Spring 2020

Teacher-Student Exchange as a Moderator of the Relationship between Core Self-Evaluations and Student Engagement in Citizenship and Counterproductive Behaviors

Holly L. Gasper
hg829826@wcupa.edu

Teacher-Student Exchange as a Moderator of the Relationship between Core Self-Evaluations and Student Engagement in Citizenship and Counterproductive Behaviors

A Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the

Department of Psychology

West Chester University of Pennsylvania

West Chester, Pennsylvania

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree of

Master of Arts

By

Holly Gasper

May 2020

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge and thank Dr. Vipanchi Mishra, for her support and patience throughout the past two years, and especially during the completion of my thesis. I could not have completed this project without her guidance and continued support of my success. Additionally, I would like to acknowledge Dr. Stefani Yorges and Dr. Megan Nolan for being a part of my thesis committee and supporting me through this process as well. Each one has provided me with the skills and knowledge I need to set goals and overcome challenges preparing me for continued learning and achievement.

Abstract

The purpose of the present study was to determine if core self-evaluations (CSE) could be used to predict participation in student citizenship behaviors (SCBs) and counterproductive student behaviors (CSBs). This study also introduced a new term to the literature, Teacher-Student Exchange (TSX), to describe the quality of relationships students have with professors and investigated how these interactions influence student participation in SCBs and CSBs. It was proposed that CSE would positively predict participation in SCBs and negatively predict participation in CSBs. It was also proposed that TSX would moderate the relationships between CSE and SCBs and CSE and CSBs. Participants included 105 participant and peer dyads who completed online questionnaires measuring core self-evaluation, student citizenship behaviors, counterproductive student behaviors, and teacher-student exchange. Overall, results did not support the hypotheses regarding the positive effects of CSE on student citizenship behaviors and the moderating role of TSX; however, results did indicate that CSE negatively predicted participation in counterproductive student behaviors. Participants of this study mainly included first-year college students who may not have the experiences that older students have had during college and is a limitation of the study. Future research should collect data across all college years and consider addressing populations of students who might have differing experiences at college such as non-traditional students and distance education students. Since CSE was found to predict participation in CSBs, institutions should consider evaluating students and identifying those students that might be at risk for higher participation in these negative behaviors.

Keywords: core self-evaluation, student citizenship behaviors, counterproductive student behaviors, leader-member exchange, teacher-student exchange.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Teacher-Student Exchange as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Core Self-Evaluations and Student Engagement in Citizenship and Counterproductive Behaviors

Introduction

Academic performance at the college level is often predicted using cognitive assessments such as grade point average (GPA) and standardized testing scores like the Standardized Assessment Test (SAT) and Graduate Record Examination (GRE; Meriac, 2012). Research on the Standardized Assessment Test (SAT) has consistently indicated that it is a better predictor of performance than any other assessment colleges use for admissions and for later success (Camara & Echternacht, 2000). Using these assessments has, however, been widely debated in the literature due to the potential for biases regarding race and gender (Geiser & Studley, 2002). For example, Rushton, & Jensen (2006) note that White Americans tend to score 15 to 18 points higher on standardized tests compared to Black Americans. Thus, it is argued in the literature that the use of cognitive assessments in academics can result in adverse impact because different scores can be attributed to socioeconomic status, test bias in development, lack of student opportunities and lack of funding for certain public-school districts (Geiser & Studley, 2002).

Since the scoring gap has been brought to the attention of academic institutions, there has been a push to develop or identify additional measures which can be used to predict performance and future success of students after graduation. In fact, some academic institutions are no longer requiring applicants to provide standardized testing scores. Current methods of enrollment and decision-making at the academic level are attempting to reduce reliance on cognitive ability assessments and placing focus on factors such as personality traits and motivation in order to reduce occurrences of bias.

Non-cognitive assessment measures, such as personality tests, core self-evaluations, and motivation, have seldom been used to evaluate academic performance and make enrollment decisions (Zettler, 2011). Such assessments can be difficult to interpret for use in academia and do not have specified norms for which colleges can base their enrollment decisions on. Although there has been much research hypothesizing that personality assessments can predict performance (Dweck, 1986; Furnham & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2004; Lounsbury, et al., 2003), most results have identified motivational variables linked to performance rather than specific personality traits. Meta-analytic research reviewing the use of the Five-Factor Model has concluded that in terms of specific personality traits, conscientiousness and openness to experience are most related to academic performance. Higher scores on both conscientiousness and openness to experience are positively correlated to higher academic performance (Ding, et al., 2017). These correlations, however, are weaker in comparison to correlations for cognitive ability tests. The use of certain personality assessments, therefore, should be as supplemental performance data to ensure that academic institutions do not rely solely on cognitive abilities and standardized testing scores which can result in biases.

Student confidence and perceived locus of control can have an effect on student performance but are not personality traits. Albert and Dahling (2016) found that perceived internal locus of control and confidence can play a role in how students perform academically. Those students who have higher evaluations of confidence and locus of control tend to have higher academic performance compared to those who have low evaluations of confidence and locus of control This implies that students who self-rate as having greater confidence in themselves and greater locus of control have better academic performance compared to those students who are less confident in themselves and feel they do not have locus of control. Core

self-evaluations, which are self-assessments of self-esteem, perceived locus of control, and self-efficacy have been found to predict performance and satisfaction in multiple corporate settings (Bono & Judge, 2003). These self-assessments, when applied to students should, therefore, also be linked to academic performance.

In addition to students' self-evaluations, the relationship a student has with mentors may also affect academic performance. Research has not fully assessed how specific relationships between students and professors affect academic performance at the college level. In general, research has shown that race and gender of a professor may have effects on students' performance and their evaluations of professors (Basow, Codos, & Martin, 2013) but does not consider the relationship between the student and the professor. Basow, Codos, and Martin (2013) found that black students often had higher performances ratings when taught by black teachers compared to being taught by white teachers but did not consider how the relationship between the student and teacher differed. Gross, et al. (2015) found that students who feel more connected to their professor based on *fit* were more likely to retain lecture notes and have higher performance in the course. In this context, fit refers to how students were matched with teachers based on pre-established performance scores, personality similarities, how the student learns and how the teacher teaches. For example, a student who learns well with visual stimuli, and is relatively introverted was matched with a teacher who uses visual stimuli and is somewhat introverted. A professor plays an essential role in guiding students and mentoring them for success. If a student does not feel they have a connection with their professor, it may result in decreased performance. Along with effects on performance, the relationship between students and teachers may result in positive or negative behaviors. If a student does not feel they have a connection or relationship with their teacher or professor, they may be more inclined to skip

class, avoid work, and cheat on assignments. It is also possible that if a student has a good relationship with their teach or professor, they may feel more inclined to help other students, or volunteer in the classroom more frequently.

In addition to research on factors that can predict academic performance and success, research has focused on other aspects of performance including citizenship behaviors and counterproductive behaviors. In organizational research, positive and negative behaviors called organizational citizenship behaviors and counterproductive work behaviors have been studied frequently as outcomes in workplace performance (Arya, 2013; Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007; Indarti, Solimun, Fernandes, & Hakim, 2017). Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) are any behaviors that employees participate in that are not required. This includes assisting other employees, taking on extra projects, and volunteering for company special projects or committees (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). In contrast, Counterproductive Work Behaviors (CWBs) are any behaviors that harm the company or individuals working in the company. These include gossip, theft of property and violence (Gruys & Sackett, 2003). At the student level, positive behaviors are considered Student Citizenship Behaviors and include behaviors such as tutoring, volunteering, and completion of assignments beyond the scope of what is required. Negative student behaviors, called Counterproductive Student Behaviors (CSBs) are any behaviors that can harm the learning process and include behaviors like cheating, avoiding work, skipping class, and stealing.

A large amount of research regarding organizational citizenship behaviors and counterproductive work behaviors suggests that personality factors such as core self-evaluation can be used to predict such behaviors (Indarti, Solimun, Fernandes, & Hakim, 2017). Drawing from this literature, it would, therefore, be useful to identify whether or not measures of core

self-evaluation can also be used to predict student citizenship behaviors and counterproductive student behaviors.

Student Citizenship Behaviors (SCBs) and Counterproductive Student Behaviors (CSBs) are non-cognitive performance outcomes which have been previously linked to certain personality traits including Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Extraversion (Chiaburu, Oh, Berry, Li, & Gardner, 2011; Meriac, 2012). However, no research has looked at how student evaluations of themselves (core self-evaluation) would be related to their engagement in counterproductive and citizenship behaviors at school. Thus, the primary purpose of this study is to explore how CSE may be related to student OCB and CWBs. Secondly, the role of exchange relationship between professor and student will also be investigated. Specifically, the moderating role of exchange relationship between professor and student on the relationship between core self-evaluation and student engagement in citizenship behaviors and counterproductive behaviors will be explored.

In order to prepare students for employment and the job market, colleges must foster student participation in citizenship behaviors. They must also attempt to identify and counteract counterproductive student behaviors (Morphew & Hartley, 2006). As previously stated, relationships that students have with their professors can lead to increased or decreased academic performance (Basow, Codos, & Martin, 2013). Similarly, Leader-Member Exchange Theory (LMX) states that a relationship subordinates have with their leaders can greatly influence job performance, as well as participation in positive and negative behaviors (Gerstner, & Day, 1997). The findings of the current study will help understand the relationships between students and professors and how this affects student engagement in citizenship and counterproductive behaviors at school which may hinder or help them in achieving their educational goals. One

potential implication of these findings could be that colleges can address issues such as cheating and plagiarizing by attempting to foster positive relationships between professors and students. Students who participate in such behaviors tend to have decreased academic success and the potential for expulsion from the institution (Simkin & McLeod, 2010). This would have the potential to increase participation in student citizenship behaviors while simultaneously decreasing the frequency of participation in counterproductive student behaviors. Fostering such relationships between students and professors, has also been linked to increased student success This might in turn boost the reputation of the college and increase enrollment (Meriac, 2012).

Moreover, with increased student success, there is greater opportunity for organizations to hire and employ individuals with increased qualifications and knowledge. This would benefit companies, in the long run, by potentially reducing the amount of time and money spent recruiting and turnover rates. Overall, assessing the quality of relationship between professor and students at the academic level and attempting to address them may result in less expense at the cost of organizations hiring students out of college, by ensuring reduced counterproductive work behaviors and increased citizenship behaviors. If such behaviors are fostered at the academic level, students may also become more marketable and employable, which in turn results in companies with higher preforming employees and reduced expenses.

To the knowledge of the author, Core Self-Evaluations have not been used to predict Student Citizenship Behaviors and Counterproductive Student Behaviors, so this research will add to current literature in that context. This study will also examine possible moderators that affect the relationship between core self-evaluation and SCBs and CSBs. It is possible that by identifying a predictor of these behaviors, universities can find ways to increase positive behaviors and reduce negative behaviors. This ensures that the university maintains its reputation

and possibly increases its reputation. Furthermore, prior research has not used the concept of LMX to explain the exchange relationship between student and professor and how this exchange relationship adds to the prediction of student's positive and negative behaviors at school. This study will be the first to explore teacher-student exchange (TSX) relationships and how they influence student behaviors at school.

The following sections will discuss definitions of Core Self-Evaluation. Next, Student Citizenship and Counterproductive Student Behaviors will be defined and discussed regarding their relationship the CSE. Finally, the literature on core self-evaluations and student-professor relationships will be reviewed.

Literature Review

Core Self-Evaluation

Core Self-Evaluation (CSE) is defined by Judge, Locke, Durham and Kluger (1998) as a broad personality trait comprised of four personality facets: self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, emotional stability, and locus of control. Chang et al. (2012) defined self-esteem as the appraisal of one's self-worth. Generalized self-efficacy is defined as one's ability to perform and cope in extensive ranges of situations (Chang et al., 2012). Emotional stability is defined as the tendencies for calm and relaxed states of being (Eysenck, 1990). Locus of control is the idea that desired outcomes are the result of one's own performance rather than by fate (Rotter, 1996). These items represent an individual's evaluation of themselves in terms of competence, capabilities, and worthiness and although may have similarities, are independent facets (Judge, Locke, Durham & Kluger, 1998). Researchers suggest that these four facets can be combined into a higher order factor: *core self-evaluation*. Researchers also suggest that this broad term *core self-evaluation* is often studied in the context of job satisfaction and life satisfaction research (Judge, Bono, Erez, & Locke, 2005)

Research conducted by Erez and Judge (2001) assessed each of the four facets of core self-evaluation and found that they did load onto the one higher order factor used today. In a series of four studies, researchers attempted to gather information regarding core self-evaluation and its relationship to job attitudes, behaviors, and performance. Study 2 was a laboratory study in which students from a northeastern university were evaluated using measures of locus of control, self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, neuroticism, task motivation and task performance. Results indicated a positive relationship between core self-evaluation facets and task motivation. Individuals who had higher scores on facets of core self-evaluation were more

motivated to complete the task provided to them. In addition, researchers saw positive correlations between core self-evaluation facets and task performance and suggested that this positive correlation was potentially mediated by motivation. These results imply that core self-evaluation led to higher motivation which resulted in higher levels of task performance.

The use of core self-evaluations in performance and satisfaction research has increased due to criticisms of Five-Factor Personality Traits. Specifically, in performance research, performance is typically viewed as fluctuating while personality traits are believed to be static (Kacmar, Collins, Harris, & Judge, 2009). In order to assess dynamic outcomes, like performance, it is suggested that a dynamic predictor be used. Core Self-Evaluation appears to be relatively dynamic and fluctuates based on situations and environments (Kacmar, Collins, Harris, & Judge, 2009). In situations and environments that an individual is comfortable in or has been in frequently, they might have higher CSEs meaning they might be more self-confident and have higher generalized self-efficacy. For those individuals in new or unique situations, they might be more self-aware and less confident in their abilities resulting in lower levels of CSEs. Because there are fluctuations in self-evaluations, then it would be more appropriate to use when measuring aspects like work performance. Individuals who had a lower rating of work performance may have had lower levels of CSE based on the situation or environment resulting in the lower performance rating and vice versa. Research in areas of performance have, therefore, attempted to use indirect measures of Core Self-Evaluation as a predictor of performance.

A meta-analysis of the four facets of Core Self-Evaluation performed by Judge and Bono (2001) revealed that each of the four facets could be correlated to job satisfaction and job performance. In terms of job satisfaction, self-esteem, general self-efficacy, locus of control and

emotional stability were all positively correlated at ρ=.24, .45, .32, and .24 respectively. For job performance, correlations were as follows for self-esteem ρ=.26; for locus of control ρ=.22; for emotional stability ρ=.19; and for generalized self-efficacy ρ=.23. Although these correlations reflect correlations of the individual facets of CSE with job satisfaction and job performance, researchers hypothesized that they would be able to similarly predict job satisfaction and job performance if a higher order factor of core self-evaluation could be created and measured. This led to the development of the core self-evaluation scale and additional research on the construct.

The Core Self-Evaluation Scale (CSES) was subsequently developed and used to analyze the four facets of core self-evaluation in one assessment. Prior to the creation and validation of the Core Self-Evaluation Scale (Judge, Erez, Bono, & Thoresen, 2003), personality inventories were used to assess core self-evaluation indirectly (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998). The Core Self-Evaluation Scale provides a direct assessment of core self-evaluation through a 12-item measure assessing each of the four facets. The scale has been found to have optimal validity coefficients, and appears to be reliable (Judge, Erez, Bono, & Thoresen, 2003). In addition, the scale has been found to positively predict job performance, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction across several studies (Judge, Erez, Bono, & Thoresen, 2003; Kacmar et al., 2009; Tavousi, & Sharifi, 2017).

Similarly, in a meta-analysis, Tavousi and Sharifi (2017), examined the relationship between CSE and job performance, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction among other variables. Results suggested that CSE did have relationships with each. Specifically, when individuals had higher ratings of CSE, they usually had higher ratings of job performance and job satisfaction. Researchers suggested that these higher ratings also led to higher life satisfaction ratings.

Judge, Erez, Bono, and Thoresen (2003) created the first measure of CSE and examined if the scale could be used to predict job performance, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction. Across four samples, results indicated that the CSES could be used as a relatively consistent measure of job performance (r=.25), job satisfaction (r=.49), and life satisfaction (r=.54). As CSE ratings increased, job performance ratings increased. Additionally, individuals with higher CSE ratings, were also likely to be more satisfied with their job and life, compared to individuals with low CSE ratings.

