

Spring 2021

## **A Study of Prosocial Behavior, Workplace Civility, and Work Engagement Among Employees in Higher Education**

Shelley Haddock Dempsey

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

---

### **Recommended Citation**

Dempsey, S. H.(2021). *A Study of Prosocial Behavior, Workplace Civility, and Work Engagement Among Employees in Higher Education*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/6368>

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you by Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact [dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu).

A STUDY OF PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR, WORKPLACE CIVILITY, AND WORK  
ENGAGEMENT AMONG EMPLOYEES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

by  
Shelley Haddock Dempsey

Bachelor of Arts  
Wofford College, 1997

Master of Education  
University of South Carolina, 1999

Master of Business Administration  
University of South Carolina, 2004

---

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in

Education Administration

College of Education

University of South Carolina

2021

Accepted by:

Susan C. Bon, Major Professor

Amber Fallucca, Committee Member

Augie Grant, Committee Member

Christina Yao, Committee Member

Tracey L. Weldon, Interim Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

© Copyright by Shelley Haddock Dempsey, 2021  
All Rights Reserved.

## **DEDICATION**

To my boys, Aiden and Cooper. May you always follow your dreams, do your best, and remember to thank God in the good times as well as in the bad. Your support got me through this journey, and I'll forever be grateful for the gift of being your mom. I love you.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to acknowledge the support of my most amazing dissertation committee. My advisor, Dr. Susan Bon, was a support during what was admittedly an intensely busy time in her own professional life, and I am beyond grateful that she made time for my project – even volunteering to fund the purchase of the random sample that truly made for a more robust study. Dr. Augie Grant was a cheerleader unlike any other and never failed to remind me how far I had come and that the end was within reach. His willingness to teach me how to do a research study during an independent study not only made it possible for me to graduate on time but also gave me the skills I needed to do my dissertation study. Dr. Christina Yao is an amazing professor who taught me to view leadership theory in a way that changed me forever. Her intense work with me on my literature review as an independent project was the push I needed to get this project going and helped me to visualize that perhaps I just might be able to do this! And to Dr. Amber Fallucca who took on this project during a busy time in her own career with many a kind word along the way, thank you and let's conference travel again as soon as covid goes away! Thank you all for what you've given to me in the last few years – I promise to repay it to future students.

Next, my success in this doctoral program is partially due to my involvement with an amazing cohort of classmates. This group was one of the most supportive groups I've ever known, and memories of group study sessions, group projects, travel to D.C., and sharing in each other's successes has been such an amazing joy. Specifically, I had the

world's best accountability partner in Mary Alexander. She never let me lose sight of the goal and was always there to remind me that I could do it. Our weekend, holiday, and evening texts reminding each other to keep going and to check in on progress were invaluable and made for memories I will carry long into the future. I'm so proud of us!

I'd also like to thank my supervisor Dr. Sandra Kelly for her support throughout this process. She provided endless encouragement and flexibility to get the doctoral work done while balancing it with my professional duties. Similarly, my staff in the Office of On Your Time Initiatives have travelled this journey with me, and I'm so grateful for them. In addition, the village of friends who gently nudged me along, helped with the children, and provided kind words throughout the process are too many to name but all so appreciated.

And finally, I am so thankful for my family. To my parents who have always believed I could anything I wanted to do and were willing participants or energetic supporters in whatever it took to do it - thank you! They also taught me the value of being kind and doing for others – long ago setting the foundation for my interest in the topic of my study. To my brother who was there for carpooling kids, delivering food to feed them, and always offering to do anything we needed – thank you! To my boys, Aiden and Cooper, for understanding when I was reading for class while in the bleachers at lacrosse games, for not complaining when fast food was a regular go-to during times that I was trying to meet a writing deadline, and for always supporting me in your words and actions – thank you! We did this together! And lastly, to my husband Scott who had his own journey with colon cancer and chemotherapy during the time I was working on this degree, thank you for understanding when I needed to keep going. Thank you for

supporting me when I sometimes doubted myself. And thank you for working so hard to beat cancer and for continuing to battle the repercussions of chemo. I love you.

## **ABSTRACT**

This quantitative research study examined the relationship between prosocial behavior, work engagement, and workplace civility among higher education professionals. The specific university employees studied were student affairs staff, academic affairs administrators, and faculty. Responses to a survey by a national random sample allowed the researcher to determine the relationship between a respondent's prosocial nature and both their workplace civility and their work engagement. In the end, all three hypotheses were supported by the data: (a) prosocial behavior scores of student affairs staff and academic affairs administrators are higher than those of faculty, (b) the prosocial behavior scores were positively correlated with work engagement scores, and (c) prosocial behavior scores were positively correlated with workplace civility scores.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION .....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT .....	vii
LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW .....	16
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS .....	39
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS.....	52
CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS .....	59
REFERENCES .....	72
APPENDIX A: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD PERMISSION .....	83
APPENDIX B: UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONALS SURVEY .....	84
APPENDIX C: PRE-NOTIFICATION E-MAIL.....	102
APPENDIX D: FORMAL INVITATION E-MAIL.....	103
APPENDIX E: SECONDARY FOLLOW UP LETTER .....	105
APPENDIX F: WORK ENGAGEMENT QUESTIONS BY POSITION TYPE.....	107
APPENDIX G: WORKPLACE CIVILITY QUESTIONS BY POSITION TYPE .....	110
APPENDIX H: PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR QUESTIONS BY POSITION TYPE.....	111

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 3.1: HIGHER EDUCATION POSITIONS .....	49
TABLE 3.2: RACE AND ETHNICITY .....	49
TABLE 3.3: GENDER.....	50
TABLE 3.4: AGE.....	50
TABLE 4.1: HIGHER EDUCATION POSITIONS .....	53
TABLE 4.2: RACE AND ETHNICITY .....	54
TABLE 4.3: GENDER.....	54
TABLE 4.4: AGE.....	55
TABLE 4.5: MEAN PROSOCIAL SCORE BY TYPE OF POPULATION .....	58
TABLE F.1: WORK ENGAGEMENT QUESTION RESPONSES BY POSITION TYPE.....	107
TABLE G.1: WORKPLACE CIVILITY QUESTION RESPONSES BY POSITION TYPE .....	110
TABLE H.1: PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR QUESTION RESPONSES BY POSITION TYPE .....	111

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **INTRODUCTION**

A college campus is a complex organization that includes multiple subcultures and identities, such as administrators, faculty, students, and staff. In addition to these various cultures on campus, the governance system for a typical public college or university includes multiple sources of authority, such as a Board of Trustees, administrative leadership, faculty senate, student government, and alumni associations.

Another important characteristic of public higher education institutions is their status as non-profit organizations, which means generally, these institutions are not in the business of making money. In fact, historically higher education institutions have been often referred to as a public good because they serve a critical role of educating the communities around them, often offering opportunities on their campuses for people of all ages varying from music classes for infants, summer camps for school age children, and continuing education for adults. Colleges and universities are also called upon to provide experts for local projects and initiatives, such as faculty who offer their research and professional perspectives on various issues for local television and print media, student musicians who play concerts for the community, and athletics coaches who lend their names to local fundraisers.

Supporting the idea of higher education as a public good, historians point to three major events: the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 and the GI Bill of 1944 (Benson & Boyd, 2015; Williams, 1991; Lucas, 2006). The Morrill Act of 1862 created U.S public

agricultural and industrial colleges and laid the initial foundation for military preparation programs like ROTC. Later, an expansion of this act in 1890 financed seventeen Historically Black College and Universities. Finally, the GI Bill, or more formally the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 provided for educational support of US veterans, with GIs making up nearly half of American college students in 1947 (Mettler, 2005).

Additionally, the establishment of the Department of Education (ED) as a Cabinet agency by Congress in 1980 provided support for higher education with the mission to "promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access" ([www.ed.gov](http://www.ed.gov)). The ED provides federal support in the forms of grants, loans, and work-study programs to ease the cost of college attendance. In a recent show of support for higher education as a public good, Loss (2012) asserted that "state support may have dropped to all-time lows in the past four years, but federal funds have held steady for research and even increased for student aid, making possible the discoveries and educated citizens our country and world need." (p. A17).

More recently, researchers surveyed a nationally representative group of adults age 18 or over for purposes of determining American's views of Higher Education. According to their research brief, 76% of respondents saw public spending on U.S. higher education as an excellent or good investment with a return to society. Similarly, 83% of respondents indicated that they believed institutions of higher education contribute to scientific advances that benefit the American society (Drezner et al., 2018). In summary, the researchers reported that the majority of study respondents view higher education as a benefit and positive contribution to society.

Just as institutions of higher education serve a larger purpose of contributing to the community, it can be argued that higher education employees may also be individuals with dispositions that make them willing to help others and support the campus and community around them. This willingness to help others, without concern for personal gain, might be demonstrated through prosocial behaviors of higher education employees. Furthermore, prosocial behaviors may serve as a means of achieving the institution's mission to serve the public by providing education and other contributions to the greater good.

Previous research suggests that an individual's tendency toward prosocial behaviors can be an indicator of their work engagement as well as their level of workplace civility (Abid et al., 2018; Castanheira et al., 2016). This study will replicate these past efforts in order to determine whether the relationship between prosocial behavior, work engagement, and workplace civility is similar for the identified professional employees in the higher education workplace settings. In addition, this study will examine and compare the prosocial behaviors for higher education professionals who work in three different sub-cultures: student affairs staff, academic affairs administrators, and faculty members. The study will explore whether these groups are similar given their proximity to each other in the shared environment of a college campus, or whether they have statistically significant differences that could lead to a deeper understanding of how to improve their work lives while decreasing workplace incivility.

### **Purpose and Hypotheses**

The purpose of this quantitative study is to compare the prosocial behavior scores of student affairs professionals, academic affairs professionals, and faculty members in a

higher education environment. In addition, this study will examine how work engagement and workplace civility correlate for these three professional groups. Survey responses from a sample of professionals will be analyzed to determine if there is a relationship between a respondent's prosocial behavior and their role in higher education, level of work engagement, and workplace civility. Ultimately, the study will ask the following questions: (a) Are these three groups different based on their prosocial behaviors? (b) Do their prosociality scores correlate with their workplace civility and work engagement scores?

The results of this study will be beneficial to administrators at all levels of higher education leadership in helping them understand the characteristics of the identified university employees and also to understand whether these characteristics vary across the three groups of employees. In other words, are the prosocial behavior scores of student affairs professionals, academic administrators, and faculty members different and to what extent are prosocial behaviors related to work engagement and workplace civility across these three employee groups.

If for example, workplace engagement and civility are positively correlated with prosocial behaviors, higher education administrators may be able to use this knowledge to transform their workplaces into more productive, engaged, and collaborative environments. In addition, such knowledge can inform future decisions for hiring, training, and the professional development opportunities provided to employees. Previous studies of employee behavior in various industries have shown that those who are prosocial are also more likely to be engaged in their work and less likely to exhibit workplace incivility. A more pleasant workplace has also been shown to be more

productive, so it is in the interest of higher education to create positive workplaces for its employees. The results of this study will lend to that body of research by expanding the study of prosocial behaviors into a higher education environment.

There are three hypotheses plus a null hypothesis:

Null Hypothesis: The prosocial scores of student affairs professionals are not significantly different from those of academic administration professionals.

H1: The prosocial scores of student affairs and academic administration professionals are higher than those of faculty members.

H2: The prosocial scores are positively correlated with the work engagement scores for student affairs, academic administration, and faculty members.

H3: The prosocial scores are positively correlated with the work civility scores for student affairs, academic administration, and faculty members.

### **Higher Education**

In the traditional higher education setting, academic affairs, the faculty, and student affairs make up three of the major subcultures on campus, and they share a long history of ebbs and flows in their relationship and responsibilities. The first group considered by this study is academic affairs professionals. They “comprise the academic side of administration in U.S. higher education and include the provost or vice president for academic affairs, the assistant provost or assistant vice president for academic affairs,

college deans, department chairs, and program coordinators” (David & Amey, 2020, p. 5). These professionals are typically the academic decision makers and academic leaders for the campus.

Faculty are the second group in the study, and although faculty members may identify as academic affairs professionals, traditional faculty members do not have the same level of administrative duties. Instead, they are responsible for the essential components - instruction and curriculum - of a student's higher education experience. Therefore, for the purposes of this study they were separated into their own category for more in-depth analysis of their specific characteristics. Faculty were the first employees of higher education, serving all roles to their first students on the original college campus where “they worked and played together, creating a very special kind of community which has been characteristic of the American residential college ever since.” (Thelin, 201, p. 7).

The history of faculty contrasts with the third and final group of the study, student affairs professionals, which only began to appear on campuses in the 1960’s when the number of college students began growing and their needs for support outside the classroom began to expand, including for example, conduct or behavior management, career advice, financial aid, and health services. As the student affairs professionals increased in numbers, “... faculty found themselves deferring to more and more varied sorts of professionals who were not professors when it came to the project of student development” (Cooper & Marx, 2018, p. 202). The presence of varying cultures in the same work environment, each with their own traditions, leadership structures, and

expectations has contributed to a history of workplace conflict and misunderstandings of each other's roles.

The student affairs professionals filled in the gaps outside of the classroom when the number of students and depth of their needs outgrew the capacity of the faculty. Though these groups existed on the same campuses working with the same students, "incorrect perceptions and lack of knowledge about each other's jobs, the alienating and confusing jargon, the increased specialization and the financial competition between these two groups has led to misunderstandings between faculty and student affairs professionals" (Kellogg, 1999, p. 2). These misconceptions can lead to disagreements, competition, and lack of understanding about the role and value the other has to students and the college campus.

It has often been said that these groups exist within their own silos, with each left to prove why they are the most critical entity for student success. Other than their shared location on a college campus, the traits of these groups differ in most other ways. Academic affairs administrators provide campus leadership which can mean making decisions that are the most budget conscious, forward thinking, and instrumental to the future health of the institution as a whole. For the purposes of this study, they are defined as those within the office of the provost or vice president for academic affairs, the assistant provost or assistant vice president for academic affairs, and college deans on the academic affairs side of the university. Meanwhile, faculty members are charged with scholarship, research and service. They provide the foundation for all curricular decisions regarding what the students will actually learn and how that learning will be measured. And finally, student affairs professionals are responsible for the support of students

outside of the classroom, ranging from tutoring services to mental health to extracurricular clubs and sports.

In addition to their roles on the campus, the professional training and preparation each receives to perform these roles is also quite different between faculty members and student affairs professionals. Faculty are trained by discipline and evaluated according to their accomplishments in teaching, service, and scholarship. Student affairs professionals, on the other hand, are trained through specific degree programs that teach them a variety of skills across student development and college life. And lastly, academic affairs administrators come from a variety of professional backgrounds with the highest levels often composed of individuals who have risen through the ranks of the faculty to become provosts or academic department leaders, and program and administrative leadership composed of those who have risen to campus leadership in other ways.

This study will examine whether faculty, academic affairs administrators, and student affairs employees are innately different with respect to prosocial behaviors, work engagement, and workplace civility. Specifically, it will consider whether one of the professional groups is more prosocial in nature than the others and also whether the degree of prosocial tendencies can be correlated with level of work engagement or workplace civility as measured by existing survey instruments. The resulting data will be used to inform conclusions about the differences in these higher education subcultures and how they are different or similar in the workplace.

### **Prosocial Behaviors**

Prosocial behaviors are “voluntary actions that are intended to help or benefit another individual or group of individuals” (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989, p. 3). They are

valued for their role of putting others first and showing outward acts of kindness. Individuals who tend to be prosocial are often associated with other such characteristics as compassion, supporting, and caring. This study examines the degree to which academic administrators, faculty, and student affairs professionals are prosocial and whether there are statistically significant differences in the groups.

The importance of measuring and understanding a person's level of prosocialness has been explored in a variety of environments outside of higher education in efforts to correlate these scores with those of level of work engagement and workplace civility. This study brings those studies into the college setting across a variety of populations that coexist in this space. The data gathered from the study will be used to make observations about the three groups that can help higher education leadership make decisions that will improve their workplace environments resulting in engaged employees and civil office settings, which according to research that will be further detailed in chapter two, will lead to higher production and retention of employees.

### **Workplace Engagement**

Though not specifically in the field of higher education, previous studies have found that individuals with higher prosocial scores tend to be more engaged in their workplace environment (Abid et al., 2018; Castanheira et al., 2016). Workplace engagement is defined as “an indicator of well-being and motivation, defined as a persistent, pervasive, and positive affective-motivational state of fulfillment in employees, characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption” (Schaufel et al., 2006, p. 227). Its correlation with prosocial behaviors is an important one to study because engaged workers have been shown to be more productive and satisfied with their work.

