, 1983). The potential, however, for contamination of the construct when using supervisors to assess OCB is an issue of concern.

OCB is often unassuming by nature, and is by definition not behavior which is directly recognized and rewarded by the system. Since part of a supervisor's job is to recognize and reward exemplary in-role behavior, supervisors may make global (haloed) ratings based on the adequacy of in-role performance, rather than on the basis of OCB contributions. In addition, extra-role behavior that does come to the attention of supervisors may have been intentionally performed in the supervisors' presence in order to be noticed. Such behavior, by definition, does not qualify as OCB.

The drawback associated with the use of supervisory ratings suggests the potential in using self ratings of OCB. Due to the often unpretentious nature of OCB, an argument can be made that the OCB performer may be in the best position to observe and report his or her behavior. Possible difficulties with this approach, however, include the tendency to inflate self ratings, and the possibility of capitalizing on common-method variance if self-report OCB is statistically related to other self-report measures.

Peer assessments may be less likely to suffer from the various disadvantages associated with either supervisory ratings or self ratings of OCB. Peer assessment has also been lauded as psychometrically superior to other sources of appraisal data (Jacobs, 1986). In addition, Kane and Lawler (1978) have asserted that peer assessment is most useful in situations in which workers have access to unique information about each other's job performance and are capable of accurately observing and judging that performance information. Since peers are often in positions to observe day-to-day helpful behaviors, peer assessments seem particularly suited to the study of OCB.

Some concerns have been voiced about the suitability of peer ratings in employment settings. The issue has primarily centered on potential friendship bias (Cederblom & Lounsbury, 1980), anticipated divisive effects (Kane & Lawler, 1978; Medland, Yates & Downey, 1974), and low perceived peer feedback value (Cederblom & Lounsbury, 1980). These potential difficulties may be minimized (as in the present study), if all peer assessments remain confidential and are not used to affect employment decisions.

In sum, supervisory ratings appear to suffer from a serious disadvantage in the evaluation of OCB due to the inherent potential for contamination of the construct. Self ratings and peer assessment, on the other hand, may be more

appropriate methods for assessing OCB, given the nature of the phenomenon. For these reasons, peer ratings, peer nominations and self ratings were used in this study in addition to the qualitative self-report data gathered for the investigation of the nature of Altruistic OCB and its motives.

Qualitative Assessment

In addition to the quantitative assessments proposed above, it is suggested that the knowledge base surrounding Altruistic OCB may be significantly enhanced by gaining a greater understanding of the nature of the behavior itself and of the forces that drive the behavior. The final aspect of the present study focused on a qualitative assessment of the nature of Altruistic OCB and the self-stated motives for the expression of Altruistic OCB.

For the purposes of this study, it is assumed that when an instance of Altruistic OCB occurs, four factors must be present. First, there must be an eliciting situation. Second, the citizen must recognize and be willing to respond to the situation. Third, the individual must perform the altruistic action. Fourth, some individual or individuals must benefit from the action.

Proceeding from this logic, the content of the qualitatively-based portion of the study bore on two major

areas of interest: the nature of Altruistic OCB (including the nature of the eliciting situation, the spontaneous versus considered nature of the action, and the beneficiary or beneficiaries of the action), and the motives which drive Altruistic OCB. The goals with regard to the first of these areas of interest were to identify commonalities in situations which elicit instances of Altruistic OCB, to determine whether Altruistic OCB is characteristically a spontaneous or considered behavior, and to determine who benefits from the behavior.

With regard to the second area of interest, the prosocial behavior literature has suggested that three typical motives which drive altruism are benevolence, egoism, and reciprocity. Benevolence, or empathy, is characterized by a willingness to help another in need, (e.g., "pure altruism"; Bar-Tal, 1976) or to promote the welfare of others (e.g., "social responsibility"; Tedeschi & Lindskold, 1976). Egoistically motivated altruism, on the other hand, represents a category of motives which result in some intrinsic self-reward such as the avoidance of shame or guilt (Batson, Bolen, Cross & Neuringer-Benefiel, 1986), or feelings of satisfaction derived from being needed by others (e.g., "the glow of good will"; Tedeschi & Lindskold, 1976). Reciprocity may take two forms: payback and instrumentality. Payback reciprocity, or restitution (Bar-Tal, 1976) is a payment to another individual in return for a

past favor, while committing an act with instrumental reciprocity in mind involves an vaguely defined anticipated reward. Such an attitude is typified by the statements ("It all comes back to you in the end", and " What goes around comes around"). The second thrust of the qualitative assessment sought to determine which, if any, of these motive bases drive Altruistic OCB.

In sum, qualitative assessment in the present study was aimed at investigating the nature of Altruistic OCB (including an examination of the nature of the eliciting situation, the spontaneous versus considered nature of the action, and the beneficiaries of the action). In addition, the qualitative assessment was directed at discovering motive bases which drive Altruistic OCB.

Summary of Hypotheses and Research Questions

As is outlined above, the following hypotheses were advanced in the present study.

Hypothesis 1: **Interpersonal orientation** will be significantly and positively related to peer and self rated Altruistic OCB.

Hypothesis 2: **Moral development** will be significantly and positively related to peer and self rated Altruistic OCB.

Hypothesis 3A: **Interpersonal trust** will positively moderate the relationship between interpersonal orientation and Altruistic OCB, such that the relationship is strengthened under conditions of high trust.

Hypothesis 3B: **Interpersonal trust** will positively moderate the relationship between moral development and Altruistic OCB, such that the relationship is strengthened under conditions of high trust.

Hypothesis 4A: **Organizational commitment** will positively moderate the relationship between interpersonal orientation and Altruistic OCB, such that the relationship is strengthened under conditions of high commitment.

Hypothesis 4B: **Organizational commitment** will positively moderate the relationship between moral development and Altruistic OCB, such that the relationship is strengthened under conditions of high commitment.

Hypothesis 5A: **Job satisfaction** (pay equity, pay satisfaction, general satisfaction) will positively moderate the relationship between interpersonal orientation and Altruistic OCB, such that the relationship is strengthened under conditions of high

satisfaction (pay equity, pay satisfaction, general satisfaction).

Hypothesis 5B: **Job satisfaction** (pay equity, pay satisfaction, general satisfaction) will positively moderate the relationship between moral development and Altruistic OCB, such that the relationship is strengthened under conditions of high satisfaction (pay equity, pay satisfaction, general satisfaction).

Hypothesis 6: The organizational context variables of **job clarity** and **participative culture** will be significantly and positively related to peer and self rated Altruistic OCB.

In addition to the above hypotheses, two research questions pertaining to the content of the qualitative portion of the study were also advanced.

Research Question 1: **What is the nature of Altruistic OCB?**

That is, what is the character of the situations which elicit such behavior, is the behavior typically spontaneous or considered, and who are the beneficiaries of such actions?

Research Question 2: **What are the self-reported motivational bases for Altruistic OCB?** That is, as reported by the

altruists themselves, do benevolence, egoism or reciprocity
considerations drive Altruistic OCB?

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Overview

An investigation of the motivational correlates of Altruistic Organizational Citizenship Behaviors was undertaken in this study using survey techniques and exploratory structured interviews. Analysis of survey data was used to address Hypotheses 1 through 6 stated above. Interviews with nominated altruists were used to investigate Research Questions 1 and 2.

Participants

The sample was drawn from the administrative and nursing staff of two hospitals (hereafter referred to as Hospital 1 and Hospital 2). Surveys were distributed to the entire nursing staff of Hospital 2, and to the registered nurses and nurse supervisors at Hospital 1. A total of 784 surveys were distributed, 25 of which served as a second administration at Hospital 1. The cover letters and the full survey administered to participants may be found in Appendices A and B. Of the 759 potential participants, 185 (24.4%) returned surveys. In

addition, eighteen of a total of twenty-two (81.8%) individuals nominated as altruists by their peers were interviewed. At Hospital 2, seven altruists were located through a nomination system already in place at that institution. At Hospital 1, eleven altruists were identified through a nomination process developed for the present study. Both the completion of surveys and participation in the interviewing procedure were voluntary.

Procedure

Survey

Development. The criterion measure for the study focused on Altruistic OCB, and consisted of a series of eleven statements. Seven of these statements comprise the empirically derived Altruism factor identified by Smith, et al., (1983) and Organ and Konovsky (1989). The actions described in these statements all benefit peers or supervisors. In order to assess a greater diversity of beneficiaries, four additional statements were also included in the criterion measure. Of these, one described an action which would benefit the respondent's supervisor; the remaining three additional statements described actions which would benefit employees

outside one's immediate department and clients/customers. The additional items were culled from pilot work by Rush (1989).

Administration. At each hospital, nurse supervisors met with the principal investigator for approximately fifteen minutes. A brief overview and expressed administrative support for the research project was given by a member of senior management. The principal investigator followed this brief introduction by providing more detail about the purposes and procedure of the research and by answering the supervisors' questions about the study. Each supervisor then received a packet containing surveys for each of his or her subordinates.

Included in each survey were a demographic information sheet, a peer/self rating form, and scales assessing the dispositional, attitudinal and organizational context variables. The demographic information sheet requested participants to provide such information as age, sex and tenure. The peer/self rating form requested ratings of the Altruistic OCB items. The dispositional, attitudinal and organizational context variable scales assessed the predictor and moderator variables of interest in the present study.

Also attached to each of the surveys was an explanatory letter endorsed by senior management and study researchers. This letter provided instructions for the completion and return of the surveys, and assured participants that no organizational

members would have access to any individual's data. At both locations, surveys were returned to the principal investigator in sealed envelopes through the in-house mail systems.

At Hospital 1, a peer nomination form was also included in the survey. This form requested participants to write a brief description of an incident in which a peer had performed an act of Altruistic OCB, including the altruist's name, and as much detail of the incident as possible. The information recorded on the peer nomination form served as the starting point for the interviewing process at that hospital.

Interview

The nominations generated through the peer nomination system at Hospital 1 and through the internal nomination process at Hospital 2 were screened for their applicability to the present research. Nominations were judged as valid incidents of altruism if they 1) depicted extra-role behaviors which had the effect of helping co-workers and 2) concerned behaviors which were not formally and explicitly rewarded by the organization. Twenty-two potential interviewees were then approached for interviews. Eighteen individuals (81.8%) agreed to be interviewed about the altruistic behavior described by their peer(s). The interviewees were questioned about the nature of the eliciting situation, the spontaneous versus

considered nature of the action, the beneficiary or beneficiaries of the action and the motive(s) for their behavior.

Measures

Peer Nomination

The peer nomination form solicited specific accounts of Altruistic OCB at Hospital 1. A brief description of Altruistic OCB, an example of an account of this behavior, and a summary of the defining characteristics of Altruistic OCB (i.e., helps others people on the job, not formally required by a person's job, not formally rewarded, and done by workers who already perform their required job behaviors at an adequate level) were followed by a request for a specific account of an act of Altruistic OCB as performed by a peer. Follow-up interviews with the altruists mentioned in these nominations allowed examination of self-stated motives for Altruistic OCB at the level of the distinct instance of behavior. A copy of this form is found in Figure 1.

We are particularly interested in a type of behavior called "Altruistic Organizational Citizenship Behavior". These are "helping" behaviors that are not enforceable requirements of a position or job. That is, the behavior is not formally expected as part of the clearly specifiable terms of a person's employment contract; rather, the behavior is a matter of personal choice such that failing to exhibit the behavior would not generally be understood as punishable. An example might be the following account of an incident which occurred in the shipping department of a paper mill:

"On this particular night, my assignment was to push large rolls of paper off an elevator and to fit metal bands around each end of each roll. To attach the metal bands, one used a special purpose tool that enabled one to wrap the binding around the paper, tighten it, then cut and staple the ends of the band around the paper. Since I was new at this job, I had not yet mastered using this tool. One of the guys working close by could see my struggle and came over to help. Several times he helped tighten a wobbly band, unhook the stapler, reload or rewind the metal spool. With his timely aid and totally patient and uncritical manner, I survived the night and the job got done."

Thus, "Altruistic Organizational Citizenship Behaviors" are behaviors which:

- 1) help other people on the job.
- 2) are not formally required by a person's job and are not formally rewarded (with money or recognition).
- 3) are done by workers who already perform their required job behaviors at an adequate level.

Our question to you is: Have you witnessed one of your fellow workers performing an act of Altruistic behavior (as defined above) at work?

If so, please record (PRINT) the person's name on the line below and then provide as much information as you can about the incident. This information will be treated as confidential. We may contact the individual you mention, however, in order to learn more about the incident. In the event that we do contact the individual, your name will not be mentioned.

Name of the coworker: _____

Description: _____

(please use the back of the page if you need more space)

Figure 1

Peer Nomination Form

Peer/Self Rating

The conventional measure of OCB (i.e., Smith, et al., 1983), has demonstrated its usefulness as a means of assessing citizenship behaviors in organizational settings (Organ & Konovsky, 1988; Smith, et al., 1983). The generality of the items contained in the scale (e.g., helps others who have heavy workloads, makes innovative suggestions to improve the department) in particular, makes it suitable for use in a wide range of organizations. However, since the focus of the present study was to specifically identify the motivational and dispositional correlates associated with Altruistic OCB, the scale used to assess levels of OCB in the present study differed somewhat from the original scale.

First, given the focus of the study, the survey was limited solely to the assessment of Altruistic OCB. Smith, et al. (1983) empirically derived a factor from the original scale which they named Altruism. As noted, all of the items identified as belonging to the Altruism factor (cf. Smith, et al., 1983) were included in the criterion assessment device used in the present study. Additionally, items identified in pilot work (Rush, 1989) as assessing Altruistic OCB were also included in the criterion scale.

Second, since peers and the self may be in the best positions to observe the dynamics of OCB, peer and self ratings

on the criterion scale were obtained instead of supervisory ratings. The eleven item peer/self rating form requested ratings of Altruistic OCB using a five-point response format ranging from "The behavior is highly uncharacteristic of this person" (1) to "The behavior is highly characteristic of this person" (5). This peer/self rating form is provided in Figure 2.

Interpersonal Orientation

Interpersonal orientation was assessed with a modified version of the Interpersonal Orientation Scale developed by Swap and Rubin (1983). The scale has twenty-nine items with a five-point response format ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5). The scale score is obtained by summing across items. Higher scores on this scale indicate a responsiveness to the interpersonal aspects of relationships, while lower scores indicate a nonresponsiveness in this regard. A coefficient alpha of .79 has been reported for the scale, as well as significant negative relationships with such variables as Machiavellianism and Inner Directedness (Swap & Rubin, 1983).

Please think of the co-workers with whom you work (not supervisors or subordinates), and whose work behavior you feel you've had ample opportunity to observe.

From among these co-workers, choose three individuals who you consider to be different from one another in how often they tend to exhibit Altruistic Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Please PRINT the names of these three individuals on the lines below marked "Peer A", "Peer B", and "Peer C"; also PRINT your own name on the line marked "Myself".

Peer A: _____ Peer C: _____
Peer B: _____ Myself: _____

Now, based on the scale provided below, please rate each of these peers and yourself on each of the following types of behaviors. Read each statement carefully, and then circle the number (1 thru 5) for the response which best describes the behavior of each peer and yourself.

- 1: The behavior is HIGHLY UNCHARACTERISTIC of this person.
- 2: The behavior is UNCHARACTERISTIC of this person.
- 3: The behavior is NEITHER UNCHARACTERISTIC NOR CHARACTERISTIC of this person.
- 4: The behavior is CHARACTERISTIC of this person.
- 5: The behavior is HIGHLY CHARACTERISTIC of this person.

	Peer A:	Peer B:	Peer C:	Myself:
1. helps other employees who are experiencing especially heavy workloads.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. volunteers to do things not formally required by their job assignment	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. goes out of the way to help people from outside the dept. with requests for information and/or assistance.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. helps peers who have been absent to catch up with their work.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. willingly attends non-required functions that help promote the company image.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. goes out of the way to be courteous and considerate to clients/customers/patients.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. takes initiative to orient new people to the dept. though it's not part of their job.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8. makes innovative suggestions to improve the overall quality of the department.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9. shares little tips with others for performing the job more efficiently or effectively.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
10. keeps the supervisor informed of potential problems though it's not their job to do so.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
11. assists the supervisor with special tasks, even though they don't have to.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Figure 2

Peer/Self Rating Form

Due to applicability and time considerations, certain items were eliminated from the original scale for the purposes of this study. The original scale was developed using a college student population, and therefore contained certain items relevant only to that population (e.g., "I often find myself wondering what my professors are really like"). These items were deleted.

In addition, while the scale is reported to be statistically unidimensional (coefficient $\alpha = .79$; Swap & Rubin, 1983), three logical subdivisions of the scale (i.e., Responsiveness to others, Sociability, and Interest in what other people are like) have been identified (Swap & Rubin, 1983). Due to its greater correspondence with the focus of the present study, only items logically belonging to the Responsiveness category were retained in the present investigation. Further, only the ten items within the Responsiveness category which evidenced the highest item-total correlations as reported by Swap and Rubin (1983) were included for study. The mean of scores on these items was calculated as a respondent's score on the variable of interpersonal orientation. A copy of this revised scale is found in Figure 3.

1. I am greatly influenced by the moods of the people I am with.
 2. Sometimes I take things that others say to me too personally.
 - 3.* What others think about my actions is of little or no consequence to me.
 4. The more people reveal about themselves, the more inclined I feel to reveal things about myself.
 - 5.* When someone does me a favor I don't usually feel compelled to return it.
 6. The more I am with others, the more I tend to like them.
 7. I would rather be given a simple and thoughtful gift than a more extravagant one that involved less thought and care.
 8. I am very sensitive to criticism.
 9. When people tell me personal things about themselves, I find myself feeling close to them.
 10. I can be strongly affected by someone smiling or frowning at me.
-

Ratings obtained on a five-point "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5) scale.

* reverse scored

Figure 3
Interpersonal Orientation Scale

Moral Development

The Defining Issues Test (DIT; Rest, 1979), was used to assess moral development. The test is composed of three scenarios which portray moral dilemmas, each of which is followed by a list of fourteen statements. Respondents are asked to rate and rank the importance of these statements in making a decision about what the protagonist in the scenario should do. The rankings of certain statements are used to derive a participant's score on an underlying continuum of moral development. Higher scores indicate a greater ability to perceive and judge moral issues, while lower scores indicate a lower level of development in judging moral issues. The coefficient alpha for the three-scenario version of the test is reported to be .76 (Rest, 1988). Scores from the DIT have been found to be negatively related to behavioral measures such as cheating and delinquency, and positively related to leadership ratings and cooperative responses in the prisoner's dilemma procedure (Rest, 1979). Due to time considerations, a two-scenario form of the test was used in the present study. A copy of this measure is found in Appendix C.

Interpersonal Trust

The Interpersonal Trust at Work Scale (Cook & Wall, 1980) was used to assess respondents' trust in management and trust in peers. The original twelve item scale is assessed using a seven-point response format ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7). The scale scores are obtained by summing item scores, with higher scores indicating greater faith and confidence in peers and management. A coefficient alpha of .85 has been recorded for the scale, and it has been found to be positively correlated with such variables as intrinsic job motivation and work involvement (Cook & Wall, 1980).

Since this scale was originally developed for use with British employees, the word "workmates" was used in several of the items. In order to adapt the scale for American use, the word "workmates" was replaced with the word "workers" wherever it occurred. Also, in order to adapt the scale for use in the present study, a five-point response format was adopted with responses ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5). Further, due to time considerations, only the items obtaining the highest factor loadings, including at least one item from each of the four a priori subdivisions of the scale (faith in peers, faith in management, confidence in peers and confidence in management) as reported by Cook and Wall

(1980), were retained in the survey. Respondents' scores on these items were averaged to provide overall scores on the variable of interpersonal trust in peers and in management. A copy of this seven-item scale is found in Figure 4.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational Commitment was measured with the short form of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Porter and Smith (1970). The measure is a nine-item scale with a seven-point response format ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7). The scale score is derived by computing the mean of item scores. Higher scores indicate greater organizational commitment. A median coefficient alpha across a variety of studies has been reported to be .90 (Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979). In order to adapt the scale for the present study, a five-point response format ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5) was adopted in the present study. A copy of this scale is found in Figure 5.

Pay Equity

Perceived pay equity was measured with an adaptation of the job equity measure developed by Scholl, Cooper and McKenna

1. Management at my firm is sincere in its attempt to meet the workers' point of view.
 2. Management can be trusted to make sensible decisions for the firm's future.
 3. Management at work seems to do an efficient job.
 4. I feel quite confident that the firm will always try to treat me fairly.
 5. Most of my fellow workers can be relied upon to do as they say they will do.
 6. I have full confidence in the skills of my fellow workers.
 7. Most of my fellow workers would get on with the job even if supervisors were not around.
-

Ratings obtained on a five-point "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5) scale.

Figure 4
Interpersonal Trust at Work Scale

- ✓ 1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.
 - ✓ 2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.
 - ✓ 3. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.
 - ✓ 4. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.
 - ✓ 5. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.
 - ✓ 6. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.
 - ✓ 7. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for, over others I was considering at the time I joined.
 - ✓ 8. I really care about the fate of this organization.
 - ✓ 9. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.
-

Ratings obtained on a five-point "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5) scale.

Figure 5
Organizational Commitment Scale

(1987). The original measure asked participants to rate the appropriateness of their pay as compared to seven different referents, one of which was based on job equity (other individuals doing the same job in the same organization). The original job equity item read "Compared with others doing the same job as me in my company with similar education, seniority and effort, I earn about:", using a nine-point scale ranging from "40% less" (-4) to "40% more" (+4) with two escape options ("I don't know" and "There is no one"). For the purposes of the present study, three items based on the original job equity item were developed, each specifying a different basis of comparison (education, seniority and effort). The job equity item was emphasized because of its demonstrated relationship with extra-role behavior (Scholl, et al., 1987). Scores on these three items were averaged to produce scores on pay equity.

Pay Satisfaction

Pay satisfaction was assessed with the two-item pay satisfaction subscale from the Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). The items read "I am satisfied with the degree to which I am fairly paid for what I contribute to the organization" and "I am satisfied with the amount of pay and fringe benefits I receive". The original scale used a seven-

point response format ranging from "extremely dissatisfied" (1) to "extremely satisfied" (7), and the subscale score is derived by computing the mean of item scores. Higher scores indicate higher pay satisfaction. The Spearman-Brown reliability coefficient for the scale was reported to be .86. A five-point response format ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5) was adopted for the purposes of the present study.

Overall Job Satisfaction

Two items were used to assess respondents' overall level of job satisfaction. The items read "I love my job" and "Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my job". The response format on these items ranged from "strongly disagree" (1) to strongly agree (5).

Organizational Context Factors

Four items assessing role clarity and adequacy of performance feedback were generated in order to assess the organizational context factor of job clarity. The items read: "My role in this organization is clearly defined", "The overall goals of the organization and the department within which I

work are clear", "Feedback on my performance is accurate and specific", and "I receive prompt feedback on my performance".

Five items assessing leadership, decision-making processes and concern for the importance of the individual were also generated in order to assess the organizational context factor of participative culture. The items read: "In this organization, there is warmth and support between workers and supervisors", "In this organization, the ideas of workers are sought and used by its leaders", "information needed for decision-making at my level of the organization is adequate and accurate", "Decision-makers at higher levels of the organization are aware of problems experienced at lower levels of the organization", and "This organization believes in the importance of individual workers". The response format for all of the organizational context items ranged from "strongly agree" (1) to "strongly disagree" (5).

Background Information

The background information form gathered demographic information concerning gender, age, educational level, employee status (part-time, full-time), weekly hours worked, job title, tenure, and place of origin (city, small town, country, and

suburbs). This background information form is presented in Figure 6.

Interview Schedule

A written plan for an interview, or interview schedule, was developed, containing a list of questions to be asked more or less verbatim. The standardization provided by an interview schedule is believed to aid the comparability or reliability of interviews (Jones, 1985). In the present study, each interviewee was asked each of the questions listed on the interview schedule, and follow-up questions were asked as necessary for clarification or elaboration. The items from the interview schedule used to guide the follow-up interviews of nominated individuals are found in Figure 7.

Analyses

Survey

Averaged peer ratings have been used in a variety of employment settings (DeNisi, Randolph, & Blencoe, 1983; McEvoy & Buller, 1987). In the present study, this practice of averaging peer ratings was adopted in order to combine ratings that the participants received from their peers.

This information will be used to tabulate group results. It will not be used to identify anyone as an individual.

1. Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

2. Age (in years): _____

3. Highest Level of Education Completed (please check one):

High school graduate _____
Some College _____
Associate's Degree _____
Bachelor's Degree _____
Master's Degree _____
beyond a Master's degree _____

4. Employee Status (please check one):

Part-time _____
Full-time _____

5. How many hours per week do you work on average? _____

6. Current job title: _____

7. How long have you been employed in your profession?

_____ year(s) and _____ month(s)

8. How long have you been employed with this organization?

_____ year(s) and _____ month(s)

9. How long have you been employed in your current job title with this organization?

_____ year(s) and _____ month(s)

10. Where did you grow up? (please check one)

in a city _____
in a small town _____
in the country _____
in the suburbs _____

11. Would you be willing to help us further with this project?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, is there a phone number where we can reach you: _____

Figure 6

Background Information Form

1. Recently, one of your co-workers nominated you as a person who goes above and beyond the call of duty to help others at work. Specifically, he/she mentioned the instance when you {relate instance}. Do you remember this? Can you tell me a little more about it?
2. What led up to this situation; what were you and others around you doing?
3. Just before you did it, if someone had asked you about why you were about to do it, what would you say?
4. Did you think it through a lot before you did it, or was it more spontaneous?
5. Who was in a position to gain from your action? Might some good come to you as a result of your action?
6. Why do you think people (including yourself) help others in this organization/in general? Why do you think people (including yourself) don't help others on the job more often?
7. Do you see yourself as a person who goes above and beyond the call of duty by helping others at work? Why or why not? (If yes) Do you think that your helpfulness is a result of your personality, or the situations you find yourself in?
8. What makes you help someone else out on the job, when another person might not?

Figure 7

Interview Schedule Items

The mean peer rating for each criterion item was computed for each participant. Then, the item scores were averaged for each participant to provide an overall mean peer rating of the participant's level of Altruistic OCB. Item scores were also averaged for each set of self ratings, providing an overall mean self rating of Altruistic OCB.

Simple correlations relating peer and self rated Altruistic OCB to interpersonal orientation and moral development were followed with multiple regression analysis regressing Altruistic OCB on these predictor variables, as well as on the moderator variables of interpersonal trust, organizational commitment and job satisfaction, and the organizational context variables of job clarity and participative culture.