Kacmar et al., (2009) also investigated the relationship between core self-evaluation and supervisor ratings of employees' job performance. Further, the moderating role of perceived work environment was also explored. Samples were drawn from two different companies: a state agency which handles health issues and a commercial food distributer. Data from employees was collected using the Core Self-Evaluation Scale, a measure of work environment, and a measure of perceived leader effectiveness. Employers and supervisors were asked to complete measures of task performance to assume job performance ratings. Results indicated a significant positive relationship between Core Self-Evaluation and job performance and perceived work environment was found to moderate this relationship. Employees who scored higher on measures of Core-Self Evaluation had higher task performance scores compared to those who had low scores on the Core Self-Evaluation Scale. This relationship was stronger when employees had favorable perceived work environments compared to those who had unfavorable perceived work environments.

Based on the studies reviewed above, it appears that Core Self-Evaluation is one higher order factor comprised of four individual facets: self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, emotional stability, and locus of control. The Core Self-Evaluation Scale, which was developed to measure

Core Self-Evaluation directly, is relatively valid and reliable and has been used to predict job performance and additional performance outcomes in the workplace. Facets of core self-evaluation have also been studied in relation to student performance (Ayra, 2013; Debusschera, Hofmansa, & De Fruyt, 2015). For example, Debusschera, Hofmansa, and De Fruyt (2015) found that higher ratings of self-control were related to increases in positive behaviors and decreases in negative behaviors associated with performance. Similarly, Ayra (2013) found that both higher locus of control and higher self-esteem led to higher performance ratings of top executives. It is, therefore, likely that Core Self-Evaluation can be used to predict student performance behaviors such as academic performance as well as student engagement in positive and negative behaviors in academic settings. Given that there are positive relationships between CSE and organizational performance, and that CSE has been used to predict organizational outcomes, it is possible that CSE can also be used to predict performance in students. This is further supported by the research discussed above, which found positive relationships between facets of CSE and student performance. Types of performance behaviors and their relationship with core self-evaluation are discussed next.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) are any helping behaviors which individuals perform that are not expected of the individual or defined in their work role (Ng & Feldman, 2009) but still contribute to the overall well-being of the organization. Many different conceptualizations of OCBs are discussed in the literature. For example, Bateman and Organ (1983) suggest that OCBs are comprised of eight dimensions including altruism, compliance, conscientiousness, cooperation, dependability, punctuality, housekeeping, and protection of company property. According to Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000) OCBs are

comprised of over 30 helping behaviors that are rooted in theory development by Katz in 1964 and can be divided into two categories: altruism and generalized compliance. Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) further define altruism as helping a specific person and generalized compliance as a form of helping behaviors that are less personal. Examples of altruism include assisting individuals who have been absent from work, helping others with a heavy workload, and volunteering for projects that are not required under an individual's job description. Examples of generalized compliance include being punctual, refraining from idle conversation, and taking undeserved breaks (LePine et al., 2002).

In 1988, Organ identified five factors that can be used to assess OCBs. These factors include: (1) altruism which is defined as any helping behaviors directed at coworkers and supervisors, (2) civic virtue, defined as involvement in company issues and politics, (3) conscientiousness, defined as achievement and goal seeking, (4) courtesy, defined as any behaviors performed to reduce problems with work associates, and (5) sportsmanship, defined as enduring minor personal inconveniences without complaint for the sake of the company (Organ & Ryan, 1995). These five facets have become the most widely used to define OCBs and scales developed by Podsakoff (1990) to assess the five factors of OCBs denoted by Organ (1988), are the most widely used assessments of organizational citizenship behaviors in the workplace.

LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002), examined the validity of the five factors of OCBs in a meta-analysis. Results indicated that each factor: altruism, civic virtue, contentiousness, courtesy, and sportsmanship, were all individual factors that did not overlap, but did predicted citizenship behaviors. The factors did have strong relationships with each other and were predictors of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and leader support, among others. Specifically, increased ratings of each factor were positively related to increased job satisfaction

and organizational commitment. Researchers also suggested that increased leader support led to higher scores on the five factors, ultimately resulting in increased job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Organizational citizenship behaviors are believed to be the result of satisfaction with the organization and feelings of loyalty toward the company (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000). Individuals who feel they have a good relationship with their company and are satisfied with what they are doing are more likely to participate in Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. These behaviors have also been linked to certain personality traits, as well as, performance at the organizational level (Chiaburu, Oh, Berry, Li, & Gardner, 2011; Indarti, Solimun, Fernandes, & Hakim, 2017). In a meta-analysis of personality traits associated with organizational citizenship behaviors, Chiaburu et al., (2011) found that Conscientiousness, Extraversion, and Emotional Stability have strong, positive correlations with organizational citizenship behaviors. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000) found similar results regarding Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Conscientiousness, but also suggest positive correlations between Agreeableness and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. As a result, personality traits are often used as predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, however traits other than those based on the Five-Factor model are rarely used. While OCBs and predictors of OCBs have been extensively researched in the organizational literature, these behaviors have not been studied much in the academic context with students rather than employees. Current research assessing citizenship behaviors in academic context is discussed in the following sections.

Student Citizenship Behaviors

With the beneficial effects of OCBs found in organizations, academic institutions have attempted to apply similar results to student context. According to Zettler (2011), student behaviors are a direct reflection of the university. It is, therefore, imperative that colleges attempt to collect data to reinforce participation in citizenship behaviors increasing enrollment and commitment to the organization. This results in increased revenue for the college during the students' time at the college and may also result in more shareholders involved in the college after students have graduated.

The current study will attempt to further add to the OCB literature by applying prior knowledge of organizational citizenship behaviors to an academic setting providing more insight into the factors that may predict student engagement in citizenship behaviors at school. These findings can help academic institutions develop initiatives to increase citizenship behaviors.

In the academic context, organizational citizenship behaviors are referred to as Student Citizenship Behaviors (SCBs) and include many activities such as assisting fellow students with course content, working in less-ideal classroom conditions, and civic engagement (volunteer work; Meriac, 2012; Schwager et al., 2014). Those students who participate in Student Citizenship Behaviors appear to have higher success in their academic career as well as increased interest in promoting the institution for which they belong (Meriac, 2012). Like organizational citizenship behaviors, student citizenship behaviors have been linked to certain personality traits and other factors which may increase or decrease the tendency to engage in such positive behaviors (Zettler, 2011). Chiaburu et al., (2011), imply that some personality traits (Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability and Extraversion), could also predict student engagement in citizenship behaviors at school. Agreeableness has also shown positive

correlations with Student Citizenship Behaviors (Schwager, et al., 2014). Those students who have higher scores on traits of Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, Extraversion, and Agreeableness tend to participate in more Student Citizenship Behaviors compared to students with lower scores on these dimensions.

Along with specific personality traits that can be used to predict student citizenship behaviors, research has identified multiple other factors that may also be related to SCBs including work values and work experience (Ng & Feldman, 2009), and supervisor ratings of students' potential (Schwager et al., 2014). In a meta-analysis, Ng and Feldman (2009) examined factors that can be used to predict OCBs. Results indicated that work values and work experiences were related to participation in OCBs. Individuals with greater levels of experience, measured here as the level of education received, were more likely to participate in citizenship behaviors compared to those with less education. Additionally, individuals who found value in their work were more likely to participate in citizenship behaviors compared to those who did not find value in their work. When applied to students, this research may suggest that students in higher grade levels will be more willing to participate in SCBs. Additionally, students who find value in citizenship behaviors, may be likely to participate more frequently in SCBs.

Schwager (2014) added to the literature by suggesting that supervisors' ratings of students' potential were related to citizenship behaviors. Students were asked to identify any citizenship behaviors that they frequently participated in and then provide forms to their supervisors to complete regarding the student's potential. Results indicated that increased student potential ratings were related to increased frequency in OCBs. Researchers suggested that using student potential ratings as a predictor of OCBs may be relatively reliable in measuring participation in citizenship behaviors.

Based on this information, it appears that research on organizational citizenship behaviors and student citizenship behaviors result in similar outcomes, however, there may be instances when it will not suffice to generalize organizational data to academic settings. By identifying factors that predict these behaviors in students, colleges may be able to create interventions that lead to increased helping behaviors across campuses, resulting in improved college reputation and increased success of students after graduation. The current research will focus specifically on volunteering and tutoring as participation in SCBs as they are most cited in student citizenship behaviors. A distinction will also be made between tutoring for course or extra credit and tutoring as a voluntary activity. These behaviors can be easily assessed with students and can be done so directly.

Core Self-Evaluation and OCBs

As discussed in the introduction, the primary purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between CSE and student engagement in citizenship and counterproductive behaviors at school. While prior research has not directly investigated the link between CSE and student citizenship behaviors, much research has been conducted in the organizational context on factors influencing employee engagement in citizenship behaviors. For example, research by Joo and Jo (2017) sought to assess the relationship between core self-evaluation and citizenship behaviors. In the study, citizenship behaviors were defined as any helping behaviors that an employee performed. Researchers collected data using the Authentic Leader Questionnaire, the Core Self-Evaluation Scale, psychological empowerment, and the Podsakoff et al., (1990) assessment of organizational citizenship behavior. Participants were 374 employees from a large Korean company. Results indicated a significant positive correlation between core self-

evaluation and OCBs (r=.65). The data also suggest that psychological empowerment may act as a moderator between Core Self-Evaluation and OCBs.

In another study, Xu and Yu (2019) sought to understand how core self-evaluation, as a whole, related to OCBs. Researchers also wanted to analyze this relationship when ethical leadership was used as a moderator and when career adaptability was used as a mediator. Participants were administered the Core Self-Evaluation Scale developed by Judge et al. (2003), a measure of ethical leadership, and a measure of career adaptability at Time 1. At Time 2, participants completed a measure of OCB developed by Lee and Allen (2002) This resulted in 156 matched survey responses from Time 1 and Time 2. Results indicated a positive correlation between core self-evaluation and OCB (r=.38 at p<.01). This relationship was found to be partially mediated by career adaptability. The relationship between core self-evaluation and OCBs was also moderated by ethical leadership. Specifically, when ethical leadership was high, there were less instances of OCBs and when ethical leadership was low, there were more instances of OCBs. This result is contradictory to what one might initially have expected, but researchers suggest that when ethical leadership is low, individuals that work under that leader may try to compensate for the leader by participating in more OCBs.

In a similar study Dietl and Meurs (2019) sought to identify the relationship between core self-evaluation and OCBs, however, researchers suggested that using an implicit measure of OCBs might be more beneficial as it removes the self-rating of other core self-evaluation measures. Thus, in a pilot study, the researchers developed an implicit CSE scale. Cronbach's Alpha for internal consistency was calculated at .87. The measure also had a strong positive correlation with the Judge et al. (2003) CSES (r=.76, p<.01). A second study was, then, completed to determine the relationship between implicit and explicit core self-evaluations and

OCBs. Participants were 154 triads of 462 raters. Each participant was asked to complete the CSES as the explicit measure of core self-evaluation and then was asked to have a personal acquaintance and a work colleague complete the implicit measure of CSE for the participant. OCBs were measured and data on task performance and income were also collected. Results indicated that explicit measures of CSE were positively correlated with OCBs *(*r=.20, p<.05), but that implicit CSE was more strongly correlated with OCBs (r=.23, p<.01) in comparison. Results also show that OCBs was strongly correlated with task performance (r=.68, p<.01).

Research discussed above suggests that core self-evaluation predicts OCBs in organizational settings. Although there is a limited amount of research examining the relationship between CSE and SCBs, research reviewed above does suggest that there may be a positive relationship between CSE and participation in SCBs. Specifically, it appears that higher ratings on CSE are positively related to more frequent participation in SCBs. The research reviewed above has shown that participation in student citizenship behaviors mirrors research on organizational citizenship behavior. Based on these similarities, it can be argued that core self-evaluation could be used as a predictor of student citizenship behaviors. Additionally, since CSE has been positively related to participation in OCB, it is possible that CSE will also be positively related to SCB. Based on this literature, the current research seeks to identify whether or not having higher scores on CSE will result in more participation in SCBs at the college level.

Those students who are high on locus of control, self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy and emotional stability may be more likely to feel confident in their work and may also have better skills to manage college life. Having higher scores on these personality dimensions may result in a student who has better time management skills, study skills, and might have the ability to create relationships easily compared to a student who has low levels of CSE. Based on this

assumption, the student high on CSE maybe more likely to have time to devote to helping other students, as well as have the patience to help them develop academically or personally. For a student who is low on CSE, they might not feel they are capable of helping or do not feel they can devote as much time to volunteering and, therefore, maybe less likely to participate in SCBs.

As the study of OCBs continues to flourish, researchers have become interested in studying negative behaviors in the workplace which are termed as counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs). These behaviors are discussed in the section below.

Counterproductive Work Behaviors

Counterproductive Work Behaviors (CWBs), in contrast to organizational citizenship behaviors, are any behaviors that undermine the goals, interests, or objectives of an organization (Marcus, Taylor, Hastings, Sturm, & Weigelt, 2016; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). These behaviors have a detrimental impact on the company when employees are more frequently participating in these behaviors. Gruys and Sackett (2003) identified eleven facets of counterproductive work behaviors including: absenteeism, property destruction, theft, misuse of time and resources, misuse of information, unsafe behavior, poor work, drug use, alcohol use, inappropriate verbal actions, and inappropriate physical actions. The eleven factors were later combined to create a five-facet model of counterproductive work behaviors including: abuse, theft, withdrawal, production deviance and sabotage (Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007).

Such behaviors can be attributed to aspects of the work environment, satisfaction, and autonomy individuals feel towards an organization they work for (Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007). For individuals who are dissatisfied with their work environment and their job, participation in Counterproductive Work Behaviors increases compared to individuals who are satisfied with

their work environment and job. Similarly, if individuals do not feel they are in control of what they do at work, they will participate in more Counterproductive Work Behaviors compared to those who feel they have more control of their work situation (Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007).

In a meta-analysis of CWB, Berry, Ones, and Sackett (2007) sought to make a distinction between organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance to establish a more concrete definition for CWBs. Organizational deviance (OD) is considered any behaviors that are directed at the organization including working slowly, leaking confidential company information, and damaging property. Interpersonal deviance (ID) is defined as behaviors targeted at individuals who work within a company and include behaviors such as gossip, violence, and theft of individuals' property. These behaviors were correlated with the Big Five Factors of Personality. Organizational deviance was negatively correlated with Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. Intrapersonal deviance was negatively correlated with Emotional Stability, Openness, Agreeableness, and Contentiousness. Intrapersonal deviance was positively correlated with Extraversion. Researchers suggested that these results implied that, in general, counterproductive behaviors would be negatively related to personality traits meaning that higher scores on personality traits leads to less participation in CWBs.

Similarly, Ménard, Brunet, and Savoie (2011) sought to examine interpersonal deviance in more depth regarding its relationship with personality traits. Participant data from a large study of workplace deviance was used for this study resulting in 284 data points. The Interpersonal Deviant Workplace Behaviors Scale was used to measure psychological and physical violence which were determined to be examples of interpersonal deviance. The NEO Personality Inventory was used to measure personality. In this study Openness was not used as a

measure of personality. Results found significant correlations between psychical violence and all 4 four factors of personality; Neuroticism, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. Psychological violence was not significantly correlated with any factors of personality, but showed a high, positive correlations with physical violence. Researches suggested that for physical violence to occur, psychological violence may already be occurring.

In another study Ayra (2013), researchers sought to find correlations between CWBs and locus of control and self-esteem. Researchers conducted a study assessing 60 executives in various companies on behaviors such as gossip sabotage, and avoidance of working. Participants were asked to complete measures including: Organizational Based Self-esteem Instrument, The Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist, Locus of Control Inventory, and Job-related Affective Well-being Scale (JAWS Scale). Findings indicated that CWBs were negatively correlated to Internal Locus of Control, Organizational Based Self-Esteem, and Job-related Affective Well-being. These results suggest that items related to core self-evaluation are also related to participation in CWBs, specifically locus of control and ratings of self-esteem.

The literature discussed above suggest that personality traits can be used as predictors of CWBs. Specifically, research indicated that certain higher levels of neuroticism and lower levels of conscientiousness led to more frequent participation in CWBs. The literature also suggests that there are counterproductive behaviors that target the institution or peer and behaviors that harm the individual. Additionally, the research suggests that factors of CSE can also be used to predict CWBs. It is possible that this research may also apply at the student level and that personality traits can be used to predict negative behaviors that students perform. This may also lead to interventions that deter students from participating in negative behaviors that can hurt the student and the institution.

These negative behaviors can have detrimental costs to the company in terms of organizational image and money lost, due to theft and turnover (Arya, 2013; Zettler, 2011). As companies begin to understand Counterproductive Work Behaviors, they can better assess instances of occurrence and ways to reduce the behavior, whether it be to increase job satisfaction, develop incentive programs, or to create awareness through training and development. Institutions including colleges and universities may also benefit by assessing and predicting counterproductive behaviors in students. The following sections will discuss certain negative behaviors students participate in.

