

Running Head: THE INVESTMENT MODEL AND ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR

Applying the Investment Model to Organizational Behavior: An Investigation of
Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Amy Gordon

Haverford College

Abstract

The current study investigated commitment and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) using the Rusbult's (1980) Investment Model. It was hypothesized that the commitment would predict OCB and workplace behaviors and mediate the effects of satisfaction, investments, and alternatives on OCB. Participants completed online surveys that also included measures of conscientiousness and Meyer and Allen's (1991) Three-Component Model of commitment. The results showed that satisfaction, alternatives, and investments predicted commitment, and commitment predicted OCB. Commitment did not mediate the association between Investment Model variables and OCB. A regression revealed that the Investment Model better predicted OCB than the Three-Component Model. Researchers should continue to implement the Investment Model to study organizational commitment and its relationship to workplace behaviors.

Applying the Investment Model to Organizational Behavior: An Investigation of Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

A person's job is one of the most important aspects of their life, not only serving as a source of income, but often providing meaning for one's life and even part of their personal identity (Laliberte-Rudman, 2002). As such a large portion of one's life is spent working, it is worthwhile to explore an employee's attitudes about their job as well as their behavior on the job. One's thoughts and feelings about their job, such as their satisfaction or how much they feel they need their job have may have implications for their actions at the workplace. An area that has garnered much research is the topic of organizational commitment, which focuses on defining commitment and investigates what it means to be committed and how or under what conditions does this commitment manifest in specific behavioral outcomes on the part of the employee. These behaviors include but are not limited to turnover, low absenteeism, punctuality, and general performance. Furthermore, some people also seem to perform behaviors that are not formally specified as a job requirement at their place of employment, such as anonymously watering the office plants while fully knowing they will not be recognized or rewarded for their actions. It is then relevant to ask if this behavior is a function of their commitment level. The current study will investigate organizational commitment and its behavioral outcomes, specifically organizational citizenship behavior, using the Rusbult's (1980a) Investment Model of Commitment.

Organizational Commitment

Commitment is a difficult concept to define because while many understand this idea intrinsically, forming a comprehensive definition has been the work of several

decades of research. Generally, subjective commitment is a long-term orientation or the likelihood for an involvement to persist (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993; Arriaga & Agnew, 2001). Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) defined organizational commitment as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in an organization” (pg. 1). They add that commitment is frequently broken down into either attitudinal commitment, which they operationalize as how people think about their relation to the organization or behavioral commitment which they define as the processes that individuals use when they become locked within the organization (Mowday et al., 1982). Commitment can be regarded as a psychological state connecting a person to an organization (Meyer & Allen, 1990). Morrow (1983) generally described thirty forms of commitment comprised of both unique and redundant pieces. These thirty can then be classified into five general categories. One can be committed to personal values or moral beliefs, a career, a job, an organization such as a social institution or company, or a union.

Another way to operationalize commitment is to describe it either as global or local depending on the focus of the commitment. Billings and Becker (1993) define local commitment as being attached to supervisors and one’s co-workers, and global commitment as being attached to top management and the organization as a whole. They found that those who are committed both locally and globally reported the highest amount of job satisfaction, least intention to leave their job, and performed more pro-social behaviors in the workplace. Locally versus globally committed individuals did not significantly differ in their overall attitudes and behavior. Their commitment level was significantly lower than the group who were both locally and globally committed and

higher than the uncommitted group. While this categorization can be an effective way of measuring commitment, it is broad and general and does not explain the underlying factors or motivations of the commitment.

O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) approach commitment in a way that focuses on the psychological bond between the individual and the organization in three areas which they term compliance, identification, and internalization. Compliance occurs when employees adopt the beliefs and attitudes of the organization only in order to gain rewards.

Identification is when an individual feels a sense of pride in and respects the accomplishments of the organization without adopting them as one's own. Finally, internalization happens when the values of the person and the organization become congruent. An individual's commitment level can contain varying combinations of these three factors.

Building on this three factor approach, three broad themes appear in the literature that address different facets of commitment. An affective theme emphasizes the individual's feelings toward the organization. Most generally, this centers on one's emotional attachment to the group (Kanter, 1968). Essentially, it is the extent to which they feel connected to the organization as a whole. Affective orientation can be described as an attitude toward the organization that links the person's identity with that of the organization (Sheldon, 1971). Commitment is also viewed as the process by which the organization's goals become those of the individual (Hall, Schneider, & Nygren, 1970). Meyer and Allen (1991) base their affective component of commitment of their Three-Component Model on the definitions contained in this thematic category. More specifically, affective orientation focuses on the emotional attachment, identification, and

involvement with the organization and is based on the individual's desire to remain with it.

The second theme is a cost-based approach to commitment focusing on the cost and rewards of remaining with the organization and those associated with leaving it. For example, a long commute to work may be a cost, but the organization may have a high quality benefits package one would not want to lose or one they could not find at another job. Kanter (1968) provides that commitment is the "profit associated with the continued participation and a cost associated with leaving" (p. 504). Commitment occurs as an individual gains investments during their time with the organization, such as money, time, and status (Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972). Meyer and Allen (1991) build their continuance component in their model from this theme which accounts for a person's need to stay with the organization.

The third theme from the literature contains definitions of commitment that reflect a sense of obligation or moral responsibility. These account for the individual's feelings of duty or necessity to remain with the current organization or group. Feelings of devotion and loyalty fall into this category. Commitment can occur when a person believes it morally right to remain with the organization despite their satisfaction (Marsh & Mannari, 1977). It can also be assessed as an internalized norm that requires one to act in a certain way to meet the needs of the organization (Wiener, 1982). This theme influenced the development of the normative component of Meyer and Allen's (1991) model, the component which addresses the individual's feeling that they ought to remain with the organization.

Meyer and Allen's (1991) Three-Component Model of commitment has been utilized in the majority of work on organizational commitment. This is perhaps due to the way they account for many dimensions of commitment. They believe each component contains a key aspect of commitment and a complete definition must, therefore, include all three areas of affective, continuance, and normative. It is important to note that these are not different types of commitment, rather that they should be understood as three aspects of commitment. Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, and Topolnytsky's (2002) meta-analysis of the Three-Component Model found that all three components are related yet distinct from one another and from job satisfaction, occupational commitment, and job involvement. This study showed that the model incorporates in cross cultural research as well. Overall, all three components are negatively related to turnover. Affective commitment most strongly predicted outcomes of turnover, absenteeism, and pro-social behavior. Normative commitment more weakly predicted these behaviors, and continuance commitment had no relationship with them. The authors find that affective and normative commitments are highly correlated, which they suggest is a potential weakness in the definitions.

While the Three-Component Model captures the different facets in the construct of organizational commitment, it lacks the ability to be used as a global measure as well, as it only measures commitment in three different aspects, not as one broad construct of commitment. This shortcoming can be avoided by measuring commitment using Rusbult's (1980a) Investment Model of Commitment which captures the aspects of alternatives, satisfaction, and investments all in one global, yet simultaneously faceted construct. Unlike the Three-Component Model that developed from a gathering of themes

present in the organizational commitment literature, the Investment Model stems from a well-established theoretical framework of interdependence theory.

Interdependence Theory and the Investment Model of Commitment

The current study will focus on commitment from the perspective of interdependence theory (Kelley, 1979; Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Interdependence theory suggests that satisfaction is one influential factor on a person's feelings of dependence on a relationship. A relationship does not have to be interpersonal but can also be between an individual and an object, group, idea, or value. If one's needs are met in that relationship and cannot be fulfilled from another source, then that person is both satisfied with and dependent on the relationship. Satisfaction is a function of rewards and costs. A reward is any outcome in the relationship that gratifies the person, something they would describe as positive or pleasurable. A cost is an outcome that detracts from a behavior such as great efforts or opposing influences. When one's rewards exceed the costs it is believed that they experience their relationship as being satisfying. Individuals vary in their expectations, and these expectations are termed as one's comparison level (CL). Additionally, a person's CL_{alt} is a measure of the outcomes that are perceived that could be obtained in a source outside of the relationship (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). If outcomes exceed the CL, that individual is satisfied. If the outcomes exceed CL_{alt} then one is dependent. A person can be dependent and not satisfied in the relationship and vice versa.

Rusbult's (1980a) Investment Model of Commitment builds on interdependence theory by accounting for one's quality of alternatives as a separate variable from its original conceptualization as CL_{alt} functioning within the satisfaction component.

Investment size was also added as a distinct, influential factor on commitment. According to this model, commitment is measured as one's subjective psychological experience of dependence (Rusbult, 1980a, 1983). The Investment Model's construct of commitment is ultimately a function of the three components, satisfaction, alternatives, and investments, strengthening as rewards increase and costs decrease within each component. Her component of satisfaction assesses outcomes, which should exceed personal expectations to keep one feeling satisfied. Satisfaction is positively correlated with commitment. Investments are anything of value one places into the relationship, such as time, money, and effort. Investments positively predict commitment. Alternatives, which negatively correlate with commitment, are any other source where a person perceives they can receive outcomes that exceed those they are getting in the current relationship. Some alternatives may be another potential partner or having no relationship at all as long as it provides outcomes more desirable than what one is receiving by remaining in the current relationship. In combination, the variables account for 61% of the variance in predicting commitment and overall support for the Investment Model was shown in a meta-analysis (Le & Agnew, 2003).

Rusbult (1980b) initially tested the Investment Model on friendships. As satisfaction and investments increased and alternatives decreased, commitment became stronger. The Investment Model was then implemented in a longitudinal study of college dating relationships (Rusbult, 1983). Results showed that over time, commitment was predicted by increases in both satisfaction and investments and decreases in quality of alternatives. The decision to stay or leave a relationship was related to commitment level. The literature now extends not only to dating couples but predicts relationship

commitment and stability for marriages (Impett, Beals, & Peplau, 2002). Branje et al. (2007) conducted a longitudinal study of approximately 1,000 adolescents which revealed that satisfaction, alternatives, and investments predicted commitment to a same sex friendship as well as relationship stability. Commitment also mediated the tendency to switch friends. While the Investment Model was initially tested on personal relationships, particularly romantic relationships, much research has applied the model to other domains.