Power analysis (Cohen, 1977) for this study indicated that at the .05 level of significance, a sample size of 80 is appropriate to attain power of .86 when a medium (.30) effect size is anticipated, and to attain power of .56 when a small to medium (.20) effect size is anticipated. A slightly higher sample size (96) will yield power of .91, given a medium effect size, and power of .63, given a small to medium effect size. A sample size of 180 yields power estimates of .99 and .86 for medium and small to medium effect sizes, respectively.

Interview

Participants' stated motives for altruistic behavior were postulated to center around three major themes: benevolence, egoism and reciprocity. The data collected in the interview portion of the study was content analyzed for patterns and consistencies in self-reported motivation and for information pertaining to the nature of the construct itself. Since individuals who were not nominated are not necessarily non-altruistic persons, using nominated/non-nominated status as a classification variable in analyses was not appropriate. A narrative summary of this information was provided instead, in an effort to help clarify and interpret the results found in the quantitatively based portion of the study.

Descriptive Information

Return Rates

Of 759 surveys distributed, 185 (24.4%) were returned to the principal investigator. Of these 185 respondents, 178 (96.2%) provided self ratings of Altruistic OCB. That is, 178 sets of ratings were available to analyze the dimensionality of self ratings of Altruistic OCB. The 185 surveys also generated peer ratings of 378 co-workers, most of whom were rated by only

one peer. Thus, 378 sets of ratings were available to analyze the dimensionality of peer ratings of Altruistic OCB. Peer ratings of Altruistic OCB and respondents' assessments of dispositional, attitudinal and contextual factors, as well as self ratings of Altruistic OCB were available for a subset (N=96) of the 185 respondents. This subset of respondents, henceforth referred to as the "target sample", provided the basis for hypothesis testing. Table 1 provides a summary of the return rates categorized by the nature of the useable data.

Demographic Characteristics

Demographic characteristics for the total sample (N=185) are reported in Tables 2 and 3. Table 2 contains the frequency counts for discrete demographic variables (e.g., age grouping, sex). Table 3 reports the means and standard deviations of continuous demographic variables (e.g., hours of work per week).

As reported in Table 2, the majority of participants comprising the survey sample were obtained from Hospital 2 and were female. Further, the majority were under forty years of age. The most frequently held job title was that of registered nurse. Most had earned either an Associate's degree, a Bachelor's degree or a three-year nursing diploma. In addition, the majority of participants worked full-time.

Table 1. Return Rates of Distributed (N=759) Surveys

	No.	%
<u>Overall Survey Return Rate</u>		
Surveys Returned	185	(24.4)
Surveys Not Returned	574	(75.6)
Total Surveys Distributed	759	
<u>Return Rate of Self Ratings</u>		
Surveys Returned With Self Ratings	178	(96.2)
Surveys Returned Without Self Ratings	7	(3.8)
Total Surveys Returned	185	
<u>Peer Ratings Matched with</u> <u>Dispositional/Attitudinal (Survey) Data</u>		
Survey Data Matched With Peer Ratings	96	(51.9)
Survey Data Unmatched With Peer Ratings	89	(48.1)
Total Surveys Returned	185	
<u>Number of Peer Ratings for</u> <u>Each Peer Rated Individual</u>		
1 Rating	280	(74.1)
2 Ratings	65	(17.2)
3 Ratings	28	(7.4)
4 Ratings	4	(1.1)
5 Ratings	1	(.3)
Total Peer Ratings Generated	378	
<u>Number of Peer Ratings Matched with Individual</u> <u>Dispositional/Attitudinal Data (Target Sample)</u>		
1 Rating	61	(63.5)
2 Ratings	20	(20.8)
3 Ratings	12	(12.5)
4 Ratings	2	(2.1)
5 Ratings	1	(1.0)
Total Matched Individuals	96	

Table 2. Frequency Counts for Discrete Demographic Variables

Variable	Survey Sample (N=185)	Target Sample (N=96)	Residual Sample (N=89)	Chi-Square: Target vs. Residual
Hospital				
Hospital 1	52	38	14	
Hospital 2	133	58	75	11.84***
Sex				
Male	15	9	6	
Female	169	87	82	
Missing	1	1	0	.13
Age				
21-29	59	24	35	
30-39	69	42	27	
40-49	34	22	12	
50-59	17	6	11	
60-69	5	2	3	
Missing	1	0	1	9.59*
Job Classification				
Administrative/Managerial	36	22	14	
Registered Nurse	78	40	38	
Other Nurse	49	22	27	
Other	19	10	9	
Missing	3	2	1	5.33
Educational Level				
High school Graduate	14	6	8	
Some College	24	10	14	
Associate's Degree	33	20	13	
Three-Year Nursing Diploma	59	29	30	
Bachelor's Degree	48	25	23	
Beyond Bachelor's Degree	6	5	1	
Missing	1	1	0	5.35
Employee Status				
Part-time	46	20	26	
Full-time	139	76	63	1.32
Origin				
City	59	27	32	
Town	49	26	23	
Country	40	23	17	
Suburb	35	19	16	
Missing	2	1	1	2.42

*p<.05 ***p<.001

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Continuous Demographic Variables

Variable	Survey Sample (N=185)		Target Sample (N=96) and Residual Sample (N=89)		t-test: Target vs. Residual
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Weekly Hours	39.08	10.20	40.06 38.01	10.52 9.54	1.38
Months in Profession	132.40	103.79	130.88 134.05	90.03 116.29	-.21
Months in Organization	85.72	86.74	83.38 88.26	73.72 99.23	-.38
Months in Job	51.10	68.11	47.67 54.80	55.28 79.84	-.70

Note: The survey sample is composed of the target sample and the residual sample
No t-values were significant at $p < .05$.

Roughly equal numbers of participants listed cities, towns, the country and the suburbs as their place of origin.

These profile characteristics among the demographic variables were also evident within the target sample (N=96). [Note that the survey sample and target sample are not independent samples.] Chi-square tests reported in Table 2 indicate that the target sample and residual sample (study sample minus the target sample) did not differ significantly from one another with regard to their representation on any of the discrete demographic variables except hospital and age. Individuals from Hospital 1 and those 30-49 years of age were overrepresented in the target sample.

As reported in Table 3 for the entire survey sample, participants averaged 39.1 hours of work per week, 132.4 months in the profession, 85.7 months with the organization, and 51.1 months in the present job with the organization. The non-significant t-values reported in Table 3 indicate that the target sample and the residual sample did not differ significantly from one another with regard to their representation in any of these continuous demographic variables.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the study in five major sections. First, the development of scales and their psychometric properties are reported; second, the influence of demographic factors is presented; third, the results pertaining to the stated hypotheses are reported; fourth, the results of supplementary analyses are presented; and fifth, the results of a content analysis of interview data are reported.

Development and Psychometric Properties of Scales

Criteria

The criterion of Altruistic OCB was assessed in this study with self ratings and peer ratings. Both sources evaluated the same scale of items composed of seven statements from the empirically derived Altruism factor reported by Smith, et al., (1983) plus four additional items included for this study. Overall self ratings of Altruistic OCB were obtained by computing the average score across all eleven items for each respondent. The raw score distributions for each of these items are reported in Appendix D.

An overall peer rating of Altruistic OCB was obtained for each subject by calculating the average of the mean ratings across raters for each item. That is, the mean of item 1 across peer ratings was computed for each subject. This process was repeated for items 2 through 11. Then, each individual's mean ratings across items 1 through 11 were averaged, to produce the overall peer ratings of Altruistic OCB. An estimate of the interrater reliability of the peer ratings based on Guilford's variance partitioning formula (Guilford, 1954, p.395-397) for two raters was found to be .64 ($n=98$). Extrapolating from this estimate (see Guilford, 1954), the interrater reliabilities for three, four and five raters were estimated to be .72, .78 and .81, respectively. The estimate of typical reliability for a single rater was estimated to be .47.

As reported in Table 4, a principal components factor analysis of the peer rated scale items yielded one interpretable factor. A principal components analysis of the self rated scale items produced two factors with eigen values greater than 1.0, although the factor structure for several of the self rated items appeared to be factorially complex (see factor structure loadings, Table 4). Despite the apparent complexity of self ratings, coefficient alphas of .92 and .81 were estimated for the peer and self rated summed scale items,

Table 4. Orthogonal Factor Loadings for Principal Components Factor Analysis of Peer Rated and Self Rated Altruistic OCB Scales

Variable	Peer Ratings (N=378)	Self Ratings (N=178)	
	Factor 1	Factor 1	Factor 2
Helps peers who have heavy workloads.	.79	.04	.75
Volunteers for things that are not required.	.83	.35	.59
Helps people outside department.	.70	.07	.73
Helps peers who have been absent.	.76	.45	.42
Attends functions that help company image.	.62	.45	.16
Courteous/considerate to clients/customers/patients.	.72	.27	.58
Orients new people although it is not required.	.82	.35	.55
Makes innovative suggestions to improve department.	.76	.70	.14
Shares tips for performing efficiently/effectively.	.78	.69	.19
Keeps supervisor informed of potential problems.	.59	.72	.07
Assists supervisor with special tasks.	.78	.65	.28
Eigen values	6.07	3.90	1.17

respectively. Estimates of coefficient alpha for the original Smith, et al, (1983) factor, as well as for the additional four items are reported in Table 5.

The internal consistency estimates suggest that all items essentially measured the same latent construct. The relationship between self ratings and peer ratings of Altruistic OCB ($r = .39$, $p < .001$), however, indicated that while the peer and self ratings may have assessed a common source of variance, the ratings were by no means redundant assessments of the behavior. Thus, the full scale assessments of self rated and peer rated Altruistic OCB were retained for use as the major criteria measures.

Although reasonably high estimates of internal consistency were obtained for the full peer and self rated scales, inspection of the scale items suggested meaningful differences among subsets of items. These differences regarded the beneficiaries of the actions portrayed in the statements. For example, item 1 ("helps other employees who are experiencing especially heavy workloads"), item 4 ("helps peers who have been absent to catch up with their work") and item 9 ("shares little tips with others for performing the job more efficiently or effectively") all portray altruistic actions which benefit peers. Similarly, item 10 ("keeps the supervisor informed of potential problems though it's not their job to do

Table 5. Internal Consistency Reliability Estimates for
the Peer Rated and Self Rated Altruistic OCB
Scales.

Scale	Items	Coefficient alpha	
		Peer Ratings (N=378)	Self Ratings (N=178)
Full Scale	1-11	.92	.81
Original Items	1,2,4,5,7,8,11	.89	.74
Additional Items	3,6,9,10	.75	.59
<u>Subscales by Beneficiary</u>			
Peers	1,4,9	.80	.54
Supervisor	10,11	.70	.68
Equivocal	2,7,8	.81	.53
Outsiders	3,6	.72	.53

so") and item 11 ("assists the supervisor with special tasks, even though they don't have to") appear to unequivocally target the supervisor as the beneficiary. In contrast, item 2 ("volunteers to do things not formally required by their job assignment"), item 7 ("takes initiative to orient new people to the department though it's not part of their job") and item 8 ("makes innovative suggestions to improve the overall quality of the department") seem to benefit an equivocal target. That is, the actions may have the effect of benefiting supervisors, or the department as a whole. Finally, item 3 ("goes out of the way to help people from outside the department with requests for information and/or assistance") and item 6 ("goes out of the way to be courteous and considerate to clients/customers/patients") are behaviors that would benefit outsiders, either co-workers outside one's own department, or patients. Since these apparently logical subgroupings of items obtained moderately high internal consistency estimates (see Table 5), the subgroups of items (inferred subscales) were retained as additional criteria measures in order to explore the correlates of Altruistic OCB as a function of the beneficiary.

Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) for the criteria are reported in Table 6. As indicated in Table 6, self ratings of Altruistic OCB were found to be slightly higher and less variable than peer ratings.

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics for Criterion Items of Altruistic OCB

Scale	<u>Peer Rated</u> Target Sample (N=96)		Survey Sample (N=178)		<u>Self Rated</u> Target Sample (N=94) and Residual Sample (N=89)		t-test: Target vs. Residual Sample
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
Full Scale	3.85	.69	4.00	.44	4.07 3.91	.44 .42	6.05*
<u>Beneficiary</u>							
Peers	3.80	.80	4.02	.51	4.05 3.98	.52 .50	.83
Supervisor	3.88	.83	3.95	.70	4.07 3.81	.68 .70	6.28*
Equivocal	3.83	.80	4.02	.53	4.09 3.95	.52 .54	2.94
Outsiders	4.17	.62	4.27	.56	4.37 4.15	.51 .59	7.38**

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Comparisons of self ratings from the target sample and the residual sample also indicated that individuals in the target sample rated themselves higher on the full scale of Altruistic OCB ($t = 6.05$, $p < .05$) as well as on the subscales designating the supervisor and outsiders as the beneficiary ($t = 6.28$, 7.38 , $p < .05$, respectively).

Predictors

The scales used to assess the predictor variables of interpersonal orientation, trust in peers, trust in management, job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, equity, organizational commitment, participative culture and job clarity were evaluated for their internal integrity. Items which were found to detract from the internal consistency of the scales were eliminated. The final estimates of internal consistency for the scales were found to range from .67 ("trust in peers") to .87 ("trust in management" and "organizational commitment"). These estimates of internal consistency, as well as the means and standard deviations for the scales are reported in Table 7. Analyses indicated that individuals in the target sample and those in the residual sample did not differ significantly with respect to any of the predictor variables (see Table 7).

The internal consistency of the moral development measure was also evaluated. However, since moral development was

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics for Predictor Variables of Interest

Scale (Coefficient Alpha)	Survey Sample (N=185)		Target Sample (N=96) and Residual Sample (N=89)		t-test: Target vs. Residual Sample
	M	SD	M	SD	
Moral Development (2 story; $\alpha = .41$)	3.76	2.06	3.95 3.56	2.02 2.10	.93
Interpersonal Orientation (7 items; $\alpha = .70$)	3.51	.56	3.56 3.45	.54 .58	1.31
Trust in Peers (3 items; $\alpha = .67$)	4.04	.60	4.09 3.99	.63 .55	1.12
Trust in Management (4 items; $\alpha = .87$)	3.36	.91	3.39 3.32	.94 .88	.52
Job Satisfaction (2 items; $\alpha = .77$)	3.78	.81	3.82 3.74	.81 .82	.69
Pay Satisfaction (2 items; $\alpha = .86$)	2.72	1.12	2.58 2.87	1.12 1.11	-1.75
Equity (3 items; $\alpha = .78$)	-.21	.61	-.21 .21	.66 .55	-.03
Organizational Commitment (9 items; $\alpha = .87$)	3.58	.60	3.61 3.55	.62 .59	.67
Participative Culture (5 items; $\alpha = .77$)	3.26	.73	3.30 3.21	.76 .70	.83
Job Clarity (4 items; $\alpha = .71$)	3.54	.67	3.54 3.54	.73 .60	.00

Note: Sample sizes for the moral development variable only are as follows: N=48 (target sample), N=43 (residual sample), N=91 (survey sample). Reliability estimates were computed using the full survey sample (N=91 for moral development, N=185 for all other variables).

assessed with a method unlike that used for any of the other predictor variables, (a two story version of Rest's Defining Issues Test: DIT), certain preliminary steps were taken to help ensure its reliability.

In all, three reliability checks were performed. First, the data were examined for high M scores (items which sound lofty and pretentious but don't mean anything). Subjects who assign importance to such items are thought to have a tendency to endorse statements for their pretentiousness, rather than on the basis of substance (Rest, 1988). Subjects with high M scores were eliminated from the data set. Second, item rankings were examined for their consistency with ratings. For example, if a subject ranked an item first, he or she should not have rated any items higher in importance than that item. Subjects with repeated inconsistencies were eliminated from the data set, since inconsistencies are thought to be indicative of an inappropriate response set (Rest, 1988). Third, if a subject showed little discrimination in ratings, (i.e. he or she rated most or all of the items as having the same level of importance) the subject's data was discarded. A lack of discrimination in ratings is considered to be evidence of a careless response set (Rest, 1988). In total, data from 91 individuals (50.8% of the study sample) were eliminated from consideration due to one or more of the above problems. The

volume of suspect data found in this study is unusual. Typically, between 5% and 15% of a sample is eliminated due to the reliability checks (Rest, 1986).

Conceptually, the DIT "P" score represents the extent to which an individual assigns importance to principled moral considerations in making a decision about moral dilemmas (Rest, 1979). An adaptation of this score was used as the index of moral development in the present study. When the full DIT is employed, the P score is derived by summing weighted ranks of items corresponding to Stage 5A (the morality of social contract), Stage 5B (the morality of intuitive humanism) and Stage 6 (the morality of principles of ideal social cooperation) across six stories. Since a two-story version of the test was used in the present study, P was calculated for each of the two stories by summing the weighted ranks of items corresponding to Stages 5A, 5B, and 6. The mean P score for the two stories was then calculated as the index of moral development for each respondent. The mean, standard deviation, and internal consistency estimate for this index of moral development are also provided in Table 7.

Influence of Demographic Factors

Preliminary analyses were conducted to examine the relationships between the demographic variables and peer and

self rated Altruistic OCB. As shown in Table 8, mean differences in peer ratings of Altruistic OCB as a function of hospital and job classification in the target sample were found to be significant ($F = 8.64, 11.49, p < .01$, respectively). These differences were also significant for self ratings of Altruistic OCB in the survey sample.

Significant relationships between educational level and peer ratings of Altruistic OCB and between age and self ratings of Altruistic OCB ($F = 2.71, 2.93, p < .05$, respectively) were also evident. Finally, inspection of the Pearson correlations between Altruistic OCB and hours worked, and tenure in the profession, organization and job revealed that only hours worked per week was significantly correlated with peer rated Altruistic OCB ($r = .23, p < .05$). Altruistic OCB in the survey sample. Employees from Hospital 1 were rated higher in Altruistic OCB than employees from Hospital 2, and administrative employees received higher mean ratings of Altruistic OCB than employees in other job classifications.

Further analyses assessing Pearson correlations within the target sample also indicated that employees from Hospital 1 and Hospital 2 differed significantly in level of reported trust in management ($r = -.42, p < .001$), pay satisfaction ($r = -.24, p < .05$), organizational commitment ($r = -.21, p < .05$), participative culture ($r = -.40, p < .001$) and job clarity ($r = -.33, p < .01$). In each instance, employees from Hospital 1

Table 8. Peer and Self Rated Altruistic OCB as a Function of Recorded Demographic Variables

Variable	Peer Rating (Full Scale) Target Sample (N=96)			Self Rating (Full Scale) Target Sample (N=94)			Self Rating (Full Scale) Survey Sample (N=178)		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>
Hospital									
Hospital 1	4.08	.45		4.15	.35		4.13	.35	
Hospital 2	3.71	.78	8.64**	4.03	.49	1.80	3.95	.46	8.01**
Sex									
Male	3.82	.88		4.14	.64		4.06	.53	
Female	3.86	.67	.03	4.07	.42	.23	4.00	.43	.30
Employee Status									
Part-Time	3.61	.79		3.97	.09		3.97	.36	
Full-Time	3.92	.65	3.20	4.10	.05	1.49	4.01	.46	.31
Job									
Administration	4.18	.45		4.15	.35		4.16	.32	
Other	3.74	.73	11.49**	4.04	.47	.98	3.96	.45	9.00**
Rated by Peers									
Once	3.82	.75		4.02	.43		4.02	.43	
More than Once	3.91	.58	.41	4.17	.46	2.46	4.17	.46	2.46
Education									
HS Graduate	3.58	.70		4.29	.57		4.14	.41	
Some College	3.80	.75		4.18	.54		4.04	.53	
Associate's	3.83	.67		4.07	.35		3.99	.39	
3-Yr Diploma	4.08	.38		4.14	.44		4.00	.48	
Bachelor's	3.57	.88		3.89	.46		3.92	.40	
Advanced	4.49	.35	2.71*	4.11	.24	1.38	4.09	.22	.63
Origin									
City	3.93	.66		4.18	.45		4.01	.51	
Town	3.89	.67		4.00	.45		3.97	.40	
Country	3.79	.64		4.12	.46		4.06	.46	
Suburbs	3.74	.84	.36	3.96	.39	1.26	3.93	.35	.63
Age									
21-29	3.78	.84		3.91	.50		3.88	.51	
30-39	3.91	.68		4.14	.42		4.08	.40	
40-49	3.94	.57		4.17	.33		4.10	.33	
50-63	3.52	.57	.92	3.97	.58	1.91	3.97	.41	2.93*

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

reported higher levels of these attributes than employees from Hospital 2.

In light of these findings, a decision was made to standardize all variables within hospital before performing tests to assess the specified hypotheses. Although interesting in its own right, the effect for hospital may be considered a design artifact in the context of the present study. Standardizing all variables within hospital has the effect of controlling for the spurious influence of hospital among obtained relationships. The resulting intercorrelations among variables of interest, after controlling for the effect of hospital, are presented in Table 9 for the target sample. The matrix of intercorrelations of study variables for the entire survey sample, after controlling for hospital, the complete matrices of zero-order correlations for the target and survey samples, and zero-order correlations within hospital may be found in Appendices E through H.

Hypothesis Testing

Statistical tests of the specified hypotheses outlined in Chapter 2 are presented below, based on the target sample and using the full (11 item) Altruistic OCB scales as the criteria. Results based on the full survey sample may be found in Appendices I and J.

Table 9. Intercorrelations Among Altruistic OCB Scales and Variables of Interest, After Controlling for the Effects of Hospital (Target Sample)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Independent:																			
1. Moral Development	--																		
2. Interpersonal Orientation	-.12	--																	
3. Trust in Peers	-.22	.30*	--																
4. Trust in Management	-.31*	-.03	-.11	--															
5. Job Satisfaction	-.14	.20*	.35*		--														
6. Pay Satisfaction	-.10	.10	.10	.27*	.42*	--													
7. Equity	-.04	-.10	-.14	.05	.02	.19*	--												
8. Organizational Commitment	-.20	.26*	.27*	.54*	.65*	.46*	-.04	--											
9. Participative Culture	-.15	.14	.21*	.55*	.36*	.46*	-.01	.50*	--										
10. Job Clarity	-.20	.20*	.08	.48*	.36*	.27*	-.01	.46*	.63*	--									
Self-Rated Altruistic OCB:																			
11. Overall	.03	-.02	.17	.04	.10	-.06	-.12	.15	.02	.10	--								
12. Peer	.14	-.01	.16	-.03	.05	.00	-.15	.08	.07	.17	.81*	--							
13. Supervisor	-.18	-.01	.14	.07	-.02	-.07	.01	.03	-.02	.08	.74*	.48*	--						
14. Equivocal	-.10	-.06	.14	-.05	.05	-.11	-.17	.14	-.03	.04	.88*	.65*	.51*	--					
15. Outsider	-.14	.07	.12	.06	.26*	.07	.00	.17	.08	.06	.67*	.38*	.44*	.55*	--				
Peer-Rated Altruistic OCB:																			
16. Overall	.05	-.02	.07	.08	.26*	-.07	-.22*	.19	.10	.19*	.37*	.37*	.25*	.28*	.19*	--			
17. Peer	.02	.03	-.01	.03	.20*	-.05	-.15	.08	.08	.20*	.37*	.41*	.27*	.26*	.19*	.92*	--		
18. Supervisor	.02	-.07	.04	.17	.18*	-.11	-.23*	.21*	.15	.22*	.23*	.23*	.17*	.19*	.02	.83*	.68*	--	
19. Equivocal	.09	-.05	.07	.05	.25*	-.08	-.19*	.17	.05	.18*	.36*	.36*	.21*	.29*	.20*	.95*	.85*	.72*	--
20. Outsider	.06	.02	.14	.12	.37*	.05	-.19*	.22*	.15	.14	.35*	.33*	.26*	.19*	.29*	.82*	.71*	.57*	.75*

Note: N=94 except for correlations with moral development (N=47)

a: $p < .05$

b: $p < .01$

c: $p < .001$

Hypotheses 1 and 2 specified a positive relationship between Altruistic OCB and the dispositional factors of interpersonal orientation and moral development, respectively. As indicated in Table 9, neither interpersonal orientation nor moral maturity were found to be significantly related to either overall peer ratings of Altruistic OCB ($r = .05, -.02, ns$) or overall self ratings of Altruistic OCB ($r = .03, -.02, ns$). These dispositional factors also were found to be unrelated to the inferred subscales. On the basis of these results, both Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 were rejected in the present sample.

Hypothesis 3A proposed that interpersonal trust (trust in management and trust in peers) would have a positive moderating effect on the relationships between interpersonal orientation and peer and self rated Altruistic OCB, such that the relationships would be strengthened under conditions of high trust. Similarly, Hypothesis 3B stated that interpersonal trust (trust in management and trust in peers) would have a moderating effect on the relationships between moral development and peer and self rated Altruistic OCB, such that the relationships would be strengthened under conditions of high trust.

