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Abstract

This dissertation explored the relationship between individual-level value differences and workplace attitudes. Using data from a sample of Canadian workers whose co-workers were currently using flexible work arrangements, the relationship between allocentrism and workers’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment was explored. A workplace-allocentrism scale was developed and validated. The scale showed adequate validity and reliability and thus was used in the main study.

The Co-Worker Model was developed and tested on a sample of adults in Canada who work in organizations where flexible work arrangements are used. Data were collected from an online research panel and then tested using structural equation modeling.

The results indicate that allocentric value orientations were positively related to reported organizational commitment, mediated by job satisfaction. This study sheds light on the importance of understanding individual-level value differences when examining
the effectiveness and/or ineffectiveness of organizational policies and practices.
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Chapter 1  
Introduction and Purpose of Study

Flexible work arrangements are benefits that an employer provides which give employees autonomy over when and where they work (Lambert, Marler & Gueutal, 2008). As such, flexible work arrangements present a choice for employees, with regard to location, amount, and the actual scheduling of their work. Flexible work arrangements may include: choosing when to start and end work, taking time off during the day or choosing when to work from home. Such choices are made available to all workers in the organization, regardless of need.

Flexible work arrangements differ from parental leave policies in that the latter may not be applicable to all employees (Grover, 1991). Whereas an employee may choose to use flexible work arrangement policies at any given moment, parental leave policies tend to be restricted to individuals with young children.

Galinsky, Bond and Sakai (2008) gathered evidence from the National Study of Employers that indicates many organizations have introduced flexible work arrangements as a means of helping employees balance their work-family demands. Providing ways for employees to balance the demands of work and family is important for organizations because doing so fosters desirable organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and engagement in organizational citizenship behaviors (e.g. Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Allen, 2001; Gordon et al., 2007).
Research on the link between flexible work arrangement provisions and organizational outcomes has focused, for the most part, on the positive effects (i.e., increased job satisfaction and organizational commitment) that arise for individuals who use these policies (e.g. Scandura and Lankau, 1997; McNall et al., 2010). However, to the author’s knowledge, there has not been any work that considered the effects of a co-worker using flexible work arrangement on workers’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment levels. Furthermore, research has not identified whether individual-level differences among co-workers influence perceptions of flexible work arrangements.

This dissertation addressed the issue of whether psychological and cultural dimensions are related to the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of workers, who report that at least one of their co-workers is currently using flexible work arrangements. This issue was studied by integrating the work-life literature with the literature on cultural influences. A model was proposed and tested to see whether the psychological-value dimension of workplace allocentrism related to the worker’s perceived satisfaction level and level of organizational commitment.

The remainder of this chapter discusses the psychological value of allocentrism. Next, it links the cultural influence literature with the work-family literature; thus, developing a model of co-workers perceptions. Finally, theoretical and practical contributions of this research are discussed.
1 Theoretical Background and Hypothesis

1.1 Values

Hofstede’s (1984) landmark study resulted in insight into the dynamics of cross-cultural workplace relations. His work is among the most widely cited sources in the cultural influence literature across work-related issues (i.e. Moorman & Blakely, 1995; Ali, Azim & Falcone, 1995; Koch & Koch, 2007). The cultural values of individualism and collectivism are of particular importance when considering work-related psychological phenomena (Triandis, 1995). As defined by Schwartz (1992, p.2) values are "desirable states, objects, goals or behaviors transcending specific situations and applied as normative standards to judge and choose alternative modes of behavior". They direct individuals toward what they perceive to be desirable behaviours and away from what is perceived by them as undesirable. Workplace values act as general constraints on the generation of work behaviours and goals (Lord & Brown, 2001).

The values of individualism and collectivism are important because they consider how society defines its self-image (Hofstede, 1984). Individualists view the self as unique and independent, influenced mainly through references to one’s own thoughts and feelings, rather than those of others. Collectivists, on the other hand, view the self as interdependent - recognizing that one’s thoughts, actions and feelings are contingent on the thoughts, actions and feelings of others.

In a meta-analytic study, Oyserman and colleagues (2002) considered the dimensions of individualism and collectivism across all studies published since 1980.
Whereas individualism was shown to be closely associated with competition, goals and independence, collectivism was associated closely with duty, harmony, and interdependence. In short, these cultural values answer the question of: "Do I focus primarily on how my actions affect me or how they affect others?" It is important to note that individualism and collectivism are believed to be two distinct constructs, rather than two ends of a continuum which coexist in different degrees (Triandis, 1994, 1995; Oyserman et al., 2002)

Triandis (1986, 1998) expanded Hofstede’s research by proposing that there is more than one type of individualism and collectivism across societies. His research showed that there is a horizontal and vertical dimension to individualism and collectivism, which is reflected in Hofstede’s (1984) cultural dimension of power distance. The latter focuses on how society handles inequalities among individuals. This explains why societies, which may score quite similarly on these two dimensions, can still behave very differently. Research (e.g. Singelis et al., 1995; Triandis, Chen, & Chan, 1998; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) shows that societies that are primarily horizontal tend to value equality, whereas, vertical societies emphasize hierarchy. The horizontal and vertical distinction is conceptually different from power distance in that power distance represents the degree to which the less powerful members in a given society perceive and accept power inequalities (Hofstede, 2001).

This distinction explains why individualistic countries such as Great Britain and the United States, which are primarily vertical, differ in their values from other individualistic countries such as Sweden or Denmark. The latter countries are primarily horizontal. The same distinction holds for collectivist countries, in that a very collectivist
country such as Japan or Korea (both vertical) has a competitive drive, yet another very collectivist country such as Israel (horizontal) does not. The distinction between vertical and horizontal aspects of culture explains these differences.

These value dimensions form four categorizations, namely, vertical-individualist, horizontal-individualist, vertical-collectivist and horizontal-collectivist. Vertical-individualist countries, such as the United States and Great Britain, value independence and competition (e.g. Triandis, 1995; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998; Cozma, 2011). They value individuals who stand out amongst others, especially individuals who strive to be better than their peers. Horizontal-individualists too maintain that being self-reliant and independent is important. But they do not emphasize the need for individuals to differentiate themselves, or for them to be seen as being better than others. Societies that emphasize independence without high status include Denmark, Sweden and Australia (e.g. Feather, 1994; Nelson & Shavitt, 2002).

Vertical-collectivists are similar to vertical individualists in that they too value competition; however, this competition is between their group versus other groups. They value the importance of a group’s interdependence and hence setting challenging group goals, in order to maintain a competitive drive. Such countries include India, Korea, and Japan (Triandis & Singelis, 1998; Cozma, 2011).

Horizontal-collectivists stress interdependence, a focus on the in-group, as well as an egalitarian view of the world. This category includes the Israeli kibbutz (Triandis, 1995; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).
1.2 Allocentrism Versus Idiocentrism

Although the majority of studies on the influence of individualism/collectivism in the workplace have been cross-cultural, these differences in values also appear within a culture. When these dimensions are measured at the individual level, they are referred to as idiocentrism and allocentrism (Triandis et al., 1985). These values are context-specific (e.g. one can be more allocentric to family than to friends and vice versa; Freeman & Bordia, 2001). The present study focused on workplace allocentrism, namely, one’s sense of collective identity in relation to peers. Given individual-level differences in values, reactions to policies often differ among individuals thus undermining the notion of “one-size-fits-all” policies. Hence, everyone may not perceive flexible work arrangements as beneficial to an organization.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the values allocentrism and idiocentrism have been shown to impact important workplace behaviors such as organizational commitment (e.g. Wasti, 2003). Specifically, research suggests that normative commitment is a stronger predictor of intent to turnover for allocentric individuals than for idiocentric individuals. Allocentrism and idiocentrism have also been found to moderate job performance. These values have also been found to moderate the relationship between perceived participative decision making opportunity and performance, at an individual and group level (e.g. Lam et al., 2002) Furthermore, the relationship between leadership style and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has been found to be moderated by allocentrism and idiocentrism (e.g. Nahum-Shani & Somech, 2011). Specifically, when leaders use transformational leadership styles, OCB increases for more allocentric individuals;
whereas, for more idiocentric individuals, OCB increases when transactional leadership styles are used.

These studies suggest that allocentrism and idiocentrism are meaningful individual differences. Thus, the same organizational characteristics and behaviours may be both effective and ineffective, depending on an individual’s value orientation. This implies that in order to be able to understand, predict and manage employees’ behaviours, attention must be paid to individual-level differences among employees.

1.3 Linking Allocentrism and Idiocentrism with Work-Family Balance

There appears to be a link between the dimensions of allocentrism and idiocentrism and work-life conflict (e.g. Spector et al., 2005; Yang, 2005). Specifically, more idiocentric individuals are more likely to report higher levels of work-life conflict than more allocentric individuals. However, much of the extant research has a macro concentration (i.e. cross-cultural differences) rather than a micro focus (individual-level differences). The paucity of research that has considered individual-level differences suggests that the relationship between work-life conflict and individual well-being is moderated by an individual’s level of allocentrism or idiocentrism (e.g. Wang et al., 2004; Aycan, 2008). Specifically, allocentrics are likely to experience negative well-being when their work interferes with the family domain. This is perhaps due to the loyalty that allocentrics feel towards their family, and so, they may be more motivated to fulfill familial responsibilities, even when those responsibilities interfere with their work domain. Idiocentrics are likely to feel worse off when their family life conflicts with their work.
domain. Idiocentrics tend to be more occupied with personal goals and the enhancement of one’s “self”; thus, activities in the family domain which take time away from “self” enhancement will make them feel worse off.

A way to assist employees in dealing with work-life conflict might be to provide flexible work arrangements. In fact, the literature on work-life conflict and flexible work arrangements has revealed considerable support for a linkage between the use of flexible work arrangements and reduced work-life conflict (e.g. Christensen & Staines, 1990; Shockley & Allen, 2007; Russell et al., 2009). Cross-cultural research on work-life conflict and the values of individualism and collectivism (or idiocentrism and allocentrism on an individual level) has repeatedly found that the use of flexible work arrangements is linked to these cultural dimensions (e.g. Raghuram, London, Larsen, 2001; Knudstrup & Ross, 2011; Masuda, Poelmans, Allen, et al., 2012). Specifically, flexible work arrangements appear to be more beneficial, to users of these policies, in primarily individualistic cultures. This is perhaps because individualistic cultures are likely to view flexible work arrangements as a policy aimed at one’s personal needs and that of the individual’s immediate family (Oyserman et al., 2002). Although users of flexible work arrangements may perceive benefits from these programs, it is unclear whether the positive effects of usage are mitigated or even offset by negative spillovers to other employees. These spillovers may come in such forms as greater workloads, decreased support and mentoring from colleagues, role conflicts, and reduced opportunities for interaction – all of which can be of importance to co-workers given the growth of teams and employee involvement in the workplace. Understanding the effects of these programs on co-workers, as well as users, is important because the quest to
improve the well being of some may inadvertently result in other employees perceiving that they are worse off.

Co-workers with more allocentric values view the self as inseparable from the others in an in-group (Triandis, 1989). Allocentric co-workers are concerned mainly with interpersonal harmony, interdependence and prioritize collective goals over personal goals. For these individuals, promoting others’ goals and maintaining harmony within the group are important behavioural motives (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). As such, co-workers who are more allocentric will likely view the use of flexible work arrangements by others in a more positive light, than co-workers who are less allocentric. This is because for allocentric co-workers, the well-being of the group is of primary importance. Policies which promote the goals and/or well-being of members of their group are likely to be viewed positively for more allocentric co-workers. For these individuals, satisfaction is derived primarily from co-worker relationships (Wasti, 2003); thus, when the members of their group are benefitting from organizational policies, they are likely to also be satisfied. And so, it is hypothesized:

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant positive relationship between a co-worker’s workplace allocentrism score and job satisfaction level.

Organizational commitment is an attitude that describes an employee’s relationship with the organization, as a whole, and with the members of the organization and implies a long-term relationship with the organization (Meyer et al., 2002). Allocentric co-workers are likely to be more concerned with the well-being of their work
group than their own. They likely view group goals as more important than their own. In that they value interdependence among the group, they may focus on how their actions and decisions impact their work group. As such, the value of allocentrism fits with the attitude of organizational commitment in that organizational commitment implies a concern for other’s welfare, belonging, solidarity and stability (Meyer et al., 2002). Individuals who score higher on allocentrism are likely to be more committed to the organization because of their focus on the group and its goals versus themselves and their personal goals. More allocentric individuals are also more likely to give more weight to social factors in their decisions based on their values of duty and loyalty to the group (Triandis, 1980). The more allocentric an individual, the more likely his or her behavior is contingent on the thoughts and feelings of relevant others. In the context of flexible work arrangements, more allocentric co-workers are more likely to consider how the use of these policies by others impacts the users’ well-being. Thus, in-group membership (i.e. organizational commitment) will be positively related to allocentrism, even when there are high demands on these individuals, because in-group goals dominate personal goals. As noted by Schwartz (2006), individuals with more allocentric values are focused on preserving the status quo and avoiding actions and attitudes, which might undermine group goals. And so, within the context of flexible work arrangement usage, it is hypothesized:

Hypothesis 2: There is a significant positive relationship between a co-worker’s workplace allocentrism score and organizational commitment level.
Both work values and individual attitudes (i.e. job satisfaction) have been shown to be correlated with affective organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991). This suggests that both values and attitudes may play an important role in explaining differences in affective commitment. Previous research has consistently found a significant and positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (i.e. Lambert, Hogan & Griffin, 2007; Latham, Locke & Fassina, 2002; Williams & Hazer, 1986). Studies have shown the mediating role of job satisfaction between organizational commitment and perceptions of organizational justice (Crow et al., 2012). Job satisfaction has also been shown to mediate the relationship between role stress and organizational commitment (Elangovan, 2001). Allocentric individuals derive job satisfaction mainly from co-worker and supervisor relationships (Wasti, 2003). As such, individuals high on allocentrism will want to maintain these relationships because of the satisfaction they receive from having relationships with their co-workers and supervisors. In order to maintain these relationships, allocentric individuals will be motivated to remain a part of the organization. In-group membership is important for allocentric individuals and this is explained through the satisfaction they derive from this membership. Hence, the third hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between a coworker's allocentrism score and organizational commitment.