This study examines whether this correlation holds true for various types of university employees.

### **Workplace Civility**

Civility in the workplace is a growing area of concern, particularly in higher education institutions where researchers increasingly document concerns about the rise in workplace bullying and incivility resulting not only in reduced quality and quantity of work but also stress, frustration, anger, demoralization, powerlessness, and anxiety (McKay et al., 2008). As widely defined in the literature, civility is the “behavior that helps to preserve the norms of mutual respect at work; it comprises behaviors that are fundamental to positively connecting with another, building relationships, and empathizing” (Pearson et al., 2000, p. 125). Again, as with prosocial behaviors, the behaviors that are seen as reflecting civility in the workplace are perceived as positive and desired for a congenial environment.

Efforts to address bullying appear to be underway, for example, the University of South Carolina Faculty Senate created a Workplace Bullying Policy (ACAF 1.80) specifically in response to bullying complaints initiated by faculty. As part of this policy, a Faculty Civility Advocate serves in a role funded by the Office of the Provost and has the responsibility of investigating workplace bullying complaints. These policies and formal faculty roles are a response to the rise in incivility in the current environment, which includes institutions of higher education.

A Civility in America 2016 survey indicated 95% of respondents believe we have a problem with civility in the United States, and 70% believe it has reached crisis proportions. Recent increases in campus incivility have resulted in the adoption of

official policies on some campuses, such as Ryerson University's (2016) Workplace Civility and Respect Policy which includes:

“All managers, faculty and staff have a responsibility to act in good faith and be active participants in contributing to the creation and enhancement of a community culture of respect, inclusion, civility, dignity and understanding for the people with whom they work. This requires taking action to deal with incidents of incivility. All parties, at a minimum, are required to be open about concerns and listen to each other's point of view. Incidents of incivility cannot be ignored and must be addressed.”

In response to the rise of bullying and incivility across higher education environments, campuses are likely eager to identify either formal policies or other possible avenues to confront workplace civility concerns.

### **Significance and Contributions**

Prosociality has been widely examined across many organizations and with many different professions including healthcare, high tech industries, and non-profit organization employees (DeDreu & Nauta, 2009; Baruch et al., 2004; Farmer & Van Dyne, 2016). This study extends the study of prosocial behaviors into the higher education setting with professionals who are faculty members, student affairs staff, or academic affairs professionals. Additionally, this study examines whether there are correlations between prosocial behaviors, work engagement, and workplace civility.

As discussed further in the literature review, professionals who exhibit high prosocial behaviors and positive work engagement are likely to be effective employees who add value and positively influence their workplace. In addition, this study explores whether or not an employee's perception of civility is positively associated with prosociality. Although these concepts have been studied separately and across multiple industries, they have not been studied together within a higher education environment.

Having this information can help campus leadership improve productivity, promote happier work environments, and hire individuals who will excel.

### **Limitations**

As with any research study, there are a number of limitations that may impact this study, such as current environmental, social, and political conditions, research methods, participant selection, and data collection instruments. For example, this study and data collection efforts took place during an unprecedented time as a result of a health pandemic that has impacted economic as well as emotional well-being of virtually all sectors of society across the globe. In addition, the researcher cannot ignore the high level of social unrest across the United States due to racial injustices, violence against African Americans, and a divisive political culture that pervades daily life.

Other limitations include the chosen research collection instruments given the use of surveys which are self-reported and may include inaccuracies. Surveys are a popular instrument in the behavioral sciences due to their ease of distribution, but their weaknesses must also be taken into consideration, including the inability for some respondents to think introspectively and honestly, potential for participants to misunderstand the questions or responses, and limited response options that may not adequately capture a respondent's preferred answer (Austin et al., 1998 & Fan et al., 2006). For this study, the instruments for measuring prosocial behavior, workplace civility, and work engagement have been used extensively by other researchers and tested for both reliability and validity to minimize limitations as much as possible.

## Definitions of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following terms are defined:

- Academic Affairs – “Those who comprise the academic side of administration in U.S. higher education include the provost or vice president for academic affairs, the assistant provost or assistant vice president for academic affairs, [and] college deans” (David & Amey, 2020. p. 5).
- Faculty member – “A fulltime employee whose main responsibility is to teach at least one course per term or semester” (Mahaffey & Welsh, 1993, p. 13).
- Prosocial Behaviors – “Voluntary actions that are intended to help or benefit another individual or group of individuals” (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989, p. 3).
- Prosociality – “Behaviors that are intended to benefit others” (Jensen, 2016, p. R748).
- Student Affairs – “Typically comprised of areas including, though not limited to, support services, such as accessibility and disability support, admissions and enrollment management, advisement, athletics, career development, financial aid, personal counseling and health services, crisis management, residential life, transfer counseling, and tutoring and study skills. At the heart of the work of student affairs professionals is the provision of holistic

(comprehensive) support services to assist students in making successful transitions in college and promoting healthy academic, social, and psychological development” (David & Amey, 2020, p. 1471).

- Workplace Civility – “Behavior that helps to preserve the norms of mutual respect at work; it comprises behaviors that are fundamental to positively connecting with another, building relationships, and empathizing” (Pearson et al., 2000, p. 125).
- Workplace Incivility - “Rude, discourteous behavior, belittling other employees in public, interrupting, and demeaning or disregarding the opinions of others” (Hodgins & McNamara, 2017, p. 191).
- Workplace Engagement – “An indicator of well-being and motivation, defined as a persistent, pervasive, and positive affective-motivational state of fulfillment in employees, characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption” (Schaufeli et al., 2006, p. 227).

### **Overview of Method**

This quantitative study utilized previously developed and widely adopted survey instruments to measure prosocial behaviors, work engagement, and workplace civility for three distinct groups of employees in a higher education environment. A national random sample of university employees was invited to complete an online survey answering questions about themselves including those from the aforementioned instruments as well

as some that were demographic in nature. Data were exported from Qualtrics into SPSS for cleaning and then analysis. The analysis of data in this project was conducted in two ways based on the kind of data involved, categorical or continuous. For the categorical variables, data analysis for this project consisted of ANOVA, or analysis of variance, when comparing across the three populations of the study. For the continuous variables, when considering correlations between the variables of prosocial behavior, workplace civility, and work engagement, bivariate analysis was utilized through Pearson's  $r$ , or Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient.

### **Organization of Dissertation**

This research study is organized into five chapters. The first chapter includes an introduction as well as background, important terms, and a brief overview of the methods that are used. Chapter two provides a review of literature related to this study and establishes the foundation for understanding the three key concepts of prosocial behaviors, workplace engagement, and civility. In addition, chapter two provides a rich description and background of the higher education environment, including specifically a review of the professional roles, relationships and distinctions across student affairs, academic affairs, and faculty members. Next, chapter three details the methodology of this quantitative study, and chapter four discusses the results of the research. And lastly, chapter four includes the findings of the study while chapter five concludes the project with discussion of future implications and possibilities for additional study.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **Introduction**

The purpose of this quantitative study is to compare the prosocial behavior scores of student affairs professionals, academic affairs administrators, and faculty members in a higher education environment and to examine how their prosocial scores correlate with work engagement and workplace civility. This review of the relevant literature will begin with a discussion of prosocial behavior and a thorough examination of the research on this influential concept. In addition to understanding the prosocial behavior research, this review provides a detailed discussion of the organizational context of existing research and presents examples of past efforts to measure engagement in prosocial behaviors, primarily in the workplace.

Next, the contemporary context for workplace civility and organizational prosocial behaviors will be explored along with the instrument for measuring workplace civility, followed by a discussion of prosocial behavior's correlation with workplace engagement and the instrument for measuring this engagement. Finally, in order to understand the context for this study, there is a review of the higher education organizational culture, the prosocial behaviors in this specific culture, and an exploration into the literature that explains three subcultures of higher education: academic affairs, faculty members, and student affairs.

## **Prosocial Behavior Overview**

Prosocial behaviors have been studied by researchers since the early 1900's in an effort to explain and understand actions that are the opposite of anti-social. However, there has not been consistent agreement on a precise definition, thus creating difficulty across studies in specifying the exact behaviors that qualify as prosocial in nature. First examined in the field of psychology, prosocial behaviors were researched as emotions felt from parent to child in which they are instinctively driven to have "tender emotions" toward their offspring (McDougall, 1908). Over time, others used the term to describe behaviors that exhibit the desire to protect and promote the well-being of others (Batson, 1987; De Dreu et al., 2000), and researchers such as Grant (2008) simply believe that any desire to exert effort on behalf of others is prosocial in nature.

Worth noting for its role in creating interest in research in the area of prosocial behaviors was the horrific murder of a young woman named Katherine "Kitty" Genovese in 1964 during which 38 bystanders did nothing, not even calling the police (Dovidio et al., 2006). Behavioral scientists used this situation to expand the study of why some people are willing to help others, under what circumstances they will help, and when they will not help. In addition, these researchers began to consider a number of processes related to these prosocial, or helping, behaviors, including those that are biological, cognitive, social and motivational (Dovidio & Penner, 2001; Caporael, 2001; Eisenberg, 2000). Fundamental to the definition, as noted by Organ (1988), "a defining characteristic of prosocial behavior is that it is voluntarily and expressly directed toward the benefit of someone else...with no apparent prospect of immediate intrinsic reward to the benefactor" (p. 27-28). For the purposes of this research project, prosocial behaviors are

defined as "voluntary actions that are intended to help or benefit another individual or group of individuals" (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989, p. 3).

Just as other essential components of organizational culture are constantly examined in the research field, such as employee performance, management structure, and teamwork, prosocial behaviors have also been studied across many professions (Wittmer & Martin, 2010; Grant & Sonnentag, 2010; Al-Yaaribi, et al., 2016). Wittmer and Martin (2010) studied prosocial behaviors in United States post office employees across day, evening, and night shifts to determine the effect of emotional exhaustion and found that the lack of human interaction on night shifts led to more emotional exhaustion than the other shifts.

Grant and Sonnentag (2010) also focused their prosocial behavior research on the role of emotional exhaustion, but they based their research on studies of professional fundraisers and public sanitation plant employees and found that prosocial actions by supervisors can counteract employees' poor self-identity and low job satisfaction, thus making the argument that the role of a supervisor is of great importance and can have an influence on an employee's personal affect as well as their feelings toward their position. And lastly, Al-Yaaribi et al. (2016) researched the area of sports teams and specifically focused on athletes' prosocial behaviors. They found that acting prosocially or antisocially affects enjoyment, effort, performance, and commitment to the sport for teammates. To date, however, the focus on prosocial behaviors has been limited in the higher education environment.

## **Organizational Context**

More recently, there has been greater exploration of prosocial behaviors beyond simply the individual who performs them and more specifically as part of the larger office organization, also referred to as good citizenship behaviors or extrarole behaviors (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Organ, 1988; Zellars et al., 2002). According to Baruch et al. (2004), “prosocial behavior in organizations is broadly linked with the notion of socially desirable behavior, since there are cultural beliefs that people should behave prosocially because it is socially desirable...” (p. 401). These prosocial behaviors are studied as part of the larger organizational context.

While an important premise of prosocial organizational behaviors is that they are done for the benefit of others in the organization, research shows that in the end, the prosocial individual will also reap the rewards of a more productive and positive workplace (Grant & Sumanth, 2009; De Dreu & Nauta, 2009; Frazier & Tupper, 2016). Grant and Sumanth (2009) researched the behaviors of fundraising callers for a for-profit company call center as well as professional fundraisers from a public institution via surveys and weekly productivity reports. With both groups, they found that managers were more likely to increase the performance of employees who were prosocially motivated. They also concluded that prosocially motivated employees are more likely to be higher achievers and also exhibit greater commitment to the organization because they are more interested in the goals of the company than in their own gain. They also found that prosocial employees are more cooperative and better able to benefit from feedback on their performance.

DeDreu and Nauta (2009) conducted a research study of supervisors in the health care industry and their employees who were all asked by their human resources director to complete a paper survey. The results of their study revealed that prosocial employees have better ratings on performance, and they are viewed as having greater initiative by those who work with them. Similar research by Frazier and Tupper (2016) also supports the concept of prosocial employees as “thriving” and having better performance of the tasks on their job descriptions. Specifically, the employees felt more psychological safety and were more likely to participate in extra-role behaviors that improved the work environment for everyone. While the fundamental definition of prosocial behaviors includes only those actions that benefit the receiver and not the doer, research shows that there are also rewards for prosocial behaviors that include a more positive work environment and the perception that prosocial employees are better performers.

Just as scholars have considered the value of being prosocial to both the employer and the prosocial employee, there is also research revealing the characteristics that most prosocial employees share (Grant, 2007; Lebel & Patil, 2018; Batson et al., 2008). Grant’s (2007) research was particularly helpful in identifying why employees engage in prosocial behaviors. According to Grant, prosocial employees want to make a positive difference in the lives of others. In fact, these employees actually used the phrase, “making a difference” as a defining purpose of their work and why it matters to them. As a result, they cultivate more valuable work relationships that benefit the greater good of the organization and the individuals who are involved in that workplace.

Similarly, Lebel and Patil (2018) found that employees with prosocial motivations focused on their colleagues and placed greater value on both other people and the groups

to which they belonged than their less prosocial colleagues. Conversely, they found that employees with low prosocial motivation were more likely to act in their own best interest and focused their energy and attention on activities that would benefit themselves. And lastly, Batson et al. (2008) found similarly in their research that prosocial individuals help others because, while it does make them feel good about themselves, they identify helping as the right thing to do. Throughout the research, prosocially motivated individuals share characteristics of being helpers who put the greater good above their own and see offering aid to others as the proper reaction when someone is in need.

Research in this area has been done across many fields and professions, such as business students and firefighters (Grant et al., 2009), high tech companies (Baruch et al., 2004), and non-profit organizations (Farmer & Van Dyne 2016). Grant et al. (2009) considered the role of prosocial behaviors in the workplace among a sample group of managers who were enrolled in an executive Master of Business Administration (MBA) program and then replicated their study with a group of firefighters. For both groups of individuals, managers and firefighters, Grant et al. (2009) reported that prosocial behaviors contribute to higher performance evaluations as rated by their supervisors. As a possible explanation for these findings, the researchers suggested that supervisors value prosocial behaviors and recognize them as having value as indicated by their tendency to reward employees they considered prosocial with better performance scores.

In a research study focused on organizational prosocial behaviors, Baruch et al. (2004) compared employee engagement in prosocial behaviors at high-tech companies in Israel and the United Kingdom. They proposed that prosocial behavior could serve as a

mediating variable between motivation and work behavior, which challenged the previous assertions that motivation alone determined work behavior. Contrary to previous assertions, Baruch et al. concluded that prosociality also increased performance.

While many of the studies discussed thus far focused on organizational prosocial behaviors in business settings, the non-profit setting is also an area of focus. For example, Farmer and Van Dyne (2016) studied prosocial organizational behaviors among employees of a non-profit organization that worked with children. They looked specifically at organization prosocial helping behavior (OPHI), which they defined as “prosocial helping identity directed specifically at beneficiaries associated with a particular organization” (p. 770). Their focus on OPHI is different from many of the previous prosocial behavior studies because OPHI is narrowly focused on a specific type of organization and not across organizations in general. Farmer and Van Dyne (2016) found that OPHI had a positive influence on employee presence of mind and work outcomes, such as intent to remain with the organization and sense of work meaningfulness.

Similar to the positive influence of prosocial behaviors on the workplace identified by Farmer and Van Dyne (2016), Campbell (2000) sought to further identify the positive influence of prosocial behaviors on an organization. As part of his effort, Campbell measured specific actions such as “putting forth extra effort, volunteering for assignments, taking action to protect the firm from unexpected danger, making suggestions for improving the company, objecting to improper directives or policies, and speaking favorably about the firm to outsiders” (p. 54). Although prosocial behaviors contributed positively to the organization, Campbell noted that “the specific behaviors are

less important than the orientations they imply - commitment, involvement, judgment, and integrity" (2000, p. 54). He notes connections between prosocial behaviors and clarity of core values of the institution, loyalty to the firm, and perception of errors as opportunities for improvement. The positive impact on the organization is the larger purpose for prosocial employees, and they will work toward that goal with less concern for themselves as individuals.