As shown in Tables 10-15, the interactions between trust in management and interpersonal orientation with regard to the criteria of peer and self rated Altruistic OCB were

Table 10. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB as a Function of Interpersonal Orientation, Controlling for Hospital

Moderators	Peer Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample; N=96)						Self Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample; N=94)							
	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	FR ²	ΔR ²	ΔFR ²	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	FR ²	ΔR ²	ΔFR ²
IO	.00			.00	.00			.02			.00	.04		
IO, TM	.01	.07		.00	.21	.00	.41	-.02	.04		.00	.10	.00	.15
IO, TM, IO+TM	.12	.23	-.20	.01	.16	.00	.07	-.11	.22	-.21	.00	.09	.00	.08
IO	.00			.00	.00			-.02			.00	.04		
IO, TP	-.02	.07		.00	.22	.00	.44	-.08	.19		.03	1.56	.03	3.07
IO, TP, IO+TP	.51	.55	-.82	.02	.70	.02	1.65	.27	.51	-.54	.04	1.28	.01	.74
IO	.00			.00	.00			-.02			.00	.04		
IO, JS	-.05	.27 ^a		.07	3.62 ^a	.07	7.23 ^{a*}	-.04	.11		.01	.57	.01	1.10
IO, JS, IO+JS	.25	.69	-.57	.08	2.73 ^a	.01	.95	-.15	-.04	.21	.01	.42	.00	.12
IO	.00			.00	.00			-.02			.00	.04		
IO, PS	.01	-.09		.01	.40	.01	.80	-.02	-.05		.00	.15	.00	.26
IO, PS, IO+PS	.53	1.20	-1.44	.05	1.51	.04	3.70	.00	-.01	-.05	.00	.10	.00	.00
IO	.00			.00	.00			-.02			.00	.04		
IO, EQ	-.02	-.22 ^a		.05	2.42	.05	4.84 ^a	-.03	-.12		.02	.70	.01	1.35
IO, EQ, IO+EQ	.05	-2.18 ^a	1.98 ^a	.11	3.77 ^a	.06	6.19 ^a	.00	1.08	.97	.03	.91	.01	1.32
IO	.00			.00	.00			-.02			.00	.04		
IO, OC	-.05	.20		.04	1.82	.04	3.64	-.06	.17		.03	1.21	.03	2.38
IO, OC, IO+OC	.50	.75	-.89	.05	1.75	.02	1.58	-.21	.02	.23	.03	.83	.00	.11

Note: Abbreviations represent interpersonal orientation (IO), trust in management (TM), trust in peers (TP), job satisfaction(JS), pay satisfaction (PS), equity (EQ), and organizational commitment (OC).

a: standardized beta weights

* p<.05

** p<.01

Table 11. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB Which Benefits Peers, as a Function of Interpersonal Orientation, Controlling for Hospital

Moderators	Peer Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample; N=96)				Self Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample; N=94)			
	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²
IO	.04			.00				
TM	.04	.01		.00	.01			.00
TM, IO*TM	.10	.09	-.10	.00	.01	-.03		.00
				.07	.40	.54	-.70	.01
IO	.04			.00				
TP	.05	-.02		.00	.01			.00
TP, IO*TP	.45	.34	-.62	.01	.06	.18		.03
				.39	.21	.04	.23	.96
IO	.04			.00				
JS	.00	.20		.04	.02	.05		.00
JS, IO*JS	.09	.32	-.17	.04	.24	-.26	.42	.12
				1.27				.24
IO	.04			.00				
PS	.05	-.07		.01	.01			.00
PS, IO*PS	.52	1.10	-1.31	.04	.01	.00		.00
				1.24	.03	-.05	.06	.01
IO	.04			.00				
EQ	.03	-.15		.02	.02	-.15		.00
EQ, IO*EQ	.11	-2.26**	2.14**	.09	.02	-1.34	1.21	.02
				3.14*	.07			1.38
IO	.04			.00				
OC	.03	.06		.01	.03	.09		.00
OC, IO*OC	.47	.50	-.70	.02	.23	-.11	.31	.32
				.48	.01	.27	.00	.01

Note: Abbreviations represent interpersonal orientation (IO), trust in management (TM), trust in peers (TP), job satisfaction, (JS), pay satisfaction (PS), equity(EQ), and organizational commitment (OC).

a: standardized beta weights

* p<.05

** p<.01

Table 12. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB Which Benefits Supervisors, as a Function of Interpersonal Orientation, Controlling for Hospital

Moderators	Peer Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample, N=96)						Self Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample, N=94)					
	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	FR ²	ΔR ²	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	FR ²	ΔFR ²
IO	-.06			.00	.29		-.00			.00	.00	
IO, TM	-.05	.15		.03	1.24	.02	2.10	.07		.00	.21	.00
IO, TM, IO*TM	.34	.70	-.67	.03	1.10	.01	.84	-.45	.64	.01	.39	.01
												.75
IO	-.06			.00	.29		-.00			.00	.00	
IO, TP	-.08	.06		.01	.32	.00	.36	.15		.02	.97	.02
IO, TP, IO*TP	.37	.48	-.70	.02	.62	.01	1.22	.28	-.22	.02	.68	.00
												.12
IO	-.06			.00	.29		-.00			.00	.00	
IO, JS	-.10	.20		.04	1.94	.04	3.58	.02		.00	.02	.00
IO, JS, IO*JS	.41	.89	-.95	.07	2.19	.03	2.63	-.41	-.58	.02	.55	.02
												1.60
IO	-.06			.00	.29		-.00			.00	.00	
IO, PS	-.05	-.11		.02	.75	.01	1.21	-.07		.00	.00	
IO, PS, IO*PS	.58*	1.43*	1.73*	.07	2.34	.05	5.43*	.04	-.13	.01	.23	.01
										.01	.16	.00
IO	-.06			.00	.29		-.00			.00	.00	
IO, EQ	-.08	-.23*		.06	2.81	.05	5.32*	.01		.00	.01	.00
IO, EQ, IO*EQ	-.05	-.95	.72	.06	2.13	.01	.78	.01	-.34	.00	.06	.00
												.17
IO	-.06			.00	.29		-.00			.00	.00	
IO, OC	-.12	.23*		.05	2.57	.05	4.84*	-.00		.00	.00	
IO, OC, IO*OC	.61	.95*	-1.16	.08	2.67	.03	2.78	-.02	.03	.00	.04	.00
								-.24	-.19	.00	.11	.00
												.08
												.24

Note: Abbreviations represent interpersonal orientation (IO), trust in management (TM), trust in peers (TP), job satisfaction (JS), pay satisfaction (PS), equity (EQ) and organizational commitment (OC)

a: standardized beta weights

* p<.05

** p<.01

Table 13. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB Which Benefits an Equivocal Target, as a Function of Interpersonal Orientation, Controlling for Hospital

Moderators	Peer Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample; N=96)					Self Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample; N=94)								
	B _i ^a	B _i ^a	B _i ^a	R ²	FR ²	ΔR ²	B _i ^a	B _i ^a	B _i ^a	R ²	FR ²	ΔR ²	ΔFR ²	
IO	-.03			.00	.09		-.06			.00	.30			
IO, TH	-.03	.04		.00	.12	.00	-.06	-.05		.01	.28	.00	.25	
IO, TH, IO*TH	-.17	-.16	.24	.00	.11	.00	-.01	.01	-.08	.01	.19	.00	.01	
IO	-.03			.00	.09		-.06			.00	.30			
IO, TP	-.06	.09		.01	.38	.01	.66	-.11	.17	.03	1.40	.03	2.49	
IO, TP, IO*TP	.51	.61	-.89	.03	.91	.02	1.98	.17	.43	.04	1.09	.01	.48	
IO	-.03			.00	.09		-.06			.00	.30			
IO, JS	-.09	.27**		.07	3.59*	.07	7.08**	-.07	.06	.01	.31	.00	.32	
IO, JS, IO*JS	.24	.71	-.60	.08	2.75*	.01	1.07	-.16	-.06	.01	.23	.00	.07	
IO	-.03			.00	.09		-.06			.00	.30			
IO, PS	-.02	-.10		.01	.49	.01	.90	-.07	-.18	.04	1.66	.03	3.00	
IO, PS, IO*PS	.42	1.00	-1.22	.04	1.21	.03	2.63	-.05	-.89	.72	1.35	.01	.74	
IO	-.03			.00	.09		-.06			.00	.30			
IO, EQ	-.05	-.20		.04	1.93	.04	3.76	-.06		.03	1.31	.02	2.32	
IO, EQ, IO*EQ	.02	-2.05*	1.88*	.09	3.16*	.05	5.45*	-.10	.16	.04	1.12	.01	.73	
IO	-.03			.00	.09		-.06			.00	.30			
IO, OC	-.08	.19		.03	1.68	.03	3.27	-.05	-.11	.02	.69	.01	1.09	
IO, OC, IO*OC	.39	.66	-.75	.05	1.50	.01	1.12	-.22	-.55	.50	.59	.00	.40	

Note: Abbreviations represent interpersonal orientation (IO), trust in management (TM), trust in peers (TP), job satisfaction, (JS), pay satisfaction (PS), equity (EQ), and organizational commitment (OC).

a: standardized beta weights

* p<.05

** p<.01

Table 14. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB Which Benefits Outsiders, as a Function of Interpersonal Orientation, Controlling for Hospital

Moderators	Peer Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample/ N=96)						Self Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample/ N=94)					
	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	FR ²	Δ R ² Δ FR ²	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	FR ²	Δ R ² Δ FR ²
IO	.05			.00	.27		.07			.01	.46	
IO, TH	.06	.11		.02	.73	.01 1.19	.07	.06		.01	.40	.00 .34
IO, TH, IO*TH	.21	.33	-.27	.02	.53	.00 .13	.17	.19	-.16	.01	.28	.00 .05
IO	.05			.00	.27		.07			.01	.46	
IO, TP	.01	.13		.02	.91	.02 1.56	.04	.10		.01	.68	.01 .90
IO, TP, IO*TP	.68	.75	-1.05	.05	1.55	.03 2.79	.70	.72	-1.04	.04	1.37	.03 2.71
IO	.05			.00	.27		.07			.01	.46	
IO, JS	-.02	.37***		.13	7.24**	.13 14.18***	.18	.48	-.31	.07	3.26*	.06 6.03*
IO, JS, IO*JS	.20	.67	-.41	.14	4.98**	.00 .52				.07	2.25	.00 .27
IO	.05			.00	.27		.07			.01	.46	
IO, PS	.05	.02		.00	.14	.00 .02	.06	.06		.01	.42	.00 .38
IO, PS, IO*PS	.44	.98	-1.08	.02	.77	.02 2.01	.34	.77	-.79	.02	.62	.01 1.01
IO	.05			.00	.27		.07			.01	.46	
IO, EQ	.03	-.19		.04	1.83	.04 3.39	.07	.00		.01	.23	.00 .00
IO, EQ, IO*EQ	.11	-2.13**	1.97*	.10	3.28*	.06 5.99*	.11	-1.11	1.13	.02	.75	.02 1.78
IO	.05			.00	.27		.07			.01	.46	
IO, OC	-.01	.23*		.05	2.51	.05 4.74*	.03	.17		.01	.43	.03 2.38
IO, OC, IO*OC	.68	.91*	-1.10	.08	2.53	.03 2.49	.29	.42	-.42	.03	1.06	.00 .34

Note: Abbreviations represent interpersonal orientation (IO), trust in management (TM), trust in peers (TP), job satisfaction, (JS), equity (EQ), and organizational commitment (OC).

a: standardized beta weights

* p<.05

** p<.01

***p<.001

Table 15. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB as a Function of Moral Development, Controlling for Hospital

Moderators	Peer Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample; N=47)						Self Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample; N=47)					
	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	FR ²	ΔR ² ΔFR ²	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	FR ²	ΔR ² ΔFR ²
MD	.06			.00	.18		.03			.00	.04	
MD, TH	.07	.01		.00	.09	.00 .00	.03	-.00		.00	.02	.00 .00
MD, TH, MD*TH	-.78	-.45	.85	.03	.52	.03 1.36	.81	.42	-.78	.03	.39	.03 1.11
MD	.06			.00	.18		.03			.00	.04	
MD, TP	.11	.24		.06	1.37	.05 2.54	.08	.22		.05	1.07	.05 2.10
MD, TP, MD*TP	.10	.23	.01	.06	.89	.00 .00	-.30	.07	.38	.05	.75	.00 .14
MD	.06			.00	.18		.03			.00	.04	
MD, JS	.08	.15		.03	.63	.02 1.07	.04	.09		.01	.18	.01 .33
MD, JS, MD*JS	.21	.21	-.13	.03	.42	.00 .04	-.31	-.07	.37	.01	.21	.01 .28
MD	.06			.00	.18		.03			.00	.04	
MD, PS	.05	-.16		.03	.69	.03 1.20	.04	.07		.01	.13	.01 .22
MD, PS, MD*PS	.55	.19	-.61	.06	.90	.03 1.31	.32	.27	-.35	.02	.22	.01 .40
MD	.06			.00	.18		.03			.00	.04	
MD, EQ	.05	-.35 ^a		.13	3.28 ^a	.12 6.36 ^a	.01	-.38 ^{aa}		.06	.04	
MD, EQ, MD*EQ	.05	-.58	.23	.13	2.18	.00 .11	.02	-.47	.09	.14	3.65 ^a	.14 7.26 ^{aa}
MD	.06			.00	.18		.03			.00	.04	
MD, OC	.09	.16		.03	.65	.02 1.12	.03	.30 ^a		.00	.04	
MD, OC, MD*OC	1.02	.56	-.95	.06	.89	.03 1.36	.13	.32	-.03	.09	2.16	.09 4.28 ^a
										.09	1.41	.00 .00

Note: Abbreviations represent moral development (MD), trust in management (TM), trust in peers (TP), job satisfaction, (JS), pay satisfaction (PS), equity (EQ), and organizational commitment (OC).

a: standardized beta weights

* p<.05

** p<.01

nonsignificant ($\Delta \underline{F}R^2=.07$, ns; $\Delta \underline{F}R^2=.08$, ns), as were the interactions between trust in peers and interpersonal orientation ($\Delta \underline{F}R^2=1.65$, ns; $\Delta \underline{F}R^2=.74$, ns), trust in management and moral development ($\Delta \underline{F}R^2=1.36$, ns; $\Delta \underline{F}R^2=1.11$, ns), and trust in peers and moral development ($\Delta \underline{F}R^2=.00$, ns; $\Delta \underline{F}R^2=.14$, ns). As shown in Tables 11-14 and 16-19, nonsignificant moderating effects were also evident in similar analyses involving the inferred subscales of Altruistic OCB as the criteria. Only one significant moderating effect -- a negative effect for the interaction of moral development and trust in management on peer ratings of Altruistic OCB with the supervisor as beneficiary ($\Delta \underline{F}R^2=5.01$, $p<.05$) -- was found. This single result was not considered to represent sufficient evidence for confirmation of the hypothesis. Therefore, on the basis of these results, both Hypothesis 3A and Hypothesis 3B were rejected in the present sample.

Hypothesis 4A stated that organizational commitment would have a positive moderating effect on the relationships between interpersonal orientation and peer and self rated Altruistic OCB, such that the relationships would be strengthened under conditions of high commitment. Similarly, Hypothesis 4B proposed that organizational commitment would positively moderate the relationships between moral development and peer and self rated Altruistic OCB. The results reported in Tables

Table 16. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB Which Benefit Others, as a Function of Moral Development, Controlling for Hospital

Peer Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample, N=47)														Self Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample, N=47)													
Moderators	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	FR ²	Δ R ²	Δ FR ²	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	FR ²	Δ R ²	Δ FR ²													
MD	.03			.00	.04			.14			.02	.95															
MD, TH	.02	-.04		.00	.05	.00	.06	.13	-.04		.02	.50	.00	.07													
MD, TH, MD*TH	-1.15	-.68	1.17	.06	.91	.06	2.64	.59	.21	-.46	.03	.46	.01	.39													
MD	.03			.00	.04			.14			.02	.95															
MD, TP	.07	.18		.03	.75	.03	1.47	.19	.23		.07	1.68	.05	2.38													
MD, TP, MD*TP	-.17	.09	.24	.03	.51	.00	.06	1.00	-.24	1.20	.10	1.66	.03	1.58													
MD	.03			.00	.04			.14			.02	.95															
MD, JS	.04	.09		.01	.21	.01	.38	.15	.05		.02	.52	.00	.10													
MD, JS, MD*JS	.11	.12	-.07	.01	.14	.00	.01	-.02	-.02	.18	.02	.36	.00	.06													
MD	.03			.00	.04			.14			.02	.95															
MD, PS	.01	-.17		.03	.68	.03	1.32	.15	.09		.03	.66	.01	.38													
MD, PS, MD*PS	.48	.16	-.56	.05	.83	.02	1.13	.60	.41	-.54	.05	.78	.02	1.03													
MD	.03			.00	.04			.14			.02	.95															
MD, EQ	.02	-.29		.08	2.05	.08	4.05	.13	-.34 ^a		.14	3.56 ^a	.12	6.07 ^a													
MD, EQ, MD*EQ	.02	-.30	.01	.08	1.33	.00	.00	.12	.39	-.75	.16	2.77	.02	1.16													
MD	.03			.00	.04			.14			.02	.95															
MD, OC	.04	.04		.00	.06	.00	.08	.18	.20		.06	1.38	.04	1.80													
MD, OC, MD*OC	.71	.33	-.69	.02	.27	.02	.68	.19	.20	-.00	.06	.90	.00	.99													

Note: Abbreviations represent moral development (MD), trust in management (TM), trust in peers (TP), job satisfaction, (JS), pay satisfaction (PS), equity (EQ), and organizational commitment (OC).

a: standardized beta weights

* p<.05

** p<.01

Table 17. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB Which Benefit Supervisors,
as a Function of Moral Development, Controlling for Hospital

Moderators	Peer Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample/ N=47)						Self Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample/ N=47)					
	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	FR ²	ΔFR ²	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	FR ²	ΔFR ²
HD	.02			.00	.03					.03	.53	
HD, TH	.07	.16		.02	.52	.02	1.02	-.10		.04	.90	.01
HD, TH, HD*TH	-1.48*	-.69	1.55*	.12	2.05	.10	5.01*	-.10	.11	.04	.65	.00
HD	.02			.00	.03					.03	1.53	
HD, TP	.05	.12		.01	.31	.01	.60	-.16	.00	.04	.91	.01
HD, TP, HD*TP	.12	.15	-.07	.01	.21	.00	.01	-1.55	-.46	.00	1.30	.04
HD	.02			.00	.03					.03	1.53	
HD, JS	.04	.11		.01	.29	.01	.56	-.19	-.10	.04	.97	.01
HD, JS, HD*JS	-.52	-.14	.59	.03	.44	.02	.73	-.49	-.23	.05	.70	.00
HD	.02			.00	.03					.03	1.53	
HD, PS	.01	-.13		.02	.36	.02	.73	-.20	-.14	.05	1.24	.02
HD, PS, HD*PS	.77	.41	-.91	.08	1.26	.06	3.06	.43	.29	.16	1.55	.04
HD	.02			.00	.03					.03	1.53	
HD, EQ	.01	-.28		.00	.03					.03	1.53	
HD, EQ, HD*EQ	.02	-.72	.46	.09	1.37	.08	3.71	-.19	-.13	.05	1.12	.02
HD	.02			.00	.03					.06	.91	.01
HD, OC	.07	.22		.05	1.12	.05	2.21	-.18	.00	.03	1.53	
HD, OC, HD*OC	-.04	.17	.11	.05	.74	.00	.02	-.47	-.12	.03	.75	.00
										.04	.53	.00

Note: Abbreviations represent moral development (HD), trust in management (TH), trust in peers (TP), job satisfaction, (JS), pay satisfaction (PS), equity (EQ), and organizational commitment (OC).

a: standardized beta weights

* p<.05

** p<.01

Table 18. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB Which Benefit an Equivocal Target, as a Function of Moral Development, Controlling for Hospital

Moderators	Peer Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample; N=7)						Self Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample; N=47)					
	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	FR ²	Δ R ² Δ FR ²	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	FR ²	Δ R ² Δ FR ²
MD	.10			.01	.46					.01	.49	
MD, TM	.09	-.03		.01	.25	.00	.10	-.03		.25	.78	.00 .03
MD, TM, MD*TM	-.45	-.32	.54	.02	.35	.01 .55	.72	.32	-.63	.03	.41	.02 .73
MD	.10			.01	.46		.10			.01	.49	
MD, TP	.15	.25		.07	1.67	.06 2.87	.14	.18		.04	.93	.03 1.38
MD, TP, MD*TP	.19	.26	-.04	.07	1.09	.00 .00	.05	.14	.09	.04	.61	.00 .01
MD	.10			.01	.46		.10			.01	.49	
MD, JS	.12	.12		.02	.55	.01 .65	.11	.06		.01	.33	.00 .18
MD, JS, MD*JS	.53	.31	-.44	.03	.50	.01 .40	-.32	-.13	.46	.02	.36	.01 .44
MD	.10			.01	.46		.10			.01	.49	
MD, PS	.08	-.18		.04	.96	.03 1.45	.11	.09		.02	.40	.01 .33
MD, PS, MD*PS	.48	.11	-.48	.06	.92	.02 .84	-.01	-.00	-.15	.02	.29	.00 .08
MD	.10			.01	.46		.10			.01	.49	
MD, EQ	.08	-.33 ^a		.12	2.94	.11 5.37 ^a	.09	-.37 ^a		.15	3.81 ^a	.14 7.06 ^a
MD, EQ, MD*EQ	.08	-.36	.04	.12	1.92	.00 .00	-.09	-.45	.08	.15	2.48	.00 .01
MD	.10			.01	.46		.10			.01	.49	
MD, OC	.13	.14		.03	.67	.02 .89	.10			.01	.49	
MD, OC, MD*OC	1.35	.67	-1.26	.08	1.28	.05 2.45	.17	.32 ^a		.11	2.68	.10 4.84 ^a
							-.03	.24	.20	.11	1.77	.06 .80

Note: Abbreviations represent moral development (MD), trust in management (TM), trust in peers (TP), job satisfaction, (JS), pay satisfaction (PS), equity (EQ), and organizational commitment (OC).

a: standardized beta weights

^a p<.05

^{aa} p<.01

Table 19. Analysis of Moderated Relationships for Altruistic OCB Which Benefit

Outsiders, as a Function of Moral Development, Controlling for Hospital

Moderators	Peer Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample; N=47)					Self Rated Altruistic OCB (Target Sample; N=47)								
	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	FR ²	ΔR ²	ΔFR ²	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	FR ²	ΔFR ²	ΔR ²
MD	.08			.01	.28			-.14			.02	.90		
MD, TM	.08	.02		.01	.14	.00	.01	-.11	.09		.03	.62	.01	.34
MD, TM, MD*TM	.26	.11	-.18	.01	.11	.00	.06	1.11	.76	-1.23	.09	1.41	.06	2.95
MD	.08			.01	.28			-.14			.02	.90		
MD, TP	.14	.28		.08	2.00	.08	3.70	-.11	.13		.04	.84	.02	.79
MD, TP, MD*TP	1.28	.73	-1.15	.11	1.84	.03	1.48	1.55	.79	-1.67	.10	1.60	.06	3.03
MD	.08			.01	.28			-.14			.02	.90		
MD, JS	.12	.28		.08	2.03	.08	3.78	-.10	.28		.10	2.32	.08	3.69
MD, JS, MD*JS	.74	.56	-.66	.10	1.69	.02	.99	.22	.42	-.34	.10	1.61	.01	.25
MD	.08			.01	.28			-.14			.02	.90		
MD, PS	.07	-.08		.01	.29	.01	.31	-.12	.19		.05	1.24	.03	1.58
MD, PS, MD*PS	.41	.16	-.41	.03	.39	.01	.58	-.04	.24	-.09	.05	.82	.03	.86
MD	.08			.01	.28			-.14			.02	.90		
MD, EQ	.06	-.32 ^a		.11	2.74	.10	5.18 ^a	-.15	-.24		.08	1.82	.06	2.70
MD, EQ, MD*EQ	.07	-.64	.33	.11	1.87	.00	.22	-.15	-.36	.12	.08	1.19	.00	.29
MD	.08			.01	.28			-.14			.02	.90		
MD, OC	.11	.14		.03	.60	.02	.93	-.09	.27		.09	2.22	.07	3.48
MD, OC, MD*OC	1.81 ^a	.88 ^a	-1.75 ^a	.12	2.09	.10	4.96 ^a	1.12	.79 ^a	-1.23	.14	2.34	.05	2.45

Note: Abbreviations represent moral development (MD), trust in management (TM), trust in peers (TP), job satisfaction, (JS) pay satisfaction (PS), equity (EQ), and organizational commitment (OC).

a: standardized beta weights

^a p<.05

^{aa} p<.01

10 and 15 indicate that the interactions between commitment and interpersonal orientation for peer and self rated Altruistic OCB ($\Delta \underline{FR}^2 = 1.58$, ns; $\Delta \underline{FR}^2 = .11$, ns), and between commitment and moral development ($\Delta \underline{FR}^2 = 1.36$, ns; $\Delta \underline{FR}^2 = .00$, ns), failed to account for significant increments in explained variance. These nonsignificant effects were also evident in analyses using the inferred subscales as criteria. On the basis of these results, both Hypothesis 4A and Hypothesis 4B were rejected in the present sample. However, a significant positive main effect was noted for commitment ($\Delta \underline{FR}^2 = 4.28$, $p < .05$) in predicting self ratings of Altruistic OCB after the effect for moral development had been entered in the equation. Similar main effects for commitment were detected in equations predicting peer rated actions which benefit supervisors ($\Delta R^2 = 4.84$, $p < .05$) and outsiders ($\Delta \underline{FR}^2 = 4.74$, $p < .05$), and self rated actions which benefit an equivocal target ($\Delta \underline{FR}^2 = 4.84$, $p < .05$). These effects are reported in Tables 12, 14 and 18, respectively.

Hypothesis 5A predicted that dimensions of job satisfaction (pay equity, pay satisfaction, general job satisfaction) would positively moderate the relationships between interpersonal orientation and peer and self rated Altruistic OCB, such that the relationships would be strengthened under conditions of high satisfaction. Hypothesis 5B stated that job satisfaction would have a moderating effect

on the relationships between moral development and peer and self rated Altruistic OCB, such that the relationships would be strengthened under conditions of high satisfaction.

As reported in Tables 10 and 15, these relationships were not supported for the conceptualizations of job satisfaction as pay satisfaction or general job satisfaction. That is, the interactions between pay satisfaction and interpersonal orientation ($\Delta \underline{F}R^2=3.70$, ns; $\Delta \underline{F}R^2=.00$, ns), between pay satisfaction and moral development ($\Delta \underline{F}R^2 = 1.31$, ns; $\Delta \underline{F}R^2 = .40$, ns), between overall job satisfaction and interpersonal orientation ($\Delta \underline{F}R^2=.95$, ns; $\Delta \underline{F}R^2=.12$, ns), and between overall job satisfaction and moral development ($\Delta \underline{F}R^2 = .04$, ns; $\Delta \underline{F}R^2 = .28$, ns) failed to account for significant increments in explained variance. However, a significant main effect ($\Delta \underline{F}R^2=7.23$, $p<.01$) was detected for job satisfaction when peer ratings were used as the criteria, and the effect for interpersonal orientation had already been entered into the equation. This incrementally significant main effect for job satisfaction was also evident in similar analyses using the inferred peer and self rated subscales of Altruistic OCB as criteria (see Tables 11-14 and 16-19).