Counterproductive Student Behaviors

As with increased interest in Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, Counterproductive Work Behaviors have also sparked attention in academic institutions. Such behaviors can decrease the reputation of the college and reduce funding the organization receives from stakeholders. In the context of academics, these behaviors are referred to as *Counterproductive Student Behaviors (CSBs)* and can include behaviors such as cheating, assisting others in cheating (Meriac, 2012), plagiarizing, stealing, and bullying (Schwager et al., 2014). Although there is significantly less research on counterproductive student behaviors, some research has been completed discussing why students might participate in CSBs. For example, Simkin and McLeod (2010) note that students have a need to get ahead which leads to cheating in courses and is the general motivation behind increased participation in counterproductive student behaviors. Their results also show that factors, such as ethical behaviors of professors, can reduce the likelihood of participation in CSBs. Additionally, students who are uninterested in course topics or those who feel like outsiders may also be prone to increased participation in counterproductive student behaviors.

Counterproductive student behaviors not only diminish the reputation of the academic organization, they also reduce student success (Meriac, 2012). Students who are actively participating in CSBs spend less time learning and, therefore, have decreased success in college (Barry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007). These students may also be asked to leave schools or be passed up for job opportunities as behaviors such as plagiarism and cheating are often noted in college transcripts. In academia, this could result in lawsuits, legal fees, and decreased application pools, all of which negatively affect the institution. Institutions should, therefore, have the capabilities to recognize and reduce the instances of counterproductive student behaviors.

Research has indicated that personality factors could be related to student engagement in counterproductive behaviors (Kluemper, McLarty, & Bing, 2015; Ng & Feldman, 2009). The Five-Factor Model associates decreased levels of conscientiousness and emotionally stability with increased likelihood of participating in counterproductive student behaviors (Kluemper, McLarty, & Bing, 2015). Kluemper, McLarty, and Bing (2015), collected data from students at a university in southern United States. Personality traits were assessed using the self-rated and acquaintance-rated of the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) and workplace deviance was assessed using a non-self-report measure which includes topics such as absenteeism, lack of emotional control, being rude to peers and supervisors, and leaving work or working on personal projects at work. Researchers asked supervisors and peers to complete the 24-item assessment of workplace deviance for participants who completed personality measures. Results indicated that self-ratings of personality were negatively correlated with supervisor ratings of deviance. (Kluemper, McLarty, & Bing, 2015).

Counterproductive student behaviors have also been predicted using non-cognitive assessments of work values (Ng & Feldman, 2009), and supervisor ratings of students' potential

(Schwager et al., 2014) in addition to personality. Schwager et al. (2014) note that supervisor's rating of students' potential can accurately predict instances of Student Counterproductive work Behaviors. Those students who have lower supervisor ratings are students who are also more likely to participate in counterproductive student behaviors. Research has not assessed how factors relating to core self-evaluations relate to CSBs, therefore, the current research will add to the literature in that context. Based on the research from CWBs at the organization level, it is possible that core self-evaluation will also be negatively correlated to CSBs. Interestingly, researchers note that higher scores on supervisor ratings does not necessarily imply students participate in more student citizenship behaviors.

As suggested by the literature discussed above, there are many factors that can be used to predict SCBs. Personality factors are most commonly used to predict the behaviors, however, factors such as work values and core self-evaluations may also be used as predictors of CSBs. The research also suggests that there are factors that can modify the relationship between personality factors and CSBs, including traits of the professors teaching courses. It is reasonable, then, to suggest that a full measure of CSE might also be able to predict CSBs.

As academic institutions gain more knowledge regarding the predictors of Student Counterproductive Work Behaviors, they can attempt to make changes to curriculum, school activities, and student-professor relationships. By doing this, the institution can help students make preferred decisions such as participating in more SCBs while reducing the chances or participation in SCWBs. If these behaviors can be avoided, students will have greater chances of attaining higher success in the college as well as the potential for more prestigious jobs which increases college reputation and revenue. This will also lead to more qualified employees and less instances of harm and loss in the company setting.

Core Self-Evaluation and CSBs

In a meta-analysis conducted by Chang et al. (2012), researchers collected data analyzing the relationship between CSE and CWBs. Researchers collected data from both published and unpublished research to study the relationship. Results showed that, overall, there was a negative relationship between CSE and CWBs (r=-.15). In general, when individuals are noted as having high ratings of CSE, they are less likely to participate in CWBs. Additionally, researchers collected data to analyze the relationship between CSE and CWBs directed toward an individual and CSE and CWBs directed toward the organization. Results showed that CSE was negatively related to CWBs directed at an individual (r=–.13) implying that individuals high on CSE are less likely to participant in CWBs that harm the individuals they work with such as gossiping. Results also showed a negative relationship between CSE and CWBs directed at the organization (r= –.24) implying that individuals with higher CSE scores are less likely to perform CWBS that can harm the company such as stealing.

Research by Neves & Champion (2013) sought to determine the relationship between core self-evaluations and workplace deviant behavior. Data was collected across 35 organizations for 518 employee-supervisor dyads. Measures included were: The Core Self-Evaluation Scale, a measure of emotional exhaustion, a measure of interpersonal trust, and a 10-item workplace deviance scale. Results indicated a negative correlation between core self-evaluation and interpersonal workplace deviance (r=-.14). Findings also suggested that emotional exhaustion mediated the relationships between core self-evaluation and organizational deviance as well as between CSE and interpersonal deviance. Specifically, emotional exhaustion was a significant mediator between core self-evaluation and organizational deviance. Emotional exhaustion also mediated that relationship between CSE and interpersonal deviance. Trust in

supervisor only mediated the relationship between core self-evaluation and organizational deviance.

Debusschera, Hofmansa, and De Fruyt (2015) attempted to further analyze the relationship between Core Self-Evaluations and Counterproductive Work Behaviors. Researchers hypothesized that higher scores on Core Self-Evaluation would reduce the tendency to perform Counterproductive Work Behaviors. Participants from 32 different Belgian companies were asked to complete the State CSE measure of core self-evaluation, a measure for CWB-I and CWB-O. CWB-I measures any counterproductive behaviors directed at an individual while CWB-O measures behaviors directed at the organization. Results indicated that State CSE was negatively correlated to CWB-I (r=-.25) and CWB-O (r=-.30). Consistent with the hypothesis, those individuals who had higher State CSE were less likely to be participating in CWB during that time period compared to those who had low State CSE ratings. Researchers also suggested that this relationship mirrored the relationship seen in research correlating CSE to task and job performance.

A few studies have looked at the predictors of counterproductive behaviors in academic context. For example, Zettler (2011) sought to analyze the relationship between self-control and counterproductive academic behavior (CAB) which was defined as cheating on exams. It was hypothesized that students who have higher ratings of self-control will not participate in CABs frequently. Participants were 233 students who voluntarily participated in the study via a web-based survey platform. These students completed a measure of self-control and a measure of counterproductive academic behavior. Results indicated that self-control was negatively correlated with CABs (r=-.39). Those students who had higher scores on self-control were less likely to cheat on exams compared to students with lower ratings of self-control.

Similarly, Crede and Niehorster (2009) sought to identify the antecedents of counterproductive student behaviors identifying the following four variables: internal control variables, propensity variables, achievement striving, and severity perceptions. Researchers hypothesized that all four variables could be used to predict participation in CSBs. Researchers also determined that CSBs could be divided into self-focused CSBs and other-focused CSBs. Self-focused CSBs included work avoidance, alcohol abuse, and low personal standards. Other-focused CSBs included property theft, cheating, and petty personal gain. Results showed a stronger correlation between self-focused CSBs and achievement striving, and self-control compared to the relationship between the two variables and other-focused CSBs. Researchers concluded that these behaviors are just as important to predict in the college setting as predicting GPA and academic performance as they directly result in academic performance increases and decreases.

Based on the studies above, it is reasonable to conclude that dimensions of CSE affect participation in CSBs. Students with low self-esteem and self-confidence are likely to have reservations about their own work and performance. They will, therefore, be more likely to participate in counterproductive student behaviors. This research does not necessarily imply that the students do not have high performance capabilities, rather the research implies that students have preconceived notions about their abilities and those CSEs influence how the student behaves.

Based on the organizational literature discussed above, it appears that higher ratings of CSE result in fewer instances of employee engagement in CWBs. A similar argument can be made in the student context, and higher ratings of CSE may suggest that there will be fewer instances of CSBs. If student outcomes are similar to organizational outcomes, colleges can

begin to create intervention and training programs to deter students from participation in CSBs through increased core self-evaluations. For instance, in the context of counterproductive student behaviors, if CSE can predict behaviors such as alcohol abuse, cheating, property theft and petty personal gain (CSBs recognized by Crede & Niehorster, 2009), then the college can create interventions to target those students and help them toward academic success.

As previously mentioned, there is research to suggest that the traits of a professor can affect performance in a classroom (Gross et al., 2015). Similarly, in the organization context, the relationship between a leader and a member (Leader-Member Exchange), is shown to be a moderator between personality traits and job performance (Bal Tastan, 2014; Chen, Lam, & Zhong, 2010).

Leader-Member Exchange

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) is defined as the relationship a leader has with his/her followers and is derived from social exchange theory and the Vertical Dyadic Linkage (VDL) (Dansereau, 1975). Leader-member exchange refers to the interactions of the leader with different followers and members based on the personality of the leader and the personalities of members in the group (Milner et al., 2007). Each member of an organization or company is expected to have a different relationship with their leader which determines the quality of the exchange (Bal Tastan, 2014). In research, high quality leader-member exchange means that a leader has a good relationship with a member or subordinate. In contrast, low quality leader-member exchange implies poor relationships between a leader and his/her subordinate. According to Gerstner and Day (1997), the quality of leader-member exchange can be assessed from the leader's point of view and from the member's point of view which may result in contradicting data which will be discussed further.

In 1995, Graen & Uhl-Bien developed the LMX-7 assessment to measure the quality of leader-member exchange (as cited in Gerstner & Day, 1997). The assessment includes seven self-assessment items measured on 5-point Likert Scales. A meta-analysis by Gerstner and Day (1997) found that the LMX-7 is psychometrically stable and valid but has different results when used by the leader and by the member. According to the meta-analysis, overall internal consistency for the LMX-7 is between .80 and .90. Researchers found that ratings of LMX from the leader and member perspective are only correlated at r=.35, which is relatively low. When LMX is assessed from the member's perspective internal consistency was calculated at Cronbach's Alpha=.85. When assessed form the leader's perspective Cronbach's Alpha is .77 indicating that LMX ratings from this perspective are slightly less reliable compared to the member's perspective but still reliable. Although there are differences in consistency of the measure, the LMX-7 continues to be the most psychometrically sound assessments of leader-member exchange quality.

Prior research regarding leader-member exchange has sought to understand how the exchanges influence job performance, organizational citizenship behavior, intention to leave and other organizational outcomes. According to Gerstner and Day's (1997) meta-analysis, LMX is positively related to member performance (r=.30) when assessed from the member's perspective. When there is a higher quality LMX, perceived by the member, it is positively related to that member's performance. LMX is also positively related to member performance (r=.55) when assessed from the leader's perspective. These results suggested that there is a stronger relationship between LMX and member performance, when the LMX quality is viewed from the leader's perspective compared to the member's perspective. Researchers noted, however, this correlation may be inflated as the leader is giving both the LMX quality rating and

the member performance rating and suggest that the member LMX rating and performance rating may be more accurate.

Chen, Lam, and Zhong (2010), sought to assess how quality of leader-member exchange from the member's perspective affected work performance in a longitudinal study of employees in a gear-manufacturing company. It was hypothesized that LMX quality would mediate the effects of trust on work performance. Researchers also hypothesized that LMX quality would mediate the effects of emotional intelligence on work performance. Measures of emotional intelligence, trust in supervisors, the LMX-7, and performance data were administered to participants. Results suggested that LMX-7 positively predicts work performance (β=.44, SE=.16, p< .01). Additionally, those employees that had higher quality LMX and trust in their supervisor were rated as having higher work performance compared to those employees who had low-quality LMX. Findings also suggested that as employees gained trust in their supervisor, they would be more likely to participate in OCBs given that they had high quality LMX.

Similarly, Lin, Lin, and Chang (2017) found that LMX moderated the relationship between types of training and subsequent performance ratings. Researchers hypothesized that individuals with higher quality LMX would have higher performance regardless of receiving promotion coaching or prevention coaching. Participants consisted of employees in a petrochemical company in Taiwan. Quality of leader-member exchange was measured using the LMK-7 and performance was measured through self-report. Results indicated that individuals with higher quality leader-member exchange had better performance ratings following promotion coaching as compared to individuals with low quality leader-member exchange. Leader-member exchange had a main effect on performance following prevention coaching, but not promotion coaching. These findings suggested that quality of leader-member exchange does have

moderating effects on performance when either performance or prevention coaching are used by the supervisor.

In a study by Bal Tastan (2014), researchers sought to assess the relationship between LMX and employee job performance. Data was collected for 190 food and drink service industry employees. To collect data the LMX-DMD was used measuring specific dimensions of leader-member exchange including loyalty and respect, affect, and contributions to exchange. Job performance and role ambiguity were also measured. Results indicated that loyalty and respect, affect, and contributions to exchange were all positively correlated with job performance. Additionally, the research suggested that when there is ambiguity of an employee's role, the relationship between LMX and Job Performance is high as employees seek to understand their role through their leader.

The studies discussed above indicate that LMX can be a moderator between personality factors and job performance. Further, findings also suggest that a stronger LMX relationship results in increased job performance. In previous research, performance was typically measured through task performance, job performance, or performance appraisal and had not focused on behaviors such as OCBs and CWBs.

More recently, authors have focused on exploring the influence of LMX on OCBs and CWBs. In a meta-analysis, Martin, Guillaume, Thomas, Lee, and Epitropaki (2016), reviewed studies regarding the relationships LMX has with work performance, OCBs and CWBs. Results indicated that LMX had strong positive effects on work performance (ρ= .30) and citizenship behaviors (ρ= .34). When LMX quality was high, meaning there was a good relationship between the leader and member, members were more likely to have higher work performance ratings and participated in more citizenship behaviors. LMX also had strong negative effects on

counterproductive performance behaviors (ρ= –.24). As the quality of LMX became stronger, members were less likely to participate in counterproductive behaviors. Researchers also suggested that LMX could act as a moderator between personality and positive and negative behaviors.

Truckenbrodt (2001) studied the relationship between LMX and organizational citizenship behaviors. A sample of 63 dyads (126 individual participants) were administered the LMX-7, a measure of organizational commitment, and the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale. Results showed a strong, positive correlation between LMX quality and organizational commitment as well as a strong, positive relationship between LMX quality and OCBs. The results imply that as the relationship between a leader and member becomes more meaningful, the member is more likely to participate in OCBs and commit to the organization that they work for.

Similarly, Seo (2017) examined the relationship between LMX and OCBs, but also examined the relationship between LMX and CWBs. It was hypothesized that higher quality LMX would be positively correlated with OCBs and negatively correlated with CWBs. A sample of 318 individuals were recruited from companies in Korea. Results indicated that individuals who had better relationship with their supervisors were more likely to participate in OCBs and less likely to participate in CWBs compared to individuals with low quality LMX. Results also indicated that when individuals perceived that the relationship they had with their supervisor was different than peers' relationships with the supervisor, it also affected the relationship. When individuals felt the relationship they had with their supervisor was not as strong as a peer's relationship, it resulted in decreased OCBs, but did not increase CWBs.

Thus, it appears from the literature reviewed above that the quality of LMX influences employees' participation in positive and negative behaviors. Specifically, it appears that high quality LMX results in more frequent participation in positive behaviors, including organizational citizenship behaviors. It also appears that higher quality LMX results in reduced frequency of participation in negative behaviors, including counterproductive work behaviors. In contrast, when LMX quality is low, employees appear to have increased participation in counterproductive behaviors and decreased participation in citizenship behaviors.

This relationship between leaders and members could also then be applied to the relationship between students and professors in academic contexts. When applied to a college or university setting, LMX may provide useful information on how the relationship between professors (leaders) and students (members) affects performance outcomes. Specifically, the current research seeks to analyze how the quality of professor-student relationship affects such behaviors as student citizenship behaviors and student counterproductive work behaviors.

Moderating role of TSX

As previously mentioned, the relationship that students have with their professors can greatly impact student success and participation in Student Citizenship and Counterproductive Student Behaviors. The relationship between students and professors has, however, only been assessed through indirect measures such as academic performance and success (Ullah & Wilson, 2007). For the purposes of this study, the term Teacher-Student Exchange (TSX) is established and used throughout the remainder of this manuscript. Most data collected in academic settings correlates student achievement and performance with ratings students gave of their professors (Cohen, 1981; Lopez, 1997; Gross et al., 2015, ud Din & Saeed, 2018; Ullah &Wilson, 2007). Early research in the area has debated that extent to which student academic performance is

linked to ratings of professors. Doyle (1975) found consistent, positive correlations between academic performance and students' ratings of professors. Seibert (1979) found similar results that students who gave professors high ratings on different assessment items also had higher course achievement compared to students who gave professors low ratings. Researchers have also found inconsistent results regarding this relationship. The inconsistency can be attributed to differences in assessments given to students and how such assessments are scored, according to Cohen (1981). These higher ratings of the professor suggest that students who have stronger relationships with their professors have better academic performance and results in higher ratings of the professor.