In a study of young cricket players, commitment was influenced by several predictors providing support that the Investment Model can be applied to commitment in sports teams (Carpenter & Coleman, 1998). Similarly, commitment to a sports activity was examined within a similar framework as the Investment Model (Raedeke, 1997). The model was used in a study of business-to-business interactions which found that satisfaction and cost-to-exit influenced the behaviors in these interactions (Ping, 1997). Furthermore, adherence to a medical regimen was predicted with the model (Putnam, Finney, Barkley, & Bonner, 1994). Lyons and Lowery (1989) used a general model similar to the Investment Model in order to describe commitment to one's community. Overall, the Investment Model serves as an effective general model of commitment, applicable in a variety of contexts.

The literature also includes research on organizational commitment using the Investment Model. A study of industrial workers found that job commitment was predicted by satisfaction, in terms of cost and rewards, value of one's alternatives, and the investment size. While both commitment and job satisfaction correlated with turnover, commitment was the best predictor of leaving one's job (Farrell & Rusbult,

1981). The effects of the Investment Model were also investigated in a twelve month longitudinal study of nurses and accountants (Rusbult & Farrell, 1983). Low costs and high rewards resulted in greater job satisfaction which in combination with low value of alternatives and increased investment strongly predicted job commitment. Over time, job costs and investments size influenced commitment. Turnover was mediated by a decrease in job commitment over time. Oliver (1990) studied organizational commitment with the Investment Model with results that supported this approach.

While a fair amount of literature utilizes the Investment Model for studying commitment in numerous contexts, there is a limited amount of work on organizational commitment from this perspective as the majority of the research uses the Three-Component Model approach. The two models do share some similarities; however, the Investment Model, unlike the Three-Component Model, allows for a both a global and faceted measurement of commitment.

Three-Component Model and the Investment Model

Several connections exist between the affective, normative, and continuance commitment of the Three-Component Model and the Investment Model's satisfaction, alternatives, and investments. According to Meyer and Allen (1997), an employee's met expectations correlate with higher affective commitment. They note that "it is not the experiences per se that influence affective commitment, but rather the discrepancy between those experiences (or lack thereof) and what the person expects" (p. 52). This idea is similar to the interdependence theory idea that satisfaction is a measure of expectations and outcomes. These similarities demonstrate a parallel between Rusbult's construct of satisfaction and Meyer and Allen's affective commitment.

Continuance commitment reflects a person's feeling of commitment based on a belief that they have to stay with the organization. Meyer and Allen (1991) suggest that this feeling is tied with one's perceptions of their investments, what they would stand to lose if they left, and alternatives, what they would stand to gain if they pursued other options. The authors define investments analogous to Rusbult's conceptualization, explaining that an investment can be time, money, and/or effort put into the organization. Meyer and Allen's definition of alternatives is comparable to Rusbult's definition as well, focusing on lowered cost and higher reward available from other sources. Alternatives in an organizational context would likely included competitive pay and the ease at which one could obtain employment elsewhere based on their skills or available resources. Because of these commonalities, the connections between the two models can be drawn.

Normative commitment, the third component of commitment is described as a feeling of obligation to stay with the current organization. Johnson, Caughlin, and Huston's (1999) commitment framework also included a feeling of obligation as an experience of commitment, which he names as the moral component. This aspect is not directly accounted for in the Investment Model; however, it could be seen as a slightly abstract type of investment. Normative commitment generally results from one's feelings of indebtedness, stemming from an awareness of the investments they have placed into the relationship. This in combination with feelings that the organization has sacrificed in order for them to obtain their job, creates normative commitment. In essence, normative commitment is an aspect of Rusbult's investments because it is the feeling associated with the awareness of gained resources.

On the whole, the literature on organizational commitment does not frequently utilize this model, and instead, most researchers opt to use Meyer and Allen's (1991) Three-Component Model. However, the Investment Model not only simultaneously supports a faceted and global construct of commitment, but also has associated behavioral outcomes that have been well investigated throughout the literature.

Investment Model Outcomes of Commitment

Much of the research on outcomes of commitment in the Investment Model stems from studies on romantic relationships, specifically in regard to relationship maintenance and stay-leave behaviors; however, a parallel can be drawn between these behaviors and those performed in the workplace by committed individuals. These behaviors are enacted for a few reasons, the first of which is that high commitment should motivate one to act in ways to ensure the stability and health of the relationship. Secondly, behaviors that benefit the relationship may also benefit the individual in the long term. Lastly, behaviors that are enacted at a cost to the individual are effective for communicating their desire for long-term commitment (Kelley, 1979).

The behaviors include the decision to remain, tendencies to accommodate, derogation of alternatives, willingness to sacrifice, and perceived superiority (Rusbult et al., 1994). Commitment can predict stay-leave behavior with higher commitment levels correlating to a desire to remain in the relationship and lower levels predicting the desire to leave the relationship (Rusbult & Martz, 1995). Additionally, a willingness to sacrifice is an individual's desire to put their partner's best interests before their own personal interests for the good of the relationship is termed their willingness to sacrifice (Van Lange et al., 1997).

Accommodation within a relationship is the amount to which one accepts dissatisfying behavior from their partner, and this behavior is also predicted by commitment level (Rusbult, Verette, Whitney, Slovik, & Lipkus, 1991). A person can respond to a dissatisfying experience in the relationship with behaviors that lie on a continuum of two dimensions: active versus passive and destructive versus constructive (Rusbult & Zembrodt, 1983). The active constructive response is termed voice and is when one takes initiative for change for a positive outcome. Active destructive behavior is known as exit and includes behaviors that seek to end the relationship. Active passive responses are given the label of loyalty and are behaviors that involve hope for a good future outcome. Finally, neglect is the term for passive destructive responses and includes behaviors that generally ignore conflict and avoid attempts at resolution. Generally, a person reacts with loyalty or voice favorably and is increasingly tempted to respond with neglect or exit when their partner responds in those ways. However, not accommodating the partner can be a cost in the relationship and, therefore, negatively influence commitment.

Derogating one's alternatives can take a variety of forms. When an attractive alternative poses a threat to the current relationship, people utilize several methods to cope with this situation. Highly committed partners generally engage in behaviors such as removing oneself from the alternative, either physically or psychologically, emphasizing commitment to current relationship, and rating the current relationship partner as better than the alternative (Rusbult et al., 1994).

Finally, committed individuals have the tendency to develop a belief that their relationship is better than it is or better than others' relationships, and they will respond

behaviorally to this belief, which can serve as an effective buffer in the face of a threatening alternative (Rusbult, Van Lange, Verette, & Yovetich, 1993). Ultimately, it is highly plausible that when the behaviors of a person committed to their organization are investigated with the Investment Model, they will perform behaviors equivalent to those of a committed individual in a romantic relationship.

Outcomes of Organizational Commitment

The relationship between organizational commitment and turnover has also been the topic of much work in the literature. Similar to the research on romantic relationships regarding one's intent and desire to remain in a relationship, organizational commitment has been used to predict their stay-leave behavior with one's organization. Steers (1979) found that organizational commitment is strongly related to the intent and the desire to remain at one's job. With more of a behavioral approach, Porter, Crampon, and Smith (1976) conducted a longitudinal study in which they assessed employees' commitment and their turnover. Within the initial fifteen months of employment, participants completed measures of their commitment. Those who decided to leave the organization within this time period showed a decrease in their commitment before their departure. Furthermore, those with a lower commitment level at the beginning of the study showed a significant tendency to leave within the first six months of employment. An early study showed that organizational commitment was moderately related to turnover (Steers, 1979). Angle and Perry (1981) provide support for organizational commitment being associated with lower turnover in a sample of bus service workers. In another longitudinal study, newly hired psychiatric technicians were given measures of job satisfaction and organizational commitment at four times during their first ten months on

the job (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974). The researchers found that organizational commitment and not job satisfaction at the third and fourth assessment times significantly predicted if the employee stayed or left their job.

Absenteeism, a workplace behavior that can be operationalized as either voluntary or involuntary, has been investigated as an outcome of organizational commitment. Involuntary absenteeism is when one is sick or has some type of emergency that would prevent them from going to work. Voluntary absenteeism, however, occurs when a person does not appear at work because they simply do not want to work. Sagie (1998) found that voluntary opposed to involuntary absenteeism is predicted by organizational commitment and job satisfaction as well as the interaction between these two factors. Steers (1977) showed support that organizational commitment was moderately related to attendance in a sample of hospital employees.

Randall, Fedor, and Longenecker (1990) conducted a study of organizational commitment and its correlation to various workplace behaviors, including absenteeism, though they made no distinction between voluntary and involuntary in their definition. This study employed the Mowday et al. (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, and participants were also asked to complete ratings of behaviors the researchers believed to be related to organizational commitment based on interviews they conducted in a pilot study. The results, however, did not show significant correlations between organizational commitment and absenteeism. Angle and Perry (1981) conducted a study measuring commitment in two dimensions: how much the participant supports the goals of the organization and their commitment to stay. Neither dimension significantly

predicted absenteeism in the employees. Overall, the work on absenteeism as an outcome of organizational commitment contains inconsistent findings.

Dishon-Berkovits and Koslowsky (2002) investigated the relationship of time urgency, organizational commitment, and age of youngest child on one's punctuality, which they operationalized as the extent to which one arrived at work on time. They used Burman, Pennebacker, and Glass's (1975) definition of time urgency as a facet of Type A personality which measures one's sense of time as a scarce resource and the tendency to plan time carefully. The age of youngest child was assessed as they hypothesized having a young child may hinder an employee's attempts to arrive at work on time due the early morning demands of the child on the parent. They found that organizational commitment was the only significant predictor that distinguished between those who came to work on time and those who were tardy. Angle and Perry (1981) also found that organizational commitment was related to being on time for one's job.

Lastly, job performance has been the topic of work in the literature, though not frequently from the perspective of organizational commitment. Steers (1979) found that commitment was unrelated to job performance. In this study, performance was measured by supervisors' ratings of employees' overall performance, quality and quantity of work, as well as promotion readiness. Keller (1997) assessed organization commitment with Porter et al.'s (1974) measure and performance using a supervisor rating on quality and quantity of work, dependability, and ability to get along with co-workers. He found that organizational commitment did not significantly predict job performance. Assessing job performance has presented a large methodological issue. Many studies have cited that the results may due to the inherent biases at play in this methodology. The discrepancy that

often appears in the supervisors' ratings and the employees' self reports, suggests that this method is neither reliable nor valid. Furthermore, job performance is difficult to operationalize and would undoubtedly challenge reliability and validity without taking extremely stringent measures in designing the study. Due to inconsistent findings and methodological issues, job performance will not be assessed in the present research.