With respect to job equity, the hypothesized moderating effects of equity on the relationships between moral development and Altruistic OCB ($\Delta \underline{F}R^2 = .11$, ns; $\Delta \underline{F}R^2 = .02$, ns) and between interpersonal orientation and self rated Altruistic OCB ($\Delta \underline{F}R^2 = 1.32$, ns) were found to be

nonsignificant. In contrast, the moderating effect of equity on the relationship between interpersonal orientation and peer rated Altruistic OCB was significant, though in the form of a negative moderating effect ($\Delta \underline{F}R^2 = 6.19, p < .05$). Additionally, a significant negative main effect for equity, after controlling for interpersonal orientation, was evident in the equation predicting peer ratings of Altruistic OCB ($\Delta \underline{F}R^2 = 4.84, p < .05$). The main effect for equity was also evident in the equations in which the effect of moral development had been entered first in an effort to predict both peer and self ratings of Altruistic OCB ($\Delta \underline{F}R^2 = 6.36, \Delta \underline{F}R^2 = 7.26, p < .05$, respectively). The significant effects of the equity variable were reflected throughout the analyses which used the inferred subscales as criteria (see Tables 11-14 and 16-19).

Closer inspection of the relationships involving the equity, dispositional and criterion variables revealed that the relationships were not entirely credible. In the target sample of 96 individuals, there was a total of twelve individuals who recorded non-zero values on the equity variable. Due to the skewness of this distribution, two outlier data points, representing subjects with very low levels of felt equity, contributed substantially to the significant relationships noted above. That is, the two individuals who indicated the lowest levels of felt equity were also rated very high in Altruistic OCB by their peers. It happened that these two

individuals were also in the lower half of the interpersonal orientation distribution. When the two outliers were removed from the data set, only one relationship among these variables remained significant. This significant effect was the negative main effect for equity on self ratings after controlling for moral development ($\Delta F_{R^2}=4.56$, $p<05$). This main effect for equity indicated that higher levels of inequity were associated with higher levels of self rated Altruistic OCB.

Finally, Hypothesis 6 predicted that the organizational context variables of job clarity and participative culture would be positively related to peer and self rated Altruistic OCB. As indicated in Table 9, participative culture was not significantly related to overall peer rated Altruistic OCB ($r=.10$, ns), or to overall self rated Altruistic OCB ($r=.02$, ns). However, the results for job clarity indicated that overall peer ratings, as well as peer ratings based on actions which benefit peers, supervisors and equivocal targets were significantly related to job clarity ($r=.19$, $.20$, $.22$, $.18$, $p<.05$, respectively). Thus, Hypothesis 6 was partially confirmed in the present study.

In sum, only one of the hypotheses specified in the present study was partially supported by the data. Job clarity was found to be significantly related to peer ratings of Altruistic OCB. Altruistic OCB was not found to be related to

the dispositional variables of interpersonal orientation or moral development, or to the contextual variable of participative culture. In addition, no evidence was found to support the hypotheses that interpersonal trust (trust in management and trust in peers), job satisfaction (overall job satisfaction, and pay satisfaction) and organizational commitment would moderate the relationships between the dispositional variables and peer and self rated Altruistic OCB.

Supplementary Analyses

Although only one of the specified hypotheses obtained partial support in the present sample, several other potentially meaningful effects were noted regarding relationships of the predictor variables with Altruistic OCB (see Table 9). Thus, supplementary multiple regression analyses were conducted in order to examine the simultaneous unique contributions of the predictor variables in predicting Altruistic OCB. In these supplementary analyses, peer and self rated Altruistic OCB were regressed on the full set of predictor variables under investigation. [The moral development variable was removed from consideration in the supplementary analyses due to its demonstrated lack of relationship with the criteria, and since the small sample size

associated with this variable would unduly limit the sample sizes used in the analyses.] The results of these full model analyses for the target sample are presented in Table 20. The results for the full survey sample may be found in Appendix K.

As reported in Table 20, the full set of predictor variables accounted for a significant amount of the variance in overall peer ratings ($F_{R^2}=2.30$, $p<.05$). Within this model, job satisfaction ($t=2.23$, $p<.05$) and pay satisfaction ($t=-2.22$, $p<.05$) were found to uniquely and significantly contribute to the prediction of peer rated Altruistic OCB. Job satisfaction bore a positive relationship to the criterion, while pay satisfaction was related negatively to the criterion.

The full set of predictor variables also accounted for a significant amount of the variance in peer ratings of behaviors when the supervisor was designated as the beneficiary ($F_{R^2}=2.35$, $p<.05$). Job satisfaction ($t=3.34$, $p<.05$) contributed significantly and positively to this equation. Peer ratings concerning actions which were equivocal with regard to the beneficiary were also significantly related in the full model ($F_{R^2}=2.42$, $p<.05$), with job satisfaction ($t=2.23$, $p<.05$) and job clarity ($t=2.11$, $p<.05$) contributing positively and significantly to this equation, and pay satisfaction ($t=-2.34$, $p<.05$) contributing negatively to the equation. Finally, the full set of predictor variables also accounted for a significant amount of the variance in peer

Table 20. Unique Effects Derived From Full Model Regression of Independent Variables with Altruistic OCB

Independent Variable	Peer Ratings (N=96)												Self Ratings (N=94)																											
	Overall				Peer				Supervisor				Equivocal				Outsider				Overall				Peer				Supervisor				Equivocal				Outsider			
	B	t	B	t	B	t	B	t	B	t	B	t	B	t	B	t	B	t	B	t	B	t	B	t	B	t	B	t	B	t	B	t	B	t						
Interpersonal Orientation	-.13	-1.23	-.03	-.30	-.07	-.64	-.18	-1.65	-.18	-1.66	-.14	-1.26	-.14	-1.18	-.06	-.50	-.19	-1.72	-.01	-.04																				
Trust in Peers	.04	.38	-.03	-.25	.11	1.04	.07	.64	.03	.28	.18	1.56	.16	1.36	.19	1.66	.13	1.12	.09	.80																				
Trust in Management	-.07	-.53	-.09	-.67	.02	.15	-.09	-.64	.02	.13	.03	-.20	-.15	-1.07	.11	.80	-.16	-1.20	-.01	-.10																				
Job Satisfaction	.29	2.23*	.27	2.01	.44	3.34**	.29	2.23*	.13	1.03	.05	.38	.01	.07	-.05	-.35	-.02	-.14	.27	1.93																				
Pay Satisfaction	-.26	-2.22*	-.17	-1.40	-.13	-1.09	-.27	-2.34*	-.29	-2.48*	.18	-1.44	-.05	-.42	-.14	-1.14	-.22	-1.83	-.05	-.39																				
Equity	-.17	-1.69	-.13	-1.21	-.17	-1.70	-.14	-1.37	-.17	-1.67	.05	-.50	-.11	-1.01	.06	.54	-.09	-.86	.01	.13																				
Organizational Commitment	.14	.81	-.05	-.29	-.04	-.22	.17	1.01	.21	1.27	.23	1.30	.07	.42	.07	.38	.39	2.24*	.02	-.15																				
Participative Culture	-.12	-.81	-.06	-.40	-.02	-.12	-.20	-1.38	-.11	-.74	.22	-1.40	-.06	-.41	-.21	-1.34	-.21	-1.40	-.02	-.15																				
Job Clarity	.23	1.77	.26	1.91	.03	.24	.27	2.11*	.26	1.99*	.22	1.44	.27	1.90	.19	1.28	.19	1.36	-.02	-.11																				
R ²	.19		.13		.20		.20		.19		.10		.09		.07		.14		.08																					
FR2	2.30*		1.37		2.35*		2.42*		2.28*		1.09		.97		.66		1.56		.79																					

p<.05

* p<.05
** p<.01

ratings of behaviors which benefit outsiders ($F_{R^2}=2.28$, $p<.05$). Pay satisfaction ($t=-2.48$, $p<.05$), and job clarity ($t=1.99$, $p<.05$) were found to uniquely and significantly contribute to the relationship with this criterion. Neither the full self rated scale nor any of the inferred subscales associated with self ratings bore significant relationships with the full set of predictor variables.

In reviewing these results, it should be noted that while certain variables may emerge from the above analyses as having greater ability than others to predict peer and self ratings, some of these predictors were highly intercorrelated with other predictor variables (see Table 9). For example, organizational commitment and job satisfaction are significantly and positively correlated ($r=.65$, $p<.001$). The apparent overlap in these predictors should be considered when drawing conclusions about the relative importance of predictor variables.

Content Analysis

For the qualitatively-based portion of this study, eighteen peer-nominated altruists were interviewed, seven of whom were obtained from Hospital 1 and eleven from Hospital 2. Case summaries of these 18 interviews may be found in Appendix L. During these sessions, four major themes were

explored. These themes were: characteristics of the eliciting situation, the spontaneous versus considered nature of the behavior, the beneficiary or beneficiaries of the action, and self-stated motives for behavior.

Pertaining to the characteristics of the eliciting situation, over half of the interviewees (10) reported that the action for which they were nominated occurred as a result of their voluntary offer to help another person. A typical eliciting situation was a short-staffed shift for which the nominee volunteered to work. Alternatively, five nominees indicated that someone requested their help. Three people could not remember whether they volunteered to help, or were asked to do so. No other clear commonalities across eliciting situations emerged during the interviewing sessions.

With regard to the nature of the action, the nominees overwhelmingly (17 out of 18) characterized their helpful action as spontaneous, rather than considered or planned. It appeared that given the nature of hospital work, unanticipated opportunities to help others may arise quite often.

Concerning the beneficiaries of helpful actions for which altruists were nominated, the nominees typically indicated that more than one party benefited. As might be expected due to the nature of the nominating procedure, the altruists specifically mentioned that co-workers benefited from their helpful actions in 15 of the 18 cases. Other beneficiaries were the patients

(in 5 cases), the institution as a whole (in 2 cases), and the altruist himself or herself (in 10 cases).

Regarding the motives for altruistic actions, benevolent, egoistic and reciprocity-driven motives were all mentioned by the interviewees. That is, when queried about the primary motive for helping, 12 of 18 nominees stated a benevolence-related motive (a desire to help co-workers or patients for the sake of helping or a love of the job in general), while 5 mentioned a reciprocity-driven motive ("what goes around comes around", or a desire to help things run smoothly/teamwork). Many (6) of the nominees also mentioned egoistic motives, such as avoiding guilt, or seeking self-gratification as a result of helping another person. When asked why they and their co-workers typically help each other on the job, all 18 nominees indicated some reciprocity-driven motive, such as a desire to contribute to a mutually rewarding work atmosphere or to act as a team. When asked why workers do not help each other more often, laziness, selfishness, a narrow perspective of one's job duties, dislike for others, overwork and burnout were mentioned.

Other points of interest which emerged during the interview process were as follows. The majority of individuals (11 out of 18) regarded the source of their helpfulness to be their personality. In addition, 7 nominees cited that both their personality and the situations they find themselves in

contribute to their altruistic behavior. Also, when asked to account for the fact that they, as opposed to their co-workers, were nominated as altruists, the nominees most often mentioned that their attitude/personality sets them apart from others. That is, they considered themselves to be more helpful by nature than their coworkers. However, four of the nominees stated that they did not view themselves as more altruistic than their non-nominated cohorts. Finally, although they were nominated by their peers as altruists, more than half (10) of the nominees did not consider themselves to be people who go above and beyond the call of duty to help others at work. Although these individuals readily admitted that they often transcended their job descriptions, they did not view such actions as "going above and beyond the call of duty". In other words, they believed that as part of the normal course of doing a "good job", they performed extra-role behaviors.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The objective for this study was to investigate hypothesized relationships between dispositional, attitudinal, contextual, and self-stated motivational factors and the Altruism dimension of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Interpersonal orientation, moral development, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, interpersonal trust, job clarity and participative culture were examined for direct or indirect relationships with Altruistic OCB. Additionally, self-stated accounts of altruistic behavior were obtained in an attempt to shed some light on the motives, eliciting situations, beneficiaries, and the spontaneous versus planned nature of such behavior. In this chapter, the principal findings of the study are discussed, including sampling considerations, the nature of the principal variables of interest, the results of hypothesis testing, supplementary findings, and the results of the qualitative analysis. Limitations of the study, as well as theoretical and practical implications, are also considered.

Initial Considerations

Before investigating the variables of interest, it was necessary to address two sampling considerations. First, due to a difficulty in obtaining peer ratings for all participants, and a desire to maintain a consistent group of subjects across analyses, a target sample was selected to be the primary focus for analyses. This target sample consisted only of individuals for whom both survey data and peer ratings were available. Tests indicated that this target sample and the residual sample (full survey sample minus the target sample) of participants differed significantly with regard to only one demographic variable, age. Individuals 30-49 years of age were overrepresented in the target sample. Generally, however, the target sample was judged to be representative of the survey sample as a whole.

Second, participants were recruited from two separate hospitals. Hospital source was found to have significant relationships with several predictor variables (trust in management, pay satisfaction, organizational commitment, participative culture, job clarity) as well as with certain criterion variables (self ratings of actions which benefit supervisors, peer ratings of actions which benefit outsiders, peer ratings of actions which benefit supervisors, peer ratings of actions with equivocal beneficiaries, overall peer ratings)

within the target sample. Since this finding was considered to be a spurious effect in the context of the purpose of the study, all variables were standardized within hospital.

The quantitative portion of the study investigated the relationships between Altruistic OCB and various dispositional, attitudinal and contextual variables. Altruistic OCB was defined as extra-role behavior which is intended to help another person or persons in the workplace, and is neither formally required nor rewarded by the organization. In this study, 11 items were used to measure peer and self rated Altruistic OCB, 7 of which were drawn from the empirically derived Altruism factor (Smith, Organ & Near, 1983; Organ & Konovsky, 1989), and 4 of which were new items.

In addition to the full scales of Altruistic OCB, logical subscales corresponding to the beneficiaries of altruism were also examined. These subscales, each of which attained moderately high estimates of internal consistency, represented actions which variously benefited peers, supervisors, an equivocal target (the supervisor or the department or organization as a whole), or outsiders (co-workers outside the department or patients/clients).

The primary focus of the study was an examination of the effect of two dispositional variables, interpersonal orientation and moral development, in relation to Altruistic OCB. Interpersonal orientation was defined as a sensitivity or

reactivity to variations in others' behavior, assessed with Swap and Rubin's (1983) Interpersonal Orientation Scale. The level of moral development was derived from an adaptation of Rest's (1979) Defining Issues Test. The index of moral development used in the study was computed from responses to two stories within the test. This index, the "P" score, represented the extent to which a respondent valued principled moral considerations in making decisions about moral dilemmas. An issue of some importance with regard to the index of moral development concerned the elimination of data due to reliability checks. Over 50% of the moral development data in the present study was eliminated due to indications of unreliable responses from the participants. As noted, this proportion of unreliable responses far exceeded the expected normal percentage (5%-15%, Rest, 1986) of unreliable responses.

Particular attitudinal factors were also of interest in the present study. These attitudinal variables (i.e., trust in peers, trust in management, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, and equity) were hypothesized to positively moderate the relationships between dispositions and Altruistic OCB. "Trust in peers" and "trust in management" were derived from rational subscales of the Interpersonal Trust at Work Scale (Cook & Wall, 1980). These scales assess respondents' faith and confidence in co-workers and management. Organizational commitment, defined as an identification with an

organization typified by a willingness to contribute to its functioning, was measured with the short form of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Porter and Smith, 1970). Job satisfaction was operationalized in the present study as overall job satisfaction, as pay satisfaction, and as pay equity.

The organizational context factors assessed in the present study were job clarity and participative culture. These factors were expected to exhibit positive relationships with Altruistic OCB. Job clarity was represented by four items measuring role clarity and adequacy of performance feedback. Participative culture was represented by five items assessing satisfaction with leadership, decision-making processes, and the degree of organizational concern for the importance of the individual. In general, the attitudinal and contextual variables were found to exhibit acceptable reliabilities for research purposes.

Hypothesized Relationships

Hypotheses 1 and 2 specified that positive, direct relationships would exist between Altruistic OCB and the dispositional factors of interpersonal orientation and moral development. These relationships were not supported, as neither overall peer rated Altruistic OCB nor overall self

rated Altruistic OCB, nor any of the inferred subscales of peer and self rated Altruistic OCB were found to have significant relationships with interpersonal orientation or moral development.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that interpersonal trust (trust in management, trust in peers) would positively moderate the relationships between interpersonal orientation and peer and self rated Altruistic OCB, and between moral development and peer and self rated Altruistic OCB. This hypothesis also was not confirmed in the present study for either the full criterion scales or the inferred subscales.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that job satisfaction (overall job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, pay equity) also would positively moderate the relationships between interpersonal orientation and peer and self rated Altruistic OCB, and between moral development and peer and self rated Altruistic OCB. Significant moderating effects were not confirmed for job satisfaction or pay satisfaction. A significant main effect for job satisfaction in predicting peer rated Altruistic OCB, however, was found after the main effect for interpersonal orientation was entered in the regression equation. Job satisfaction bore a positive relationship to overall peer rated Altruistic OCB and two of the inferred peer rated subscales (actions which benefit outsiders and equivocal targets). These results indicated that, given the (virtually nonexistent)

effects of interpersonal orientation, higher levels of job satisfaction were associated with higher levels of peer rated Altruistic OCB. This effect is in agreement with previous research (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Motowidlo, 1984; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983) which found significant, positive relationships between satisfaction and OCB.

Additionally, the hypothesized moderating effect was not found for equity with regard to the relationships between peer or self rated Altruistic OCB and moral development, nor with regard to the relationships between peer or self rated Altruistic OCB and interpersonal orientation. However, in the course of testing these relationships, other significant relationships among equity, Altruistic OCB (overall, and inferred subscales), and the dispositional variables of interpersonal orientation and moral development became evident. First, significant negative main effects were found for equity in regression equations predicting peer ratings of Altruistic OCB (i.e., overall ratings, and actions directed toward supervisors) after the (nonsignificant) main effect for interpersonal orientation was entered in the equation, and in equations predicting peer ratings of Altruistic OCB (i.e., overall ratings, actions directed toward an equivocal target, and actions directed toward outsiders) and self ratings of Altruistic OCB (overall ratings, actions directed toward peers, and actions directed toward an equivocal target) after the

(nonsignificant) main effects for moral development had been entered in the equations. These results indicated that, given the effects for the dispositional variables, equity bore a negative relationship to overall peer and self ratings of Altruistic OCB in the target sample. In other words, lower levels of equity were associated with higher levels of peer rated Altruistic OCB.

Second, significant moderating effects for equity regarding interpersonal orientation and peer rated Altruistic OCB relationships were evident. After the effects for interpersonal orientation and equity had been entered in regression equations to predict peer rated Altruistic OCB (overall ratings, actions directed toward peers, toward an equivocal target, and toward outsiders) the interaction term for interpersonal orientation and equity was found to be significant. These results appear to indicate that the negative relationship between equity and Altruistic OCB was stronger under low levels of interpersonal orientation. However, as noted previously, certain characteristics of the distribution of the equity variable should be considered when interpreting these effects for equity.

First, the distribution of responses for equity was negatively skewed. That is, 84 of 96 respondents indicated that they were neutral (felt equitably compensated, didn't know how others were compensated, or had no referent others) with

respect to pay equity. Of the 12 remaining respondents who perceived that they were being inequitably rewarded relative to a referent group, only one reported feeling overreward inequity. This finding regarding the low frequency of overreward inequity is in line with previous research in equity theory (e.g., Carrell & Dittrich, 1978), indicating that perceptions of relative overcompensation are typically less frequent than perceptions of relative undercompensation.

In effect, then, a relatively small number of individuals who regarded themselves as undercompensated relative to a referent group in the present study seem to have provided the basis for the negative effects for pay equity discovered in the analyses. Nevertheless, these significant effects seemed to provide limited support for the idea that equity was negatively associated with Altruistic OCB. These effects are counter to both the expectations outlined in the present study, and to Organ's (1988) hypothesis that a positive relationship between equity and OCB should exist.

Although contrary to expectations, and of doubtful veracity, there is at least one plausible explanation for the negative effect for equity. Huseman, Hatfield, and Miles (1987) have suggested that certain individuals (i.e., Benevolents) may actually prefer their outcome/input ratios to be lower than the outcome/input ratios of their referent other (i.e., a sense of underreward inequity). According to Huseman,

et al., there are several possible sources for the Benevolent's preference for underreward equity. These sources include a deeply valued sense of social responsibility (Rushton, 1980), an empathetic arousal triggered by others' needs (Rosenhan, 1978), and a self-serving motive designed to enhance one's self image (Homans, 1961) or to establish a base of social power by providing unreciprocated services to others (Blau, 1964). Viewed in this light, the negative relationship between Altruistic OCB and perceptions of equity may have substantive meaning.

Another explanation for a negative equity-Altruistic OCB relationship might stem from the working situation specific to participants in the present study. Although members of a nursing unit may well consider each other as peers, and therefore use each other as referents in equity considerations, the members of such units may differ in certain key ways. A typical nursing unit might consist of a charge (registered) nurse, several practical nurses, and a few nursing assistants. These positions require different rates of pay, and perhaps, varying opportunities to exhibit Altruistic OCB. For example, it may be true that the nursing assistants in a given unit, while paid less than the nurses in the unit, may more often be confronted with opportunities to perform OCB. In such a scenario, a nursing assistant could be undercompensated, as compared to the referents within the work unit, and might also

score higher on the scale of Altruistic OCB than his or her counterparts.

Hypothesis 5 proposed that organizational commitment would have a positive moderating effect on the relationships between interpersonal orientation and peer and self rated Altruistic OCB, and between moral development and peer and self rated Altruistic OCB. This hypothesis also was not confirmed in the present study. However, a significant main effect for commitment on self ratings of Altruistic OCB was evident after the effect for moral development had been entered in the regression equation. This effect, which was also reflected in the results for three of the inferred subscales (peer rated actions which benefit supervisors, peer rated actions which benefit outsiders, and self rated actions which benefit an equivocal target) suggested that higher levels of commitment were associated with higher levels of Altruistic OCB.

Hypothesis 6 specified that the organizational context variables of job clarity and participative culture would be directly and positively related to peer and self rated Altruistic OCB. None of the criteria (i.e., overall peer ratings, overall self ratings, or inferred subscales of the peer and self rated scales of Altruistic OCB) were found to be significantly related to participative culture. Job clarity, in contrast, was found to be significantly and positively related to overall peer ratings, and to three of the inferred

subscales for the peer rated scale (actions directed toward peers, supervisors, and an equivocal target).

In sum, only one of the specific relationships predicted for the study was partially confirmed. Job clarity was found to be significantly and positively related to peer rated Altruistic OCB. Although most of the hypothesized relations were inconclusive, significant correlations among particular criteria and predictor variables, and the significant, albeit non-hypothesized effects discovered during hypothesis testing suggested the need for additional analyses.

Supplementary Findings

The supplementary multiple regression analyses involved regressing peer and self rated Altruistic OCB on the full set of dispositional, attitudinal and contextual variables to assess the relative direct effects of each of these predictors (excluding moral development) relative to the criteria. The results based on the target sample indicated that, in concert, the set of predictor variables could not significantly predict an overall self rated measure of Altruistic OCB, or any of the inferred self rated subscales. Analyses based on the full survey sample (see Appendix I), however, indicated that self ratings with the peer as beneficiary and with the outsider as beneficiary were significantly related to the set of

predictors. Trust in peers positively and significantly contributed to the prediction of actions which benefit peers, and job satisfaction positively and significantly contributed to the prediction of actions which benefit outsiders.

With regard to the peer ratings of Altruistic OCB, analyses based on the target sample revealed that the full set of variables was able to account for a significant portion of the variance in overall ratings, as well as for the actions (subscales) which benefited the supervisor, an equivocal target, and outsiders. In the case of overall ratings, job satisfaction was found to relate significantly and positively, and pay satisfaction to relate significantly and negatively. Job satisfaction was also significantly and positively related to actions which benefited the supervisor. Actions with an equivocal target as beneficiary were significantly and positively predicted by job satisfaction and job clarity, and significantly and negatively predicted by pay satisfaction. Finally, actions which benefited outsiders were significantly and positively predicted by job clarity and significantly and negatively predicted by pay satisfaction.

In all, self ratings of Altruistic OCB were not predicted in the target sample by the predictor variables investigated in the study. The results of the supplementary analyses (based on the target sample) indicated that job satisfaction, pay

satisfaction and job clarity accounted for unique variance in peer ratings of Altruistic OCB, however.

These results indicated that higher levels of overall job satisfaction, role clarity and feedback were significantly associated with higher levels of Altruistic OCB. The results for pay satisfaction, in contrast, suggested that lower levels of pay satisfaction were associated with higher ratings of Altruistic OCB. This finding is similar to the finding for equity noted previously, and is equally curious. The negative relationship for pay satisfaction may be interpreted in much the same way as the effect for equity (e.g., a preference for being underrewarded). The conceptual similarity of the two constructs also suggests that the effect for pay satisfaction may be seen as a partial replication of the unexpected effect for equity found in the present study.

In sum, the quantitative results partially supported only one of the stated hypotheses -- job clarity was positively related to peer ratings of Altruistic OCB. The results of the quantitative analyses also suggested, however, that two additional variables (i.e., the attitudinal variables of job satisfaction and pay satisfaction) were associated with Altruistic OCB. Among these significant relationships, the relationship between Altruistic OCB and job satisfaction appears to be the most robust. The confirmation of this relationship in fact serves one of the objectives of the study,

which was to partially replicate the findings of Bateman and Organ (1983), Graham (1986), Smith, Organ and Near (1983), and others, who have previously documented significant relationships between satisfaction and extra-role behavior. It may be recalled that Organ (1988a, 1988b) has argued that the common sense notion of a relationship between satisfaction and performance can be supported empirically if performance is operationalized as extra-role behavior.

Also recall, however, that Organ (1988a, 1988b) conceptualized satisfaction as driven by equity, or fairness considerations. His contention, which provided a basis for the expectations outlined in the present study, was that equity/pay satisfaction would be positively related to extra-role behavior. The results of the present study, however, were counter to those expectations. That is, significant negative effects for pay satisfaction and equity were found in the present study. These findings, as noted, while non-intuitive, may be interpreted as resulting from participants' preferences for underreward inequity, or as resulting from dynamics specific to the present study. Clearly, further research is needed to clarify these relationships.

The significant positive relationship between Altruistic OCB and job clarity makes more intuitive sense than the reported relationship between pay satisfaction and Altruistic OCB. The finding that higher levels of job clarity are related

to higher levels of Altruistic OCB may represent an important addition to the knowledge base which surrounds OCB. Clarity of role expectations (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Keller, 1975), and the accuracy, specificity and timeliness of feedback (Ilgen, Fisher, & Taylor, 1979; Jablin, 1979; Matsui, Okada, & Inoshita, 1983)) have been recognized for many years as being related to effective organizational behavior in general. The present study suggests the potential importance of role clarity and feedback with regard to one specific type of organizational behavior -- Altruistic OCB. There may be at least two substantive interpretations for this finding regarding job clarity.