The hypothesized co-worker model is depicted in Figure 1. The purpose of the present study was to address the current gaps in the literature. The study involved an analysis of the relationship between allocentrism and the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of workers, whose co-workers were seen making use of
flexible work arrangements. A scenario-based scale that measures workplace allocentrism was developed and validated. While a family-specific scale has already been developed (Lay et al., 1998), a scale measuring allocentric values in a workplace context does not exist. The scale developed for this study was used to test whether cultural values impact the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of workers whose co-workers were seen making use of flexible work arrangements.

The contribution of the study to the literature is two-fold. First, to the author’s knowledge, there is no dataset regarding flexible work arrangements and co-worker perceptions in Canadian organizations. Canadian workers were chosen for the following reasons: Canada is a very individualistic society, in which people are expected to be self-reliant; flexible work arrangements are perceived to be more beneficial in more individualistic societies because they are aimed at personal needs; and finally, 61% of Canadian organizations offer flexible work arrangements (Grant Thornton, 2012), which is very similar to the United States (62%) and above average compared to the world. Second, the survey allows an understanding of values influencing job satisfaction and organizational commitment of workers, whose co-workers are seen making use of flexible work arrangement policies. These attitudes were chosen because at the individual-employee level, within a given context, the influence theoretically flows from abstract values to midrange attitudes to specific behaviors (Homer & Kahle, 1988). Thus, the relationship between values and attitudes is more proximal and should, theoretically, be studied first.
1.4 Theoretical and Practical Significance

This research makes several theoretical and practical contributions to the literature. First, it examines the relationship between worker allocentrism and both job satisfaction and organizational commitment of workers, whose co-workers are seen making use of flexible work arrangement policies.

In terms of practical significance, this research sheds light on the importance of an organization taking a micro-perspective when implementing human resource (HRM) policies. Individual differences in values explain why individuals respond differently to HRM policies. The model developed in this dissertation suggests that these individual differences are related to differences in the job attitudes of workers. Given that these values exert meaningful effects on an individual’s behavior, it is important for HR departments to be aware of these differences and to be open to flexible organizational policies and practices on the basis of individual differences (Lawler & Finegold, 2000).
Chapter 2
Literature Review

This dissertation developed and tested a model of the relationship between use of flexible work arrangements from the perspective of co-workers, who do not take advantage of flexible work arrangements, and workplace attitudes, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The literature on flexible work arrangements and values is reviewed. Specifically, the relationship between allocentrism and flexible work arrangements usage, and the implications for flexible work arrangements and workplace behaviours are examined.

This review highlights three gaps in the literature. The first gap is the limited scope of flexible work arrangements treatment. Previous research has focused mostly on the effects of flexible work arrangements policies on its users (i.e. Christensen & Staines, 1990; Shockley & Allen, 2007; Russell et al., 2009). The effects of flexible work arrangements usage on co-workers have been largely ignored. Further, much of the literature has focused on positive outcomes associated with flexible work arrangements usage (i.e. Lambert, 2000; McNall, Masuda & Nicklin, 2010; Wayne et al., 2006). The second gap is the limited scope of research on values in relation to flexible work arrangement policies. Prior research has been limited to national differences in values, rather than considering value differences at an individual-level. The third gap is the potential relationship between allocentrism and workplace attitudes of workers, when co-workers are seen making use of flexible work arrangements. Although allocentrism has been examined in relation to several workplace outcomes such as organizational
commitment, decision making, leadership, the literature has not examined this relationship in the context of flexible work arrangement policies.

To address these gaps, I expanded flexible work arrangements by focusing on co-workers. Consideration of individual-level value differences was found to shed light on the possible implications of flexible work arrangements usage on workplace outcomes, namely, job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

This chapter begins with a review of the positive outcomes associated with flexible work arrangements. Next, a discussion of the potential negative outcomes related to flexible work arrangements practices is presented. This is followed by a review of workplace values and their relationship to an individual’s behavioural decisions. The major theories on values are discussed. The chapter concludes with a review on the relationship between the specific value of allocentrism and workplace outcomes.

2 Review of the Literature

2.1 Positive Outcomes Associated with Flexible Work Arrangements

The Human Resource Management (HRM) literature has focused on the conflicting demands that employees face between the domains of work and life. This conflict has been defined as an inter-role conflict where engaging in one role makes it difficult for an individual to engage in the other role (Kahn et al., 1964). The literature suggests that there is a negative relationship between work-life balance policies and work-life conflict (Hammer, Allen and Grigsby, 1997; Anderson, Coffey and Byerly, 2002; Kossek, Lautsch and Eaton, 2006).
Both the Job Demands and Resources (JD-R) theory (Karasek, 1979) and signaling theory (Grover & Crooker, 1995; Casper & Harris, 2008) are useful for understanding this association. Karasek found that job demands and resources interact with one another. Certain resources mitigate the negative effects that individuals experience from stress. Applying this to flexible work arrangements implies that organizations that have flexible work arrangements policies provide individuals with a resource that can minimize the negative effects of stress. Flexible work arrangements signal to employees that the organization cares about and is supportive of them. This acts as a buffer by reducing the negative impact of incompatible work and life demands that individuals may face.

Wayne et al. (2006) showed that flexible work arrangements not only reduce work-life conflict, they can also create work-life enrichment and a positive spillover in the lives of employees. Further, in a survey of 220 employees, McNall, Masuda and Nicklin (2010) found that offering flexible work arrangements in the form of flexitime and a compressed workweek had a positive relationship with work-life enrichment that in turn was related to job satisfaction and low turnover intentions.

Employee perceptions of workplace flexibility are also related to organizational-level outcomes. Individuals who perceive that their organization is flexible, and that these policies are usable have a favourable work-life balance and work long hours before their work-life balance becomes affected in a negative way. (Hill, Hawkins, Ferris, Weitzman, 2001; Hayman, 2009). Providing employees with flexibility is a signal that the
organization trusts them. Thus, employees typically respond with increases in effort (Eldridge & Nisar, 2011).

At the organizational level, outcomes related to flexible work arrangements can be categorized as psychological and behavioural. Psychological outcomes are usually linked to recruitment and retention (i.e. Dex & Scheibi, 2001; Rau & Hyland, 2002; Richman, Civian, Shannon, Hill & Brennan, 2008). Firms may adopt flexible work arrangements to signal to their employees and job applicants that they care about an individual’s well-being. This is likely to be an important motivator in firms that demand highly-skilled employees, or where recruitment and retention costs are high. Numerous studies have found that firms that adopt these policies benefit in terms of lower turnover rates (e.g. Christensen & Staines, 1990; Kossek & Nichol, 1992).

The literature on behavioral outcomes associated with flexible work arrangement policies has focused on organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and job satisfaction. Grover and Crooker (1995) utilized the 1991 General Social Survey to assess the impact of flexible work arrangement policies on organizational commitment. Access to flexible work arrangements was positively related to organizational commitment and negatively related to turnover intentions. Drawing on the theory of organizational signaling (Grover & Crooker, 1995; Casper & Harris, 2008) the results indicate that individuals respond with a greater sense of attachment to the firm. Other studies have shown that the use of and satisfaction with flexible work arrangements relate positively to organizational commitment (i.e. Aryee, Luk, & Stone, 1998; Halpern, 2005; Houston & Waumsley, 2003).
A meta-analytic study (Baltes, Briggs, Huff, Wright & Neuman, 1999) found that flexible work arrangement policies were positively related to job satisfaction, reduced absenteeism, productivity, satisfaction with work schedule. Lambert (2000) examined the relationship between work-life policies and organizational citizenship behavior. Using structural equation modeling, the author found that individuals who perceived the firm’s work-life policies as useful for themselves were likely to engage in pro-social organizational citizenship behavior benefitting the organization.

2.2 Negative Outcomes Associated with Flexible Work Arrangements

Although flexible work arrangements have been associated with both positive organizational and individual outcomes, there are drawbacks. When individuals perceive that there could be a future negative consequence associated with the use of flexible work arrangements, they will be less satisfied and less likely to use them. In an experimental study, Cohen and Single (2001) found that peers and supervisors made more pessimistic predictions regarding promotions and anticipated turnover about individuals who used flexible work arrangements than those who did not. This suggests that those who use flexible work arrangements are perceived as less professional and less capable of managing their time than those who do not use flexible work arrangements. Furthermore, employees in workplaces with flexible work arrangements policies report greater stress and feel less secure about their job (Eldridge & Nisar, 2011). This is because individuals perceive that organizations are offering flexible work arrangements policies, they should reciprocate in some way. With increased work intensification and less time to fulfill work-related responsibilities (mainly due to the individual’s responsibilities in other
domains), some have concluded that flexible work arrangements policies generate an increase in work intensification. Kelliher and Anderson (2010) showed that because an exchange relationship exists between an employer and employee, when flexible work arrangements policies are provided individuals perceive that a payoff must be made in the form of work intensification.

Most of the research on negative outcomes of flexible work arrangements has focused on the actual users of these policies. The role of co-workers in this context has been ignored. Thus, Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2009) called for researchers to examine the role of co-workers in work-life interfaces. This is because these policies affect more than the user. An increase in a co-worker’s workload, reduced face time, increased perceptions of injustice stemming from the fact that someone else is using these policies, may exist. While flexible work arrangements are made available to all employees within an organization, there is evidence that these policies may work on a first-come-first-served basis (Working Families, 2008). This suggests that once a member of the work group is using flexible work arrangements, co-workers may perceive that they no longer have access to these policies. Moreover, there is an increasing tendency for organizations to flatten their structures and create team-based structures (Lawler, 1994). Given a team-based work environment, the use of such policies by one employee has spill-over effects on co-workers.

2.3 Values

Latham’s (2012) motivational taxonomy presents a continuum of motivation sources. These sources range from the most distal source of an individual’s needs, through to
differences in traits and values. In order to understand, predict, and influence an employee’s motivation, it is necessary to study needs, personality traits and values.

Needs are defined as physiological and psychological elements which affect both the survival and well-being of individuals (Latham, 2012). Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of needs and Hogan’s (2003) need theory point to the same conclusion – namely, that needs are universal. However, the most salient needs of an individual influence motivation. Needs create values, which in turn lead to goals (Latham, 2012). While needs explain behaviour, they do not account for differences in action – namely explaining why an individual chose one path of action over another. This difference, however, can be explained through consideration of individual difference variables such as personality traits (Latham, 2012).

Early Industrial-Organizational psychology research was inconsistent in its findings regarding the effects of personality traits on behavior (Locke, Shaw, Saari & Latham, 1981). Researchers in that time period found little or no effect of traits on behaviour in the workplace (i.e., Guion & Gottier, 1965; Mitchell, 1979). The introduction of the Five Factor Model (FFM) of personality (Wiggins, 1996), however, sparked a resurgence in research on the effects of individual trait differences on behavior. Differences in personality traits explain why individuals choose different actions to satisfy similar needs. One’s behaviour is compatible with one’s personality. This notion, however, is contextual. As Stewart and Barrick (2004) noted, individual trait differences are only apparent in weak situations (high workplace autonomy) and less so in strong situations, namely highly structured situations. Given that today’s workplace is
characterized with a great deal of autonomy for employees, the focus of this present study was on flexibility in the workplace because this setting can be categorized as “weak”. Individual trait differences are likely to affect behavioural choices in weak situations (Mischel, 1977; Meyer, Dalal & Hermida, 2010).

Values represent tendencies to prefer certain states over others (Hofstede, 1984). Because values suggest a preference, they are motivational for individuals. They signal what an individual likes and wants, and what that person wishes to avoid. Schwartz’ (1992, 2006) value theory suggests six characteristics, or features, that all values shares. These features include: (1) values are beliefs; (2) values refer to desirable goals; (3) values transcend actions and situations; (4) values are used as standards; (5) values are relative; and (6) the relative importance of values for an individual guides action. Schwartz (1992, 2006) argued that what differentiates one value from another is the specific goal it motivates individuals to attain. Individuals can hold values towards achievement, power, security, tradition, etc. Not everyone holds the same values, and not every value will motivate individuals in the same way. Values are in their nature quite general. They influence attitudes, but cannot be used as direct predictors of behaviour in specific situations (Schwartz, 2006).

Hofstede’s (1984) cross-cultural study, conducted in IBM, provides valuable insight on cross-cultural value differences. His study revealed four general value dimensions, which explain differences in employee behavior across cultures. These dimensions include (1) low-high power distance, (2) uncertainty avoidance, (3) individualism and collectivism, and (4) masculinity and femininity. Most cross-cultural
research has focused on explaining cross-cultural differences using the values of individualism and collectivism. Individualistic cultures are categorized by emotional independence with respect to groups or organizations. Autonomy is valued in individualistic cultures. In contrast, collectivist cultures stress emotional dependence with respect to work groups or organizations. Collectivist cultures are defined by a feeling of “us” (Hofstede, 1984).

Triandis (1986, 1998) expanded Hofstede’s research in at least two critical ways. First, he measured individualism and collectivism in broad cultural settings, rather than a strict focus on work contexts. Second, his research pointed to the fact that the distinction between individualism and collectivism is not clear-cut. There exist different types of individualism and collectivism across societies. His research showed that individualism and collectivism have a horizontal and vertical dimension to them, similar to Hofstede’s power distance dimension. This explains why countries that score similarly on Hofstede’s scale are quite different. According to his research (Triandis 1996; Triandis et al., 1998; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998), there are four broad cultural types: vertical collectivist, vertical individualist, horizontal collectivist, and horizontal individualist.

Vertical collectivists view themselves as part of the group, but are still willing to accept hierarchy and inequality within the group. Although they value competition, this competition is across groups rather than within the collective (Triandis & Singelis, 1998; Cozma, 2011). Vertical individualists value independence and competition. They view the self as autonomous. They also accept inequality and hierarchy (Triandis, 1995; Cozma, 2011). Horizontal collectivists view themselves as part of the group and perceive
all members of the collective as equal. They have an egalitarian view of society (Triandis, 1995; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Finally, horizontal individualists stress autonomy and interdependence, but believe in an egalitarian view of society. They do not feel the need to differentiate themselves from others (Feather, 1994; Triandis, 1995).

The crux of cross-cultural research on individualism and collectivism has focused on nation-level differences in values. However, differences occur not only across cultures but also across individuals within a given culture. When measured at the individual level, Triandis and colleagues (1985) refer to individualism and collectivism as idiocentrism and allocentrism. Idiocentrism and allocentrism have been shown to impact such workplace behaviors as organizational commitment, job performance, and organizational citizenship behaviour.