Three-Component Model of Commitment and Workplace Behaviors

Most of the research on organizational behaviors of turnover and absenteeism, utilizes Meyer and Allen's Three-Component Model when assessing organizational commitment. All three conceptualizations of commitment have been shown to correlate with turnover (Allen & Meyer, 1996). Likewise, Somers (1995) found that affective commitment predicted turnover, affective and normative commitment interacted to significantly relate to intent to remain, and continuance commitment was shown to moderate affective commitment in intent to remain, such that high levels of continuance commitment lessened one's intent to remain. Absenteeism was explored in a number of studies of which the findings suggest that affective commitment negatively correlates with voluntary absenteeism (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Hackett, Bycio & Hausdorf, 1994; Gellatly, 1995; Somers, 1995).

Investment Model and Workplace Behaviors

When Farrell and Rusbult (1981) applied the Investment Model in a workplace setting, they found that both commitment and job satisfaction correlated with turnover, but commitment was the best predictor of leaving one's job. The Investment Model was also used in a twelve month longitudinal study of nurses and accountants (Rusbult & Farrell, 1983). Low costs and high rewards resulted in greater job satisfaction, which in

combination with low value alternatives and increased investment, strongly predicted job commitment. Over time, job costs and investment size influenced commitment. Turnover was mediated by a decrease in job commitment over time.

Senter and Martin (2007) measured job satisfaction, alternatives, and organizational commitment to predict turnover in part time employees of whom they divided into fixed employees, those who needed their job, and flexible employees, those who did not need on the job. For the fixed employees, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and the amount of pay offered by other jobs were significant predictors of turnover. Organizational commitment was found to be the best predictor of turnover for both fixed and flexible part time workers. While Senter and Martin (2007) do not investigate turnover behavior using the Investment Model, several components of the model are measured and the results align with the general findings in the literature on the Investment Model.

Rusbult, Farrell, Rogers, and Mainous (1988) used components of the Investment Model to predict behavioral outcomes in the workplace. High satisfaction and investment predicted voice and loyalty responses to conflict at work. Voice as defined as raising concerns in order to resolve conflict, and loyalty as remaining positive but quiet, are the active and passive positive responses, respectively. High alternatives predicted exit (leaving the job) and voice behavior. Not only does this study investigate stay-leave behavior similar to that found in personal relationships, but it also examines accommodation, another common relationship maintenance behavior.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Commitment as defined by the Investment Model predicts a variety of outcomes in both romantic relationships and workplace behaviors and, consequently, clear behavioral similarities between both contexts are present. The current study will focus on one behavior in particular, organizational citizenship behavior. This ground of behaviors bear semblance to several of the predicted outcomes of commitment, particularly those associated with relationship maintenance found in the literature on the Investment Model. Because of this parallel it is useful to explore the behavior using the Investment Model, opposed to the Three Component Model.

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) first appears in the literature in a study by Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) which generally defines OCB as behaviors that “go beyond formal role requirements” and that are “acts of cooperation, helpfulness, suggestions, gestures of goodwill, altruism” (p. 653). The authors divide OCB into two distinct dimensions: altruism and compliance, operationalized as helping others and adhering to workplace rules and norms, respectively. Participants were bank employees who completed questionnaires assessing these factors. The results showed that there is indeed a distinction between the two dimensions of OCB and that job satisfaction predicted these behaviors. Job satisfaction, described as an employee’s mood, best predicted altruism. Both leader supportiveness and lying at work were correlated with general compliance.

Building on the previous work, Organ (1988) further developed his definition of OCB, describing it as “behaviors that are not recognized by the formal reward system and that promote the effective functioning of the organization” (p.4). With this expanded definition of OCB, he transitioned from a two-dimensional model of altruism and general

compliance to a five-dimensional model of altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, civic virtue, and conscientiousness. This new conceptualization captured more facets of the behavior than the old model. Altruism remains close to the original conceptualization of helping others without benefit for the self. Courtesy includes behaviors that demonstrate a consideration of others before the self. Keeping a positive moral in the workplace, such as not complaining and speaking well of the organization can be classified as sportsmanship behaviors. Civic virtue reflects one's desire to integrate oneself into the organization with activities such as keeping up with changes within the company. Finally, conscientiousness, distinct from the Big Five trait of conscientiousness, includes behaviors in which the individual obeys rules and conforms to social norms in the workplace.

Other conceptualizations of OCB have emerged in the literature. Williams and Anderson (1991) combined Organ's (1988) five factor taxonomy of OCB into two-dimensions: OCB-I and OCB-O. OCB-I are behaviors that are directed at an individual and comprised of the facets of courtesy and altruism. OCB-O consists of sportsmanship, civic virtue, and conscientiousness as these behaviors influence the organization. However, some favor a one-dimensional OCB construct (Allen & Rush, 1998; Chen, Hui, & Segó, 1998). A meta-analysis revealed that all five factors were highly related to one another and the different facets were not correlated with differing attitudinal antecedents such as job satisfaction or commitment (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). In other words, all five OCB facets all were predicted by similar attitudes, suggesting that this measure of OCB effectively assesses the construct. In another meta-analysis, Hoffman, Blair, Meriac, and Woehr (2007) showed further support for the five factor OCB construct.

They find that the Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) measure of OCB based on Organ's (1988) five factors is the most widely used in research because it is a highly valid and reliable measure of OCB.

Throughout the literature OCB has been shown to be predicted by a variety of factors including, supervisor fairness, supervisor support, personality, and social influence within the workplace (LePine et al., 2002; Chen & Chui, 2008; Neuman & Kickul, 1998; Bommer, Miles, & Grover, 2003). When investigated with Meyer and Allen's (1991) Three-Component Model a relationship is shown between some of the components and OCB. Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, and Topolnytsky's (2002) meta-analysis found that affective commitment was strongly related to OCB, whereas normative commitment was related, but not strongly, and continuance commitment was unrelated to OCB. Generally the research on OCB is unsystematic, stemming from a large assortment of approaches which create a sense of disorder in the literature on this topic.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior and the Investment Model

Using the well-established theoretical framework of the Investment Model to study OCB will clarify and remove redundancy from the literature. While many studies investigate the variables of satisfaction and other variables that describe behaviors or cognitions similar to those represented in the alternatives and investments components, the variables selected for study often seem arbitrary and generally do not follow any theoretically based logic as to why they were selected or what they will predict. A unity and cohesion is much needed in this area of research, one that the Investment Model will be able to provide. This approach is broad enough to encompass and account for a variety

of behaviors, yet can still account for specific categories pertinent to the study of organizational commitment and its related behavioral outcomes, particularly OCB.

The relationship between job satisfaction and OCB has been examined in the literature. One study examined the effects of personality and job satisfaction on OCB and showed that job satisfaction accounted for a significant amount of the variance not explained by personality dimensions (Organ & Lingl, 1995). Chui and Chen (2005) took a slightly different approach and found that intrinsic job satisfaction mediates the relationship between job characteristics (*i.e.*, job variety, identity, meaningfulness, and challenge) and OCB. Organ and Konovsky (1989) divided job satisfaction into cognitive and affective dimensions and examined the influence of each on OCB. Participants were asked about their typical mood at work, their attitudes toward their job, and their pay compared to equivalently trained peers within the same organization. A regression revealed that pay cognitions significantly predicted OCB. This finding suggests that a cost and reward aspect to job satisfaction exists which effectively supports the satisfaction component of the Investment Model. Organ (1988) showed that a clear correlation exists between job satisfaction and OCB. He provided evidence using eight studies that measure of job satisfaction, each defining satisfaction in differing ways and all showed a significant relationship with OCB.

The construct of alternatives has been explored in the literature on organizational behavior. Thau, Bennet, Stahlberg, and Werner (2004) conducted a study measuring the attractiveness of alternative job opportunities, the ease of obtaining these alternatives, and OCB at current place of employment. They found that there were no main effects for either the ease of obtaining an alternative or attractiveness of that alternative. Neither a

participant's belief that an alternative job was easy or difficult to get nor the extent to which employees rated their alternative job opportunity as attractive had a significant influence on their OCB. However, an interaction was found between low ease and high attractive alternatives and OCB at one's current job. Alternatives jobs rated as hard to get and highly attractive were significantly correlated with OCB at one's current place of employment. The researchers explain that these findings show that a person attempts to make do with what they have, in this case by performing more OCB, if they feel that a desirable job is out of their reach. Individuals will improve the current relationship when they know it is their best or least costly option. This line of thought follows the cost and reward rational integral to the Investment Model.

The literature on the relationship between job investments and OCB is worth examination due to its connections to the Investment Model. Money, time, and emotional connection can be considered investments in a romantic relationship (Rusbult et al., 1994). These factors also hold when examined in an organizational setting as well, for the time spent with an organization, tenure, can be categorized as an investment. Another example of an investment within an occupational context could be when one relocates in order to live closer to a job. However, one study that did investigate organizational tenure found a significant negative correlation with OCB (Thau et al., 2004). This finding suggests that the longer one has been at their current job, the less likely they are to perform OCB. This evidence does not provide direct support for Investment Model perspectives on OCB, and consequently, more work needs to be done on measuring variables of investments in the organization and how it relates to organizational commitment and OCB.

Organizational commitment has been shown to correlate with OCB (Williams & Anderson, 1991; Organ & Ryan, 1995). Foote and Tang (2008) investigated the effects of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on OCB. Their study focused on team commitment within an organization, and they found that the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB was moderated by team commitment. While the results focused on team commitment and not individual commitment, the findings are still relevant as they also show commitment as a unique factor, distinct from job satisfaction. Schappe (1998) argued organizational commitment and job satisfaction are not the same. In order to separate them as individual factors and determine their effects on OCB, he conducted a regression analysis and found that of procedural justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment, only organizational commitment is a significant predictor of OCB, aligning with the theory of the Investment Model.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Investment Model Outcomes of Commitment

In addition to several studies that fall within the theoretical framework of the Investment Model, the five factor construct of OCB shares some similarities with the predicted outcomes of commitment from the Investment Model literature, which provide further support for studying OCB using the Investment Model. Rusbult et al. (1994) provide evidence for relationship maintenance behaviors of committed partners. These behaviors work toward improving and strengthening the relationship as well as communicating one's commitment to the partner. It is feasible that OCB functions similarly within an organizational context, paralleling the maintenance behaviors in a personal relationship.