One interpretation is in line with the theoretical basis of the hypothesis outlined in the present study. That is, individuals with clear job expectations and adequate (accurate, specific and timely) feedback may be able to efficiently complete their in-role duties, and thus 'afford the luxury' of being able to perform extra-role behaviors as well. A possible rival hypothesis for this finding is that, in general, high extra-role performers may actually be more intelligent or more attentive to the surrounding environment, and thus have clearer perceptions of their job roles, or are better able to process feedback. This apparent relationship between job clarity and Altruistic OCB is another area which could benefit from focused research.

Qualitative Findings

In an attempt to further clarify and expand upon the quantitative findings in the present study, a qualitative investigation was conducted as to the nature and motive bases of Altruistic OCB. The research questions outlined for the study concerned these issues.

Research question 1 concerned the nature of Altruistic OCB with particular interest in the character of situations which elicit such behavior, whether the behavior is typically spontaneous or considered, and who benefits from such actions. Content analysis of recorded interviews with the nominated altruists suggested several themes.

The character of the situations was found to be typically mundane. That is, the situations were not out of the ordinary; they were typically reported to be normally occurring (yet extra-role) events. In many cases, the nominee did not remember the specific instance of behavior he or she had performed. Other individuals were surprised that they had been singled out for recognition for extra-role behavior. These results correspond with Organ's (1988) definition of OCB as characteristically inconspicuous behavior, which is not done purposefully to attract attention or organizational rewards. Also corresponding with Organ's (1988) definition of OCB is the

fact that virtually all of the nominees indicated that their helpful actions were spontaneous, as opposed to planned. It appeared that the hospital setting was particularly conducive to spontaneous extra-role contributions, as many of the opportunities to perform extra-role behaviors (e.g., being asked to remain at work for an extra shift, volunteering to help during a medical emergency) necessitated a spontaneous response to the needs of others.

The beneficiaries of the helpful actions varied considerably. The majority of nominees mentioned that their peers had benefited in some way from their altruistic action. This finding might have been expected, since most of the peer nominators recounted instances in which they had been helped by the nominee. Other parties who benefited from the helpful actions were the nominee, patients, or the institution as a whole. Nominees reported that they ultimately benefited from their own helpful actions since the persons they helped might someday reciprocate. Patients either benefited directly from the altruistic action (e.g., they might be treated with special kindness by a nursing assistant) or indirectly (e.g., over the course of a work shift, they might be provided with better quality health care because a nurse had volunteered to cover the shift, and thus ease a short-staffing problem). The institution as a whole also might benefit from acts of altruism, the nominees reported, because of the long term

benefits of increased efficiency or because of a positive image in the community.

Research question 2 was concerned with the self-reported motivational bases for Altruistic OCB. The altruism literature suggests that benevolence, egoism, and reciprocity are characteristic motives for such behavior (Batson, Bolen, Cross & Neuringer-Benefiel; Bar-Tal, 1976; Tedeschi & Lindskold, 1976). All three of these motives were cited by the nominees when asked about why they performed the acts of Altruistic OCB. Benevolence was typified by individuals who said they helped as a more or less automatic reaction to the needs of another person. Egoism was exemplified by participants who said they helped others in order to feel good about themselves, or to avoid guilt. Reciprocity was typified by individuals who said they were motivated to help because they would like someone else to do the same for them at a later date. Although it was not always mentioned as the primary motive for behavior, reciprocity considerations were mentioned by almost all of the nominees during the course of the interviews. This finding appears to correspond to Organ's emphasis on the importance of equity in understanding extra-role behavior.

Other results from the qualitative portion of the study are interesting in light of the quantitative findings. For example, although no support was found for the effects of the dispositional factors in the quantitative analyses, all of the

nominees indicated that their personality influenced their altruistic behavior. In addition, when asked to account for why they were nominated by their peers, nominees most often mentioned that their attitude/personality sets them apart from others.

In sum, the qualitative investigation of Altruistic OCB performed in the present study indicated that the character of the eliciting situations was typically mundane, the beneficiaries of the actions varied considerably, and self-stated motives appeared to be based on benevolence, egoism and reciprocity considerations. Also, although the quantitative results did not support the dispositional hypotheses, the qualitative results suggested that the altruists themselves considered dispositional factors to be important determinants of Altruistic OCB.

Limitations of the Study

Before discussing the theoretical and practical implications of the findings, a discussion of the limitations of the study is in order. These limitations concern the measures used in the study, sampling and sample size issues, and the correlational nature of the study.

One concern within the present study involves the reliability of the measures. The data obtained by the moral

development measure, for example, were fraught with reliability problems, requiring that over 50% of the data be discarded. This unusually high unreliability rate may indicate that respondents did not attend to the moral development measure seriously or complete it in a careful manner. The lack of DIT data also severely limits any conclusions which may be drawn about the relationships between moral development and Altruistic OCB.

A related problem is that the measures used to assess moral development, interpersonal orientation, trust in peers, and trust in management were, by necessity, shortened versions of longer scales. Although these shortened scales for the most part were internally consistent, the reduced reliabilities of the scales relative to the longer scales may have attenuated relationships with the criteria.

A third difficulty concerns the possible influence of common method bias. The significant relationships found between some of the predictor variables and self rated Altruistic OCB, for example, may be accounted for to some degree by variance shared as a result of the common method used to assess the variables. The conclusions that may be drawn concerning the relationships between self rated Altruistic OCB and any of the predictor variables are thus necessarily limited. It is interesting to note, however, that self ratings were much less predictable than peer ratings -- an observation

which perhaps lends credence to the findings of the present study. In addition, the reported job satisfaction relationship may take on added credibility, as it was found using both self ratings and peer ratings.

Another potential limitation of the study related to the measures focuses on the issue of confidentiality. The survey form required respondents to record their own names, to record the names of three co-workers, and to rate themselves and their co-workers on a potentially emotion-laded subject of work behavior. It is possible that the non-anonymous nature of the survey may have affected the respondents' candor with respect to their responses to the survey measures. Similarly, the statements provided by peer nominated altruists during interviews may have been influenced by a social desirability bias. That is, nominees may have tended to describe their actions as spontaneous, rather than planned, or due to their personalities, rather than situational factors, because they perceived these responses to be socially desirable. The implication is that such socially desirable responses may not accurately represent the nature of the behavior. These limitations notwithstanding, it may also be argued that when questions about the nature of Altruistic OCB must be asked, it is entirely reasonable to direct such questions toward the altruists themselves, since they are perhaps best able to evaluate their own motives and predispositions.

In addition to the issues concerning the study measures, sample size and sampling issues represent other potential concerns in the present research. The low survey return rate, and the difficulty experienced in matching peer ratings with dispositional, attitudinal and contextual data resulted in a relatively small (N=96) sample size for target sample analyses. A small sample size, of course, limits the power of the statistical tests to detect significant effects, particularly in the case of moderated effects.

The sampling issue concerns the fact that the study participants were recruited from hospitals, which are generally considered to employ highly altruistic individuals due to the nature of the work. It is likely that hospitals inculcate powerful norms regarding altruistic acts, particularly when those acts are directed toward patients. Thus, any conclusions drawn from this study may be limited to service-oriented environments where helping behavior is similarly valued.

One final potential difficulty concerns the correlational nature of the study. The hypotheses and corresponding analyses were designed to investigate statistical associations among a specified constellation of variables, rather than to determine causality. While it is vital to the study of OCB to discover associations among dispositional, attitudinal and contextual variables and Altruistic OCB, the

conclusions drawn from this study cannot be taken to imply causation. Future research in this area may build upon such correlational results with techniques such as structural equation modeling, which would allow an assessment of the validity of causal hypotheses.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

The findings reported in this study may serve to augment the evolving theoretical and empirical network which currently surrounds Altruistic OCB. In particular, the study has identified certain attitudinal and contextual variables which appear to be related to the expression of Altruistic OCB (e.g., job satisfaction, pay satisfaction/equity and job clarity). These findings point to the possible importance of culture/context variables in predicting Altruistic OCB, and the possible utility of viewing altruism as determined by situational, rather than dispositional factors.

The significant results for job satisfaction, pay satisfaction and equity appear to lend some support to Organ's (1988) contention that satisfaction and equity are somehow associated with OCB, although the results found for pay satisfaction and equity in the present study were counter to expectations. Future research should continue to investigate the apparently complex relationships between these attitudinal

variables and OCB. The results for job clarity suggest potentially important theoretical implications regarding the role of organizational culture/context variables in predicting OCB. While not the primary focus of the present study, role clarity and performance feedback emerged as important factors in the prediction of Altruistic OCB. This finding is in agreement with theoretical work set forth by Brief and Motowidlo (1986), who predicted that aspects of the organizational context and work environment should be related to the expression of prosocial behavior.

Another finding which lends indirect support to the importance of culture/context variables in predicting Altruistic OCB was the effect for hospital. It is possible that the mean differences found between the two hospitals on a variety of predictor and criterion variables could be accounted for by culture/context differences specific to each hospital. In a larger sense, it is also possible that within the health care industry as a whole, certain culture/context variables (such as role expectations concerning altruistic behavior) may be important determinants of Altruistic OCB. Therefore, research in other settings may reveal different patterns of results than those found in the present study. Future research must focus on the importance of culture/context variables in predicting OCB and should sample from settings which differ qualitatively from the health care industry.

A final set of theoretical implications arises from the lack of support found for the central premise of the study; i.e., the prediction that dispositions would be related to the expression of Altruistic OCB. The dispositions of interpersonal orientation and moral development were predicted to be positively related to the expression of Altruistic OCB. Although the limitations of the moral development data must be considered, one possible conclusion is that dispositions may not be significantly related to the expression of Altruistic OCB. That is, it may be erroneous to conceptualize the variance in altruism as accounted for by dispositional, or trait differences among individuals.

A rival hypothesis is that situational, or state variables may be antecedent to the expression of Altruistic OCB. Lending support to such an idea is previous research in altruism (Berkowitz & Conner, 1966; Darlington & Macker, 1966; Staub, 1968) which indicated that the expression of altruism can be affected by manipulating situational variables which lead to affective or cognitive states. If the expression of Altruistic OCB is in large part due to situational factors, the nonsignificant findings for the trait variables in the present study would be expected. Although research to date which has directly investigated the impact of emotional states on the expression of Altruistic OCB (Organ & Konovsky, 1989) has proven inconclusive, this is certainly an area which warrants

further investigation. In particular, it is important to clarify whether dispositions are generally unimportant factors in the prediction of Altruistic OCB, or alternatively, whether only the specific dispositional factors examined in this study were unrelated to Altruistic OCB.

In terms of practical implications, the results of the present study provide some indications of how extra-role altruism in an organizational setting might be facilitated. Of particular practical significance are the findings that job satisfaction and job clarity appeared to be related to the expression of Altruistic OCB. The qualitative assessments also suggested that Altruistic OCB may be motivated by reciprocity considerations. On the basis of these findings, employers wishing to promote Altruistic OCB should be sensitive to the issues of job satisfaction, job clarity, and a climate which promotes reciprocity. Job satisfaction can be enhanced in a variety of ways. One practical suggestion might be to determine specific areas of dissatisfaction within the larger context of overall dissatisfaction (e.g., through surveying or interviewing methods) and then take steps to correct those perceived difficulties. Job clarity might be increased by providing employees with clear expectations of their roles, (e.g., via clear written expectations), followed by specific, accurate and timely feedback (e.g., performance appraisals, intermittent feedback) on the adequacy of their in-role

behavior. An atmosphere of reciprocity might be fostered by promoting teamwork and camaraderie within work groups, and perhaps by providing organizational rewards to employees based on group performance.

In conclusion, the present study attempted to identify whether certain dispositional, attitudinal and contextual variables, and self-stated motives were related to the expression of Altruistic OCB, as assessed with peer and self ratings. In all, the results of the study may suggest more questions than answers. The central premise of the study, that dispositional factors were related to the expression of Altruistic OCB, found no support. This inconclusive finding suggests many questions regarding the validity of hypotheses relating dispositions to extra-role behavior. Limited support was provided to suggest that the attitudinal and contextual variables of job satisfaction, pay satisfaction and job clarity were related to peer and self ratings of Altruistic OCB. However, the results for pay satisfaction, and related results for equity were counter-intuitive, again suggesting more questions than answers. In addition, the qualitative investigations served to help clarify the nature and motives of Altruistic OCB. Perhaps most importantly, these qualitative data highlighted the importance of reciprocity considerations.

As noted, the above findings suggest possible avenues that may promote extra-role behavior in a practical sense. It

is clear that future research must continue to build upon the growing literature base concerning Altruistic OCB so that ultimately, clear practical implications regarding Altruistic OCB may become readily apparent. Based on the present study, it appears that future research concerning Altruistic OCB must focus on the importance of cultural and situational factors as antecedents of this type of prosocial behavior.

REFERENCES

References

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67(5), 422-436.
- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper.
- Bar-Tal, D. (1976). Prosocial behavior: Theory and research. New York: Wiley.
- Bateman, T. S. & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". Academy of Management Journal, 26(4), 587-595.
- Batson, C. D., Bolen, M. H., Cross, J. A. & Neuringer-Benefiel, H. E. (1986). Where is the altruism in the altruistic personality? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50(1), 212-220.
- Beatty, R. W., Schneier, C. E., & Beatty, J. R. (1977). An empirical investigation of perceptions of ratee behavior frequency and ratee behavior change using behavioral expectation scales. Personnel Psychology, 30, 647-658.
- Berkowitz, L. (1972). Social norms, feelings, and other factors affecting helping and altruism. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology: Vol 6. New York: Academic Press.
- Berkowitz, L. (1987). Mood, self-awareness, and willingness to help. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52(4), 721-729.
- Berkowitz, L., & Conner, W. H. (1966). Success, failure, and social responsibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 664-669.
- Bernardin, H. J., & Beatty, R. W. (1984). Performance appraisal: Assessing human behavior at work. Boston: Kent.
- Blau, P. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. New York: Wiley.
- Blood, M. R. (1969). Work values and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 53, 456-459.

- Bohannon, P. (1963). Social anthropology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Brief, A. P. & Motowidlo, S. J. Prosocial organizational behaviors. Academy of Management Review, 11(4), 710-725.
- Buchholz, R. A. (1977). The belief structure of managers relative to work concepts measured by a factor analytic model. Personnel Psychology, 30, 567-587.
- Carrell, M. R., & Ditttrich, J. E. (1978). Equity theory: The recent literature, methodological considerations, and new directions. Academy of Management Review, 3, 202-210.
- Cederblom, R. B., & Lounsbury, J. W. (1980). An investigation of user acceptance of peer evaluations. Personnel Psychology, 33, 567-579.
- Cialdini, R. B., & Kenrick, D. T. (1976). Altruism as hedonism: A social development perspective on the relationship of negative mood state and helping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34(5), 907-914.
- Cook, J., & Wall, T. D. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfillment. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53, 39-52.
- Crandall, J. E. (1978). Effects of threat and failure on concern for others. Journal of Research in Personality, 12, 350-360.
- Cummings, (1981). Designing effective work-groups. In P. C. Nystrom & W. Starbuck (Eds.), Handbook of organizational design, (pp. 250-271). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Darlington, R. B., & Macker, C. E. (1966). Displacement of guilt-produced altruistic behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 442-443.
- DeNisi, A. S., Randolph, & Blencoe (1983). Potential problems with peer ratings. Academy of Management Journal, 26, 457-464.
- Freud, A. (1963). The infantile instinct life. In H. Herma & G. M. Karth (Eds.), A handbook of psychoanalysis. New York: World Publishing Company.

- Gannon, M. J., & Noon, J. P. (1971). Management's critical deficiency: Executives unaware of applicable research. Business Horizons, 14, 49-56.
- Goodale, J. G. (1969). A canonical regression analysis of work values and biographical information of civil service employees. Unpublished manuscript, Bowling Green State University.
- Graham, J. W. (1986). Organizational citizenship informed by political theory. Paper presented at Academy of Management meetings, Chicago, IL.
- Guilford, J. P. (1954). Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 159-170.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). Work redesign. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Homans, G. C. (1961). Social behavior: Its elementary forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich.
- Huseman, R. C., Hatfield, J. D., & Miles, E. W. (1987). A new perspective on equity theory: The equity sensitivity construct. Academy of Management Review, 12, 222-234.
- Iaffaldano, M. T., & Muchinsky, P. M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: a meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 97(2), 251-273.
- Ilgen, D. R., Fisher, C. D., & Taylor, M. S. (1979). Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 349-371.
- Isen, A. M., Clark, M., & Schwartz, M. F. (1976). Duration of the effect of good mood on helping: "Footprints in the sands of time". Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34(3), 385-393.
- Isen, A. M., Horn, N., & Rosenhan, D. L. (1973). Effect of success and failure on children's generosity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27(2), 239-247.
- Jablin, F. M. (1979). Superior-subordinate communication: The state of the art. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 1201-1222.

- Jacobs, R. R. (1986). Numerical rating scales. In R. A. Berk (Ed.), Performance assessment: Methods and applications (pp. 82-99). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Jones, R. A. (1985). Research methods in the social and behavioral sciences. Sinauer, Sunderland, MA.
- Kane, J. S. & Lawler, E.E., III. (1978). Methods of peer assessment. Psychological Bulletin, 85, 555-586.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. Behavioral Science, 9, 131-133.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Katzell, R. A. & Yankelovich, D. (1975). Work, productivity, and job satisfaction. New York: The Psychological Corporation.
- Keller, R. T. (1975). Role conflict and ambiguity correlates with job satisfaction and values. Personnel Psychology, 28, 57-64.
- Konovsky, M. A. (1986). Antecedents and consequences of informal leader helping behavior: A structural equation modeling approach. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Krebs, D. L. (1970). Altruism--an examination of the concept and a review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 73(4), 258-302.
- Landy, F. J., & Farr, J. L. (1983). The measurement of work performance: Methods, theory, and applications. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lodahl, T., & Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 49, 24-33.
- Matsui, T., Okada, A., & Inoshita, O. (1983). Mechanisms of feedback affecting task performance. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 31, 114-122.
- McEvoy, G. M., & Buller, P. F. (1987). User acceptance of peer appraisals in an industrial setting. Personnel Psychology, 40, 785-797.

- Medland, F. F., Yates, L. G., & Downey, R. G. (1974). Associate ratings of senior officer potential. Research Problem Review, 74-2, U. S. Army, Research Institute for the Behavior and Social Sciences.
- Merrens, M. R., & Garrett, J. B. (1975). The Protestant Ethic scale as a predictor of repetitive work performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 334-339.
- Mirels, H. L., & Garrett, J. B. (1971). The Protestant Ethic as a personality variable. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 36, 40-44.
- Motowidlo, S. J. (1984). Does job satisfaction lead to consideration and personal sensitivity? Academy of Management Journal, 27(4), 910-915.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14, 224-247.
- O'Reilly, C., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(3), 492-499.
- Organ, D. W. (1977). A reappraisal and reinterpretation of the satisfaction-causes-performance hypothesis. Academy of Management Review, 2, 46-53.
- Organ, D. W. (1988a). Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Organ, D. W. (1988b). A restatement of the satisfaction-performance hypothesis, Journal of Management, 14(4), 547-557.
- Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74(1), 157-164.
- Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best run corporations. New York: Warner Books.

- Petty, M. M., McGee, G. W., & Cavender, J. W. (1984). A meta-analysis of the relationships between individual job satisfaction and individual performance. Academy of Management Review, 9(4), 712-721.
- Porter, L. W., & Smith, F. J. (1970). The etiology of organizational commitment. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Irvine.
- Puffer, S. M. (1987). Prosocial behavior, noncompliant behavior, and work performance among commission salespeople. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72(4), 615-621.
- Rest, J. R. (1979). Development in judging moral issues. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rest, J. R. (1988). DIT Manual: Manual for the defining issues test (3rd ed.). Minneapolis, MN: Center for the Study of Ethical Development.
- Rest, J. R. (1986). Moral development: Advances in research and theory. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Robinson, J. P., & Shaver, P. R. (1973). Measures of social psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. (1964). Management and the worker. New York: Wiley Science Editions.
- Rosenhan, D. L. (1978). Toward resolving the altruism paradox: Affect, self-reinforcement and cognition. In L. G. Wispé (Ed.), Altruism, sympathy, and helping. New York: Academic Press.
- Rosenhan, D. L., Underwood, B. & Moore, B. (1974). Affect moderates self-gratification and altruism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30(4), 546-552.
- Rubin, J. Z., & Brown, B. R. (1975). The social psychology of bargaining and negotiation. New York: Academic Press.
- Rush, M. C. (1989). Dimensionality and beneficiaries of organizational citizenship behavior. Working paper: University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- Rushton, J. P. (1980). Altruism, socialization, and society. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Russell, J. A. (1985). Research methods in the social and behavioral sciences. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates.
- Scholl, R. W., Cooper, E. A., & McKenna, J. F. (1987). Referent selection in determining equity perceptions: Differential effects on behavioral and attitudinal outcomes. Personnel Psychology, 40, 113-124.
- Schuler, R. S., Aldag, R. J., & Brief, A. P. (1977). Role conflict and ambiguity: A scale analysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 20, 111-128.
- Sherrod, D. R., Armstrong, D., Hewitt, J., Madonia, B., Speno, S., & Teruya, D. (1977). Environmental attention, affect, and altruism. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 7(4), 359-371.
- Sherrod, D. R., & Downs, R. (1974). Environmental determinants of altruism: The effects of stimulus overload and perceived control on helping. Journal of Experimental & Social Psychology, 10, 468-479.
- 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.
- Snyder, M. (1987). Public appearances, private realities: The psychology of self-monitoring. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Stebay, N. M. (1987). Helping behavior in rural and urban environments: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 102(3), 346-356.
- Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1983). Motivation and work behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sundstrom, E., DeMeuse, K. P., & Futrell, D. (in press). Work-teams: Applications and effectiveness. American Psychologist.
- Swap, W. C., & Rubin, J. Z. (1983). Measurement of interpersonal orientation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44(1), 208-219.
- Tedeschi, J. T. & Lindskold, S. (1976). Social psychology: interdependence, interaction, and influence. New York: Wiley.

- Underwood, B., Berenson, J. F., Berenson, R. J., Cheng, K. K., Wilson, D., Kulik, J., Moore, B. S., & Wenzel, G. (1977). Attention, negative affect, and altruism: an ecological validation. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 3, 54-58.
- Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). Leadership and decision-making. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Wijting, J. P. (1969). A canonical regression of background factors and work values among underprivileged workers. Unpublished manuscript, Bowling Green State University.
- Williams, L. J., Podsakoff, P. M., & Huber, V. (1986). Determinants of organizational citizenship behaviors: A structural equation analysis with cross-validation. Unpublished manuscript, Bloomington, Indiana.
- Wispe, L. G. (1972). Positive forms of social behavior: An overview. Journal of Social Issues, 28(3), 1-19.
- Wollack, S. (1968). The work values of occupational groups: A multiple discriminant analysis. Unpublished manuscript, Bowling Green State University.
- Wollack, S., Goodale, J. G., Wijting, J. P. & Smith, P. C. (1971). Development of the survey of work values. Journal of Applied Psychology, 9, 229-249.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTERS

SURVEY OF ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR

An Invitation to Participate...

This survey is part of a research project designed to increase our understanding of organizational behavior. We would like you to evaluate some aspects of your work behavior, as well as the behavior of some of your co-workers. We would also like to record some of your attitudes and feelings about various aspects of your work.

We would greatly appreciate it if you would volunteer to assist us in this project. If you do agree to participate, please know that your responses to the survey will be treated as completely confidential. No one in this organization will see the responses associated with any one individual; only the researchers will see the data. We are asking that you record your name in order for us to match your data with data obtained from some of your co-workers. After the data are matched, individuals will be identified by number only, and the original surveys will be destroyed.

Please follow the specific instructions given at the beginning of each section carefully. The survey has five sections and should take less than 45 minutes to complete. When you have finished the survey, please seal it in the envelope provided and drop it in the in-house mail by Thursday, May 25. In addition to completing the survey, we ask that you not discuss your answers with any of your co-workers until we are finished with the project.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact either of us. Thank you very much for your time and assistance with this important project.

Sincerely,

Sharon L. Wagner

Sharon L. Wagner
Principal Investigator and Doctoral Candidate,
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
(615) 584-3621

Michael C. Rush

Michael C. Rush, Ph.D.
Project Director
Industrial/Organizational Psychology Program
University of Tennessee
(615) 974-3161

Name: _____
(please PRINT your name here)

MEMORANDUM

TO: _____

FROM: Administrator and CEO

RE: Organizational Behavior Research Project

I would appreciate your participation in a project of great importance to _____ We are taking part in a research project dealing with organizational behavior which Dr. Michael Rush and Sharon Wagner are conducting at the University of Tennessee. Approximately two weeks ago, Sharon distributed surveys to staff members. She is now distributing a second round of surveys, and has asked me to express my support for the project. We really need your input in order to make this endeavor a success.

To negate any questions you may have regarding the confidentiality of your responses, let me assure you that when we agreed to participate in this project, the research team and I agreed that absolute confidentiality of responses must be maintained. If you do agree to participate, please be assured that no one in this organization (including myself) will see the responses associated with any one individual; only the researchers will see the data. Please be assured I do not know the names of the individuals receiving this memo.

For example, as part of the survey, the researchers ask you to record your name and the names of three of your co-workers. The names are necessary since they will be matching your data with data obtained from some of your co-workers. After the data are matched, the researchers will destroy the original surveys and will computer analyze the results, identifying individuals by number only.

The survey should take less than 30 minutes to complete, and should be sealed in the envelope provided and returned by in-house mail by Wednesday, June 14. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact either of the researchers listed below. If you have already completed the survey, please disregard this letter.

Thank you for taking time out of your busy day to assist us.

cc: Sharon L. Wagner, Principal Investigator
Industrial/Organizational Psychology (615/584-3621)

Michael C. Rush, Ph.D., Project Director
I.T. I/O Psychology (615/974-3161)

MEMORANDUM

TO:

FROM:

Director of Nursing for Behavioral Services

RE: Organizational Behavior Research Project

DATE: June 21, 1989

I would like to ask for your participation in a joint project with and University of Tennessee Knoxville that we think will be beneficial to you and your patients. This survey is part of a research project dealing with organizational behavior which Dr. Michael Rush and Sharon Wagner are conducting at the University of Tennessee. You will be asked to evaluate some aspects of your work behavior, as well as the behavior of some of your co-workers. You will also be asked to record some of your attitudes and feelings about various aspects of your work and the system that supports you in your work. The information we receive will enhance our ongoing efforts

When we became involved with this project, the research team and I agreed that absolute confidentiality of responses must be maintained. If you participate, please know that your responses to the survey will be treated as completely confidential. No one in this organization (including myself) will see the responses associated with any one individual; only the researchers will see the data.

