

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Jaime D. Morris for the Master of Science
in Psychology presented October 28, 2013

Title: Examining the Relationship Between Coworker Interpersonal Citizenship
Behavior, Affective Commitment and Employee Turnover Intentions

Abstract approved: _____

The purpose of this study was to examine how coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior and the level of affective commitment influence employee turnover intentions. Participants were employees of a Midwestern university who worked in different job categories. To gain understanding of how the level of coworker support and affective commitment affect turnover intentions, participants were surveyed to see if the lack of these behaviors combined with either high or low levels of affective commitment influenced their decision to leave. Significant values were found for levels of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior and self-interpersonal citizenship behavior and its effect on affective commitment ($r = .21, p < .05$ and $r = .31, p < .001$), respectively, and a marginally significant value was found regarding the employees' level of self-reported interpersonal citizenship behavior and turnover intention ($r = -0.15, p = .09$). No evidence was found to support the absence of coworker interpersonal support affected employee turnover intentions. Further study in the area of social relationships and employee turnover are warranted.

Keywords: citizenship behavior, turnover intention, affective commitment

EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COWORKER INTERPERSONAL
CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR, AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT AND EMPLOYEE
TURNOVER INTENTIONS

A Thesis

Presented to the Department of Psychology

EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

by

Jaime D. Morris

October 2013

Approved for the Department of
Psychology

Approved by the Dean of the Graduate
School and Distance Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My most sincere thanks to the members of my thesis committee: Dr. George Yancey, Dr. Brian Schrader, and Dr. Sheryl Lidzy. I would like to give special thanks to my advisor, Dr. Yancey, for all of his help on this project. His motivating support, guidance, and patience helped me make it through this process. I am also thankful for the tuition assistance committee of Emporia State University, which approved financial assistance for the completion of my degree. I am truly thankful to God who led me to pursue this degree and gave me the strength to complete it. A special thanks also goes to my loving family and friends who were always there to encourage me. My boss, Elaine Henrie and all of my coworkers have also been extremely supportive through this entire process, rooting for me all the way; for that I am very grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER	
1 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	1
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	1
Importance of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors	5
Who Is More Likely to Exhibit OCB?	7
Organizational Commitment and OCB	8
Other facets of OCB	11
Race and OCB	11
Counterproductive Work Behaviors	12
Leadership influences on OCB	13
Job Satisfaction and OCB	14
OCB and Turnover	15
Interpersonal Citizenship Behavior and Turnover Intentions	23
Hypotheses and Research Questions	25
2 METHOD	30
Participants	30
Measurements	30
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	30
Affective Commitment	31
Turnover Intention	32
Task Interdependence	32
Procedure	32
3 RESULTS	34

Main Hypotheses and Research Questions	34
Hypothesis 1a.....	34
Hypothesis 1b.....	34
Hypothesis 2a.....	34
Hypothesis 2b.....	35
Hypothesis 3a.....	35
Hypothesis 3b.....	35
Hypothesis 4a.....	36
Hypothesis 4b.....	36
Hypothesis 5a.....	37
Hypothesis 5b.....	37
Research Question 1	37
Research Question 2	38
Exploratory Analyses	38
4 DISCUSSION	45
Practical Implications.....	53
Limitations	54
Future Research	56
REFERENCES	59
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scales.....	74
Appendix B: Affective Commitment Scale.....	77
Appendix C: Turnover Intention Scale	79
Appendix D: Task Interdependence Scale	81
Appendix E: Demographic Data	83
Appendix F: IRB Human Subjects Approval Letter	85
Appendix G: Informed Consent.....	87

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
1	Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for the Main Study Variables	39
2	Age and Tenure Correlations with the Main Study Variables	42
3a	Descriptive Statistics for Gender on the Main Study Variables	43
3b	Descriptive Statistics for Race on the Main Study Variables	44

CHAPTER 1

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Barnard (1938) first pointed out the importance of cooperation among coworkers in organizations. Barnard's work was influenced by two major theories. The first is the norm of reciprocity which states that there is an expectation people will react to others in kind, they will return benefits for benefits, or respond to indifference or hostility in a likewise fashion. Social exchange theory posits that all human relationships are formed by the use of a subjective cost-benefit analysis and a comparison of alternatives. In short, "you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours" relationships form between employees. He found good behaviors are often reciprocated between coworkers (Barnard, 1938).

Daniel Katz (1964) found three basic types of behavior that were essential in order for an organization to function properly. First, leadership needs to be able to entice people to enter into and remain in the organization, second, leadership must be able to depend upon employees to perform specific tasks effectively and responsibly, and third, there should be unprompted and ground-breaking activity that goes beyond role prescriptions. Katz also noted that an organization that relied completely on only those three basic behaviors would have a very fragile social system (Katz, 1964). Every organization depends on cooperation at multiple levels, including helping behaviors, gestures of goodwill, altruism, and other citizenship behaviors in order to accomplish tasks on a day to day basis (Smith, Organ & Near, 1983).

Organ (1988) is given credit for creating and defining the term organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Organizational citizenship behavior is defined as individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate, promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988). OCBs are behaviors employees are not required to perform. These behaviors are not included in job descriptions and employees who choose not to participate in these behaviors cannot be officially punished by their employer. Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994) further expanded the definition of OCB by adding that as extra-role behaviors performed by workers, they are not recognized as part of an official reward system. While employees cannot be punished for not engaging in OCB, there is also no formal reward system for going above and beyond job prescriptions. OCBs have a major effect on the social structure of organizations.

Conceptually, helping behaviors can be described as actions that include helping others with, or preventing the likelihood of work related problems (Bachrach, Bendoly & Podsakoff, 2001). Some helping behaviors are aimed at individuals, and are called OCB-I (Williams & Anderson, 1991).

OCB has been further broken down into several different categories. Five dimensions of OCB were identified by Organ (1988): (1) altruism, which involves helping others, (2) courtesy, which is helping behavior that prevents problems, (3) sportsmanship, having a positive attitude such as choosing not to complain in the face of less than ideal circumstances, (4) conscientiousness, which encompasses good habits such as punctuality and regular attendance, and (5) civic virtue, participation in activities that are important to the organization. Helping behaviors that fall into the interpersonal

category are altruism and courtesy. Organ (1990) later added to the breakdown of OCB by introducing two additional dimensions – peacekeeping and cheerleading. Additionally, Graham and Verma (1991) contributed to dimensionality by introducing organizational loyalty; Borman and Motowidlo (1993) added endorsing, support, and defending organizational objectives, and Morrison and Phelps (1999) added individual initiative to the growing list of OCB dimensions.

Another taxonomy of OCB is OCB-O, which is helping behavior that is directly beneficial to the organization. Sportsmanship involves tolerating inconveniences that are taking place in the company in order to improve the organization without complaining (Bachrach et al., 2001). Organizational loyalty (Graham, 1991) is a type of OCB-O that is concerned with protecting the organization. An employee who exhibits this behavior endorses, supports and defends the organizations objectives.

What are some of the effects of OCB at the individual level? Although OCB is not formally recognized by the organizational reward system, managers may take individual level OCBs into account during performance evaluations and considering financial rewards. An employee who engages in OCB activities, such as helping coworkers, keeping a good attitude in the face of unpleasant circumstances, or participating in activities that are beneficial to the organization, are sure to be noticed. These types of behaviors could help lighten the load of supervisors and may motivate them to return the favor in the form of promotion, positive performance evaluations, and financial incentives (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff & Blume, 2009). Because they are behaviors that go above and beyond the call of duty, supervisors may look at such employees favorably and attribute their activities as a genuine concern for the organization and its

effectiveness. This may further lead those in charge to believe the employee has a high level of organizational commitment. Simply put, managers like to see employees exhibit these behaviors and it is highly likely to have an effect on reward decisions, especially in comparison to employees who exhibit lower levels of OCB (Lefkowitz, 2000). These theories are consistent with previous empirical research by Allen and Rush (1998) and MacKenzie, Podsakoff and Fetter (1991), which revealed that OCB activities are shown to have a positive relationship to performance evaluations and reward allocations.

At the organizational or group level, OCBs have been extensively studied and found to show that OCB may enhance effectiveness at both levels. An experienced employee who takes the time to orient newer employees to procedures and norms in their unit may help increase group or unit level effectiveness (Podsakoff et al., 2009). Lower level employees may contribute to the company by sharing ideas for improving the operations of activities in their work space to which supervisors may not be privy. An employee who is willing to share his or her first-hand knowledge may help make changes that cause the organization to become more effective. Of utmost importance, employees who engage in high levels of OCB may help foster an environment of team spirit, increase morale and unify those working in their immediate environment. All of these outcomes may serve to enhance organizational effectiveness.

In order to account for specific consequences of OCB at both the individual and organizational level, Podsakoff et al. (2009) undertook the task of examining some of the theorized outcomes of OCB. Their extensive search produced 168 independent samples, which consisted of 51,235 individuals to test individual level outcomes and 3,611 units for unit level analysis. They found that OCBs are positively related to job performance

ratings ($r_c = .60$). OCBs were also shown to have a relatively strong positive relationship with reward allocation decisions ($r_c = .57$). Further breakdown of this dimension revealed that the relationship was significantly stronger between OCB and reward recommendations ($r_c = .77$). Average correlation coefficients were corrected for measurements and sampling error.

Regarding OCBs and organizational outcomes, overall unit level OCB were positively related to unit level performance ($r_c = .43$). OCB were also found to have a positive relationship with customer satisfaction ($r_c = .23$), suggesting that high levels of OCBs within units not only contributes to strengthening coworker relationships, but also contributed to increased positive customer experiences. This is especially vital in service oriented organizations. OCB was found to be negatively related to unit level incidents of turnover ($r_c = -0.22$) (Podsakoff et al., 2009).

Some precursors that have been identified as possible reasons for OCBs are job satisfaction (Organ & Lingl, 1995), support of leadership (Smith et al., 1983), organizational commitment (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986), perceptions of fairness (Moorman, 1993), and personality (Organ & Konovsky, 1989). These dimensions have been studied extensively and revealed that all were likely motives for OCB with the exception of personality (Coyne & Ong, 2007).

Importance of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

OCBs are very important in terms of holding organizations together. In order to thrive, an organization needs members who are concerned with engaging in positive behaviors that benefit both their coworkers and the organization. OCBs encourage

positive interpersonal relationships between employees, and in turn, help the organization succeed (Organ, 1988).

Numerous investigations have suggested that OCB has a positive impact on job performance (Coyne & Ong, 2007). Organ (1988) posited that the impact on job performance occurred due to the decrease of the resources the organization would have otherwise needed to devote to maintenance activities. It was also suggested that OCB has a positive impact on job performance due to enriched coworker productivity, and because OCBs help enhance the attraction of the organization, which in turn increases employee retention. OCB may also help the organization's ability to embrace necessary changes, such as unit restructuring/reorganization (Podsakoff, Ahearne & MacKenzie, 1997).