Allocentrism and idiocentrism have been shown to moderate the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intentions. Wasti’s (2003) study found that normative commitment was a strong predictor of turnover intentions for allocentric individuals and weaker for idiocentric individuals. This finding stresses the importance of values in predicting individual differences in turnover intentions. In a similar study, Yao and Wang (2006) showed that normative commitment was the most salient predictor of voluntary turnover. This relationship was moderated by idiocentric and allocentric values of individuals. Higher levels of normative commitment correlated with lower turnover intentions. This relationship was stronger for more allocentric than idiocentric individuals.
Allocentrism and idiocentrism have also been shown to moderate the relationship between decision making and job performance. Allocentrism and idiocentrism can explain both group-level and individual-level performance. Specifically, a strong positive relationship has been found to exist between opportunity to participate in decisions and group performance, when allocentrism is high. For individuals who score high on idiocentrism, there is a strong positive relationship between opportunity to participate in decisions and individual performance (Lam et al., 2002). Furthermore, these relationships have been shown to operate irrespective of societal boundaries – indicating that these value dimensions are strong individual-level predictors.

In a study of the relationship between leadership style and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), Nahum-Shani and Somech (2011) found idiocentrism and allocentrism to be important moderators. That is, the relationship between leadership style and OCB is contingent upon these value differences. When leaders use transformational leadership styles, OCB increases given that individuals are allocentric. When individuals are idiocentric, OCB increases when transactional leadership styles are used. This finding suggests the importance of being aware of individual-level value differences, particularly when deciding on an appropriate leadership style.

Taken together, these findings suggest that allocentrism and idiocentrism are salient individual-level differences. As such, differences in individual value orientations can explain why HRM policies and practices can appear to be partly effective and ineffective. Thus, it is important to focus on differences in individual-level value orientations within the workplace.
The primary purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between worker job satisfaction and organizational commitment levels and the value dimension of allocentrism, when co-workers are seen making use of flexible work arrangement policies. The model proposes: (1) allocentrism is positively related to job satisfaction, (2) allocentrism is positively related to commitment to the organization, and (3) the job satisfaction mediates the relationship between workplace allocentrism and organizational commitment.
Chapter 3
Pilot Study

3 Development of a Workplace Allocentrism Scale

Individualism and collectivism are among the most common means of distinguishing between cultures (Triandis, 1995). These values describe the way in which a culture defines its self-image (Hofstede, 1984). Individualists tend to view themselves as independent from the whole. Collectivists view themselves as interdependent. These concepts can be applied to both societal- and individual-level analyses. When they are measured at the individual level, they are referred to as idiocentrism and allocentrism respectively (Triandis et al., 1985).

Several measurement tools have been developed to measure idiocentrism and allocentrism (i.e. Individualism and Collectivism Scale, Triandis & Gelfand, 1998; Individualism and Collectivism (INDCOL) Scale, Singelis et al., 1995; Communal Orientation Scale (COS), Clark et al., 1987; and the Collective Self-Esteem Scale, Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). Nevertheless, there is debate surrounding the reliability and validity of these measures (Freeman & Bordia, 2001; Chen & West, 2008).

Cronbach (1990) stressed that the broader the construct and the lower the fidelity of the construct, the lower the reliability. Individualism and collectivism are two distinct constructs, not two ends of a continuum (Triandis, 1994, 1995; Oyserman et al., 2002). Thus, the call by Oyserman and colleagues (2002) to assess each element of these constructs separately, as a means of addressing the measurement issues with these scales.
One relatively straightforward way to separate these constructs is to specify a relevant group of interest (Rhee, Uleman & Lee, 1996). Freeman and Bordia (2001) studied the individualist and collectivist tendencies of Australian college students. They found that students can be individualistic to friends and collectivist to family, and vice versa (Freeman & Bordia, 2001). This shows that research must be context-specific with individualism and collectivism.

While Lay and colleagues (1998) have developed the Family Allocentrism and Idiocentrism Scale, a workplace-specific scale has yet to be developed. Thus, the purpose of this pilot study was to create a workplace allocentrism scale. Given the growth of team-based environments in today's organizations, allocentrism was chosen as the focus of this pilot study (rather than idiocentrism or both) because it was deemed more relevant to assess how co-workers construe themselves relative to their workgroup or team.

Recently, there has been a call for researchers to measure cultural orientations using scenario-based scales, rather than Likert-based scales (e.g. Heine et al., 2001, 2002; Kitayama, 2002). A scenario-based scale is preferred because Likert-based scales tend to have lower criterion-validity in cross-cultural settings (Peng, Nisbett, Wong, 1997). This is due to the different interpretations of typical statements in Likert-based scales (Peng et al., 1997). Scenario based scales ask questions within a specific context, thus minimizing problems of value meaning construction (Peng et al., 1997). When statements are specific, individuals do not need to create their own interpretations. Furthermore, scenario-based scales ask respondents about their behavioral preferences rather than their judgment of abstract concepts. This may further alleviate the issue of social-comparison
and deprivation-based judgments that previous scales have suffered from (Peng et al., 1997). By eliminating some of the error variance due to interpretation, a scenario-based scale may improve the validity of these measures. Therefore, this study developed a scenario-based workplace allocentrism scale.

3.1 Methods and Results

To develop a scenario-based workplace allocentrism scale, this study employed mixed methods in three phases. First, HR practitioners were consulted to develop the workplace allocentrism scale. Second, a survey followed by cognitive interviews were conducted to test the content validity of the scale. Cognitive interviewing involves administering draft survey questions, while gathering information on the survey response (Beatty & Willis, 2007). This is the dominant method used to identify and to correct potential problems with survey questions in the development or pre-testing phase (Beatty & Willis, 2007). This method is used to detect whether participants are not understanding any of the newly developed survey items. Finally, a survey was conducted to test the reliability and validity of the scenario-based scale. The following sections describe the details of the three research phases.

3.1.1 Conceptual Definition

Following the steps for scale validation (Mackenzie, Podsakoff & Podsakoff, 2011), a conceptual definition of the construct of workplace allocentrism was first developed. Allocentrism was conceptualized on the basis of the definition put forth by Triandis and colleagues (1995). Allocentric individuals are defined as viewing themselves as part of a group, giving priority to group-goals over individual goals behaving on the basis of
perceived duties and obligations to the group, and continuing to take part in group relationships even when the costs outweigh the benefits (Triandis et al., 1995). This procedure allowed for an identification of what the construct is intended to represent in both unambiguous terms and also in terms consistent with prior research (Mackenzie, Podsakoff & Podsakoff, 2011).

3.1.2 Item Generation

Next, items were generated to represent the construct. Input from HR practitioners (n=7) was utilized to develop 14 scenarios that assess allocentrism in the workplace. Email invitations soliciting input were sent out to alumni from a graduate program in Industrial Relations and HRM from a large Canadian university. Interested individuals were asked to provide information on scenarios that they had witnessed in their workplaces, in which the dimension of allocentrism was present. HR practitioners represented transportation, education, finance, management and health care sectors of the economy. The majority of the participants worked in the private sector (n=5). The original 14 scale items are in Appendix A.

3.1.3 Content Validity

Graduate students in Industrial Relations and HRM (n=36) from a large Canadian university were asked to assess whether the scenarios were related to the theoretical dimension of allocentrism. In order to complete this activity, it is required that individuals possess adequate intellectual ability to be able to rate the relationship between the scale items and the definitions of the theoretical dimensions (Schriesheim et al., 1993). As such, graduate students, in an Industrial Relations/HRM department, were
appropriate. The present researcher administered the questionnaire to these subject matter experts. The questionnaire took approximately 15 minutes to complete.

The respondents rated each of the 14 scenarios on the extent to which they felt the items were consistent with the dimension of allocentrism on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (completely). Allocentrism was conceptualized on the basis of the definition put forth by Triandis and colleagues (1995), which is reflective of both vertical and horizontal collectivism. However, this distinction (vertical versus horizontal) is used to distinguish on a country-level, rather than an individual level; and so, one measure of allocentrism was developed taking into consideration both types of collectivism. Allocentric individuals are defined as viewing themselves as part of a group, giving priority to group-goals over individual goals behaving on the basis of perceived duties and obligations to the group, and continuing to take part in group relationships even when the costs outweigh the benefits (Triandis et al., 1995). Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations. All 14 scenarios were judged to be representative of the dimension of allocentrism. Therefore, they were retained for further analysis.

3.1.4 Cognitive Interviews

Consistent with the literature (Willis, 1994; McColl, 2001), two rounds of cognitive interviews were conducted with graduate students in Industrial Relations and HRM. Graduate students (n=20) participated in the first round of interviews. They were asked the following two questions: (1) Are there any scenarios that you found confusing? and (2) Are there any scenarios that you found redundant? The first round of interviews did not find any issues with the items; however, a second round was conducted for good
measure. Graduate students (n=16) participated in the second round of interviews and were asked the same questions. Once again, no problems with the items were identified. Therefore, all of the items were retained in their original form.

3.1.5 Measurement Model Specification

Following the measurement and validation model outlined by Mackenzie, Podsakoff and Podsakoff (2011), model specification was the next step in the analysis. This step requires a researcher to formally specify the measurement model to be used in scale validation. A one-factor reflective model was specified to measure the latent construct of workplace allocentrism using the 14 scenario items. Figure 2 depicts the measurement model.

3.1.6 Scale Evaluation and Refinement

The scale was then subjected to evaluation and refinement. Data were collected from a sample of undergraduate students at a large Canadian university (n=235) to assess the psychometric properties of the scale and assess its criterion-related validity. Although it is recommended that the sample represent the population for which this scale is intended (i.e. employed individuals), it is recognized that due to time and resource constraints this may not always be an option. Therefore, it is recognized that undergraduate students may be more accessible to the researcher but also may be quite similar to the population of interest, in some cases (Mackenzie, Podsakoff & Podsakoff, 2011). Given that the majority of the sample used had work experience (n=235, $\bar{x}$=4.1 years, SD=4.1) undergraduates were deemed appropriate to use for scale evaluation and refinement.
Sample size is an important factor to consider in conducting scale evaluation and refinement, in order to minimize Type I and II errors. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) recommends a sample size between 100 to 500 (Comrey & Lee, 1992) and a minimum ratio of number of respondents to number of items in the scale from 3:1 to 10:1 (Cattell, 1978; Everitt, 1975). The sample used in this analysis (n=235) was deemed appropriate. The sample consisted of 58% females, the average age was 21.8 years (SD=3.7), and participants had an average of 4.1 (SD=4.1) years work experience.

Given that, each indicator was associated with only one latent factor (i.e., workplace allocentrism) individual indicator reliability and validity was evaluated by examining whether a significant relationship existed between each individual indicator and the latent construct (Mackenzie, Podsakoff & Podsakoff, 2011). The results of the initial model are presented in Table 2 (Model 1).

The relationships between the latent construct and scenarios 5 and 6 were low and non-significant. In addition, the factor loadings for scenarios 8, 10, and 12 were low (less than .30) Non-significant or weak loadings indicate a lack of validity (Gerbing & Anderson, 1984).

Next, initial model fit was examined. The results are presented in Table 3 (Model 1). A model is regarded to be acceptable if it meets the following conditions: the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) exceeds .93 (Byrne, 1994), the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) is less than .08 (Brown & Cudeck, 1993; Hu & Bentler, 1998), and the relative chi-square should be less than 2 or 3 (Kline, 1998; Ullman, 2001). The initial model had the
following fit: CFI=.62, RMS=.07, SRMR=.62 and relative chi-square = 2.21. Overall, there was inadequate fit in this model.

Before any items were deleted, the reliability of the set of indicators at the construct level was evaluated through an examination of Cronbach's (1951) internal consistency reliability (Mackenzie, Podsakoff, & Podsakoff, 2011). The initial scale consisted of 14 items ($\alpha = .58$) (See Table 4). Significant improvements to the index of reliability could be made through the deletion of the weak-loading scenarios.

The next stage was to refine the scale. This included the elimination of indicators, which had (1) non-significant loadings on the hypothesized construct, and (2) indicators which would significantly improve the scale reliability if they were deleted (Mackenzie, Podsakoff & Podsakoff, 2011).

Scenarios 5, 6, 8, 10, and 12 had low and non-significant loadings on the latent construct. As such, the decision was made to eliminate these five items (scenarios 5, 6, 8, 10, and 12).

Individual indicator validity and model fit were reassessed. Error terms were free to covary between one pair of items to improve fit and help reduce bias in the goodness of fit of the model (Reddy, 1992). The resulting loadings are presented in Table 2 (Model 2). All 9 indicators loaded significantly on the latent construct. The model had the following fit (Table 3): CFI=.97, RMSEA=.03, SRMR =.05, and relative chi-square = 1.16 ($p=.26$). This model had adequate fit. The resulting scale had 9 items ($\alpha = .63$).
Lower alpha levels are expected in scenario-based scale assessment because of the lower internal consistency in these scales, compared to Likert-based scales (Chan & Schmitt, 1997; Motowidlo et al., 1990). Scenario-based scales are more situational and thus have higher specific variances and lower inter-correlations. As such, the lower alphas of these scales are accepted.

The measurement model was re-estimated using a new sample of data. The new sample, which was also used to test the main models, (n=432) was recruited from an online panel owned by Qualtrics Labs Inc. and consisted of working adults in Canada, of which 50% females, 30% were between the ages of 45-54, and approximately 80% were employed full-time. Individual indicator validity and model fit were reassessed. The resulting loadings are presented in Table 5. All 9 indicators loaded significantly on the latent construct. The model had the following fit: CFI=.91, RMSEA=.06, SRMR =.05, and relative chi-square = 2.86. This model had adequate fit. The internal consistency of the items was .71.

3.1.7 Construct Validity

Next, the criterion-related validity of the 9-item scale was assessed. Assessing the criterion-related validity involves testing whether the focal construct is significantly related to other constructs that are in its nomological network (Mackenzie, Podsakoff & Podsakoff, 2011). Undergraduate students from a large Canadian university (N=235) were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with the 16 statements in Triandis and Gelfand’s (1998) “Individualism and Collectivism Scale”. The results are presented in Table 6. The workplace allocentrism scale was positively correlated with vertical
collectivism and horizontal collectivism (r=.56; r=.86). The workplace allocentrism scale was not significantly correlated with vertical and horizontal individualism, and the relationships were negative. Based on the criteria of r > .50 (Swinkels et al., 2006), the new scale was deemed to have construct validity and this suggests that the scale is measuring what it is intended to measure.