The researchers will be computer analyzing the results of this project. They are asking that you record your name in order for them to match your data with data obtained from some of your co-workers. After the data are matched, individuals will be identified by number only, and the researchers will destroy the original surveys. Also in the interest of confidentiality, we ask that you not discuss your answers with any of your co-workers until we are finished with the project.

The survey has four sections and should take less than 30 minutes to complete. When you have finished the survey, please seal it in the envelope provided and drop it in the in-house mail by Wednesday, June 28. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact either

page 2
Memo to Nurse Managers

of the researchers listed below.

Thank you for your time and assistance with this important project.

cc: Sharon L. Wagner, Principal Investigator
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
University of Tennessee (615) 584-3621

Michael C. Rush, Ph.D., Project Director
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
University of Tennessee (615) 974-3161

APPENDIX B

SURVEY

Survey of Organizational Behavior

Section 1.

We are particularly interested in a type of behavior called "Altruistic Organizational Citizenship Behavior". These are "helping" behaviors that are not enforceable requirements of a position or job. That is, the behavior is not formally expected as part of the clearly specifiable terms of a person's employment contract; rather, the behavior is a matter of personal choice such that failing to exhibit the behavior would not generally be understood as punishable. An example might be the following account of an incident which occurred in the shipping department of a paper mill:

"On this particular night, my assignment was to push large rolls of paper off an elevator and to fit metal bands around each end of each roll. To attach the metal bands, one used a special purpose tool that enabled one to wrap the binding around the paper, tighten it, then cut and staple the ends of the band around the paper. Since I was new at this job, I had not yet mastered using this tool. One of the guys working close by could see my struggle and came over to help. Several times he helped tighten a wobbly band, unhook the stapler, reload or rewind the metal spool. With his timely aid and totally patient and uncritical manner, I survived the night and the job got done."

Thus, "Altruistic Organizational Citizenship Behaviors" are behaviors which:

- 1) help other people on the job.
- 2) are not formally required by a person's job and are not formally rewarded (with money or recognition).
- 3) are done by workers who already perform their required job behaviors at an adequate level.

Our question to you is: Have you witnessed one of your fellow workers performing an act of Altruistic behavior (as defined above) at work?

If so, please record (PRINT) the person's name on the line below and then provide as much information as you can about the incident. This information will be treated as confidential. We may contact the individual you mention, however, in order to learn more about the incident. In the event that we do contact the individual, your name will not be mentioned.

Name of the coworker: _____

Description: _____

(please use the back of the page if you need more space)

Survey of Organizational Behavior

Section 2.

Please think of the co-workers with whom you work (not supervisors or subordinates), and whose work behavior you feel you've had ample opportunity to observe.

From among these co-workers, choose three individuals who you consider to be different from one another in how often they tend to exhibit Altruistic Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Please PRINT the names of these three individuals on the lines below marked "Peer A", "Peer B", and "Peer C"; also PRINT your own name on the line marked "Myself".

Peer A: _____ Peer C: _____
 Peer B: _____ Myself: _____

Now, based on the scale provided below, please rate each of these peers and yourself on each of the following types of behaviors. Read each statement carefully, and then circle the number (1 thru 5) for the response which best describes the behavior of each peer and yourself.

- 1: The behavior is HIGHLY UNCHARACTERISTIC of this person.
- 2: The behavior is UNCHARACTERISTIC of this person.
- 3: The behavior is NEITHER UNCHARACTERISTIC NOR CHARACTERISTIC of this person.
- 4: The behavior is CHARACTERISTIC of this person.
- 5: The behavior is HIGHLY CHARACTERISTIC of this person.

	Peer A:	Peer B:	Peer C:	Myself:
1. helps other employees who are experiencing especially heavy workloads.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. volunteers to do things not formally required by their job assignment	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. goes out of the way to help people from outside the dept. with requests for information and/or assistance.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. helps peers who have been absent to catch up with their work.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. willingly attends non-required functions that help promote the company image.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. goes out of the way to be courteous and considerate to clients/customers/patients.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. takes initiative to orient new people to the dept. though it's not part of their job.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8. makes innovative suggestions to improve the overall quality of the department.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9. shares little tips with others for performing the job more efficiently or effectively.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
10. keeps the supervisor informed of potential problems though it's not their job to do so.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
11. assists the supervisor with special tasks, even though they don't have to.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Survey of Organizational Behavior

Section 3-

In this section, questions about "fellow workers" refer to all of your coworkers, not just the ones you evaluated in Section 2. For each item, please circle one of the following options:

SA = strongly agree A = agree I = neither agree or disagree D = disagree SD = strongly disagree

- | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|-------------|
| 01. Management at my firm is sincere in its attempt to meet the workers' point of view. | SA A ? D SD | 15. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for. | SA A ? D SD |
| 02. Management can be trusted to make sensible decisions for the firm's future. | SA A ? D SD | 16. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization. | SA A ? D SD |
| 03. Management at work seems to do an efficient job. | SA A ? D SD | 17. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar. | SA A ? D SD |
| 04. I feel quite confident that the firm will always try to treat me fairly. | SA A ? D SD | 18. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance. | SA A ? D SD |
| 05. Most of my fellow workers can be relied upon to do as they say they will do. | SA A ? D SD | 19. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for, over others I was considering at the time I joined. | SA A ? D SD |
| 06. I have full confidence in the skills of my fellow workers. | SA A ? D SD | 20. I really care about the fate of this organization. | SA A ? D SD |
| 07. Most of my fellow workers would get on with the job even if supervisors were not around. | SA A ? D SD | 21. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work. | SA A ? D SD |
| 08. I am satisfied with the amount of pay and fringe benefits I receive. | SA A ? D SD | 22. In this organization, there is warmth and support between workers and supervisors. | SA A ? D SD |
| 09. If I won a million dollars tomorrow, I would quit work. | SA A ? D SD | 23. In this organization, the ideas of workers are sought and used by its leaders. | SA A ? D SD |
| 10. I love my job. | SA A ? D SD | 24. Information needed for decision-making at my level of the organization is adequate and accurate. | SA A ? D SD |
| 11. I am satisfied with the degree to which I am fairly paid for what I contribute to the organization. | SA A ? D SD | 25. Decision-makers at higher levels of the organization are aware of problems experienced at lower levels of the organization. | SA A ? D SD |
| 12. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my job. | SA A ? D SD | 26. Feedback on my performance is accurate and specific. | SA A ? D SD |
| 13. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful. | SA A ? D SD | | |
| 14. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization. | SA A ? D SD | | |

(PLEASE TURN PAGE TO CONTINUE)

Survey of Organizational Behavior

SA = strongly agree A = agree I = neither agree or disagree D = disagree SD = strongly disagree

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>27. I receive prompt feedback on my performance. SA A ? D SD</p> <p>28. This organization believes in the importance of individual workers. SA A ? D SD</p> <p>29. My role in this organization is clearly defined. SA A ? D SD</p> <p>30. The overall goals of the organization and the department within which I work are clear. SA A ? D SD</p> <p>31. Compared with others doing the same job as me in my company with similar education, I earn about: (please check one option)</p> <p> ___40% less ___30% less ___20% less ___10% less
 ___about the same
 ___10% more ___20% more ___30% more ___40% more
 ___I don't know ___there is no one else</p> <p>32. Compared with others doing the same job as me in my company with a similar level of seniority, I earn about: (check one option)</p> <p> ___40% less ___30% less ___20% less ___10% less
 ___about the same
 ___10% more ___20% more ___30% more ___40% more
 ___I don't know ___there is no one else</p> <p>33. Compared with others doing the same job as me in my company who put forth a similar amount of effort, I earn about: (check one option)</p> <p> ___40% less ___30% less ___20% less ___10% less
 ___about the same
 ___10% more ___20% more ___30% more ___40% more
 ___I don't know ___there is no one else</p> <p>In this section, questions referring to "others" or "people" refer to all people you know, not just those on the job.</p> <p>Q1. I am greatly influenced by the moods of the people I am with. SA A ? D SD</p> <p>Q2. Sometimes I take things that others say to me too personally. SA A ? D SD</p> <p>Q3. What others think about my actions is of little or no consequence to me. SA A ? D SD</p> | <p>Q4. The more people reveal about themselves, the more inclined I feel to reveal things about myself. SA A ? D SD</p> <p>Q5. When someone does me a favor I don't usually feel compelled to return it. SA A ? D SD</p> <p>Q6. The more I am with others, the more I tend to like them. SA A ? D SD</p> <p>Q7. I would rather be given a simple and thoughtful gift than a more extravagant one that involved less thought and care. SA A ? D SD</p> <p>Q8. I am very sensitive to criticism. SA A ? D SD</p> <p>Q9. When people tell me personal things about themselves, I find myself feeling close to them. SA A ? D SD</p> <p>10. I can be strongly affected by someone smiling or frowning at me. SA A ? D SD</p> <p>11. I'm often able to read people's true emotions correctly through their eyes. SA A ? D SD</p> <p>12. My powers of intuition are quite good when it comes to understanding others' emotions and motives. SA A ? D SD</p> <p>13. I can usually tell when I've said something inappropriate by reading it in the listener's eyes. SA A ? D SD</p> <p>14. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations. SA A ? D SD</p> <p>15. I have found that I can adjust my behavior to meet the requirements of my situation I find myself in. SA A ? D SD</p> <p>16. Once I know what the situation calls for, it's easy for me to regulate my actions accordingly. SA A ? D SD</p> |
|--|---|

STORY #1

HEINZ AND THE DRUG

In Europe a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging ten times what the drug cost to make. He paid \$200 for the radium and charged \$2,000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about \$1,000, which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying, and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said "No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it". So Heinz got desperate and began to think about breaking into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife. Should Heinz steal the drug?

Recommendation (check one):

Should Heinz steal the drug? ☐ should steal it ☐ can't decide ☐ should not steal it

Rating: (Please circle one of the following options for each issue below.)

G = Great importance M = Much importance S = Some importance
L = Little importance N = No importance

Issues:

1. Whether a community's laws are going to be upheld..... G M S L N
2. Whether it is only natural for a loving husband to care so much
for his wife that he'd steal..... G M S L N
3. Whether Heinz is willing to risk getting shot as a burglar or
going to jail for the chance that stealing the drug might help..... G M S L N
4. Whether Heinz is a professional wrestler, or has considerable
influence with professional wrestlers..... G M S L N
5. Whether Heinz is stealing for himself or doing this solely to
help someone else..... G M S L N
6. Whether the druggist's rights to his invention have to be respected..... G M S L N
7. Whether the essence of living is more encompassing than the
termination of dying, socially and individually..... G M S L N
8. What values are going to be the basis for governing how people act
towards each other..... G M S L N
9. Whether the druggist is going to be allowed to hide behind a worthless
law which only protects the rich anyhow..... G M S L N
10. Whether the law in this case is getting in the way of the most basic
claim of any member of society..... G M S L N
11. Whether the druggist deserves to be robbed for being so greedy and cruel.. G M S L N
12. Whether stealing in such a case would bring about more total good for
the whole society or not..... G M S L N

Importance Rankings (check four issues):

	Issue											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Most important issue	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Second most important	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Third most important	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fourth most important	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

STORY #1
NEWSPAPER

Fred, a senior in high school, wanted to publish a newspaper for students so that he could express many of his opinions. He wanted to speak out against the war in Vietnam and to speak out against some of the school's rules, like the rule forbidding boys to wear long hair.

When Fred started his newspaper, he asked his principal for permission. The principal said it would be all right if before every publication Fred would turn in all his articles for the principal's approval. The principal approved all of them and Fred published two issues of the paper in the next two weeks.

But the principal had not expected that Fred's newspaper would receive so much attention. Students were so excited by the paper that they began to organize protests against the hair regulation and other school rules. Angry parents objected to Fred's opinions. They phoned the principal telling her that the newspaper was unpatriotic and should not be published. As a result of the rising excitement, the principal ordered Fred to stop publishing. She gave as a reason that Fred's activities were disruptive to the operation of the school.

Recommendation (check one):

Should the principal stop the newspaper? ☐ should stop it ☐ can't decide ☐ should not stop it

Rating: (Please circle one of the following options for each issue below.)

G = Great importance M = Much importance S = Some importance
L = Little importance N = No importance

Issues:

1. Whether the principal is more responsible to students or to the parents... G M S L N
2. Whether the principal gave her word that the newspaper could be published for a long time, or just promised to approve the newspaper one issue at a time..... G M S L N
3. Whether the students would start protesting even more if the principal stopped the newspaper..... G M S L N
4. When the welfare of the school is threatened, whether the principal has the right to give orders to students..... G M S L N
5. Whether the principal has the freedom of speech to say "no" in this case.. G M S L N
6. Whether, by stopping the newspaper the principal would be preventing full discussion of important problems..... G M S L N
7. Whether the principal's order would make Fred lose faith in the principal. G M S L N
8. Whether Fred was really loyal to his school and patriotic to his country.. G M S L N
9. The effect that stopping the paper would have on the students' education in critical thinking and judgments..... G M S L N
10. Whether Fred was in any way violating the rights of others in publishing his own opinions..... G M S L N
11. Whether the principal should be influenced by some angry parents when it is the principal that knows best what is going on in the school..... G M S L N
12. Whether Fred was using the newspaper to stir up hatred and discontent..... G M S L N

Importance Rankings (check four issues):

	Issue											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Most important issue	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Second most important	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Third most important	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fourth most important	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Survey of Organizational Behavior

Section 1-

This section deals with how people think about social problems. You will be asked to read two stories. In each of these stories, a person is facing a problem. After you read each story, you will be asked to indicate your recommendation for what the person in the story should do.

After making a recommendation, you will be presented with several issues the person in the story must consider. You will be asked to rate the importance of these issues in making a decision about what to do, using a scale ranging from of "Great Importance" to "No Importance". Some of the items may not be understandable, or sound like gibberish. You should rate such items as "No importance".

Finally, you will be asked to choose which of these issues are of the greatest importance in making a decision about what to do. Of the items that are presented, you will pick one as most important (relative to the others), then the second most important, third, and fourth most important. To make your importance ratings, mark an "X" beneath the items you regard as the most important in making this decision.

Different people have different opinions on these questions. There are no "right" answers to such problems in the way that math problems have right answers. The following is a sample story, and an example of how to complete this part of the questionnaire. (Although this example does not really deal with a social problem, it will illustrate our instructions.)

FRANK AND THE CAR (sample story)

Frank Jones has been thinking about buying a car. He is married, has two small children and earns an average income. The car he buys will be his family's only car. It will be used mostly to get to work and drive around town, but sometimes for vacation trips also. In trying to decide what car to buy, Frank Jones realized that there were a lot of questions to consider. For instance, should he buy a larger used car or a smaller new car for about the same amount of money? Other questions occur to him.

Recommendation (check one): Frank should: ☒ buy new car ☐ can't decide ☐ buy used car

Ratings: (Please circle one of the following options for each issue below.)

G = Great importance M = Much importance S = Some importance
L = Little importance N = No importance

Issues:

1. Whether the car dealer was in the same block as where Frank lives..... G M S L ☒ N
2. Whether a new car would be more economical in the long run than a used car. ☒ G M S L N
3. Whether the car was green, Frank's favorite color..... G M ☒ S L N
4. Whether the cubic inch displacement was at least 200..... ☒ G M S L N
5. Whether a large, roomy car would be better than a compact car..... ☒ G M S L N
6. Whether the front cornbibles were differential..... G M S L ☒ N

Importance Rankings (check four issues):

	Issue					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Most important issue	—	—	—	—	☒	—
Second most important	—	☒	—	—	—	—
Third most important	—	—	☒	—	—	—
Fourth most important	☒	—	—	—	—	—

Note that in the sample question, issue #5 was regarded as most important, issue #2 as second most important, issue #3 as third most important, and issue #1 as fourth most important.

Now, please read the following two stories, and make a recommendation, importance ratings, and rankings as illustrated above..

Survey of Organizational Behavior

Section I. Background Information

This information will be used to tabulate group results. It will not be used to identify anyone as an individual.

1. Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female
2. Age (in years): _____
3. Highest Level of Education Completed (please check one):

High school graduate	_____
Some College	_____
Associate's Degree	_____
Bachelor's Degree	_____
Master's Degree	_____
beyond a Master's degree	_____
4. Employee Status (please check one):

Part-time	_____
Full-time	_____
5. How many hours per week do you work on average? _____
6. Current job title: _____
7. How long have you been employed in your profession?
_____ year(s) and _____ month(s)
8. How long have you been employed with this organization?
_____ year(s) and _____ month(s)
9. How long have you been employed in your current job title with this organization?
_____ year(s) and _____ month(s)
10. Where did you grow up? (please check one)

in a city	_____
in a small town	_____
in the country	_____
in the suburbs	_____
11. Would you be willing to help us further with this project?
Yes ☐ No ☐
If yes, is there a phone number where we can reach you: _____

Thanks again for your help!

APPENDIX C

DEFINING ISSUES TEST

This section deals with how people think about social problems. You will be asked to read two stories. In each of these stories, a person is facing a problem. After you read each story, you will be asked to indicate your recommendation for what the person in the story should do.

After making a recommendation, you will be presented with several issues the person in the story must consider. You will be asked to rate the importance of these issues in making a decision about what to do, using a scale ranging from of "Great Importance" to "No Importance". Some of the items may not be understandable, or sound like gibberish. You should rate such items as "No importance".

Finally, you will be asked to choose which of these issues are of the greatest importance in making a decision about what to do. Of the items that are presented, you will pick one as most important (relative to the others), then the second most important, third, and fourth most important. To make your importance ratings, mark an "X" beneath the items you regard as the most important in making this decision.

Different people have different opinions on these questions. There are no "right" answers to such problems in the way that math problems have right answers. The following is a sample story, and an example of how to complete this part of the questionnaire. (Although this example does not really deal with a social problem, it will illustrate our instructions.)

FRANK AND THE CAR

(sample story)

Frank Jones has been thinking about buying a car. He is married, has two small children and earns an average income. The car he buys will be his family's only car. It will be used mostly to get to work and drive around town, but sometimes for vacation trips also. In trying to decide what car to buy, Frank Jones realized that there were a lot of questions to consider. For instance, should he buy a larger used car or a smaller new car for about the same amount of money? Other questions occur to him.

Recommendation (check one): Frank should: X buy new car ___ can't decide ___ buy used car

Ratings: (Please circle one of the following options for each issue below.)

G = Great importance M = Much importance S = Some importance
L = Little importance N = No importance

Issues:

1. Whether the car dealer was in the same block as where Frank lives..... G M S L N
2. Whether a new car would be more economical in the long run than a used car. G M S L N
3. Whether the car was green, Frank's favorite color..... G M S L N
4. Whether the cubic inch displacement was at least 200..... G M S L N
5. Whether a large, roomy car would be better than a compact car..... G M S L N
6. Whether the front connibilies were differential..... G M S L N

Importance Rankings (check four issues):

	Issue					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Most important issue	—	—	—	—	<u>X</u>	—
Second most important	—	<u>X</u>	—	—	—	—
Third most important	—	—	<u>X</u>	—	—	—
Fourth most important	<u>X</u>	—	—	—	—	—

Note that in the sample question, issue #5 was regarded as most important, issue #2 as second most important, issue #3 as third most important, and issue #1 as fourth most important.

Now, please read the following two stories, and make a recommendation, importance ratings, and rankings as illustrated above..

STORY #1
HEINZ AND THE DRUG

In Europe a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging ten times what the drug cost to make. He paid \$200 for the radium and charged \$2,000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about \$1,000, which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying, and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said "No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it". So Heinz got desperate and began to think about breaking into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife. Should Heinz steal the drug?

Recommendation (check one):

Should Heinz steal the drug? ☐ should steal it ☐ can't decide ☐ should not steal it

Ratings: (Please circle one of the following options for each issue below.)

G = Great importance M = Much importance S = Some importance
L = Little importance N = No importance

Issues:

1. Whether a community's laws are going to be upheld..... G M S L N
2. Whether it is only natural for a loving husband to care so much
for his wife that he'd steal..... G M S L N
3. Whether Heinz is willing to risk getting shot as a burglar or
going to jail for the chance that stealing the drug might help..... G M S L N
4. Whether Heinz is a professional wrestler, or has considerable
influence with professional wrestlers..... G M S L N
5. Whether Heinz is stealing for himself or doing this solely to
help someone else..... G M S L N
6. Whether the druggist's rights to his invention have to be respected..... G M S L N
7. Whether the essence of living is more encompassing than the
termination of dying, socially and individually..... G M S L N
8. What values are going to be the basis for governing how people act
towards each other..... G M S L N
9. Whether the druggist is going to be allowed to hide behind a worthless
law which only protects the rich anyhow..... G M S L N
10. Whether the law in this case is getting in the way of the most basic
claim of any member of society..... G M S L N
11. Whether the druggist deserves to be robbed for being so greedy and cruel.. G M S L N
12. Whether stealing in such a case would bring about more total good for
the whole society or not..... G M S L N

Importance Rankings (check four issues):

	Issue											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Most important issue	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Second most important	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Third most important	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fourth most important	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

STORY #2 NEWSPAPER

Fred, a senior in high school, wanted to publish a newspaper for students so that he could express many of his opinions. He wanted to speak out against the war in Vietnam and to speak out against some of the school's rules, like the rule forbidding boys to wear long hair.

When Fred started his newspaper, he asked his principal for permission. The principal said it would be all right if before every publication Fred would turn in all his articles for the principal's approval. The principal approved all of them and Fred published two issues of the paper in the next two weeks.

But the principal had not expected that Fred's newspaper would receive so much attention. Students were so excited by the paper that they began to organize protests against the hair regulation and other school rules. Angry parents objected to Fred's opinions. They phoned the principal telling her that the newspaper was unpatriotic and should not be published. As a result of the rising excitement, the principal ordered Fred to stop publishing. She gave as a reason that Fred's activities were disruptive to the operation of the school.

Recommendation (check one):

Should the principal stop the newspaper? ☐ should stop it ☐ can't decide ☐ should not stop it

Ratings: (Please circle one of the following options for each issue below.)

G = Great importance M = Much importance S = Some importance
L = Little importance N = No importance

Issues:

- Whether the principal is more responsible to students or to the parents... G M S L N
- Whether the principal gave her word that the newspaper could be published for a long time, or just promised to approve the newspaper one issue at a time..... G M S L N
- Whether the students would start protesting even more if the principal stopped the newspaper..... G M S L N
- When the welfare of the school is threatened, whether the principal has the right to give orders to students..... G M S L N
- Whether the principal has the freedom of speech to say "no" in this case.. G M S L N
- Whether, by stopping the newspaper the principal would be preventing full discussion of important problems..... G M S L N
- Whether the principal's order would make Fred lose faith in the principal. G M S L N
- Whether Fred was really loyal to his school and patriotic to his country.. G M S L N
- The effect that stopping the paper would have on the students' education in critical thinking and judgments..... G M S L N
- Whether Fred was in any way violating the rights of others in publishing his own opinions..... G M S L N
- Whether the principal should be influenced by some angry parents when it is the principal that knows best what is going on in the school..... G M S L N
- Whether Fred was using the newspaper to stir up hatred and discontent..... G M S L N

Importance Rankings (check four issues):

	Issue											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Most important issue	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Second most important	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Third most important	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fourth most important	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

APPENDIX D

RAW SCORE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR CRITERION ITEMS

Response: 1 2 3 4 5 Missing

Item 1.

Rater 1	24	39	55	151	109	0
Rater 2	9	9	19	32	29	280
Rater 3	2	3	3	14	11	345
Rater 4	0	1	0	1	3	373
Rater 5	0	0	0	0	1	377

Item 2.

Rater 1	29	53	70	149	77	0
Rater 2	7	17	18	37	19	280
Rater 3	3	5	11	8	6	345
Rater 4	1	0	0	2	2	373
Rater 5	0	0	0	1	0	377

Item 3.

Rater 1	8	27	83	175	85	0
Rater 2	4	6	21	42	25	280
Rater 3	2	0	7	17	7	345
Rater 4	0	0	1	1	3	373
Rater 5	0	0	0	0	1	377

Item 4.

Rater 1	13	39	138	140	48	0
Rater 2	3	9	47	31	8	280
Rater 3	1	1	16	11	4	345
Rater 4	0	0	2	1	2	373
Rater 5	0	0	0	0	1	377

Item 5.

Rater 1	26	66	142	104	40	0
Rater 2	6	18	45	24	5	280
Rater 3	1	4	13	7	8	345
Rater 4	0	0	0	2	3	373
Rater 5	0	0	1	0	0	377

Item 6.

Rater 1	5	20	36	166	151	0
Rater 2	4	7	9	36	42	280
Rater 3	0	1	3	16	13	345
Rater 4	0	0	0	2	3	373
Rater 5	0	0	0	0	1	377

Response: 1 2 3 4 5 Missing

Item 7.

Rater 1	10	40	90	161	77	0
Rater 2	5	8	23	39	23	280
Rater 3	1	3	7	14	8	345
Rater 4	0	0	1	1	3	373
Rater 5	0	0	0	0	1	377

Item 8.

Rater 1	7	23	107	165	76	0
Rater 2	5	7	30	39	17	280
Rater 3	1	2	7	14	9	345
Rater 4	0	0	1	1	3	373
Rater 5	0	0	0	0	1	377

Item 9.

Rater 1	10	36	90	153	89	0
Rater 2	7	3	26	41	21	280
Rater 3	1	2	7	14	9	345
Rater 4	0	0	2	2	1	373
Rater 5	0	0	0	0	1	377

Item 10.

Rater 1	8	25	97	161	87	0
Rater 2	4	8	21	38	27	280
Rater 3	1	1	6	15	10	345
Rater 4	0	1	0	3	1	373
Rater 5	0	0	0	1	0	377

Item 11.