Lin, Hung, and Chiu (2008) found that in service organizations OCBs show loyalty and help to promote the organization's products. Individuals who exhibit OCBs are also likely to go above and beyond the requirements of the service, which results in the organization's promises being delivered in a reliable, responsible, and helpful way. These kinds of acts help to foster a sense of satisfaction on the part of the customer, and thereby increase positive reviews and feelings, perhaps increasing customer loyalty.

OCBs are important and beneficial to organizations for the multitude of benefits they provide. OCBs are positively related to job performance, they enhance organizational performance, strengthen the social ties of the organization, provide organizational flexibility, and enable members to cope with positive conditions of interdependence. OCBs also contribute to resource transformation, innovation and adaptability. Additionally, they are an effective means to coordinate activities, make supervisors' jobs easier by freeing their time and energy, and have the potential to

enhance the look of the organization, thereby increasing the organization's ability to attract and retain the best employees (Podsakoff et al., 1997). Research indicates that sportsmanship and helping behaviors had a positive relationship with the quantity of outputs (Podsakoff et al., 1997). Organizations need all of these in order to function at maximum capacity. These qualities should be of utmost importance to managerial staff.

Who Is More Likely to Exhibit OCB?

Farrell and Finkelstein (2007) looked at two OCB dimensions, altruism (helping) and civic virtues. Altruism, which are helping behaviors directed at specific persons, is viewed as more of a feminine trait, and is seen as less optional for women, while civic virtue, which reflects responsibility and involvement in the organization, is viewed as a masculine trait (less optional for men). Three studies were conducted using different job scenarios. The scenarios took on what was considered to be a masculine, feminine and neutral nature. Participants were asked what the likelihood or motive of the employee conducting citizenship behaviors was from a given list and/or task relevant behaviors. The results of the study showed women were viewed as more likely to participate in helping and civic virtue behaviors than men. In addition, the masculine job condition had more expectations of civic virtue behaviors than did the feminine job condition. The study also revealed women were more likely to display helping behaviors because they wanted to help.

Paine and Organ (2000) suggested that collectivist cultures may display more OCB than individualist cultures. Collectivist cultures rely heavily on interdependence; therefore, this type of culture is more likely to engage in OCB on a regular basis, as behavior such as this would be expected and considered to be the norm (Farh, Zhong &

Organ, 2004). In individualistic cultures, where people tend to rely on self, helping behaviors would be considered the exception rather than the norm.

People high in conscientiousness are more likely to engage in OCBs, as well as people with high affective commitment (AC) to the organization. People high in positive affect (PA) engage in OCBs. In addition, employees who perceive a high level of organizational justice and engage in high levels of impression management are more likely to engage in OCBs (Bateman & Organ, 1983).

Regarding age, it would seem that older employees may be more likely to engage in OCBs. Analysis of a sample of nurse employees concluded that job satisfaction, organizational commitment and trust in management were factors most important to younger employees, while concerns with morality was a precursor of altruistic behavior among older participants (Wagner & Rush 2000).

Organizational Commitment and OCB

Organizational commitment was a major focus of research in the 1990s (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch & Topolnytsky, 2002). During this decade of research it was found that organizational commitment was a multidimensional construct with various antecedents and consequences. Organizational commitment is a term used to describe the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization (Moorman, Niehoff & Organ, 1993). An employee's level of organizational commitment has been said to be a precursor to OCB. An employee's level of commitment may reflect his or her willingness to help the organization even in the absence of a reward.

Early research on organizational commitment focused primarily on the individual's emotional attachment to the organization (Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979). More recent research has expanded organizational commitment and includes Meyer, Allen and Gellatly's (1990) three components. Those components are normative, affective, and continuance commitment.

Normative commitment is an aspect that reflects a perceived obligation to remain in the organization. For example, an individual may feel obligated to stay with an organization that invests its resources in training an employee, helping him or her learn new skills, and providing other perks, such as tuition payment for job related courses. The term normative implies that it is the "norm" for people to remain loyal to the organization of which they are a part. Some antecedents of normative commitment are an employee's personal characteristics, social experiences, and organizational investments (Meyer et al., 2002). Generally speaking, employees' feelings of job security have decreased in recent years, and, therefore, many organizations have tried to come up with ways to increase normative commitment on the part of the employee by establishing procedures an employee may find more attractive, such as having policies that include grievance procedures, procedures that aim to promote employees from within the organization, and providing employees with increased security (Meyer et al., 2002). Employees who stay with the organization from the standpoint of normative commitment stay because they feel they ought to stay.

Continuance commitment involves an employee taking into account the possible costs associated with leaving an organization. An employee who stays with an organization out of continuance commitment feels he or she has few options and that

staying with the organization would be more beneficial than the costs associated with leaving. In other words, employees who perceive the costs associated with leaving the organization are greater than the costs of staying with the organization because they feel like they need to stay. Some antecedents of continuance commitment are personal characteristics, alternatives, and investments (Meyer et al., 2002).

Affective commitment may be the most important type of commitment in terms of a person's likelihood to participate in OCBs. Affective commitment is a form of emotional attachment the employee has with the organization. Affective commitment refers to the employee's level of identification with and involvement in the organization (Burton, Lee & Holtom, 2002). These are the employees who stay with the organization because they want to stay. This form of organizational commitment has been considered to be the most beneficial in terms of enhancing organizational effectiveness. Employees who have a high level of affective commitment are less likely to engage in withdrawal behavior and more likely to accept changes in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Research has examined the outcomes of affective commitment and found it to be positively related with in-role job performance and extra-role behaviors, (Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin & Jackson, 1989). This research also found that when compared to normative and continuance commitment, affective commitment correlated strongly with a wide range of outcomes. Affective commitment showed a strong negative correlation with turnover intention, absenteeism (Meyer et al., 1993), whereas normative and continuance commitment demonstrated reduced levels of OCBs and lack of desire to participate in helping behaviors that go beyond the scope of their job descriptions. An individual with high affective commitment toward an organization is more likely to

consider the best interests of the organization than someone with only high continuance or normative commitment (Meyer, Allen & Smith, 1993).

Other facets of OCB

Race and OCB. When it comes to race, there is a difference between how whites and minorities (non-whites) perceive they are valued in society. Such difference in views may have an effect on the performance of OCBs. If a non-white employee views himself or herself as less valuable to the organization, the likelihood they will perform extra-role behaviors may decrease. Because one view of OCB has been conceptualized as affect based behavior, a negative mood state may lessen the likelihood a person will perform OCBs. Negative affect is the tendency of certain people to feel negative mood states (Watson & Clark, 1992). Therefore, it is plausible that persons experiencing high negative affectivity will be less likely to participate in altruistic behaviors.

Non-white employees view themselves as having less privileges and rights than their white counterparts not only in the workplace but life in general. Such perceptions are likely to increase the occurrence of higher levels of negative affect (NA) (Jones & Schaubroeck, 2004). People in this mood state would have lower expectations of achieving a desired outcome. It was theorized that once an individual begins to believe his or her work does not count as much as the next employee, he or she will begin to disengage from any attempt to attain goals (Carver & Scheier, 1990). Additionally, black and Hispanic employees were more likely to perceive experiences of discrimination and unfair treatment than their white counterparts (Dixon, Storen & Van Horn, 2002).

Jones and Schaubroeck (2004) conducted a study to determine the effects of NA on OCB across different races. One hundred fifty-one employees across 17 different departments in a large Midwestern private hospital were surveyed. White employees made up 91% of the sample. All other participants were categorized as non-white. The sample was 86% female, with an average of 40 years of age. One supervisor for each department was also asked to complete a questionnaire that evaluated the OCB of each of the participants in his or her department.

OCB was assessed using a 14 item instrument developed by Bateman, Organ, and Smith (Organ, 1988). Job satisfaction was assessed using the general satisfaction scale from Hackman and Oldham's Job Diagnostic Survey (1980), and internalization was measured using a scale created by Becker (1992). This study found race had a significant effect on negative affectivity and supported the hypothesis that minorities would report higher levels of NA. NA and coworker support were significantly related to job satisfaction, with job satisfaction showing a significant relationship to internalization commitment. Results of zero order correlations also showed the relationship between job satisfaction and self-rated altruism and supervisor rated compliance was significant.

Counterproductive work behaviors. Counterproductive work behaviors (CWB) are destructive behaviors that are opposite of OCBs. A person engaging in such behavior is likely to perform intentional behaviors that are harmful to the legitimate interest of the organization (Dalal, 2005). These employees may be out for revenge, and this harmful behavior is usually carried out in retaliation to what the employee perceives to be unfair conditions or an unjust workplace atmosphere. People who are high in negative affect are more likely to engage in CWB. CWB are detrimental to organizations.

Leadership influences on OCB. Many leadership theories have suggested the importance of leading by example (Choi & Mai-Dalton, 1999; Manz & Sims, 1981; Trevino & Brown, 2005). Specifically, transformational and charismatic leadership theories stress that role modeling by leaders is important in encouraging subordinates to follow their lead (Yaffe & Kark, 2011). The purpose of their study was to focus on the role-modeling of OCB by examining OCB that is targeted at an entire group or organization. Because OCB cannot be fostered by use of formal job descriptions, training or a reward system, it should be affected by role modeling. When leader OCB is directed at an entire group, it should motivate the group as a whole to participate. This is important because research has suggested that group level OCB contributes to organizational effectiveness (Podsakoff et al., 2009).

The study conducted by Yaffe and Kark (2011) aimed to extend existing knowledge about leading by example, identify potential mediators and moderators of the effect of leader OCB at the group level in an organizational setting, and contribute to the study of antecedents of group level OCB. They hypothesized that leader OCB would be positively related to group level OCB. The population for the study was a large Israeli communication organization. The sample was taken from 67 work units from three different departments. Six hundred eighty-three surveys were collected in total. Area managers rated the level to which they thought group managers modeled OCB directed toward the organization. The results of the study suggested that leaders could educate subordinates about the importance of contributing to the organization by performing OCBs if they lead by example. They suggest that organizations should begin with the hiring process and attend to HR practices that would be more likely to enhance OCBs. In

addition, Yaffe and Kark (2011) suggested that organizations should invest in more programs aimed at leadership development to help build leader OCB competencies.

Job satisfaction and OCB. Cognitive job satisfaction is measured based on logical and rational evaluations whereas affective based satisfaction is based on overall positive emotions toward the duties of the job. Brief and Roberson (1987) tested for the effect of cognition and affect on three measures of satisfaction using the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) created by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), and the Faces Scales (Dunham & Herman, 1975; Kunin, 1955). The results found influences from both affect and cognition were present, with the MSQ being the most cognitively based. The MSQ includes items to measure working conditions, salary, quality of supervision, degree of autonomy and importance of the job (Moorman, 1993). Answers based on the cognitive approach to job satisfaction center on specifics about job conditions rather than emotional responses to the work environment.

A similar study by Williams (1988) provided support for Organ and Near's (1985) theory that cognitive responses were important to take into consideration when measuring for job satisfaction. Organ and Konovsky (1989) later studied indicators of cognition and affect to determine which one was most likely to predict OCB. Results of the study showed that the variance in OCB among subjects was more closely related to cognition than affect. Regression analysis revealed that the coefficient of determination tied to cognition was significant and much larger than that of affect. Therefore, there was greater likelihood of OCB being predicted as a result of cognitive measures.