In a study by Ullah and Wilson (2007) researchers analyzed the relationship between student engagement and academic success. They also sought to study how peer and faculty relationships influenced the relationship between engagement and academic success. Data from the National Survey of Student Engagement from 2003-2005 were used in this analysis. Data included cumulative GPA, ACT scores, ratings of engagement (determined by the amount of times students asked questions in classes), and demographics for each randomly selected student across the three years. Results show a positive correlation between engagement and GPA scores. Results also show a correlation between engagement and student relationship with faculty. Researchers suggest that when students' relationships with faculty is used as a moderator, engagement may be a stronger predictor of academic success. Specifically, researchers note that stronger relationships between students and faculty may increase class engagement and result in higher GPA.

Research by Buskirk-Cohen and Plants (2019) added to the literature by assessing if academic success was better predicted by Grit or a students' sense of belonging. Researchers

measured academic performance through GPA, Grit and sense of belonging. Belonging was further broken into measures of social acceptance, professors' pedagogical caring, and university belonging. Of the variables measured, results show that professor caring was the only variable significantly correlated with academic performance. Professor caring was also positively correlated with social acceptance, academic commitment, university belonging, and Grit. Researchers suggest that students in university settings already have grit and personalities geared toward success and so at the university level, the relationship between grit and academic performance is no longer as important compared to student-professor relationships. This suggestion implies that professor caring may act as a moderator between grit and academic performance.

In both studies, researchers sought to identify whether or not relationships with faculty influenced college student success. Researchers also suggested that this relationship may act as a moderator for student success. The current belief is that stronger relationships between students and faculty will lead to higher levels of academic success, while weaker relationships will result in lower levels of academic success.

Based on the literature discussed above, it is likely that CSE will be positively related to student citizenship behaviors; however, the extent to which students may engage in SCBs may be influenced by the strength of relationship students have with their teachers and professors. When students have a positive relationship with their professors, they may be more likely to perform behaviors that assist the professor in his/her attempt to teach. These students may also feel that they have more time to devote to extracurriculars while balancing their schoolwork, including tutoring other students and volunteering outside the classroom. Additionally, teachers and professors who have better relationships with specific students may be more likely to

recommend that a student participate in more activities such as volunteering and tutoring. Professors may also be more likely to recommend that student to other professional faculty and staff when needed. In general, having a positive TSX might result in an environment where more opportunities are available to the student. If a student has high ratings of CSE but does not have a good relationship with their professor, they may be less likely to have opportunities that are available to those students that have stronger relationships.

In contrast, it is likely that CSE will be negatively related to counterproductive student behaviors; however, the extent of this relationship may also be influenced by the relationship a student has with their professors. When students do not have strong relationship with their professors, they may be more likely to participate in CSBs. Specifically, when students do not feel a connection with their professors, they may not try as hard in class, or skip class altogether. They may also be more likely, then, to cheat or plagiarize because they haven't learned material. If students have a strong relationship with their professor, however, they may be less inclined to participate in CSBs. These students may also consider participating more frequently in SCBs like volunteering more of their time outside of class and completing extra credit because they have support from their professor and may want to stand out to their professor.

Students who have low CSE and weak relationships with professors, however, are likely to be students that participate most frequently in CSBs and least frequently in SCBs. These students are likely those who do not have the confidence or motivation to perform in classes. That, in concert with weak TSX, results in a student who does not feel valued or motivated to work and participate in classes. When students are not confident in themselves and do not have support from, or feel valued by, their professors, they will likely not perform well in class and may resort to participation in CSBs, plagiarism, and cheating to pass classes. These students may

also be the students most likely to drop-out of institutions which can have negative repercussions for the student and the institution itself.

The Present Study

Core Self-Evaluation (CSE) is a broad personality trait comprised of four personality facets: self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, emotional stability, and locus of control (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998). Research has indicated that CSE might be a better predictor of dynamic behaviors such as job and task performance which vary based on the environment (Judge, Erez, Bono, & Thoresen, 2003; Kacmar, Collins, Harris, & Judge, 2009; Tavousi, & Sharifi, 2017). For example, results of a meta-analysis by Tavousi and Sharifi (2017) indicated that individuals with high CSE are likely to have high performance ratings, which results in higher job and life satisfaction. Additionally, research has examined facets of CSE linking CSE to positive and negative behaviors (Ayra, 2013; Debusschera, Hofmansa, & De Fruyt, 2015). These relationships are also seen in the student setting. Students having high ratings of CSE facets are likely to perform better and participate in more positive behaviors (Debusschera, Hofmansa, & De Fruyt, 2015). However, minimal research has used CSE to predict positive and negative behaviors within student populations.

Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) are any helping behaviors which an individual performs not defined in their job description or role (Ng & Feldman, 2009). Researchers have concluded that OCBs can be categorized into five facets including: altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, courtesy, and sportsmanship. A meta-analysis conducted by LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) found that each facet of OCBs was linked to increased job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Research in organizational settings also suggests that higher CSE results in more frequent participation in OCBs while lower CSE does not result in increased frequency of OCBs (Joo & Jo, 2017).

Previous research has also indicated that students perform student citizenship behaviors (SCBs) which are any behaviors not required including: participation in volunteer activities, tutoring other students, and assisting professors and teachers when asked (Schwager, et al., 2014; Zettler, 2011). Prior research has indicated that facets of CSE can predict student performance and participation in SCBs. For example, Zettler (2011) found that emotional stability and self-control were related to participation in SCBs. It is suggested that when students have high CSE, they are more likely to participate in SCBs and might have more opportunities to perform SCBs. Students with high CSE are more motivated to perform well and have confidence in themselves and their work. They are also likely to seek out more opportunities where they can perform. Based on this research, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 1: Core Self-Evaluation will be positively correlated with participation in Student Citizenship Behaviors.

Counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) are any behaviors that undermine the goals, interests, or objectives of an organization (Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007; Marcus, Taylor, Hastings, Sturm, & Weigelt, 2016; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). Research concluded that participation in CWBs can be predicted using personality measures (Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007; Ménard, Brunet, & Savoie, 2011). In a meta-analysis, Barry, Ones, and Sackett (2007) concluded that participation in CWBs was negatively correlated with the Big Five personality traits. Previous research has also shown CSE as a predictor of CWBs. For example, Chang et al. (2012) found that CSE ratings were negatively related to counterproductive behaviors. When individuals have high CSE they are less likely to participate in CWBs compared to individuals with low CSE.

Research has also concluded that students participate in counterproductive student behaviors (CSBs) including behaviors such as: cheating, stealing, and bullying (Meriac, 2012; Schwager et al., 2014). CSBs have been predicted using personality measures (Kluemper, McLarty, & Bing, 2015) and research has found that all five personality traits are negatively related to participation in SCBs. Research suggests that facets of CSE can predict participation in CSBs, however, little research has been done. Since organizational research has suggested that CWBs can be predicted using CSE and CSBs are similar to CWBs, it is reasonable to suggest that CSE can also be used to predict CSBs. Students will lower levels of CSE are likely to be less motivated to perform well and may lack the confidence to seek assistance or in their work. Due to the lack of motivation and confidence, these students may participate in more negative behaviors, such as cheating or not attending classes. It is, therefore, hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 2: Core Self-Evaluation will be negatively correlated with participation in Counterproductive Student Behaviors.

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) is the relationship that a leader has with his/her followers and how that exchange affects how work gets done (Dansereau, 1975, Milner et al., 2007). According to a meta-analysis by Gerstner and Day (1997), high quality LMX is related to increased member performance. When a leader and member have a good relationship, the member's performance is likely to be higher. Chen, Lam and Zhong (2010) found similar results suggesting that strength of LMX can increase work performance. There is also a body of research that analyzes how LMX influences participation in OCBs and CWBs. A meta-analysis by Martin, Guillaume, Thomas, Lee, and Epitropaki (2016) concluded that stronger relationships between leaders and members is positively correlated to participation in OCBs and negatively correlated with participation in CWBs.

Current education literature has suggested that the relationship a student has with their professor influences academic performance (Cohen, 1981; Gross et al., 2015; Lopez, 1997; Ullah & Wilson, 2007). The present study will add to the literature by exploring the teacher-student exchange (TSX) which is defined as the relationship between students and professors in academia. Researchers have concluded that when students have stronger relationship with their professors, they are more likely to succeed academically compared to students that do not have good relationship with their professors. Ullah and Wilson (2007) concluded that the relationship between a student their professor moderates the relationship between engagement and student success.

Current literature does not consider if TSX can moderate the relationship between CSE and SCBs. Research has indicated that high quality LMX leads to increased work performance and may lead to increased participation in OCBs (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Seo, 2017). Research also indicated that positive relationships with professors increases student performance (Ullah & Wilson 2007). It is likely that the relationship students have with professors may also impact a student's participation in positive behaviors, or SCBs. It is, therefore, hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 3: The relationship between CSE and student engagement in SCBs will be moderated by TSX such that those having a strong TSX relationship will be more likely to engage in SCBs as compared to those with a weak TSX relationship.

Current research also does not consider if TSX can moderate the relationship between CSE and CSBs. Seo (2017) suggested that when individuals had low quality LMX with their leaders, they were more likely to participate in CWBs. Buskirk-Cohen and Plants (2019) found that professor caring and involvement in student performance was correlated directly to academic performance. Since research indicates LMX moderates the relationship between CSE

and CWBs, it is also likely that TSX will moderate the relationship between CSE and CSBs. It is, therefore, hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 4: The relationship between CSE and student engagement in CSBs will be moderated by TSX such that those with a strong TSX relationship will be less likely to engage in CSBs as compared to those with a weak TSX relationship.

Methods

Participants

Participants were recruited via West Chester University's Psychology Department Research Participant Pool. A total of 185 participants completed the survey, however only participants whose peer also completed the survey and whose peer responses were valid were included in the data analysis. Validation of peer surveys was based on survey completion. Therefore, a total of 105 participant's data was retained. The majority of participants were between the ages of 18-25 years (99.0%) with 81.0% being female and 18.1% being male. The remaining 1.0% were aged 35+ years and did not provide data on gender. Participants mainly identified as being Caucasian (69.5%), with 17.1% Black/African American, 4.8% Asian American/Oriental/Pacific Islander, 4.8% Puerto-Rican, 2.9% Other, and 1.0% Other Hispanic. Participants were predominately first-year students (61.0%), with 21.0% sophomores, 13.3% juniors, and 4.8% Seniors.

The majority of peers were between the ages of 18-25 years (97.1%), with 1.9% between 26-35 years, and 1.0% were 35 years or older. Peers were 78.1% female, 19.0% males, and 2.9% other. Similar to participants, peers mainly identified as Caucasian (79.0%), with 13.3% Black/African American, 2.9% Asian America/Oriental/Pacific Islander, 1.9% Puerto-Rican, 1.9% Other, and 1.0% Mexican American/Chicano. Predominantly, peers were first-year students (61.0%), with 15.2 % sophomores, 13.3% seniors, 9.5% juniors, and 1.0% graduate students.

Measures

The participant survey consisted of 70 items and included the following measures: Core Self-Evaluation (CSE), Student Citizenship Behaviors (SCB), Counterproductive Student

Behaviors (CSB), Teacher-Student Exchange (TSX), and a brief demographics section. Each measure is described below.

Core Self-Evaluation Scale: The Core Self-Evaluation Scale is a 12-Item Scale developed by Judge, Erez, Bono, and Thoresen (2003) used to measure the five sub-categories of CSE including: self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, emotional stability, and locus of control. Items were measured on a five-point Likert scale anchored at *1=Strongly Disagree* to *5= Strongly Agree*. Example items are: *I am confident I get the success I deserve in life* and *Sometimes when I fail, I feel worthless.* Cronbach's alpha reliability of this measure was .82.

Student Citizenship Behaviors: This sixteen-item scale was adapted from the Organizational Citizenship Behavior developed by Lee and Allen (2002). The original scale measured tendencies toward performing OCBs directed toward the individual and the organization. Researchers adapted the scale to measure student citizenship behaviors directed toward individuals (SCBI) and the institution (SCBO). Items were measured on a five-point Likert scale anchored at *1=Never* to *5=Very Frequently*. An example item directed toward individuals is *Willingly gave your time to help other students who have school related problems.* An example item directed toward the institution is *Showed pride when representing the college/university in public.* Cronbach's alpha reliability for the measure was .86. The Cronbach's alpha reliability for the SCBI sub-scale was .80 and for the SCBO sub-scale was .82.

Counterproductive Student Behaviors: This 33-item measure was developed using items from two CWB scales, Gruys (1999) and Bennett and Robinson (2000) which were originally developed to measure workplace deviant behaviors. Items from these scales were adapted to measure counterproductive student behaviors at the institution level. Items were measured on a five-point Likert scale anchored at *1=Never* and 5=*Very Frequently*. Example

items are *Spread false rumors about the institution* and *Argued or fought with a professor*. Cronbach's alpha reliability of this measure was .86.

Teacher-Student Exchange: This eight-item scale was adapted from a scale by Mosley (2012) to measure quality of interactions between teachers and students. Two items that were not relevant to the purpose of the current study as they addresses how professors might return favors to students rather that focusing on relational criteria and were removed from the scale. Items were measured on a five-point Likert Scale anchored at *1=Strongly Disagree* to *5=Strongly Agree.* Example items include *My professors have confidence in my ideas* and *My professors have respect for my capabilities.* Cronbach's alpha reliability of this measure was .84.

Demographics: Participants were asked to answer four questions regarding their gender, age, racial ancestry, and current year in college.

The peer survey consisted of 50 items and included the following measures: Student Citizenship Behaviors, Counterproductive Student Behaviors, and a brief demographics section. Peers were also asked to provide the unique ID code provided by the researcher. Peers were asked to complete the items with respect to the participants' behaviors in college.

Student Citizenship Behaviors: This sixteen-item scale was the same scale provided to participants and measured the participants' citizenship behaviors directed toward individuals and the institution. Minor changes were made to the scale to prompt the peer to answer with respect to the participant. Like the participant scale, two sub-scales were used to measure behaviors toward individuals (SCBI) and the institution (SCBO) and items were measured on a five-point Likert scale anchored at *1=Never* to *5=Very Frequently*. An example item direct toward individuals is *Willingly gave their time to help other students who have school related problems.*

An example item directed toward the institution is *Showed pride when representing the college/university in public.* Cronbach's alpha reliability for the measure was .92. The Cronbach's alpha reliability for the SCBI sub-scale was .89 and for the SCBO sub-scale was .89.

Counterproductive Student Behaviors: This 33-item measure was the same scale provided to participants and measured the participants' counterproductive student behaviors at the institution level. Minor changes were made to prompt the peer to respond with respect to the participants' behaviors and items were measured on a five-point Likert scale anchored at *1=Never* and 5=*Very Frequently*. Example items are *Intentionally performed their work below acceptable standards* and *Lost their temper while in class.* Cronbach's alpha reliability of this measure was .97.

Demographics: Peers were asked to answer four questions regarding their gender, age, racial ancestry, and current year in college.

Procedure

Participants came into the lab during their scheduled lab time and were asked to review an information sheet provided electronically on desktop computers through Qualtrics survey software. Once participants reviewed the information sheet, they were asked to continue by selecting the "next" button, if they agreed to participate in the study. Upon consent, participants were asked to complete measures of core self-evaluation, citizenship behaviors, counterproductive behaviors, and teacher-member exchange and demographic measures. The survey took approximately 25-30 minutes to complete. Participants were asked to supply the researcher with the name and email address of a peer who would be willing to answer questions about the participant's behaviors after completion of the survey. The study specifically required

West Chester University email addresses to ensure that each email address was valid and to more easily pay peers for their participation. Participants were thanked for participation in the study and asked to inform their peer that they would be receiving an email from the PI to complete a survey and that upon completion and validation, the peer would receive a $5.00 gift card. After the participant left the lab, research assistants assigned credit to the participant via Sona tracking systems.