### **Research Instruments**

Just as the definition of prosocial behaviors varies across studies, the measurement of prosocial behaviors varies from researcher to researcher and can be done in several ways. Researchers have created and used an array of instruments that fall into three categories: (a) self-assessment or self-report with the subject completing the evaluation directly, (b) peer assessment with a same-level colleague completing the evaluation about their coworker or (c) other people- assessment which could include any other person who completes the evaluation, such as a supervisor or instructor (Martí-Vilar, 2019). An example of self-assessment is the Teenage Inventory of Social Skills (Inderbitzen & Foster, 1992) which consists of 40 items and measures both prosocial and antisocial behaviors. It was used to measure the social skills of students who were addicted to video games against those of students who were not addicted, resulting in findings that students who were not addicted to video game had much higher social skills than those who were (Kheradmand et al., 2012). In the study, the student completed the assessment for themselves and about themselves.

Prosocial behaviors have also been measured using a peer assessment survey method. For example, Rutten et al. (2008) asked adolescent soccer players to answer

questions about their teammates in order to identify influencing factors for on and off field prosocial behavior. Based on the survey responses of the players about their teammates, Ruten et al. reported that on-field prosocial behaviors correlated strongly with those off the field. In peer assessment, a same level colleague, classmate, or teammate is asked to provide an assessment of their peer.

The other-people assessment of prosocial behaviors has been used in a variety of settings. For example, in the K12 setting, teachers and parents were asked to evaluate their students and children using a prosocial behaviors instrument (Bahmani et al., 2016). Bahmani et al. sought to determine if there was a relationship between prosocial behaviors and mental toughness. Based on survey responses by the teachers and parents, the mental toughness of the 14-year-old students and children was positively correlated with prosocial behavior. Specifically, Bahmani et al. concluded that higher prosocial behaviors of the students and children were associated with mental toughness. In other-people assessment, often an authority figure such as a parent, teacher, doctor, or coach is the one doing the assessment of the subject.

Prosocial behavior research instruments also vary in terms of what traits are used to indicate prosocial behaviors. Researchers have designed a number of scales to measure prosocial traits such as altruism, trust, and pleasantness (Caprara & Pastorelli, 1993); public behaviors, anonymous behaviors, direct behaviors, emotional behaviors, compliant behaviors, and altruistic behaviors (Carlo & Randall, 2002); and perspective-taking, solidarity, aid response, and assistance altruism (Morales-Rodriguez & Suarez-Perez, 2011). The specific characteristics that are studied to gauge an individual's level of prosocial behaviors, often referred to as prosociality, may vary across the various

research instruments. Nonetheless, across all the instruments, prosocial behavior is associated with doing for others.

And lastly, age is also a factor in determining the appropriate scale for a particular study. Researchers have shown over time and widely accepted that prosocial tendencies increase with age (Rushton, 1975; Knight & Dubro, 1984; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1991). Therefore, they have developed a variety of scales to meet the needs of researching various age groups. For example, the Child Behavior Scale by Ladd and Profilet (1996) is for ages 15-19 and the Prosocial Behavior Questionnaire by Gomez and Silva (1993) is similarly for ages 10-17, and the Prosocialness Scale for Adults by Caprera et al. (2005) is for adults as its name suggests.

For the purposes of this study, the researcher uses the Prosocialness Scale for Adults (Prosocial Scale), a single dimension instrument which measures actions that range from assisting, helping, sharing, caring, to empathy for others (Caprera et al., 2005). The Prosocial Scale has been used across a wide variety of populations in countless research studies, and in an even wider array of organizations. For example, Yip and Kelly (2013) studied whether upward and downward social comparisons can decrease prosocial behavior for undergraduate college students. In a K12 educational setting, Caprera et al. (2009) examined the role of agreeableness and self-efficacy beliefs in predicting prosociality across time among adolescents. While in the non-profit environment, Leiberg et al. (2011) researched whether compassion training increases prosocial behavior among female adult volunteers.

As reported in all of the above studies, the full Prosocial Scale of 16 items was used with five-point Likert scales. Across these studies, the scale was found to be both a

reliable and valid tool for assessing an individual's prosociality across a variety of populations. Although the Prosocial Scale has been widely used in an array of organizational settings, the higher education setting has not been included in past research efforts. Furthermore, these past research efforts to correlate with other scales, such as self-efficacy (Caprara et al., 2009), have also not considered the issue of civility nor have these studies included a focus on the potential correlation between civility and prosocial behavior.

## **Workplace Civility Overview**

### **Organizational Context**

As previously mentioned, this study explores the correlation between prosocial behaviors and civility in the workplace. Workplace Civility is defined as "behavior that helps to preserve the norms of mutual respect at work; it comprises behaviors that are fundamental to positively connecting with another, building relationships, and empathizing" (Pearson et al., 2000, p. 125). Conversely, its polar opposite, incivility, is "rude, discourteous behavior, belittling other employees in public, interrupting, and demeaning or disregarding the opinions of others" (Hodgins & McNamara, 2017, p. 191).

In the contemporary environment of bipartisan politics, mounting religious disputes, and easily ignited tempers on social media, the argument could be made that incivility is on the rise. In fact, 95% of those responding to Civility in America's 2016 survey indicated we have a problem with civility in the United States, and 70% believe it has reached crisis proportions. In addition, research shows that rudeness, in addition to the obvious unpleasantness it brings, reduces performance on both routine and more advanced tasks (Porath & Erez, 2007).

Further, merely witnessing rudeness, decreases the viewer's performance of prosocial behaviors (Porath & Erez, 2009). Employers must maintain an awareness of the negative impact incivility can have on their workforce, particularly in terms of decreased performance. One study estimated a cost of \$14,000 per employee for losses in worktime and productivity (Porath & Erez, 2007). For these reasons and many others, an operationalized push for civility, or more prosocial behaviors, is a timely topic to consider.

Higher education is not excluded from the recent discussions around civility, in fact, recent trends across higher education reveal that workplace bullying and incivility have become far too common in academia (Twale & DeLuca, 2008). According to Twale and De Luca, colleges are more susceptible to the risk of bullying and incivility due to their top-down organizational structure. The negative behaviors come in a variety of forms including demoralization, humiliation, and resentment, and their negative effects ripple throughout the institution impacting retention, collegiality, and productivity (Raskauskas & Skrabee, 2011). It is important to consider the correlation between prosocial behaviors and civility in the workplace in an effort to promote a respectful and responsible environment.

### **Research Instruments**

In order to study civility, it is important to operationalize how it will be measured. The literature refers to a small number of instruments for this purpose including the Workplace Incivility Scale (Cortina et al., 2001), the Uncivil Workplace Experiences Questionnaire (Martin & Hine, 2005), and the Civility Norms Questionnaire-Brief (Walsh et al., 2012). The Workplace Incivility Scale uses 8 items to measure the

workplace behavior of both supervisors and coworkers, and the Uncivil Workplace Experiences Questionnaire uses 124 items to measure a variety of toxic work behaviors including gossiping, privacy invasion, hostility, and exclusionary behavior. Though these scales have been widely used, they focus more on measuring the concept from the direction of the negative in looking at incivility. Meanwhile, the final scale, the Civility Norms Questionnaire approaches the topic from the positive angle of measuring civility with 4 questions: (a) Rude behavior is not accepted by your coworkers, (b) Angry outbursts are not tolerated by anyone in your unit/workgroup, (c) Respectful treatment is the norm in your unit/workgroup, (d) Your coworkers make sure everyone in your unit/workgroup is treated with respect. For the purposes of this study, the more positive approach as well as the shorter length of the Civility Norms Questionnaire resulted in its selection for measuring workplace civility among our higher education survey respondents.

## **Workplace Engagement Overview**

### **Organizational Context**

In addition to the aforementioned positive characteristics of prosocial behaviors in the workplace, another important one to consider is how they contribute to workplace engagement. Workplace engagement is an important concept because it “is an indicator of well-being and motivation, defined as a persistent, pervasive, and positive affective-motivational state of fulfillment in employees, characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption” (Schaufeli et al., 2006, p. 227). Previous studies have found prosocial behavior and workplace engagement to be positively correlated. Specifically, individuals with higher prosocial scores tend to be more engaged in their work environment, which

leads to higher engagement in work (Abid et al., 2018; Castanheira et al., 2016). This is a correlation that lends itself for study in higher education.

Abid et al. (2018) studied workplace engagement among workers in the service sector and found that it was positively correlated with the prosociality of employees. Using a self-administered questionnaire of bank employees, the researchers utilized 5 questions related to prosocial motivation from a larger instrument by Grant and Sumanth (2009) and the full 17 item Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) that will also be used in this study. In addition, they found that these engaged employees were more likely to thrive in their work environment.

Meanwhile, Castanheira et al. (2016) also found that among officers and soldiers in the Portuguese Army, prosocial motivations were positively correlated with workplace engagement thus enhancing both employee effort and job persistence. This correlation is significant for employers who value engaged and productive employees. An unengaged and unproductive employee is not beneficial to the organization and could be seen as a waste of their salary. In addition, should this employee decide to leave, the cost is even greater with human resources researchers estimating the cost of losing and replacing one employee at between 93%-200% of their salary (Cascio, 1991; Johnson, 1995; Treglown, et al., 2018).

It is worth noting that costs could be even higher in academia where employees such as faculty, are often provided with research start-up packages and other incentive packages to attract highly skilled and productive scholars. In addition, the costs of replacing employees in higher education settings extend beyond the hiring process and

packages because when these employees leave, they take certain skills and their research with them.

### **Research Instrument**

As noted above, the correlation between prosocial behavior and work engagement has been documented in a number of business and public service organizations, but such research has not been replicated in the field of higher education. In order to do so as part of this study, it was necessary to use an instrument to measure work engagement in a manner that quantifies it for comparison with the other variables. Unlike measuring prosocial behaviors, which had a multitude of instruments, the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufell et al., 2006) is widely recognized as the primary tool for measuring work engagement. Its 17 questions break down into the primary areas of vigor, dedication, and absorption, and it has been published in more than a dozen languages.

As previously mentioned with the Prosocialness Scale for Adults, the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale is also completed by the individual as opposed to an external evaluator. Other studies that have used this instrument include Vallieres et al.'s (2017) study of health workers in Sierra Leone in to assess their levels of work engagement across multiple levels of education, Tomas et al.'s (2018) research on the work engagement of Dominican Teachers, and Torabinia et al.'s (2017) study of nursing professionals in Persia. In all instances, the study was found to be valid and reliable and remains the preeminent instrument in the study of workplace engagement.

### **Higher Education Organizational Culture**

As the setting for this study, it is important to consider the culture of organizations of higher education. Kuh et al. (1993) stated, "Collegiate culture is in many

ways an expression of an institution's values which guide how people judge situations, acts, objects, and people" (p. 41). Traditionally, higher education values have included characteristics that are also associated with prosocial behaviors, like helping others reach their potential, promoting values and diversity, and serving the larger mission of the institution (Coman & Bonciu, 2016). As Amey and Reesor (2015) stated, "Compared with the corporate and private sectors, educational organizations are often touted as collegial institutions whose members are drawn together by a common mission to serve students and provide an educated citizenry" (p. 18). This collegiality is critical to the non-profit and pro-student nature of most colleges and universities, and it makes them a prime location for a study of prosocial behaviors in the workplace.

Higher education institutions often have missions that focus specifically on improving students while improving the world. For example, Wofford College's (2020) mission includes providing an "education that prepares its students for extraordinary and positive contributions to a global society" (Wofford.edu, 2020) and the University of South Carolina's mission includes both "education of the state's citizens" and "responsibility to the state and society to promote...an enhanced quality of life" (UofSC1, 2020). In addition, Dinc (2017) writes, "the discretionary and extra-role behavior of the academic and administrative staff, and the factors that can increase such behavior in public and private universities, have become vital" (p. 2). Though still business enterprises that must make wise use of revenue, institutions of higher education also have missions that are typically both student-focused and concerned with the world outside their campuses.

In addition to the culture of higher education, its structure is also an important consideration. Typically, it consists of committees as a means of promoting shared decision-making across multiple areas as well as shared governance (Farris, 2016). As a result, many university employees find that much of their work is, as a rule, outside of their official job descriptions and formal conditions of employment (Hatfield, 2006; Tierney, et al., 2004). Related to the previous discussion of prosocial behaviors, studies have looked at the concepts of sharing, caring and positive interactions on these working teams in higher education and found that they promote both commitment to the team and increase team productivity (Akbari et al., 2016; Farris, 2018; Podsakoff et al., 2000). The characteristics lend themselves to this study as an ideal location for a study of prosocial behaviors.

Finally, it is important to note that institutions of higher education are made up of various smaller subcultures that may have varying levels of prosociality among their members. Of particular interest to this study are the areas of academic affairs, faculty, and student affairs. The following is an explanation of these areas after an overview of their historical relationship.

### **Academic Affairs, Faculty, and Student Affairs**

Historically, there has been a tension between academic affairs and faculty with student affairs. Originally the faculty did the work of the university and were responsible for the wellbeing of their students, both academically and otherwise (Hirt & Frank, 2013). As colleges grew, the field of student affairs came into existence with a vested role in the support services required outside of the academic life of the student. In addition, “incorrect perceptions and lack of knowledge about each other’s jobs, the

alienating and confusing jargon, the increased specialization and the financial competition between these two groups has led to misunderstandings between faculty and student affairs professionals” (Kellogg, 1999, p. 2). Currently, in most institutions of higher education, student affairs staff are responsible for everything outside of academic research, teaching, and service, which are designated as the primary responsibilities of academic affairs and faculty.

### **Academic Affairs/Faculty**

A key characteristic of academic affairs is its hierarchical structure which includes a Provost at the helm, followed by a dean for each college, then a department chair for each unit, and lastly the faculty who range from full professors, to assistant and associate professors, to clinical and adjunct faculty (Bess & Dee, 2012). All have varying levels of responsibility and authority. As previously reported in other fields, researchers have also found that faculty are more productive in environments that are prosocial (Cipriano, 2011) with increased success in the areas of scholarship, research, and service. Faculty have also indicated that collegiality is very important to their job satisfaction (COACHE, 2012) and “essential” to their preferred academic environment (Gappa et al., 2007).

On the other hand, research has also shown that faculty members struggle with the characteristics associated with prosocial behavior due to the intensity of balancing their research, scholarship, and service responsibilities (Tierney, 1997). Tierney noted in his research that they shared common statements regarding their lack of time to do anything other work with many claiming to work seven days per week, working late hours, and having little down time. In fact, he reported that 75% of the faculty he surveyed reported

that they worked at least three nights per week, and more than 90% worked four or more hours at least one day during the weekend. They shared similar sentiments about maintaining this same level of work during the summer with little time off. Interestingly, some members of his survey had worked in academia as well as in industry and nearly all of them reported that their work in higher education had been more intense and time-intensive than their work outside of academia. The time required of faculty to reach their tenure and promotion goals leaves little extra time for helping others in a prosocial manner. Similarly, Bess (1991) observed “most academics do not even know what collegiality is” (p. 1) and they would be better off describing what it feels like to lack collegiality in the workplace.

Lastly, Massy et al. (1994) pointed out three major areas that hinder the ability of faculty to be prosocial to each other: limited resources, poor communication, and current systems of reward and evaluation. First, constrained resources increase competition for funding and often pressures for time. Next, fragmented communication is associated with autonomy due to faculty often working in isolation; specialization into defined research areas; civility due to avoiding divisive issues; generational splits often along junior and senior faculty lines; and personal politics that can be polarizing. And lastly, current reward systems such as the intense emphasis on research, large differences in salaries, and ineffective assessment lead to future fragmentation (Massy et al., 1994). Therefore, the basis is set for a faculty that is less inclined to act prosocially in the field of higher education.

As a result of the fragmented opportunities for faculty to show prosocial behaviors in the workplace, there has been a growing effort to build communities by

implementing mentorship programs, collaborative teaching, and more opportunities for socializing new faculty (Gillespie et al., 2005; Mathews, 2003; Sorcinelli, 1994; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). However, fewer opportunities exist for mid-level and advanced faculty (COACHE, 2012). And a 1999 report by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) even discouraged collegiality as a promotion criterion because they believed it promoted homogeneity and threatened academic freedom. As a criterion for evaluation, defining collegiality could be considered arbitrary. In addition, it runs the risk of being partial to those in positions of privilege and power, while penalizing those who are not.