The newly developed 9-item scenario-based scale of workplace allocentrism was found to be adequate in terms of reliability and validity through the results of an adequate model fit and construct validity.

3.2 Discussion

The major outcome of this part of the study is the development of a workplace allocentrism scale. This scale was designed to measure the allocentric value of individuals in the workplace. Through a mixed methods research design, a workplace allocentrism scale was developed and its reliability and validity was demonstrated.

3.3 Implications and Limitations

This study developed a reliable and valid workplace allocentrism scale which can be of use to future studies in HRM and organizational behavior. This scale has a strict workplace focus; and so, it is more specific than previous measures of allocentrism. Given that previous scales have suffered from low fidelity due to the broad nature of the measurement scales, this study contributes a context-specific scale, which may alleviate some of the measurement issues associated with previous allocentrism scales.
The present study also contributes to cultural-influence literature. As is the case with all studies, there are limitations that should be noted when interpreting the results. First, undergraduate students with workplace experience formed the major population of this study. The newly developed scale was replicated with employees; however, it should be reassessed to establish further validity. Second, future research should evaluate the test-retest reliability of this scale. Test-retest reliability is assumed to be a better measure of the reliability for scenario-based scales because it does not measure internal consistency (Chan & Schmitt, 1997; Motowidlo et al., 1990). Likert based scales consist on abstract statements and standardized response formats, whereas, scenario-based scale capture more behavioral measures thus they have higher item variances and lower inter-correlations (Konig et al., 2007). Third, future research should examine the construct validity of this measure with respect to the GLOBE measure of institutional- and in-group collectivism. Also, the discriminant validity of this measure should be further examined. Finally, this study relied solely on participants in Canada. Future research should examine whether the scale's properties hold across other cultures.

3.4 Conclusion

This scale may prove useful for cultural-influence and organizational scholars. Researchers can use this scale to assess the allocentric orientations of individuals within the workplace. Awareness of this value orientation is important because workplace values act as general constraints on workplace behaviours (Lord & Brown, 2001). The existence of individual-level differences in value orientations can explain why individuals react differently to the same organizational policies and practices. Thus, an
awareness of these differences can assist HR managers in understanding and managing employee behaviour.
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The purpose of this second study was to address whether a relationship exists between the value dimension of workplace allocentrism and the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of workers, whose co-workers were seen making use of flexible work arrangements. This chapter explains the methodology used to test the hypothesized co-worker model.

4 Research Design

A correlational design using cross-sectional survey methodology that included a number of survey instruments, was used to test the proposed co-worker model. A cross-sectional design was deemed appropriate for this research for the following reasons. First, the cross-sectional study design allows the researcher to compare many variables at a single point in time. Second, it allows the researcher to gather information from a variety of employed individuals who have flexible work arrangement policies in their workplace. Third, because this research was focused on associations, rather than cause and effect, a cross-sectional design was convenient in terms of time and resources.

4.1 Sample Characteristics

In order to qualify for the study, a participant had to possess three characteristics. First, the person had to be between the ages of (18-64) and second, had to have flexible work arrangement policies available at work. Third, flexible work arrangement policies must have been used by at least one individual on the participant’s team or by someone with
whom the participant regularly works.

4.2 Sample Disposition

Participants were recruited from an online panel owned by Qualtrics Labs Inc. - a survey tool that allows users to develop and administer surveys to select panels. Canadian panel members (n=18,125) were randomly selected by Qualtrics Labs Inc. to receive invitations to participate in this study. Of the 18,125 sent an initial invitation, 2134 expressed an interest in completing the survey (12% response rate). Of those who acknowledged the invitation, 32 were disqualified for not providing consent. Another 1065 were disqualified through lack of qualification on the sample requirements, that is not of working age, at their organization for less than 6 months, unemployed, organization did not offer flexible work arrangements, and/or did not work with someone who is/has used flexible work arrangements. Of the remaining 1069 panelists, 254 were cleaned from the study for timing out of the survey, and 383 were eliminated for not completing the survey. This left a final sample size of 432 participants (2% response rate). This sample size was deemed appropriate based on the recommendations of Bentler and Chou (1987). Table 7 reports the full sample disposition.

Of the 432 completed surveys, 50 percent were women and 50 percent were men, ranging in age from 18 to 64. Most participants were married (62%). Seventy-nine percent of them were employed full-time, 86% of the sample had used flexible work arrangements at some point in their career, and only 36% reported that a formal policy existed for flexible work arrangement usage. Finally, 61% of respondents indicated that their work team was interdependent. Detail on the demographic breakdown, by gender, is
provided in Table 8.

4.3 Data Collection

Common method variance (CMV) was a concern in this study because the relationships between the variables were measured with the same method – self-reports- and at the same time. Following the recommendations of Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Lee and Podsakoff (2003), several techniques were used to control for this issue. The predictor and criterion variables were separated methodologically to reduce the logical flow of variables. This was done in two ways. First, a psychological separation was created through the use of a cover story, which made it seem that these two variables were not connected. Second, different response formats were used (i.e., scenario-based scales, 5-point Likert scale, 7-point Likert scale) for the measurement of the predictor and criterion variables.

4.4 Incentives

Participants were rewarded with incentives for completing the survey, namely, points that could be redeemed for prizes. These incentives were provided to the research participants to recognize the time and effort involved in participating in the research. Qualtrics Labs Inc. decided on the amount of compensation based on how long the survey took to complete (i.e. how many points to reward). Individuals who quit the survey before completion would not have invested a great deal of time and effort in participating in the survey, and so there was no disadvantage to them from not receiving points. The survey tool stressed that the compensation was conditional upon (1) qualifying for the survey based on the specific characteristics sought after and (2) completing the survey. The
compensation was not set too high to obstruct the voluntary participation (i.e. the points from one survey were not adequate enough to attain a prize).

4.5 Ethical Considerations

This study presented minimal risk to the participants. Informed consent was given to each participant prior to completing the survey. The participants were informed that participation was voluntary, and they could withdraw at any time. Anonymity was ensured as only Qualtrics Labs Inc. had access to respondents' contact information. All identifying information was cleaned by Qualtrics Labs Inc. prior to making it available to the researcher. Data were only made available to the present researcher.

4.6 Measures

The following section describes the measures that were included. Table 9 contains the full list for each measure.

4.6.1 Workplace Allocentrism

A scenario-based scale was created for this study to measure the value of allocentrism within the workplace. This measure was created to address the low reliability issue that can be attributed to the broad nature of these constructs (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk & Gelfand, 1995). Based on recommendations that measures of allocentrism should specify a relevant group of interest to improve its reliability (Rhee, Uleman & Lee, 1996), a measure was constructed specifically for the workplace. While a family-specific scale of allocentrism had already been developed (Lay et al., 1998), a scale relevant to the workplace did not exist. The development and validation of this scale is detailed in Chapter 3. The internal consistency of the final nine item scale was .71.


4.6.2 Job Satisfaction

The Overall Job Satisfaction Scale (OJS; Brayfield & Rothe, 1951) was used to measure job satisfaction. The OJS was chosen over the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1967) because it assesses how individuals feel about their jobs rather than what they believe about the actual components of their job. The coefficient of reliability for this measure ranges from .88 to .91 (Shore, Newton & Thornton, 1990; Moorman, 1991; Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999). This measure correlates positively with a composite measure of job facets supervisory support, autonomy, distributive justice, employee perceptions of support, sensitivity to equity and job involvement lending credit to convergent validity (Aryee, Fields & Luk, 1999). A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) provided empirical evidence of this measure’s distinctness from measures of organizational commitment and job involvement, which supports its discriminant validity (Brooke, Russell & Price, 1988). The reliability of the six items was .90.

4.6.3 Organizational Commitment

To measure commitment, the 6-item affective commitment portion of the TCM Employee Commitment Survey (Meyer, Allen & Smith, 1993) was used. The reliability and validity of this survey have been researched and supported extensively (Allen & Meyer, 1996, 2000). The coefficient alphas ranged from .77 to .88 for affective commitment (i.e. Cohen, 1996, 1999; Cohen & Kirchmeyer, 1995; Meyer & Allen, 1997). Using CFA, Cohen (1996) assessed the discriminant validity of this composite measure. The evidence suggested that affective commitment was empirically distinct from job involvement, career commitment and work involvement. The reliability of these
six items was .86.

4.6.4 Demographic and Control Measures

The study used the following control variables: gender, age, marital status, and presence of children. Research on job satisfaction and gender has found evidence for a gender gap. On average, women report higher job satisfaction than men (Dalton & Marcis, 1987; Clark, 1997). Furthermore, flexible work hours result in higher job satisfaction levels and organizational commitment levels for both women and employees who have family responsibilities (Scandura & Lankau, 1997). Several studies have found a positive correlation between age and job satisfaction (i.e. Hunt & Saul, 1975; Kacmar & Ferris, 1989; Hassell & Perrewe, 1993). Age and marital status have also been found to be positively correlated with organizational commitment. Research has also found a negative correlation between education and organizational commitment (Glisson & Durick, 1988).

Measures of the participant's tenure in the organization and size of current team were also gathered. In addition, the survey controlled for the presence of task interdependence on the team (Pearce & Greggerson, 1991) and prior use of FWA (Grover, 1991).

4.7 Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and structural equation modeling (SEM). CFA was used as a means of construct validation to ensure that the measures were loading on their appropriate latent factors (MacCallum & Austin, 2000). SEM is a useful technique in cross-sectional designs to observe latent variables when
there are multiple dependent variables. Multiple equations allow for assessing multiple indicators that measure each concept (MacCallum & Austin, 2000). The hypothesized theoretical model of the relationships were tested to see if the theory matched the data. Path analysis techniques were used to examine the relationship between the variables of workplace allocentrism, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Bivariate and multiple regression analyses computed path coefficients for the main model. Two direct relationships were tested: workplace allocentrism and job satisfaction, workplace allocentrism and organizational commitment. Finally, job satisfaction was tested as a mediator of the workplace allocentrism and organizational commitment relationship.

As noted earlier, common method variance (CMV) was a concern in this study because the relationships between the variables were measured with the same method – self-report, and at the same time. Statistical remedies were used to assess the presence of CMV. Specifically, Harman’s single factor test was used (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Harman’s single factor test assesses whether the majority of the variance can be accounted for by a single factor.

Chapter 5 presents the detailed results of this study.
This chapter presents the results of the data analysis. Confirmatory factor analysis and tests of discriminant validity are presented. The results of the measurement model are reported, as well as, the Harman's single factor test. Finally, the tests of hypotheses are reported for the structural model.

5 Results

5.1 Descriptive Statistics and Tests of Discriminant Validity

Table 10 presents the scale reliabilities, means and standard deviations for each scale and inter-scale correlations for all study variables.

A series of confirmatory factor analyses were conducted in order to assess the potential presence of common method variance, as well as to establish the discriminant validity of the scales (Podsakoff, Mackenzie Lee & Podsakoff, 2003). The measurement model was tested first. All items loaded onto their respective factors (i.e. workplace allocentrism, job satisfaction, organizational commitment). The three factors were allowed to correlate. In order to improve fit and help to reduce bias in the estimated parameter values, error terms were free to covary between one pair of workplace allocentrism items, job satisfaction and organizational commitment items, as recommended by Reddy (1992).
Four fit indices were used to establish the goodness of fit of the model. A model is regarded to be acceptable if it meets the following conditions: the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) exceeds .95 represents good model fit and values greater than .90 are acceptable (Bentler, 1990), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) are below .08 (Brown & Cudeck, 1993; Hu & Bentler, 1998), and the relative chi-square should be less than 2 or 3 (Kline, 1998; Ullman, 2001).

The three-factor model showed an acceptable model fit ($\chi^2=538$; $df =183$, CFI=.91; RMSEA=.07; SRMR=.05). Sequential $\chi^2$ difference tests were carried out comparing the full measurement model to three alternative nested models. Specifically, the full measurement model was compared to the three alternative nested models, as shown in Table 11. The results showed that the model fit of any of the alternative models was significantly worse than that of the full measurement model ($p<.001$). Finally, Harman's single factor test was conducted to test for the presence of common method variance. The results suggest that the constructs used in the study are distinct and that common method bias did not influence the results. Figure 3 presents the final measurement model.

### 5.2 Test of Hypotheses

A mediated model was tested using latent variable structural equation modeling in AMOS v22. The model examined whether co-workers’ allocentric value orientations were related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment levels, and whether co-
workers' job satisfaction levels mediated the relationship between workplace allocentrism and organizational commitment.

Mediation was examined by testing three models (saturated, direct and indirect) (Mathieu & Taylor, 2006). The saturated model involved estimating paths from workplace allocentrism to job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and a direct path from job satisfaction to organizational commitment. The saturated model had an acceptable fit ($\chi^2=538; df=183; \text{CFI}=.91; \text{RMSEA}=.07; \text{SRMR}=.05$)

Next, a direct effects model was tested. A direct path was estimated from workplace allocentrism to organizational commitment and no paths were tested leading to or coming from the mediator (job satisfaction). The direct effects model showed a weak model fit ($\chi^2=831; df=185; \text{CFI}=.83; \text{RMSEA}=.09; \text{SRMR}=.19$). The direct effects model was nested within the saturated model. This warranted the use of $\chi^2$ difference test to compare the fit. This model was significantly different from the saturated model ($\Delta \chi^2(2)=293, p<.001$). This difference in fit indicates that either workplace allocentrism has a direct relationship with job satisfaction, or that job satisfaction has a significant relationship with organizational commitment. Either way, the results lend support to the importance of the mediator variable in this relationship.

Finally, an indirect effects model was estimated with a direct path from workplace allocentrism to job satisfaction and from job satisfaction to organizational commitment. The indirect effects model showed a better model fit than the direct effects model ($\chi^2=545; df=184; \text{CFI}=.91; \text{RMSEA}=.07; \text{SRMR}=.06$), and again differed significantly from the saturated model ($\Delta \chi^2(1)=7, p<.01$). This difference in fit indicates
that the independent variable has a direct relationship with the outcome variable. The fit statistics for all three models are presented in Table 12.

The parameter estimates in Figure 4 show that workplace allocentrism was significantly related to both job satisfaction ($\beta = .32$) and organizational commitment ($\beta = .13$). Furthermore, job satisfaction was significantly related to organizational commitment ($\beta = .76$). The model further indicated that the path between workplace allocentrism and organizational commitment was partially mediated by job satisfaction.