Looking for a link between OCB and job satisfaction, Moorman (1993) conducted research to determine if cognitively based job satisfaction would be a predictor of OCB.

He hypothesized that JS measures defined by cognitive influence would be more strongly tied to OCB than JS measures defined by affective influences. Cross-sectional survey data were obtained from two companies to test the effects of the two categories of job satisfaction on OCB. The MSQ was used as a cognitive measure of job satisfaction based on previous studies. The Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Scale (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951) was used to measure affective job satisfaction. OCB were measured by the Organizational Citizenship Behavior scale modified from a previous version by Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1989). Means, standard deviations and zero-order correlations were obtained and supported the hypothesis. The MSQ had the strongest relationship to four of five OCB dimensions (altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship and conscientiousness).

OCB and Turnover

The study of turnover is concerned with measuring the number of separations from an organization. This includes resignations, retirements, reductions in workforce, deaths, discharges and inter-agency transfers. Turnover rates are usually calculated in terms of number per fiscal year.

There are two main types of turnover. Voluntary turnover occurs when an employee leaves the organization of his or her own free will, and involuntary turnover occurs when an employee is forced to leave. Turnover can be very costly to an organization. Employee turnover costs are often measured in terms of the number of turnovers per fiscal year (Michaels & Spector, 1982). Productivity is affected by turnover, and time and money must be invested in recruiting new hires. In addition, training will also be necessary for the new hires (Michaels & Spector, 1982). These activities take away from the productivity of others, who may now need to neglect their own job duties

in order to take on duties that once belonged to lost employees, or for taking their time to train new hires.

New trends have surfaced during the research of turnover intention. These trends include predictions of individual differences, an increase on contextual variables with a focus on employee relationships, factors that cause employees to stay with the organization (job satisfaction, organizational commitment, etc.) and turnover processes over time (Holtom, Mitchell, Lee & Eberly, 2008). Studies indicate turnover as a reflection of efficiency of an organization, thus, if turnover is an indication of efficiency, then OCB should have a negative relationship with employee turnover (Chen, Hui & Sego, 1998). Avoidance behaviors previously studied by Chen, Eisenberger, Johnson, Sucharski, and Aselage (2009) are not adequate predictors of turnover.

Aryee and Chay (2001) examined workplace justice, citizenship behavior, and turnover intentions in a union context. The majority of behavioral research in the union context has focused on participation as either a multidimensional or a one-dimensional concept. The lack of consensus on the subject led to research conducted by Fullagar, Parks, Clark, and Gallagher (1995), which determined union participation should be viewed from an OCB perspective. The reasoning for this theory was they found both OCB and union participation shared similarities in that both were forms of discretionary behavior, participation in said behaviors was beneficial to the organization, and lack of participation in either behavior could not be penalized. Union behaviors that are discretionary include participation in union activities, attending meetings, and taking part in elections (Barling, Fullagar, Kelloway & McElvie, 1992). OCB were further broken down into OCBO for OCBs that support the organization and OCBI for behaviors that

contributed to interpersonal support. Distributive justice refers to the distribution of resources and criteria used to make allocation decisions while procedural justice refers to the perception of fairness of outcomes within the organization, and the procedures used to determine these outcomes (Folger & Greenberg, 1985).

The relationship between perceived union support and outcomes such as citizenship behavior and turnover intentions had not been previously examined in a union context. Aryee and Chay (2001) hypothesized that distributive and procedural justice would both be related to OCBI, and that procedural justice would be more strongly related to OCBO and turnover intentions than distributive justice.

An eight item scale developed by Skarlicki and Latham (1996, 1997) was utilized for participants to self-report dimensions of OCBO and OCBI and their level of participation in union activities. A three item scale based on a scale created by Camman, Fichman, Jenkins and Klesh (1979) was used to measure turnover intentions. Perceptions of distributive and procedural justice were measured by a 13 item scale based on the work of Fryxell and Gordon (1989). Demographics such as gender, union tenure and age were collected as well.

Results showed that union helpfulness fully mediated the relationship between workplace justice and OCBO/OCBI. The hypothesis was partially supported in that distributive justice ($\beta = .25, p < .01$) and procedural justice ($\beta = .25, p < .01$) were related to OCBI. However, only procedural justice was found to be negatively related to union turnover intentions ($\beta = -0.26, p < .01$). An important limitation on the study is the fact that self-report measures of OCBO and OCBI may have been inflated.

Chen, Hui and Segó (1998) examined levels of OCB as a predictor of employee turnover intentions, and tested the strength of the relationship across 11 companies in the People's Republic of China. They found a lack of empirical support for the relationship between behavioral events and turnover. Behavioral antecedents are avoidance behaviors that reduce the inclusion of the individual in the work role (Katz & Kahn, 1978). These behaviors include, but are not limited to, tardiness and absenteeism. Research done solely on the basis of examining behavioral antecedents has not shown those behaviors in and of themselves to be good predictors of employee turnover (Benson & Pond, 1987). Prior research theorized these behaviors have not been shown to be valid predictors of turnover because they are not discretionary. This research broadens behavioral antecedents to include discretionary behaviors; those behaviors that are not expected as part of the employee's formal role (OCBs).

Because extra-role behaviors are discretionary, an employee who has become disgruntled in some way with the organization may choose to withhold his or her OCBs. When an employee reaches the point where she or he considers leaving the organization, she or he is more likely to test the waters with avoidance responses that have the fewest negative consequences (Chen et al., 1998), and because OCB are discretionary and have no direct impact on salaries, employment status or lifestyle outside of work, the employee may find that withdrawing these behaviors is the "safest" way to begin withdrawing from the organization. That is to say, a person's lack of willingness to perform discretionary behaviors toward the organization or his or her coworkers may indicate separation from the organization is imminent.

High levels of OCB are theorized to be a result of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, or both (Organ & Ryan, 1995); therefore, it is feasible that an employee who withholds such behaviors lacks commitment to the organization. Employees may believe that OCBs will have a positive impact on evaluations, decisions regarding promotion and compensation (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994), so an employee who is committed to staying with the organization would be remiss to neglect these extra-role behaviors.

Chen, Hui and Segó (1998) hypothesized that OCB is a direct predictor of turnover, and employees who show low levels of OCB are more likely to leave an organization than those who show high levels of OCB. Data for this study were collected from middle-level managers and technical workers in 11 different companies. The sample of 205 participants had a mean age of 28.7 years and 51% were men. Average job tenure was 2 years. Questionnaires included questions about organizational commitment, job satisfaction, rewards, and job alternatives. Supervisors of the participants evaluated subordinate levels of OCBs. Turnover intention was measured using Camman, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh's (1979) 3-item scale. Internal consistency for this scale is .78. Three categories of OCBs were measured – altruism, sportsmanship, and conscientiousness. Items for this portion of the survey were adopted from scales developed by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) and had internal consistency coefficients of .87, .69, and .75, in that order. Three items were adopted for altruism, five items were adopted for sportsmanship, and three items were adopted for conscientiousness. In addition, actual turnover reports were collected from company records at 2 and 10 months after the questionnaire was initially completed. Average turnover rates for all

organizations was 7.5% at 3 months, and 18% at the ten month mark. Job satisfaction, job rewards/investments and organizational commitment were also included as control variables.

Zero-order correlations revealed that OCB was negatively related to true turnover ($r = -0.28, p < .01$), turnover intention was positively related to actual turnover ($r = .15, p < .05$), and turnover intention was negatively related to OCB ($r = -0.17, p < .05$). These correlations provide support for the hypothesis that OCB and turnover intention have a relationship to actual turnover.

Coyne and Ong (2007) examined the relationship between OCB and turnover in a cultural context by studying the effects of OCB in different branches of the same organization in Malaysia, Germany, and England. The results of the study indicated people who showed high levels of OCB showed lower intent for leaving than those who exhibited lower OCBs, with the largest negative correlation in the category of sportsmanship (-0.62). There was no evidence to support differences across cultures in levels of turnover intentions. However, there were differences in OCB. In order to evaluate differences between Malaysian employees and German and English employees, a multivariate analysis (MANOVA) was carried out. The country was used as the independent variable and all five dimensions of OCBs (altruism, civic virtue, sportsmanship, courtesy and conscientiousness) were entered as dependent variables. Results showed that the main effect for the country (Malaysia) was significant across all dimensions when compared with German employees. When compared to English employees only civic virtue and sportsmanship were higher in the Malaysian organization ($p < 0.001$ and $p < 0.001$, respectively).

Podsakoff et al. (2009) also examined OCBs and employee withdrawal intentions. The results indicated that OCBs were negatively related to both turnover intention ($r_c = -0.22$) and actual turnover ($r_c = -0.14$). Analysis also revealed a negative relationship between OCBs and incidents of employee absenteeism ($r_c = -0.16$). These results suggest that employees who exhibit high levels of OCB are less likely to have feelings about leaving the organization than those employees who exhibit low levels of OCB. Higher level OCB performers also are less likely to have excessive absences.

Attachment theory was put forth by John Bowlby (1969) and was founded on the premise that people are born with innate behaviors that serve to attract supportive figures who are available to protect them in times of psychological or physical distress. Having such support available helps people feel a sense of security, but on the flip side, a lack of supportive responses from those deemed as attachment figures results in feelings of insecurity (Richards & Schat, 2011). Review of research regarding turnover found people are less likely to leave their jobs if they feel connected to the social fabric of the organization. The connection of self to others is a reflection of the level of job embeddedness (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee & Sablinski, 2001). According to Mitchell et al., individuals who have higher levels of job embeddedness are more likely to stay at their place of employment. These individuals take into account their connection with coworkers, the feeling that their personal values align with their current position, and uneasiness about losing those connections if they were to depart the organization.

Employees who experience attachment anxiety impede their ability to form affective bonds with coworkers (Rom & Mikulincer, 2003). This can influence the person's likelihood to become embedded. For those individuals who are avoidant, the

attachment system is disabled in order to block connection with others. This behavior results in lower likelihood of job embeddedness to the organization. Absence of job embeddedness results in increased likelihood to entertain thoughts of leaving the organization (Maertz & Griffeth, 2004). Individuals with such insecure personality traits develop fewer positive relationships at work. Individuals who have attachment-avoidant personalities usually have negative attitudes toward others and the organization (Richards & Schat, 2011). They prefer to avoid activities that involve working with others and may use work tasks as an excuse to avoid socializing with coworkers. These kind of behaviors result in decreased inclination to exhibit the OCB-I dimensions of altruism and courtesy. Regarding OCB-O, the avoidant individual is more likely to avoid other extra-role behaviors that include others, meaning they won't attend social gatherings or meetings (Hardy & Barkham, 1994).

Research shows that interaction among coworkers has steadily increased over the years, with 82% of US companies having more than 100 employees utilizing teams as part of the work routine (Cascio, 1998). There has also been an increase in the number of collective tasks among coworkers (Harrison, Johns, & Martocchio, 2000). Social support can be linked to individual stress, burnout, and physical strain (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008). The contribution, or lack thereof, of coworkers to the social structure of the team can have an effect on employees who work closely with them. Behavioral outcomes such as turnover intention, lateness and absenteeism can be affected.