Lastly, the research of Victorinox et al. (2017) in the area of prosocial behavior in the professoriate is worth noting in that it points out the significant number of female faculty and faculty of color who indicate lower levels of collegiality by their colleagues, which correlated with lower levels of job satisfaction by these same faculty members. In fact, collegiality explained more than two thirds of the variance in job satisfaction among these groups, spurring Victorino et al. (2017) to suggest, “one might argue that faculty collegiality should be considered an even more vital and necessary condition for untenured faculty entering and working within the academy” (p. 793). Other research on female and minority faculty has also shown that they often report feelings of isolation and lack of belonging when compared to their white male counterparts (Aguirre, 1999; Clark & Corcoran, 1986, Johsrud & Sadao, 1998; Sabharwal & Corley, 2009).

### **Student Affairs**

While student affairs is also somewhat hierarchical in structure, with a Vice President or Dean at the lead, followed by various director positions over each unit (Bess

& Dee, 2012), it is seen as collaborative in nature. In fact, College Student Educators International listed “collaboration with other institutional units” as one of five characteristics expected of a student affairs division (Zhang, 2016, p.57). There may be a push by leadership to collaborate, work across areas, and get outside of silos to better serve students. While employees in the faculty and academic affairs typically come to their position through the pathways of specific academic disciplines, such as history, chemistry, or public health, those in student affairs typically attend graduate programs that focus broadly on higher education and student affairs. These higher education programs have been called “instrumental in providing emerging and new professionals with foundational knowledge and skills to work with an increasingly diverse student body and to understand the organizational and functional aspects in the field” (Wilson et al., 2019, p. 20). As a result of these programs and associated training, student affairs professionals have a great overall understanding of campus life and college activities outside of academics.

The higher education programs are also designed to incorporate ten competency areas that have been identified and defined by the leading professional organizations in the field, College Student Educators International (ACPA) and Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education (NASPA). The two membership organizations proposed and adopted the groundwork for the competencies in 2010 and have continued to refine and develop them in the last ten years. They are in the areas of Personal and Ethical Foundations (PPF); Values, Philosophy, and History (VPH); Assessment, Evaluation, and Research (AER); Law, Policy, and Governance (LPG); Organizational and Human Resource (OHR); Leadership (LEAD); Social Justice and Inclusion (SJI);

Student Learning and Development (SLD), Technology (TECH), and Advising and Supporting (A/S) (ACPA, NASPA, 2015). In addition, each of the competencies has an associated rubric by which the student affairs professional can assess their knowledge, skills, and abilities as foundational, intermediate, or advanced. Prosocial terms such as collaborate and mentor show up in the rubrics several times, and the rubric for Advising and Supporting specifically lists the importance of a “disposition to promote the growth and health of others” (ASPA, NASPA, 2015, p. 12). Throughout the educating, training, and socializing of its professionals, the importance of prosocial behaviors is stressed in student affairs.

As a final consideration in the differences between academic affairs, faculty, and student affairs, it is worth considering whether the content focused nature of faculty and discipline specific training that were discussed above cause them to be more oriented toward their own individual goals for success, with less concern or focus on helping the colleagues and students around them. And as an accompaniment to this content focus for faculty is the potential for academic administrators to have a greater focus outside of themselves and more so toward the results of their leadership and position on the individuals who report to them and the students under their purview. Likewise, student affairs professionals also have job duties that are outward facing and more focused on guiding and directing others than on the personal professional goals that can be central to the tenure and promotion process of faculty.

### **Summary**

As detailed in this chapter, the college campus is an ideal location for a study such as this to more closely examine three distinct populations and their varying levels of

prosocial behaviors, work engagement, and workplace civility. In addition, the potential correlation of these characteristics warrants a closer study, bringing associations that have been studied in other environments into that of higher education. The resulting analysis and conclusions will provide more detail to decision makers as the work to improve the experiences of their employees and improve the work environment.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **METHODS**

This chapter outlines the methodology used in the study and is organized into the following sections: research design, measures of dependent and independent variables, demographics, data collection, research question and hypothesis testing, data analysis and participants. As stated in chapter one, the purpose of this study is to compare the prosocial behavior scores of student affairs professionals, academic affairs professionals, and faculty members in a research-focused public higher education environment and determine how work engagement and workplace civility correlate for these three professional groups. Finally, a survey research design is detailed to allow analysis of responses from the three groups in order to determine if there is a relationship between a respondent's prosocial behavior and their role in higher education, level of work engagement, and workplace civility.

#### **Research Design**

Survey research is a basic quantitative design that is useful when exploring the relationship among concepts (Visser et al., 2000), such as prosocial behaviors, work engagement, and workplace civility. Given the desire to measure across three populations, survey research enables the use of standardized questions across all three professional groups and ensures that data collection efforts are consistent.

An electronic questionnaire was used to survey the participant sample due to the ease of distribution to a large sample size without the expense of mailing paper surveys

or meeting in person to complete surveys with large groups (Couper, 2000; Sheehan & Hoy, 1999; Weible & Wallace, 1998). In addition, this survey was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic of 2020 which limited the ability to access people and increased the need for reducing contact.

Before the survey was administered and data was collected, approval was acquired from the University of South Carolina's Research Administration Office's Institutional Review Board (IRB) (Appendix A). Informed consent information was included on the first page of the survey to all members of the sample detailing that their response was both anonymous and by choice and completion of the survey was considered as informed consent to participate in the study. The Informed Consent statement is included in the survey as Appendix B. Following the approval of the IRB, the electronic questionnaire was distributed by email to a purchased list of higher education employees from a national random sample from four-year public research I institutions in the United States.

The timeline for data collection included electronic distribution of the survey in October 2020 followed by analysis of the data in November and December 2020. The invitation to participate included a pre-notice email (Appendix C) followed one week later by the first link to the survey (Appendix D) and a reminder two additional days later (Appendix E).

### **Population and Sampling Frame**

The population studied in this project includes higher education employees who are categorized as faculty, academic affairs administration, or student affairs. The data was collected from a national random sample of higher education employees purchased

from a professional clearinghouse. Random sampling has long been considered a favorite technique for scientific study because it “removes bias from the selection procedure and should result in representative samples” (Gravetter & Forzano, 2010, p. 146). The names and contact information were available from a password protected location on the vendor’s webpage and could be downloaded into a an excel sheet for easier manipulation.

### **Power Analysis**

The power analysis calculator is available at <https://clincalc.com/stats/samplesize.aspx> and was used by filling in the blanks for Group 1 with a mean of 3.52 and standard deviation of .64 from a previous study using the Prosocialness Scale for Adults (Caprera et.al, 2005) and setting the minimum detectable effect size to 10%. The minimum detectable effect size is the effect size below which we cannot precisely distinguish the effect from zero, even if it exists (Dong & Maynard, 2013). Consistent with the guidelines for power analysis, this study needed at least 52 members per each of the three groups: faculty, academic administration, and student affairs. It far exceeded these minimums with nearly 700 participants and a 23.5% response rate.

### **Measures**

The primary variables of interest in the present study are prosocial behaviors, work engagement, and workplace civility. After careful review of a variety of measures for assessing the three key constructs of interest in this study, the survey instruments identified below were selected.

## **Prosocial Behaviors**

For the purposes of this study, the researcher used the Prosocialness Scale for Adults, a single dimension instrument for self-evaluation which considers action to assisting, helping, sharing of caring, and empathy with others (Caprera et al., 2005). It consists of 16 items with responses on a five-point Likert scale: Never/Almost Never True, Occasionally True, Sometimes True, Often True, and Almost Always/Always True. The Prosocialness Scale for Adults has been used in more than 300 studies of varying types. As such, its validity and reliability have been supported on numerous occasions since its origin in 2005. Most recently, it was used in a study of the COVID-19 pandemic's impact on individual and social well-being with a focus on support for the compensatory social interaction model (Canale et al., 2020). Across the studies, consistency in means is present.

## **Work Engagement**

The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale is widely recognized as the primary tool for measuring work engagement (Schaufell et al., 2006). This scale includes 17 questions that break down into the vigor, dedication, and absorption dimensions, and it has been published in more than a dozen languages. It is completed by the individual as opposed to an external evaluator. Responses on a seven-point Likert scale include the following: Never, Almost Never - A few times a year or less, Rarely - Once a month or less, Sometimes - A few times a month, Often - Once a week, Very often - A few times a week, and Always - Every day. The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale has been used in more than 700 studies. Both its reliability and validity have been established and

confirmed on many occasions, including the validation of the English version against those in other languages.

### **Workplace Civility**

The Civility Norms Questionnaire-Brief is a 4-item instrument that measures the civility of a work environment (Walsh et al., 2011). As with the other instruments mentioned above for measuring prosocial behaviors and workplace engagement, this instrument is also a self-evaluation. Responses on a seven-point Likert scale include Strongly disagree, Disagree, Somewhat disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat agree, Agree, and Strongly agree. The Civility Norms Questionnaire-Brief has been used nearly 200 times in various studies since its origin in 2011. In these studies, both the reliability and validity of the instrument have been found with means across studies remaining consistent.

### **Demographics**

This study measured traditional demographic variables such as gender, age, race and ethnicity. For use in coding and interpretation, respondents were asked to indicate their gender using the following options: female, male, non-binary, or no response. Age was collected by asking respondents to fill in their birth year. Response options to race were based on the options on the 2020 United States Census: White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, or Some Other Race. Respondents may select all that apply. And lastly, based on the U.S. Department of Education's (2020) categories for ethnicity, there was a question with the options of Hispanic or Latino or Not Hispanic or Latino.

## **Data Collection Procedures**

In order to answer the research questions, a survey was used to collect data from the identified three groups: faculty, academic administration, and student affairs. The survey included questions from the three instruments designed to measure prosocial behaviors, work engagement, and workplace civility. The three instruments were ordered in the survey based on their questions focus on attitudes, then behavioral intentions, followed by behaviors, and lastly attributes (Feldman & Lynch, 1988). The order is based on the idea that questions about someone's attitude and intentions are more difficult for them to answer than those regarding their actual behaviors and attributes. As such, the work engagement survey questions was first, followed by workplace civility items, then prosocial behavior questions, and lastly the demographic questions. Within each of these question sets, the order of the questions was randomized to prevent bias associated with item order (Lavrakas, 2008).

### **Informal Pilot Study**

A two-level informal pilot study was conducted in late August 2020 to confirm that all questions were clear and that the survey was functioning correctly. First, it was sent by email to a convenience sample of five of the researcher's colleagues and coworkers predominantly at the University of South Carolina. These individuals were asked to complete the survey with special attention to whether any questions were confusing. As a second phase of the pilot study, a slightly larger group of 15 colleagues was asked to complete the full survey to make sure the responses were collected correctly in Qualtrics and that no additional edits needed to be made to the survey before widely

publishing it to the purchased list. This last phase of the pilot also confirmed the amount of time it took to complete the survey.

### **Data Collection**

Collection of data took place during October 2020 via Qualtrics. The targeted number of responses was based on a quota response of at least 300 with 100 coming from each of the three groups being studied: faculty, academic administration, and student affairs staff. A multiple wave was used with one follow-up reminder email two days after the initial survey email. As this survey was based on the professional role of the participants, the survey was sent to them on a Tuesday during the workday at 2:00pm EST due to the inclusion of several time zones, with a reminder email the following Thursday at 2:00pm EST as well. A total of 354 responses came before the reminder and an additional 326 came after the reminder email for a total of 680 responses.

### **Data Cleaning**

Data cleaning is an important step to make sure the information from the survey is consistent across each record and free of errors. First, the data was downloaded from Qualtrics into SPSS. As a part of cleaning up the data, the responses of all participants who completed less than 90% of the questionnaire was deleted, based on Schafer's (1999) research that a missing rate of 5% or less is inconsequential and Bennett's (2001) findings that statistical analysis is not likely to be biased until an excess of 10% of data are missing. Next, the categorical responses were rekeyed for use in data analysis. And lastly, to maintain anonymity, all identifying information such as IP addresses was deleted.

## **Research Question and Hypothesis Testing**

The research question and associated hypotheses for this study were considered by conducting a pedestrian analysis of the data. SPSS was used to conduct a multivariate analysis to determine whether statistically significant relationships exist in the variables. As a reminder, the purpose of this quantitative study was to compare the prosocial behavior scores of student affairs professionals, academic affairs professionals, and faculty members in a higher education environment. In addition, this study examined how work engagement and workplace civility correlate for these three professional groups. Survey responses from a sample of professionals was analyzed to determine if there is a relationship between a respondent's prosocial behavior and their role in higher education, level of work engagement, and workplace civility. There are three hypotheses plus a null hypothesis. They are each listed below along with the instrument that was used in the survey to assess them.

Null Hypothesis: The prosocial scores of student affairs professionals are not significantly different from those of academic administration professionals.

H1: The prosocial scores of student affairs and academic administration professionals are higher than those of faculty members.

- Prosocialness Scale for Adults

H2: The prosocial scores are positively correlated with the work engagement scores for student affairs, academic administration, and faculty members.

- Prosocialness Scale for Adults
- Utrecht Work Engagement Scale

H3: The prosocial scores are positively correlated with the work civility scores for student affairs, academic administration, and faculty members.

- Prosocialness Scale for Adults
- Civility Norms Questionnaire

### **Data Analysis**

The analysis of data in this project was done in two ways based on the kind of data involved, categorical or continuous. For the categorical variables, data analysis for this project consists of ANOVA, or analysis of variance, when comparing across the three populations of the study, as ANOVA is the preferred statistical test for measuring differences across two or more groups. The ANOVA is appropriate when one dependent variable is expected to change due to manipulation of an independent variable.

Several assumptions for using ANOVA must be met and these include the following: the dependent variable is a continuous variable, the independent variable is a categorical variable, the samples are random and independent, homogeneity of the variance is satisfied, and the dependent variable is normally distributed for each level of the independent variable (Fitzgerald & Flinn, 2000). For the continuous variables, when considering correlations between the variables of prosocial behavior, workplace civility, and work engagement, bivariate analysis was utilized through Pearson's  $r$ , or Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient. It is used to measure the strength, direction, and probability of linear associations, and it ranges from negative 1 to positive 1. The assumptions associated with its use are that both variables should be normally distributed, there are no significant outliers, the variables are continuous, the variables have a linear

relationship, the observations are paired, and the presence of homoscedascity, or equal variance (Magiya, 2019).

### **Participants**

Participant names were generated through Market Data Retrieval using random selection across three identified groups of higher education employees at public 4-year Research I institutions in the United States. The original email list included 3000 names made up of 50% faculty (N = 1492), 30% student affairs (N = 893), and 20% academic affairs administrators (N = 615). Of these, 26 retirees opted out after an initial email notice that they had been selected for the survey, so the survey was distributed to 2974 people. After an initial emailing of the survey and one follow up email, 697 respondents started the survey, and 680 finished it. An additional 50 retirees opted out and a total of 105 emails were bounced back as undeliverable. Of the 680 who finished the survey, 589 of them completed 90% or more of the items, so this research is based on those 589 individuals. The 23.5% response rate for this survey exceeded expectations and more than achieved the goal of 300 respondents as previously indicated.

The respondents to the survey were all from one of three subgroups: faculty, academic affairs, and student affairs. Faculty made up approximately 50% (N= 296) of the respondents, Student Affairs professionals were 26% (N=151), and Academic Affairs made up the remaining 24% (N=142). Table 4.1 shows the breakdown of respondents with their respective prosocial scores.

Of the 296 faculty who responded, 52% were full professors (N = 152), 33% were associate professors (N = 99), 11% were assistant professors (N = 33), and 4% marked their faculty category as other (N = 12).

Table 3.1: Higher Education Positions

<b>Position</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Prosocial Score</b>
Faculty	296	50%	3.88
Student Affairs Staff	151	26%	4.11
Academic Administration	142	24%	4.14

The respondents answered several demographic questions, including race, gender, and age. The majority of respondents self-reported their race as white (N=490), followed by the remaining participants who self-identified as Black or African American (N=50), Hispanic or Latino ethnicity (N=24), Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (N=27); American Indian or Alaska Native (N=1), Some Other Race (N=13), and No Response (N=12). In Table 4.2 Some Other Race was indicated by 2.2% (N=13) and No Response by 2% (N=12). Respondents were also able to select more than one race, which is why N=617 in Table 4.2.