### 5.3 Controls

Previous research has found that control variables such as gender, age, marital status, presence of children and tenure, influence the results of work-family research. A descriptive analysis of the present data shows that the control variables showed very little differentiation among respondents. For example, previous research (Grover, 1991) has suggested the inclusion of "prior use of FWA" as a control variable. However, in the current data set, most individuals (86%) had already used FWA, and so it was dismissed as a control variable. Further, 70% of individuals indicated that they did not have a child under the age of 13 currently living with them. Thus, this variable too was dismissed as a control.

Through an iterative process, controls were added into the model and standardized estimates were calculated. Of the six control variables assessed, tenure was the only control with a significant individual relationship with organizational commitment, marital status remained the only control with a significant individual
relationship with job satisfaction. Adding these variables, however, did not alter the pattern of hypothesized relationships (significant vs. non-significant) nor did it alter the effect size of the main relationships, namely, workplace allocentrism and job satisfaction; workplace allocentrism and organizational commitment; job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Therefore, it was decided to leave the models without controls. Table 13 provides an assessment of the controls and their statistical significance versus the two main outcome variables.

Chapter 6 discusses the findings of this analysis, examines the practical applications of the results, and offers suggestions for future research.
Chapter 6
Discussion

The purpose of this study was to assess whether psychological and cultural dimensions affect the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of co-workers when flexible work arrangements are used by someone on their team, or by someone with whom they regularly interact.

The data used in this study were collected from a cross-sectional panel of working adults which were analyzed using structural equation modeling techniques. The online panel provided a broad range of employees in Canada. This allowed a broad examination of the effect of flexible work arrangement usage on co-workers.

This chapter summarizes the results of the study and examines the findings in light of the work-family and cultural-influence literatures. Limitations of the study are also discussed. Finally, the practical implications of this study and future directions are given.

6 Findings

6.1 The Hypothesized Co-Worker Model

The hypothesized Co-Worker Model was shown to be an adequate fit for the data in this study. This suggests that the hypothesized relationships were indicative of the data collected. The results showed that there was a significant positive relationship between a
co-worker’s level of allocentrism and job satisfaction. More allocentric co-workers were more likely to exhibit higher levels of job satisfaction. Further, the results indicated a significant positive relationship between a co-worker’s level of allocentrism and organizational commitment. Co-workers that were more allocentric were more likely to show higher organizational commitment. Moreover, job satisfaction was shown to mediate the relationship between a co-worker’s level of allocentrism and organizational commitment.

6.2 Contributions

6.2.1 Theoretical Contributions

This study presents findings that make several contributions to the literature. First, they add to the literature on flexible work arrangements by expanding the focus on co-workers who have someone on their team, or someone they regularly interact with, who use flexible work arrangements. Past research in this area (e.g. Scandura and Lankau, 1997; McNall et al., 2010) has focused primarily on the implications of flexible work arrangement usage on the actual users of these policies and the effects of this usage on workplace behaviors (i.e. job satisfaction and organizational commitment). The literature has not considered the effects on workers’ job attitudes, whose co-workers are seen making use of these policies. Thus, this study adapts a more comprehensive perspective of the relationship of flexible work arrangement usage and affect in the workplace.

Second, the present study considers the effect of individual-level value differences (i.e. workplace allocentrism) on workers' job satisfaction and organizational
commitment levels. While past research has considered the effect of value differences on organizational behaviors (i.e. organizational citizenship behaviors, job performance), the effect on organizational attitudes, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment, in the context of flexible work arrangement usage, has been largely ignored. The research that has been conducted linking cultural values and organizational behavior, in the context of flexible work arrangements, has been more macro-focused (i.e. examining cross-national effects of these policies). To the author's knowledge, micro-level analyses have not been conducted within this context.

Further, the study examined the mechanism through which individual-level value differences in allocentrism influenced the organizational commitment of co-workers. Specifically, it showed that job satisfaction mediated this relationship. Past research has demonstrated that job satisfaction is an important mediator in the relationship between organizational variables and organizational commitment (i.e. Elangovan, 2001; Crow et al., 2012). However, there has been little to no work showing whether job satisfaction does in fact act as an important mediator in the values-commitment relationship. Therefore, this study adds to the literature by showing that allocentrism is related to job satisfaction, which in turn adds to co-workers' organizational commitment.

The results of this study are similar to research and theory on organizational justice. Meta-analytic findings have revealed that procedural justice and organizational commitment are strongly related (i.e. Colquitt et al., 2001; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch & Topolnytsky, 2002). Similarly, the present study found that more allocentric value tendencies were positively related to organizational commitment. Social exchange theory reveals that perceptions of fair treatment instill a sense of obligation within the employee
to repay this treatment through workplace behaviours (i.e. job satisfaction and organizational commitment). (e.g. Moorman, Blakely & Niehoff, 1998; Pillai, Schriesheim & Williams, 1999). Similarly, more allocentric individuals, who feel more a part of the collective, and so, they exhibit higher levels of organizational commitment. Allocentric individuals value a feeling of "us" and prioritize group goals over individual goals. When others use flexible work arrangements, they perceive the team as representative of themselves and in doing so form an exchange relationship with the organization on behalf of the collective. Overall, this study has important contributions to the work-family and cultural-influence literatures. It is one of the first to explore the effect of flexible work arrangements on co-workers, rather than users. In addition, it is the first to explore the relationship between individual-level value differences (i.e. allocentrism) and workplace attitudes, in the context of flexible work arrangements.

6.2.2 Practical Contributions

This study’s results have organizational- and individual-level practical implications. These findings indicate the importance of the relationship between users of flexible work arrangements and their co-workers. Specifically, given the link between individual-level value differences and workplace behaviors, HR managers and users of flexible work arrangements should be cognizant of co-worker perceptions of this policy usage.

Managers and employees should be very aware of the procedures involved in flexible work arrangement usage. Following the established norms regarding such policy usage has been shown to improve perceptions of procedural justice for the individuals
who see others making use of these policies (Sprinkle, 2012). Further, implementing formal policies for flexible work arrangement usage should be strongly considered. Only 36% of the study’s participants indicated that a formal policy for flexible work arrangements existed in their organizations. Previous research has found that idiosyncratic and informal deals struck to accommodate on-going flexible work arrangement usage is increasingly being interpreted by others as outside of normal practices and such deals are being perceived as unfair by employees (Hornung et al., 2008). Following established norms and guidelines reduces the ambiguity surrounding the usage of these policies (Sprinkle, 2012). Furthermore, less allocentric individuals respond better to formalized policies, because they prefer to resolve any conflicts by relying on formal policies (Gorodnichenko & Roland, 2012). Thus, further lending credit to the recommendation to formalize flexible work arrangement policies. When co-workers perceive that guidelines and procedures are being disregarded, they may feel that this reduces any control over the usage of flexible work arrangements. Perceptions of lack of control have been shown to increase co-workers’ propensity towards deviant behavior (Bennett & Robinson, 2003). As such, there is further evidence to justify formalizing flexible work arrangement policies in workplaces.

Managers should also pay attention to the composition of their work-group. Previous research has shown that more allocentric workers respond with higher OCBs, when the manager uses a transformational leadership style; whereas, more idiocentric workers respond with higher OCBs, when the manager employs a transactional leadership style (e.g. Nahum-Shani & Somech, 2011). Thus, if managers are aware that the work group that they are managing is more or less allocentric, they can use different
leadership styles to manage these workers so that OCBs increase when a member(s) of the group are seen making use of flexible work arrangements.

Organizations should also pay particular attention to the culture of their organization. Creating a culture of a work-life organization is critical for workplaces which have flexible work arrangement policies. In such cultures, covering for flexible work arrangement absences is considered to be a normal part of a co-worker’s inputs and outputs (Sprinkle, 2012). Previous research (i.e. Gilliland, Benson & Schepers, 1998) has suggested that there are behavioral violation thresholds between co-workers, and once these thresholds are reached – employees will ignore reciprocal relationships. This has implications for flexible work arrangement usage in that unless the culture of an organization is more altruistic and reciprocal, co-workers may eventually get fed up with covering for others’ absences or re-arranging schedules to accommodate those using the policies and will restrict or ignore reciprocal relationships.

Finally, because co-workers may feel procedural injustice when they see others making use of flexible work arrangement policies, managers and users of these policies should consider justifying the leave-taking. Such justification can involve the use of timely information and honesty in terms of the reasoning behind using these policies. These two procedures have been shown to improve perceptions of procedural, interpersonal and informational justice for co-workers (Sprinkle, 2012).
6.3 Limitations

This study makes theoretical and practical contributions to the work-family and cultural-influence literatures; however, there are limitations that should be acknowledged when interpreting the results of the study.

First, the cross-sectional nature of the study means that causality cannot be inferred. Although the hypotheses were based on theory, and structural equation modeling was used to provide simultaneous estimates for all paths, causality cannot be implied from the model. An experimental design could produce results that are more conclusive. Second, the design of the online survey allowed individuals to opt out at any time throughout the survey. Therefore, a self-selection problem may have existed in which the bias of those who self-selected into the survey may have affected the results.

Third, the study relied exclusively on self-report measures, which raises the possibility of common method variance (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Following the recommendations laid out by Podsakoff et al. (2003), steps were taken to minimize this concern. These included methodologically separating the predictor and criterion variables to reduce the logical flow of variables, different response formats were used throughout the survey, and scales with established construct validity were used in the study. Further, statistical tests were used to assess the presence of common method variance (Podsakoff et al., 2003), and the results suggested that common method variance did not overly influence the results.
Fourth, the model tested in this study presupposed that using flexible work arrangements will hurt co-workers, perhaps through an increased work load, less face time, or perceptions of injustice surrounding the actual usage of these policies. While anecdotal evidence of such negative effects does exist (Working Families, 2008), to the author’s knowledge there has not been specific research evidence of such a negative effect.

Finally, the construct validity of the allocentrism measurement tool should be acknowledged. Although an unbiased process was followed (Podsakoff et al., 2011) to create the measurement tool, future research should focus on further establishing the validity of this new tool.

### 6.4 Future Research

Future research should consider exploratory work on the present allocentrism measurement tool to further establish construct validity. Specifically, future research should test whether these results are culturally robust. Given that Canada is a very individualistic country (Hofstede, 2001), one would expect to have more individuals scoring lower on the allocentrism score than in a more collectivistic country. As such, future research should test the reliability and validity of this new measure on a very collectivistic society, such as China or India.

Given that allocentrism and idiocentrism are considered two distinct constructs which can coexist in different degrees (e.g. Triandis et al., 1985; Triandis, 1995; Oyserman et al., 2002), future research could benefit from incorporating idiocentrism
into the hypothesized co-worker model. Both work-family and cultural-influence literatures could benefit from an understanding of the role of both of these values in the context of flexible work arrangement usage.

Further, future research should explore the differences in these values and their effects on workplace behaviours for the co-workers and the respective users. Given the nature of the study and the online panel, that was used, it was impossible to link users of flexible work arrangements with their co-workers to compare the effects of these policies; thus, the focus was on co-workers. However, given data within which these dyads can be created could shed light on the overall effect of flexible work arrangement usage for the team, rather than individual-level insight. Moreover, future research should examine differences in the relationships between allocentrism and these workplace attitudes for organizations, which are just introducing flexible work arrangement policies.

In addition, future research should also explore the relationship between length of flexible work arrangements usage and workers’ job attitudes (i.e. job satisfaction and organizational commitment). This study relied on individuals who had seen a co-worker making use of flexible work arrangements within the past year. A measure of how long these policies had been used by these individuals was not included. In line with research on behavioral violation thresholds (i.e. Gilliland, Benson & Schepers, 1998), the work-family literature could benefit from understanding how much is too much and whether lengthy and continuous usage of flexible work arrangements moderates the relationship between workplace values and job attitudes.
Furthermore, future research should also explore whether there are differential relationships between workplace values and job attitudes based on how many co-workers are seen making use of flexible work arrangements. This study asked participants whether someone was seen making use of these policies, but participants were not explicitly asked how many co-workers were being seen using flexible work arrangements. Future research should consider whether the number of co-workers being seen using these arrangements moderates the relationship between workplace values and job attitudes. Moreover, future research should examine whether simultaneous usage of these policies by others also acts as a moderator of these relationships.

Finally, future research should explore under what conditions do these relationships between allocentrism and job satisfaction and organizational commitment hold. Specifically, future research should examine whether job type, level of task interdependence, size of group and formality of workplace policies are important moderators in the relationship between allocentric values and job attitudes. Certain work groups may be more affected by the usage of flexible work arrangements by a co-worker because of their specific working conditions. An understanding of which conditions act as important moderators of these relationships would be beneficial for future theory building and for HR managers in understanding which groups they should be paying specific attention to when these policies are introduced and actually used by a member of the group.
6.5 Conclusion

In light of increasing availability and usage of flexible work arrangements, understanding the outcomes associated with these policies is of increasing importance. Previous research has looked at the outcomes associated with flexible work arrangement policies for the users of these policies; however, the outcomes for co-workers have been largely ignored.