The PI sent an email to each peer with the link to complete the peer portion of the survey. The email included a unique identifier which was used to link the participant survey and peer survey. Each peer was asked to review an information sheet about the study and provide consent in order to complete the survey. Once consent was obtained, participants were asked to input the unique identifier provided in the email they received from the PI. Each peer was asked to complete a survey regarding the participant's tendency to participate in citizenship behaviors and counterproductive behaviors and informed that their responses could not be accessed by the participant. Once peers had completed the survey, their responses were validated, and $5.00 gift cards were distributed electronically as compensation. Peers were identified only by their unique ID and those who did not complete the survey did not receive compensation. Follow-up emails were sent to peers asking for participation in 2-week intervals. Participants and peers could not access each other's responses to the survey.

Results

Table 1 reports means, standard deviations, and correlations among study variables.

Table 1: Intercorrelations Among Study Variables (*N*=105)

Variable	*M*	*SD*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*
1. CSE	3.623	0.43865	**0.82**					
2. Participant SCB	3.0475	0.63071	0.1	**0.86**				
3. Peer SCB	2.3141	0.39177	0.042	-0.127	**0.92**			
4. Participant CSB	1.3219	0.23936	-.220*	0.18	0.086	**0.86**		
5. Peer CSB	1.2365	0.45719	0.056	-0.036	0.187	0.129	**0.97**	
6. TSX	3.8155	0.50302	.210*	.438**	0.003	-0.044	0.055	**0.84**

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Reliability coefficients are indicated in Bold on the diagonal.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that core self-evaluation will be positively related to participation in student citizenship behaviors. A regression analysis with CSE as the predictor and participant SCB as the dependent variable indicated non-significant results, R^2=.01, F(1,103)=1.031, *n.s.* Additionally, when a regression analysis was performed with CSE as the predictor and peer ratings of SCB as the dependent variable non-significant results were indicated, R^2=.003, F(1,103)=.181, *n.s* Thus, Hypothesis 1 was not supported.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that core self-evaluation will be negatively related to participation in counterproductive student behaviors. A regression analysis with CSE as the predictor and participant CSB as the dependent variable indicated a significant result, R^2=.048, F(1,103)=5.241, p =.024, suggesting that CSE can be used to predict participants' responses to participation in CSBs. When a regression analysis was performed with CSE as the predictor and peer ratings of CSB as the dependent variable non-significant results were indicated, R^2=.003, F(1,103)=.326, *n.s.* Thus, Hypothesis 2 was partially supported as results suggest that CSE is related to participants' ratings of participation in CSB but is not related to peers' ratings of participant CSB.

Hypothesis 3 proposed that the relationship between CSE and student engagement in SCBs will be moderated by TSX such that those having strong TSX relationship, will be more likely to engage in SCBs as compared to those with weak TSX relationship. To test this hypothesis, a regression analysis was conducted with CSE and TSX as predictors, in the second step of the analysis an interaction term between CSE and TSX was included in the model. Participant SCB was used as the dependent variable. Results were not significant, R^2=.01, F(1,102)=.393, *n.s.* Additionally, when peer SCB ratings replaced participant SCB ratings in the regression analysis, non-significant results were obtained, R^2=.004, F(1,102)=.088, *n.s.* Thus,

Hypothesis 3 was not supported and there was no significant evidence to suggest that CSE and student engagement in SCBs is moderated by TSX.

Hypothesis 4 proposed that the relationship between CSE and student engagement in CSBs will be moderated by TSX such that those with strong TSX relationship will be less likely to engage in CSBs as compared to those with weak TSX relationship. To test this hypothesis, a regression analysis was conducted with CSE and TSX as predictors, in the second step of analysis and interaction term between CSE and TSX was included in the model. Participant CSB was used as the dependent variable. Results were not significant, R^2=.05, F(1,102)=.98, *n.s.* Additionally, when peer CSB ratings replaced participant CSB ratings in the regression analysis, non-significant results were obtained, R^2=.004, F(1,102)=.088, *n.s.* Thus, Hypothesis 4 was not supported and there was no significant evidence to suggest that CSE and student engagement in CSBs is moderated by TSX.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate if core self-evaluation can be used to predict student citizenship behaviors and counterproductive student behaviors. It was hypothesized that CSE would be positively related to participation in SCBs and negatively related to student participation in CSBs. This study also introduced the term Teacher-Student Exchange (TSX) as a moderator of the relationship between CSE and SCBs and CSE and CSBs. It was hypothesized that the relationship between CSE and student engagement in SCBs will be moderated by TSX such that those having strong TSX relationship, will be more likely to engage in SCBs as compared to those with weak TSX relationship. Additionally, it was hypothesized that the relationship between CSE and student engagement in CSBs will be moderated by TSX such that those with strong TSX relationship will be less likely to engage in CSBs as compared to those with weak TSX relationship.

While literature has shown that CSE has positive relationships with OCBs (Dietl & Meurs, 2019; Xu and Yu, 2019), and that there are similarities between OCBs and SCBs, (Meriac 2012; Schwager et. al., 2014), the first hypothesis, proposing that CSE would positively predict SCBs, was not supported. Based on the data collected, most participants were in their first year of college and completed this study to receive research credit. It is possible that first-year students are more focused on adjusting themselves to college life and do not have the ability or time to complete student citizenship behaviors. Additionally, this research chose to focus on volunteering and tutoring activities as SCBs directed at individuals. Tutoring is typically reserved for upper level classes and first-year students may not feel qualified to do so. There is a potential for other behaviors, such as small act of kindness that students are performing that may better represent SCBs specifically for first-year students. LePine, Erex, and Johnson (2002)

suggest there are five factors of OCBs. Perhaps SCBs are also multidimensional and the behaviors the students engage in are dependent upon their college experience. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach, (2002) suggest that OCBs are the result of satisfaction with and feelings of loyalty toward the company. There is a possibility that at the start of their college year, students may not have developed such strong feelings and therefore there is a likelihood that they did not participate in as many SCBs during their college years.

The literature also suggested that CSE could be used as a predictor of CSBs (Kluemper, McLarty, & Bing, 2015; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). It was hypothesized that CSE would negatively predict student participation in CSBs. According to the data, there is evidence to support this hypothesis. This suggests that institutions could use CSE measures to identify students at risk of participating in CSBs and address concerns as needed. This may come in the form of additional mentorship from professors or peer mentorships which would provide students with feelings of belonging. If institutions can address these concerns early, students may be less likely to perform CSBs frequently and might reduce the college drop-out rates. Reducing the frequency of participation in CWBs would potentially result in a more successful student academically, and in the workforce. It would provide students with the knowledge they need to succeed in the workplace and how their individual skills can be used. Additionally, these students may attribute their success to the efforts of the university providing a positive image of the college and increase the institution's reputation.

The research also introduced Teacher-Student Exchange (TSX) to the literature to describe the quality of relationship students have with their professors. Research has indicated that the relationships students have with their professors can greatly impact success in academics and participation in positive and negative behaviors (Gross et. al., 2015; Ullah & Willson, 2007).

It was hypothesized that TSX would moderate the relationship between CSE and SCB such that those with strong TSX relationship will participate in more SCBs compared to those with weak TSX relationships. Results did not support this hypothesis. It was also hypothesized that TSX would moderate the relationship between CSE and CSB such that those with strong TSX would be less likely to participate in CSBs compared to those with weak TSX relationships. Results also did not support this hypothesis. Although the literature suggests that strong relationships with professors results in academic success, it is possible that it does not moderate the relationship between CSE and SCBs and CSE and CSBs but mediates or confounds the relationship. TSX might explain the relationships between CSE and SCBs and CSE and CSBs rather that influence the strength of the relationship. TSX may also be an additional variable that can predict participation in SCBs and CSBs and is, therefore, confounding.

However, based on the sample demographics, it can be argued that students did not have the time to foster strong relationships with their professors and therefore this may have led to a weak TSX relationship. Again, most participants identified as first year students, who would not have had the amount of time it takes to foster strong relationships with professors and feel as though they know their professors well enough to respond to a survey. Older students who have declared majors or have had the chance to work more closely with professors may feel more support from their professors. They may feel that their professors are confident in their work and want them to succeed as opposed to a first-year student who does not know their professors well enough to gauge whether or not their professors are the right mentors for them. Future research should look at the role of TSX on student participation in SCBs and CSBs over a period of time such as from first year of college to senior year of college.

Limitations and Future Directions

As with all research, the current study had some limitations. Specifically, the majority of participants were first-year students. During the first year or college, students are typically trying to determine a major, adapt to college life, and build relationships in terms of friends, professors, mentors, and advisors. While managing these changes, first-year students may not be frequently participating in student citizenship behaviors due to the necessity to strive as an individual. Additionally, these students may not have had the time to develop strong relationships with their peers or professors. Especially with first-year students, professors are typically not the mentors and advisors that they will develop strong relationships with and work with closely. These relationships typically begin once a student has declared a major and decides what path they want to choose for their career. Future research should focus on recruiting participants who are further along in their education or even recruiting participants who are in their sophomore, junior and senior years to get a more representative college student population. For example, participants should be recruited from current senior students and compared to data from first-year students to identify difference in participation in SCBs and OCBs. In such a study, researchers could also compare the TSX quality with first-year students and seniors.

An additional limitation to this student was with the data collection process. As mentioned, participants were asked to provide the name and email address for a peer who could respond to a survey regarding the participants' behaviors at school. As first-year students, participants may not have developed strong relationships with peers who could respond to the survey confidently. This method was chosen to confirm email addresses; however, future research should attempt to collect peer data from individuals that can confidently respond to survey questions regarding the participant. Additionally, researchers may want to collect data

from other sources, including mentors, professors, or supervisors. This data will provide a more holistic view of participant behaviors.

Future research should also take into account the different types of students entering college and going into the workforce. As institutions become more diverse, student populations include non-traditional students such as transfer students, distance education students, student veterans, students with disabilities, and many other categories. While it may be difficult to collect data for all student categories, information regarding students can greatly impact their interactions with peers, professors, and other staff. This might also be linked to ability to participate in certain positive and negative behaviors. For example, a non-traditional student may not be able to participate in as many SCBs at college because they have a full-time job or family that prevents them from spending additional time on campus other than completing coursework. These labels may also impact participants' core self-evaluations, so research in this area would help to provide information on how institution could better approach certain student populations and ensure they are prepared for the workforce once they have completed their studies.

In conclusion, the current study provided evidence that core self-evaluation could be used to predict student participation in counterproductive student behaviors, but all other results failed to be significant. Institutions can use this information to identify students who are at risk of participating in these negative behaviors and address behaviors effectively to ensure students are feeling valued and prepared to move into the workforce upon graduation or to figure out their future plans. Especially in institutions that have first-year experience courses, using CSE could provide meaningful and important information regarding students and help the student and professor to work together to build an impactful college experience geared toward the student's interests and needs. This process can aid in the success of the student at college and ensure they

reach their goal. This will ultimately provide organizations with well-prepared, successful graduates to work in their organizations. Organizations can then use these initial efforts of the institutions to form successful and confident employees. This would ultimately result in increased reputation of the institution and the organization and likely increased revenue and support.

References

Albert, M. A., & Dahling, J. J. (2016). Learning goal orientation and locus of control interact to predict academic self-concept and academic performance in college students. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *97*, 245–248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.03.074

Arya, B. (2013). Correlates of counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, *39*(1), 95-102.

Bal Tastan, S. (2014). Examination of the Relationship Between Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Quality and Employee Job Performance in the Moderating Context of Perceived Role Ambiguity. *International Journal of Management Economics and Business*,*10*(22), 211-233.

Basow, S. A., Codos, S., & Martin, J. L. (2013). The effects of professors' race and gender on student evaluations and performance. *College Student Journal*, *47*(2), 352–363.

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job Satisfaction and the Good Soldier: The Relationship between Affect and Employee Citizenship. Academic and Management Journal, 26, 587 595. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/255908

Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*: 410-424

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, *10*(2), 99–109. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002pass:[_]3

Buskirk-Cohen, A., & Plants, A. (2019). Caring About Success: Students' Perceptions of Professors' Caring Matters More Than Grit. *International Journal of Teaching & Learning in Higher Education, 31*(1), 108–114. Retrieved from https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=shib&db=eue&AN=13096529&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Camara, W., & Echternacht, G. (2000). The SAT I and high school grades: Utility in predicting success in college (College Board Report No. RN–10). New York: *College Entrance Examination Board*

Chang, C.-H., Ferris, D. L., Johnson, R. E., Rosen, C. C., & Tan, J. A. (2012). Core Self Evaluations: A Review and Evaluation of the Literature. *Journal of Management,* 38(1), 81–128. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311419661

Chiaburu, D. S., Oh, I.-S., Berry, C. M., Li, N., & Gardner, R. G. (2011). The five-factor model of personality traits and organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*(6), 1140–1166. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024004

Côté, S., DeCelles, K. A., McCarthy, J. M., Van Kleef, G. A., & Hideg, I. (2011). The Jekyll and Hyde of emotional intelligence: Emotion-regulation knowledge facilitates both prosocial and interpersonally deviant behavior. *Psychological Science, 22*(8), 1073–1080. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611416251

Dalal, R. S. 2005. A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 90: 1241-1255

Dansereau Jr., Fred. (1975). A Vertical Dyad Linkage Approach to Leadership within Formal Organizations. A Longitudinal Investigation of the Role Making Process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance., 13*(1), 46-78

Debusscher, J., Hofmans, J., & De Fruyt, F. (2016). The effect of state core self-evaluations on task performance, organizational citizenship behaviour, and counterproductive work behaviour. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *25*(2), 301–315. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2015.1063486

Dietl, E., & Meurs, J. A. (2019). Implicit core self-evaluations and work outcomes: Validating an indirect measure. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *92*(1), 169 190. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12244

Ding, Y., Laux, J., Salyers, K., & Kozelka, S. (2017). Personality and graduate academic performance among counselor education and school psychology students. *School Psychology Forum: Research in Practice*, *11*(3), 105–122. Retrieved from https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=shib&db=psyh&AN=2 18-17176-003&site=ehost-live&scope=site&custid=s3916018

Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist*, 41, 1040–1048.

Erez, A., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations to goal setting, motivation, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(6), 1270–1279. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.6.1270

Furnham, A., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2004). Personality and intelligence as predictors of statistics examination grades. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 943–955. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2003.10.016

Geiser, S., & Studley, R. (2002). UC and the SAT: Predictive Validity and Differential Impact of the SAT I and SAT II at the University of California. *Educational Assessment*, *8*(1), 1 26. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326977EA0801pass:[_]0

Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-Analytic review of leader–member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*(6), 827–844. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.6.827

Gross, J., Lakey, B., Lucas, J. L., LaCross, R., Plotkowski, A. R., & Winegard, B. (2015). Forecasting the student–professor matches that result in unusually effective teaching. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *85*(1), 19–32. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12049

Gruys, M. L., & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11, 30–41.

Indarti, S., Solimun, Fernandes, A. A. R., & Hakim, W. (2017). The effect of OCB in relationship between personality, organizational commitment and job satisfaction on performance. *Journal of Management Development*, *36*(10), 1283–1293. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-11-2016-0250

Joo, B.-K., & Jo, S. J. (2017). The effects of perceived authentic leadership and core self- on organizational citizenship behavior: The role of psychological empowerment as a partial

mediator. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *38*(3), 463–481. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-11-2015-0254

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Erez, A., & Locke, E. A. (2005). Core Self-Evaluations and Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Self-Concordance and Goal Attainment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*(2), 257–268. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.2.257

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E., & Thoresen, C. J. (2003). The Core Self-Evaluations Scale: Development of a measure. *Personnel Psychology*, *56*(2), 303-331. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00152.x

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*(1), 17–34. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.1.17

Kacmar, K. M., Collins, B. J., Harris, K. J., & Judge, T. A. (2009). Core self-evaluations and job performance: The role of the perceived work environment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(6), 1572–1580. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017498

Kluemper, D. H., McLarty, B. D., & Bing, M. N. (2015). Acquaintance ratings of the Big Five personality traits: Incremental validity beyond and interactive effects with self-reports in the prediction of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(1), 237–248. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037810.supp (Supplemental)

Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(1), 131–142. doi:10.1037/0021- 9010.87.1.131

LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(1), 52–65. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.52

Lin, W., Lin, C., & Chang, Y. (2017). The impact of coaching orientation on subordinate performance: the moderating effects of implicit person theory and LMX. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, *55*(1), 86–105. https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12107

Lounsbury, J. W., Sundstrom, E., Loveland, J. M., & Gibson, L. W. (2003). Intelligence, "Big Five" personality traits, and work drive as predictors of course grade. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 1231–1239. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00330-6

Martin, R., Guillaume, Y., Thomas, G., Lee, A., & Epitropaki, O. (2016). Leader–member exchange (LMX) and performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, *69*(1), 67–121. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12100

Ménard, J., Brunet, L., & Savoie, A. (2011). Interpersonal workplace deviance: Why do offenders act out? A comparative look on personality and organizational variables. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement*, *43*(4), 309–317. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024741

Meriac, J. P. (2012). Work ethic and academic performance: Predicting citizenship and counterproductive behavior. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *22*(4), 549–553. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2012.03.015

Milner, K., Katz, L.-A., Fisher, J., & Notrica, V. (2007). Gender and the Quality of the Leader Member Exchange: Findings from a South African Organization. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 37(2), 316–329. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630703700207

Morphew, C., & Hartley, M. (2006). Mission Statements: A Thematic Analysis of Rhetoric across Institutional Type. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *77*(3), 456-471. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3838697

Muhammad Hafidz, S. W., Mohd Hoesni, S., & Omar, F. (2012). The relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Asian Social Science*, *8*(9), 32-37. https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n9p57

Neves, P., & Champion, S. (2015). Core self-evaluations and workplace deviance: The role of resources and self-regulation. *European Management Journal*, *33*(5), 381–391. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2015.06.001

Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2009). How broadly does education contribute to job performance? *Personnel Psychology*, *62*(1), 89–134. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744 6570.2008.01130.x

Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, *48*(4), 775–802. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *1*(2), 107–142. https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7

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

Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(1), 66–80. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021 9010.87.1.66

Rushton, J. P., & Jensen, A. R. (2006). The Totality of Available Evidence Shows the Race IQ Gap Still Remains. *Psychological Science*, *17*(10), 921–922. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01803.x

Schwager, I. T. L., Hülsheger, U. R., Lang, J. W. B., Klieger, D. M., Bridgeman, B., & Wendler, C. (2014). Supervisor ratings of students' academic potential as predictors of citizenship and counterproductive behavior. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *35*, 62–69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2014.07.005

Seo, J. (2017). *The effects of leader-member exchange (LMX) social comparisons on employees' work behaviors*. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*. ProQuest Information & Learning. Retrieved from https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=shib&db=psyh&AN=2 16-53070-054&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Simkin, M. G., & McLeod, A. (2010). Why do college students cheat? *Journal of Business Ethics*, *94*(3), 441–453. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0275-x

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*(4), 653-663.