Table 3.2: Race and Ethnicity

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Prosocial Score</b>
White	490	83.00%	3.98
Black or African American	50	8.50%	4.14
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	27	4.60%	4.08
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	0.20%	NA
Some Other Race	13	2.20%	NA
No Response	12	2.00%	NA
Hispanic or Latino	24	4.10%	4.01

Survey respondents also self-reported their gender, with 45.8% identifying as females (N=270), 52.5% as males (N=309), and .5% as non-binary (N=3). There were 1.2% (N=7) who chose not to respond to the question regarding their gender.

Table 3.3: Gender

<b>Gender</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Prosocial Score</b>
Female	270	45.8%	4.12
Male	309	52.5%	3.89
Non-binary	3	0.5%	NA
No Response	7	1.2%	NA

Lastly, respondents were asked to report their ages in the survey by identifying their birth year. For analysis purposes, birth year was then adjusted to an age in years. Of the 589 survey responses, 571 survey participants reported their birth year, but 18 respondents left this question blank. Table 4.4 includes the reported age of participants across the three groups of respondents who participated in this study. The youngest participant reported their age as 30 years old and the oldest reported they were 85 years old, with a mean of 57 years old.

Table 3.4: Age

<b>Group</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Mean</b>
All	55 years	56.54
Academic Administrators	54 years	60.47
Faculty	53 years	55.75
Student Affairs	42 years	54.31

### **Summary**

In summary, this project is quantitative in nature and makes use of an electronic survey distributed via a national random sample. The primary variables are position in higher education, level of prosocial behavior, degree of workplace civility, and level of work engagement. Following the collection of surveys, the data was analyzed for similarities and differences across the higher education positions as well as correlations between the characteristics of being prosocial, civil in the workplace, and engaged in

work. This study serves as the first time these specific characteristics have been studied across these specific populations in a higher education environment.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **FINDINGS**

#### **Introduction**

The previous chapter detailed the methods for this quantitative study including its research design, how each variable would be measured, and where data would be collected. In addition, it outlined how data would be analyzed. This chapter will expand knowledge of the study by using descriptive statistics to better explain the sample and giving an analysis of the data as it relates to the hypotheses presented earlier in this document. It also includes the details of a post hoc analysis of the data.

#### **Participants**

Participant names were generated through Market Data Retrieval using random selection across three identified groups of higher education employees at public 4-year Research I institutions in the United States. The original email list included 3000 names made up of 50% faculty (N = 1492), 30% student affairs (N = 893), and 20% academic affairs administrators (N = 615). Of these, 26 retirees opted out after an initial email notice that they had been selected for the survey, so the survey was distributed to 2974 people. After an initial emailing of the survey and one follow up email, 697 respondents started the survey, and 680 finished it. An additional 50 retirees opted out and a total of 105 emails were bounced back as undeliverable. Of the 680 who finished the survey, 589 of them completed 90% or more of the items, so this research is based on those 589

individuals. The 23.5% response rate for this survey exceeded expectations and more than achieved the goal of 300 respondents as previously indicated.

The respondents to the survey were all from one of three subgroups: faculty, academic affairs, and student affairs. Faculty made up approximately 50% (N= 296) of the respondents, Student Affairs professionals were 26% (N=151), and Academic Affairs made up the remaining 24% (N=142). Table 4.1 shows the breakdown of respondents with their respective prosocial scores.

Table 4.1: Higher Education Positions

<b>Position</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Prosocial Score</b>
Faculty	296	50%	3.88
Student Affairs Staff	151	26%	4.11
Academic Administration	142	24%	4.14

Of the 296 faculty who responded, 52% were full professors (N = 152), 33% were associate professors (N = 99), 11% were assistant professors (N = 33), and 4% marked their faculty category as other (N = 12).

The respondents answered several demographic questions, including race, gender, and age. The majority of respondents self-reported their race as white (N=490), followed by the remaining participants who self-identified as Black or African American (N=50), Hispanic or Latino ethnicity (N=24), Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (N=27); American Indian or Alaska Native (N=1), Some Other Race (N=13), and No Response (N=12). In Table 4.2 Some Other Race was indicated by 2.2% (N=13) and No Response by 2% (N=12). Respondents were also able to select more than one race, which is why N=617 in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Race and Ethnicity

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Prosocial Score</b>
White	490	83.00%	3.98
Black or African American	50	8.50%	4.14
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	27	4.60%	4.08
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	0.20%	NA
Some Other Race	13	2.20%	NA
No Response	12	2.00%	NA
Hispanic or Latino	24	4.10%	4.01

Survey respondents also self-reported their gender, with 45.8% identifying as females (N=270), 52.5% as males (N=309), and .5% as non-binary (N=3). There were 1.2% (N=7) who chose not to respond to the question regarding their gender.

Table 4.3: Gender

<b>Gender</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Prosocial Score</b>
Female	270	45.8%	4.12
Male	309	52.5%	3.89
Non-binary	3	0.5%	NA
No Response	7	1.2%	NA

Lastly, respondents were asked to report their ages in the survey by identifying their birth year. For analysis purposes, birth year was then adjusted to an age in years. Of the 589 survey responses, 571 survey participants reported their birth year, but 18 respondents left this question blank. Table 4.4 includes the reported age of participants across the three groups of respondents who participated in this study. The youngest participant reported their age as 30 years old and the oldest reported they were 85 years old, with a mean of 57 years old.

Table 4.4: Age

<b>Group</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Mean</b>
All	55 years	56.54
Academic Administrators	54 years	60.47
Faculty	53 years	55.75
Student Affairs	42 years	54.31

### **Reliability**

The reliability of the three measures used in this study was assessed using the Cronbach's alpha coefficient to determine internal reliability (Nunnally, 1978). For each of the measures, the resulting coefficient alpha was at or above .90. Specifically, for the 17 Work Engagement items  $\alpha=.919$ , for the 4 Civility items  $\alpha=.920$ , and for the 16 PSB items  $\alpha=.898$ . Thus, the internal reliability of all three measures was within the ranges deemed acceptable by Nunnally (1978).

### **Data Analysis**

Data were analyzed using the SPSS data analysis software. Specifically, the analysis of variance (ANOVA) method was used to determine if there were statistically significant differences across the three groups of participants.

**Hypothesis 1. The prosocial scores of student affairs and academic administration professionals are higher than those of faculty members.** As the position of the

professionals is a categorical variable, comparing the means of the prosocial scores for each category shows that the prosocial scores for student affairs (mean=4.11) and academic affairs (mean=4.14) are indeed higher than those of faculty (mean=3.88).

Using ANOVA, the difference is confirmed as statistically significant ( $p=.000$ ,  $F= 16$ ).

Therefore, the findings supported the decision to reject the null and accept hypothesis one

which postulated that both student affairs professionals and academic administrators had statistically higher prosocial scores than faculty members.

**Hypothesis 2. Prosocial behavior scores are positively correlated with work engagement scores for student affairs, academic administration, and faculty members.**

Prosocial behavior scores and work engagement scores for respondents were positively correlated with an  $r = .343$  ( $p = 0.000$ ). Thus, there is support for hypothesis two that the prosocial behavior scores for the university professionals in the study are positively correlated with their work engagement scores.

**Hypothesis 3. Prosocial behavior scores are positively correlated with workplace civility scores for student affairs, academic administration, and faculty members.**

Prosocial scores and workplace civility were positively correlated ( $r = .187$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ). Therefore, we can conclude that the two variables are positively correlated for individuals represented by this study.

**Post Hoc Analysis**

Post hoc analysis of both race and gender showed no significant differences in the prosocial behavior, workplace civility, and work engagement survey scores. However, the analysis revealed a positive correlation between age and both work engagement ( $r = .281$ ,  $p = .000$ ) and workplace civility ( $r = .147$ ,  $p = .000$ ).

Analysis of the individual questions that made up the scores for prosocial behavior, workplace civility, and work engagement revealed that faculty scored lowest on all 37 questions, with no cases in which their average score for a question was higher

than those of student affairs and academic administrators. Appendix F, Appendix G, and Appendix H further detail the mean scores and significance for each of the questions used in this study, separated by instrument.

Next, on most questions, 31 out of 37 of them, the academic administrators had mean scores that were higher than or the same as student affairs staff. For the remaining six questions, student affairs staff had higher mean scores than the academic administrators. The six questions were (E17) I always persevere even when things do not go well, (P4) I am available for volunteer activities to help those who are in need, (P5) I am empathetic with those who are in need, (P6) I help immediately those who are in need, (P10) I try to console those who are sad, and (P16) I immediately sense my friends' discomfort even when it is not directly communicated to me.

Additionally, a review of the individual questions showed that on the questions related to work engagement, all three professional groups had their lowest mean scores on the three same questions: (E6) When I am working, I forget everything else around me, (E14) I get carried away when I'm working, and (E16) It is difficult to detach myself from my job.

A similar review of the mean scores for the questions from the prosocial behavior instrument also revealed that all three groups of higher education employees had their lowest scores on the same three questions: (P8) I intensely feel what others feel, (P11) I easily lend money or other things, and (P15) I spend time with those friends who feel lonely.

Because this study is limited to academics, the means for each measure were compared to means for other samples. In general, the prosocial scale mean for the

academics in this study was higher than reported for other populations. Table 4.5 provides a comparison with the identical prosocial behavior score reported in other studies.

Table 4.5: Mean Prosocial Score by Type of Population

<b>Population</b>	<b>Mean Prosocial Score</b>	<b>Researchers</b>
Adolescent females in K12	4.16	Caprera et al. (2009)
Academic Administration	4.14	Dempsey (2021)
Student Affairs Staff	4.11	Dempsey (2021)
Higher Ed Faculty	3.88	Dempsey (2021)
Young adult females (age 17-21)	3.76	Alessandri et al. (2009)
Adolescent males in K12	3.72	Caprera et al. (2009)
Swedish clergy	3.43	Buratti et al. (2020)
Young adult males (age 17-21)	3.39	Alessandri et al. (2009)

### **Conclusion**

This study determined that the prosocial behavior scores of student affairs and academic affairs professionals are higher than those of faculty. In addition, as in previous studies set outside of higher education, the prosocial behavior scores are positively correlated with both work engagement scores and workplace civility scores. Next, Chapter 5 will further detail and discuss the findings of this survey along with their implications on actual practice. It will also expand upon potential limitations of the study and suggestions for continued future research.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS**

#### **Introduction**

Previous research suggests that an individual's tendency toward prosocial behaviors can be an indicator of work engagement as well as level of workplace civility (Abid et al., 2018; Castanheira et al., 2016). This study replicated these past efforts in order to determine whether the relationship between prosocial behavior, work engagement, and workplace civility is similar for professional employees in the higher education workplace setting.

In addition, the study examined and compared the prosocial behaviors for higher education professionals who work in three different sub-cultures: student affairs staff, academic affairs administrators, and faculty members. The study explored whether these groups are similar given their proximity to each other in the shared environment of a college campus, or whether there are statistically significant differences in terms of their prosocial behaviors. Identifying the level of prosocial behaviors across these three sub-cultures of higher education professionals could lead to a deeper understanding of how to improve campus work engagement while decreasing workplace incivility.

In this quantitative study, a national random sample of higher education professionals was surveyed via electronic questionnaire to determine their scores in the areas of prosocial behaviors, work engagement, and workplace civility. Specifically, the

respondents were randomly selected from across the three positions of interest: student affairs staff, academic administrators, and faculty members.

This chapter will conclude the study by reviewing the findings for each of the three hypotheses and associated research questions. In addition, exploring the results of post hoc analysis. Next, the chapter explores practical implications and details some of the limitations and opportunities for future study before concluding with final comments on the on the research.

### **Findings**

As discussed in the literature review, professionals who exhibit high prosocial behaviors and positive work engagement are likely to be effective employees who add value and positively influence their workplace. In addition, this study explored whether an employee's perception of civility is positively associated with their prosociality. Having this information can help campus leadership improve productivity, promote happier work environments, and hire individuals who will excel. To better understand the value and role of prosocial behaviors in the higher education work environment, the following hypotheses were identified:

**Hypothesis 1. The prosocial scores of student affairs and academic administration professionals are higher than those of faculty members.** As shown in chapter four, the results of the study supported this hypothesis and found that the scores of both student affairs staff and academic administrators are higher than those of faculty members.

**Hypothesis 2. Prosocial behavior scores are positively correlated with work engagement scores for student affairs, academic administration, and faculty members.** As with the first hypothesis, the second hypothesis was also supported by the

survey's results which showed that the prosocial behavior scores were positively correlated with the work engagement scores.

**Hypothesis 3. Prosocial behavior scores are positively correlated with workplace civility scores for student affairs, academic administration, and faculty members.**

The third and final hypothesis was also supported by the results of the survey, as the prosocial behavior scores of the higher professionals was positively correlated with their workplace civility scores.

As these findings reveal, the prosocial scores of academic administrators and student affairs staff are higher than those of faculty on a college campus. In addition, the study showed the prosocial scores were positively correlated with both work engagement and workplace civility. The data gathered from the study can be used to make observations about the three groups that can help higher education leadership make decisions that will improve their workplace environments resulting in engaged employees and civil office settings which, according to research, will lead to higher production and retention of employees.

The findings of this study are somewhat consistent with prior prosocial behavior research that found individuals with higher prosocial scores tend to be more engaged in their workplace environment and have a higher level of workplace civility (Abid et al., 2018; Castanheira et al., 2016). This correlation with prosocial behaviors is important because engaged workers have been shown to be more productive and satisfied with their work. In addition, employees in a civil workplace are more likely to be collaborative and maintain positive work relationships.

### **Post Hoc Analysis**

Post hoc analysis of the data using ANOVA was done for several variables including race, gender, and age. The post-hoc analysis is a type of statistical test that is done after completion of the study (Salkind, 2010). The post hoc analysis was performed to determine whether or not there were statistical differences in the responses of participants based on their race, gender or age. Neither race nor gender were found to have statistically significant differences in this study.

Differences in age, however, led to statistically significant differences in scores for both work engagement and workplace civility. There was a positive correlation for both, meaning that the older respondents had higher scores for both characteristics, younger respondents had lower scores.

Next, a closer review of how each of the three professional groups scored on the individual questions that made up the survey showed that in all cases, faculty had the lowest mean scores. In addition, in nearly all cases, academic administrators scored higher than those employees who were categorized as student affairs.

### **Statement of Positionality**

The positionality of the researcher as an employee of higher education should be stated. She has worked in a public, four-year research institution for more than 20 years and held positions in both academic affairs and student affairs. Most recently she assumed the role of president of the institution's newly created staff senate where she often hears issues related to campus civility, the contrasting positions of faculty and staff on campus, and the role of staff on the campus as a whole.

## **Discussion and Practical Implications**

There are several ways the results of this study can inform higher education practices. First, as detailed in chapter four, even the lowest prosocial scores of this study, which were those of faculty, are equal to or higher than the prosocial scores in many other studies. It appears that higher education professionals are generally prosocial in nature when compared to other professions or populations. Perhaps, it is the mission driven environment of serving students and the community that attracts prosocial individuals to work on a college campus. Therefore, when recruiting or interviewing candidates, current employees of universities should consider whether candidates will fit into a culture that values putting others first and acts of kindness, as indicated in this research. In addition, examples of prosocial behaviors, particularly those that are extra-role, should be recognized and appreciated by superiors.

Next, as indicated by the results of this survey, higher prosocial scores are positively correlated with work engagement scores. In other words, individuals who scored highly on the prosocial scale also scored highly on the work engagement scale, which is similar to past research in different fields (Abid et al., 2018; Castanheira et al., 2016). Employees with high work engagement are typically more productive, and are likely to have a positive impact on institutional effectiveness and efficiency (Castanheira et al., 2016). In addition, highly engaged employees are more likely to be retained by the institution because they are content in their current work (Farmer & Van Dyne, 2016).

Greater production, retention, and satisfaction are desirable qualities for any industry. Perhaps they are even more important in higher education where the future generations of scholars are trained, where the research of faculty could change the world,

and where our communities look for input from the best and brightest professionals in a number of disciplines.

Similar to the positive effects of high prosocial behavior and high work engagement, this study found between prosocial behavior and workplace civility were positively correlated for all three groups. A decrease in civility in the community at-large makes the need for civility on our campuses perhaps more important. Civil working environments not only improve the professional lives of the employees on campus, but they allow them to be more productive in their duties whether it be as faculty, student affairs staff, or academic administrators.