This research examined the effects of flexible work arrangement usage on the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of co-workers. The results indicate that for employees whose co-workers are seen making use of flexible work arrangements, workers with more allocentric value orientations have higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. These findings suggest that HR managers should pay attention to co-workers and their workplace behaviours when others are using flexible work arrangements. In addition, it indicates that value orientations are important to consider when evaluating the effectiveness of workplace policies and practices. What may appear effective for some, may be ineffective for others due to individual-level differences in values.
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### 8 Tables

#### 8.1 Table 1: Means and Standard Deviations of the Workplace Allocentrism Items Resulting From Content Validity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Definition of Self</th>
<th>Goal Orientation</th>
<th>Relationship Orientation</th>
<th>Determinant of Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdependent VS</td>
<td>Priority given to</td>
<td>Communal relationship in</td>
<td>Behaviour determined by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>In-group goals VS personal goals</td>
<td>which benefits are given without the obligation to repay VS Exchange relationship based on assumption that a benefit is given with the expectation of receiving a comparable benefit in return</td>
<td>societal norms VS Behaviour determined mostly by individual's attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
<td>(1.16)</td>
<td>(1.12)</td>
<td>(1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.34)</td>
<td>(1.23)</td>
<td>(1.20)</td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.53)</td>
<td>(1.20)</td>
<td>(1.08)</td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 4</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.28)</td>
<td>(1.19)</td>
<td>(1.42)</td>
<td>(1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 5</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 6</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 7</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 8</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 9</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 10</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 11</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 12</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.31)</td>
<td>(1.35)</td>
<td>(1.30)</td>
<td>(1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 13</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.46)</td>
<td>(1.21)</td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
<td>(1.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 14</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.27)</td>
<td>(1.33)</td>
<td>(1.39)</td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.2 Table 2: Standardized Factor Loadings of the Workplace Allocentrism Items Results of CFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBS1</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS2</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS3</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS4</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.58***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS5</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS6</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS7</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS8</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS9</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS10</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS11</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS12</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS13</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS14</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 235. All factor loadings are fully standardized lambda loadings derived from a confirmatory factor analysis using AMOS v22. *** p<.001. ** p < .01. * p < .05.
### 8.3 Table 3: Results of CFA Model Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$(df)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Initial model</td>
<td>170.40 (77)</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14 scenarios)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Refined Model</td>
<td>30.13 (26)</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9 scenarios)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 235. CFI = Confirmatory Fit Index. RMSEA = Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation. SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR).
### 8.4 Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Initial and Refined Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Initial Scale</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.80 (6.95)</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Final Scale</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.33 (5.59)</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 235.
8.5 Table 5: Standardized Factor Loadings of the Workplace Allocentrism Items Results of CFA on New Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBS1</td>
<td>.67***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS2</td>
<td>.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS3</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS4</td>
<td>.68***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS7</td>
<td>.38***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS9</td>
<td>.57***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS11</td>
<td>.51***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS13</td>
<td>.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS14</td>
<td>.42***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 432. All factor loadings are fully standardized lambda loadings derived from a confirmatory factor analysis using AMOS v22. *** p<.001. ** p < .01. * p < .05.
8.6 Table 6: Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Workplace Allocentrism</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Horizontal Collectivism</td>
<td>27.82</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Vertical Collectivism</td>
<td>29.02</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 235. All correlations are fully standardized derived from a confirmatory factor
### 8.7 Table 7: Sample Disposition of Online Panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total sample released</td>
<td>18,125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Refusal (ignored email invitation)</td>
<td>(15,991)</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responded to invitation</strong></td>
<td><strong>2166</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused consent</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified based on Sampling Requirements</td>
<td>(1065)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must be working age (18-64)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must be employed full or part-time</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must have been at the organization for at least 6 months</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization must offer FWA</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must work with/have worked with someone who has used FWA</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminated for timing out</td>
<td>(254)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminated for incomplete</td>
<td>(383)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Completes</strong></td>
<td><strong>432</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.8 Table 8: Demographic Analysis of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Participants</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 years old</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years old</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years old</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years old</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years old</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Domestic Partner</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single/Never Married</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/Divorced/Widowed</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months to less than 1 year</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year to less than 2 years</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to less than 3 years</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to less than 5 years</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to less than 10 years</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to less than 15 years</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years or more</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Under 13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous FWA Usage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal FWA Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of Work Team</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-50</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or more</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Interdependence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.9 Table 9: Survey Measures

Workplace Allocentrism

Please choose the number that is closest to how you feel.

1. Imagine that your co-worker makes a very big mistake on an important project that you are working on together. What do you do? (ALLO1)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meet with your co-worker and work together on fixing the problem.</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extremely true of me</td>
<td>very true of me</td>
<td>somewhat true of me</td>
<td>somewhat true of me</td>
<td>very true of me</td>
<td>extremely true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let your co-worker worry about fixing it. It was their mistake.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Imagine that you are presenting a project plan to senior management, with your co-worker. What do you do? (ALLO2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus on what you did.</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extremely true of me</td>
<td>very true of me</td>
<td>somewhat true of me</td>
<td>somewhat true of me</td>
<td>very true of me</td>
<td>extremely true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on how the team worked together.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Imagine that in the middle of working on a team project, you are offered a promotion. What do you do? (ALLO3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start your new job whenever the organization wants you to.</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extremely true of me</td>
<td>very true of me</td>
<td>somewhat true of me</td>
<td>somewhat true of me</td>
<td>very true of me</td>
<td>extremely true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to push back the start date so you can finish the project.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Imagine that you are working on a team project. One day, your manager and a senior VP are congratulating you on your amazing work. What do you do? (ALLO4)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Make a point of saying that it was a team effort.</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extremely true of me</td>
<td>very true of me</td>
<td>somewhat true of me</td>
<td>somewhat true of me</td>
<td>very true of me</td>
<td>extremely true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take all the credit and enjoy the praise.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Imagine that your co-worker asked for help with something and you offered your assistance. A few weeks later, you ask for some help but your co-worker does not help you. What do you do? (ALLO5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Make a point to never help your co-worker again.</th>
<th>➡️ ➡️ ➡️ ➡️ ➡️ ➡️</th>
<th>Rationalize why your co-worker couldn't help you. Maybe they were too busy or didn't know how to assist you.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) extremely true of me</td>
<td>(2) very true of me</td>
<td>(3) somewhat true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) somewhat true of me</td>
<td>(5) very true of me</td>
<td>(6) extremely true of me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Imagine that you come up with a great idea that would benefit your entire department. You know that you will not get any personal benefit from sharing this - but the department will gain. What do you do? (ALLO6)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share it. Everyone should benefit from this.</th>
<th>➡️ ➡️ ➡️ ➡️ ➡️ ➡️</th>
<th>Do not say anything. Save your idea for when you know you could gain from it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) extremely true of me</td>
<td>(2) very true of me</td>
<td>(3) somewhat true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) somewhat true of me</td>
<td>(5) very true of me</td>
<td>(6) extremely true of me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Imagine that someone asked you to perform a task that falls out of your duties and responsibilities. What do you do? (ALLO7)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perform the task if it is reasonable and would benefit the organization.</th>
<th>➡️ ➡️ ➡️ ➡️ ➡️ ➡️</th>
<th>Do not do it. It doesn't fall under your job description.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) extremely true of me</td>
<td>(2) very true of me</td>
<td>(3) somewhat true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) somewhat true of me</td>
<td>(5) very true of me</td>
<td>(6) extremely true of me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Imagine that you saw a manager behave inappropriately towards another employee in the hallway. Other employees saw this behaviour but ignored it. What do you do? (ALLO8)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report the behaviour to Human Resources.</th>
<th>➡️ ➡️ ➡️ ➡️ ➡️ ➡️</th>
<th>Pretend you didn’t see it and continue with your day.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) extremely true of me</td>
<td>(2) very true of me</td>
<td>(3) somewhat true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) somewhat true of me</td>
<td>(5) very true of me</td>
<td>(6) extremely true of me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Imagine that you asked one of your employees to send the director something by the end of the workday. The next day you get yelled at by the director for not sending the information. What do you do? (ALLO9)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Take the blame. You should have followed up with your employee if it was that important.</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true of me</td>
<td>true of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell the director it was the employee’s fault for not sending it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Job Satisfaction**

Please indicate how much you agree with each statement using the 5-point scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree.

1. I am often bored with my job (SAT1)*
2. I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job (SAT2)
3. I am satisfied with my job for the time being (SAT3)
4. Most days I am enthusiastic about my work (SAT4)
5. I like my job better than the average worker does (SAT5)
6. I find real enjoyment in my work (SAT6)

**Organizational Commitment**

Please indicate how much you agree with each statement using the 7-point scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 7=strongly agree.

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization (COM1)
2. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own (COM2)
3. I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization (COM3)*
4. I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization (COM4)*
5. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me (COM5)
6. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization (COM6)*
### Table 10: Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Scale Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Allocentrism</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.80***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N=432. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.*
### 8.11 Table 11: Fit Statistics from Measurement Model Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2 (df)$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>$\chi^2_{\text{diff}} (df)_{\text{diff}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Measurement Model</td>
<td>538 (183)</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model A(^a)</td>
<td>801 (185)</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>263 <strong>2</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model B(^b)</td>
<td>776 (185)</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>238 <strong>2</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model C(^c)</td>
<td>649 (185)</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>111 <strong>2</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model D(^d)</td>
<td>963 (186)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>425 <strong>3</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Harman’s Single Factor Test)

Notes: N=432. ***p* < .001; $X^2$ = chi-square discrepancy, $df$ = degrees of freedom; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; $\chi^2_{\text{diff}}$ = difference in chi-square, $df_{\text{diff}}$ = difference in degrees of freedom. In all measurement models, error terms were free to covary between one pair of allocentrism, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment items, respectively, to improve fit and help reduce bias in the estimated parameter values (Reddy, 1992). All models are compared to the full measurement model.

- **a** = Allocentrism and job satisfaction combined into a single factor
- **b** = Allocentrism and organizational commitment combined into a single factor
- **c** = Organizational commitment and job satisfaction combined into a single factor
- **d** = All factors combined into a single factor
8.12 Table 12: Structural Equation Model Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ (df)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>$\chi^2_{diff}$ (df)_{diff}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturated model</td>
<td>538 (183)</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effects model</td>
<td>831 (185)</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effects model</td>
<td>545 (184)</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N=432. ** $p<.01$. *** $p<.001$. Error terms were free to covary between one pair of allocentrism, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment items, respectively, to improve fit and help reduce bias in the estimated parameter values (Reddy, 1992).
8.13 Table 13: Controls and Relationship to Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Size of Team</th>
<th>Work Interdependence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2$, (df) Baseline Model: 538 (183)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>578</th>
<th>603</th>
<th>563</th>
<th>583</th>
<th>569</th>
<th>568</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Note. N= 432. s=significant at the 95% confidence level. ns= not significant at the 95% confidence level.
9 Figures

9.1 Figure 1: Hypothesized Co-Worker Model
9.2 Figure 2: Workplace Allocentrism Measurement Model
9.3 Figure 3: Workplace Allocentrism Measurement Model
9.4 Figure 4: Standardized Parameter Estimates of Final Model

Notes: N=432. **p<.01. ***p<.001.
**Appendix A**

**Initial Workplace Allocentrism Items**

1. Imagine that your co-worker makes a very big mistake on an important project that you are working on together. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meet with your co-worker and work together on fixing the problem.</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true of me</td>
<td>true of me</td>
<td>Let your co-worker worry about fixing it. It was their mistake.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Imagine that you are presenting a project plan to senior management, with your co-worker. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus on what you did.</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true of me</td>
<td>true of me</td>
<td>Focus on how the team worked together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Imagine that in the middle of working on a team project, you are offered a promotion. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start your new job whenever the organization wants you to.</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true of me</td>
<td>true of me</td>
<td>Try to push back the start date so you can finish the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Imagine that you are working on a team project. One day, your manager and a senior VP are congratulating you on your amazing work. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Make a point of saying that it was a team effort.</th>
<th>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6)</th>
<th>Take all the credit and enjoy the praise.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely very somewhat very extremely true of me</td>
<td>true of me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Imagine that you accidently hear the organization will be laying off many members of your department. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keep the information to yourself and pretend you didn't hear it.</th>
<th>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6)</th>
<th>Share this information with members of the department so they are better prepared.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely very somewhat very extremely true of me</td>
<td>true of me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Imagine that your co-worker made a big mistake at work that could have serious consequences. Your manager is trying to figure out who made this mistake and is asking around. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point at the person who made the mistake.</th>
<th>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6)</th>
<th>Don't say anything even though you know who did it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely very somewhat very extremely true of me</td>
<td>true of me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Imagine that your co-worker asked for help with something and you offered your assistance. A few weeks later, you ask for some help but your co-worker does not help you. What do you do?

| Make a point to never help your co-worker again. | (1) extremely | (2) very | (3) somewhat | (4) somewhat | (5) very | (6) extremely |
| Rationalize why your co-worker couldn't help you. Maybe they were too busy or didn't know how to assist you. | true of me | true of me |

8. Imagine that you found out important information about the company you are working in. Someone asked you if you know anything related to this matter. What do you do?

| Share the information because it is important. | (1) extremely | (2) very | (3) somewhat | (4) somewhat | (5) very | (6) extremely |
| Don't say anything unless they tell you something you want to know. | true of me | true of me |

9. Imagine that you come up with a great idea that would benefit your entire department. You know that you will not get any personal benefit from sharing this - but the department will gain. What do you do?

| Share it. Everyone should benefit from this. | (1) extremely | (2) very | (3) somewhat | (4) somewhat | (5) very | (6) extremely |
| Do not say anything. Save your idea for when you know you could gain from it. | true of me | true of me |
10. Imagine that in the team meeting you missed, your group unanimously decided on a course of action. You personally disagree with this plan. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Don't say anything. Go with what was already decided.</th>
<th>Make a point of speaking your mind.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) extremely true of me (2) very true of me (3) somewhat true of me (4) very extremely true of me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Imagine that someone asked you to perform a task that falls out of your duties and responsibilities. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perform the task if it is reasonable and would benefit the organization.</th>
<th>Do not do it. It doesn't fall under your job description.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) extremely true of me (2) very true of me (3) somewhat true of me (4) very extremely true of me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Imagine that you have noticed one of your co-workers coming in late and leaving early on a regular basis. At first it didn't bother you, but now you find you need to work harder to make up for what they are not doing. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report this behavior to your manager. It is not acceptable that you should pick up the slack for this individual.</th>
<th>Say nothing and continue to do what you are doing. No one seems to notice this besides you.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) extremely true of me (2) very true of me (3) somewhat true of me (4) very extremely true of me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Imagine that you saw a manager behave inappropriately towards another employee in the hallway. Other employees saw this behaviour but ignored it. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report the behaviour to Human Resources.</th>
<th>Report the behaviour to Human Resources.</th>
<th>Pretend you didn’t see it and continue with your day.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) extremely true of me</td>
<td>(2) very true of me</td>
<td>(3) somewhat true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) somewhat true of me</td>
<td>(5) very true of me</td>
<td>(6) extremely true of me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Imagine that you asked one of your employees to send the director something by the end of the workday. The next day you get yelled at by the director for not sending the information. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Take the blame. You should have followed up with your employee if it was that important.</th>
<th>Take the blame. You should have followed up with your employee if it was that important.</th>
<th>Tell the director it was the employee’s fault for not sending it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) extremely true of me</td>
<td>(2) very true of me</td>
<td>(3) somewhat true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) somewhat true of me</td>
<td>(5) very true of me</td>
<td>(6) extremely true of me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Content Validity Survey

Information Sheet for Research
University of Toronto
Center for Industrial Relations and Human Resources
Principal Investigator: Joanna Pitek
Faculty Advisor: Dr. Gary Latham

Title of Study: Assessing the Content Validity of a New Workplace Allocentrism Scale

Welcome to my survey and thank you again for your willingness to participate in this research project. The information that you provide in this survey will go far in helping to evaluate the content validity of a new allocentrism/idiocentrism scale. I've made this survey as short as possible. It should take about 10-15 minutes to complete.

