

A Cross Cultural Analysis of the Mediating Role of Purpose in Life on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

J. R. Smith¹, Kelley Duncanson², Alisa L. Mosley³ & Samuel N. Perkins⁴

Abstract

This study investigated the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), job satisfaction and life satisfaction in a cross cultural setting. The dimensions of OCB include altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. However it has been cautioned that civic virtue, sportsmanship, and courtesy have dissimilar meanings and in some cases are nonexistent in other cultures. The OCB dimensions of altruism and conscientiousness were examined in the study. Additionally, this study examines the potential mediating role of the purpose in life construct, a variable not often captured for analysis in the OCB research literature. The sample consisted of US and Bahamian managers in the banking industry. Regression analysis and t-tests were performed to address study hypotheses. The study indicated significant differences existed between the two countries for dimensions of satisfaction, the two OCB dimensions and the new construct purpose in life mediates as well as increase OCB altruism and conscientiousness. Study limitations are delineated and directions for future research are offered.

Keywords: Altruism, Conscientiousness, OCB, Life Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction, Purpose in Life

¹Professor of Marketing, Jackson State University, Jackson, MS, USA. Email: jrsmith@jsums.edu, Phone: 601-979-2534, FAX 601-979-2535

²Assistant Professor of Management, School of Business, The College of the Bahamas, Oakes Field. Email: kelly.duncanson@cob.edu.bs, Phone: 242-302-4421

³Associate Vice President Academic Affairs, Tennessee State University, Nashville, TN, USA. Phone: 615-963-2923, Email: amosley@tnstate.edu

⁴Assistant Professor of Management, Jackson State University, Jackson, MS, USA. Email: Samuel.n.perkins@jsums.edu, Phone: 601-979-2979

1. Introduction

George and Brief (1988) indicated that an employee may exercise work behavior beyond the call of duty that is neither required nor expected but is paramount in maintaining the effectiveness and survival of the organization (Organ 1988). [Emphasis added] Organ (1988) specifically defines organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as an individual's conduct that represents discretionary acts not directly or explicitly recognized by a formal reward system. He also notes this behavior is not enforceable, nor found in any job description, neither is it included in an employee's written contract, but it is rather, a personal choice and the lack thereof is non-punishable. Furthermore, a few OCB researchers argue that some behaviors are generally expected of participants and explicitly agreed to when accepting a position with a company (e.g. Korschun, Bhattacharya & Swain 2014; MacCatherine 2009; Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie 2006). Moreover, when exercised, OCB can enhance the effective functioning of an organization (Podsakoff & MacKenzie 1997).

Eminent pioneers in the OCB literature study findings lend empirical support indicating a relationship existing between OCB and organizational effectiveness (e.g. Korschun, Bhattacharya & Swain 2014; Barnes, Ghumman & Scott 2013; Bowling, Eschleman & Wang 2010; MacCatherine 2009; Ackfeldt & Coote 2005, Ahearne, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff 2004; Dunlop & Lee 2004; Walz & Niehoff 2000). Organizations should manage, support, and encourage ways to promote such behavior. Hence, OCB is a paramount workplace issue that warrants continuous empirical research investigations.

The dimensions of OCB include altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. However, caution is advised when attempting to apply these dimensions across international settings. Farh, Earley, and Lin (1997) recommend that the relationship between OCB and the construct organizational justice be examined when operating in international settings. Therefore, emphasis in this research is directed toward expanding our understanding of what additional variables explain OCB in the workplace and whether OCB dimensions are transferable internationally.

2. Research Problem

This study is an investigation to address two major research questions. (1) How effective are the altruism and conscientiousness dimensions of organization citizenship behavior in explaining the job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and purpose in life constructs exercised by employees and supervisors employed in the banking industry in the United States and Bahamas? (2) Does purpose in life mediate the relationships between (a) job satisfaction and OCB and (b) life satisfaction and OCB? Based on the cross cultural literature reported above, the following predictions are advanced:

- H₁: No significant differences exist between the Bahamian and American banking employee's altruism behavior.
- H₂: No significant differences exist between the Bahamian and American banking employee's conscientiousness behavior.
- H₃: Purpose in life will increase OCB altruism when added to job and life satisfaction.
- H₄: Purpose in life will increase OCB conscientiousness when added to job and life satisfaction.
- H₅: The relationship between job satisfaction and OCB altruism will be mediated by purpose in life.
- H₆: The relationship between job satisfaction and OCB conscientiousness will be mediated by purpose in life.
- H₇: The relationship between life satisfaction and OCB altruism will be mediated by purpose in life.
- H₈: The relationship between life satisfaction and OCB conscientiousness will be mediated by purpose in life.

3. Literature Review

3.1 OCB Altruism Dimension

Altruism consists of helping a "specific" other or coming to the aid of someone who already has a problem (Organ et al., 2006).

Altruism as defined by Farh et al. (1997) is the discretionary behavior that has the effect of helping others around him or her; mostly peers, clients, or supervisors, with an organizationally relevant task or problem; and concluded that altruism is universal in nature.

Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) found that altruistic behaviors are influenced by the personality characteristic of positive affect and job satisfaction. Vey and Campbell (2004) found that altruism was more frequently considered as an extra-role behavior than other OCB dimensions. Wayne and Cordeiro (2003) study results revealed altruism may be applied differently based on gender, while a study conducted by Emmerik, Jawahar, and Stone (2005) lends empirical support to the assumption that altruism is related to OCB.

3.2 OCB Conscientiousness Dimension

Conscientiousness, sometimes referred to as generalized compliance, requires an individual to go beyond the call of duty; work attendance and cleanliness, with no target or recipient in mind (Organ et al. 2006). Farh et al. (1997) defines conscientiousness as discretionary behaviors on the part of the employee that go well beyond the minimum role requirements of the organization in the areas of attendance, obeying rules and regulations, taking breaks, and working hard. Farh et al. (1997) concluded that the Chinese OCB dimensions developed were virtually identical to conscientiousness and altruism which was identified by Organ (1988) and measured by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter (1990). The authors also concluded that conscientiousness is universal in nature.

King, George, and Hebl's (2005) research findings indicated that the impact of conscientiousness in a social context depends on a positive interpersonal orientation. However, Organ and Lingl (1995) found that conscientiousness was a significantly negative personality predictor of satisfaction with coworkers when the effect of agreeableness served as a control variable in the study. In research done by Konovsky and Organ (1996), they questioned whether certain dispositional factors could account for the relationship between contextual work attitudes and OCB and found conscientiousness predicted some forms of OCB. Conscientious people demand much of themselves and perhaps more of others, even in mundane matters that others might not consider important (Organ & Lingl 1995).