Past researchers (McKay et al., 2008) have reported that civil workplaces are more productive, engaged, and collaborative. In addition, employees report that civility or the lack of civility is a powerful influence on their well-being at work and in their personal lives (Lim, et al., 2008). As revealed in this study, the positive correlation between prosocial behavior and workplace civility is a powerful reminder that university leadership must build systems that emphasize the need for civility, allow for reporting of incivility so that it can be addressed. For example, they could recognize examples of civility as they happen so that colleagues understand what is expected on their campus, and they should simultaneously provide and enforce expectation for the discipline of those are reported for incivility.

It is worth noting that faculty, unlike student affairs and academic administration, have a very structured tenure system that outlines the steps for promotion. This intensive process rests upon the ability to show a proven record of service, scholarship, and teaching. The balance of achieving all three as part of their professional life, in addition

to any personal demands, can be intense and leave little time for activities that are seen as prosocial.

In addition, faculty are typically assessed more often than the other professional groups in this project, so they must be concerned with multiple student assessments as part of the courses they teach as well as peer assessments, internally and externally, and supervisor evaluations. Particularly for new faculty, this intense scrutiny that requires looking inward at how they are performing can be counterproductive to getting them to look outward for opportunities that may be more collaborative or prosocial in nature. It is worth pondering whether the traditional tenure and promotion process is a grand tradition that makes higher education special or whether it has become somewhat antiquated and needs to be revamped to build a system that allows for more collegiality, while building and reinforcing the values that this research study found beneficial to the organization as a whole.

Lastly, institutions of higher education should consider ways to value and reward actions that are prosocial in nature. Before valuing and rewarding these behaviors, it would be beneficial to define what they are and make them a part of the culture. This could be done through a code of ethics, a statement of valued characteristics, or some other university-wide creed that all university employees can refer to as the values of their workplace. Based on the results of this study, valuing prosocial behaviors and increasing their importance to employees will correlate with an increase in both work engagement and workplace civility. Greater work engagement will improve retention and productivity, and increased civility will allow for a collegial environment in which

employees can focus more on their role in the institution as opposed to how they will react to incivility.

Before closing out this section on discussion of the study and its implications, it is necessary to note that, as with most situations, there are instances that will serve as the exception. The institution and supervisor should maintain an awareness that while prosocial behaviors, work engagement, and workplace civility are related, not having a prosocial disposition does not necessary make someone a bad employee or poor worker. Taking the homogenous approach that only prosocial employees are good employees can be dangerous and harmful in that it could exclude good people. Perhaps a future study could more closely examine the individuals who score lower on the prosocial scale to determine what characteristics they share and whether any of them might also be correlated to being a successful higher education employee, such as perhaps the ability to do intensive individual research projects that require working without the benefit of groupmates or assignments that require a more competitive than collaborative personality. In summary, the findings of this study are worth consideration while avoiding being exclusionary or narrowly-focused. In fact, future studies might examine whether the questions on the prosocial instrument might need to be updated for the higher education environment to allow for a more broad definition of what it means to be prosocial in a mission-based research institution.

### **Limitations and Opportunities for Future Study**

A primary limitation for this study is the timing of the survey in the midst of a global pandemic. Specifically, the research distributed the survey to the randomly selected participants during the Covid-19 pandemic. It took place during a time that

higher education employees confronted struggles they had never faced such as moving instruction completely online within a tight timeline; supporting students who were struggling with issues related to unemployment, housing, and food insecurity; and budget concerns that closed college campuses at record rates (Bleichmar, 2021; Son, et al., 2020; Johnson et al., 2020).

Though participants were specifically asked to respond as they would have prior to the pandemic, the individuals who made up the national random sample for this study were the very people who were most involved with the intensive work of the Covid-19 responses on their campuses. Thus, it is quite likely that their responses may have been affected by the pandemic and the accompanying challenges. It is worth noting that 38% of respondents stated they would have answered questions differently prior to the pandemic. In addition, as the nature of the workplace changed due to covid with many employees working partially or exclusively at home, a future study could replicate this study to see if this change in work location and lack of physical proximity to colleagues changes the results.

Another limitation could be the type of individuals who responded. As previously defined, prosocial behaviors are done for the benefit of another person. It is within reason to think that a person who is less prosocial might not have been inclined to help out by taking the time to complete an online survey for a doctoral student they likely had never met. Therefore, the responses may have been skewed towards showing that higher education employees are more prosocial.

An additional limitation is that there are many other groups that make up a college campus beyond the three sub-groups in this study. For example, future studies may wish

to also include student employees, facilities staff, and administration support staff. Their positions typically have less flexibility and autonomy, so they may have different perspectives and responses to the Work Engagement, Civility, and Prosocial Behavior Scales used in this study. In addition, while this project was limited to studying only full-time faculty, future studies may benefit from including adjunct faculty who exist outside of the tenure process and are often employed on semester by semester contracts.

Although the participants in this study were randomly selected from throughout the United States, the respondents were not asked to identify their campus or where they were located in the country. Future studies could contribute and expand on this research by including geographical demographics for the participants to study whether different areas of the country have higher prosocial behavior scores than others. For example, does the reputation of Southern hospitality hold true in matters related to the workplace on a college campus. Interestingly, a study of university faculty pay satisfaction and job satisfaction across U.S. geographical regions found support for greater satisfaction in the West Coast, Southwest, and Midwest and lower satisfaction in the South Central, Northwest, Mid Atlantic, and Mountain State region (Terpstra & Honoree, 2004). It would be useful to know if the results of the current study of prosocial behaviors would also vary by geographic region.

One last limitation may have been the sensitivity of the topic and the potential for exposure of the responses. For example, a university member may have been uncomfortable reporting that their working environment was anything less than perfectly civil for fear of having that information become public and attached to them and contributing to any sort of retaliation. Though anonymity was expressed to the

respondents and maintained throughout the survey process, some professionals might have feared sharing private information about their opinions on how engaged they are at work and the degree to which they help others. The characteristics of prosocial behavior and being highly engaged at work are seen as desirable in the workplace (Castanheira et al., 2016), so some respondents may have been inhibited from sharing their true feelings if anything other than the most positive.

### **Conclusion**

This project started as a conversation regarding the importance of prosocial behaviors in higher education and whether such behaviors were related to or contributed to civil workplaces. We knew it was a conversation that was happening in other industries but as revealed in the literature, the focus on prosociality research appeared to be missing across higher education university and college communities. Moreover, only one study was found after an extensive search in the literature that focused on prosocial behaviors in higher education (Victorina, et al., 2017). According to Victorina, prosocial behaviors, called collegiality in the study, are highly and significantly related to job satisfaction for college faculty. As a result, he recommended multiple ways prosocial behaviors should be embedded into the researching, service, and teaching of faculty.

Further, previous research showed that prosocial behaviors were correlated with many positive characteristics in industries outside of higher education, such as healthcare, high tech industries, and non-profit organizations (DeDreu & Nauta, 2009; Baruch et al., 2004; Farmer & Van Dyne, 2016), but studies on college campuses were limited, and none considered whether these characteristics held true across a variety of university professions. The lack of research and the increasing call for promoting civility across

campuses, especially for faculty (Twale & De Lucca, 2008). Additionally, the researcher's interest in university culture and long career in higher education contributed to the interest and commitment to completing this project and contributing to the field of research on prosociality.

In summary, prosocial behaviors are correlated with both work engagement and workplace civility for student affairs staff, academic administrators, and faculty in higher education. This finding is significant because it can support the need for higher education leaders to build opportunities for gauging, growing, and rewarding prosocial behaviors on their campuses. As seen in the results, even though faculty had the lowest prosocial scores of the three university populations studied, they still had scores higher than most other groups studied across the literature. This tendency for employees in higher education should be supported and encouraged, as it correlates positively with the other positive characteristics of work engagement and workplace civility.

If leaders in higher education can increase the prosocial behaviors of their employees, they can thereby increase the likelihood of maintaining good workers by keeping them engaged in their work and happy in their office environment. In addition, research tells us that engaged employees are more productive, so the campuses would benefit from greater output in various forms whether it is research, student support, or innovative academic advancements.

It is worth considering that the traditional world of the college campus has been drastically changed due to Covid-19. We have seen the necessary pivot to online courses and exaggerated social distancing of faculty, staff, and students on campuses that did allow for face-to-face instruction. It can be more difficult to be prosocial when you

cannot share a space. Even picking up someone's dropped pen, bringing a stressed colleague a cup of coffee, or sharing a meal are difficult if not frowned upon during a highly contagious pandemic. For this reason, our campuses will have to be creative in how they promote and reward prosocial behaviors.

Finally, Covid-19 has increased the stress on campuses with employees balancing the responsibilities of virtual school for K-12 children, virus risk for friends and family, and adapting their own work to a virtual environment (Gaskell, 2020). Campuses have been forced to consider cost saving efforts such as furloughs, staff layoffs, and reduction in faculty. Some states, like Kansas, have even revisited the option of making tenured faculty easier to terminate (Pettit, 2021). The environment is rife for stress and anxiety, thus adding urgency to the need for campus leaders to consider options for how they can best provide for their universities and staff.

Budget cuts may negatively impact the ability to retain quality staff and faculty across many higher education institutions. Higher education leaders should promote prosociality across their institutional communities given the results of this study of three primary employee communities on a college campus. As prior studies indicated, this study confirmed that prosociality has the potential to enhance civility and positively impact work engagement. Based on this study, higher education leaders should take time to promote the need for prosocial behaviors for the benefits they provide to the individual employees as well as to the campus as a whole.

## REFERENCES

- AAUP. (2016). On Collegiality as a Criterion for Faculty Evaluation. <https://www.aaup.org/report/collegiality-criterion-faculty-evaluation>
- ACPA and NASPA. (2015). Professional competency areas for student affairs practitioners. College Student Educators International.
- Abid, G., Sajjad, I., Elahi, N. S., Farooqi, S., & Nisar, A. (2018). The influence of prosocial motivation and civility on work engagement: The mediating role of thriving at work. *Cogent Business & Management*, 5(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2018.1493712>
- Aguirre, A. (1999). Women and minority faculty in the academic workplace: Recruitment, retention, and academic culture. Jossey-Bass.
- Akbari, M., Kashani, S. H., & Hooshmand Chajjani, M. (2016). Sharing, caring, and responsibility in higher education teams. *Small Group Research*, 47(5), 542–568. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496416667609>
- Al-Yaaribi, A., Kavussanu, M., & Ring, C. (2016). Consequences of prosocial and antisocial behavior for the recipient. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 26, 102–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.06.012>
- Alessandri, G., Caprara, G. V., Eisenberg, N., & Steca, P. (2009). Reciprocal relations among self-efficacy beliefs and prosociality across time. *Journal of Personality*, 77(4), 1229–1259. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00580.x>
- Austin, E. J., Deary, I. J., Gibson, G. J., McGregor, M. J., & Dent, J. B. (1998). Individual response spread in self-report scales: Personality correlations and consequences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 24(3), 421–438. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869\(97\)00175-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869(97)00175-x)
- Baruch, Y., O’Creevy, M. F., Hind, P., & Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2004). Prosocial behavior and job performance: Does the need for control and the need for achievement make a difference? *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 32(4), 399–411. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2004.32.4.399>
- Batson, C. D. (1987). Prosocial motivation: Is it ever truly altruistic? In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 20, pp. 65–122). Academic Press.

- Batson, C., Ahmad, N., Powell, A., & Stocks, E. (2008). Prosocial motivation. J. Y. Shah & W. L. Gardner (Eds.) *Handbook of motivational science*, (pp. 135–149).
- Bennett, D. A. (2001). How can I deal with missing data in my study? *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 25(5), 464–469.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-842x.2001.tb00294.x>
- Benson, M., and Boyd, H. (2015). The "public" university: Recalling higher education's democratic purpose. *Thought & Action*.
- Bess, J. L. (1992). Collegiality: toward a clarification of meaning and function. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 8, pp. 1–36). Agathon Press.
- Bess, J. L., & Dee, J. R. (2012). *Understanding college and university organization: theories for effective policy and practice*. Stylus.
- Bleichmar, F. (2021, February 17)). 3 key post-COVID opportunities for higher ed in 2021. *University Business Magazine*.  
<https://universitybusiness.com/opportunities-colleges-higher-education-post-covid-2021/>
- Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *The Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 710. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258391>
- Buratti, S., Geisler, M., & Allwood, C. M. (2020). The association between prosocialness, relational-interdependent self-construal and gender in relation to burnout among swedish clergy. *Review of Religious Research*, 62(4), 583–602.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13644-020-00420-3>
- Campbell, D. J. (2000). The proactive employee: Managing workplace initiative. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 14(3), 52–66.  
<https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2000.4468066>
- Canale, N., Marino, C., Lenzi, M., Vieno, A., Griffiths, M., Gaboardi, M., & Santinello, M. (2020). How communication technology helps mitigating the impact of COVID-19 pandemic on individual and social wellbeing: Preliminary support for a compensatory social interaction model. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/zxsra>
- Caporael, L. R. (2001). Evolutionary psychology: Toward a unifying theory and a hybrid science. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 607–628.  
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.607>
- Caprara, G. V., Alessandri, G., Di Giunta L., Panerai L., & Eisenberg, N. (2009). The contribution of agreeableness and self-efficacy beliefs to prosociality. *European Journal of Personality*, 24(1), 36–55.

- Caprara, V. C., Steca, P., Zelli, A., & Capanna, C. (2005). A new scale for measuring adults' prosocialness. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 21(2), 77–89.
- Caprara, G.V, & Pastorelli, C. (1993). Early emotional instability, prosocial behavior, and aggression: Some methodological aspects. *European Journal of Personality*, 7(1) 19–36.
- Carlo, G., & Randall, B. A. (2002). The development of a measure of prosocial behaviors for late adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 31(1), 31–44.
- Cascio, W. (1991). *Costing human resources*. South-Western Educational Publishing.
- Castanheira, F., Chambel, M. J., Lopes, S., & Oliveira-Cruz, F. (2016). Relational job characteristics and work engagement: Mediation by prosocial motivation. *Military Psychology*, 28(4), 226–240. <https://doi.org/10.1037/mil0000116>
- Cipriano, R. E., (2011). *Facilitating a collegial department in higher education: Strategies for success*. Jossey-Bass.
- Clark, S. M, & Corcoran, M., (1986). Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty: A case of accumulative disadvantage. *The Journal of Higher Education*. 57(1) 20-43.
- COACHE. (2021, February 8). Collaborative on academic careers in higher education. <https://coache.gse.harvard.edu/>
- Coman, A., & Bonciu, C. (2016). Organizational culture in higher education: Learning from the best. *European Journal of Social Sciences Education and Research*, 6(1), 135. <https://doi.org/10.26417/ejser.v6i1.p135-145>
- Cooper, M. G., & Marx, J. (2018). *Media U: how the need to win audiences has shaped higher education*. Columbia University Press.
- Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the Workplace: Incidence and Impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6, 64–80.
- Couper, M. P. (2000). Web-based surveys: A review of issues and approaches. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 64, 464–494.
- David, M. E., & Amey, M. J. (2020). *The Sage Encyclopedia of Higher Education*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- De Dreu, C. K., & Nauta, A. (2009). Self-interest and other-orientation in organizational behavior: Implications for job performance, prosocial behavior, and personal initiative. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4), 913–926. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014494>

- Dinc, M.S. (2017). *Organizational Behavior in Higher Education*. LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Dong, N., & Maynard, R. (2013). PowerUp!: A tool for calculating minimum detectable effect sizes and minimum required sample sizes for experimental and quasi-experimental design studies. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 6(1), 24–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2012.673143>
- Dovidio, J. F., Penner, L. A., Piliavin, J. A., & Schroeder, D. A. (2006). *The Social Psychology of Prosocial Behavior*. Taylor and Francis.
- Dovidio, J.F., & Penner, L. A. (2001). Helping and altruism. In G. Fletcher & m. Clark (Eds.), *International handbook of social psychology: interpersonal processes* (pp. 162–95). Oxford.
- Drezner, N. D., Pizmony-Levy, O., & Pallas, A. (2018). Americans views of higher education as a public and private good. Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Eisenberg, N. (2000). Emotion, regulation, and moral development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51(1), 665–697. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.665>
- Eisenberg, N., & Fabes R.A. (1991) *Prosocial behavior and empathy: A multimethod developmental perspective*. Prosocial Behavior. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Eisenberg, N., & Mussen, P. H. (1989). *The roots of prosocial behavior in children*. Cambridge University Press.
- Etikan, I. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
- Fan, X., Miller, B. C., Park, K. E., Winward, B. W., Christensen, M., Grotevant, H. D., & Tai, R. H. (2006). An exploratory study about inaccuracy and invalidity in adolescent self-report surveys. *Field Methods*, 18(3), 223–244. <https://doi.org/10.1177/152822x06289161>
- Farmer, S. M., & Van Dyne, L. (2016). Organization-specific prosocial helping identity: Doing and belonging as the basis of “being fully there.” *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(6), 769–791. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2166>
- Farris, D. (2016). Antecedents, moderators, and expressions of organizational citizenship in university administrative committees. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. George Mason University.
- Farris, D. (2018). Organisational citizenship behaviour in university administrative committees. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 40(3), 224–238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080x.2018.1462438>