The decision to remain in an interpersonal relationship is termed stay-leave behavior, and in a work setting is turnover. A study by Chen, Chui, and Seago (1998) collected supervisors' ratings of employee OCB and compared them to employee turnover. Those who performed more OCB were less likely to leave their job. The cost incurred by performing OCB, communicated to the organization and the self, the decision to remain within the relationship with the organization.

Another predicted outcome of commitment in the Investment Model is the tendency to accommodate, which is the amount to which one accepts dissatisfying behavior from their partner and is predicted by commitment level (Rusbult et al., 1994). Farrell and Rusbult's (1992) meta-analysis found that the way employees respond to conflict in the workplace depends on their satisfaction, alternatives, and investment size. Those with high satisfaction more frequently used the voice and loyalty responses and used fewer neglect and exit response. Superior alternatives related to more frequent active responses either voice or exit. High investment size correlated with higher tendencies toward voice and loyalty and with less neglect.

The voice construct can be loosely associated with civic virtue factor in OCB, as it describes one actively following and responding to changes within the organization. The loyalty construct seems to parallel the sportsmanship factor assesses one's maintaining positive moral and passively keeping quiet about complaints.

The willingness to sacrifice is an individual's desire to put their partner's best interests before their own personal interests for the good of the relationship is termed their willingness to sacrifice (Van Lange et al., 1997). Both the courtesy and altruism factors of OCB address putting other's or the organization's best interests before their

own. These individuals might not directly benefit from their helpful actions, but the organization or their relationship with the organization does.

Perceived superiority occurs when a committed individual believes their relationship is better than it is, and/or better than other's relationships (Rusbult et al., 1994). The factor of sportsmanship also reflects the essence of this maintenance behavior as it involves an individual spreading positive moral about or thinking favorably of the organization.

Based on the numerous connections between the behavioral outcomes of a committed person in a personal relationship and OCB is highly plausible that the behaviors of an organizationally committed individual can also be effectively investigated using the Investment Model.

Summary and Research Goals

Most of the research on OCB does not focus on showing a direct relationship between organizational commitment and OCB without examining some other variable as a predictor. These factors do not seem to be selected in accordance with any theoretical model, and, therefore, the literature generally lacks a clear, systematic study of the predictors of this OCB. Similarly, the research on organizational commitment is also disorganized and redundant. To resolve this problem, the current study will investigate the determinants of organizational commitment as well as the influence of commitment on OCB using one theoretical model. This approach is also optimal as it assesses commitment as a global construct mediating the predictors of satisfaction, alternatives, and investments, which then also creates a faceted commitment construct as it accounts for a variety of influential factors as well, unlike the Three-Component Model.

Furthermore, the present study will link two areas of research simultaneously: Investment Model on organizational commitment and organizational commitment and OCB. Lastly, as the facets of OCB seem to parallel the outcomes of commitment in the Investment Model which provides further impetus to investigate OCB with the model. In the current study, participants will complete online questionnaires measuring their organizational commitment using the Investment Model, their OCB, and workplace behaviors.

H1: The individual components of the Investment Model: satisfaction, alternatives, and investments will each predict organizational commitment in the predicted directions. Satisfaction and investment size will positively correlate with commitment, and alternatives will be negatively related to commitment.

H2: Organizational commitment will predict OCB.

H3: Organizational commitment will predict workplace behaviors such as intent and desire to remain at current job as well as social outcomes.

H4: Satisfaction, alternatives, and investments will individually predict OCB and workplace behaviors.

H5: The direct effects of satisfaction, alternatives, and investments on OCB will be mediated by organizational commitment; therefore, their direct effects will be reduced when organizational commitment is added to the model.

H6: Organizational commitment assessed with Rusbult and Farrell's (1983) Investment Model of Commitment will more strongly predict OCB than Meyer and Allen's (1991) Three Component Model of Commitment.

Research Question: Conscientiousness was added as a control variable to determine the effects of personality on OCB.

Methods

Participants

Data were collected from 311 participants; however, responses from individuals who did not complete the Investment Model and OCB questionnaires were unusable, leaving 267 participants (192 females, 74 males, 1 unreported). They were currently employed individuals in various occupational fields of which 17.6 % identified themselves as K-12 teachers, 10.7 % reported being college professors, 13.8% said they were staff at a college or university. Small business employees comprised 7.3 % of the participants, and 5.4 % of participants were employees of large businesses. Non profit employees accounted for 1.1 % of participants. Student workers at Haverford and Bryn Mawr Colleges were 35.6 % of the sample. Lastly, 8.4 % of participants reported working in fields other than those described in the given categories. The mean age of the sample was 35 years old. Schools were directly contacted by the researchers and asked to participate. In addition, a link to the present study was posted on Haverford College's message board as well as in e-mails to the faculty and staff listserv. Participants were compensated with an entry into a lottery drawing for monetary prizes.

Procedure and Measures

Participants completed an online cross-sectional survey containing the following measures:

Investment Model. Rusbult and Farrell's (1983) Investment Model measure assesses participants' job satisfaction, alternatives, investments, and commitment. All items are scored on a nine-point Likert-type scale (see Appendix A). The value of work alternatives were measured with seven items, four concrete and four global statements (α

= .82). Participants rated their perceptions about ease and availability of job alternatives. One global item is “All things considered, how good are your alternatives to this job?” (1 = terrible, 9 = excellent). Job investments were measured in a twenty item questionnaire assessing one’s investments in areas such as tenure, friendship involvement at the job, spousal employment, and retirement programs ($\alpha = .88$). One example of a global item is “All things considered, to what extent are there activities/events/persons/objects associated with your job that you would lose if you were to leave?” (1 = none, 9 = a great many). Job satisfaction was assessed with two direct and four indirect items ($\alpha = .90$): “In general, how much do you like your job?” (1 = don’t like it at all, 9 = like it very much) and “How does this job compare to your ideal job?” (1 = far from ideal, 9 = close to ideal), respectively. Commitment was measured using five global items ($\alpha = .88$) such as “How committed are you to your current job? (1 = not at all committed, 9 = extremely committed) and “How likely is it that you will quit this job in the near future?” (1 = extremely likely, 9 = not at all likely).

Organizational citizenship behavior. The OCB questionnaire developed by Podsakoff, et al. (1990) consists of twenty-five items divided between five subscales (see Appendix B). Each subscale with the exception of civic virtue has four items. The Altruism subscale ($\alpha = .83$) contains items such as “I am always ready to lend a helping hand to those around me” and “I help orient new people even though it is not required.” Conscientious ($\alpha = .83$) is assessed with questions including: “I obey company rules and regulations even when no one is watching” and “I do not take extra breaks.” A sample item from the Courtesy subscale ($\alpha = .90$) is “I am mindful of how my behavior affects other people’s jobs.” The Civic Virtue subscale ($\alpha = .82$) contains items such as “I read

and keep up with organization announcements, memos, and so on.” The Sportsmanship subscale ($\alpha = .88$) includes reversed scored items such as “I consume a lot of time complaining about trivial matters.” All items are rated on a seven-point Likert type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). All five subscales were combined into one global OCB measure ($\alpha = .90$).

Workplace behaviors. The researchers developed the Organizational Commitment Outcomes Scale to measure an employee’s desire and intent to remain at the job, and relationships with coworkers (see Appendix C). Four questions assess desire ($\alpha = .87$), and intent ($\alpha = .88$) to remain, two questions in each category. Participants rate on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree) the extent to which they agree with the statements (e.g., “I do not intend to find a new job”). Another five items, using the same rating scale, assess coworker relationships ($\alpha = .90$) (e.g., “I spend time outside of work with my coworkers.”).

Trait conscientiousness. John and Srivastava’s (1999) Big Five Inventory measures extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience. For the purposes of the present study, only the conscientiousness facet of the questionnaire were implemented (see Appendix D). Nine items assess conscientiousness ($\alpha = .85$) (e.g., “Does things efficiently” and “Perseveres until the task is finished”). Items are scored using a five-point Likert-type scale (1= Disagree Strongly, 5 = Agree Strongly).

Affective, normative, and continuance commitment. The Affective, Normative, and Continuance Commitment scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1991) measures commitment across three dimensions (see Appendix E). The questionnaire contains three

subscales. The Affective commitment subscale consists of eight statements assessing employees' attitudes toward their job (e.g., "This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me."). Participants rate items on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree) with $\alpha = .85$. The Normative subscale contains eight statements measuring the degree to which employees feel obligated to remain with their organization (e.g., "This organization deserves my loyalty.") with $\alpha = .86$. The Continuance subscale has a total of nine items, statements that assess the amount to which the employees' feel they need to stay at the current organization (e.g., "Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire."). This scale showed $\alpha = .85$. The rating scales on both the Normative and Continuance subscales are the same as the Affective subscale.

Results

Descriptive statistics including means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations can be found in Table 1. All analyses were conducted with a significance level of $p \leq .05$.

Hypothesis 1

To test Hypothesis 1 which predicts that alternatives, investments, and satisfaction will predict organizational commitment, a linear regression was performed which revealed that alternatives ($\beta = -.10, p = .02$), investments ($\beta = .30, p < .01$), and satisfaction ($\beta = .48, p < .01$) each significantly predicting organizational commitment $F(2, 265) = 77.64, R^2 = .47, p < .01$. When trait conscientiousness was entered into the regression to control for personality, it was found that it accounted for no significant variance ($\beta = .05, p = .35$).

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 which predicted that commitment would predict OCB was tested with a linear regression. Commitment ($\beta = .42, p < .01$) significantly predicted with $F(1, 266) = 57.04, R^2 = .18, p < .01$. A second regression controlling for trait conscientiousness ($\beta = .52, p < .01$) showed that conscientiousness along with commitment ($\beta = .32, p < .01$) also significantly predicted OCB with $F(2, 257) = 98.45, R^2 = .44, p < .01$.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 includes several predictions that workplace behaviors will be predicted by commitment. These were tested using linear regressions. First, commitment ($\beta = .11, p < .07$) was found to have a marginally significant effect on predicting the desire to remain with $F(2, 254) = 1.66, R^2 = .01, p < .01$. However, conscientiousness ($\beta = -.04, p = .55$) did not significantly predict the desire to remain.