3.3 Job Satisfaction

In addition to the relationship between OCB and organizational effectiveness, researchers have further proclaimed, with some confidence that a relationship exists between OCB and job satisfaction across a variety of organizations and occupations.(e.g. Barnes, Ghumman & Scott 2013; Ueda 2012; Hrobowski-Culbreath 2011; Bowing, Eschleman & Wang 2010; Puffer1987; Scholl, Cooper & McKenna 1987; Motowidlo, Packard, & Manning 1986;Graham 1986; Williams, Podsakoff, & Huber 1986; Motowidlo 1984; Bateman & Organ 1983;Smith et al. 1983).However, individually, these studies provide weak interpretations because of some measurement or procedural problems (Organ 1988). Nevertheless, when examined as a whole, the cited studies show an apparent connection between OCB and job satisfaction. Therefore, the common belief that “a happy worker is a productive worker” really has yet to be strongly supported.

Spence and Robbins (1992) conducted a study on workaholics and found because of the high percentage of time spent in enjoyable tasks, their life satisfaction and meaning in life were at higher levels. Bonebright, Clay, and Ankenmann (2000) also found that enthusiastic workaholics had significantly more life satisfaction and purpose in life than nonenthusiastic workaholics and significantly more life satisfaction and purpose in life than enthusiastic workaholics. Therefore, reexamining the behavior of job performance, two new elements, life satisfaction and meaning in life or purpose in life may strengthen or better explain OCB. Zika and Chamberlain (1992) stated that “life satisfaction” and “meaning in life” are two recognized and relevant indicators of a persons’ well-being.

3.4 Life Satisfaction

In order to increase OCB, employers need workers who are not only satisfied with their jobs but satisfied with their life. Research has shown that individuals who are satisfied with their life are more pleasant (Chimote & Srivastava 2013; Erdogan, Bauer & Mansfield 2012; Westerfield 2012; Baral & Bhargava 2010; Greguras & Diefendorff 2010; Diener 1990; Diener & Emmons 1984).

A subjective well-being construct has been developed (Diener 1984; Diener & Larsen 1993) that assists with the understanding of unhappiness or ill-being in the form of depression, anxiety, and unpleasant emotions. Two broad aspects of subjective well-being have been identified as affective components; pleasant affect and unpleasant affect (Diener 1990; Diener & Emmons 1984) and a cognitive component, which is referred to as life satisfaction (Andrews & Withey 1976). Life satisfaction as defined by Shin and Johnson (1978) refers to a judgmental process, in which individuals assess the quality of their lives on the basis of their own unique set of criteria. Therefore, life satisfaction is a conscious cognitive judgment of one's life in which the criteria for judgment are up to the person (Pavot & Diener 1993).

Kickul and Lester (2001) found that both job and life satisfaction may be antecedents to affect and its consequences in work settings. They found positive satisfaction resulted in (1) positive mood states, (2) lower expected absenteeism and turnover intentions, and (3) greater expected OCB. The authors' research findings also revealed that life satisfaction was associated with mood states and intentions, similarly to job satisfaction; however, negative job satisfaction was more negatively influential on expectations of quitting than negative life satisfaction (Kickul & Lester 2001). Furthermore, Shoenfelt and Battista (2004) noted that negative job information was associated with lower ratings on job satisfaction, not on life satisfaction and negative life information was followed by lower ratings on life satisfaction but not job satisfaction.

3.5 Purpose in Life

Frankl (1959), a holocaust survivor, introduced the theory of "purpose in life". Purpose in life has been documented as a mediator between satisfaction with life and suicide ideation and moderated by the relation between depression and suicide ideation (Heisel & Flett 2004). Frankl (1969) suggested that life does not have a meaning or a purpose in and of itself, but rather, purpose in life is specific to the individual and comes from the circumstances of the person's immediate life.

Purpose in life is one of the driving needs of self-actualization in Maslow's top tier of the pyramid. Self-actualization implies an outwardness and openness that contrast with the introspection that can be a prerequisite for great artistic self-expression. Maslow (1954) defines this top layer as the needs that do not involve balance or homeostasis and once engaged these needs can be felt continually.

If the job satisfaction score reflects “something in the person” that is a stable condition over time, then purpose in life as a variable should be included.

Bundick (2011) explored the benefits of purpose in life with respect to youth development reflecting on emerging adulthood. Richards' (1966) investigation found a common goal among individuals was to “find a real purpose in life.” An altruistic factor emerged when life goals were certain. The meaning in life typically involves having a goal or a sense of unified purpose (Baumeister 1991). Research evidence has been provided suggesting that some degree of heritability as stable response patterns with altruism and aggression are inversely related to each other (Rushton, Fulker, Neale, Nias, & Eysenck 1986). In some research, purpose in life is used as a mediator between independent variables such as personality and locus of control.

3.6 Cross-Cultural Research Perspective

Hofstede (2001) described culture as collective programming of the minds which manifests itself not only in values, but in more superficial ways: in symbols, heroes, and rituals. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000) are of the opinion that data based research efforts directed toward determining the extent of organization citizenship behavior (OCB) being exercised by employees and supervisors in a cross-cultural context have been minimal and begs for future research explorations.

Adams, Srivastava, Herriot & Patterson (2013) conducted a sample of 232 U.S. expatriates working in the United Kingdom and 210 full-time non-expatriate employees working in diverse organizations in the United States to discern careerist orientation and organizations citizenship behavior. Hierarchical regression analyses were used to test study hypotheses. Findings indicated that employees who experienced lower life satisfaction, careerist orientation vastly affected their OCB. Findings in summary fashion indicated that “Expatriate employees with a high careerist orientation exhibited lower level of OCB than non-expatriates with a high careerist orientation.”

Paine and Organ (2000) found that different countries had alternate names for OCB: Australia "Tall Poppy/Crawler"; Chile "Fraternal criticism/support"; England "Towing the company line/brown nosing"; India "Training"; Japan "Chusei-sin" (loyalty) or "Aisha-seisin (Love of the organization); South Korea "Corporate Culture"; and Taiwan "Good Corporate Citizenship". It should also be noted that these terms are also used in US business when referring to OCB. Workplace behaviors described as altruistic, courteous, and conscientious have some cultural nuances to their meanings, as well as, the circumstances that might inhibit or facilitate these behaviors (Paine & Organ 2000). However, despite the above differences, some researchers have concluded that the general forms of citizenship behavior holds relatively well across international contexts (Lievens & Anseel 2004).

A study conducted by Farh et al. (1997) in Taiwan produced the OCB dimensions altruism, conscientiousness, and civic virtue, common to those found in the United States, while two additional dimensions, interpersonal harmony and protecting company resources, emerged specific only to the Taiwanese culture. Chiu and Chen's (2005) findings suggest that Taiwanese managers who enrich job characteristics and place greater emphasis on enhancing employees' intrinsic satisfaction promote an employees' OCB. Therefore, in order to reap the full benefits of organizational effectiveness promised, future research is needed to test the effects of cultural differences on the relationship between OCBs and other variables such as differences in value of sportsmanship between U.S. and Japanese managers (Hui, Law, & Chen 1999).