Coworkers may mimic behaviors seen by those who work closely with them. Seeing coworkers get away with negative behaviors such as excessive absenteeism can result in the same behavior from the observing employee (Mathieu & Kohler, 1990).

Notice of other coworkers slacking off, seeing that they are exerting the minimum effort necessary to perform their tasks, can also influence an employee to engage in effort reduction (Kidwell & Bennett, 1993). Furthermore, coworkers can influence an employee's intention to leave the organization and actual turnover by withholding communication and emotional support (Cox, 1999) or by observations of coworkers speaking negatively of the organization, or the actual act of departing the organization (Krackhardt & Porter, 1986). The quality of such exchanges and observations of coworkers can affect the level of job embeddedness an employee feels. Higher quality of such exchanges leads to reduced turnover and job searches outside the organization (Lee & Mitchell, 1994).

Meta-analytic analysis performed by Chiaburu and Harrison (2008) suggested that coworker support is associated with less effort reduction, $\rho = -0.23$ ($k = 8$, $N = 2,217$), and decreased incidences of absenteeism, $\rho = -0.08$ ($k = 26$, $N = 7,601$). In addition, there is a negative association between coworker support and an employee's intent to leave the organization, $\rho = -0.27$, indicating that as the level of coworker support goes up, intent to leave the organization goes down. There is also a negative association between coworker support and actual turnover $\rho = -0.17$, indicating that as coworker support increases actual turnover decreases.

Interpersonal Citizenship Behavior and Turnover Intentions

Interpersonal citizenship behavior (ICB) is another term for OCBI. Very little research has been done regarding the influence of interpersonal citizenship behavior (ICB) among coworkers on turnover intentions. Aside from a few exceptions, research studies have largely neglected the impact of social relationships with coworkers on

outcomes such as voluntary turnover and job satisfaction (Ducharme & Martin, 2000). Job embeddedness, a construct introduced by Mitchell et al. (2001) suggests that employees can become attached to coworkers and become ingrained into the organization, has been found to be correlated with both actual turnover and turnover intention. These findings support the need for more research on relational reasons for staying with, or leaving, an organization. A study by Regts and Molleman (2013) focused on the association between interpersonal citizenship behavior and the recipients' turnover intention; a construct which has received very little attention. Employees who feel they work in an environment where helpful behaviors are abundant have lower incidences of turnover (Bertelli, 2007), and that satisfaction with one's coworkers has a negative relationship with voluntary departure of employees from the organization. ICB is nonobligatory, and may suggest that the exhibitor of such behaviors has an attachment to the recipient, which may in turn extract affirmative feelings in the recipient (Mossholder, Settoon and Henagan, 2005). Molleman and Regts collected cross-sectional and multi-source data through questionnaires from nurses at two Dutch hospitals. They found that the correlation between ICB and turnover intention were significantly negative ($r = -.20$, $p < .05$), and that the relationship between task interdependence and ICB was significantly positive ($r = .29$, $p < .01$). No statistically significant relationship was found between age, tenure or the standard deviation of receiving ICB as predictors of turnover. They found that receiving ICB from coworkers correlates with reduced intent to turnover via job satisfaction.

Hypotheses and Research Questions

The review of literature has shown that employee relationships are important and are in need of further investigation in order to predict organizational outcomes. It is imperative that organizations take a closer look at how employee relationships may affect turnover. The loss of human capital in organizations should be of concern to leadership, as it leads to loss of productive time, which in turn leads to increased resources needed to replace lost employees (Michaels & Spector, 1982). Furthermore, investigation in organizational cultures other than nursing facilities may give further insight into the relationship between ICB and turnover. The type of job duties and number of coworkers combined with the level of task interdependence may generate different results.

H1a: There will be a negative relationship between an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior and employee turnover intention.

Prior research suggests that high levels of employee citizenship behavior contribute to the social fabric of coworker relationships (Podsakoff et al., 2009) and the result was lower incidences of employee turnover. If high levels of employee citizenship behavior contribute to positive relationships between coworkers, then it is conceivable that employees who exhibit little or no citizenship behavior will have weaker relationships with coworkers, which may in turn lead to an increased desire to look elsewhere for employment.

H1b: There will be a negative relationship between the perceived level of coworkers' interpersonal citizenship behavior and employee turnover intention.

Perceived lack of coworker support may contribute to higher levels of turnover intention due to a weakened relationship between the employee and coworker (Burton, Lee & Holtom, 2002).

H2a: There will be a positive relationship between an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior and the employee's affective commitment towards the organization.

An employee's level of affective commitment reveals an element of their identification with, and involvement in the organization (Moorman, Niehoff & Organ, 1993). Employees who have a high level of affective commitment are said to exhibit increased levels of extra-role behaviors (Meyer et al., 1989). Given prior research in this area, it is possible that employees who perceive high levels of interpersonal citizenship behavior also have a higher level of affective commitment.

H2b: There will be a positive relationship between the perceived level of coworkers' interpersonal citizenship behavior and the employee's affective commitment towards the organization.

The perception of positive relationships between coworkers can help increase the level of affective commitment because it binds people together through positive social relationships (Regts & Molleman, 2013).

H3a: The relationship between an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior and his or her turnover intention will be moderated by the level of task interdependence, such that the relationship will be stronger when task interdependence is higher.

An employee who has a higher level of task interdependence will be affected by coworkers who are not helpful, as it may hinder him or her from performing some of his or her tasks. The higher the level of task interdependence, the more an employee will rely on coworkers and expect interpersonal citizenship behavior (Paine & Organ, 2000).

H3b: The relationship between the perceived level of co-workers' interpersonal citizenship behavior and employee turnover intention will be moderated by the level of task interdependence, such that the relationship will be stronger when task interdependence is higher.

The level of task interdependence, that is, the potential impact a coworker's behavior or job duties has on another employee's ability to accomplish their own tasks, will serve as a moderator to the employee's intent to turnover. An employee who has low task interdependence with coworkers will not be affected as significantly as they would if task interdependence was high (Regts & Molleman, 2013).

H4a: The relationship between an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior and the employee's affective commitment towards the organization will be moderated by the level of task interdependence, such that the relationship will be stronger when task interdependence is higher.

An employee with a high level of affective commitment will exhibit higher levels of interpersonal citizenship behavior (Bateman & Organ, 1983). Higher levels of affective commitment combined with high task interdependence should strengthen this effect, because an employee with high affective commitment will have a genuine concern for the functioning of the organization (Podsakoff et al., 2009).

H4b: The relationship between the perceived level of co-workers' interpersonal citizenship behavior and the employee's affective commitment towards the organization will be moderated by the level of task interdependence, such that the relationship will be stronger when task interdependence is higher.

Task interdependence can increase the level of an employee's job embeddedness. An employee who has a higher level of job embeddedness will have increased affective commitment toward the organization (Mitchell et al., 2001).

H5a: The more an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior exceeds the perceived level of co-workers' interpersonal citizenship behavior, the greater the employee's turnover intention will be.

The norm of reciprocity states that a person who does for others will expect the same in return. Employees will expect their helpful behaviors to be reciprocated by their coworkers (Barnard, 1938). Thus, if they perceive that their helpful behavior is not being returned in kind they may grow resentful and decide to leave the organization.

H5b: The more an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior exceeds the perceived level of co-workers' interpersonal citizenship behavior, the lower the employee's affective commitment towards the organization will be.

Affective commitment refers to the employee's level of identification with and involvement in the organization (Burton, Lee & Holtom, 2002). An employee who perceives a reduced level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior that is lower than what she/he feels she/he is giving out may experience decreased desire to be involved in the organization, thus lowering their level of affective commitment.

Research question one. Which type of interpersonal citizenship behavior, self or co-worker, best predicts turnover intention? Also, do they add unique variance in explaining turnover intention?

Research question two. Which type of interpersonal citizenship behavior, self or co-worker, best predicts affective organizational commitment? Also, do they add unique variance in explaining affective organizational commitment?

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Participants

One hundred forty one employees of a Midwestern state university voluntarily completed my survey. One hundred forty one surveys were collected, with 69.6% of the participants being female and 30.4% of the participants being male; 89.5% were non-minorities and 10.5% were minorities. The largest percentage of participants work in administrative support (27.7%), 26.2% were faculty, 22.7% were professionals, 9% were student services employees, 6.4% were managerial and 2.8% were building services employees. Tenure ranged from one month to 41 years, with the average tenure being 12.07 years. Ages of the participants ranged from 20 to greater than 60 years of age with the mean age of the respondents in the 40-49 years-old category.

Measurements

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). ICB was measured by eight items adapted from Lambert et al.'s (2008) study. The items used in that study were adapted from a complete list of OCBs by extrapolating the questions that investigated OCBI, which is also known as interpersonal citizenship behaviors (ICB). The study by Lambert et al. used a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The current study used the same eight items, but with a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). The purpose of using a six-point Likert scale was to help respondents steer away from focusing on using a neutral response (Hui, Lee & Rousseau, 2004). These scaling differences make it difficult to compare Lambert et al.'s (2008) findings with my findings.

The participants used these eight items to score themselves (See Appendix A) and the same eight items to score the perceived level of their coworkers' ICB (See Appendix A). Based on Lambert et al.'s 2008 study, this scale has a Cronbach's alpha value of .80. In this study, the items measuring self-ICB and other-ICB had Cronbach alpha values of .77 and .91, respectively. These values indicate this is a reliable measure for this construct. Items 3, 4 and 7 were reverse-scored on both scales. Lambert et al. reported a mean score of 31 ($SD = 4.69$). By dividing 31 by eight the result is 3.88, which is just below four on a five-point scale. When I measured ICB the mean was 4.93 on a six-point scale for self-rating ($SD = .60$) and 4.15 for coworker rating ($SD = .98$). Thus, my participants seem to rate their ICBs slightly higher than Lambert et al.'s participants did, but they rate their coworker's ICBs lower.

Affective commitment (AC). AC was ascertained with an eight-item scale created by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) with a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). A study conducted by Meyer et al. (1990) in which they collected data on employees in two manufacturing firms and a university concluded that the test had an internal consistency of .87. The current research used a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) (see Appendix B). The purpose of using a six-point Likert scale was to help respondents steer away from focusing on using a neutral response (Hui et al., 2004). These scaling differences make it difficult to compare Meyer et al.'s (1990) research with my research. The scale used for this study had a Cronbach's alpha value of .86, which indicates a good level of reliability. Items 3, 5, 6 and 7 were reverse scored. Meyer et al. reported a mean score of 5.57 ($SD = 1.16$) on a seven-point scale in their study. My participants had an average score of 4.27

($SD = .91$) on a six-point scale. Thus, both groups were above average and the greater standard deviation in Meyer et al.'s study could be explained by the bigger range in scale scores.