One's intent to remain at their current job ($\beta = .71, p < .01$) was found to be significantly predicted by commitment with $F(2, 254) = 121.95, R^2 = .49, p = .04$. Once again, conscientiousness ($\beta = -.40, p = .39$) did not significantly predict the intent to remain.

Lastly, the influence of commitment on social outcomes such as friendships with coworkers was investigated. It was found that both commitment ($\beta = .33, p < .01$) and conscientiousness ($\beta = .16, p = .008$) significantly predicted social outcomes with $F(2, 251) = 22.89, R^2 = .16, p < .01$.

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 predicts that alternatives, satisfaction, and investments will significantly predict OCB and workplace behaviors. Linear regressions were conducted controlling for conscientiousness to investigate their effects on OCB. Investments, satisfaction, and conscientiousness all significantly predicted OCB (see Table 2). None of the variables, however, significantly predicted the desire to remain (see Table 3). One's intent to remain was significantly predicted by satisfaction, but alternatives and investments only marginally predicted intent to remain (see Table 4). Finally, social outcomes were significantly predicted by satisfaction, investments, and marginally by conscientiousness (see Table 5).

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 predicts that commitment will be a mediating variable for satisfaction, alternatives, and investments on OCB. To test for mediation several criteria must be met. First, it must be shown that commitment is a significant predictor of OCB. A linear regression showed that commitment ($\beta = .42, p < .001$) significantly predicted OCB with $F(3, 265) = 57.05, R^2 = .18, p < .01$. Secondly, satisfaction, alternatives, and investments must each predict commitment which was found in the results for Hypothesis 1. Additionally, alternatives, satisfaction, and investments all must individually significantly predict OCB. A regression found that alternatives ($\beta = .07, p < .18$) did not significantly predict OCB with $F(3, 265) = 39.18, R^2 = .31, p < .001$. However, satisfaction ($\beta = .20, p < .01$) and investments ($\beta = .44, p < .01$) each were associated with OCB (see Table 6). Though commitment failed to mediate the relationship between alternatives and OCB, a Sobel test was conducted to determine if commitment mediates the relationship between both satisfaction and alternatives on OCB. The test revealed that

commitment mediated the association between satisfaction and OCB with ($z = 2.29, p < .05$). A partial mediation was found between investments and OCB with ($z = 2.14, p < .05$).

Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis 6 assesses the strength of the Investment Model to predict OCB compared to the Three-Component Model. A linear regression was conducted which found that only investments ($\beta = .23, p < .001$) and conscientiousness ($\beta = .43, p < .001$) significantly predicted OCB with $F(8, 252) = 33.03, R^2 = .52, p < .001$, somewhat supporting our hypothesis as one of the Investment Model components and none of the Meyer and Allen components significantly predicted OCB (see Table 7).

Exploratory Analyses

In addition, some exploratory analyses were performed on between group differences for some of the hypotheses. The groups were formed by combining professors and K-12 teachers ($n = 89$) and comparing them to the student workers ($n = 95$). For means and standard deviations (see Table 8).

Hypothesis 1 was tested to compare the teachers and the student workers on predictors of commitment. A linear regression on the teachers revealed that investments ($\beta = .22, p < .02$) and satisfaction ($\beta = .42, p < .001$) significantly predicted commitment, and alternatives ($\beta = -.16, p < .09$) marginally predicted commitment $F(3, 87) = 13.12, R^2 = .32, p < .001$. The student workers showed that satisfaction ($\beta = .54, p < .001$) significantly predicted commitment, but investments ($\beta = .12, p < .19$) and alternatives ($\beta = .02, p < .79$) did not $F(3, 94) = 16.42, R^2 = .35, p < .001$ (see Table 9).

Hypothesis 6 weighs the Investment Model against the Three Component Model on predicting OCB while controlling for conscientiousness for the teachers and the student workers. In a linear regression for the teachers, only normative commitment ($\beta = .32, p < .007$) and conscientiousness ($\beta = .46, p < .001$) significantly predicted OCB with $F(8, 81) = 5.71, R^2 = .39, p < .001$ (see Table 10). In the student workers group, only conscientiousness ($\beta = .51, p < .001$) was a significant predictor of OCB with $F(8, 90) = 9.04, R^2 = .47, p < .001$ (see Table 11).

To test whether teachers or student workers differed in their alternatives, satisfaction, investments, conscientiousness, and commitment an independent samples t-test was conducted. The teachers significantly differed from the student workers in investments, satisfaction, commitment, and conscientiousness; however, the groups did not significantly differ in alternatives with $t(182) = -.60, p = .55$ (see Table 12).

Discussion

The goal of the present study was to extend the literature on the Investment Model to an organizational setting and to use it investigate commitment on OCB. Evidence was found to support several of our hypotheses on the Investment Model and OCB. The first hypothesis was supported as satisfaction, alternatives, and investments predicted commitment. The second hypothesis, that commitment will predict OCB was also supported. In addition, commitment significantly predicted the workplace outcomes of intent to remain and social behaviors, but the desire to remain did not have a significant relationship with commitment; therefore, the third hypothesis was only partially supported. Hypothesis 4 which expected that satisfaction, alternatives, and investments would each predict OCB, social behaviors, and the desire and intent to remain was

partially supported. Both satisfaction and alternatives predicted OCB. None of the components predicted desire to remain, and only satisfaction predicted intent to remain. Lastly, satisfaction and investments were associated with social outcomes on the job. The fifth hypothesis, which predicted that commitment would mediate the relationship between satisfaction, alternatives, and investments on OCB and was partially supported. Commitment fully mediated satisfaction and partially mediated investments on OCB; however commitment failed to mediate the association between alternatives and OCB. The final hypothesis was supported, for the Investment Model was found to be a better predictor of OCB than the Three-Component Model.

In addition to these six hypotheses exploratory analyses were conducted to examine differences between the teachers and the student workers. For the teachers, satisfaction and investments predicted commitment, and alternatives were a marginally significant predictor. Overall, only normative commitment and trait conscientiousness predicted OCB for this group.

In the student workers group, it was found that only satisfaction predicted commitment to the job, and only conscientiousness predicted OCB. The teachers significantly differed from the student workers in investments, satisfaction, commitment level, and conscientiousness; however the groups did not differ in alternatives.

Hypothesis 1

The findings for Hypothesis 1 provide overall support for the Investment Model predicting organizational commitment. This aligns with Rusbult and Farrell (1983) which shows that the Investment Model can be applied in an organizational setting. These results are also consistent with Le and Agnew (2003) which shows overall support for the

model and includes analyses on organizational commitment research. When controlling for the personality trait of conscientiousness, evidence was found to support the Investment Model as a broad, inclusive theoretical model that accounts for individual differences.

Hypothesis 2

The results for the second hypotheses also mirror previous findings for studies conducted on organizational commitment and OCB. Schappe (1998) found that of the variables of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice, only organizational commitment significantly predicted OCB. The present study provides further evidence for this relationship in addition to showing that the Investment Model's construct of commitment has the ability to predict OCB, a major strength of the present research.

The results suggest that OCB may indeed function similarly to the maintenance behaviors found in romantic relationships. When one is committed to their job, they engage in OCB, which may serve to communicate their commitment to the organization. By helping coworkers, speaking highly of the organization, and not wasting company time employees actively demonstrate their organizational commitment.

When controlling for conscientiousness, this trait was found to be a significant predictor of OCB. While it was predicted that conscientiousness would not have a significant effect, the present findings are not surprising, for several studies have shown trait conscientiousness as a predictor of OCB (Hatrup, O'Connell, & Wingate, 1998; LePine & Van Dyne, 2001; Neuman & Kickul, 1998). Furthermore, we found that trait conscientiousness and the conscientiousness subscale of OCB were highly correlated.

Though past research has shown that these factors are indeed distinct, it seems that conscientiousness is personality trait that is highly influential in workplace behavior. While it was expected that the Investment Model commitment construct would account for personality differences, perhaps conscientiousness may be one of the few personality variables that has a strong significant effect on OCB. It also may be highly distinct from commitment and, therefore, cannot be accurately accounted for with that construct or the other components of the Investment Model.

Hypothesis 3

It was found that commitment also predicted several workplace behaviors besides OCB. The intent to remain at the current organization, a variable that is frequently measured in the literature on organizational commitment with the Three-Component Model, was assessed using Investment Model and found to be predicted by Rusbult's commitment. Furthermore, it is relevant to add that intent to remain and commitment might actually be similarly operationalized, for both constructs center on the idea that the individual plans on staying within a particular relationship. Consequently, it is likely that this variable is not truly an outcome, but rather a redundancy in constructs of commitment.

One's desire to remain with the current employer was marginally predicted by commitment. This suggests that despite being committed, one may not necessarily want to stay with their organization. This finding can still be explained using interdependence theory the concept from which the Investment Model developed. It may be the case that these individuals do not want to stay, however, still are committed because of high investments and/or low alternatives. In essence they are dependent, but not necessarily

satisfied in the relationship. Rusbult and Martz (1995) conducted a study of women in abusive relationships, finding that despite low satisfaction, many still had high levels of commitment, citing reasons such as financial investments, children, or a lack of available alternative partners. Commitment level predicted those who returned to their partners, even if the women reported feeling highly dissatisfied. While our sample may not want to stay with their organization, they might still report being committed due to possessing high investments and/or low alternatives. Some examples of this scenario might include having an excellent benefits package at the current place of employment, spending a large amount of time and/or money on schooling or professional training, or simply having few other job options.