4. Methodology

The identification of the study samples will be identified and method of selection will be specified and justified to foster valid and reliable results. The samples source of data and the data collection procedures and measures are also presented to analyze the data and address the study questions posed and test whether study hypotheses are rejected or supported.

4.1 Samples

The random samples were comprised of banking industry employees from the Bahamas and Southern regions of the United States.

A pilot study was conducted to establish whether the questionnaire would be clear to members of the targeted populations. Two hundred and forty six business student majors attending a public university in the South participated. Based on the results of the factor loadings, the methodology established for this research was assumed adequate. The pilot study demonstrated that the survey instrument has sufficient power to produce scientifically valid results (See Appendix A).

4.2 The Bahamian Sample

The Bahamian Sample was comprised of eight financial institutions. Two hundred and fifty surveys were distributed between the eight banks to randomly selected managers and their employees. The Bahamian banks were authorized dealers or agents as defined by the Central Bank of the Bahamas and of equal status to those in the U.S. As authorized dealers, Bahamian banks have the authority to deal in gold and all foreign currencies (Lomer 2005).

4.3 The United States Sample

The United States sample was comprised of nine financial institutions situated in Central Mississippi, Northern Alabama, and Central Tennessee. Two hundred and fifty surveys were distributed between the nine banks to randomly selected managers and their employees. Banks selected for participation were similar to those chosen for the Bahamian sample.

Surveys were hand delivered and picked-up from each bank's Human Resources Department. Each Human Resources Director received packets with surveys in security envelopes. These envelopes were dispersed randomly to mid-level managers for distribution or to employees in their department. Each security envelope contained a survey, general directions, and a consent form. Employees that wish to participate were instructed to return the security envelope directly to the Human Resources Department.

Completed questionnaires were returned by 393 banking employees for a 78.60% response rate. One hundred and ninety-six U.S. questionnaires were returned out of 250 yielding a response rate of 78.40% and 197 Bahamian questionnaires were returned out of 250 yielding a response rate of 78.80%. Table 1 presents the sample response rates.

4.4 Procedures and Measures

The survey instrument consisted of four developed scales to measure the OCB dimensions and consequences. OCB dimensions, altruism and conscientiousness were measured using a five item scale developed by Podsakoff et al. (1990). Job satisfaction was measured using an Overall Job Satisfaction 4 item scale developed by Quinn & Shepard (1974). Life satisfaction was measured using a Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS) five item scale developed by Diener et al (1985). Purpose in life was measured using a Purpose in Life Test (PIL) 20 item scale developed by Crumbaugh and Maholic (1964). For each of their scale items, respondents used a 7-point rating scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree).

5. Results and Discussion

Table 2 shows the five factors examined from the factor analysis and their respective reliability coefficients. Cronbach alpha values illustrate the reliability of the scales used in the analysis. The Cronbach alpha coefficients for each scale exceed .70, which suggests that the measures are reliable.

Table 1: Sample Response Rate

	US	%	Bahamas	%	Totals	%
Non-returned questionnaires	49	19.60	50	20.00	99	19.80
Ineligible questionnaires / (incompletes)	5	2.00	3	1.20	8	1.60
Completed questionnaires	196	78.40	197	78.80	393	78.60
Totals	250	100.00	250	100.00	500	100.00
Study Sample Size	196		197		393	

Table 2: Reliability Coefficient Values for Factors Used in Analyses

Factor	Cronbach Alpha (α)
Factor 1 Purpose In Life	.90
Factor 2 Life Satisfaction	.87
Factor 3 OCB Altruism	.89
Factor 4 Overall Job Satisfaction	.89
Factor 5 OCB Conscientiousness	.86

Hypothesis 1 states that no significance differences exist between the Bahamian and American banking employee's altruism behavior. A t-test was performed to examine the difference between the two countries from their self-reported scores for the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Altruism dimension. The results indicate that there is a significant relationship between the two countries ($t = 5.96$, $df = 356.91$, $p < .001$). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was supported, since the American banking employees reported a higher level of Altruism ($M = 6.12$, $SD = .65$) than Bahamian banking employees ($M = 5.65$, $SD = .90$) with equal variances not assumed. The results of the t-test is shown in Table 3

Table 3: Comparison of Means Predicting OCB Altruism

	Mean	Standard Deviation
United States	6.12	0.65
Bahamas	5.65	0.90
$t = 5.96$, $df = 356.91$, $p < .001$		

Hypothesis 2 states that no significance differences exist between the Bahamian and American banking employee's conscientiousness behavior. A t-test was performed to examine the difference between the two countries on the self-reported scores for the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Conscientiousness dimension. The results indicated that there is a significant relationship between the two countries' reported Organizational Citizenship Conscientiousness behavior ($t = 6.42$, $df = 327.42$, $p < .001$). Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was not supported, since American banking employees self reported scores ($M = 6.19$, $SD = .69$) were higher than Bahamian banking employees self reported scores ($M = 5.60$, $SD = 1.11$). The results of the t-test is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Comparison of Means Predicting OCB Conscientiousness

	Mean	Standard Deviation
United States	6.19	.69
Bahamas	5.60	1.11
$t = 6.42$, $df = 327.42$, $p < .001$		

Hypothesis 3 states that Purpose in life will increase OCB altruism when added to job and life satisfaction.

Regression analyses were performed for the total sample (N=393) to discern whether the new construct, purpose in life impacted OCB altruism behavior. The regression results of the total sample indicated that the linear combination of overall job satisfaction and life satisfaction was significantly related to OCB Altruism, $F = 16.88$, $p < .001$. The $R^2 = .08$, indicates that approximately 8% of the variance in Altruism of banking employees can be accounted for by the job satisfaction and life satisfaction variables. Life Satisfaction makes the most significant contribution to Altruism ($p < .001$) and Job Satisfaction revealed a significant relationship to altruism ($p < .001$).

A second regression was performed adding the variable Purpose in Life. The results of the total sample indicated that the linear combination of overall job satisfaction, life satisfaction and purpose in life was significantly related to OCB Altruism, $F = 27.81$, $p < .001$. The $R^2 = .12$, indicating that 12% of the variance in Altruism of banking employees can be accounted for by job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and purpose in life variables. Life Satisfaction was not significant to Altruism ($p = .57$) however; Job Satisfaction revealed a significant relationship to Altruism ($p = .01$). Purpose in Life was the most significant contributor to Altruism ($p < .001$). The difference between the R^2 s was significant when a partial F test was performed ($F = 22.98$, $p < .01$). Thus, Hypothesis 3 was supported for the total sample. The results of the first and second regressions are provided in Table 5.