Tavousi, M. N., & Sharifi, M. M. (2017). Core Self-Evaluations Scale: The formation of a construct. *Developmental Psychology: Journal of Iranian Psychologists*, *13*(51), 245 256. Retrieved from https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=shib&db=psyh&AN=2 17-34954-002&site=ehost-live&scope=site&custid=s3916018

Truckenbrodt, Y. B. (2001). *An empirical assessment of the relationship between leader member exchange and organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior*. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*. ProQuest Information & Learning. Retrieved from https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=shib&db=psyh&AN=2 01-95005-090&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Ullah, H., & Wilson, M. A. (2007). Students' Academic Success and Its Association to Student Involvement with Learning and Relationships with Faculty and Peers. *College Student Journal*, *41*(4), 1192–1202. Retrieved from https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=shib&db=eue&AN=50 023110&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Xu, X., & Yu, K. (2019). When core self-evaluation leads to career adaptability: Effects of ethical leadership and implications for citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2018.1564724

Zettler, I. (2011). Self-control and academic performance: Two field studies on university citizenship behavior and counterproductive academic behavior. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *21*(1), 119–123. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2010.11.002

Appendices

Appendix A

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
West Chester University | Ehinger Annex
West Chester, PA 19383 |
610-436-3557 www.wcupa.edu

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION PACKAGE
REVISED COMMON RULE
Effective 1/21/2019

The application package should be **one** Microsoft Word document assembled in the following order:

1. Section I: Project Information – Fill in all appropriate information and check all appropriate boxes under review categories.
2. Section II: Detailed Protocol – Concise, complete responses following each individually lettered request for information. Include all information requested.
3. Completed Checklist
4. Section III: Signatures (accepted forms of signature include: scans of original signatures, electronic signatures, and typed signatures)
5. Appropriate Informed Consent Form(s).
6. Any research instrument used (questionnaire, survey, psychological test, etc.).
7. Letters of approval from participating institutions, if any. (must be on institution letter head with signature)
8. External support proposal, if any (one only, attached to the application with original signatures). Do not include the budget.
9. CITI human subject training completion certificate. Please visit http://www.wcupa.edu/research/irb.aspx for more information.

Submission Instructions: Visit http://wcupa.edu/research/irb.aspx for more information.

1. Please e-mail complete application and all attachments as **one** Microsoft Word document to irb@wcupa.edu. A submission containing multiple files will not be accepted. The IRB cannot edit or add to your application once submitted. It is suggested you keep a complete editable copy, preferably electronic, in case revisions are necessary.

2. Once your application passes initial vetting (2-4 business days), you will receive an e-mail stating that your application has been forwarded to a committee member for review. You will then be provided contact information for your reviewer and an estimated time for approval.

3. Any questions or concerns regarding your review can be sent directly to your reviewer.

* All PI's, co-PI's, and faculty sponsors submitting a protocol to the IRB are required to provide evidence of CITI human subject training. Please Visit: http://www.wcupa.edu/research/irb.aspx for more information. Training must have been completed no more than 3 years from date of this application.

Please note:

- If you have any additions or changes in procedures involving human subjects, it is required to revise your IRB application with the amendments and submit to the IRB as a revision (i.e., under I.G. check off that the submission is a *revision*). Please note that your revised application will go through IRB office's routine application processing. You cannot employ the revisions until you receive IRB approval of your revised application submission.

- Any and all adverse effects to the human subjects are required to be brought to the attention of the IRB immediately and in writing.

- All IRB protocols as Full Board Review and some expedited will be required to undergo a continuing review process at an interval that is no more than one year from the protocol approval date.

Any questions regarding this form can be directed to the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at irb@wcupa.edu or 610-436-3557

WCU Institutional Review Board Application Form

Section I: Project Information

Application Date:	**August 21, 2019**		
Research Project Period: From	September 20, 2019 (Upon IRB Approval)	To	September 20, 2020
(Research cannot begin until IRB approval and analysis should be complete before closing the protocol)			

I.A Principal Investigator Name:	Holly Gasper			Email:	HG829826@wcupa.edu
College:	West Chester University	Department:	Psychology	Phone:	570-614-4118
Date of IRB (CITI) Training:	July 24, 2019	(Must attach CITI completion report)			
Mailing Address (If PI is a student):	183 Carey Drive, West Chester, PA 19383				

Co- Principal Investigator Name:				Email:	
College:		Department:		Phone:	
Date of IRB (CITI) Training:		(Must attach CITI completion report)			

Co- Principal Investigator Name:				Email:	
College:		Department:		Phone:	
Date of IRB (CITI) Training:		(Must attach CITI completion report)			

Research Team					
Student Investigator Name:	Shereese Richardson	Role:	Research Assistant	Email:	sr898058@wcupa.edu
Date of IRB (CITI) Training:	January 28, 2019	(Must attach CITI completion report)			
Student Investigator Name:	Leah Hamidian	Role:	Research Assistant	Email:	lh873141@wcupa.edu
Date of IRB (CITI) Training:	July 31, 2019	(Must attach CITI completion report)			
Student Investigator Name:	Justin Schwoerer	Role:	Research Assistant	Email:	JS815586@wcupa.edu
Date of IRB (CITI) Training:	August 25, 2018	(Must attach CITI completion report)			
Student Investigator Name:	Sarah Blose	Role:	Research Assistant	Email:	sb887741@wcupa.edu
Date of IRB (CITI) Training:	July 21, 2019	(Must attach CITI completion report)			

Student Investigator Name:	Patrick Allen	Role:	Research Assistant	Email:	pa940344@wcupa.edu
Date of IRB (CITI) Training:	August 15, 2019	(Must attach CITI completion report)			

I.D Title of Project:	A Study of Core Self-Evaluation, Student Citizenship Behaviors, and Counterproductive Student Behaviors

I.E If the Principal Investigator is a student, provide the following:					
Faculty Sponsor:	Dr. Vipanchi Mishra		Email:	VMishra@wcupa.edu	
College:	West Chester University	Department:	Psychology	Phone:	610-430-5942
Date of IRB (CITI) Training:	August 1, 2018	(Must attach CITI completion report)			

I.F Has this project previously been considered by the IRB?	Yes:		No:	X
If yes, approximate date of review:				

I.G For previously approved protocols only: Check if submission is a	renewal		revision	
Protocol ID# of original submission:				

I.H Review Category:

Please check (or place an "X") in **either Exempt, Expedited, or Full Board Review** based on the categories below the review designations. Mark any items that may apply under the selected review designation:

_X_ **Exempt Review** (based on the following AMENDED categories):

___(1) Research, conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, that specifically involves normal educational practices that are not likely to adversely impact students' opportunity to learn required educational content or the assessment of educators who provide instruction. This includes most research on regular and special education instructional strategies, and research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

_X_ (2) Research that only includes interactions involving educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior (including visual or auditory recording) if at least one of the following criteria is met:

__(i) The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects cannot readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects;

___(ii) Any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research would not reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, educational advancement, or reputation; or

_X_ (iii) The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects can readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects, and an IRB conducts a ***limited IRB review*** to make the determination required by §__.111(a)(7)

___(3)(i) Research involving benign behavioral interventions in conjunction with the collection of information from an adult subject through verbal or written responses (including data entry) or audiovisual recording if the subject prospectively agrees to the intervention and information collection and at least one of the following criteria is met:

___(A) The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects cannot readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects;

___(B) Any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research would not reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, educational advancement, or reputation; or

___(C) The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects can readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects, and an IRB conducts a ***limited IRB review*** to make the determination required by §__.111(a)(7).

(ii) For the purpose of this provision, benign behavioral interventions are brief in duration, harmless, painless, not physically invasive, not likely to have a significant adverse lasting impact on the subjects, and the investigator has no reason to think the subjects will find the interventions offensive or embarrassing. Provided all such criteria are met, examples of such benign behavioral interventions would include having the subjects play an online game, having them solve puzzles under various noise conditions, or having them decide how to allocate a nominal amount of received cash between themselves and someone else.

(iii) If the research involves deceiving the subjects regarding the nature or purposes of the research, this exemption is not applicable unless the subject authorizes the deception through a prospective agreement to participate in research in circumstances in which the subject is informed that he or she will be unaware of or misled regarding the nature or purposes of the research.

___(4) Secondary research for which consent is not required: Secondary research uses of identifiable private information or identifiable biospecimens, if at least one of the following criteria is met:

(i) The identifiable private information or identifiable biospecimens are publicly available;

(ii) Information, which may include information about biospecimens, is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects cannot readily be ascertained directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects, the investigator does not contact the subjects, and the investigator will not re-identify subjects;

(iii) The research involves only information collection and analysis involving the investigator's use of identifiable health information when that use is regulated under 45 CFR parts 160 and 164, subparts A and E, for the purposes of "health care operations" or "research" as those terms are defined at 45 CFR 164.501 or for "public health activities and purposes" as described under 45 CFR 164.512(b); or

(iv) The research is conducted by, or on behalf of, a Federal department or agency using government-generated or government-collected information obtained for nonresearch activities, if the research generates identifiable private information that is or will be maintained on information technology that is subject to and in compliance with section 208(b) of the E-Government Act of 2002, 44 U.S.C. 3501 note, if all of the identifiable private information collected, used, or generated as part of the activity will be maintained in systems of records subject to the Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a, and, if applicable, the information used in the research was collected subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.

___(5) Research and demonstration projects that are conducted or supported by a Federal department or agency, or otherwise subject to the approval of department or agency heads (or the approval of the heads of bureaus or other subordinate agencies that have been delegated authority to conduct the research and demonstration projects), and that are designed to study, evaluate, improve, or otherwise examine public benefit or service programs, including procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs, possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures, or possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs. Such projects include, but are not limited to, internal studies by Federal employees, and studies under contracts or consulting arrangements, cooperative agreements, or grants. Exempt projects also include waivers of otherwise mandatory requirements using authorities such as sections 1115 and 1115A of the Social Security Act, as amended. (i) Each Federal department or agency conducting or supporting the research and demonstration projects must establish, on a publicly accessible Federal Web site or in such other manner as the department or agency head may determine, a list of the research and demonstration projects that the Federal department or agency conducts or supports under this provision. The research or demonstration project must be published on this list prior to commencing the research involving human subjects.

___ (6) Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies:

(i) If wholesome foods without additives are consumed, or

(ii) If a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the

Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

___Expedited Review *Skip this section if the Exempt category above applies.

Does the Research Present **no more than minimal risk** to human subjects and involve only the procedures described in one or more of the categories below: (please choose)

___Collection of blood samples by finger stick, heel stick, ear stick, or venipuncture as follows:

(a) from healthy, nonpregnant adults who weigh at least 110 pounds. For these subjects, the amounts drawn may not exceed 550 ml in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week; or

(b)from other adults and children, considering the age, weight, and health of the subjects, the collection procedure, the amount of blood to be collected, and the frequency with which it will be collected. For these subjects, the amount drawn may not exceed the lesser of 50 ml or 3 ml per kg in an 8-week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week.

___Prospective collection of biological specimens for research purposes by noninvasive means.

Examples: (a) hair and nail clippings in a non-disfiguring manner; (b) deciduous teeth at time of exfoliation or if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction; (c) permanent teeth if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction; (d) excreta and external secretions (including sweat); (e) uncannulated saliva collected either in an unstimulated fashion or stimulated by chewing gumbase or wax or by applying a dilute citric solution to the tongue; (f) placenta removed at delivery; (g) amniotic fluid obtained at the time of rupture of the membrane prior to or during labor; (h) supra- and subgingival dental plaque and calculus, provided the collection procedure is not more invasive than routine prophylactic scaling of the teeth and the process is accomplished in accordance with accepted prophylactic techniques; (i) mucosal and skin cells collected by buccal scraping or swab, skin swab, or mouth washings; (j) sputum collected after saline mist nebulization.

___Collection of data through noninvasive procedures (not involving general anesthesia or sedation) routinely employed in clinical practice, excluding procedures involving x-rays or microwaves. Where medical devices are employed, they must be cleared/approved for marketing. (Studies intended to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of the medical device are not generally eligible for expedited review, including studies of cleared medical devices for new indications.)

Examples: (a) physical sensors that are applied either to the surface of the body or at a distance and do not involve input of significant amounts of energy into the subject or an invasion of the subject=s privacy; (b) weighing or testing sensory acuity; (c) magnetic resonance imaging; (d) electrocardiography, electroencephalography, thermography, detection of naturally occurring radioactivity, electroretinography, ultrasound, diagnostic infrared imaging, doppler blood flow, and echocardiography; (e) moderate exercise, muscular strength testing, body composition assessment, and flexibility testing where appropriate given the age, weight, and health of the individual.

___Research involving materials (data, documents, records, or specimens) that have been collected, or will be collected solely for non-research purposes (such as medical treatment or diagnosis). (NOTE: Some research in this category may be exempt from the HHS regulations for the protection of human subjects. 45 CFR 46.101(b)(4). This listing refers only to research that is not exempt.)

___Collection of data from voice, video, digital, or image recordings made for research purposes.

___Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies. (NOTE: Some research in this category may be exempt from the HHS regulations for the protection of human subjects. 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) and (b)(3). This listing refers only to research that is not exempt.)

___**Full Board Review** (check if none of the above applies)

I.I If your project involves any of the following as subjects, please check:		
		pregnant women
		prisoners or other persons under the supervision of the criminal justice system
		children
		fetuses
		elderly persons
		non-English speaking persons
		persons with acute and/or severe mental or physical illness

I.J Is this research being undertaken with any non-WCU organization?		Yes	X	No
If yes, name of cooperating institution:				
If yes, attach letter of approval from the cooperating institution (signed on letterhead)				

I.K Has a proposal for external support been submitted?		Yes	X	No
If yes, please provide the title of the proposal:				
If yes, please provide the funding source:				
If yes, is notification of IRB approval required?		Yes		No

Section II: Detailed Protocol: PLEASE PROVIDE COMPLETE ANSWERS TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:
(NOTE: Please keep headings, and type or cut and paste your text below each heading.)

A. **OVERVIEW/PURPOSE:** Provide a brief summary of the proposed research in lay terms**.** Include brief background (with citations), major hypotheses (if appropriate), research questions, and research design.