Social outcomes were shown to be predicted by commitment, supporting the hypothesis. Amodio and Showers (2005) found that in highly committed relationships having similar traits correlated with liking. Though this study focused on romantic relationships, it is plausible that this finding is evident in the results of the present study with individuals viewing their coworkers as similar to themselves. Additionally, it might be appropriate to suggest all employees belong to the same in-group; therefore, commitment to the organization would likely also entail a liking for those who are also committed to the group. This aligns with the literature on attraction, which shows that people tend to prefer others who are similar to themselves (Newcomb, 1961). Similarity in this case could be simply belonging to the same career, educational institution, or place of employment. Furthermore, this finding could also be explained in the relationship literature. The developing and fostering of connections within one's relationship partner's network may be a type of maintenance behavior, for it communicates a desire to

incorporate oneself into the relationship partner's social life. Self-expansion theory posits that closeness between relationship partners can be described as a process of including the other's resources and experiences within one's own identity or a feeling of possessing or owning these things can feasibly offer an explanation of this finding (Aron & Aron, 1997).

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 focused on satisfaction, investments, and alternatives and their influence on OCB as well as the set of three workplace outcomes with results showing that satisfaction and investments predicted OCB. Organ (1988) gathered support from numerous studies all of which found that job satisfaction predicts OCB.

Investments as operationalized in the present research, has not previously been shown as a predictor of OCB in the literature, making this finding a major strength of the study. Investments are items of value the employee has placed into the relationship with the organization. In the face of high investments, performing OCB may be a way to ease feelings of indebtedness. When the individual realizes what is at stake in the relationship, it is likely that they would take action to prevent relationship dissolution in order to protect their assets. OCB may function as a means to strengthen a relationship that one cannot afford to lose.

Alternatives did not predict OCB, differing from a study by Thau, Bennet, Stahlberg, and Werner (2004) that found that when individuals had low or no alternatives, they performed more OCB. However, this study is the only published research on this topic, and more work may need to be done in order to find more conclusive evidence on alternatives and OCB. Furthermore, Trait conscientiousness also

significantly predicted OCB which providing further evidence that more conscientious individuals seem to perform OCB.

Desire to remain was not predicted by any of the three variables. A desire to remain could be factor tied to personal or emotional reasons, not fully captured with this model. While the satisfaction component should account for these individual preferences, it does not seem to be functioning as expected in the present study. It is possible that the desire to remain variable may not be theoretically relevant enough to the Investment Model, and, consequently, it might not be able to predict this behavioral outcome.

Intent to remain was predicted by satisfaction and predicted marginally by alternatives and investments. As it seems that intent to remain is operationalized very similarly to commitment, and satisfaction is the strongest predictor of commitment in the Investment Model, this finding aligns with the overall findings of the model. In addition, alternatives and investments predicted intent also supporting past findings of Investment Model research.

Social outcomes were predicted by satisfaction and investments. Social outcomes likely provide a source of satisfaction, for personal relationships with coworkers may be a desirable outcome of one's expectations for the job. One's social network within an organization may very feasibly be categorized as an investment as those relationships could be valuable assets to the individual, something that they placed time and energy into developing and maintaining. In addition, it may also be that one's satisfaction with a job easily facilitates relationships within the organization because it may be an arena in which to maximize positive outcomes which can then provide a boost to satisfaction. Likewise, job satisfaction may also be a result of having desirable coworker relationships.

Hypothesis 5

It was predicted that commitment would mediate the relationship between satisfaction, alternatives, and investments on OCB. Commitment was found to fully mediate the association between satisfaction and OCB as the effects of satisfaction were less significant when commitment was added to the analysis. Commitment partially mediated the relationship between investments and OCB. Alternatives, however, were not mediated by commitment. Finding support for commitment as a mediator in two of the three components shows its strength as a predictor of OCB. Furthermore, the Investment Model operationalization of commitment as both a global and faceted construct seems to be an effective predictor of OCB. While various other commitment measures have been shown to predict OCB, the Investment Model has never been one of them; however, with the present research, evidence now exists to show that the model can predict OCB as well.

Hypothesis 6

The last hypothesis expected that the Investment Model will be more effective predictor of OCB than the Three-Component Model. It was shown that none of Meyer and Allen's commitment components significantly predicted OCB, and investments served as a significant predictor which alternatives was a marginally significant predictor. Furthermore, conscientiousness was a significant predictor. These findings suggest that not only are particular personality types more likely to perform OCB, but feeling that one has valuable assets placed into their relationship with the organization is a strong predictor of who performs OCB. It may be appropriate to again, interpret high investments as something that must be protected, which could be functioning as a

motivation for an individual to protect their relationship by enacting OCB.

Conscientiousness again, cannot be ruled out, for it consistently is found to be a predictor of OCB. This finding implies that the Investment Model should be implemented in future research on organizational commitment as well as work on OCB.

Exploratory Analyses

Exploratory analyses were conducted to investigate differences between teachers and college student workers. Baseline levels of investments, alternatives, satisfaction, commitment, and conscientiousness show that the groups significantly differ from one another in all variables except alternatives.

Hypothesis 1 was tested for the teachers group, and results support the hypothesis as investments and satisfaction significantly predicted commitment, and alternatives marginally predicted commitment. It is worth noting that this group reported higher levels of satisfaction with their job than the students. In addition, the teachers show higher levels of investments which could be due to a variety of factors including the amount of education and training needed to become a teacher or professor, the sense of identity that comes with a professional career path, the dependence on the income, and perhaps even a feeling of investment arising from relationships with their students. Lastly, alternatives marginally predicted commitment in the teacher group, unlike in the student workers. However, both groups did not differ on baseline measures of alternatives.

For the student workers, only satisfaction was a significant predictor of commitment. This could suggest that only the extent to which student workers value positive outcomes leads to job commitment. It may be the case that the students are more

motivated by enjoyment and positive experiences, perhaps as a result of their age.

However, satisfaction, according to past research on the Investment Model is the strongest predictor of commitment; therefore, this finding might not be that surprising.

Neither investments nor alternatives predicted commitment for the students. It is possible that because the student workers are primarily working part time, it might be that they simply do not have as much invested in their jobs. These jobs are relatively abundant and more than likely do not require extensive training. Student workers generally do not spend more than a few years maximum at their jobs and probably work less than forty hours a week. Furthermore, as these jobs are part time, it seems unlikely personal identity or financial security would be completely jeopardized upon job loss.

Hypothesis 6, which expected that the Investment Model would be a better predictor of OCB than the Three-Component Model, was also examined for both groups. For teachers, the only predictors of OCB were conscientiousness and normative commitment. Conscientiousness was found to still have a strong influence on OCB, especially in this analysis as it was pitted against eight other variables, but still was a significant predictor. Normative commitment as a significant predictor still can be interpreted as support for the Investment Model. A sense of duty or obligation can be functioning similarly to investments as this feeling may simply be the awareness of one's indebtedness, a feeling that can be alleviated by protecting the current relationship from dissolution with performance of pro-social, relationship maintenance behaviors.

In the student workers group, conscientiousness was still a significant factor in predicting OCB. Perhaps paralleling the teachers' group normative commitment finding, investments was a marginally significant predictor of OCB for students. As found

repeatedly in the results of the present study as well as throughout the literature, conscientiousness seems to be the best predictor of OCB. Moreover, a feeling of investment or obligation also seems to be an effective predictor of the performance of OCB. Overall, the between groups analysis for Hypothesis 6 parallel the findings for the entire sample.

Strengths and Limitations

The current study not only extends the work on the Investment Model on organizational commitment, an area that has not received much attention in the literature as most of the research on organizational commitment stems from the Three-Component Model, but also it contributes to the OCB literature providing evidence to support that the Investment Model as an effective framework for predicting OCB. The present research simultaneous joins organizational commitment research and OCB research with the use of a single theoretical model.

As much of the literature on organizational commitment and OCB is disordered and redundant, the present research serves to clarify the past research by placing many of the previously investigated variables into a coherent, theoretically established model. Moreover, this study found that the Investment Model better predicted OCB than the Three-Component Model. Though Meyer and Allen's model has been utilized in a majority of the organizational literature, the present study shows support for the effectiveness of the Investment Model. Rusbult's model stems from a well-established theoretical background. All three Meyer and Allen commitment components, are paralleled, described and organized more effectively in the Investment Model framework,

where, unlike the Three-Component Model, commitment can be both a global and a faceted construct.

This study provided further support for the Investment as a mediated model with commitment mediating the relationship between satisfaction, alternatives, and investments on behavior outcomes. While much of the literature on the Investment Model in personal relationships provides evidence for the mediated model, the present research provides evidence to support this in organizational settings as well. Furthermore, these results also support the generalizability of the Investment Model, for it has been shown to function with employees in a variety of occupational fields, including educators and college student workers.

This study also added evidence to the literature to support that organizational commitment predicts social outcomes in the workplace. One's commitment level does determine the extent to which they develop relationships with their coworkers in the form of spending time with one another outside of the work setting, etc. Previous work has shown that workplace social networks are related to OCB performance (Bowler & Brass, 2006). While the present work does not show this directly, evidence exists that suggests that both behaviors can be predicted with organizational commitment.

An unexpected finding in the current study was the strong influence of trait conscientiousness on commitment and OCB. While past work has shown that this trait does predict OCB, the researchers expected individual differences to be accounted within the Investment Model (Hattrup, O'Connell, & Wingate, 1998; LePine & Van Dyne, 2001; Neuman & Kickul, 1998). It is possible that either the Investment Model may indeed sufficiently account for personality and our methodology is the cause of this

finding or that conscientiousness may be the one particularly strong Big Five trait that stands out as a unique predictor in organizational settings. However, it may simply be the case that individuals higher in conscientiousness are more committed workers who also perform more OCB due to their personality.

One limitation that could be present in this study is the sole use of self-report measures which in general pose a threat to validity due to inherent self-presentational biases. This may be particularly relevant in the current study as individuals may report being more hard-working and generous than they truly are in the workplace because it is socially desirable to enact those behaviors. A solution to this limitation would be to implement supervisor and peer ratings in addition to the individual's self-report in future work.

Future Directions

Based on the findings from the current study, future work should entail further study of organizational commitment using the Investment Model. The relationship between OCB and social outcomes using the Investment Model, perhaps with special attention to the extent to which coworker relationships are considered investments should be an area of future investigation. Additionally, researchers should continue to pursue the effects of personality variables, in order to clarify the effect of all of the Big Five traits on commitment. It might also be worthwhile to investigate more behavioral types of dependent variables instead of using only self-report. Future work should continue to implement the Investment Model to consider other types of workplace outcomes, specifically punctuality and absenteeism, both of which not garnered significant work in the literature and have not been assessed using the Investment Model. As work is a

universal aspect of life, the Investment Model should be used to study workplace behavior in cross cultural work to see if the effects still hold or how they may differ.