Regression analysis was performed for the U.S. and the Bahamian banking employees to discern whether the new construct, purpose in life significantly contributed toward determining OCB Altruism behavior in the two samples. The results of the U.S. banking employees indicated that the linear combination of overall job satisfaction and life satisfaction was significantly related to OCB Altruism, $F = 3.973$, $p = .020$. The $R^2 = .04$, indicating that approximately 4% of the variance in Altruism of American banking employees can be accounted for by the job satisfaction and life satisfaction variables. Life Satisfaction was an insignificant contribution to Altruism ($p = .340$) and Job Satisfaction significantly contributed to OCB Altruism ($p = .037$).

Table 5: Multiple Regression Analysis of Independent Variables Predicting Altruism for Total Sample

Independent Variables	Standardized Beta	SE	F	R ²
1st Regression (w/o Purpose)			16.876***	.08
Job Satisfaction	.157***	.032		
Life Satisfaction	.184***	.033		
2nd Regression (w/ Purpose)			27.808***	.12
Job Satisfaction	.126**	.030	*** p < 0.001	
Life Satisfaction	.031	.035	** p < 0.01	
Purpose In Life	.353***	.057	* p < 0.05	
partial F-test = 22.98 (p < .01)				

Only Standardized regression coefficients are shown

A second regression was performed adding the variable Purpose in Life. The regression results for the U.S. banking employees indicated that the linear combination of overall job satisfaction, life satisfaction and purpose in life was significantly related to OCB Altruism, $F = 7.872$, $p = .001$. The $R^2 = .11$, indicating that approximately 11% of the variance in Altruism of American banking employees can be accounted for by job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and purpose in life variables. Job Satisfaction significantly contributed to OCB Altruism ($p = .05$) but Life Satisfaction was an insignificant contribution to Altruism ($p = .446$) which had a negative standardized beta coefficient, indicating an inverse relationship. Purpose in Life was a significant contributor to Altruism ($p = .001$). The difference between the R^2 's was significant when a partial F test was performed ($F = 7.59$, $p < .01$). Thus, Hypothesis 3 was supported with regards to American banking employees. The results of the first and second regressions are provided in Appendix B, Table 6.

Table 6: Multiple Regression Analysis of Independent Variables Predicting Altruism for U.S. Banking Employees

Independent Variables	Beta	SE	F	R ²
1st Regression (w/o Purpose)			3.973*	.04
Job Satisfaction	.160*	.040		
Life Satisfaction	.073	.040		
2nd Regression (w/ Purpose)			7.872***	.11
Job Satisfaction	.145*	.038	*** p < 0.001 ** p < 0.01 * p < 0.05	
Life Satisfaction	-.062	.042		
Purpose In Life	.300***	.069		
partial F-test = 7.59 (p < .01)				

Only Standardized regression coefficients are shown

A Regression analysis was performed on the Bahamian banking employees to discern whether the new construct, purpose in life significantly contributes toward determining OCB altruism behavior. The results indicated that Bahamian banking employees' overall job satisfaction and life satisfaction was significantly related to OCB Altruism, $F = 10.952$, $p < .001$. The $R^2 = .10$, indicating that approximately 10% of the variance in Altruism of Bahamian banking employees can be accounted for by job satisfaction and life satisfaction variables. Life Satisfaction significantly contributed to Altruism ($p < .001$) and Job Satisfaction was an insignificant contribution to OCB Altruism ($p = .175$).

A second regression was performed adding the variable Purpose in Life. The regression results for the Bahamian banking employees indicated that the linear combination of overall job satisfaction, life satisfaction and purpose in life was significantly related to OCB Altruism, $F = 17.756$, $p < .001$. The $R^2 = .22$, indicating that approximately 22% of the variance in Altruism of Bahamian banking employees can be accounted for by job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and purpose in life variables. Job Satisfaction was an insignificant contribution to OCB Altruism ($p = .383$) and Life Satisfaction was an insignificant contribution to Altruism ($p = .170$). Purpose in Life was a significant contribution to Altruism ($p < .001$). The difference between the R^2 s was significant when a partial F test was performed ($F = 14.60$, $p < .01$).

Thus, Hypothesis 3 was supported with regards to Bahamian banking employees. The results of the first and second regressions are provided in Table 7.

Table 7: Multiple Regression Analysis of Independent Variables Predicting Altruism for Bahamian Banking Employees

Independent Variables	Beta	SE	F	R ²
1st Regression (w/o Purpose)			10.592***	.10
Job Satisfaction	.099	.046		
Life Satisfaction	.266***	.050		
2nd Regression (w/ Purpose)			17.756***	.22
Job Satisfaction	.060	.043	*** p < 0.001	
Life Satisfaction	.102	.051	** p < 0.01	
Purpose In Life	.388***	.083	* p < 0.05	
partial F-test = 14.60 (p < .01)				

Only Standardized regression coefficients are shown

Hypothesis 4 states that Purpose in Life will increase OCB conscientiousness when added to job and life satisfaction. Regression analysis was performed for the total sample including the U.S. and the Bahamian banking employees to discern whether the new construct, purpose in life significantly contributes toward determining OCB conscientiousness behavior. The regression results for the total sample indicated that a linear combination of overall job satisfaction and life satisfaction was significantly related to OCB Conscientiousness, $F = 39.043$, $p < .001$. The $R^2 = .17$, indicating that approximately 17% of the variance in Conscientiousness of banking employees can be accounted for by job satisfaction and life satisfaction variables. Life Satisfaction significantly contributed to Conscientiousness ($p < .001$) and Job Satisfaction significantly contributed to Conscientiousness ($p < .001$).

A second regression was performed adding the variable Purpose in Life. The regression results for the total sample indicated that the linear combination of overall job satisfaction, life satisfaction and purpose in life was significantly related to OCB Conscientiousness, $F = 46.774$, $p < .001$.

The $R^2 = .27$, indicating that approximately 27% of the variance in Conscientiousness of banking employees can be accounted for by job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and purpose in life variables. Life Satisfaction ($p < .05$), Job satisfaction ($p < .001$), and Purpose In Life ($p < .001$) significantly contributed to OCB Conscientiousness. The difference between the R^2 s was significant when a partial F test was performed ($F = 26.00$, $p < .01$). Thus, Hypothesis 4 was supported for the total sample. The results of the first and second regressions are provided in Table 8.