Turnover intention. Turnover intention was measured by Colarelli's (1984) three-item Intent to Quit Scale (see Appendix C). This scale uses a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). The scale was determined by Saks (2006) to have an internal consistency of .82. The scale used for the current study had a Cronbach's alpha value of .90. This value indicates high reliability. The study by Saks (2006) reported a mean turnover intention score of 2.63 ($SD = 1.17$). In my study the mean was 2.48 ($SD = 1.43$). Thus, my scores are similar to Sak's scores.

Task interdependence. Task interdependence was measured by a five-item scale adapted from Van et al. (2000) (see Appendix D). The purpose of this scale was to assess to what extent the carrying out of one's job duties are dependent on others. The scale used by Van et al. has a reliability rating of .67. The items will be scored on a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). The scale used for this study had a Cronbach's alpha value of .79, indicating a high internal consistency. Item 2 was reverse scored. Van et al.'s study reported a mean score of 3.52 ($SD = .86$). My average score was 4.43 ($SD = .98$), thus, my scores are higher than Van et al.'s scores.

Procedure

Prior to collecting data, ESU Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was granted (See Appendix F). The survey questions (see Appendices A through D) were organized onto three pieces of paper with the 32 Likert scale items being condensed onto one page, front and back, and numbered 1 through 32. The demographic items were

placed on the third page and each packet was stapled. Informed consent forms (see Appendix G) were provided with each survey, but were placed in the packet as a separate unattached sheet. The researcher personally visited departments across the university. The participants were given an additional envelope in which to send back the survey and informed consent acknowledgement separately. The participants were instructed to read and sign the informed consent, to complete the survey if they were in agreement, and to return the survey and informed consent in the self-addressed envelopes provided. The participants were asked to return the survey within one week of having received it. At the conclusion of week two after surveys had been handed out, only 17 were returned. Due to the nature of the survey items being collected, the conclusion was made that participants may have been hesitant to fill out and return the paper forms for fear of lack of confidentiality. Therefore, the survey items were transferred onto an online survey, where participants could read the consent form, and choose to continue the survey with complete anonymity. The survey link was emailed to the population of the university, with the exception of the offices that had already been supplied with paper forms. All participants were assured of confidentiality. At the conclusion of day five, no new surveys had been completed within a 24-hour period, thus the survey was closed and data was organized onto an Excel spreadsheet before being entered into SPSS for analysis.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Main Hypotheses and Research Questions

Hypothesis 1a. It was predicted that there would be a negative relationship between an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior and turnover intention. To test this hypothesis, I examined the correlation between the two variables and found a marginally significant negative relationship between the employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior and turnover intention ($r = -0.15, p = .09$). Thus, part A of my first hypothesis was only marginally supported. This result weakly indicates that as an employee's perceived level of citizenship behavior increases, turnover intention decreases, and vice versa.

Hypothesis 1b. It was hypothesized that there would be a negative relationship between perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior and employee turnover intention. I ran a correlation between the two variables to test this theory. There was no significant relationship found between level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior and employee turnover intention ($r = -.07, p > .05$). Thus, part B of my first hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 2a. The prediction was made that there would be a positive relationship between an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior and the employee's affective commitment toward the organization. To explore this hypothesis, a correlation was conducted and a positive relationship was found between an employee's perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior and the employee's affective commitment toward the organization ($r = .31, p < .001$). Part B of

my second hypothesis was supported, indicating that higher levels of an employee's affective commitment lead to higher levels of interpersonal citizenship behavior.

Hypothesis 2b. It was hypothesized that there would be a positive relationship between the perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior and the employee's affective commitment toward the organization. To test this hypothesis, a correlation between the two variables was examined and found to be significant ($r = .21$, $p < .05$), indicating that increased levels of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior may have a positive effect on an employee's level of affective commitment. Thus, part B of the second hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis 3a. It was predicted that the relationship between an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior and his or her turnover intention would be moderated by the level of task interdependence, such that the relationship would be stronger when task interdependence is higher. First, the median task interdependence score was calculated. Then the participants were divided into high task interdependence and low task interdependence groups. The correlation coefficient was calculated between the employees' perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior and their turnover intention for the two groups. For the high task interdependence group, the correlation was $r = -0.26$, and for the low task interdependence group the correlation was $r = -0.03$. Thus, the hypothesis was in the expected direction. However, when Fisher's r -to- Z transformation was conducted, the difference between the two correlations was not significant ($Z = -1.31$, $p > .05$).

Hypothesis 3b. It was predicted that the relationship between the perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior and employee turnover intention would be

moderated by the level of task interdependence, such that the relationship would be stronger when task interdependence is higher. For the high task interdependence group, the correlation between the perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior and employee turnover intention was $r = .03$, and for the low task interdependence group the correlation was $r = -0.13$. Thus, this hypothesis was not in the expected direction and there was no need to conduct a Fisher's r -to- Z transformation to know that this hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 4a. It was hypothesized that the relationship between an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior and the employee's affective commitment toward the organization would be moderated by the level of task interdependence, such that the relationship would be stronger when task interdependence was higher. For the high task interdependence group, the correlation between an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior and the employee's affective commitment toward the organization was $r = .32$, and for the low task interdependence group the correlation was $r = .15$. Thus, this hypothesis was in the expected direction. However, when Fisher's r -to- Z transformation was conducted, the difference between the two correlations was not significant ($Z = 1.03, p > .05$).

Hypothesis 4b. It was hypothesized that the relationship between the perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior and the employee's affective commitment toward the organization would be moderated by the level of task interdependence, such that the relationship would be stronger when task independence was higher. For the high task interdependence group, the correlation between the perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior and the employee's

affective commitment toward the organization was $r = .05$, and for the low task interdependence group the correlation was $r = .17$. Thus, this hypothesis was not in the expected direction and a Fisher's r -to- Z transformation conducted to know that this hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 5a. It was hypothesized that the more an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior exceeded the perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior, the greater the employee's turnover intention would be. First, a new variable was created by subtracting the participants' score on perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior from their score on the employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior. A high score on this new variable would indicate that the participant helped out his or her coworkers more than his or her coworkers helped him or her; while a low (or negative) score would indicate that the participant helped out his or her coworkers less than his or her coworkers helped him or her. Thus, I expected participants with high scores to feel more resentment and be more likely to entertain turnover intentions. However, this hypothesis was not supported ($r = -0.03$, $p > .05$) and it was not in the expected direction.

Hypothesis 5b. It was hypothesized that the more an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior exceeded the perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior, the lower the employee's affective commitment toward the organization would be. This hypothesis was not supported ($r = -0.02$, $p > .05$).

Research question 1. Which type of interpersonal citizenship behavior, self or coworker, best predicted turnover intention? Also, do these two variables add unique variance in explaining turnover intention? From the first hypothesis, it is clear that the

interpersonal citizenship behavior of the self predicts turnover intention ($r = -0.15$) better than the interpersonal citizenship behavior of one's coworkers ($r = -0.07$). A regression analysis was run to predict turnover intention in which I first entered the interpersonal citizenship behavior of the self into the equation, followed by the interpersonal citizenship behavior of one's coworkers. After entering the first predictor the regression analysis returned a value of $R^2 = .03$. The second variable was unable to add significant explanatory variance to the regression equation.

Research question 2. Which type of interpersonal citizenship behavior, self or coworker, best predicts affective organizational commitment? Also, do these two variables add unique variance in explaining affective organizational commitment? From the second hypothesis, it is clear that the interpersonal citizenship behavior of the self predicts affective organizational commitment ($r = .31$) better than the interpersonal citizenship behavior of one's coworkers ($r = .21$). Regression analysis was run to predict affective organizational commitment in which I first entered the interpersonal citizenship behavior of the self into the equation, followed by the interpersonal citizenship behavior of one's coworkers. After entering the first predictor the regression analysis returned a value of $R^2 = .12$. The second variable was unable to add significant explanatory variance to the regression equation.

Exploratory Analyses

The descriptive statistics and the correlations between my main study variables are presented in Table 1. One thing noticeable from Table 1 is that both employee and coworker ICB and affective commitment are higher when task interdependence is higher.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for the Main Study Variables

	N	M	SD	1	2	3	4
1. Employee ICB	134	4.93	.60				
2. Coworker ICB	132	4.15	.98	.21*			
3. Turnover Intention	134	2.48	1.43	-0.15	-0.07		
4. Affective Org Comm	134	4.27	.91	.31**	.21*	-.62**	
5. Task Interdependence	138	4.43	.98	.29**	.30**	-.09	.35**

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

Also, when coworker ICB is higher so is self ICB. Finally, employees with high affective commitment are much less likely to be thinking about leaving the organization.

I found that task interdependence was a significant moderator of the relationship between an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior and the perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior. For the high task interdependence group, the correlation between an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior and the perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior was $r = .35$, but for the low task interdependence group the correlation was $r = -0.10$. When I conducted a Fisher's r -to- Z transformation, I found that the difference between the two correlations was significant ($Z = 2.65, p < .01$).

I also examined how my demographic variables were related to my four main variables. For age and tenure, I calculated correlation coefficients. As can be seen in Table 2, age and tenure are not strongly related to my main variables, with the exception of age and an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior where older employees perceive themselves as providing more interpersonal citizenship behaviors.

For gender and minority status, I calculated t-tests. As can be seen in Table 3a, gender was not significantly related to any of the four variables. As seen in Table 3b, minority status was, however, related to an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior, where non-minority employees perceive themselves as providing more interpersonal citizenship behaviors ($t(131) = 3.32, p < .01$). However, I also found that minority status was confounded with age, such that non-minority employees were older ($M = 4.47, SD = 1.17$) than the minority employees ($M = 3.14, SD = .86; t(130) =$

4.11, $p < .001$). Thus, if older, non-minority employees see themselves as exhibiting more interpersonal citizenship behaviors than younger, minority employees, is this an age based phenomenon or a race and ethnicity based phenomenon? I do not know.

Table 2

Age and Tenure Correlations with the Main Study Variables

	N	M	SD	Age	Tenure
Employee ICB	138	4.93	.60	.23*	.07
Coworker ICB	136	4.15	.98	-0.03	-0.10
Turnover Intention	138	2.48	1.43	-0.08	-0.05
Affective Org Comm	138	4.27	.91	.07	.03

* $p < .01$

Table 3a

Descriptive Statistics for Gender on the Main Study Variables

	Male			Female		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Employee ICB	41	4.84	.53	94	5.00	.59
Coworker ICB	40	3.95	1.03	93	4.23	.97
Turnover Intention	41	2.44	1.27	94	2.46	1.47
Affective Org Comm	41	4.22	.83	93	4.32	.92

* $p < .01$

Table 3b

Descriptive Statistics for Race on the Main Study Variables

	Non-minority			Minority		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Employee ICB	119	5.00*	.55	14	4.48*	.63
Coworker ICB	118	4.17	.99	13	4.09	.90
Turnover Intention	119	2.48	1.38	14	2.17	1.72
Affective Org Comm	119	4.30	.91	14	4.13	.83

* $p < .01$

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

Results only marginally supported the first part of H1. I found a marginally significant negative relationship between the employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior and turnover intention. This result coincides with research conducted by Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994) who theorized that employees who intend to stay with an organization would not neglect extra-role behaviors due to their tendency to believe that these behaviors could lead to positive outcomes of performance evaluations. The marginally significant negative result found in the current study indicates that an employee who exhibits high levels of interpersonal citizenship behavior may have a decreased likelihood to leave the organization.