Thank you again,

Joanna Pitek
**INSTRUCTIONS.** Please rate each of the 14 scenarios on the extent to which you believe the scenarios are consistent with each of the four dimensions.

1 (not at all)  2 (somewhat)  3 (moderately)  4 (mostly)  5 (completely)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Definition of Self</th>
<th>Goal Orientation</th>
<th>Relationship Orientation</th>
<th>Determinant of Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Interdependent VS Independent</td>
<td>Priority given to In-group goals VS personal goals</td>
<td>Communal relationship in which benefits are given without the obligation to repay VS Exchange relationship based on assumption that a benefit is given with the expectation of receiving a comparable benefit in return</td>
<td>Behaviour determined by societal norms VS Behaviour determined mostly by individual's attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Imagine that your co-worker makes a very big mistake on an important project that you are working on together. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meet with your co-worker and work together on fixing the problem.</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>True of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let your co-worker worry about fixing it. It was their mistake.</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True of me</td>
<td>True of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Imagine that you are presenting a project plan to senior management, with your co-worker. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus on what you did.</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>True of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on how the team worked together.</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True of me</td>
<td>True of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Imagine that in the middle of working on a team project, you are offered a promotion. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start your new job whenever the organization wants you to.</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>True of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to push back the start date so you can finish the project.</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True of me</td>
<td>True of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Imagine that you are working on a team project. One day, your manager and a senior VP are congratulating you on your amazing work. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Make a point of saying that it was a team effort.</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>True of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take all the credit and enjoy the praise.</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True of me</td>
<td>True of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Imagine that you accidentally hear the organization will be laying off many members of your department. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keep the information to yourself and pretend you didn't hear it.</th>
<th>extremely</th>
<th>very</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>very</th>
<th>extremely</th>
<th>true of me</th>
<th>true of me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share this information with members of the department so they are better prepared.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Imagine that your co-worker made a big mistake at work that could have serious consequences. Your manager is trying to figure out who made this mistake and is asking around. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point at the person who made the mistake.</th>
<th>extremely</th>
<th>very</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>very</th>
<th>extremely</th>
<th>true of me</th>
<th>true of me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't say anything even though you know who did it.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Imagine that your co-worker asked for help with something and you offered your assistance. A few weeks later, you ask for some help but your co-worker does not help you. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Make a point to never help your co-worker again.</th>
<th>extremely</th>
<th>very</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>very</th>
<th>extremely</th>
<th>true of me</th>
<th>true of me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rationalize why your co-worker couldn't help you. Maybe they were too busy or didn't know how to assist you.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Imagine that you found out important information about the company you are working in. Someone asked you if you know anything related to this matter. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share the information because it is important.</th>
<th>extremely</th>
<th>very</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>very</th>
<th>extremely</th>
<th>true of me</th>
<th>true of me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't say anything unless they tell you something you want to know.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Imagine that you come up with a great idea that would benefit your entire department. You know that you will not get any personal benefit from sharing this - but the department will gain. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share it. Everyone should benefit from this.</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true of me</td>
<td>true of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not say anything. Save your idea for when you know you could gain from it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Imagine that in the team meeting you missed, your group unanimously decided on a course of action. You personally disagree with this plan. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Don't say anything. Go with what was already decided.</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true of me</td>
<td>true of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make a point of speaking your mind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Imagine that someone asked you to perform a task that falls out of your duties and responsibilities. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perform the task if it is reasonable and would benefit the organization.</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true of me</td>
<td>true of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not do it. It doesn't fall under your job description.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Imagine that you have noticed one of your co-workers coming in late and leaving early on a regular basis. At first it didn’t bother you, but now you find you need to work harder to make up for what they are not doing. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report this behavior to your manager. It is not acceptable that you should pick up the slack for this individual.</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true of me</td>
<td>true of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say nothing and continue to do what you are doing. No one seems to notice this besides you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


13. Imagine that you saw a manager behave inappropriately towards another employee in the hallway. Other employees saw this behaviour but ignored it. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report the behaviour to Human Resources.</th>
<th>Pretend you didn’t see it and continue with your day.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) extremely true of me</td>
<td>(1) extremely true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) very true of me</td>
<td>(2) very true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) somewhat true of me</td>
<td>(3) somewhat true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) somewhat true of me</td>
<td>(4) somewhat true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) very true of me</td>
<td>(5) very true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) extremely true of me</td>
<td>(6) extremely true of me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Imagine that you asked one of your employees to send the director something by the end of the workday. The next day you get yelled at by the director for not sending the information. What do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Take the blame. You should have followed up with your employee if it was that important.</th>
<th>Tell the director it was the employee’s fault for not sending it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) extremely true of me</td>
<td>(1) extremely true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) very true of me</td>
<td>(2) very true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) somewhat true of me</td>
<td>(3) somewhat true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) somewhat true of me</td>
<td>(4) somewhat true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) very true of me</td>
<td>(5) very true of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) extremely true of me</td>
<td>(6) extremely true of me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C
Validity and Reliability Survey

Information Sheet for Research
University of Toronto
Center for Industrial Relations and Human Resources
Principal Investigator: Joanna Pitek
Faculty Advisor: Dr. Gary Latham

Title of Study: Assessing the Validity & Reliability of a New Workplace Allocentrism Scale

Welcome to my survey and thank you again for your willingness to participate in this research project. The information that you provide in this survey will go far in helping to assess the validity and reliability of a new allocentrism/idiocentrism scale. I've made this survey as short as possible. It should take about 10-15 minutes to complete.

Thank you again,

Joanna Pitek
By continuing with this survey, I agree to participate in this research project.

I understand that the purpose of this questionnaire is to determine individual-level cross-cultural differences. It will take me approximately 15 minutes to complete this questionnaire.

I know that I may ask, now and in the future, any questions that I may have about this project by emailing the researcher at joanna.pitek@mail.utoronto.ca or her supervisor at latham@rotman.utoronto.ca. I may also ask questions about my rights as a research participant by contacting the University of Toronto’s Office of Research Ethics either by email at ethics.review@utoronto.ca or by phone at 416-946-3273.

I understand that I am free to stop completing the survey at any time during this allotted time and/or am free to skip any part of this questionnaire, without any adverse consequences. If I choose not to participate, the researcher will dispose of my questionnaire immediately. I understand that my data will be included in the study should I hand in my form once the study has been completed.

I also understand that no person from my class (including the instructor and teaching assistants) will know of my participation (or lack thereof) nor will they have access to my individual responses to the questionnaire.

I also understand that only the researcher conducting this project and her supervising professor will have access to my responses for data analysis purposes. Furthermore, I understand that only aggregate descriptions of all participants’ responses to the survey will be presented in oral or written format.

I also understand that the researcher will keep the data indefinitely in a secure location.

I consent to participate in this research project.

S1. I consent to participate in this research project. (Select one answer)

☐ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)

(PROGRAMMER NOTE: IF NO (2) AT S1, THANK YOU AND TERMINATE)
S2. Imagine that your co-worker makes a very big mistake on an important project that you are working on together. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Meet with your co-worker and work together on fixing the problem. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Meet with your co-worker and work together on fixing the problem. Very true of me. (2)
- Meet with your co-worker and work together on fixing the problem. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Let your co-worker worry about fixing it. It was their mistake. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Let your co-worker worry about fixing it. It was their mistake. Very true of me. (5)
- Let your co-worker worry about fixing it. It was their mistake. Extremely true of me. (6)

S3. Imagine that you are presenting a project plan to senior management, with your co-worker. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Focus on what you did. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Focus on what you did. Very true of me. (2)
- Focus on what you did. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Focus on how the team worked together. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Focus on how the team worked together. Very true of me. (5)
- Focus on how the team worked together. Extremely true of me. (6)

S4. Imagine that in the middle of working on a team project, you are offered a promotion. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Start your new job whenever the organization wants you to. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Start your new job whenever the organization wants you to. Very true of me. (2)
- Start your new job whenever the organization wants you to. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Try to push back the start date so you can finish the project. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Try to push back the start date so you can finish the project. Very true of me. (5)
- Try to push back the start date so you can finish the project. Extremely true of me. (6)

S5. Imagine that you are working on a team project. One day, your manager and a senior VP are congratulating you on your amazing work. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Make a point of saying that it was a team effort. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Make a point of saying that it was a team effort. Very true of me. (2)
- Make a point of saying that it was a team effort. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Take all the credit and enjoy the praise. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Take all the credit and enjoy the praise. Very true of me. (5)
- Take all the credit and enjoy the praise. Extremely true of me. (6)
S6. Imagine that you accidentally hear the organization will be laying off many members of your department, What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Keep the information to yourself and pretend you didn't hear it. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Keep the information to yourself and pretend you didn't hear it. Very true of me. (2)
- Keep the information to yourself and pretend you didn't hear it. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Share this information with members of the department so they are better prepared. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Share this information with members of the department so they are better prepared. Very true of me. (5)
- Share this information with members of the department so they are better prepared. Extremely true of me. (6)

S7. Imagine that your co-worker made a big mistake at work that could have serious consequences. Your manager is trying to figure out who made this mistake and is asking around. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Point at the person who made the mistake. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Point at the person who made the mistake. Very true of me. (2)
- Point at the person who made the mistake. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Don't say anything even though you know who did it. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Don't say anything even though you know who did it. Very true of me. (5)
- Don't say anything even though you know who did it. Extremely true of me. (6)

S8. Imagine that your co-worker asked for help with something and you offered your assistance. A few weeks later, you ask for some help but your co-worker does not help you. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Make a point to never help your co-worker again. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Make a point to never help your co-worker again. Very true of me. (2)
- Make a point to never help your co-worker again. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Rationalize why your co-worker couldn't help you. Maybe they were too busy or didn't know how to assist you. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Rationalize why your co-worker couldn't help you. Maybe they were too busy or didn't know how to assist you. Very true of me. (5)
- Rationalize why your co-worker couldn't help you. Maybe they were too busy or didn't know how to assist you. Extremely true of me. (6)

S9. Imagine that you found out important information about the company you are working in. Someone asked you if you know anything related to this matter. What do you do? (Select one answer)
Share the information because it is important. Extremely true of me. (1)
Share the information because it is important. Very true of me. (2)
Share the information because it is important. Somewhat true of me. (3)
Don't say anything unless they tell you something you want to know. Somewhat true of me. (4)
Don't say anything unless they tell you something you want to know. Very true of me. (5)
Don't say anything unless they tell you something you want to know. Extremely true of me. (6)

S10. Imagine that you come up with a great idea that would benefit your entire department. You know that you will not get any personal benefit from sharing this - but the department will gain. What do you do? (Select one answer)

Share it. Everyone should benefit from this. Extremely true of me. (1)
Share it. Everyone should benefit from this. Very true of me. (2)
Share it. Everyone should benefit from this. Somewhat true of me. (3)
Do not say anything. Save your idea for when you know you could gain from it. Somewhat true of me. (4)
Do not say anything. Save your idea for when you know you could gain from it. Very true of me. (5)
Do not say anything. Save your idea for when you know you could gain from it. Extremely true of me. (6)

S11. Imagine that in the team meeting you missed, your group unanimously decided on a course of action. You personally disagree with this plan. What do you do? (Select one answer)

Don't say anything. Go with what was already decided. Extremely true of me. (1)
Don't say anything. Go with what was already decided. Very true of me. (2)
Don't say anything. Go with what was already decided. Somewhat true of me. (3)
Make a point of speaking your mind. Somewhat true of me. (4)
Make a point of speaking your mind. Very true of me. (5)
Make a point of speaking your mind. Extremely true of me. (6)
S12. Imagine that someone asked you to perform a task that falls outside of your duties and responsibilities. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Perform the task if it is reasonable and would benefit the organization. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Perform the task if it is reasonable and would benefit the organization. Very true of me. (2)
- Perform the task if it is reasonable and would benefit the organization. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Do not do it. It doesn't fall under your job description. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Do not do it. It doesn't fall under your job description. Very true of me. (5)
- Do not do it. It doesn't fall under your job description. Extremely true of me. (6)

S13. Imagine that you have noticed one of your co-workers coming in late and leaving early on a regular basis. At first it didn't bother you, but now you find you need to work harder to make up for what they are not doing. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Report this behavior to your manager, It is not acceptable that you should pick up the slack for this individual. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Report this behavior to your manager, It is not acceptable that you should pick up the slack for this individual. Very true of me. (2)
- Report this behavior to your manager, It is not acceptable that you should pick up the slack for this individual. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Say nothing and continue to do what you are doing. No one seems to notice this besides you. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Say nothing and continue to do what you are doing. No one seems to notice this besides you. Very true of me. (5)
- Say nothing and continue to do what you are doing. No one seems to notice this besides you. Extremely true of me. (6)

S14. Imagine that you saw a manager behave inappropriately towards another employee in the hallway. Other employees saw this behavior but ignored it. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Report the behavior to Human Resources. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Report the behavior to Human Resources. Very true of me. (2)
- Report the behavior to Human Resources. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Pretend you didn't see it and continue with your day. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Pretend you didn't see it and continue with your day. Very true of me. (5)
- Pretend you didn't see it and continue with your day. Extremely true of me. (6)
S15. Imagine that you asked one of your employees to send the director something by the end of the workday. The next day you get yelled at by the director for not sending the information. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Take the blame. You should have followed up with your employee if it was important. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Take the blame. You should have followed up with your employee if it was important. Very true of me. (2)
- Take the blame. You should have followed up with your employee if it was important. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Tell the director it was the employee's fault for not sending it. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Tell the director it was the employee's fault for not sending it. Very true of me. (5)
- Tell the director it was the employee's fault for not sending it. Extremely true of me. (6)
S16. Please indicate how much you agree with each statement using the 9-point scale, indicated below. Choose the number that is closest to how you feel. **(Select one answer for each row)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definitely No (1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>Definitely Yes (9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competition is the law of nature. (1)</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members should stick together, no matter what sacrifices are required. (2)</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel good when I cooperate with others. (3)</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often do “my own thing.” (4)</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rely on myself most of the time; I rarely rely on others. (5)</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d rather depend on myself than others. (6)</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a coworker gets a prize, I would feel proud. (7)</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important that I do my job better</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
than others. (8)
It is important to me that I respect the decisions made by my groups. (9)
It is my duty to take care of my family, even when I have to sacrifice what I want. (10)
My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me. (11)
Parents and children must stay together as much as possible. (12)
The well-being of my coworkers is important to me. (13)
To me, pleasure is spending time with others. (14)
When another
person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused. (15)
Winning is everything. (16)

S17. Are you... (Select one answer)

☐ Male (1)
☐ Female (2)

S18. What is your current age?