Rater 1	14	39	102	149	74	0
Rater 2	10	9	22	36	21	280
Rater 3	2	5	6	9	11	345
Rater 4	0	1	1	0	3	373
Rater 5	0	0	0	1	0	377

APPENDIX E

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG SELF-RATED ALTRUISTIC OCB SCALES AND
VARIABLES OF INTEREST, AFTER CONTROLLING FOR THE EFFECTS
OF HOSPITAL (SURVEY SAMPLE)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Independent:															
1. Moral Development	--														
2. Interpersonal Orientation	-.14	--													
3. Trust in Peers	-.18*		--												
4. Trust in Management	-.32*	.10	.00	--											
5. Job Satisfaction	-.17*	.16*	.11	.42*	--										
6. Pay Satisfaction	-.21	.12	.03	.33*	.40*	--									
7. Equity	-.01	-.02	-.06	.03	.08	.17*	--								
8. Organizational Commitment	-.23*	.22*	.20*	.62*	.85*	.41*	.02	--							
9. Participative Culture	-.21*	.16*	.20*	.62*	.43*	.28*	.01	.64*	--						
10. Job Clarity	-.28*	.12	.09*	.50*	.42*	.36*	.01	.45*	.58*	--					
Self-Rated Altruistic OCB:															
11. Overall	-.00	-.05	.18*	.12	.12	-.02	-.05	.15*	.04	.09	--				
12. Peer	.01	-.03	.18*	.06	.09	.04	-.11	.11	.08	.14*	.83*	--			
13. Supervisor	-.14	.02	.13*	.08	-.00	-.06	.01	.03	.02	.07	.71*	.46*	--		
14. Equivocal	.07	-.06	.15*	.05	-.00	-.07	-.09	.10	-.03	-.00	.87*	.67*	.49*	--	
15. Outsider	-.03	-.03	.13*	.09	.24*	-.03	.13*	.14*	.07	.10	.68*	.43*	.37*	.52*	--

Note: N=178 except for correlations with moral development (N=86)

a: $p < .05$

b: $p < .01$

c: $p < .001$

APPENDIX F

ZERO-ORDER INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG ALTRUISTIC OCB SCALES
AND VARIABLES OF INTEREST (TARGET SAMPLE)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<u>Independent:</u>																				
1. Moral Development	--																			
2. Interpersonal Orientation	-.13	--																		
3. Trust in Peers	-.23	.30*	--																	
4. Trust in Management	-.24	-.05	-.01	--																
5. Job Satisfaction	-.15	.19*	.11	.37*	--															
6. Pay Satisfaction	-.08	.09	.11	.33*	.43*	--														
7. Equity	-.03	-.10	-.13	.08	.03	.20*	--													
8. Organizational Commitment	-.19	.25*	.28*	.56*	.65*	.48*	-.06	--												
9. Participative Culture	-.11	.11	.21*	.62*	.37*	.33*	.02	.60*	--											
10. Job Clarity	-.17	.18*	.09	.55*	.38*	.38*	.01	.48*	.68*	--										
<u>Self-Rated Dependent:</u>																				
11. Overall	.04	-.03	.16	.10	.12	-.01	-.10	.18*	.08	.15	--									
12. Peer	.15	-.01	.16	-.01	.05	.01	-.14	.08	.08	.17	.81*	--								
13. Supervisor	-.16	-.03	.13	.16	.01	-.01	.04	.08	.08	.15	.75*	.47*	--							
14. Equivocal	.11	-.07	.13	-.01	.06	-.09	-.16	.15	.01	.07	.88*	.65*	.51*	--						
15. Outsider	-.14	.06	.11	.08	.26*	.09	-.01	.19*	.10	.08	.67*	.38*	.44*	.55*	--					
<u>Peer-Rated Dependent:</u>																				
16. Overall	.07	-.04	.07	.09	.28*	-.00	-.19*	.23*	.19*	.26*	.39*	.36*	.29*	.28*	.20*	--				
17. Peer	.03	-.02	-.01	.20*	.21*	-.01	-.13	.11	.13	.24*	.39*	.41*	.29*	.27*	.20*	.92*	--			
18. Supervisor	.03	-.08	.04	.25*	.20*	-.04	-.19*	.24*	.22*	.28*	.26*	.23*	.22*	.19*	.03	.84*	.69*	--		
19. Equivocal	.11	-.07	.07	.16	.28*	-.01	-.15	.22*	.15	.26*	.38*	.35*	.26*	.29*	.20*	.95*	.74*	--		
20. Outsider	.07	-.00	.14	.18	.38*	.11	-.16	.26*	.22*	.21*	.31*	.33*	.30*	.20*	.29*	.83*	.72*	.59*	.76*	--
21. Hospital	-.10	.07	-.02	-.42*	-.12	-.24*	-.11	-.21*	-.40*	-.33*	-.13	-.02	-.22*	-.06	-.05	-.25*	-.16	-.23*	-.28*	-.22*

Note: N=94 except for correlations with moral development (N=47)

a: $p < .05$

b: $p < .01$

c: $p < .001$

APPENDIX G

ZERO-ORDER INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG SELF-RATED
ALTRUISTIC OCB SCALES AND VARIABLES OF INTEREST
(SURVEY SAMPLE)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Independent:															
1. Moral Development	--														
2. Interpersonal Orientation	-.15	--													
3. Trust in Peers	-.19	.10	--												
4. Trust in Management	-.28*	.06	.03	--											
5. Job Satisfaction	-.17	.16*	.11	.43*	--										
6. Pay Satisfaction	-.20	.32	.05	.35*	.41*	--									
7. Equity	-.01	-.02	-.06	.03	.08	.17*	--								
8. Organizational Commitment	-.23*	.21*	.21*	.21*	.62*	.66*	.42*	-.02							
9. Participative Culture	-.18	.14*	.22*	.66*	.44*	.31*	-.00	.64*	--						
10. Job Clarity	-.27*	.12	.11	.53*	.43*	.38*	.02	.46*	.61*	--					
Self-Rated Dependent:															
11. Overall	.01	-.05	.20*	.17*	.13*	.01	-.04	.17*	.10	.13*	--				
12. Peer	-.03	-.03	.18*	.08	.09	.05	-.11	.12	.09	.15*	.82*	--			
13. Supervisor	-.12	.01	.15*	.16*	.02	-.03	-.01	.06	.09	.12	.72*	.45*	--		
14. Equivocal	.08	-.06	.16*	.09	.01	.05	-.09	.11	.01	.02	.88*	.67*	.50*	--	
15. Outsider	.01	-.03	.14*	.12	.24*	.04	.13*	.15	.09	.12	.68*	.43*	.38*	.53*	--
16. Hospital	-.07	.02	-.10	-.33*	-.08	-.13*	-.01	-.13*	-.30*	-.22*	-.19*	-.05	-.24*	-.12	-.10

Note: N=178 except for correlations with moral development (N=86)

a: $p < .05$

b: $p < .01$

c: $p < .001$

APPENDIX H

ZERO-ORDER INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG STUDY VARIABLES
OF INTEREST (WITHIN HOSPITAL 1 AND HOSPITAL 2)

HOSPITAL 1

	IO	TP	TM	JS	PS	EQ	OC
IO	1.00000						
TP	.54961	1.00000					
TM	-.02005	-.00077	1.00000				
JS	.23023	.25698	.53039	1.00000			
PS	.03939	.12449	.51863	.47497	1.00000		
EQ	-.19898	-.16909	.05122	.02510	.26095	1.00000	
OC	.35627	.41834	.61784	.84747	.55009	.04589	1.00000
PC	.31862	.44703	.53801	.59922	.52612	.07759	.76642
JC	.11499	.06610	.49837	.29242	.46061	.11489	.44621
SRTG	.13474	.26324	.18641	.06352	-.06964	-.04605	.19508
SPEER	.15311	.11853	.05498	-.13200	.04620	-.04829	.06759
SSUP	-.01621	.21633	.08845	-.13868	-.02834	.00294	.06911
SESUP	.16584	.17493	.10903	.00598	-.27412	-.18149	.11993
SOUT	.15573	.30556	.19342	.35465	.17080	.14400	.25117
PRTG	.27103	.30141	.28944	.49876	.03349	-.31881	.49259
PPEER	.31354	.11515	.21262	.28062	.04635	-.28380	.22210
PSUP	.07863	.20301	.19071	.29261	-.07405	-.26580	.29484
PESUP	.20322	.26664	.20547	.47489	.02532	-.19742	.48604
POUT	.33018	.39260	.40708	.63535	.25896	-.27194	.60050
	PC	JC	SRTG	SPEER	SSUP	SESUP	SOUT
PC	1.00000						
JC	.65206	1.00000					
SRTG	.03268	.03541	1.00000				
SPEER	.08426	.26375	.65780	1.00000			
SSUP	-.02172	.05151	.79866	.47750	1.00000		
SESUP	.04194	.01428	.85439	.52090	.55243	1.00000	
SOUT	.05776	-.17392	.53759	.00650	.27254	.43041	1.00000
PRTG	.38526	.10644	.14762	.11928	.05321	.09923	-.01759
PPEER	.25771	.18478	.15999	.29635	.04097	.18815	-.14084
PSUP	.29887	.13659	.00877	.06547	-.00708	-.00122	-.11141
PESUP	.25781	-.00376	.11716	.09437	.04615	.07015	-.02204
POUT	.46656	.09583	.12309	-.04654	.00825	.00572	.16993
	PRTG	PPEER	PSUP	PESUP	POUT		
PRTG	1.00000						
PPEER	.74090	1.00000					
PSUP	.81266	.51008	1.00000				
PESUP	.90676	.64481	.64034	1.00000			
POUT	.80626	.45728	.51938	.69651	1.00000		

N=37; correlations at or above .28 are significant at $p < .05$

(IO= Interpersonal Orientation, TP= Trust in Peers, TM= Trust in Management, JS= Job Satisfaction, PS= Pay Satisfaction, EQ= Equity, OC= Organizational Commitment, PC= Participative Culture, JC= Job Clarity, SRTG= Overall Self Ratings, SPEER= Self Ratings of Actions Which Benefit Peers, SSUP= Self Ratings of Actions Which Benefit the Supervisor, SESUP= Self Ratings of Actions Which Benefit an Equivocal Target, SOUT= Self Ratings of Actions Which Benefit Outsiders, PRTG= Overall Peer Ratings, PPEER= Peer Ratings of Actions Which Benefit Peers, PSUP= Peer Ratings of Actions Which Benefit the Supervisor, PESUP= Peer Ratings of Actions Which Benefit an Equivocal Target, POUT= Peer Ratings of Actions Which Benefit Outsiders)

HOSPITAL 2

	IO	TP	TM	JS	PS	EQ	OC
IO	1.00000						
TP	.08290	1.00000					
TM	-.02525	-.03218	1.00000				
JS	.17306	-.02998	.29906	1.00000			
PS	.17148	.09660	.16381	.35930	1.00000		
EQ	-.04056	-.12302	.02994	.01957	.15006	1.00000	
OC	.19253	.15043	.54295	.45274	.36955	-.16269	1.00000
PC	.03742	.05016	.56982	.17160	.07040	-.06480	.43238
JC	.27075	.10696	.47231	.42103	.27549	-.06840	.46699
SRTG	-.11066	.11179	.01452	.13663	-.03514	-.13296	.14067
SPEER	-.10286	.18841	-.04839	.15962	-.01626	-.17290	.09164
SSUP	-.00655	.08074	.07066	.06004	-.09168	.01785	.00757
SESUP	-.18887	.11462	-.08510	.07842	-.01219	-.16165	.16394
SOUT	-.00367	-.05228	.01949	.17821	.00476	-.06272	.11731
PRTG	-.14466	-.03748	.04099	.17926	-.11920	-.19569	.07296
PPEER	-.06938	-.05980	-.00520	.19261	-.08668	-.11965	.02992
PSUP	-.14605	-.04935	.16633	.12022	-.12772	-.21308	.16696
PESUP	-.17293	-.01857	.01714	.16581	-.13693	-.18873	.03167
POUT	-.16705	-.01122	.04603	.21281	-.06771	-.15974	-.00310
	PC	JC	SRTG	SPEER	SSUP	SESUP	SOUT
PC	1.00000						
JC	.62955	1.00000					
SRTG	.02359	.13678	1.00000				
SPEER	.07544	.14087	.86519	1.00000			
SSUP	-.00359	.09344	.72424	.48327	1.00000		
SESUP	-.04799	.06121	.88820	.69059	.49279	1.00000	
SOUT	.10146	.19158	.75072	.58197	.54466	.62292	1.00000
PRTG	.00666	.21827	.43726	.43842	.31631	.32814	.28887
PPEER	.02672	.20424	.42748	.44212	.33658	.28628	.32367
PSUP	.08218	.24879	.31038	.28512	.24676	.25159	.09251
PESUP	-.03030	.23184	.42952	.43919	.26940	.35394	.30317
POUT	-.00938	.16122	.44137	.47368	.37463	.26279	.35949
	PRTG	PPEER	PSUP	PESUP	POUT		
PRTG	1.00000						
PPEER	.95416	1.00000					
PSUP	.84214	.72539	1.00000				
PESUP	.95720	.89267	.74759	1.00000			
POUT	.82914	.78847	.58667	.77364	1.00000		

N=57; correlations at or above .25 are significant at $p < .05$

(IO= Interpersonal Orientation, TP= Trust in Peers, TM= Trust in Management, JS= Job Satisfaction, PS= Pay Satisfaction, EQ= Equity, OC= Organizational Commitment, PC= Participative Culture, JC= Job Clarity, SRTG= Overall Self Ratings, SPEER= Self Ratings of Actions Which Benefit Peers, SSUP= Self Ratings of Actions Which Benefit the Supervisor, SESUP= Self Ratings of Actions Which Benefit an Equivocal Target, SOUT= Self Ratings of Actions Which Benefit Outsiders, PRTG= Overall Peer Ratings, PPEER= Peer Ratings of Actions Which Benefit Peers, PSUP= Peer Ratings of Actions Which Benefit the Supervisor, PESUP= Peer Ratings of Actions Which Benefit an Equivocal Target, POUT= Peer Ratings of Actions Which Benefit Outsiders)

APPENDIX I

ANALYSIS OF MODERATED RELATIONSHIPS FOR SELF-RATED
ALTRUISTIC OCB AS A FUNCTION OF INTERPERSONAL ORIENTATION
CONTROLLING FOR HOSPITAL

Self Rated Altruistic OCB (Survey Sample; N=178)							
Predictor Variables	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	FR ²	R ²	FR ²
IO	-.05			.00	.41		
IO, TM	-.06	.12		.02	1.55	.02	2.69
IO, TM, IO*TM	.02	.23	-.14	.02	1.05	.00	.06
IO	-.05			.00	.41		
IO, TP	-.07	.19		.04	3.38	.03	6.33*
IO, TP, IO*TP	.03	.27	-.14	.04	2.26	.00	.07
IO	-.05			.00	.41		
IO, JS	-.07	.13		.02	1.59	.02	2.76
IO, JS, IO*JS	.00	.21	-.12	.02	1.07	.00	.07
IO	-.05			.00	.41		
IO, PS	-.05	-.01		.00	.21	.00	.02
IO, PS, IO*PS	.23	.64	-.75	.01	.77	.01	1.87
IO	-.05			.00	.41		
IO, EQ	-.05	.05		.00	.41	.00	.41
IO, EQ, IO*EQ	-.05	.01	-.04	.00	.28	.00	.01
IO	-.05			.00	.41		
IO, OC	-.09	.17		.03	2.71	.03	5.00*
IO, OC, IO*OC	.03	.28	-.18	.03	1.83	.00	.74

Note: Abbreviations represent interpersonal orientation (IO), trust in management (TM), trust in peers (TP), job satisfaction (JS), pay satisfaction (PS), equity (EQ), and organizational commitment (OC).

a: standardized beta weights

* p<.05

** p<.01

APPENDIX J

ANALYSIS OF MODERATED RELATIONSHIPS FOR ALTRUISTIC OCB
AS A FUNCTION OF MORAL DEVELOPMENT,
CONTROLLING FOR HOSPITAL

Self Rated Altruistic OCB (Survey Sample; N=178)								
Predictor Variables	B ₁ ^a	B ₂ ^a	B ₃ ^a	R ²	FR ²	R ²	FR ²	
MD	-.00			.00	.00			
MD, TM	.04	.13		.02	.67	.02	1.34	
MD, TM, MD*TM	.93	.58	-.88	.05	1.30	.03	2.52	
MD	-.00			.00	.00			
MD, TP	.02	.12		.01	.55	.01	1.09	
MD, TP, MD*TP	-.19	.05	.21	.01	.38	.00	.06	
MD	-.00			.00	.00			
MD, JS	.02	.12		.01	.58	.01	1.15	
MD, JS, MD*JS	-.04	.10	.06	.01	.39	.00	.01	
MD	-.00			.00	.00			
MD, PS	.03	.15		.02	.89	.02	1.77	
MD, PS, MD*PS	.18	.26	-.18	.02	.67	.00	.24	
MD	-.00			.00	.00			
MD, EQ	-.01	-.33**		.11	4.95	.11	9.89*	
MD, EQ, MD*EQ	-.01	-.36	.04	.11	3.26	.00	.01	
MD	-.00			.00	.00			
MD, OC	.06	.26*		.06	2.78	.06	5.56*	
MD, OC, MD*OC	.22	.32	-.16	.06	1.85	.00	.06	

Note: Abbreviations represent interpersonal orientation (IO), trust in management (TM), trust in peers (TP), job satisfaction (JS), pay satisfaction (PS), equity (EQ), and organizational commitment (OC).

a: standardized beta weights * p<.05 ** p<.01

APPENDIX K

UNIQUE EFFECTS DERIVED FROM FULL MODEL REGRESSION OF
PREDICTOR VARIABLES WITH ALTRUISTIC OCB

Self Ratings (N=178)

Predictor Variable	Overall		Peer as Beneficiary		Supervisor as Beneficiary		Supervisor as Equivocal Beneficiary		Outsider as Beneficiary	
	B	t	B	t	B	t	B	t	B	t
Interpersonal Orientation	-.07	-.93	-.08	-1.11	.02	.21	-.08	-1.02	-.07	-.93
Trust in Peers	.16	2.10*	.19	2.40*	.15	1.94	.16	2.06*	.13	1.67
Trust in Management	-.01	-.05	.12	1.14	.16	1.44	.09	.84	.03	.31
Job Satisfaction	.02	.19	.05	.48	-.04	-.37	-.07	-.71	.26	2.54*
Pay Satisfaction	-.01	-.08	-.11	-1.27	-.11	-1.27	-.10	-1.20	-.11	-1.24
Equity	-.10	-1.34	-.03	-.35	.03	.43	-.06	-.77	.13	1.77
Organizational Commitment	.07	.58	.15	1.24	.00	.01	.24	1.97	.02	.13
Participative Culture	-.08	-.73	-.20	-1.79	-.12	-1.01	-.22	-1.91	-.09	-.35
Job Clarity	.15	1.55	.10	1.00	.10	.96	.03	.36	.06	.62
R ²		.07		.19		.04		.08		.10
FR ²		1.35		2.30*		.87		1.52		2.07*

* p<.05

** p<.01

APPENDIX L
CASE REPORTS

CASE 01

Qualitative Data: Case 01

Hospital: 2

Job Title: Ward Clerk

Nomination:

"I caught ...[01] helping... [another floor] on a day they had no ward clerk, while keeping up with her own work as well."

Interview:

The interviewee (01) was working as a ward clerk on one floor of the hospital, when she was asked if she would be available to cover for another department on a different floor. Although she was asked to help out, and she was expected to help if she was not too busy, she was free to say no to this request without fear of penalty. Situations like this arise quite often, according to the interviewee. Saying yes to this request meant that for the rest of her shift, she would alternate between stations every 30-45 minutes. Her self-stated motive for this action was that "if the floor doesn't have a clerk, it really messes up the nurses". Additionally she says that helping someone else also makes the day go faster and that her decision to help was a spontaneous one. The nurses gained from her helpful action, and 01 did not stand to gain anything by helping the other floor. In general, the interviewee says she and others at the hospital like to help others on the job because it makes others' work easier, and if you help someone now, they are apt to return the favor later. She says people don't help others on the job more often because they are too busy themselves. For example, she will not consent to help another floor if she is very busy and it would "put my floor in a bind". She sees herself as someone who sometimes goes above and beyond the call of duty to help others at work, and feels that her helpfulness is a result of both her personality and the situations she finds herself in. That is, her personality is such that even if she does not want to help, she will feel guilty if she does not. She finds that she is asked to help more often than others because she is organized with her work, and she doesn't mind helping others.

CASE 02

Qualitative Data: Case 02

Hospital: 2

Job Title: LPN

Nomination:

"I caught...[02] being concerned about a housekeeper being very ill. [She]...found a wheelchair and helped to take the housekeeper...to the emergency room for treatment. [She]... always goes an extra mile to help someone out."

Interview:

Interviewee 02 was sitting in the day room with other staff members when someone came to the door to say that a housekeeper was sick and needed a wheelchair. Interviewee 02 volunteered to get the wheelchair. She then took it to the housekeeper, who was suffering from a great deal of anxiety. Interviewee 02 talked to her to calm her down, then took her to the health office. At the health office it was decided that the woman should be taken to the emergency room, and 02 helped to take the woman there. The woman was later diagnosed as having gastritis. Interviewee 02's self-stated motive for this action was that "I believe in helping people in need". She stated that she loves to help people, it makes her feel good, and that "it doesn't hurt to take time out" to do so. She also mentioned her faith in God, which keeps her going, and that she tries to live by the golden rule. She appeared to take pride in her helpfulness. Her decision to help was a spontaneous one, and the sick housekeeper was the only person Interviewee 02 felt gained from her helpful action. When asked if any good might come to her as a result of helping the housekeeper, she responded that she didn't think about it that way. In general 02 feels that others at the hospital share her philosophy about helping others, since she feels people must care to do this type of work, and since they are trained to help others. She says that letting co-workers know that you are willing to help them fosters a warm and caring working environment. She was somewhat at a loss to explain why some people don't help others on the job more often, but concluded that they must be too busy themselves. Interviewee 02 sees herself as someone who goes above and beyond the call of duty to help others at work, and feels that her helpfulness is a result of her personality. She related that when she was a young girl she used to pray that

she would grow up and become a nurse. Now she prays that God will let her help others. She says that in general "if you need me, I'm there to help".

CASE 03

Qualitative Data: Case 03

Hospital: 2

Job Title: Nursing Assistant--Orthopedics

Nomination:

"I caught [03]...working 3-11 shift...when we were short staffed. She cared for her patients and was helpful to the other staff. She demonstrated a good shift relationship and is a very caring person. She never complained."

Interview:

The interviewee [03] was working the 7-3 shift when two people called to say they would not be able to come into work for the 3-11 shift. The interviewee spontaneously volunteered to work the additional shift. If she had not volunteered to help, the department would have had to call the staffing department to see if anyone else could work the shift. She says her motives were that she "knows how [difficult] it is" when a shift is short-staffed, it gave her something to do--since she had no plans for that evening, and she knew that her patients needed help. Additionally, she mentioned that she develops close relationships with each of her patients, to the extent that some of them cry when they are dismissed from the hospital, and that her patients were the ones who gained by her helpful action. When asked what good might come to her as a result of her helpful action, she pointed to a button she was wearing proudly. She had received the button through the hospital's system for recognizing altruistic behavior. This recognition was not an anticipated reward. In addition, she received "shift differential" (a slightly higher pay rate) while working the evening shift. This differential did not appear to be a motivating factor for 03. In general, she says that she and her co-workers help each other on the job because it "takes a special breed to be in nursing" and deal with its emotional demands. She says she does not know why some people at the hospital don't help others more. She sees herself as someone who goes above and beyond the call of duty to help others at work, and credits this helpfulness to her personality. She has wanted to become a nurse since she was a little girl, has recently become a nursing assistant, and is looking forward to her RN training. When asked what makes her help someone else out on the job when another person might not, she responded

that she does what needs to be done without being asked, and almost by reflex, and she often asks others if they need help.

CASE 04

Qualitative Data: Case 04

Hospital: 2

Job Title: LPN--Orthopedics

Nomination:

"I caught [04]...giving excellent nursing care to all of her assigned patients when we are short staffed. [04] does her assignment without complaining. She is always willing to help the other staff when needed. It is always a pleasure working with her. She is an asset to [Hospital 2]...."

Interview:

Due to the general nature of the nomination, 04 was asked to recount a specific instance of helping behavior. Earlier on the evening of the interview, she had transferred a patient to another floor for a nurse who was too busy to do so. 04 was caught up on her own work, and had volunteered to transfer the patient. When asked what motivated her to help, she said there was no reason, she just had her own work under control, and saw no reason not to help the other nurse, who was busy. She stated that her decision to help was spontaneous. She said that the patient stood to gain from her action, as she otherwise could have lain for as many as 2-3 hours waiting to be transferred. She stated that she also volunteers to give pain medication to patients when their nurses are too busy to do so, because "she knows how it hurts" to suffer from a broken bone or a similar injury. In general, 04 said she and others at the hospital help others because they like to pitch in and do whatever needs to be done. She does not know why people don't help others on the job more often. She does not see herself as someone who goes above and beyond the call of duty to help others at work; rather, she sees such voluntary actions as part of her job. She feels that her helpfulness is a result of her personality. She enjoys doing things for other people in all areas of her life. She mentioned that she was the oldest of three sisters, and that her sisters depended on her. Her family relies on her to this day, and she often volunteers for activities at her children's school and Sunday school. She seems to enjoy and take pride in the role of helper.

CASE 05

Qualitative Data: Case 05

Hospital: 2

Job Title: LPN--Orthopedics

Nomination:

"I caught [05]...helping to staff our 3-11 shift by working a double shift...She gives good nursing care and shows how much she cares for the patients by volunteering to help us when we were short staffed. I appreciate her."

Interview:

An individual called in sick for the 3-11 shift. Thus, the shift was short staffed and needed volunteers. 05 was called, and she agreed to work the shift in addition to her 11-7 shift. She did this on two occasions, and in each case, she could have said no to the request without penalty. Her self-stated motive for this action was that the people on the shift needed help, and she knew from experience that it "makes it a lot harder on everyone when we're understaffed", and it is easier when "everyone on the shift works as a team". Her action was spontaneous. Everyone on the shift was in a position to gain from her action, according to 05. She herself also stood to benefit from the action, as during the 3-11 shift she has a greater opportunity to deal directly with patients and their families. She saw it as a learning experience. She believes that she and others in the hospital help each other because nurses are there because they like to help others, and with a team effort, "everybody gains". She also mentioned that she particularly likes to work with others as a team, something she found to be helpful in her former job as a sales manager at a department store. She does see many co-workers who don't help on the job more often, and feels that burnout due to understaffing is a major culprit. In fact, she feels that most of her co-workers, especially the RN's, are suffering from burnout. These people enter a vicious cycle, 05 says, where they feel others don't help them, so they see no reason to help others. They reach the point where they no longer care about their patients or themselves, and no longer enjoy their work, but just see it as a job. 05 sees herself as someone who sometimes goes above and beyond the call of duty to help others at work, and feels that her helpfulness is a result of both her personality and the situations she finds herself in. That is,

she tries in general to treat others as she would like to be treated, enjoys helping people, especially patients and families, and does lots of little helpful things for others, but when the situation warrants, she responds by being particularly helpful.