For the second part of H1, I predicted there would be a negative relationship between the perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior and employee turnover intention. This hypothesis was not supported. In other words, it would seem that the level of an employee's coworker's helping behaviors does not influence an employee's decision to leave. Minimal research has been conducted examining the relationship between helpful behaviors of coworkers and its impact on an employee's intention to quit. However, I expected the relationship to be significant due to the results of the research conducted by Bertelli (2007) among treasury officials, which found people who feel they work in an environment where helpful behaviors are abundant have lower incidences of turnover. I suspect this finding may have been linked to the occupation of the population the researcher studied. This finding among treasury officials may have been significant due to the nature of the job, which may include a heavy

reliance on others in order to complete job duties. Maybe university employment is less task interdependent.

Results supported part A of H2, where I predicted there would be a positive relationship between an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior and the employee's affective commitment toward the organization. This prediction was made based on prior research conducted by Meyer et al. (1989), which found employees who exhibited higher levels of citizenship behavior also had high levels of affective commitment. In addition, affective commitment is said to be linked to an employee's amount of involvement in the organization (Burton, Holtom & Lee, 2002).

For the second part of H2, I predicted there would be a positive relationship between the perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior and the employee's affective commitment toward the organization. This hypothesis was supported. According to previous research, positive social relationships help to bind people together within the organization, whereas negative social relationships work to do the opposite (Molleman & Regts, 2013). Positive social relationships help to increase an employee's affective commitment toward the organization.

Hypothesis 3a predicted the relationship between an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior and his or her turnover intention would be moderated by the level of task interdependence such that the relationship would be stronger when task interdependence was higher. The results supported the hypothesis in the sense that it was in the expected direction, but when I conducted a Fisher's *r*-to-*Z* transformation the difference between the correlations was not significant. My first result demonstrated the employees who were thinking of leaving had lower interpersonal

citizenship behaviors. It makes sense for these employees to begin withdrawing behaviors that are not mandatory (Chen, Hui & Segó, 1998). However, it would seem in my study that the level of task interdependence has little to do with turnover intention and an employee's level of citizenship behavior. Perhaps an employee who has decided to leave an organization does so without thought of the way in which his or her tasks are intermingled with coworkers.

For Hypothesis 3b, it was predicted that the relationship between the perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior and employee turnover intention would be moderated by the level of task interdependence such that the relationship would be stronger when task interdependence was higher. The difference in these correlations was not in the expected direction, thus, the hypothesis was not supported. I believed an employee who had high reliance on others to accomplish tasks may be influenced to look elsewhere for employment if helpful behavior from coworkers was not up to par. Employees can become attached to coworkers and become ingrained into the organization. The level of job embeddedness has been found to be correlated with both actual turnover and turnover intention (Mitchell et al., 2001). My thinking was that the level of coworker citizenship behavior could help or harm the social ties the employee has to an organization such that they may be influenced to leave if enough frustration and resentment were bred by the lack of positive social relationships. But my thoughts were not borne out by the data. The behaviors of one's peers, helpful or not helpful, were unrelated to turnover intentions in Hypothesis 1b, and whether one depended on those peers or not also did not make a difference. When it comes to the decision to leave one's

organization, perhaps coworker characteristics are not high on the decision list on whether to stay or leave.

For Hypothesis 4a, I expected the relationship between an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior and the employee's affective commitment toward the organization to be stronger when task interdependence was higher. Although the results were in the expected direction, Fisher's r-to-Z transformation showed no significance. My thinking was an employee who has a high level of affective commitment would report higher rates of citizenship behaviors because affective commitment serves as a precursor to citizenship behaviors (Moorman, Niehoff & Organ, 1993). Additionally, citizenship behaviors enhance organizational effectiveness (Podsakoff, Ahearne & MacKenzie, 1997). Thus, employees with high levels of affective commitment may be more likely to engage in these behaviors, especially in instances of high task interdependence, because they want to help coworkers and ensure the organization is successful. Perhaps an employee engages in the same amount of citizenship behavior regardless of the level of task interdependence. Employees may be so concerned with the success of the organization, or delivering of services to customers that they will perform these behaviors even in instances of low interdependence among coworkers.

For Hypothesis 4b, I expected the relationship between the perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior and the employee's affective commitment toward the organization to be stronger when task interdependence was higher. Again, Fisher's r-to-Z transformation revealed no support for this prediction. My thinking was that helpful behavior on the part of coworkers would increase positive relationships in the

workplace, resulting in increased commitment, and it would form a stronger bond between coworkers, which would increase an employee's level of job embeddedness (Mitchell et al., 2001); especially in instances of high task interdependence. But that was not the case. Maybe the level of an employee's commitment is not determined by additional helpful actions of their coworkers, even when such actions are needed to perform well, and is instead motivated by other factors, such as the job itself, or treatment of the employee by leadership, or other factors.

Hypothesis 5a predicted that the more an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior exceeded the perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior, the greater the employee's turnover intention would be. This hypothesis was not supported. My thinking was an employee who had higher levels of citizenship behavior than their coworkers would have high levels of resentment, which would influence them to look for work elsewhere, perhaps where their good deeds would be reciprocated. This is based on the social exchange theory introduced by Barnard (1938). If people expect like-behaviors in return and they feel they are not a recipient of the same behaviors they are giving, then this might cause an employee to become disgruntled. Maybe the level of the employee's affective commitment or satisfaction with his/her job is such that she/he is happy to help others, without expecting anything in return. This could produce a form of cognitive dissonance, where a person's commitment increases because of the lack of external justifications for enduring something negative.

Hypothesis 5b predicted that the more an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior exceeded the perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior, the lower the employee's affective commitment toward the

organization would be. This hypothesis was not supported. There may be other factors at play that more directly affect an employee's level of affective commitment. Instead, these employees may have a high level of conscientiousness, high positive affect, or be more concerned with impression management (Bateman & Organ, 1983). These mindsets would cause employees to be more concerned with their own behavior than that of others. In cases such as these, affective commitment may not be affected in relation to coworker behavior. These employees may merely be looking out for themselves, hoping their extra-role behaviors lead to promotion or some other rewards. They may believe management will take notice of their actions and they will look upon them favorably when comparing them to their coworkers (Leftkowitz, 2000). Or, as mentioned in the previous paragraph, perhaps doing more produces cognitive dissonance, where a person's commitment increases because of the lack of external justifications for enduring something negative.

My two research questions explored which type of interpersonal citizenship behavior, self or coworker, would best predict turnover and affective organizational commitment, and whether the two variables would add any unique variance in explaining these two variables. For both variables, an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior not only outperformed the perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior, but the perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior was unable to add any unique explanatory variance. It could be that employees are reluctant to leave a stable job regardless of coworker behavior, due to economic conditions. These employees may be staying based on continuance commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1990), which has caused them to examine the pros and cons associated with leaving. Lack of extra-role behaviors by coworkers may not be the most causal factor in

terms of making the decision to depart. Concerning affective commitment, maybe it is the employee's own level of emotional attachment to the organization that causes them to perform extra-role behaviors, and is not dependent on the actions of others. In addition, employees with higher levels of affective commitment are more likely to consider what is best for the organization (Meyer et al., 1993). This may make them more likely to exhibit the extra-role behavior of good sportsmanship (Organ, 1988) and continue engaging in citizenship behaviors regardless of the lack of extra-role performance by coworkers.

After analysis of the main hypotheses, I looked at demographic variables to see how they related to the four main variables. Age was significantly related to the perceived level of the employee's own interpersonal citizenship behaviors. Older employees believed they exhibit more interpersonal citizenship behavior than their younger counterparts. Perhaps changes in culture between the generations make them more likely to work harder and be more helpful than those who are younger or have been employed for fewer years. Additionally, analysis of a sample of nurse employees conducted by Wagner and Rush (2000) concluded job satisfaction, organizational commitment and trust in management were factors most important to younger employees, while concerns with moral judgment was a precursor of altruistic behavior among older participants. This could explain the variation in the levels of interpersonal citizenship behaviors reported by people in different age groups, as the younger generation may not find citizenship behaviors as important as their more experienced counterparts.

Minority status was also related to an employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior. Non-minority employees believed that they exhibit more interpersonal citizenship behaviors than minorities. This result is what I would have

expected, due to previous research that suggests that minorities may be experiencing increased negative mood states, due to the perception that their efforts will not be rewarded with the outcomes that are desired (Jones & Schaubroeck, 2004). This negative mood state may explain the decreased reports of citizenship behaviors. It is important to note, however, that the results of the tests showed age was confounded with minority status, as the non-minority employees were older than the minority employees. Exploratory analysis of age/tenure of employees revealed that older employees reported themselves as engaging in higher incidences of citizenship behaviors than younger employees. Thus, I cannot completely determine whether the difference between the groups is due to age or minority status.

Exploratory analysis also revealed that task interdependence moderated the relationship between the employee's perceived level of interpersonal citizenship behavior and the perceived level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior. Employees who reported higher levels of task interdependence had a high correlation between self and coworker measures of interpersonal citizenship behavior, while employees who reported lower levels of task interdependence had a low correlation between self and coworker measures of interpersonal citizenship behavior. When task interdependence is high, employees either believe that (a) they and their coworkers are engaging in high levels of citizenship behavior or (b) neither they nor their coworkers are engaging in high levels of citizenship behavior. However, when task interdependence is low, reports of self-citizenship behavior and coworker citizenship behavior were unrelated. When there is high task interdependence and interpersonal citizenship behavior is high, perhaps it creates a norm for helping that everyone conforms to. On the other hand, when such help

breaks down, perhaps it infects the entire team. On teams with low interdependence, however, perhaps the norms for helping others are less explicit and more left up to each individual.

Practical Implications

The purpose of the present study was to assess the effects of lack of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior on an employee's affective commitment and intention to leave the organization. Based on research by Podsakoff et al., (1997), which found that at the individual and team level, citizenship behaviors help foster positive relationships between coworkers, I expected to find that employees whose coworkers exhibited low levels of interpersonal citizenship behaviors would have weak relationships with their coworkers and, would therefore, decide to seek employment elsewhere. However, I found no evidence to support that a lack of support from coworkers in the area of interpersonal citizenship behavior had an effect on an employee's intention to quit. Interpersonal citizenship behaviors are discretionary and cannot be enforced by employers (Organ, 1988). Therefore, if the level of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior has no effect on employee turnover an organizational culture whose employees do not participate in such behaviors may not find importance of such behaviors in terms of decreasing turnover.