Table 8: Multiple Regression Analysis of Independent Variables Predicting Conscientiousness for Total Sample

Independent Variables	Beta	SE	F	R^2
1st Regression (w/o Purpose)			39.043***	.17
Job Satisfaction	.221***	.036		
Life Satisfaction	.272***	.038		
2nd Regression (w/ Purpose)			46.774***	.27
Job Satisfaction	.190***	.034	*** $p < 0.001$ ** $p < 0.01$ * $p < 0.05$	
Life Satisfaction	.118*	.039		
Purpose In Life	.356***	.064		
partial F-test = 26.00 ($p < .01$)				

Only Standardized regression coefficients are shown

Regression analysis was performed for the U.S. and the Bahamian banking employees to discern whether the new construct, purpose in life significantly contributes toward determining OCB conscientiousness behavior in the two groups. The regression results for the U.S. banking employees indicated that a linear combination of overall job satisfaction and life satisfaction was significantly related to OCB Conscientiousness, $F = 8.482$, $p = .001$. The $R^2 = .08$, indicating that approximately 8% of the variance in Conscientiousness of American banking employees can be accounted for by job satisfaction and life satisfaction variables. Job Satisfaction significantly contributed to Conscientiousness ($p = .05$) and Life Satisfaction significantly contributed to OCB Conscientiousness ($p = .009$).

A second regression was performed adding the variable Purpose in Life. The regression results for the U.S. banking employees indicated that the linear combination of overall job satisfaction, life satisfaction and purpose in life was significantly related to OCB Conscientiousness, $F = 11.411$, $p < .001$. The $R^2 = .15$, indicating that approximately 15% of the variance in Conscientiousness of American banking employees can be accounted for by job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and purpose in life variables. Job Satisfaction ($p = .074$) and Life Satisfaction ($p = .441$) were insignificant contributors to Conscientiousness. However, Purpose in Life was a significant contributor to Conscientiousness ($p < .001$). The difference between the R^2 s was significant when a partial F test was performed ($F = 7.96$, $p < .01$). Thus, Hypothesis 4 was supported with regards to American banking employees. The results of the first and second regressions are provided in Table 9.

A Regression analysis was performed on the Bahamian banking employees to discern whether the new construct, purpose in life significantly contributes toward determining OCB conscientiousness behavior. The results indicated that Bahamian Banking employees' overall job satisfaction and life satisfaction was significantly related to OCB Conscientiousness, $F = 26.357$, $p < .001$. The $R^2 = .21$, indicating that approximately 21% of the variance in

Table 9: Multiple Regression Analysis of Independent Variables Predicting Conscientiousness for U.S. Banking Employees

Independent Variables	Beta	SE	F	R ²
1st Regression (w/o Purpose)			8.482***	.08
Job Satisfaction	.144*	.041		
Life Satisfaction	.197**	.041		
2nd Regression (w/ Purpose)			11.411***	.15
Job Satisfaction	.129	.040	*** $p < 0.001$	
Life Satisfaction	.061	.044	** $p < 0.01$	
Purpose In Life	.301***	.072	* $p < 0.05$	
partial F-test = 7.96 ($p < .01$)				

Only Standardized regression coefficients are shown

Conscientiousness of Bahamian banking employees can be accounted for by job satisfaction and life satisfaction variables. Life Satisfaction ($p < .001$) and Job Satisfaction ($p = .002$) significantly contributed to OCB Conscientiousness.

A second regression was performed adding the variable Purpose in Life. The regression results for the Bahamian banking employees indicated that the linear combination of overall job satisfaction, life satisfaction and purpose in life was significantly related to OCB Conscientiousness, $F = 32.335$, $p < .001$. The $R^2 = .33$, indicating that approximately 33% of the variance in Conscientiousness of Bahamian banking employees can be accounted for by job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and purpose in life variables. Job Satisfaction ($p = .006$) and Life Satisfaction ($p = .011$) significantly contributed to Conscientiousness. Purpose in Life accounted for the most significant contribution to Conscientiousness ($p < .001$). The difference between the R^2 s was significant when a partial F test was performed ($F = 17.48$, $p < .01$). Thus, Hypothesis 4 was supported with regards to Bahamian Banking employees. The results of the first and second regressions are provided in Table 10.

Table 10: Multiple Regression Analysis of Independent Variables Predicting Conscientiousness for Bahamian Banking Employees

Independent Variables	Beta	SE	F	R ²
1st Regression (w/o Purpose)			26.357***	.21
Job Satisfaction	.215**	.053		
Life Satisfaction	.342***	.058		
2nd Regression (w/ Purpose)			32.335***	.33
Job Satisfaction	.175**	.049	*** $p < 0.001$ ** $p < 0.01$ * $p < 0.05$	
Life Satisfaction	.176**	.059		
Purpose In Life	.393***	.095		
partial F-test = 17.48 ($p < .01$)				

Only Standardized regression coefficients are shown

Hypothesis 5 states that the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB altruism will be mediated by the purpose in life construct. Regressions were run using the Causal method as well as the Sobel, Aroian, and Goodman tests for the total sample population.

The results indicated that for the total sample, purpose in life significantly mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB altruism ($z = 4.20$, $p < .001$). Regressions and the Sobel, Aroian, and Goodman tests were repeated for the U.S. population and the results indicated that purpose in life significantly mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB altruism ($z = 2.50$, $p < .05$). The same analysis was repeated for the Bahamian sample and the results indicated that purpose in life significantly mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB altruism ($z = 3.10$, $p < .01$). Hypothesis 5 was supported and the results are provided

Table 11. Hypothesis 6 states that the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB conscientiousness will be mediated by the purpose in life construct. Regressions were run using the Causal method as well as the Sobel, Aroian, and Goodman tests for the total sample population. The results indicated that for the total employee banking sample, purpose in life

Table 11: Regression Analysis and Sobel/Aroian/Goodman tests for Purpose in Life Construct Mediating between Job Satisfaction and Altruism

	All Bank Employees	US Bank Employees	Bahamian Bank Employees
Z-value	4.20	2.50	3.10
Regression	$p < .001$	$p < .05$	$p < .01$
Sobel test	$p < .001$	$p < .05$	$p < .01$
Aroian test	$p < .001$	$p < .05$	$p < .01$
Goodman test	$p < .001$	$p < .05$	$p < .01$

significantly mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB conscientiousness ($z = 4.40$, $p < .001$). Regressions and the Sobel, Aroian, and Goodman tests were repeated for the U.S. population and the results indicated that purpose in life significantly mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB conscientiousness ($z = 2.60$, $p < .01$). The same analysis was repeated for the Bahamian sample and the results indicated that purpose in life significantly mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB conscientiousness ($z = 3.20$, $p < .001$). Hypothesis 6 was supported for all three groupings of banking employees and the results are provided in Table 12.

Table 12: Regression Analysis and Sobel/Aroian/Goodman Tests for Purpose in Life Construct Mediating between Job Satisfaction and Conscientiousness

	All Bank Employees	US Bank Employees	Bahamian Bank Employees
Z-value	4.40	2.60	3.20
Regression	$p < .001$	$p < .01$	$p < .001$
Sobel test	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p < .001$
Aroian test	$p < .001$	$p < .010$	$p < .01$
Goodman test	$p < .001$	$p < .01$	$p < .001$

Hypothesis 7 states that the relationship between life satisfaction and OCB altruism will be mediated by the purpose in life construct. First, regressions were run using the Causal method as well as the Sobel, Aroian, and Goodman tests for the total sample population. The results indicated that purpose in life significantly mediates the relationship between life satisfaction and OCB altruism ($z = 5.81, p < .001$). Regressions and the Sobel, Aroian, and Goodman tests were repeated for the U.S. population and the results indicated that purpose in life significantly mediates the relationship between life satisfaction and OCB altruism ($z = 3.50, p < .001$). The same analysis was repeated for Bahamian banking employees and the results indicated that purpose in life significantly mediates the relationship between life satisfaction and OCB altruism ($z = 4.40, p < .001$). Hypothesis 7 was supported and the results are provided in Table 13.