The main purpose of this study is to investigate the influence of core self-evaluations on the tendency for students to participate in positive behaviors, Student Citizenship Behaviors (e.g. volunteering and tutoring), and negative behaviors, Counterproductive Student Behaviors (e.g. defacing college property, missing class, and cheating).Core Self-Evaluation (CSE) is defined in the literature as a broad personality trait consisting of four factors: self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, Emotional Stability, and locus of control (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1988; Judge, Bono, Erez, & Locke, 2005). Current research has shown that Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Counterproductive Work Behaviors can be predicted using CSE and other personality traits (Dietl & Meurs, 2019; Xu & Yu, 2019). In organizational context, CSE has been positively related to employee participation in Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) and negatively related to their engagement in Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWBs). This topic has not been researched significantly in the academic context. Research has shown that personality traits can be used to predict student participation in positive and negative behaviors; however, a measure of Core Self-Evaluation has not been used to predict these behaviors It is suggested that student citizenship behaviors are similar to organizational citizenship behaviors and counterproductive student behaviors are similar to counterproductive work behaviors. Hence, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 1: Core self-evaluation will positively predict student engagement in citizenship behaviors at school.
Hypothesis 2: Core self-evaluation will negatively predict student engagement in counterproductive behaviors at school

Leader-Member Exchange posits that relationship between a leader and member affects how the member performs. LMX may also influence participation in citizenship behaviors and counterproductive behaviors (Dansereau, 1975, Milner et al., 2007). LMX has been shown to act as a moderator between personality measures and participation in OCBs and CWBs (Martin, Guillaume, Thomas, Lee, & Epitropaki, 2016). Education research has often suggested that the relationship a student has with their professor might influence the students' academic performance (Ullah & Wilson, 2007). Borrowing from the literature in organizational context, the present study proposes the term Teacher-Student Exchange (TSX) to summarize this relationship and seeks to establish TSX as a moderator between CSE and participation in SCBs and CSBs. It is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 3: The relationship between CSE and student engagement in SCBs will be moderated by TSX such that those having strong TSX relationship, will be more likely to engage in SCBs as compared to those with weak TSX relationship.
Hypothesis 4: The relationship between CSE and student engagement in CSBs will be moderated by TSX such that those with strong TSX relationship will be less likely to engage in CSBs as compared to those with weak TSX relationship.

This study utilizes a cross-sectional design, in which data will be collected at one point in time by participants and their peers. Student participants will complete a survey that will include measures of core self-evaluation, student citizenship behaviors, counterproductive student behaviors, and teacher-student exchange. The survey will be administered via Qulatrics software platform, student will complete the survey in a computer lab in the Psychology Department. Students peers will be asked to complete a survey regarding the student's behaviors including a measure of student citizenship behavior and counterproductive student behavior. The peer will receive this survey via email collected from the student.

B. **PARTICIPANTS:** Describe the source(s) of participants and the selection criteria. Include inclusion/exclusion criteria for selection and why this population is appropriate for the study. Include approximate number of participants. Also specifically, how will you obtain potential participants, and how will you contact them? As an Appendix - include a copy of all emails, flyers, advertisements, etc. that you will use to invite people to participate. Will any compensation or incentives be given for participation? If so, what?

Participants will be recruited from the Psychology Department Subject Pool, for participation in this survey. The study will be advertised on the sona-system website which is the psychology research participant pool website. Since this study requires the participant to also provide information regarding a peer, the participants themselves will receive 1 research credit for participation in the study and their peer will receive $5.00 compensation via an online gift card upon completion of the survey. Students under the age of 18 will be excluded from participation in this survey either as a subject or as a peer. Participants will be asked to come to Psychology Lab in Wayne Hall 335 to complete the survey through Qualtrics. At the end of the survey they will be asked to provide the email address of a peer who is currently enrolled at WCU, who will also be completing a survey regarding the participant. A separate Qualtrics link will be emailed to each peer to complete the survey regarding the participant Please see attachments for an email script to peers. The participant and peer will have a unique identifying code to link their responses. Approximately 100 pairs of students (200 individuals) will be recruited for this study.

C. **INFORMED CONSENT PROCESS**: Describe the consent process step by step, include who will be doing the consenting process, where, etc.

(or if you are applying for a waiver of consent, provide detailed justification for the requested waiver. (see 45 CFR 46.116(c) and/or 45 CFR 46.116(d) for waiver guidelines.)

Attach a copy of all consent documents as an Appendix after Section III, Signatures Page – do not include it in this section.

Participants will be asked to complete the study through a Qualtrics survey administered via a computer. Before starting the survey, each participant will be required to read an information sheet describing the purpose of the research study. By selecting to continue on in the survey, participants will be providing their consent to participate in the study. Both the student and the student's peer will be provided with a copy of the information sheet at the beginning of the survey (See the attachments for Informed Consent Form for both participant and peer).

D. **PROCEDURES**: Provide a step-by-step description of each procedure, including the frequency, duration, and location of each procedure. Include specific information about the participants' time and effort commitment. Also include all data collection instruments (e.g., surveys, questionnaires, scripts, data collection sheets, interview questions, audio/video recording methods). Explain how the data will be analyzed.

Individuals who volunteer to complete this survey will be asked to come to a psychology lab in Wayne Hall 335 at West Chester University. Trained research assistants (Shereese Richardson, Leah Hamidian, Justin Schwoerer, Sarah Blose, Patrick Allen)
will administer the survey to the participants. First, information sheets about the purpose of the study will be displayed on the computer. Individuals will be asked to read the information sheet and click continue if they agree to participate in the study. Upon consent, participants will be asked to complete measures of core self-evaluation, citizenship behaviors, counterproductive behaviors, and teacher-member exchange. The survey will take approximately 25-30 minutes. After survey completion, Qualtrics will create a unique identifier code, and participants will be asked to provide a West Chester University email address for a peer. Participants will be providing their name, the peer's name and the peer's email address which will be kept in a secure file in the psychology lab in Wayne Hall 335. The study requires specifically West Chester University email addresses to ensure that each email address is valid and to more easily pay peers for their participation. As with participants, peers have to be 18 years or older to participate in the study. They will be thanked for participation and appropriate credit will be assigned via sona-system website.

After completion of the survey, Holly Gasper will send an email to each peer with the link to complete the peer portion of the survey and the unique identifier which will be used to link the participant survey and peer survey. Each peer will be asked to complete a survey regarding the participants' tendency to participate in citizenship behaviors and counterproductive behaviors. Participants will not have access to Peer responses and Peers will not have access to participant responses. Participants will be rewarded for completion of the survey with 1 research credit and peers will receive a $5.00 for completion of the survey. Upon completion of the peer survey, the participant and peer data will be matched only through the unique identifier and not through participant/peer name.

E. **CONFIDENTIALITY:** How will confidentiality of the data be maintained? Include the exact location (e.g., building and office number) of the signed originals of the Informed Consent Forms, the method of storage, and the names and titles of individuals having access to the consent documents and data. Specify the date for destruction of data (surveys, disks, etc.; must be a minimum of 3 years)? *(The faculty advisor should have full access and be able to produce the data in the case of an audit.)*

Participants and their peers will each provide their consent by reading the information sheet before beginning the study. No identifying information will be collected from the participants completing this study. However, participant's will provide their peer's email, which will be used to send the email and survey link. This data will not be used in any other manner and will remain secure on Holly Gasper's password protected computer.

There will be no way to link survey responses to survey participants as each participant will be given an identification number once the data is downloaded. While surveys of participants will be linked with their peer, any identifying information will not be obtained. Once data has been collected online, it will be exported in excel format into a password protected document and stored on Holly Gasper's password protected computer for a period of three years (September 2022). The laptop will remain at Holly Gasper's home located at 183 Carey Drive, West Chester PA, 19383. Holly Gasper and research supervisor, Dr. Vipanchi Mishra, will have access to the data collected from the study.

F. **RISKS & DISCOMFORTS:** Describe all known and anticipated risks to the participant that they may encounter in this research. (e.g. side effects, risks of placebo, deception, confidentiality breach). Include how you are mitigating them and how you will handle them in the event that they occur.

There are no known risks of participating in this study except that participants may feel uncomfortable answering questions regarding their behaviors at school and relationships with professors. Participants will be informed that their responses are confidential, and they are free to withdraw from the study at any time during the study without repercussions.

G. **BENEFITS:** Describe the anticipated benefits to participants by participating in this study. If there are none, please state that there is no direct benefit to the participant. Also, please state the importance of the knowledge that may reasonably be expected to result from this research study.

The results of this study would not directly benefit the participants. The study will, however, provide information which institutions can use to identify students who are likely to participate in citizenship behaviors and counterproductive behaviors. Institutions may use this information to identify when TSX relationship is likely to foster participation in SCBs or CSBs. Specifically, institutions may use this information to recognize when students have weak relationships with their professors and attempt to foster strong relationships to reduce instances of participation in CSBs while increasing participation in SCBs. They may also want to recruit students with strong TSX relationships and use these students to assist other students in creating better relationships. Once these cases have been identified, institutions can create intervention programs, training programs and assessment and evaluation techniques to foster citizenship behaviors and reduce counterproductive behaviors. This study will also add to the literature on student citizenship behaviors and counterproductive student behaviors while simultaneously introducing the term Teacher-Student Exchange (TSX)

CHECKLIST

(Please complete checklist **after** completing application)

I.	**Project Information**				
X	All appropriate fields are filled in.				
X	If this research is being undertaken with any non-WCU organization, a letter of approval from that organization is attached.				
X	Copies of questionnaires, surveys, etc. are attached.				
Is this protocol associated with an application for external funding?			Yes	X	No
II.A.	**Summary**				
X	Background with supporting evidence				
X	Major hypotheses or research questions are provided (if applicable).				
X	Research design has been reviewed by faculty advisor if submitted by a student.				
II.B.	**Selection of Subjects Identified**				
X	Source of subjects is identified.				
X	Include approximately how many.				
X	Selection criteria are explained.				
X	Contact method is explained.				
II.C	**Informed Consent Form**				
X	Consent process described step by step.				
X	Including location and who/how conducting consent process				
II.D	**Procedure Outlined**				
X	Step by step description of each procedure is provided.				
X	Frequency, duration and location of each procedure are provided.				
II.E	**Confidentiality**				
X	Location of signed Consent Form originals is identified.				
X	Method of storage is identified.				
X	Names of people with access are listed.				
X	The means for maintaining confidentiality are fully explained.				
II.F	**Risks**				
X	Known or anticipated risks are explained. Possible side effects, use of placebos, risks of normal treatment, etc. are fully explained.				
II.G	**Benefits**				
X	Anticipated benefits to the subject are described.				
X	Importance of resulting knowledge is described.				
APPENDIX	**Informed Consent Form**				
X	All relevant Informed Consent Forms are attached. (in English and translated if necessary if participant population is non- English speaking population)				
X	Contact information for Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (610-436-3557) is included.				
X	Appropriate language is used (usually 7th/8th grade language)				
The following bold headings must be included and explained in each informed consent form:					
X	X	Summary (must begin with a concise focused paragraph of key information)			
	X	Nature and Purpose of the Project.			
	X	Explanation of Procedures.			
	X	Identification of Any Experimental Medical Treatments or Procedures.			
	X	Discomfort and Risks.			
	X	Benefits			
	X	Confidentiality			

	X	Explanation of compensation, if any.
	X	Name of person to contact in case of research-related injury.
X	Withdrawal Notice is included.	
X	Any special circumstances dictated by the research design are included.	

Attachments:

Identify attachments that have been included and those that are not applicable (n/a).

	Attached	X	N/A	Copy of fliers, ads, posters, emails, web pages, letters for recruitment
	Attached	X	N/A	Scripts of intended conversations to participants to introduce the research
	Attached	X	N/A	Copies of IRB approvals or letters of permission from other sites
X	Attached		N/A	Copies of all instruments, surveys, focus group or interview questions, tests, etc.
X	Attached			CITI Human Subject Training Certificate(s) – **REQUIRED**

III.	**Signatures**
X	Faculty sponsor has reviewed the application in its entirety
X	All required signatures are present

Section III: Signatures

A. I certify that I have read the West Chester University Human Subjects Research Policy and to the best of my knowledge the information presented herein is an accurate reflection of the proposed research project.

1. I certify that all information provided in this application is complete and correct.
2. I understand that, as Principal Investigator, I have ultimate responsibility for the conduct of this study, the ethical performance this project, the protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects, and strict adherence to any stipulations imposed by the West Chester University IRB.
3. I certify that all individuals involved with the conduct of this project are qualified to carry out their specified roles and responsibilities and are in compliance with West Chester University policies regarding the collection and analysis of the research data.
4. I agree to comply with all West Chester policies and procedures, as well as with all applicable federal, state, and local laws regarding the protection of human subjects, including, but not limited to the following:
    a. Conducting the project by qualified personnel according to the approved protocol
    b. Implementing no changes in the approved protocol or consent form without prior approval from the IRB
    c. Obtaining the legally effective informed consent from each participant or their legally responsible representative prior to their participation in this project using only the currently approved, stamped consent form
    d. Promptly reporting significant adverse events and/or effects to the IRB in writing within 5 working days of the occurrence.
5. If I will be unavailable to direct this research personally, I will arrange for a co-investigator to assume direct responsibility in my absence. This person has been named as co-investigator in this application, or I will advise the IRB, by letter, in advance of such arrangements.

	6. I agree to conduct this study only during the period approved by West Chester University IRB. 7. I will prepare and submit a renewal request and supply all supporting documents to the IRB before the approval period has expired if it is necessary to continue the research project beyond the time period approved by the West Chester University IRB. 8. I will prepare and submit a final report upon completion of this research project. My signature indicates that I have read, understand and agree to conduct this research project in accordance with the assurances listed above.		
PI Signature:	**Holly L. Gasper**	Date:	**8/20/2019**
Co-PI Signature:		Date:	
Co-PI Signature:		Date:	
B.	**Approval by faculty sponsor (required when PI is a student):**		
	1. By my signature as faculty advisor/sponsor on this research application, I certify that the student or guest investigator is knowledgeable about the regulations and policies governing research with human subjects and has sufficient training and experience to conduct this particular study in accord with the approved protocol. *2. I certify that the project will be performed by qualified personnel according to the approved protocol using conventional or experimental methodology.* *3. I agree to meet with the investigator on a regular basis to monitor study progress.* *4. Should problems arise during the course of the study, I agree to be available, personally, to supervise the investigator in solving them.* *5. I assure that the investigator will promptly report significant adverse events and/or effects to the IRB in writing within 5 working days of the occurrence.* *6. If I will be unavailable, I will arrange for an alternate faculty sponsor to assume responsibility during my absence, and I will advise the IRB by letter of such arrangements. If the investigator is unable to fulfill requirements for submission of renewals, modifications or the final report, I will assume that responsibility.* *7. I have read the application in its entirety and affirm the content accuracy, clarity, and methodology.* *8. I accept the responsibility for the conduct of this research, the supervision of human subjects, and maintenance of informed consent documentation as required by the IRB.* *9. I understand that I should have full access to the data and be able to produce the data in the case of an audit.*		
Signature	**Vipanchi Mishra**	*Date*	**08/20/2019**

Insert Attachments here

- Student Participant Consent Form
- Peer Consent Form
- Student Participant Questionnaire
    - Core Self-Evaluation Measure
    - Student Citizenship Behavior Measure
    - Counterproductive Student Behavior Measure
    - Teacher-Student Exchange Measure
    - Demographics
- Email Script to Peer
- Peer Questionnaire
    - Student Citizenship Behavior Measure
    - Counterproductive Student Behavior Measure
    - Demographics
- CITI Training Certifications
    - Holly Gasper
    - Vipanchi Mishra
    - Shereese Richardson
    - Leah Hamidian
    - Justin Schwoerer
    - Sarah Blose
    - Patrick Allen

Student Participant Consent Form

[Note: This information sheet will be presented as the first page of the online survey.]

Project Title: A Study of Core Self-Evaluation, Student Citizenship Behaviors, and Counterproductive Student Behaviors

Investigator(s): Holly Gasper; Dr. Vipanchi Mishra

Project Overview:

Participation in this research project is voluntary and is being done by Holly Gasper as part of her Master's Thesis to identify if Core Self-Evaluation can be used as a predictor of student behaviors in school and how certain relationships influence participation in these behaviors. It will take about 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire. There are no known risks of participating in this study except that participants may feel uncomfortable answering questions regarding their behaviors and relationships with professors. This research will help provide information which institutions can use to identify students who are likely to participate in citizenship behaviors and counterproductive behaviors.

The research project is being done by Holly Gasper as part of her Master's Thesis to identify if Core Self-Evaluation can be used as a predictor of student behaviors and how certain relationships influence participation in behaviors. If you would like to take part, West Chester University requires that you agree and sign this consent form.

You may ask Holly Gasper any questions to help you understand this study. If you don't want to be a part of this study, it won't affect any of your studies from West Chester University. If you choose to be a part of this study, you have the right to change your mind and stop being a part of the study at any time.