S19. How many years of work experience have you had (this includes volunteer)?

THANK YOU.
Appendix D  
Full Study Survey

Information Sheet for Research  
University of Toronto  
Center for Industrial Relations and Human Resources  
Principal Investigator: Joanna Pitek  
Faculty Advisor: Dr. Gary Latham

Title of Study: Worker Perceptions of Organizational and Team-Based Behaviors

Welcome to my survey and thank you again for your willingness to participate in this research project. The information that you provide in this survey will go far in helping to understand worker perceptions of organizational and team-based behaviors. I've made this survey as short as possible. It should take about 10-15 minutes to complete.

Thank you again,

Joanna Pitek
By continuing with this survey, I agree to participate in this research project.

I understand that the purpose of this questionnaire is to determine worker perceptions of organizational and team-based behaviors. It will take me approximately 10-15 minutes to complete this questionnaire.

I know that I may ask, now and in the future, any questions that I may have about this project by emailing the researcher at joanna.pitek@mail.utoronto.ca or her supervisor at latham@rotman.utoronto.ca. I may also ask questions about my rights as a research participant by contacting the University of Toronto’s Office of Research Ethics either by email at ethics.review@utoronto.ca or by phone at 416-946-3273.

I understand that I am free to stop completing the survey at any time during this allotted time and/or am free to skip any part of this questionnaire, without any adverse consequences. I also understand that no person from my place of employment will know of my participation (or lack thereof) nor will they have access to my individual responses to the questionnaire.

I also understand that only the researcher conducting this project and her supervising professor will have access to my responses for data analysis purposes.

Furthermore, I understand that only aggregate descriptions of all participants’ responses to the survey will be presented in oral or written format.

I also understand that the researcher will keep the data indefinitely in a secure location.

S1. I consent to participate in this research project. (Select one answer)

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

(PROGRAMMER NOTE: IF NO (2) AT S1, THANK YOU AND TERMINATE)

S2. Are you… (Select one answer)

- Male (1)
- Female (2)
S3. What is your current age? (Select one answer)

- Under 18 (1)
- 18-24 (2)
- 25-34 (3)
- 35-44 (4)
- 45-54 (5)
- 55-64 (6)
- 65-74 (7)
- 75 and over (8)

(PROGRAMMER NOTE: IF UNDER 18 (1) OR 65-74 (7) OR 75 AND OVER (8) AT S3, THANK YOU AND TERMINATE)

S4. In which province or territory do you live? (Select one answer)

- Alberta (1)
- British Columbia (2)
- Manitoba (3)
- New Brunswick (4)
- Newfoundland and Labrador (5)
- Nova Scotia (6)
- Ontario (7)
- Quebec (8)
- Prince Edward Island (9)
- Saskatchewan (10)
- North West Territories (11)
- Nunavut (12)
- Yukon (13)

S5. And, are you employed full time, or part time? (Select one answer)

- Full-time (1)
- Part-time (2)
- Unemployed (3)

(PROGRAMMER NOTE: IF UNEMPLOYED AT S5, THANK YOU AND TERMINATE)
S6. How long have you been working at your current organization? (Select one answer)

- Under 6 months (1)
- Between 6 months to less than 1 year (2)
- Between 1 year to less than 2 years (3)
- Between 2 to less than 3 years (4)
- Between 3 to less than 5 years (5)
- Between 5 years to less than 10 years (6)
- Between 11 years to less than 15 years (7)
- 15 years or more (8)

(PROGRAMMER NOTE: IF UNDER 6 MONTHS (1) AT S6, THANK YOU AND TERMINATE)

S7. Does your work group, or department have work-life flexible work arrangements; that is, does it allow workers to have control over their own schedule so they may adjust hours so as to take care or do things in the non-working part of life? (This includes part-time employment). (Select one answer)

- Yes, have work-life flexible working arrangements (1)
- No, do not have work-life flexible working arrangements (2)
- Not sure (3)

(PROGRAMMER NOTE: IF NO (2) OR NOT SURE (3) AT S7, THANK YOU AND TERMINATE)

S8. Are you currently using/have used this type of flexible work arrangement within the past year? (This includes part-time employment). (Select one answer)

- Yes, I am / have within the past year (1)
- No, I am not currently using it / have not in the past year (2)

S9. In your current organization, is someone on your team or someone with whom you work regularly using / have used this type of flexible work arrangement within the past year? (This includes part-time employment). (Select one answer)

- Yes, within the past year (1)
- Yes, but NOT within the past year (2)
- No (3)

(PROGRAMMER NOTE: IF YES BUT NOT WITHIN THE PAST YEAR (2) AND NO (3) AT S9, THANK YOU AND TERMINATE)
S10. Please indicate how much you agree with each statement using the 5-point scale, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree *(Select one answer for each row)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am often bored with my job. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my job for the time being. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most days I am enthusiastic about my work. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like my job better than the average worker does. (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find real enjoyment in my work. (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S11. Please indicate how much you agree with each statement using the 7-point scale, where 1=strongly disagree and 7=strongly agree **(Select one answer for each row)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (5)</th>
<th>Agree (6)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization. (1)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own. (2)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel like &quot;part of the family&quot; at my organization. (3)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel &quot;emotionally attached&quot; to this organization. (4)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me. (5)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel a strong sense of</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging to my organization. (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer. (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now. (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel guilty if I left my organization now. (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization deserves my loyalty. (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it. (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I owe a great deal to this organization. (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be very hard for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
me to leave my organization now, even if I wanted to. (13) Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now, (14) Right now staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire. (15) I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization. (16) One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives. (17) 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 that I have here. (18)

S12. Imagine that your co-worker makes a very big mistake on an important project that you are working on together. What do you do? (Select one answer)

☐ Meet with your co-worker and work together on fixing the problem. Extremely true of me. (1)
☐ Meet with your co-worker and work together on fixing the problem. Very true of me. (2)
☐ Meet with your co-worker and work together on fixing the problem. Somewhat true of me. (3)
☐ Let your co-worker worry about fixing it. It was their mistake. Somewhat true of me. (4)
☐ Let your co-worker worry about fixing it. It was their mistake. Very true of me. (5)
☐ Let your co-worker worry about fixing it. It was their mistake. Extremely true of me. (6)

S13. Imagine that you are presenting a project plan to senior management, with your co-worker. What do you do? (Select one answer)

☐ Focus on what you did. Extremely true of me. (1)
☐ Focus on what you did. Very true of me. (2)
☐ Focus on what you did. Somewhat true of me. (3)
☐ Focus on how the team worked together. Somewhat true of me. (4)
☐ Focus on how the team worked together. Very true of me. (5)
☐ Focus on how the team worked together. Extremely true of me. (6)
S14. Imagine that in the middle of working on a team project, you are offered a promotion. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Start your new job whenever the organization wants you to. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Start your new job whenever the organization wants you to. Very true of me. (2)
- Start your new job whenever the organization wants you to. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Try to push back the start date so you can finish the project. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Try to push back the start date so you can finish the project. Very true of me. (5)
- Try to push back the start date so you can finish the project. Extremely true of me. (6)

S15. Imagine that you are working on a team project. One day, your manager and a senior VP are congratulating you on your amazing work. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Make a point of saying that it was a team effort. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Make a point of saying that it was a team effort. Very true of me. (2)
- Make a point of saying that it was a team effort. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Take all the credit and enjoy the praise. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Take all the credit and enjoy the praise. Very true of me. (5)
- Take all the credit and enjoy the praise. Extremely true of me. (6)

S16. Imagine that you accidentally hear the organization will be laying off many members of your department. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Keep the information to yourself and pretend you didn't hear it. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Keep the information to yourself and pretend you didn't hear it. Very true of me. (2)
- Keep the information to yourself and pretend you didn't hear it. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Share this information with members of the department so they are better prepared. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Share this information with members of the department so they are better prepared. Very true of me. (5)
- Share this information with members of the department so they are better prepared. Extremely true of me. (6)

S17. Imagine that your co-worker made a big mistake at work that could have serious consequences. Your manager is trying to figure out who made this mistake and is asking around. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Point at the person who made the mistake. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Point at the person who made the mistake. Very true of me. (2)
- Point at the person who made the mistake. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Don't say anything even though you know who did it. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Don't say anything even though you know who did it. Very true of me. (5)
- Don't say anything even though you know who did it. Extremely true of me. (6)
S18. Imagine that your co-worker asked for help with something and you offered your assistance. A few weeks later, you ask for some help but your co-worker does not help you. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Make a point to never help your co-worker again. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Make a point to never help your co-worker again. Very true of me. (2)
- Make a point to never help your co-worker again. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Rationalize why your co-worker couldn't help you. Maybe they were too busy or didn't know how to assist you. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Rationalize why your co-worker couldn't help you. Maybe they were too busy or didn't know how to assist you. Very true of me. (5)
- Rationalize why your co-worker couldn't help you. Maybe they were too busy or didn't know how to assist you. Extremely true of me. (6)

S19. Imagine that you found out important information about the company you are working in. Someone asked you if you know anything related to this matter. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Share the information because it is important. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Share the information because it is important. Very true of me. (2)
- Share the information because it is important. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Don't say anything unless they tell you something you want to know. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Don't say anything unless they tell you something you want to know. Very true of me. (5)
- Don't say anything unless they tell you something you want to know. Extremely true of me. (6)

S20. Imagine that you come up with a great idea that would benefit your entire department. You know that you will not get any personal benefit from sharing this - but the department will gain. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Share it. Everyone should benefit from this. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Share it. Everyone should benefit from this. Very true of me. (2)
- Share it. Everyone should benefit from this. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Do not say anything. Save your idea for when you know you could gain from it. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Do not say anything. Save your idea for when you know you could gain from it. Very true of me. (5)
- Do not say anything. Save your idea for when you know you could gain from it. Extremely true of me. (6)
S21. Imagine that in the team meeting you missed, your group unanimously decided on a course of action. You personally disagree with this plan. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Don't say anything. Go with what was already decided. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Don't say anything. Go with what was already decided. Very true of me. (2)
- Don't say anything. Go with what was already decided. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Make a point of speaking your mind. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Make a point of speaking your mind. Very true of me. (5)
- Make a point of speaking your mind. Extremely true of me. (6)

S22. Imagine that someone asked you to perform a task that falls outside of your duties and responsibilities. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Perform the task if it is reasonable and would benefit the organization. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Perform the task if it is reasonable and would benefit the organization. Very true of me. (2)
- Perform the task if it is reasonable and would benefit the organization. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Do not do it. It doesn't fall under your job description. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Do not do it. It doesn't fall under your job description. Very true of me. (5)
- Do not do it. It doesn't fall under your job description. Extremely true of me. (6)

S23. Imagine that you have noticed one of your co-workers coming in late and leaving early on a regular basis. At first it didn't bother you, but now you find you need to work harder to make up for what they are not doing. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Report this behavior to your manager. It is not acceptable that you should pick up the slack for this individual. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Report this behavior to your manager. It is not acceptable that you should pick up the slack for this individual. Very true of me. (2)
- Report this behavior to your manager. It is not acceptable that you should pick up the slack for this individual. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Say nothing and continue to do what you are doing. No one seems to notice this besides you. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Say nothing and continue to do what you are doing. No one seems to notice this besides you. Very true of me. (5)
- Say nothing and continue to do what you are doing. No one seems to notice this besides you. Extremely true of me. (6)
S24. Imagine that you saw a manager behave inappropriately towards another employee in the hallway. Other employees saw this behavior but ignored it. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Report the behavior to Human Resources. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Report the behavior to Human Resources. Very true of me. (2)
- Report the behavior to Human Resources. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Pretend you didn't see it and continue with your day. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Pretend you didn't see it and continue with your day. Very true of me. (5)
- Pretend you didn't see it and continue with your day. Extremely true of me. (6)

S25. Imagine that you asked one of your employees to send the director something by the end of the workday. The next day you get yelled at by the director for not sending the information. What do you do? (Select one answer)

- Take the blame. You should have followed up with your employee if it was important. Extremely true of me. (1)
- Take the blame. You should have followed up with your employee if it was important. Very true of me. (2)
- Take the blame. You should have followed up with your employee if it was important. Somewhat true of me. (3)
- Tell the director it was the employee's fault for not sending it. Somewhat true of me. (4)
- Tell the director it was the employee's fault for not sending it. Very true of me. (5)
- Tell the director it was the employee's fault for not sending it. Extremely true of me. (6)

S26. What is your current marital status? (Select one answer)

- Married / Domestic Partner (1)
- Single / Never Married (2)
- Separated / Divorced (3)
- Widowed (4)

S27. How many children do you have living in your household that are 13 years of age or younger? (Select one answer)

- 1 (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- 5 (5)
- 6 or more (6)
- None (7)
S28. At your organization, are work-life flexible work arrangements handled formally (i.e. there is a written policy) or informally (i.e. there is no written policy)? *(Select one answer)*

- Formally (1)
- Informally (2)
- Don't know, never checked (3)

S29. In the past year, have you ever asked for and been denied work-life flexible work arrangements? *(Select one answer)*

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

S30. In the past year, have you ever exercised control over your start/stop time without asking permission? *(Select one answer)*

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

S31. Including yourself, how many employees are considered members of your work team? *(Select one answer)*

- 1-3 (1)
- 4-6 (2)
- 7-10 (3)
- 11-15 (4)
- 16-20 (5)
- 21-30 (6)
- 31-40 (7)
- 41-50 (8)
- 51-60 (9)
- 61-74 (10)
- 75 or more (11)

S32. Would you consider that you are interdependent with others at work? That is, do you work continuously with other employees and depend on them to complete their assigned duties so that you can complete yours? *(Select one answer)*

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Not Sure (3)

THANK YOU.