Table 13: Regression Analysis and Sobel/Aroian/Goodman Tests for Purpose in Life Construct Mediating between Job Satisfaction and Conscientiousness

	All Bank Employees	US Bank Employees	Bahamian Bank Employees
Z-value	5.81	3.50	4.40
Regression	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p < .001$
Sobel test	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p < .001$
Aroian test	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p < .001$
Goodman test	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p < .001$

Hypothesis 8 states that the relationship between life satisfaction and OCB conscientiousness will be mediated by the purpose in life construct. Regressions were performed using the Causal method in addition to the Sobel, Aroian, and Goodman tests for the total sample population.

The results indicated that purpose in life significantly mediates the relationship between life satisfaction and OCB conscientiousness ($z = 6.10, p < .001$). Regressions and the Sobel, Aroian, and Goodman tests were repeated for the U.S. population and the results indicated that purpose in life significantly mediates the relationship between life satisfaction and OCB conscientiousness ($z = 3.56, p < .001$). The same analysis was repeated for the Bahamian sample and the results indicated that purpose in life significantly mediates the relationship between life satisfaction and OCB conscientiousness ($z = 4.60, p < .001$). Hypothesis 8 was supported and the results are provided in Table 14.

Table 14: Regression Analysis and Sobel/Aroian/Goodman Tests for Purpose in Life Construct Mediating between Job Satisfaction and Conscientiousness

	All Bank Employees	US Bank Employees	Bahamian Bank Employees
Z-value	6.10	3.56	4.60
Regression	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p < .001$
Sobel test	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p < .001$
Aroian test	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p < .001$
Goodman test	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p < .001$

As a result of statistical analyses testing study hypotheses, findings fared quite well in indicating that the new construct "Purpose in Life" significantly contributes toward Organizational Citizenship Behavior exercised by the US and Bahamian sample respondents.

Study findings fairly well supported the hypothesized predictions that the Purpose in Life construct significantly mediate the US and Bahamian managers and employees job performance OCB in the workplace.

6. Study Limitations and Future Research

6.1 Study Limitations

An apparent limitation of study findings for generalization purposes is a random sampling of banks in the southern region of the United States.

It is quite apparent that southern culture may significantly differ from that of New England, Midwestern, Western, and Northern managers and employees OCB exemplified in the workplace.

An apparent limitation of this study was the use of two dimensions of OCB (altruism and conscientiousness) instead of all five normally investigated in OCB studies. However it has been cautioned that civic virtue, sportsmanship, and courtesy have dissimilar meanings and in some cases are nonexistent in other cultures.

The sampling unit poses limitations of study results. The banking industry was investigated as the unit for analysis because of its relative significance to the Bahamian economy. Would similar results have been obtained if other service and goods industries were researched as units for analyses to determine employee OCB in other countries cultural comparative studies?

The sample size was appropriate while the data collection and analyses may pose limitations on study findings. Scores were self reported which might suggest a halo effect regarding employees OCB. Rather than having a supervisor rate the employees on their altruism and conscientiousness behavior, employees rated themselves on their helpfulness and conscientiousness.

Control mechanisms must be in place to insure that OCB is separately measured among supervisors and employees. Employees and supervisors should not rate themselves. Well constructed cross-cultural research designs should guard against such confounding of data collected.

6.2 Future Research

Future cross-cultural comparative US and Bahamian studies should focus on other OCB dimensions such as sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue to ascertain whether significant relationships exist with the job satisfaction, life satisfaction and purpose in life constructs. Studies should focus on an assessment of total sample respondents as well as US and Bahamian sample groups separately. Valuable information may be obtained if within and across sample groups' differences and similarities are assessed with respect to OCB dimensions being exercised by employees in both countries.

It is indeed critical to emphasize that employee cultural differences be recognized and embraced when conducting cross-cultural OCB research. Several managers in this study noted that home training was very important with regards to employees being helpful and conscientious in the workplace. The American and some Bahamian managers basically concluded that training and teaching organizational citizenship behaviors were quite challenging and difficult to assess at times.

Hofstede's (1980) seminal work on cultural consequences should be a continuous avenue for future research in the OCB literature. Cultural dimensions such as individualism/collectivism have shown to play a role in citizenship behavior (van Dyne, Vandewalle, Kostova, Latham, & Cummings, 2000; Moorman & Blakely, 1995).

A continuous research priority should be empirical research efforts directed toward studying all OCB dimensions (altruism, conscientiousness, civic virtue, sportsmanship, and courtesy) and their relationship to the job satisfaction, life satisfaction and purpose in life constructs in single and cross-cultural company settings to discern employee OCB.

Another avenue for future OCB single country and cross-cultural research directions should focus on employees in other service (e.g. tourism, health care, telecommunications, food services, transit, entertainment) and goods (e.g. clothing, food, pharmaceuticals, furniture, automobiles, industrial) industries.

7. Managerial Implications

It is indeed critical that administrators employed in multinational corporations be cognizant of cultural differences that exist in the workplace. A formal screening process identifying documented job descriptions, qualifications, and specifications should be in place. Inevitably, this procedure should complement a purpose in life ideology, job satisfaction and subsequent satisfactory work productivity and OCB.