It is important to note that analysis of the data did result in marginally significant results in the area of turnover as it relates to an employee's own level of citizenship behaviors. I found marginal significance to indicate employees who engage in these behaviors are less likely to quit, with the reverse being true for those who report lower levels of interpersonal citizenship behavior. With this in mind, organizations may want to

visit the idea of paying attention to the level of extra-role support being offered by employees in order to help gauge the possibility of voluntary departures from the organization. Prior research by Chen, Hui and Segó (1998) showed significant data to support that low levels of citizenship behavior lead to turnover. Therefore, longitudinal studies may yield significant results for an organization by examining the progression of the cycle of citizenship behaviors of employees, perhaps revealing decreasing amounts of citizenship type behaviors over time and seeing if it leads to turnover. If results show a trend, management may explore ways to intervene to see if they can prevent turnover intention from turning into true turnover.

Although I was unable to find evidence to support that lack of coworker interpersonal citizenship behavior led to turnover, I did find a positive relationship between the perceived level of interpersonal coworker support and affective commitment of the employee. Research shows organizations fostering a culture that contributes to increasing their employee's level of organizational commitment can help decrease employee turnover, thereby decreasing costs associated with replacing lost employees (Michaels & Spector, 1982). Perhaps organizations should focus on fostering positive relationships with employees, thereby increasing affective commitment and avoiding the loss of good employees. This study may encourage further research in the area of social relationships among employees as it relates to affective commitment and causes of turnover.

Limitations

The biggest limitation to the internal validity of this study was its correlational design. Because none of my independent variables were manipulated, I was unable to

make any causal inferences. I was merely able to report on relationships between variables.

Another limitation of the study is the population that was used to collect data. Perhaps targeting a population that works in teams and relies heavily on coworker support would yield different results. I feel in an environment with a heavy reliance on teamwork, there may be a more direct link established between coworker support and turnover intention. This study may provide more evidence to connect the link between coworker support and turnover if conducted in a population that has high rates of employee turnover.

Reliability is a limitation, as the data collected was not even across the different job categories. People in different job categories are performing different tasks, therefore larger sample sizes in the job categories that were least represented by this survey may have yielded different results. The distribution of job types may have contributed to the types of responses received. Though numerous participants across all job categories were solicited for survey completion, the number of responses returned was not representative of a broad spectrum of job types. Due to the nature of the survey, in that it was administered electronically and employees were contacted via email, it may be that employees who work in food services or building services are not carrying out tasks that require them to (a) check email regularly, or (b) have time to sit and fill out an online survey. These jobs are more physical task oriented, and require employees to spend most of their time away from computers.

Due to the nature of the organization used for this research, it may be that employees have other means of obtaining information they need to perform their job

duties, so it may not affect their feelings about coworker helpfulness as much. For employees whose job duties are independent of their coworkers, the level of helpfulness displayed by a coworker may not matter as much as it would to a person who works in teams.

Another limitation of the study was the number of responses from females (69.6%) in comparison to males (30.4%). As stated previously, women are more likely to engage in helping behaviors than men (Farrell & Finkelstein, 2007). It is plausible that more women completed this survey due to their likelihood to want to help. Another possibility is women who responded to the survey are working mostly with other women, which may indicate that citizenship behaviors are naturally abundant. It would have been interesting to see what the results would have been had more males responded.

The final limitation is the current state of the United States economy. Employees may be hesitant to leave what they consider to be a stable job simply on the basis of lack of helpful behavior. In economic conditions where steady work is hard to come by, lack of help from coworkers may seem like a small issue in the grand scheme of things. In a healthy economy where jobs are abundant, resentment may build in the face of knowing one has other options. Employees who have other options may be more likely to consider looking elsewhere for employment, rather than staying with the organization out of continuance commitment.

Future research

In depth examination of the links between age differences, race, and interpersonal citizenship behavior may shed some light on different attitudes regarding such behaviors. The variables of age and race were confounded in the current study so I was unable to

conclude which variable predicted the amount of citizenship behavior undertaken. Future studies with larger sample sizes may be able to provide more insight into this phenomenon.

Another area of future research may be to conduct a similar study with a different population. The type of job being performed may make a significant difference in an employee's resentment if they are not on the receiving end of helpful coworker behaviors. A job where tasks are built around working on a line, where employees may have to wait for others to complete tasks in order to carry out their own specified duties may cause increased frustration leading to higher likelihood to look elsewhere for employment.

Collectivist cultures were found to display more citizenship behaviors than individualistic cultures (Paine & Organ, 2000). Since this study was conducted in a population that is part of an individualistic culture, it may be beneficial to conduct such a study in an environment where helpful behaviors are expected, and considered to be the norm (Farh, Zhong & Organ, 2004). In the current population, helpful behaviors would be an exception rather than the norm. Employees in collectivist cultures who report lower rates of helpful behaviors on the part of their coworkers may be more likely to have increased resentment due to the expectation of such behavior. It would be worthwhile to see if such a study may produce results indicative of the effect non-reciprocated citizenship behaviors would have on the social fabric of an organization in a collectivist culture.

Finally, conducting a study that examines the relationship between interpersonal citizenship behavior and employee turnover may yield different results during a time period where the economy is flourishing. An employee who views him or herself as

having other options may not be as likely to stay when experiencing frustration due to lack of coworker support.

References

- Allen, T. D., Barnard, S., Rush, M. C., & Russell, J. E. A. (2000). Ratings of organizational citizenship behavior: Does the source make a difference? *Human Resource Management Review, 10*(1), 97-114. doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(99\)00041-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(99)00041-8)
- Allen, T. D., & Rush, M. C. (1998). The effects of organizational citizenship behavior on performance judgments: A field study and a laboratory experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(2), 247-260. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.2.247>
- Aryee, S., & Chay, Y. W. (2001). Workplace justice, citizenship behavior, and turnover intentions in a union context: Examining the mediating role of perceived union support and union instrumentality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(1), 154-160. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.154>
- Bachrach, D. G., Bendoly, E., & Podsakoff, P. M. (2001). Attributions of the "causes" of group performance as an alternative explanation of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(6), 1285-1293. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.6.1285>
- Barling, J., Fullagar, C., Kelloway, E. K., & McElvie, L. (1992). Union loyalty and strike propensity. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 132*(5), 581-590. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/618288920?accountid=27180>
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- 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. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/616874290?accountid=27180>
- Becker, T. E. (1992). Foci and bases of commitment: Are they distinctions worth making? *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(1), 232-244. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/618118215?accountid=27180>
- Benson, P. G., & Pond, S. B. (1987). An investigation of the process of employee withdrawal. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1(3), 218-229. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/617426647?accountid=27180>
- Bertelli, A.M. (2007). Determinants of bureaucratic turnover intention: Evidence from the department of the treasury. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 17(2), 235–258.
- Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35, 307-311.
- Brief, A. P., & Roberson, L. (1987). *Job Attitude Organization: An Exploratory Study*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Meetings, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. *Personnel Selection in Organizations* (pp. 71-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss* (1st ed.). New York: Basic Books.

- Burton, J. P., Lee, T. W., & Holtom, B. C. (2002). The influence of motivation to attend, ability to attend, and organizational commitment on different types of absence behaviors. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 14*(2), 181-197. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/619909479?accountid=27180>
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1979). *The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1990). Origins and functions of positive and negative affect: A control-process view. *Psychological Review, 97*(1), 19-35.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.97.1.19>
- Cascio, W. F. (1998). *The theory of vertical and horizontal individualism and collectivism: Implications for international human resource management*. Elsevier Science/JAI Press. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/619394794?accountid=27180>
- Chen, X., Hui, C., & Segó, D. J. (1998). The role of organizational citizenship behavior in turnover: Conceptualization and preliminary tests of key hypotheses. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(6), 922-931. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.6.922>
- Chen, Z., Eisenberger, R., Johnson, K. M., Sucharski, I. L., & Aselage, J. (2009). Perceived organizational support and extra-role performance: Which leads to which? *The Journal of Social Psychology, 149*(1), 119-124.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.149.1.119-124>

- Chiaburu, D. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and meta-analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCBs, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(5), 1082-1103.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.5.1082>
- Choi, Y., & Mai-Dalton, R. R. (1999). The model of followers' responses to self-sacrificial leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*, 397-421. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00025-9
- Colarelli, S. M. (1984). Methods of communication and mediating processes in realistic job previews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*(4), 633-642.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.69.4.633>
- Cox, S. (1999). Group communication and employee turnover: How coworkers encourage peers to voluntarily exit. *Southern Communication Journal, 64*, 181-192.
- Coyne, I., & Ong, T. (2007). Organizational citizenship behaviour and turnover intention: A cross-cultural study. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18*(6), 1085-1097. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585190701321831>
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(6), 1241-1255. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241>
- Dixon, K. A., Storen, D. & C. E. Van Horn. (2002). *A Workplace Divided: How Americans View Discrimination and Race on the Job*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University, John J. Heldrich Center for Workforce Development.

- Ducharme, L. J., & Martin, J. K. (2000). Unrewarding work, coworker support, and job satisfaction: A test of the buffering hypothesis. *Work and Occupations, 27*(2), 223-243. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/619460096?accountid=27180>
- Dunham, R. B., & Herman, J. B. (1975). Development of a female FACES scale for measuring job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*, 629-631.
- Farh, J. L., Zhong, C. B., & Organ, D. W. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior in the People's Republic of China. *Organization Science, 15*(2), 241-253.
- Farrell, S. K., & Finkelstein, L. M. (2007). Organizational citizenship behavior and gender: Expectations and attributions for performance. *North American Journal of Psychology, 9*(1), 81-95. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/621694312?accountid=27180>
- Folger, R., & Greenberg, J. (1985). Procedural justice: An interpretive analysis of personnel systems. In K. Rowland & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resources management* (Vol. 3, pp.141-183). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Fryxell, G., & Gordon, M. (1989). Workplace justice and job satisfaction as predictors of satisfaction with union and management. *Academy of Management Journal, 32*, 851-866.
- Fullagar, C. J. A., Parks, J. M., Clark, P. F., & Gallagher, D. G. (1995). *Organizational citizenship and union participation: Measuring discretionary membership behaviors.* (pp. 311-331). American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10185-015>

- Gordon, M., & Fryxell, G. (1993). The role of interpersonal justice in organizational grievance systems. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management* (pp.231-255). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4(4), 249-270. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/618103371?accountid=27180>
- Graham, J. W., & Verma, A. (1991). Predictors and moderators of employee responses to employee participation programs. *Human Relations*, 44(6), 551-568. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/617967091?accountid=27180>
- Hackman, J.R., & Oldham, G.R. (1980). *Work design*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hardy, G. E., & Barkham, M. (1994). The relationship between interpersonal attachment styles and work difficulties. *Human Relations*, 47(3), 263-281. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/618469711?accountid=27180>
- Harris, M. M., & Schaubroeck, J. (1988). A meta-analysis of self-supervisor, self-peer, and peer-supervisor ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 41(1), 43-62. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/617445357?accountid=27180>
- Harrison, D. A., Johns, G., & Martocchio, J. J. (2000). *Changes in technology, teamwork, and diversity: New directions for a new century of absenteeism research*. In G. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resources management* (Vol. 18 pp. 43–91). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Holtom, B. C., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., & Eberly, M. B. (2008). Turnover and retention research: A glance at the past, a closer review of the present, and a venture into the future. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1), 231-274.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1>
- Hui, C., Lee, C., & Rousseau, M. (2004). Psychological contract and organizational citizenship behavior in china: Investigating generalizability and instrumentality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 311-321.
- Jones, J. R., & Schaubroeck, J. (2004). Mediators of the relationship between race and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 16(4), 505-527.
Retrieved from
<http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/620699639?accountid=27180>
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9(2), 131-146. Retrieved from
<http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/615442720?accountid=27180>
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. J. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Kidwell, R. E., & Bennett, N. (1993). Employee propensity to withhold effort: A conceptual model to intersect three avenues of research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 18(3), 429-456. Retrieved from
<http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/618352526?accountid=27180>