Conclusions

As organizational commitment has been shown to be important predictor of pro-social workplace, it can be said that a committed employee is invaluable to the organization, for that person will give back to the organization, often in ways that could never be regulated or required. To maximize the efficient functioning of various workplaces and industries, it seems to be of the utmost importance to hire individuals who will be committed employees in addition to fostering commitment in those who are already employed within the organization. Researchers should continue to investigate commitment, its antecedents, and outcomes, for productivity will likely improve with an increased knowledge of human behavior in the workplace.

References

- Allen, N., & Meyer, J. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49(3), 252-276.
- 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, 247–260.
- Amodio, D.M. & Showers, C. J. (2005). 'Similarity breeds liking' revisited: The moderating role of commitment. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 22(6), 817-836.
- Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. L. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(1), 1-14.
- Aron, A., & Aron, E. N. (1997). Self-expansion motivation and including other in the self. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Handbook of personal relationships: Theory, research, and interventions* (2nd ed., pp. 251-270). London: John Wiley & Sons.
- Arriaga, X. B., & Agnew, C. R. (2001). Being committed: Affective cognitive, and conative components of relationship commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 1190-1230.
- Becker, T. E., & Billings, R. S. (1993). Profiles of commitment: An empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 177–190.
- Blau, G. (1989). Testing generalizability of a career commitment measure and its impact on employee turnover. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 35, 88-103.

- Bommer, W. H., Miles, E. W., Grover, S. L. (2003). Does one good turn deserve another? Coworker influences on employee citizenship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*(2), 181-196.
- Bowler, W. M. & Brass, D. J. (2006). Relational correlates of interpersonal citizenship behavior: A social network perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(1), 70-82.
- Branje, S. J. T., Frijns, T., Finkenauer, C., Engels, R., & Meeus, W. (2007). You are my best friend: Commitment and stability in adolescents' same-sex friendships. *Personal Relationships, 14*, 587-603.
- Burman, M. A., Pennebaker, J. W. & Glass, D. C. (1975). Time consciousness, achievement striving and the Type A coronary-prone behavior pattern. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 84*, 76-79.
- Carpenter, P. J., & Coleman, R. (1998). A longitudinal test of elite youth cricketers' commitment. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 29*, 195–210.
- Chen, C., & Chui, S. (2008). An integrative model linking supervisor support and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 23*(1-2), 1-10.
- 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.
- Chui, S., & Chen, H. (2005). Relationship between job characteristics and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediational role of job satisfaction. *Social Behavior and Personality, 33*(6), 523-540.
- Dishon-Berkovits, M., & Koslowsky, M. (2002). Determinants of employee punctuality

The Journal of Social Psychology, 142(6), 723-739.

Farrell, D. & Rusbult, C. E. (1981). Exchange variables as predictors of job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover: The impact of rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 27, 78-95.

Foote, D.A., & Tang, T. L. (2008). Job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior (ocb): Does team commitment make a difference in self-directed teams? *Management Decision*, 46(6), 933-947.

Gellatly, I. (1995). Individual and group determinants of employee absenteeism: Test of a causal model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 469-485.

Hackett, R. D., Bycio, P., & Hausdorf, P. A. (1994). Further assessments of Meyer and Allen's (1991) 3-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 15-23.

Hall, D., Schneider, B., & Nygren, H. (1970). Personal factors in organizational identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 176-190.

Hattrup, K., O'Connell, M. S., & Wingate, P. H. (1998). Prediction of multidimensional criteria: Distinguishing task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 11, 305-319.

Hoffman, B. J., Blair, C. A., Meriac, J. P., & Woehr, D. J. (2007). Expanding the criterion domain? A quantitative review of the OCB literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 555-566.

Hrebiniak, L., & Alutto, J. (1972). Personal and role-related factors in the development of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 555-572.

Impett, E. A., Beals, K. P., & Peplau, L. A. (2002). Testing the investment model of

relationship commitment and stability in a longitudinal study of married couples.

Current Psychology, 20(4), 312-326.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theory. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, 2nd edition (pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford Press.

Johnson, M. P., Caughlin, J. P., & Huston, T. L. (1999). The tripartite nature of marital commitment: personal, moral, and structural reasons to stay married. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 160-177.

Kanter, R. M. (1968). Commitment and social organization; A study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities. *American Sociological Review*, 33(4), 499-517.

Keller, R. T. (1997). Job involvement and organizational commitment as longitudinal predictors of job performance: A study of scientists and engineers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(4), 539-545.

Kelly, H. H. (1979). *Personal relationships: their structures and processes*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kelley, H. H. & Thibaut, J. W. (1978). *Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence*. New York: Wiley.

LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 52-65.

LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (2001). Voice and cooperative behavior as contrasting forms of contextual performance: Evidence of differential relationships with big five personality characteristics and cognitive ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86,

325–336.

- Lyons, W. E., & Lowery, D. (1989). Citizen response to dissatisfaction in urban communities: A partial test of a general model. *Journal of Politics, 51*, 841-868.
- Marsh, R. M., & Mannari, H. (1977). Organizational commitment and turnover: A prediction study. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 22*(1), 57-75.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*(1), 1-18.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*, 61–89.
- 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*, 538–551.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D.J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*, 20–52.
- Morrow, P. (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case of work commitment. *Academy of Management Review, 8*, 486-500.
- Mowday, R., Porter, L., & Steers, R. (1982). *Organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York: Academic Press.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of

organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.

Newcomb, T. M. (1961). *The acquaintance process*. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, & Winston.

Neuman, G. A., & Kickul, J. R. (1998). Organizational citizenship behaviors: Achievement orientation and personality. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 13, 263-279.

Oliver, N. (1990). Rewards, investments, alternatives and organizational commitment: Empirical and evidence and theoretical development. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 19-31.

O'Reilly, C., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 492-499.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington MA: Lexington Books.

Organ, D. W. & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 157-164.

Organ, D. W. & Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 135(3), 339-350.

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.

Ping, R. A., Jr. (1997). Voice in business-to-business relationships: Cost-of-exit and demographic antecedents. *Journal of Retailing*, 73, 261-281.

- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects of followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Leadership Quarterly, 1*(2), 107-142.
- Porter, L., Steers, R., Mowday, R., & Boulian, P. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 59*, 603-609.
- Porter, L. W., Crampon, W. J., & Smith, F. J. (1976). Organizational commitment and managerial turnover: A longitudinal study. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 15*, 87-98.
- Putnam, D. E., Finney, J. W., Barkley, P. L., & Bonner, M. J. (1994). Enhancing commitment improves adherence to a medical regimen. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62*, 191-194.
- Raedeke, T. D. (1997). Is athlete burnout more than just stress? A sport commitment perspective. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 19*, 396-417.
- Randall, D. M., Fedor, D. B., & Longenecker, C. O. (1990). The behavioral expression of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 36*, 210-224.
- Rusbult, C. E. (1980a). Commitment and satisfaction in romantic associations: A test of the investment model. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 16*, 72-86.
- Rusbult, C. E. (1980b). Satisfaction and commitment in friendships. *Representative Research in Social Psychology, 11*, 96-105.
- Rusbult, C. E. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The development (and deterioration) of satisfaction and commitment in heterosexual couples. *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 101-117.

Rusbult, C.E., & Buunk, B.P. (1993). Commitment processes in close relationships: An interdependence analysis. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 10, 175-204.

Rusbult, C.E., Drigotas, S.M., & Verette, J. (1994). The investment model: An interdependence analysis of commitment processes and relationship maintenance phenomena. In D. J. Canary & L. Stafford (Eds.). *Communication and relational maintenance* (pp. 115-139). San Diego: Academic Press.

Rusbult, C. E., & Farrell, D. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The impact on job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover of variations in rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 429-438.

Rusbult, C. E., & Farrell, D. (1992). Exploring the exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect typology: The influence of job satisfaction, quality of alternatives, and investment size. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 5(3), 201-218.

Rusbult, C. E., Farrell, D., Rogers, G., & Mainous, A. G. (1988). Impact of exchange variables on exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect: An integrative model of responses to declining job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31(3), 599-627.

Rusbult, C. E., Van Lange, P.A.M., Verette, J., & Yovetich, N. A. (1993). Perceived superiority and well-being in close relationships. Unpublished manuscript, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Rusbult, C.E., Verette, J., Whitney, G.A., Slovik, L.F. & Lipkus, I. (1991). Accommodation processes in close relationship: Theory and preliminary empirical evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 53-78.

Rusbult, C. E., & Zembrodt, I. M. (1983). Responses to dissatisfaction in romantic

- involvements: A multidimensional scaling analysis. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 19, 274-293.
- Sagie, A. (1998). Employee absenteeism, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction: Another look. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 52(2), 156-171.
- Schappe, S. P. (1998). The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Psychology*, 132, 277-290.
- Senter, J. L., & Martin, J. E. (2007). Factors affecting the turnover of different groups of part-time workers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 71, 45-68.
- Somers, M. J. (1995). Organizational commitment, turnover, and absenteeism: An examination of direct and interaction effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(1), 49-58.
- Sheldon, M.E. (1971). Investments and involvements as mechanisms producing commitment to the organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 142-150.
- 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.
- Steers, R. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22(1), 46-56.
- Thau, S., Bennet, R. J., Stahlberg, G., & Werner, J. M. (2004). Why should I be generous when I have valued and accessible alternatives? Alternative exchange partners and OCB. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 607-626.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H.H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. New York: Wiley.

Van Lange, P.A.M., Rusbult, C.E., Drigotas, S. M., Arriga, X.B., Witcher, B.S., & Cox, C.L. (1997). Willingness to sacrifice in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(6), 1373-1395.

Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 418-428.