References

- Ackfeldt, A.L., & Coote, L. V. 2005. A study of organizational citizenship behavior in a retail setting. *Journal of Business Research*, 58, 151-159.
- Adams, John W., Srivastava, Abhishek, Herriot, Peter & Patterson, Fiona. (2013). Careerist orientation and organizational citizenship behavior in expatriates and non-expatriates. *Journal of Career Development*, December 40(6), pp. 469-489.
- Ahearne, M. A., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, P. M. 2004. Determinants of sales team success: An empirical examination of the indirect effects of leadership empowerment behaviors on sales team performance. Unpublished working paper, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Andrews, F.M., & Withey, S.B. 1976. *Social Indicators of Well-Being: America's Perception of Life Quality*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Baral, R., & Bhargava, S. (2010). Work-family enrichment as a mediator between organizational interventions for work-life balance and job outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(3), pp. 274-300.
- Barnes, C. M., Ghumman, S., & Scott, B. A. (2013). Sleep and organizational citizenship behavior: the mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18(1), pp. 16-26.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. 1983. Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee 'citizenship'. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587-595.
- Baumeister, R. 1991. *Meaning of Life*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Bonebright, C.A., Clay, D.L., & Ankenmann, R.D. 2000. The relationship of workaholism with work-life conflict, life satisfaction, and purpose in life. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47(4), 469-477.
- Bowling, N.A., Eschleman, K. J., Wang, Q. (2010). A meta-analytic examination of the relationship between job satisfaction and subjective well-being. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 83(4), pp.915-934.
- Bundick, M. J. (2011). The benefits of reflecting on and discussing purpose in life in emerging adulthood: New directions for youth development. 132, pp. 89-103.
- Chimote, N., & Srivastava, V. N. (2013). Work-life balance benefits: from the perspective of organizations and employees. *IUP Journal of Management Research*, 12(1), pp. 6273.
- Chiu, S.F., & Chen, H.L. 2005. Relationship between job characteristics and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediational role of job satisfaction. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 33(6), 523-540.
- Crumbaugh, J., & Maholic, L. 1964. An experimental study in existentialism: The approach to Frankl's concept of Noonegenic neurosis. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 20, 200-207.
- Diener, E. 1984. Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95, 542-575.
- Diener, E. 1990. Issues in defining and measuring subjective well-being, Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Diener, E., & Emmons, R.A. 1984. The independence of positive and negative affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 1105-1117.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R.A., Larsen, R.J., & Griffin, S. 1985. The satisfaction with life scales. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71-75.

- Diener, E., & Larsen, R. J. 1993. The subjective experience of emotional well-being. *Handbook of Emotions*, 405-415.
- Dunlop, P.D., & Lee, K. 2004. Workplace deviance, organizational citizenship behavior, and business unit performance: The bad apples do spoil the whole barrel. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 67-80.
- Emmerik, H.V., Jawahar, I.M., & Stone, T. 2005. Association among altruism, burnout dimensions, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Work & Stress*, 19(1), 93-100.
- Erdogan, B., Bauer, T.N., & Mansfield, L.R. (2012). Whistle while you work: a review of the life satisfaction literature. *Journal of Management*, 38(4), pp. 1038-1083.
- Farh, J.L., Earley, P.C., & Lin, S.C. 1997. Impetus of action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 421-444.
- Frankl, V. E. 1959. *Man's search for meaning*. New York: World Publishing.
- Frankl, V. E. 1969. *The will to meaning: Principles and application of logotherapy*. New York: World Publishing.
- George and Brief. "Feeling good-doing good"; D. W. Organ, *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books/
- Graham, J. W. 1986. Organizational citizenship informed by political theory. Paper presented at the meeting of Academy of Management, Chicago, IL.
- Greguras, G. J., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2010). Why does proactive personality predict employee life satisfaction and work behaviors? A field investigation of the mediating role of the self-concordance model. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(3), pp. 539-560.
- Heisel, M.J., & Flett, G.L. 2004. Purpose in life, satisfaction with life, and suicide ideation in a clinical sample. *Journal of Psychopathology & Behavioral Assessment*, 26(2), 127-135.
- Hofstede, G. 1980. *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. 2001. *Culture and consequences* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hrobowski-Culbreath, G. (2011). Flexible work arrangements: An evaluation of job satisfaction and work-life balance. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. Capella University.
- Hui, C., Law, K. S., & Chen, Z. X. 1999. A structural equation model of the effects of negative affectivity, leader-member exchange, and perceived job mobility on in-role and extra-role performance: A Chinese case. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 77, 3-21.
- Kickul, J., & Lester, S.W. 2001. Broken promises: Equity sensitivity as a moderator between psychological contract breach and employee attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 16(2), 191-218.
- King, E.B., George, J.M., & Hebl, M.R. 2005. Linking personality to helping behaviors at work: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Personality*, 73(3), 585-609.
- Konovsky, M.A., & Organ, D.W. 1996. Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17(3), 253.
- Korschun, D., Bhattacharya, C.B., Swain, S.D. (2014). Corporate social responsibility, customer orientation, and the job performance of frontline employees. *Journal of Marketing*, 78(3), pp. 20-37.

- Lievens, F., & Anseel, F. 2004. Confirmatory factor analysis and invariance of an organizational citizenship behaviour measure across samples in a Dutch-speaking context", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 299-306.
- Lomer, D. (Ed.). 2005. *Bahamas handbook*. Nassau, Bahamas: Etienne Dupuch, Jr. Publications Ltd.
- MacCatherine, J. M. (2009). Mediating effects of collective efficacy perceptions on the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and workgroup performance. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. Capella University
- Maslow, A. 1954. *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper.
- Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. 1995. Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 127-142.
- Motowidlo, S. J. 1984. Does job satisfaction lead to consideration and personal sensitivity? *Academy of Management Journal*, 27, 910-915.
- Motowidlo, S.J., Packard, J.S., & Manning, M.R. 1986. Occupational stress: Its causes and consequences for job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 618-629.
- Organ, D.W. 1988. *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W., & Lingl, A. 1995. Personality, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 135(3), 339-350.
- Organ, D.W., Podsakoff, P.M., & MacKenzie, S.B. 2006. *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Paine, J.B., & Organ, D.W. 2000. The cultural matrix of organizational citizenship behavior: Some preliminary conceptual and empirical observations. *Human Resource Management*, 10(1), 45-59.
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E. 1993. Review of the satisfaction with life scale. *Psychological Assessment*, 5(2), 164-172.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. 1997. Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(2), 262-270.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. 1997. Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 133-151.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., & Fetter, R. 1990. Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B., & Bachrach, D.G. 2000. Organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
- Puffer, S. M. 1987. Prosocial behavior, noncompliant behavior, and work performance among commission salespeople. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 615-621.
- Quinn, R.P., & Shepard, L.G. 1974. *The 1972-1973 Quality of Employment Survey*. Institute of Social Responsibility. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Richards, J. M. 1996. Life goals of American college freshman". *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 13, 12-20.