1. **What is the purpose of this study?**
    - The purpose of this study is to identify if Core Self-Evaluation can be used as a predictor of student behaviors and how certain relationships influence participation in these behaviors.
2. **If you decide to be a part of this study, you will be asked to do the following:**
    - Complete survey Questionnaire, this survey will take 30 minutes of your time
    - At the end of the survey provide name and email address of one of your peers enrolled at WCU
3. **Are there any experimental medical treatments?**
    - No
4. **Is there any risk to me?**
    - Possible risks or sources of discomfort include: There are no known risks of participating in this study except that participants may feel uncomfortable answering questions regarding their behaviors and relationships with professors.
    - If you experience discomfort, you have the right to withdraw at any time.
5. **Is there any benefit to me?**
    - This study will provide information which institutions can use to identify students who are likely to participate in citizenship behaviors and counterproductive behaviors.
6. **How will you protect my privacy?**
    - The session will **not** be recorded.

- Your records will be private. Only Holly Gasper, Dr. Vipanchi Mishra, the student's faculty advisor, will have access to the data collected as a part of this study.
- Your name will **not** be used in any reports.
- Records will be stored:
  - Password Protected File/Computer
- Records will be destroyed Three Years After Study Completion

7. **Do I get paid to take part in this study?**
   - Participants will receive 1 Research Credit for participation in this study.
8. **Who do I contact in case of research related injury?**
   - For any questions with this study, contact:
     - **Primary Investigator:** Holly Gasper at 570-614-4118 or HG829826@wcupa.edu
     - **Faculty Sponsor:** Vipanchi Mishra at 610-430-5942 or vmishra@wcupa.edu
     - Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (610-436-3557)
9. **What will you do with my Identifiable Information/Biospecimens?**
   - Not applicable.

For any questions about your rights in this research study, contact the ORSP at 610-436-3557.

By proceeding in the survey, I am confirming that I have read this form and I understand the statements in this form. I am confirming that I am 18 years of age or older. I know that if I am uncomfortable with this study, I can stop at any time.

_____(click to continue)

Peer Consent Form

[Note: This information sheet will be presented as the first page of the online survey.]

Project Title: A Study of Core Self-Evaluation, Student Citizenship Behaviors, and Counterproductive Student Behaviors

Investigator(s): Holly Gasper; Dr. Vipanchi Mishra

Project Overview:

Participation in this research project is voluntary and is being done by Holly Gasper as part of her Master's Thesis to identify if Core Self-Evaluation can be used as a predictor of student behaviors in school and how certain relationships influence participation in these behaviors. It will take about 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire and you will be answering questions related to your peer at West Chester University. There are no known risks of participating in this study except that participants may feel uncomfortable answering questions regarding the behaviors of their peer. This research will help provide information which institutions can use to identify students who are likely to participate in citizenship behaviors and counterproductive behaviors.

The research project is being done by Holly Gasper as part of her Master's Thesis to identify if Core Self-Evaluation can be used as a predictor of student behaviors and how certain relationships influence participation in behaviors. If you would like to take part, West Chester University requires that you agree and sign this consent form.

You may ask Holly Gasper any questions to help you understand this study. If you don't want to be a part of this study, it won't affect any of your studies from West Chester University. If you choose to be a part of this study, you have the right to change your mind and stop being a part of the study at any time.

1. **What is the purpose of this study?**
    - The purpose of this study is to identify if Core Self-Evaluation can be used as a predictor of student behaviors and how certain relationships influence participation in these behaviors.
2. **If you decide to be a part of this study, you will be asked to do the following:**
    - Complete a survey Questionnaire regarding behaviors of your peer at school
    - This study will take about 30 minutes of your time.
3. **Are there any experimental medical treatments?**
    - No
4. **Is there any risk to me?**
    - Possible risks or sources of discomfort include: There are no known risks of participating in this study except that participants may feel uncomfortable answering questions regarding their behaviors and relationships with professors.
    - If you experience discomfort, you have the right to withdraw at any time.
5. **Is there any benefit to me?**
    - This study will provide information which institutions can use to identify students who are likely to participate in citizenship behaviors and counterproductive behaviors.
6. **How will you protect my privacy?**
    - The session will **not** be recorded.

- Your records will be private. Only Holly Gasper, Dr. Vipanchi Mishra, the student's faculty advisor, will have access to the data collected as a part of this study.
- Your name will **not** be used in any reports.
- Records will be stored:
  - Password Protected File/Computer
- Records will be destroyed Three Years After Study Completion

7. **Do I get paid to take part in this study?**
   - Participants will receive 1 Research Credit for participation in this study.
8. **Who do I contact in case of research related injury?**
   - For any questions with this study, contact:
     - **Primary Investigator:** Holly Gasper at 570-614-4118 or HG829826@wcupa.edu
     - **Faculty Sponsor:** Vipanci Mishra at 610-430-5942 or vmishra@wcupa.edu
     - Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (610-436-3557)
9. **What will you do with my Identifiable Information/Biospecimens?**
   - Not applicable.

For any questions about your rights in this research study, contact the ORSP at 610-436-3557.

By proceeding in the survey, I am confirming that I have read this form and I understand the statements in this form. I am confirming that I am 18 years of age or older. I know that if I am uncomfortable with this study, I can stop at any time.

_____ (click to continue)

Participant Questionnaire

Core Self-Evaluation Measure

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E., & Thoresen, C. J. (2003). The Core Self-Evaluations Scale: Development of a measure. *Personnel Psychology, 56*(2), 303-331. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744 6570.2003.tb00152.x

Instructions: Below are several statements about you with which you may agree or disagree. Using the response scale below, indicate your agreement or disagreement with each item by placing the appropriate number on the line preceding that item.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

1. - I am confident I get the success I deserve in life.
2. -Sometimes I feel depressed. (r)
3. - When I try, I generally succeed.
4. - Sometimes when I fail I feel worthless. (r)
5. - I complete tasks successfully.
6. - Sometimes, I do not feel in control of my work. (r)
7. - Overall, I am satisfied with myself.
8. - I am filled with doubts about my competence. (r)
9. -1 determine what will happen in my life.
10. - I do not feel in control of my success in my career. (r)
11. - I am capable of coping with most of my problems.
12. -There are times when things look pretty bleak and hopeless to me. (r)

r = reverse scored. This measure is nonproprietary (free) and may be used without permission.

Student Citizenship Behaviors in College

Lee, K. and Allen, N.J. (2002) Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Workplace Deviance: The Role of Affect and Cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 131-142. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021 9010.87.1.131

Instructions: Please complete the following questionnaire with respect to your behaviors at college in the past 6 months. Your participation in this survey is voluntary and you can withdraw at any point.

Below is a list of behaviors you may have performed at school in the past six months . Using the following scale, indicate how frequently you participated in these behaviors in the past 6 months.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	Very Frequently

OCBI Items

1. Helped other students who have been absent.

2. Willingly gave your time to help other students who have school related problems

3. Went out of the way to make newer students feel welcome in the at school.

4. Showed genuine concern and courtesy toward classmates, even under the most trying situations.

5. Shared personal property with other students to help them in school work.

OCBO Items

1. Attended functions that are not required but that help the college/university image.

2. Kept up with developments in the college/university.

3. Defended the college/university when other students criticized it.

4. Showed pride when representing the college/university in public.

5. Offered ideas to improve the functioning of the college/university.

6. Expressed loyalty toward the college/university.

7. Took action to protect the college/university from potential problems.

8. Demonstrated concern about the image of the college/university.

Counterproductive Student Behaviors in College

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(3), 349-360. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349

Gruys, M.L. (1999) The Dimensionality of Deviant Employee Performance in the Workplace. University of Minnesota.

Instructions: Below is a list of behaviors you may have performed at school. Using the following scale, indicate how frequently you participated in these behaviors in the past 6 months at school.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	Very Frequently

1. Engaged in alcohol consumption in the classroom.
2. Argued or fought with a peer.
3. Deliberately bent or broke a rule(s)
4. Defaced, damaged, or destroyed property, equipment, or product belonging to the institution.
5. Disobeyed professor's instructions.
6. Spread false rumors or gossip about a peer.
7. Covered up mistakes.
8. Came to class under the influence of drugs
9. Had your performance affected due to a hangover from alcohol.
10. Made unwanted sexual advances toward a peer.
11. Saw peers engage in unacceptable behavior and not report it.
12. Intentionally performed your work below acceptable standards.
13. Intentionally came to class late.
14. Argued or fought with a professor.
15. Was absent from class without a legitimate excuse
16. Lied to a professor or supervisor to cover up a mistake.
17. Played computer games during class time.
18. Verbally abused a professor.
19. Spread false rumors about the institution
20. Used sexually explicit language in the classroom.
21. Spent too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead of completing school work.
22. Made fun of someone in class
23. Said something hurtful to someone in class
24. Repeated a rumor or gossip about your institution
25. Made an ethnic, religious, or racial remark or joke in class
26. Lost your temper while in class
27. Neglected to follow your professor’s instructions
28. Intentionally worked slower than you could have worked
29. Played a mean prank on someone in class
30. Left your work for someone else to finish
31. Acted rudely toward someone in class

32. Put little effort into your work at school
33. Publicly embarrassed someone in class

Teacher-Student Exchange (TSX)

This questionnaire contains items that ask you to describe your relationship with your professors in general. For each of the ten questions, the responses are:

Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Don't Know = 3, Agree = 4, and Strongly Agree = 5.

1. My professors are satisfied with my work.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

2. My professors would help me with my school problems.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

3. My professors have confidence in my ideas.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

6. My professors and I have mutually helpful relationships.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

7. My professors have trust that I would carry my workload.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

8. My professors are some of my leaders.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

9. My professors have respect for my capabilities.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

10. I have excellent working relationships with my professors.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Demographic Questionnaire:

1. Which of the following categories below best describes your gender?
   (a) Male
   (b) Female
   (c) Other

2. What is your current age?
   (a) 18-25
   (b) 26- 35
   (c) 35+

3. Which of the following best describes your racial ancestry?
   ____ American Indian
   ____ Asian-American/Oriental/Pacific Islander
   ____ Asian East Indian
   ____ Black/African-American
   ____ Mexican-American/Chicano
   ____ Puerto-Rican
   ____ Other Hispanic
   ____ White/Caucasian
   ____ Other

4. What is your current year in college?
   (a) First-Year
   (b) Sophomore
   (c) Junior
   (d) Senior
   (e) Graduate Student

5. Please provide a West Chester University email address for a peer you feel confident answering questions about your behavior at school. This peer can be any student who is currently enrolled at WCU with an @wcupa.edu email address and should be 18 years of age or older. Your peer should be someone who you feel knows you well enough to answer questions regarding your behaviors at school. Please reach out to your peer mentioning that they should be receiving an email from Holly Gasper (HG829826@wcupa.edu) with the survey link within the next week.

The following email will be sent to the peer by Holly Gasper upon completion of the survey by the participant.

Email Script to Peer

Dear [insert peer name here].

You are receiving this email because your peer would like you to complete a survey on their behalf regarding their behaviors at school (e.g., in classes, on campus, etc.). This peer should have mentioned that you would be receiving this email and I hope you will take the time to answer the survey questions using the following link

This survey should take no longer that 20 minutes to complete. You will be asked to enter the following Unique Identifier to complete the survey [Insert ID here]. Upon completion and validation of responses, you will receive a 5.00 gift card through email for Amazon.com.

Please address any questions to HG829826@wcupa.edu or VMishra@wcupa.edu.

Thank you in advance for completing this survey,
Holly Gasper
Master's Student-Industrial and Organizational Psychology
HG829826@wcupa.edu

Peer Questionnaire

Please type the unique identifier provided in your email into the space provided below.

_____

Please complete the following questionnaire with respect to your **peer's behaviors** at college in the past 6 months. Your participation in this survey is voluntary and you can withdraw at any point.

Student Citizenship Behaviors in College

Lee, K. and Allen, N.J. (2002) Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Workplace Deviance: The Role of Affect and Cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 131-142. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021 9010.87.1.131

Instructions: Below is a list of behaviors you may have witnesses your peer perform. Using the following scale, indicate how frequently they participated in these behaviors in the past 6 months.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	Very Frequently

OCBI Items

1. Helped other students who have been absent.

2. Willingly gave their time to help other students who have school related problems

3. Went out of the way to make newer students feel welcome in the at school.

4. Showed genuine concern and courtesy toward classmates, even under the most trying situations.

5. Shared personal property with other students to help them in school work.

OCBO Items

1. Attended functions that are not required but that help the college/university image.

2. Kept up with developments in the college/university.

3. Defended the college/university when other students criticized it.

4. Showed pride when representing the college/university in public.

5. Offered ideas to improve the functioning of the college/university.

6. Expressed loyalty toward the college/university.

7. Took action to protect the college/university from potential problems.

8. Demonstrated concern about the image of the college/university.

Counterproductive Student Behaviors in College

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(3), 349-360. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349

Gruys, M.L. (1999) The Dimensionality of Deviant Employee Performance in the Workplace. University of Minnesota.

Instructions: Below is a list of behaviors you may have witnessed your peer perform. Using the following scale, indicate how frequently they participated in these behaviors in the past 6 months.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	Very Frequently

1. Engaged in alcohol consumption in the classroom.
2. Argued or fought with a peer.
3. Deliberately bent or broke a rule(s)
4. Defaced, damaged, or destroyed property, equipment, or product belonging to the institution.
5. Disobeyed professor's instructions.
6. Spread false rumors or gossip about a peer.
7. Covered up mistakes.
8. Came to class under the influence of drugs
9. Their performance has been affected due to a hangover from alcohol.
10. Made unwanted sexual advances toward a peer.
11. Saw peers engage in unacceptable behavior and not report it.
12. Intentionally performed their work below acceptable standards.
13. Intentionally came to class late.
14. Argued or fought with a professor or supervisor.
15. Was absent from class without a legitimate excuse
16. Lied to professor or supervisor to cover up a mistake.
17. Played computer games during class time.
18. Verbally abused a professor.
19. Spread false rumors about the institution
20. Used sexually explicit language in the classroom.
21. Spent too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead of completing school work.
22. Made fun of someone in class
23. Said something hurtful to someone in class
24. Repeated a rumor or gossip about the institution
25. Made an ethnic, religious, or racial remark or joke in class
26. Lost their temper while in class

27. Neglected to follow their professor's instructions
28. Intentionally worked slower than they could have worked
29. Played a mean prank on someone in class
30. Left their work for someone else to finish
31. Acted rudely toward someone in class
32. Put little effort into their work at school
33. Publicly embarrassed someone in class

Demographic Questionnaire:

6. Which of the following categories below best describes your gender?
   (a) Male
   (b) Female
   (c) Other

7. What is your current age?
   (a)18-25
   (b)26- 35
   (c) 35+

8. Which of the following best describes your racial ancestry?
   ____ American Indian
   ____ Asian-American/Oriental/Pacific Islander
   ____ Asian East Indian
   ____ Black/African-American
   ____ Mexican-American/Chicano
   ____ Puerto-Rican
   ____ Other Hispanic
   ____ White/Caucasian
   ____ Other

9. What is your current year in college?
(a) First-Year
(b) Sophomore
(c) Junior
(d) Senior
(e) Graduate Student

Appendix B

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs | West Chester University | Wayne Hall
West Chester, PA 19383 | 610-436-3557 | www.wcupa.edu

Protocol ID # 20190926A

TO: Holly Gasper, Dr. Vipanchi Mishra, & Student Research Team

FROM: Nicole M. Cattano, Ph.D.
Co-Chair, WCU Institutional Review Board (IRB)

DATE: 9/25/2019

Project Title: Needs Assessment for WCU PASSHE Resource Pantry

Notification of Initial Study Exemption Determination

☒ **Exempt From Further Review**

This Initial Study submission meets the criteria for exemption per the regulations found at 45 CFR 46.104 (2 iii). As such, a limited review was conducted and additional IRB review is not required.

The determination that your research is exempt does not expire, therefore, annual review is not required and no expiration date will be listed on your approval letter. If changes to the research are proposed that would alter the IRB's original exemption determination, they should be submitted to the WCU IRB for approval, using the IRB application form (check off I.G. Revision).

Your research study will be archived 3 years after initial determination. If your Exempt study is archived, you can continue conducting research activities as the IRB has made the determination that your project met one of required exempt categories. The only caveat is that no changes can be made to the application. If a change is needed, you will need to submit a NEW Exempt application. Please see www.wcupa.edu/research/irb.aspx for more information.

However, it is very important that you *close-out your project when completed or if you leave the university*. Faculty mentors are responsible for oversight of student projects and should ensure exempt studies are completed and closed-out before the student leaves the university.

The Principal Investigator and/or faculty mentor is responsible for ensuring compliance with any applicable local government or institutional laws, legislation, regulations, and/or policies, whether conducting research internationally or nationally. Please contact the WCU Office of Sponsored Research and Programs at irb@wcupa.edu with any questions.

Sincerely,

Co-Chair of WCU IRB

WCU Institutional Review Board (IRB)
IORG#: IORG0004242
IRB#: IRB00005030
FWA#: FWA00014155

West Chester University is a member of the State System of Higher Education