- Fitzgerald, S. M., & Flinn, S. (2000). Evaluating research studies using the analysis of variance (ANOVA). *Journal of Hand Therapy*, 13(1), 56–60. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0894-1130\(00\)80054-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0894-1130(00)80054-x)
- Frazier, M. L., & Tupper, C. (2016). Supervisor prosocial motivation, employee thriving, and helping behavior: A trickle-down model of psychological safety. *Group & Organization Management*, 43(4), 561–593. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601116653911>
- Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative. Jossey-Bass.
- Gaskell, A. (2020, October 21). The impact of Covid-related stress On employee Engagement. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/adigaskell/2020/10/27/the-impact-of-covid-related-stress-on-employee-engagement/>
- Gillespie, D., Dolšak, N., Kochis, B., Krabill, R., Lerum, K., Peterson, A., & Thomas, E. (2005). Research circles: Supporting the scholarship of junior faculty. *Innovative Higher Education*, 30(3), 149–162. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-005-6300-9>
- Grant, A. M. (2007). Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 393–417. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.24351328>
- Grant, A. M. (2008). Does intrinsic motivation fuel the prosocial fire? Motivational synergy in predicting persistence, performance, and productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 48–58. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.48>
- Grant, A. M., & Sumanth, J. J. (2009). Mission possible? The performance of prosocially motivated employees depends on manager trustworthiness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4), 927–944. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014391>
- Grant, A. M., Parker, S., & Collins, C. A. (2009). Getting credit for proactive behavior: Supervisor reactions depend on what you value and how you feel. *Personnel Psychology*, 62(1), 31–55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.01128.x>
- Grant, A. M., & Sonnentag, S. (2010). Doing good buffers against feeling bad: Prosocial impact compensates for negative task and self-evaluations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 111(1), 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2009.07.003>
- Gravetter, F. J & Forzano, L. B. (2011). Research methods for the behavioural sciences. Cengage Learning.
- Hatfield, R. (2006). Collegiality in higher education: Towards an understanding of the factors involved in collegiality. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications, and Conflict*, 10(1), 11–19.

- Hirt, J.B. and Frank, T.E. (2013). Student development and consumerism: Student services on campus. In J.S. Levin and S.T. Kater (Eds.) *Understanding community colleges* (pp. 37-52). Routledge.
- Hodgins, M., & Mannix McNamara, P. (2017). Bullying and incivility in higher education workplaces. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 12(3), 190–206. <https://doi.org/10.1108/qrom-03-2017-1508>
- Inderbitzen, H. M., & Foster, S. L. (1992). The teenage inventory of social skills: Development, reliability, and validity. *Psychological Assessment*, 4(4), 451–459. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.4.4.451>
- Jensen, K. (2016). Prosociality. *Current Biology*, 26(16). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2016.07.025>
- Johnson, A. (1995). The business case for work-family programs. *Journal of Accountancy*. 180(2), 53.
- Johnson, N., Veletsianos, G., & Seaman, J. (2020). U.S. faculty and administrators' experiences and approaches in the early weeks of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Online Learning*, 24(2). <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v24i2.2285>
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Sadao, K. C. (1998). The common experience of "otherness": ethnic and racial minority faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(4), 315–342. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.1998.0010>
- Kellogg, K. (1999). Collaboration: student affairs and academic affairs working together to promote student learning. George Washington University.
- Kheradmand, A., Zamani, B., Hedayati, N., Cheshomi, M., & Abedi, A. (2012). P-45—Comparing the social skills of students addicted to computer games with normal students. *European Psychiatry*, 27, 1. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0924-9338\(12\)74212-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0924-9338(12)74212-8)
- Knight, G. P., & Dubro, A. F. (1984). An individualized regression and clustering assessment of the social values of adults and children. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 18(3), 372–382. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566\(84\)90021-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566(84)90021-7)
- Kuh, G. D. (1993). Cultural perspectives in student affairs work. American College Personnel Association.
- Ladd, G. W., & Profilet, S. M. (1996). The child behavior scale: A teacher-report measure of young children's aggressive, withdrawn, and prosocial behaviors. *Developmental Psychology*, 32(6), 1008–1024. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.32.6.1008>

- Lavrakas, P., (2008). Item order randomization. *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods*. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963947.n255>
- Lebel, R. D., & Patil, S. V. (2018). Proactivity despite discouraging supervisors: The powerful role of prosocial motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(7), 724–737. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000301>
- Leiberg, S., Klimecki, O., & Singer, T. (2011). Short-term compassion training increases prosocial behavior in a newly developed prosocial game. *PLoS ONE*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0017798>
- Lim, S., Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Personal and workgroup incivility: Impact on work and health outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 95–107. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.95>
- Loss, C. P. (2020, July 22). Why the Morrill Land-Grant Colleges Act still matters. *CHE*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/why-the-morrill-land-grant-colleges-act-still-matters/>
- Lucas, C. (2006). *American higher education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Magiya, J. (2020, November 21). Pearson Coefficient of Correlation Explained. *Medium*. <https://towardsdatascience.com/pearson-coefficient-of-correlation-explained-369991d93404>
- Mahaffey, J., & Welsh, M. F. (1993). Scholarship and the vitality of a community college faculty. *Community College Review*, 21(1), 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009155219302100105>
- Martí-Vilar, M., Corell-García, L., & Merino-Soto, C. (2019). Systematic review of prosocial behavior measures. *Revista De Psicología*, 37(1), 349–377. <https://doi.org/10.18800/psico.201901.012>
- Martin, R. J., & Hine, D. W. (2005). Development and validation of the Uncivil Workplace Behavior Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(4), 477–490. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.477>
- Massy, W. F., Wilger, A. K., & Colbeck, C. (1994). Departmental cultures and teaching quality: Overcoming “hollowed” collegiality. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 26(4), 11–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.1994.9938496>
- Mathews, P. (2003). Academic mentoring. *Educational Management & Administration*, 31(3), 313–334. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263211x03031003007>
- McDougall, W. (1908). *An introduction to social psychology*. Methuen.

- McKay, R., Arnold, D. H., Fratzi, J., & Thomas, R. (2008). Workplace bullying in academia: A Canadian study. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 20(2), 77–100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-008-9073-3>
- Mettler, S. (2005). *Soldiers to citizens: The GI Bill and the making of the greatest generation*. Oxford University Press.
- Morales Rodríguez, M., & Suárez-Pérez, C. D. (2011). Construcción y validación de una escala para evaluar habilidades prosociales en adolescentes. Ponencia. XI Congreso Nacional de Investigación Educativa. Consejo Mexicano de Investigación Educativa, Delegación Coyoacán, México, Distrito Federal.
- Mortorell, MC., Aloy, M., Gomez, O., and Silva, F. (1993). Cuestionario de evaluación del Autoconcepto. TEA.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory: 2nd ed.* McGraw-Hill.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books.
- Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Porath, C. L. (2000). Assessing and attacking workplace incivility. *Organizational Dynamics*, 29(2), 123–137. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0090-2616\(00\)00019-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0090-2616(00)00019-x)
- Pettit, E. (2021, January 28). Kansas Regents Make It Easier to Dismiss Tenured Professors. CHE. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/kansas-regents-allow-sped-up-dismissals-of-tenured-faculty-members>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513–563. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600307>
- Porath, C. L., and Erez, A. (2009). Overlooked but not untouched: How rudeness reduces onlookers' performance on routine and creative tasks. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 109(1), 29–44.
- Raskauskas, J., and Skrabee, C. (2011). Bullying and occupational stress in academia: Experiences of victims of workplace bullying in New Zealand universities. *Journal of Intergroup Relations*, 35(1), 18–36.
- Reesor, L. M. (2015). *Beginning your journey: A guide for new professionals in student affairs (4th ed.)*. NASPA-Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education.
- Rushton, J. P. (1982). Social learning theory and the development of prosocial behavior. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.) *The Development of Prosocial Behavior* (p. 77–105). Academic Press.

- Rutten, E. A., Dekovic, M., Jan, G., Stams, J. M., Schuengel, C., Hoeksma, J. B., & Biesta, G. J. J. (2008). On- and off-field antisocial and prosocial behavior in adolescent soccer players: A multilevel study. *Journal of Adolescence*, 31(3), 371–387. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2007.06.007>
- Ryerson University. Workplace Civility and Respect Policy. <https://www.ryerson.ca/policies/policy-list/workplace-civility-respect-policy/>
- Salkind, N. J. (2010). Post hoc analysis. *Encyclopedia of Research Design*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Sadeghi Bahmani, D., Hatzinger, M., Gerber, M., Lemola, S., Clough, P. J., Perren, S., Brand, S. (2016). The origins of mental toughness—Prosocial behavior and low internalizing and externalizing problems at age 5 predict higher mental toughness scores at age 14. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01221>
- Schafer, J. L. (1999). Multiple imputation: A primer. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 8(1), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/096228029900800102>
- Schaufeli, W.B, and Bakker, A.B. (2004). Utrecht work engagement scale: Preliminary Manual. Utrecht University.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701–716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
- Sean, P. & Kane, P. D. (2019, July 14). Sample Size Calculator. <https://clincalc.com/stats/samplesize.aspx>.
- Sheehan, K. B., & Hoy, M. B. (1999). Using e-mail to survey internet users in the United States: Methodology and assessment. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.1999.tb00101.x>
- Son, C., Hegde, S., Smith, A., Wang, X., & Sasangohar, F. (2020). Effects of COVID-19 on college students' mental health in the United States: Interview survey study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2020 Sep 3;22(9):e21279. <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.21279>
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (1994). Effective approaches to new faculty development. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 72(5), 474–479. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1994.tb00976.x>
- Terpstra, D. E., & Honoree, A. L. (2004). Job satisfaction and pay satisfaction levels of university faculty by discipline type and by geographic region. *Education*, 124(3), 528

- Thelin, J. R. (2011). *A history of American higher education*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Tierney, W. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 68(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2959934>
- Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: community and socialization in academe*. State University of New York Press.
- Tierney, W. G., & Minor, J. T. (2004). A cultural perspective on communication and governance. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2004(127), 85–94. <https://doi.org/10.1002/he.158>
- Tomás, J. M., Santos, S. de, Georgieva, S., & Enrique, S. (2018). Utrecht work engagement scale in Dominican teachers: Dimensionality, reliability, and validity. *Revista De Psicología Del Trabajo y De Las Organizaciones*, 34(2), 089–093. <https://doi.org/10.5093/jwop2018a11>
- Torabinia, M., Mahmoudi, S., Dolatshahi, M., & Abyaz, M. R. (2017). Measuring engagement in nurses: the psychometric properties of the Persian version of Utrecht work engagement scale. *Medical Journal of the Islamic Republic Of Iran*, 31(1), 83–89. <https://doi.org/10.18869/mjiri.31.15>
- Treglown, L., Zivkov, K., Zarola, A., & Furnham, A. (2018). Intention to quit and the role of dark personality and perceived organizational support: A moderation and mediation model. *PLoS ONE*, 13(3). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0195155>
- Twale, D. J., & De, L. B. M. (2008). *Faculty incivility: the rise of the academic bully culture and what to do about it*. Jossey-Bass.
- United States Department of Education. (2020). 2020 Census. <https://2020census.gov/en.html>
- United States Department of Education. (2020). Race and Ethnicity Collection and Reporting. <https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/mission/mission.html>
- University of South Carolina. (2021). Home. <https://www.sc.edu/>
- University of South Carolina. (2018). Inaugural Faculty Civility Advocate looks back on developing the role. Office of the Provost. [https://www.sc.edu/about/offices\\_and\\_divisions/provost/about/news/2018/faculty\\_civility\\_advocate.php](https://www.sc.edu/about/offices_and_divisions/provost/about/news/2018/faculty_civility_advocate.php)
- U.S. Department of Education. (2021). Home. <https://www.ed.gov/>
- Vallières, F., McAuliffe, E., Hyland, P., Galligan, M., & Ghee, A. (2017). Measuring work engagement among community health workers in Sierra Leone: Validating

- the Utrecht work engagement scale. *Revista De Psicología Del Trabajo y De Las Organizaciones*, 33(1), 41–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rpto.2016.12.001>
- Victorino, C., Nylund-Gibson, K., & Conley, S. (2018). Prosocial behavior in the professoriate: A multi-level analysis of pretenured faculty collegiality and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 32(5), 783–798. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijem-09-2017-0258>
- Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. J. (2000). Survey research. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Social and Personality Psychology* (p. 223–252). Cambridge University Press.
- Walsh, B. M., Magley, V. J., Reeves, D. W., Davies-Schrills, K. A., Marmet, M. D., & Gallus, J. A. (2011). Assessing workgroup norms for civility: The development of the civility norms questionnaire-brief. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 27(4), 407–420. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-011-9251-4>
- Weible, R., & Wallace, J. (1998). Cyber research: The impact of the internet on data collection. *Marketing Research*, 10(3), 18–31.
- Williams, R. L. (1991). *The Origins of federal support for higher education: George W. Atherton and the land-grant college movement*. Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Wittmer, J. L. S., & Martin, J. E. (2010). Emotional exhaustion among employees without social or client contact: The key role of nonstandard work schedules. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(4), 607–623. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9153-x>
- Wofford College. Wofford College: Home Page. Wofford College <http://www.wofford.edu/>.
- Yip, J. J., & Kelly, A. E. (2013). Upward and downward social comparisons can decrease prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43(3), 591–602. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2013.01039.x>
- Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J., and Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(6), 1068–1076. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.6.1068>
- Zhang, N. (2016). *Rentz's student affairs practice in higher education*. Charles C. Thomas Publisher, LTD.

# APPENDIX A

## INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD PERMISSION



OFFICE OF RESEARCH COMPLIANCE

### INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR HUMAN RESEARCH APPROVAL LETTER for EXEMPT REVIEW

Shelley Dempsey  
901 Sumter Street  
Byrnes 206  
Columbia, SC 29208 USA

Re: Pro00104289

Dear Ms. Shelley Dempsey:

This is to certify that the research study *A Study of Prosocial Behavior, Workplace Civility, and Work Engagement among Employees in Higher Education* was reviewed in accordance with 45 CFR 46.104(d)(2) and 45 CFR 46.111(a)(7), the study received an exemption from Human Research Subject Regulations on 10/8/2020. No further action or Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight is required, as long as the study remains the same. However, the Principal Investigator must inform the Office of Research Compliance of any changes in procedures involving human subjects. Changes to the current research study could result in a reclassification of the study and further review by the IRB.

Because this study was determined to be exempt from further IRB oversight, consent document(s), if applicable, are not stamped with an expiration date.

All research related records are to be retained for at least three (3) years after termination of the study.

The Office of Research Compliance is an administrative office that supports the University of South Carolina Institutional Review Board (USC IRB). If you have questions, contact Lisa Johnson at [lisaj@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:lisaj@mailbox.sc.edu) or (803) 777-8870.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Lisa M. Johnson".

Lisa M. Johnson  
ORC Assistant Director and IRB Manager

## **APPENDIX B**

### **UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONALS SURVEY**

#### **SD - Dissertation Instrument**

##### **Start of Block: Introduction**

Q1 You are being asked to participate in a survey research project as part of a dissertation study by a doctoral student at the University of South Carolina. Your participation is completely voluntary and should take approximately eight minutes or less. You may choose to discontinue participation at any point. Your participation in this project is limited to answering the survey with your best response to each item. No personal information will be solicited, so your responses will not be connected with you or your full name. By completing this survey, you are giving your permission to aggregate and analyze the information. If you have any questions about this project or the results, please send an email to the project coordinator, Shelley Dempsey (sdempsey@mailbox.sc.edu or 803-777-9441) or doctoral advisor Dr. Susan Bon at bons@mailbox.sc.edu.