- Krackhardt, D., & Porter, L. W. (1986). The snowball effect: Turnover embedded in communication networks. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(1), 50-55.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.1.50>
- Kunin, T. (1955). The construction of a new type of attitude measure. *Personnel Psychology, 8*, 65-78.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Griffin, M. L. (2008). Being the good soldier: Organizational citizenship behavior and commitment among correctional staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 35*(1), 56-68. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0093854807308853>
- Lee, T. W., & Mitchell, T. R. (1994). An alternative approach: The unfolding model of voluntary employee turnover. *Academy of Management Review, 19*, 51-89.
- Lefkowitz, J. (2000). The role of interpersonal affective regard in supervisory performance ratings: A literature review and proposed causal model. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73*(1), 67-85. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/619486195?accountid=27180>
- Lin, C., Hung, W., & Chiu, C. (2008). Being good citizens: Understanding a mediating mechanism of organizational commitment and social network ties in OCBs. *Journal of Business Ethics, 81*(3), 561-578. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9528-8>
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1991). Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*(1), 123-150. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/618095691?accountid=27180>

- Maertz, C. P., & Griffeth, R. W. (2004). Eight motivational forces and voluntary turnover: A theoretical synthesis with implications for research. *Journal of Management*, *30*(5), 667-683. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jm.2004.04.001>
- Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (1981). Vicarious learning: The influence of modeling on organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, *6*, 105–113.
doi:10.2307/257144
- Mathieu, J. E., & Kohler, S. S. (1990). A test of the interactive effects of organizational commitment and job involvement on various types of absence. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *36*(1), 33-44. Retrieved from
<http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/617750984?accountid=27180>
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*(4), 538-551. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.4.538>
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Sage Publications, Inc, Thousand Oaks, CA. Retrieved from
<http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/619273511?accountid=27180>
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Gellatly, I. R. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *75*(6), 710-720.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.75.6.710>

- Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the commitment that counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*(1), 152-156.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.74.1.152>
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*(1), 20-52.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842>
- Michaels, C. E., & Spector, P. E. (1982). Causes of employee turnover: A test of the mobility, Griffith, Hand, and Meglino model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*(1), 53-59. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.67.1.53>
- Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B. C., Lee, T. W., Sablinski, C. J., & Erez, M. (2001). Why people stay: Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*(6), 1102-1121. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3069391>
- Moorman, R. H. (1993). The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Relations, 46*(6), 759-776. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/618358932?accountid=27180>
- Moorman, R. H., Niehoff, B. P., & Organ, D. W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 6*(3), 209-225. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/618442378?accountid=27180>

- Mossholder K.W., Settoon, R.P., & Henagan, S.C. (2005). A relational perspective on turnover: Examining structural, attitudinal, and behavioral predictors. *Academy of Management Journal* 48(4), 607–618.
- Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extra-role efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4), 403-419.
- Retrieved from
<http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/619656859?accountid=27180>
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 224-247.
doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(79\)90072-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(79)90072-1)
- O'Reilly, C. A., & 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. Retrieved from
<http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/617194801?accountid=27180>
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books/D.C. Heath & Company, Lexington, MA. Retrieved from
<http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/617482088?accountid=27180>
- Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior, In B. M. Staw, & L. L. Cummings (Eds.). *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 12, 43–72. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*(1), 157-164. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.74.1.157>
- Organ, D. W., & Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 135*(3), 339-350. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/618899061?accountid=27180>
- Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1985). Cognition vs affect in measures of job satisfaction. *International Journal of Psychology, 20*(2), 241-253. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/617164721?accountid=27180>
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*(4), 775-802. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/618918996?accountid=27180>
- Paine, J. B., & Organ, D. W. (2000). The cultural matrix of organizational citizenship behavior: Some preliminary conceptual and empirical observations. *Human Resource Management Review, 10*(1), 45-59. doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(99\)00038-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(99)00038-8)
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(1), 122-141. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013079>

- Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(2), 262-270. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.2.262>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly, 1*(2), 107-142.
- Retrieved from
<http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/618248971?accountid=27180>
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. (1989). *A Second Generation Measure of Organizational Citizenship Behavior*. Working Paper, Indiana University.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research, 31*(3), 351-363. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/618515573?accountid=27180>
- Regts, G., & Molleman, E. (2013). To leave or not to leave: When receiving interpersonal citizenship behavior influences an employee's turnover intention. *Human Relations, 66*(2), 193-218. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726712454311>
- Richards, D. A., & Schat, A. C. H. (2011). Attachment at (not to) work: Applying attachment theory to explain individual behavior in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(1), 169-182. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020372>

- Rom, E., & Mikulincer, M. (2003). Attachment theory and group processes: The association between attachment style and group-related representations, goals, memories, and functioning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(6), 1220-1235. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.6.1220>
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(7), 600-619. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Latham, G. P. (1996). Increasing citizenship behavior within a labor union: A test of organizational justice theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(2), 161-169. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.2.161>
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Latham, G. P. (1997). Leadership training in organizational justice to increase citizenship behavior within a labor union: A replication. *Personnel Psychology, 50*(3), 617-633. Retrieved from <http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/619161024?accountid=27180>
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago; Rand McNally.
- 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. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653>
- Trevino, L. K., & Brown, M. E. (2005). The role of leaders in influencing unethical behavior in the workplace. In R. E. Kidwell & C. L. Martin (Eds.). *Managing organizational deviance* (pp. 69–87). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Van, D. V., Emans, B., & Vliert, V. D. (2000). Team members' affective responses to patterns of intragroup interdependence and job complexity. *Journal of Management*, 26(4), 633-655. Retrieved from

<http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/619539229?accountid=27180>

Wagner, S. L., & Rush, M. C. (2000). Altruistic organizational citizenship behavior: Context, disposition, and age. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 140(3), 379-91. Retrieved from

<http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/199850667?accountid=27180>

Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1992). On traits and temperament: General and specific factors of emotional experience and their relation to the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality*, 60(2), 441-476. Retrieved from

<http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/618240342?accountid=27180>

Williams, L. J. (1988). *Affective and Non-Affective Components of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Determinants of Organizational Citizenship and in-Role Behaviors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University.

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors.

Journal of Management, 17(3), 601-617. Retrieved from

<http://www.whitelib.emporia.edu/docview/618086939?accountid=27180>

Yaffe, T., & Kark, R. (2011). Leading by example: The case of leader OCB. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 806-826. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0022464>

Appendix A

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scales

Self-Report of One's Own OCB

Directions: Please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with the following statements by circling the appropriate number between 1 and 6 for each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I frequently volunteer to do things without being asked.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I often take time away from my job to help others with their work without asking for a reward.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Sometimes I will coast during part of the workday when there is little work to do rather than trying to find new work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. If possible, I take extra unauthorized breaks.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I put forth a great deal of effort at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I often try to help fellow employees so they will become more productive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. When possible, I take longer lunches or breaks than allowed.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. I often help others at work who have a heavy workload without being asked to do so.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Perceptions of One's Coworkers' OCB

Directions: Please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with the following statements by circling the appropriate number between 1 and 6 for each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. My coworker(s) frequently volunteer to do things without being asked.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. My coworker(s) often take time away from their job to help others with their work without asking for a reward.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Sometimes my coworker(s) will coast during part of the workday when there is little work to do rather than trying to find new work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. If possible, my coworker(s) take extra unauthorized breaks.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. My coworker(s) put forth a great deal of effort at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. My coworker(s) often try to help fellow employees so they will become more productive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. When possible, my coworker(s) take longer lunches or breaks than allowed.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. My coworker(s) often help others at work who have a heavy workload without being asked to do so.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix B
Affective Commitment Scale

Directions: Please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with the following statements by circling the appropriate number between 1 and 6 for each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I do not feel a strong sense of "belonging" to my organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I enjoy discussing about my organization with people outside it	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix C

Turnover Intention Scale

Directions: Please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with the following statements by circling the appropriate number between 1 and 6 for each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I frequently think of quitting my job at this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I am planning to search for a new job during the next 12 months.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. If I have my own way, I will not be working for this organization one year from now.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix D

Task Interdependence Scale

Directions: Please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with the following statements by circling the appropriate number between 1 and 6 for each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I need information and advice from my colleagues to perform my job well.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I have a one-person job; it is not necessary for me to coordinate or cooperate with others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I need to collaborate with my colleagues to perform my job well.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. My colleagues need information and advice from me to perform their jobs well.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I regularly have to communicate with colleagues about work related issues.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix E
Demographic Data

Demographics

If any of the items below make you feel uncomfortable, feel free to leave them blank.

Age: Please circle your age category

Under 20 20 – 29 30 – 39 40 – 49 50 – 59 60 or above

Gender: Please circle your gender

Male Female Other (i.e., Transgender)

Race/Ethnicity: Please circle which category best describes your race/ethnicity

Minority Non-minority

Tenure: Please specify how long you have been working in this organization (in years)

_____ years

Job Category: Please circle the category that best fits your position description

Administrative support

Faculty

Student services

Managerial

Building services

Food service

Professional

Other, please specify:

Thank You!

Appendix F

IRB Human Subjects Approval Letter

Appendix G
Informed Consent

INFORMED CONSENT

The Department of Psychology at Emporia State University supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research and related activities. The following information is provided so that you can decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time, and that if you do withdraw from the study, you will not be subjected to reprimand or any other form of reproach. Likewise, if you choose not to participate, you will not be subjected to reprimand or any other form of reproach.

This study is intended to examine whether there the level of extra role behaviors received by an employee's coworkers has any effect that that employee's intention to leave the organization and his/her affective commitment to the organization. The approximate participation time will be 10 to 20 minutes.

During the data collecting process, participants can either email their results back to the researcher to the address: jmorri12@g.emporia.edu, of which only I, the researcher, have the password to. Or the participants can give the survey to the researcher in person or by campus mail. In order to protect participants' confidentiality, only I have the access to the names. Moreover, after the research, all the data forms will be locked up for three years, and then be destroyed.

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

Subject _____
print name

Date _____

Subject _____
sign name

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

Signature of Author

10/28/2013

Date

Examining the Relationship Between Coworker
Interpersonal Citizenship Behavior, Affective
Commitment & Employee Turnover Intentions

Title of Thesis

Signature of Graduate Office Staff Member

Date Received