- Rushton, J.P., Fulker, D.W., Neale, M.C., Nias, D.K.B., & Eysenck, H.J. 1986. Altruism and aggression: The heritability of individual differences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 1192-1198.
- Scholl, R.W., Cooper, E.A., & McKenna, J.F. 1987. Referent selection in determining equity perceptions: Differential effects on behavioral and attitudinal outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 113-124.
- Shin, D.C., & Johnson, D.M. 1978. Avowed happiness as an overall assessment of the quality of life. *Social Indicators Research*, 5, 475-492.
- Shoenfelt, E.L., & Battista, L. 2004. A laboratory study of satisfaction effects on mood state, withdrawal intentions, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Psychological Reports*, 95(3), 803-820.
- 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.
- Spence, J.T., & Robbins, A.S. 1992. Workaholism: Definition, measurement and preliminary results. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 58, 160-178.
- Ueda, Y. (2012). The relationship between work-life balance programs and employee satisfaction: gender differences in the moderating effect of annual income. *Journal of Business Administration Research*, 1(1), pp. 65-74.
- Van Dyne, L., Vandewalle, D., Kostova, T., Latham, M. E., & Cummings, L. L. 2000. Collectivism, propensity to trust and self-esteem as predictors of organizational citizenship in a non-work setting. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 3-23.
- Vey, M.A., & Campbell, J.P. 2004. In-role or extra-role organizational citizenship behavior: Which are we measuring? *Human Performance*, 17(1), 119-135.
- Walz, S. M., & Niehoff, B. P. 2000. Organizational citizenship behaviors: Their relationship to organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 24, 301-319.
- Wayne, J.H., & Cordeiro, B.L. (2003). Who is a good organizational citizen? Social perceptions of male and female employees who use family leave. *Sex Roles*, 49(5/6), 233-246.
- Westerfield, R. (2012). The role of organizational identification in work-life balance program effectiveness. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. Saint Louis University.
- Williams, L. J., Podsakoff, P. M., & Huber, V. 1986. Determinants of organizational citizenship behaviors: A structural equation analysis with cross-validation. Unpublished manuscript.
- Zika, S., & Chamberlain, K. 1992. On the relation between meaning in life and psychological well-being. *British Journal of Psychology*, 83, 133-145.

Appendix A

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Purpose in Life Q3	.765	.114	.139	-6.10E-02	7.698E-03	2.882E-02	.100	-2.84E-02
Purpose in Life Q4	.729	.270	.153	3.832E-02	-1.46E-02	8.405E-02	.102	2.419E-02
Purpose in Life Q11	.628	.229	1.984E-02	.178	.113	.162	.270	.201
Purpose in Life Q20	.619	.114	1.225E-02	7.743E-02	8.381E-03	9.827E-02	.481	.179
Purpose in Life Q13	.615	1.334E-02	4.624E-02	.106	-4.92E-02	7.511E-02	.138	-2.91E-02
Purpose in Life Q17	.608	5.361E-02	8.626E-02	.100	8.308E-02	.189	.404	-2.90E-02
Purpose in Life Q7	.584	-7.25E-02	.111	.128	2.630E-02	.118	-7.33E-02	-1.00E-01
Purpose in Life Q10	.562	.297	2.475E-02	-8.17E-03	.110	.230	6.145E-02	.288
Purpose in Life Q9	.530	.354	6.713E-02	.198	.121	.287	1.350E-02	.301
Purpose in Life Q12	.502	.249	4.442E-03	.158	.248	.341	.360	.109
Purpose in Life Q8	.459	.312	.122	.134	.125	.169	4.799E-02	.368
Life Satisfaction Q2	.436	.788	1.795E-02	.129	.184	.155	.171	1.767E-02
Life Satisfaction Q3	.225	.766	7.909E-02	.126	7.871E-02	8.226E-02	.160	1.321E-02
Life Satisfaction Q1	.121	.756	-1.56E-02	3.921E-02	.239	.104	6.840E-02	-6.20E-02
Life Satisfaction Q4	.126	.720	.305	8.910E-03	6.945E-03	.136	3.659E-02	-2.12E-03
Life Satisfaction Q5	9.317E-02	.548	.102	4.501E-02	.101	.181	-8.75E-02	.196
OCB Altruism Q5	.111	5.440E-02	.805	.166	3.005E-02	-3.03E-02	6.221E-02	-.109
OCB Altruism Q3	1.941E-03	.101	.794	.111	9.812E-02	.205	-3.79E-02	.121
OCB Altruism Q4	9.022E-02	2.657E-02	.790	.180	6.031E-02	7.499E-02	5.864E-02	-.115
OCB Altruism Q2	8.638E-02	5.259E-02	.781	.162	.166	4.188E-02	-7.41E-03	.127
OCB Altruism Q1	.166	.170	.632	.156	2.831E-02	8.683E-03	1.023E-02	5.876E-02
OCB	.166	6.877E-02	.226	.006	9.640E-02	-.124	-1.32E-02	-8.99E-03
Conscientiousness Q4	.166	6.877E-02	.226	.006	9.640E-02	-.124	-1.32E-02	-8.99E-03
OCB	8.567E-02	.215	.153	.771	.157	9.465E-03	-3.32E-02	.126
Conscientiousness Q3	8.567E-02	.215	.153	.771	.157	9.465E-03	-3.32E-02	.126
OCB	-2.61E-02	-4.02E-02	.122	.759	.114	6.021E-02	-9.42E-04	6.835E-02
Conscientiousness Q2	-2.61E-02	-4.02E-02	.122	.759	.114	6.021E-02	-9.42E-04	6.835E-02
OCB	5.597E-02	.146	.103	.681	.109	.177	.232	-.237
Conscientiousness Q1	5.597E-02	.146	.103	.681	.109	.177	.232	-.237
OCB	.240	2.355E-02	.328	.668	6.224E-02	-3.12E-02	-3.52E-02	-1.27E-02
Conscientiousness Q5	.240	2.355E-02	.328	.668	6.224E-02	-3.12E-02	-3.52E-02	-1.27E-02
Overall Job Satisfaction Q2	.106	.163	.103	9.886E-02	.844	7.429E-02	7.964E-02	6.800E-02
Overall Job Satisfaction Q3	7.389E-02	.136	2.710E-02	6.139E-02	.842	9.111E-02	1.382E-02	4.236E-02
Overall Job Satisfaction Q4	-4.79E-04	7.547E-02	2.998E-02	.218	.839	-4.75E-02	-3.07E-02	-1.45E-02
Overall Job Satisfaction Q1	1.632E-02	.159	.238	.106	.726	9.937E-02	.131	-5.08E-02
Purpose in Life Q1	.189	.151	.138	2.364E-02	.101	.765	.138	3.676E-02
Purpose in Life Q2	.246	.231	7.420E-02	-1.93E-02	3.588E-02	.759	.119	.108
Purpose in Life Q5	.416	.258	9.514E-02	2.554E-02	-2.25E-02	.569	8.882E-03	.220
Purpose in Life Q6	.483	.241	4.348E-03	2.874E-02	.149	.493	6.397E-02	-6.31E-02
Purpose in Life Q18	6.788E-02	1.655E-02	5.773E-02	-8.23E-04	1.918E-02	7.386E-02	.758	5.686E-02
Purpose in Life Q16	.300	.204	-.118	6.387E-02	-7.71E-03	-2.04E-02	.532	-.120
Purpose in Life Q14	.357	1.616E-02	9.461E-02	-6.21E-02	.158	.127	.476	.114
Purpose in Life Q19	.406	.164	5.139E-02	1.553E-02	.114	.352	.476	.325
Purpose in Life Q15	5.027E-02	2.620E-02	6.474E-03	-2.46E-02	-1.15E-02	.111	9.528E-02	.821

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
 Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
 a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.