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.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics: Intercorrelations, Means, and Standard Deviations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 Alternatives	1.00								
2 Investments	-.01	1.00							
3 Satisfaction	-.19*	.44*	1.00						
4 Commitment	-.20*	.51*	.63*	1.00					
5 Affective Com	-.16*	.66*	.66*	.59*	1.00				
6 Continuance Com	-.18*	.40*	.31*	.31*	.29*	1.00			
7 Normative Com	-.17*	.27*	.37*	.37*	.48*	.23*	1.00		
8 Conscientiousness	.05	.33*	.12	.18*	.34*	.15*	.20*	1.00	
9 OCB	.03	.53*	.38*	.42*	.51*	.27*	.32*	.58*	1.00
Mean	4.18	6.30	7.14	6.75	4.82	4.04	4.45	4.12	5.39
Standard Deviation	1.54	1.98	1.49	2.10	1.45	1.50	1.46	.65	.70

* $p < .01$

Table 2

Predicting OCB with Alternatives, Satisfaction, and Investments Controlling for

Conscientiousness

Model	β	t	$p <$	R^2	F	df	$p <$
				.50	63.98	4, 256	.001
Alternatives	.05	1.08	.28				
Satisfaction	.19	3.78	.001				
Investments	.30	5.76	.001				
Conscientiousness	.46	9.79	.001				

Table 3

Predicting Desire to Remain with Alternatives, Satisfaction, and Investments Controlling for Conscientiousness

Model	β	t	$p <$	R^2	F	df	$p <$
				.02	.98	2, 253	.42
Alternatives	.01	.19	.85				
Satisfaction	.10	1.39	.17				
Investments	.05	.62	.54				
Conscientiousness	-.05	-.68	.50				

Table 4

Predicting Intent to Remain with Alternatives, Satisfaction, and Investments Controlling for Conscientiousness

Model	β	t	$p <$	R^2	F	df	$p <$
				.16	11.80	4, 253	.03
Alternatives	-.11	-1.88	.06				
Satisfaction	.28	4.27	.001				
Investments	.13	1.91	.06				
Conscientiousness	.02	.31	.76				

Table 5
Predicting Social Outcomes with Alternatives, Satisfaction, and Investments Controlling for Conscientiousness

Model	β	t	$p <$	R^2	F	df	$p <$
				.22	16.82	4, 250	.002
Alternatives	-.001	-.03	.98				
Satisfaction	.20	3.06	.002				
Investments	.30	4.48	.001				
Conscientiousness	.10	1.70	.09				

Table 6

Predicting Commitment as a Mediator of Alternatives, Satisfaction, and Investments on OCB

Model	β	t	$p <$	R^2	F	df	$p <$
				.31	39.18	3, 265	.001
Alternatives	.07	1.34	.18				
Satisfaction	.20	3.37	.001				
Investments	.44	7.74	.001				

Table 7

Predicting OCB with Investment Model Components, Conscientiousness, Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment, and Normative Commitment

Model	β	t	$p <$	R^2	F	df	$p <$
				.52	33.03	8, 252	.001
Alternatives	.08	1.75	.08				
Investments	.23	3.48	.001				
Satisfaction	.09	1.33	.18				
Com (IM)	.10	1.60	.11				
Conscientiousness	.43	8.93	.001				
Affective Com	.06	.76	.45				
Continuance Com	.05	.86	.39				
Normative Com	.09	1.65	.10				

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations for Teachers and Student Workers

	<u>Teachers</u>		<u>Student Workers</u>	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Alternatives	4.07	1.69	4.18	1.48
Investments	7.78	.86	4.56	1.72
Satisfaction	7.72	1.21	6.70	1.36
Com (IM)	7.80	1.42	5.73	2.10
Affective Com	5.50	1.12	3.89	1.25
Continuance Com	4.37	1.37	3.15	1.30
Normative Com	4.52	1.57	4.34	1.33
OCB	5.62	.52	4.99	.71
Conscientiousness	4.21	.57	3.88	.74

Table 9

Predicting Commitment in Teachers with Alternatives, Satisfaction, and Investments

<u>Teachers</u>	Model	β	t	$p <$	R^2	F	df	$p <$
					.32	13.12	3, 87	.001
	Alternatives	-.16	-1.71	.09				
	Satisfaction	.42	4.29	.021				
	Investments	.22	2.36	.001				

<u>Student Workers</u>	Model	β	t	$p <$	R^2	F	df	$p <$
					.35	16.42	3, 94	.001
	Alternatives	.02	.27	.79				
	Satisfaction	.54	5.84	.001				
	Investments	.12	1.32	.19				

Table 10

Predicting OCB in Teachers with Investment Model Components, Three-Component Model, and Conscientiousness

Model	β	t	$p <$	R^2	F	df	$p <$
				.39	5.71	8, 81	.001
Alternatives	.11	1.02	.31				
Investments	.06	.54	.59				
Satisfaction	.06	.46	.65				
Com (IM)	.07	.72	.48				
Conscientiousness	.46	4.65	.001				
Affective Com	-.07	-.49	.62				
Continuance Com	-.06	-.55	.58				
Normative Com	.32	2.76	.007				

Table 11

Predicting OCB in Student Workers with Investment Model Components, Three-Component Model, and Conscientiousness

Model	β	t	$p <$	R^2	F	df	$p <$
				.47	9.04	8, 90	.001
Alternatives	-.02	-.21	.84				
Investments	.19	1.89	.06				
Satisfaction	-.03	-.24	.81				
Com (IM)	.14	.138	.17				
Conscientiousness	.51	5.31	.001				
Affective Com	-.09	-.74	.46				
Continuance Com	-.04	-.41	.69				
Normative Com	.17	1.41	.16				

Table 12

*Predicting Differences between Teachers and Student Workers on Investment Model**Components and Conscientiousness*

Model	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> <
Alternatives	-.60	182	.55
Investments	15.29	181	.001
Satisfaction	5.41	182	.001
Commitment	7.90	182	.001
Conscientiousness	3.33	181	.001

Appendix A

Investment Model Scale

All responses are rated on 9-point Likert-type scale.

Alternatives:

1. All things considered, how good are your alternatives to this job?
2. In general, how do your alternatives compare to your current job?
3. How do your alternatives compare to your ideal way of occupying your time?

Investments:

1. All things considered, to what extent are there activities/events/persons/objects associated with your job that you would lose if you were to leave?
2. How does your investment in this job compare to what most people have invested in their jobs?
3. In general, how much have you invested in this job?

Satisfaction:

1. All things considered, how satisfied are you with your current job?
2. In general, how much do you like your job?
3. Knowing what you now know, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide?
3. If a good friend of yours told you that he/she was interested in working in a job like yours for your employer, what would you tell him/her?
4. How does this job compare to your ideal job?

5. How does your job measure up to the sort of job you wanted when you took it?

Commitment:

1. How long would you like to stay at this job?
2. How likely is it that you will quit this job in the near future?
3. How attached are you to your current job?
4. On the average, how many hours per month have you spent attempting to find a different job?

Appendix B

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Measure

Responses are obtained using a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1=strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree.

Altruism items:

1. I help others who have heavy workloads
2. I am always ready to lend a helping hand to those around me
3. I help others who have been absent
4. I willingly help others who have work-related problems
5. I help orient new people even though it is not required

Conscientiousness items:

1. I feel that I am one of the most conscientious employees
2. I believe in giving an honest day's work for an honest day's pay
3. My attendance at work is above the norm
4. I do not take extra breaks
5. I obey company rules and regulations even when no one is watching

Sportsmanship items:

1. I am the classic "squeaky wheel" that always needs greasing (R)
2. I consume a lot of time complaining about trivial matters (R)
3. I tend to make "mountains out of molehills" (R)
4. I always focus on what's wrong, rather than the positive side (R)

5. I always find fault with what the organization is doing (R)

Courtesy items:

1. I try to avoid creating problems for co-workers
2. I considers the impact of my actions on co-workers
3. I do not abuse the rights of others
4. I take steps to try to prevent problems with other employees
5. I am mindful of how my behavior affects other people's jobs

Civic virtue items:

1. I keep abreast changes in the organization
2. I attend meetings that are not mandatory, but are considered important
3. I attend functions that are not required, but help the company image
4. I read and keep up with organization announcements, memos, and so on

Appendix C

Organizational Commitment Outcomes Scale

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

I want to remain at my current job.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neither disagree nor agree			Strongly agree

I don't want to leave my current job.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neither disagree nor agree			Strongly agree

I do not have plans to leave my current job.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neither disagree nor agree			Strongly agree

I do not intend to find a new job.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neither disagree nor agree			Strongly agree

How many years have you been at your current job? _____years and _____months

If applicable, do you have tenure? _____

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

I share a friendship with one or more of my coworkers.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neither disagree nor agree			Strongly agree

I make it a point to get to know my coworkers.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neither disagree nor agree			Strongly agree

I spend time outside of work with my coworkers.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neither disagree nor agree			Strongly agree

I consider one or more of my coworkers to be friends.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neither disagree nor agree			Strongly agree

I value the relationships I have with my coworkers.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neither disagree			Strongly agree

Appendix D

The “Big Five” Inventory

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who *likes to spend time with others*? Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.

1 = Disagree Strongly

2 = Disagree a Little

3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree

4 = Agree a Little

5 = Agree Strongly

I See Myself as Someone Who . . .

____ 3. Does a thorough job

____ 8. Can be somewhat careless

____ 13. Is a reliable worker

____ 18. Tends to be disorganized

____ 23. Tends to be lazy

____ 28. Perseveres until the task is
finished

____ 33. Does things efficiently

____ 38. Makes plans and follows
through with them

____ 43. Is easily distracted

Appendix E

Affective, Normative, and Continuance Commitment

1=strongly disagree

7=strongly agree

Affective Commitment Scale Items

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

Continuance Commitment Scale Items

1. I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up.
2. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
3. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization right now.
4. It wouldn't be too costly for me to leave my organization in the near future.

5. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
6. I believe that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.
7. One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.
8. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice; another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.
9. If I had not already put so much of myself into the organization, I might consider working elsewhere.

Normative Commitment Scale Items

1. I think that people these days move from company to company too often.
2. I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.
3. Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me.
4. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I believe loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.
5. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere, I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.
6. I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization.
7. Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers.

8. I do not think that wanting to be a “company man” or “company woman” is sensible anymore.

Normative Commitment Scale Items

1. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer.
2. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.
3. I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.
4. This organization deserves my loyalty.
5. I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.
6. I owe a great deal to my organization.