One final note - anyone who completes this survey has the option of being entered in a raffle for a \$100 Visa gift card. If you would like to be included, you will have the option of entering your email address at the end of the survey so that I can contact you with the reward. This information is being stored separately from the other survey responses, so

they will not be connected to compromise the confidentiality of your answers.

**End of Block: Introduction**

**Start of Block: Block 5**

Q11 Which of the following most accurately describes your current (or most recent) position in higher education:

1. Academic Affairs - university employee who works in the academic administration of the campus (1)
2. Student Affairs - university employee who works in support services to assist students in making successful transitions (2)
3. Faculty - full-time university employee whose main responsibility is to teach (3)

Skip To: Q13 If Which of the following most accurately describes your current (or most recent) position in higher... = Faculty - full-time university employee whose main responsibility is to teach

**Display This Question:**

If Which of the following most accurately describes your current (or most recent) position in higher... = Faculty - full-time university employee whose main responsibility is to teach

Q13 What is your title as a Faculty Member:

4. Full Professor (1)
5. Associate Professor (2)
6. Assistant Professor (3)

7. Other (4) \_\_\_\_\_

**End of Block: Block 5**

**Start of Block: Work Engagement**

Q2 PLEASE ANSWER AS YOU WOULD HAVE PRIOR TO COVID-19. The following statements are about how you feel at work. Read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never felt this feeling, indicate "never" after the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by marking the bubble below the answer that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

	Never (1)	A few times a year or less (2)	Once a month or less (3)	A few times a month (4)	Once a week (5)	A few times a week (6)	Every day (7)
At my work, I feel bursting with energy (1)	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose (2)	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.
Time flies when I'm working (3)	15.	16.	17.	18.	19.	20.	21.

At my job, I feel strong and vigorous (4)	22.	23.	24.	25.	26.	27.	28.
I am enthusiastic about my job (5)	29.	30.	31.	32.	33.	34.	35.
When I am working, I forget everything else around me (6)	36.	37.	38.	39.	40.	41.	42.
My job inspires me (7)	43.	44.	45.	46.	47.	48.	49.

When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work (8)	50.	51.	52.	53.	54.	55.	56.
I feel happy when I am working intensely (9)	57.	58.	59.	60.	61.	62.	63.
I am proud of the work that I do (10)	64.	65.	66.	67.	68.	69.	70.
I am immersed in my work (11)	71.	72.	73.	74.	75.	76.	77.

I can continue working for very long periods of time (12)	78.	79.	80.	81.	82.	83.	84.
To me, my job is challenging (13)	85.	86.	87.	88.	89.	90.	91.
I get carried away when I'm working (14)	92.	93.	94.	95.	96.	97.	98.
At my job, I am very resilient mentally (15)	99.	100.	101.	102.	103.	104.	105.

It is difficult to detach myself from my job (16)	106.	107.	108.	109.	110.	111.	112.
At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well (17)	113.	114.	115.	116.	117.	118.	119.

**End of Block: Work Engagement**

**Start of Block: Workplace Civility**

Q3 PLEASE ANSWER AS YOU WOULD HAVE PRIOR TO COVID-19. Answer the following questions about your work unit.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Rude behavior is not accepted by your coworkers (1)	120.	121.	122.	123.	124.	125.	126.
Angry outbursts are not tolerated by anyone in your working unit. (2)	127.	128.	129.	130.	131.	132.	133.

Respectful treatment is the norm in your working unit. (3)	134.	135.	136.	137.	138.	139.	140.
Your coworkers make sure everyone in your work unit is treated with respect (4)	141.	142.	143.	144.	145.	146.	147.

**End of Block: Workplace Civility**

**Start of Block: Prosocial Behaviors**

Q4 PLEASE ANSWER AS YOU WOULD HAVE PRIOR TO COVID-19. Indicate the answer that most closely describes your response to the statements below.

	Never/Almost Never True (1)	Occasionally True (2)	Sometimes True (3)	Often True (4)	Almost Always/Always True (5)
I am pleased to help my friends/colleagues in their activities (1)	148.	149.	150.	151.	152.
I share the things that I have with my friends (2)	153.	154.	155.	156.	157.
I try to help others (3)	158.	159.	160.	161.	162.
I am available for volunteer activities to help those who are in need (4)	163.	164.	165.	166.	167.

I am empathetic with those who are in need (5)	168.	169.	170.	171.	172.
I help immediately those who are in need (6)	173.	174.	175.	176.	177.
I do what I can to help others avoid getting into trouble (7)	178.	179.	180.	181.	182.
I intensely feel what others feel (8)	183.	184.	185.	186.	187.
I am willing to make my knowledge and abilities available to others (9)	188.	189.	190.	191.	192.

I try to console those who are sad (10)	193.	194.	195.	196.	197.
I easily lend money or other things (11)	198.	199.	200.	201.	202.
I easily put myself in the shoes of those who are in discomfort (12)	203.	204.	205.	206.	207.
I try to be close to and take care of those who are in need (13)	208.	209.	210.	211.	212.
I easily share with friends any good opportunity that comes to me (14)	213.	214.	215.	216.	217.

I spend time with those friends who feel lonely (15)	218.	219.	220.	221.	222.
I immediately sense my friends' discomfort even when it is not directly communicated to me (16)	223.	224.	225.	226.	227.

**End of Block: Prosocial Behaviors**

**Start of Block: Block 6**

Q14 For each of the previous questions, you were asked to answer as you would have BEFORE Covid-19. Do you think any of your answers would differ since the start of Covid-19?

235. No (1)

236. Yes (2)

Skip To: Q15 If For each of the previous questions, you were asked to answer as you would have BEFORE Covid-19. D... = Yes

Display This Question:

If For each of the previous questions, you were asked to answer as you would have BEFORE Covid-19. D... = Yes

Q15 You indicated your answers would be different in the days since Covid-19. Please explain more about how they would differ:

---

---

---

---

---

**End of Block: Block 6**

**Start of Block: Demographics**

Q7 What is your gender?

- 237. Female (1)
- 238. Male (2)
- 239. Non-binary (3)
- 240. No Response (4)

Q8 In what year were you born (4 digits)

---

Q10 Which best describes your race?

- White (1)
- Black or African American (2)
- American Indian or Alaska Native (3)
- Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (4)
- Some Other Race (5)
- American Indian or Alaska Native (6)
- No Response (7)

Q13 Which best describes your ethnicity?

- 241.  Hispanic or Latino (1)
- 242.  Not Hispanic or Latino (2)

Q14 Approximately how long have you been in your current (or most recent) professional position (in months)?

---

**End of Block: Demographics**

**Start of Block: Block 7**

Q14 Thank you for your participation. If you would like to be entered in a drawing for a \$100 Visa gift card, please click on the following link where you can enter your contact information.

[https://uofsc.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\\_eh9xzvYXarXkZSZ](https://uofsc.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_eh9xzvYXarXkZSZ)

Please note that this information will not be associated with your responses to the previous questions.

With great appreciation,

Shelley Dempsey

PhD Candidate - University of South Carolina

[sdempsey@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:sdempsey@mailbox.sc.edu)

**End of Block: Block 7**

## **APPENDIX C**

### **PRE-NOTIFICATION E-MAIL**

Dear \${m://FirstName}:

You have been selected as part of a random sample of higher education professionals to participate in a doctoral dissertation study for a graduate student at the University of South Carolina. The survey will take less than ten minutes, and your participation will provide valuable information about the workplace in higher education.

Please look for the survey to arrive via email on Thursday, October 15.

All timely respondents will be entered in a drawing for a \$100 Visa gift card. Participation is voluntary and completely anonymous.

Sincerely,

Shelley Dempsey

PhD candidate – University of South Carolina

SDempsey@mailbox.sc.edu

Doctoral Advisor – Dr. Susan Bon – BonS@mailbox.sc.edu

## APPENDIX D

### FORMAL INVITATION E-MAIL

Dear \${m://FirstName}:

As indicated in an email sent to you earlier this week, you have been selected as part of a national random sample of higher education professionals to participate in my University of South Carolina doctoral dissertation study for the PhD in Higher Education and Policy. The electronic survey will take less than eight minutes to complete, and your participation will provide valuable information about the workplace in higher education.

To thank you for your time, you have the opportunity to enter a drawing for a \$100 Visa gift card. In order to maintain the anonymity of your survey responses, please click on the link at the end of the survey which will take you to a separate site to enter your information. Your name and email address, should you decide to provide them for the drawing, will not be linked with your responses.

Please use the following link to access the short survey:

[\\${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}](#)

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:

[\\${l://SurveyURL}](#)

Participation is voluntary and completely anonymous with study information kept in a secure location at the University of South Carolina and respondent names not linked to their specific survey responses. The results of this study may be published, but your identity will not be revealed.

Your participation will be invaluable to the pursuit of my PhD, and my advisor and I are available to answer any questions you might have.

Sincerely,

Shelley Dempsey

PhD candidate – University of South Carolina

SDempsey@mailbox.sc.edu

Doctoral Advisor – Dr. Susan Bon – [BonS@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:BonS@mailbox.sc.edu)



Follow this link to opt out:

[Click here to unsubscribe](#)

## APPENDIX E

### SECONDARY FOLLOW UP LETTER

Dear \${m://FirstName}:

As a reminder, you have been selected as part of a national random sample of higher education professionals to participate in my University of South Carolina doctoral dissertation study for the PhD in Higher Education and Policy. The electronic survey will take less than eight minutes to complete, and your participation will provide valuable information about the workplace in higher education. Please complete by October 24.

To thank you for your time, you have the opportunity to enter a drawing for a \$100 Visa gift card. In order to maintain the anonymity of your survey responses, please click on the link at the end of the survey which will take you to a separate site to enter your information. Your name and email address, should you decide to provide them for the drawing, will not be linked with your responses.

Follow the following link to access the short survey:

[\\${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}](#)

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:

[\\${l://SurveyURL}](#)

Participation is voluntary and completely anonymous with study information kept in a secure location at the University of South Carolina and respondent names not linked to their specific survey responses. The results of this study may be published, but your identity will not be revealed.

Your participation will be invaluable to the pursuit of my PhD, and my advisor and I are available to answer any questions you might have.

Sincerely,

Shelley Dempsey

PhD candidate – University of South Carolina

SDempsey@mailbox.sc.edu

Doctoral Advisor – Dr. Susan Bon – BonS@mailbox.sc.edu



Follow the link to opt out of future emails:

[Click here to unsubscribe](#)

## APPENDIX F

### WORK ENGAGEMENT QUESTIONS BY POSITION TYPE

Table F.1: Work Engagement Question Responses by Position Type

Question	Position	Mean	F	Sig.
E1 V- At my work, I feel bursting with energy	Academic Affairs	5.89	9.750	0.000
	Student Affairs	5.73		
	Faculty	5.36		
E2 D- I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose	Academic Affairs	6.43	12.568	0.000
	Student Affairs	6.45		
	Faculty	6.03		
E3 A- Time flies when I'm working	Academic Affairs	6.43	3.558	0.029
	Student Affairs	6.37		
	Faculty	6.21		
E4 V- At my job, I feel strong and vigorous	Academic Affairs	6.04	10.713	0.000
	Student Affairs	5.89		
	Faculty	5.53		
E5 D- I am enthusiastic about my job	Academic Affairs	6.39	8.998	0.000
	Student Affairs	6.28		
	Faculty	5.97		

E6 A- When I am working, I forget everything else around me	Academic Affairs	5.41	0.249	0.780
	Student Affairs	5.36		
	Faculty	5.30		
E7 D- My job inspires me	Academic Affairs	6.14	9.621	0.000
	Student Affairs	6.09		
	Faculty	5.67		
E8 V- When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work	Academic Affairs	6.23	7.571	0.001
	Student Affairs	5.97		
	Faculty	5.75		
E9 A- I feel happy when I am working intensely	Academic Affairs	6.45	12.263	0.000
	Student Affairs	6.09		
	Faculty	5.92		
E10 D- I am proud of the work that I do	Academic Affairs	6.69	13.769	0.000
	Student Affairs	6.64		
	Faculty	6.28		
E11 A- I am immersed in my work	Academic Affairs	6.54	12.913	0.000
	Student Affairs	6.42		
	Faculty	6.08		
E12 V- I can continue working for very long periods of time	Academic Affairs	6.42	16.103	0.000
	Student Affairs	6.29		
	Faculty	5.86		
E13 D- To me, my job is challenging	Academic Affairs	6.37	8.342	0.000

	Student Affairs	6.11		
	Faculty	5.90		
E14 A- I get carried away when I'm working	Academic Affairs	5.63	2.546	0.079
	Student Affairs	5.63		
	Faculty	5.37		
E15 V- At my job, I am very resilient mentally	Academic Affairs	6.37	17.388	0.000
	Student Affairs	6.25		
	Faculty	5.79		
E16 A- It is difficult to detach myself from my job	Academic Affairs	5.59	1.116	0.328
	Student Affairs	5.40		
	Faculty	5.33		
E17 V- At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well	Academic Affairs	6.44	18.144	0.000
	Student Affairs	6.50		
	Faculty	5.98		

## APPENDIX G

### WORKPLACE CIVILITY QUESTIONS BY POSITION TYPE

Table G.1: Workplace Civility Question Responses by Position Type

Question	Position	Mean	F	Sig.
C1 - Rude behavior is not accepted by your coworkers	Academic Affairs	6.23	21.051	0.000
	Student Affairs	6.07		
	Faculty	5.38		
C2 - Angry outbursts are not tolerated by anyone in your working unit.	Academic Affairs	6.23	21.180	0.000
	Student Affairs	6.09		
	Faculty	5.38		
C3 - Respectful treatment is the norm in your working unit.	Academic Affairs	6.44	25.378	0.000
	Student Affairs	6.40		
	Faculty	5.64		
C4 - Your coworkers make sure everyone in your work unit is treated with respect	Academic Affairs	6.17	29.036	0.000
	Student Affairs	6.15		
	Faculty	5.27		

## APPENDIX H

### PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR QUESTIONS BY POSITION TYPE

Table H.1: Prosocial Behavior Question Responses by Position Type

Question	Position	Mean	F	Sig.
P1 - I am pleased to help my friends/colleagues in their activities	Academic Affairs	4.85	26.299	0.000
	Student Affairs	4.68		
	Faculty	4.45		
P2 - I share the things that I have with my friends	Academic Affairs	4.53	8.641	0.000
	Student Affairs	4.53		
	Faculty	4.28		
P3 - I try to help others	Academic Affairs	4.79	16.157	0.000
	Student Affairs	4.74		
	Faculty	4.51		
P4 - I am available for volunteer activities to help those who are in need	Academic Affairs	3.92	1.549	0.213
	Student Affairs	4.01		
	Faculty	3.84		
P5 - I am empathetic with those who are in need	Academic Affairs	4.58	8.373	0.000
	Student Affairs	4.68		
	Faculty	4.41		

P6 - I help immediately those who are in need	Academic Affairs	4.14	8.660	0.000
	Student Affairs	4.23		
	Faculty	3.91		
P7 - I do what I can to help others avoid getting into trouble	Academic Affairs	4.33	15.002	0.000
	Student Affairs	4.21		
	Faculty	3.90		
P8 - I intensely feel what others feel	Academic Affairs	3.66	7.196	0.001
	Student Affairs	3.55		
	Faculty	3.30		
P9 - I am willing to make my knowledge and abilities available to others	Academic Affairs	4.73	12.734	0.000
	Student Affairs	4.62		
	Faculty	4.45		
P10 - I try to console those who are sad	Academic Affairs	4.21	6.808	0.001
	Student Affairs	4.24		
	Faculty	3.96		
P11 - I easily lend money or other things	Academic Affairs	3.20	1.693	0.185
	Student Affairs	3.21		
	Faculty	3.03		
P12 - I easily put myself in the shoes of those who are in discomfort	Academic Affairs	3.96	3.531	0.030
	Student Affairs	3.90		
	Faculty	3.73		
P13 - I try to be close to and take care of those who are in need	Academic Affairs	3.80	7.611	0.001
	Student Affairs	3.82		

	Faculty	3.51		
P14 - I easily share with friends any good opportunity that comes to me	Academic Affairs	4.16	2.428	0.089
	Student Affairs	4.03		
	Faculty	3.97		
P15 - I spend time with those friends who feel lonely	Academic Affairs	3.54	3.299	0.038
	Student Affairs	3.49		
	Faculty	3.32		
P16 - I immediately sense my friends' discomfort even when it is not directly communicated to me	Academic Affairs	3.80	11.517	0.000
	Student Affairs	3.85		
	Faculty	3.46		