CASE 06

Qualitative Data: Case 06

Hospital: 2

Job Title: Ward Clerk

Nominations:

"I caught [06]...working the ER 3-11 on an extremely busy Monday night. Even though she had never worked ER she plowed through and tried hard. She even took some verbal abuse from a physician; she kept right on working."

"I caught [06...who] came in to work extra...[on] an extraordinarily bad day. [She] worked from 9am to 11pm."

" I caught [06]...coming in several hours early to help out on a unit that had no ward clerk. This has been done several times!"

Interview:

On the night described in the first nomination, 06 was working PRN, which meant that she was on call if someone called in sick, or that she could be asked to "float around" to different departments as needed throughout the night. If called, however, she was not required to come in. She was called to work in the ER, which she had never done before, and she agreed to do so. She received a 5 minute tour of the area, and 15 minutes later 5 patients from ambulances arrived. She soon found that the computer used in the keyboard was the same as ones she had used in other departments, but that the keyboard layout was different, so she made mistakes in keying in numbers, and had to start over a few times. She found herself very jittery, but wanted to help. A doctor with a notoriously poor bedside manner gave her some verbal abuse, but she kept plugging away. She called staffing for some help, but no one was available. She was able to catch up with the work, and an hour later, relief came. She is motivated by her love for the job, and as a single mother, is motivated by the money she can make when she works PRN. She says she feels good when she can help someone. When someone is needed in the area she normally covers (CCU), she is particularly apt to help, since she hates for her unit not to be covered. Another motivating factor for her to come in while on PRN is that, while she enjoys CCU,

there is little patient contact. In different departments, she is able to meet patients and become acquainted with different areas of medicine. She says she learns something new on every shift. Working also helps her stay busy. There is some indication that she feels diligent work may help her get a full time position, instead of working on the floor one day a week and PRN for 4, as she does now. 06 also takes pride in the fact that she is known as a helpful and dependable person around the hospital, and that departments specifically ask for her when she is working PRN. She says that her decision to work is largely spontaneous, but that if she had been awake early and up many hours with her child, she would reconsider. By coming into work, 06 says the nurses benefit. She can call the doctor for them, or go to the pharmacy. She says that she and her co-workers help others because the atmosphere is one of helpfulness. ("People are here because they are sick--we are the lucky people that get to help them".) She says further that most of her co-workers will go out of their way to help each other, but that a few will not, and she is not sure why. She sees herself as someone who goes above and beyond the call of duty to help others at work. She relates that in CCU she is often teased that "that's not part of your job description". She often gets water, pills, and blankets for patients in order to make the load easier on the nurses, and to help the patients. She feels that her helpfulness is a result of both her personality and the situations she finds herself in, since she is helpful in general, but that she is especially helpful when the nurses and doctors need help. She feels that her attitude makes her an especially helpful person, since she does not bring her personal business into the hospital, she likes to laugh and make others laugh, and the nurses know that they can depend on her helpfulness.

CASE 07

Qualitative Data: Case 07

Hospital: 1

Job Title: Secretary

Nomination:

"I hired a new secretary to allow [07]...to concentrate on transcription duties. The new employee was having great difficulty with learning her tasks even following orientation. [07]...managed to complete her work in addition to patiently instructing the new person (over and over). The new person continued to have an unreasonably difficult time with the job and was finally asked to take another job. [07]...never complained or "gave up" teaching this person."

Interview:

Interviewee 07 explained that the new secretary had tried very hard at her job, but simply could not do the work adequately. She says she was patient with this individual, who never quite grasped the job requirements. 07 found herself checking the new secretary's work frequently, and because the woman worked slowly, she took over a large share of the typing. Interviewee 07's self-stated motive for this action was that she perceived the new secretary to be a nice person who was trying hard, and who needed additional instruction. She said it was easier for her to help than to watch the woman get frustrated and upset. Additionally, she stated that she likes to treat others as she would like to be treated, and that she wants to make the department run as smoothly as possible. 07 described her helping behaviors with regard to the new secretary as spontaneous ones. She stated that the new secretary was the only person who stood to gain from her action, and that she (07) did not stand to gain anything because of her action. In general, 07 believes that you must be a caring/giving person to work in a health care environment; you must be aware of people's needs and concerns. She believes that at Hospital 1, employees are very helpful to one another, but that at other facilities, people may not help each other more because they don't believe such actions are part of their jobs. When asked if she sees herself as someone who goes above and beyond the call of duty to help others at work, she says she does not think of it that way, that such behaviors are part of her job. She feels that her helpfulness is a result of her personality,

since it is gratifying for her to help others, and to see others improve themselves. When asked what makes her help someone else out on the job, when another person might not, she responded that she is a very dependable person, and is nearly always "on top of my own work".

CASE 08

Qualitative Data: Case 08

Hospital: 1

Job Title: RN--Recovery

Nomination:

"On two separate occasions [08]...volunteered to take call on holidays when the regularly scheduled person was unable to do so. She just did this to help out, though she would rather have been off."

Interview:

Interviewee 08 volunteered to be on call and available for work on two holidays when the supervisor asked if anyone was available to do so. 08 said that she did not have anything else to do, and thought that others might have plans, so she spontaneously volunteered to work. She says she was in a position to gain a little money by being on call, but that more importantly, the hospital and the other nurses she worked with stood to gain, since she was saving someone work, and keeping things running smoothly. She further stated that the atmosphere at Hospital 1 is one in which everyone works together, and that her action was not unusual--"if you help others they'll help you". To the best of her recollection, she did end up being called into work on both occasions. Her self-stated motive for her own action and similar ones done by co-workers in her department is that the members of the unit all care for each other, work closely as a team, and don't want the burden to be too great on anyone. She feels that workers at Hospital 1 are very helpful to one another, but that at other institutions, people may refrain from helping each other on the job more often because they do not care about others, but only think about themselves. When asked if she saw herself as a person who goes above and beyond the call of duty to help others, she responded that she sees herself as a person who helps others, and feels others will reciprocate. Since she helps others even when there is not a great need, she feels that her helpfulness is attributable in larger part to her personality than to situational factors. She says she tries to help others as often as she can, but will "back off" if she thinks they don't really need her help. When asked what makes her help someone else out on the job when another person might not, she said that she felt all organizational members are helpful to others.

CASE 09

Qualitative Data: Case 09

Hospital: 1

Job Title: Engineering Supervisor

Nominations:

"[09]...is a most accommodating person. He will go out of his way to aid "anyone". He demonstrates this each day by helping visitors with car problems, and fellow workers with work or personal problems. I believe [09]...believes in and actively shows that each individual is responsible to the help and betterment of mankind"

"There is no one incident I can remember. He is always helpful and handy when you need an extra hand."

Interview:

Due to the general nature of the nominations, 09 was asked to recount a specific instance of helping behavior. He related that he had helped the newest man in the department on several occasions, who was unacquainted with maintenance. He said there were a lot of things this new man needed to learn, like how to rebuild flush valves, the layout of electrical wires, and how to reset the power equipment room in the event of power failure. While the new man, 09 and others were working, the new man would ask 09 for help or guidance, or 09 would volunteer his help. 09 stated that one of his motives for helping the man was that he wants him to have the confidence to take care of the equipment on his own. He remembers that someone had to show him the ropes too, and that it can be difficult to learn the job. He stated that his helpful actions are spontaneous; if he sees a need for his help, he'll help right away. He said that the employee he helped was in a position to gain from his action, and the next new employee would benefit, since the man that 09 had helped could pass on the information he had learned. He also stated that his action benefits himself since when he (09) is on call, the new man can take care of problems that arise, without calling for his help. Additionally, less down time on equipment could ultimately result from his helpful actions. He says that he, and others in his department help each other a lot, since they need more personnel and are "spread thin". Thus, if one man has some slack time, he will pitch in and give the others a hand. He

said that the atmosphere is a helpful one, and that the group men in that department are "pretty good old boys". When asked why people don't help others on the job more often, he was at a loss, and said that he has been fortunate to have always worked in departments characterized by helpfulness. Then he concluded that some people in other organizations might have an "attitude problem" (self-centeredness). He said he does see himself as someone who goes above and beyond the call of duty to help others at work, stating that he likes to help any way he can, even if not paid for it. He said that he likes to live by the golden rule, and be a good Christian. He feels that his helpfulness is a result of his personality. He credits his helpfulness to a caring, and to his youth.

CASE 10

Qualitative Data: Case 10

Hospital: 1

Job Title: RN--Recovery

Nominations:

"One evening, I would be the only nurse working in the PACU unit after 5:30 pm. As the day progressed we realized there would be too many patients for one nurse to safely care for. [10]...had plans to attend a dinner and had prepared a special dish of food to take. She stayed over with me as long as I needed help and missed her dinner. I knew how much she wanted to leave but she didn't.

Interview:

Interviewee 10 stated that on the evening described above, one of the nurses scheduled to work the 3-11 shift did not come in. She volunteered to stay over, since "it had to be done". She was going to attend a garden club potluck dinner that evening, but did not go. She said that in a health care organization, you cannot look the other way when someone needs your help, and that this sort of situation occurs quite often, and others in her department pitch in too. She further stated that "most nurses are caretakers" and "if you don't take better care of others than of yourself, you don't belong in health care". When asked about her motives, she said that in her own mind, she had no choice when the situation arose. There were unconscious people in the unit that needed help, and only a few nurses at the hospital are adequately trained in recovery. If she had left, it would not have been fair to the patients, or to the nurse on duty. Interviewee 10 enjoys caring for patients, and likes the other people in her unit. She said that "if the shoe was on the other foot" others would stay and help her; she does not ever remember anyone leaving in such a situation. She stated that her helpful action was spontaneous. She said that the patients stood to gain from her action, and that she stood to gain a personal feeling of a job well done, since she believes in doing a job well, or not doing it at all. She feels that she, and others in the recovery unit help others because they are people who have respect for themselves and others. She tries to treat her patients like family. She thinks that some people do not help others on the job more often because they have burned out and see their job only as a

way of making a living. She credits her lack of burnout after 29 years to the fact that while she gives a lot at work, she gets recharged at home because of her supportive and loving husband and her faith in God. She hopes that she is a person who goes above and beyond the call of duty to help others at work, and feels she is better or worse at it on any given day. Interviewee 10 credits her helpfulness to her personality, and to her nursing training, which was a three year program in a segregated, disciplined military-like atmosphere. 10 feels that the thing that makes her help other people when another person might not is the fact that she is a "people person". She says she is extroverted and believes that most people are basically good. Attesting to the fact that 10 is often helpful to others on the job, she said that she would not have even remembered the specific instance related above except that the nominator had shown her the nomination form before turning it in, and had reminded her of the incident.

CASE 11

Qualitative Data: Case 11

Hospital: 1

Job Title: RN--Cardiac Surgery

Nomination:

"When I first came to work in my present position doing quality assurance, and since I was unfamiliar with the method used in this establishment, [11]... (who had had the position previously) assisted with teaching these methods to me so that I could perform the job more efficiently."

Interview:

When Interviewee 11 started in her present position with the hospital, another individual took over her former job. Interviewee 11 saw that this person was taking on a great deal of work. She helped this new person to review studies which had been conducted at the hospital, to interpret new guidelines, and generally "showed her the ropes". Since 11 had full responsibility for her new job title, she came in during her off-time to help the new employee with an important PR project for the hospital. Although she was, in a strict sense, going beyond the call of duty to help this new employee, 11 stated that she felt she was doing her job by showing the new employee the ropes. When asked about her motives, she expressed that she had "no sink or swim attitude toward people". She elaborated by saying that she thought the new employee could do a more efficient job if she spent time with her, and that the new girl would feel more comfortable, and gain more satisfaction from the job as a result. She also stated that she wanted to prevent the new girl from making the same mistakes she had made, and that she wanted the new girl to grow professionally, as she had, as a result of the job. She also said she would appreciate help if "the shoe was on the other foot". She stated that her helpful action was spontaneous. She said that the "whole staff" stood to gain from her action, and that more efficient nursing in general results in a higher level of patient care. She stressed that if the staff appears to be confident, it makes the patients confident in the abilities of the staff. She said that she received some unanticipated personal recognition from the

administration for her helpful actions at work, and that due to her consistent concern with patient care, she has been asked to take on more important responsibilities with the hospital. When asked why people help others in the organization, 11 stated that ideally, all employees should have what is optimum for the patients in mind while the patients are in a dependent state, which leads to cooperation among nurses. Also, she stated that since all nurses cannot be proficient in all areas of the equipment used in surgery, they must cooperate and share their knowledge, in order to do what is best for the patient. This attitude, she says, breeds a cooperative and cohesive atmosphere. However, she said, some nurses have an attitude that if they see someone "slacking off" they feel that they can slack off too. Also, some nurses felt "put upon" and make everything a big job, and make certain everyone is made aware of their plight. Further, she said, some people, by their nature, can watch others work and not pitch in because they are not asked to do so, or are not assigned to the task. When asked if she goes above and beyond the call of duty to help others at work, she says she doesn't really think about it, that if she has time and is able, she will help others on the job. In fact, she sees such helpfulness as part of her job. She said she likes to believe her personality is the root of her helpfulness, since she is a helpful person in different types of situations, but also feels that training and past experiences, like serving in Vietnam, have taught her the value of a cooperative atmosphere. She feels that the thing that makes her help other people when another person might not is the fact that she tries to always keep the patients foremost in her mind. If she approaches a helping behavior with the idea that she is helping a patient, rather than a co-worker, she can easily provide the helpful action even if she doesn't particularly like the co-worker.

CASE 12

Qualitative Data: Case 12

Hospital: 1

Job Title: Sonographer

Nominations:

"During busy days, [12]...has stayed behind her allocated time and completed patients. Although overtime was paid, this overtime was not prescheduled. She stayed to help the late scheduled individual."

Interview:

Interviewee 12 works in the ultrasound/radiology department. She operates equipment which examines soft tissues such the gall bladder, liver, uterus, and ovaries. Patients may individually schedule appointments for examinations, but the bulk of the work in this department is physician-ordered, and unpredictable. The behavior described above, 12 says, is fairly typical; on busy days, she stays over to help with patients when needed. She says that although her scheduled shift may be over, it often becomes apparent that there is more work to be done. She says that many of the patients must have full bladders for their examinations, so it can be quite uncomfortable for them to wait their turn. She sees no reason to leave when she can speed up the process of seeing patients by staying. She says she does what must be done, because her philosophy is to take care of patients. When asked about her motives, she said she simply does what needs to be done. She says that her action is largely spontaneous, since she can usually tell right away if her assistance will be needed after the close of her shift. She related that the patients and the person scheduled to stay late are in positions to benefit from her action, and that some good might come to her since the employees rotate through shifts and that someone might someday do the same for her. She added that staying to help out makes for good relations with her fellow employees, and that she is usually thanked for staying. She feels that she, and others in the hospital help others because it is "the human thing to do" and because it facilitates good co-worker relations. She feels that some people (but not herself) may not help others on the job more often because of selfishness or active dislike for co-workers. Such dislike, 12 says, can even lead to sabotage of others' work. She sees herself as a person who goes above and

beyond the call of duty to help others at work, and adds that this is not very difficult to do since her actual required job duties are very narrow. She attributes her helpfulness to her personality for the most part, since she likes people and likes to make them feel comfortable, but that certain situations at work also trigger her helpfulness. She says that what makes her an especially helpful person is her concern for people, and her lack of interest in manipulating them.

CASE 13

Qualitative Data: Case 13

Hospital: 1

Job Title: RN--Surgery

Nomination:

"I was given some information to use to organize work that I would be responsible for. I found the information unclear and was unfamiliar with an item that I would need. [13]... was busy preparing for something else but took time to help me."

Interview:

Interviewee 13 did not recall the instance of behavior for which she was nominated. For this reason, the rest of the questioning referred to her helping behavior in general. Generally, she said, when she sees that someone is in need of help, she tries to "put herself in that person's place", and she is able to spontaneously provide assistance. Her self-stated motive for helping others on the job is simply that she responds to co-workers' need for help, and that if she was in the same position, she would want someone to help her. When asked who was in a position to gain from the specific action recounted on the nomination form, she said the other nurse was in a position to gain, and that some good might ultimately come to her, (13), since "turnabout is fair play". In general, 13 says she and others at the hospital like to help others on the job because "everyone is in it together". That is, when someone helps a co-worker, he or she is ultimately helping himself or herself, since all goes smoothly. She says people don't help others on the job more often because they "don't want to take the time". She does not see herself as someone who goes above and beyond the call of duty to help others at work, since while she believes she is helpful to others, she does not see her helpfulness as going beyond the job role. She feels that her helpfulness is a result of both her personality and the situations she finds herself in, although her personality probably plays a more major role, since she is helpful in a variety of settings. When asked what makes her help someone else out on the job when another person might not, she responded that she does not see herself as special in this regard, that the majority of nurses help one another. She jokingly stated "maybe I was the first person around".

CASE 14

Qualitative Data: Case 14

Hospital: 1

Job Title: RN--Occupational Health

Nomination:

"I was in charge of a cholesterol screening in a town about 40 miles from [Hospital 1].... Just before we were scheduled to begin the screening, I realized I had forgotten something that was essential, and could not begin until we had it. [14]...grabbed what I needed at [Hospital 1]..., and met me halfway...so I wouldn't have to drive all the way back and delay the screening even further.

Interview:

Interviewee 14 recalled that on the day described above, the employee had forgotten a main component of the cholesterol screening. She could not remember if the employee had asked her to bring the component, or if she had volunteered to do so. In any case, she said, although she was busy with her own duties, there was no question that she would bring the equipment to the co-worker, since the cholesterol screening would otherwise not have started until later, and it "wouldn't have looked good for the company". When she was asked what motivated her to help this person, she simply said "she [the co-worker] needed it [the equipment]". 14 described her action as a spontaneous one. She said that the co-worker who was helped was in a position to gain from her action, and the reputation of the hospital was also maintained. She did not feel that any good could have come to herself as a result of her action. She feels that co-workers, including herself, help each other on the job because they are loyal to Hospital 1, and work together toward the goal of making the hospital look good in the community. When asked why people, including herself, don't help each other more often, she responded that within her department, all five individuals will gladly help each other, but that people outside the department sometimes don't cooperate because they are cantankerous, or jealous. She explained that nurses in her department are able to wear street clothes at work, and go to business lunches. These perks can make nurses outside the department jealous. 14 feels that she is "not necessarily" a person who goes above and beyond the call of duty by helping others at work. She explained that in

general, nurses become nurses because they like to do things for others, so for most of them, including herself, helpfulness stems from their personalities. She sees herself as going beyond the call of duty by "doing that special thing I could have gotten away with not doing" approximately "half the time". When asked what makes her help someone else out on the job, when another person might not, she responded "that's the way I am; I'm a nice person".

CASE 15

Qualitative Data: Case 15

Hospital: 1

Job Title: Physical Therapist

Nomination:

"No one individual incident comes to mind, but [15]...is always there to help when it is needed. Ours is a close-knit department where everybody helps each other; however [15]...is usually the first one to offer assistance."

Interview:

Due to the general nature of the nomination above, [15] was asked to recall a specific helping behavior she had performed on the job. She stated that she stays late a lot, so that everyone else doesn't have to work too hard. She says she would like others to help her too, and she tries to encourage others not to go home until everyone is finished. Each day, there are an unspecified number of outpatient appointments and physician-ordered work. Her motive for staying late, she says, is so that all the patients can be seen on the day they come in. Her action in this regard is spontaneous, she says. She sees that there is work to be done, and she does it. 15 also stated that patients (the people who gain from her helpful actions. As an example, she said that patients recovering from broken hips must be walked twice a day, and her therapists are the only people who do this. If it is not done, it prolongs the length of rehabilitation, and hospital stay. The good that comes to her as a result of her helpful actions is the self-gratification which results from her work and the patient contact. When asked why she, and others in the organization help one another on the job, she responded that "we've all been dumped on...worked with someone who didn't do her share of the work. [We've learned] that it takes a team effort so that people won't burn out". 15 feels that people don't help each other on the job more often because they may have an attitude typified by the statement "she never helps me so I won't help her". Also, she explained that people who have worked with each other for a while build up associations with one another regarding helping behavior. That is, A will help B and B will help A, but C will not help A or B, nor will A or B help C. 15

feels that she goes above and beyond the call of duty more than the average person, but that she feels it is her duty to do so. She credits this helpfulness to her personality. She says that she was "raised to help others" before herself, and that her family, especially her father, tends to "bend over backwards for others". When asked what makes her help other people when another person might not, she credits her short tenure at the hospital. Since she has only worked there for eight months, she does not have grudges against co-workers from the past as other workers do.

CASE 16

Qualitative Data: Case 16

Hospital: 1

Job Title: RN--Recovery

Nominations:

"I was asked to draw ABG's from an arterial line. I did not know the specific procedure, and [16]...walked me through it step by step."

Interview:

Interviewee 16 explained that ABG's are arterial blood gases which are drawn from an IV-like line, which monitors blood pressure. It is a procedure which is not routinely done, and a nurse must often learn it on the job. 16 stated that the nurse she helped was relatively new, and that she tried to let this new nurse gain as much direct experience as possible. 16 either offered to help or was asked to help, and told the newer nurse "I'll talk you through". If she hadn't helped the nurse, no adverse consequences would have resulted for her (16). Her self-stated motive was that the newer nurse needed the experience of doing this procedure on her own. When asked if she thought through her action a lot, or if it was more spontaneous, she responded that she probably had been prepared for the fact that the procedure would have to be done, and that the nurse was going to need supervision. She said that the nurse she helped gained from her action since she learned a new procedure, and that she (16) gained as well, since she won't have to do all of these procedures in the future. She believes that the co-workers in recovery help each other out because they like each other, and that they all get along well, even though they work long hours in sticky situations. People don't help each other more, according to 16, because they become concerned only with doing their own job, and tend to let others take care of themselves. She sees herself as a person who "probably" goes above and beyond the call of duty to help others at work, but that this is true of all people in her department. She sees her helpfulness both as a result of her personality and of the situations she finds herself in. That is, she sees helping others at work as "part of being a caring human being", and that the job is such that individuals work in teams, which fosters helpfulness. When asked what makes her help other people when another person might not, she responded

that she "happened to be there" and that someone else would have done the same.

CASE 17

Qualitative Data: Case 17

Hospital: 1

Job Title: RN

Nominations:

"I am new at [Hospital 1]...and [17]...has told me on multiple occasions to please call her for any questions concerning paychecks, computer, and other employee problems. She has always gone the extra [mile]...to help one find solutions.

Interview:

Interviewee 17 described her job as involving coordination of payroll, doctor's standing orders, etc. She stated that she has been a manager for 5 years, so she knows the ropes, and she likes to provide new employees with a good impression of the hospital. The new employee who made the statement above was in charge of records involving holidays, vacation, and sick days. There are a lot of details involved with this type of work, and the procedures were not fully detailed in the employee handbook, so 17 offered to help, should the employee have any questions. When asked why she offered to help, she said "that's what I'm here for; I went into nursing to help people". 17 is not sure whether such help is really part of her job, but says she tries to make it a policy to help everyone. She described her action as spontaneous. She stated that the new employee was in a position to gain from her action, and so was the hospital, since if the new employee gets a good impression of the hospital, she is more likely to stay. When asked if some good might come to her, she said she hadn't thought about it, that it was just an "automatic" reaction. 17 feels that co-workers help each other out because the hospital has always been characterized by friendliness. When asked why people don't help each other more often, she was at a loss, finally responding that perhaps such people don't realize they are needed by others. She does not see herself as a person who goes above and beyond the call of duty to help others at work, since she just does what she feels she is supposed to do. She credits her helpfulness to both her personality, and the situations she finds herself in. That is, her personality dictated that she choose nursing as a career so that she could help others, and she is helpful as a mother and grandmother, and that at Hospital 1, it has always been stressed to be

helpful and friendly. When asked what makes her help other people when another person might not, she responded that she was surprised to be selected for an interview, and that her actions are not out of the ordinary at the hospital.

CASE 18

Qualitative Data: Case 18

Hospital: 2

Job Title: Ward Clerk

Nominations:

"I caught [18]...working on her day off when we were short a secretary."

Interview:

Interviewee 18 stated that she is scheduled to work two nights a week. She helps the regular clerk by coming in when that person needs the night off. This individual will call 18 at her home, usually the night before, to ask if she could cover for her. 18 is motivated to help since the other woman has children, and as a single mother, she knows how difficult that can be. Also, if the situation was reversed, she would like to be able to rely on the other clerk to cover for her. If she didn't help, no adverse consequences would result for her, since the department can rely on the clerk pool. Since she usually works that department, however, she knows the procedures better than others, so the nurses prefer to have her working there. She says that as long as she knows her mother can babysit her child, her helpful action is spontaneous. She said she really doesn't know who is in a position to gain from her action, except the other clerk, who benefits from having a day off. She said that she does get paid for this work, and that it makes her feel good that the nurses have confidence in her and feel the "floor is covered". She says that she and others help one another because it makes everything run more smoothly. She's not sure why others don't help one another more often, and mentioned that helpfulness varies by shift. She tries to be a person who goes above and beyond the call of duty to help others at work, and says she tries to help the patients (by getting them a drink, etc.) whenever possible, so that the nurses won't be burdened. She feels that her helpfulness is a result of her personality, and says that she is the type of person who takes her grandmother to the doctor, babysits for the neighbor's kids, etc. She also mentioned that she attended a management training seminar while working at a former job which taught her the value of teamwork. She's not sure what makes her help someone out on the job when someone

else might not. She mentioned that she had been nominated about 15 times for the helpfulness award at the hospital.

VITA

Sharon Lynn Wagner was born in Lansing, Michigan on August 13, 1962. She was graduated from Holt High School in 1980, and subsequently attended Arizona State and Michigan State Universities, graduating from the latter in 1985 with a Bachelor of Arts degree. She then entered the Industrial/Organizational Psychology program at the University of Tennessee, where she completed the requirements for her Ph.D. in October of 1989.

The author has accepted a position with Personnel Designs, Inc. in Grosse Pointe Woods, Michigan. There, she plans to develop her professional interests in the areas of employee selection and motivation, managerial assessment and organizational culture, and to pursue her leisure interests: swimming, reading and travel.